

THE ANNALS OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY

OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE UNITED STATES

VOLUME X, 1962-1963

NUMBER 1-2 (29-30)

STUDIES IN POLITICAL SCIENCE AND HISTORY: THEODORE
B. CIUCIURA, ALEXANDER DOMBROWSKY, LEONID C. SONE-
VYTSKY

REVIEW ARTICLE: PETRO ODARCHENKO

BOOK REVIEWS: ALEXANDER ARCHIMOVICH, VSEVOLOD
HOLUBNYCHY, NEONILA KORDYSH, VASYL MARKUS

OBITUARIES

CHRONICLE

INDEX TO VOLUMES I-X: JOSEPH DANKO

INDEX TO PORTRAITS

INDEX TO CHRONICLE



The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S. are published by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S., Inc.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: Alexander Archimovich, *President of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States* Dmitry Čiževsky, *Heidelberg University* Alexander Granovsky, *University of Minnesota* John S. Reshetar, Jr., *University of Washington* George Y. Shevelov, *Columbia University* Volodymyr P. Timoshenko, *Stanford University*

EDITOR: Leonid C. Sonevytsky

The views expressed by contributors are not necessarily those of the editor of *The Annals*

All correspondence, orders, and remittances should be addressed to *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.*, 206 West 100 Street, New York, New York 10025

SUBSCRIPTION RATE FOR ONE VOLUME: \$6.00

Price of this volume: \$6.00

Copyright 1964, by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S., Inc.

THE ANNALS OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS
AND SCIENCES IN THE U.S., INC.

VOLUME X, 1962-1963

NUMBER 1 (29)

CONTENTS

STUDIES IN POLITICAL SCIENCE AND HISTORY

- Lenin's Idea of a Multinational Commonwealth 3
THEODORE B. CIUCIURA
- The Ukrainian Question in R. H. Lord's Writings on the Paris
Peace Conference of 1919 65
LEONID C. SONEVYTSKY
- Herodotus and Hippocrates on the Anthropology of the Scyth-
ians 85
ALEXANDER DOMBROWSKY

REVIEW ARTICLE

- A Survey of Publications on Ukrainian Ethnography and Folk-
lore in the Years 1957-1962 92
PETRO ODARCHENKO

BOOK REVIEWS

- Yaroslav Pasternak, *Arkheolohiya Ukrayiny* (Neonila Kordysh) 111
- Robert S. Sullivant, *Soviet Politics and the Ukraine, 1917-1957*
(Vsevolod Holubnychy) 112
- Akademiya Nauk Ukrayins'koyi RSR. Sektor Derzhavy i Prava,
Istoriya derzhavy i prava Ukrayins'koyi RSR, 1917-1960
(Vasyl Markus) 116
- Studies on the Soviet Union*. New Series. Volume II, Number
I: Special Issue on Agriculture in the USSR (Alexander
Archimovich) 123

OBITUARIES

Volodymyr Doroshenko (Wolodymyr Mijakowskyj)	126
Volodymyr Sichynsky (Damian Horniatkevych)	131
Ivan Kabachkiv (Iwan Zamsha)	134
Mykola Efremov (Alexander Archimovich)	136
Ivan Bahryanyi (Hryhory Kostiuk)	139
Todos' Os'machka (Jurij Lawrynenko)	141
Mykhaylo Orest-Zerov (Oleh Zujewskyj)	144
Andriy Derevyanko (L. D.)	145
CHRONICLE	147
A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION	163
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	164

Lenin's Idea of a Multinational Commonwealth

THEODORE B. CIUCIURA

For a long time certain relevant passages of *The Communist Manifesto* were used by many socialists as the criteria for evaluating the system of antagonistic nation-states and the widespread rule by aliens in the world's dependent countries. The *Manifesto* appealed to workers of the world to maintain international solidarity in their struggle against capitalism. The proletarian world revolution was to destroy not only the capitalist social order, but the whole system of nation-states, as well as "the exploitation of one nation by another"; in the new supra-national world community the "national differences and antagonisms between peoples," already on the wane in capitalistic society, would "vanish still faster."¹ This prophesy has not materialized. One century later, contrary to the expectations of Marx and Engels, the nation-state system still exists, and national differences and antagonisms between peoples are very much in evidence.

The new Communist community of nations, originated by Lenin and the Bolsheviks in the years from 1917 to 1923 and extended after World War II, now controls approximately one third of the earth's surface and more than one third of all humanity. This fact, as well as a certain widening of the political influence of this community upon other countries of Asia, Africa, and even America, has tended to focus the attention of many writers on the changed role of the Soviet Union in the field of international relations, and on the subject of supra-national cooperation and integration within the Communist bloc of states.²

¹ *The Communist Blueprint for the Future: The Complete Texts of All Four Communist Manifestos, 1848-1961*, introd. Thomas P. Whitney (New York, 1962), p. 29. S. F. Bloom explains in *The World of Nations: A Study of the National Implications in the Work of Karl Marx* (New York, 1941), that this phrase does not mean "the complete disappearance of all national distinctions whatsoever, but specifically the abolition of sharp economic and social differences" (p. 26), and offers a searching analysis of Marx's positive attitude toward nationality (acceptance of the nation as a substantial historical entity), and his internationalist rather than cosmopolitan view of the organization of the world.

² Milovan Djilas brings this out with great clarity and anger in *Lenin on Relations Between Socialist States* (New York, Yugoslav Information Center, 1950),

However, the Communist community of nations already existed, in the form of the multinational USSR even before World War II. Many concepts, methods of action, and political relationships within the Soviet bloc of nations on which attention is focused at the present time originated and were applied at the international or, at least, quasi-international level in the dealings of the Russian Federation (RSFSR) with her neighbors before the Nazi German invasion. The whole complex of these concepts, methods of action, and political relationships is well-known as the Soviet nationality (nationalities or "national") policy, and a number of works has been published on the subject in the Soviet Union as well as in the West.³

These works may be grouped into four categories. The first and largest deals with general aspects of the Soviet nationality policy. Soviet publications on the subject—both early and more recent ones—are all highly favorable. Western publications range from a few commendatory accounts (especially in the early period of the existence of the USSR) to more numerous critical ones (especially during the Stalinist era); the more detailed works tend to be more critical.⁴

an abridged translation of his article published in the September 1949 issue of the *Komunist*, the official organ of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. Djilas states that "the newest phase of international development is characterized by the spread of Socialism, by the co-existence of a whole series of Socialist states, and by the continued fundamental weakening of capitalism" (p. 6). However, he accuses the Soviet Union of being "the wreckers of the international solidarity of workers and the violators of the equality of peoples" (p. 7); "their actions are not only contrary to Marx's and Lenin's doctrine regarding relations between socialist countries and workers' parties, but are a direct and deliberate revision of the teachings of this doctrine" (p. 8). Another writer draws the outlines of the Soviet design for a world state and contrasts "Soviet statements concerning the completely voluntary nature of an ever-expanding Soviet state with the Soviet practice, grounded in theoretical justification for war, of subjugating nations by means of crude military force." Elliot R. Goodman, *The Soviet Design for a World State* (New York, 1960), p. XVII.

³ Cf. Djilas' statement that "Lenin's theory on relations between socialist states is an integral part of his theory regarding the national question" (p. 49).

⁴ The most representative are: Walter R. Batsell, *Soviet Rule in Russia* (New York, 1929), chs. III, X; Hans Kohn, *Nationalism in the Soviet Union* (New York, 1933), and his "The Nationality Policy of the Soviet Union," in Samuel N. Harper, ed., *The Soviet Union and World-Problems* (Chicago, 1935); C. A. Macartney, *National States and National Minorities* (London, 1934); Werner von Harpe, *Die Grundsätze der Nationalitätenpolitik Lenins* (Berlin, 1941); John Maynard, "The Nationalities," in his *The Russian Peasant and Other Studies* (London, 1942); Jacob Robinson, "The Soviet Solution of the Minorities Problem," in R. M. MacIver, ed., *Group Relations and Group Antagonism: A Series of Addresses and Discussions* (New York, 1944); Anna Louise Strong, *Peoples of the USSR* (New

To the second category belong special studies on the status of non-Russian nationalities in the USSR, many of them on the Ukraine, the second largest republic of the Union.⁵ Works on Soviet federalism form the third category. All western works (with one notable exception) purport to be unable to find evidence of true federalism in the USSR, even despite the amendment of the Soviet Union's Constitution in 1944, and the constitutional changes that were made after 1956, when the Soviet ministerial system was revised and the republics' administrative powers were increased.⁶ The Soviet concept of the self-determination of nations is discussed in the works of the fourth category,⁷ and a subdivision of this group includes works deal-

York, 1944); Corliss Lamont, *The Peoples of the Soviet Union* (New York, 1946); Josef Winternitz, *Stalin und die nationale Frage* (Berlin, 1950); Roman Smal-Stocki, *The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian Communist Imperialism* (Milwaukee, 1952); Walter Kolarz, *Russia and Her Colonies* (3d ed.; New York, 1953); Richard Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and Nationalism, 1917-1923* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954)—includes extensive bibliography on the problem of non-Russian nationalities in the USSR—see also bibliography in the works by J. Borys (see note 5), and G. Decker (see note 7); Rudolf Schlesinger, "Introduction," *The Nationalities Problem and Soviet Administration: Selected Readings on the Development of Soviet Nationalities Policy* (London, 1956). It is well worth studying the following Soviet works: G. Safarov, *Natsional'nyi vopros i proletariat* (Petrograd, 1922); M. Ravich-Cherkasskii, *Markszim i natsional'nyi vopros* (Kharkiv, 1923); G. I. Broido, *Natsional'nyi i kolonial'nyi vopros* (Moscow, 1924); N. N. Popov, *Lenin o natsional'nom voprose* (Moscow, 1924); M. Velikovskii and I. Levin, eds., *Natsional'nyi vopros: Khrestomatiya* (2 vols.; Moscow, 1931); A. Rysakoff, *The National Policy of the Soviet Union* (New York, 1931); L. Perchik, *How the Soviet Government Solves the National Question* (Moscow, 1932); M. Chekalin, *The National Question in the Soviet Union* (New York, 1941); S. K. Erygin and F. D. Ryzhenko, *Leninskaya programma po natsional'nomu voprosu* (Moscow, 1959).

⁵ Basil Dmytryshyn, *Moscow and the Ukraine, 1918-1953: A Study of Russian Bolshevik Nationality Policy* (New York, 1956); Jurij Borys, *The Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine: A Study in the Communist Doctrine of the Self-Determination of Nations* (Stockholm, 1960); Olaf K. Caroe, *Soviet Empire: The Turks of Central Asia and Stalinism* (London, 1953); Walter Kolarz, *The Peoples of the Soviet Far East* (London, 1954).

⁶ Rudolf Schlesinger, *Federalism in Central and Eastern Europe* (London, 1945), too commendatory but a valuable account; see also V. V. Aspaturian, "The Theory and Practice of Soviet Federalism," *Journal of Politics*, XII, No. 1 (1950). Karel Hulička's "Soviet Federalism," in Clifford A. L. Rich, ed., *European Politics and Government: A Comparative Approach* (New York, 1962), is fairly representative for the general appraisal of Soviet federalism in other works on comparative study of government by Herman Finer, Robert G. Neumann, Samuel H. Beer and Adam B. Ulam, and others.

⁷ Of special interest are: Alfred Cobban, *National Self-Determination* (London, 1944), ch. XI; Edward Hallett Carr, "The Bolshevik Doctrine of Self-Determina-

ing with the influence of the Soviet slogan of national self-determination on the peoples of Asia and Africa.⁸ In a way, recent works on the new role of the Soviet Union with respect to international relations in general, and more particularly within the Soviet bloc, constitute a fifth category.⁹

In many of the above-mentioned works the role of the original architect of Soviet nationality policy and federalism is incorrectly assigned to Stalin, and the importance of Lenin as the chief contributor is not adequately stressed. Lenin's far greater theoretical contributions to Soviet nationality policy were elaborated by the writer of this article¹⁰ in 1953 and by Alfred D. Low in 1958.¹¹ "There can

tion," in his *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1923*, I (London, 1950); Pierre Vergnaud, *L'idée de la nationalité et de la libre disposition des peuples dans ses rapports avec l'idée de l'État (Etude des doctrines politiques contemporaines), 1870-1950* (Geneva, 1955), ch. VI; Günter Decker, *Das Selbstbestimmungsrecht der Nationen* (Göttingen, 1955), ch. VIII; Samad Shaheen, *The Communist (Bolshevik) Theory of National Self-Determination* (The Hague, 1956); G. Starushenko, *The Principle of National Self-Determination in Soviet Foreign Policy* (Moscow, 1963).

⁸ See Demetrio Boersner, *Bolsheviks and the National and Colonial Question, 1917-1928* (Geneva, 1957); Frederick C. Barghoorn, "Nationality Doctrine in Soviet Political Strategy," *Review of Politics*, XVI, No. 3 (1954); Rupert Emerson, *From Empire to Nation: The Rise to Self-Assertion of Asia and Africa* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960). See also Julian Towster, "Soviet Policy on Nationalities," *Antioch Review*, XI, No. 4 (1951), pp. 437-48 ("force of example . . . and reliance on a bandwagon psychology to win new segments of humanity for the Communist cause," p. 447); and Kolarz, *Russia and Her Colonies*, pp. 303-19 (ch. X: "Soviet Nationalities Policy as a World Problem").

⁹ There has been a widespread tendency among international lawyers and political scientists to disregard the practical importance of the 1944 amendment to the Constitution of the USSR which granted (i.e., returned) to the Union's republics the right to conduct their own foreign relations. However, one writer asserts that "the juridical capacity of the Republics to embark on diplomatic adventures meets the formal canons of internal and international law," and "at opportune moments it may be transmuted into concrete diplomatic benefits." Vernon V. Aspaturian, "The Union Republics and Soviet Diplomacy: Concepts, Institutions, and Practice," *American Political Science Review*, LIII, No. 2 (1959), 383. The theoretical as well as practical aspects of the growth of the Communist community of nations after World War II are ably discussed in other recent works: Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), Paul Shoup, "Communism, Nationalism, and the Growth of the Communist Community of Nations After World War II," *American Political Science Review*, LVI, No. 4 (1962), 886-98.

¹⁰ "The Nationality Question and Lenin's Idea of a Multinational State: Critical Notes" (unpublished Master's thesis, Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University in the City of New York, 1953).

¹¹ *Lenin on the Question of Nationality* (New York, 1958).

be little doubt about the role in the realm at first of theory and then of practice which Stalin played in shaping the national policy of the Soviet Union," states Dr. Low. "A comparison, however, of Lenin's and Stalin's writings on the problem of nationality prior to 1917 clearly reveals Stalin's dependence on Lenin. . . . Lenin was the guiding hand and the more important and more original thinker."¹² He also correctly notes the "striking renaissance" of the Leninist policy after Stalin's demise, as well as the fact that "Lenin's ideas on nationality were developed with the view to the proletariat's exploiting the grievances of oppressed nationalities, primarily in Russia, but also in other multinational states and colonial empires," and that his nationality program always had "general significance and universal applicability."¹³

However, this writer cannot accept, without reservations, the statement of Dr. Low that "self-determination is presented by Lenin as the real core of his and the Bolsheviks' nationality program."¹⁴ In the writer's opinion, the concept of national self-determination and the right to independence was the second stage in the dialectical development of Lenin's idea of a multinational commonwealth. The first stage was a transformation of the multinational Russian Empire by the granting of limited and territorially conditioned autonomy to non-Russian nationalities, and the third stage—Lenin's federalistic design—was a peculiar combination of the two preceding stages. The core of Lenin's idea of a multinational commonwealth, as in his political thought generally, is his concept of a monolithic Communist party implementing the Marxist concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin's idea of a multinational commonwealth is worthy of notice, having been designed not only for the Russian and neighboring peoples. "The Russian model," Lenin stated in 1920, "reveals to all countries something, and something very essential, of their near and inevitable future."¹⁵

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 12–13. See also Decker, p. 157.

¹⁴ Alfred D. Low, *Lenin on the Question of Nationality* (New York, 1958), p. 30. Cf. Starushenko, p. 234 ("the principle of self-determination . . . the cornerstone of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the national question").

¹⁵ Quoted in A. Denisov and M. Kirichenko, *Soviet State Law* (Moscow, 1960), p. 145 (from Lenin's work *The Infantile Disease of 'Leftism' in Communism*).

THE FIRST STAGE OF THE FORMATION OF THE IDEA:
LENIN AND THE MULTINATIONAL RUSSIAN EMPIRE

Lenin's idea of a multinational commonwealth was less a product of Russian political thought and Marxist ideology than it was an organizational and conceptual strategy evolved to meet the exigencies of political action of the Bolshevik Party from 1903 to 1923. There can be no doubt that Russian political thought relevant to the condition of the Russian Empire and its problem of the non-Russian nationalities greatly influenced the Russian—Vladimir Ulyanov; clearly there is equally no doubt that the ideals of socialism and West European socialist attitude towards the nationality problem had a great influence on the Marxist—Nicholas Lenin. This latter statement does not mean that Ulyanov-Lenin accepted all the concepts of orthodox Marxism. As a practical politician he accepted some and adapted them to his own needs; others he repudiated without hesitation, as he also abandoned some of his own ideals after he took the reins of the Soviet state into his hands.

In the early thinking of Lenin on the nationality problem the fundamental tenets of Marxism constituted perhaps a stronger influence than did Russian political thought. In his first major article, "Who Are the Friends of the People?" (1894), Lenin tackled the problems of nation, nationality, and national relations. At that time, however, he was unaware of the complexity of the nationality problem in the Russian Empire. Being convinced that "the creation of national relations was equivalent to the creation of bourgeois relations," he refused to recognize national feeling as a separate factor existing outside the material interests of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie. Lenin did not deny that the tsarist regime severely oppressed numerous non-Russian nationalities. However, he felt that the only acceptable means for the overthrow of any oppression was the class struggle of the workers, and he proposed the "amalgamation" (*splochenie, soedinenie*) of the working-class organizations of different peoples "into a single international working-class army to fight international capitalism."¹⁶ This was the influence of *The Communist Mani-*

¹⁶ V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniya*, I, 73-74. Unless otherwise noted, all citations are from the third Russian edition of Lenin's collected works (30 vols.; Moscow, 1928-37), hereafter referred to as Lenin. In a few instances quotations come from supplemental vol. XXXVI (1957) to the 4th edition (35 vols.; Moscow, 1941-52), the newest English edition, *Collected Works* (transl. of the 4th enlarged Russian edi-

festo which stated that the exploitation of one nation by another was unjust, but assured that in proportion as an end is put to "the exploitation of one individual by another," so also will an end be put to "the exploitation of one nation by another."¹⁷ The question of the national liberation was regarded as a subordinate part of the question of the proletarian revolution. It just is not true that "Karl Marx and the founders of the First International" had "put on the same plane the fight for the liberation of the proletariat and the fight for the liberation of the oppressed nationalities."¹⁸ In fact, they strongly disapproved of the formation of small national states.¹⁹

The founders of Marxism were convinced internationalists. According to Lenin, they maintained a rigorous, critical stand toward national liberation movements, evaluating the conditional historical significance of these movements.²⁰ In general, Karl Marx and the whole socialist movement at first took a somewhat negative stand toward struggles for national liberation, considering them distractions from the all-important class struggle.²¹ Later on, and in the case of Ireland

tion; Moscow, 1960-), special *Leninskii sbornik* (36 vols.; Moscow, 1924-34, 1959), and other English editions of Lenin's individual works.

¹⁷ *The Communist Blueprint for the Future*, p. 29. See Erygin, p. 30.

¹⁸ Czeslaw Poznanski, *The Rights of Nations* (London, 1942), p. 4. This work starts out with the premises that "national rights are a necessary part of the rights of man" and that there is "interdependence between national rights and national statehood" (p. VI), and ably sums up the valid claims of small nations for freedom.

¹⁹ See Bloom, pp. 35-38.

²⁰ Lenin, "O prave natsii na samoopredelenie," XVII, 459. Cf. V. I. Lenin, *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination: Selected Writings* (New York, 1951), p. 47. On Marx's "relativism in the evaluation of national movements," see Boersner, pp. 2-5.

²¹ A Ukrainian Communist author, in comparing the ideas of Marx and Bakunin on the nationality problem, states that "in his insistence on unconditional national independence for all nations and nationalities, Bakunin . . . sets up an absolute, which is contradictory to Marx." V. V. Havrylyuk, *Natsional'ne pytannya v Markska i Engel'sa* (Kharkiv, 1930), p. 33. A German author, in a classical exposition of Marx's teaching, criticizes K. Kautsky for his support of the right of small nations to self-determination, and convincingly attests that the attitude of Marx and Engels was negative to such a right. Heinrich Cunow, *Die Marxsche Geschichts-, Gesellschafts- und Staatslehre*, II (Berlin, 1921), 38-49. Several authors take notice of traces of German nationalism in Marx's thought: H. Kohn mentions "his uncritical attitude toward his own emotional German nationalism," in "The Nationality Policy of the Soviet Union," *The Soviet Union and World-Problems*, p. 88, and S. F. Bloom states that "both he and Engels . . . absorbed much anti-Slav prejudice in his early German environment" (p. 188). Another scholar observes that "both Marx and Lassalle have sometimes put forward ideas which

only, Marx acknowledged that he long considered "the separation of Ireland from England impossible," but subsequently his more penetrating study convinced him to the contrary: "I now think it inevitable, although after the separation there may come federation" (1867). "It is in the direct and absolute interest of the English working class to get rid of their present connection with Ireland" (1869).²²

Friedrich Engels at first favored the struggles for national liberation (especially that of the Poles), but later on he radically changed his attitude to an outright negative one. For a while, he objected to the claims of the Danes to Schleswig on the ground that they were only "a half-civilized nation."²³ In one of his letters to Marx from Manchester (1851), Engels approved the German-Russian partition of Poland, especially the Prussian annexation of the western Polish provinces.²⁴ In an address in Cologne (1849) he calls small groups of subjugated peoples or ethnic groups "the dregs of peoples" that justly are doomed for extinction. The dominant nations are entitled to take the "historical initiative into their hands" as they are "the representatives of revolution," while small ethnic groups are "the representatives of counterrevolution."²⁵ Bohemia, for instance, should be incorporated into Germany.²⁶

Afterwards, the attitude of other theorists, German Marxists such as August Bebel, Eduard Bernstein, and Karl Kautsky, who followed one strain of Marx's thought—a genuine sympathy for all the oppressed—was more favorable toward the oppressed nationalities. Rosa greatly resemble those of Pan-Germanism though their motives were different." Frederick Hertz, *Nationality in History and Politics* (London, 1944), p. 263. See also Cobban, p. 102, Goodman, p. 9–12.

²² Letters to Engels quoted in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence, 1846–1895*, transi. by Dona Torr (New York, 1942), pp. 228 and 280. Cf. August Bebel and Eduard Bernstein, eds., *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Friedrich Engels und Karl Marx, 1844–1883*, IV (Stuttgart, 1913), 225, and Karl Marx — Friedrich Engels, *Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe*, III. Abt., III, 442; IV, 258. See also Lenin, XVII, 461–64.

²³ Karl Marx — Friedrich Engels, *Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe*, I. Abt., VII, 353.

²⁴ Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence, 1846–1895*, pp. 37–38. Cf. Velikovskii, I, 97–98. In a letter Engels even used the scurrilous word *Polacken* (instead of *Polen*) for the Poles (1863). Marx — Engels, *Gesamtausgabe*, III. Abt., III, 143.

²⁵ Karl Marx — Friedrich Engels, *Werke*, VI (East Berlin, 1959), 172–74 (on "the erroneous views of Engels," see p. XII). Quoted in Velikovskii, I, 100–103.

²⁶ Marx — Engels, *Werke*, VIII (East Berlin, 1960), 52 ("as *Bestandteil* — constituent part of Germany" [1852]). Gustav Mayer, ed., *Friedrich Engels*, II. Band: *Engels und der Aufstieg der Arbeiterbewegung in Europa* (The Hague, 1934), p. 43.

Luxemburg, an organizer of a strongly anti-nationalist socialist group in Poland and also an influential theorist in German socialist circles, following another, predominant strain of Marx's thought—a preference for large countries which were in a position to develop modern economies—took a completely negative stand toward the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples. Engelbert Pernerstorfer, Karl Renner, and Otto Bauer, Marxist theorists in the multinational Austro-Hungarian Empire, attempted to win over national groups to the supra-national idea of socialism on the basis of intra-empire economic interdependence of autonomous nationalities. Works of all these theorists were perused by Lenin.²⁷

While preaching the idea of the class struggle in general and the struggle against the tsarist regime in particular, and at the same time carefully analyzing the political reality in the Russian Empire, Lenin soon perceived a certain parallelism of aims between the Russian revolutionary movement and the movements for national emancipation of the non-Russian peoples of the Empire, as well as the growing strength of these movements. Inasmuch as all these movements—the proletarian and the “national”—were directed against the same force—tsarism—Lenin thought it appropriate not only to refrain from combating directly the aims of the “national” groups but also to attempt to win over their masses to the cause of the proletarian revolution. In his efforts to create a strong monolithic proletarian party, Lenin embarked upon the integration of non-Russian elements into the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party (RSDRP) and, after some time, upon the formulation of a program of transformation of

²⁷ In referring to the statement in the *Communist Manifesto* that workers were without a fatherland, Bebel said that even the immediate “disciples of Marx and Engels” did not share that opinion, and that “all peoples who are under a foreign yoke strive for national independence”; it is only natural that “each nation which lives under the domination of another first of all struggles for its independence” (report of the Commission on the Problem of Militarism and International Policy of the Stuttgart Congress of the Second International, 1907). Quoted in Velikovskii, I, 132. See also Eduard Bernstein, “Vom geschichtlichen Recht der kleinen Staaten,” in *Sozialdemokratische Völkerpolitik* (Leipzig, 1917), pp. 107–17; Karl Kautsky, “Der Kampf der Nationalitäten und das Staatsrecht in Österreich,” *Die Neue Zeit*, XVI, Nos. 17–18 (1898). Pernerstorfer criticizes (1906) the “outmoded understanding of internationalism, according to which any acknowledgment of national differences was in sharp contradiction to the idea of Social Democracy,” and asserts that “it is only natural that socialism should plead for each oppressed nation. For the same reason it would be paradoxical for one to ignore the interests of his own nation.” Quoted in Velikovskii, pp. 125–27.

the multinational Russian Empire which, although satisfying to some extent the demands of the non-Russian nationalities, would still preserve that Empire as a hopeful point of departure for the world revolution. In order to strengthen the Party in Russia, Lenin developed the socialist idea of the international solidarity of the workers into the form of the solidarity of non-Russian workers with Russian ones, and the subordination of national interests and struggles for national emancipation to the class struggle of Russian workers. In such articles as "The Protest of the Finnish People" (1901) and "The Tsar Against the Finnish People" (1909), he asserted that Russian labor, rather than their own native bourgeoisie, is the true friend of the oppressed nationalities.²⁸

In practice, Lenin's primary concern was his fight against the decentralization of the Party structure, particularly against any attempt to set up within or outside the Party a number of autonomous "national" (i.e., non-Russian) Social Democratic groups. He believed that such groups and, even more so, independent non-Russian parties would put their national aims above general class aims and that this would result in a definite weakening, if not the absolute decline, of the single socialist movement in the Russian Empire.

The most important views of Lenin on this question are contained in his "Speech on the Problem of the *Bund's* Position in the RSDRP" at the Second Congress of the Party (1903), in which he opposed the demands of the Jewish Socialist *Bund* (Union) for the recognition of its exclusive right to organize and represent Jewish labor in the Russian Empire,²⁹ and in his draft of the resolution "On the 'National' Social Democratic Organizations" at the so-called February 1913 Party Conference (actually held in December 1912) in Cracow.³⁰ Lenin discussed the need for a unified centralized and militant party of professional revolutionaries in detail in the work "What Is To Be Done?" (1902); in his article "The Position of the *Bund* in the Party" (1903), he assailed the idea of transforming the RSDRP into a federa-

²⁸ Lenin, IV, 335 ff.; XIV, 183 ff. See also *Collected Works*, V, 310. In an article (1912) Lenin used the phrase "ardent supporter [*iskrennyi storonnik*] of the oppressed nationalities." Lenin, XVI, 177.

²⁹ Lenin, VI, 18-20. See also "Does the Jewish Proletariat Need an 'Independent' Political Party?" *Collected Works*, VI, 245-49; "The Latest Word in Bundist Nationalism," *ibid.*, 518-21.

³⁰ Lenin, XVI, 234-35.

tion of "national" Social Democratic parties and stated that "the idea of the separate Jewish nation" was "politically reactionary."³¹

In his fight for the centralized structure of the Party Lenin was expressing less his own original ideas than the views of the Russian *narodniki* (populists) of the second half of the nineteenth century. Already in 1882 the populists had stated that "for populism as a socialist party, every sort of national passion is strange," but asserted that "all joint efforts should be directed against the common enemy" under the guidance of a "unified, strictly centralized revolutionary organization."³² Having constantly in view the integration of the Party, Lenin was forced to pay attention to the nationality problem in the Russian Empire. As a practical party worker, he realized that with numerous non-Russian socialists actively participating in the national liberation movements not only as individuals but also through their own independent socialist parties,³³ a real program for the reconstruction of the Russian Empire incorporating at least some of the demands of the non-Russian dependencies was imperative.

Lenin envisioned only an internal reconstruction of the Empire, not its dismemberment. In his article on the nationality question in the Party program (1903), Lenin discussed point nine of the program, which dealt with the right of nations to self-determination, and asserted emphatically that the Empire was to be preserved because, in his opinion, the "disintegration of Russia" would mean in effect the "disintegration of the forces of the proletariat."³⁴

The above-mentioned program of the RSDRP, adopted by its Second Congress which met from July 30 to August 22, 1903 in Brussels and London, included only a few demands for the reconstruction of the existing multinational Russian state. After the overthrow of the

³¹ *Ibid.*, VI, 84 (transl. in *Collected Works*, VII, 100: "The idea that the Jews form a separate nation is reactionary politically").

³² Quoted in B. Bazilevskii (V. Bogucharskii) [V. Ya. Yakovlev], ed., *Literatura partii Narodnoi Voli*, II (St. Petersburg, 1905), 34-35.

³³ In the official Soviet publication it is stated that "as the national-liberation movement spread it became necessary for the revolutionary Social-Democrats to have a clear-cut theoretical program and policy on the national question and Lenin drew one up." *Outline History of the U.S.S.R.* (Moscow, 1960), p. 170. See also chapter on "National Movements in Russia" in Pipes, pp. 7-21; "The Ukrainian National Movement Before the February Revolution," in Borys, pp. 67-90.

³⁴ "Natsional'nyi vopros v nashei programme," Lenin, V, 342-43. In both instances the Russian term *raspadenie* is translated as "disintegration," while in the *Collected Works*, VI, 461, it is rendered as "the disintegration of Russia" and "the division of the forces of the proletariat."

tsarist autocracy the constitution of a new democratic republic of Russia was to guarantee:

1. Local self-government on a wide scale; home rule [territorial self-government] for all localities [regions] where the population is of a special composition and characterized by special conditions of life (*point three*);

2. The right of any people to receive instruction in its own tongue—this to be secured by creating schools at the expense of the state and the local organs of self-government; the right of every citizen to use his native language at meetings; introduction of the use of the native language on a par with the state language in all local, public, and state institutions (*point eight*);

3. Equal rights for all citizens, irrespective of sex, creed, race, or nationality (part of *point seven*).³⁵

As seen from the above text, the RSDRP did not consider the nationality problem of sufficient importance to propose a concrete plan for the real reconstruction of the Russian Empire. After all, even the Russian Social Democratic press paid little attention at that time to that question. In the *Iskra* (The Spark), an official publication of the RSDRP, the nationality problem, or some aspect of it, was mentioned only a few times between 1900 and 1903, although there were over 500 notes and articles on general party work in the Ukraine alone.

It is well worth mentioning that in the draft of the program's point three, a few additional words after "characterized by special conditions of life," namely, "[different] from the Russian territories proper," were deleted.³⁶ Obviously, this was done in order to prevent the Russian Empire from even verbally being divided into Russia proper and the Empire's dependencies which had been deprived of their former home rule.³⁷

³⁵ Quoted in *The Communist Blueprint for the Future*, pp. 69–70.

³⁶ See M. Lozyns'kyi, *Pol's'kyi i rus'kyi revolyutsiynyi rukh i Ukrayina* (Lviv, 1908), p. 152.

³⁷ A historical and juridical analysis of the liquidation of the autonomy of the Baltic countries, Finland, Poland, the Ukraine, etc., is presented in Boris E. Nolde, *Ocherki russkogo gosudarstvennogo prava* (An Outline of Russian Constitutional Law) (St. Petersburg, 1911). In the chapter "Regional Autonomy in the History of the State Development of Russia," pp. 277–554, Professor Nolde, a lawyer of international reknown, declares that the above-mentioned countries were included in the Russian Empire on the basis of *mezhdugosudarstvennye dogovory* [inter-state treaties, treaties between states], and were assured the right "to live in accordance with their own laws, which were quite different from Russian law and which constituted the foundation of the system of their own organs of government" (p. 462). Although the extent of national home rule varied from state to state, all of them lost their liberties when "all treaties and promises were

Lenin's personal view did not outstrip the program of 1903. Even at the Second Congress of the Party he proposed to omit the word "territorial" in "territorial self-government," stating that "this word is obscure and could be interpreted as though Social Democracy requires the division of the entire state into many territories."³⁸ The official Party nationality policy, designed to grant some sort of territorially conditioned autonomy to the non-Russian nationalities, exceeded, no doubt, at that time his own views. This was the consequence of both currents of influence—Marxism and Russian revolutionary thought. Marx and Engels consistently advocated state centralism. And the Decembrists, who were the first in modern Russian history to begin an organized resistance against tsarist autocracy (the December uprising of 1825), favored, for the most part, a design for a strictly centralized Russian state. Colonel Paul Pestel asserted in his constitutional design for Russia that Russian dependencies "never had and never would be allowed to enjoy political independence," but must remain forever in the Russian state; he even advocated that certain adjacent territories be annexed to Russia for security reasons.³⁹

In an article written at that time concerning the autonomistic demands of Armenian socialists (1903), Lenin asserts that "the demands of the Armenian Social Democrats" are justified if they speak of "political and civil freedoms," but "it is not in the interests of the proletariat to preach federalism and national autonomy."⁴⁰ It may be concluded that, in 1903 and for some time afterwards, Lenin accepted from the Party's nationality policy program only the general principle of the equality of citizens and the granting to non-Russians of certain, not clearly defined, linguistic rights in schools and in local political institutions. Later on, however, as Marx once did concerning Ireland, Lenin considerably changed his ideas about the nationality problem in the Russian Empire, still subordinating the problem, though, to his basic concept of a monolithic proletarian party.

finally declared as being no longer in effect." Of no avail were the protests of men such as Gregory Poletyka, who objected to the progressing uniformity of the imperial framework which, quotes Nolde, "opposed law and freedom" and violated "the sanctity of treaties, the preservation of which is the source of the honor of monarchs and the security of the territory and welfare of nations." (pp. 329-31).

³⁸ Quoted in Lozyn'skyi, p. 152.

³⁹ *Russkaya Pravda: Nakaz Vremennomu Verkhovnomu Pravleniyu* (St. Petersburg, 1906), pp. 15-16.

⁴⁰ "O manifeste armyanskikh sotsial-demokratov," Lenin, V, 243.

The gradual formation of Lenin's idea of a multinational commonwealth—a rather intricate combination of diversified and often contradictory constituents—began in his formal negation of the so-called Austrian socialist design for a multinational state. That design was initiated in 1899 at the all-Austrian Social Democratic Congress in Brno (Brünn), and formulated later by Karl Renner and Otto Bauer.⁴¹

This Congress assembled the representatives not of one single Austrian Social Democratic Party, but of the six autonomous weakly "federated" Social Democratic organizations—Austrian-German, Czech, Polish, Ruthenian (Ukrainian), South-Slavic (Slovene), and Austrian-Italian. The committee of the South-Slavic Social Democratic organization submitted a draft resolution in which they proposed that the Austrian part of Austria-Hungary become a "democratic *Nationalitäten-Bundesstaat* (federal state of nationalities)"; in this state the constituent federal parts would not be territorial units (provinces), as they are in the usual modern federal structure, but national "autonomous groups," regardless of the settlement of their individual members.⁴² However, the idea of national autonomy on a corporate group basis ("personality" principle of the rights of a national minority) received only partial recognition. The Congress ratified a compromise resolution in which it recognized "the right of every nation [of Austria] to national existence and national development"; it proposed that the old 'historical' *Kronländer* (crown provinces) which were composed of different ethnic territories (e.g., Czech and German in Bohemia, Ukrainian and Polish in Galicia, Ukrainian and Rumanian in Bukovina) be replaced by new national-territorial unit-provinces in accordance with the ethnic distribution of nationalities. National legislative councils (e.g., Austro-German, Czech, etc.)

⁴¹ Rudolf Springer [Karl Renner], *Der Kampf der Oesterreichischen Nationen um den Staat*, I. Teil: *Das nationale Problem als Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsfrage* (Leipzig and Vienna, 1902); Otto Bauer, *Die Nationalitätenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie* (Max Adler and Rudolf Hilferding, eds., *Marx-Studien, Blätter zur Theorie und Politik des Wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus*, Vol. II; Vienna, 1907). Another and similar design for the "United States of Great-Austria" was formulated by Aurel C. Popovici in *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Gross-Österreich: Politische Studien zur Lösung der nationalen Fragen und staatsrechtlichen Krisen in Österreich-Ungarn* (Leipzig, 1906).

⁴² See M. B. Ratner, *Evolutsiia sotsialisticheskoi mysli v natsional'nom voprose* (n.p., 1906), p. 76; C. A. Macartney, "The National Struggles in Austria" (pp. 140-52). For a critical account of these struggles and the proposed solution, from the Great-German viewpoint, see Paul Samassa, *Der Völkerstreit im Habsburgerstaat* (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 161-68.

composed of the representatives of the new self-governing provinces and ethnic minority groups (in provinces predominantly inhabited by other nationalities) were to determine the cultural affairs of each nationality, while the central parliament was to legislate on all common state matters.⁴³

Karl Renner, a jurist and political theorist, and Otto Bauer, an economist, dealt with this new design for a multinational state and elaborated a detailed plan for the reconstruction of Austria. "Renner's basic idea," asserts one authority on the modern history of Austria-Hungary, "rests on the objective of adapting the structure of the federal state to the requirements of the multinational state."⁴⁴ First and foremost Renner proposed that the "fetish" of historical boundaries of the old provinces be "unthroned," and that the new boundaries be drawn according to the ethnic principle.⁴⁵ Along with a constitutional affirmation of the corporate individuality of different ethnic groups, the new administrative division of the Austrian multinational state would have made nine-tenths of the state's territory unilingual; here only the territorial principle of national rights was to be operative and in each of these new provinces the original nationality was to enjoy true national home rule. In the remaining one tenth of Austrian territory, intermixedly inhabited by two or more ethnic groups, there were to be set up both common territorial and separate ethnic group organs of local self-government; here the territorial principle would operate along with the ethnic group (group's personality) principle of national rights. "In the unilingual, wholly national districts, each nation has its closed national territory, its undeniable and undisturbed home; these create a type of exclusive *Dominium der Nation* (national dominion)," asserts Renner, "while the multilingual districts form a *Kondominium* (condominium) of two or more nations."⁴⁶ Otto Bauer elaborated this idea in more detail

⁴³ Ratner, p. 79; text of the resolution in Springer, pp. 147-48.

⁴⁴ Robert A. Kann, *The Multinational Empire*, Vol. II: *Empire Reform* (New York, 1950), p. 158.

⁴⁵ Springer, p. 40.

⁴⁶ Springer, pp. 147-48, or Karl Renner, *Das Selbstbestimmungsrecht der Nationen* (Leipzig, 1918), p. 230 (new edition of 1902 work). The division of Austria-Hungary into fifteen national provinces (or semi-sovereign states) was proposed by Popovici, pp. 308-309 (German Austria, German Bohemia, German Moravia, Hungary, Bohemia, Slovakia, Transylvania, Croatia, Slovenia, Polish West Galicia, Ruthenian [Ukrainian] Galicia, including Bukovina and Transcarpathian Ruthenia, etc.).

from the viewpoint of intra-empire economic interdependence and the interests of the socialist movement. He asserted that the elimination of the struggles of nationalities "enhances the power of the proletariat: it secures the unity of the Party."⁴⁷ In the opinion of Karl Kautsky, "this *Doppelorganisation* (dichotomous organization) is an ingenious and fruitful idea which deserves the attention even of those who are inclined to criticize the details."⁴⁸

Although Lenin violently opposed this Austrian design for a multinational state, he actually negated only its subsidiary principle of cultural (extra-territorial "personal") group autonomy of nationalities (later called, in Bolshevik literature, cultural-national autonomy). The idea of national autonomy on a group basis only was too intimately connected with the "federal" structure of the Social Democratic movement in Austria which Lenin detested, steadfastly and unchangeably advocating a monolithic party structure. However, Lenin accepted the basic feature of the Austrian design—the division of a multinational empire into a number of "national," linguistically homogeneous territories with a certain degree of self-government. He only categorically rejected the idea of extraterritorial ("personal") autonomy of the non-Russian nationalities in the Russian Empire, an idea that quickly gained ground not only within the Jewish Socialist *Bund* and the whole Jewish community (territorially dispersed and particularly interested in securing their group rights), but also among many Russians and non-Russians alike.

Lenin remained an unwavering adherent of the centralized great state. However, he retracted his former view that it was not the concern of the proletariat to advocate regional autonomy. "Marxists will in no case advocate the principle of either federation or decentralization," Lenin asserts now, but straightaway expounds that territorial autonomy does not contradict "democratic centralism" as the fundamental principle of the socialist state and that therefore it may be adopted in Russia; "democratic centralism not only does not

⁴⁷ Bauer, p. 511.

⁴⁸ *Nationalität und Internationalität* (Ergänzungshefte zur Neuen Zeit, No. 1; Stuttgart, 1908), p. 29. However, Kautsky does not share the hope of Renner and Bauer that the proposed reconstruction of Austria would really put an end to the antagonism of nationalities (p. 29); and it will not promote proletarian revolution in Austria (p. 34). On the other hand, Austria may serve as an example for the future dichotomous organization of federated Europe in many constituent nations and a few large economic regions (p. 36).

exclude local self-government with [and] the autonomy of regions which are distinguished by specific economic and social conditions, distinct national composition of the population, etc., but on the contrary, it requires them."⁴⁹

In a lecture on the Ukrainian emancipation movement it was stated that, while the current program of Ukrainians (in central and eastern Ukraine) reached only toward federalism and autonomy, there were tendencies toward complete independence, and that the Ukrainians anticipated the disintegration of the Russian Empire in the future war, after which thirty million Ukrainians would secede from the Russian state. In discussing this lecture, Lenin asks (1914):

Why is this "federalism" not harmful to the unity of either the United States of America or Switzerland? Why is "autonomy" not harmful to the unity of Austria-Hungary? Why is it that "autonomy" consolidated the unity of England and many of her dependencies for an even longer period . . . ? Why cannot the unity of Russia be *consolidated through* the autonomy of the Ukraine?⁵⁰

Drafting a platform for the Fourth Congress of the Social Democratic group in Latvia, Lenin advocated "extensive self-administration and autonomy of the individual regions, the boundaries of which are to be determined also on the basis of ethnic criteria."⁵¹

It was only now (1913-14) that Lenin began to foster the program of territorial (regional) autonomy as a solution to the nationality question in the Russian Empire; it was to be counterbalanced, however, by centralized control of the monolithic proletarian party. In all probability, Lenin's growing familiarity with both the potentialities of the non-Russian national emancipation movements and the opinions of Engels on local and provincial self-governments provided the setting for this change. Engels thought long ago (1891) that for a modern national state, the most suitable form was a unitary republic (*einheitliche Republik*)

but not in the sense of the present-day French Republic, which is simply the Empire founded in 1798 without the Emperor. From 1792 to 1798 each French department, each commune had complete self-government on the American pattern, and that we [Germany] also must have. How self-govern-

⁴⁹ "Kriticheskie zametki po natsional'nomu voprosu" (1914), Lenin, XVII, 155.

⁵⁰ "Eshchyo o 'natsionalizme'" (1914), *ibid.*, pp. 219-20.

⁵¹ "Proekt platformy k IV sezdu sotsial-demokratii Latyshskogo kraja" (1913), *ibid.*, p. 65.

ment is to be attained, and how one can be ready without a bureaucracy, is shown by America, the First French Republic, and today Australia, Canada and the other English colonies. And such a provincial and communal self-government (*provinzielle und gemeindliche Selbstverwaltung*) is much more free than, for example, Swiss federalism.⁵²

From the passage quoted above, one student of federalism draws the conclusion that Engels "denied the traditional form of the federal state, but his ideal of a centralized republic was a decentralized unitary state with wider autonomy of local self-government."⁵³

In the "Resolution on the National Question" presented to, and adopted by, the Central Committee of the RSDRP at the "August (Summer) Conference" in Poronin, near Zakopane, western Galicia, in the early fall of 1913, Lenin asserted that "wide regional autonomy (*oblastnaya avtonomiya*) and full democratic local self-government" was indispensable for the proper transformation of the state; what is more, demarcation of the boundary lines of the ethnically conditioned administrative divisions should be made by the local population on the basis of "economic and social conditions, the nationality composition of the population, etc."⁵⁴

Lenin began to expound the conclusions he had just reached to political exiles in lectures in Zurich on July 9, Geneva on July 10, and Bern on July 13, 1913. He criticized both those Party members who opposed autonomy for the non-Russian territories of the Russian Empire, and those Russians and non-Russians who desired to base the reconstruction of the Empire on other premises. The chief objections to Lenin's design were raised by *Bund* leaders, who insisted that cultural autonomy should be granted not to those territories which were inhabited by non-Russian populations, but to the corporate nationality groups whose members were to be organized without regard to where they lived. One of the *Bund* members, Vladimir Lipnik, stated that "Lenin's view and that of his followers expresses primitivism concerning the nationality question," and since "capitalism causes the mingling of nations, it is impossible to connect a nation

⁵² Friedrich Engels, "Zur Kritik des sozialdemokratischen Programmwurfes 1891," *Die Neue Zeit: Wochenschrift der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, XX (I), No. 1 (1901-1902), 11. The weekly was edited by Karl Kautsky.

⁵³ Sobei Mogi, *The Problem of Federalism: A Study in the History of Political Theory* (2 vols.; London, 1931), II, 849.

⁵⁴ "Rezolyutsiya po natsional'nomu voprosu," Lenin, XVII, 12.

with a definite territory [*sic*]."⁵⁵ Lenin carried on an equally vigorous campaign against the opponents of his autonomist design in his private correspondence. In a letter to S. G. Shaumyan who favored the obligatory use of the Russian state language for the entire state and self-government on a local level only, he wrote:

No, I absolutely do not agree with you, and I accuse [you] of *Königlich preussischer Sozialismus* [royal Prussian socialism]. . . . You are *against* autonomy; you are for local self-government *only*. I do not agree. Let me remind you of Engels' interpretation that centralization does not exclude local "liberties" at all. . . . Autonomy is *our* plan for the [re]construction of a democratic state.⁵⁶

Which countries or territories did Lenin believe should receive autonomy? What powers were to be granted to autonomous territories? Lenin did not elaborate systematically his views on these subjects. In general he held that autonomy should be granted to all those non-Russian territories of the Russian Empire which had their own linguistically and ethnically homogenous population. In his article "Critical Remarks on the National Problem" (1913), Lenin opposed the view of Rosa Luxemburg who not only denied the right of nations to self-determination, but also demanded that only Poland be granted autonomy status. She contended that autonomy was impossible for Lithuania, for example, since only thirty-one per cent of the population within the old boundaries of "historic" Lithuania were Lithuanians (the Grand Duchy of Lithuania essentially was a common Lithuanian-Belorussian-Ukrainian state). Lenin insisted that autonomy should be granted to all nationalities. For this, a basic change in the administrative division of the Russian Empire in accordance with ethnic principle would be essential. If this were done, for example, a solid majority of the population within ethnic Lithuania would be Lithuanian.⁵⁷ One of the most outstanding *Bund* theoreticians, Vladimir Medem [Goldblat] (who, along with Vladimir Kossovsky [M. Levinson], translated into Russian the principal Austrian works on the nationality problem), in defending the idea of "cultural-national" autonomy, tried to show the unsuitability of na-

⁵⁵ Quoted in *Leninskii sbornik*, XVII, 215.

⁵⁶ "Pis'mo S. G. Shaumyanu" (1913), Lenin, XVII, 89-90. *Leninskii sbornik*, III, 470-72.

⁵⁷ "Kriticheskie zametki po natsional'nomu voprosu," *ibid.*, pp. 156-57. On Rosa Luxemburg, see n. 95.

tional territorial autonomy by pointing out that Latvian and Estonian territories were too small for that, having populations of only one-half to two millions. In answer to this Lenin asked:

Why cannot there be autonomous districts with a population of not merely five hundred but even fifty thousand? Why cannot these districts unite in various ways with neighboring districts of various sizes into a single autonomous *krai* [land]?⁵⁸

Lenin outright asserts that

For the removal of all national oppression it is of utmost importance to create autonomous districts, even of a very small size, with a wholesome, single national [ethnic-group] composition.⁵⁹

To a certain degree he seemed to approach the idea of extraterritorial "cultural-national" autonomy, which he opposed in principle, when he asserted that "members of a given nationality disseminated over the corners of the country, or even the earth, could join and establish [*tyagotet' i vstupať*] mutual relations and free unions of various types."⁶⁰ However, in the same article, Lenin writes, regarding the creation of a "single national union" of the ethnic German communities on the Volga River, the German suburbs of Riga (Latvia), Łódź (Poland), and the German colony of St. Petersburg, that such matters should concern only the "priests, bourgeois, Philistines, anybody, but not Social Democrats."⁶¹ Very likely he had in mind, in the first case, only cultural group relations of the members of an ethnic group living outside its native *krai*; in the second case, political and extraterritorial—i.e., membership—relationships of individuals to their corporatively organized nationality.

In creating the new administrative districts, Lenin stated that not only ethnic composition and settlement of population should be considered, but also economic motives. First of all, cities should not be separated from their hinterland villages and districts. Marxists should not "stand wholly and exclusively upon the ground of the 'national-

⁵⁸ Lenin, XVII, 157. Medem's views were contained in an article "K postanovke natsional'nogo voprosa v Rossii," *Vestnik Evropy*, Nos. 8, 9 (1912); see also his *Sotsial-Demokratiya i natsional'nyi vopros* (St. Petersburg, 1906), and V. Kossovskii [M. Levinson], *Voprosy natsional'nosti* (Vilnius, 1907).

⁵⁹ Lenin, XVII, 158.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

territorial' principle."⁶² The central parliament should determine, although taking into consideration the wishes of the local population, the boundaries of the autonomous regions and the extent of authority of the autonomous assemblies.⁶³ As to the delimitation of central and regional functional spheres—i.e., the division of authority between the central and regional governments—Lenin considered that only problems of purely local, regional, or "national" (ethnic-group) significance should be within the authority of the latter. The central government should deal with general political and economic problems such as defense, political-rights legislation, codes of law, taxes, customs, industrial legislation, railways, communications; also labor and even education (general principles of the educational system such as, for instance, the monopoly of a secular school system).⁶⁴

Within certain limits, excluding its federalism, Lenin cited Switzerland as one of the countries which "serve us as an example of how free people live peacefully together" in a multinational state.⁶⁵ On the problem of the language to be used in government, he believed that the requirement of a single state language (i.e., Russian) should be abolished and that there should be equality of all the languages of the peoples who make up the multinational state. "Switzerland does not lose but rather benefits from the fact that it has no *single* state language for the whole state, but three," he asserts, comparing the ethnic composition of the Russian Empire and Switzerland. "In Switzerland seventy per cent of the population is German (in Russia, forty-three per cent Russian); twenty-two per cent French (in Russia, seventeen per cent Ukrainian); seven per cent Italian (in Russia, six per cent Polish and four-and-a-half per cent Belorussian)."⁶⁶ In Switzerland "bills for referendum are printed in *five* languages, i.e., in addition to the three state [official] languages, also in the two 'Romansh' dialects. . . . In the cantons of Graubünden and Wallis . . . both dialects enjoy full equality."⁶⁷ Is it not possible, asks Lenin, to adapt this "exclusively-Swiss" solution "to any county, or even sec-

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 158.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 158-59.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 155. (Here Lenin accepts the view of Rosa Luxemburg on the subject.)

⁶⁵ "Rabochii klass i natsional'nyi vopros" (1913), Lenin, XVI, 389.

⁶⁶ "Liberali i demokraty v voprose o yazykakh" (1913), *ibid.*, pp. 595-96; see also *ibid.*, XVII, 134.

⁶⁷ "Kriticheskie zametki po natsional'nomu voprosu" (1913), *ibid.*, pp. 150-51.

tion of a county, in Russia where, among two hundred thousand inhabitants, there are *two dialects* of forty thousand citizens who desire to enjoy *full equality* of language in their homeland?"⁶⁸ On this occasion Lenin criticized the Russian liberals who, in his opinion, although they differed from the reactionaries in that they at least recognized the right of the non-Russian peoples to teach their children in their native language, still demanded that the Russian language be retained as the state language "by compulsory and obligatory force." Lenin believed that the Russian language did not need to be taught under compulsion.⁶⁹

Lenin devoted special attention to the problem of schools. He always contended that, in a multinational state, all nationalities should be guaranteed the right to teach in their native tongue; but the general management of school affairs should be in the hands of the central government, and there should be only one established language of instruction in any administrative division of the state. Presumably this meant that in Russia proper all schools would be conducted in Russian, in Poland in Polish, etc. Lenin particularly assailed the idea of dividing the schools according to nationalities in the ethnically mixed localities; this, of course, would be the kernel of so-called cultural-national autonomy. The introduction of national divisions in the school system, in Lenin's opinion, would be undemocratic and harmful to the interests of the class struggle. This struggle requires real international fellowship; the division of the schools on an ethnic group basis would disunite the children and favor the development of chauvinism.⁷⁰ Lenin leveled particularly sharp criticism against the efforts to create separate Jewish schools. These schools, like any other "national" schools, would foster only "wild and silly national superstitions," whereas the interests of the working class require "the removal of all barriers between nations, the integration of children of diverse nations in uniform schools."⁷¹ In his article, "How Bishop Nikon Defends the Ukrainians," Lenin acknowledges that "the protest against the oppression of Ukrainians by Russians is fully justified," and extends a qualified approval to the Bishop's demand to

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 151.

⁶⁹ "Nuzhen li obyazatel'nyi gosudarstvennyi yazyk?" (1914), *ibid.*, pp. 179-80.

⁷⁰ "Kriticheskie zametki po natsional'nomu voprosu," *ibid.*, p. 147. See also "Eshchyo o razdelenii shkol'nogo dela po natsional'nostyam" (1913), *ibid.*, pp. 124-26.

⁷¹ "Natsionalizatsiya evreiskoi shkoly" (1913), *ibid.*, XVI, pp. 553-54; see also Lenin, XVII, p. 153.

permit the organization of Ukrainian schools and societies. However, he makes the point that, although the Bishop spoke of the thirty-seven million Ukrainians persecuted by the Russians, he did not come out in defense of other oppressed peoples as well. "One cannot go to the defense of the Ukrainians from oppression without defending from oppression all peoples without exception."⁷²

Finally Lenin tackled the question of the national minorities proper—i.e., those non-Russian colonies and ethnic groups living outside their own ethnic homelands such as the Jews, the Armenians in Georgia, etc. He declared that proletarian democracy is opposed in principle to "the slightest oppression . . . the slightest injustice to national minorities."⁷³ To prevent this, a general state law should be enacted for the protection of any national minority, in accordance with which "any [legislative] attempt of a national majority to create for itself national privileges, or to curtail the rights of a national minority (in the field of education, use of language, budget matters, etc.) should be declared void, and the putting of such a law into effect should be prohibited under threat of punishment."⁷⁴ The general state law on the protection of minorities should be supplemented by special legislative enactments of the regional diets (in the new administrative districts set up on the ethnic basis), and properly implemented by the organs of local self-government. Lenin himself did not offer any concrete proposals on this matter. He only suggested, in connection with his rejection of the division of schools on an ethnic group basis, that "under the conditions of true democracy it is wholly possible to secure the interests of teaching of one's native tongue, history, etc., *without* dividing the schools on an ethnic group basis."⁷⁵

Lenin presented his original formulation of the idea of a multinational state in his lecture, "Russian Social Democracy and the National Question," March 21, 1914, to the Polish university student association *Spójnia*, in Cracow. In his talk Lenin stressed "the neces-

⁷² "Kak episkop Nikon zashchishchaet ukraintsev?" *ibid.*, XVI, 617-18.

⁷³ "Rabochii klass i natsional'nyi vopros" (1913), *ibid.*, pp. 389-90.

⁷⁴ "Tezisy po natsional'nomu voprosu" (1913, pub. 1925), *ibid.*, p. 509.

⁷⁵ "Natsional'nyi sostav uchashchikhsya v russkoi shkole," *ibid.*, XVII, 115. See also "Kriticheskie zametki po natsional'nomu voprosu," *ibid.*, XVII, 153. In the chapter "Equality of Nations and the Rights of a National Minority" (pp. 149-53), Lenin suggests that special teachers paid by the state, and rooms in state schools should be provided for the instruction of the Jewish language and history, and that similar arrangements should be made for the children of Armenian and Rumanian minority groups in St. Petersburg, and even for a single Georgian child.

sity of approaching the nationality question from the point of view of the revolutionary requirements of the present historical epoch." Early capitalism had "a tendency to create national states"; while the epoch of mature capitalism has "a tendency to create large multinational states." Russia is in the transitional period. She inherited from the past the oppression of the non-Russian nationalities which "inevitably motivates national movements for emancipation." To resist these movements is not advisable; even the "idea of suppressing such movements must be opposed." The Russian proletariat should effect international conciliation and solidarity, and then the Russian state should be reconstructed into a multinational republic. Lenin wrote:

We think of this republic as a centralized state, with local and regional self-government, with the old administrative divisions broken up and the new divisions made according to the actual conditions of the settlement of ethnic groups, with the abolition of all privileges (including the compulsory all-state language), and with full equality of all regional languages, after the example of Switzerland. . . . However, such a republic cannot retain by force regions where a movement for national liberation has arisen, i.e., a movement for the establishment of an independent national state.⁷⁶

The outbreak of World War I, which found Lenin outside the borders of the Russian Empire, distracted his attention for some time from the reconstruction problem. After a while, a certain change or, perhaps, simply a shift of emphasis took place in his views on the reconstruction of the Russian state. His old, wholly negative stand against federalism was reshaped finally into a conditionally positive one (Lenin already alluded to federalism in 1914). In his work, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination" (1916), Lenin states that:

One can be a determined opponent of this principle [federalism] and an adherent of democratic centralism, but still give preference to federation over national inequality as the only road to complete democratic centralism.

In order to reinforce his argument, Lenin asserts that, from this particular point of view, "Marx, being a centralist, gave preference even to a federation of Ireland with England over the enforced submission of Ireland to the English."⁷⁷

⁷⁶ *Leninskii sbornik*, XVII, 227-28, 233.

⁷⁷ Lenin, XIX, 40 (chapter III: "The Meaning of the Right to Self-Determination and Its Relation to Federation"). Lenin quoted Marx's opinion on the subject

This very guarded turn toward federalism may be explained partly by Lenin's observation that many non-Russian exiles in Switzerland waged an active campaign in favor of radical changes in the Russian Empire. Some of them announced the necessity of the complete secession of the Russian dependencies from the Empire. Their activities were sympathetically received not only by the Central Powers, but also by liberal circles in western Europe.⁷⁸ Under these conditions the program of territorial autonomy for the dependent peoples of the Russian Empire was less enticing; reconstruction on a formal federal basis was bound to be more attractive. Any centrifugal tendencies in the federal framework of the new multinational commonwealth were to be counterbalanced by the centripetal force of the monolithic proletarian party. While Lenin accepted transitorily more the terminology than the essence of federalism, he did not give up his idea of territorial autonomy on an ethnic basis. In his work, *State and Revolution: The Teaching of Marxism on the State and the Duties of the Proletariat in Revolution* (1917), Lenin generally disapproves of federalism but recognizes, on Engels' authority, the federal republic as "a step forward" in the development of a multinational commonwealth. However, having admitted the objective of adapting the federal structure to the requirements of a multinational state, Lenin proceeds to discuss the structure of the "united and centralized republic" set up on the basis of territorial autonomy, and asserts that "the greatest amount of local, provincial and other freedom known in history was granted by a *centralized*, and not a federal, republic."⁷⁹

THE SECOND STAGE OF THE FORMATION OF THE IDEA: LENIN AND THE SELF-DETERMINATION OF NATIONS

Lenin's 'territorial-autonomistic' program of reconstruction, which was designed to satisfy the demands of the non-Russian peoples of the Russian Empire, had the same aim as its ancillary but more publicized program for national self-determination "up to secession and the establishment of independent states": this aim was "to direct the

in his *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination* (1914), Lenin, XVII, 461-63 (chapter VIII: "Karl Marx the Utopian and Practical Rosa Luxemburg").

⁷⁸ See P. N. Milyukov, *Natsional'nyi vopros* ([Berlin] 1925), pp. 177-83.

⁷⁹ V. Il'in [N. Lenin], *Gosudarstvo i revolyutsiya: Uchenie marksizma o gosudarstve i zadachi proletariata v revolyutsii* (Petrograd, 1918), pp. 67-68; Lenin, XXI, 416, 418-20.

national movements of emancipation into the channel of the common struggle against tsarism under the hegemony of the working class."⁸⁰

Under ordinary circumstances the application of the concept of free self-determination of nations would have resulted in the secession of the non-Russian dependencies from the Empire. Lenin, however, intended it to have a quite opposite, though peculiarly logical and feasible twofold effect: first, the preservation of the Empire from imminent disintegration, and second, by its influence on other peoples inside and outside the Empire, the provision of a setting for a future Soviet world state. Thus, Lenin's concept of self-determination really was a second stage in the growth of his idea of a multinational commonwealth, a stage in which that idea transcended the boundaries of Russia and her dependencies. Nowadays, in the wake of the actualization of self-determination of nations, we see that not large federal states, but many small states have been established. According to Lenin, the demand, or even struggle, for general recognition of the right of nations to self-determination "is altogether different from the demand for secession, parceling, the establishment of small states."⁸¹ For example, to advocate women's "right to divorce" does not mean, he argued, to encourage or to "vote for divorce."⁸² In the previously mentioned lecture to Polish students (1914) Lenin, having upheld the right of nations to self-determination, stated outright that "the gist of the matter does not lie in the slogan [of self-determination], but in the content which is given to it." The Polish Socialist Party (PPS) which struggles for the independence of Poland gives the concept a nationalistic petty bourgeois content. The Polish Social Democrats who are satisfied with the autonomy of Poland in the Russian state framework understand the matter correctly, but

⁸⁰ *Leninskii sbornik*, XVII, 228. Compare the following statement: "Paradoxical as it may seem the slogan [of self-determination of nations] was designed not to break up the unity of the Russian Empire but to prevent Polish and Jewish Social Democrats [as well as other non-Russian socialist groups] from maintaining autonomous sections within the All-Russian party. The purpose was to help centralize the multinational Socialist movement of the Empire around a hard-core leadership—Lenin." Stanley W. Page, *Lenin and World Revolution* (New York, 1959), p. 20. See also V. V. Aspaturian, "The Theory and Practice of Soviet Federalism," *Journal of Politics*, XII, No. 1 (1950), 21–23.

⁸¹ "Sotsialisticheskaya revolyutsiya i pravo natsii na samoopredelenie" (1916), Lenin, XIX, 39. Cf. "Right to secede vs. opportunity to secede," Boersner, p. 40.

⁸² Lenin, XVII, 119. See also *ibid.*, 448–49 ("the advocates of freedom of divorce" should not be accused "of encouraging the destruction of family ties"); XIX, 232.

"unfortunately they are unable to make any practical use of it"⁸³ (which presumably meant advocating the general right of national self-determination but working for internal regional autonomy within the framework of the Russian state).

Lenin was not the first Russian to advocate the right of national self-determination. The First Congress of the RSDRP recognized it in 1898, following the example of the London Congress of the Second International in 1896,⁸⁴ as did earlier several Russian revolutionary thinkers such as Herzen and Bakunin,⁸⁵ and such political organizations as *Velikoruss* (Great Russian) (1861), *Molodaya Rossiya* (Young Russia) (1862), *Narodnaya Volya* (People's Will) (1880), and *Narodnoe Pravo* (People's Right) (1890).⁸⁶ The Second Congress of

⁸³ *Leninskii sbornik*, XVII, 232.

⁸⁴ At this Congress the representatives of the Polish Socialist Party (PPS) demanded that the Congress declare its support for the independence of Poland, while Rosa Luxemburg as a representative of the smaller "Social Democracy of Poland and Lithuania" opposed placing the demand of Poland's independence into the international socialist program. Adopting a middle position, the Congress declared only in general terms that it "endorses the full right of self-determination of all peoples and expresses its sympathy for the workers of any country which suffers . . . from the yoke of war, or national or other absolutism." See *Verhandlungen und Beschlüsse des internationalen sozialistischen Arbeiter- und Gewerkschafts-Kongresses zu London* (Berlin, 1897), p. 18. See Lenin, XVII, 455-56. A. D. Low maintains that Lenin's interpretation of self-determination in this declaration (*Selbstbestimmungsrecht*—in the German text, but only "autonomy" in the English minutes) as the right to secession is not warranted, not even on the basis of the German version. Low, p. 148, n. 12. See also Decker, pp. 153-54.

⁸⁵ Alexander Herzen wrote in a letter (1859) that "Poland, just like Italy and Hungary, has an inalienable full right to statehood, independent of Russia"; and he assumed that "the Ukraine, remembering the oppression of the Muscovites . . . [and] not forgetting how she was treated in the Commonwealth [Polish-Lithuanian state] . . . may refuse to be either Polish or Russian"; therefore "the Ukraine should be recognized as a free and independent country." Quoted in M. P. Dragomanov, *Sobranie politicheskikh sochinenii*, I (Paris, 1905), 42, 45.

Michael Bakunin, in a speech delivered at the Conference of the League for Peace and Freedom (1868), called for "the recognition of the absolute right to full autonomy of every nation, whether large or small"; later he demanded that "full freedom and the right to self-assertion and direction by their own will, without any interference direct or indirect on our part, be returned to Poland, Lithuania, the Ukraine, the Finns, and the Baltic Latvians, as well as to the Caucasian land." M. A. Bakunin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (ed. I. Balashov), I, 54, 232.

⁸⁶ An article in the *Velikoruss* newsletter, No. 2, calls for the "unconditional liberation of Poland" and "full freedom to determine [her] own fate" for the Ukraine. It even states that "judging by their vivid feeling of suffering from our despotism, it is to be expected that, at the first opportunity to think about their

the RSDRP recognized in its program (1903) "the right to self-determination of all nations which make up the composition of the [Russian] state."⁸⁷ No official clarification was made of the content of this right or of the methods to be used to implement it. Lenin, discussing this (ninth) point of the program, explained that "the unconditional recognition of the struggle for freedom of self-determination does not obligate us to support every demand for national self-determination"; the latter must be subordinated to the interests of the class struggle, which make imperative the preservation of the integrity of the Russian Empire. In his opinion "the disintegration of Russia" would have been equivalent to "the disintegration of the forces of the proletariat."⁸⁸ Social Democrats "should always and unconditionally aim toward the closest unity of the proletarians of all nationalities"; after all, states Lenin, "Social Democracy, as the party of the proletariat, has as its fundamental and principal purpose the promotion of the self-determination, not of peoples and nations, but of the proletariat of every nationality."⁸⁹ With this, Lenin declares against any literal interpretation of the principle of national self-determination, one which would be binding for all times. He declares that "it is necessary to take into consideration new political circumstances; old decisions cannot be accepted for guidance without taking new things into calculation, for this would mean being faithful to

fate, they [the Ukrainians] will want to secede from us." G. A. Kuklin, ed., *Itogi revolyutsionnogo dvizheniya v Rossii za sorok let, 1862-1902 gg.* (Geneva, 1903), pp. 170-71 (suppl.)

The declaration of *Molodaya Rossiya* demands "full independence for Poland and Lithuania as the provinces which made known their unwillingness to remain united with Russia" as well as the possibility for all other non-Russian provinces to decide by majority vote "if they desire to enter the framework of the Russian federative republic." *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Likewise the program of the *Narodnaya Volya* Party states that "the peoples who were annexed under compulsion to Russian tsardom" should be granted freedom "to secede or to remain in an all-Russian union." See Bazilevskii (Bogucharskii), p. 292.

In the program of the liberal *Narodnoe Pravo* Party it was asserted that, taking into consideration the fact that Russia is not a homogeneous whole... the recognition of the right of political self-determination for all the nationalities who were amalgamated with her is the imperative prerequisite of political liberty." See Kuklin, pp. 77, 283 (suppl.).

⁸⁷ *Vsesoyuznaya Kommunisticheskaya Partiya (b) v rezolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh sezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK, 1898-1932, I* (Moscow, 1933), p. 22.

⁸⁸ "Natsional'nyi vopros v nashei programme" (1903), Lenin, V, 342-43.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 337. On Stalin's advocacy of self-determination by the proletariat, see note 156.

the letter, but not the spirit, of the teaching [of Marxism]." For instance, Poland, in relation to Russia, was formerly a progressive country and for that reason Marx then sympathized with the demand for Poland's independence; but the situation changed later.⁹⁰

Subsequently Lenin worked out his dichotomous concept (divided into "letter" and "spirit") of national self-determination. On the one hand, Lenin defended with manifest sincerity the right of all peoples to political self-determination; but in application to the peoples of the Russian Empire, he considered that the realization of this right would be harmful to the unity of the proletarian struggle and steadfastly maintained his opposition toward any movement of secession. It should be mentioned that, as a result of the dichotomy of his concept of national self-determination, Lenin managed to hold both positive and negative opinions simultaneously about the same countries. For instance, he declared that Bulgaria, Serbia, the Ukraine, and Poland, as well as Ireland and India, deserved the right of self-determination, but at the same time he opposed the independence of Poland and the Ukraine. In an article in 1912 Lenin, in defending the independence of the Balkan countries from both Turkey and Russia, affirmed that "no one in Russia ever trampled so much on the truly democratic principles of a genuine independence of *all* peoples as did the nationalists and the Octobrists."⁹¹ In later articles of that period, in connection with the Balkan War, Lenin opposed "all protectionism of the Slavs by foxes and wolves" (i.e., by England, France, and tsarist Russia), and favored "full self-determination of peoples, complete democracy, and the liberation of the Slavs from any protectionism of the 'great powers.'"⁹² Referring to conditions in Russia, Lenin reproached the party of Constitutional Democrats for first evading a reply to the question of whether or not their Party recognized the right of nations to self-determination, and only afterwards declaring that the eleventh point of their program recognized only "the right of free cultural self-determination." Lenin called this a "senseless, extravagant abuse of words," since "in the whole history of international democracy . . . the self-determination of nations has

⁹⁰ Lenin, V, 340. On "the letter of Marxism" and "the spirit of Marxism," see also *ibid.*, XVII, 457-58 (Lenin's article "On the Right of Nations to Self-Determination," 1914).

⁹¹ "Azartnaya igra," *ibid.*, XVI, 149.

⁹² "O lise i kuryatnike," *ibid.*, p. 160.

been understood exactly as *political* self-determination—i.e., the right to secession, [and] the creation of an independent national state”—not some sort of “freedom of language” that Russian liberals meant by “cultural self-determination.”⁹³

In his major work, *On the Right of Nations to Self-Determination* (1914), Lenin drew attention to the fact that in the ruling classes of Russia there was apparent “a categorical denial of the equality of nationalities and of the right to self-determination” that was further accentuated by the old motto “autocracy, orthodoxy, and nationality, the latter being understood as [ethnic] Russian only. Even the Ukrainians have been proclaimed ‘*inorodtsy*’ [aliens] and even their language is being suppressed.”⁹⁴ Since Marxists fight all oppression, they cannot take such a position. Says Lenin:

If we do not issue and propagate the slogan of the *right* to secession, we shall play into the hands, not only of the bourgeoisie, but also the feudal and absolutist forces of the *oppressor* nation. . . . Fearing to ‘help’ the nationalist bourgeoisie of Poland, Rosa Luxemburg, in rejecting the *right* of secession which is contained in the program of *Russian* Marxists, in fact supports the opportunistic conciliatoriness toward the privileges (and worse than privileges) of the Russians.⁹⁵

Further on, he states outright:

⁹³ “Kadety i natsionalisty” (1912), *ibid.*, pp. 176-77; “Kadety i ‘pravo narodov na samoopredelenie’” (1913), *ibid.*, XVII, 108-109; “Natsional-liberalizm i pravo natsii na samoopredelenie” (1914), *ibid.*, pp. 168-69.

⁹⁴ “O prave natsii na samoopredelenie,” *ibid.*, p. 443.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 440. For slightly different translations of this passage, see Lenin, *Critical Remarks on the National Question: The Right of Nations to Self-Determination* (Moscow, n. d.), p. 90, and his *Questions of National Policy and Proletarian Internationalism* (Moscow, n. d.), p. 80. Rosa Luxemburg unwaveringly opposed the demands for national self-determination and Polish “social patriotism” at the London Congress of the Second International (see n. 84), and in her written works such as “Der Sozialpatriotismus in Polen,” *Die Neue Zeit*, XIV(II), No. 4 (1895-96), “Kwestja narodowościowa i autonomia” (Nationality Question and Autonomy), in *Przegląd Socjaldemokratyczny*, Nos. 6-10 (1908), 12, 14-15 (1909). Shortly before her death she castigated (1918) “Lenin and company” for having inflated Ukrainian nationalism into a political factor by “their doctrinaire agitation for national self-determination.” She also spoke ironically about the “nations and *Natiönchen* [‘little nations’] such as Poles, Ukrainians, Belorussians, Lithuanians, Czechs, Yugoslavs, ten new nations of the Caucasus” announcing their claims for statehood, and “the Zionists already constructing their Palestine ghetto, temporarily in Philadelphia . . .” See the excerpts of Rosa Luxemburg’s unpublished manuscripts, in Carl Grünberg, ed., *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung* (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 291, 293. See also Shaheen, pp. 90-92.

So far the establishment of a free and independent national state has remained in Russia a privilege of the Russian nation alone. We Russian proletarians do not endorse any privileges, and we do not endorse this one either.⁹⁶

Lenin particularly stressed the Ukrainian problem in declaring "the right of the Ukraine to such a [independent] state."⁹⁷ In the same work, Lenin argued that the recent secession of Norway from Sweden was a good lesson for socialists; it showed

on what grounds cases of the secession of nations are possible, and actually occur, under modern economic and political relations. . . . This example is *practical* proof that it is the *bounden duty* of class-conscious workers to conduct systematic propaganda and prepare the ground for the settlement of conflicts that may arise over the secession of nations not in the "Russian way," but only in the way they were settled in 1905 between Norway and Sweden.⁹⁸

In his lecture to Polish students in Cracow (1914), Lenin was forced to defend himself against criticism that his idea of self-determination was an abstract one since he opposed any secession from the Russian state. Lenin stated:

The slogan of self-determination is not an abstract one. . . . First of all it is a means of struggle against Great Russian nationalism which, for centuries, has taught the Russian masses and soldiers that the lands and peoples conquered by their arms and blood are their lawful booty to be treated as their property, as objects of exploitation. Without a categorical counteraction against that ideology of imperialistic nationalism, one cannot talk about real international solidarity nor the attaining of democracy.⁹⁹

World War I brought to the fore the problem of national self-determination. The resolution of the Conference of socialists from Denmark, Holland, Norway, and Sweden at Copenhagen, January 1915, called for "recognition of the right of self-determination of the nations."¹⁰⁰ The manifesto of the Conference of anti-war socialist groups at Zimmerwald, Switzerland, September 1915, also recognized "the right of nations to self-determination." In the journal set up by

⁹⁶ Lenin, XVII, 441.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 452.

⁹⁹ *Leninskii sbornik*, XVII, 233.

¹⁰⁰ See Sarah Wambaugh, *Plebiscites Since the World War*, I (Washington, D.C., 1933), p. 3, n. 1.

the Conference (*Vorbote*) two sets of "theses" concerning the question of national oppression of dependent peoples were published in 1916. Both of them condemned it very strongly, but the first, written by Lenin, provided for national self-determination; the second, written by Karl Radek (who followed in the Rosa Luxemburg's steps), asked only for the direct "infusion of the struggle against national oppression into the broad stream of the revolutionary struggle for socialism."¹⁰¹ In his thesis "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination," as well as in "The Discussion of Self-Determination Summed Up" published also in 1916, Lenin did not change the fundamentals of his teaching on the question of the dependent countries. He continued to advocate his dichotomous concept of national self-determination, only perhaps more convincingly. In his public lectures of that time Lenin laid great emphasis on the slogan of self-determination; this tended to create the impression that the Bolshevik Party was the most sympathetic of all the Russian parties toward the cause of the dependent peoples. At the International Socialist Conference in Bern in April 1916, Lenin championed the rights of all oppressed nations and reproached Western European and Russian socialists alike with neglecting to condemn in principle any national oppression. German and Austrian socialists "keep silence about German annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, Denmark, [western] Poland, etc., but very often 'struggle against annexations' of Finland, Poland, the Ukraine, the Caucasus, etc., by Russia, of India by England, etc."; similarly English, French, Italian, and Russian socialists "keep silence about the annexation of India by the English, of Nice or Morocco by the French, of Tripoli or Albania by the Italians, of Poland, the Ukraine, etc., by the Russians."¹⁰² Lenin declared that an English socialist is obliged to work "for the freedom of secession of Ireland, India, etc.," a Russian socialist "for the freedom of secession of the Ukraine, Finland, etc.," a Dutch socialist "for the freedom and independence of Dutch India." A socialist who does not do this, Lenin stated, "is a socialist and internationalist in words only, and a chauvinist and annexationist in reality." And he added, "It is clear that those Russian 'socialists' who speak and write against the 'break-up of Russia' . . . are likewise annexationists."¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ Quoted in Lenin, XIX (suppl. documents), 440.

¹⁰² *Leninskii sbornik*, XVII, 168.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

In a note written at that time (not published until after the war), Lenin even asserted that "socialists and democrats of the oppressed nations should denounce in all their propaganda and agitation those socialists of the oppressor nations (regardless of whether they are Russians or German . . .) as scoundrels who do not stand consistently and unconditionally for the freedom of secession of the nations oppressed (or forcibly retained) by their own nations."¹⁰⁴ In the above-mentioned two works, Lenin wrote that "Russians who do not demand the freedom of secession of Finland, Poland, the Ukraine . . . conduct themselves like chauvinists, like lackeys . . . of imperialistic monarchies and the imperialistic bourgeoisie"; Social Democrats who only "acknowledge" the right to self-determination but "do not struggle for freedom of separation," are in his eyes, "imperialists and lackeys of tsarism."¹⁰⁵ Lenin strengthened his stand with a quotation from a letter Marx wrote Engels in which he noted "a deficiency common to socialists of the dominant nations (English and Russian): not understanding their obligation to the oppressed nations, [and] taking up the prejudices of the imperialistic bourgeoisie."¹⁰⁶

Lenin expressed similar views in his already mentioned lectures in Bern and Geneva (1916). One member of the Jewish *Bund* recollected the astonishment of the audience when Lenin supposedly "advocated cutting away Russia's peripheral provinces, the Ukraine, the Baltic provinces, and the rest," and quoted Lenin as having said that: "We Great Russians have always acted like boors toward subject peoples. All we can do is suppress them."¹⁰⁷ Most probably the audience did not grasp the dichotomy of Lenin's intricate (or "paradoxical," as Stalin said twenty years later¹⁰⁸) concept of national self-determination. Lenin did not envisage an actual secession; from 1903 on, he continued to stress that the task of a proletarian party was "two-sided: the recognition of the right to self-determination for all nations . . . and the closest indissoluble union in the class struggle of the proletarians of all nations in a given state."¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ "V tryokh sosnakh zabludilis'" (Zurich, 1916), *ibid.*, p. 333.

¹⁰⁵ "Sotsialisticheskaya revolyutsiya i pravo natsii na samoopredelenie: Tezisy" (1916), Lenin, XIX, 46; "Itogi diskussii o samoopredelenii" (1916), *ibid.*, p. 272.

¹⁰⁶ Lenin, XVII, 459. Also *Leninskii sbornik*, XVII, 248.

¹⁰⁷ Quoted in David Shub, *Lenin: A Biography* (Garden City, N.Y., 1948), p. 133.

¹⁰⁸ J. V. Stalin, *Politicheskii raport Tsentral'nogo Komiteta* (Moscow, 1936), p. 95.

¹⁰⁹ "O prave natsii na samoopredelenie" (1914), Lenin, XVII, 458. In the Moscow translation of this passage the word *dvustoronnyaya* is rendered not as two-sided (or bilateral), but as "twofold." Lenin, *Questions of National Policy*, p. 106.

Lenin's teaching of the "two-sided" party policy was officially accepted by the previously mentioned Poronin Party Conference (1913) when it was decided that

the question of the right of nations to self-determination . . . is not to be confused with the question of the expediency of the secession of one nation or another. The Social Democratic Party should decide this latter question wholly independently in every individual case, from the point of view of the interests of all social development and the class struggle for socialism.¹¹⁰

The "two-sided" party policy was to be implemented by the stipulation of different tasks for the socialists of an oppressor nation and those of an enslaved nation. The socialists of the former should struggle against their nationalism and against the enforced confinement of other nations within the framework of their national state. The socialists of an oppressed nation should combat all manifestations of nationalism among their people; they should "adhere to and bring into life the complete and unconditional unity of labor, including the organizational unity of the enslaved nation with the labor of the dominating nation."¹¹¹

Lenin's dichotomous concept of self-determination of nations is not without historical precedent in Russian political thought. Alexander Herzen also had recognized the right to self-determination, especially of Poland and the Ukraine. But, as did Lenin afterwards, Herzen answered the question: "Do we desire that free Poland secede from free Russia?" in the negative: "No, we do not desire that; and how can one desire that at a time when exclusive nationalities, when international hostilities, are among the chief obstacles that hamper general human progress."¹¹² One article published shortly after Lenin's death in an official Party periodical noted that the program of the People's Will Party in the 1880's, which included the right of non-Russian peoples to full independence as well as an appeal to common action and reconstruction of the Empire based on a community of

¹¹⁰ Quoted in *Vsesoyuznaya Kommunisticheskaya Partiya*, p. 239; also Lenin, XVII, 12-13.

¹¹¹ "Sotsialisticheskaya revolyutsiya i pravo natsii na samoopredelenie: Tezisy," Lenin, XIX, 41.

¹¹² Quoted in Dragomanov, p. 42.

interests, "almost completely coincided" with the program "elaborated by Lenin."¹¹³

The peculiarity of Lenin's approach to the problem of the dependent peoples of the Russian Empire lies in the interlocking of his two important conceptual and organizational endeavors.

The first was his attempt to provide the many non-Russian nationalities in Eastern Europe and Asia with a chance to participate in the development of their respective regions and to direct the forces of regional nationalisms into the channels of neighborly cooperation. Lenin stated once that "the recognition of the *right* of *all* nations to self-determination implies the maximum of *democracy* and the minimum of nationalism."¹¹⁴

The second endeavor was his skillful use (or abuse, from the viewpoint of later developments) of the slogan of self-determination of nations as a psychological weapon—as a means of aiding the Bolshevik Party to take control of the seceding non-Russian dependencies of the Russian Empire. Lenin had this on his mind when he asserted, even before the dissolution of the Empire, that "freedom of secession is the best and only political means of combatting the idiotic system of small states (*Kleinstaaterei*)."¹¹⁵ Once he approvingly agreed, by noting *ganz richtig* marginally to the dictum in a work of one Dutch socialist, that small nations are always threatened in their very existence and, therefore, "the proletariat of these countries . . . should follow the policy of the proletariat of great countries."¹¹⁶ Such conduct by the workers' parties of small nations was expected to lead to the creation of large multinational commonwealths. "We desire great states; a rapprochement, eventually even a merger, of nations," Lenin declared, and added that this should be done "on a genuinely demo-

¹¹³ B. Gorev, "Rossiiskie korni leninizma," *Pod znamenem marksizma*, No. 2 (February 1924), p. 89, n. 1.

¹¹⁴ "O prave natsii na samoopredelenie" (1914), Lenin, XVII, 458.

¹¹⁵ *Leninskii sbornik*, XXX, 128. Lenin often emphasized the importance of impressing people by proper catchwords; see, e.g., his letter to Shaumyan (1913) in which he speaks of "that psychology, which especially is important in the nationality question." Lenin, XVII, 89. Several authors bring this out by pointing out that Lenin wanted to placate "national *amour propre*" of non-Russian nationalities. See Maynard, pp. 400-401; also Cobban, p. 108. One author asserts that Lenin's concepts were "nothing more than a sop to attract the gullible among the nationalities or a lever to facilitate the work of the 'renegades' among them." Shaheen, p. 145.

¹¹⁶ *Leninskii sbornik*, XVII, 302 (Hermann Gorter, *Der Imperialismus, der Weltkrieg und die Sozialdemokratie* [Amsterdam, 1915]).

cratic, truly international basis, which is unthinkable without the freedom of secession."¹¹⁷ He was convinced, almost with the certainty of a physicist who knows well the laws and forces of physics, that the more freedom to secede was granted to a dependent country the less would be the desire for actual secession, since the conveniences which great states have to offer are not open to doubt.¹¹⁸

Lenin did not elaborate on the method by which free self-determination was to be realized, and only incidentally stated that the decision properly must be made by the representative assembly or by a referendum of the particular dependent people, and not by the central government of the state.¹¹⁹ And he eliminated in principle the use of force by the government of the former oppressor state as "a menace to the democratic structure of the state."¹²⁰

The events of World War I prompted Lenin to concentrate on his concept of national self-determination while paying little attention to his initial idea of territorial autonomy on an ethnic basis for the non-Russian nationalities. The outcome of the war provided him with a rare opportunity to carry both his ideas into practice. The third year of World War I—1917—brought a great change in the Russian political situation. Weakened by failures at the front and isolated from the broad popular masses, the tsarist regime fell. Lenin returned to Russia from his Swiss exile.

¹¹⁷ Lenin, XVIII, 328.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, XIX, 39–40. For example, Lenin took for granted at that time that "the secession of Poland and Finland after the victory of socialism [in Russia] could take place only for a short time," because Polish and Finnish workers would have no cause to fear oppression by socialist Russia. "O karikature na marksizm" (1916), *ibid.*, p. 228. However, Lenin changed his views later when he took notice of the "imperialistic attitudes toward the oppressed nationalities" practiced by some Soviet Russian leaders (see p. 62). M. Djilas asserts that, according to Lenin's later views, only a close military and economic union of socialist states, and not necessarily complete integration, was "indispensably needed." Such a union was to be realized, first of all, by means of an enlightened and mutual "economically non-profit-bearing and politically non-dominant assistance." Djilas, pp. 38–43. See Lenin, XIX, 255.

¹¹⁹ Lenin, XVII, 119; XIX, 39.

¹²⁰ *Leninskii sbornik*, XVII, 228–29. Already in 1903 Lenin assured that "Social Democracy always shall fight against any attempt to influence from the outside national self-determination by coercion or any other injustice." Lenin, V, 337–40. However, Lenin did not exclude war against actual secession when it was not supported by the proletarian party (1913): "When a democratic vote gives the reactionaries a majority, one of two things may, and usually does, occur: either the decision of the reactionaries is implemented . . . or the conflict with the reactionaries is decided by a civil or other war." "O natsional'noi programme," Lenin, XVII, 119.

In the article, "The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution," Lenin defined "the program of the revolutionary proletariat" as including "complete freedom of secession, the broadest local (and national) autonomy, and elaborate guarantees of the rights of national minorities."¹²¹ Within a short time the Seventh (April) Conference of the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party (of Bolsheviks) was convened and, under Lenin's influence and with Stalin as spokesman, ratified the following resolution:

The policy of national oppression, an inheritance of autocracy and monarchy, is supported by the great landowners, capitalists and petty bourgeoisie in the interests of protecting their class privileges and promoting dissension among the workers of various nationalities.

The right of free secession and the establishment of independent states should be conceded to all the nations which make up Russia. The denial of such a right, and the failure to adopt measures which guarantee its practical realization, amounts to the support of a policy of conquest and annexation. Only the recognition by the proletariat of the right of nations to secession guarantees the full solidarity of the workers of various nations and favors a true democratic coming together of nations.

The conflict which has occurred at the present time between Finland and the Russian Provisional Government illustrates very clearly that denial of the right to freedom of secession leads to a direct continuation of the policy of tsarism.¹²²

Later in the resolution, however, it is stated that the "problem of the expediency of secession" will be decided by the Party "from the viewpoint of the interests of all social development, and the interests of the class struggle for socialism." For those peoples who remained within the Russian state, the Party proposed territorial autonomy.¹²³

¹²¹ "Zadachi proletariata v nashei revolyutsii: Proekt platformy proletarskoi partii" (written in April, published in September 1917), Lenin, XX, 123.

¹²² Quoted in *Vsesoyuznaya Kommunisticheskaya Partiya*, pp. 271-72. On Stalin's changing role from an ardent supporter, then an official spokesman for Lenin's views, to a virtual opponent, see note 130, and pp. 41-42. A brief account of Stalin's views on the nationality question is given in M. D. Kammari, *The Development by J. V. Stalin of the Marxist-Leninist Theory of the National Question* (Moscow, 1951). Stalin is called "the genius who is continuing the great cause of Lenin," and who has developed "the theory of Marxism-Leninism applicable to the new epoch of history which is rightly called the Stalin epoch" (p. 5). However, a new Soviet work on the nationality problem mentions Stalin only casually. Erygin, pp. 28, 30, 77, 91, 96, 97.

¹²³ Compare Party's prewar statement on the "two-sided" nationality policy, p. 36 and note 110.

This resolution was a complete reflection of Lenin's ideas. It passed, but the opposition was not insignificant.¹²⁴ During the discussion the atmosphere was extremely tense, as "this was not only a theoretical quarrel," wrote the Party historian Yaroslavsky, "but a question imposed upon us by life itself, a question which concerned a great many states forcibly annexed to Russia, states which tended toward secession (the Ukraine and especially Finland) and which at that time were already in conflict with the Provisional Government on the question of autonomy."¹²⁵ The opponents to the recognition of the right of nations to self-determination considered that it was reactionary because it would lead to a political and economic division of the Russian state. Their spokesman, George Pyatakov, a Russian Bolshevik leader from the Ukraine, thought that if the general opinion of the Bolsheviks, including Lenin, was against the division of the Russian state, then the proclamation by the Party of the right of nations to self-determination would be a "contentless right." "Social Democrats," he said, "declare certain rights in order to realize them in one way or another. But if we say that the realization of such a right is harmful, then it is incomprehensible why we should declare it."¹²⁶ Actually Pyatakov had opposed Lenin's idea of self-determination of nations in the past (1916), having formulated a very pertinent question in one of his articles: "What will the worker think when, asking a propagandist the question of independence (i.e., political self-determination for the Ukraine), he is answered that the socialists stand for the right of secession but are engaged in propaganda against secession." Lenin's answer was that "P. Kievsky [G. Pyatakov] does not know how to think."¹²⁷

In the plenary session of the Conference Lenin himself tried to prove the validity of his opinion:

Why we Russians, who oppress a great number of nations, more than anyone else, should not recognize the right of secession of Poland, the Ukraine, Finland. . . . Shall we continue the policy of the tsars? That would mean a

¹²⁴ Data on the voting differ among Soviet historians. There were 56 votes cast for, 26 against, 18 abstaining, according to Em. Yaroslavskii, *Istoriya VKP(b)*, I (Moscow, 1926), 118.

¹²⁵ Em. Yaroslavskii, *Ocherki po istorii VKP(b)*, I (3d ed.; Moscow, 1937), 239.

¹²⁶ Quoted in Velikovskii, I, 406.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 377. Lenin's article "O karikature na marksizm i ob 'imperialisticheskom ekonomizme'" (1916) contains his argumentation against Pyatakov's unpublished article. See Lenin, XIX, 191-235, 466.

complete refusal of internationalist tactics, it would mean chauvinism of the worst pattern. . . . We want the brotherly union of all peoples. If there should be a Ukrainian republic as well as a Russian republic, we will have greater association, more confidence in one another. Once the Ukrainians see that ours is the Republic of the Soviets, they will not separate themselves.¹²⁸

At the conclusion of the discussion Stalin stated that "in general both resolutions [i.e., his and Lenin's, and Pyatakov's drafts] amount to the same thing,"¹²⁹ as if foreshadowing his own future nationality policy in the Soviet Union.

THE THIRD STAGE OF THE FORMATION OF THE IDEA: THE EMERGING PATTERN OF SOVIET FEDERALISM

Lenin began to put into practice his ideas on the reconstruction of the Russian state as soon as he came into power in the newly created Soviet government. His influence was felt not only in the substance of the Soviet nationality policy, but even in the very words used in the acts which put it into effect. His first assistant in these problems was Joseph Stalin who, at Lenin's behest, had written a pamphlet on the nationality problem four years earlier and who generally supported his ideas.¹³⁰

¹²⁸ Quoted in Velikovskii, I, 408-10. Felix Dzerzhinsky [Dzierżyński] opposed Lenin's views and even accused him of "sharing a similar point of view with the Polish, Ukrainian, and other chauvinists." Velikovskii, p. 411. A few years later, speaking of the typical Russian bureaucrat, "of that really Russian man, the Great-Russian chauvinist, in substance a rascal and lover of violence," Lenin stated that Dzerzhinsky "distinguished himself there [in Georgia] by his 'genuine' Russian frame of mind (it is common knowledge that people of other nationalities who become Russified overdo this Russian frame of mind)," and castigated him, along with Stalin, for "imperialist attitudes towards oppressed nationalities." Lenin, *Questions of National Policy*, pp. 199-200, 202.

¹²⁹ Quoted in Velikovskii, I, 418. Though Stalin abstained from criticizing Lenin's views openly, his statement seems to indicate not only his nonacceptance of Lenin's ideas, but also his proclivity to attach little importance (later) to the formal aspects of the structure of the Soviet multinational commonwealth.

¹³⁰ In his struggle for a centralized party before World War I, Lenin was energetically supported by Joseph Dzhugashvili (Stalin), a Russified Georgian. At Lenin's behest, Stalin wrote a pamphlet (1913) entitled "The National Question and Social Democracy" (later on the title was changed to "Marxism and the National Question"). In this work, as in an earlier article written in Georgian in 1904, "How Social Democrats Understand the National Question" (see Russian translation in *Pod znamenem marksizma*, No. 12 [1939], pp. 60-72), Stalin confined himself to a reproduction of the Party's concepts, chiefly as formulated by Lenin.

In the very first act, "The Appeal to the Workers, Soldiers and Peasants on the Victory of the October Revolution and Its Next Tasks," dated October 25 (November 7, New Style), 1917, the Soviet government announced that it would "guarantee the genuine right of self-determination to all nations that inhabit Russia."¹³¹ Next day, in the "Decree of Peace," it demanded "the right of free voting" for any oppressed nationality and stipulated, as the proper method of carrying out the principle of national self-determination, that "such plebiscite" must take place "under the condition of complete removal of the [foreign] armies."¹³² On November 2 (November 15), 1917, the "Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia," issued over the signatures of Lenin and of Stalin (as People's Commissar for the Affairs of Nationalities), proclaimed "the right of the nations to free self-determination up to secession and the establishment of independent states," and also "the equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia," "abolishment of all national and national-religious privileges and restrictions," and "free development of the national minorities and ethnic groups that live in Russia."¹³³

However, Lenin's calculated certainty that the declaration of free self-determination of nations alone would suffice to placate the dependencies of Russia and that they would then voluntarily remain in the

Professor Pipes states that "this essay represented no advance over discussion held by Russian Social Democrats previous to 1913, but rather a not too intelligent restatement of old arguments, replete with errors in fact and in reasoning." Pipes, p. 41. Therefore the assurances, fairly widespread for some time past, to the effect that Stalin "developed the fundamentals of the solution of the nationality problem four years before the victory of the Socialist Revolution" (Winternitz, p. 24 [a pro-Communist work]), and that before that time Lenin had had "nothing to do with the nationality problem" (N. Basseches, *Stalin: Das Schicksal eines Erfolges* [Bern, 1950], p. 26 [anti-Communist]) are completely fallacious. Yet even such a prominent scholar as Alfred Cobban wrote that "the leading specialist of the Communist Party on the question was his [Lenin's] colleague Stalin, in whose writings a more elaborate treatment of the whole problem can be found." *National Self-Determination*, p. 104; likewise Macartney, p. 453; Maynard, pp. 380, 402; and Malbone W. Graham, in Harper, ed., *The Soviet Union and World-Problems*, p. 162. For correct evaluation, see also Low, pp. 10-11, 141-43 (notes 7 and 9); Shaheen, pp. 66-72; and especially Erich Hula, "The Nationalities Policy of the Soviet Union: Theory and Practice," *Social Research*, II, No. 2 (1944), 171-79.

¹³¹ Quoted in V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin, *O sovetskoi konstitutsii* (Moscow, 1936), p. 257.

¹³² Quoted in T. A. Taracouzio, *The Soviet Union and International Law* (New York, 1935), pp. 405-406. See also Starushenko, pp. 88-92.

¹³³ V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin, *O sovetskoi konstitutsii*, pp. 267-68.

reconstructed Russian state did not materialize. In the majority of the non-Russian lands which up to that time had belonged to the Russian Empire, national non-Bolshevik governments aiming at independence or at least at some kind of federal union with Russia were set up. How did the new Soviet government, which had just declared the right of the nations to free self-determination up to secession, treat these governments? In a very peculiar, though not wholly unforeseen, manner. The attitude toward the Ukraine, the largest dependency of Russia, may serve as an example.

Bolshevik influence in the Ukraine was slight as evidenced by the results of the elections to the Russian Constituent Assembly, November 12 (25), 1917.¹³⁴ It is no wonder then, as a noted Bolshevik Party historian, N. Popov, acknowledges, that "the successor to the Provisional Government [Petrograd] in the Ukraine was not the Soviet Government but the Government of the Central Ukrainian Council"¹³⁵ (the autonomous Ukrainian People's Republic was proclaimed on November 7 [November 20, New Style], 1917). First of all, the Bolshevik attempt to dominate the Ukrainian soviets was unsuccessful. The All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets (*rady*) in Kiev, on December 4-6 (December 17-19, New Style), 1917, declared its adherence to the Ukrainian representative assembly, the Central *Rada* (Council), although it had been prepared and convoked by the Kiev Committee of Soviets under the leadership of a Bolshevik, Eugenia Bosh. "The opening of the Congress," writes another Bolshevik historian and an active participant in the rally, M. Mayorov, "turned into a complete demonstration against the Bolsheviks. Ministers of the Central Council were elected as presiding officers of the Congress, and the audience welcomed them with tremendous applause."¹³⁶

¹³⁴ The Bolsheviks received, on the average, only 10% of the votes in the Ukraine (at the same time, about 40% in the central provinces of Russia proper); in such provinces as Kiev, Volhynia, and Poltava, the Bolsheviks received only 3%, 4%, or 6% of the votes cast. See Lenin's analysis of the election results, "Vybory v uchreditel'noe sobranie i diktatura proletariata" (pub. 1919), Lenin, XXIV, 632, 645. See also M. M. [N. N.] Popov, *Narys istoriyi Komunistychnoyi Partiyi (bil'shovykiiv) Ukrayiny* (Kharkiv, 1929), pp. 120-22; M. V. Vishnyak, *Vse-rossiiskoe uchreditel'noe sobranie* (Paris, 1932), p. 91; and especially Borys, pp. 157-61.

¹³⁵ Popov, p. 123.

¹³⁶ M. Mayorov, *Z istoriyi revolyutsiyanoi borot'by na Ukrayini, 1914-1919* (Kharkiv, 1928), p. 50. See also John S. Reshetar, Jr., *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917-1920: A Study in Nationalism* (Princeton, 1952), pp. 93 ff.; Dmytryshyn, pp.

In the meantime, the Council of People's Commissars of Soviet Russia, by an act of December 4 (December 17), 1917, acknowledged the establishment of the Ukrainian People's Republic. In the same act, however, it blamed the Ukrainian government for acts unfriendly to the Soviets and issued an ultimatum demanding political collaboration; otherwise the *Rada* would be considered "as being in a state of open war against the Soviet power in Russia and in the Ukraine."¹³⁷ Lenin himself was the principal author of that peculiar document.¹³⁸ The All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets (in Kiev) denounced the act of the Soviet Russian government as violating the right of the Ukrainian people to "self-determination and free development of its state life" (resolution of the Congress), and stated, in its appeal to the peoples of Russia, that "the SNK [Council of People's Commissars] recognizes the right to self-determination and secession only in words. In reality . . . these same commissars give the right of self-determination only to their Party, while attempting, just as the tsarist regime did, to keep other groups and peoples under their rule by force of arms."¹³⁹ Subsequently, the Bolshevik delegates to the Congress left Kiev and went to Kharkiv, which had just been occupied by Soviet Russian forces, where, in collaboration with the Congress of local soviets, they proclaimed themselves to be the genuine All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets, December 11–12 (December 24–25, New Style), 1917. They elected a Central Executive Committee and subsequently appointed a new governing body of the Ukraine, the People's Secretariat, as the counterpart of the General Secretariat in Kiev. Thus the first Soviet government of the Ukraine was formed, Decem-

28–30; Borys, pp. 173–76; Robert S. Sullivant, *Soviet Politics and the Ukraine, 1917–1957* (New York, 1962), pp. 34–36.

¹³⁷ RSFSR, *Sobranie zakononii i rasporyazhenii rabocheho i krestyanskogo pravitel'stva*, I, No. 6 (1917), art. 90. See also Lenin, XXII, 121–23.

¹³⁸ See preparatory drafts in *Leninskii sbornik*, XVIII, 59–62. According to explanatory notes, the recognition of independence was drafted by Lenin and the ultimatum itself by L. Trotsky. *Ibid.*, XXII, 591. Three versions concerning the authorship are noted in Borys, p. 165, n. 89. One author insists that "there is nothing contradictory in the combination, in one decree of the Soviet government, of recognition of the Ukraine's independence with an ultimatum to her bourgeois-nationalist government." Schlesinger, *The Nationalities Policy*, p. 14. However, another author states that this Ukrainian government was "representing social-revolutionaries, social-democrats, social-federalists (a Ukrainian radical group) and national minorities." Carr, I, 292.

¹³⁹ Quoted in P. Khrystyuk, *Zamitky i materiyaly do istoriyi ukraiyins'koyi revolyutsiyi* (Vienna, 1921), II, 72–73.

ber 17 (December 30, New Style), 1917. It was done, according to N. Popov, "with the energetic participation, and partly by the direct initiative, of the military units . . . which arrived from the north, mainly from the Petrograd [Leningrad] and Moscow garrisons" because the local Bolsheviks "lacked the strength as well as the resolution . . . to seize the power in their own hands."¹⁴⁰

The Bolsheviks attempted to utilize the creation of the Soviet government of the Ukrainian People's Republic (this name of the Ukrainian state was retained by the Bolsheviks until they introduced a new name, "The Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic," on January 14, 1919) for concrete diplomatic benefits, though without success, at the Peace Conference at Brest Litovsk, as well as for military conquest.¹⁴¹ Later on, the Second All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets, which was summoned by the People's Secretariat in Katerynoslav, made a declaration of independence of the Ukraine on March 18, 1918, following the declaration of independence by the Central Coun-

¹⁴⁰ Popov, p. 135. See documents and articles in *Letopis' revolyutsii* (later *Litopys revolyutsyi*), Nos. 5-6 (1927), No. 1 (1928), and *Arkhiv Radyans'koyi Ukrayiny*, Nos. 1-2 (1932); see also Akademiya Nauk Ukrayins'koyi RSR, *Istoriya derzhavy i prava Ukrayins'koyi RSR, 1917-1960* (Kiev, 1961), pp. 57-67, and sources indicated in n. 136.

¹⁴¹ It is interesting to note that even after the first armed clashes between the forces of the Soviet Russian government and those of the Ukrainian Kiev Central Council, L. Trotsky, as the head of the Soviet Russian Peace delegation, recognized the independence of the Ukrainian People's Republic and agreed to the participation in the conference of the delegates from Kiev (declarations of December 28 and 30, 1917 [January 10 and 12, 1918, New Style]). Later on, Trotsky included the representatives from Kharkiv in his delegation and asked the Central Powers to recognize them as the representatives of the Ukrainian People's Republic. See Khrystyuk, II, 109. In general, the Bolsheviks endeavored to create the impression that this was not a war of aggression, but a civil war. One member of the People's Secretariat states that "our conception was as follows: the Ukrainian Soviet government, the People's Secretariat, goes to war against the bourgeois government, with the brotherly help of the Council of the People's Commissars." Georg Lapchyn's'kyi, "Persnyi period radyans'koyi vlady na Ukrayini," in *Litopys revolyutsyi*, No. 1 (1928), p. 175. However, Lapchyn's'kyi notes "the rudeness towards local [Soviet Ukrainian] authorities" exhibited by the commissars of the Russian military forces (p. 174). He also quotes another member of the People's Secretariat (and a Soviet Ukrainian representative in Brest Litovsk): "As our sole support in our fight against the Central Council we have only forces brought from Russia into the Ukraine by [V. A.] Antonov, who frowns upon everything Ukrainian as hostile, counterrevolutionary" (p. 172). Lenin personally tried to soften his field commander; he noted "the complaints of the People's Secretariat" against his behavior, and urged him to show "national arch-tact." See Lenin's telegrams to Antonov in Lenin, *Sochineniya* (4th ed.), XXXVI (1957), 432-33. See also Carr, I, 297-98.

cil in Kiev, on January 22, 1918.¹⁴² Subsequently, the Council of People's Commissars of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic received the delegation of the Soviet government of the Ukraine, an event which somehow passed by almost unnoticed, and recognized the UNR (Ukrainian People's Republic) as an independent Soviet Republic on April 3, 1918.¹⁴³

The Bolsheviks failed, however, this time to sovietize the Ukraine, although they were more successful in later years—in the Ukraine as well as in other former dependencies of Russia. Formally independent Soviet governments were set up, under the effective control of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks), which defeated and replaced the non-Soviet national governments (with the exception of the Baltic states, Finland and Poland). The concept of self-determination of nations could not be disclaimed altogether: Lenin had become, as A.D. Low aptly states, “the prisoner of his own slogan,”¹⁴⁴ and it needed to be substantiated by the granting of at least formal independence to the former dependencies of Russia.

In the clash of the Bolsheviks with, and their victory over, the national liberation movements of the non-Russian peoples (1917–22), Lenin's idea of a multinational state with its ancillary concept of self-determination of nations passed its first practical test. And it underwent an important transmutation: retaining its core, the concept of the monolithic Bolshevik Party, it lost one of its original components but gained two other components that Lenin before had guardedly appreciated but not accepted (which later were practically negated by Stalin). First, quite in line with his general political and legal theory in which the resort to force was broadly applicable, Lenin repudiated without hesitation his antecedent renunciation of force as the means of preventing the disintegration of the former Russian

¹⁴² “The Resolution on the State Structure” of the Congress of Soviets formally announced that the “Ukrainian People's Republic becomes an independent Soviet republic” (with the boundaries designated by the Third and Fourth Universal of the Central Council in Kiev), and expressed the confidence that the increasing number of Soviet republics would soon be united into one “World Socialist Federation.” See “Materiyaly pro druihy Vseukrayins'kyi Zyizd Rad,” in *Litopys revolyutsiyi*, No. 2 (1928), p. 263.

¹⁴³ RSFSR, *Izvestiya Vserossiiskogo TsIK Sovetov*, No. 65 (April 4, 1918), p. 4. See M. Matviyevs'kyi, “Suverenitet Ukrayiny ta dohovir vid 28/XII 1920 r.,” in *Zbirnyk stattey katedry ‘Problemy suchasnoho prava’ ta Pravychnoho fakul'tetu Kharkiv'skoho Instytutu Narodn'oho Hospodarstva*, II (Kharkiv, 1928), 32–33.

¹⁴⁴ Low, p. 124. See n. 160.

Empire. Second, Lenin took a more practical look at the prospect for the withering away of national differences and antagonisms; he admitted the necessity of a more loose and flexible, possibly broadly federal structure for a multinational commonwealth, which would be counterweighted by the centripetal power of the monolithic Bolshevik Party. Third, Lenin finally decided to give his concepts more general significance and international applicability in order to provide a pattern for the future Communist community of nations. The Party program (1919), according to E. C. Carr, "established for the first time the identity of principle and policy as applied to the nationalities of the former Russian Empire and to those oppressed by other imperialist powers—the link between Soviet domestic and foreign policy."¹⁴⁵ "Lenin's vision," states A. D. Low, "embraced equally Europe, Asia, Africa, the world; he abandoned the traditional and limiting view which sharply distinguished between oppressed peoples in Europe and those overseas."¹⁴⁶

The transmutation of Lenin's idea started when he took forceful measures against the seceding non-Russian lands of the former Russian Empire and when he simultaneously began to realize his prewar program of limited territorial autonomy for the non-Russian ethnic groups within the new, smaller, and essentially Russian Soviet state—the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic (RSFSR). This transmutation was concluded when the multilateral "Treaty of the Formation of the USSR," avowedly international in character, was ratified in December 1922.

The fundamentals of the reconstruction of the RSFSR are contained in its first Constitution, of July 10, 1918:

The Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic is established on the basis of a free union of free nations, as a federation of Soviet national republics (*Art. 2*). The soviets of the provinces which are distinguished by a special way of life and national composition may unite into provincial autonomous unions (*Art. 11*). The Russian Socialist Federative Republic, in

¹⁴⁵ Carr, I, 269.

¹⁴⁶ Low, p. 76. See "O karikature na marksizm i ob 'imperialisticheskom ekonomizme'," Lenin, XIX, 191–235. Lenin distinguished "three distinct types of countries in the question of self-determination": (1) the advanced countries of West Europe (and America), where national movements are of the past; (2) the East of Europe, where they are contemporary; (3) semi-colonies and colonies where, to a considerable extent, they are coming in the future (pp. 203–204). See also Lenin, XIX, 43–44.

recognizing equal rights of citizens without difference of race or nationality, announces that the establishment of any kind of privileges or superiority on this basis is contrary to the fundamental laws of the Republic, as is any kind of oppression of national minorities or restriction of their equality (*Art. 22*).¹⁴⁷

Even before the adoption of this Constitution, the Soviet government created a special People's Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities; in time subcommissariats for the affairs of each different nationality were attached to this; for example, for Moslem affairs (January 19, 1918), for Jewish affairs (January 23, 1918), for the Chuvash (May 24, 1918), for the Volga Germans (June 5, 1918), etc.¹⁴⁸

The cooperation of the various ethnic groups was solicited. Lenin devoted special attention to the peoples of Central Asia; for instance, in the proclamation "To All Moslem Toilers of Russia and the East," issued over the signatures of Lenin and Stalin on November 20 (December 3, N.S.), it is stated:

From now on your traditions and customs, your national and cultural institutions are proclaimed free and inviolable. . . . Build your national life freely and without interference.¹⁴⁹

In another proclamation Lenin and Stalin summoned the Moslems, "in the name of your freedom, in the name of your national development," to struggle against the enemies of the Soviet regime. At the

¹⁴⁷ Quoted in S. S. Studenikin, ed., *Istoriya sovetskoj konstitutsii v dokumentakh, 1917-1956* (Moscow, 1957), pp. 143-47.

¹⁴⁸ The creation of a separate ministry for the affairs of nationalities (or national minorities) on October 26 (November 8, New Style), 1917, was not an original Soviet idea. As early as July 1, 1917, a special Department (Secretariat) for the Affairs of National Minorities was established within the General Secretariat of the Ukraine, with state undersecretaries for Russian, Polish, and Jewish affairs. National minority groups were encouraged to set up their own institutions of public law-national councils (October 1917)—and were granted so-called cultural autonomy (January 9, 1918). In this respect the most noteworthy was the Jewish National Council. It was the first instance in modern history when the Jews, as a recognized nationality, were urged to organize themselves politically. See M. Rafes, *Ocherki po istorii 'Bunda'* (Moscow, 1923), pp. 281 ff.; Arthur von Balogh, *Der internationale Schutz der Minderheiten* (Munich, 1928), p. 189; Jakob Robinson, "Autonomie," *Encyclopaedia Judaica: Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, III (1929), 759-60; Simon Dubnow, "Jewish Autonomy," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, VIII (1932), 393.

¹⁴⁹ Quoted in *Politika sovetskoj vlasti po natsional'nym delakh za tri goda, 1917-1920* (Moscow, 1920), p. 78. See "Lenin and the East," Cobban, pp. 141-53.

same time, however, Moslem press organs were persecuted and many Moslem organizations were liquidated when they did not sympathize with the Bolshevik cause.¹⁵⁰

Lenin had long considered it imperative to reform the administrative divisions, primarily on the basis of the ethnic composition of the population, and the Soviet Russian government proceeded toward the creation, within the framework of the RSFSR, of autonomous non-Russian territorial units. On the basis of a resolution of the People's Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities the first such autonomous territory was to be the "Tatar-Bashkir *shtat* [state]"; later, on March 22, 1918, a resolution was adopted for the creation not of a "state," but of a "Tatar-Bashkir Republic."¹⁵¹ Because of the Civil War, the Soviet government proceeded slowly in its endeavor. In 1918 (October 19) only the "Labor Commune of Volga Germans," like "an echo of the German Revolution,"¹⁵² was established; later it was constructed into an "Autonomous Republic." In 1919 only the Bashkir Autonomous Republic was created. In the years 1920-1923 many other autonomous republics and provinces were created; e.g., the Tatar, Kirghiz, Kalmuck, Karelian, and others. Agencies representing these territories were organized within the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the RSFSR, and later, as a sign of their lesser constitutional status, within the People's Commissariat for the Affairs of Nationalities (1920). The actual differences between the regular Russian *gubernii* (provinces) and the autonomous *oblasti* (frontier provinces), and even the autonomous republics were not considerable, though only the latter possessed separate agencies of government designated as central executive committees and councils of people's commissars (with commissars for internal affairs, justice, education, agriculture, etc.). The main difference, in fact, was not in legal status, but consisted of the ethnic composition of the local population, which was predominantly non-Russian. A well-known Soviet lawyer of that period stated that territorial autonomy was limited to the fact that "the entire administration in such regions, as well as the cultural work, is carried on in

¹⁵⁰ See *Politika sovetskoi vlasti*, p. 80.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 100-101. See Batsell, p. 139; on Soviet conquest of the Moslem borderlands, see also Pipes, pp. 155-92.

¹⁵² I. N. Ananov, *Ocherki federal'nogo upravleniya S.S.S.R.* (Leningrad, 1925), p. 14.

the local language."¹⁵³ Another lawyer confirmed that "the [smaller] autonomous provinces . . . differed only in quantity from the [larger autonomous] republics";¹⁵⁴ the autonomous provinces were weaker and therefore needed more assistance from the center, whereas the autonomous republics were stronger and needed less assistance.¹⁵⁵

The simultaneous efforts of the Soviet Russian government to reconstruct the administrative division of the RSFSR and to take over and sovietize the seceded former dependencies of Russia were re-evaluated and strengthened by the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) in 1919.

In the discussion of the plank on the nationality problem of the new Party program, Nicholas Bukharin, using arguments close to those of Rosa Luxemburg, endorsed Stalin's position (in 1918) by proposing that the formula of "self-determination of nations" be changed to "self-determination of the working classes of every nationality" for the former dependencies of Russia; however, the first formula would be left for other dependent peoples, such as the Hindus. In reference to the Polish problem, he stated that this should be decided by the will of the Polish proletariat only, for "we absolutely do not sanction and do not respect the will of the Polish bourgeoisie."¹⁵⁶ George Pyatakov objected not only to the right of self-determination of nations, but also to the right of self-determination of the non-Russian proletariat, although he had headed the newly created "Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government of the Ukraine" in the autumn of 1918. "We cannot allow that the prole-

¹⁵³ M. A. Reisner, *Gosudarstvo burzhuzii i R.S.F.S.R.* (Moscow and Petrograd, 1923), p. 385.

¹⁵⁴ P. Stuchka, *Uchenie o gosudarstve proletariata i krest'yanstva i ego konstitutsii: SSSR i RSFSR* (5th ed.; Moscow and Leningrad, 1926), p. 250.

¹⁵⁵ G. S. Gurvich, *Osnovy sovetskoi konstitutsii* (4th ed.; Moscow, 1924), p. 117.

¹⁵⁶ *Programma i ustav R.K.P. (bol'shevikov)* [incl. reports of N. I. Bukharin and V. I. Lenin, Eighth Congress] (Moscow, 1922), pp. 36-39. This statement calls to memory Lenin's former viewpoint (1903), when he stated that the duty of the party of the proletariat is to promote "the self-determination, not of peoples and nations, but of the proletariat of every nationality" (see n. 89). Also, at the Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets in 1918, Stalin asserted the necessity "of limiting the principle of self-determination to the right to self-determination not of the bourgeoisie, but of the laboring masses." In fact, this Congress confirmed "the nationality policy of the Government of People's Commissars directed at putting into effect the principle of self-determination of nations, which is understood in the spirit of self-determination of the laboring masses." V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, *O sovetskoi konstitutsii*, pp. 15-16, 281.

tariat of the particular nations can, nor has the right to, make decisions as to their destiny," stated Pyatakov; and then, referring to Lenin's policy of the creation of a community of formally independent Soviet republics actually subordinate to the Moscow center, he commented rather aptly:

Once we unite economically, build one apparatus, one Higher Council of the National Economy . . . then this notorious "self-determination" will not be worth an eggshell. This is either a simple diplomatic game which in some cases should be played, or, if we consider it in earnest, still worse than a game.¹⁵⁷

Lenin opposed the views of Bukharin and Pyatakov, demanding that the slogan of the right of nations to self-determination be included in the program. "We cannot," he stated, "deny this to any of the peoples who reside within the boundaries of the former Russian Empire." He repeated what he had said in 1917 when Bukharin had proposed discarding the minimum Party program and putting into effect the maximum program:

Don't boast when setting off to the hunt; boast when returning from the hunt. When we win power and wait a while, then we will achieve this [the maximum program]. . . . The same concerns the right of nations to self-determination.¹⁵⁸

The conclusion to be drawn from this quotation is that Lenin did not envisage a decentralized system of Soviet states; he continued to work for a tightly centralized community of Soviet republics. Although Lenin's design actually favored the predominance of the Russians in the new community, its purpose was international in character. He also was not unaware of Russian chauvinism when he stated that:

Among us there are Communists who say, "one school only, therefore you dare teach in no other language except Russian." In my opinion such a Communist is a Great Russian chauvinist. He lies within many of us, and it is necessary to war with him.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ Quoted in Em. Yaroslavskii, ed., *Istoriya VKP(b)*, IV (Moscow, 1929), pp. 407-408.

¹⁵⁸ Quoted in *Programma i ustav R.K.P. (bol'shevikov)*, p. 57; Lenin, XXIV, 135.
¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 155. Professor Pipes imputes Lenin's censure of Russian chauvinism to "the proponents of the Bukharin-Pyatakov-Stalin line." Pipes, p. 110. See, though, a forceful argumentation on Lenin being "an ardent Russian nationalist," in Smal-Stocki, pp. 53-54; "Great-Russian bias," Low, p. 17; and ch. III ("Underlying Factors in Soviet Russification") in Frederick C. Barghoorn, *Soviet Russian Nationalism* (New York, 1956), pp. 67-91. See also n. 179.

The most important decision accepted by the Party Congress—and included into the Party program—was that “the Party advocates the federative union of states [*federativnoe obedinenie gosudarstv*], organized according to the Soviet pattern,” but only as “one of the transitional forms on the way to full unity.”¹⁶⁰ No less vital was the resolution on the unity of the Bolshevik Party (on the “National [i.e., non-Russian] Organizations”):

So far the Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, and Belorussia exist as separate Soviet republics. Thus, at this time, the problem of the *state* framework was decided. But this in no way signifies that the Russian Communist Party should in turn be organized on the basis of a federation of independent Communist parties. The Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party resolves: the imperative existence of a single, centralized Communist Party with one Central Committee. . . . Central committees of the Ukrainian, Latvian, Lithuanian Communists have the rights of provincial committees of the Party and are wholly subordinate to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party.¹⁶¹

According to E. H. Carr, the Party program of 1919 contains “the most authoritative brief exposition of Party doctrine on the subject in its finished form.”¹⁶² However, although reflecting Lenin’s views at that time, it really did not mark the end of the development of his idea of a multinational commonwealth. This idea continued to grow and to influence decisively Soviet political affairs, being in turn influenced by them, until the end of Lenin’s active political life.

Lenin and his associates looked upon the first Constitution of the RSFSR (1918) and the emerging “federative union” of the Russian and neighboring Soviet republics as a point of departure toward a supranational Soviet world state, although the union seemed to many Russians and non-Russians, proponents and opponents of the Soviet regime alike, as merely a disguised reconquest by Russia of her former dependencies. Lenin was confident that the first Soviet Constitution really “reflects the ideals of the proletariat of the whole world”; in a speech introducing the Constitution before the Fifth All-Russian

¹⁶⁰ Lenin, XXIV, 697 (suppl. “Documents and Sources”). “Thus federalism, emphatically rejected by Marx, Engels, and Lenin,” states Aspaturian, “now emerges as the post-revolutionary antidote to the pre-revolutionary doctrine of self-determination.” *Journal of Politics*, XII, No. 1 (1950), 25.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 718–19. See also Goodman, pp. 234–35.

¹⁶² Carr, I. 269.

Congress of Soviets in July 1918, the assurance was expressed that "the Russian Soviet Republic sooner or later will be surrounded by daughter and sister republics, which by uniting, will give good grounds for a federation, first of Europe, and then of the whole world."¹⁶³ The platform adopted by the First Congress of the Communist International in March 1919 proclaimed that the proletariat must "transform the whole world into one self-sustaining commonwealth [*soobshchestvo*], realize liberty and fraternity of nations."¹⁶⁴ Lenin felt certain that a "World-wide Federative Republic of Soviets" would be established soon.¹⁶⁵ That sentiment found its expression also in the first Constitution of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic (since 1937 the word *Soviet* has been placed before the word *Socialist*), adopted by the Third All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets in Kharkiv, March 10, 1919, and promulgated March 14, 1919, in a period of fierce battles between the Bolshevik forces and those of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic. Article 4 of the Constitution states:

The Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic declares its firm determination to join a united International Socialist Soviet Republic as soon as conditions evolve permitting its rise; at the same time the Ukrainian Socialist Republic declares its complete solidarity with the already existing Soviet republics, and its resolution to join in the closest political alliance with them for the common struggle for the victory of Communist world revolution, as well as in the closest cooperation with them in the sphere of Communist construction which is conceivable only by international endeavor.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ "Rech' na mitinge v khamovnicheskom raione" (July 1918), Lenin, XXIII, 150; speech on the Constitution, by George Steklov, quoted in *Pyatyi userossiiskii sezhd sovetov: Stenograficheskii otchyot* (Moscow, 1918), p. 186. See Goodman, p. 30.

¹⁶⁴ "Platforma Kommunisticheskogo Internatsionala," in Bela Kun, ed., *Kommunisticheskii internatsional v dokumentakh* (Moscow, 1933), p. 62. At the First Congress of the Communist International Communist representatives of several former dependencies of Russia, such as Poland, Finland, the Ukraine, all three Baltic states, Belorussia, Armenia, and even of the Volga Germans directly participated. However, only Nicholas Skrypnyk from the Ukraine signed the platform along with Lenin and other delegates.

¹⁶⁵ "III. Kommunisticheskii Internatsional," Lenin, XXIV, 194.

¹⁶⁶ *Ukrayins'ka SRR, Zbirnyk uzakonen' ta rozporjadzhen' Robitnycho-Selyans'koho Uryadu Ukrayiny*, No. 19 (March 18, 1919), art. 204 (p. 256).

Although the Soviet Ukrainian Constitution of 1919 was no less "Leninist" than was its model, the Soviet Russian Constitution of 1918, a Soviet Ukrainian law professor compares article four of the former with the corresponding article eight of the Russian document and concludes that the Soviet Ukrainian Constitution's federalism is conceived more broadly as it aims at the creation of a world-wide

Very soon Lenin exhorted Ukrainian and Russian Communists in the "Letter to the Workers and Peasants of the Ukraine on the Occasion of the Victory Over Denikin," written at the end of 1919, "to provide for the toilers of the whole world an example of a really firm union of workers and peasants of different nations in the struggle for Soviet power . . . [and] the creation of a World Federative Soviet Republic"; at the same time he stated that "the independence of the Ukraine is recognized by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee . . . and the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks"; taking into consideration the fact that there were, in his opinion, two parties and four points of views represented in the Soviet government of the Ukraine (the Bolsheviks who favored independence, those who were for some degree of federation with Russia, those who stood for a complete union with Russia, and finally, the Ukrainian Communist-Borotbists [*borot'ba*, struggle] who unconditionally demanded Ukrainian independence), Lenin urged that Russian Communists be "compliant toward the Ukrainian Communist-Bolsheviks and Borotbists" and that they "suppress in our midst the slightest signs of Great Russian nationalism."¹⁶⁷ Concerning the relations between the socialist states of Russia and the Ukraine, Lenin stated that the Bolsheviks, confronted with the demand for "unconditional independence of the Ukraine," do not "make this attitude a matter for disagreement and division" and do not "see in it any obstacles for harmonious proletarian cooperation"; "as regards the question of the national boundaries, federative or any other bond between the states, there must be no disagreement among Communists. . . . These questions will be decided upon by the All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets."¹⁶⁸ Only "a close military and economic union is indispensably needed."¹⁶⁹

M. Djilas, writing in an official Yugoslav Communist Party organ

republic, while the Russian Constitution speaks only of a free and voluntary union of the laboring classes and all the nations of Russia. A. R. Gyunter, "Osobennosti Konstitutsii USSR po sravneniyu s Konstitutsiyami drugikh Soyuznykh Respublik," *Vestnik sovetskoi yustitsii* (later *Visnyk radyans'koyi yustytysi*), No. 2 (12), 1924, pp. 40-42. In fact, the official expression of the Soviet Ukrainian view antedated the Soviet Russian Constitution (see n. 142).

¹⁶⁷ "Pis'mo k rabochim i krest'yanam Ukrainy po povodu pobed nad Denikinym" (December 28, 1919), Lenin, XXIV, 660, 656-59.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 658.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 659.

(1949), quoted these statements of Lenin and expressed his own opinion:

What was "indispensably needed" was close military and economic union . . . What was secondary and therefore not "indispensable" . . . was "the solution of the questions of independence and the state frontiers" . . . What this solution was to be . . . depended in the final analysis on the common interests of the movement in the given situation and, more directly, on the freely expressed demands and wishes of the Ukrainian workers and peasants themselves.¹⁷⁰

At the same time, however, in an internal Bolshevik Party directive, Lenin accused the Borotbist Party of violating "the basic principles of Communism by its support of banditry which directly abets the White [Russian] and international imperialism."¹⁷¹ He also acted to strengthen by all possible means the subordination of the Bolshevik Party and the Red Army in the Ukraine to the Moscow center.¹⁷²

After the stabilization of the Soviet regime in Russia and in most of the former dependencies of the Russian Empire, Lenin was instrumental in the legal formalization of the relations to those former

¹⁷⁰ Djilas, p. 14. He also asserts that "the principle of voluntary action," which is nothing else but "the reverse side of the principle of the people's right of self-determination," was violated by the Stalinist "methods of ruthless imposition upon socialist states" (pp. 18, 22, 24). In order to reinforce his argument, Djilas quotes (p. 29) Lenin: "We must not, by foreseeing all the phases of development in other countries, decree anything from Moscow" (from Lenin's report on the Party program, March 19, 1919; see Lenin, XXIV, 139).

¹⁷¹ *Leninskii sbornik*, XXXV, 93-94.

¹⁷² Lenin was not unaware of many irregularities that occurred in the course of the realization of his concept of a new international commonwealth. Once Angelica Balabanoff, for some time Acting People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Ukraine (and secretary of the Communist International), complained to Lenin that the Soviet Russian security organs had sent to the Ukraine, without her knowledge, the *agent provocateur*, "Count Pirro," as the supposed Brazilian ambassador to the Ukrainian Soviet government. Lenin replied to her, "Comrade Angelica, what use can life make of you?" Angelica Balabanoff, *My Life as a Rebel* (New York, 1938), pp. 234-35. In 1922, speaking at the Eleventh Congress of the Bolshevik Party, Lenin stated very significantly: "The Ukraine is an independent republic and that is very good. But in Party matters it sometimes—what is the more polite way of expressing it?—sidesteps (*beryt obkhod*), and we shall have to get at them in some way because the people there are sly and the Central Committee [in the Ukraine] I will not say deceives but somehow moves slightly away from us." Lenin, XXVII, 251-52 (as transl. in John S. Reshetar, Jr., "Lenin on the Ukraine," *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States*, IX, Nos. 27-28 [1961], 11; quoted also in Dmytryshyn [1956], p. 258, n. 12).

dependencies who were able to gain their independence. Treaties of peace were concluded between the RSFSR and the five new independent republics: with Estonia on February 2, 1920, Lithuania on July 12, 1920, Latvia on August 11, 1920, Finland on October 14, 1920, and Poland on March 18, 1921.

Some kind of a formal union of several other new republics and territories with the RSFSR was envisaged by Lenin (1920), not unlike that of the British Commonwealth of Nations in respect of the multiplicity of dominions and dependencies at the time between World War I and the Statute of Westminster (1931). In his draft of the "Theses on the National and Colonial Question," Lenin stated:

In practice federation has already shown its expediency in the relationship of the RSFSR to other Soviet republics (in the past: Hungary, Finland, Latvia; at the present: Azerbaidzhan, the Ukraine), and internally in the RSFSR in relation to nationalities who previously had no state status or autonomy (i.e., the Bashkir and Tatar autonomous republics in the RSFSR, established in 1919 and 1920).

Acknowledging that the proposed new structure of the Soviet commonwealth was meant to be only "a transitory form toward complete unity," Lenin stated:

With the following in mind, it is essential to strive for a closer federative union: first, the impossibility of maintaining the existence of the Soviet republics, constantly surrounded by the militarily more mighty imperialist states of the whole world, without closer cooperation among the Soviet republics; second, close economic cooperation of the Soviet republics is essential . . . and third, our aim is to create a single world economy, according to a general plan, controlled by the proletariat of all nations.¹⁷³

A new formal structure of the Soviet commonwealth of nations was created, in addition to the Constitution of the RSFSR, by the treaties of "Workers' and Peasants' Alliance" which were concluded between the RSFSR and the Soviet republics of Armenia, Azerbaidzhan, Belo-

¹⁷³ "Pervonachal'nyi nabrosok tezisov po natsional'nomu i kolonial'nomu voprosam" (June 1920), Lenin, XXV, 287. Lenin's statement concerning new international federalism was incorporated verbatim into the resolutions of the Second Congress of the Communist International (July-August, 1920) as point seven, "National and Colonial Problems." *Kommunisticheskii Internatsional v dokumentakh*, p. 127. Several points concerning the formal resemblance (*skhodstvo*) between the state structure of Soviet Russia and that of Great Britain are briefly discussed by B. D. Pletnev in "Gosudarstvennaya struktura R.S.F.S.R.," *Pravo i zhizn'*, VI, No. 1 (1922), pp. 29-30. See also n. 175.

Russia, Georgia, and the Ukraine. These treaties were duly ratified by the congresses of soviets of these republics, and recorded in the official "Collection of Valid Treaties, Agreements, and Conventions Concluded by the RSFSR with Foreign States" (1920-21).¹⁷⁴

The treaties provided for common—actually Soviet Russian—command of the armed forces, and subordination of several departments of state administration of the non-Russian republics to the corresponding people's commissariats of the RSFSR. Both Lenin's old tendency to grant to the non-Russian lands only limited territorial autonomy, and the dichotomy of his concept of self-determination of nations found their succinct expression in these treaties. "Military and economic union" was established in the Treaty of Alliance between the RSFSR and the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic (Art. 1) on December 28, 1920; however, "the independence and sovereignty of either Party" was acknowledged in the preamble to the Treaty, and even that "no obligation of the U[krainian] SSR toward whomsoever ensue from the sole fact of the earlier belonging of the territory of the U[krainian] SSR to the former Russian Empire" (Art. 2).¹⁷⁵

All the treaties concluded in 1920 and 1921 by the Soviet Russian government marked the end of the first phase in the rise of Soviet federalism, being both a realization of Lenin's reinterpreted idea of territorial (regional) autonomy on the ethnic basis, and a substitute for self-determination of nations. This turbulent period was characterized by the use of force against individuals and whole ethnic groups in the Bolsheviks' struggle first for survival and later for the creation

¹⁷⁴ The word *soyuz* used in the treaties for description of the new relationship between Russia and the other Soviet republics means both "alliance" and "union." At first in translation into English "alliance" was often used (Batsell, pp. 246-47, 274; Taracouzio, pp. 252-53, 450-73); recently "union" has been used more frequently. The confusion of meaning helped "to bridge the transition from one status [the *soyuz*-alliance of 'independent republics'] to another [constituent republic-provinces of the Soviet *Soyuz-Union*]." Carr, I, 381.

¹⁷⁵ RSFSR, *Sbornik deistvuyushchikh dogovorov, soglashenii i konventsii, zaklyuchennykh R.S.F.S.R. s inostrannymi gosudarstvami*, I (Moscow, 1921), No. 8, pp. 15-16. M. O. Reikhel' discusses in "Rossiisko-ukrainskii dogovor," *Vestnik sovet'skoi yustitsii*, Nos. 2-4 (1924), the legal aspect of the relations between the new Soviet republics before and after the creation of the USSR, and asserts that, first "it was a union of [independent] states, a confederation" (No. 3, p. 71), and afterwards it was "simultaneously, a union of states and a federal state" as a "synthesis . . . a higher form of presently known forms of the unification of states" (No. 4, p. 100). See also Matviyevskiy's article (n. 143); Batsell, pp. 246-47; Sullivant, p. 60.

of a Soviet commonwealth of nations, and also by Lenin's optimistic expectations that soon new Soviet republics would successfully rise in the West and join the Soviet commonwealth.¹⁷⁶

The years of treaties ushered in the second phase in the rise of Soviet federalism, with both less violence and less optimism. During this transitory period each of the non-Russian Soviet republics—though under the omnipotent and all-pervading tutelage of the centralized Bolshevik Party, and being obliged to follow closely the example of the RSFSR—was permitted to build its own formal fabric of government: central and local political institutions, codes of laws, sets of administrative regulations, institutions and designs of cultural revival, and even, to a limited extent, its own foreign service.¹⁷⁷

By this time Lenin had acquired considerable insight into the actual relations and antagonisms between the Russians and the neighboring peoples. He was now inclined to recognize, to a moderate extent, the naturalness of the existence of national differences and interests. The manifesto of the Second Congress of the Communist International (August 1920) enunciated the "slogan of Soviet Federation" to the world proletariat, claiming that "the fraternal collaboration of all national units of mankind can be realized only through a federation of Soviet republics."¹⁷⁸ Previously Lenin had hoped for a speedy amalgamation of nations, mostly by the assimilation of small peoples by large ones.¹⁷⁹ But he had considerably changed his view. In his

¹⁷⁶ See Goodman, pp. 30–36.

¹⁷⁷ Public documents of the non-Russian republics for that time contain rich legislative and administrative materials. It is evident that political and legal terminology was being re-examined and developed, or, in many instances, newly created. For example, in the official *Zbirnyk uzakonen' ta rozporядzhen' Robotnycho-Selyans'koho Uryaduu Ukrainy* (Collection of Laws and Administrative Enactments of the Workers' and Peasants' Government of the Ukraine)—there was also a Russian-language edition—there were promulgated numerous proclamations, resolutions, statutes, and decrees of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars; ordinances, regulations, circulars, and other decisions of the People's Commissariats; codes of laws, as well as treaties with foreign countries. The bulk and contents of the volumes of this collection, before the creation of the USSR and a few years afterwards, are really impressive; however, subsequent volumes are conspicuously small and contain only province-type public documents, indicating clearly the anti-federalist trend in the development of the Soviet political system.

¹⁷⁸ "Manifest II Kongressa Kommunisticheskogo Internatsionala" (August 7, 1920), *Kommunisticheskii Internatsional v dokumentakh*, pp. 142, 151.

¹⁷⁹ See his discussion, "The Nationalist Bogy of 'Assimilation,'" in the article "Critical Remarks on the National Problem" (1913), Lenin, XVII, 139–44. Lenin

major work *The Infantile Disease of 'Leftism' in Communism* (June 1920), Lenin stated:

So long as national and state differences exist among peoples and countries, —and these differences will continue to exist for a very, very long time, even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world-wide scale—the unity of international tactics of the Communist workers' movement of all countries demands not the elimination of variety, not the abolition of national differences (that is a foolish dream at the present moment), but such an application of the *essential* principles of Communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat) as will *correctly modify* these principles in [certain] *particulars*, correctly adapt, [and] apply them to national and national-state differences.¹⁸⁰

This probably marked the high point of Lenin's recognition of the elements of nationalism as well as of the aspirations of the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet commonwealth. Unwaveringly upholding his concept of the monolithic and omnipotent Party, Lenin was ready to grant, within the framework of a Soviet federative commonwealth, limited autonomy to these peoples (although more substantial than he had thought advisable before), as well as a politico-legal recognition of their *national identity based on a fixed territory*. This recognition was to be effected on two levels: *international*, for larger nationalities organized in "independent" national Soviet republics, and *internal-constitutional* (within the RSFSR and other larger states), for smaller nationalities or ethnic groups organized as autonomous republics, autonomous provinces, and national districts.

The structure of the Soviet commonwealth based on the Constitution of the RSFSR and on the bilateral treaties of alliance of the RSFSR with other Soviet republics—the five already mentioned,

quotes the immigration statistics of the United States of America and comments approvingly that "New York State . . . is like a mill which grinds up national distinctions. And what is taking place in large, international dimensions in New York is also taking place in *every* big city and factory settlement" (p. 141). In his opinion the assimilation process is, in general, "*absolutely progressive*" (p. 143). See Low, pp. 61–64, 171–73. One writer notes Lenin's "fervent passion for assimilation of the non-Russian nationalities among the Russian nation," and sees "Lenin acting as a Russian" but clothing "his intentions under the high-flown verbiage of the 'interests of democracy'." Shaheen, p. 89. See also John S. Reshetar, Jr., "Lenin on the Ukraine," *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy*, IX, Nos. 27–28 (1961), 5–6.

¹⁸⁰ "Detskaya bolezn' 'levizny' v kommunizme" (April-May, 1920), Lenin, XXV, 227. See also Goodman, p. 232.

and the new "Soviet People's republics" of Bukhara and Khorezm (former khanates in Central Asia), and the Far Eastern Republic—did not satisfy Lenin. As yet it was not an international union which could rival the recently created League of Nations.¹⁸¹ However, the prevailing sentiment within the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) ran high towards the outright incorporation of the non-Russian republics into the RSFSR. Even influential groups within the Party's provincial organizations in the republics, such as the Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) of the Ukraine, supported such incorporation, for at that time their members were predominantly ethnic Russians.¹⁸² This sentiment found its expression in a "Draft Resolution on the Relations Between the RSFSR and the Independent Republics" which was prepared by the special commission of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party under the chairmanship of Joseph Stalin who, for many years, had been acting as a recognized proponent of Lenin's views on the problem of nationalities.¹⁸³

In his September 27, 1922, letter to the Politbureau of the Bolshevik Party, which was published in the Soviet Union only after Stalin's death, Lenin took issue with the design of the so-called "autonomization" (incorporation into RSFSR on the basis of regional autonomy), insisting that non-Russian republics should prepare not for an "entry into the RSFSR," but for a "formal unification with the RSFSR in a Union of Soviet Republics of Europe and Asia." He stated:

We [the RSFSR] acknowledge ourselves as equal with the Ukrainian Socialist

¹⁸¹ In order to counter effectively the League of Nations, termed as "nothing else than an insurance contract by means of which the victors in the war mutually secure their booty" (point three), the resolution of the Second Congress of the Communist International commissions the Soviet Russian Republic "to group around it imperatively . . . the Soviet movement of the progressive workers of all countries, and . . . all national-liberation movements of colonies and oppressed nationalities" (point five). *Kommunisticheskie Internatsional v dokumentakh*, pp. 126-27. "The U.S.S.R. is not a Russian state; it is an international society and a rival to the League of Nations," asserts H. N. Brailsford in "Internationalism," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, VIII (1932), 216; this statement is much more accurate with regard to Lenin's design for the new union of Soviet republics than to the actual make-up of the USSR as developed by J. V. Stalin.

¹⁸² See Pipes, pp. 269-70; Dmytryshyn, pp. 81-82; Borys, pp. 154-55.

¹⁸³ See Denisov and Kirichenko, p. 126; Lenin, *Sochineniya* (4th ed.), XXXVI (1957), 671, n. 664; *Leninskiy sbornik*, XXXVI (1959), 498, n. 1; Akademiya Nauk Ukrayins'koyi RSR, *Istoriya derzhavy i prava Ukrayins'koyi RSR, 1917-1960* (Kiev, 1961), pp. 243-44. See also Borys, pp. 297-304, and Erygin, pp. 95-96.

Soviet Republic and the others and, together with them and on an equal basis, we enter into a new Union, a new federation, the "Union of Soviet Republics of Europe and Asia" . . . We should . . . not destroy their independence, but build a new superstructure, a federation of equal republics.¹⁸⁴

Solely due to Lenin's personal influence and not without Stalin's continued opposition, the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee resolved, on October 6, 1922, "to consider it necessary that a treaty be concluded between the Ukraine, Belorussia, the Transcaucasian republics, and the RSFSR concerning their unification in a Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the right of free secession from this Union being reserved to every republic."¹⁸⁵

Lenin, although already very ill, tried to direct personally the organizational preparation for the union. From the Kremlin on November 10, 1922, a month before his factual retirement from the government, he sent greetings to the All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets in which he stressed, as the most important matter on the agenda of the Congress, the entry of the Ukraine into a federal union with the other Soviet republics.¹⁸⁶ However, most of the measures taken by the Bolshevik Party to organize the Union were effected without Lenin's participation. The preparatory work was conducted with lightning speed. The desire to unite in the USSR was expressed first by the Ukrainian Republic and by the Transcaucasian Republic (which recently had been established as a federation of Armenia, Azerbaidzhan, and Georgia) on December 13, 1922. On that same day the Federative Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics of Transcaucasia was reorganized into the Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic, and a new Constitution for the new Republic was adopted. The Belorussian Republic announced its decision to join on December 16, and the Russian Republic on December 26, 1922. The joint conference of delegations from these republics adopted drafts of a "Declaration" and a "Treaty on the Formation of the USSR" on December 29, 1922, and on the following day these acts were ap-

¹⁸⁴ *Leninskii sbornik*, XXXVI (1959), 497. See also V. V. Pentkovskaya, "Rol' V. I. Lenina v obrazovanii SSSR," *Voprosy istorii*, No. 3 (March, 1956), 13-24; "Neopublikovannye dokumenty V. I. Lenina," *Kommunist*, No. 9 (June, 1956), 15-26; S. I. Yakubovskaya, "Rol' V. I. Lenina v sozdanii Soyuz Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik," *Kommunist*, No. 10 (July, 1956), 26-41.

¹⁸⁵ Quoted in Denisov and Kirichenko, p. 70. See also Starushenko, p. 100.

¹⁸⁶ Lenin, XXVII, 378.

proved by the First Congress of Soviets of the USSR. The world was formally notified about the creation of the new Union by the "Proclamation of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to All Nations and Governments of the World," on July 6, 1923. The first Constitution of the Union was adopted by the Second Congress of Soviets of the USSR on January 31, 1924, ten days after the death of Lenin, the spiritual father of the Union. It consisted of two parts entitled: "Declaration on the Formation of the USSR" and "Treaty on the Formation of the USSR."

There is no doubt that Lenin's teaching determined the formulation of the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR (December 30, 1922). The treaties concluded by the Russian Republic in 1920-21 had effected the politico-legal recognition of the national identity of the non-Russian Soviet republics at a higher—i.e., international—level. The Treaty on the Formation of the USSR strengthened that recognition by affirming the politico-legal equality between Russia and her former dependencies. However, the Treaty also limited the independence of all Soviet republics by affirming their mutual interdependence and by creating common organs of the Union and other instrumentalities for the future political unity of the Soviet commonwealth of nations. This Treaty might have created a real federatively organized commonwealth if it had been properly implemented and not obstructed by the leadership of the Bolshevik Party.

On the same day that the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR was adopted, and on the following day (December 30 and 31, 1922), Lenin dictated a series of notes in which he re-examined, for the last time, his idea of a multinational commonwealth. There could hardly be more devastating corroboration of the gulf between his and the Bolsheviks' theory and practice of relations between Russia and her dependencies. Lenin noted the abuses in the nationality interrelationships committed by the Russian-dominated Soviet administrative apparatus which was "borrowed by us from tsarism and only barely annointed with the Soviet chrism," the "endless amount" of coercions and insults of which the Russians were guilty, sometimes even unnoticed by themselves—all of this amounting to "imperialistic attitudes toward the oppressed nationalities." Reprimanding Stalin for

his Russian nationalist disposition, Lenin proposed a complete re-examination of Soviet nationality policy, and stated:

We cannot be sure in advance that as a result of that work we shall not take a step backward at our next Congress of Soviets, i.e., retain the union of socialist Soviet republics only in the military and diplomatic spheres, and in all other respects restore the full independence of the separate commissariats [of the republics]. It must be kept in mind that the dispersion of the commissariats, and the lack of coordination between them and Moscow and the other centers can be adequately paralyzed by Party authority if the latter is applied with the minimum of circumspection and impartiality.¹⁸⁷

This time, however, Lenin's advice was disregarded.

The "Treaty" included in the first Constitution of the USSR differed profoundly from the original Treaty on the Formation of the USSR. The important differences between the two documents were, later on, either completely overlooked by Soviet and foreign writers, or only commented upon in a simplified and minimizing way. First of all, representation of the Union at international forums was changed to include also the management of all international relations and the concluding of all international agreements by the Union. To the Treaty's provision granting to the Union the power to change the external boundaries of the Union was added a provision for effecting changes of internal boundaries between the individual Union republics. Whereas the Treaty had only provided power for the Union to legislate on the fundamentals of the internal commercial system and foreign trade, the Constitution provided for the exclusive management of foreign trade by agencies of the Union. The Treaty had provided for the establishment by Union authorities of a common plan for the economy of the Union, as well as granting to the Union powers concerning the making of concession agreements with foreigners. The Constitution, however, provided for a wholly centralized system of economy, and introduced the division of industrial enterprises into local, republic, and all-Union types (the third type was to be exclusively managed by the Union). Further, the Treaty's provision for the general regulation of transport, post, and telegraph affairs was

¹⁸⁷ "K voprosu o natsional'nostyakh ili ob 'avtonomizatsii,'" Lenin, *Sochineniya* (4th ed.), XXXVI (1957), 553, 555, 558-59. See Pipes, pp. 265-82. "These letters show," asserts Boersner, p. 122, "the colossal difference which exists between Lenin and his successors, in terms of character and ideals."

changed into the management of these by the Union, and the provision for the establishment of the foundation of the Soviet armed forces was changed into "organization and management." The Treaty provided that the Union ratify the Union budget and establish a unified monetary and banking system, as well as a coordinated system of Union, republic, and local taxation. The Constitution added that the budgets of the Union republics were not to be considered independent but constituted merely divisions of the Union budget, and that for additional taxes on the republic or local (provincial and county) level, permission of the Union had to be secured.¹⁸⁸

It certainly may be said that these changes were not inconsequential. They weakened the entire federative and international character of the new Union and laid the foundations for the eventual anti-federalist Stalinist reconstruction through which the dominance of the Russian Republic was established and even glorified, while the other republics were denied the right to, or the chance of, genuine national emancipation and development.

Saint Mary's University
Halifax, Nova Scotia

¹⁸⁸ NKYu USSR, *Sbornik postanovlenii i rasporyazhenii R.—K. Pravitel'stva* (Kharkiv, 1923), No. 1. See also D. A. Magerovskii, *Soyuz Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik. Obzor i materialy* (Moscow, 1923), pp. 70–73; S. A. Kotlyarevskii, *S.S.S.R. i soyuznye respubliky* (Moscow, 1924), pp. 9–24; S. B. Krylov, "Istoricheskii protsess razvitiya sovetskogo federalizma," *Sovetskoe pravo*, No. 5 (11), 1924, 36–66; E. B. Genkina, *Obrazovanie SSSR* (2d ed.; Moscow, 1947), pp. 142–44; Batsell, pp. 284, 306–308; Sullivant, pp. 76–80; and especially Robert H. McNeal, "Stalin's Conception of Soviet Federalism, 1918–1923," *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States*, IX, Nos. 27–28 (1961), 12–25.

The Ukrainian Question in R. H. Lord's Writings on the Paris Peace Conference of 1919

LEONID C. SONEVYTSKY

I

In 1920 and 1921 three works appeared which, in Robert C. Binkley's words, "had the tone of official American history" of the Paris Peace Conference of 1919: a book written by Bernard Baruch, a volume by Charles H. Haskins and Robert H. Lord, and one edited by Edward M. House and Charles Seymour.¹ The last two works included chapters composed by Robert Howard Lord of Harvard University, author of a study on the second partition of Poland,² who served as "specialist for Poland and Russia" on The Inquiry.³ Subsequently, at the age of 34, Lord became chief of the Polish Division and a member of the Russian Division of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace at the Paris Conference. He also represented the United States on the Inter-Allied Mission to Poland, the Commission on Negotiation of an Armistice Between Poland and the Ukraine, and the Commission on Polish Affairs and its subcommissions for the study of Poland's eastern and western frontiers.⁴

¹ Robert C. Binkley, "Ten Years of Peace Conference History," *Journal of Modern History*, I (1929), 608. The three works were:

Bernard Baruch, *The Making of the Reparation and Economic Sections of the Treaty* (New York, Harper, 1920);

Charles Homer Haskins and Robert Howard Lord, *Some Problems of the Peace Conference* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1920);

Edward Mandell House and Charles Seymour, eds., *What Really Happened at Paris: The Story of the Peace Conference, 1918-1919, by American Delegates* (New York, Scribner's, 1921).

² Robert Howard Lord, *The Second Partition of Poland: A Study in Diplomatic History* (Harvard Historical Studies, Vol. XXIII; Cambridge, Mass., 1915).

³ See Sidney Edward Mezes, "Preparations for Peace," in House and Seymour, p. 7.

The Inquiry was a body of experts organized in 1917 under the direction of Edward M. House for the purpose of collecting data and preparing reports for the American delegation to the Peace Conference.

⁴ For the composition and organization of the Paris Peace Conference and its various organs see *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: The Paris Peace Conference, 1919* (13 vols.; Washington, GPO, 1942-1947), III, 1-153.

In his work with *The Inquiry* and at the Peace Conference Lord dealt with many problems concerning the Ukraine directly or indirectly. His comments on these matters are thus of particular interest, and even more so if one recalls the following remark made by Edward M. House about the Paris Peace Conference:

The final decisions rested with others, but these decisions were largely based upon facts and opinions furnished by those who tell the story of *What Really Happened in Paris*.⁵

On the same subject, Sidney E. Mezes, chief of the Territorial Section of the American Peace Commission, wrote:

As it turned out, the staff of *The Inquiry* were concerned in Paris, as members of commissions, with delicate questions of policy, and it may be noted that the decisions which they had a part in negotiating were only in the rarest instances modified by the supreme council.⁶

Soon after his return from Paris, Robert H. Lord delivered a series of lectures, shortly thereafter published, on the new settlement in Eastern Europe.⁷ In an article which appeared in the volume edited by Edward M. House and Charles Seymour, Lord primarily analyzed the Polish territorial settlement of the Paris Conference; in a chapter on Poland printed in *Some Problems of the Peace Conference*, he discussed more extensively geographic, ethnic, historic, and other aspects of the Polish question as well. Lord's comments on Polish boundaries in the east, Poland's history, Polish claims to the ethnically non-Polish eastern provinces of pre-1772 Poland, the Polish-Ukrainian conflict in Galicia and the attempts made at Paris in 1919 to settle it, and similar matters, clearly reveal his attitude toward various problems having direct relation to the Ukraine.

⁵ House and Seymour, p. VII.

⁶ Sidney Edward Mezes, "Preparations for Peace," in House and Seymour, p. 8.

The part played by the commissions at Paris in 1919 was summarized by Clive Day, chief of the Balkan Division of the American Peace Commission, as follows: "They [i.e., the commissions] had no proper authority except that of recommendation. They had, in fact, immense influence on the outcome of the Conference." Clive Day, "The Atmosphere and Organization of the Peace Conference," in House and Seymour, p. 26.

⁷ Lord's lectures delivered at the Lowell Institute in January 1920 were published in the same year, together with the lectures delivered by Charles H. Haskins, in *Some Problems of the Peace Conference*; Lord's talk given at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia on December 17, 1920, was printed in 1921 in House and Seymour, *What Really Happened at Paris*.

2

Although the restoration of an independent Poland had become one of the war aims of the Allies long before the war ended, it was, according to Lord, very difficult to determine Poland's proper boundaries.⁸

Geographically, Poland was, in the opinion of the former chief of the Polish Division of the American Peace Commission, "one of the hardest countries in the world to define." On the one hand, he writes,

it is true that Polish geographers are accustomed to treat the whole region between the Baltic, the Carpathians, the Dvina, and the Dnieper . . . [as one geographic unit and] to argue that this entire area ought likewise to form a political unit—Poland.

On the other hand, however,

it must be admitted that Russian scientists have demonstrated with equal ease that nearly all of the region in question is geographically a part of Russia; while the patriotic scholars of Kiev and Lemberg have proved that nature intended a great part of this same region to belong to neither Poland nor Russia, but to a *tertium quid* called the Ukraine.⁹

Lord concedes that it was easier to define the area of ethnic Poland. The region in which the majority of the population was Polish-speaking included "nearly the whole of the so-called 'Congress Kingdom' of Poland" and "the western part of Galicia."¹⁰ Lord adds, however, that there were also scattered Polish enclaves in eastern Galicia and in the provinces to the east of Congress Poland. According to him, the Russian nationality statistics for the provinces adjacent to the Congress Kingdom in the east were "so grossly inaccurate and fraudulent that we are left in great uncertainty as to the

⁸ Lord attributes the difficulties mainly to the wide dispersion of the Polish population, the divergence between Poland's historic boundaries and the contemporary ethnic ones, the alleged "lack of adequate data" on the ethnic makeup and political gravitation of the border populations, and the lack of natural frontiers. Haskins and Lord, p. 170.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 157-58.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 158. The northeastern and eastern border districts of Congress Poland were, according to the Imperial Russian census, inhabited predominantly by a non-Polish population: five out of seven districts of the Suwałki Province in the northeast of the Congress Kingdom were predominantly Lithuanian, while the eastern regions of the provinces of Siedlce and Lublin, which shortly before World

real ethnographic situation" there.¹¹ Lord assumes that there existed "a large debatable zone" of which it was "difficult to say" what the ethnic majority was, and that "at present, it is almost impossible to say with certainty just where ethnographic Poland leaves off."¹² He argues that "there is much reason to suppose, however, that if ever an honest census is taken here, the eastern limits of the Polish ethnographic area will be extended considerably beyond the boundaries of the Congress Kingdom."¹³

A similar view was expressed by Lord in response to a request for his comment on the frequent statement that the aims of the Polish government were imperialistic. The former chief of the Polish Division of the American Peace Commission replied that this charge was usually made "with regard to the claims of the Polish Government to certain territories on the east" and that in the main it was based on "inaccurate knowledge of the ethnographic situation." He agreed that, according to the pre-1914 Russian statistics, "a good deal of territory" claimed by Poland did not have a Polish majority, but added that "these statistics of the old Russian Government, like those of the Turks, were in large part simply fabricated for political reasons."¹⁴

War I were detached from Congress Poland and organized into the new province of Kholm, had majorities of Ukrainian (in the official language of the time, Little Russian) population. See *Perвая vseobshchaya perepis' naseleniya Rossiiskoi Imperii, 1897*, issue 7: *Nalichnoe naselenie oboego pola po uezdnam, s ukazaniem chisla lits preobladayushchikh rodnym yazykov* (The First General Census of the Population of the Russian Empire, 1897, issue 7: Present Population of Both Sexes by Districts, with Indication of the Number of Persons According to Their Mother Tongues), 1905, pp. 28-30.

However, Lord maintains that it was possible to assume that Russia had renounced all claims to the Congress Kingdom, i.e., also to the border districts which had no ethnic Polish majorities, since in March 1917 the government of Prince Lvov had accepted the principle of an independent Polish state "including all regions with an indisputable Polish ethnic majority." Referring to the "Curzon line" which left to Poland not only the whole of the Kholm (Chełm) Province but also some additional portions of ethnically Ukrainian as well as Beloruthenian territories, he remarks: "Whatever lies to the west of it [i.e., the Curzon line] is indisputably [sic] Polish." Haskins and Lord, pp. 171-72.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 159. The data of the Imperial Russian nationality statistics contradicted Polish claims to the provinces east of the Congress Kingdom.

¹² House and Seymour, p. 84.

¹³ Haskins and Lord, p. 159.

¹⁴ House and Seymour, *op. cit.*, Appendix: Stenographic Notes of Questions Asked and Answers Given After the Lectures in the Academy of Music, Philadelphia, p. 452. To illustrate "how unreliable the Russian figures often are," Lord

This rather severe criticism of the Imperial Russian statistics hardly seems justified. Moreover, although he denounces the reliability of the pre-1914 Russian nationality statistics which did not support the Polish claims, Lord registers no complaint about the accuracy of the Austrian linguistic statistics which, because of their partisan compilation, did favor the Poles in Galicia.

Lord's comments on the history of Poland disclose his ardent admiration for the old Polish state of the pre-partition period. He thinks that historic Poland has been much condemned and much misunderstood, and argues that the time has come for a revision of the conventional judgments about the old Polish state. Lord idealizes that state as "the largest and most ambitious experiment with a republican form of government . . . since the days of the Romans," and as "the first experiment on a large scale with a federal republic down to the appearance of the United States." He describes Poland of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in which the nobility exercised an unlimited power over the masses of the serfs, as "the freest state in Europe, the state in which the greatest degree of constitutional, civic, and intellectual liberty prevailed." Lord attributes to the old Poland features peculiar to the United States: "Like the United States today, Poland was at that time the melting-pot of Europe, the haven for the poor and oppressed of all the neighboring

pointed to the case of the district of Vilna (Vilnius) which actually was exceptional rather than typical of the vast areas to the east of Congress Poland claimed by the Poles.

Lord's reasoning was almost identical a quarter of a century later when the question of Polish boundaries became once again an object of international negotiations. On February 8, 1945, at the time of the Yalta Conference, he read a paper entitled "The Russo-Polish Boundary Problem" at a meeting of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Subsequently this paper appeared in the *Proceedings* of the Society, Vol. 48 (covering the period from October 1944 through May 1947, and published in 1952), pp. 407-23, with a note stating that "it has been materially revised for printing, in view of the vastly changed situation existing in the autumn of 1946." In the paper Lord maintains that the Peace Conference of Paris "never attempted a definitive settlement of the eastern frontier" of Poland for two reasons, one of them being that, allegedly, "it was difficult to know how far to the east the 'lands of indisputably Polish population' might extend. The only official evidence on that subject was the old Tsarist census of 1897—as biased and unreliable a source as could well be imagined." Lord again argues that the Curzon line, although intended primarily to be an administrative measure, was a line that showed what "was indisputably Polish," and continues: "But it was admitted that they [i.e., the Poles] might have valid claims to much of the territory that lay east of that line . . ." (*Ibid.*, pp. 415-16).

countries." In short, he pictures the old Polish state as "a unique exception among the rapacious and militaristic monarchies of that age," and as "a bulwark of liberty, republicanism and Western civilization" in Eastern Europe.¹⁵

The former chief of the Polish Division of the American Peace Commission acknowledges that the medieval Poland of the Piasts, which was limited to the ethnically Polish areas, "enjoyed better natural frontiers than it was ever later to possess."¹⁶ He emphasizes, however, that the contemporary average Pole thought of his country not in terms of the modest area of ethnic Poland but in terms of the whole wide expanse of pre-1772 historic Poland, and that it was the general desire of the Poles to save as much of that pre-1772 Poland as possible, and to restore, in part at least, the old Polish state on some twentieth-century basis.¹⁷ Lord expresses the view that it certainly does not advance us toward a solution of these questions, nor is it a sign of insight or fair-mindedness, to brand these ideas as due simply to "Polish imperialism" or "chauvinism" or "megalomania," . . . or to castigate the Poles for claiming a single mile of territory outside the area where . . . there is demonstrably a Polish-speaking majority. No nation with a thousand years of history behind it could be expected to rise to such heights of self-abnegation.¹⁸

The former chief of the Polish Division of the American Peace Commission registers with evident sympathy various arguments advanced by the Poles in support of their claims to the ethnically non-Polish eastern territories of pre-1772 Poland. He refers to these areas as the "ancient heritage" of the Poles, and speaks of the "debatable regions where the ethnographic situation and the wishes of the population are . . . doubtful."¹⁹

Lord admits the existence of the national movements among the peoples once subjected to Polish rule, but he is not consistent in his remarks about these movements. In one passage he writes that "strong national movements" have grown up among the Lithuanians and the Ukrainians; elsewhere he defines them as of "uncertain strength."²⁰

¹⁵ Haskins and Lord, pp. 166-68, 198.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 164, 168-69.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 169-70.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 168, 172, 196.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 168 and 196, respectively.

Twenty-five years later Lord commented on the growth of national movements

In analyzing the various aspects of the Polish territorial settlement, Lord considers the problem of Poland's eastern boundaries to the north of Galicia as simply a matter of delimitation between Poland and Russia, as if the Ukrainians and Beloruthenians were not involved.²¹

3

One of the questions discussed repeatedly at Paris in 1919 was the problem of Eastern Galicia which, according to Lloyd George, gave the Peace Conference "no end of trouble."²² As the chief of the Polish Division of the American Peace Commission and member of various commissions of the Paris Conference, Lord took an active part in those deliberations and played an important role in determining certain policies of the Peace Conference with regard to Eastern Galicia. Therefore, his remarks on this subject, which are much more extensive in scope than on any other question concerning the Ukraine, require a thorough examination.

In the article on Poland printed in the volume edited by Edward E. House and Charles Seymour, Lord reports on Eastern Galicia

among the Ukrainians, Beloruthenians, and Lithuanians in the late nineteenth century as follows: "Hampered in all three cases by the lack of any large educated or middle class, the national movements attained much success among the Lithuanians, fair success among the Ukrainians, but no great vigor among the poor and inert White Russians." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, LXVIII, 415.

²¹ Lord uses such expressions as "there lies between Poland and Russia a large debatable zone," "it is almost impossible to say . . . where ethnographic Poland leaves off and ethnographic Russia begins," and "the claims Poland might have to territories east of this [i.e., Curzon] line . . . must . . . be left to future negotiations between Poland and Russia." See House and Seymour, pp. 83-84.

In his article on Poland in *Some Problems of the Peace Conference* Lord mentions that the provinces to the east of Congress Poland were inhabited by "numerous races . . . Poles, Lithuanians, White Russians, Jews, Ukrainians, etc.," and in another passage he describes these territories as the regions "where Polish, Russian, Lithuanian, and Ukrainian claims all come into collision," adding, however, that Polish claims to the areas east of the Curzon line "can only be settled by negotiations *between Poland and Russia*." Haskins and Lord, pp. 159, 172. (Italics mine. L. C. S.)

In his paper, "The Russo-Polish Boundary Problem," Lord uses almost exactly the same language: ". . . these [i.e., Polish] claims, it was hoped [at the Peace Conference of Paris], would later be settled by peaceful agreement between Poland and Russia . . ." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, LXVIII, 416.

²² David Lloyd George, *The Truth About the Peace Treaties* (London, V. Gollancz, 1938), Vol. I, p. 342.

briefly and rather cautiously. He recalls that since the country was in dispute between the Poles and the Ukrainians, the Peace Conference was confronted with a complicated set of problems. He mentions that the Conference finally decided to put Eastern Galicia under Polish sovereignty, but as an autonomous unit, "with ample guarantees for the national rights of the three and one-half millions of Ukrainians, who form the majority of the population," and with provisions for a plebiscite to be held after twenty-five years. Having noted the unwillingness of the Poles to accept these conditions and the arguments advanced by the Poles to explain their refusal, Lord concludes his remarks with the statement that, while the Poles are actually in possession of Eastern Galicia, the ultimate fate of the area has not been settled.²³

Lord's attitude toward the question of Eastern Galicia is fully revealed in *Some Problems of the Peace Conference* where he discusses the problem at considerable length. Analyzing the dissolution of Austria-Hungary in 1918, the former chief of the Polish Division of the American Peace Commission points out that "power passed to the National Councils improvised by the Czecho-Slovaks, the Yugo-Slavs, the Poles, the Ukrainians, the Roumanians, the Magyars, and . . . the German Austrians."²⁴ Thus, when the Peace Conference met at Paris, the territories of the Dual Monarchy

had already been partitioned, in rough, provisional fashion . . . among eight states corresponding to the eight principal nationalities of that Empire. Five of these states were reckoned at Paris as Allies—Italy, Rumania, Yugo-Slavia, Czecho-Slovakia, and Poland; two of them—Hungary and German Austria—ranked as enemies; while as to the Galician Ukrainians, Paris could never quite make up its mind whether to count them as friends, enemies, or neutrals.²⁵

As a result of the spontaneous dissolution of Austria-Hungary, the Peace Conference did not have to concern itself with the question of whether to preserve the existence of the Dual Monarchy; the only main issues which remained to be settled at Paris were, according to Lord, the establishment of a peace with the enemy states of German Austria and Hungary, and of "a definitive division of the Hapsburg

²³ House and Seymour, p. 83.

²⁴ Robert Howard Lord, "Austria," in Haskins and Lord, p. 209.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

inheritance that would be just, practical, and conducive to the peace and security of Europe."²⁶

The Polish territorial settlement of 1919 is regarded by Lord as "an honest application of the principles laid down in the Fourteen Points."²⁷ Nevertheless, he concedes that the fate of Eastern Galicia was settled "*vi et armis*, without the Conference and at times to the lively displeasure of the Conference," and that in spite of this the Allied and Associated Powers eventually sanctioned the Polish occupation of the country and intended to place Eastern Galicia under the sovereignty of Poland.²⁸ This action of the Peace Conference, he continues, "has been denounced as a craven surrender in the face of a *fait accompli*, a betrayal of principle, the sacrifice of three and a half million Ukrainians to the ravenous Polish imperialists."²⁹ Lord defends, however, the settlement. Having disposed in three sentences of all the other possible solutions, he asserts that "the only practical solution" was to entrust the Poles with the occupation and administration of the disputed country.³⁰

This emphasis on expediency in determining the future of Eastern Galicia contrasts sharply with Lord's insistence upon the principle of self-determination in the case of the Polish-German territorial settlement. Reviewing the work of the Paris Peace Conference on the boundary line between Poland and Germany, he remarks: "One may rejoice in the fact that, in spite of the risks involved, the Peace Conference had the courage to carry through a Polish-German settlement based on principle and not upon expediency or selfish convenience."³¹

To be sure, Lord stresses the point that Poland is to be entrusted with the administration of Eastern Galicia only subject to certain guarantees for the Ukrainian population of the country. Yet, writing about Gdańsk (Danzig), he himself questions the efficiency of any such guarantees.³²

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Robert Howard Lord, "Poland," in Haskins and Lord, p. 171.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 192. It is not without interest to note here that in his comments on the Polish claims to the ethnically non-Polish areas of pre-1772 Poland, Lord assures that "no one in Poland . . . proposes to compel the other races which have developed pronounced nationalist movements to unite with Poland against their will." *Ibid.*, p. 168.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

³² "Whatever may be one's hopes as to the League of Nations, in the present

In his brief notes on the history of Eastern Galicia, Lord mentions that the country was originally settled by the Ruthenians, "a branch of that Little Russian race for which the general name Ukrainian is now coming into use." He adds that "after belonging to various Ruthenian principalities in the early middle ages, Eastern Galicia was conquered by Poland in 1340" and that "the conquest of the principality of Halicz in 1340 marked the beginning of Polish encroachments upon the Ukrainian nationality."³³ Subsequently, until 1772, the country belonged to Poland, and Lord uses this as one of his arguments for entrusting the Poles with the occupation and administration of Eastern Galicia.³⁴ He does not apply, however, similar reasoning in cases of other territorial problems, such as that of Upper Silesia, a region which was lost by Poland in the first half of the fourteenth century and which for four hundred years belonged to the empires of the Habsburgs and the Hohenzollerns. **On the contrary**, Lord used all his influence as the American member of the Commission on Polish Affairs of the Paris Peace Conference and its Subcommission for the Study of Western Frontiers of Poland to achieve the outright cession of Upper Silesia to Poland.³⁵

Another factor brought forward by Lord in favor of placing Eastern Galicia under the sovereignty of Poland is that the Poles were actually in possession of the country.³⁶ But this argument of expediency is not extended by him to those Polish territories of Prussia which, at the time of the drafting of the German peace treaty, were in the actual possession of Germany.

Lord does not dispute the fact that the Poles constituted only a minority in Eastern Galicia; he puts the number of the Poles at 27% of the total population of the country.³⁷ At the same time he endeav-

state of the League it is scarcely fair to ask a nation to stake its most vital interests upon the efficiency of such a guarantee" [i.e., a guarantee by the League of Nations]. Haskins and Lord, p. 183.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 189 and 160.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

³⁵ See Stenographic Report of Meeting Between President Wilson, The Peace Commissioners, and Technical Advisers of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, Held at Hotel Crillon, Paris, on June 3, 1919, in Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement* (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1922), Vol. III, pp. 482 ff.

³⁶ Haskins and Lord, p. 195.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 189. The Austrian linguistic statistics for Galicia were so inaccurate that, in order to obtain a more correct picture of the real ethnic situation in the country, both the Ukrainian and the Polish geographers preferred to base their

ors to enhance the importance of the Polish minority, resorting even to such inaccurate statements as "there are *several large rural districts* of Polish-speaking majority" in Eastern Galicia, and using rather questionable statistics to prove that socially and intellectually there is "a striking contrast" between the Ukrainians and the Poles of the country.³⁸

The figures Lord gives as the percentages of Ukrainians and Poles employed in agriculture, commerce and industry, and the liberal professions, are not the official Austrian figures for Galicia, but those derived for Eastern Galicia indirectly and rather arbitrarily by E. Romer, a Polish author.³⁹ Romer's calculations were published during the Ukrainian-Polish war of 1918-1919 in an article designed to prove the alleged racial superiority of the Poles over the Ukrainians in Eastern Galicia.⁴⁰ Romer's figures appeared, slightly modified, a few months later in a Polish pamphlet prepared for propaganda purposes at the Paris Peace Conference.⁴¹ In that form Lord accepted them at their face value. In fact, Romer's calculations gave a considerably distorted picture of the then existing situation. Even twenty years later, the percentage of Poles in Eastern Galicia engaged in agriculture was much higher, and their percentages in commerce

calculations on the more reliable Austrian statistics of faiths. See, e.g., Stephen Rudnitsky, *Ukraine, the Land and Its People: An Introduction to Its Geography* (New York, 1918), p. 131, and St. Pawłowski, "Stosunki narodowościowe w Galicyi wschodniej" (The Ethnic Relations in Eastern Galicia), in *W obronie Galicyi wschodniej* (In Defense of Eastern Galicia) (Lviv, 1919), p. 68.

According to the last pre-1914 Austrian census of 1910, the Roman Catholics comprised 25% of the total population of Eastern Galicia. Since the Poles of Eastern Galicia were usually Roman Catholic and the Ukrainians Greek Catholic, this figure was often taken to represent the percentage of the Poles in the country (although actually not all the Roman Catholics were Poles). The Poles formed an even smaller percentage of the total population if one leaves out of consideration the areas bordering on Western Galicia, to the west of the Syan (San) River, which were ethnically Polish and were not claimed by the Ukrainians.

³⁸ Haskins and Lord, p. 189. (Italics mine. L. C. S.)

³⁹ For the official Austrian figures for Galicia based on the census of 1910, see K. K. Statistische Zentralkommission, *Österreichische Statistik*, Neue Folge, 3. Band: *Berufsstatistik nach den Ergebnissen der Volkszählung vom 31. Dezember 1910*, 10 Heft: Galizien und Bukowina (Vienna, 1916), pp. 222, 225.

⁴⁰ Eugeniusz Romer, "Struktura społeczna i kultura materyalna Polaków i Rusinów w Galicyi Wschodniej" (The Social Structure and the Material Culture of the Poles and the Ruthenians in Eastern Galicia), in *W obronie Galicyi wschodniej* (Lviv, 1919), and as a reprint.

⁴¹ See W. Lutosławski and E. Romer, *The Ruthenian Question in Galicia* (Paris, June 1919), p. 28.

and industry as well as in the liberal professions much lower than were Romer's corresponding figures for 1910, as is shown by calculations made on the basis of the Polish census of 1931.⁴²

OCCUPATION OF THE POLISH POPULATION OF GALICIA
(per cent)

		1910	1931
	Austrian Census ^a	According to E. Romer and R. H. Lord ^b	According to V. Kubijovyč ^c
Agriculture	72.3	44	69.9
Commerce and Industry	17.8	39	16.8
Liberal Professions and Others	9.9	17	13.3

^a Based on the figures given for the Roman Catholic population of Galicia.

^b Derived for the Roman Catholic population of Eastern Galicia.

^c Based on the Polish census; derived for Eastern Galicia.

According to the Austrian census of 1910, 283.7 out of 1000 persons in Galicia in the age group over 10 years listed as Poles could neither read nor write; an additional 77.2 could only read.⁴³ In their pamphlet published in Paris Lutosławski and Romer arbitrarily reduced the figure of illiterate Poles to 263 out of 1000 persons.⁴⁴ Lord asserts, however, that only 23% of the Poles were illiterate.⁴⁵

In general, the discrepancies between the percentages of the Ukrainians and Poles employed in agriculture, commerce and industry, and

⁴² See V. Kubijovyč and H. Selehen, "Chyslo i budova lyudnosti Ukrayiny" (The Size and Structure of the Population of the Ukraine), in *Entsyklopediya ukrayino-znavstva* (Munich-New York, 1949), Vol. I, p. 138. Cf. the English edition of this work entitled *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia* (University of Toronto Press, 1963), Vol. I, p. 175, table X.

⁴³ See K. K. Statistische Zentralkommission, *Österreichische Statistik*, Neue Folge, I. Band: *Die Ergebnisse der Volkszählung vom 31. Dezember 1910*, 3. Heft: Die Alters- und Familienstandsgliederung und Aufenthaltsdauer (Vienna, 1914), pp. 94-95.

Of 4,670,167 persons in Galicia listed as Poles in the 1910 Austrian linguistic statistics, 808,327 were Jews. *Ibid.*, Neue Folge, I. Band, 2. Heft: Die Bevölkerung nach der Gebürtigkeit, Religion und Umgangssprache in Verbindung mit dem Geschlechte, nach dem Bildungsgrade und Familienstande; die körperlichen Gebrechen; die soziale Gliederung der Haushaltungen, pp. 54-55. The percentage of illiteracy among the Galician Poles alone, without including the Jews, was actually higher.

⁴⁴ Lutosławski and Romer, *The Ruthenian Question*, p. 30.

⁴⁵ Haskins and Lord, p. 190.

the liberal professions, and between the corresponding percentages of illiteracy were considerably smaller than the figures given by Lord imply.

Without disclosing the circumstances to which the Polish minority owed its privileged position in Eastern Galicia, Lord concludes that the Poles were "socially, economically, and intellectually the strongest element in the country, although in numbers they [were] considerably inferior to their rivals."⁴⁶ He advances this conclusion as another argument in support of the Polish occupation and administration of Eastern Galicia.⁴⁷ However, Lord takes quite a different attitude toward the German minority in the Prussian provinces inhabited by Polish majorities. In the latter case, he makes no effort to compare the percentages of Germans and Poles employed in agriculture, commerce and industry, and the liberal professions, and draws no conclusion as to which nationality was socially, economically, and intellectually more developed.⁴⁸ Instead, he argues rather bluntly that "a large number of these Germans have, so to speak, no right to be there," and that "there is little reason to grieve very much over the prospect of seeing this more or less parasitical population faced with the alternative of submitting to the rule of the majority among which they live or else of returning to where they came from."⁴⁹ Lord makes no such references to the Polish minority in Eastern Galicia, although in his outline of the history of Poland he himself calls attention to the Polish colonization and Polonization of the ethnically non-Polish eastern territories of the old Polish state.⁵⁰

4

As to the Ukrainians of Eastern Galicia, Lord acknowledges the fact that they make up the majority of the population in the country.⁵¹

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

⁴⁸ Such a comparison would have been rather unfavorable to the Poles.

⁴⁹ Haskins and Lord, pp. 174, 175.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 193. In his writings about the Paris Peace Conference Lord sometimes refers to the Galician Ukrainians as Ukrainians, but for the most part he calls them Ruthenians. He sets their number at 59% of the total population of Eastern Galicia (Haskins and Lord, p. 189). According to the Austrian statistics of faiths, regarded by both Ukrainian and Polish scholars as reflecting the actual ethnic situation in Eastern Galicia more accurately than the Austrian linguistic statistics (*see* footnote 37), the Greek Catholics, i.e., the Ukrainians, comprised 62%

He agrees with the proposition that the majority ought to rule but contends that "it was very difficult to apply this principle in this particular case." Lord argues that the Ukrainians of Eastern Galicia were divided in what he first terms "two distinct national movements" and later refers to as "two Ruthenian parties," one striving for an independent Ukraine, the other favoring union with Russia. "If one might judge from the relative strength of the two Ruthenian parties as they existed before the war," he continues, "the party which wanted an independent Ukrainian state might be a majority among the Ruthenians, but was only a minority in the total population."⁵²

First of all, Lord uses an expression which may erroneously imply that there was only one Ukrainian party in Galicia striving for an independent Ukrainian state. Actually independence was the goal of all three major Ukrainian parties in Galicia: the National Democrats, the Radicals, and the Social Democrats. In the 1907 election to the Austrian parliament, these three parties won 22 seats in Galicia, and the so-called Russophiles received only 5 seats. In the next election to the Austrian parliament, held in 1911, the number of the deputies representing the three Ukrainian parties mentioned increased to 24, while the number of the Russophile deputies decreased to two; in the elections to the Galician diet in 1913, the Russophiles received only one seat as compared to 30 won by the Ukrainian parties whose program provided for an independent Ukrainian state as their ultimate goal.⁵³ Thus the steadily declining Russophile movement virtually ceased to be a significant factor among the Ukrainians in

of the total population of Eastern Galicia on the eve of World War I. Cf. Stephen Rudnitsky, *Ukraine*, p. 131; St. Pawłowski, "Stosunki narodowościowe," in *W obronie Galicyi wschodniej*, pp. 61, 74. Since some Galician Ukrainians, however, were Roman Catholic, even this figure (62%) is rather a low estimate. The percentage of Ukrainians was higher if one excluded those areas of Eastern Galicia to the west of the Syan River which were ethnically Polish and were not claimed by the Ukrainians.

⁵² Haskins and Lord, p. 193.

⁵³ For the comparison of the number of deputies elected by various Galician parties to the Austrian parliament in 1907 and 1911, see K. K. Statistische Zentralkommission, *Österreichische Statistik*, Neue Folge, VII. Band, 1. Heft: Die Ergebnisse der Reichsratswahlen in den im Reichsrate vertretenen Königreichen und Ländern im Jahre 1911 (Vienna, 1913), p. 12. The figures for the elections to the Galician diet in 1913 are taken from K. Levytsky, "Halychyna 1772-1918" (Galicia 1772-1918), in *Ukrayins'ka zahal'na entsyklopediya* (Ukrainian General Encyclopedia) (3 vols.; Lviv, 1930-35), III, 650.

Galicia before the First World War. Since the Ukrainians comprised at that time almost two thirds of all the inhabitants of Eastern Galicia, it is obvious that even without a relatively small and progressively shrinking Russophile fraction, they still formed a majority in the total population of the country. Finally, it is to be mentioned that the Ukrainian Russophiles were, after all, as opposed to the Polish rule over Eastern Galicia as were all the other Ukrainian parties in the country.

In an effort to strengthen Polish claims to Eastern Galicia, Lord questions the ability of the Galician Ukrainians to govern the country. He dismisses the Ukrainian peasants as "ignorant and inarticulate," and presents the Ukrainian intellectuals as incapable of running the government.⁵⁴ Instead of drawing attention to the enormous and rapid political, intellectual, and economic progress made by the Ukrainians of Galicia in the decades preceding the outbreak of the war in 1914, Lord prefers to picture them as "the poorest, most ignorant and most backward of all the races of Austria."⁵⁵ And yet, he makes no attempt to expose the causes of what was undoubtedly an unsatisfactory situation. Lord mentions that under the Austrian rule "the Poles have continued to be the dominant nation" in Galicia,⁵⁶ but he does not point out that it was because of the obstruction by the Polish majority in the Galician diet that the Ukrainians could not have an adequate number of high schools, or that it was because of the powerful Polish opposition at Vienna that all the efforts of the Ukrainians to obtain a university of their own were frustrated.

Expressing doubt as to whether the Ukrainians of Galicia were capable of governing the country, Lord argues for placing Eastern Galicia under the rule of the Poles. However, he himself writes elsewhere in his article about the capabilities of the Poles as follows:

... it must be admitted that in the past the Poles have shown themselves deficient in organizing and administrative ability, in economic enterprise, in

⁵⁴ Haskins and Lord, pp. 193-94.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 191. This statement is, in fact, not quite accurate. If one takes into consideration, for instance, the question of illiteracy, the most illiterate of all the nationalities of Austria were, according to the last pre-1914 Austrian census, the Serbo-Croats. See K. K. Statistische Zentralkommission, *Österreichische Statistik*, Neue Folge, I. Band: *Die Ergebnisse der Volkszählung vom 31. Dezember 1910*, 3. Heft: Die Alters- und Familienstandsgliederung und Aufenthaltsdauer (Vienna, 1914), p. 22*, Übersicht 18: Bildungsgrad nach Alter und Umgangssprache ohne Unterscheidung des Geschlechts.

⁵⁶ Haskins and Lord, p. 189.

cohesion, solidarity, and discipline. A century and more of servitude to foreigners has not been the best of schooling for orderly and efficient self-government, nor has it permitted the nation to keep altogether abreast of the West in intellectual and economic progress.⁵⁷

Lord asserts that for centuries the Ukrainian-Polish relations in Galicia were, on the whole, "relatively satisfactory and amicable" until the growing national movement among the Ukrainians assumed a marked anti-Polish tendency and led to "the rather bitter racial feud that has raged in Eastern Galicia in the past thirty years" (i.e., from about 1890).⁵⁸ In other words, the relations were what Lord terms "satisfactory" as long as the Ukrainians did not challenge the political and economic supremacy of the Polish minority of the country. The former chief of the Polish Division of the American Peace Commission says nothing about the stubborn resistance of the Polish bureaucracy and landlords to any change which might have affected their privileged political and economic status in Eastern Galicia. Instead, he ascribes the continuous intensification of the Ukrainian-Polish conflict in Galicia to the "insidious activities of the Austrian government, which lost no opportunity to stir up the two races against each other, aiding now one and than the other in accordance with the traditional Austrian maxim, 'divide and rule,'" as well as to the alleged interference of the German government.⁵⁹ Echoing one of the favorite themes of the Polish anti-Ukrainian propaganda at the Paris Peace Conference, Lord maintains that, in the conflict with the Poles, the Ukrainians of Galicia were "accustomed to look to Berlin and Vienna for aid and direction."⁶⁰

Lord argues that "nearly all the many Allied officers who were sent in to study the situation were unanimous in the opinion" that the government of West Ukraine had been "a sorry failure," adding that the Peace Conference's aim of assuring war-racked Eastern Galicia a speedy return to orderly government and stable conditions could not be effected "by handing back the country to the local Ukrainian politicians, who had tried and failed."⁶¹ Actually, many Allied officials sent to Poland either were pro-Polish or based their

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 190.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 190-91.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

information about the conditions in Eastern Galicia almost exclusively on Polish sources which could hardly be regarded as impartial. Observers who tried to examine the situation without relying on one-sided sources reached quite a different conclusion. For instance, the chief United States representative on the Inter-Allied Mission to Poland, Major General F. J. Kernan, reported, on the basis of his on-the-spot investigation, in April 1919 to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace:

The distinct impression I brought away from Eastern Galicia was that the Ukrainians were exceedingly anxious for a truce, and that their leaders were intelligent men by no means Bolshevik and sincerely desirous of building up a great Ukrainian Republic. General Pavlenko⁶² was quite frank and stated that the Russian Soviet forces were pressing the Ukrainians on the East and that his government was anxious to secure a truce on the Polish side in order to bring as strong a Ukrainian force as possible into action against the Russian Soviets. Besides my own observations, I talked with quite a number of disinterested observers who had been travelling through The Ukraine quite recently and as a result I am convinced that the present Ukrainian Government and the Ukrainians in the mass are by no means Bolshevik . . . The Ukrainians are wholly isolated from Europe and they have, I believe, been misrepresented in a large degree to the world, it being the policy of their enemies to denounce them as bandits and Bolsheviks. Reiterated statements of this kind have their effect, however groundless they may be.⁶³

Another American, Major Lawrence Martin of the General Staff of the United States Army, who had travelled through Eastern Galicia and Volhynia prior to the Polish offensive in mid-May 1919, stressed in his report that the Ukrainian government under Petlura was competent and effectual, that the Poles and Jews in Galicia were well treated by Ukrainians, and concluded: "[I] regard Petlura in Volhynia and Holubowitz in Galicia with their ministers as capable of organizing the country satisfactorily."⁶⁴

⁶² At that time Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Galician Army.

⁶³ See Confidential Report of Major General F. J. Kernan for the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, Paris, 11 April 1919, in Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement*, III, 220-21.

⁶⁴ *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States: Russia, 1919* (Washington, GPO, 1937), p. 778.

The references are to Symon Petlura, Head of the Directory of the Ukrainian Republic, and to Dr. Sydir Holubovych, President of the Council of State Secretaries (i.e., Prime Minister) of the Republic of West Ukraine.

According to Lord, the Republic of West Ukraine was set up by "one Ruthenian party."⁶⁵ In fact, the West Ukrainian Republic was proclaimed by the Ukrainian National Council which included representatives of various parties;⁶⁶ the first State Secretariat (Cabinet) of the Republic of West Ukraine was a coalition government composed of members of the Ukrainian National Democratic, Radical, Christian Social, and Social Democratic parties.⁶⁷

Finally, in order to justify his policy, Lord argues, disregarding all the evidence to the contrary, that "the majority of the population—Poles, Jews, and Ruthenians alike—were relieved when . . . the Polish troops came in" and that the Polish occupation allegedly "seemed to meet with the rather general approval of the inhabitants" of the country.⁶⁸

5

It remains to be added that Lord had ample opportunity to get acquainted with the Ukrainian point of view on various matters. As the chief of the Polish Division of the American Peace Commission, he had easy access to all the publications submitted by the Ukrainian delegation to the Peace Conference and its individual organs. In the "Bibliographical Note" attached to his article on Poland in *Some Problems of the Peace Conference*, Lord himself mentions such Ukrainian works as T. Savtchenko's *L'Ukraine et la question ukrainienne* (Paris, 1918), M. Lozynsky's *Les "Droits" de la Pologne sur la Galicie* (Lausanne, 1917), and E. Levitsky's *La Guerre polono-ukrai-*

⁶⁵ Haskins and Lord, p. 192.

⁶⁶ See Dr. M. Lozynsky, *Halychyna v rr. 1918-1920* (Galicia in the Years 1918-1920) (*Études et documents relatifs à l'histoire de la révolution ukrainienne de 1917-1920*, Vol. V; Vienna, Institut Sociologique Ukrainien, 1922), pp. 29ff.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44.

⁶⁸ Haskins and Lord, pp. 194, 195.

Actually, after the occupation of the capital of Galicia by Polish troops the Jewish population of the city suffered a two-day pogrom in reprisal for the neutrality observed by the Jewish community during the Ukrainian-Polish battle for the city. See Jozef Bendow, *Der Lemberger Judenpogrom November 1918-Jänner 1919* (Vienna-Bрно, 1919), and Max Blokzyl, *Poland, Galicia and the Persecutions of the Jews at Lemberg* (1919).

For details concerning the reign of terror and the persecution of the Ukrainian population of Eastern Galicia following the Polish occupation, see *The Book of the Bloody Cruelties: Returns Concerning the Invasion of the Poles into the Ukrainian Territory of Galicia in 1918-19* (Vienna, 1919), an official publication of the government of the West Ukrainian Republic. The Ukrainian edition of this publication appeared under the title *Krivava knyha* (2 vols.; Vienna, 1919-21).

nienne en Galicie (Bern, 1919).⁶⁹ Moreover, during the Paris Conference Lord maintained contact with Ukrainians; it was he who arranged a meeting in June 1919 between the representatives of the Ukrainian delegation and the U.S. Secretary of State Robert Lansing.⁷⁰

In a study on Woodrow Wilson and the rebirth of Poland, published in 1953, Louis L. Gerson notes that "immediately after the cessation of hostilities, Poland, in order to forestall the decisions of the Peace Conference, began to conquer neighboring territories without regard to the wishes of other nationalities."⁷¹ After a careful examination the author comes to the conclusion that "two powerful factors encouraged Poland's early aggression"—the French policy and "the hold which the Poles had on the American delegation" at Paris.⁷² The analysis of Lord's writings illustrates the pro-Polish policy of the chief of the Polish Division of the American Peace Commission at the Peace Conference of 1919.

It is not surprising that James T. Shotwell, chief of the History Division of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, regarded Lord as "a partisan of Poland,"⁷³ and that David Hunter Miller, the legal adviser of the United States delegation at the Paris Peace Conference, remarked in his diary on Monday, May 5, 1919: "Mr. Lord came in and I talked with him a little about Poland and found him very pro-Polish. His general idea seems to be to do nothing in the way of protecting minorities."⁷⁴ Lord's comments discussed in this article indicate that he was one of those to whom Lloyd George referred as "fanatical pro-Poles" among the American Polish experts at the Paris Peace Conference whose "judgment in any dispute in which Poland was concerned was vitiated by an invincible partisanship."⁷⁵

⁶⁹ Haskins and Lord, pp. 199-200.

⁷⁰ For details see Arnold D. Margolin, *From a Political Diary: Russia, the Ukraine, and America, 1905-1945* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1946), p. 48.

⁷¹ Louis L. Gerson, *Woodrow Wilson and the Rebirth of Poland, 1914-1920: A Study in the Influence on American Policy of Minority Groups of Foreign Origin* (Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany 58; New Haven, Yale University Press, 1953), p. 113.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 119-20.

⁷³ James T. Shotwell, *At the Paris Peace Conference* (New York, Macmillan, 1937), p. 305.

⁷⁴ David Hunter Miller, *My Diary at the Conference of Paris with Documents* (21 vols.; New York, privately printed, 1924), I, 289.

⁷⁵ David Lloyd George, *The Truth About the Peace Treaties*, II, 991.

The policy recommended and promoted by Lord aimed at forcible incorporation into Poland of the predominantly Ukrainian Eastern Galicia and other ethnically non-Polish territories in the east, without regard to the wishes of the majority of the population. This policy was detrimental to the Ukrainian cause, but at the same time it did not contribute to the stability of the new Polish state. Nor did it prove to be successful. Lord himself was destined to see the end of Polish rule over Eastern Galicia and all the other ethnically non-Polish territories east of the Curzon line.⁷⁶

Columbia University

⁷⁶ Lord strongly opposed the new Polish territorial settlement of 1945. In his paper, "The Russo-Polish Boundary Problem," he expressed his view on the question of the eastern frontier of Poland as follows: "... because it seems to me that the Polish arguments in the case [reference is made to the territories east of the Curzon line which were occupied by Poland after World War I and ceded by Poland after World War II] are, in general, much stronger, my own feeling is that Poland ought to have been restored to the whole of her prewar territory." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, LXVIII, 421.

Herodotus and Hippocrates on the Anthropology of the Scythians

ALEXANDER DOMBROWSKY

The geopolitical characteristics of southeastern Europe left definite imprints on its anthropological structure during the early historical epoch in both its physical-somatological and the spiritual-psychological aspects. The nomadism that characterized the vast Eurasian area during prehistoric and early historic periods, had dual significance. On the one hand, it continuously slowed down the process of ethnogenetical and socio-political development in this area; on the other, it ushered in ever new elements of a psycho-physical nature into the anthropological type of inhabitants of the Ukraine. Eastern Europe, in general, and the Ukraine, in particular, constituted an area where many cultures and ethnic elements crossed at various times. Its broad anthropological span wavered between the Indo-European and central Asiatic influences, including the Mongolian. Therefore, research in the anthropology of Eastern Europe in the prehistoric and early historic eras, and particularly in the anthropology of ancient Ukraine—based on the archaeological finds of skeletons of two main types, the dolichocephalic and the brachycephalic—is faced with a difficult task and can at best reach only general conclusions.

In addition to archaeological discoveries, the researcher has at his disposal ethnographic data recorded in ancient historiography—especially in Herodotus' "Scythia"—which, however, does not go back to the prehistoric era but begins with the Scythian period. To be sure, Herodotus does mention the Cimmerians, but the reference is very brief and does not contain much factual information. The mythological material of Herodotus' "Scythia" on the origins of the Scythians does not contribute much to research work on the Scythian question. But the examination of his ethnographic data—in this case, with regard to the anthropological question—requires a great deal of meticulous study, for early historic editing of the material has passed through various phases of mythologizing. Even some references of Hippocrates—an author preoccupied with problems of natural and medical sciences—bring confusion into anthropological research as

regards the ethnic composition of Eastern Europe in the early historic epoch.

Hippocrates, a physician of the fifth century B.C. and the founder of medical science, discussed in his work, "On Air, Water, and Places,"¹ the effects of climate on the human being; he included Scythia in his research. The work is a treatise on the relationship between the geographical (or anthropogeographical) and the ethnographic-historical factors of early historic man in certain geographical regions of the ancient world. Having described briefly the way of life and the customs of the Sarmatians and the Scythians (chapters 17-18), Hippocrates proceeds to a description of Scythia's climate and the physical structure of its inhabitants. Being firmly convinced that man's physique is determined by the climate in which he lives and his geographical environment in general, Hippocrates writes that Scythians, as inhabitants of a cold region with no drastic changes in the weather, were characterized by a thick, fleshy, nonmuscular body. Their abdomens, especially the lower sections, were soft. The entire Scythian tribe, according to Hippocrates, was redheaded. Finally, the ancient scientist comments on the barrenness of the Scythian women.²

Hippocrates' description of the physique of the Scythians had a definite influence on the writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries concerning the problem of the ethnic classification of the Scythians. Some of them accepted the relation of Hippocrates: Potocki, Niebuhr, Neumann, and Kiepert shared the view that the Scythians were of Mongolian or of Turko-Tatar extraction.³ Neumann even went as far as to state that he had found similarities between Scythian and Mongolian names. It was not until the twentieth century that scholars accepted the theory of the Iranian origins of the

¹ Περὶ ἀέρων, ὑδάτων, τόπων.

² Hippocrates' views are worthy of attention inasmuch as he was familiar, according to Gossen, with the Pontic lands, and thus with Scythia. See Pauly-Wisowa, *Realencyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. VIII (1913).

³ Jean Potocki, *Memoire sur un nouveau peryple du Pont Euxin, ainsi que sur la plus ancienne histoire des peuples du Taurus, du Caucase, et de la Scythie* (Vienna, 1796); Potocki, *Fragments historiques et géographiques sur la Scythie, la Sarmatie et les Slaves* (3 vols.; Brunswick, 1796); Potocki, *Recherches sur la Sarmatie* (2 vols.; Warsaw, 1789); Potocki, *Essay sur l'histoire universelle et recherches sur celle de la Sarmatie* (4 vols.; 1789-1792); Barthold Georg Niebuhr, "Untersuchungen ueber die Geschichte der Skythen, Geten und Sarmaten," *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften*, I (Bonn, 1828); Karl Neumann, *Die Hellenen im Skythenlande*, I (Berlin, 1855); Heinrich Kiepert, *Lehrbuch der alten Geographie* (Berlin, 1878).

Scythians on the basis of linguistic, ethnographic, and archaeological data. Yet the outmoded view of "Mongolizing" the Scythians had few supporters even in the twentieth century, such as Peisker⁴ and particularly Minns.⁵ Some remnants of Hippocrates' theory may still be found in general historical works. Thus, Nazaroff⁶ feels that the Scythians can best be compared with the Kirghiz—a view which may be said to represent an indirect outcome of the conception emanating from the narrative of Hippocrates. Even *The Cambridge Ancient History* is not totally free from the theory of Hippocrates.

The most important counterbalancing view to the Hippocratic conception on the anthropological type of the Scythians comes from Herodotus' "Scythia." The ethnographic material in this work greatly contributed to the theory of the Iranian origin of the Scythians. In addition, some linguistic remnants of Scythian origin, including names, indicate that the Scythians belonged to the Iranian branch of the Indo-European linguistic family. It would not be irrelevant to mention the names of the Scythian forefathers given in the mythological material of Herodotus' "Scythia": Lepoxais, Arpoxais, Colaxais (IV, 5-7). The ending *xais* is similar to the old Indian (Sanskrit) word *kshaya* (ruler, king), and to the old Persian *khshâya* or *thiya* (king). Thus, Iranianism is quite evident here.⁷ In addition, a certain number of Scythian names are provided by the Greek inscriptions in Tanais, Panticapaeum, Phanagoria, Olbia, and Tyras.

The linguistic question of the Scythians is closely connected with that of the Sarmatians. According to Herodotus' narrative, the Sarmatians (*Sauromatai* in Herodotus' work) evolved as a result of the merging of two tribes: the Amazon females and the Scythian males (IV, 110-17). It is possible that Herodotus in his *History* was trying to explain, by means of the above-mentioned narrative, the relationship between the Scythians and the Sarmatians, both of whom belonged to a common ethnic group. The result of the merging was that "the *Sauromatai* speak the Scythian language, but

⁴ J. Peisker, "Die älteren Beziehungen der Slaven zu Turkotataren und Germanen," *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, No. 3 (1905).

⁵ Ellis Howell Minns, *Scythians and Greeks* (Cambridge, 1913).

⁶ P. S. Nazaroff, "The Scythians, Past and Present," *The Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 250 (1929).

⁷ Otto Schrader, *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde* (2d ed.; Berlin and Leipzig, 1917-29), II, 408.

they speak it incorrectly" (IV, 117).⁸ It can be inferred from this that the Scythian and Sarmatian languages differed only in dialect.

The linguistic remnants of the Sarmatians, which are more numerous than the Scythian ones, clearly attest to the Iranian origin of the Sarmatian language. Since both Scythian and Sarmatian, according to Herodotus, were quite similar, differing only in dialect, and since the Sarmatian language, according to the prevailing views of present-day scholars, belonged to the Iranian linguistic family, then the language of the Scythians belonged also to the Iranian linguistic group and the Scythians must have belonged to the Iranian family—to the Aryans, and not to the Mongols.⁹ Müllenhoff argues convincingly that anyone trying to disprove the Aryan origin of the Scythians, would have to prove first that the Sarmatians were not of Iranian origin and that the Scythian names can be explained easily and completely with the aid of another language.¹⁰ Thus, the direct as well as the indirect linguistic material substantiates the view of the Iranian origin of the Scythians.

Some of Herodotus' ethnographic material also points to the Iranian origin of the Scythians—as, for example, special reverence for fire (IV, 5, 68), high penalties for untruthfulness and breach of oath (IV, 68), and a general lack of images and statues in honor of the gods (IV, 59).

It would not be irrelevant to emphasize that Herodotus—who completely parted with the logography and idealization of the Barbarians—and Hippocrates both appear to be quite realistic in their description of the Scythians. Nevertheless, they differ in many respects. The father of history assumed a pragmatic approach in ancient historiography and rejected, by and large, the mythological element; as Heiberg¹¹ states, he knew the Pythagoreans but did not allow himself to be swayed by their cosmological theories which had a great deal of influence on the geographical science of that time. However, Herodotus could not divest his knowledge of the spirit of

⁸ φωνῆ δὲ οἱ Σαυρομάται νομίζουσι Σκυθικῆν, σολοικίζοντες αὐτῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου, ἐπεὶ οὐ χρηστῶς ἐξέμαθον αὐτὴν αἱ Ἀμαζόνες.

⁹ Alexander Dombrowsky, "Lingvistychni remanenty antychnoyi Ukrayiny" (The Linguistic Remnants of Ancient Ukraine), *Kyiv* (Philadelphia), No. 5 (1951), p. 235.

¹⁰ Karl Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* (Berlin, 1892), III, 124; Kaspar Zeuss, *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme* (München, 1837).

¹¹ Johan Ludvig Heiberg, *Mathematics and Physical Science in Classical Antiquity* (London, 1922), p. 11.

his era; he approached the anthropological problems from the ethnographic point of view, as Myres¹² points out. Hippocrates was a realist in the description of the Scythians, but much more as a physician and a scholar in the field of natural science and anthropogeography. Thus, these were two distinct types of realism: that of a historian-ethnographer and that of a physician-scientist.

Hippocrates devoted more attention to the Scythians because they differed from all other peoples and constituted a distinct anthropological type, much like the Egyptians. The specific elements of the anthropological character and the extreme differences between the Scythians, from a cold climate, and the Egyptians, from a hot climate, induced Hippocrates to utilize this contrasting anthropogeographical material for his medical-naturalist work, "On Air, Water, and Places." This subject matter of research was generally quite similar to the scholarly preoccupation of the old center of ancient Greek science, the Ionic school, with which Herodotus was not in agreement. Diller¹³ provides additional Scythian-Egyptian extremes, well-known in ancient times, which may have affected the comparison of these two peoples in the anthropogeographic work of the ancient physician-scientist. Egypt had its distinct customs, Scythia had its distinct characteristics emanating from the cold climate. The Egyptians considered themselves to be the oldest people, while the Scythians spoke of themselves as the youngest of peoples. According to the geographic map of Hecataeus, there are some similarities between the Nile River of Egypt and the Ister (Danube) River of Scythia. The rivers flowing through Scythia were compared to the canals of Egypt. And finally, the women of Egypt were famous in the ancient world for their fecundity; in the case of the Scythian women, it was just the opposite. Hippocrates tries to "pragmatize" the anthropogeographic data of both lands, drawing conclusions from the point of view of medicine and natural science, and presenting the anthropological type of the Scythians as having characteristics of the Mongolian race.

With regard to the relation of Hippocrates, Ebert comments that the images of the Scythians on ancient vases found in Chertomlyk,

¹² J. L. Myres, "Herodotus and Anthropology," in *Anthropology and the Classics*, edited by R. R. Marett (Oxford, 1908), pp. 121-68.

¹³ Hans Diller, *Wanderarzt und Aitiologie* (Philologus, Supplementband XXVI, Heft 3) (Leipzig, 1934).

Voronezh, and Kul Oba represent persons of middle height, stocky, with broad bearded faces, low foreheads, straight noses, with hair falling in braids to the neck—thus, a people “that may, perhaps, have also some Mongolian blood in their veins; but, on the whole, their physique is still that of the Iranians.”¹⁴ The question arises as to why Hippocrates would give misleading information about the anthropological type of the Scythians. A partial answer to this question is given by Ebert¹⁵ as well as other scholars; Ebert asserts that Hippocrates may have been misled by the existing similarities in the customs of the Iranian Scythians and the Mongolians, which were common to all nomads as a result of similar conditions of life. In addition, the ancient author could have easily lost himself in the ethnic web of the vast Eurasian expanse which was constantly subjected to the migratory movements of the nomads.

It is our opinion that most students of anthropology of Eastern Europe in prehistoric and early historic periods fail to consider one significant fact, namely, that the representatives of ancient historiography frequently confused the geographical concepts with the ethnic and ethnological ones. The problem of the Hyperboreans and the very conception of Scythia may serve as classic examples of this confusion. The Hyperboreans, a mythical people, constituted at first a purely geographical concept as indicated by the name itself; but gradually, as the horizons of geographical concepts of the ancient world broadened, this concept assumed an ethnic coloring in the light of mythical geography and the philosophically and religiously idealistic imagination of the Greeks. In the case of the concepts of “Scythia” and “Scythians,” the situation was just the reverse: the purely ethnic concept in time assumed a political and geographic character, that is to say, all of the territory dominated by the Scythians (in all probability, a rather small dominating class of nomads in contrast to the large ethnic substratum of the native agrarian population) was named “Scythia” and all of its inhabitants “Scythians.” This name remained even after the Scythians ceased to dominate the territory.

14 “Leute, die vielleicht auch etwas mongolisches Blut in den Adern haben, im ganzen aber doch den körperlichen Habitus der Iranier besitzen.” Max Ebert, *Südrussland im Altertum* (Bonn and Leipzig, 1921), pp. 87–88; see also figures 34, 68, 56.

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 106–7.

In all probability, Hippocrates erroneously included among the Iranian Scythians those Mongolian and semi-Mongolian nomadic tribes which moved constantly across the part of the Eurasian region known throughout the ancient world as Scythia. It should be remembered that, as Niederle¹⁶ and other scholars emphasize, the Nomad Scythians as well as the so-called Royal Scythians were nomads. Hippocrates confused all of them with the Mongolian tribes of Eurasia. This ethnic and ethnological chaos prevalent in the nomadic web of Eurasia could also have confused such scholars as Peisker who gave serious consideration to the conception of Hippocrates. Peisker's view is refuted by Niederle who points to the Scythian iconography as evidence of the fallacy of the theory of the Mongolian origin of the Scythians.¹⁷

In the author's opinion, Hippocrates considered only that Mongolian or semi-Mongolian type which was an insignificant minority in the countries of southeastern Europe; he failed to consider other anthropological types, those of the Indo-European family, types which constituted a predominant majority in this area, as shown clearly by the ethnographic data of ancient historiography, particularly, in the works of its foremost representative, Herodotus. These overwhelming Indo-European elements prevailed in both the somatological and the psychological aspects over the minor islands of the Mongolian types which had wandered as nomads into the territory of ancient Ukraine.

New York

¹⁶ Lubor Niederle, *Manuel de l'antiquité slave*, I (Paris, 1923), p. 173.

¹⁷ Lubor Niederle, "Les theories nouvelles de Jan Peisker sur les anciens slaves," *Revue des études slaves*, Vol. II (1922), pp. 19-37; Niederle, *Slovanské starožitnosti*, I, 2 (Praha, 1925), p. 258.

Review Article

A Survey of Publications on Ukrainian Ethnography and Folklore in the Years 1957-1962

PETRO ODARCHENKO

INTRODUCTION

Research work in the field of Ukrainian ethnography and folklore attained a peak of development in the 1920's. The work was centered at the four scholarly institutions in Kiev—the Ethnographic Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, the Theodore Vovk Museum of Anthropology and Ethnology, the Cabinet of Primitive Culture at the Chair of History of the Ukraine, and the Cabinet of Musical Folklore—and at the two research centers of Kharkiv and Odessa—the Regional Ethnological Section of the Kharkiv Scientific Research Chair of the History of Ukrainian Culture and the Ethnographic-Dialectological Section of the Odessa Commission of Regional Studies at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Much ethnographic and folklore material was collected through the help of numerous corresponding members of the Ethnographic Commission (village teachers, students, agronomists, physicians). On the basis of this data as well as previously published material, Ukrainian scholars wrote a number of valuable scientific studies which appeared either separately or in periodical publications (10 volumes of the *Etnohrafichnyi visnyk* [Ethnographic Journal], *Zapysky Etnohrafichnoho tovarystva* [Publications of the Ethnographic Society], *Pervisne hromadyanstvo* [Primitive Society], *Visnyk Odes'koyi komisiyi krayeznavstva* [Journal of the Odessa Commission of Regional Studies], *Pobut* [Way of Life], and others). Among the outstanding works of this period are collections devoted to the *chumaky* (Ukrainian carters bringing salt and other goods from the Crimea), harbor pilots, and guilds; the collection *Zvenyhorodshchyna* (Zvenyhorod Region); *Kazky ta opovidannya z Podillya* (Tales and Stories from Podillya) collected by Mykola Levchenko (1928); *Ukrayins'ki narodni dumy*,

Korpus (Ukrainian Folk *Dumy*: A Complete Collection), Vols. I-II (1927-1931), edited by Kateryna Hrushevska. Also the collections of Ukrainian folk songs published by Klyment Kvitka, and the monumental work of Oleksander Andriyevsky, *Bibliohrafiya literatury z ukrayins'koho folkloru* (A Bibliography of the Literature on Ukrainian Folklore), 1930.

In the early 1930's all these research institutions were closed by the Soviet government; many Ukrainian ethnographers were arrested and exiled or sent to concentration camps.

In 1936 the Institute of Ukrainian Folklore was established. It published a journal, *Ukrayins'kyi fol'klor* (Ukrainian Folklore), in 1939-41, under the title *Narodna tvorchist'* (Folk Creativeness). However, this publication was of little scholarly value. Verses about Stalin by school pupils and village "activists" were presented as works of "Soviet folklore." The period of the "personality cult"—that is, the cult of Stalin—had a negative effect on the study of Ukrainian folklore. It produced works which had no relation to folklore but did have obvious political and propaganda overtones. Most of the so-called "folk songs" and *dumy* (Ukrainian folk poems) published in the 1930's, 1940's, and early 1950's glorified Stalin: for example, *Velykomu Stalinu—Narodni pisni ta dumy* (To the Great Stalin: Folk Songs and Poems), Kiev, 1949, 355 pages; *Dyakuyemo Stalinu—Poetychni tvory spivtsiv-kolomyikariv Zakarpattya* (We Thank Stalin: Poetic Works of the *Kolomyika*-singers of Transcarpathia), Uzhhorod, 1951, 54 pages; *Fol'klor Vitchyznyanoi viyny* (Folklore of the Patriotic War), Lviv, 1945, 64 pages.¹ However, following the abrogation

¹ Of the collections of this period which have some value, the following should be mentioned: H. Ver'ovka, *Ukrayins'ki narodni pisni Zakarpattya* (Ukrainian Folk Songs of Transcarpathia) (Kiev, 1947); M. Leontovych, *Ukrayins'ki narodni pisni* (Ukrainian Folk Songs), edited by M. Verykivsky (Kiev, 1952), 159 pages; M. Lysenko, *Zibrannya tvoriv v 20 tomakh*. Tom 17: *Ukrayins'ki narodni pisni dlya holosu* (Collected Works in 20 Volumes. Vol. 17: Ukrainian Folk Songs for Voice) (Kiev, 1954), 167 pages; *Narodna lirika* (Folk Lyrics), edited with a preface and annotations by M. Stel'makh and I. Synytsya (Kiev, 1956), 397 pages; *Satyra y humor*. *Zbirnyk* (Satire and Humor: A Collection), edited by F. Makivchuk (Kiev, 1948), 302 pages; O. Spendiarov, *Ukrayins'ki narodni pisni* (Ukrainian Folk Songs) (Kiev, 1954), 88 pages; Ya. Stepovyi, *Ukrayins'ki narodni pisni* (Ukrainian Folk Songs) (Kiev, 1952), 27 pages; *Ukrayins'ki narodni kazky* (Ukrainian Folk Tales), with an introduction by H. Sukhobrus (Kiev, 1953), 332 pages; *Ukrayins'ki narodni kazky* (Ukrainian Folk Tales) (Kiev, 1954), 292 pages; *Ukrayins'ki narodni kazky v 3 knyzhakh* (Ukrainian Folk Tales in Three Volumes), Vol. 1 (1946), 122 pages, Vol. 2 (1947), 129 pages, Vol. 3 (1948), 133 pages, edited by M. Voznyak;

of the "personality cult," all these "folk songs" disappeared from collections published during the last seven years. From 1947 to 1956 there were fourteen doctoral dissertations on ethnography and folklore published in the Ukrainian SSR, but none was of much scholarly value. The subjects of these dissertations were primarily of a political nature (e.g., "Friendship of Peoples in Folk Songs," "Stalin in Moldavian Folklore").

In 1944, the Institute of the Study of Art, Folklore, and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR was established. During the first decade of its existence this Institute published only three volumes of its *Naukovi zapysky* (Research Papers)—Vols. I–II in 1947, and Vol. III in 1954—containing some articles on ethnography. The fourth volume, *Ukrayins'ka etnografija* (Ukrainian Ethnography), appeared in 1958; it was devoted exclusively to the problems of ethnography. Since 1957 the Institute has been publishing a quarterly, *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnografija* (Folk Creativeness and Ethnography). Thus, after almost twenty five years of decline, a new period of intensified research work was initiated in the area of Ukrainian folklore and ethnography.²

Ukrayins'ki narodni kazky (Ukrainian Folk Tales), edited by M. Popov (Kiev, 1951), 406 pages; *Ukrayins'ki narodni pisni* (Ukrainian Folk Songs) (Kiev, 1951), 558 pages.

Also worth mentioning is a small collection, *Ukrayins'ki narodni pisni* (Ukrainian Folk Songs) (Kiev, 1951), 80 pages, containing fifty-seven songs with single-voice melodies. They were selected by M. Hordiychuk from the huge collection of P. Demutsky, an outstanding Ukrainian folklorist. In 1954, P. Demutsky's *Ukrayins'ki narodni pisni—Bahatoholosyia* (Ukrainian Folk Songs: Polyphony), 88 pages, was published.

In 1955 the collection *Ukrayins'ki narodni pisni* (Ukrainian Folk Songs) appeared in two volumes (484 and 416 pages), edited by Z. Vasylenko and M. Hordiychuk. This collection included musical scores. Most of the material was taken from published sources, but some was obtained from the collection of manuscripts of the Institute of the Study of Art, Folklore, and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, which also published, in 1955, a collection entitled *Ukrayins'ki narodni dumy ta istorychni pisni* (Ukrainian Folk Dumy and Historical Songs), edited by Maksym Ryl'sky, 660 pages. Authentic folklore works comprise only 334 pages of this collection, however, while the rest are "Soviet dumy and historical songs" (e.g., "On Lenin and Stalin," "On Chapaev," "On Voroshilov," "On Revolutionary Spain," "On Vatutin") which are actually the work of known authors. The introduction to this collection was written by P. Pavlii.

2 Of the studies on Ukrainian folklore and ethnography published before 1957, F. Lavrov's book on Ukrainian proverbs (1955) should be mentioned. Also of scholarly value is a work published in Moscow by the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in 1956 under the title *Vostochnoslavianskii etnograficheskii sbornik. Ocherki narodnoi material'noi kul'tury russkikh, ukrainsev i belorussov v XIX—nachale XX vv.* (East Slavic Ethnographic Collection: Studies on the Russian, Ukrainian,

The period of the "thaw," which actually began in 1957, has had a positive effect on research in Ukrainian folklore and ethnography, but Party supervision and directives still impede the work of ethnographers and folklorists, compelling them to continue to collect and publish artificial works of so-called "Soviet folklore" which praise collective farms, the Communist Party, Lenin, Socialist competition, Russia, etc.

I. PUBLICATIONS OF UKRAINIAN FOLKLORE TEXTS

A number of works on Ukrainian ethnography and folklore have been published during the last six years (1957-62), including many new anthologies of Ukrainian folklore.

In 1957, in Kiev, a collection of prerevolutionary Ukrainian folk tales and stories was published under the title *Ukrayins'ki narodni kazky, lehendy, anekdoty* (Ukrainian Folk Tales, Legends, Anecdotes), 543 pages. It consists of the following sections: fairy tales about animals, adventure stories, heroic tales and legends, stories with overtones of social protest, anecdotes, and trivia. Some of the texts were taken from unpublished materials and manuscripts collected for the Institute of the Study of Art, Folklore, and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. The book was intended primarily for the general reader rather than the scholar. Another popular anthology of Ukrainian folklore, *Ukrayins'ka narodna satyra i humor* (Ukrainian Folk Satire and Humor), 288 pages, appeared in 1957 in Lviv. Of particular interest among the most recent collections of Ukrainian folklore is the volume entitled *Zahadky* (The Riddles), a publication sponsored by the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (Kiev, 1962, 510 pages).

Several collections of folk songs have been published. In 1957 *Ukrayins'kyi narodnyi pisennyk* (A Book of Ukrainian Folk Songs) appeared with texts and music. Another collection of songs with the music included was brought out in 1958 under the title *Ukrayins'ki*

and Belorussian Material Folk Culture of the 19th and the Beginning of the 20th Centuries), 805 pages. This collection, amply illustrated, contains the following studies: E. E. Blomkvist, "Krest'yanskie postroiiki russkikh, ukraintsev i belorussov" (Peasant Buildings of the Russians, Ukrainians, and Belorussians); I. I. Lebedev, "Pryadanie i tkachestvo vostochnykh slavyan" (Spinning and Weaving of the Eastern Slavs); G. S. Maslov, "Narodnaya odezhda russkikh, ukraintsev i belorussov v XIX-nachale XX vv." (Folk Costumes of the Russians, Ukrainians, and Belorussians in the 19th and Beginning of the 20th Centuries).

narodni lirychni pisni (Ukrainian Lyric Folk Songs), 668 pages, edited by Maksym Ryl'sky and published by the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. Its contents are divided as follows: love and family songs, social songs (Cossack songs, serf songs, songs of recruits and soldiers, *chumak* songs, songs of poor, lonely men and of migratory laborers), Soviet lyric songs (the latter hardly belong to folklore since they were created by individual authors whose names often appear in the explanatory notes). The introductory article by Andriy Kin'ko entitled "Life's Truth in the Lyric Songs of the Ukrainian People" analyzes the themes and the artistic peculiarities of Ukrainian folk songs. Quotations from Kalinin, Radishchev, Lenin, Belinsky, Dobrolyubov, Chernyshevsky, Gorky, Marx, and Engels are cited, although they bear no relation to the songs. Of Ukrainians, only Hohol' (Gogol) and Franko are quoted. There are no quotations from such prominent writers as Shevchenko, Hrabovsky, Kotsyubynsky, Lesya Ukrayinka, Nechuy-Levitsky, Myrnyi, Dovzhenko, Ryl'sky, and Malushko.

In 1962, the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR published a collection entitled *Zakarpats'ki narodni pisni* (Transcarpathian Folk Songs), 372 pages, edited, introduced, and annotated by Z. Vasylenko. The editor's article, scholarly in character, discusses the thematic peculiarities of Transcarpathian folk songs, and devotes special attention to the analysis of the musical and lyrical structure of Transcarpathian melodies, particularly the most typical local genre of their folk music—the *kolomyika*. The songs contained in the collection are divided into the following groups: calendar and ritualistic songs; historical songs; soldier and recruit songs; songs about daily life; love songs; humorous songs; the *kolomyiky*; and songs about "the building of Communism." The first chapter also contains carols of pre-Christian origin, and wedding songs. However, the poetic Transcarpathian carols of the Christian cycle are not included in the collection.

Among the more sumptuous publications intended for a wider public as well as for students, the book *Dumy* (Ukrainian Historical Folk Poems) should be mentioned (Kiev, 1959; 184 pages of large size). Editing, introduction, and annotation were rendered by M. Stel'makh. The volume contains attractive illustrations in color done by M. Derehus, V. Kravchenko, D. Shavykin, M. Khmel'ko, V. Kasiyan, and I. Pryntsevsky. Most of the texts of the *dumy* are presented on the basis of the original editions of P. Kulish, M. Maksymovych,

A. Metlynsky, V. Antonovych, M. Drahomanov, and the versions published in the periodical *Osnova* (1862). One work of dubious origin in this collection is the *duma* called "Semen Paliy and Mazepa." The editor himself noted in his remarks that "some researchers are of the opinion that the *duma* 'Semen Paliy and Mazepa' has literary origins." It was included in the collection obviously for political reasons, for this *duma* expresses an attitude hostile to Hetman Ivan Mazepa.

In 1962 the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR published *Ukrayins'kyi dytyachyi fol'klor* (Ukrainian Children's Folklore), 248 pages. The collection consists of lullaby songs; caressing and comforting songs; calendar poetry and incantations; humorous songs, fables, tongue-twisters; game-songs and games; fairy tales; riddles. The music for the songs is included in the back of the book. A brief description of the special characteristics of the material is given in the introductory article by V. Boyko.

A number of small-sized collections appeared in the years 1958-62 in editions of from 50,000 to 250,000 copies: *Struny sertsya—Ukrayins'ki pisni pro kokhannya* (The Strings of the Heart: Ukrainian Love Songs), Kiev, 1958, 148 pages; a second edition in 1962, 238 pages; *Zhartivlyvi pisni* (Humorous Songs), Kiev, 1961, 224 pages; *Mudrist' narodna—Ukrayins'ki pryslivya ta prykazky* (Folk Wisdom: Ukrainian Proverbs and Sayings), Kiev, 1962, 156 pages; *Ukrayins'ki zahadky* (Ukrainian Riddles), Kiev, 1962, 158 pages; *Narodni perlyny—Zbirnyk naykrashchykh ukrayins'kykh narodnykh pisen'* (Folk Pearls: A Collection of the Best Ukrainian Folk Songs), and *Narodni usmishky—Zbirnyk naykrashchykh humorystychnykh tvoriv* (Popular Laughs: the Best Folk Humor), 1961, 152 pages.

As a result of editorial policy there are noticeable gaps in these collections. All materials which do not agree with official ideology have been excluded. Thus the collection of Ukrainian proverbs includes no proverbs that express belief in God. Neither are there to be found folk proverbs about private property, such as *Svoya khata, svoya strikha—sviy batechko, svoya utikha* (Your own home, your own roof—your own father, your own joy). Instead, there are such samples of "Soviet folklore" as *Lenina zapovit—na tysyachi lit* (Lenin's testament—for thousands of years).

Intensification of anti-religious campaigns in the last years has been reflected in the re-editing of song lyrics in which the words "God"

and "Lord" appear. When the two editions (1958 and 1962) of the collection *Struny sertsya* are compared, differences in the texts can be readily noticed. Whereas the earlier edition (1958) gives authentic lyrics, the 1962 edition contains texts that have been deliberately altered. For instance, a popular song of literary origin (M. Starytsky) has the following opening line in the 1958 edition: *Nich yaka, Hospody, misyachna, zoryana* (O Lord, what a moonlit, starlit night). The same lyrics were given in Starytsky's *Poetychni tvory* (Poetical Works), 1958. In the notes to this work, the folk version of the song was given (*Nich yaka, Hospody, misyachno, zoryano*). Thus, the word "Lord" appears in both versions, the literary and the popular. However, in the 1962 edition of *Struny sertsya*, the line was changed: the word *Hospody* (Lord) was omitted and the adjective *yasnaya* (bright) was added at the end.

A second example of deliberate alteration can be found in the text of the popular song *Oy hylya, hylya, huson'ky na stav*, which contains the following lines (1958 edition): *Oy, Bozhe, Bozhe, yakyi ya vdausya! Briv ya cherez richen'ku ta y ne vmyvavsya*. (O God, O God, how strange I am! I waded across the river and did not even wash). In the 1962 edition of *Struny sertsya*, these two lines have been deleted from the song.

A third example is the popular song *Babusyu ridnen'ka* (Dear Grandmother). The 1958 edition had the following lines: *Yak nichka nastane, to ya y ne zasnu. Yak ochi zaplyushchu, molytvu tvoryu*. (When the night comes, I cannot fall asleep. When I close my eyes, I make up a prayer). In the 1962 edition, these lines have been omitted.

The sole exception to the rule seems to be the favored song of the Ukrainian cosmonaut Pavlo Popovych, *Dyulyus' ya na nebo ta y dumku hadayu* (I gaze at the skies and spin a thought), from which the word "God" was not deleted: *Chomu meni, Bozhe, ty krylets' ne dav* (O, Lord, why have you not given wings to me).

II. STUDIES ON UKRAINIAN FOLKLORE

An outstanding achievement of the Ukrainian folklorists in the period of the last six years was the appearance of a systematic survey of Ukrainian folk creativeness in two volumes, *Ukrayins'ka narodna poetychna tvorchist'* (Ukrainian Folk Poetic Creativeness), published in Kiev in 1958 by the Institute of the Study of Art, Folklore and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (Vol.

I, 816 pages; Vol. II, 2d ed., revised and supplemented, 336 pages). Actually, the second volume ("The Soviet Period") bears little relation to folklore as it contains written works of individual authors which often were published in local newspapers rather than passed on orally among the people.

The first volume ("Pre-October Period") treats general questions of folk poetic creativeness and presents a survey of Ukrainian folklore in historical context according to genre. A brief "Introduction" by Maksym Ryl'sky is followed by a rather lengthy chapter entitled "The Nature and Specifics of Folk Poetic Creativeness" by Pavlo Popov. Saturated with quotations from Marx, Lenin, Gorky, and Kalinin, this chapter is obviously a concession to the Communist regime and not a scholarly contribution. In the following chapter, Popov, a prominent biographer of the outstanding Ukrainian philosopher Hryhoriy Skovoroda, gives a thorough analysis of the latter's attitude toward folk poetry. Individual sections of this chapter were written by I. Tsapenko, M. Nechytalyuk, O. Dey, M. Matviychuk, and M. Ishchuk, in addition to Popov. The chapter contains basic information on the history of Ukrainian folklore studies; however, the frequent reference to "the indivisible unity" of Ukrainian folklore studies with those of the Russians, and the repeated stressing of the "assistance" rendered by the Russian cultural leaders create an impression of servility. The chapter concludes with an interesting article entitled "The Repressive Censorship and Persecution of Ukrainian Folklore by Tsarist Russia" by F. Lavrov, who has made use of archival material not previously investigated, and who has presented a series of hitherto unknown facts. Then follow chapters on various types of Ukrainian folklore: labor songs (P. Pavliy), incantations (H. Sukhobrus), calendar rite poetry (V. Bobkova), wedding rite poetry (H. Sukhobrus), lamentations (M. Stel'makh), riddles (P. Popov), proverbs and popular sayings (P. Popov), fairy tales (H. Sukhobrus), anecdotes (H. Sukhobrus), legends and popular stories (H. Sukhobrus), the *dumy* (P. Pavliy), historical songs (M. Rodina), ballads (A. Kin'ko), lyrical songs (A. Kin'ko), songs of literary origin (M. Stel'makh), the *kolomyiky* and the *chastushky* (M. Hrinchenko and V. Khomenko), folk drama (P. Ponomar'ov), workers' folklore (V. Bobkova and P. Pavliy).

The authors provide rich and valuable material. However, because of the limitations imposed on them by the Soviet regime, they could

not present a history of Ukrainian folklore with sufficient objectivity and thoroughness. In particular, the sections on calendar rite poetry and historical songs show the effects of these limitations.

In presenting the survey of Ukrainian carols (the *kolyadky* and the *shchedrivky*), Bobkova ignores completely the numerous carols of the Christian cycle. Yet in 1931, in *Literaturnaya entsiklopediya* (Literary Encyclopedia) published by the Communist Academy, Yuri Sokolov devoted half his article on carols (Vol. V, pp. 402-406) to the analysis of Ukrainian carols of the Christian cycle. The anti-religious tendency is also manifested by the complete exclusion from the survey of the popular genre of psalms and religious songs, chiefly sung and played by lyre players.

Political bias resulted in the omission of all historical songs, proverbs, and popular sayings expressing anti-Russian attitudes. In the chapter "Historical Songs" there is no mention of a large group of Ukrainian songs directed against Muscovy, and against Russian national and political oppression—specifically the numerous Ukrainian folk songs on the destruction of the Zaporozhian Sich by the Russians and the forced deportation of the Ukrainian Cossacks to hard labor on the construction of canals in the vicinity of St. Petersburg. Folk songs in which the Ukrainian people curse the Russian tsars, particularly Catherine II, are also omitted from the text. The bibliography to the chapter even fails to list one of the most important studies on the subject, "Novi ukrayins'ki pisni pro hromads'ki spravy" (New Ukrainian Songs on Public Affairs), by Mykhaylo Drahomanov (Geneva, 1881).

In the chapter "Ballads" no mention is made of the fact that Ukrainian ballads reflect Western influences on Ukrainian folk poetry. Probably for political and ideological reasons no reference was made to Drahomanov's important study "Vidhuky lytsars'koyi poeziyi v ukrayins'kykh narodnikh pisnyakh" (Reflections of Chivalric Poetry in Ukrainian Folk Songs) published in *Rozvidky Mykhayla Drahomanova* (Mykhaylo Drahomanov's Studies), Vol. 1 (Lviv, 1899). While analyzing in this study the ballad about a king's son, "Oy, poyikhav korolevych ta y na polyuvannya" (Oh, the king's son went hunting), Drahomanov came to the conclusion that the theme of the ballad came from Western Europe to the Ukraine, and later passed from there to Russia. Drahomanov concluded that Poland

and the Ukraine served as a cultural bridge between Western Europe and Russia.

A number of important works on Ukrainian folklore are omitted from the bibliographies to each chapter. No mention is made of the valuable studies of V. Petrov, especially his outstanding work on incantations. Also omitted are the works of V. Hnatyuk on carols, studies of M. Sumtsov, V. Verkhovynets, and F. Vovk on weddings, works of V. Danyliv, I. Svyentsitsky, Z. Kuzelya, and V. Petrov on lamentations (yet, for no apparent reason, a book of E. Barsky, *Prichitaniya severnogo kraya*, 1872, is listed), the work of M. Sumtsov on proverbs, the basic work of S. Savchenko on the fairy tale (1914); no mention is made of the second volume of the collection of Ukrainian folk *dumy* edited by Kateryna Hrushevska, the study of D. Revutsky on *dumy* and historical songs, works of K. Kvitka on ballad songs, or of a number of other outstanding publications.

Ukrainian folklorists have shown a special interest in the study of the Ukrainian folk epos, particularly the Ukrainian folk *dumy*. As early as 1955 Maksym Ryl'sky's *Heroyichnyi epos ukrayins'koho narodu* (The Heroic Epos of the Ukrainian People) appeared. In 1958, under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, a symposium was published (*Istorychnyi epos skhidnykh slovyan* [The Historical Epos of the East Slavs], 258 pages), consisting of articles by M. Ryl'sky, K. Huslysty, M. Hordiychuk, and others, devoted to particular problems in the study of Ukrainian folk *dumy*—especially the question of their origin and the investigation of the specific musical qualities of the *dumy* and the historical songs. In the same year (1958), the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, in a joint effort with the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, published a symposium entitled *Osnovnye problemy eposa vostochnykh slavyan* (The Basic Problems of the Epos of East Slavs), 347 pages. Eight articles were devoted to the study of the Ukrainian folk poems (by M. Ryl'sky, F. Lavrov, K. Huslysty, M. Plisetsky, P. Popov, H. Sukhobrus, V. Khomenko, and M. Hordiychuk). In 1959, the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR published the study of I. Tsapenko, *Pytannya rozvytku heroyichnogo eposu skhidnykh slovyan* (The Question of the Development of the Heroic Epos of East Slavs), 134 pages. In a chapter on "The Origin of the Ukrainian *Duma* Epos," the author criticizes Zhytetsky's theory on the origin of the *dumy*, and argues that "the origin of the formation of *dumy* as a genre,

must be sought not in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries, but in earlier times, possibly in the fifteenth century." Finally, mention should also be made of the valuable study by Anna Halyna Horbach entitled "Osoblyvosti epichnoho stylyu ukrayins'kykh narodnykh dum" (Peculiarities of the Epic Style of the Ukrainian Folk *Duma*), published in the *Zbirnyk pamyati Z. Kuzeli* (Collection in Memory of Z. Kuzelya), Paris, 1960.

Numerous articles on the various aspects of Ukrainian folklore were published in the periodical *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnografyia* (Folk Creativeness and Ethnography). The following articles warrant mentioning: L. Demyan, "Tradytsiynе boykivs'ke vesillya" (Traditional Boikian Wedding), No. 1 (1960); I. Duz', "Komsomol'ske vesillya v seli Kokhanivka na Odeshchyni" (Comsomol Wedding in the Village Kokhanivka in the Odessa Region), No. 3 (1960); M. Plisetsky, "Pro pokhodzhennya dumy Ivas' Konovchenko" (On the Origin of the *Duma* about Ivas' Konovchenko), No. 3 (1961); V. Bobkova "Potebnya pro khudozhnyu symboliku narodnoyi pisni" (Potebnya on the Symbolism of the Folk Song), No. 4 (1960); V. Hoshovsky, "Deyaki osoblyvosti istorychnoho rozvytku ukrayins'koyi narodnoyi pisni na Zakarpatti" (Some Peculiarities of the Historical Development of the Ukrainian Folk Song in Transcarpathia), No. 1 (1960); M. Hnatyuk, "Z pisennykh narodnykh skarbiv Volyni" (From the Folk Song Treasures of Volhynia), No. 2 (1961); L. Yashchenko, "Pro deyaki osoblyvosti rozvytku suchasnoho pisennoho fol'kloru Ukrayiny" (On Some Peculiarities of the Development of Recent Song Folklore of the Ukraine), No. 3 (1960); H. Lytvak, "Spivanka pro Oleksu Dovbusha" (The Song about Oleksa Dovbush), No. 1 (1960); V. Oliynyk, "Z istoriyi zbyrannya ta doslidzhennya narodnykh pisen' pro Ustyma Karmalyuka" (From the History of the Collection and Studies of Folk Songs about Ustym Karmalyuk), No. 4 (1960); H. Nud'ha, "Naydavnishni zapysy ukrayins'kykh narodnykh pisen'" (The Oldest Records of Ukrainian Folk Songs), No. 2 (1961); "Fol'klorna spadshchyna O. Dovzhenka" (The Folklore Heritage of O. Dovzhenko), No. 1 (1959); M. Huts', "Oleksa Dovbush u narodniy poeziyi" (Oleksa Dovbush in Folk Poetry), No. 1 (1962).

The problem of the interrelationship between folklore and literature and the arts has been elaborated in numerous articles and monographs. However, there is as yet no general synthetic work on the subject. Most of the studies that have been published in this field

deal with the element of folklore in the creative works of Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko. F. Komarynets', who wrote a dissertation on "The Poetry of Shevchenko and Folk Creativeness," published two articles in *Zbirnyky prats' naukovykh Shevchenkius'kykh konferentsiy* (Collections of Papers Delivered at Scholarly Conferences on Shevchenko) entitled "Folklore Sources of Shevchenko's Poetry," (1956) and "On the Question of Folk Creativeness in the Historical Poetry of Shevchenko" (1957). The following articles on the subject were published in the journal *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnografyia*: I. Pil'huk, "Zhinocha dolya v narodniy lirytsi ta v lirytsi T. H. Shevchenka" (Woman's Fate in Folk Lyrics and in the Lyrics of T. H. Shevchenko), No. 1 (1961); V. Skrypka, "Fol'klor u ranniy tvorchosti Shevchenka" (Folklore in the Early Works of Shevchenko), No. 3 (1960).

The second part of the voluminous work of Oleksiy Dey, *Ivan Franko i narodna tvorchist'* (Ivan Franko and Folk Creativeness), Kiev, 1955, 300 pages, has been devoted to the question of the application of folklore material in the works of Ivan Franko. Also, the following articles on the subject have been published: Maksym Ryl'sky, "Pro zvyazky Ivana Franka z narodnoyu pisneyu" (On the Connections of Ivan Franko with Folk Song), in *Vinok I. Frankovi* (A Garland for I. Franko), 1957; Ya. Shust, "Poeziya I. Franka i narodna pisnya" (The Poetry of I. Franko and the Folk Song), in *Ivan Franko—Statti i materialy* (Ivan Franko: Articles and Materials), Vol. VI (Lviv, 1958).

Several studies have dealt with the folklore motifs in Mykhaylo Kotsyubynsky's works: M. Hrytsyuta, *M. Kotsyubyns'kyi i narodna tvorchist'* (M. Kotsyubynsky and Folk Creativeness), Kiev, Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, 1958; M. Hrytsyuta, "*Fata Morhana Kotsyubyns'koho i narodnopoetychna tvorchist'*" (The *Fata Morgana* of Kotsyubynsky and Folk Poetic Creativeness), in *Literatura v shkoli* (Literature in School), No. 2 (1957); M. Hrytsyuta, "Fol'klorna osnova povisty M. Kotsyubyns'koho *Tini zabutykh predkiv*" (The Folklore Basis of M. Kotsyubynsky's Novel "The Shadows of the Forgotten Ancestors"), in *Radyans'ke literaturoznavstvo* (Soviet Study of Literature), No. 1 (1958). The same subject in Lesya Ukrayinka's works is treated in articles "Lesya Ukrayinka i narodna tvorchist'" (Lesya Ukrayinka and Folk Creativeness) by Mariya Derkach in *Radyans'ka zhinka* (The Soviet Woman), No. 8 (1953), and "Lesya

Ukrayinka i ukrayins'ka narodna tvorchist'” (Lesya Ukrayinka and Ukrainian Folk Creativeness) by Petro Odarchenko in *Zbirnyk pamyati Z. Kuzeli* (Collection in Memory of Z. Kuzelya), Paris, 1960.

The influence of folklore on the work of other Ukrainian writers has been subject of the following publications: O. Danys'ko, “I. Kotlyarevskiy i narodnopoetychna tvorchist'” (I. Kotlyarevsky and Folk Poetic Creativeness), in *Naukovi zapysky* (Research Studies) of the Kotlyarevsky Memorial Museum of Literature in Poltava, Vol. I (Poltava, 1958); O. Honchar, “Znachennya fol'kloru v formuvanni tvorchoho metodu H. Kvitky-Osnovyanenka” (The Significance of Folklore in the Formation of the Creative Method of H. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko), in *Doslidzhennya z literaturoznavstva ta movoznavstva* (Studies in the History of Literature and Linguistics), Kiev, 1960; O. Kysel'ov, “Panas Myrnyi i ukrayins'ka narodna tvorchist'” (Panas Myrnyi and Ukrainian Folk Creativeness), in *Radyans'ke literaturoznavstvo* (Soviet Studies in Literature), Vol. XIV (1950). The journal *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnohrafyia* published the following articles on the subject: F. Pohrebennyk, “Osyp Makovey i narodna tvorchist'” (Osyp Makovey and Folk Creativeness), No. 4 (1958); I. Semenchuk, “Narodna pisnya v novelyakh Olesya Honchara” (Folk Song in the Short Stories of Oles' Honchar), No. 4 (1960). Finally, an article by V. Shadura, “Fol'klorni elementy v movi poeziy P. H. Tychyny” (Folklore Elements in the Language of the Poems of P. H. Tychyna) appeared in *Naukovi zapysky* (Research Papers) of the University of Dnipropetrovske, Vol. LXVIII, series *Movoznavstvo* (Linguistics), No. 16 (1958).

Works on the history of folklore studies have appeared in various periodicals and collections during the last few years. In 1957, the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR published a 120-page volume by M. Lomova, *Etnohrafichna diyal'nist' I. Franka* (Ethnographic Studies of I. Franko). The first part of the work of Oleksiy Dey mentioned above (*Ivan Franko i narodna tvorchist'*) deals with the subject “Ivan Franko as Researcher of Folk Poetic Creativeness.” *Naukovi zapysky* (Research Papers) of the University of Uzhhorod (Vol. XXXV, 1958) included an article by M. Yas'ko, “Volodymyr Hnatyuk—doslidnyk fol'kloru Zakarpattya” (Volodymyr Hnatyuk as Folklore Researcher of Transcarpathia). A symposium, *Oleksandr Opanasovych Potebnya*, published by the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (Kiev, 1962, 112 pages) contains an article by V. Bob-

kova "O. O. Potebnya—doslidnyk narodnoyi poetychnoyi tvorchosty" (O. O. Potebnya as Researcher of Folk Poetic Creativeness). The periodical *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnohrafyia* has published articles on the following scholars and writers who studied Ukrainian folklore: Filaret Kolessa (No. 1, 1957), Mykola Hrinchenko (No. 4, 1957), Waclaw Zaleski (No. 4, 1957), Mykola Leontovych (No. 1, 1958), Petro Sokal'sky (No. 2, 1958), Ludvik Kuba (No. 3, 1958), Klyment Kvitka (No. 4, 1958), Yevheniya Yaroshynska (No. 4, 1958), Andriy Loboda (No. 2, 1959), Mykola Tsertelev (No. 3, 1959), Pavlo Popov (No. 3, 1960), Oskar Kolberg (No. 2, 1961), Taras Shevchenko (No. 2, 1961), Ahatanhel Krymsky (No. 3, 1961).

General surveys of research in the field of Ukrainian folklore and ethnography during the last forty years have been published in *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnohrafyia* by P. Pavlii (No. 3, 1958) and H. Stel'makh (No. 4, 1959). However, these surveys contain many omissions. Little is said on the research conducted in the 1920's, almost nothing about the extensive and prolific work of Ukrainian scholars associated with the Ethnographic Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and other research centers of that time. Some of the more important works published during that period are not listed. No mention is made of Viktor Petrov, an outstanding ethnographer, editor of the *Etnohrafichnyi visnyk* (Ethnographic Journal) published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and director of the Ethnographic Commission, nor of numerous other scholars, mostly victims of the Soviet policy of repression in the 1930's (Volodymyr Bilyi, N. Dmytruk, I. Halyun, Mykhaylo Hayday, Vyacheslav Kaminsky, Mykola Levchenko, D. Revutsky, Ye. Rykhlik, Yi. Spaska, S. Tereshenkova, etc.).

A bibliographic index of folklore literature for the period 1945–1958 ("Bibliohrafichnyi pokazhchyk literatury z fol'kloru, 1945–1958") appeared in the journal *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnohrafyia* (Nos. 2–4, 1959; No. 1–4, 1960; Nos. 1, 3, 1961).

III. STUDIES ON UKRAINIAN FOLK MUSIC AND FOLK DANCE

Ukrainian folk music is one of the most popular subjects of ethnographic study in present-day Ukraine. The following articles, published in the journal *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnohrafyia*, should be mentioned: V. Dovzhenko, "Ukrayins'ka radyans'ka muzychna fol'klorystyka peredvoyennykh rokiv" (Soviet Ukrainian Musical Folk-

lore Studies in the Prewar Years), No. 1 (1960); O. Pravdyuk, "Z istoriyi vvychennya ladovykh osoblyvostey ukrayins'koyi narodnoyi muzyky" (On the History of Research on Harmonic Peculiarities of Ukrainian Folk Music), No. 1 (1958); L. Yashchenko, "Narodne bahatoholossya" (Folk Polyphony), No. 2 (1959); L. Yashchenko, "Osnovni strukturno-stylistychni typy ukrayins'koho narodnoho bahatoholossya" (Basic Structural-Stylistic Types of Ukrainian Folk Polyphony), No. 2 (1958). Special attention has been devoted to the use of Ukrainian folklore by composers: Kyrylo Stetsenko (No. 3, 1959; No. 4, 1961), Stanyslav Lyudkevych (No. 4, 1959), Filaret Kolesa (No. 2, 1960), Vasyly Verkhovynets' (No. 3, 1960), Mykola Ly-senko (No. 3, 1962).

A number of studies have been devoted to the conventional instruments of folk music (the *bandura*, the lyre, the *kobza*) and to their performers. First of all, several monographs deserve mention: A. Humenyuk, *Ukrayins'ki narodni muzychni instrumenty, instrumental'ni ansambl'i ta orkestry* (Ukrainian Folk Musical Instruments, Instrumental Groups and Orchestras), Kiev, 1959; F. Lavrov, *Kobzar Ostap Veresay* (Ostap Veresay, a *Kobza* Player), Kiev, 1955; M. Ryl'sky and F. Lavrov, *Kobzar Yehor Movchan* (Yehor Movchan, a *Kobza* Player), Kiev, 1958. Among the more interesting articles are: F. Lavrov, "Tvortsy i ispolniteli ukrainskogo eposa" (The Creators and Performers of the Ukrainian Epos), in *Osnovnye problemy eposa vostochnykh slavyan* (The Basic Problems of the Epos of East Slavs), 1958; M. Shchokol', "Ukrayins'ka kobza-bandura" (The Ukrainian *Kobza-Bandura*), in *Mystetstvo* (Art), No. 3 (1956)). The periodical *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnografija* devoted several articles to this subject: F. Lavrov, "Kobzar Mykhaylo Kravchenko" (Mykhaylo Kravchenko, A *Kobza* Player), No. 2 (1958); M. Ryl'sky, "Nash Yehor Movchan" (Our Yehor Movchan), No. 2 (1958); M. Shchokol', "Kobzar Volodymyr Perepelyuk" (Volodymyr Perepelyuk, A *Kobza* Player), No. 4 (1960); T. Zinchenko, "Slavetnyi banduryst Ivan Kuchuhura-Kucherenko" (The Famous *Bandura* Player Ivan Kuchuhura-Kucherenko), No. 4 (1961).

Recently, the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR published a de luxe album, *Portrety ukrayins'kykh kobzariu O. Slastiona* (Portraits of Ukrainian *Kobza* Players by O. Slastion) with an introduction, notes, and comments by Yu. Turchenko (Kiev, 1961, 62 pages). The album contains reproductions of 23 portraits of famous Ukrainian

kobza players. Opanas Slaktion, an outstanding Ukrainian artist, ethnographer, and art critic, spent over fifty years on this portrait gallery of *kobza* players: the first portrait was made in 1875 and the last in 1928. The volume, edited by the academician Vasyl' Kasiyan, is of great scholarly and artistic value.

Another recent work of scholarly value is the book entitled *Ukrayins'ki narodni tantsi* (Ukrainian Folk Dances), 1962, 360 pages, edited by A. Humenyuk and published under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. On the verso of the title page the following annotation appears: "This book classifies and describes Ukrainian folk dances, defines basic choreographic terminology and positions, and depicts the dance movements. It contains choreography and music for seventy-eight Ukrainian folk dances which attest to the thematic and genre richness of the Ukrainian folk-dancing art." The volume includes numerous colored plates which show not only movements of the dances, but also folk costumes of the Poltava, Kiev, and Chernihiv regions, and of Volhynia, Galicia, Bukovina, Polissya, and other areas of the Ukraine. The book has two major divisions: theory and dances.

IV. STUDIES ON UKRAINIAN FOLK ARTS AND CRAFTS

An important publication in the field of Ukrainian ethnography, particularly with reference to Ukrainian folk arts and crafts, is the series *Materialy z etnohrafyi ta khudozhn'oho promyslu* (Materials on Ethnography and Industrial Arts) published by the Ukrainian State Museum of Ethnography and Industrial Arts of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. In the period 1954-61 six volumes appeared in this series. (Beginning with Vol. IV the series is called *Materialy z etnohrafyi ta mystetstvoznaustva* [Materials on Ethnography and the History of Art].)

The State Publishing House of Fine Arts and Musical Literature has begun publishing a set of five de luxe albums under the collective title *Ukrayins'ke narodne mystetstvo* (Ukrainian Folk Art). The set is scheduled to include the following albums: *Tkanyny i vyshyuky* (Tapestries and Embroideries), *Vbrannya* (Costumes), *Riz'ba po derevu i khudozhniy metal* (Wood Carving and Artistic Metal), *Keramika, farfor i sklo* (Ceramics, China, and Glass), and *Narodnyi zhyvopys* (Folk Painting). The first two of these albums have already appeared. *Tkanyny i vyshyuky*, published in 1960, is a large album

printed on first-rate paper. It contains 86 reproductions in color and 173 in black and white. The second of the five albums, *Vbrannya*, appeared in 1961. It includes 248 plates, most of them in color. These two volumes are valuable contributions to the study of Ukrainian folk art.

A number of monographs on Ukrainian folk art, general material culture, and way of life have been published since 1957. O. Kulyk's book, *Ukrayins'ke narodne khudozhnye vyshyvannya* (Ukrainian Folk Artistic Embroidery), containing 76 pages of text and 23 plates, appeared in 1958. An album, *Ukrayins'ki narodni vyshyvky* (Ukrainian Folk Embroidery), with 12 pages of text and 17 plates of embroidery patterns, was published in Kiev in 1959. Another album published in 1959 was O. Kul'chytska's *Narodnyi odyah zakhidnykh oblastey URSS* (Folk Costumes of the Western Provinces of the Ukrainian SSR), Kiev, Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. It consists of 16 pages of text and 74 plates. In the same year, also under the auspices of the Kiev Academy of Sciences, appeared a monograph by L. Sukha, *Khudozhni metalevi vyroby ukrayintsiiv Skhidnykh Karpat druhoyi polovyny XIX–XX st.* (Artistic Metal Products of Ukrainians of the Eastern Carpathians in the Second Half of the Nineteenth and in the Twentieth Century), Kiev, 1959, 104 pages.

Two works on ceramics by K. Mateyko were published by the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR: a monographic study, *Narodna keramika zakhidnykh oblastey Ukrayins'koyi RSR XIX–XX st.* (Folk Ceramics in the Western Provinces of the Ukrainian SSR in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries), Kiev, 1959, 107 pages, and a de luxe album, *Khudozhnya keramika zakhidnykh oblastey Ukrayins'koyi RSR* (Artistic Ceramics in the Western Provinces of the Ukrainian SSR), Kiev, 1962. The album is an excellent publication, both for its scholarly value and its handsome appearance. It contains 28 pages of text and 60 colored plates; the text is in three languages—Ukrainian, Russian, and English.

In 1961, the Institute of Structural Architecture published a monograph by V. Samoylovych entitled *Narodna tvorchist' v arkhitekturi sil'skoho zhytla* (Folk Creativeness in Village Architecture), 340 pages. This work has value for architects as well as for ethnographers, as it examines in detail the decorative arts—wall-painting, wood carving, engraving, etc. Numerous illustrations are distributed throughout the book; at the end there are over 100 plates depicting types of build-

ings, structure and decoration on windows and doors, wall-painting, techniques of wall and pilaster decoration, painting of stoves, gates, and so forth.

Finally, a publication on changes in the way of life under the Communist regime should be mentioned: I Symonenko, *Sotsialistychni peretvorenniya v pobuti trudyashchykh sela Neresnytsi, Zakarpats'koyi oblasti* (Socialist Transformations in the Way of Life of Working People in the Village Neresnytsya of the Transcarpathian Province), Kiev, Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, 1957, 134 pages.

A number of articles on Ukrainian folk art have been published in the quarterly *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnografiya*. The following are worth noting: H. Sydorenko, "Kylymarstvo Poltavshchyny" (Carpet-making of the Poltava Region), No. 1 (1959); I. Syibert, "Suchasnyi reshetyliv's'kyi kylym" (The Present Reshetyliv Carpet), No. 1 (1960); articles on carpets by A. Zhuk (No. 2, 1961; Nos. 1 and 3, 1962); K. Dobryanska, "Typy ta koloryt zakhidnoukrayins'koyi narodnoyi vyshyvky" (Types and Coloring of West Ukrainian Folk Embroidery), No. 2 (1959); I. Matyasyak, "Mystetstvo riz'by po derevu v s. Zhabye ta navkolyshnikh selakh" (The Art of Carving in Wood in the Village Zhabye and Neighboring Villages), No. 3 (1959); K. Promenytsky, "Zakhidnoukrayins'ki riz'byari—maystry narodnoyi skul'ptury" (West Ukrainian Engravers—Masters of Folk Sculpture), No. 3 (1959); O. Solomchenko, "Riz'byar Ivan Balahurak" (The Engraver Ivan Balahurak), No. 3 (1961); I. Kravets', K. Povod, and Yu. Pudov, "Keramik tsentral'noyi Kyivschchyny" (Ceramics of the Central Kiev Region), No. 1 (1960); Ya. Zapasko, "Honcharne mystetstvo v s. Dybyntsi Kyivskoyi obl." (The Art of Pottery in the Village Dybyntsi of the Kiev Province), No. 3 (1960); P. Musiyenko, "Mayster narodnoho mystetstva Opishni" (A Master Folk Artist of Opishnya), No. 1 (1960); V. Shcherbak, "Ukrayins'ke narodne mystetstvo na suchasnomu etapi" (The Present Stage of Ukrainian Folk Art), No. 4 (1960).

The quarterly *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnografiya* contains two bibliographical indexes on works in Ukrainian ethnography, for the period 1957–58 (No. 3, 1959) and for the period 1959–60 (No. 2, 1961).

Much attention of Ukrainian ethnographers has been concentrated on the study of the material culture and folk art of Western Ukraine. Not occupied by the Soviets until 1939, Western Ukraine was spared

the tragic years of forced collectivization and the famine of 1933, as well as the bloody period of the Ezhov terror that the central and eastern Ukrainian lands experienced. These factors, at least in part, explain why the people of Western Ukraine were able to maintain more of their folk culture than were the inhabitants of the rest of the country.

Washington, D.C.

Book Reviews

Yaroslav Pasternak. *Arkheolohiya Ukrayiny*. Toronto, 1961. Published for the Shevchenko Scientific Society by the Committee for the Publication of "Arkheolohiya Ukrayiny" by Y. Pasternak. 789 pages.

The book contains 661 pages of Ukrainian text, summaries in English and German, bibliography, and index. It also includes 18 maps, 4 colored tables as well as many other tables, numerous photographs and illustrations.

As stated by the author of the book—which he dedicated to "young archaeologists, historians, researchers, and those who are interested in Ukrainian antiquity"—this work is "an attempt at a survey of the ancient and early history of all the Ukrainian lands within their ethnic boundaries."

The author has devoted almost his entire life to the collection of material for his great work: he has made extensive use of archaeological literature in many languages, studied archaeological finds in museums, and applied material from his own excavations which he conducted in Western Ukraine.

The book encompasses the periods from the Lower Paleolithic (archaeological finds attest to the existence of Chellean, Acheulean, and Mousterian man in the Ukraine) to the medieval Kievan Rus inclusive.

In examining the cultural and historical development of the population of the Ukraine, Pasternak points to specific lines of cultural development as early as the Neolithic Age in the northern, forest region of the Ukraine and in the southern steppes. During the Neolithic-Eneolithic period, the area between the Dniester and the Dnieper rivers, north of the steppe zone, was inhabited by the agricultural tribes of the Trypilian culture, whom Pasternak consider to be the ancestors of the Slavs.

The areas of Western Ukraine were occupied as early as the Eneolithic Age by several migratory waves of Nordic tribes whose advance to the middle Dnieper and Southern Buh during the early Bronze Age is traced by the author. Much information is given on the changes that took place in the steppe area of the Ukraine during the Bronze Age under the influence of new advancing tribes of the so-called Catacomb culture, and, toward the end of the Bronze Age, by the Cimmerians and the pre-Scythians.

In the chapter on Greek colonization of the Black Sea shores, the author deals extensively with each colony. Lengthy chapters are devoted to the invasions of the Scythians, Sarmatians, Goths, Huns, to the migrations

of the early Slavs, and to the origins and establishment of the Kievan Rus. In the last chapter the author discusses the finds from archaeological excavations and the literary sources which give a picture of the cultural and economic life of the Ukraine in the period of the Kievan Rus. Also valuable are the chapters on ancient cities of the Kievan Rus. The author gives the history of their establishment, evaluates information from the chronicles and archaeological material, and traces the history of the research done on the subject.

Arkheolohiya Ukrayiny (Archaeology of the Ukraine) by Dr. Yaroslav Pasternak is not only a survey of the ancient and early history of the Ukrainian lands based primarily on extensive archaeological data and scholarly literature, it is also a review of archaeological excavations, both pre-revolutionary and postrevolutionary, done in the Ukraine and an examination of the development of archaeological research.

St. Paul, Minn.

NEONILA KORDYSH

Robert S. Sullivant. *Soviet Politics and the Ukraine, 1917-1957*. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1962. 438 pages.

This book is a welcome contribution to the growing field of Ukrainian studies. Another American author has displayed a genuine interest in things Ukrainian and has demonstrated his belief that the Ukraine's role in Soviet internal politics has been sufficiently important to merit attention and study.

The book is about Soviet Russian policies in the Ukraine, which are described as aimed at the reassertion of Russia's authority over the continuously dissenting Ukrainian "nationalist" forces. A political as well as a historical study, the book covers the entire forty-year span of Soviet Ukrainian history. There is much purely historical detail, although an attempt is always made to discover the underlying political relationships. Despite some accurate historical description and valid political analysis, the work has certain shortcomings—primarily, perhaps, because the author tried to cover too much ground.

Although the work was completed for publication in June 1962, Dr. Sullivant made use of no newer scholarly studies than one published in 1959—J. A. Armstrong's monograph on the Ukrainian Party bureaucracy. Most of his references belong to the pre-1956 period, however, and consist chiefly of Stalinist literature of the type of the notorious monograph by A. V. Likholat (1954), which even Soviet critics have since repudiated. Sullivant failed to include such English-language publications as those of H. Kostiuuk's *Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine, 1929-39*, and J. Borys' *The Russian Com-*

munist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine, both of which were available in 1960; he also omitted some pertinent papers that appeared in the English edition of the *Ukrainian Review* of the Munich Institute for the Study of the USSR. These writings, to be sure, have their own limitations, but since Sullivant has relied on several rather doubtful, mimeographed emigré publications in Ukrainian, the reader cannot be convinced that he omitted the English-language works mentioned as a result of careful selection.

Some Soviet unpublished dissertations the author used in the libraries of Moscow undoubtedly were of value inasmuch as these works were based on certain archival sources, but it is doubtful whether they merit the description "excellent" (p. vi). It is to be regretted that most Soviet collections of documents on early Soviet Ukrainian history (some of which will be mentioned below) have been overlooked by the author, especially such an important source as the Soviet Ukrainian *Litopys revolyutsiyi* with its rich material on that period.

The use of Soviet periodicals has also been rather haphazard: in his bibliography (pp. 420-21) Sullivant lists *Bil'shovyk Ukrayiny* only for the years 1930-31 and 1935-36; *Komunist Ukrayiny* only for the period 1955-57; Moscow *Pravda* only since 1934. *Radyans'ka Ukrayina*, a Kiev daily, has not been used at all. Most of these sources are available in this country, as well as in the Moscow libraries in which the author spent six months.

A few of Sullivant's historical accounts need to be discussed here. The Ukraine on the eve of the 1917 Revolution, according to the author, was an extremely underdeveloped country: Kiev "was largely rural in position and outlook," having "no enterprises employing more than one and one-half or two thousand workers" (p. 23). Actually, Kiev at that time was the center of the Empire's sugar and food industries. As to enterprises employing more than 1,500 or 2,000 workers, this criterion seems to be much too high: even today, in the United States of America, there are not many enterprises of such a size. In 1917 the Ukraine was more industrially developed, on the whole, than was Russia itself.

The author's statements on the Borotbist Party are contradictory. "At the time of the November Revolution," he writes, "in the Kherson and Poltava provinces, active Bolshevik groups were to be found, but they were united with, and to a certain extent dominated by, other parties (the Socialist Revolutionary Party and the Internationalists or Borotbists)." In a long footnote to this statement, the author asserts that the Bolsheviks "formed joint organizations with the Borotbists" in Odessa and other Ukrainian provinces as well (p. 334). However, on p. 55 Sullivant says that the Borotbist Party did not exist before May 1918, and that not until August 1919 did it, for the first time, enter into a coalition with the Bolsheviks.

Apparently, in the first instance the author misinterpreted E. Bosh's statement in her book, *God bor'by*, to which he refers; "Internationalists" of November 1917 were not Borotbists but rather left-wing Ukrainian Social Democrats.

In several places the author mentions casually that it was the army of the RSFSR that brought the Bolsheviks to power, first in Kharkiv and later in Kiev. Yet subsequently he writes (p. 36) that "the reaction of Russian leaders to the formation of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic was immediate and enthusiastic"—as if it came about spontaneously. Such Soviet collections of documents as *Litopys revolyutsiyi, Velikaya Oktyabr'skaya sotsialisticheskaya revolyutsiya na Ukraine: Fevral' 1917—April' 1918* (1957), and *Perepiska sekretariata TsK RSDRP (b) s mestnymi partiinymi organizatsiyami* (1957) leave no doubt that the establishment of the Ukrainian Bolshevik government was planned and carried out by the then Commissar for the Affairs of Nationalities of the RSFSR, Stalin, and that there was no local spontaneity in its establishment. Furthermore, there is enough documented evidence to prove that it was not a "Ukrainian Soviet Republic" that was officially established in Kharkiv at the time, but rather a governmental body called a "People's Secretariat" of the "Ukrainian People's Republic"—that is, merely a rival Soviet government opposed to the existing government (called General Secretariat) of the Ukrainian People's Republic in Kiev. In fact the name "Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic" was not used officially until January 1919.

In a quotation from the Petrograd *Izvestiya* of December 30, 1917, Sulivant reproduces an accurate contemporary Russian designation of the Kharkiv government as the Bolshevik government "of the Ukrainian People's Republic" (p. 37) but does not discuss this fact. It is rather important to point out that it was the shrewd tactic of Lenin and Stalin, who at the time appreciated the existence of the independent Ukrainian state much more than did some later historians, to establish by artifice a Bolshevik government of the "Ukrainian People's Republic" in Kharkiv in order to conceal from the population and from the world the true nature of the war they planned. Lenin even proposed to rename the RSFSR army in the Ukraine an "Army of the Ukrainian People's Republic." What Lenin and Stalin were doing in the Ukraine in January 1918 was attempting to make it appear that the war they had started was not a war between two nations, the RSFSR and the Ukraine, but rather a civil war or a class struggle—a war between two Ukrainian governments of one and the same independent Ukrainian state. It was the first application of the Communist tactic which later was repeated in Finland in the case of the Kuusinen government in 1940, in Poland in the case of the Lublin government in 1944, in Iranian Azerbaijan in 1946, in Laos recently, and so forth.

Sullivant's historical account of the later periods of Soviet Ukrainian history is at times arbitrary and highly controversial. The tragic events of the years 1932-34, for example, seem to be both misrepresented and misinterpreted (pp. 187-94). The author speaks of a "powerful nationalist peasant resistance" to collectivization that manifested itself in refusals to deliver harvests to the state. In addition, he alleges, the harvest was bad. Molotov and Kaganovich arrived in July 1932 to demand that the Ukrainian Bolsheviks pay "greatest attention to the Ukraine's rural areas." (Actually they were told to pay no attention to the needs of the rural areas but to take all the grain that it was possible to take, including seed grain, as it was needed for export to pay the bills for the First Five-Year Plan.) Since the CP (B)U, for some reason, did not heed Molotov's advice, continues Sullivant, the situation in the Ukraine worsened and almost got out of hand, all due to those "rebellious nationalist peasants." The leadership of the CP (B)U was then found to be "inadequate" for its tasks and was purged. The food situation developed to merely the "verge of starvation." In general, the author declares, "no quantitative measurement of the impact of the changes of 1933 is possible."

This extremely inaccurate picture could only have been derived from later Stalinist accounts of the period. At present these doubtful sources are no longer used, even in the Soviet Union; in more and more Soviet writings today there appear admissions and references to the fact that the disastrous famine in the Ukraine in 1932-33 actually did occur.

The purges of 1937, the events of the war and of the postwar period are treated in the book in a similar manner. Along with data and views based primarily on Stalinist historiography, there are some critical surmises and conjectures by the author. At the same time it must be emphasized that Sullivant has uncovered or brought to timely attention many significant facts that are new, interesting, and revealing, such as, for instance, his reference to H. Petrovsky's 1929 complaint about the Ukraine's underprivileged position in the Union budget (p. 157).

Finally, a few words on the author's assumption that Ukrainians, as well as other non-Russians within the USSR, are merely national minorities rather than subjugated nations. This assumption implies that the national aspirations of such minorities do not differ qualitatively from the aspirations of any other dissenting group in any normal *politeia*. Actually, however, the problem of Ukrainian political emancipation is not that of an oppressed national minority—one of many dissenting groups in a society—but of an oppressed dependent country. The presently-existing Ukrainian SSR is a state—not a truly independent one to be sure, but one with recognized international status—and Ukrainians constitute a majority of the population in this state. They are not a "national minority," as were not, for instance,

the Algerians, who were also called by French political scientists a "national minority" in the one and indivisible France.

In the case of the non-Russian republics of the USSR, one is dealing with different but compact groups inhabiting definite territories and having different cultures, languages, religions, histories, social and political institutions, legal traditions, and levels of economic development; in other words, with different societies rather than with dissenting groups in one and the same society. Such is the real complexity of the problem of Soviet dependent nationalities: while the dissention of any other group within a society usually stems from one or a few of the factors mentioned, that of dependent nationalities arises from all of them combined. In fact, no single, specialized discipline can explain the problem properly, and this is the main reason why it is still misunderstood nowadays.

Hunter College

VSEVOLOD HOLUBNYCHY

Akademiya Nauk Ukrayins'koyi RSR. Sektor Derzhavy i Prava. *Istoriya derzhavy i prava Ukrayins'koyi RSR, 1917-1960*. Kiev: Vydavnytstvo Akademiya Nauk URSR, 1961. 730 pages.

The practice of treating separately the constitutional history of a Union republic ceased in the USSR in the thirties. Similarly the history of the Party and that of legal development in the individual republics occupied an underprivileged place in general studies in the USSR.

The end of Stalinism brought about some changes in these fields of study. Beginning in 1956, historians and writers on legal matters began to pay more attention to political and constitutional development in their own republics. Consequently several monographs appeared in the Ukrainian SSR, the publication of which would have been unthinkable prior to 1954-55. These studies include works on local government in the Soviet Ukraine in 1917-20,¹ on several aspects of the history of the government and law of the Ukrainian SSR,² on the constitutional history of the Ukrainian SSR,³ on the foreign relations of the Soviet Ukraine in the early period,⁴ on the history of Soviet Ukrainian criminal legislation and its

1 B. M. Babiy, *Mistevi orhany derzhavnoyi vlady Ukrayins'koyi RSR v 1917-1920 rr.* (Kiev, Akademiya Nauk URSR, 1956).

2 Akademiya Nauk Ukrayins'koyi RSR, *Narysy z istoriyi derzhavy i prava Ukrayins'koyi RSR* (Kiev, 1957).

3 A. P. Taranov, *Istoriya konstytutsiyi Ukrayins'koyi Radyans'koyi Sotsialistychnoyi Respubliki* (Kiev, Akademiya Nauk URSR, 1957).

4 P. P. Udovychenko, *Z istoriyi zovnishnoyi polityky URSR, 1919-1922* (Kiev, Akademiya Nauk URSR, 1957).

court system,⁵ and on international acts signed by the Ukrainian SSR,⁶ to mention only a few.

During this same period of time the Academy of Sciences in Kiev, in particular its Sector of Government and Law Studies, was busy preparing a collective work on the Soviet Ukraine intended to present a general and systematized treatment of constitutional and legal development in that Republic throughout its existence. The result of this effort is a huge volume edited by Soviet Ukrainian scholars under the chairmanship of the academician Volodymyr Koretsky, presently a judge of the International Court of Justice at the Hague.

Eleven authors contributed a chapter each to the volume, and two more authors wrote on special problems in the first chapter. As a result of the collective authorship, the chapters are uneven; despite all editing, there are many redundancies.

Under the heading "State and Law" is included a survey of political history (internal and external development), an analysis of institutions, a description of central and local government and of court organization, and a presentation of the legal system in all aspects of public and private laws. This volume is a model to be followed by similar works in the other republics. The government and law of the Soviet Ukraine since its establishment in December 1917 are presented along the lines just described. Each of the eleven chapters covers a definite phase of Soviet history. The historical periods are similar to those defined in the official survey of Soviet Ukrainian history published in 1958. They are: the October Revolution and the creation of the Ukrainian Soviet State; the civil war and foreign intervention (1918-20); the reconstruction of the national economy (1921-25); socialist industrialization and the preparation for the complete collectivization of agriculture (1926-29); the establishment of collective agriculture (1929-33); the completion of socialism in the national economy of the Soviet Ukraine (1933-37); the strengthening and development of socialist society (1937-41); the Great Patriotic War (1941-45); postwar reconstruction of the economy (1945-53); the raising of the economy and the fulfillment of socialist construction (1953-58); the intensive construction of a Communist society (1959-).

This type of historical analysis, in agreement with the Marxist interpretation of state and society, takes into consideration only economic and social criteria, and excludes such criteria as political, institutional, power-relationship, etc. According to Soviet interpretation, the law and political institu-

⁵ P. P. Mykhalenko, *Narysy z istoriyi kryminal'noho zakonodavstva Ukrayins'koyi RSR* (Kiev, Akademiya Nauk URSR, 1959), Vol. I.

⁶ Akademiya Nauk Ukrayins'koyi RSR, *Ukrayins'ka RSR u mizhnarodnykh vidnosynakh* (Kiev, 1959).

tions are simply a superstructure of economic and social processes. However, the Soviet experiment itself considerably undermines this basic Marxist thesis because it reflects most effectively its opposite: that organization, political power, a definite philosophy of society, and coercive legal norms preceded the "reconstruction" of society.

For each of the above-mentioned historical periods the authors present an overall survey of the development of the USSR and of the Ukrainian Republic in particular: their foreign political problems, the evolution of central and local governmental organs (i.e., legislative, executive, and judiciary) and also of particular fields of law (administrative, civil, family, labor, land and collective farm law, criminal procedure, and lawsuit).

The constitutional development of the Soviet Ukraine closely followed that of Soviet Russia, and later that of the USSR. Ukrainian constitutions of 1919, 1929, and 1937 were patterned after the constitutions of the RSFSR of 1918, and those of the USSR of 1924 and 1936. Characteristically Ukrainian features were included in the first constitution during the period of the quasi-satellite existence of the Soviet Ukraine in 1918-23; these disappeared with the incorporation of the Ukraine into the Soviet Union. Since that time no constitutional changes or major modifications in legislation have been introduced on the republican level without having been initiated first centrally. This applies not only to matters covered by Union prerogatives, but also to those retained by the republics.

Unification and uniformity, under the guise of "democratic centralism," are the main characteristics of the Soviet federation, and these void Soviet federalism of any real content. The authors fail to discuss critically the complex and controversial relationship between the Ukraine and Russia in 1919-23, and do not elaborate sufficiently on Soviet federalism as such. Surprisingly, the role of the Communist Party as the principal residue of political power is not emphasized, although the monolithic structure of the Party in all the republics became the most important unifying factor of the system.

As for the various sets of Soviet law, no special Soviet Ukrainian law distinctly different from a Russian or an all-Union law exists, despite the existence of separate republican codes: Civil Code (adopted in 1923), Land Code (1922, modified in 1927, outdated after collectivization), Family Code (1926), Criminal Code (1922, 1927), Code of Civil Procedure (1924, 1929), Code of Criminal Procedure (1922, 1927). All Soviet Ukrainian codes differ only slightly from similar codes of the Russian SFSR; the Labor Code (1922) totally reproduces the Russian Labor Code. Only in two fields did the Ukrainian legislators show initiative: in their Education Code (1922) and in their Administrative Code (1927). Both of these have become completely or partially outdated. The recent work of codification in the USSR and in

the Ukraine, begun in 1956, did not receive enough attention from the authors, particularly in their comparative aspects—i.e., in what respects do the recent codes differ from previous legislation?

As has already been pointed out, this volume has little theoretical value. Many constitutional and legal problems are not defined and analyzed—e.g., the nature of Soviet sovereignty, federalism, citizenship, the right of secession, property rights, revolutionary legality, etc. The book is merely descriptive, and only as such may it have some use since it contains information and facts unpublished in the USSR for long time. However, even considered simply as a descriptive study, it has inexcusable omissions, especially in the specific context of the development of the Ukrainian Republic immediately before and after the creation of the Union. The autonomous rights of the Ukraine in foreign relations, national defense, the activities and status of the Soviet Ukrainian government in Russia during the German occupation in 1941–43, administrative divisions and territorial changes, and the status of national minorities in the Ukraine are treated only marginally. One would also expect the authors to give more extensive information on several concepts of the Union as presented in 1922–24 by spokesmen of the republics, in particular on those of the Ukrainians (Skrypnyk's opposition to centralism is not even mentioned).

The selectivity of information, facts, and names illustrates the use of Stalinist techniques. When the authors speak of the composition of governmental or Party organs, only those leaders now admitted to the Communist pantheon are mentioned. The ritual "etc." censors the names of leading figures of the Soviet Ukraine later fallen into disgrace.

It goes without saying that this volume reflects the current nationality policy of the Party toward the Ukraine. However, the authors and editors were scrupulously cautious and subservient even in exploiting the present limited possibilities of criticizing Stalinist practices. For them all measures taken by the Party are "progressive," reflecting ideas of "humanism and democracy," corresponding to "genuine" Marxism and Leninism, be they the abolition and later the re-establishment of capital punishment, a liberal or strict approach to the problem of abortion, the encroachment on republican rights by the center or the expansion of those rights in the form of administrative decentralization, the suppression of political commissars in the army or their restitution, etc. The authors call the judiciary system introduced by Stalin's Constitution of 1936 "the democratization of the judiciary" (p. 523); the reforms put into effect in 1953–58 in the spirit of "Socialist legality" again are referred to as the development of Socialist democracy (p. 685).

The authors apply different criteria for evaluating similar phenomena. For example, collectivized agriculture is hailed as the most advanced and

just form of economic activity; but this very form, when retained by the German occupation authorities in 1941-43 in order to exploit better the Ukrainian agricultural resources (even the names were similar under the Germans and the Soviets—"community farms" and "state farms"), is labeled as slave economy (p. 548).

Misrepresentation and mutilation of facts are an almost inseparable part of Soviet publications, and the work of Kiev's Academy is not immune to them. According to the authors, the Ukrainian Central Rada, consisting predominantly of socialists, "protected the interests of capitalists and big landowners" (p. 57); it also "categorically opposed the realization of Ukrainian autonomy prior to the Constitutional Assembly" (p. 54). On page 157, we read: "On December 14 [1918] German troops, retreating under the blows of the Soviet armies, passed Kiev over to the bands of Petlyura." The facts are, however, that the Red Army at that time was far from Kiev and that the national units of Petlyura took the capital after a battle with pro-German Hetmanites. Other examples of this arbitrary presentation of history: Trotskyist opposition wanted the "restoration of capitalism in the USSR" (p. 336); the Briand-Kellogg pact was "an instrument in preparation of anti-Soviet war" (p. 337); in 1938-39 "the imperialist camp, and primarily the leading quarters of the USA, England and France tried to come out of crisis through the organization of war against the USSR" (p. 492); in Western Ukraine (under Poland prior to 1939) the Ukrainian "exploiting classes and Uniate clergy" participated with the Polish government in the suppression of Ukrainian national culture (p. 499).

A number of strained facts are presented by the authors, probably in an attempt to enhance the international status of the Soviet Ukraine after 1945. "The Ukrainian SSR has solved with the neighboring countries of people's democracies all important questions in regard to the state boundaries and their regime. The treaties of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance promoted the strengthening of friendly contacts between the Ukrainian SSR and the Socialist countries, and the expansion of her relations with all other countries" (p. 608). "During 1952-58 agreements were signed concerning cultural cooperation of the Ukrainian SSR with the People's Republic of China and all European people's democracies, with Syria, Belgium, Norway, etc." (p. 667). The fact is that the Ukraine was not the contracting party in any of the treaties concerning her territory, her boundaries, or her economic and cultural exchanges with foreign countries. No agreement can be quoted in this regard with the Ukraine as its signatory. To the best of our knowledge, based on, among other sources, the official publication of the Kiev Foreign Ministry, *Ukrayins'ka RSR u mizhnarodnykh vidnosynakh*, 1959, the Ukrainian SSR in the last eighteen

years signed only two bilateral agreements—with the Polish Committee of Liberation in 1944 and with UNRRA in 1945.

To the same category of unsubstantiated statements belongs the following: "The Ukrainian SSR recognized new countries of a Socialist type which came into existence as a result of World War II and the defeat of German Fascism" (p. 564). However, we know of no specific diplomatic act nor other pronouncement of the Kiev government which might be interpreted as expressly conveying recognition to Poland, Czechoslovakia, or Yugoslavia.

There are many other inaccuracies and factual errors in this collective work: among the prerogatives of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR according to the 1937 Constitution there is incorrectly listed the right "of appointment and recall of plenipotentiary representatives of the Ukrainian SSR in foreign countries" (p. 511); on page 625 the above mentioned right is presented as already having been realized by the Presidium which, after 1944, "appointed and recalled the plenipotentiary representatives of the Ukrainian SSR in foreign countries, and received credentials from the accredited diplomatic representatives of foreign countries." Except for the Ukrainian representation at the UN, there is no permanent Ukrainian diplomatic mission abroad. As for foreign diplomats being accredited in Kiev, there have been none up to now except for the UNRRA agents in 1945-46. When Great Britain in 1947 expressed her wish to enter into diplomatic relations with Kiev, Moscow's government refused to permit it. This fact is not even mentioned by the authors.

In regard to the "expanded rights" of the Ukrainian Republic in the field of military organization by a constitutional amendment in February 1944, the book states the following: "The Ukrainian SSR did not make use of the right granted to her, and did not establish her own regular military units. However, there were organized in the Ukrainian SSR the auxiliary armed forces which played an important role in the defeat of the enemy. Those were the destruction batallions, people's home guard, and partisan units" (p. 559-60). As a matter of fact, all those temporary units were organized before 1944 and not as a result of the "expanded rights" of the Ukraine. The only practical result of this constitutional amendment was the appointment of generals Herasymenko and his successor, Kovpak, as the Ukrainian Minister of National Defense, a purely honorific post which in the late 1940's was discontinued. The book does not mention this fact either.

A few other points are noteworthy in relation to the ambiguous statehood of the Ukrainian SSR. The book gives sufficient proof that the Kharkiv Soviet government was a creation of Russian Bolsheviks and that its establishment was motivated by the existence of the Ukrainian Central

Rada. Only because of the latter did the Bolsheviks create their own state government. The Communists even used the same name—the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR)—for their Soviet state in the Ukraine until December 12, 1919 (p. 167), and the official publication of the Soviet Ukrainian government bear the name *Vestnik Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliki*. The thesis of the legal succession of the Soviet Ukraine to the original Ukrainian People's Republic is presently denied by Soviet scholars.

One more detail furnished by the book illustrates the working of the Soviet electoral system. In connection with the 1957 elections to the local soviets, the results of the elections to the "settlement" soviets in 15 districts and to the village soviets in one electoral district were annulled because the candidates allegedly did not obtain an absolute majority (p. 684). This is rare information on (a) a non 99% result for official candidates, and (b) an annulment of results and second balloting. The authors do not provide a satisfactory comment on this unusual fact. Allegedly, "this was a proof of the increased demands on the candidates from the voters." Most likely, in the opinion of this reviewer, the Party consents now in a few cases to disclose a low voting percentage on the lowest level in order to admonish voters to participate more actively in elections, or else the candidates presented by the local units were later found to be unfit for the job by the higher echelons and the annulment of the election might have provided the best pretext for their dismissal.

A few remarks on some technical shortcomings of this voluminous work must be added. There is neither a bibliography nor an index so badly needed in using this type of reference work; nor do the Soviet authors use maps, tables, or schemes to illustrate, for instance, the changes in the structure of governments. The heavy, dull style, the lack of a clear presentation of one institution or problem in its entirety, the confused treatment of the same problem throughout many phases and, hence, much repetition, do not facilitate the use of this work as a textbook which, among others, was supposed to be its purpose.

The real significance of this work lies in the fact that it constitutes the first specific and systematized treatise of Soviet Ukrainian government and law, and that it provides students of Soviet federalism with some—though selected and limited—data and facts on the subject. The analysis and evaluations presented by the authors are determined by current Communist Party policy and, therefore, are less reliable and not of much value.

Studies on the Soviet Union. New Series. Volume II, Number 1: Special Issue on Agriculture in the USSR. Munich: Institute for the Study of the USSR, 1962. 160 pages.

This collection was published in English to serve as a reference for students of Soviet agriculture.

The first part of the volume (pp. 7-62) includes papers presented at an Institute seminar held on April 24-25, 1962. The papers are concerned with various aspects of agriculture in the USSR: Agricultural Administration (Aleksandr Yurchenko), Soviet Agriculture and the March 1962 Plenum (Symon Kabysch), Reorganization of Soviet Agriculture (Nikolai Novak-Decker), Military Aspects of Soviet Agricultural Reorganization (Nikolai Galay), Mechanization of Agriculture (George Vvedensky), Reasons for the Crisis in Soviet Agriculture (Andreas Bilinsky), Causes of Soviet Agricultural Difficulties (Andrei Lebed), Increase in Prices of Meat and Dairy Products (Eugeny Glovinsky). Some authors attempt to predict the future development of agriculture in the USSR (Fedor Hayenko, Stefan Stolte, and Yury Mironenko).

Problems of agriculture in the USSR are analyzed on the basis of various sources. Unfortunately, some authors (e.g., N. Galay) were not critical enough in their usage of Soviet statistics on grain production.

The second part of the book (pp. 63-159) is composed of reference material on the development and present state of agriculture in the USSR. It was compiled by S. Kabysch on the basis of recent Soviet collections of materials relating to economics and agriculture, such as *Narodnoe khozyaistvo SSSR* (for several years), *Ekonomicheskaya zhizn' SSSR* (1961), and *Sel'skoe khozyaistvo SSSR* (1960). A series of collections was used for individual republics, such as *Narodnoe khozyaistvo RSFSR* (1960), *Belorusskaya SSR* (1957), *Atlas sil'skoho hospodarstva Ukrayinskoyi RSR* (1958), *Litovskaya SSR* (1955), *Latviiskaya SSR* (1957), *Gruzinskaya SSR* (1958), *Kirgizskaya SSR* (1960), *Tadzhikskaya SSR* (1956), and *Uzbekskaya SSR* (1956). Also the *Bol'shaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* and *SSSR v tsifrah v 1960 g.* were used, as well as newspapers *Izvestiya*, *Pravda*, *Kazakhstanskaya pravda*, and *Sel'skaya zhizn'*.

The introductory chapter (pp. 63-65) presents a short analysis of the Soviet agrarian system. The author cautions the reader against using Soviet statistics uncritically. The reference material includes chapters on land reserves of the Soviet Union, state farms, collective farms, industrial crops, potatoes and vegetables, fodder crops, and livestock breeding. Agriculture in the individual Soviet republics is reviewed.

Tables referring to the USSR as a whole include data on areas composed of various types of agricultural land (arable, fallow and derelict, virgin

land, hay land, flood land, marsh land, pasture, perennial crop land, orchards, vineyards, and small fruit gardens). Statistical figures are presented for the period from 1928 to 1961. Data on 1913 are included for a comparison. In the chapter "State Farms," tables present data for individual years on growth in the number of state farms, increase in the number of specialized state farms, growth of state farms in terms of manpower, equipment, sown area, crops and livestock, electrification, and deliveries in thousands of tons and in percentage of total deliveries. Tables in the chapter "Collective Farms" give data for individual years on the number and size of collective farms, livestock, mechanization, gross harvests, state deliveries of main crops, and areas sown to individual crops. For the USSR as a whole, data are presented for individual years on various crops (indicating areas sown, gross harvests, yields per hectare), on livestock (cows, pigs, sheep, goats, horses), and on livestock produce (meat, milk, eggs, and wool). For each table, sources of statistical data are cited.

It is an asset of the book that detailed data are tabulated both for the individual republics and for economic regions in much the same way as for the USSR as a whole. For the Ukraine, information is presented according to the latest (1961) subdivision into three economic regions: the Donets-Dnieper, South-West and Southern regions. In addition, the author refers to physiographic zones of the Ukraine (Polissya, Forest-Steppe, Steppe, Southern Arid, and Carpathian and Crimean Mountain Zones).

A shortcoming of the book as a whole lies in the fact that figures for 1913 are taken not from primary, prerevolutionary sources, but from Soviet publications in which 1913 data on gross harvests and yields are usually reduced to demonstrate an allegedly increased crop production in the period of Soviet rule. For example, on page 76 data on gross harvest of cereal in Russia in 1913 are shown equaling 86 million tons. Actually, according to the *Ezhegodnik* published by the Imperial Russian Department of Agriculture, the gross harvest then exceeded 5,600 million *puds*, or 92 million tons. Such inaccuracies are continuously repeated in tables showing data for 1913 on areas sown to various crops, as well as those picturing gross harvests and yields per hectare (pp. 74-79). Some authors based their figures for 1913 on Soviet publications rather than on primary sources even in their evaluation of statistical data for the period 1913-61. Thus, according to Lebed (p. 32), in 1961 the yield of cereals per capita was higher than it was in 1913. Quite an opposite conclusion would have been arrived at, however, if data for 1913 had been based on primary sources and adjusted as needed for purposes of comparison.

As a matter of fact, even Soviet publications were not always consistent in evaluating prerevolutionary crop statistics. In its publications of the 1920's the Gosplan (State Planning Commission) regarded it necessary to

increase the 1913 official statistics of crops to make them comparable with postrevolutionary crop statistics (cf. Vladimir Timoshenko, *Agricultural Russia and the Wheat Problem*, Stanford University, 1932, pp 169-70). The author of this review analyzed Soviet data on gross harvests in Russia and the Soviet Union, making critical comments on interpretations of these figures by some economists abroad, in his paper on the subject published in *Vestnik Instituta po izucheniyu SSSR*, No. 3 (35), Munich, 1960.

Notwithstanding the shortcomings mentioned, the volume under review presents much material of value for the study of Soviet agriculture.

Ukrainian Technical Institute in New York

ALEXANDER ARCHIMOVICH

Obituaries

VOLODYMYR DOROSHENKO

1879–1963

Volodymyr Doroshenko, a prominent Ukrainian bibliographer, literary scholar and political figure, and a full member of the Academy, died in Philadelphia on August 25, 1963, at the age of 83. Doroshenko became a member of the Ukrainian Scientific Society in Kiev in 1913, and a full member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in 1925; he was a member also of Ukrainian research institutes and scholarly societies in Warsaw, Berlin, and Prague. Doroshenko's close association with the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences began from the moment of its founding in West Germany after World War II. He took part in the activities of several Academy sections, particularly in those of the Literary and Philological Section and of the Bibliographical Section; he edited the Academy publication *Ukrayins'ki bibliolohichni visti* (Ukrainian Bibliological Bulletin), the first issue of which appeared in Augsburg in 1948.

Doroshenko came to the United States in October 1949, settled in Philadelphia, and continued his scholarly activities on an even larger scale. His contributions to the work of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. were accompanied by those he made to the Shevchenko Scientific Society, especially to the latter's library with which he was associated for more than fifty years, serving both as a librarian and a bibliographer.

Doroshenko's scholarly interests in the last period of his life were concentrated on three writers: Hohol' (Gogol), Shevchenko, and Franko. Chronologically, this covered almost the entire nineteenth century in Ukrainian literature. His work was revealed in papers delivered at various meetings of the Academy and the Shevchenko Scientific Society, in articles published in Ukrainian periodicals, and in elaborated bibliographical surveys on the topics of interest to him.

One of the most active senior members of the Academy, Doroshenko frequently took part in executive meetings, presented numerous papers at scholarly conferences, and edited *Naukovyi zbirnyk* (Symposium of Science), Vol. II (New York, Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., 1953), as well as other publications. He played an active part in renewing the work of the Academy's Shevchenko Institute in 1955 when he became the editor-in-chief of the annual *Shevchenko*, a publication devoted to current research on Shevchenko and including a section reviewing the more

important studies on Shevchenko published on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

In the last period of his life Doroshenko worked intensively on reviewing and supplementing his fundamental bibliography of Shevchenko's writings which, as *Pokazhchyyk vydan' Shevchenkovykh tvoriv* (A Bibliography of Publications of Shevchenko's Works), comprised Vol. XVI of *Povne vydannya tvoriv T. Shevchenka* (A Complete Edition of T. Shevchenko's Works), published by the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw (Warsaw-Lviv, 1939). In the course of his work Doroshenko investigated all major Shevchenko collections existing in the Western World, including those of the Library of Congress and of numerous private collections, and corresponded with literally the whole Ukrainian scholarly world abroad. As a result, he found and recorded a great number of editions of Shevchenko's writings published in various countries during the stormy war and postwar years (many of these editions became unavailable soon after their appearance). The second edition of Doroshenko's bibliography of Shevchenko's writings appeared in 1961 as Vol. XIV of *Taras Shevchenko -- Tvory* (Taras Shevchenko: Works), published in Chicago, Ill., by M. Denysiuk Publishing Co.

Doroshenko contributed generously to the enrichment of the Academy's library and archives. While acquiring material for the Library of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and collecting even minor Ukrainian publications, he found and donated many, sometimes unique, items to the Museum-Archives of the Academy. In 1945, Doroshenko systematically began to transfer his bibliographic files into the custody of the Academy. He also gave the Academy copies of books presented to him by their authors, some of them with personal dedications. Doroshenko intended to publish as works of the Academy Bibliographical Section under his direction bibliographies on Hohol', Hrushevsky, and the Ukrainian press in the Western World that he had compiled in the course of recent years. His annotated bibliography of Ukrainian periodicals published since 1945 in Western Europe and in the New World was planned to appear as a special issue in the series of bibliographical indexes prepared by the Bibliographical Section.

During his long life Doroshenko helped hundreds of authors locate reference materials. He edited dozens of periodicals and monographs. He participated in editing the *Ukrayins'ka zahal'na entsyklopediya* (Ukrainian General Encyclopedia), 1930-35, and the bibliography of M. Hrushevsky's works published by the VUAN (All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences) in *Yuvileynyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademika Mykhayla Serhiyevycha Hrushev'skoho; chastyna bibliohrafichna* (A Festschrift in Honor of Academician Mykhaylo Serhiyevych Hrushevsky: Bibliographical Part), Kiev, 1929. Earlier he translated into Russian the greater part of M. Hrushevsky's history of Ukrainian Cossacks which was published in two volumes under the title

Istoriya ukrainskogo kozachestva (A History of Ukrainian Cossacks) in St. Petersburg (1913-14). He also cooperated in preparing for publication V. Ihnatiyenko's work, *Bibliohrafiya ukrayins'koyi presy, 1816-1916* (Bibliography of the Ukrainian Press, 1816-1916), Kiev, 1930. Doroshenko contributed numerous articles and reminiscences to more than one hundred periodicals and newspapers, among them *Ukrainskaya zhizn'* (Ukrainian Life), Moscow; *Kievskaya starina* (The Kiev Antiquity), Kiev; *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* (The Literary and Scholarly Herald), Lviv and Kiev; *Rada* (The Council), Kiev; *Ukrayina* (Ukraine), Kiev; *Ukrayina*, Paris; *Dilo* (Action), Lviv; *Svoboda* (Liberty), Jersey City, New Jersey; *Ameryka* (America), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and many others.

Doroshenko's unique knowledge of the Ukrainian printed word and of publications in various fields of Ukrainian life made him an unsurpassed expert in compiling both broad and specialized reviews of Ukrainian bibliography. As early as in the pre-World War I period, Doroshenko contributed a well-selected and systematized bibliography of Ukrainian publications for the years 1912 and 1913 which was published in 1915 under the title "Ukrainovedenie" in *Obozrenie trudov po slavyanovedeniyu* (A Survey of Publications on Slavistics) by the Imperial Russian Academy of Sciences. In the 1920's he compiled for the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences detailed annual reviews which were published in the journal *Ukrayina* (Ukraine) edited by academician Mykhaylo Hrushevsky.

Doroshenko was an authority on Ivan Franko. His fundamental bibliography, *Spys tvoriv Ivana Franka* (A Bibliography of Ivan Franko's Works), appeared in publications of the Shevchenko Scientific Society (Lviv, 1918 and 1930). Other of this bibliographical works that deserve mention are: "Adam Mickiewicz w literaturze ukraińskiej" (Adam Mickiewicz in Ukrainian Literature), published in *Kamena*, No. 10 (Kholm, 1924); "Pereklady z M. Hoholya na ukrayins'ku movu" (Translations of M. Hohol' into Ukrainian) and "Ukrayins'ki pereklady z Leva Tolstoho" (Ukrainian Translations of Lev Tolstoi's Works), both in *Bibliolohichni visti* (Bibliological Bulletin), Kiev, 1927; "Pokazchych literatury pro Ol'hu Kobylyans'ku" (An Index of Publications on Olha Kobylyanska), in *Al'manakh na chest' O. Kobylyans'koyi* (A Collection in Honor of O. Kobylyanska), Chernivtsi, 1928; "Gete v ukrayins'kykh perekladakh, perespivakh ta nasliduvannyakh" (Goethe in Ukrainian Translations, Adaptations, and Imitations), in *V stolittya smerty Y. V. Gete* (On the One Hundredth Anniversary of J. W. Goethe's Death), a collection of the Shevchenko Scientific Society (Lviv, 1932); "Novisha literatura pro Kulisha" (Recent Publications on Kulish), in *Zapysky NTSh* (Proceedings of the Shevchenko Scientific Society), Lviv, 1938; and "Ukrainian Press in the U.S.A.," in W. Weresh, ed., *Guide to Ukrainian-American Institutions, Professionals and Business* (New York, 1955).

It is a great misfortune that some bibliographical materials collected by Doroshenko were lost, such as the index to the *Zapysky NTSh* in which the authors of anonymous notes and book reviews were revealed, and the card index to the dictionary of Ukrainian pseudonyms compiled on the basis of materials obtained from the authors themselves. These works perished at the time of the destruction of the Museum of the Struggle for the Liberation of the Ukraine in Prague, where Doroshenko was director during the final period of World War II.

Doroshenko also wrote a number of literary studies. His critical articles on M. Yevshan and "Moloda Muza" (The Young Muse), as well as on Serhiy Yefremov's *Istoriya ukrayins'koho pys'menstva* (A History of Ukrainian Literature) were published in *Literaturno-naukovyj vistnyk* (The Literary and Scholarly Herald), Nos. 1 and 12 (1911), and later in Doroshenko's book, *Zhyttya i slovo* (The Life and the Word), Lviv, 1918. He also wrote articles on Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko, Borys Hrinchenko, Yevhen Hrebinka, Vasyl' Stefanyk, Hryts'ko Chuprynka, Marko Cheremshyna, Spyrydon Cherkasenko, Mykola Ustyianovych, Mykola Hohol', Katrya Hrynevych, and other literary figures. He contributed an article, "The Life of Mykhaylo Drahomanov," to the *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*, Vol. II, No. 1 (Spring, 1952). One of his last articles published, "Ivan Franko i Mykhaylo Hrushevs'kyi" (Ivan Franko and Mykhaylo Hrushevsky), appeared in *Suchasnist'* (Our Times), Nos. 1 and 2 (1962). It should also be mentioned that Doroshenko translated into Ukrainian writings by Anatole France (*Crainquebille*) and Octave Mirbeau (*Les Mauvais Bergers* and others).



Volodymyr Doroshenko was born in 1879 in St. Petersburg into a physician's family descended from a collateral line of the seventeenth-century Ukrainian Hetman Doroshenko. In 1880 his father returned to the Ukraine, and the young Volodymyr was raised in the village of Bilotserkivtsi, Poltava Province. After his graduation from the secondary school in the town of Pryluka, he studied first at the Faculty of History and Philology of Moscow University, and later at the Faculty of Philosophy of Lviv University. From his student days on, Doroshenko actively participated in Ukrainian political life. He was one of the founders of the Ukrainian Student Circle (*Hromada*) in Moscow, a member of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Party (RUP), and later of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party, the USDRP (until 1911). In 1907, in the period of reaction that followed the first Russian revolution, he was arrested; he was imprisoned until the spring of 1908 in Kiev and Poltava prisons. He was brought before the military court several

times and finally he was acquitted. Doroshenko then crossed the Russo-Austrian frontier and settled in Lviv in Galicia, where he lived, except for short intervals, for more than thirty-five years. Until 1944 he worked in the Library of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and became its director in 1937.

During World War I Doroshenko was one of the founders and a member of the board of the Union for the Liberation of the Ukraine; he was also the editor-in-chief of *Visnyk* (The Herald) and other publications of the Union. In November 1918 he moved to Kiev, where he became office manager for the Permanent Secretary of the Ukrainian Academy, Professor Ahatanhel Krymsky. Late in January 1919 Doroshenko went to Stanyslaviv in Galicia, where he joined the editorial staff of the daily *Republyka* (The Republic), a semi-official organ of the government of the West Ukrainian Republic.

A bibliography of Doroshenko's writings covering the first fifteen years of his activities was published in *Literatura i zhyttya* (Literature and Life), Lviv, 1925; a bibliography of his works published to 1955 was compiled by Stepan Mykytka and appeared in the latter's *Volodymyr Doroshenko — Z nahody 75-richchya vyznachnoho vchenoho y hromadyanyna* (Volodymyr Doroshenko: On the Occasion of the 75th Anniversary of a Distinguished Scholar and Citizen), Philadelphia, 1955; a review of Doroshenko's works on Shevchenko, "Moyi shevchenkoznavchi pratsi" (My Publications on Shevchenko), was published by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. in No. 4 of its annual *Shevchenko* (New York, 1955).

Doroshenko wrote several papers on the Shevchenko Scientific Society, in particular on its library, including *Ohnyshche ukrayins'koyi nauky — Istoriya NTSh* (The Home of Ukrainian Scholarship: A History of the Shevchenko Scientific Society), New York-Philadelphia, 1951, and *Ukrayins'ka natsional'na biblioteka — Biblioteka NTSh* (Ukrainian National Library: The Library of the Shevchenko Scientific Society), Lviv, 1936. The latter work was also published in Polish ("Ukraińska Biblioteka Narodowa w Polsce," in *Biuletyn polsko-ukraiński*, No. 30, Warsaw, 1936) and in German ("Die nationale Bibliothek der Westukraine," in *Ukrainische Kulturberichte* published by the Ukrainian Scientific Institute, Berlin, 1936).

The last of his generation to have been closely associated with the Shevchenko Scientific Society of Ivan Franko's and Mykhaylo Hrushevsky's era, Doroshenko remained until his death true to its ideals and traditions.

VOLODYMYR SICHYNSKY

1894-1962

Volodymyr Sichynsky deserves a prominent place among the contributors to Ukrainian culture. He was an architect, a graphic artist, an art expert, and a teacher. His talents were many, and his artistic productivity may be compared to that of Vasyl Krychevsky and even to that of Petro Kholodnyi.

Volodymyr Sichynsky's father, the Reverend Yukhym Sichynsky, was a prolific archaeologist and art expert, distinguished by his investigations of the old churches of Podillya. He was also the founder and the first director of the regional Historical and Archaeological Museum in Kamyanets Podilsky and an ardent Ukrainian patriot. Both father and son undoubtedly were influenced in their interests by Kamyanets itself—the picturesque capital of Podillya encircled by old fortress walls and the river Smotrych. The family home must have stimulated the artistic interests of young Volodymyr. While still a young boy, Volodymyr accompanied his father on expeditions to the surrounding areas to study the wooden churches.

Volodymyr Sichynsky received his basic education between 1905 and 1912 in a secondary technical school at Kamyanets. For his higher education he went to St. Petersburg (1912-17), where he became friends with the prominent Ukrainian graphic artist, Yuriy Narbut. He completed his studies at the University of Prague after World War I, between 1923 and 1926. During the time of the restoration of the Ukrainian state, Volodymyr Sichynsky was among the founders of the Institute of Architecture in Kiev (1918-19); later he became the director of the Department of Construction of the Podillya Province.

When the Bolsheviks occupied the Dnieper Ukraine, Sichynsky left for Lviv, where he became a teacher in a Ukrainian secondary school (1921-23). At this time he frequently went on expeditions sponsored by the Ukrainian Museum in Lviv to study old architecture in Galicia and Volhynia. As a result of this architectural research, Sichynsky published the work *Arkhitektura Krekhivs'koho monastyrya po derevorytu 1699 r.* (The Architecture of the Krekhiv Monastery According to the Woodcut of 1699), Lviv, 1923, as well as two studies, *Derevyani dzvinytsi i tserkvy Halyts'koyi Ukrayiny XVI-XIX stol.* (Wooden Bell-Towers and Churches of the Sixteenth-Nineteenth Centuries in the Galician Ukraine) and *Arkhitektura v starodrukakh* (Architecture in Old Prints). These studies appeared in publications of the National Museum in Lviv in 1925.

In 1923 Volodymyr Sichynsky went to Prague, where he was a lecturer, and eventually an assistant professor, at the Ukrainian Institute of Higher Education. At the same time he was working toward the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, which he received in Prague in 1927. In 1942 he was appoint-

ed professor-extraordinary of art history at the Ukrainian Free University in Prague. He also taught in the Prague art school "Studio."

In 1934 Volodymyr Sichynsky was invited to Lviv to participate in conservation and restoration work on the Cathedral of St. George. As a result of his studies and work, he wrote the monograph *Arkhitektura Katedry sv. Yura u L'vovi* (Architecture of the Cathedral of St. George in Lviv), 1934, published by the Lviv Theological Academy. An important supplement to his topographical research in Lviv was his study, "Tserkva sv. Dukha Hr.-katol. Dukhovnoyi Semynariyi u L'vovi" (The Church of the Holy Ghost of the Greek Catholic Theological Seminary in Lviv), which appeared in the *Pratsi Hr.-katol. Bohoslov'skoyi akademiyi u L'vovi* (Studies of the Greek Catholic Theological Academy in Lviv), 1936-39, Vol. III. In the same period his monograph on the old architecture of the Galician Ukraine, *Arkhitektura Lavrova* (Architecture of Lavriv), was published, both in the *Zapysky ChSVV* (Research Publications of the Order of St. Basil the Great), Vol. V (1932-41), and separately (1936).

In Lviv, Sichynsky and such Ukrainian artists as Petro Kholodnyi, Pavlo Kovzhun, and Robert Lisovsky were fellow members in art societies (Society of the Friends of Ukrainian Art, and Association of Independent Ukrainian Artists).

Professor Sichynsky participated in scholarly conferences and international congresses, among them the First and Second Congresses of Slavic Geographers and Ethnographers (1924, 1927), the Fourth Congress of Art Education, the Fourth Congress of Bibliophiles (1926), and the First Congress of Folk Art (1928). As a young research scholar he also entered the competition organized by the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations in Paris (1927). He was among the five winners selected from 42 participants representing 14 nations to receive a grant for research. His outstanding study, *Istoriya ukrayins'koho graverstva XVI-XVIII stol.* (History of Ukrainian Engraving in the Sixteenth-Eighteenth Centuries), which appeared in 1937, published by the *Zapysky ChSVV* in Lviv, was a result of this grant. In the same year Sichynsky published his *Narysy z istoriyi ukrayins'koyi promyslovosti* (Outline of the History of Ukrainian Industry), Lviv, Kooperatyvna Respublyka, 1937, a work containing much valuable archival material on industrial art.

In 1938 Sichynsky's work *Chuzhyntsi pro Ukrayinu* (Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions) appeared. It eventually was printed in four editions in the Ukrainian language, one in French (1949), and one in English (1953). Its popularity encouraged Sichynsky to plan another, similar work—a book on Muscovy in foreign comments—but he was prevented from completing this project by a serious illness.

In the early 1940's two representative works by Sichynsky were pub-

lished in album form—*Monumenta Architecturae Ucrainae* (Prague, 1940) and *Ukrayins'ke uzhytkove mystetstvo* (Ukrainian Applied Art), Prague, 1943, with texts in both Ukrainian and German. Sichynsky also published a number of articles in Czech, German, and Ukrainian. During World War II Sichynsky lived mainly in Prague, where in October 1944 he was arrested by the Gestapo and subsequently was transferred to a prison in Berlin.

After the war, in 1949, Sichynsky came to the United States. He was employed to plan the decoration of the Roman Catholic Cathedral of the Holy Trinity in Newark, New Jersey. He designed the altars, inner portals, colonnades, and capitals, all of which were executed in Italy. His artistic work in the United States did not put a stop to his scholarly activities. It was in the United States that he published his great work on the history of Ukrainian architecture which he intended as only the first part of a multivolumed study of all aspects of Ukrainian art. This work on architecture was the culmination of 35 years of research. It was published by the Shevchenko Scientific Society and the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., with the assistance of the East European Fund, in two volumes (New York, 1956) as *Istoriya ukrayins'koho mystetstva. I. Arkhitektura* (History of Ukrainian Art. I: Architecture). In it, Sichynsky analyzes the evolution of the forms of Ukrainian architecture. He treats fully each of the three main periods of Medieval, Renaissance, and Baroque architecture. The work begins with an introductory chapter and a summary of the prehistoric and ancient monuments in the Ukraine and ends with a survey of Ukrainian architecture in modern times. An important supplement to each chapter is an extensive bibliography.

The volumes on architecture were to be followed by the history of Ukrainian engraving, painting, graphics, and folk art. Unfortunately, Sichynsky was unable to finish this work. Among his manuscripts there are only fragments which were intended for the succeeding volumes. He also left behind, in manuscript, a dictionary of Ukrainian artists which includes about 4,000 names.

Altogether Volodymyr Sichynsky published about 600 books and articles. In addition to those mentioned previously, the following deserve notice: *Arkhitektura staroknyazivs'koyi doby X–XIII stol.* (Architecture of the Old Princely Era, the Tenth-Thirteenth Centuries), Prague, 1926, and *Arkhitektura mista Bardiyeva* (Architecture of the City Bardiyiv [Bardejov]), Lviv, 1931. Along with the numerous monographs and articles dealing with various Ukrainian artists, fields of art, and problems of heraldry, topography, and art education, Sichynsky also wrote many critical reviews.

The achievements of the late Volodymyr Sichynsky were recognized by Ukrainian scholarly societies: from 1930 on he was a full member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society; he became one of the first full members of

the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences when it began its activity in Augsburg after World War II.

Sichynsky's outstanding achievement in church architecture was the imposing Church of the Holy Ghost in Mykhaylivtsi (Michalovce) in the Pryashiv (Prešov) region. It was built in 1933-34 and is a centered church with a characteristic pediment. The whole is a synthesis of architectural forms based on the medieval tradition, adopted by Sichynsky after years of study. He created a simpler version of the same design for a church in Whippany, New Jersey, built in 1949. In designing wooden churches, Sichynsky based himself on the traditions of the Ukrainian Baroque. He left two examples of this style: one is the church in the village Komarnyky at the Dukla pass, built in 1937; the other is the Ukrainian Catholic church in Pôrto União, Brazil, built in 1951. Sichynsky also demonstrated his ability to design villas in a style adapted from the traditional Ukrainian manor house. In this respect he followed in the footsteps of Vasyl Krychevsky.

In the field of graphic arts, Sichynsky designed covers and did illustrations for a number of works. He avoided the influence even of such great artists as Vasyl Krychevsky and Yuriy Narbut, preferring to follow an independent direction. The characteristic features of his graphic art are virtuosity in execution and a synthesized expression. Finally, one must include among his graphic works the drawings with which he illustrated his scholarly studies, especially those concerned with architecture.

DAMIAN HORNIATKEVYCH

IVAN KABACHKIV

1874-1962

On December 2, 1962, Ivan Maksymovych Kabachkiv, an economist and jurist and a full member of the Academy, died in New York City. Scholar and educator, he had been active in political life in the Ukraine and later in that of the Ukrainians abroad.

Kabachkiv was born on September 23, 1874, in the town of Veremiyivka, Poltava Province, into an old family that traced its ancestry to the Ukrainian Cossacks of the Cherkasy Regiment. In 1893 he was graduated from Pavlo Galagan College in Kiev, and in 1898 from the Faculty of Law of St. Petersburg University. Immediately after his graduation he was appointed to a position in the Imperial Ministry of Finance, and in 1903 he was employed by the Russian Imperial Auditing Board. During these years he also practiced law and lectured in economics.

Late in 1917 Kabachkiv returned to the Ukraine. In 1919 he accepted

the position of Auditor General of the Ukrainian Republic. After the Bolshevik occupation of the Ukraine, Kabachkiv continued to fulfill his duties of Auditor General for the Ukrainian government-in-exile. He held this position until his death. Kabachkiv was a highly qualified expert and a man of principle, tactful but firm in his decisions.

While abroad Kabachkiv engaged in research and educational activities. He participated in the work of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw; he taught at the Mykhaylo Drahomanov Ukrainian Institute of Higher Education in Prague (1925-34), the Ukrainian Technical Husbandry Institute in Poděbrady (1937-42), and the Ukrainian Free University (from 1944, first in Prague, and later in Munich, where he became a professor of the University). Kabachkiv lectured on political economy, the history of economic and social doctrines, economic policy, and the history of Ukrainian law.

Kabachkiv came to the United States in 1949. He became a full member of the Academy and participated in its activities, especially in the Section of Economics and Law of the Academy.

While working for Ukrainian institutions of higher learning abroad, Kabachkiv was actively engaged in the elaboration of Ukrainian terminology in economics. He was the author of the textbooks *Politychna ekonomiya* (Political Economy), Prague, 1924, and *Istoriya ekonomichnykh ta sotsyial'nykh doktryn* (History of Economic and Social Doctrines), Part I, Poděbrady, 1943.

Of particular interest is Kabachkiv's study "Rekonstruktsiya podatkovoyi systemy v SSSR" (The Reconstruction of the Taxation System of the USSR), printed in *Pratsi Ukrayins'koho Naukovoho Instytutu* (Publications of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute), vol. XXXII, Warsaw, 1936, pp. 114-63. It is a critical analysis of the taxation system of the USSR, and includes a comparison of it with those of several Western countries. The paper reveals basic inconsistencies and contradictions in Soviet taxation policy. In discussing the subject Kabachkiv analyzed a sales tax which reached as high as 90 per cent of the price of consumer mass goods; he described this hidden tax as a form of "excessive exploitation of the population" (p. 161). In the same paper Kabachkiv concerned himself with the problem of the rights of the Soviet Union republics, emphasizing that centralization had brought about a considerable limitation of the independence of these republics. Kabachkiv's study even at present is of value for students of the taxation system of the USSR.

Among other works published by Kabachkiv are his "Struktura derzhavnoho byudzhetu na Ukrayini y u Chekhoslovats'kiy respublitsi" (The Structure of the State Budget in the Ukraine and in the Czechoslovak Republic), printed in *Pratsi Ukrayins'koho Vysokoho Pedagogichnoho In-*

stytutu im. Mykhayla Drahomanova u Prazi (Publications of the Mykhaylo Drahomanov Ukrainian Institute of Higher Education in Prague), *Naukovyi zbirnyk* (Research Studies), vol. II, Prague, 1934, pp. 128-55, and *Maybutnya orhanizatsiya Derzhavnogo kontrolyu v Ukrayini* (The Future Organization of State Auditing in the Ukraine), Prague, 1944. Several of Kabachkiv's manuscripts, prepared for publication, were lost during the final phase of World War II, on the night of April 17, 1945, at the railroad station of Karlovy Vary (Karlsbad). Among them were "The State Taxation System in the USSR and Reforms to Be Carried Out in the Ukraine during the Transition Period" and "Cooperatives: Their Tasks and Their Significance in the Reconstruction of the National Economy of the Ukraine."

IWAN ZAMSHA

MYKOLA EFREMOV

1904-1962

Dr. Mykola Efremov died suddenly on September 13, 1962, in New York City, at the age of 57. His scientific interests were unusually wide and varied. He wrote approximately eighty books, papers, and articles on mineralogy, geology, economic geology, geochemistry, crystallochemistry, technological processing of mineral raw materials, and physics.

Mineralogical works of Efremov treat of magnesium silicates of the Kuban and Azov regions, the North Caucasus, the Urals, and the Kola Peninsula; sulfates of the Kuban region and the North Caucasus; barites of Karachai; fluorites of Amderma; and iron ores of Taman and the Kerch Peninsula. He discovered and described 16 new minerals, most of which were introduced into international mineralogical nomenclature. Max H. Hey notes that Mykola Efremov discovered the following minerals: abhazite, adigeite, alumodeweylite, azovskite, bedenite, calcium ferri-phosphate, ferrihalloysite, karachaite, kolskite, and labite.¹ L. J. Spencer adds alumoantigorite and alumochrysolite to the list of minerals discovered by Efremov.² Some of these minerals have names derived from Ukrainian geographical names—for example, azovskite, labite (Velyka Laba River in the Kuban region), and bedenite (Beden Mountain in the Kuban region). One mineral, calcium

¹ Max H. Hey, *An Index of Mineral Species and Varieties Arranged Chemically, with an Alphabetical Index of Accepted Mineral Names and Synonyms* (London, 1950), pp. 287, 288, 294, 310, 315, 334, 386, 435, 442, 447.

² L. J. Spencer, "Nineteenth List of New Mineral Names," *The Mineralogical Magazine and Journal of the Mineralogical Society*, XXIX (1952), 975.

ferri-phosphate, discovered by Efremov, was later renamed efremovite in his honor by other mineralogists.³

Mykola Efremov conducted geological investigations in the Kuban region, the Azov coastal region, and in the Urals. While in exile, he investigated arctic areas of the Urals and the Kola Peninsula. His monographs summarize his investigations of some mineral deposits of the Ukraine such as Taman and Kerch iron ore deposits, Nikopol and Laba manganese deposits, Beden chromite deposits, and Novorossiisk marl deposits. These works, of scientific and practical value for the Ukraine, as well as Efremov's other publications, were appreciated by such prominent scientists as academicians V. I. Vernadsky and A. Fersman; some were printed in publications of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.⁴

While living abroad, Mykola Efremov worked for a number of European, and later, of American, scientific institutions. In 1944-45 he was associated with the Slovak Geological State Institution; several of his papers appeared in publications of this Institution.⁵ Later, Efremov was invited to lecture on mineralogy and petrography at the International UNRRA University at Munich, where his book, *Die Entwicklung der chemischen Elemente. Versuch einer Radiogeochemie*, was published.⁶ At the same time Professor Efremov taught geology and mineralogy at the Ukrainian Technical Husbandry Institute in Regensburg, Germany. Publications of this Institute brought out his work, "Nova forma periodychnoyi systemy khemichnykh elementiv, yak vidobrazhennya zakonomirnostey evolyutsiyi materiyi" (A New Form of the Periodic System of Chemical Elements as the Expression of Regularities in the Evolution of Matter).⁷ Efremov participated in the work of three scientific congresses in Europe, including the Congress of German Mineralogists that took place on August 22-28, 1950.⁸

On coming to this country, Efremov cooperated closely with the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. At conferences of its Biological Section he delivered the following papers: "A New Understanding

³ Gregorio Gagarin and Jorge R. Cuomo, *Algunas proposiciones sobre nomenclatura mineralogica* (Buenos Aires, 1949), p. 14; Spencer, p. 980.

⁴ Akademiya Nauk SSSR, *Comptes Rendus (Doklady)*, XXIV (1939), 455-58; XXVIII (1940), 442-45.

⁵ "Die chemische Konstitution einiger Hydrasilikate," *Arbeiten der Slowakischen Geologischen Staatsanstalt*, Bratislava, Heft 11b (1944), pp. 1-24; "Das Gesetz des Massengleichgewichtes und seine Bedeutung bei den mineralbildenden Prozessen," *ibid.*, Heft 12 (1945), pp. 1-27; "Die Theorie der Alumosilikate," *ibid.*, Heft 12b (1945).

⁶ München, 1948, 262 p.

⁷ Ukrayins'kyi Tekhnichno-Hospodars'kyi Instytut. *Naukovyi Byuletyn'*, 1950, Nos. 9-12, p. 1-139 (in Ukrainian and German).

⁸ *Fortschritte der Mineralogie*, XXIX-XXX (1950-51), Heft 1; *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Geologischen Gesellschaft*, CII.

of Mendeleev's Theory" (Dec. 30, 1951); "At the Boundaries of Chemistry, Geochemistry, and Biology" (Dec. 28, 1952); "Between Cosmos and Earth" (Oct. 18, 1953); "New Data on Mineralogy of the Ukraine" (June 23, 1956); "A Magnesium Stage as the Contemporary Stage of Development of Matter" (June 8, 1957); "A New Constant in Nature and Its Importance in the Cosmos" (April 26, 1958); "Isomorphism Phenomena in the Light of the Law of Prime Numbers" (Oct. 17, 1959); "The Mystery of the Evenki (Tungus) Wonder" (April 14, 1962). One of Efremov's works was published in the *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences*.⁹ Efremov delivered several papers before meetings of the Society of Ukrainian Engineers in America. In publications of this Society the following Efremov articles appeared: "Periodychna systema yoniv" (A Periodic System of Ions), "Nova metoda vyrakhovuvannya yonnykh radiyusiv" (A New Method of Computation of Ionic Radii), "Spivvidnoshennya mizh masamy pozytyvno ta negatyvno nasazhenykh yoniv u mineral'nykh tilakh" (The Interrelation between Masses of Positive and Negative Ions in Mineral Bodies).¹⁰ Efremov also participated in meetings of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, where he delivered a paper, "The Periodic Table of Chemical Elements as a Pattern of Harmony of the Universe," on September 10, 1961. One of his papers was summarized in the *Proceedings of the Shevchenko Society*.¹¹

Mykola Efremov was a member of the American Geophysical Union, the Geological Society of America, the Mineralogical Society of America, the New York Academy of Sciences, and the American Physical Society. At meetings of the American Physical Society he presented the following papers: "Nuclide Families in the Periodic System," "Formula for Calculation of Isotopes in the Rows of Periodic System," "Complex Symmetrical Series as a Key to the Calculation of Isotopes of Lanthanides," "Symmetrical Relations between the Sums of Isotopes in Vertical Groups," and "Rule of Pairs in the Theory of Isomorphism."¹²

ALEXANDER ARCHIMOVICH

⁹ "An Innovation in the Understanding of Mendeleev's Periodic Law," *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*, II (Winter 1952), 401-34, and Appendix (5 pages).

¹⁰ *News of the Society of Ukrainian Engineers in America*, 1952, Nos. 2, 4, and 5.

¹¹ "Kerchenites from the Iron Ore Deposits of Taman and Crimea Peninsulae," *Proceedings of the Shevchenko Scientific Society*, New York, I (1953), 19-21.

¹² *Bulletin of the American Physical Society*, New York, Columbia University, Series II, Vol. VII (1962), pp. 86-87, 113-14, 239, 416, 491-92.

IVAN BAHRYANYI

1907-1963

Ivan Pavlovych Bahryanyi, a distinguished Ukrainian writer and political leader, died on August 25, 1963, in St. Blasien sanatorium, in the Black Forest, West Germany, after a long illness.

Ivan Bahryanyi was born Ivan Lozovyaha on October 2, 1907, in the village of Kuzemyne near Okhtyrka in the Kharkiv Province. His father, Pavlo Lozovyaha, was a mason. Bahryanyi attended the Professional School of Arts and Ceramics in Krasnopillya from 1920 to 1924, and Kiev Art Institute from 1925 to 1929.

Bahryanyi's creative writing covered a wide range; it included elegies and philosophical poems, satires, political pamphlets, adventure stories, novels, and plays. His poetry and prose began to be published in 1926 in Kiev and Kharkiv literary and art monthlies such as *Vsesvit* (Universe), *Globus* (Globe), *Zhyttya y revolyutsiya* (Life and Revolution), *Chervonyi shlyakh* (Red Path), and others. Bahryanyi's first collection of poems, *Do mezh zakazanykh* (Up to the Forbidden Boundaries), appeared in 1927 (Kiev, Masa). The poem *Ave Maria* was published in Okhtyrka in 1929; the historical novel in verse, *Skel'ka*, in 1930 (Kharkiv, Knyhospilka).

In the years 1926-28 Bahryanyi was associated with the literary group MARS (Workshop of the Revolutionary Word) together with such prominent writers as Borys Antonenko-Davydovych, Dmytro Fal'kivsky, Hryhoriy Kosynka, Todos' Os'machka, Valeriyany Pidmohyl'nyi, Yevhen Pluzhnyk, and Borys Teneta. In the early thirties, when a wave of terror swept through the Ukraine, all these writers, like many other Ukrainian intellectuals, were arrested by the Soviet secret police. Bahryanyi was arrested in 1932 and sent to a concentration camp in the Soviet Far East. During the many years of his imprisonment he was deprived of any opportunity to have his works published.

Bahryanyi was one of the few writers of the MARS group to survive the terror of the 1930's.¹ During World War II both he and Os'machka succeeded in escaping to the West, where they resumed their literary careers. In 1943 Bahryanyi wrote his outstanding poem, "Hulyay-Pole"; he also recreated a cycle of poems, "V poti chola" (In the Sweat of One's Brow), confiscated during his arrest in 1932, as well as the poem, "Zoloty bumerang" (The Golden Boomerang), written in prison in Kharkiv. In 1944 the monthly

¹ Of the writers mentioned, Kosynka and Fal'kivsky were executed by an NKVD firing squad in December 1934; Pidmohyl'nyi and Pluzhnyk died in Soviet concentration camps in the 1930's; Teneta committed suicide early in 1935, while imprisoned by the Soviet secret police. In addition to Bahryanyi, only Os'machka and Antonenko-Davydovych survived, the latter being "rehabilitated" after spending more than twenty years in concentration camps.

Vechirnya hodyna (The Evening Hour) published Bahryanyi's adventure story, *Zvirolovy* (The Trappers), the first version of the novel which later appeared under the title *Tyhrolovy* (The Tiger Hunters).

Beginning in 1946, Bahryanyi actively participated in the organization and activities of an association of Ukrainian writers in West Germany called MUR (Ukrainian Artistic Movement). He contributed poems and articles on subjects related to the arts to collections published by MUR. When the Union of Ukrainian Writers Abroad, *Slovo* (The Word), with its headquarters in New York City, came into being in 1954, Bahryanyi immediately joined this new organization. He took part in its Congress held in New York City in 1958, and was elected a member of the board of the Union and its Vice-President for Europe.

The following works by Bahryanyi were published after World War II: *Tyhrolovy* (The Tiger Hunters), a novel in two parts (Ulm-Augsburg, Germany, Prometej, 1946); *Zoloty bumerang* (The Golden Boomerang), a collection of poems with the subtitle *Reshtky zahublenoho, konfiskovanoho ta znyshchenoho, 1926-1946* (Remnants of Poetry Lost, Confiscated, and Destroyed, 1926-1946), Prometej, 1946; *Morituri* (Ulm-Augsburg, Prometej, 1947), a play, staged in West Germany; *Rozkrom* (The Havoc), a story written in the guise of a puppet show of the Nativity (Ulm-Augsburg, Prometej, 1948); *Heneral* (General), a satirical play (Ulm-Augsburg, Ukrayina, 1948); *Sad hetsymans'kyi* (The Garden of Gethsemane), a novel (Ulm, Ukrayina, 1948-50); *Ohnenne kolo* (The Fiery Circle), a novel about the tragedy at Brody (Ulm, Ukrayina, 1953); *Anton Bida—heroy truda* (Anton Bida—A Hero of Labor), a satirical poem with the subtitle *Povist' pro di-pi; vidpovid' lyudolovam* (The Story of a Displaced Person: An Answer to Men Hunters), Ulm, Ukrayina, 1956; and *Buynyi viter* (Raging Wind), a novel, Vol. 1: *Marusya Bohuslavka* (Ulm, Ukrayina, 1957). In addition to these works Bahryanyi wrote a number of articles and political pamphlets, as well as works for children.

Bahryanyi's novel *Tyhrolovy* also was published in English under the title *The Hunters and the Hunted* (London, Macmillan; New York, St. Martin's Press, 1956), in German as *Das Gesetz der Taiga* (Köln-Graz, Styria Verlag, 1961), and in Dutch as *Vlucht in de Taiga* (Utrecht-Antwerpen, Prisma-boeken, 1959). His *Sad hetsymans'kyi* also appeared in French as *Le jardin de Gethsémani* (Paris, Nouvelles éditions latines, 1961); a German edition is now being published. Bahryanyi's political pamphlet, *Chomu ya ne khochu vertatys' do SSSR* (Why I Do Not Want to Return to the USSR), Winnipeg, 1946, was translated into English, German, Spanish, and Italian.

In addition to being a creative writer, Bahryanyi was one of the leading figures in the political and public life of Ukrainians abroad during the postwar period. From 1948 until his death, he was Secretary General of the

Ukrainian Revolutionary-Democratic Party (URDP). Bahryanyi was the founder and, for many years, the editor of the newspaper *Ukrayins'ki visti* (The Ukrainian News), published in Neu Ulm, West Germany. From 1948 on he was a member of the Ukrainian National Council, and in the period between 1952 and 1962 he twice was its chairman. In November 1962, less than a year before his death, Bahryanyi was elected Vice-President of the Ukrainian Republic in Exile.

HRYHORY KOSTIUK

TODOS' OS'MACHKA

1895-1962

Todos' (Teodosiy) Os'machka, an outstanding Ukrainian poet and prose writer of the postrevolutionary period, died on September 7, 1962, in Pilgrim State Hospital, Long Island, New York.

Os'machka's life and his artistic work were closely interrelated. As a man and a poet, he fought the strong currents of the age of totalitarian wars and revolutions. In his works we can find the tragic collision of two powerful forces in the Ukraine: the force of rebirth and the force of genocide and annihilation. From this great conflict, deepened by a feeling of responsibility to man, Os'machka's unusually original poetry and prose arose.

Todos' Os'machka was born on May 3, 1895, into a peasant family in the village of Kutsivka in the Cherkasy region, the southern part of the old Kiev Province. His father was a talented, self-taught veterinarian, an intelligent man, kind-hearted but poor. Todos' was the oldest son in a family of many children. He had some formal schooling and, with the help of self-education, managed to become a teacher. During World War I, an Imperial Russian military court tried him for his poem, "Dumy soldata" (Thoughts of a Soldier), one of his early works.

The revolution and the restoration of the Ukrainian state opened to Os'machka the road to Kiev, the capital city, and its University. Os'machka took part in the literary life of Kiev in the twenties. Three volumes of poems—*Krucha* (The Precipice), Kiev, Slovo, 1922; *Skyts'ki vohni* (The Scythian Lights), Kharkiv, Derzhavne Vydavnytstvo Ukrayiny, 1925; and *Klekit* (The Sound of a Crane), Kiev, 1929—made him famous, both in the Soviet Ukraine and beyond its frontiers. Readers were impressed by the boldness and the novelty of the poet's expressions. At a time when many writers were trying to adapt themselves to the Bolshevik regime, Os'machka made his poetry a voice of resistance, a moral protest, a symptom of the

spiritual strength of a reborn nation. In this confrontation not the Bolsheviks but the poet seemed to be the real revolutionary.

Condemning the Soviet Russian terror in the Ukraine in the years 1919-21, the poet predicted even worse catastrophies. His prediction became true. However, this negative element was not the main characteristic of his work. He drew his themes from his native land, the Ukraine, and its thousand years of history; from its cultural heritage, which includes a vibrant language, Taras Shevchenko's Promethean motives and his lyrics of love, the lyrico-epic Cossack *dumy* and songs, *Slovo o polku Ihorevi* (The Tale of the Host of Ihor), and the epics of the old Kievan period with their fanciful hyperbolization.

What especially impresses the reader of Os'machka's poetry is his ability to combine the elements of this cultural heritage with bold innovations and modern techniques. It is impossible to describe his style by any single "ism." His works are characterized by dynamic tension, and they burst out into new forms of expressionism. At the same time there are present existentialist motifs of man and country abandoned by God and the world; surrealistic, seemingly impenetrable, metaphors; and the neoromantic world-wide desire for identity. And yet as a whole Os'machka's poetry has the plastic unity of a lyrical painting.

In the twenties Os'machka belonged to the Lanka, a group of writers that included Valeriyanyan Pidmohyl'nyi, Yevhen Pluzhnyk, Hryhoriy Kosynka, and Borys Antonenko-Davydovych. At first these writers were regarded by the authorities as "fellow travelers," but with a new wave of terror they were branded as "enemies of the people." Some were executed, others deported from the Ukraine to die in Siberia. Os'machka later composed a memorial under the title "Moyi tovaryshi. Istorychno-memuarna rozvidka pro lyudey rozstrilyanoho ukrayins'koho vidrozhennya 20-kh rokiv" (My Friends: A Historical Memoir about Men of the Slaughtered Ukrainian Rebirth of the Twenties) which was published in the newspaper *Ukrayins'kyi Prometey* (The Ukrainian Prometheus), Detroit, 1955, Nos. 25-31.

Ironically it was Os'machka, perhaps the most uncompromising of all the writers of the Lanka group, who survived the terror of the thirties. But the cost of his survival was frightful. In order to save himself he simulated madness and was shuffled time and again from prison to a psychiatric ward and back to prison. In part as a consequence, he developed a persecution complex. Some of the time during this period he lived as a hobo, sleeping in cemeteries and doorways, wandering from one end to the other of a country filled with terror and suffering from famine.

World War II made it possible for Os'machka to escape to the West. In quick succession he produced three books: a collection of poems, *Suchasnykam* (To My Contemporaries), Cracow, Ukrayins'ke Vydavnytstvo, 1943; a

long poem written in octaves, *Poet* (Regensburg, Ukrayins'ke Slovo, 1946); and a novel, *Starshyi boyaryn* (The Best Man), Neu Ulm, Prometey, 1946.

Poet is the last great work of Os'machka in the field of poetry. In this poem his fantasy is stretched extravagantly and his metaphors impress by their complexity and unexpectedness. The poet wages a battle with eternity, defending man, his nation, life itself, and the universe. Here and there the gigantic structure slides into chaos, but this is compensated for by occasional flashes of brilliance and intuition. The poem is partly autobiographical. A revised version is included in a collection of Os'machka's poetry entitled *Iz-pid svitu—Poetychni tvory* (From Under the World: Selected Poems), edited by George Šerech-Shevelov and published by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States (New York, 1954).

The novel *Starshyi boyaryn* depicts life in the Ukraine in the prerevolutionary era. Here Os'machka proved himself to be in the tradition of his countryman Hohol' (Gogol), both in his presentation of the grotesque and the pathetic as well as the tragic.

Os'machka came to the United States in the late forties and published two additional novels: *Plan do dvoru* (Annihilation), Toronto, Ukrayins'ko-Kanadiys'kyi Legion, 1951, and *Rotonda dushohubtsiv* (The Rotunda of Murderers), published in Canada in 1956; the latter also appeared in English under the title *Red Assassins* (Minneapolis, T. S. Denison, 1959). Both novels depict the genocide in the Ukraine in the thirties. *Plan do dvoru* is about the liquidation of independent farmers in the Ukraine. *Rotonda dushohubtsiv* is autobiographical: it describes the simulated madness the author adopted in his fight for survival. It is the agony and apotheosis of the struggle of a living man against a gigantic machine threatening first to break his spirit and eventually to destroy him completely. The book centers not on the existentialist situation of a lonely man in a void or one faced with a free choice, but rather on the unconquerable desire of a man to live, to endure the utmost torment and suffering without capitulating. In this novel Os'machka succeeded in creating a classic work in the field of artistic self-analysis.

Os'machka loved Shakespeare; he translated *Macbeth* into Ukrainian twice. A few years before his death he again turned to his favorite dramatist. As a result, a volume of his excellent translations was published under the title *Trahediya Makbeta. Korol' Henri IV* (The Tragedy of Macbeth. King Henry IV), Munich, Na Hori, 1961. Os'machka also translated into Ukrainian Oscar Wilde's *The Ballad of Reading Gaol* (Neu Ulm, Ukrayins'ki Visti, 1958), and some poems of Byron. The latter were included in the collection of his poetry entitled *Kytytsi chasu, 1943–1948* (The Bouquet of Time, 1943–1948), which was published in Neu Ulm in 1953.

MYKHAYLO OREST-ZEROV

1901–1963

On March 12, 1963, in Augsburg, West Germany, the Ukrainian poet, Mykhaylo Orest-Zerov, died unexpectedly of a heart attack.

Mykhaylo Orest was born in Zinkiv, in the Poltava Province, on November 27, 1901. The son of an educator, he spent his childhood and adolescence there, and in Krolevets, in the Chernihiv Province. After being graduated from a secondary school on the left-bank Ukraine, Orest moved to Kiev, where he completed his philological studies at the Institute of People's Education.

In Kiev, partly owing to the widespread literary connections of his brother, Mykola Zerov, Orest became acquainted with a number of Ukrainian writers and poets, in particular with those of the neoclassical school. At that time he returned to the literary efforts he had begun in his high school years. Although almost everything he wrote (mostly lyrical poems) merited publication, Orest did not print anything while living under the Soviet regime. According to his own frequently repeated statement, he did not wish to profane his Muse for the benefit of Communist ideology.

Thus only during the war, in 1942, after the Soviet retreat from the Ukraine, did Orest, who had spent four years in Soviet concentration camps, begin to publish his poetry. His earliest collection, *Luny lit* (The Echoes of Years), appeared in 1944 (Lviv, Ukrayins'ke Vydavnytstvo). It was a mature and highly artistic work which immediately secured for its author a prominent place in contemporary Ukrainian literature as a "rightful successor to the Kievan school of neoclassicists."

In the same year—1944—due to events of the war, Orest left his fatherland and went to Germany. Augsburg in Bavaria became his permanent residence, and he spent the rest of his life there. Most of his work abroad was written in Augsburg.

Literary critics have stressed the "harmonious equilibrium" of Orest's verse. Although there was some disagreement among the most authoritative reviewers concerning the interpretation of the principal elements in his creative work (especially after his second collection, *Dusha i dolya* [Soul and Destiny], appeared in Augsburg in 1946), hardly anyone denied the enduring value of his "realm of the word" for the future development of Ukrainian poetic language.

The two following volumes of poetry by M. Orest were published in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1952: *Derzhava slova* (The Realm of the Word) and *Hist' i hospoda* (Guest and Inn). These works and several collections of his translations established him as one of the leading contem-

porary Ukrainian poets, and a paramount singer of the "earthly nature and the heavenly truth" (V. Derzhavyn).

Mykhaylo Orest was very productive at translating Western European poetry into Ukrainian. His translations include collections of selected poems of Stefan George (Augsburg, 1952), selected poems of R. M. Rilke, H. von Hofmannsthal, and M. Dauthendey (Augsburg, 1953), an anthology of German poetry (Munich, 1954), an anthology of French poetry (Munich, 1954), and poems of Charles Leconte de Lisle (Munich, 1956). His anthology of European poetry in Ukrainian entitled *More i mushlya* (The Sea and the Shell) was published in Munich in 1959, and a collection of seven German *novellas* also translated by him into Ukrainian was published in Munich in 1962.

Through his masterly translations Orest gave the Ukrainian reader the opportunity to recognize in the works of various Spanish, Italian, French, German, and English poets elements that made the reader feel closer to their intellectual world. The reviewers called Orest's method of translating "egocentric," clearly setting it apart from that of translators who prepared their work for chrestomathies. The compilers of the latter, however, in Orest's opinion, never follow their own tastes but strive only to present faithfully "the most celebrated, the most characteristic, and the best (or those generally regarded as the best) pieces of poetry." Orest's main object was to create translations that could be "amalgamated with the stock of national literature."

The intensive scholarly work of editing and publishing the literary heritage of the neoclassicists, particularly that of Mykola Zerov, at which he had made a good start, as well as the preparation of the fifth collection of his own poetry under the title "Pizni vrana" (The Late Sprouts), indicated the poet's constantly expanding creative activities. His untimely death cut short his work that promised to bequeath many new treasures to Ukrainian literature.

OLEH ZUJEWSKYJ

ANDRIY DEREVYANKO

1889-1963

On May 24, 1963, Andriy Tymofiyovych Derevyanko, a member of the Academy, a scientist, civil engineer, and inventor, died at Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.

Derevyanko was born on November 30, 1889, in Kharkiv Province. In 1912 he was graduated from a technical school in Rostov; he then en-

tered the Kharkiv Institute of Business, from which he was graduated in 1917. At the time of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917 he was involved in the organization of the Ukrainian school system.

Beginning with the early 1920's, Derevyanko worked at construction projects in Kharkiv and attended evening courses at the Kharkiv Institute of Civil Engineering. He received his degree in 1931. From 1930 to 1936 he was in charge of the department of mechanization of construction work at the Kharkiv Research Institute of Structures. Until the war began he lectured at several institutions of higher learning in Kharkiv, including the Institute of Civil Engineering and the Institute of Aircraft Production. His research was concentrated on the organization of construction processes, and he published forty papers on the subject.

After World War II Derevyanko lived in Austria, where he worked as a civil engineer and was an active member of the Ukrainian emigré community. He lectured at the Ukrainian university courses for adults in Salzburg.

Derevyanko came to the United States in 1949 and settled in Trenton, New Jersey. From 1956 to 1962 he worked at Princeton University with a group engaged in research on atomic energy.

Derevyanko actively supported the work of the Academy from its beginnings in this country. He delivered lectures at Academy conferences on current topics of atomic research. He also generously helped in raising funds for the Academy.

L. D.

Chronicle

During the period from April 1, 1961, to June 30, 1963, the following lectures were delivered at the plenary sessions of the Academy:

- May 6, 1961 Conference commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the death of Ahatanhel Krymsky, the first permanent secretary of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev
- Omelian Pritsak: "Krymsky as Orientalist"
 - Isydora Lewkowycz: "Krymsky as Ethnographer"
 - George Y. Shevelov: "Krymsky and Ukrainian Linguistics"
 - Jurij Lawrynenko: "Poetry and Belles Lettres of Krymsky"
- June 6, 1961 Olexander Ohloblyn: "Modern Ukrainian Historiography"
- September 5, 1961 Jaroslav Rudnyčyj: "International Congresses on Onomastics and Comparative Literature Held in 1961"
- March 10, 1962 Grand Conference in honor of Taras Shevchenko sponsored by the Shevchenko Scientific Society in America and the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States.
- Jurij Lawrynenko: "Shevchenko's *Kobzar* in the Spiritual History of the Last Century"
 - Gregory Luzhnytsky: "Vital Strength of Shevchenko's Word"
- June 9, 1962 Olexander Ohloblyn: "Recent Studies by Ukrainian Historians Abroad (since 1945)"
- June 10, 1962 Commemoration of the Third Anniversary of Michael Vetukhiv's Death
- September 30, 1962 Conference inaugurating the 1962-63 academic year
- Alexander Archimovich: "Last Year's Activities of the Academy against the Background of the Preceding Twelve Years' Work and the Tasks in the Coming Academic Year"
 - Jurij Lawrynenko: "Shevchenko's Synthesis in Franko's Internal Tragedy"

- October 28, 1962 Ihor ševčenko: "Fifty Days on Mount Sinai"
- November 25, 1962 Conference commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of Mykola Lysenko's death
- Alexander Archimovich: Opening Address
 - Wadym Kipa: "Lysenko as the Giant of Ukrainian Music"
 - Isidora Kossach-Borysova: "Lysenko among Friends and Relatives: Memoirs"
 - Rev. Hryhory Pavlovsky: "Reminiscences on Mykola Lysenko"
 - Songs and operatic arias by Lysenko performed by Hanna Scherey and Lew Reynarowycz
- December 1, 1962 George Y. Shevelov: "Ukrainian Linguistics in the Ukraine, 1953-61"
- December 22, 1962 Memorial meeting honoring the memory of the late Todos' Os'machka, sponsored by the Academy and the Union of Ukrainian Writers, *Slovo*
- Jurij Lawrynenko: "Highlights of Os'machka's Life and Creative Work"
 - Eugene Malaniuk: "Todos' Os'machka"
 - Hryhory Kostiuk: Concluding Remarks
 - Recitations of Os'machka's work: Joseph Hirniak and Olympia Dobrovolska
- December 30, 1962 Conference commemorating the ninetieth anniversary of Bohdan Lepkyi's birth
- Jurij Lawrynenko: "Bohdan Lepkyi: Poet and Literary Critic"
 - Sofia Rabij-Karpinska, "Literary Heritage of Bohdan Lepkyi"
 - Damian Horniatkevych: "Bohdan Lepkyi: The Artist and the Man"
- January 27, 1963 Annual meeting of members and friends of the Academy
- Alexander Archimovich: "Activities of the Academy during the Previous Year"
 - Wolodymyr Mijakowskyj: "The Work of the Museum-Archives and the Library of the Academy"
 - Iwan Zamsha: "Finances of the Academy"
 - Marian P. Kots: "The Plan of Activities of the Asso-

- ciation of Friends of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States”
- March 17, 1963 Grand Conference in honor of Taras Shevchenko sponsored by the Shevchenko Scientific Society in America and the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States
- Borys Martos: “Social and Political Views of Shevchenko”
 - Bohdan Krawciw: “Translations of Shevchenko’s Works into Foreign Languages”
- March 23, 1963 Conference in observance of the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Volodymyr Vernadsky, first president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, 1918
- Alexander Archimovich: Opening Address
 - Brian H. Mason: “Vernadsky as Scientist”
 - Lubov Drashevskaja: “Vernadsky, First President of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences”
 - Levko Chikalenko: “Reminiscences”
- March 24, 1963 Conference devoted to the history of Shevchenko monuments
- Jurij Lawrynenko: “The Shevchenko Movement”
 - Eugene Blakytyni and Vadym Pavlovsky: “A History of the Design Competitions for Shevchenko Monuments and a Critical Review of Designs”
 - Wolodymyr Mijakowskyj: “A Unique Shevchenko *Kobzar* with the Author’s Handwritten Corrections”
- At the exhibit arranged on the occasion of the conference were shown the *Kobzar* published in 1860 with Shevchenko’s corrections, ten original photographs of Shevchenko and his contemporaries, and designs of Shevchenko monuments from 1911.
- March 30, 1963 Alexander Granovsky: “Modern Studies of Aphids”
- April 20, 1963 Wolodymyr Kubijowytch: “The Composition of the Population of the Ukrainian SSR with Regard to Nationalities on the Basis of Data of the 1959 and 1926 Censuses”

The following lectures were held under the auspices of the sections and commissions of the Academy in New York City:

LITERARY AND PHILOLOGICAL SECTION

- December 8, 1962 Nestor Novovirsky: "Ideological Basis of Kotlyarevsky's Creative Work"
- February 16, 1963 Oleksandra Zyvotko: "*The Last Prophet*, by Leonid Mosendz"

SHEVCHENKO INSTITUTE

- April 23, 1961 Petro Odarchenko: "Shevchenko and Lesya Ukrayinka"
 • Apollon Trembowetsky: "Shevchenko and Kotsyubynsky"
- February 11, 1962 Vasyl Barka: "Truth of the *Kobzar*"
- November 4, 1962 Yuri Perchorovych: "Taras Shevchenko in Volhynia"
- December 2, 1962 Wolodymyr Mijakowskyj: "Two Recent Books on the Brotherhood of Sts. Cyril and Methodius (George Luciani and Peter Zaionchkovsky)"

THE MUSEUM-ARCHIVES OF THE ACADEMY

- March 3, 1963 Conference devoted to the activities of the publishing house *Na Hori*
- Wolodymyr Mijakowskyj: Opening Address
 - Bohdan Krawciw: "The General Character of the Publishing House and Its Recent Publications of the Works of the Modern Ukrainian Writers Vira Vovk, Marta Kalytovska, and Oleh Zujewskyj"
 - Jurij Solovij: "Dinkelsbühl Milieu of the Publishing House *Na Hori*"
 - Vasyl Barka: "Kostetsky as Writer (Expressionistic Prose)"
 - Oleh Zujewskyj: "Shakespearean Translations Published by *Na Hori*"
 - Bohdan Boychuk: "Translations of Ezra Pound and García Lorca"

Publications of *Na Hori* and engravings by Jurij Solovij, Luboslau Hutsaliuk, and Volodymyr Prokuda were exhibited

HISTORICAL SECTION

- December 2, 1961 Conference together with the Commission for Study of the Post-Revolutionary Ukraine and the Soviet Union

- Constantine Warvariv: "Materials on the History of the Ukraine's Diplomatic Relations"
- March 31, 1962 Theodore Mackiw: "Analysis of Hetman Mazepa's Letter to Emperor Joseph I"
 - Vasyl Omelchenko: "H. A. Poletyka's Life and Work"
- April 15, 1962 Conference together with the Group of Fine Arts
 - Ihor Sonevytsky: "The Tragic Life of Artem Vedel"
- May 13, 1962 Adamantia Pollis: "Stages in the Development of Nationalism"
- June 3, 1962 Ivan Sweet: "Hetman Demyan Mnohohrshnyi in Siberia, 1696-1701"
- June 9, 1962 Conference of Ukrainian historians and social scientists
 - Olexander Ohloblyn: Opening Address
 - Alexander Dombrowsky: "Early History of the Ukraine as Interpreted by Soviet Historians"
 - Vsevolod Holubnychy: "The Present State of Research on the History of Economics and Economic Thought in the Ukrainian SSR"
 - Vasyl Markus: "Studies in Modern Ukrainian History and Political Science in the Ukrainian SSR and Abroad"
 - Constantine Warvariv: "Modern Ukrainian History in Works of American Historians and Political Scientists"
 - Jaroslaw Pelenski: "The State of Historical Studies in the Ukrainian SSR after the Twentieth Congress of the CP USSR"
- June 15, 1963 Second annual conference of Ukrainian historians and social scientists, devoted to the history of social-political thought and social movements of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries
 - Wolodymyr Mijakowskyj: "Research in the 1920's at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences on the History of Social Movements"
 - Jurij Lawrynenko: "On the Origin of Ukrainian Political Parties"
 - Eugene Pyziur: "Drahomanov's Constitutional Doctrine"
 - Lubomyr Wynar: "Volodymyr Antonovych as Historian of the Cossacks"

- Lubomyr M. Koval: "M. Tuhan-Baranovsky as Scholar and Ukrainian"
- Mykhaylo Woskobijnyk: "The Ukrainians and the Ukrainian Cause in the Russian State *Duma*"

ANCIENT HISTORY SECTION

- May 7, 1961 Tatiana Ivanivska: "Concerning a Dating of the Silver Vase in the Metropolitan Museum"
- Alexander Dombrowsky: "On the Problem of Paleo-ethnography of the Eurasian Territory in Herodotus' Work"
- November 19, 1961 Jotham Johnson: "An Ancient Horoscope in the City of Dura"
- December 23, 1961 Yuri Perchorovych: "Bastarnae in Galicia"
- March 24, 1962 Alexander Dombrowsky: "On the Problem of Darius' Campaign Against the Scythians"
- February 9, 1963 Alexander Dombrowsky: "The Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Translation of Herodotus' 'Scythia' and the Twentieth Anniversary of the Death of the Translator, Ukrainian Historian Teofil Kostruba"
- April 21, 1963 Corinne G. Tuft: "A Psychological Exploration of Ancient and Modern Education"
- May 19, 1963 Yuri Perchorovych: "Forgotten Sources for the Study of Ukrainian Prehistory"

COMMISSION FOR STUDY OF THE POST-REVOLUTIONARY UKRAINE
AND THE SOVIET UNION

- May 13, 1961 Ivan L. Rudnytsky: "Vyacheslav Lypynsky: Leader, Historian, and Political Thinker"
- December 10, 1961 Wasyl Tuchak: "The Ukraine in Khrushchev's Political Biography"
- December 30, 1961 Jurij Lawrynenko: "Khrushchev's Program on Nationalities against the Background of the Eighty-fifth Anniversary of the Ems *Ukaz* by Alexander II"
- Anthony Adamovich: "Russification as a Manifestation of the Nationalities Policy in Belorussia"
 - Rudolph Pakalus: "National Opposition in the Government and the Communist Party of Latvia"

- Vsevolod Holubnychy: "A Revision of the Marxist-Leninist Theory of Nationalities in the New Program of the CP USSR"
- March 23, 1962 Iwan Majstrenko: "Some Aspects of the History of the Ukrainian Communist Party"
- October 6, 1962 Ivan L. Rudnytsky: "The Ukraine in the Evolution of the Communist System"
- October 19, 1962 Vsevolod Holubnychy: "The Stalinist Purges in Recent Books by Hryhory Kostyuk and Borys Lewytzkyj"
- April 6, 1963 Vsevolod Holubnychy: "An Analysis of Political Development in the Ukraine, 1960-62"
- June 2, 1963 M. K. Dziewanowski: "Piłsudski and the Ukraine, 1918-21"
- June 12, 1963 Michael Dobrianskyj: "Present Linguistic Policy in the Ukraine"

COMMISSION FOR STUDY OF THE HISTORY OF SOCIAL THOUGHT IN
THE UKRAINE

- November 10, 1962 Eugene Malaniuk: "On the Problem of Hohol' (Gogol)"
- November 24, 1962 Martha Bohachevsky: "The Revolution of 1848 in Galicia and Its Ideology"
- April 27, 1963 Ivan L. Rudnytsky: "Some Problems of Ukrainian History of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries"
- May 11, 1963 Gregory Luzhnytsky: "The Galician Greek-Catholic Clergy as a Social Class"

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SECTION

- December 9, 1961 Ivan Sweet: "*Mandzhurs'kyi vistnyk*, weekly, 1932-37"

BIOLOGICAL SECTION

- May 14, 1961 Andriy Derevyanko: "The Present State of Peaceful Use of Atomic Energy"
- May 21, 1961 Alexander Archimovich: "Developments in Agriculture in 1960 in the USSR and the Ukraine"
- April 14, 1962 Mykola Efremov: "Mystery of the Evenki (Tungus) Wonder"

- May 20, 1962 Natalia Ossadcha-Janata: "Botanic Nomenclature in Slavic Languages"
- December 16, 1962 Conference together with the Technical Section
 • Michael Yarymovych: "Moon-landing Program"
- May 26, 1963 Natalia Ossadcha-Janata: "The History of Herb Usage in the Ukraine"
- June 8, 1963 Conference, together with the Section of Economics and Law, on the present state of agriculture in the USSR and the Ukraine
 • Alexander Archimovich: "Achievements of Agriculture of the USSR and the Ukraine in 1962 as Compared with Those of Previous Years"
 • Iwan Bakalo: "Problem of Milk Production in the USSR and the Ukraine"
 • Vsevolod Holubnychy: "Problems of Agriculture as an Integral Part of the Economy of the USSR and the Ukraine"

PHILOSOPHICAL SECTION

- May 20, 1961 Wasyl Rudko: "Philosopher Pamfil Yurkevych"
- May 18, 1963 Ivan Fizer: "The Problem of Objective Beauty in the Soviet Discussion"

ECONOMICS AND LAW

- December 8, 1961 Vasyl Markus: "Nationality Minorities in Central-Eastern Europe after World War II"
- December 27, 1961 Zinovij Melnyk: "Ukrainian Capital in the USSR Economy during the First Five-Year Plan, 1928-32"
- March 18, 1962 Bohdan Halajczuk: "The Soviet Conception of the Sovereignty of the Union Republics and the Satellite Countries"
- December 15, 1962 Mykola Velychkivsky: "Stolypin's Reform and the Causes of its Failure"
- March 16, 1963 Iwan Bakalo: "The Present State of Training of Agriculturists of High and Intermediate Qualifications in the USSR and the Ukraine"
- June 22, 1963 Zinovij Melnyk: "Methods to Determine the Economic Efficiency of Investments in the USSR and the USA"

GROUP OF FINE ARTS

- April 29, 1961 Zenowij Lysko: "Ukrainian Folk-Songs: Musicological Problems"
- March 3, 1962 Presentation by Yuri Tamarsky, cinema producer, of three color films he produced in Brazil
- May 27, 1962 The above program was repeated in the Ukrainian Institute of America, where a related exhibit of Indian arms and ceramics also was on view.
- March 31, 1963 Conference together with the Historical Section
 • Ihor Sonevytsky: "The Fate of Vedel's Heritage"
 (with musical illustrations)

COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF THE HISTORY OF
UKRAINIAN-JEWISH RELATIONS

- June 10, 1961 Vsevolod Holubnychy: "The Position and Role of the Jews in Soviet Ukrainian Society Prior to World War II"
- March 25, 1962 Alfred Berlstein: "Jewish Spiritual Movements in the Ukraine"
- December 28, 1962 Lubow Margolena-Hansen: "A Sociological Approach to the Normalization of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations"

COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF THE HISTORY OF
UKRAINIAN IMMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES

- February 23, 1962 Ivan Sweet: "The Life and Activities of Ahapiy Honcharenko in a New Light"
- May 12, 1962 Roman Ihnytzyk: "On the Problem of the Preservation of the National Culture of Ukrainians in the USA and Canada"

COMMISSION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE LITERARY HERITAGE OF
VOLODYMYR VYNNYCHENKO

- April 22, 1961 Petro Odarchenko: "Volodymyr Vynnychenko and Ukrainian University Students of the 1920's"
- December 3, 1961 Hryhory Kostiuk: "The Publication of Vynnychenko's Diary: The Task and the Prospects"

THE NEW BUILDING OF THE ACADEMY

Early in April 1961 the Academy moved into its own building at 206 West 100 Street in New York City, bought for it with funds raised by mem-

bers and friends. The three-storied building, formerly occupied by the Bloomingdale Branch of the New York Public Library, houses the Museum-Archives and the Library of the Academy, has rooms for scholarly conferences and a spacious hall suitable for art exhibits, concerts, and recitals.

The building was solemnly consecrated on December 17, 1961. The rite was performed by the Most Reverend Mstyslav, Archbishop of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States, with the participation of priests, a deacon, and a choir.

The grand opening of the new building of the Academy took place on January 28, 1962. Numerous representatives of scholarly institutions and public organizations participated in the ceremonies. Program:

- George Y. Shevelov: Opening Address
- Hryhory Kostiuk: "Acknowledgments"
- Iwan Zamsha: "Fund Raising Campaign"

Stephen Jarema was presented with a diploma for his gratuitous assistance in purchase of the building.

ART EXHIBITS

The following art exhibits were arranged by the Academy:

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| January 28, 1962 | <p>An exhibition of eighteen paintings of Yukhym Mykhayliv was arranged for the occasion of the opening of the new building of the Academy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolodymyr Mijakowskyj: Opening Address <p>On the closing day of the exhibition (March 17, 1962), a conference was held by the Group of Fine Arts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damian Horniatkevych: Opening Address • Wolodymyr Mijakowskyj: "About the Artist" • Wadym Kipa: Musical Selections |
| April 1, 1962 | <p>Opening of the first exhibition of painting by Volodymyr Vynnychenko, arranged by the Commission for the Preservation of the Literary Heritage of Volodymyr Vynnychenko</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damian Horniatkevych: Opening Address • Hryhory Kostiuk: "Vynnychenko as Writer and Artist" |
| June 2, 1962 | <p>Opening of an exhibition of architectural designs by Eugene Nolden (Blakytnyi)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alexander Archimovich: Opening Address • Eugene Nolden (Blakytnyi): "Modern Architectural Trends" |

- Vadym Pavlovsky: "Architectural Design by Nolden"
- September 29, 1962 Exhibition of a series of drawings and water colors by Antin Warywoda (Wooden architecture of the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries in Western Ukraine and adjoining countries)
- Alexander Archimovich: Opening Address
 - Damian Horniatkevych: "The Significance of Warywoda's Work for the History of Ukrainian Architecture"
 - Antin Warywoda: "My Work on Preparing Materials for the Exhibition"
- December 29, 1962 Opening of an exhibition of works by Vasyl Krychevsky in commemoration of the tenth anniversary of his death
- Damian Horniatkevych: Opening Address
 - Vadym Pavlovsky "Remarks on the Works Exhibited"
 - Eugene Blakytyni: "Vasyl Krychevsky's Multifaceted Creativity"
 - Serhij Lytwynenko: "Reminiscences on Vasyl Krychevsky"
- February 10, 1963 Showing of 150 colored slides of paintings by Vasyl Krychevsky; comments by Petro Cholodny Jr. and Vadym Pavlovsky
- May 4, 1963 Opening of an exhibition of painting by Petro Cholodny Jr.
- Alexander Archimovich: Opening Address
 - Eugene Blakytyni: "The Creative Work of Petro Cholodny"

CONCERTS AND RECITALS

- May 5, 1962 Recitation of Shevchenko poems by Joseph Hirniak and Olympia Dobrovol'ska (adapted by Jurij Lawrynenko)
- May 19, 1962 Concert and recital on the occasion of the closing of the Vynnychenko Exhibition. Recitations of excerpts from Vynnychenko's works by Olympia Dobrovol'ska, Lidia Krushelnytska, and Ihor Shuhan. Tamara Makov'ska, songs; Marianna Shumylovych, piano; Ihor Shvets and Adrian Megasiuk, violin
- June 16, 1962 A Wadym Lesytch Evening

- Hryhory Kostiuk: Introductory Remarks
 - Wadym Lesytch: Poetry reading
- February 2, 1963 An evening of Ukrainian music and literature arranged by the Doroshenko Relief Committee
- Alexander Archimovich: Opening Address
 - Nina Syniawska: "Needy Ukrainian Scholars in Western Europe"
- Participating artists: Lidia Krushelnytska, M. Cisyk, Hanna Scherey, Joseph Hirniak, and W. Cisyk
- February 24, 1963 Concert commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the death of composer Mykola Lysenko, sponsored by the Academy and the Ukrainian Opera Ensemble Ihor Sonevytsky, conductor
- Opera-miniature *Nocturne*
 - Arias and songs
- Participating artists: Marta Kobryn-Kokolska, Ivan Hosch, Hanna Scherey, Lew Reynarowycz, Olena Zamiaty, Christina Karpevych, Ihor Shuhan, Olha Kiritchenko, and Oksana Lenec-Tarnavska
- May 5, 1963 Concert presented by two generations of musicians
- Wadym Kipa: Introductory Remarks
- Participating artists: George Sawchyn, George Sawycky, Phyllis Falletta, Iryna Kipa, Olexander Nedilko, Volodymyr Lysnyak, Isabella Fomenko, Jaro Megasiuk, and Wadym Kipa

GROUP OF THE ACADEMY IN DENVER, COLORADO

- July 15, 1961 Borys Vavryshchuk: "Significance of Radioactivity in Biology"
- August 12, 1961 Lubomyr Wynar: "The Problem of Objectivism in Historical Studies" and "The Youth of Andriy Voynarovsky"
- September 16, 1961 Filimon Ukradyha: "Mechanism for the Elimination of Potassium by the Kidneys in Men and Animals"
- Lev Bykovsky: "Natalena Koroleva's Life and Creative Work, 1944-60"
 - Halyna Zavadovych: Reading of the first chapter of N. Koroleva's *Shcho ye istyna?* (What is Truth?)
- November 4, 1961 Lev Bykovsky: "In Memory of Professor Yakiv Moralevych"

- Maria Ovcharenko: "Serhiy Yefremov's Research on Shevchenko"
- March 3, 1962 Bohdan Wynar: "Recent Research at American Scholarly Institutions on Topics Related to the Ukraine"
 - M. Pelekhatyuk and Lev Bykovsky: "Studies on the History of Ukrainian Immigration in Colorado"
- May 12, 1962 Mrs. Evelyn Lewis, Miss Nell Scott, and Miss Ramona Wright: "The New Face of the Public Library"
- September 29, 1962 Opening of an exhibition of paintings by Maria Harasovska-Dachyshyn
 - Maria Harasovska-Dachyshyn: Introductory Remarks
 - Stefania Levchenko: "An Outline of Harasovska-Dachyshyn's Life and Creative Work Based on Materials of Theodore Kurpita"
- November 24, 1962 Lubomyr Wynar: "The Origin of Ukrainian Cossacks and the Role of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky"
 - Lev Bykovsky: "A Brief Report on Recent Writings of Natalena Koroleva" and reading of her work *Neumyrushcha vdacha* (Immortal Character)
- March 2, 1963 Bohdan Wynar: "Economic Studies of Ukrainian Emigrés"
- May 25, 1963 George Slastion: "On the Problem of the Form of the Ukrainian National Cross," Part 1
- June 22, 1963 George Slastion: The same, Part 2

GROUP OF THE ACADEMY IN DETROIT, MICHIGAN

- May 27, 1961 Jaroslaw Zubal: "Hunting in the Ukraine"
- June 30, 1961 Zinovij Melnyk, "Methods of Computing Profits at Enterprises in the Ukrainian SSR"
- December 30, 1961 A. Shashlo: "Artificial Satellites and Their Significance"
- March 24, 1962 Conference commemorating Taras Shevchenko sponsored by the Academy group in Detroit and the group of the Shevchenko Scientific Society
 - Mychajlo Ovchynnyk: Opening Address
 - Jaroslaw Zubal: "Plants in Shevchenko's Works"
 - Oleksa Veretenchenko: "Shevchenko and the Sea"
 - Roman Bzhesky: "Shevchenko's Works Written in Russian"

- October 6, 1962 • Bohdan Lonczynna: Concluding Remarks
Volodymyr Lysi: "International Status of the USSR Republics," Part 1
- November 23, 1962 Conference sponsored by the Academy group and the group of the Shevchenko Scientific Society

 - Bohdan Lonczynna: Opening Address
 - Wasyl Wytwycky: "Music Critics on Mykola Ly-senko, 1862-1962"
 - Jaroslaw Zubal: Concluding Remarks
- December 7, 1962 Teodor Kalytovsky: "The Nature of Viruses"
- December 22, 1962 Volodymyr Lysi: "International Status of the USSR Republics," Part 2
- March 23, 1963 Shevchenko Conference sponsored by the Academy group and the group of the Shevchenko Scientific Society

 - Jaroslaw Zubal: Opening Address
 - Mykhaylo Bazhansky: "Tribute of Ukrainian Poets to Shevchenko"
 - Pavlo Malyar: "Religion in Shevchenko's Work"
- April 7, 1963 Conference commemorating the tenth anniversary of the death of Borys Ivanytsky

 - Jaroslaw Zubal: "Scientific Heritage of Borys Ivanytsky"
 - Reminiscences

GROUP OF THE ACADEMY IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

- May 12, 1961 Conference commemorating Taras Shevchenko

 - Apollon Trembowetsky: "The Shevchenko Heritage and Mykhaylo Kotsyubynsky" and "Shevchenko and Stepan Rudansky"
- June 2, 1961 Yar Slavutych: "The International Onomastics Congress in Italy"
- December 15, 1961 Volodymyr Kedrovsky: "Reminiscences on the Ukrainian Writer Mykola Chernyavsky"
- February 17, 1962 Olexa Powstenko: "The Kiev Cave Monastery—a Treasure of Ukrainian Architecture"
- March 25, 1962 Shevchenko Conference sponsored by the Academy group and the group of the Shevchenko Scientific Society

- Panteleymon Kovaliv: Opening Address
 - Petro Odarchenko: "Shevchenko Traditions in the Poetry of Lesya Ukrayinka"
 - P. Oryshkevych: "Nature and Geographic Features in Shevchenko's Works"
 - Panteleymon Kovaliv: "The Last Days and the Death of Shevchenko"
 - Olexa Powstenko: Concluding Remarks
- December 8, 1962 Conference commemorating Todos' Os'machka
- Petro Odarchenko: "The Writings of Todos' Os'machka"
 - Ludmyla Kovalenko: "On the Psychology of Os'machka's Creative Work"
 - Mykola Nedzvedsky: "Reminiscences on Os'machka in Kiev"
- December 28, 1962 Yar Slavutych: "The Poetry of Volodymyr Svidzinsky"
- Yar Slavutych: Reading of his own poetry
- December 29, 1962 Conference marking the 35 years of scholarly activities of Panteleymon Kovaliv, arranged by the group of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Washington with the participation of the Academy group and the Association of Ukrainians in Washington, D.C.
- George Starosolsky: Opening Address
 - Petro Odarchenko: "Scholarly Activities of P. Kovaliv"
 - Rev. Yuri Huley: "Theological and Theological-Educational Work of P. Kovaliv"
 - Panteleymon Kovaliv: Concluding Remarks
- December 30, 1962 Serhij Krascheninnikow: "Kiev One Hundred Years Ago"
- February 2, 1963 Petro Odarchenko: "Two Academic Collections Devoted to Shevchenko"
- Olexa Powstenko: "Ukrainian Architecture in Shevchenko's Paintings"
- February 24, 1963 Shevchenko Conference sponsored by the Academy group and the group of the Shevchenko Scientific Society
- Volodymyr Doroshenko: "Taras Shevchenko as a Man"
 - Petro Odarchenko: "Shevchenko in Ukrainian Poetry"

A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

The following transliteration system has been used:

<i>Ukrainian</i>	<i>Russian</i>
а	а
б	б
в	в
г	г
г	g
д	д
е	е
є	ye
ж	zh
з	z
и	и
й	й
й	y
ий	yi
і	і
ї	yi
к	к
л	л
м	м
н	н
о	о
п	п
р	р
с	с
т	т
у	у
ф	ф
х	kh
ц	ts
ч	ch
ш	sh
щ	shch
ь	'
ю	yu
я	ya
	а
	б
	в
	г
	д
	е
	ё
	ж
	з
	и
	й
	к
	л
	м
	н
	о
	п
	р
	с
	т
	у
	ф
	х
	ц
	ч
	ш
	щ
	ъ
	ы
	ь
	э
	ю
	я
	о
	р
	г
	д
	е
	yo
	zh
	z
	i
	i
	k
	l
	m
	n
	o
	p
	r
	s
	t
	u
	f
	kh
	ts
	ch
	sh
	shch
	omitted
	y
	'
	e
	yu
	ya

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The editor wishes to thank Joseph Danko for compiling the index to volumes 1–10 of *The Annals* which is published in number 2 of this volume.

Lubow Abramiuk translated Todos' Os'machka's obituary. Lubov Drashevska translated the book review by Alexander Archimovich, and the obituaries of Volodymyr Doroshenko, Ivan Kabachkiy, Mykola Efremov, and Ivan Bahryanyi. Sophia Sluzar did the translation of Volodymyr Sichynsky's obituary. Zenon Snylyk translated the article by Alexander Dombrowsky, the review article by Petro Odarchenko, and the book review by Neonila Kordysh. June Mintz and Gustave Niles edited English texts of the manuscripts. Iwan Zamsha compiled the chronicle and was in charge of production. Theodore B. Ciuciura and Wolodymyr Mijakowskyj gave much help in editorial work. To all these persons the editor wishes to express his deep gratitude.

INDEX

INDEX
VOLUMES 1–10
1951–1963

INDEX TO VOLUMES I–X (JOSEPH DANKO) . . .	3
INDEX TO PORTRAITS	40
INDEX TO CHRONICLE	41
EDITORS AND EDITORIAL COMMITTEE	
MEMBERS	53

Index to Volumes I–X

Compiled

by

JOSEPH DANKO

This is a combined author and subject index. Names of authors have been set in capitals and small capitals; subjects are in bold face.

Entries under authors' names are arranged as follows: 1. Original articles by the author; 2. Review articles and book reviews by the author; 3. Articles about the author. Entries under subjects are arranged alphabetically, according to the title of the article. Major subjects, such as Language, History, etc., are subdivided; within these subdivisions entries are arranged alphabetically by title.

Books reviewed in *The Annals* will be found both under the name of the reviewer and under the heading "Book Reviews." Obituaries will be found under the author of the obituary, under the name of the deceased, and under the heading "Obituaries."

Sample entries:

Explanation:

DU FEU, VERONICA M.

Ukrainianisms in Seventeenth-Century Russian. 8:87-94, 1960.

Du Feu's article was printed in volume 8, pages 87-94, of *The Annals* for 1960.

Ukraine — History
1500-1800

The Significance of the Soviet Tercentenary of the Pereyaslav Treaty. J. S. Reshetar. 4:981-94, Winter-Spring 1955.

An article on the tercentenary of the Pereyaslav Treaty, by J. S. Reshetar, is to be found in volume 4, pages 981-994, of *The Annals* for Winter-Spring 1955.

J. D.

INDEX

- Abramiuk, Lubow** 10, No. 1:164, 1962-1963.
- Academic Freedom in the U.S.S.R.**
see **Freedom, Academic**
- Academic life**
Congress of Slavic Youth, 1890-1892. O. Odlozilik. 6:1327-57, 1958.
- Agriculture**
The Agrarian-Industrial Dichotomy in the Ukraine as a Factor in Soviet Nationality Policy. R. S. Sullivant. 9:110-25, 1961.
- Anatomic Structures of *Cucurbita* Fruit and Their Importance for the Study of Economic Qualities of the Fruit. K. Starcheva-Sandul. 5:1188-1201, 1956.
- On the Rationale of the Soviet Collectivization of Agriculture in 1929. V. Holubnychy. 9:75-109, 1961.
- Saline Soils of Southern Ukraine. P. Birko. 3:838-52, Spring 1954.
- Varieties of Cereals Bred in the Ukraine Before World War II. I. Bepalow. 6:1420-28, 1958.
- ALTBAUER, MOSHE**
Phonetic Variants of Hebrew Loan-Words in Ukrainian. 8:115-20, 1960.
- Anglo-Ukrainian relations**
The Question of Anglo-Ukrainian Relations in the Middle of the Seventeenth Century. L. Vynar. 6:1411-18, 1958.
- Anti-Trinitarianism** *see* **Socinianism**
- Archaeology — Ukraine** *see* **Ukraine — Archaeology**
- ARCHIMOVICH, ALEXANDER**
Mykola Efremov [Obituary]. 10, No. 1:136-38, 1962-1963.
The Role of Insects in the Process of Pollination of the Flowers of Sugar Beet. 4:995-1001, Winter-Spring 1955.
Studies on the Soviet Union. New Series. Vol. II, No. 1: Special Issue on Agriculture in the USSR. Munich, 1962. 10, No. 1:123-25, 1962-1963.
- ARCHIMOWITSCH, ALEXANDER** *see* **ARCHIMOVICH, ALEXANDER**
- ARMSTRONG, JOHN A.**
The Ukrainian Apparatus as a Key to the Study of Soviet Politics. 9:225-33, 1961.
Barghoorn, Frederick C. *Soviet Russian Nationalism*. New York, 1956. 6:1433-35, 1958.
- Arshenevsky, Serhiy** 3/4:[468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- Babulevych, Serhiy** 3/4:[468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- Bahryanyi, Ivan** [Obituary]. H. Kostiuik. 10, No. 1:139-41, 1962-1963.
- Bandura**
A Note on the History of the Bandura. M. J. Diakowsky. 6:1419, 1958.
- Baran, Stepan** [Obituary]. 3:595-96, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Baroque, Ukrainian**
Western Europe and the Ukrainian Baroque: An Aspect of Cultural Influences at the Time of Hetman Ivan Mazepa. O. Ohloblyn. 1:127-37, Fall 1951.

- BASILEVICH, IVAN**
Teofil Yanovsky (In Memory of His Death). 5:1236-37, 1956.
- BERLSTEIN, ALFRED**
The Figure of Mickiewicz in Ivan Franko's Life. 6:1372-80, 1958.
- Berynda, Pamvo.** *Leksikon* see HÜTTL-WORTH, GERTA
- BESPALOW, IVAN**
Varieties of Cereals Bred in the Ukraine Before World War II. 6:1420-28, 1958.
- Bibliography**
History of the Ukrainian Holdings at the Library of Congress. J. B. Rudnyćkyj. 6:1406-10, 1958.
West European and American Doctoral Dissertations on the Ukraine (1945-60). J. Danko. 9:313-33, 1961.
- Biletsky, Leonid** [Obituary]. 4: 1042-43, Winter-Spring 1955.
Biletsky, Leonid (Bilecky, L. T.) see also 3/4:[468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- BILINSKIJ, JAROSLAW** see **BILINSKY, YAROSLAV**
- BILINSKY, ANDREAS**
Allgemeine Probleme des internationalen Privatrechts der Sowjetunion. 9:262-85, 1961.
- BILINSKY, YAROSLAV**
Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Ivan Franko, and the Relations Between the Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia in the Last Quarter of the 19th Century. 7:1542-66, 1959.
The Ukrainian SSR in International Affairs after World War II. 9:147-66, 1961.
Huszar, George B. de and Associates. *Soviet Power and Policy*. New York, 1955. 5:1228-29, 1956.
- Bilous, Antin** [Obituary]. 4:1045-46, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Biology**
The Role of Insects in the Process of Pollination of the Flowers of Sugar Beet. A. Archimowitsch. 4:995-1001, Winter-Spring 1955.
The Variability of *Chilodonella Cyprini* Moroff. S. Kraschenin-nikow. 2:293-304[4], Summer 1952.
What is a Species? The Essence, the Extent, and the Definition of the Species Concept. S. Paramonov. 1:138-49, Fall 1951.
- BIRKO, PETRO**
Saline Soils of Southern Ukraine. 3:838-52, Spring 1954.
- Blavatsky, Volodymyr** [Obituary]. 3:596-97, Spring-Summer 1953.
- BOCIURKIW, BOHDAN R.**
The Renovationist Church in the Soviet Ukraine, 1922-1939. 9:41-74, 1961.
- BOHDAN, C. Y.**
Inkeles, Alex and Raymond A. Bauer. *The Soviet Citizen*. Cambridge, Mass., 1959. 9: 299-303, 1961.
- BOJKO, JURIJ**
Ivan Mirtschuk [Obituary]. 9: 334-37, 1961.
- Book reviews**
Akademiya Nauk Ukrayins'koyi RSR. Sektor Derzhavy i Prava. Istoriya derzhavy i prava Ukrayins'koyi RSR, 1917-1960. Kiev, 1961. (Rev. by V. Markus) 10, No. 1:116-22, 1962-1963.
Armstrong, John A. *Ukrainian Nationalism, 1939-1945*. New

- York, 1955. (Rev. by I. L. Rudnytsky) 9:286-94, 1961.
- Baranauskas, Antanas. *The Forest of Anyksciai, the original Lithuanian text with English translation by Nadas Rastenis; edited by Juozas Tininis.* Los Angeles, 1956. (Rev. by Yar Slavutych) 6:1442, 1958.
- Barghoorn, Frederick C. *Soviet Russian Nationalism.* New York, 1956. (Rev. by J. A. Armstrong) 6:1433-35, 1958.
- Bilećkyj, O. I., ed. *Chrestomatija davn'oi ukraïnskoï literatury — Doba feodalizmu.* Kiev, 1949. (Rev. by D. Čiževsky) 1:57-62, Winter 1951.
- Biletsky, O. I. *Vid davnyiny do suchasnosti.* Kiev, 1960. 2 vols. (Rev. by B. Krawciw) 9:306-12, 1961.
- Bray, R.G.A. de. *Guide to the Slavonic Languages.* London, 1952. (Rev. by V. Chaplenko) 2:332-34, Summer 1952.
- Clark, M. Gardner. *The Economics of Soviet Steel.* Cambridge, Mass., 1956. (Rev. by S. G. Prociuk) 6:1439-42, 1958.
- Dmytriw, Olya. *Ukrainian Arts.* Compiled by Olya Dmytriw, edited by Anne Mitz. New York, 1952. (Rev. by Y. Hnizdovsky) 2:476-77, Winter 1952.
- Dorošenko, Volodymyr. *Ohnyšče ukraïnskoï nauky: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenko.* New York, 1951. (Rev. by D. Horniatkevych) 1:179-81, Fall 1951.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1950 ed., article *Ukraine* (Vol. 22, pp. 667-672) and *White-Russia* (Vol. 23, p. 578). (Rev. by R. Smal Stocki) 1:172-74, Fall 1951.
- Florinsky, Michael T. *Russia: A History and an Interpretation.* New York, 1953. (Rev. by M. Luther) 3:733-35, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Gudzy, N. K., ed. *Rusko-ukraïnskiye literaturnyie svyazi.* Moscow, 1951. (Rev. by V. Porsky) 2:336-37, Summer 1952.
- Gurian, Waldemar. *Bolshevism: An Introduction to Soviet Communism.* Notre Dame, Ind., 1952. (Rev. by M. Luther) 2:444-47, Winter 1952.
- Gurian, Waldemar, ed. *The Soviet Union: Background, Ideology, Reality. A Symposium.* Notre Dame, Ind., 1951. (Rev. by J. S. Reshetar) 1:177-78, Fall 1951.
- Harkins, William. *Anthology of Czech Literature.* New York, 1953. (Rev. by J. Fizer) 4:1040-41, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Harvard Slavic Studies, Vol. I. Ed. H. G. Lunt. Cambridge, Mass., 1953. (Rev. by H. M. Nebel) 3:591-93, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Harvard Slavic Studies, Vol. II. Ed. by Horace G. Lunt. Cambridge, Mass., 1954. (Rev. by P. Rudy) 5:1229-33, 1956.
- Holoskevych, H. *Pravopysny slovnyk.* 8. vyd. New York, 1952. (Rev. by P. Odarchenko) 2:334-35, Summer 1952.
- Holub, Josef and Kopečny, František. *An Etymological Dictionary of the Czech Language.* Prague, 1952. (Rev. by D.

- Čiževsky) 2:465-67, Winter 1952.
- Hrabec, Stefan. *Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy polskich XVI-XVII w.* Toruń, 1949. (Rev. by Yury Šerech) 3:696-730, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Huszar, George B. de and Associates. *Soviet Power and Policy.* New York, 1955. (Rev. by J. Bilinski) 5:1228-29, 1956.
- Inkeles, Alex and Bauer, Raymond A. *The Soviet Citizen.* Cambridge, Mass., 1959. (Rev. by C. Y. Bohdan) 9:299-303, 1961.
- Istoriya ukrayins'koi literatury. Tom I: *Dozhovtneva literatura.* Kiev, 1954. (Rev. by D. Čiževsky) 4:1035-40, Winter-Spring 1955.
- İstoryčna hramatyka ukrajins'koi movy. *Pidručnyk dlja studentiv movno-literaturnykh fakul'tetiv pedahohičnykh instytutiv, O. P. Bezpal'ko [ta inshij]* Kiev, 1957. (Rev. by G. Y. Shevelov) 6:1429-33, 1958.
- Jakobson, Roman. *Slavic Languages.* 2d ed. New York, 1955. (Rev. by J. B. Rudnyčkyj) 5:1221-24, 1956.
- Jasny, Naum. *The Socialized Agriculture of the U.S.S.R.* Stanford, 1949. (Rev. by G. Makhov) 1:65-68, Winter 1951.
- Kazemzadeh, Firuz. *The Struggle for Transcaucasia: 1917-1921.* New York, 1952. (Rev. by P. Hrycak) 2:337-40, Summer 1952.
- Kjellberg, Lennart. *Catalogue des Imprimés Slavons des XVIe, XVIIe, et XVIIIe siècles, con-*servés à la Bibliothèque de l'Université Royale d'Uppsala. Uppsala, 1951. (Rev. by D. Čiževsky) 3:590, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Kohn, Hans. *Pan-Slavism, Its History and Ideology.* Notre Dame, Ind., 1953. (Rev. by I. L. Rudnytsky) 3:864-66, Spring 1954.
- Kostiuk, Hryhory. *Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine: A Study of the Decade of Mass Terror (1929-1939).* New York, 1960. (Rev. by J. Pelenski) 9:294-99, 1961.
- Kotsevalov, A[ndriy] *Antichnaya istoriya i kul'tura Severnogo Prichernomor'ya v sovetskom nauchnom issledovanii.* Munich, 1955. (Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the USSR. *Issledovaniya i materialy*, Seriya 1-ya, vyp. 19). (Rev. by A. Dombrovsky) 6:1436-37, 1958.
- Kovaliv, Pantelejmon. *Molytovnyk služebnyk: Pamjatka XIV stolittja.* New York, 1960. (Rev. by J. B. Rudnyčkyj) 8:206-7, 1960.
- Kucharzewski, Jan. *The Origins of Modern Russia.* New York, 1948. (Rev. by I. L. Rudnytsky) 2:471-73, Winter 1952.
- Lebedev, D. M. *Geografiya v Rossii XVII veka (do-petrovskoi epokhi).* *Očerki po istorii geograficheskikh znanii.* Moscow, 1949. (Rev. by J. V. Sweet) 3:866-67, Spring 1954.
- Lucyk, G. H. *Contributions to Methods in Onomastics, Choronymy and Toponyms and Their Origin.* Winnipeg, 1953. (Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences. Series: *Onomastica*, No. 6).

- (Rev. by A. Kocevalov) 5: 1219-21, 1956.
- Malanyuk, E. *Narysy z istoriyi našoyi kul'tury*. New York, 1954. (Rev. by D. Čiževsky) 5:1226-28, 1956.
- Matthews, W. K. *Languages of the U.S.S.R.* Cambridge, 1951. (Rev. by J. B. Rudnyčkyj) 1: 175-76, Fall 1951.
- Modern Languages Association of America. Publication, 1953, Apr. (LXVIII, No. 2). (Rev. by D. Čiževsky) 3:588-89, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Moore, Barrington. *Terror and Progress USSR: Some Sources of Change and Stability in the Soviet Dictatorship*. Cambridge, Mass., 1954. (Rev. by J. S. Reshetar) 3:863-64, Spring 1954.
- Ohienko, Ivan, Metropolitan. *Ukrains'ka literaturna mova*. Saskatoon, Canada, 1951. (Rev. by P. Kovaliv) 3:571-83, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Ohloblyn, Alexander. *Treaty of Pereyaslav, 1654*. Translated by B. Budurovych. Toronto—New York, 1954. (Rev. by N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko) 5:1224-26, 1956.
- Ostrogorski, Georgije. *Pronija, Prilog istoriji feudalizma u Vizantiji i u južnoslovenskim zemljama*. Beograd, 1951. (Rev. by I. Ševčenko) 2:448-59, Winter 1952.
- Pasternak, Yaroslav. *Arkheologiya Ukrainy*. Toronto, 1961. (Rev. by N. Kordysh) 10, No. 1:111-12, 1962-1963.
- Pljušč, P. P. *Narysy z istoriji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*. Kiev, 1958. (Rev. by P. Kovaliv) 8:207-9, 1960.
- Pobóg-Malinowski, Władysław. *Najnowsza Historia Polityczna Polski, 1864-1945*. Vol. I. Paris, 1953. (Rev. by I. L. Rudnytsky) 3:731-33, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Pyziur, Eugene. *The Doctrine of Anarchism of Michael A. Bakunin*. Milwaukee, Wis., 1956. (Rev. by I. L. Rudnytsky) 5: 1233-35, 1956.
- Reshetar, John S. *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917-1920: A Study in Nationalism*. Princeton, 1952. (Rev. by I. L. Rudnytsky) 2: 316-22, Summer 1952.
- Richhardt, Rosemarie. *Polnische Lehnwörter im Ukrainischen*. Berlin, 1957. (Rev. by G. Y. Shevelov) 8:210-15, 1960.
- Ringheim, Allan. "Eine Altserbische Trojasage". Prague—Uppsala, 1951. (Rev. by D. Čiževsky) 3:591, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Rudnyčkyj, J. B. *The Term and Name "Ukraine"*. Winnipeg, 1951. (Rev. by Yury Šerech) 2:435-43, Winter 1952.
- Šerech, Yury. *Narys suchasnoyi ukrayinskoyi literaturnoyi movy*. Munich, 1951. (Rev. by P. Odarchenko) 2:473-75, Winter 1952.
- Shabad, Theodore. *Geography of the U.S.S.R. A Regional Survey*. New York, 1951. (Rev. by V. Gvozdetzky) 1:169-71, Fall 1951.
- Soviet Science: A Symposium Presented on Dec. 27, 1951, at the Philadelphia Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; arranged by Conway Zirkle [and]

- Howard A. Meyerhoff. Edited by Ruth C. Christman. Washington, D.C., 1952. (Rev. by M. Vetukhiv) 2:460-64, Winter, 1952.
- Studies on the Soviet Union. New Series. Vol. II, No. 1: Special Issue on Agriculture in the USSR. Munich, 1962. (Rev. by A. Archimovich) 10, No. 1: 123-25, 1962-1963.
- Sullivant, Robert S. Soviet Politics and the Ukraine, 1917-1957. New York, 1962. (Rev. by V. Holubnychy) 10, No. 1: 112-16, 1962-1963.
- Toynbee, Arnold. A Study of History. New York, 1951-54. (Rev. by L. Okinshevich) 2: 305-15, Summer 1952.
- Ukrainka, Lesja. Sobranie sočinienij v trech tomach. Perevod s ukrainskogo. Edited by M. Ryl'skyj, N. Braun, and A. Dejč. Moscow, 1950. (Rev. by P. Odarčenko) 1:164-68, Fall 1951.
- Ukrainka, Lesya. Spirit of Flame: A Collection of the Works of Lesya Ukrainka. New York, 1950. (Rev. by P. Odarčenko) 1:62-64, Winter 1951.
- Vaillant, André. Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome I: Phonétique. Lyon—Paris, 1950. (Rev. by Yury Šerech) 1:157-63, Fall 1951.
- Vasmer, Max. Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bd. I-II, A-Po. Heidelberg, 1950-56. (Rev. by D. Čiževsky) 2:323-31, Summer 1952; 2:467-71, Winter 1952; 5:1202-18, 1956.
- Vossoyedinienie Ukrainy s Rossiyei, dokumenty i materialy v 3-kh tomakh. Moscow, 1954. (Rev. by A. Yakovliv) 4:1002-34.
- Wasowsky, Ivan. Outline History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Vol. I: The Baptism of Ukraine to the Union of Brestye (988-1596). New York—Bound Brook, 1956. (Rev. by I. Sweet) 6:1437-39, 1958.
- Yakemtchouk, Romain. La Ligne Curzon et la IIe guerre mondiale. Louvain—Paris, 1957. (Rev. by V. Markus) 9:303-6, 1961.
- Zirkle, Conway, ed. Death of a Science in Russia: The Fate of Genetics as Described in "Pravda" and Elsewhere. Philadelphia, 1949. (Rev. by M. Vetukhiv) 1:68-70, Winter 1951.
- Books, Ukrainian, in the Library of Congress**
- History of Ukrainian Holdings at the Library of Congress. J. B. Rudnyčkyj. 6:1406-10, 1958.
- BORSCHAK, ÉLIE**
- A Little Known French Biography of Yuras' Khmelnytsky. 3: 509-17, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Pylyp Orlyk's *Devolution of the Ukraine's Rights*. Presentation and Introduction. 6:1296-1306, 1958.
- Élie Borschak [Obituary]. J. Pelenski. 8:224-29, 1960.
- Borysthenes**
- Borysthenes-Borysthenites and Tanais-Tanaites. A. Kotsevalov. 7:1517-30, 1959.
- British-Ukrainian relations see Anglo-Ukrainian relations**
- Bukovina**
- Bukovina in the Diplomatic Negotiations of 1914. L. C. Sonevsky. 7:1586-1629, 1959.

Byzantium

An Important Contribution to the Social History of Late Byzantium. [Ostrogorski, Georgije *Pronija, Prilog istoriji feudalizma u Vizantiji i u južnoslovenskim zemljama*. Beograd, 1951]. (Rev. by I. Sevčenko) 2:448-59, Winter 1952.

Cathedral of St. Sophia, Kiev

Powstenko, Olexa. *The Cathedral of Sophia in Kiev. Katedra sv. Sofiji u Kyjevi*. [New York, 1954]. 3/4:[1]-[472], Summer-Fall 1954.

Cereals

Varieties of Cereals Bred in the Ukraine Before World War II. I. Bepalov. 6:1420-28, 1958.

CHAPLENKO, VASYL

Bray, R. G. A. de. *Guide to the Slavonic Languages*. London, 1952. 2:332-34, Summer 1952.

Chernigov Regiment see Chernihiv Regiment . . .**Chernihiv Regiment, Mutiny of**

The Decembrist Milieu in the Diary of Pelagja Rościszewska. V. Pors'kyj. 1:21-28, Winter 1951.

Chernozems

A New Soil Map of the Ukraine. G. Makhov. 1:43-56 [map], Winter 1951.

CHIKALENKO, LEVKO

The Origin of the Paleolithic Meander. 3:518-34[4], Spring-Summer 1953.

Ukrainian-Russian Negotiations in 1920: A Recollection. 7:1647-55, 1959.

Chmielnicki, B. see Khmel'nytsky, Bohdan

Choulguine, Alexander [Obituary]. V. Markus. 8:216-19, 1960.

Chronicles

Phraseology in the Galician-Volyanian Chronicle: A Study in Distributional Stylistics. D. S. Worth. 8:55-69, 1960.

A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography. D. Doroshenko. 5/6:13-304, 1957.

Ukrainian Chronicles of the 17th and 18th Centuries. D. Doroshenko. 1:79-97, Fall 1951.

Church (see also Religion)

The Renovationist Church in the Soviet Ukraine, 1922-1939. B. R. Bociurkiw. 9:41-74, 1961.

CHYKALENKO, LEVKO *see* CHIKALENKO, LEVKO

CHYZ, YAROSLAV J.

In Memory of Arnold Margolin. 7:1688-89, 1959.

Yaroslav J. Chyz [Obituary]. 7:1698-99, 1959.

CHYZHEVSKY, DMYTRO *see* ČIŽEVSKY, DMITRY

CIUCIURA, THEODORE B.

Lenin's Idea of a Multinational Commonwealth. 10, No. 1:3-64, 1962-1963.

Ciuciura, Theodore B. *see also* 7:1711, 1959; 10, No. 1:164, 1962-1963.

ČIŽEVSKY, DMITRY

Gogol: Artist and Thinker. 2:261-78, Summer 1952.

The Influence of the Philosophy of Schelling (1775-1854) in the Ukraine. 5:1128-39, 1956.

Ivan Vyšenskyj. 1:113-26, Fall 1951.

Preface [to] *Socinianism in Poland and South-West Rus'*, by Orest Levytsky. 3:485-88, Spring-Summer 1953.

Catalogue des Imprimés Slavons des XVIe, XVIIe, et XVIIIe siècles, conservés à la Biblio-

- thèque de l'Université Royale d'Uppsala*, par Lennart Kjellberg. Uppsala, 1951. 3:590, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Chrestomatija davn'oï ukrainskoï literatury — Doba feodalizmu*. Edited by . . . O. I. Bilečyj. Kiev, 1949. 1:57-62, Winter 1951.
- An Etymological Dictionary of the Czech Language*, [by] Josef Holub and František Kopečný. Prague, 1952. 2:465-67, Winter 1952.
- Istoriya ukrayins'koi literatury*. Vol. I: *Dozhovtneva literatura*. Kiev, 1954. 4:1035-40, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Malanyuk, E.: *Narysy z istoriyi našoyi kul'tury*. New York, 1954. 5:1226-28, 1956.
- A New Russian Etymological Dictionary. [Vasmer, Max. *Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* . . . Heidelberg, 1950-51. I-V]. 2:323-31, Summer 1952.
- PMLA, Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 1953*, April (LXVIII, No. 2). 3:588-89, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Remarks on *Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 5:1202-18, 1956.
- Ringheim, Allan: "Eine Altserbische Trojasage". Prague — Uppsala, 1951. (*Publications de l'Institut Slav d'Uppsala, IV*). 3:591, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Vasmer, Max: *Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Words ZYK to KAŠUBY. Heidelberg, 1952. 2:467-71, Winter 1952.
- Čiževsky, Dmitry *see also* 3:696 and 730, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Collective farms, Collectivization** *see Agriculture*
- Colonialism, Russian** *see Nationality policy, Soviet*
- Common Law** *see Law*
- Communist Party of the Ukraine**
The Ukrainian Apparatus as a Key to the Study of Soviet Politics. J. A. Armstrong. 9:225-33, 1961.
- Conflict of laws** *see Law*
- Congresses of Slavic Youth** *see Slavic Youth Congresses*
- Cossack chronicles** *see Chronicles*
- Cucurbita** *see Agriculture*
- CYMBALISTY, BOHDAN Y. *see* BOHDAN, C. Y.
D., L.
Andriy Derevyanko [Obituary]. 10, No. 1:145-46, 1962-1963.
Dmytro Halychyn [Obituary]. 9:337, 1961.
Oleksander Morhun [Obituary]. 9:338, 1961.
Philip Friedman [Obituary]. 8:229, 1960.
- Dankevych, Kateryna** 3/4: [468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- DANKO, JOSEPH
Index to Volumes I-X [of *The Annals*]. 10, No. 2: 3-39, 1962-1963.
West European and American Doctoral Dissertations on the Ukraine (1945-60). 9:313-33, 1961.
- Decembrists**
The Decembrist Milieu in the Diary of Pelagja Rościszewska. V. Porškyj. 1:21-28, Winter 1951.

- Excerpts from the Diary of Pelagja Rościszewska. 1:29-35, Winter 1951.
- New Soviet Literature on the Decembrists in the Ukraine. V. Pors'ky. 3:584-87, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Deduction des droits de l'Ukraine**
Pylyp Orlyk's *Devolution of the Ukraine's Rights*. Presentation and Introduction by Ę. Borshak. 6:1296-1312, 1958.
- Derevyanko, Andriy** [Obituary]. L. D. 10, No. 1:145-46, 1962-1963.
- DIAKOWSKY, M. J.**
A Note on the History of the Bandura. 6:1419, 1958.
- Dissertations, Doctoral**
West European and American Doctoral Dissertations on the Ukraine (1945-60). J. Danko. 9:313-33, 1961.
- Dobrovolsky, G.** 3/4:[468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- Dobzhansky, Theodosius** 8:5, 1960.
- DOMBROWSKY (DOMBROVSKY), ALEXANDER**
Andriy Kotsevalov [Obituary]. 8:219-23, 1960.
A Few Examples of Analogy in the Ancient Ukrainian and Judaic Cultures. 7:1531-41, 1959.
The Genesis of the Geographical Notion of Scythia in the Ancient World. 5:1178-87, 1956.
Herodotus and Hippocrates on the Anthropology of the Scythians. 10, No. 1:85-91, 1962-1963.
Kotsevalov, A. *Antichnaya istoriya i kul'tura Severnogo Pritchernomor'ya v sovetskom nauchnom issledovanii*. Munich, 1955. 6:1436-37, 1958.
- DOROSHENKO (DOROŠENKO), DMYTRO**
Drahomanov and Ukrainian Historiography. 2:23-46, Spring 1952.
Ohlyad ukrayins'koyi istoriohrafiyi see his Survey of Ukrainian Historiography
A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography (Translated by George Luckyj). 5/6:13-304, 1957.
Ukrainian Chronicles of the 17th and 18th Centuries. 1:79-97, Fall 1951.
Dmytro Dorošenko [Obituary]. 1:182-83, Fall 1951.
Doroshenko, Dmytro see also 3/4: [468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- DOROSHENKO, VOLODYMYR**
The Life of Mykhaylo Drahomanov. 2:6-22, Spring 1952.
Volodymyr Doroshenko [Obituary]. W. Mijakowskyj. 10, No. 1:126-30, 1962-1963.
- Dovzhenko, Hryhoriy** [Obituary]. 7:1699-1700, 1959.
- DRAGOMANOV M.** see **DRAHOMANOV, MYKHAYLO**
- DRAHOMANOV, MYKHAYLO**
The Centralization of the Revolutionary Struggle in Russia. 2: 181-92, Spring 1952.
Free Union: Draft of a Ukrainian Political and Social Program. 2:193-205, Spring 1952.
A Geographic and Historical Survey of Eastern Europe. 2:141-52, Spring 1952.
Germany's Drive to the East and Moscow's Drive to the West. 2:161-74, Spring 1952.
The Lost Epoch: Ukrainians Under the Muscovite Tsardom, 1654-1876. 2:153-60, Spring 1952.

- Panslav Federalism. 2:175-80, Spring 1952.
- Political and Social Ideas in Ukrainian Folk Songs. 2:209-13, Spring 1952.
- The Program of the Review *Hromada*. 2:206-8, Spring 1952.
- Taming of the Shrew in the Folklore of the Ukraine. 2:214-18, Spring 1952.
- A Bibliography of Drahomanov's Major Works. S. Drahomanov and I. Rudnytsky. 2:131-40, Spring 1952.
- Drahomanov and the English-Speaking World. S. Drahomanov. 2:63-69, Spring 1952.
- Drahomanov and the European Conscience. P. E. Mosely. 2:1-5, Spring 1952.
- Drahomanov and Ukrainian Historiography. D. Doroshenko. 2:23-46, Spring 1952.
- Drahomanov as a Political Theorist. I. L. Rudnytsky. 2:70-130, Spring 1952.
- Drahomanov as Folklorist. P. Odarchenko. 2:36-46, Spring 1952.
- Drahomanov's Impact on Ukrainian Politics. M. Stakhiv. 2:47-62, Spring 1952.
- The Life of Mykhaylo Drahomanov. V. Doroshenko. 2:6-22, Spring 1952.
- Mykhaylo Drahomanov: A Symposium and Selected Writings*. Ed. by I. L. Rudnytsky. 2:1-225, Spring 1952.
- Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Ivan Franko, and the Relations Between the Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia in the Last Quarter of the 19th Century. Y. Bilinsky. 7:1542-66, 1959.
- DRAHOMANOV, SVITOZOR**
Drahomanov and the English-Speaking World. 2:63-69, Spring 1952.
Svitozor Drahomanov [Obituary]. 7:1697-98, 1959.
Drahomanov, Svitozor *see also* 7:1542, 1959.
- and IVAN L. RUDNYTSKY
A Bibliography of Drahomanov's Major Works. 2:131-40, Spring 1952.
- Drang nach Osten**
Germany's Drive to the East and Moscow's Drive to the West. M. Drahomanov. 2:161-74, Spring 1952.
- DRASHEVSKA, LUBOV** *see* D., L. *See also* 3/4: [468], Summer-Fall 1954; 5/6:456, 1957; 7:1711, 1959; 8:5, 1960; 10, No. 1: 164, 1962-1963.
- DU FEU, VERONICA M.**
Ukrainianisms in Seventeenth-Century Russian. 8:87-94, 1960.
- Dubynetz, Ivan** [Obituary]. 3:738-39, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Economics**
M. I. Tuhan-Baranovsky and Western European Economic Thought (Speech on the 5th Anniversary of His Death). V. P. Timoshenko. 3:803-23, Spring 1954.
Periodic Industrial Crises. A History of British Crises. M. I. Tuhan-Baranovsky. 3:745-802, Spring 1954.
- EFREMOV, MYKOLA (NICHOLAS)**
An Innovation in the Understanding of Mendeleev's Periodic Law. 2:401-34[6], Winter 1952.
Mykola Efremov [Obituary]. A.

- Archimovich. 10, No. 1:136-38, 1962-1963.
- EFREMOV, SERHIY *see* JEFREMOV, SERHIJ
- Elections, Soviet Union**
Representation of Nationalities and Occupations in the Soviets. P. H. Juviler. 9:201-24, 1961.
- Emerson, Rupert 9:147, 1961.
- Epigraphy**
Borysthenes-Borysthenites and Tanais-Tanaites. A. Kotsevalov. 7:1517-30, 1959.
- Ethnic minorities *see* Minorities**
- Ethnography**
A Few Examples of Analogy in the Ancient Ukrainian and Judaic Cultures. A. Dombrovsky. 7:1531-41, 1959.
A Survey of Publications on Ukrainian Ethnography and Folklore in the Years 1957-1962. P. Odarchenko. 10, No. 1:92-110, 1962-1963.
- Etymology *see* Language**
- Europe, Eastern**
A Geographic and Historical Survey of Eastern Europe. M. Drahomanov. 2:141-52, Spring 1952.
History of Civilization of Eastern Europe in the Work of Arnold Toynbee. L. Okinshevich. 2:305-15, Summer 1952.
- Family names *see* Language**
- FEDENKO, PANAS
My Meetings with Arnold Margolin. 7:1680-87, 1959.
- Federalism**
Federalism and the Russian Empire. B. Krupnytsky. 2:239-60, Summer 1952.
Lenin's Idea of a Multinational Commonwealth. T. B. Ciuciura. 10, No. 1:3-64, 1962-1963.
Panslav Federalism. M. Drahomanov. 2:175-80, Spring 1952.
Stalin's Conception of Soviet Federalism (1918-1923). R. H. McNeal. 9:12-25, 1961.
- FIZER, JOHN (IVAN)
Harkins, William. *Anthology of Czech Literature*. New York, 1953. 4:1040-41, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Folklore, Jewish**
A Few Examples of Analogy in the Ancient Ukrainian and Judaic Cultures. A. Dombrovsky. 7:1531-41, 1959.
- Folklore, Ukrainian**
A Few Examples of Analogy in the Ancient Ukrainian and Judaic Cultures. A. Dombrovsky. 7:1531-41, 1959.
A Survey of Publications on Ukrainian Ethnography and Folklore in the Years 1957-1962. P. Odarchenko. 10, No. 1:92-110, 1962-1963.
Taming of the Shrew in the Folklore of the Ukraine. M. Drahomanov. 2:214-18, Spring 1952.
- Folk songs, Ukrainian**
Political and Social Ideas in Ukrainian Folk Songs. M. Drahomanov. 2:209-13, Spring 1952.
- Foreign relations, Ukraine *see* Ukraine — Foreign relations**
- Forestry**
Ukrainian Forestry. B. Ivanytsky [Ed. by P. Nikishyn]. 3:553-70, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Franko, Ivan**
The Figure of Mickiewicz in Ivan Franko's Life. A. Berstein. 6:1372-80, 1958.
Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Ivan Franko, and the Relations Between the Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia in the Last Quarter of

the 19th Century. Y. Bilinsky.
7:1542-66, 1959.

Stress in Ivan Franko's Poetry.
M. Ovcharenko. 8:121-40,
1960.

Freedom, Academic

Academic Freedom in the U.S.S.R.
A Review of the Conference
Held in New York on April
3-4, 1954. 3:853-62, Spring
1954.

FRIEDMAN, PHILIP

The First Millenium of Jewish
Settlement in the Ukraine and
in Adjacent Areas. 7:1483-
1516, 1959.

Philip Friedman [Obituary]. L.
D. 8:229, 1960.

Fruits *see* Agriculture

Galicia

Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Ivan
Franko, and the Relations Be-
tween the Dnieper Ukraine and
Galicia in the Last Quarter of
the 19th Century. Y. Bilinsky.
7:1542-66, 1959.

Galician-Volynian Chronicle

Phraseology in the Galician-Voly-
nian Chronicle: A Study in Dis-
tributional Stylistics. D. S.
Worth. 8:55-69, 1960.

German-Russian relations *see* Rus- sian-German relations

Germany (*see also* *Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands*)

Germany's Drive to the East and
Moscow's Drive to the West.
M. Drahomanov. 2:161-74,
Spring 1952.

Gogol, N. V.

Gogol: Artist and Thinker. D.
Čiževsky. 2:261-78, Summer
1952.

GOLDELMAN, SALOMON

Patterns in the Life of an Ethnic
Minority. 7:1567-85, 1959.

Golden Horde

Timur's Campaign of 1395 in the
Ukraine and North Caucasus.
Z. V. Togan. 6:1358-71, 1958.

GOLDENWEISER, ALEXIS

[On Arnold D. Margolin. Eulogy].
7:1690-93, 1959.

GOLDMAN, ILYA J.

Nation and State in the Modern
World. 7:1630-46, 1959.

Grammar *see* Language

Great Britain — Relations with U- kraine *see* Anglo-Ukrainian rela- tions

Grelick, Eda 5/6:456, 1957; 7:
1711, 1959.

GRUSHEVSKII, M. *see* HRUSHEVSKY,
MYKHAYLO

GVOZDETSKY, VASYL

Shabad, Theodore. *Geography of
the U.S.S.R.: A Regional Sur-
vey*. New York, 1951. 1:
169-71, Fall 1951.

HALAJCZUK, BOHDAN T.

The Soviet Ukraine as a Subject
of International Law. 9:167-
88, 1961.

Halychyn, Dmytro [Obituary]. L. D.
9:337, 1961.

HANSEN, LUBOW (MARGOLENA) *see*
MARGOLENA, LUBOW

Herodotus

Herodotus and Hippocrates on the
Anthropology of the Scythians.
A. Dombrowsky. 10. No. 1:
85-91, 1962-1963.

Hippocrates

Herodotus and Hippocrates on
the Anthropology of the Scyth-
ians. A. Dombrowsky. 10, No.
1:85-91, 1962-1963.

History (History of individual coun-
tries entered under the name of
the country)

The Decline of the Empire of the

- Oghuz Yabghu. O. Pritsak. 2: 279-92, Summer 1952.
- Herodotus and Hippocrates on the Anthropology of the Scythians. A. Dombrowsky. 10, No. 1: 85-91, 1962-1963.
- History of Civilization of Eastern Europe in the Work of Arnold Toynbee. L. Okinshevich. 2: 305-15, Summer 1952.
- Hlobenko, Mykola** *see* **Ohloblyn (Hlobenko), Mykola**
- HNIZDOVSKY, YAKIV**
Ukrainian Arts, compiled by Olya Dmytriw, edited by Anne Mitz. New York, 1952. 2:476-77, Winter 1952.
- Hohol, Mykola** *see* **Gogol, N. V.**
- HOLLING, FRED** *see* **POTEBNJA, ALEXANDER.** Present and Past Active...
- HOLOVKO, NEONILA (KORDYSH)** *see* **KORDYSH, NEONILA**
- HOLUBNYCHY, VSEVOLOD**
 On the Rationale of the Soviet Collectivization of Agriculture in 1929. 9:75-109, 1961.
- Sullivant, Robert S. *Soviet Politics and the Ukraine, 1917-1957.* New York, 1962. 10, No. 1: 112-16, 1962-1963.
- HORBATSCH, OLEKA**
 Ivan Maksymovyč, ein verkanner ukrainischer Lexikograph des 18. Jahrhunderts und sein Wörterbuch. 8:95-114, 1960.
- HORNIATKEVYCH, DAMIAN**
 Volodymyr Sichynsky [Obituary]. 10, No. 1:131-34, 1962-1963.
- Dorošenko, Volodymyr. *Ohnyšče ukraïnskoï nauky: Naukove Tovarystvo im. T. Ševčenko.* New York, 1951. 1:179-81, Fall 1951.
- Horniatkevych, Damian *see also* 3/4: [468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- Horodetsky, Volodymyr (Serhiy)** [Obituary]. 5:1238-39, 1956.
- Horoshak, Ksenia** 9:201, 1961.
- Hromada**
 The Program of the Review *Hromada.* M. Drahomanov. 2: 206-8, Spring 1952.
- HRUSHEVSKY, MYKHAYLO**
 The Traditional Scheme of "Russian" History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of the Eastern Slavs. 2:355-64, Winter 1952.
- Hrushevsky, Mykhaylo *see also* Doroshenko, D. A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography...
- HRYCAK, PAVLO (PAUL)**
 Kazemzadeh, Firuz. *The Struggle for Transcaucasia: 1917-1921.* New York, 1952. 2:337-40, Summer 1952.
- Pavlo Hrycak [Obituary]. 6: 1447-48, 1958.
- Hrycak, Pavlo *see also* 5/6:456, 1957.
- Hryhoriev, Nykyfor** [Obituary]. 3: 738, Fall-Winter 1953.
- HÜTTL-WORTH, GERTA**
 On the Western Loan-Words in P. Berynda's *Leksikon.* 8:70-80, 1960.
- HURSKY, JACOB P.**
 The Origin of Patronymic Surnames in Ukrainian. 8:169-90, 1960.
- Hutsuls**
 Le nom de famille houtzoule. A. de Vincenz. 8:191-205, 1960.
- HVOZDETSKY, VASYL** *see* **GVOZDETSKY, VASYL**
- Igor (Ihor) Tale**
 The Igor Tale Exhibition at Harvard. 2:341-42, Summer 1952.

Industry

The Agrarian-Industrial Dichotomy in the Ukraine as a Factor in Soviet Nationality Policy. R. S. Sullivant. 9:110-25, 1961.

Periodic Industrial Crises. A History of British Crises. M. I. Tuhan-Baranovsky. 3:745-802, Spring 1954.

Inscriptions *see* **Epigraphy****Insects**

The Role of Insects in the Process of Pollination of the Flowers of Sugar Beet. A. Archimowitsch. 4:995-1001, Winter-Spring 1955.

Intellectual history

The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine. I. L. Rudnytsky. 6:1381-1405, 1958.

Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Ivan Franko, and the Relations Between the Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia in the Last Quarter of the 19th Century. Y. Bilinsky. 7:1542-66, 1959.

Intellectual life *see* **Intellectual history****Intelligentsia** *see* **Intellectual history****International law** *see* **Law****International relations** *see* **Ukraine** — **Foreign relations**

Istoriya Rusov (*see also* DOROSHENKO, D. A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography . . .)

The Ethical and Political Principles of "Istoriya Rusov". O. Ohloblyn. 2:388-400, Winter 1952.

Istoriya Rusov and Its Author. A. Yakovliv. 3:620-69, Fall-Winter 1953.

Where Was *Istoriya Rusov* Written? O. Ohloblyn. 3:670-95, Fall-Winter 1953.

IVANYTSKY, BORYS

Ukrainian Forestry [Edited by P. Nikishyn]. 3:553-70, Spring-Summer 1953.

Borys Ivanytsky [Obituary]. 3:594-95, Spring-Summer 1953.

JACOBSSON, GUNNAR

Some Remarks on the Origin of the Gerund in Ukrainian. 8:45-54, 1960.

Jakobson, R. 3:730, Fall-Winter 1953.

JEFREMOV, SERHIJ

Dorohoju syntezu — Ohljad istoriohrafii ukraïnskoho pyśmenstva, *see* his *Historiography of Ukrainian Literature*.

Historiography of Ukrainian Literature [Translated and supplemented by George Luckyj]. 1:4-20, Winter 1951.

Jewish-Ukrainian relations *see* **Ukrainian-Jewish relations****Jews in the Ukraine**

Andreas Count Sheptytsky, Archbishop of Lviv, Metropolitan of Halych, and the Jewish Community in Galicia during the Second World War. K. I. Lewin. 7:1656-67, 1959.

A Study of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations. J. L. Lichten. 5:1160-77, 1956.

JUVILER, PETER H.

Representation of Nationalities and Occupations in the Soviets. 9:201-24, 1961.

Kabachkiv, Ivan [Obituary]. I. Zamsha. 10, No. 1:134-36, 1962-1963.

- Karpovich, Michael** 7:1542, 1959.
- KEDROWSKY (KEDROVSKY), VOLODYMYR**
[On Arnold D. Margolin. Eulogy]. 7:1693-94, 1959.
- Kekalo, Mykyta** [Obituary]. 1: 183-84, Fall 1951.
- Kharkiv University**
A Hundred and Fifty Years of Kharkiv University. M. Vetukhiv. 5:1140-59, 1956.
- Kharkov University** *see* **Kharkiv University**
- Khmel'nytsky, Bohdan**
Bohdan Khmelnyts'ky's Treaty with the Tsar of Muscovy in 1654. A. Yakovliv. 4:904-16, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Khmel'nytsky, Yuras'**
A Little Known French Biography of Yuras' Khmelnytsky. Ė. Borschak. 3:509-17, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Kiev. Cathedral of St. Sophia** *see* **Cathedral of St. Sophia, Kiev**
- Kievskaya Starina** *see* **DOROSHENKO, D.** A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography . . .
- KOCEVALOV, ANDRIJ** *see* **KOTSEVALOV, ANDRIY**
- Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands**
Lenin und die "verpasste Revolution" in Deutschland. G. von Rauch. 9:26-40, 1961.
- Köprülü, Mı Fuad** 2:279, Summer 1952.
- KORDYSH, NEONILA**
Notes on Weaving in the Trypillian Culture of the Ukraine. 1:98-112, Fall 1951.
Settlement Plans of the Trypillian Culture. 3:535-52[4], Spring-Summer 1953.
Pasternak, Yaroslav. *Arkheolohiya Ukrayiny*. Toronto, 1961. 10, No. 1:111-12, 1962-1963.
- KORDYSH-HOLOVKO, NEONILA** *see* **KORDYSH, NEONILA**
- KOSCHMIEDER, ERWIN**
Das Praesens historicum und das Praesens scenicum im Ukrainischen und Serbokroatischen. 8:152-68, 1960.
- KOSTIUK, HRYHORY**
Ivan Bahryanyi [Obituary]. 10, No. 1:139-41, 1962-1963.
- KOTSEVALOV, ANDRIY**
Borysthenes-Borysthenites and Tanais-Tanaites. 7:1517-30, 1959.
Lucyk, G. H. *Contributions to Methods in Onomastics, Chorology and Toponyms and Their Origin*. Winnipeg, 1953. 5:1219-21, 1956.
Andriy Kotsevalov [Obituary]. A. Dombrovsky. 8:219-23, 1960.
- KOVALIV, PANTELEIMON**
Problems of the Ukrainian Literary Language [Review article on Metropolitan Ilarion's *Ukrain's'ka literaturna mova*. Saskatoon, Canada, 1951]. 3: 571-83, Spring-Summer 1953.
Pljušč, P. P. *Narysy z istoriji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*. Kiev, 1958. 8:207-9, 1960.
- Kozlovs'ka, Valeriya** [Obituary]. 5: 1237-38, 1956.
- KRASCHENINNIKOW, SERHIJ**
The Variability of *Chilodonella Cyprini* Moroff. 2:293-304 [4], Summer 1952.
- Krasytsky, Yuriy (Georgiy)** 3/4: [468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- KRAWCIW, BOHDAN**
Biletsky, O. I. *Vid davnyiny do suchasnosti*. Kiev, 1960. 9: 306-12, 1961.
- KRUPNYTSKY, BORYS**
Federalism and the Russian Empire. 2:239-60, Summer 1952.

- General Characteristics of Pylyp Orlyk. 6:1247-59, 1958.
- Borys Dmytrovych Krupnytsky [Obituary]. O. Ohloblyn. 6: 1443-46, 1958.
- Krychevsky, Vasył** [Obituary]. 2: 478, Winter 1952.
- Kurinyj, Petro** 3/4: [468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- Kuzela, Zenon** [Obituary]. 2:344, Summer 1952.
- Kuziv, Vasył, Rev.** [Obituary]. 7: 1696-97, 1959.
- L. D. *see* D., L.
- Language** *see* specific languages below
- Language, Belorussian**
Infinitives of the Type CS **terti* / **tirti* in Slavic. V. Swoboda. 8:34-44, 1960.
- Language, Common Slavic** *see* **Language, Slavic**
- Language, Greek**
Borysthenes-Borysthenites and Tanais-Tanaites. A. Kotsevalov. 7: 1517-30, 1959.
- Language, Hebrew**
Phonetic Variants of Hebrew Loan-Words in Ukrainian. M. Altbauer. 8:115-20, 1960.
- Language, Polish**
On Slavic Linguistic Interrelations. Ukrainian Influence on the Polish Language in the 16th and 17th Centuries. [...] J. Šerech. 3:696-730, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Language, Russian**
A New Russian Etymological Dictionary [Vasmer, Max. *Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bd. 1-2, A-Po. Heidelberg, 1950-56]. D. Číževsky. 2:323-31, Summer 1952; 2:467-71, Winter 1952; 5: 1202-18, 1956.
- Present and Past Active Participles (-ь, -вь) as Secondary Predicates. A. Potebnja (Tr. by F. Holling). 5:1055-78, 1956.
- Ukrainian Borrowings in Seventeen-Century Northern Russian. B. O. Unbegaun. 8:81-86, 1960.
- Ukrainianisms in Seventeenth-Century Russian. V. M. Du Feu. 8:87-94, 1960.
- Language, Serbo-Croatian**
Das Praesens historicum und das Praesens scenicum im Ukrainischen und Serbokroatischen. E. Koschmieder. 8:152-68, 1960.
- Language, Slavic**
Deux notules. A. Vaillant. 8: 32-33, 1960.
- Infinitives of the Type CS **terti* / **tirti* in Slavic. V. Swoboda. 8:34-44, 1960.
- A New Comparative Grammar of Slavic Languages [Vaillant, André. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Tome I: Phonétique. Lyon — Paris, 1950]. (Rev. by J. Šerech) 1:157-63, Fall 1951.
- Present and Past Active Participles (-ь, -вь) as Secondary Predicates. A. Potebnja (Tr. by F. Holling). 5:1055-78, 1956.
- Language, Ukrainian**
Alexander Potebnja as a Linguist. G. Y. Shevelov. 5:1112-27, 1956.
- An Important Work in Ukrainian Onomastics [J. B. Rudnyčkyj. *The Term and Name "Ukraine"*. Winnipeg, 1951]. Yury Šerech. 2:435-43, Winter 1952.
- Infinitives of the Type CS **terti* / **tirti* in Slavic. V. Swoboda. 8:34-44, 1960.
- Ivan Maksymovyč, ein verkannter ukrainischer Lexikograph

- des 18. Jahrhunderts und sein Wörterbuch. O. Horbatsch. 8: 95-114, 1960.
- Le nom de famille houtzoule. A. de Vincenz. 8:191-205, 1960.
- On Slavic Linguistic Interrelations. Ukrainian Influence on the Polish Language in the 16th and 17th Centuries. [. . .] Y. Šerech. 3:696-730, Fall-Winter 1953.
- On the Western Loan-Words in P. Berynda's *Leksikon*. G. Hüttl-Worth. 8:70-80, 1960.
- The Origin of Patronymic Surnames in Ukrainian. J. P. Hur-sky. 8:169-90, 1960.
- Phonetic Variants of Hebrew Loan-Words in Ukrainian. M. Altbauer. 8:115-20, 1960.
- Phraseology in the Galician-Voly-nian Chronicle: A Study in Distributional Stylistics. D. S. Worth. 8:55-69, 1960.
- Das Praesens historicum und das Praesens scenicum im Ukrainischen und Serbokroatischen. E. Koschmieder. 8:152-68, 1960.
- Present and Past Active Participles (-ъ, -въ) as Secondary Predicates. A. Potebnja (Tr. by F. Holling). 5:1055-78, 1956.
- Some Remarks on the Origin of the Gerund in Ukrainian. G. Jacobsson. 8:45-54, 1960.
- Stress Alternations in the Ukrainian Substantive Declension: Types and Role. E. Stankiewicz. 8:141-51, 1960.
- Stress in Ivan Franko's Poetry. M. Ovcharenko. 8:121-40, 1960.
- Towards an Understanding of Potebnja (Critical and Bibliographical Observations). O. Vetukhiv. 5:1079-1111, 1956.
- The Treatment of the Common Slavic *ě in Ukrainian. M. Samilov. 8:15-31, 1960.
- Ukrainian Borrowings in Seventeen-Century Northern Russian. B. O. Unbegaun. 8:81-86, 1960.
- Ukrainianisms in Seventeenth-Century Russian. V. M. Du Feu. 8:87-94, 1960.
- Law (see also State, Theory of)**
- Allgemeine Probleme des internationalen Privatrechts der Sowjetunion. A. Bilinsky. 9: 262-85, 1961.
- The Constitution of Pylyp Orlyk. M. Vasylenko. 6:1260-95, 1958.
- The Soviet Ukraine as a Subject of International Law. B. T. Halajczuk. 9:167-88, 1961.
- Ukrainian Common-Law Procedure. A. Yakovliv. 2:365-87, Winter 1952.
- LAWRYNENKO, JURIJ**
- Todos' Os'machka [Obituary]. 10, No. 1:141-43, 1962-1963.
- Lenin, Vladimir Il'ich**
- Lenin on the Ukraine. J. S. Reshetar. 9:3-11, 1961.
- Lenin und die "verpasste Revolution" in Deutschland. G. von Rauch. 9:26-40, 1961.
- Lenin's Idea of a Multinational Commonwealth. T. B. Ciuciura. 10, No. 1:3-64, 1962-1963.
- LEVYTSKY, OREST**
- Socinianism in Poland and South-West Rus'. Preface by D. Čiževsky. 3:485-508, Spring-Summer 1953.
- LEWIN, KURT I.**
- Andreas Count Sheptytsky, Archbishop of Lviv, Metropolitan of Halych, and the Jewish Community in Galicia during the

- Second World War. 7:1656-67, 1959.
- Lewis, Robert 9:201, 1961.
- LEWYTYZKYJ, BORYS
Die Sowjetukraine und die europäischen volksdemokratischen Länder (1958-1960). 9:189-200, 1961.
- LICHTEN, JOSEPH L.
A Study of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations. 5:1160-77, 1956.
- Linguistics *see* Language
- LIPÍŃSKI, W. *see* LYPYNSKY, VYACHESLAV
- Literature, Comparative
The Figure of Mickiewicz in Ivan Franko's Life. A. Berlstein. 6:1372-80, 1958.
- Literature, Greek
A New Fragment of Sappho? I. Ševčenko. 1:150-52, Fall 1951.
- Literature, Ukrainian
Historiography of Ukrainian Literature. S. Jefremov. 1:4-20, Winter 1951.
Ivan Vyšenskyj. D. Čiževskyj. 1:113-26, Fall 1951.
Shevchenko's Mind and Thought. S. Smal Stockyj. 2:227-38, Summer 1952.
Soviet Interpretation of a Ukrainian Classic [Ukrainka, Lesja. *Sobranije sočinenij v trech tomach*. *Perevod s ukrainskogo*. Moscow, 1950]. (Rev. by P. Odarchenko) 1:164-68, Fall 1951.
The Struggle for Shevchenko: Shevchenko in Soviet Interpretation. P. Odarchenko. 3:824-37, Spring 1954.
- Loan-words *see* Language
- Lorchenko, Vasyl [Obituary]. 2:479, Winter 1952.
- Lord, Robert Howard
The Ukrainian Question in R. H. Lord's Writings on the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. L. C. Sonevtsky. 10, No. 1:65-84, 1962-1963.
- LOW, ALFRED D.
Patriotism, "Bourgeois Nationalism," and the Nationality Policy of the USSR after Stalin. 9:126-46, 1961.
- LUCKYJ, GEORGE
Jefremov, Serhij: *Historiography of Ukrainian Literature* [Translated and supplemented by George Luckyj]. 1:4-20, Winter 1951.
Luckyj, George *see also* Doroshenko, Dmytro. *A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography...*
- LUTHER, MICHAEL
A Study of Bolshevik Power. Gurian, Waldemar. *Bolshevism: An Introduction to Soviet Communism*. Notre Dame, Ind., 1952. 2:444-47, Winter 1952.
Florinsky, Michael T. *Russia: A History and an Interpretation*. 2 vols. New York, 1953. 3:733-35, Fall-Winter 1953.
- LYPYNSKY, VYACHESLAV
The Ukraine at the Turning Point. 3:605-19, Fall-Winter 1953.
- LYSIAK-RUDNYTSKY, IVAN *see* RUDNYTSKY, IVAN L.
- MCNEAL, ROBERT H.
Stalin's Conception of Soviet Federalism (1918-1923). 9:12-25, 1961.
- Makarenko, Mykola 3/4: [468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- MAKHIV (MAKHOV), GREGORY
A New Soil Map of the Ukraine. 1:43-56 [map], Winter 1951.
Jasny, Naum. *The Socialized Agriculture of the U.S.S.R.* Stanford, Calif., 1949. 1:65-68, Winter 1951.

- Gregory Makhiv [Obituary]. 2: 478-79, Winter 1952.
- Maksymovych, Ivan**
Ivan Maksymovyč, ein verkannter ukrainischer Lexikograph des 18. Jahrhunderts und sein Wörterbuch. O. Horbatsch. 8:95-114, 1960.
- MARGOLENA, LUBOV**
A Note on My Father. 7:1677-79, 1959.
- MARGOLIN, ARNOLD**
Excerpts from the Book *Ukraina i politika Antanty: Zapiski evreya i grazhdanina* [Edited by Leonid C. Sonevtsky]. 7: 1461-82, 1959.
Arnold Davydovych Margolin, 1877-1956. M. Vetukhiv. 7: 1671-76, 1959.
In Memory of Arnold Margolin. Y. Chyz. 7:1688-89, 1959.
My Meetings with Arnold Margolin. P. Fedenko. 7:1680-87, 1959.
A Note on My Father. L. Margolena. 7:1677-79, 1959.
[On Arnold D. Margolin, Eulogy]. A. Goldenweiser. 7:1690-93, 1959.
[On Arnold D. Margolin, Eulogy]. V. Kedrovsky. 7:1693-94, 1959.
Margolin, Arnold *see also* 7:1647, 1959.
- MARKUS, VASYL**
Alexander Choulguine [Obituary]. 8:216-19, 1960.
Akademiya Nauk Ukrayins'koyi RSR. Sektor Derzhavy i Prava. *Istoriya derzhavy i prava Ukrayins'koyi RSR, 1917-1960*. Kiev, 1961. 10, No. 1: 116-22, 1962-1963.
Yakemtchouk, Romain. *La Ligne Curzon et la IIe guerre mon-*
diale. Louvain — Paris, 1957. 9:303-6, 1961.
- Mathewson, Ruth** 5/6:456, 1957; 7:1711, 1959.
- Mazepa, Isaak** [Obituary]. 2:343-44, Summer 1952.
- Meander ornaments**
The Origin of the Paleolithic Meander. L. Chikalenko. 3: 518-34[4], Spring-Summer 1953.
- Mendeleyev's Periodic Law**
An Innovation in the Understanding of Mendeleyev's Periodic Law. N. Efremov. 2:401-34 [6], Winter 1952.
- Mezine (Mezin)** *see* Mizyn'
- Mickiewicz, Adam**
The Figure of Mickiewicz in Ivan Franko's Life. A. Berlstein. 6:1372-80, 1958.
- MIJAKOWSKYJ, WOŁODYMYR** (*see also* PORŠKYJ [PORS'KY], VOŁODYMYR)
Volodymyr Doroshenko [Obituary]. 10, No. 1:126-30, 1962-1963.
Mijakowskyj, Wolodymyr *see also* 10, No. 1:164, 1962-1963.
- MILLER, MICHAEL**
A Stone Statuette from Ratzenburg. 1:36-42, Winter 1951.
- Minorities** (*see also* Nationality policy, Soviet)
Patterns in the Life of an Ethnic Minority. S. Goldelman. 7: 1567-85, 1959.
- Mintz, June** 10, No. 1:164, 1962-1963.
- Mirtschuk, Ivan** [Obituary]. J. Bojko. 9:334-37, 1961.
- Mizyn' (Mezine)**
The Origin of the Paleolithic Meander. L. Chikalenko. 3: 518-34[4], Spring-Summer 1953.

- Morhilevsky, Ipolit** 3/4:[468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- MORHUN, N.** *see* POLONS'KA-VASYLENKO, NATALYA D.
- Morhun, Oleksander** [Obituary]. L. D. 9:338, 1961.
- MOSELY, PHILIP E.**
Drahomanov and the European Conscience. 2:1-5, Spring 1952.
Michael Vetukhiv, Founding President of the Academy. 8: 5-14, 1960.
- Musical instruments**
A Note on the History of the Bandura. M. J. Diakowsky. 6:1419, 1958.
- Myshuha, Luke** [Obituary]. 4: 1045, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Names** *see* Language
- Narodnaya Volya**
The Centralization of the Revolutionary Struggle in Russia. M. Drahomanov. 2:181-92, Spring 1952.
- National minorities** *see* Minorities
- National question** *see* Nationality policy...
- Nationalism**
Patriotism, "Bourgeois Nationalism," and the Nationality Policy of the USSR after Stalin. A. D. Low. 9:126-46, 1961.
- Nationality policy, Austro-Hungarian Monarchy**
Congresses of Slavic Youth, 1890-1892. O. Odlozilik. 6:1327-57, 1958.
- Nationality policy, Soviet**
The Agrarian-Industrial Dichotomy in the Ukraine as a Factor in Soviet Nationality Policy. R. S. Sullivant. 9:110-25, 1961.
Lenin on the Ukraine. J. S. Reshetar. 9:3-11, 1961.
- Lenin's Idea of a Multinational Commonwealth. T. B. Ciuciura. 10, No. 1:3-64, 1962-1963.
Patriotism, "Bourgeois Nationalism," and the Nationality Policy of the USSR after Stalin. A. D. Low. 9:126-46, 1961.
Representation of Nationalities and Occupations in the Soviets. P. H. Juviler. 9:201-24, 1961.
Stalin's Conception of Soviet Federalism (1918-1923). R. H. McNeal. 9:12-25, 1961.
The Ukrainian Apparatus as a Key to the Study of Soviet Politics. J. A. Armstrong. 9:225-33, 1961.
The Ukrainian SSR in International Affairs after World War II. Y. Bilinsky. 9:147-66, 1961.
- NEBEL, HENRY M., JR.**
Lunt, Horace G., ed. *Harvard Slavic Studies*, Vol. I. Cambridge, Mass., 1953. 3:591-93, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Negel, N.** 3/4:[468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- NIKISHYN, P.** *see* IVANYTSKY, BORYS. Ukrainian Forestry...
- Niles, Gustave** 10, No. 1:164, 1962-1963.
- NOL'DE, BORIS E.**
Essays in Russian State Law [Edited by Andriy Yakovliv]. 4: 873-903, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Numismatics**
A Hoard of Roman Gold Medallions and Silver Objects Dating from the "Migration of Peoples" Found in Volhynia in 1610. V. Shuhayevsky. 1: 153-56, Fall 1951.
- Obituaries**
Bahryanyi, I. 10, No. 1:139-41, 1962-1963.

- Baran, S. 3:595-96, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Biletsky, L. 4:1042-43, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Bilous, A. 4:1045-46, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Blavatsky, V. 3:596-97, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Borschak, É. 8:224-28, 1958.
- Choulguine, A. 8:216-19, 1960.
- Chyz, Y. J. 7:1698-99, 1959.
- Derevyanko, A. 10, No. 1:145-46, 1962-1963.
- Doroshenko, D. 1:182-83, Fall 1951.
- Doroshenko, V. 10, No. 1:126-30, 1962-1963.
- Dovzhenko, H. 7:1699-1700, 1959.
- Drahomanov, S. 7:1697-98, 1959.
- Dubynetz, I. 3:738-39, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Efremov, M. 10, No. 1:136-38, 1962-1963.
- Friedman, P. 8:229, 1960.
- Halychyn, D. 9:337, 1961.
- Hlobenko, M. *see* Ohloblyn, M.
- Horodetsky, V. 5:1238-39, 1956.
- Hrycak, P. 6:1447-48, 1958.
- Hryhoriev, N. 3:738, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Ivanytsky, B. 3:594-95, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Kabachkiv, I. 10, No. 1:134-36, 1962-1963.
- Kekalo, M. 1:183-84, Fall 1951.
- Kotsevalov, A. 8:219-24, 1960.
- Kozlovs'ka, V. 5:1237-38, 1956.
- Krupnytsky, B. 6:1443-46, 1958.
- Krychevsky, V. 2:478, Winter 1952.
- Kuzela, Z. 2:344, Summer 1952.
- Kuziv, V. 7:1696-97, 1959.
- Lorchenko, V. 2:479, Winter 1952.
- Makhiv, G. 2:478-79, Winter 1952.
- Margolin, A. D. 7:1671-94, 1959.
- Mazepa, I. 2:343-44, Summer 1952.
- Mirtschuk, I. 9:334-37, 1961.
- Morhun, O. 9:338, 1961.
- Myshuha, L. 4:1045, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Ohloblyn (Hlobenko), M. 6:1446-47, 1958.
- Orest-Zerov, M. 10, No. 1:144-45, 1962-1963.
- Os'machka, T. 10, No. 1:141-43, 1962-1963.
- Pošyvajlo, F. 1:73, Winter 1951.
- Radzimovsky, V. 3:736-37, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Senko, Y. 6:1448, 1958.
- Shcherbakivsky, V. 7:1695-96, 1959.
- Shul'hyn, O. *see* Choulguine, A.
- Sichynsky, V. 10, No. 1:131-34, 1962-1963.
- Skubova, M. 2:345-46, Summer 1952.
- Tymošenko, S. 1:71-72, Winter 1951.
- Tyshchenko, Y. 3:737, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Vetukhiv, M. 8:5-14, 1960.
- Yakovliv, A. 4:1043-44, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Yanovsky, T. 5:1236-37, 1956.
- Zerov, M. *see* Orest-Zerov, M.
- Zilynsky, I. 2:345, Summer 1952.
- Žurko, M. 1:72-73, Winter 1951.
- ODARCHENKO (ODARČENKO), PETRO
Drahomanov as Folklorist. 2:36-46, Spring 1952.
- The Struggle for Shevchenko:
Shevchenko in Soviet Interpretation. 3:824-37, Spring 1954.
- Soviet Interpretation of a Ukrai-

- nian Classic [Ukrainka, Lesja. *Sobranie sočinenij v trech tomach*. Pervod s ukrainskogo. Moscow, 1950]. 1:164-68, Fall 1951.
- A Survey of Publications on Ukrainian Ethnography and Folklore in the Years 1957-1962. 10, No. 1:92-110, 1962-1963.
- Holoskevych, H. *Pravopysny slovnyk*, 8. vyd. New York, 1952. 2:334-35, Summer 1952.
- Serech, Jury. *Narys suchasnoyi ukrajins'koyi literaturnoyi movy*. Munich, 1951. 2:473-75, Winter 1952.
- Spirit of Flame: A Collection of the Works of Lesya Ukrainka*. Translated by Percival Cundy, Foreword by Clarence A. Manning. New York, 1950. 1:62-64, Winter 1951.
- Odarchenko, Petro *see also* 3/4: [468], Summer-Fall 1954.
- ODLOŽILIK, OTAKAR
Congresses of Slavic Youth, 1890-1892. 6:1327-57, 1958.
- Oghuz Yabghu Empire**
The Decline of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu. O. Pritsak. 2:279-92, Summer 1952.
- OHLOBLYN, ALEXANDER *see* OHLOBLYN, OLEXANDER
- Ohoblyn (Hlobenko), Mykola** [Obituary]. 6:1446-47, 1958.
- OHLOBLYN, OLEXANDER
Borys Dmytrovych Krupnytsky [Obituary]. 6:1443-46, 1958.
The Ethical and Political Principles of "Istoriya Rusov." 2: 388-400, Winter 1952.
Ukrainian Autonomists of the 1780's and 1790's and Count P. A. Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky. 6:1313-26, 1958.
Ukrainian Historiography, 1917-1956 (Translated by Roman Olesnytsky). 5/6:305-435, 1957.
Western Europe and the Ukrainian Baroque: An Aspect of Cultural Influences at the Time of Hetman Ivan Mazepa. 1:127-37, Fall 1951.
Where Was *Istoriya Rusov* Written? 3:670-95, Fall-Winter 1953.
Ohoblyn, Olexander *see also* 3/4: [468], Summer-Fall 1954; 4/5: [v], Summer-Fall 1955; 5/6: 456, 1957; 6:1411, 1958.
- OKINSHEVICH, LEO
History of Civilization of Eastern Europe in the Work of Arnold Toynbee. 2:305-15, Summer 1952.
- Olbia**
Borysthenes-Borysthenites and Tanais-Tanaites. A. Kotsevalov. 7: 1517-30, 1959.
- OLESNICKI (OLESNYTSKY), ROMAN *see* OHLOBLYN, OLEXANDER. Ukrainian Historiography . . .
- Onomastics** *see* Language
- Orest-Zerov, Mykhaylo** [Obituary]. O. Zujewskij. 10, No. 1:144-45, 1962-1963.
- Orlyk, Pylyp**
The Constitution of Pylyp Orlyk. M. Vasylenko. 6:1260-95, 1958.
General Characteristics of Pylyp Orlyk. B. Krupnytsky. 6: 1247-59, 1958.
Pylyp Orlyk's *Devolution of the Ukraine's Rights*. Presentation and Introduction by Ė. Borschak. 6:1296-1312, 1958.
- Os'machka, Todos'** [Obituary]. J. Lawrynenko. 10, No. 1:141-43, 1962-1963.
- OVCHARENKO, MARIA
Stress in Ivan Franko's Poetry. 8:121-40, 1960.

Panslavism

Panslav Federalism. M. Draho-
manov. 2:175-80, Spring 1952.

PARAMONOV, SERHIJ

What is a Species? The Essence,
the Extent, and the Definition
of the Species Concept. 1:138-
49, Fall 1951.

Paris Peace Conference

The Ukrainian Question in R. H.
Lord's Writings on the Paris
Peace Conference of 1919. L.
C. Sonevsky. 10, No. 1:65-
84, 1962-1963.

Patronymic surnames

The Origin of Patronymic Sur-
names in Ukrainian. J. P.
Hursky. 8:169-90, 1960.

Pavlovsky, Vadim 3/4:[468], Sum-
mer-Fall 1954.

PELENSKI, JAROSLAW

Élie Borschak [Obituary]. 8:
224-28, 1960.

Kostiuk, Hryhory. *Stalinist Rule
in the Ukraine: A Study of the
Decade of Mass Terror (1929-
1939)*. New York, 1960. 9:
294-99, 1961.

Pereyaslav, Treaty of, 1654

Bohdan Khmelnyts'ky's Treaty
with the Tsar of Muscovy in
1654. A. Yakovliv. 4:904-
16, Winter-Spring 1955.

Essays in Russian State Law. B.
E. Nol'de. 4:873-903, Winter-
Spring 1955.

The Problem of the Juridical Na-
ture of the Ukraine's Union
with Muscovy. V. Prokopo-
vych. 4:917-80, Winter-Spring
1955.

The Reunion of the Ukraine with
Russia. *Vossoyedinenie Ukrai-
ny s Rossiyei, dokumenty i ma-
terialy v 3-kh tomakh*. Moscow,
1954. (Review article by A.

Yakovliv) 4:1002-34, Winter-
Spring 1955.

The Significance of the Soviet
Tercentenary of the Pereyaslav
Treaty. J. S. Reshetar. 4:981-
94, Winter-Spring 1955.

The Ukraine at the Turning Point.
V. Lypynsky. 3:605-19, Fall-
Winter 1953.

Periodic Law *see* **Mendeleyev's Pe-
riodic Law**

Philology *see* **Language**

Philosophy

The Influence of the Philosophy
of Schelling (1775-1854) in the
Ukraine. D. Čiževsky. 5:
1128-39, 1956.

Polish-Ukrainian relations *see* U-
krainian-Polish relations

Political theory

Draho-manov as a Political Theo-
rist. I. L. Rudnytsky. 2:70-
130, Spring 1952.

Lenin's Idea of a Multinational
Commonwealth. T. B. Ciuciura.
10, No. 1:3-64, 1962-1963.

Nation and State in the Modern
World. I. J. Goldman. 7:
1630-46, 1959.

Pollination

The Role of Insects in the Proc-
ess of Pollination of the Flow-
ers of Sugar Beet. A. Archi-
mowitsch. 4:995-1001, Win-
ter-Spring 1955.

POLONS'KA-VASYLENKO, NATALYA D.
*The Settlement of the Southern
Ukraine (1750-1775)*. New
York, 1955. 4/5:1-350[XX],
Summer-Fall 1955.

Ohloblyn, Alexander. *Treaty of
Pereyaslav, 1654*. Translated
by B. Budurovych. Toronto-
New York, 1954. 5:1224-26,
1956.

- PORŚKYJ (PORS'KY), VOLODYMYR**
 The Decembrist Milieu in the Diary of Pelagja Rościszewska. 1:21-28, Winter 1951.
 New Soviet Literature on the Decembrists in the Ukraine. 3: 584-87, Spring-Summer 1953.
Rusko-ukrainskiye literaturnyye svyazi. Ed. by N. K. Gudzy. Moscow, 1951. 2:336-37, Summer 1952.
- Poshyvajlo, Fedir** [Obituary]. 1:73, Winter 1951.
- POTEBNJA, ALEXANDER**
 Present and Past Active Participles (-ь, -вь) as Secondary Predicates (Translated by Fred Holling). 5:1055-78, 1956.
 Alexander Potebnja as a Linguist. G. Y. Shevelov. 5:1112-27, 1956.
 Towards an Understanding of Potebnja (Critical and Bibliographical Observations). O. Vetukhiv. 5:1079-1111, 1956.
- POWSTENKO, OLEXA**
The Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev. Katedra sv. Sofiyi u Kyjevi. [New York, 1954]. 3/4: [1]-[472], Summer-Fall 1954.
- PRITSAK, OMEIJAN**
 The Decline of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu. 2:279-92, Summer 1952.
- PROCIUK, STEPHAN G.**
 Clark, M. Gardner. *The Economics of Soviet Steel*. Cambridge, Mass., 1956. 6:1439-42, 1958.
- PROKOPOVYCH, VYACHESLAV**
 The Problem of the Juridical Nature of the Ukraine's Union with Muscovy [Edited by Andriy Yakovliv]. 4:917-80, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Protestantism** *see* **Religion**
- Radzimovsky, Valentyna** [Obituary]. 3:736-37, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Raeff, Mark** 4/5:[v], Summer-Fall 1955.
- Ratzenburg, Statuette from**
 A Stone Statuette from Ratzenburg. M. Miller. 1:36-42, Winter 1951.
- RAUCH, GEORG VON**
 Lenin und die "verpasste Revolution" in Deutschland. 9:26-40, 1961.
- Reformation** *see* **Religion**
- Religion** (*see also* **Church**)
 Socinianism in Poland and South West Rus'. O. Levytsky. Preface by D. Čiževsky. 3:485-508, Spring-Summer 1953.
- Renaissance in literature, Ukrainian** *see* **Vyshensky, Ivan**
- Renovationist Church, Ukrainian** *see* **Church**
- RESHETAR, JOHN S., JR.**
 Lenin on the Ukraine. 9:3-11, 1961.
 The Significance of the Soviet Tercentenary of the Pereyaslav Treaty. 4:981-94, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Moore, Barrington, Jr.** *Terror and Progress USSR: Some Sources of Change and Stability in the Soviet Dictatorship*. Cambridge, Mass., 1954. 3: 863-64, Spring 1954.
The Soviet Union: Background, Ideology, Reality. A Symposium edited by Waldemar Gurian. Notre Dame, Ind., 1951. 1:177-78, Fall 1951.
- Roman culture in the Ukraine**
 A Hoard of Roman Gold Medallions and Silver Objects Dating from the "Migration of Peoples" Found in Volhynia in

1610. V. Shuhayevsky. 1:153-56, Fall 1951.
- ROŚCISZEWSKA, PELAGJA**
Excerpts from the Diary of Pelagja Rościszewska. 1:29-35, Winter 1951.
- RUDNYČKYJ, JAROSLAV B.**
History of Ukrainian Holdings at the Library of Congress. 6:1406-10, 1958.
- Jakobson, Roman. *Slavic Languages*. 2d ed. New York, 1955. 5:1221-24, 1956.
- Kovaliv, Pantelejmon. *Molytovnyk služebnyk: Pamjatka XIV stolittja*. New York, 1960. 8:206-7, 1960.
- Matthews, W. K. *Languages of the U.S.S.R.* Cambridge, 1951. 1:175-76, Fall 1951.
- RUDNYTSKY, IVAN L.**
Drahomanov as a Political Theorist. 2:70-130, Spring 1952.
The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine. 6:1381-1405, 1958.
An American Study of the Ukrainian Revolution [Reshetar, John S. *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917-1920: A Study in Nationalism*. Princeton, 1952]. 2:316-22, Summer 1952.
- Armstrong, John A. *Ukrainian Nationalism, 1939-1945*. New York, 1955. 9:286-94, 1961.
- Kohn, Hans. *Pan-Slavism — Its History and Ideology*. Notre Dame, Ind., 1953. 3:864-66, Spring 1954.
- Kucharzewski, Jan. *The Origins of Modern Russia*. New York, 1948. 2:471-73, Winter 1952.
- Pobóg-Malinowski, Władysław. *Najnowsza Historia Polityczna Polski, 1864-1945*. Vol. I. Paris, 1953. 3:731-33, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Pyziur, Eugene. *The Doctrine of Anarchism of Michael A. Bakunin*. Milwaukee, Wis., 1956. 5:1233-35, 1956.
- Rudnytsky, Ivan L. *see also* Drahomanov, Mykhaylo. *Mykhaylo Drahomanov: A Symposium...*, and Drahomanov, Svitozor, and Ivan L. Rudnytsky. *A Bibliography of...*
- RUDNYTSKY, YAROSLAV** *see* **RUDNYČKYJ, JAROSLAV B.**
- RUDY, PETER**
Lunt, Horace G., ed. *Harvard Slavic Studies*, Vol. II. [Cambridge, Mass.] 1954. 5:1229-33, 1956.
- Rumanian-Russian relations** *see* **Russian-Rumanian relations**
- Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky, P. A.**
Ukrainian Autonomists of the 1780's and 1790's and Count P. A. Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky. O. Ohloblyn. 6:1313-26, 1958.
- Ruska Pravda**
Ukrainian Common-Law Procedure. A. Yakovliv. 2:365-87, Winter 1952.
- Russia — Foreign policy**
Germany's Drive to the East and Moscow's Drive to the West. M. Drahomanov. 2:161-74, Spring 1952.
- Russia — History**
Bohdan Khmelnyts'ky's Treaty with the Tsar of Muscovy in 1654. A. Yakovliv. 4:904-16, Winter-Spring 1955.
Federalism and the Russian Empire. B. Krupnytsky. 2:239-60, Summer 1952.
The Problem of the Juridical Nature of the Ukraine's Union with Muscovy. V. Prokopo-

- vych. 4:917-80, Winter-Spring 1955.
- The Traditional Scheme of "Russian" History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of Eastern Slavs. M. Hrushevsky. 2:355-64, Winter 1952.
- Russia — Politics and government**
The Centralization of the Revolutionary Struggle in Russia. M. Drahomanov. 2:181-92, Spring 1952.
- Essays in Russian State Law. B. E. Nol'de [Ed. by A. Yakovliv]. 4:873-903, Winter-Spring 1955.
- The Significance of the Soviet Tercentenary of the Pereyaslav Treaty. J. S. Reshetar. 4: 981-94, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Russia — Relations with Ukraine see Ukrainian-Russian relations**
- Russia see also Soviet Union**
- Russian-German relations**
Lenin und die "verpasste Revolution" in Deutschland. G. von Rauch. 9:26-40, 1961.
- Russian-Rumanian relations**
Bukovina in the Diplomatic Negotiations of 1914. L. C. Sonevtsky. 7:1586-1629, 1959.
- Russian-Ukrainian relations see Ukrainian-Russian relations**
- Russification see Nationality policy, Soviet**
- Russkaya Pravda see Ruska Pravda**
- St. Sophia Cathedral see Cathedral of St. Sophia, Kiev**
- SAMILOV, MICHAEL**
The Treatment of the Common Slavic *ě in Ukrainian. 8:15-31, 1960.
- SANDUL, KLAVDIA see STARCHIEVA-SANDUL, KLAVDIA**
- Sappho**
A New Fragment of Sappho? I. Ševčenko. 1:150-52, Fall 1951.
- Satellite countries — Relations with the Ukraine see Ukraine — Relations with satellite countries**
- Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von**
The Influence of the Philosophy of Schelling (1775-1854) in the Ukraine. D. Čiževsky. 5: 1128-39, 1956.
- Scythia, Scythians see Ukraine — History — Early period and Middle Ages**
- Self-determination see Nationality policy . . .**
- Senko, Yuriy [Obituary].** 6:1448, 1958.
- ŠERECH, JURY (YURY) see SHEVELOV, GEORGE Y.**
- Serbs in the Ukraine see POLONS'KA-VASYLENKO, N. D. The Settlement of . . .**
- ŠEVČENKO, IHOR**
A New Fragment of Sappho? 1:150-52, Fall 1951.
An Important Contribution to the Social History of Late Byzantium [Ostrogorski, Georgije. *Pronija, Prilog istoriji feudalizma u Vizantiji i u južnoslovenskim zemljama.* Beograd, 1951]. 2:448-59, Winter 1952.
Ševčenko, Ihor see also 3/4: [468], Summer-Fall 1954; 4/5: [v], Summer-Fall 1955.
- SHANKOWSKY, LEW**
Soviet and Satellite Sources on the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. 9:234-61, 1961.
- Shcherbakivsky, Vadym [Obituary].** 7:1695-96, 1959.
- Sheptytsky, Andreas**
Andreas Count Sheptytsky, Archbishop of Lviv, Metropolitan of Halych, and the Jewish Community in Galicia during the

- Second World War. K. I. Lewin. 7:1656-67, 1959.
- SHEREKH, YURY *see* SHEVELOV, GEORGE Y.
- SHEVCHENKO, IHOR *see* ŠEVČENKO, IHOR
- Shevchenko, Taras**
 Shevchenko's Mind and Thought. S. Smal Stockyj. 2:227-38, Summer 1952.
- The Struggle for Shevchenko: Shevchenko in Soviet Interpretation. P. Odarchenko. 3:824-37, Spring 1954.
- SHEVELOV, GEORGE Y.
 Alexander Potebnja as a Linguist. 5:1112-27, 1956.
- Bezpal'ko, O. P., M. K. Bojčuk, M. A. Žovtobrjux, S. P. Samijlenko, I. J. Taranenko. *Istorična hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy. Pidručnyk dlja studentiv ...* Kiev, 1957. 6:1429-33, 1958.
- An Important Work in Ukrainian Onomastics [Rudnyčkyj, J. B. *The Term and Name "Ukraine"*. Winnipeg, 1951]. (Signed: Yury Šerech) 2:435-43, Winter 1952.
- A New Comparative Grammar of Slavic Languages [Vaillant, André. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Tome I: Phonétique. Lyon — Paris, 1950]. (Signed: Jury Šerech) 1:157-63, Fall 1951.
- On Slavic Linguistic Interrelations. Ukrainian Influence on the Polish Language in the 16th and 17th Centuries [Hrabec, Stefan. *Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy polskich XVI-XVII w.* Toruń, 1949]. (Signed: Yury Šerech) 3:696-730, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Richardt, Rosemarie. *Polnische Lehnwörter im Ukrainischen*. Berlin, 1957. 8:210-15, 1960.
- SHUHAYEVSKY, VALENTINE
 A Hoard of Roman Gold Medallions and Silver Objects Dating from the "Migration of Peoples" Found in Volhynia in 1610. 1:153-56, Fall 1951.
- Šul'phyn, Oleksander** *see* Choulguine, Alexander
- Sichynsky, Volodymyr [Obituary]. D. Horniatkevych. 10, No. 1: 131-34, 1962-1963.
- Skubova, Maria [Obituary]. 2: 345-46, Summer 1952.
- Slavic Youth Congresses**
 Congresses of Slavic Youth, 1890-1892. O. Odložilik. 6:1327-57, 1958.
- SLAVUTYCH, YAR
 Baranauskas, Antanas. *The Forest of Anyksčiai*, the original Lithuanian text with English translation by Nadas Rastenis; edited by Juozas Tininis. Los Angeles, 1956. 6:1442, 1958.
- Slusser, Robert** 4/5:[v], Summer-Fall 1955.
- Sluzar, Sophia** 10, No. 1:164, 1962-1963.
- SMAL-STOCKI, ROMAN
Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1950 edition, article *Ukraine* (Vol. 22, pp. 667-72) and *White-Russia* (Vol. 23, p. 578). 1: 172-74, Fall 1951.
- SMAL STOCKYJ, STEPAN
 Shevchenko's Mind and Thought. 2:227-38, Summer 1952.
- Snylyk, Zenon** 10, No. 1:164, 1962-1963.
- Socinianism**
 Socinianism in Poland and South-West Rus'. O. Levytsky. Pref-

ace by D. Čiževsky. 3:485-508, Spring-Summer 1953.

Soils

A New Soils Map of the Ukraine. G. Makhov. 1:43-56 [map], Winter 1951.

Saline Soils of Southern Ukraine. P. Birko. 3:838-52, Spring 1954.

SONEVYTSKY, LEONID C.

Bukovina in the Diplomatic Negotiations of 1914. 7:1586-1629, 1959.

The Ukrainian Question in R. H. Lord's Writings on the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. 10, No. 1:65-84, 1962-1963.

Sonevytsky, Leonid C. *see also* Margolin, Arnold D. Excerpts from the Book . . .

Sophia, St., Cathedral *see* **Cathedral of St. Sophia, Kiev**

Southern Ukraine, Settlement of *see* POLONS'KA-VASYLENKO, N. D. *The Settlement of . . .*

Soviet Union — Law *see* **Law**

Soviet Union — Politics and government

Academic Freedom in the U.S.S.R. A Review of the Conference Held in New York on April 3-4, 1954. 3:853-62, Spring 1954.

The Agrarian-Industrial Dichotomy in the Ukraine as a Factor in Soviet Nationality Policy. R. S. Sullivant. 9:110-25, 1961.

Lenin's Idea of a Multinational Commonwealth. T. B. Ciuciura. 10, No. 1:3-64, 1962-1963.

Representation of Nationalities and Occupations in the Soviets. P. H. Juviler. 9:201-24, 1961.

Stalin's Conception of Soviet Fed-

eralism (1918-1923). R. H. McNeal. 9:12-25, 1961.

The Ukrainian Apparatus as a Key to the Study of Soviet Politics. J. A. Armstrong. 9:225-33, 1961.

Soviet Union *see also* **Russia**

Species *see* **Biology**

STACHIW, MATTHEW (STAKHIV, MAT-VIY)

Drahomanov's Impact on Ukrainian Politics. 2:47-62, Spring 1952.

Stalin, Iosif

Stalin's Conception of Soviet Federalism (1918-1923). R. H. McNeal. 9:12-25, 1961.

STANKIEWICZ, EDWARD

Stress Alternations in the Ukrainian Substantive Declension: Types and Role. 8:141-51, 1960.

STARCHEVA-SANDUL, KLAVDIA

Anatomic Structures of *Cucurbita* Fruit and Their Importance for the Study of Economic Qualities of the Fruit. 5:1188-1201, 1956.

State, Theory of

Nation and State in the Modern World. I. J. Goldman. 7: 1630-46, 1959.

Lenin's Idea of a Multinational Commonwealth. T. B. Ciuciura. 10, No. 1:3-64, 1962-1963.

STOCKI, ROMAN *see* SMAL-STOCKI, ROMAN

STOCKYJ, STEPAN *see* SMAL STOCKYJ, STEPAN

Students, Ukrainian, Participation in Slavic Youth Congresses *see* **Slavic Youth Congresses**

Sugar beet

The Role of Insects in the Process of Pollination of the Flowers

- of Sugar Beet. A. Archimovitsch. 4:995-1001, Winter-Spring 1955.
- SULLIVANT, ROBERT S.**
The Agrarian-Industrial Dichotomy in the Ukraine as a Factor in Soviet Nationality Policy. 9: 110-25, 1961.
- SVIT, IVAN** *see* SWEET, JOHN V.
- SWEET, JOHN V.**
Lebedev, D. M. *Geografiya v Rossii XVII veka*. Moskva, 1949. 3:866-67, Spring 1954.
Wlasowsky, Ivan. *Outline History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church*. Vol. I: *The Baptism of Ukraine to the Union of Berestye (988-1596)*. New York — Bound Brook, 1956. 6:1437-39, 1958.
- SWOBODA, VICTOR**
Infinitives of the Type CS **terti*/**irti* in Slavic. 8:34-44, 1960.
- Synodal Church, Ukrainian** *see* Church
- Szeptyckyj, Andrej** *see* Sheptytsky, Andreas
- Tanais**
Borysthenes-Borysthenites and Tanais-Tanaites. A. Kotsevalov. 7:1517-30, 1959.
- Tatars**
Timur's Campaign of 1395 in the Ukraine and North Caucasus. Z. V. Togan. 6:1358-71, 1958.
- TIMOSHENKO, VOLODYMYR P.**
M. I. Tuhan-Baranovsky and Western European Economic Thought (Speech on the 5th Anniversary of His Death). 3: 803-23, Spring 1954.
Timoshenko, Volodymyr P. *see also* 9:75, 1961.
- Timur**
Timur's Campaign of 1395 in the Ukraine and North Caucasus. Z. V. Togan. 6:1358-71, 1958.
- TOGAN, ZEKI VELIDI**
Timur's Campaign of 1395 in the Ukraine and North Caucasus. 6:1358-71, 1958.
- Torki** *see* Oghuz Yabghu Empire
- Toynbee, Arnold**
History of Civilization of Eastern Europe in the Work of Arnold Toynbee. L. Okinshevich. 2: 305-15, Summer 1952.
- Tripol'e culture** *see* Trypillian culture
- Trypillian culture**
Notes on Weaving in the Trypillian Culture of the Ukraine. N. Kordysh. 1:98-112, Fall 1951.
Settlement Plans of the Trypillian Culture. N. Kordysh. 3:535-52[4], Spring-Summer 1953.
- TSCIŽEWSKIJ D.** *see* ČIŽEVSKY, DMITRY
- TUGAN-BARANOVSKY, M. I.** *see* TUHAN-BARANOVSKY, MYKHAYLO I.
- TUHAN-BARANOVSKY, MYKHAYLO I.**
Periodic Industrial Crises. A History of British Crises. 3:745-802, Spring 1954.
M. I. Tuhan-Baranovsky and Western European Thought (Speech on the 5th Anniversary of His Death). V. P. Timoshenko. 3:803-23, Spring 1954.
- Turkmen** *see* Oghuz Yabghu Empire
- Tymoshenko, Serhij** [Obituary]. 1: 71-72, Winter 1951.
- TYMOSHENKO, VOLODYMYR P.** *see* TIMOSHENKO, VOLODYMYR P.
- Tyshchenko, Yuriy** [Obituary]. 3: 737, Fall-Winter 1953.
- UPA** *see* Ukrayins'ka Povstancha Armiya

USSR *see* **Soviet Union****Ucrainica in the Library of Congress**

History of Ukrainian Holdings at the Library of Congress. J. B. Rudnyčkyj. 6:1406–10, 1958.

“Ukraine”

An Important Work in Ukrainian Onomastics [Rudnyčkyj, J. B. *The Term and Name “Ukraine”*. Winnipeg, 1951]. Y. Šerech. 2:435–43, Winter 1952.

Ukraine — Agriculture *see* **Agriculture****Ukraine — Archaeology**

A Hoard of Roman Gold Medallions and Silver Objects Dating from the “Migration of Peoples” found in Volhynia in 1610. V. Shuhayevsky. 1:153–56, Fall 1951.

Notes on Weaving in the Trypillian Culture of the Ukraine. N. Kordysh. 1:98–112, Fall 1951.

The Origin of the Paleolithic Meander. L. Chikalenko. 3:518–34[4], Spring-Summer 1953.

Settlement Plans of the Trypillian Culture. N. Kordysh. 3:535–52[4], Spring-Summer 1953.

A Stone Statuette from Ratzenburg. M. Miller. 1:36–42, Winter 1951.

Ukraine — Foreign relations

Excerpts from the Book *Ukraina i politika Antanty: Zapiski evreya i grazhdanina*. A. D. Margolin. 7:1461–82, 1959.

The Question of Anglo-Ukrainian Relations in the Middle of the Seventeenth Century. L. Vynar. 6:1411–18, 1958.

Ukrainian-Russian Negotiations in 1920: A Recollection. L. Chikalenko. 7:1647–55, 1959.

The Ukrainian SSR in International Affairs after World War II. Y. Bilinsky. 9:147–66, 1961.

Ukraine — History (*see also* **Nationality policy, Soviet, Ukraine — Foreign relations, Ukraine — Politics and government, Ukrainian-Russian relations**)**Historiography** (*see also* **Chronicles**)

Drahomanov and Ukrainian Historiography. D. Doroshenko. 2:23–46, Spring 1952.

The Ethical and Political Principles of “Istoriya Rusov.” O. Ohloblyn. 2:388–400, Winter 1952.

A Geographic and Historical Survey of Eastern Europe. M. Drahomanov. 2:141–52, Spring 1952.

Istoriya Rusov and Its Author. A. Yakovliv. 3:620–69, Fall-Winter 1953.

A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography. D. Doroshenko (Tr. by G. Luckyj). 5/6:13–304, 1957.

The Traditional Scheme of “Russian” History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of the Eastern Slavs. M. Hrushevsky. 2:355–64, Winter 1952.

Ukrainian Historiography, 1917–1956. O. Ohloblyn (Tr. by R. Olesnytsky). 5/6:305–435, 1957.

Where Was *Istoriya Rusov* Written? O. Ohloblyn. 3:670–95, Fall-Winter 1953.

Early period and Middle Ages
A Few Examples of Analogy in

- the Ancient Ukrainian and Judaic Cultures. A. Dombrowsky. 7:1531-41, 1959.
- The Genesis of the Geographical Notion of Scythia in the Ancient World. A. Dombrowsky. 5:1178-87, 1956.
- Herodotus and Hippocrates on the Anthropology of the Scythians. A. Dombrowsky. 10, No. 1:85-91, 1962-1963.
- Timur's Campaign of 1395 in the Ukraine and North Caucasus. Z. V. Togan. 6:1358-71, 1958.
- 1500-1800**
- Bohdan Khmelnyts'ky's Treaty with the Tsar of Muscovy in 1654. A. Yakovliv. 4:904-16, Winter-Spring 1955.
- The Constitution of Pylyp Orlyk. M. Vasylenko. 6:1260-95, 1958.
- Essays in Russian State Law. B. E. Nol'de [Ed. by A. Yakovliv]. 4:873-903, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Federalism and the Russian Empire. B. Krupnytsky. 2:239-60, Summer 1952.
- General Characteristics of Pylyp Orlyk. B. Krupnytsky. 6:1247-59, 1958.
- A Little Known French Biography of Yuras' Khmelnytsky. É. Borschak. 3:509-17, Spring-Summer 1953.
- The Lost Epoch: Ukrainians Under the Muscovite Tsardom, 1654-1876. M. Drahomanov. 2:153-60, Spring 1952.
- The Problem of the Juridical Nature of the Ukraine's Union with Muscovy. V. Prokopovych [Ed. by A. Yakovliv]. 4:917-80, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Pylyp Orlyk's *Devolution of the Ukraine's Rights*. Presentation and Introduction by É. Borschak. 6:1296-1312, 1958.
- The Question of Anglo-Ukrainian Relations in the Middle of the Seventeenth Century. L. Vynar. 6:1411-18, 1958.
- The Reunion of the Ukraine with Russia. *Vossoyedinienie Ukrainy s Rossiyei, dokumenty i materialy v 3-kh tomakh*. Moscow, 1954. (Review article by A. Yakovliv) 4:1002-34, Winter-Spring 1955.
- The Settlement of the Southern Ukraine (1750-1775)*. N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko. 4/5:1-350[XX], Summer-Fall 1955.
- The Significance of the Soviet Tercentenary of the Pereyaslav Treaty. J. S. Reshetar. 4:981-94, Winter-Spring 1955.
- The Ukraine at the Turning Point. V. Lypynsky. 3:605-19, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Ukrainian Autonomists of the 1780's and 1790's and Count P. A. Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky. O. Ohloblyn. 6:1313-26, 1958.
- Western Europe and the Ukrainian Baroque: An Aspect of Cultural Influences at the Time of Hetman Ivan Mazepa. O. Ohloblyn. 1:127-37, Fall 1951.
- 1800-1917**
- Bukovina in the Diplomatic Negotiations of 1914. L. C.

Sonevytsky. 7:1586-1629, 1959.

The Decembrist Milieu in the Diary of Pelagja Rościszewska. V. Porškyj. 1:21-28, Winter 1951.

Excerpts from the Diary of Pelagja Rościszewska. 1:29-35, Winter 1951.

The Intellectual Origins of Modern Ukraine. I. L. Rudnytsky. 6:1381-1405, 1958.

Mykhaylo Drahomanov, Ivan Franko, and the Relations Between the Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia in the Last Quarter of the 19th Century. Y. Bilinsky. 7:1542-66, 1959.

New Soviet Literature on the Decembrists in the Ukraine. V. Pors'ky. 3:584-87, Spring-Summer 1953.

1917-1920

An American Study of the Ukrainian Revolution [Reshetar, J. S. *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917-1920: A Study in Nationalism*. Princeton, 1952]. I. L. Rudnytsky. 2: 316-22, Summer 1952.

Excerpts from the Book *Ukraina i politika Antany: Zapiski evreya i grazhdanina*. A. D. Margolin [Ed. by L. C. Sonevytsky]. 7:1461-82, 1959.

The Ukrainian Question in R. H. Lord's Writings on the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. L. C. Sonevytsky. 10, No. 1:65-84, 1962-1963.

Ukrainian-Russian Negotiations in 1920: A Recollection. L. Chikalenko. 7:1647-55, 1959.

1939-

Andreas Count Sheptytsky, Archbishop of Lviv, Metropolitan of Halych, and the Jewish Community in Galicia during the Second World War. K. I. Lewin. 7:1656-67, 1959.

Soviet and Satellite Sources on the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. L. Shankowsky. 9: 234-61, 1961.

Ukraine — Politics and government

The Constitution of Pylyp Orlyk. M. Vasilenko. 6:1260-95, 1958.

Drahomanov's Impact on Ukrainian Politics. M. Stakhiv. 2: 47-62, Spring 1952.

Free Union: Draft of a Ukrainian Political and Social Program. M. Drahomanov. 2:193-205, Spring 1952.

The Ukrainian Apparatus as a Key to the Study of Soviet Politics. J. A. Armstrong. 9: 225-33, 1961.

Ukraine — Relations with Russia see Ukrainian-Russian relations

Ukraine — Relations with satellite countries

Die Sowjetukraine und die europäischen volksdemokratischen Länder (1958-1960). B. Lewytzkyj. 9:189-200, 1961.

Ukraine — Revolution, 1917-1920 see Ukraine — History — 1917-1920

Ukraine, Southern, Settlement of see POLON'SKA-VASYLENKO, N. D. *The Settlement of...*

Ukraine in the United Nations

The Soviet Ukraine as a Subject of International Law. B. T. Halajczuk. 8:167-88, 1961.

- The Ukrainian SSR in International Affairs after World War II. Y. Bilinsky. 9:147-66, 1961.
- Ukrainian-Jewish relations** (*see also* **Jews in the Ukraine**)
A Study of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations. J. L. Lichten. 5:1160-77, 1956.
- Ukrainian-Polish relations**
The Ukraine at the Turning Point. V. Lypynsky. 3:605-19, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Ukrainian-Russian relations** (*see also* **Nationality policy, Soviet**)
The Agrarian-Industrial Dichotomy in the Ukraine as a Factor in Soviet Nationality Policy. R. S. Sullivant. 9:110-25, 1961.
- Bohdan Khmelnytsky's Treaty with the Tsar of Muscovy in 1654. A. Yakovliv. 4:904-10, Winter-Spring 1955.
- The Centralization of the Revolutionary Struggle in Russia. M. Drahomanov. 2:181-92, Spring 1952.
- Essays in Russian State Law. B. E. Nol'de [Ed. by A. Yakovliv]. 4:873-903, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Lenin on the Ukraine. J. S. Reshetar. 9:3-11, 1961.
- The Lost Epoch: Ukrainians Under the Muscovite Tsardom. M. Drahomanov. 2:153-60, Spring 1952.
- The Problem of the Juridical Nature of the Ukraine's Union with Muscovy. V. Prokopovych. 4:917-80, Winter-Spring 1955.
- The Ukraine at the Turning Point. V. Lypynsky. 3:605-19, Fall-Winter 1953.
- The Ukrainian Apparatus as a Key to the Study of Soviet Politics. J. A. Armstrong. 9:225-33, 1961.
- Ukrainian Autonomists of the 1780's and 1790's and Count P. A. Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky. O. Ohloblyn. 6:1313-26, 1958.
- Ukrainian-Russian Negotiations in 1920: A Recollection. L. Chikalenko. 7:1647-55, 1959.
- Ukrainian Communist Party** *see* **Communist Party of the Ukraine**
- Ukrainian Academy of Sciences**
The Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences: the Past and the Task Ahead. 1:1-3, Winter 1951.
- Ukrainian Insurgent Army** *see* **Ukrayins'ka Povstancha Armiya**
- Ukrainka, Lesja** *see* **Ukrayinka, Lesya**
- Ukrayinka, Lesya**
Soviet Interpretation of a Ukrainian Classic [Ukrainka, Lesja. *Sobranie sochinenij v trech tomach*. Perevod s ukrainskogo. Moscow, 1950]. (Rev. by P. Odarčenko) 1:164-68, Fall 1951.
- Ukrayins'ka Povstancha Armiya**
Soviet and Satellite Sources on the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. L. Shankowsky. 9:234-61, 1961.
- UNBEGAUN, BORIS O.
Ukrainian Borrowings in Seventeen-Century Northern Russian. 8:81-86, 1960.
- United Nations, Ukraine's membership in** *see* **Ukraine in the United Nations**
- United States — Foreign policy**
The Ukrainian Question in R. H. Lord's Writings on the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. L. C. Sonevytsky. 10, No. 1:65-84, 1962-1963.

- U.S. Library of Congress** *see* **Ucrainica in the Library of Congress Universities**
- A Hundred and Fifty Years of Kharkiv University. M. Vetukhiv. 5: 1140-59, 1956.
- VAILLANT, ANDRÉ**
Deux notules. 8:32-33, 1960.
- VASYLENKO, MYKOLA**
The Constitution of Pylyp Orlyk. 6:1260-95, 1958.
- VASYLENKO, N. D.** *see* **POLONS'KA-VASYLENKO, NATALYA D.**
- VETUKHIV, MICHAEL**
Arnold Davydovych Margolin, 1877-1956. 7:1671-76, 1959.
A Hundred and Fifty Years of Kharkiv University. 5:1140-59, 1956.
Death of a Science in Russia: The Fate of Genetics as Described in "Pravda" and Elsewhere. Edited by Conway Zirkle. Philadelphia, 1949. 1:68-70, Winter 1951.
Symposium of Soviet Science [*Soviet Science*, a Symposium arranged by Conway Zirkle and Howard A. Meyerhoff, edited by Ruth C. Christman. Washington, 1952]. 2:460-64, Winter 1952.
Michael Vetukhiv, Founding President of the Academy. P. E. Mosely. 8:5-14, 1960.
Vetukhiv, Michael *see also* 3/4: [7], Summer-Fall 1954; 4/5: [v], Summer-Fall 1955; 7:[iii], 1959.
- VETUKHIV, OLEXA**
Towards an Understanding of Potebnja (Critical and Bibliographical Observations). 5: 1079-1111, 1956.
- Vil'na spilka** *see* **DRAHOMANOV, M.** Free Union...
- VINCENZ, ANDRÉ DE**
Le nom de famille houtzoule. 8: 191-205, 1960.
- Volhynia**
A Hoard of Roman Gold Medallions and Silver Objects Dating from the "Migration of Peoples" Found in Volhynia in 1610. V. Shuhayevsky. 1: 153-56, Fall 1951.
- VYNAR, LUBOMYR** *see* **WYNAR (VYNAR), LUBOMYR R.**
- Vyshensky, Ivan**
Ivan Vyšenskyj. D. Čiževsky. 1: 113-26, Fall 1951.
- Vyvid prav Ukrainy**
Pylyp Orlyk's *Devolution of the Ukraine's Rights*. Presentation and Introduction by É. Bor-schak. 6:1296-1312, 1958.
- Weintraub, W.** 3:730, Fall-Winter 1953.
- Wenrich, D. H.** 2:301, Summer 1952.
- Wilde, S. A.** 1:43, Winter 1951.
- Wood research** *see* **Forestry**
- WORTH, DEAN STODDARD**
Phraseology in the Galician-Volynian Chronicle: A Study in Distributional Stylistics. 8:55-69, 1960.
- WORTH, GERTA** *see* **HÜTTL-WORTH, GERTA**
- WYNAR (VYNAR), LUBOMYR R.**
The Question of Anglo-Ukrainian Relations in the Middle of the Seventeenth Century. 6:1411-18, 1958.
- Yabghu** *see* **Oghuz Yabghu Empire**
- YAKOVLIV, ANDRIY**
Bohdan Khmelnyts'ky's Treaty with the Tsar of Muscovy in 1654. 4:904-16, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Istoriya Rusov and Its Author.* 3:620-69, Fall-Winter 1953.

- Ukrainian Common-Law Procedure. 2:365-87, Winter 1952.
- The Reunion of the Ukraine with Russia. *Vossoyedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiyei, dokumenty i materialy v 3-kh tomakh*. Moscow, 1954. 4:1002-34, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Andriy Yakovliv [Obituary]. 4: 1043-44, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Yakovliv, Andriy *see also* Nol'de, Boris E. Essays in Russian...; Prokopovych, Vyacheslav. The Problem of the Juridical...; and 4:[ii] and 917, Winter-Spring 1955.
- Yanovsky, Teofil (In Memory of His Death). I. Basilevich. 5: 1236-37, 1956.
- Yaroslav the Wise, Grand Prince of Kiev 3/4:[5] and [7], Summer-Fall 1954.
- YEFREMOV, MYKOLA *see* EFREMOV, MYKOLA (NICHOLAS)
- YFEREMOV, SERHIY *see* JEFREMOV, SERHLJ
- Youth
 Congresses of Slavic Youth, 1890-1892. O. Odlozilik. 6:1327-57, 1958.
- Zadunaysky, P. A. *see* Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky, P. A.
- Zamsha, Iwan *see also* 5/6:456, Ivan Kabachkiv [Obituary]. 10, No. 1:134-36, 1962-1963.
- Zamsha, Iwan *see also* 5/6:456, 1957; 7:1711, 1959; 10, No. 1: 164, 1962-1963.
- Zerov, Mykhaylo *see* Orest-Zerov, Mykhaylo
- Zilynsky, Ivan [Obituary]. 2:345, Summer 1952.
- ZUJEWSKYJ, OLEH
 Mykhaylo Orest-Zerov [Obituary]. 10, No. 1:144-45, 1962-1963.
- Zurko, Maksym [Obituary]. 1:72-73, Winter 1951.

Index to Portraits

- Doroshenko, Dmytro (1882–1951) 5/6:13, 1957
Drahomanov, Mykhaylo (1841–1895) 2:i, Spring 1952
Krupnytsky, Borys (1894–1956) 6:1247, 1958
Margolin, Arnold (1877–1956) 7:1461, 1959
Margolin, Arnold (in 1901) 7:1670, 1959
Margolin, Arnold, and Victor Chernov (in 1943) 7:1671, 1959
Potebnja, Alexander (1835–1891) 5:1055, 1956
Shevchenko, Taras (1814–1861), self-portrait (sepia, 1849) 2:227, Summer 1952
Vetukhiv, Michael (1902–1959) 8:5, 1960
Yakovliv, Andriy (1872–1955) 4:873, Winter-Spring 1955

Index to Chronicle

This index includes all personal names mentioned in the chronicles of volumes 1—10 of *The Annals*, i.e., names of lecturers or other participants (e.g., speakers, artists, singers) in conferences and commemorative (memorial) meetings, as well as names of persons discussed, honored, or commemorated.

References are to volume (in bold face numerals) and page.

INDEX TO CHRONICLE

- Adamovich, Anthony, 7:1701, 1704; 8:230; 10:152
- Alexander II, Tsar of Russia, 10:152
- Antonovych, Volodymyr, 7:1702; 10:151
- Antypiw, Olexa, 5:1243
- Archimovich, Alexander (Arkhimovych, Olexander), 2:480, 482; 3:870; 4:1051; 5:1243; 6:1452, 1453, 1455; 7:1704, 1705; 8:230, 232; 9:339; 10:147, 148, 149, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158
- Archimowitsch, O. (see Archimovich, Alexander)
- Armstrong, John A., 3:600; 5:1242; 6:1450; 7:1702
- Bahaliy, Dmytro, 6:1450, 1451
- Bakalo, Iwan, 8:339; 10:154
- Barka, Wasyl, 10:150
- Basilevich, Ivan (Bazylevych, I.), 2:347, 350
- Bazansky, Michael (Bazhansky, Mykhaylo), 10:160
- Bazylevych, I. (see Basilevich, Ivan)
- Beauplan, Guillaume le Vasseur de, 7:1703
- Berlstein, Alfred, 5:1240; 6:1449; 10:155
- Besoushko, Wolodymyr (Bezushko, V.), 5:1241; 8:231
- Bilaniuk, Petro, 3:601; 4:1051; 8:234
- Bilinsky, Yaroslav (Bilinskij, Jaroslaw), 6:1449; 8:231, 232; 9:341
- Birko, Petro, 2:349, 480; 3:600; 6:1455
- Blakytyni, Eugene (see Nolden, Eugene)
- Bloch, Marie (see Halun-Bloch, Marie)
- Bohachevsky, Martha, 10:153
- Bohomolets, Oleksander, 3:741
- Bojko, Jurij (Boyko, Yuriy), 7:1703
- Boniface, of Querfurt, St. (see Bruno-Boniface)
- Borovec, Taras (see Bulba-Borovets, Taras)
- Borowsky, Mychajlo, 4:1051; 6:1452
- Borysiw, Isidora (see Kossach-Boryssova, Isidora)
- Botvynovsky, Yukhym, Rev., 9:341
- Boychuk, Bohdan, 10:150
- Boyko, Yuriy (see Bojko, Jurij)
- Bruno-Boniface, of Querfurt, St., 4:1049
- Brzeski (Bzhesky), Roman, 10:159
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew, 9:339
- Bulba-Borovets, Taras, 3:869
- Bykovsky, Leo (Lev), 1:74, 185; 2:348, 349, 481; 3:599, 869; 4:1052; 5:1244; 6:1454, 1455; 8:233; 10:158, 159
- Chaplenko, Vasyly, 2:480; 4:1050, 1052; 6:1452, 1454; 8:231, 232; 9:341, 342
- Chapman, Eulalia, Mrs., 6:1454
- Chernyavsky, Mykola, 10:160
- Chikalenko, Levko (Chykalenko, L.), 1:74, 185, 186; 2:347; 3:740; 4:1049; 7:1702; 9:340; 10:149
- Chirovsky, Nicholas (Chyrovsky, M.), 3:869
- Chmielnicki, B. (see Khmel'nytsky, Bohdan)
- Cholodny, Mykola (see Kholodny, Mykola)
- Cholodny, Petro, Sr. (Kholodny, Petro), 1:75; 5:1241
- Cholodny, Petro, Jr., 10:157
- Chomiak, Martha (see Bohachevsky, Martha)
- Chopin, F., 2:350
- Chorniy, Stepan (see Czornij, Stephen)
- Choulguine, Alexander, 8:230

- Chudyniv, Volodymyr B. (Čudyniv-Bohun, V.), 1:75; 2:347
- Chyhryntsiv, Mykyta, 9:341
- Chykalenko, L. (see Chikalenko, Levko)
- Chyrovsky, M. (see Chirovsky, Nicholas)
- Chyz, Yaroslav J., 5:1241; 6:1450, 1452; 9:339
- Chyzhevsky, Dmytro (see Čiževsky, Dmitry)
- Cisyk, Maria, 10:158
- Cisyk, Wolodymyr, 10:158
- Čiževsky, Dmitry, 1:74, 75; 2:347, 348, 480; 3:598, 599, 602; 4:1047, 1048, 1049, 1052; 5:1240, 1241, 1243; 6:1449
- Comenius, Johann Amos (see Komenický, Jan Amos)
- Cromwell, Oliver, 6:1451
- Cymbalisty, Bohdan Y., 9:341
- Czihrinciw, N. (see Chyhryntsiv, Mykyta)
- Czornij, Stephen (Chorniy, Stepan), 9:343
- Daczyszyn-Harasowska, Maria (see Harasowska-Daczyszyn, Maria)
- Dallin, Alexander, 8:230
- Danylenko-Danylevsky, Kost, Rev., 9:339
- Darius, King of Persia, 10:152
- Darwin, Charles Robert, 7:1701
- Dechtiar, Joseph (Dekhtyar, I.), 4:1051
- Demydchuk, Semen, 2:349; 3:599, 741, 868; 4:1049; 9:339
- Denysenko, Hryhorij, 7:1707
- Denyziuk, Mykola, 9:341
- Derevyanko, Andriy, 10:153
- Dobrianskyj, Michael, 10:153
- Dobroniha (Dobronega), daughter of Volodymyr the Great, Grand Prince of Kiev, 5:1241
- Dobrovol'ska, Olimpia, 10:148, 157
- Dolnycky (Dolnytsky), Myron, 6:1455; 9:343
- Dombrowsky, Alexander (Dombrowsky, O.), 2:481; 4:1049; 5:1242; 6:1451; 7:1703; 8:231; 10:151, 152
- Doroshenko, Dmytro, 1:74, 185, 186, 187; 2:347; 3:598; 4:1048; 5:1240; 6:1450
- Doroshenko, Volodymyr, 2:347; 3:868; 5:1240; 6:1449; 7:1703; 8:232; 9:339, 341; 10:161
- Dragomanov, M. (see Drahomanov, Mykhaylo)
- Drahomanov, Mykhaylo, 1:186, 187; 2:347, 348; 6:1449; 10:151
- Drahomanov, Svitozor, 1:185; 2:347; 3:869; 4:1050
- Drashevska, Lubov, 6:1453; 10:149
- Dray-Khmara, Mykhaylo, 8:231
- Dubriwnyj, Pawlo (Dubrivnyi, Pavlo), 9:340
- Dubrowsky, Ivan, 8:234
- Dubrowskyj, Wasyl (Dubrovsky, Wasyl), 8:233
- Dubynetz, Ivan, 3:741
- Dyhdalevych, Olha, 8:231
- Dyvnych, Yu. (see Lawrynenko, Jurij)
- Dziewanowski, M. K., 10:153
- Efremov, Nicholas (Yefremov, Mykola), 2:347, 482; 3:600, 741; 5:1243; 6:1453; 7:1704; 8:232; 10:153
- Efremov, Serhiy (see Yefremov, Serhiy)
- Ezhov, Nikolai (Yezhov, N.), 3:741
- Fal'kivsky, Dmytro, 3:869
- Falletta, Phyllis, 10:158
- Fedotov, Georgii, 4:1047
- Fedyshyn, Oleh, 3:869; 8:231
- Filipovich, Alexander (Fylypovych, O.), 7:1706
- Fizer, John (Ivan), 10:154
- Fomenko, Isabella, 10:158
- Fomenko, Mykola, 5:1244

- Franko, Ivan, 6:1449, 1454, 1455; 7:1702, 1703, 1707; 8:231, 232; 10:147
- Frederiksen, Oliver J., 4:1047
- Friedman, Philip, 3:598
- Furkalovsky, K. (see Turkalo, Kost)
- Fylypovych, O. (see Filipovich, Alexander)
- Fylypovych, Pavlo, 7:1706; 8:231
- George, St. (see Yuriy, St.)
- Getz, Lew (Gets, Lev), 9:342
- Gogol, N. (Hohol, M.), 2:347; 7:1702; 10:153
- Goldman, Ilya J., 7:1704
- Granovsky, Alexander (Oleksander), 1:74, 185; 4:1051; 6:1455; 7:1701, 1706; 10:149
- Gregory VII, Pope, 4:1049
- Grushevskii, M. (see Hrushevsky, Mykhaylo)
- Gvozdetsky, Vasyl, 6:1454; 8:233
- Halajczuk, Bohdan T., 9:339; 10:154
- Halecki, Oscar, 1:186; 6:1450; 8:230
- Halun-Bloch, Marie, 9:343
- Hansen, Lubow (see Margolena-Hansen, Lubow)
- Harasowska-Daczyszyn, Maria (Harasovska-Dachyshyn, Maria), 10:159
- Harkins, William E., 6:1449
- Hayes, Valentine (see Hayevsky, Valentyn)
- Hayevsky, Valentyn, 6:1454
- Hemingway, Ernest, 5:1241
- Henry IV, Holy Roman Emperor, 4:1049
- Herodotus, Greek historian, 6:1451; 8:231; 10:152
- Hirniak, Joseph, 2:350; 10:148, 157, 158
- Hlobenko, Mykola (see Ohloblyn, Mykola)
- Hluszko, Stefan (Hlushko, S.), 8:233; 9:343
- Hohol, M. (see Gogol, N.)
- Holovko, Neonila (see Kordysh-Holovko, Neonila)
- Holub, V. (see Holubnychy, Vsevolod)
- Holubenko, Petro, 2:348; 3:600
- Holubnychy, Vsevolod (Holub, V.; Holub, B.; Golub, Vsevolod), 2:350; 3:869; 4:1050, 1051; 5:1242; 6:1452, 1453; 7:1704, 1705; 8:233; 9:339, 341; 10:151, 153, 154, 155
- Honcharenko, Ahapiy, 5:1241; 6:1454; 10:155
- Horbatschewsky, Lidia (Horbachev-ska, L.), 3:870
- Horbatschewsky (Horbachevskyj), Valerian, 2:480
- Horniatkevych, Damian, 1:74, 75, 185, 186, 187; 2:347, 350, 481, 482; 3:601, 602, 742, 870; 4:1047, 1052; 5:1240, 1241, 1244; 6:1449, 1453; 7:1705; 8:230; 9:342; 10:148, 156, 157
- Horodetsky, Volodymyr (Horodecky, V.), 2:480; 3:741
- Hosch, Ivan, 10:158
- Hromyk, Ivan, 6:1454; 8:233
- Hrushevsky, Mykhaylo, 4:1047; 6:1449; 9:341
- Hrycak, Pavlo (Hrytsak, P.), 5:1242; 6:1450, 1451
- Hryhorenko, Ilja, 3:741
- Hryhoriev, Nykyfor, 3:600
- Hrynevycheva, Katrya, 7:1703
- Hrynewych, Jaroslaw (Hrynevych, Yaroslav), 7:1703
- Hryshko, Vasyl, 2:482; 5:1240, 1242
- Hrytsak, P. (see Hrycak, Pavlo)
- Huley, George (Yuri), Rev., 10:161
- Humbert, Cardinal, 7:1701
- Humenna, Dokia, 3:598
- Hutsaliuk, Luboslau, 10:150
- Iaropolk (see Yaropolk, Grand Prince of Kiev)

- Iaroslav the Wise (see Yaroslav the Wise, Grand Prince of Kiev)
- Illarion (Ivan Ohiyenko), Metropolitan, 2:348; 6:1450
- Ilnytzyk, Roman, 10:155
- Ivanytsky, Borys, 5:1234; 7:1707; 10:160
- Iwaniwsky, Tatiana (Ivanivska, T.), 4:1049, 1052; 5:1242; 6:1452; 10:152
- Izyaslav, Grand Prince of Kiev, 4:1049
- Janata, N. (see Ossadcha-Janata, Natalia)
- Jarema, Stephen, 5:1241; 10:156
- Jaworsky, Alexander (see Sas-Jaworsky, Alexander)
- Jefremov, Serhij (see Yefremov, Serhiy)
- Johnson, Jotham, 10:152
- Joseph I, Holy Roman Emperor, 10:151
- Kalytovska, Marta, 10:150
- Kalytowsky, Theodore, 10:160
- Karanowicz (Karanovych), Daria, 3:742
- Kardinalovska, A., 3:599
- Karpevych, Christina, 10:158
- Karpinsky, Sophia (see Rabij-Karpinsky, Sophia)
- Karpiv, Petro, 6:1455
- Karpova, Halyna, 6:1455
- Karpovich, Michael, 1:186
- Keck, David D., 7:1705
- Kedrowsky (Kedrovsky), Volodymyr, 4:1050; 6:1455; 7:1707; 10:160
- Kekalo, Mykyta, 1:74, 185
- Khmel'nytsky, Bohdan, 3:868; 6:1451, 1454
- Kholodny, Mykola, 4:1051
- Kholodny, Petro (see Cholodny, Petro, Sr.)
- Khotkevych, Hnat, 5:1244
- Khrushchev, Nikita Sergeevich, 10:152
- Khvylyovyi, Mykola, 3:600
- Kipa, Iryna, 10:158
- Kipa, Wadym, 2:350; 7:1702, 1703; 8:230; 10:148, 156, 158
- Kiritchenko, Olha, 10:158
- Kistyakovsky, B. A., 7:1705
- Klen, Yuriy (Jurij), 1:187; 6:1451
- Kline, George L., 6:1449
- Kobryn-Kokolska, Marta (see Kokolska-Kobryn, Marta)
- Kobrynska, Maria, 4:1052
- Kobzey, T., 9:342
- Koc, Marian (see Kots, Marian P.)
- Kocelevalov, A. (see Kotsevalov, Andriy)
- Kokolska-Kobryn, Marta, 10:158
- Komenský, Jan Amos, 6:1449
- Korbyn, George (Yu.), 6:1454
- Kordysh-Holovko, Neonila, 6:1451
- Korol, Nestor, 7:1704
- Koroleva, Natalena, 6:1455; 10:158, 159
- Korowytsky, Ivan, 2:481; 7:1703; 9:340
- Kosarenko-Kosarevytch, Vasyl, 4:1049
- Kosenko, K. (see Kossenko, Konstantin)
- Koshelnyak, Yuriy (see Koszelnik, Jurij)
- Kossach-Boryssova, Isidora, 10:148
- Kossenko, Konstantin (Kosenko, K.), 1:185; 2:347; 3:868
- Kostetsky, Ihor, 10:150
- Kostiuk, Hryhory (Podolyak, B.), 2:350; 3:599, 600, 741, 869; 4:1052; 5:1242; 7:1705; 8:231; 9:340, 342; 10:148, 153, 155, 156, 158
- Kostomarov, Mykola, 7:1701
- Kostruba, Teofil, 10:152
- Kosynka, Hryhoriy (G.), 3:869
- Koszelnik, Jurij (Koshelnyak, Yuriy), 6:1455

- Kot, Stanisław, 4:1047
 Kotlyarevsky, Ivan, 10:150
 Kotovych, Anatoliy, 6:1452
 Kots, Marian P., 10:148
 Kotsevalov, Andriy (Kocevalov, A.), 2:347; 4:1049; 6:1451, 1452; 7:1703; 8:231
 Kotsyubynsky, Mykhaylo, 10:150, 160
 Koval, Lubomyr (see Kowal, Lubomyr M.)
 Kovalenko, Halyna, 3:869
 Kovalenko, Ludmyla, 10:161
 Kovaliv, Panteleimon, 3:598; 6:1455; 7:1707; 8:234; 9:343; 10:161
 Kowal, Lubomyr M., 10:152
 Kozak, Edward, 6:1455
 Kozlovska, Valeria, 1:185
 Krachno, Claudia (see Taranova, Claudia)
 Krachno, Eugene, 7:1702
 Krascheninnikov, Serhij (Krasheninikov, S.), 3:601; 4:1051; 5:1243; 6:1453; 8:232; 10:161
 Krat, Mychajlo, 5:1241
 Krawciw (Kravtsiv), Bohdan, 6:1451, 1453; 7:1703; 9:340; 10:149, 150
 Kropywiansky, Theodor (Kropyvyan-sky, T.), 7:1706; 9:343
 Krotiuk, Maria (Krotiyuk, M.), 8:233
 Krotiuk, Serhy (Krotiyuk, S.), 5:1244
 Krupnytsky, Borys, 4:1049
 Krupsky, Kornel, 9:343
 Krushelnytska, Lidia, 7:1703; 10:157, 158
 Krychevsky, Vasyl, 3:601; 10:157
 Krylow, Iwan (Krylov, I.), 3:601, 869, 870; 4:1052
 Krymsky, Ahatanhel, 10:147
 Kubijowytsch, Wolodymyr (Kubiyo-vych, Volodymyr), 7:1701; 10:149
 Kulish, Mykola, 4:1048; 8:231
 Kulish, Panteleymon, 6:1455; 9:340
 Kurpita, Theodore, 10:159
 Kushakevych, Serhiy, 5:1243
 Kushnirenko, Mykola, 5:1241
 Kusiw, Basil, Rev. (Kuziv, Vasyl), 2:349; 4:1050; 7:1701
 Kuwahara, P., 7:1701
 Kuziv, Vasyl (see Kusiw, Basil, Rev.)
 Kyrychenko, Olha (see Kiritchenko, Olha)
 Kysilewskyj, Constantin (Kysilevsky, Kost), 4:1047; 5:1240; 8:230
 Lawrynenko, Jurij (Dyvnych, Yu.), 2:350; 4:1050; 5:1242; 6:1452; 9:340; 10:147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 157
 Lenec-Tarnawska, Oksana (see Tarnawska-Lenec, Oksana)
 Lepki, Leo (Lepky, Lev), 3:602
 Lepki, Leo R. (Lepkyj, Rostislav), 2:482
 Lepkyi, Bohdan, 2:482; 3:602; 10:148
 Lesytsch, Wadym, 10:157, 158
 Lev, Vasyl (see Lew, Wasyl)
 Levchenko, K. (see Lewczenko, Kyrylo)
 Levchenko, Stefania (see Lewczenko, Stefania)
 Levicky, Vitali (Levytsky, Vitaliy), 6:1452
 Levkovych, I. (see Lewkowycz, Isydora)
 Levytsky, Borys (see Lewytskyj, Borys)
 Levytsky, Mykhaylo, 3:870; 4:1051; 5:1242, 1243; 8:234
 Levytsky, Vitaliy (see Levicky, Vitali)
 Lew, Wasyl (Lev, Vasyl), 5:1240, 1244; 6:1450; 9:340
 Lewczenko, Kyrylo (Levchenko, K.), 6:1454
 Lewczenko, Stefania (Levchenko, Stefania), 10:159
 Lewis, Evelyn M., Mrs., 10:159
 Lewis, Reed, 9:339
 Lewkowycz, Isydora, 10:147

- Lewytzkij, Borys, 10:153
 Lichten, Joseph L., 4:1048; 6:1449; 7:1702; 8:230; 9:339
 Lipiński, W. (see Lypynsky, Vyacheslav)
 Liwycykj (Livytsky), Mykola, 7:1707
 Lonchyna (Lonczyzna), Bohdan, 9:343; 10:160
 Lorca, García, 10:150
 Luciani, Georges, 10:150
 Luckyj, George (Lutsky, Yury), 1:185; 2:350, 351; 3:598, 741
 Luther, Michael, 2:482; 3:600
 Luznycky (Luzhnytsky), Gregory, 4:1050; 7:1702; 10:147, 153
 Lypa, Yuriy, 2:349, 481
 Lypynsky, Vyacheslav, 6:1450; 10:152
 Lysenko, Mykola, 3:602; 10:148, 158, 160
 Lysiak-Rudnytsky, I. (see Rudnytsky, Ivan L.)
 Lysko, Zenowij, 10:155
 Lysniak, Wolodymyr, 10:158
 Lysyj, Wolodymyr, 10:160
 Lytwynenko, Serhij (Lytvynenko, Serhiy), 1:187; 3:601; 7:1703; 10:157
 Lyzohub, Volodymyr, 2:482
- Mackiw, Theodore, 5:1241; 10:151
 Majstrenko, Iwan, 10:153
 Makhiv (Makhov), Gregory, 2:349, 480, 482; 3:600; 5:1243; 6:1455
 Makovska, Tamara, 10:157
 Makowski, Tomasz, 7:1703
 Maksymovych, Mykhaylo, 5:1243
 Malaniuk, Eugene, 5:1240; 6:1451; 10:148, 153
 Maliar, Pawlo (Malyar, Pavlo), 10:160
 Margolena-Hansen, Lubow (Margolin, L.), 4:1051; 7:1707; 8:232, 234; 10:155
 Margolin, Arnold, 1:75; 2:480; 3:868; 4:1047; 5:1241; 6:1449, 1450
 Margolin, L. (see Margolena-Hansen, Lubow)
 Markus, Vasyl, 6:1452; 8:233; 9:341; 10:151, 154
 Martos, Borys, 7:1701, 1705; 10:149
 Masaryk, Tomaš Garrigue, 4:1047
 Mason, Brian H., 10:149
 Mazepa, Ivan, 2:348; 7:1707; 8:230; 9:340; 10:151
 Megasiuk, Adrian, 10:157
 Megasiuk, Jaro, 10:158
 Melnyk, Zinowij Lew, 10:154, 159
 Mendeleev, D. I., 2:347
 Menges, Karl H., 2:348; 3:598; 4:1048; 5:1240
 Mickiewicz, Adam, 4:1048; 5:1240, 1241; 6:1449
 Mijakowskyj, Wolodymyr (Porskyj, V.), 1:74, 75, 185, 186; 2:347, 351, 482; 7:1701, 1702, 1707; 9:340; 10:148, 149, 150, 151, 156
 Miller, Edgar G., 4:1047
 Mills, Yaroslava (see Surmach, Yaroslava)
 Mishchenko (Miščenko), M., 1:74; 2:347, 350; 3:600, 601
 Miyakovsky, Volodymyr (see Mijakowskyj, Wolodymyr)
 Mnohohrishnyi, Demyan, 10:151
 Modzalevsky, Vadym, 5:1242; 6:1450
 Moralevych, Yakiv, 10:158
 Morhun, N. (see Polonska-Vasylenko, Natalya)
 Mosely, Philip E., 1:185; 2:347; 3:740; 6:1450; 8:230
 Mosendz, Leonid, 10:150
 Mstyslav, Archbishop of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States, 10:156
 Mykhayliv, Yukhym, 10:156
 Mykulenko, Larysa, 7:1703
- Nahayewsky, Isidore, Rev., 4:1049; 7:1703

- Nazarko, Irenaeus, OSBM, Rev., 5: 1241
 870; 5:1242, 1243; 6:1452, 1453; 9:341; 10:154
- Nedilko, Alexander, 10:158
 Ovcharenko, Maria, 10:159
- Niedzwiadzky (Nedzvedsky), Mykola, 10:161
 Ovchynnyk, Michael (Mychajlo), 3: 742; 9:343; 10:159
- Nikishyn, P., 5:1243
- Nolden, Eugene (Blakytyni, Eugene), 10:149, 156, 157
 Pakalus, Rudolph, 10:152
- Novakivsky, Oleksa, 3:602
 Pallister, John C., 3:601; 4:1051
- Novovirsky, Nestor, 10:150
 Pankiv, M., 2:349
- Nyzankowsky, Zenon (Nyzhankivsky, Z.), 3:742
 Pankivskyj, Kost, 8:230
- Nyzhankivsky, Nestor, 3:742
 Parfanowycz, Sophie (Parfanovych, Sophia), 2:350
- Odarchenko, Petro, 1:185, 186; 2: 348, 480, 481; 3:598, 868; 4:1048; 5:1241; 6:1449, 1451, 1455; 7: 1703, 1707; 8:234; 9:343; 10:150, 155, 161
 Pavlov, I. P., 2:347
- Odložilik, Otakar, 4:1047
 Pavlovsky, Gregory (Hryhory), Rev., 10:148
- Ohiyenko, Ivan (see Ilarion)
 Pavlovsky, Oleksiy, 5:1240
- Ohloblyn, Mykola (Hlobenko, Mykola), 7:1703
 Pavlovsky, Vadim, 3:601; 6:1449; 10:149, 157
- Ohloblyn, Olexander, 1:185; 2:348, 349, 481, 482; 3:598, 599, 740, 868, 869; 4:1047, 1048, 1049; 5: 1241, 1242; 6:1449, 1450, 1451; 7:1702; 8:230; 10:147, 151
 Pelechatiuk, Nicholas (Pelekhatyuk, M.), 10:159
- Okinshevich, Leo, 2:347, 350, 480
 Pelenska, Iryna (see Vynnytska, Iryna)
- Oles', Oleksander, 2:348
 Pelenski, Jarosław (Pelensky, Yaroslav), 9:341; 10:151
- Olesijuk, Timothy (Olesiyuk, Tymish), 9:342
 Pelensky, Yevhen Yu., 8:232
- Olesnicki (Olesnycky), Roman, 6: 1452
 Perchorowycz, George (Perkhorovych, Yuri), 5:1242; 8:231; 9:340; 10:150, 152
- Olzhych, Oleh (Olżyč, O.), 1:187
 Perejma, Eugene (Pereyma, Yevhen), 7:1707; 8:233; 9:343
- Omelchenko, William (Vasyl), 8:231; 10:151
 Petlyura, Symon, 5:1241
- Orel, Artem, 1:186
 Petrivsky (Petrovsky), Volodymyr, 2:349, 482
- Orest-Zerov, Mykhaylo (Orest, Mykhaylo), 9:343
 Philipov, Alexander, 4:1048, 1052
- Oryshkewych, P., 10:161
 Pidmohyl'nyi, Valeriy, 3:869
- Osadcha-Yanata, N. (see Ossadcha-Janata, Natalia)
 Pil'huk, Ivan I., 6:1455
- Os'machka, Todos', 10:148, 161
 Piłsudski, Józef, 10:153
- Össadcha-Janata, Natalia (Osadcha-Yanata, N.), 1:186; 2:347; 3:742, 869
 Plevako, Mykola, 9:340
- Polonska-Vasylenko, Natalya, 3:869
 Pluzhnyk, Yevhen, 3:869
- Porskyj, V. (see Mijakowskyj, Wołodymyr)

- Potebnja, Alexander, 5:1240
 Pound, Ezra, 10:150
 Powstenko, Olexa (Povstenko, Olexa), 1:74; 2:347; 4:1048; 5:1240; 6:1455; 7:1707; 8:234; 9:343; 10:160, 161
 Pritsak, Omeljjan, 9:339; 10:147
 Prokop, Myroslav, 4:1050
 Prokopowych, Teofan, 3:599
 Prokuda, Wolodymyr, 10:150
 Prychodko, Mykola, 7:1706
 Prychodko, Victor (Prykhodko, V.), 2:481; 3:602; 4:1052
 Prychodko, Wasyl (Prykhodko, V.), 4:1050, 1051; 7:1706; 8:234
 Pyziur, Eugene (Yevhen), 2:481; 3:598, 741; 7:1705; 10:151
 Rabij-Karpinsky, Sophia, 2:482; 10:148
 Radysh, Myroslav, 3:602
 Radzimovska, Valentyna, 4:1050
 Rejnarowycz, Leo (Reynarowycz, Lew), 10:148, 158
 Repin, I. E. (Ryepin, I.), 5:1244
 Reshetar, John S., Jr., 2:350, 481; 4:1047; 5:1242, 6:1450
 Revay, Julian I. (Revai, Yu.), 4:1050
 Reynarowycz, Lew (see Rejnarowycz, Leo)
 Ripetsky, Stepan, 3:870; 9:339
 Romaniuk, Leonid, 6:1454
 Rostovtsev, M. I., 4:1049
 Rozhin, Basil (Vasyl), 2:349; 4:1051
 Rozhin, Ivan, 1:185; 2:349, 350; 3:601, 741, 742, 870; 4:1050, 1051; 5:1241, 1242, 1243; 6:1453, 1455; 7:1706, 1707; 8:233
 Rudansky, Stepan, 10:160
 Rudko, Wasyl, 5:1243; 10:154
 Rudnycka, Milena, 3:741; 6:1449
 Rudnyčkyj, Jaroslav B. (Rudnytsky, Ya.), 1:75; 2:347, 349, 481; 4:1048, 1052; 6:1449, 1450; 7:1702; 10:147
 Rudnytsky, Ivan L. (Lysiak-Rudnytsky, I.), 2:347, 481; 3:869; 4:1050; 6:1453; 7:1704; 8:231; 9:341; 10:152, 153
 Rudnytsky, Stepan, 4:1052
 Rudnytsky, Ya. (see Rudnyčkyj, Jaroslav B.)
 Rudy, Peter, 3:602
 Saksahansky, Panas, 6:1454
 Samokysha, Mykola, 4:1052
 Sas-Jaworsky, Alexander (Sas-Yavorsky, Oleksander), 7:1702
 Sawchyn, George, 10:158
 Sawycky, George, 10:158
 Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von, 4:1052
 Scherey, Hanna, 10:148, 158
 Schulga, Illya (Shulha, Illya), 7:1706
 Schulga, Lidia (Schulha, Lidiya), 7:1706
 Schumylowych, Marianna, 10:157
 Schwarz, Solomon, 9:342
 Scott, Nell I., 10:159
 Šerech, Yu. (see Shevelov, George Y.)
 Ševčenko, Ihor, 2:349; 3:599; 7:1701; 8:230; 10:148
 Shajenko, Peter (Shaenko, P.), 7:1706
 Shakespeare, William, translations of, 10:150
 Shandor, Vincent (Vinkentiy), 6:1453
 Shashlo, Andrew, 7:1706; 8:234; 10:159
 Shatzky, Jacob, 3:598
 Shcherbakivsky, Vadym, 7:1702
 Sheptytsky, Andreas (Sheptycky, Andrey), Metropolitan, 5:1240
 Sherey, Hanna (see Scherey, Hanna)
 Sherman, Charles B., 5:1240
 Shevchenko, Ihor (see Ševčenko, Ihor)
 Shevchenko, Taras, 1:185, 186; 2:348, 480; 3:598, 868; 4:1047; 5:1240; 6:1450, 1455; 7:1701, 1702, 1703, 1707; 8:230, 234; 9:340,

- 341, 343; **10**:147, 149, 150, 157, 159, 160, 161
- Shevelov, George Y. (Šerech, Yu.), **2**:480; **3**:598, 599, 602, 868; **5**:1240; **6**:1449, 1450; **7**:1702, 1703; **8**:230; **9**:340; **10**:147, 148, 156
- Shlemkevych, Mykola, **1**:185; **3**:868; **7**:1705
- Shuhan, Ihor, **10**:157, 158
- Shuhan, Olha (see Kiritchenko, Olha)
- Shulha, Illya (see Schulga, Illya)
- Shulha, Lidiya (see Schulga, Lidia)
- Shul'hyn, Oleksander (see Choultguine, Alexander)
- Shumylovych, Marianna (see Schumylovych, Marianna)
- Shvets, Ihor, **10**:157
- Sichynsky, Volodymyr, **2**:481; **3**:602
- Sichynsky (Sitsinsky), Yukhym, **3**:602
- Skala-Starycky, Myroslaw (Skala, Miro), **5**:1243
- Skrypyuk, Mykola, **3**:600
- Slabchenko, Mykhaylo, **6**:1450
- Slastenenko (Slastyonenko), E., **4**:1051
- Slastion, George (Yuriy), **4**:1052; **6**:1454; **7**:1706; **10**:159
- Slastion, Opanas (Afanasiy), **4**:1052; **7**:1706
- Slavutych, Yar, **10**:160, 161
- Smal-Stocki, Roman, **1**:74, 185; **3**:740
- Smolych, Yuriy, **9**:342
- Solovij, Jurij, **10**:150
- Sonevtsky, Ihor, **3**:602, 742; **6**:1453; **9**:342; **10**:151, 155, 158
- Sonevtsky, Leonid C., **3**:600; **7**:1702
- Sosnovy, Timothy, **3**:600
- Spassky, Boris, **8**:232
- Spengler, Oswald, **6**:1453
- Stakhiv, Eugene (Yevhen), **5**:1242; **8**:231
- Stalin, Iosif V., **3**:741
- Stankevich, John (Stankevič, Janko), **1**:75, 186; **5**:1242
- Starosolsky, George (Yu.), **7**:1707; **10**:161
- Starycky, Myroslaw (see Skala-Starycky, Myroslaw)
- Stec, William (Vasyl), **2**:482
- Steciuk, Basil (Stetsiuk, Vasyl), **5**:1242
- Stefanyk, Vasyl, **8**:233
- Stilman, Leon, **2**:347; **7**:1702
- Stocki, Roman (see Smal-Stocki, Roman)
- Stolypin, P. A., **10**:154
- Sultan, Garip, **7**:1704
- Surmach, Myron, **2**:349
- Surmach, Yaroslava (Slavka), **6**:1453
- Svidzinsky, Volodymyr, **10**:161
- Svit, Ivan (see Sweet, John V.)
- Svyentsitsky, Ilarion, **6**:1453
- Sweet, John V. (Svit, Ivan), **3**:599, 600, 741; **4**:1049; **5**:1241; **6**:1451; **7**:1702, 1704; **8**:231, 233; **10**:151, 153, 155
- Syniawska (Synyavska), Nina, **7**:1705; **10**:158
- Synyavsky, A. S., **4**:1049
- Szeptyckyj, Andrej (see Sheptytsky, Andreas)
- Tamarski, George (Tamarsky, Yuri), **10**:155
- Tamerlane (see Timur)
- Taranova, Claudia, **7**:1702
- Tarnawska-Lenec, Oksana, **10**:158
- Timoshenko, Volodymyr P. (Tymoshenko, V. P.), **1**:74, 185; **2**:347; **3**:600; **5**:1240, 1244
- Timur (Tamerlane), Mongol leader, **7**:1701
- Togan, Zeki Velidi, **7**:1701
- Tomorug, Myroslava, **8**:232, 234
- Toynbee, Arnold, **6**:1453
- Tratschuk, Arkadij (Trachuk, A.), **2**:349; **3**:741; **4**:1049
- Trembicky, Walter R. (Trembitsky, Volodymyr), **3**:869; **4**:1050; **9**:342

- Trembowetsky, Apollon, 10:150, 160
- Trend, H., 9:343
- Tschizewskij, D. (see Čiževsky, Dmitry)
- Tuchak, Wasyl, 8:233; 10:152
- Tufte, Corinne G., 10:152
- Tugan-Baranovsky, M. I. (see Tuhan-Baranovsky, Mykhaylo)
- Tuhan-Baranovsky, Mykhaylo, 10:152
- Turkalo, Jaroslav, 9:342
- Turkalo, Kost (Furkalovsky, K.), 1:74; 2:348; 3:870
- Tutkovsky, Pavlo, 6:1455
- Tychyna, Pavlo, 6:1452
- Tymoshenko, V. P. (see Timoshenko, Volodymyr P.)
- Tyshchenko, Yuriy, 2:348, 349, 481; 3:598, 599, 868
- Ukradyha, Filimon, 3:601, 741; 5:1243; 6:1454; 8:233; 10:158
- Ukrainka, Lesia (see Ukrayinka, Lesya)
- Ukrayinka, Lesya, 2:348, 481; 5:1241; 6:1449, 1451; 10:150, 161
- Varvariv, Kost (see Warvariv, Constantine V.)
- Varyvoda, A. (see Warywoda, Antin)
- Vasmer, Max, 5:1240
- Vasylenko, Mykola, 5:1242
- Vasylenko-Polonska, N. (see Polonska-Vasylenko, Natalya)
- Vasyleva, Olena, 6:1451
- Vasyl'kivsky, Serhiy, 4:1052
- Vavryshchuk, Borys (see Wawryszczuk, Borys)
- Vedel', Artem, 9:342; 10:151, 155
- Velychkivsky, Mykola, 1:185, 186; 10:154
- Velykokhat'ko, F. (see Welykochatko, Th.)
- Veretenchenko, Oleksa, 10:159
- Vernadsky, Volodymyr, 10:149
- Vetukhiv, Michael, 1:74, 75, 185, 186; 2:347, 349, 480; 3:599, 601, 740; 4:1047, 1048; 5:1240, 1241; 6:1449, 1450, 1451; 7:1701, 1702; 8:230, 232, 233, 234; 10:147
- Vladimir the Great (see Volodymyr the Great, Grand Prince of Kiev)
- Volodymyr the Great, Grand Prince of Kiev, 4:1049; 5:1241
- Volynets, I. (see Woly nec, Ilja)
- Voskobiynyk, M. (see Woskobijnyk, Michael)
- Vovk, Vira (see Wowk, Wira)
- Voynarovsky, Andriy, 10:158
- Vynar, B. (see Wynar, Bohdan S.)
- Vynar, L. (see Wynar, Lubomyr R.)
- Vynnychenko, Volodymyr, 1:187; 3:599, 870; 4:1052; 6:1454; 7:1705; 9:342; 10:155, 156, 157
- Vynnytska, Iryna, 8:232
- Vyrsta, Aristid (see Wirsta, Aristide)
- Vyshnevetsky, Dmytro, 10:159
- Vytvytsky, Vasyl (see Wytwycky, Wasyl)
- Warvariv, Constantine V. (Varvariv, Kost), 7:1704; 8:232; 9:342; 10:151
- Warywoda, Antin, 10:157
- Washington, George, 6:1450
- Wawryszczuk, Borys (Vavryshchuk, Borys), 10:158
- Weinreich, Uriel, 9:340
- Welykochatko, Th. (Velykokhat'ko, F.), 3:601
- Wikander, Stig, 8:230
- Winchester, Landon H., 6:1453
- Wirsta, Aristide (Vyrsta, Aristid), 7:1701
- Woly nec, Ilja (Volynets, I.), 3:741; 5:1242; 7:1706
- Woskobijnyk, Michael (Mykhaylo), 10:152
- Wowk, Wira (Vovk, Vira), 10:150
- Wright, Ramona M., 10:159

- Wuorinen, John H., 5:1240
 Wynar, Bohdan S. (Vynar, B.), 4:
 1052; 5:1244; 6:1454; 7:1706; 8:
 233; 9:342; 10:159
 Wynar, Lubomyr R. (Vynar, L.), 4:
 1049; 6:1451, 1454; 7:1706; 10:
 151, 158, 159
 Wynnyska, Iryna (see Vynnytska,
 Iryna)
 Wytwycky, Wasyl (Vytvytsky, Va-
 syl), 6:1455; 9:343; 10:160
 Yakovliv, Andriy, 2:480, 481; 3:
 599, 740, 868; 5:1241
 Yanata, N. (see Ossadcha-Janata,
 Natalia)
 Yaropolk, Grand Prince of Kiev, 4:
 1049
 Yaroslav the Wise, Grand Prince of
 Kiev, 5:1240
 Yarymovych, Michael, 10:154
 Yasinsky, Yu., 8:234
 Yavorsky, Oleksander (see Sas-Ja-
 worsky, Alexander)
 Yefremov, Mykola (see Efremov,
 Nicholas)
 Yefremov, Serhiy, 10:159
 Yezhov, N. (see Ezhov, Nikolai)
 Yuriy, St., 5:1240
 Yurkevych, Pamfil, 10:154
 Zahajkewycz, Bohdan (Zahaykevych,
 B.), 4:1049; 6:1452; 7:1701, 1704;
 9:341
 Zaionchkovsky, Peter, 10:150
 Zaklynskyj, Myron, 7:1705
 Zakrewska, Hanna, 1:74
 Zamiata, Olena, 10:158
 Zamsha, Iwan, 2:349, 350; 3:600;
 10:148, 156
 Zaplitny, A., 7:1707
 Zarsky, Edward (Zharsky, E.), 8:232
 Zawadowych, Gregory (Zavadovych,
 H.), 5:1244
 Zawadowych (Zavadovych), Halyna,
 10:158
 Zeromski, Stefan, 9:343
 Zerov, Mykhaylo (see Orest-Zerov,
 Mykhaylo)
 Zerov, Mykola, 6:1455; 7:1706; 8:
 231
 Zharsky, E. (see Zarsky, Edward)
 Znayenko, Myroslava (see Tomorug,
 Myroslava)
 Zozula, Jakiw (Zozulya, Yakiv), 6:
 1450
 Zubal, Jaroslaw (Yaroslav), 4:1051;
 5:1243; 6:1455; 7:1707; 10:159,
 160
 Zujewskyj, Oleh, 10:150
 Zywootko, Alexandra (Zyvoitko, Olek-
 sandra), 10:150

EDITORS AND EDITORIAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

EDITORS

Michael Vetukhiv, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Winter 1951)—Vol. 7 (1959)
George Y. Shevelov, Vol. 8 (1960)—Vol. 9 (1961)
Leonid C. Sonevytsky, Vol. 10 (1962–1963)

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

George Luckyj, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Winter 1951)—Vol. 2, No. 2 (Summer 1952)

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Lubov Drashevskaja (Science), Vol. 8 (1960)
Leonid C. Sonevytsky (History and Economics), Vol. 8 (1960)

TECHNICAL EDITORS

Henry M. Nebel, Jr., Vol. 3, No. 2 (Fall-Winter 1953)—Vol. 5, No. 2/3
(Winter-Spring 1956)
Louise E. Luke, Vol. 8 (1960)

TECHNICAL EDITOR, UKRAINIAN SECTION

Iwan Zamsha, Vol. 3, No. 4/Vol. 4, No. 1, 2 (Summer-Fall 1954)

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Alexander Archimovich, Vol. 10 (1962–1963)
Dmitry Čiževsky, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Fall 1951)—Vol. 10 (1962–1963)
Alexander Granovsky, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Winter 1951)—Vol. 10 (1962–1963)
John S. Reshetar, Jr., Vol. 8 (1960)—Vol. 10 (1962–1963)
George Y. Shevelov, Vol. 10 (1962–1963)
Roman Smal-Stocki, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Winter 1951)—Vol. 9 (1961)
Volodymyr P. Timoshenko, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Winter 1951)—Vol. 10 (1962–1963)

*THE ANNALS OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY
OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE UNITED STATES*

- Vol. I, No. 1, 1951. *Out of print.*
- Vol. I, No. 2, 1951. *One dollar and fifty cents.*
- Vol. II, No. 1 (3), 1952. Mykhaylo Drahomanov: A Symposium and Selected Writings. *Three dollars.*
- Vol. II, No. 2 (4), 1952. *One dollar and fifty cents.*
- Vol. II, No. 4 (6), 1952. *One dollar and fifty cents.*
- Vol. III, No. 1 (7), 1953. *One dollar and fifty cents.*
- Vol. III, No. 2 (8), 1953. *One dollar and fifty cents.*
- Vol. III, No. 3 (9), 1954. *One dollar and fifty cents.*
- Vol. III, No. 4 (10)/Vol. IV, No. 1-2 (11-12), 1954. Olexa Powstenko, The Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev. *Twelve dollars and fifty cents.*
- Vol. IV, No. 3 (13), 1955. *Three dollars.*
- Vol. IV, No. 4 (14)/Vol. V, No. 1 (15), 1955. N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, The Settlement of the Southern Ukraine (1750-1775). *Six dollars.*
- Vol. V, No. 2-3 (16-17), 1956. *Three dollars.*
- Vol. V, No. 4 (18)/Vol. VI, No. 1-2 (19-20), 1957. Dmytro Doroshenko and Olexander Ohloblyn, A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography. *Six dollars.*
- Vol. VI, No. 3-4 (21-22), 1958. *Three dollars.*
- Vol. VII, No. 1-2 (23-24), 1959. Special Issue Devoted to the Memory of Arnold Margolin. *Three dollars.*
- Vol. VIII, No. 1-2 (25-26), 1960. Studies in Linguistics. *Six dollars.*
- Vol. IX, No. 1-2 (27-28), 1961. Studies in History of the Post-Revolutionary Ukraine and the Soviet Union. *Six dollars.*

Orders may be placed with The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States, Inc., 206 West 100 Street, New York, New York 10025

