

The Ukrainian Diaspora

Vic Satzewich

Global Diasporas





11 New Fetter Lane
London EC4P 4EE
29 West 35th Street
New York NY 10001

ISBN 0-415-29658-7



9 780415 296588

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
Introduction	1
1 Ukrainians and the concept of diaspora	8
2 Emigration and the formation of a labor diaspora (1890–1914)	26
3 What kind of Ukrainian are you? Cleavages within the pre-World War II diaspora	49
4 The third wave: World War II and the displaced persons	86
5 The social organization of the postwar diaspora	107
6 Ukraine in the postwar diaspora: exposing human rights abuses	140
7 Ukrainians and their sense of victimization	165
8 The diaspora and the challenges of Ukrainian independence	190
Conclusion	214
<i>Notes</i>	223
<i>Bibliography</i>	238
<i>Index</i>	259

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book has been some time in the making and I have incurred a number of debts along the way. Sergei Vainykof helped with research assistance, as did Heather Gillespie, who is now at law school learning the intricacies of how to sue people. Patrick Kyba was a wonderful traveling companion on a research visit to Ukraine. Even though they may not have known exactly why I was asking so many questions, I would like to thank Oryst Pidzamecky, Michael Wawryshyn, Eugene Duvalko, Ihor Bardyn, Wsevolod Isajiw, Dirk Hoerder, Christiane Hartzig, Bob Miles, Christina Isajiw and Father Walter Makarenko for bits and pieces of information, and advice, over the years. Ron Cahute's unique sense of humor and take on life, along with Melanie Cahute and *Dobrodiyka* Olga Makarenko's kindness, warmth and hospitality will always be appreciated. While not able to address all of their concerns, the thoughtful comments of the referees were very helpful in revising the manuscript. Freya Godard and Frances Nugent provided efficient editorial advice. I also want to thank Robin Cohen for initially encouraging me to take up this topic, and Mari Shullaw at Routledge for sticking with this project. The staff in the Department of Sociology at McMaster University, including Jackie Tucker, Olga Cannon, Corrine Jehle, Wendy Goncalves and Maria Wong, are absolute treasures and help run a busy department. I am also fortunate to work with a number of wonderful colleagues who played only indirect, but nevertheless important, roles in this book. Charlene Miall has an infectious sense of humor and invariably provides sensible advice. Pam Sugiman has a unique way of keeping things in perspective. Billy Shaffir introduced me to the joys of smoked meat sandwiches, John Fox shares his interest and expertise in *The Sopranos* with me, and Rhoda Hassmann has 'talked me down' a number of times. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Department of Canadian Heritage provided substantial, and much appreciated, financial contributions that enabled me to conduct the research for this book. Some of the ideas in this book were presented at the

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

'Year 2020' conference, organized by the Ukrainian American Professionals and Businesspersons Association of New York and New Jersey; the Recasting European and Canadian History Conference held in Bremen, Germany; and at a race and ethnicity symposium in the Department of Sociology at McMaster. Linda Mahood read the chapters many times, and the manuscript in full. She is the reason I drive so fast from work to home. Jack and Lucy Satzewich, as usual, make sure that I do not get too distracted by my work, which is, as Martha Stewart says, 'a good thing'. Any and all errors, of course, are my responsibility.

INTRODUCTION

On October 23, 1994, a fifteen-minute segment of the CBS news-magazine program *60 Minutes* was devoted to the increase in anti-Semitism in Ukraine since that country became independent in 1991. The item was called ‘The Ugly Face of Freedom’ and was hosted by Morely Safer. The program showed snippets from interviews with Jewish leaders who described what appeared to be rampant anti-Semitism in Ukraine. It also juxtaposed events and organizations that were associated with atrocities committed against Jews during World War II with present-day Ukraine; the implication was that in the 1990s Ukrainians were continuing in their alleged long-standing and traditional hatred of Jews. In one scene the program overlaid images of goose-stepping German soldiers during the war with a torchlight march of a present-day Ukrainian youth organization. The images were accompanied by the sound of marching boots, implying that the youths were the new brownshirts of Ukrainian ethnic nationalism. Elsewhere in the program, Safer commented:

Many of the Ukrainian men of Lvov [Lviv] who marched off as members of the SS never returned, killed fighting for Hitler. But last summer, a good number of the survivors, veterans of the SS Galicia Division, did return for a reunion laid on by the Lvov City Council – Ukrainian SS veterans now living in Canada, the United States and Ukraine. Nowhere, certainly not in Germany, are the SS so openly celebrated. And for this reunion, Cardinal Lubachevsky, head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, gave his blessing, just as his predecessor did to the SS more than 50 years ago.

(Cited in Kuropas, 1995)

Near the end of the program Safer moderated the allegations with the comment ‘that Ukrainians . . . are not genetically anti-Semitic’.

INTRODUCTION

But the Ukrainian diaspora community considered that he meant exactly the opposite (Gregorovich, 1998). The broadcast raised the ire of Ukrainians in the United States and Canada. In the weeks following, thousands of letters were reportedly sent to CBS protesting the bias and hatred expressed in the program, and demonstrations were held at the CBS offices in Washington and New York (Kuropas, 1995). In addition, an ad hoc committee of Ukrainian Americans met with Safer, the producer Jeffrey Fager and the vice-president of CBS Joseph Peyronnin to demand an apology and a retraction. The CBS executives stood by the story, but they did agree to 'revisit the issue'.

At least two detailed critiques of the program were published, one by the noted Ukrainian-American historian Myron Kuropas (1995) and another by Andrew Gregorovich (1998) of the Ukrainian Canadian Research and Documentation Centre in Toronto. Among other things, both critiques argued that it was not anti-Semitism that led Ukrainians to join the Waffen-SS during the war, but rather their hatred of the Soviet system. The critiques also commented on the seemingly deliberate mistranslation of the term *zhyd*, which in Ukrainian means Jew, but which was translated as 'kike' in the television program, and the meaning of the wartime activities of organizations like the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists.

The program distorted historical fact, provided mistranslations of statements originally made in Ukrainian, altered dates on which events allegedly occurred, used statements out of context, produced unsubstantiated photos, accepted statements from discredited sources at face value, and, in numerous instances, employed half-truths to insinuate a rising tide of anti-Semitism exists in western Ukraine.

(Kuropas, 1995)

The published criticisms also considered the motives behind the program. Kuropas and Gregorovich both suggested that larger geo-politics were at play. Kuropas called the program a 'willful act of hate mongering . . . The fingerprints of the KGB can be seen all over the CBS broadcast' (Kuropas, 1995). Like others in the diaspora community, he considered the program to be part of a covert attempt by the Russian security forces to undermine the legitimacy of independent Ukraine. In response to his rhetorical question 'is it possible that Mr Safer and the CBS were hoodwinked by a Russian agent?' Kuropas pointed out that this was not the first time that an American journalist was fooled by 'the Russians'. As evidence, he referred to the *New York Times* reporter Walter Duranty and his false reporting, sixty years earlier, of the famine that was

INTRODUCTION

orchestrated by Joseph Stalin in Soviet Ukraine in 1932–3 (see Carynyk, 1986a, 1986b).

The suspicions about a Russian conspiracy were also fed by the timing of the broadcast, which coincided with Leonid Kuchma's first visit to North America as President of Ukraine: 'The purpose of the program was to blacken Ukraine and its 53 million people' and to undermine the international stature of the country (Gregorovich, 1998).

Others, however, argued that the program was simply an example of tabloid journalism. Askold Lozynskyj (1999) of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA) and president of the Ukrainian World Congress did not believe that CBS had an anti-Ukrainian agenda *per se*; at the same time he did not think the program was simply 'a mistake'. In his view, the producers were marginally aware of a lingering historical hostility between Ukrainians and Jews and exploited that hostility to create a sensational story. And some members of the Jewish community agreed. In fact, the Ukrainian diaspora's case against the program was supported by a number of Jewish leaders who also disavowed the allegations in the program. Yaakov Bleich, the American-born Chief Rabbi of Ukraine, who was interviewed for the program and whose statements appeared to be particularly damning, later stated that his comments were taken out of context and that the program did 'not convey the true state of affairs in Ukraine' (cited in Gregorovich, 1998: 3). Other Jewish leaders, including Martin Plax, area director of the American Jewish Congress in Cleveland, Ohio, complained that the distortions in the program did little to help the Jews in Ukraine:

The Jews who have chosen to remain in Ukraine and to live Jewishly cannot be aided by an eruption of indignation and panic. We can give aid to them however, by supporting the forces that exist within Ukraine which are striving to contain any hatred and promote stability and moderation. If we do anything other, we may learn another lesson: that those who distort the present, by assuming that nothing has changed from the past, will increase the probability that they might relive the past from which they hoped to escape.

(Plax, n.d.)

In the light of CBS's unwillingness either to retract the story or to apologize, members of the Ukrainian-American community turned to the courts. At first they considered a class action lawsuit against CBS on the grounds that it had defamed the Ukrainian people. This strategy was dropped because in US law the definition of aggrieved parties in class

INTRODUCTION

action cases is fairly narrow. Instead two individuals, Alexander Serafyn and Oleg Nikolyszyn, with the support of the UCCA and a number of prominent Ukrainian-American lawyers, petitioned the American Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to reject CBS's application for broadcast licenses for stations it had acquired in Detroit, Michigan, and Providence, Rhode Island. Their argument was that since the *60 Minutes* item distorted the news, the network had failed to serve the public interest (Serafyn *et al.*, 1998: 7).

The legal wrangling lasted for nearly four and a half years, but in April 1999 a settlement was reached. The complainants agreed to drop their petition to the FCC, and in exchange CBS agreed to cover the legal fees of the community, which amounted to some US\$328,000. The attorneys representing the complainants in turn donated their fees from CBS to a number of Ukrainian-American organizations.¹

In the opinion of the UCCA and other members of the Ukrainian-American community, the settlement was neither a complete victory nor a complete defeat. Though the Ukrainian diaspora in the United States and Canada was disappointed that CBS stood by the story and refused to admit that it had distorted any facts, it regarded the settlement, and the negotiations that led to it, as a moral and political victory. Arthur Belendiuk (1999) a Ukrainian-American attorney who helped present the community's case, observed that the Ukrainian Americans had stood up for themselves and that they would be a force to be reckoned with the next time that CBS or any other media outlet defamed Ukraine or Ukrainians. Another Ukrainian-American attorney involved in the case, Donna Pochoday, argued that

the Ukrainian community should be aware that this is probably the closest we've ever come to protect our interest as a group in cases of news distortion and defamation of our good name. Other groups have not been afraid, nor would we as a Ukrainian American community be afraid or too timid to have our voices heard.

(Pochoday, 1999)

And at a conference of Ukrainian-American organizations held in Washington, DC in June 1999, Askold Lozynskyj caustically 'thanked' CBS for having galvanized the community and drawn 'the baby boomer' generation of Ukrainian Americans into organized Ukrainian diaspora life.

This episode in the life of the Ukrainian community in North America is also significant because it highlights a central dilemma in the academic literature on both the sociology of ethnicity and the sociology of migration:

INTRODUCTION

what is the relationship between ancestral homelands and members of ethnic groups who have left that homeland, or have never even set foot in it? This dilemma, which in turn touches on a number of broad theoretical and conceptual questions about the intersection of ethnic identity, group boundary maintenance, history and historical memory, and ancestral homelands, forms the intellectual backdrop for this book. Although the issues are relevant to many different ethnic groups in various places and situations, this book explores that dilemma by using the case of the Ukrainian diaspora in North America.

Chapter 1 is a theoretical chapter that outlines some of the main conceptual issues, in particular the concept of diaspora as a heuristic device. I review competing definitions of diaspora and argue that, while there are a number of conceptual problems associated with how diasporas are defined, the concept and some recent typologies remain useful because of the questions that they generate and the kinds of sign posts they provide for further research and comparative analysis. In addition, the chapter briefly sketches some of the similarities and differences between the Ukrainian diaspora experience and that of other groups.

Chapter 2 asks two questions about the first wave of Ukrainian migration and the process of diaspora formation. Why did Ukrainians begin to leave their homes in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries? And what impact did international migration, settlement in a new land and ethnic elites have on the formation of the identity of the first wave of migrants? I argue that Ukrainians left their ancestral homelands to search for wage labor. However, in addition to providing Ukrainian peasants with work and land that they could farm, emigration at the turn of the century also resulted in their discovery and definition of themselves as 'Ukrainian'. Put differently, part of the process of diaspora formation involved becoming conscious of themselves as Ukrainian.

Chapter 3 deals with the second wave of migration, which occurred between the wars. In particular it asks why Ukrainians left their homelands during those years, and it traces the impact of World War I and the Russian Revolution on the way that group boundaries were formed within the Ukrainian diaspora. These critical events in Ukraine's history helped solidify a division that had already begun to emerge in the diaspora between nationalists and communists, and one of the purposes of this chapter is to examine how those divisions played themselves out in relation to the diaspora politics of the homeland. I will show that various nationalist groups in the diaspora thought that the diaspora condition was temporary and they therefore plotted for, and worked towards, Ukrainian independence from both Poland and Russia. For diaspora communists, the Russian Revolution provided an opportunity for a return movement to develop,

INTRODUCTION

and every effort was made to support efforts to create a Ukrainian socialist state. What is theoretically interesting about these episodes in the history of the interwar Ukrainian diaspora in North America is that they show that diasporas do not necessarily display just one attitude towards the homeland, and that hostility within groups can be just as important to the formation and maintenance of group boundaries as hostility between groups.

Chapter 4 deals with the third wave of migration: the displaced persons. It traces the influence of World War II on emigration from Ukraine, and discusses the postwar solidification of political factions within the nationalist side of the diaspora and the uneasy relationship between longer-settled members of the nationalist-oriented diaspora and the highly politicized displaced persons, who took on the characteristics of a victim diaspora.

Chapter 5 is an examination of the organizational structure of the Ukrainian diaspora in North America. By looking at the concept of institutional completeness, the chapter asks how Ukrainians have used ethnic organizations to maintain the boundaries and consciousness of their group. The chapter shows that Ukrainians have maintained a strong ethnic group consciousness over many decades and that the diaspora has been a site of creativity for Ukrainians. Through the formation of umbrella organizations and through the use of the Internet, the diaspora has also tried, albeit with only mixed success, to maintain a sense of solidarity among its members, both those in North America and those in other parts of the world.

Chapter 6 examines the effect that the Cold War and the associated human rights violations in Soviet Ukraine had on the Ukrainian diaspora in North America. It begins by discussing Soviet repression of the Ukrainian people, language and culture in Ukraine after World War II. It then asks how those violations of human rights in Soviet Ukraine affected the consciousness and political mobilization of Ukrainians in North America. In other words, how did Ukrainians respond to their inability to return to Soviet Ukraine, how did they mobilize to support the wider Ukrainian population, and Ukrainian dissidents in particular, in Soviet Ukraine, and how did these activities help to solidify, and at the same time help undermine, group boundaries?

Chapter 7 describes the sense of historical and contemporary victimization that permeates some aspects of Ukrainian diaspora life in North America. The emphasis is on how members of the Ukrainian diaspora responded to Nazi war crimes trials, and to the related allegations of Ukrainian anti-Semitism in the 1980s and 1990s. The chapter also examines the resentment displayed by some members of the Ukrainian diaspora towards the Canadian and American governments for not placing the famine in Soviet Ukraine in 1932–3 on the same philosophical and political terrain as the Jewish Holocaust. It suggests that while victimization is not

INTRODUCTION

the only, or even the most important, narrative in Ukrainian diaspora community life, the cultivation of a sense of victimization may be one avenue by which the Ukrainian diaspora maintains its identities and group boundaries; it may also be one way to draw new generations of diaspora Ukrainians into the ethnic fold.

Chapter 8 examines the effect that Ukrainian independence has had on the organized Ukrainian diaspora. In many ways, independence has been a case of prophecy realized. The fall of the Iron Curtain and the rise of an independent Ukrainian state were what many individuals and organizations in the postwar North American Ukrainian diaspora had longed and worked for. Independence has accordingly resulted in increased opportunities for the diaspora to return to Ukraine and has resulted in a new fourth wave of emigration from Ukraine. However, the developments have had certain unforeseen consequences. The question is being asked whether there needs to be a Ukrainian diaspora now that Ukraine is independent, how do longer-settled members of victim and cultural diasporas interact with new labor migrants, and who the more authentic Ukrainians are. In the conclusion, I return to the issue of diaspora and discuss some of the ways in which the concept of diaspora needs to be revised, expanded and modified in the light of the Ukrainian experience.

1

UKRAINIANS AND THE CONCEPT OF DIASPORA

In the years immediately following World War II, the term 'diaspora' was not used by Ukrainians living outside of Ukraine. Instead, it was much more common for them to think of themselves either as being 'in the emigration' or as 'an immigration'. The diaspora label tended to be used only when Soviet authorities wanted to discredit Ukrainian émigré nationalists living abroad who were calling for the overthrow of the Soviet regime and the liberation of Ukraine. For the Soviets, diaspora was a pejorative term that referred to groups of people living abroad who had ulterior political motives for their interest in their ancestral homelands in the Soviet Union. As Harvard historian Roman Szporluk (1998) explains: 'The Soviets needed to characterize immigrants negatively since the immigration fought against the "silent liquidation" that was proceeding against Ukrainians in a complicated historical and political process'. Szporluk suggests, however, that the politicized Ukrainians 'in the emigration' were not, in fact, offended by the diaspora label and gradually embraced it as part of their self-definition.

Since the late 1980s, the term diaspora has increasingly formed part of the everyday vocabulary of Ukrainians living outside of Ukraine, who routinely use the term to describe their organizational life and identity. For instance, in October, 1998, the Ukrainian American Professionals and Businesspersons Association of New York and New Jersey organized a 'Year 2020' conference. Its goal was to begin to formulate answers to four fundamental questions. 'Will there be a North American Ukrainian diaspora in the year 2020?', 'Does an independent Ukraine enrich and invigorate the diaspora, or undermine its reason for being?', 'Will a new wave of immigrants play a key role in the diaspora's future?' and 'Are the futures of the Canadian and American diasporas tied to each other, or will their paths be shaped by markedly different circumstances?' In 1994, the Shevchenko Scientific Society in New York helped fund the publication of *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World: A Demographic and Sociological*

Guide to the Homeland and its Diaspora. The Society is currently preparing an encyclopedia of the diaspora, which is intended to be a source of information about all Ukrainian communities outside of Ukraine. And, to complicate things even further, the Ukrainian World Coordinating Council and the Ukrainian World Congress (each of which claims to represent the interests of Ukrainians in the diaspora), see Ukrainians living abroad as made up of two diasporas – an ‘eastern’ diaspora, which lives in various countries in eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, and a ‘western’ diaspora, which lives in North and South America, western Europe and Australia.

The postwar shifts in the way that the concept of diaspora has been used in reference to Ukrainians outside of Ukraine inevitably raises the question of definitions. In other words, what does the concept of diaspora refer to, and why is it a useful tool for carving up social reality? Before discussing the concept of diaspora, this chapter briefly considers some of the parallels between the Ukrainian diaspora and other diasporas. This will set the stage for a critical theoretical analysis of the concept of diaspora, and for a discussion of the scope and limitations of this study.

Comparing the Ukrainian diaspora

In addition to being a label used by Ukrainians to refer to themselves, the idea of a diaspora, through implicit and explicit comparisons with the Jewish diaspora, has helped Ukrainians living abroad to understand their own community life and politics (Bardyn, 1993). Indeed, according to Manoly Lupul (1990: 466), ‘the Jewish people – . . . members of a persevering and successful diaspora that has regained its promised land – have always been the model for Ukrainians in Canada’. According to Lupul (1990: 466), discussions of Ukrainian-Canadian issues are replete with references to the Jewish community, and ‘*Dyvitsia na zhydiv* [look at the Jews] has been the *coup de grace* or call-to-arms of many a Ukrainian Canadian leader’. Some diaspora Ukrainians have, for example, pointed out that after the founding of the state of Israel, Jews in the diaspora did the same soul-searching that Ukrainians are now doing about the new independent Ukraine. It was once thought that the existence of Israel makes the Jewish diaspora unnecessary, and the creation of an independent Ukrainian state in 1991 is sometimes thought of in the same way. Others have pointed out that even though many diaspora Ukrainians are disillusioned with certain facets of life and government in independent Ukraine, many Jews living abroad have consistently stood behind the state of Israel even though they have their own reservations about some of the government’s policies. Furthermore, Ukrainians have pointed out that

Jews are concerned about the long-term survival of their communities in many of the same ways as Ukrainians. For example, *The Vanishing American Jew*, by Alan Dershowitz (1997), has both comforted and alarmed some Ukrainians in the diaspora. Some find solace in the fact that ‘even the Jews’ are being assimilated and are seeing the fortunes of their organizations decline; others suggest that if the Jews cannot withstand the forces of assimilation and survive as a diaspora, then there is little hope for groups that appear to be less powerful and less organized.

The persecution of the Jews also has parallels in the narratives of Ukrainian diaspora life, for many diaspora Ukrainians argue that their ethnic group has been the victim of genocide, and that there was a Ukrainian Holocaust that was at least equal in horror to the Jewish Holocaust. The famine of 1932–3 is considered as a deliberate attempt by Stalin and the Soviet regime to physically annihilate the Ukrainians as an ethnocultural group. And the Soviet government’s subsequent policy of Russification is seen as a further attempt to destroy Ukrainians, culturally if not physically.

In fact, much of the vocabulary that forms the discourse about the Jewish Holocaust is increasingly being used by Ukrainians when they describe their own experiences and those of their ancestors. At the 1997 World Forum of Ukrainians, for instance, the Ukrainian World Congress proposed that the Ukrainian World Coordinating Council be authorized to lobby the Ukrainian government to strike a ‘Second Nuremberg’ where leaders of the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and of Ukraine would be tried for crimes against ‘the Ukrainian people and the human race’. These crimes ‘include forced starvation, terror, deportation, genocide and penal servitude’. The Congress also wanted the Forum to ask the Ukrainian government to proclaim a Ukrainian Day of Sorrow and Memory for all Ukrainians who died in their fight for the survival of the Ukrainian nation (Ukrainian World Congress, 1997). In that same vein, the Ukrainian Canadian Civil Liberties Association (UCCLA), which was formed, in part, to lobby the Canadian government to acknowledge, and pay restitution for, the internment of Ukrainian Canadians during World War I, uses emotion-laden terms from both the Cold War and the Holocaust to describe what happened to the Ukrainians. Terms like ‘concentration camps’ and ‘gulag archipelago’ are used regularly to describe the Canadian internment operations. The UCCLA web site, for example, describes the camps as the Canadian ‘gulag archipelago’, an obvious reference to the Soviet Union and its treatment of dissidents. Similarly, the term ‘concentration camps’ evokes images of barbed wire fences, emaciated prisoners, brutal prison guards and, above all, the Jewish Holocaust.

Though Ukrainians less often compare themselves with groups other than Jews, the experiences of other diaspora groups may actually be just as relevant, in particular those of other east central Europeans in North America such as Latvians, Lithuanians, Hungarians and Poles. For the Ukrainians and other east central Europeans, their ancestral homelands were all dominated by the Soviet Union and this gave them a number of things in common as diasporas. First, they were physically cut off from their homelands. Certainly the Soviet Union and countries of the eastern bloc liked to see the occasional diaspora socialist or communist return temporarily to the homeland to tell Soviet workers how well off they were and how exploited the workers were in the west, but large numbers of diaspora returnees were not welcome, particularly if they had nationalist political aspirations.

Second, until the 1980s, not many people in these communities were keen on actually returning while their countries were under Soviet control. The fear of arrest or repression for having left the homeland, particularly among those who escaped during the chaos of World War II, acted as a strong brake on any return movement. Even going back temporarily as a tourist or to visit relatives was out of the question.

Third, the anti-Soviet attitudes of many people in the diasporas who came from east central Europe, or whose ancestors had come from there, led to an active political mobilization against human rights abuses and the wider Soviet domination of their homelands. Many longed for, and worked toward, the day that their ancestral homelands might one day be free.

Fourth, because of Soviet restrictions on emigration, for many years east central European groups in North America saw very few new arrivals from the homeland. Some individuals did occasionally escape from the Soviet Union or the larger eastern bloc in circumstances that were sometimes not dissimilar to the adventures of James Bond, but their numbers were far less than the masses of emigrants who left before and during World War II. In fact, the decades-long drought in new immigrants for many east central European diaspora groups in North America may mean that they all have similar difficulties integrating new members into existing structures and organizations. This issue certainly requires further research.

Fifth, the diaspora has been a site of creativity for many east central European groups. During the period between the end of World War II and the rise of independent states in the former Soviet Union and eastern bloc, eastern European diaspora groups felt that in many ways their authentic language, culture and traditions were making their last stand in the diaspora. The suppression by the Soviet Union of languages other than Russian, and its efforts to create *Homo sovieticus* in a Russian mold, seriously threatened the ethnic cultures and languages, or so it appeared in the

diaspora. For Ukrainians and other east central European groups, some of the impetus to maintain the language and culture of the ethnic group came from that larger political subtext.

Finally, the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the fall of the Iron Curtain have provided new opportunities for members of these diasporas to reacquire themselves with their ancestral homelands. However, after decades of separation, the freer movement of goods, people, ideas and information to and from the homeland may be having unintended consequences. Though it is not entirely accurate to compare the 'reunification' of the Ukrainian diaspora and Ukraine with the reunification of East and West Germany, commentators have noted how both forms of 'reunification' have resulted in a greater sense of the differences between 'us' and 'them'. In some ways, getting reacquainted has only led to a greater recognition of the differences.

Despite these similarities, there are also differences between the Ukrainian case and that of other east central European groups. Though this idea is still speculative and needs further research, the Ukrainian diaspora seems to have been less successful in becoming involved in the politics of the homeland than other diasporas. The Ukrainian diaspora's involvement in the politics of the homeland also seems to be less welcome in the homeland. While there are political parties in Ukraine that draw at least some of their resources and leadership from the diaspora, the extent of Ukrainian diaspora involvement in politics in the homeland seems to differ markedly from that of places like Latvia. The President of Latvia, Vaira Vike-Freiberga, left the country as a child, grew up in refugee camps in Germany and spent much of her adult life as a professor of psychology at the University of Montreal. However, in 1999 she was elected President. Though the case of a person who had spent most of her life in the diaspora and has then become a head of state in the ancestral homeland may be more the exception than the rule, it does suggest a dramatically greater social acceptance of diaspora involvement in the politics of the homeland. And, finally, comparatively fewer diaspora Ukrainians seem willing to 'return' to, or to move to their ancestral homeland, than members of other east central European diasporas. The size, nature and extent of 'return' movements are difficult to measure, and further comparative research on this topic is also necessary. However, if there is a difference between the Ukrainian diaspora and other diasporas in the willingness to return, one reason may be the make-up of those different communities. The contemporary Ukrainian diaspora, particularly in North America, has comparatively few first-generation immigrants. In 1986, for example, 92 percent of the Ukrainian population in Canada had been born in Canada (Isajiw and Makuch, 1994: 328), and in 1980 83.1 percent of the American-Ukrainian

population had been born in the United States (Markus and Wolowyna, 1994: 363). If the pull of the 'old country' grows weaker with the number of generations that people are removed from the ancestral homeland, such differences may be due to general sociological processes rather than the particularities of different ethnic groups.

The concept of diaspora

Even though the term 'diaspora' is widely used in Ukrainian communities in North America, and even though parallels can be drawn between the diaspora experience of the Ukrainians and that of Jews and other east central European groups, not everyone considers it a useful term. The dissenting view has not been expressed systematically, but some reservations about the applicability of the diaspora concept appeared in an article in the Canadian *Ukrainian News* in October 1998. Thomas Prymak, a professor of history at the University of Toronto, took issue with the recent tendency of many ethnic communities, including Ukrainians, to refer to themselves as a diaspora. In his view, there are three reasons why it is inaccurate to call Ukrainians a diaspora. First, he argued that, historically speaking, the vast majority of Ukrainians have always lived in their European homeland. Despite various waves of emigration from the late nineteenth century, the reality is that most Ukrainians have stayed home and therefore have no history as a diaspora. Second, he suggests that only a small proportion of Ukrainians left Ukraine for political reasons. The comparatively few political émigrés from Ukraine are not, in his view, very representative of the total emigration, which was made up largely of labor migrants who left Ukraine for essentially economic reasons. Third, he argues that, in the case of Canada, people of Ukrainian ancestry are so thoroughly assimilated that the vast majority think of themselves as Canadian first and Ukrainian second. In view of the high rates of language loss and intermarriage, he suggests that the term diaspora is of limited use in describing the Ukrainian-Canadian community (Prymak, 1998).

Both Prymak's reservations about the concept of diaspora, and the ease with which the term is used within the organized Ukrainian community raise the question of definitions. Specifically, how should diaspora be defined, and does the term help us understand the social reality of emigrants and their ancestors who left an ancestral homeland?

The penchant of ethnic groups to use the term diaspora as part of their self-definition has its parallel in the academic world, where the word has experienced a certain amount of conceptual inflation. A keyword search of sociological abstracts for 'diaspora' turns up eighteen scholarly social science papers published in 1980-1, but no fewer than eighty-seven papers

published in 1999–2000. Cohen (1997: ix) points out that the word is derived from the Greek terms *speiro* (to sow) and *dia* (over), and was originally used to refer to processes of migration and colonization. In the 1970s, it referred more narrowly to a forcible collective banishment, and was applied mainly to the Jews or, occasionally, to Palestinians and Armenians. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, scholars in the area of Black Studies began to refer increasingly to the African diaspora or the Black Atlantic. And, by the 1990s, any group that had a history of migration and community formation was termed a diaspora (Safran, 1991; Akenson, 1995). Indeed, the term has become so popular that sociologist Floya Anthias calls it a ‘mantra’ (Anthias, 1998: 557), and historian Donald Akenson (1995: 382) a ‘massive linguistic weed’ that threatens to take over academic discourse about immigration and ethnicity.

Anthias (1998) finds two general ways that the concept of diaspora has been employed in scholarly analysis. One approach likens diaspora to a social condition and process; the other uses ‘diaspora’ as a descriptive, typological tool. According to Anthias (1998), the conceptualization of diaspora as a social condition and process tends to be linked to post-modern understandings of globalization and recent literature on transnationalism (Basch *et al.*, 1994). The diaspora condition is seen to be structured by the complicated interplay between migration and settlement. It is characterized by complex and contradictory sentiments, attitudes and practices that are ‘put into play through the experience of being *from* one place and *of* another’ (Anthias, 1998: 565). Migration results in the formation of new and fluid identities and social boundaries, which in turn are rooted in a desire to be different within a global context that seems increasingly to emphasize homogeneity. These new identities are also seen to result in wider social and political changes, particularly in the hybrid spaces of global cities, where numerous diasporas come into contact and interact. In some formulations, new diaspora identities and hybrid social spaces are believed to undermine traditional understandings of ethnic identity and the nation state. Traditional ethnic identities become destabilized in the diaspora because of multiple forms of interaction with other diaspora groups; national boundaries become less significant because diaspora groups often have loyalties to two or more different states. Thus, the emphasis within the ‘diaspora-as-condition approach’ is on the ways that new identities, cultural forms and social spaces are created and negotiated in the course of complex interactions between different kinds of ‘home’.

The typological approach, on the other hand, is linked to the work of Robin Cohen (1997). Cohen, like the proponents of the first approach, is dissatisfied with the traditional analyses of international migration and ethnic relations. In particular, he is critical of the static terms in which

ethnic-relations theory has conceptualized movement from, and return to, a 'homeland'. Leaving and returning 'home' are much more complicated, multilayered and interactive than implied by concepts like migration, settlement and assimilation. In Cohen's view, many groups that have migrated display complex loyalties and emotional attachments to an 'old country'. These vary in both intensity and direction, but they nevertheless signal an attachment to an ancestral homeland and a larger imagined community.

Cohen uses the cases of the Afro-Caribbean, British, Armenian, Chinese, Jewish, Lebanese and Sikh communities to construct both an ideal-type and a typology of different kinds of diaspora. He suggests that diasporas normally exhibit several of the following features:

- dispersal from an original homeland, often traumatically
- alternatively, the expansion from a homeland in search of work, in pursuit of trade or to further colonial ambitions
- a collective memory and myth about the homeland
- an idealization of the supposed ancestral home
- a return movement
- a strong ethnic group consciousness sustained over time
- a troubled relationship with host societies
- a sense of solidarity with co-ethnic members in other societies
- the possibility of a distinctive creative, enriching life in tolerant host countries.

(Cohen, 1997: 180)

Though an important element in Cohen's (1997) definition is a forcible and traumatic dispersal from an ancestral home, he includes mass movements of people for economic reasons, such as the search for work and trading partners. Political persecution is not, therefore, the only basis for the diaspora condition (Akenson, 1995: 382).

According to Cohen, the type of diaspora a group becomes, however, depends in large part on the reasons they left their country in the first place. *Victim diasporas*, such as the Jews and Armenians, were formed as a result of the traumatic events that occurred in their homeland and that resulted in large-scale and widespread dispersal. *Imperial diasporas* are formed out of the colonial or military ambitions of world powers. Despite cultural differences between Scots, English and Irish, Cohen argues that the people from the United Kingdom who moved overseas to the new dominions and the colonies formed a larger British imperial diaspora. *Labor diasporas* consist of groups who move mainly in search of wage labor; they include the Turks who, after World War II, emigrated to a variety of countries in Europe,

North America and the Middle East. *Trade diasporas*, like those formed by the Chinese merchants who emigrated to Southeast Asia in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, consist of people who left their homelands to pursue opportunities as movers of goods and services in the emerging system of international trade. And, finally, Cohen develops the notion of a *cultural diaspora* to characterize the migration and settlement experiences of migrants of African descent from the Caribbean after World War II. These migrants are taken by Cohen (1997: 127–53) to be the paradigmatic case of people who have developed a unique culture and identity out of the influences of Africa, the Caribbean and their new countries of settlement.

Anthias (1998), who points to a number of specific limitations of both conceptions of diaspora, highlights two more general problems with the concept. The post-modern conception of diaspora tends to be silent on the contradictory tendencies of globalization. In relation to notions of hybrid identities, she argues that being in the diaspora and living in a globalized world can often reinforce and solidify old ethnic boundaries and attachments rather than undermine them. Even though the identities chosen by some individuals and groups may become more fluid as a result of movements back and forth, globalization and the diaspora condition may also lead to various kinds of fundamentalism (Anthias, 1998: 567). Referring to Cohen's typology, Anthias suggests that there is no logical reason why priority should be given to the reasons for dispersal as the basis for constructing a typology of different kinds of diaspora. The intentions of those who left their countries of origin may have little to do with the kind of diaspora a group becomes: 'The factors that motivate a group to move . . . do not constitute adequate ways of classifying groups for the purpose of analyzing their settlement and accommodation patterns, nor their forms of identity' (Anthias, 1998: 563).

A more general problem with both conceptions of diaspora is that those who use the term sometimes slip into a form of ethnic essentialism. The notion of a diaspora tends to invoke the homeland as the essential ethnicity of individuals and collectivities. But as theorists of ethnicity have pointed out, ethnicity is situational and socially negotiated in particular situations. While one's ancestors may 'objectively' be from one particular part of the world, the ethnicity that develops in the diaspora is the result of the complex interaction between homeland cultures and identities, and the cultures, identities and politics of countries of settlement. In turn, this means that the identity of a diaspora may be a reflection of the kind of society that the group lives in, rather than a basic and primordial ethnic attachment to an ancestral homeland (Anthias, 1998: 569).

This criticism has some resonance for the analysis of the Ukrainian diaspora. Though more research is needed on this issue, the differences

between the political cultures of Canada and the United States seem to have an important influence on the ways that the two diaspora communities understand themselves and relate to their respective 'host' societies and to the newly independent Ukraine. Frances Swyrypa (1998) notes, for example, that the erection of monuments to Ukrainian poet and national hero Taras Shevchenko in Winnipeg, Manitoba, in 1961 and Washington, DC in 1964 had different meanings for Ukrainian Canadians and Ukrainian Americans, and that part of the difference was rooted in the differing political cultures, patterns of settlement and community formation in the two countries.

Second, like the earlier concept of community, both approaches may overstate the homogeneity of a group. Diasporas, like communities, often (and perhaps usually) contain social divisions, conflicts and differences. Cohen recognizes that, depending on the conditions that propelled specific waves of emigration, any particular ethnic group may contain different types of diaspora. However, according to Anthias (1998), neither conceptualization has anything to say about class and gender in the diaspora experience. Even though the class backgrounds of the original emigrants from a homeland may be similar, the particular trajectories of social mobility for various generations of a diaspora can vary. Furthermore, a diaspora that has been in existence in its country of settlement for more than one generation is rarely homogenous in its class make-up. The existence of class diversity in diaspora communities can entail the emergence of qualitatively different identities and interests in relation to issues like settlement, return, assimilation and attitude toward a homeland. Furthermore, men and women in diaspora communities may have different understandings of settlement, accommodation and the relationship to the homeland, and may differ in the roles they play in sustaining a diaspora consciousness and communities.

These reservations are also relevant for the Ukrainian diaspora (Pawliczko, 1994). It can be argued that Ukrainians in the diaspora have emphasized their within-group differences as much as their similarities within a larger imagined community. In many ways, the story of Ukrainian diaspora community life in the west is one of conflict, struggle and hostility between Ukrainians of different political persuasions, religious affiliations, classes and waves of immigration. Divisions between socialists and nationalists, Catholic and Orthodox churches, eastern and western Ukrainians, new-wave immigrants and longer-settled members of the community, and between followers of different nationalist leaders, have all at some point fractured the Ukrainian diaspora.

Gender differences may be equally important in this regard. In her study of Ukrainian-Canadian women and ethnic identity between 1891 and

1991, the historian Frances Swyripa (1993: 257) argues that in the nationalist-oriented camp, being female and being Ukrainian resulted in a particular set of 'group-imposed behaviour models and obligations that tied Ukrainian-Canadian women to Ukraine and emphasized their membership in the Ukrainian nation'. The organized nationalist community's perception of Ukraine's special predicament in the twentieth century meant that Ukrainian women in the diaspora had both special obligations and special needs. As women, the traditional female roles of mothering and homemaking 'became magnified and carried special Ukrainian nuances'. Much of the community work of Ukrainian-Canadian women was organized by a larger commitment to the cause of an independent Ukraine and to the cultural survival of Ukrainians in the diaspora. She also argues that "being Ukrainian" meant the obligation to follow in the footsteps of the Great Women of Ukraine, who acted as models and sources of inspiration and bound Ukrainian women together in a sisterhood that stretched across the ocean and over the centuries' (Swyripa, 1993: 259).

Ukrainian independence and the aging of the postwar victim diaspora have eased some of the factional disputes, but one of the things that this book suggests is that it may be more appropriate to think of Ukrainians as making up a number of different diasporas (see also Gabaccia, 2000).

Despite Anthias's (1998) concerns about the typological approach to diaspora, these problems do not alter the fundamental value of Cohen's overall framework. Cohen's ideal-type is useful because it warns against simplistic 'all-or-nothing' characterizations of diaspora. There are many nuances involved with being a diaspora, and there is little to be gained by dismissing the utility of the concept just because a group does not display one of the features of an ideal-type. Furthermore, the problem of difference and divisions within a diaspora can be incorporated into Cohen's typology. Variables like class, gender, generation and period of migration can have a significant effect on the ways that different segments of a diaspora understand themselves and relate to their respective homelands. In the end, typologies are useful because they are heuristic devices that help generate certain kinds of questions, point to certain paths of investigation and facilitate comparisons.

For our purposes, then, Cohen's typology generates a number of questions that are relevant to the analysis of the Ukrainian diaspora and that guide the overall direction of this book: what led to the emigration of a group from its ancestral homeland? What is the influence of the conditions of emigration on ethnic identity and diaspora formation? How do members of an ethnic community relate to an ancestral homeland? How do different generations, different waves of migration and individuals with different ideologies and political views relate to the same ancestral

homeland? How do diaspora groups maintain their group boundaries? What part do ethnic elites play in diaspora formation and reproduction? How are different generations drawn into organized diaspora life? What part does the ancestral homeland play in sustaining a sense of common ethnicity, identity and group boundaries? How do narratives of victimization, both in the homeland and in the countries of settlement, figure in the process of group boundary maintenance? How and why do certain historical and contemporary events in an ancestral homeland come to have meaning for groups of people who are one or more generations removed from that homeland? What are the forms of return that diaspora groups display? And, finally, what is the meaning of different forms of return?

Challenges and scope

There are a number of complications if we try to use the case of the Ukrainian diaspora to answer these questions. The first complication is how to determine the size of the diaspora. As Table 1 shows, of the nearly 59 million people in the world who are estimated to be of Ukrainian heritage, over 21 million live outside the current boundaries of Ukraine (Pawliczko, 1994: 8–9). Pawliczko (1994: 8–9) arrives at the figure of 21 million by compiling estimates from countries where Ukrainians are known to live or to have settled. The estimates for specific countries are derived from a number of sources, including the census, surveys and church and organizational records. But, as indicated in Table 1, different sources of data can produce dramatically different results. In the case of the former Soviet republics, the 1989 Soviet census reported that there were 4.3 million Ukrainians in Russia, 291,000 in Belarus and 900,000 in Kazakhstan. Yet, other data suggests that there may be as many as 8.6 million Ukrainians in Russia, 1 million in Belarus, and 4 million in Kazakhstan. These wide-ranging estimates are, in part, the result of a legacy of deliberate undercounting of non-Russian minorities during the Soviet period. For example, in the Kuban region of Russia alone there are estimated to be 4.2 million Ukrainians, but for political reasons Ukrainians were not allowed to identify themselves as ‘Ukrainians’ in the 1989 Soviet census (Pawliczko, 1994: 10). In other countries, there are less pernicious reasons for the varying estimates of the numbers of Ukrainians. Some countries do not specifically measure the ethnic make-up of their population, and so surrogate measures such as country of birth and mother tongue are often used instead.

Another difficulty in determining the size of a diaspora is whether ethnicity and ethnic group membership are defined with objective or subjective criteria (Isajiw, 1999). Invariably, there are discrepancies between

UKRAINIANS AND THE CONCEPT OF DIASPORA

Table 1 Ukrainian population distribution

Ukraine	37,419,000
Republics of the Former Soviet Union	
Armenia	8341
Azerbaijan	32,345
Belarus	291,008–1,000,000 ^a
Estonia	48,271
Georgia	52,443
Kazakhstan	896,240–4,000,000 ^a
Kyrgyzstan	108,027–300,000 ^a
Latvia	92,101
Lithuania	44,789
Moldova	600,366–800,000
Russia	4,362,872–8,600,000 ^b
Tajikistan	41,375
Turkmenistan	35,578
Uzbekistan	153,197
Eastern Europe	
Bulgaria	1000
Czech and Slovak Republics	150,000–200,000
Hungary	11,000
Poland	250,000–500,000
Romania	150,000–300,000
Western Europe	
Austria	4200
Belgium	2332
Denmark	100
Finland	50–100
France	25,000–30,000
Germany	20,032
Italy and the Vatican	250
Luxembourg	100
Netherlands	80–100
Norway	50–100
Spain	140–150
Sweden	2000
Switzerland	100
United Kingdom and Ireland	20,000–35,000
Republics of former Yugoslavia	45,000
North America	
Canada	963,310–1,000,000
United States	730,056–1,300,000
Central America	25–50
South America	
Argentina	220,000
Brazil	350,000

UKRAINIANS AND THE CONCEPT OF DIASPORA

Table 1 (contd)

Paraguay	5000–8000
Uruguay	4000–5000
Venezuela	800–1300
Other South American countries	100–200
Australia and Oceania	
Australia	30,000
New Zealand	200–300
Africa, Asia and the Middle East	
Former Soviet far east	2,000,000 ^c
Estimated total number of Ukrainians	58,693,854 ^d

Source: Abridged from Pawliczko (1994: 9–10).

Notes

^a The official 1989 census statistic for this republic (the first number given) is known to have been vastly underestimated.

^b We know that the official 1989 census statistic is vastly underestimated because, in some regions, Ukrainians were not allowed to be registered as Ukrainian; they were arbitrarily listed as Russian. For example, it is believed that as many as 4.2 million people living in Krasnodar Territory of Russia (known as the Kuban region among Ukrainians) are of Ukrainian origin.

^c Note:

- In Asia. Ukrainians are found in large numbers in the former Soviet territories. In the maritime provinces of the far east, they are believed to constitute perhaps as many as one-third of the more than 6 million inhabitants of the Khabarovsk and Primore territories, and the Amur, Sakhalin, Kamchatka and Magadan *oblasts*.
- Statistics are not available for other areas of Asia or for Africa or the Middle East; the majority of Ukrainians residing in these areas are believed to be businesspersons, professors, members of the armed forces and other professionals on assignment from other countries or students attending schools. Their numbers are not known since most do not remain long enough to establish permanent communities; rather, they return to their own countries upon completion of their assignment or studies. It is believed that there are few Ukrainians residing permanently in the countries of Africa, Asia or the Middle East.

^d This number is based on the upper limits of the range, which more accurately reflect the actual number of Ukrainians and which, in some cases, are still probably underestimated.

the number of people who are part of an *ethnic group* and the number who are part of an *ethnic community* (Swyripa, 1993: ix). The high-end estimates may be based on what is seen to be the objective condition of having some form of Ukrainian heritage. In this case, it may be more accurate to speak of Ukrainians as a diaspora group. On the other hand, if ethnicity is defined with criteria that emphasize identity and the subjective attachments that people have to their group, it is more accurate to think of the Ukrainian diaspora in terms of a community of people with particular

attitudes, values and goals. Ultimately, processes of assimilation would suggest that the number of Ukrainians as an ethnic community may be smaller than Ukrainians as an ethnic group.¹ The defining of ethnicity has vexed social scientists for generations and this is not the place to try to solve that problem. Suffice to say that neither approach is entirely satisfactory and that estimates of the absolute size of a diaspora should be approached with caution.

Second, and related to the problem of determining the size of the Ukrainian diaspora, is that Ukrainians outside of Ukraine are made up of a combination of people who have emigrated from their ancestral homeland and people who are stranded minorities (Cohen, 1997: 190–1). Ukraine in many ways is a cartographer's dream. Sorting through Ukraine's twentieth-century borders could keep a team of map-makers gainfully employed for years. In the first half of the last century, the boundaries were redrawn numerous times because of war, revolution and other geo-political forces. Between the wars, what is present-day Ukraine was divided among Soviet Ukraine, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and several Soviet republics, and before World War I, it was divided between the Russian and the Austro-Hungarian empires. The current borders of Ukraine have been in existence only since 1954. In that year, Nikita Khrushchev essentially 'gave' the Crimea to Soviet Ukraine as a 300th anniversary gift for the 1654 Treaty of Pereyaslav that was agreed to between the Ukrainian Monarch Bohdan Khmelnytsky and the Russian Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich (Marples and Duke, 1995: 272). Khrushchev's gift was intended to signal 'yet another affirmation of the great fraternal love and trust of the Russian people for Ukraine' (cited in Magocsi, 1996: 653).

Because of the tug-of-war over Ukrainian lands in the twentieth century, Ukrainian ethnographic territory does not correspond to the present-day political borders of Ukraine. For example, anthropologists note that Ukrainian ethnographic territory extends into the present-day southern Russian region of the Kuban. If an ethnographic definition of Ukrainian lands is used, then, strictly speaking, Ukrainians in the Kuban are not part of the diaspora because they have never left their 'homeland', or they settled in that homeland a very long time ago. Similarly, many Ukrainians who live in Poland and the Czech and Slovak republics have never moved from their ancestral homelands, but because of the way that borders were drawn and redrawn during the course of the twentieth century, they too are now outside of Ukrainian political territory. This raises certain conceptual problems for the study of diasporas. Some leaders of the Ukrainian community in Poland, for example, are adamant that they 'are not diaspora, but indigenous . . . [because] their ethnic lands are now found on Polish territory, and they have the same rights and responsibilities as other

Polish citizens' (Lew, 1997). In many ways, it can be argued that the Ukrainians who live in Ukrainian ethnographic territory in countries that are contiguous to Ukraine are stranded minorities that were left behind because of the peculiarities of state formation. It should be noted, however, that the claiming of certain groups as Ukrainians (either as stranded minorities or diaspora) in the countries that border Ukraine is not unproblematic. There are, in fact, scholarly and political debates about whether groups like the Lemkos in Poland, and the Rusyns in the Czech and Slovak republics are 'really' Ukrainian (Magosci, 1983: 53).

The third difficulty analyzing the Ukrainian diaspora is that it is difficult to generalize about such a large diaspora that is scattered over at least forty different countries, and which, in modern times, has a history of more than a hundred years. If the figures in Table 1 are accepted as reasonably accurate estimates, thirteen countries have populations of over 100,000 Ukrainians: in the former Soviet Union, there are Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia and Uzbekistan; in eastern Europe there are the Czech and Slovak republics, Poland and Romania; and in the Americas there are the United States, Canada, Argentina and Brazil. Ten countries have Ukrainian populations estimated at between 25,000 and 100,000. And pockets of fewer than 25,000 Ukrainians are found in two dozen countries including Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Switzerland and Venezuela.

Similarly, the movement of Ukrainians abroad over the past 125 years has been an extraordinarily complex process that has touched all segments of society, including young and old, men and women, peasants and wage laborers, intellectuals, professionals, government officials, soldiers and members of the clergy. Most commentators suggest that the Ukrainian diaspora is made up of four 'waves of migration', each a mixture of labor migrants and political refugees. The first wave, which took place roughly between 1880 and 1914, consisted mainly of labor migrants; the second wave occurred between 1920 and 1930 and consisted of a combination of labor migrants and political refugees; the third wave occurred between 1940 and 1954 and consisted mainly of political refugees; the fourth wave began in the late 1980s and continues to this day. The majority of fourth-wave emigrants are labor migrants, although some refugees can also be found within this wave. This means that the Ukrainian diaspora is made up of elements of first-generation migrants who first formed a combination of labor and victim diasporas, and people who are separated by as many as four or five generations from their immigrant ancestors and who tend to display more of the features of a cultural diaspora.

The fourth complication in writing about the Ukrainian diaspora is that contemporary Ukraine is ethnically mixed. Out of a population of about

52 million, 37.4 million, or 72 percent, claim Ukrainian as their ethnic identity, with the other 28 percent of the population being made up of, among others, Russians, Jews, Germans, Poles, Moldovans, Romanians and Tatars (Wilson, 1997: 22). Thus Ukraine is both the ancestral homeland of a number of non-Ukrainian groups who left Ukrainian territory for various reasons during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and a place where members of other diasporas have settled. The Tatars, for instance, have a 700-year history in the Crimean peninsula, which, as noted above, is currently part of Ukraine. In 1944, virtually the entire population of Tatars was deported from the Crimea to Siberia and Soviet Central Asia as punishment for having been anti-Soviet and pro-German during World War II (Magocsi, 1996: 653; Marples and Duke, 1995: 266). At the moment, there is a politically significant return movement of Tatars to the Crimea, and leaders of that movement are calling for Tatar sovereignty over their Crimean ancestral homeland (Marples and Duke, 1995). Furthermore, many diaspora Jews and German Mennonites trace their ancestry to Ukrainian territory, and while Israel is one significant 'homeland' for diaspora Jews, so too are places like Ukraine.²

The largest non-Ukrainian ethnic group in Ukraine are the Russians, and they present yet another complication when one tries to understand the relationship between Ukraine and the diaspora. Many ethnic Russians have long family histories in eastern Ukraine, whereas the Russian presence in other parts of Ukraine is the result of a more modern Soviet attempt to Russify the country (Smith and Wilson, 1997). Since the break-up of the Soviet Union, both of these segments of the Russian population have been regarded as part of the Russian diaspora: 'Russians, both numerically and politically dominant in the Soviet system, were practically overnight made into a diaspora and stood to lose much from these developments' (Bremmer, 1994: 261). Indeed, Ukraine is the home of the largest component of the new post-Soviet Russian diaspora, and there is considerable uncertainty about the role that Russia and the Russian diaspora will play in the future of independent Ukraine (Laitin, 1998; Smith and Wilson, 1997).

In light of the challenges that have been noted above, there are three limitations to this book. First, it is not an analysis of non-Ukrainian groups for whom Ukraine might be considered an ancestral homeland. Second, it makes little mention of groups, like the Russians, for which Ukraine is arguably a diaspora site. Third, the analysis concentrates mainly on the Ukrainian diaspora in North America. Hence, the book relies mainly on published English-language sources. Although some attention is paid to Ukrainians in Europe, Australia and South America, the discussion tends to be concentrated on the diaspora in North America, where the

population is the largest and most active. Archives in Canada, the United States, Europe and elsewhere contain extensive records of individuals and organizations that are clearly relevant to an understanding of the Ukrainian diaspora. However, a project of this scale cannot make extensive use of this kind of primary source. At some points, though, the analysis draws on observational and interview data collected in the course of five trips to Ukraine between 1985 and 1999, observational data obtained participating in a variety of diaspora community functions, and interviews conducted with leaders of Ukrainian diaspora organizations in Canada. The arguments and analysis presented in this book are not only relevant to individuals interested in the analysis of diasporas, but also to members of the Ukrainian diaspora community who are concerned about what it means to live in the diaspora in the twenty-first century.

2

EMIGRATION AND THE FORMATION OF A LABOR DIASPORA (1890–1914)

When the Ukrainian peasant looked up, he could see above him, riding on his back, the Polish noble, the Romanian boyar, the Jewish innkeeper-lender, and a few of his own people as well. But when he looked down, all he could see was earth, and precious little of that.

(Himka, 1982: 14)

The term ‘waves of migration’ is something of a misnomer because it implies that migrants are an undifferentiated mass who have little control over their circumstances and their decisions to move. But, of course, it is individuals and families who migrate, and they do so for different reasons. Their stories involve an innumerable variety of circumstances, obstacles and means of survival. At the same time, though, individuals and families rarely migrate as isolated units. Invariably, there are larger social pressures that impinge on groups of people, and so it is possible to detect common experiences and recurring patterns in the many narratives. Nevertheless, the Ukrainians who left their homeland as part of the different waves of migration did so for many reasons. In the late nineteenth century they left the parts of Ukraine dominated by the Habsburgs for reasons different from those that propelled a later generation to leave Soviet Ukraine during World War II. And the forces that propel Ukrainians to leave Ukraine today are both different from, and similar to, the conditions that propelled earlier waves of emigrants.

This chapter poses two main questions about the initial creation of the Ukrainian diaspora in North America. What conditions led to the emigration of Ukrainians during the first wave of emigration between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; and what kinds of identities were developed by the emigrants who migrated to North America? I argue that the first-wave emigrants who left for the west between the 1880s and 1914 constituted a classic labor diaspora in that they were trying to escape poor economic conditions and were almost exclusively in search of wage labor

or opportunities for farming. Emigrants who moved within the Russian Empire were also propelled by economic conditions, but at the same time many were also part of larger Russian plans for the colonization of the north and far east. I also suggest, however, that many of the people who left Ukrainian territory at the turn of the century did not have a clear sense of themselves as Ukrainians when they arrived in the diaspora. While one of the criteria of diaspora noted in the previous chapter is the existence of a strong ethnic group consciousness that is maintained over time, the irony in the case of Ukrainians (and perhaps for other ethnic groups as well) is that their consciousness of themselves as 'Ukrainian' did not develop until they were *in* the diaspora and was not part of the baggage that they *brought* to the diaspora. In other words, many first-wave migrants became 'Ukrainian' in the diaspora. As is consistent with the literature on the social construction of ethnic identity (Nagel, 1994), despite being racialized by the political and labor elites, the formation of a Ukrainian identity in North America was the result of a combination of external factors in the host societies, the points of origin of immigrants and nationalizing elites.

Conditions in Ukraine

Before 1917, much of present-day Ukraine was divided between the Austro-Hungarian Empire, ruled by the Habsburgs and the Russian Empire, ruled by the Romanovs. Within these two multicultural empires there was a certain correspondence between ethnicity and social class. In both cases, the vast majority of Ukrainians were peasants. In 1897, in the portion of Ukraine that was part of the Russian Empire, 93 percent of Ukrainians were peasants (Magocsi, 1996: 319); in 1900 in Galicia and Bukovyna (the two Austro-Hungarian provinces with the highest concentrations of Ukrainians), 95 percent of Ukrainians were peasants (Himka, 1982: 12). In both empires, the rest of the Ukrainians were sprinkled among the emergent urban proletariat, the clergy, the intelligentsia, the civil service and the nobility (Krawchenko, 1985: 44).

In those circumstances, it is not surprising that the vast majority of Ukrainians who emigrated from both empires during the late nineteenth century were peasants. The transition from feudalism to capitalism occurred later in the two empires than it had in other parts of Europe (Kolchin, 1987; Rudolph, 1991: 344), but like many of the earlier mass movements of people within Europe, emigration from both parts of Ukraine was rooted in the reorganization of property relations resulting from the demise of serfdom.

The decline of feudal relations of production in much of western Europe began in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Hilton *et al.*, 1978).

However, the so-called 'second serfdom' of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in parts of eastern Europe and Russia meant that Ukrainian and other peasants continued to be enmeshed in a system of feudal-like mutual obligations until well into the nineteenth century (Kolchin, 1987). The specific nature of the obligations varied within and between the two empires. However, the two most significant obligations of Ukrainian peasants to their landlords were the *corvée* (*barshchina* in Russian, *panshchyna* in Ukrainian), that is, the provision of labor services, or cash payments in lieu of labor (*obrok* in both Russian and Ukrainian). In Dnieper Ukraine, where the majority of peasants provided labor services, the obligation could range anywhere from three to six days of work per week (Krawchenko, 1985: 16). At times, Russian landlords also required landless peasants to work in factories to earn the cash needed to fulfill their obligations (Magocsi, 1996: 321). In Austria-Hungary, better-off peasant households fulfilled their *corvée* obligations by providing both labor power and livestock to their landlords, while poorer households provided only manual labor (Rudolph, 1991: 345). As with their eastern counterparts, Ukrainian peasants' labor services could entail as many as five or six days of work per week. In some circumstances, peasants could also be required to turn over as much as 75 percent of what they produced on their own land as a form of tribute or taxation.

The peasant-serfs were essentially the property of the landlord and therefore were subject to a variety of restrictions on their personal freedom, including their choice of a husband or wife, where they sold their surplus, and where they lived and worked. Since the prosperity of the landlords depended on their ability to extract surplus from their peasants, they tended to be reluctant to release peasants from their obligations. In Dnieper Ukraine, however, some labor mobility was allowed and encouraged by the Tsarist government. In the first half of the nineteenth century, some landless peasants who owed taxes to the central government were allowed to move to cities for between six months and three years. These 'state peasants' (peasants who were in debt to the state) were sent by state authorities to work in factories in the cities to earn money to pay taxes (Melnyk, 1991: 249).

The obligations between peasant and landlord were not, however, completely one-sided. The landlords were obliged to provide for the peasantry in the event of crop failure, epidemics or other catastrophes (Himka, 1982:16), and to allow the peasants access to the common lands. These commons were important for the peasantry because they were used as pastures and were places where food and fuel could be gathered.

In Austria-Hungary the revolution of 1848 and, in Russia, the administrative reforms introduced by Tsar Alexander II in 1861 resulted

in the abolition of serfdom. The circumstances surrounding this were different in the two empires, but the consequences for the peasantry were similar. As Karl Marx noted in his analysis of the transition from feudalism to capitalism in western Europe, eastern European peasants in the post-emancipation period quickly learned that freedom was both relative and relational (Miles, 1987). No longer did they have to work for their landlords or make cash payments to them. They were free to move about, marry whom they wanted and sell their produce in the most advantageous ways they could. However, they were also free to go hungry, pay taxes to the state, sleep under haystacks, go into debt and lose their land when their debts became unmanageable.

In both empires the peasants' financial and labor service obligations were eliminated and peasant households were allowed to keep their traditional allotments. The catch, however, was that households had to compensate their former landlords for the land and the forgone labor. In Russia, the peasants had to pay their landlords 20 percent of the value of the land, the balance coming from the government coffers. If a peasant household could not afford to pay its former landlord, labor service contracts were renegotiated. Meanwhile, in order to recoup the money it had paid to the landlords on their behalf, the Russian state imposed a special forty-nine-year tax on the peasants (Subtelny, 1994: 255). In Austria-Hungary too, the state imposed special supplementary taxes on the newly freed peasant households in order to earn back the money it had paid out to the landlords (Himka, 1982: 12).

Further privations resulted from the landlords' refusal to give up their rights to the commons. Peasant households which previously had the use of the commons were required to pay for the use of pastures, woodlands, streams and lakes. In eastern Galicia alone between 1870 and 1880 some 32,000 disputes over the use of common land were brought before the courts (Rudolph, 1991: 348).

One result of these provisions was that many households quickly found themselves in debt. Peasants frequently took out loans to pay taxes, buy seeds and tools, pay for the use of pastures, host the christenings and marriages of their children and bury their loved ones. Interest rates tended to range between 52 and 104 percent per annum, but 500 percent was not unheard of (Himka, 1982: 16). Those who defaulted on their loans were forced to sell their land. In Galicia during the last quarter of the nineteenth century the courts ordered on average 2400 land auctions a year. Nearly one-third of the land auctions in the 1890s in Galicia involved loans of less than 100 crowns (Himka, 1982: 17).

Inheritance practices also contributed to economic hardship for the Ukrainian peasantry in the post-emancipation period. According to

tradition, each son was entitled to a portion of the household's allotment, and so over the years the land holdings became smaller and more fragmented. In Russia, the average size of peasant land holdings on the eve of the abolition of serfdom was between 7 and 16 acres (Magocsi, 1996: 325; Spechler, 1991). By 1900, and depending on the province, it was 40 to 64 percent smaller. In the Austro-Hungarian province of Galicia, the average peasant land holding decreased from 12 acres in 1859 to 7 acres in 1880 and to 6 acres in 1900 (Magocsi, 1996: 424). In 1901, over 80 percent of all land holdings in Galicia were smaller than 12 acres (Rudolph, 1991: 369). Household plots were usually spread over a number of different locations, often some distance from each other. The early twentieth-century economist Franciszek Bujak described a typical peasant holding in Galicia in the following terms: 'one peasant's property consists on the average of twenty to thirty separate lots. They are sometimes four to five miles away from farm buildings or extend in strips of a few yards wide over a length of a kilometre or more' (cited in Rudolph, 1991: 348). At the same time, the number of individual land holdings increased dramatically. In eastern Galicia, for example, the number of holdings increased from 527,740 in 1820 to 584,625 in 1857, to over 1 million in 1902 (Rudolph, 1991: 347). The small size and fragmentation of land holdings were widely believed to be responsible for the inefficiency of Galician agriculture.

Emancipation did, however, lead to the socio-economic differentiation of the peasantry. Some peasant households became medium and large landowners in their own right. These households were able to accumulate enough land to reproduce their conditions of existence with only occasional forays into wage labor (Lehr, 1991: 33). For other peasants (particularly the *bidniaky* or 'poor ones'), whose initial allotments were on smaller and less productive plots of land, emancipation ushered in new and more severe forms of poverty. Temporary and permanent migration in search of wage labor became a regular part of Ukrainian peasant life in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in both Austro-Hungarian and Russian-ruled Ukraine. Generally, Ukrainians in the Russian Empire migrated to the east and Ukrainians in the Austro-Hungarian Empire to the west.

Countries of destination

The pressure to leave one's home does not fully account for international migration. In the Ukrainian case, it coincided with a demand for both individual and household labor in other parts of the Russian Empire and other countries. The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were periods of capital accumulation, and such periods are often characterized

by increases in the demand for labor (Miles, 1987). However, many of the countries that were experiencing intense capital accumulation were also undergoing processes of state formation (Denoon, 1983). Political, economic and labor elites in countries of in-migration therefore often engaged in complex debates about the value of potential immigrants. In many ways, how groups were seen to fit into larger western 'racial' cosmologies was one of the chief determinants of how their economic and social abilities were assessed (Jacobson, 1998). These considerations often acted as a brake on particular immigration flows. State immigration policies were, then, often the product of debates between different elites about the economic and citizenship value of particular groups of people, and they entailed complex processes of inclusion and exclusion (Satzewich, 1991). Thus, Ukrainian peasants who considered emigrating were evaluated on the basis of their capacity to work, and their capacity to sustain wider political institutions and practices in civil society. Depending on the circumstances, which were based in no small measure on the degree to which employers were desperate to find workers, Ukrainian immigrants confronted immigration policies that ranged from aggressive recruitment to cautious acceptance to outright exclusion.

Migration within the Russian Empire

Before emancipation, some Ukrainian peasants had escaped their feudal obligations by fleeing to the eastern steppes of Ukraine and into Russian ethnographic territory, particularly east of the Black Sea in the Kuban region. For several decades after emancipation, restrictions on eastward migration continued because the landlords wanted the labor power of their newly liberated peasants to be readily available. Thus, before the late 1880s, Ukrainians and Russians who ended up in Siberia or the Russian far east tended to be political exiles or prisoners who had not gone there voluntarily.

By the late 1880s, restrictions were eased on migration within Russia. According to Barbara Anderson (1980), people from areas of high literacy and more developed agriculture moved to regions and cities that were modernizing, and people from poorer farming regions and with lower rates of literacy moved to newer agricultural frontiers (see also Clem, 1991: 240). Since Ukrainian peasants were concentrated in the latter category they tended not to move to growing cities and towns in search of wage labor in the emerging factory system (Krawchenko, 1985: 18, 53). They avoided cities and wage labor, partly because they were unfamiliar with wage labor, and partly because they were not used to competing with the better-organized Russian workers.

In the late 1880s, the Tsarist government began to encourage Ukrainians and Russians to settle on the eastern edges of the empire. As a result, voluntary migrants from Ukraine and other western parts of Russia tended to move to Siberia, the Russian far east, Kazakhstan and other frontier destinations. By 1890, voluntary migrants from Russia to the east far outnumbered involuntary migrants, who consisted of exiles and prisoners. Between 1871 and 1880, for example, an annual average of 7000 voluntary migrants went to Asiatic Russia, but between 1891 and 1900 the annual average increased to 108,000 a year and between 1901 and 1910 increased yet again to a quarter-million a year (Anderson, 1980: 122–3). Though individuals and households from parts of western Russia (including ethnic Russians, Ukrainians and Jews) left for Asiatic Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the nine *gubernias* (or provinces) of Ukraine contributed the most significant proportions of eastward migrants. It is estimated that between 1871 and 1896 over 725,000 Ukrainians settled in southern Siberia, Kazakhstan and the far east. They were joined by a further 900,000 Ukrainians between 1897 and 1916 (Naulko *et al.*, 1993:2). Between 1894 and 1914, nearly 2 million Ukrainians migrated to the Don and Kuban River valleys in Russia and to southern Siberia, Central Asia to the border with China, and the Pacific coast in the far east (Magocsi, 1996: 325; Naulko *et al.*, 1993: 11).¹

In many ways, the mass movements to the Russian far east were similar to the mass movements of Ukrainians and others who moved in search of land or wage labor to western Canada and the United States. Land-hungry and exploited peasants who had few choices of wage labor close to home saw migration to the easternmost reaches of the Russian Empire as a way to escape their grinding poverty (Naulko *et al.*, 1993: 11). Though there is little scholarly research on the Ukrainians who moved to the far eastern and northern reaches of the Russian Empire at this time, there is evidence that the Ukrainians did endeavor to form their own associations, publish their own newspapers and maintain aspects of their cultural life (Cipko, 1994: 131).

Migration from the Austro-Hungarian Empire

Most of the Ukrainians who emigrated westward during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries came from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in particular, the provinces of Bukovyna and Galicia, along with Carpatho-Ukraine (Himka, 1982: 11). It is estimated that between 1870 and 1914 some 2.5 million Ukrainians left their homes in Ukraine in order to improve their economic conditions (Pawliczko, 1994: 115–16). In the province of Galicia alone, it is estimated that between 1880 and 1910 over

800,000 people emigrated;² those emigrants represented over 10 percent of the population of the province (Rudolph, 1991: 362).

In the Austro-Hungarian Empire, less well-off Ukrainian peasants worked for wages either on the estates of the nobility, at odd jobs in surrounding villages and towns, or in the oil and mineral wax industries near Drohobych and Boryslav (Himka, 1982: 17). Middle-stratum peasants who had more resources but who still had to supplement their household income with wage labor sought better-paying opportunities further afield (Rudolph, 1991: 377; Balan, 1991; Lehr, 1991: 33; Hryniuk, 1991), in other parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Hahn, 2000), in other parts of Europe or in North and South America.

The Ukrainians from Austro-Hungary who migrated west during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were a mixture of temporary and permanent migrants. A significant proportion consisted of entire households who did not plan to return. This household migration followed a pattern of chain migration in which friends, neighbors or relatives who had earlier moved to North America and Brazil sent information back to people in their home villages. However, like their continental European counterparts, many were single, or married men who left their families behind. For them, emigration was a temporary measure that would allow them to return home a hero and enable their families to pay off debts and buy more land. As inevitably happens with temporary migrants, it was more difficult to return home with bags of money than originally planned; wages that were supposed to buy land or pay off debts back home went instead towards the necessities of life in the new land. Thus, by the eve of World War I what had been intended as a one- or two-year sojourn in North America had evolved into a multi-year grind of making enough to just make ends meet. Many eventually gave up the idea of returning with a nest egg and went back to Ukraine in no better financial shape than when they had left. Others gave up the idea of return altogether and settled in North America.

One of the first overseas countries to recruit Ukrainians aggressively was Brazil. Before World War I, Ukrainians went to Brazil in two phases. Between 1895 and 1897, 20,000 were recruited to clear forests in the province of Parana, and between 1907 and 1914 another 15–20,000 Ukrainians from Galicia and Vohlynia were recruited to work on railway construction gangs (Boruszenko and Kozlinsky, 1994: 445). After the abolition of slavery, Brazilian plantation owners, in search of other sources of labor, sent recruitment agents to Austria-Hungary in order to offer the peasants jobs, land and prosperous futures (Willems, 1955). Some of the recruiters are said to have helped persuade peasants to sell their property to innkeepers, who in turn shared the profits with the recruiters on the subsequent sale of the land (Kaye, 1964: 13).

By all accounts, conditions were unfavorable for both agricultural settlement and wage labor in Brazil. The Ukrainians who moved to remote jungle areas to clear land for agriculture often found themselves the targets of hostility and violence from the indigenous peoples. Several Ukrainians were killed by indigenous people who were resisting colonization and the spread of capitalist agriculture into their traditional lands (Kaye, 1964: 14). Even in the absence of such hostility, clearing the jungle was a daunting and dangerous task, and many of the Ukrainians became disillusioned and were desperate to find a way out (Kaye, 1964: 14–15). Some eventually left to settle in the United States and Canada. Nevertheless, many stayed on and moved to larger towns in Parana and elsewhere in Brazil, where they continue to form a viable Ukrainian diaspora community (Subtelny, 1994: 545).³

At about the same time, Hawaii was also competing for Ukrainian peasants. Between 1897 and 1900, about 600 Ukrainians were recruited by immigration agents to work as indentured laborers on Hawaiian sugar plantations. The plantation owners paid their agents generous bonuses for every man, woman and child they recruited. Many of those recruits had already made their decision to leave Ukraine and were waiting in German ports for transportation to North America. Some were persuaded that Hawaii was a New Jerusalem where they would find good wages, easy work and a mild climate (Ewanchuk, 1986: 6). The first recruits planned to homestead in Hawaii after their indentures expired. A second group migrated to Hawaii the year after, largely on the strength of letters they had received a year earlier from their relatives before they departed for Hawaii. These letters acted as a link in the process of chain migration.

One reason that Ukrainians were recruited for plantation work in Hawaii is that they were perceived as white, whereas until then most of the indentured servants on Hawaiian sugar plantations had come from China and Japan. Both the plantation owners and the government hoped that once the Ukrainian workers' indentures expired, they would settle in Hawaii and help bolster the white population of the islands. They were concerned that the islands would eventually be overrun with former indentured servants from China and Japan.

In 1909 and 1910, a second group of several hundred Ukrainians were recruited by immigration agents working on behalf of plantation owners and the Hawaiian Board of Immigration. This time the Ukrainians recruited were from the ranks of those who had voluntarily moved to Manchuria and the Russian far east from the Kyiv, Odessa and Poltava regions and the Don River valley. Some were also Ukrainian political prisoners who had been incarcerated in Siberian jails and who, upon their release, were sent to the far east by Russian authorities (Ewanchuk, 1986:

117). Unlike the 1897–8 recruits, the second group at first saw the move to Hawaii as a stepping stone to the American mainland (Ewanchuk, 1986: 14).

As in Brazil, the working and living conditions on the sugar plantations were terrible. In fact, the economic exploitation of the Ukrainian labor force eventually attracted the attention of Ukrainians who had settled on the American mainland and who helped persuade the American Federation of Labor to conduct an investigation in late 1910 (Ewanchuk, 1986: 132–3). Most of the Ukrainians who were recruited to Hawaii eventually moved to the American mainland, although a few descendants of the original Ukrainian contract workers are still living in Hawaii (Ewanchuk, 1986).

The two countries that became home to the largest numbers of first-wave Ukrainian emigrants were Canada and the United States. Despite problems in determining who was a ‘Ukrainian’ at the time (this will be discussed in more detail in the next section), Halich estimates that between 1899 and 1914 about 254,000 Ukrainian immigrants arrived in the United States (Halich, 1937: 150–3). He also estimates that in 1909 there were approximately 470,000 first- and second-generation Ukrainian Americans in the United States (Halich, 1937; see also Kuropas, 1991: 25). Between 1891 and 1914 about 250,000 Ukrainians, mostly from Galicia and Bukovyna, emigrated to Canada. It is estimated that nearly 80,000 Ukrainians returned to Ukraine before World War I because they had either planned to come only temporarily, or because they became disillusioned with life in Canada (Isajiw and Makuch, 1994: 333).

Mass Ukrainian emigration to the United States began in the 1870s. The first two groups were ‘Lemkos’, who came from the Lemko region of the Carpathian mountains in present-day Poland, and Carpatho-Ukrainians, who also lived in the Carpathian mountains but in a region which is now part of Ukraine. Ukrainians from Bukovyna and Galicia did not begin migrating *en masse* to the United States until the 1890s (Kuropas, 1991: 20). The American authorities did not have to recruit Ukrainian immigrants because rapid industrial expansion in the latter part of the nineteenth century was its own magnet. The first Ukrainian immigrants learned of opportunities in the United States from their Polish and Hungarian neighbors, who had begun emigrating a few years earlier. Thus, the early years of Ukrainian migration to the United States tended to reflect a process of chain migration. According to Kuropas (1991: 23), only 3.1 percent (389 of 12,361) of the Ukrainians who emigrated to the United States in 1908 did not have relatives or friends among the earlier immigrants.

Chain migration was also an important part of Ukrainian emigration to Canada (Petryshyn, 1991). However, the Canadian state played a more deliberate part than the American government in recruiting and selecting

immigrants. Although Canada was still very much intended to be British in both character and traditions, at the beginning of the twentieth century the Liberal government realized that there would be no large-scale settlement of the west unless the scope of immigrant recruitment was broadened to the southern and eastern borderlands of Europe. Thus, the Canadian government offered cash bonuses to immigration and shipping agents in Europe for every man, woman and child they could persuade to get on a ship to Canada (Avery, 1995: 20–1). The terms and conditions varied, but for Ukrainian immigrants they involved payments of five dollars for every member of an ‘agricultural’ family over the age of twelve. In order to deter the recruitment of destitute immigrants, the government paid the bonus only for families who possessed more than one hundred dollars (Petryshyn, 1991: 23). This requirement was the cause of one of the points of contention between the government and recruiters in Europe, for the government claimed that between 1901 and 1903 only 2279 of the 16,510 Galician and Bukovynian immigrants recruited had the necessary cash. Hence, the agents were not paid their bonuses for over 14,000 Ukrainians that they claimed to have recruited. In 1904, the agents were able to have the money stipulation for Galician and Bukovynian immigrants removed, and they received retroactive payments for the immigrants they had recruited.

Some credit for recruiting Ukrainians to Canada should also be given to Dr Joseph Oleskiw, an agronomist from Lviv who was interested in larger political-economic questions surrounding the plight of the Galician peasantry. In an effort to stem what he thought was the disastrous flow of peasants to Brazil, Oleskiw began studying socio-economic and agricultural conditions in Canada. His first pamphlet, *Pro Vilni Zemli (About Free Lands)*, was based on literature that was initially intended to help recruit British and western European immigrants, but which was nevertheless sent to him by the Canadian government. In the summer of 1895 he toured Canada at his own expense to get first-hand knowledge of Canadian conditions. After returning to Lviv he published a second pamphlet, *O emigratsii (About Emigration)*, in which he reiterated his view that the Canadian prairies were a more suitable destination for Ukrainian immigrants than the jungles of Brazil. Oleskiw’s pamphlets circulated widely through the system of local village reading clubs that were established by the Galician *Prosvita* (Enlightenment) Society.⁴ After he returned from Canada, Oleskiw worked to promote Canada as a destination for Ukrainian emigrants (Kaye, 1964). Though his contribution to the promotion of Ukrainian emigration to Canada was downplayed by government officials at the time, Frank Pedley, the Superintendent of Immigration eventually admitted that, at the turn of the century, ‘the bulk of Galicians came out . . . as a result of Oleskiw’s work’ (Petryshyn, 1991: 20).

Despite coming from broadly similar socio-economic backgrounds, Ukrainians in the United States and Canada displayed different patterns of geographical settlement and occupational distribution. While both groups formed part of a broadly defined labor diaspora, Ukrainian immigrants in the United States tended to form part of the working class in the coal mines and factories in the industrialized northeast. The majority of the first Ukrainian immigrants were men who migrated alone in order to work for wages. They intended to return to their villages with enough money to pay off the household's debt and buy land. Some single women also migrated; most of them found work as domestics or in female-dominated service and manufacturing concerns. According to Kuropas, the typical immigrant during this period was 'poor, illiterate and unskilled' (Kuropas, 1991: 231). In 1900, for example, 49 percent of all Ruthenian immigrants in the United States were illiterate (Kuropas, 1991: 23). As the emigration progressed, more Ukrainians emigrated as families. According to Kuropas, few of the first wave of immigrants became farmers (1991: 37). They, he says, 'had already become accustomed to the steady dollar' and did not want to take the risk of becoming farmers (Kuropas, 1991: 37).⁵

In Canada, on the other hand, most of the first Ukrainian households in Canada became farmers or farm laborers on the expanding prairie frontier. Between the mid-1890s and 1905, the majority of Ukrainian migrants came as family units, although in some cases married men left their families back home and sent for them once they were able to earn enough to pay their passage to Canada. Most settled in the present-day provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

To a certain extent, the distinction between 'farmer' and 'worker' on the prairies was artificial (Isajiw, 1982: 61). For their first few years in Canada, the majority of households that homesteaded on the prairies had members who worked for wages for all or part of the year. Men tended to work in railway construction and maintenance and for better-off farmers (Isajiw, 1982: 61), while women worked as domestics either in cities or on more prosperous farms. After 1905, when Canadian immigration policy changed towards the recruitment of industrial workers, increasing numbers of Ukrainians formed part of the working class in prairie cities such as Winnipeg and Edmonton, and in frontier regions of Northern Ontario and British Columbia (Isajiw and Makuch, 1994: 333).

One of the unique aspects of Ukrainian settlement on the Canadian prairies was their formation of block settlements. Like other immigrants, Ukrainians tended to settle close to their co-ethnics and their relatives. This was encouraged by government officials because it made their settlement work easier. These block settlements made Ukrainians more visible in Canada than in the United States. In the eastern United States,

Ukrainians constituted only a tiny fraction of the burgeoning population and the labor force. Though they formed fairly large pockets in a number of smaller communities, in the larger industrial centers, they were largely invisible. In western Canada, however, Ukrainians were a larger proportion of the total population, and a more visible part of the social landscape. Thus, even though the Ukrainian population was considerably larger in the United States than in Canada, because the overall Canadian population was smaller Ukrainians seem to have had a greater presence in Canada than in the United States.

The racialization of Ukrainian immigrants in North America

Despite an immigration policy in North America that was generally favorable to the presence of Ukrainians, the political, economic and labor elites in both countries displayed considerable ambivalence about the long-term desirability of Ukrainian immigrants. Since the Ukrainians came from the physical, political and symbolic periphery of Europe, there was much uncertainty about who they were and how they would fit into North American society. In both Canada and the United States, preexisting racialized discourses were superimposed on Ukrainian immigrants in order to make sense of who they were.

At the time, 'race' cut both ways. Early twentieth-century supporters and opponents alike framed their remarks about Ukrainian immigrants in highly racialized terms. Perhaps the best-known and most influential booster of the Ukrainian immigrant in the Canadian government was Clifford Sifton, the Minister of the Interior between 1896 and 1905. Though there is disagreement about what part he played in recruiting Ukrainian immigrants (Petryshyn, 1991), Sifton does appear to have believed that Ukrainians would eventually make reasonably good citizens. A number of years after he left his portfolio, and while debates about 'the quality' of immigrants were still raging in Canada, Sifton justified his earlier promotion of Ukrainian immigration, likening Ukrainians to beasts of burden who were biologically suited to the hard labor needed to homestead on the virgin prairie:

when I speak of quality I have in mind something that is quite different from what is in the mind of the average writer or speaker upon the question of immigration. I think a stalwart peasant in a sheepskin coat, born on the soil, whose forefathers have been farmers for ten generations, with a stout wife and half-dozen children, is good quality.

(Cited in Lehr, 1991: 40)

Among the opponents of Ukrainian immigration, despite their scanty knowledge about who these people were, there was almost universal agreement that they were racially different from Canadians. An influential Canadian commentator, drawing on an observation made by a like-minded American, explained in considerable detail where people from southern and eastern Europe fitted into the larger racial cosmology:

A line drawn across the continent of Europe from northeast to southwest, separating the Scandinavian Peninsula, the British Isles, Germany, and France from Russia, Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Turkey, separates countries not only of distinct races but also of distinct civilizations. It separates Protestant Europe from Catholic Europe; it separates countries of representative institutions and popular government from absolute monarchies; it separates lands where education is universal from lands where illiteracy predominates; it separates manufacturing countries, progressive agriculture, and skilled labor from primitive hand industries, backward agriculture, and unskilled labor; it separates an educated, thrifty peasantry from a peasantry scarcely a single generation removed from serfdom; it separates the Teutonic race from Latin, Slav, Semitic, and Mongolian races.

(Cited in Osborne, 1991: 85)

Politically significant portions of the Anglo-Canadian and American elites wanted to keep their countries white, and so were skeptical of whether Ukrainians could ever think, be and act like white people. The main point of contention between those who voiced concern over immigration flows was whether their racial otherness was permanent or whether they could eventually be transformed into Canadians and Americans. Supporters like Sifton thought that they could be assimilated, but detractors felt that the 'hordes' of Galicians, Bukovynians and Ruthenians were of decidedly inferior racial stock and that any government policy that facilitated their entry would spell ruin.

In Canada, racial anxieties focused particularly on the dangers of block settlements (Osborne, 1991: 95). In 1897, the *Nor'Wester* newspaper wrote:

It is a positive misfortune for an enlightened community to be handicapped by having a cargo of these people settled in or near it. Both economically and socially they will lower the standard of citizenship. If they are put in colonies by themselves, they will be still less susceptible to progressive influences; and the districts where the colonies are located will be shunned by desirable

immigrants. Not only are they useless economically and repulsive socially, but they will constitute a serious political danger. They are ignorant, priest ridden and purchasable. In the hands of a practical politician, a few thousand of such votes will decide the political representation of the province . . . All who are interested in the progress of Manitoba should protest more vigorously against the further importation of such a dangerous element.

(Cited in Lehr, 1991: 39)

Thus, while block settlements were regarded favorably in government circles, for the wider Canadian public and many Canadian politicians they were a recipe for disaster. Critics believed that Ukrainians and other eastern or southern Europeans who settled in close physical proximity to each other would never have to assimilate into an Anglo-Canadian way of life. The settlements would enable these groups to continue to maintain their own languages, traditions and customs and would remove any reason to rub shoulders with, and learn from, superior races (Lehr, 1991: 38).

In the industrialized, coal-mining centers in the eastern United States, hostility toward Ukrainian and other eastern European immigrants was no less vicious than on the Canadian prairies (Halich, 1937; Balch, 1969; Higham, 1955). Much of the American working-class anxiety about Ukrainians and other eastern Europeans was due to competition in local labor markets, but some of the concern of the American economic elite was also due to Ukrainians' sympathy for socialist and social-democratic politics. Thus, their ambivalent place within the social category of 'white' or 'Caucasian', along with their political orientations, raised anxiety about who they were and whether they were truly loyal to America. However, both forms of hostility took racialized forms, and, much as they were in Canada, Ukrainian immigrants were often regarded as 'the scum of the continent' who 'diseased' the upstanding communities within which English, Scottish, Irish, Welsh, Germans and Americans lived (Kuropas, 1991: 33-4; see also Higham, 1955; Jacobson, 1998; Barrett and Roediger, 1999).

This kind of ideological hostility was often translated into everyday racism directed against Ukrainians. As in the case of other racialized groups, biographical and autobiographical accounts of the first wave of Ukrainian immigrants are full of stories of racist insults, slights, jokes and degradations in their relations with members of majority groups. Ukrainians also experienced various kinds of social exclusion and discriminatory treatment at the hands of Canadian and American institutions. Some responded to the racial humiliations by assimilating and trying to shed the visible symbols of their culture and identity as soon as they could.

Changing one's name to pass as an *anglic* (an Englishman) was not uncommon. Others responded by turning inwards and finding comfort and a reaffirmation of their identity in a narrow range of activities within the community (Swyrypa, 1993). In fact, it was this larger climate of hostility that many commentators see as part of the reason for the particularly vibrant community life among diaspora Ukrainians during the first half of the twentieth century. Preferring their own cultural practices and institutions to mainstream institutions and society, many Ukrainians in North America formed their own organizations, churches, dance groups and reading rooms as a way of asserting and maintaining their identity.

Becoming Ukrainian in the diaspora

Depending on what one thinks of post-modern discussions of ethnic identity, the early twentieth century is either a dream or a nightmare. Most of the Ukrainians who migrated to North America during the first wave of immigration did not arrive with a clear sense of themselves as 'Ukrainians'. Sociologists have long recognized that the understanding of one's own identity often becomes keener when it is challenged. Canadians, for example, may not have a clear sense of who they are and what makes them unique when they are at home, but when they travel abroad many develop a heightened understanding of themselves as an ethnic group (Howard-Hassmann, 1999). A similar sociological process seems to have happened with first-wave Ukrainian immigrants. When the first wave of immigrants began to arrive in North America in the late nineteenth century, the word 'Ukrainian' was unfamiliar to most people, including the immigrants themselves. Yet, by the beginning of World War I, it began to replace a variety of other local and regional designations. The formation of a Ukrainian identity, and the development of a sense of shared meaning of Ukrainianness, was the result of an interplay between their points of origin, nationalizing elites, religion and the conditions in North America.

Like other European peasant migrants at the turn of the century, members of the first wave of Ukrainian emigration, before they emigrated, tended to have local identities that were rooted in a village or region. When pressed by immigration officials and census enumerators in the United States and Canada to say 'who they were', some responded with the country that issued their travel documents. Thus, depending on where they came from, some Ukrainians thought they were, and came to be defined as, Austrian, Hungarian or Russian. Some answered with a regional identity like Bukovynian, Galician or Lemko. Yet others gave their religion, so that Ukrainian Greek Catholics came to be thought of as 'Greeks' (Kaye, 1964: xxiii).

If a larger ethnonational identity was expressed by immigrants upon their arrival in North America, it tended to be 'Rusyn' (Kuropas, 1991). But further complications arose when it came to translating these terms into English. The first immigrants to North America initially translated 'Rusyn' as 'Russian' or 'Little Russian' (Marunchak, 1982). By 1900, though, 'Ruthenian' became the regular English translation, and by the First World War, Ukrainian came increasingly to replace Ruthenian.

As the historian Myron Kuropas notes, by World War I, the Ruthenian population of the United States was split into three ethnonational designations: Ukrainian, Carpatho-Rusyns and Russian: about 20 percent of Ruthenians adopted a Russian identity, 40 percent a Carpatho-Rusyn identity, and the other 40 percent a Ukrainian identity (Kuropas, 1991: 124; Procko, 1979). While the dynamics of these identity transformations need to be examined within each historically specific diaspora context, in the remainder of this chapter it is worthwhile to focus on the United States.

In the United States, the transformation of people with a variety of local or regional identities into Rusyns and Ruthenians and then into the more refined categories of Ukrainians, Russians and Carpatho-Rusyns, was largely the result of the self-conscious work of clerical elites and their associated nationalizing agencies, such as churches, fraternal benefit associations, newspapers and reading rooms. Much of the stimulus for the development of a specifically Ukrainian national identity in the United States came from 'the American circle' of Greek Catholic priests from Galicia. Formed in 1890 in Lviv, the American circle consisted originally of seven seminarians who self-consciously planned to take up their pastoral duties in the United States, remain celibate in order to avoid conflict with the Roman Catholic Church and organize the Ruthenian community in the United States along Ukrainian ethnonational lines (Kuropas, 1991: 76). Between 1895 and 1898, the seven moved to the United States and settled variously in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut and New York in communities that had large concentrations of Ruthenians. Despite friction with the Roman Catholic hierarchy, which was reluctant to recognize the legitimacy of 'Greek Catholicism', largely because their priests could marry, the priests took up their first pastoral duties in Catholic churches. They soon established the Ruthenian National Union (RNU), a fraternal benefit society which offered life insurance for Ruthenian workers, and adopted the newspaper *Svoboda (Liberty)* as their organ. These 'Ukrainophiles' cohered around the development of a distinctly Ukrainian national identity (Procko, 1979: 54). The RNU was established, in part, to counter the influence of what was considered the excessive influence of the Hungarian-oriented Greek Catholic Union and its organ the *American Ruthenian Messenger* (Kuropas, 1991: 57).

The development of a specifically 'Ukrainian' national identity in the United States occurred over a twenty-year period between 1895 and 1914. In April, 1894, *Svoboda* published what it defined as the 'Ten National Commandments' of the 'Ruthenian' American population. However, shortly after its takeover by the RNU, *Svoboda* began to introduce the terms 'Ukraine' and 'Ukrainian' 'unobtrusively, and almost casually, to the Ruthenian community' (Kuropas, 1991: 82). It also began to introduce Ukrainian national symbols. Among other things, it printed stories about Taras Shevchenko, one of the leading poets of the Ukrainian national revival in the late nineteenth century. It also published yearly almanacs which contained articles on the history of Ukraine, literature by Shevchenko and Ivan Franko (another writer of the Ukrainian national revival), articles on Ukrainian language and religion, and calendars that noted dates of particular ethnoreligious significance to Ukrainians (Kuropas, 1991: 84).

Ukrainianization also took place through a number of other organizations. Reading rooms (or *chytalni*) were encouraged by priests, as well as fraternal benefit societies and their related newspapers as ways of promoting literacy and a Ukrainian national consciousness. *Prosvita* Societies, which had been initially established in Ukraine in order to raise the intellectual level of the peasantry, were also established in the United States. Though they had to struggle in the early years of their existence, by 1917 there were some notable successes. Women's organizations, youth organizations, choirs, orchestras, bands, dance ensembles and heritage schools for children were also an important part of the process by which the Ruthenian identity in America was transformed into a Ukrainian and American identity (Kuropas, 1991: 86–105).

By 1914, the 'Ukrainophiles' within the Ruthenian-American community felt confident enough to assert a specifically Ukrainian ethnocultural identity. At its 1914 convention, the Ruthenian National Union changed its name to the Ukrainian National Association (UNA). At the same time *Svoboda* promulgated the 'Eleven National Commandments' for *Ukrainians*, which were a reworking of the initial ten commandments for Ruthenians:

- 1 The Ukrainian child should associate with Ukrainian children and speak only in Ukrainian when in their company.
- 2 Parents or older members of the family should teach children to read and write Ukrainian during the child's preschool years.
- 3 Homes should be beautified with Ukrainian religious and historical paintings and pictures.
- 4 The Ukrainian child should learn Ukrainian sayings, as well as Ukrainian verses, songs, and games.
- 5 Let Ukrainian tradition live in the Ukrainian family. The father or

- older members of the family should always remember the important national dates from our history.
- 6 The family should read Ukrainian books in unison during the long winter evenings.
 - 7 Every Ukrainian home should have *Svoboda*, the truly Ukrainian national newspaper.
 - 8 The treasure of each family should be its library containing the best Ukrainian books.
 - 9 The Ukrainian family should take advantage of every opportunity to attend a Ukrainian play, concert or a commemoration of a national holiday.
 - 10 Every father, mother, and older members of the family should belong to the Ukrainian National Association and they should enroll their children in the juvenile division.
 - 11 Every family should try to bring back those members who have fallen away from Ukrainian traditions.

(quoted in Kuropas, 1991: 86)

One of the challenges faced by the Ukrainian ethnic elite was to develop a Ukrainian identity for the Ruthenian population, and construct a sense of community solidarity and shared meanings about being Ukrainian that distinguished between the Russophile and Magyarophile Ruthenians. Developing a specifically Ukrainian ethnonational consciousness in the United States was therefore complicated by the fact that leaders of other ethnonational orientations competed for the hearts, identities, loyalties and resources of the Ruthenian population (Markus, 1979). Thus, part of the process involved in carving out a Ukrainian identity for the Ruthenian population of the United States entailed conflicts with what were perceived to be other less authentic Ruthenians: the Carpatho-Rusyns and Russians.

The Hungarian-oriented Greek Catholic Union and its newspaper *Viestnik* played a leading role in the conflict with Ukrainophiles. Carpatho-Rusyns fought tooth and nail to deter and discredit those who were trying to promote a Ukrainian-oriented Ruthenian identity. A 1908 article in *Viestnik*, for example, declared:

Ukrainian priests are pushing the lying *Svoboda* into the hands of peasants instead of the lives of the saints which they themselves haven't read. Ukrainian priests are leading the way to Ukrainian slavery, one in which our national ideals will be lost. 'Ukrainchiks' are confusing our meetings. We have reached a time when our 'Ukrainchiks' offer division, robbery and thievery . . . A priest is supposed to spread the Kingdom of God and not the

Kingdom of Ukraine . . . Ukrainians are ripping our Christian faith from our hearts. The Poles are stealing our rite. The Ukrainian is stealing our very faith . . . Ukraine is separating children from parents, brothers, sisters, priests from parishes . . . evil and diabolical hatred burns in the hearts of Ukrainians . . . Our tattered, hungry sons of Ruthenian soil run to America but even here they are caught by the Ukrainians.

(Cited in Kuropas, 1991: 115–16)

Equally scathing rebukes of the Magyarophiles can be found in Ukrainophile publications at the same time.

The Magyarophiles within the Greek Catholic Union, and *Viestnik*, were not successful in their push to have Ruthenians from sub-Carpathia adopt a Hungarian identity. This was because the priests tended to speak Hungarian, but most of the immigrants from that region could not speak that language. The Greek Catholic priests from sub-Carpathia eventually worked to establish a distinct Carpatho-Rusyn identity in the United States. Thus, the Magyarophiles' identity marker became a narrower regional designation, Carpatho-Rusyn. They solidified this identity, in part, by distancing themselves from the Ukrainophiles (Kuropas, 1991: 113–20). In commenting on the efforts by the Ukrainophiles to Ukrainianize the 'Greek Catholics of Hungary/Russians of Hungary', the Carpatho-Rusyn clergy claimed that the main difference between themselves and the 'Russians of Galicia' (Ukrainians) was that:

The Greek Catholics of Hungary are inclined towards refinement and exhibit an honest, sincere, open-hearted, and active nature. This cannot be said of those from Galicia. The reason for this is that the Russians of Hungary were not as politically and religiously oppressed as were those of Galicia. The Russians of Hungary enjoyed quite enough liberty while those of Galicia for many hundreds of years were almost slaves under the power of the Poles. For this reason, the Greek Catholics of Galicia are more responsive to political and social campaigns than either the Magyars or Russians of Hungary.

. . . the Russians of Hungary and those of Galicia never had anything in common until they came to America. It was here that an attempt was made to bring them together and to make them one in religious and national matters. These attempts were not only unsuccessful but in some ways were to widen the breach between them.

(Cited in Kuropas, 1991: 117)

The Ukrainophiles in the United States had also had competition from a Russian ethnonational stream. When the United States purchased Alaska from Russia in 1867, many Russians stayed in America. Many in turn moved to California, and in 1872 the seat of the Russian Orthodox diocese in the United States moved from Sitka, Alaska, to San Francisco, California. Growth in the church was slow, however, until the late 1890s. The Russophile sentiments of the Ruthenian-American community was promoted by a former Greek Catholic priest from Carpatho-Ukraine, Father Alexis Toth. In 1891, Toth and his financially struggling Minneapolis Greek Catholic parishioners from Carpatho-Ukraine were persuaded to join the Russian Orthodox Church (Kuropas, 1991: 55), partly because of the financial support of the Tsarist government in Russia (Magocsi, 1994: 30). Toth's charismatic personality, coupled with the hostile response that Greek Catholic priests and churches received from the Roman Catholic hierarchy, combined to produce some notable successes in conversions from Greek Catholicism to Russian Orthodoxy. By the time of his death in 1909, Toth was credited with having brought more than 25,000 Catholic Carpatho-Rusyns to the Russian Orthodox fold (Magocsi, 1994: 30). The Russian Orthodox Church in turn established its own fraternal benefit societies, newspapers and reading rooms. According to Kuropas (1991: 124), the 'Ruthenians who joined the Russian Orthodox Church in America rarely returned to the Ruthenian fold. They were absorbed by the Russian ethnonational stream and became, in both religious belief and national orientation, thoroughly and irrevocably Russian.'

Russians promoted the ideal of an indivisible Russian state and saw all of the Slavic peoples in Tsarist Russia as 'Russians' of one sort or another. They called Ukrainians their 'Little Russian' brothers and thought that the idea that Ukraine was a political-historical entity, and Ukrainians a national entity, was a fiction being promoted by Ukrainophile priest-radicals. This animosity towards Ukraine as a political entity and Ukrainian as an ethnic or cultural identity was expressed in a poem in the 1911 annual almanac of a fraternal benefit organization, the Russian Brotherhood Organization:

You are the sons of the holy Rus'!...
 May this land of your mother remain dear to your heart ...
 The Poles and Jews would subvert you with the idea of 'Ukraine'
 An ideal land in which there are no Polish landlords and no Jews.
 That is double talk
 No such land exists
 Study the History and writings of Rus'.

And thereby strengthen your resistance to the Ukrainians.
And you will grow to be proud sons of Mother Rus'.

(Cited in Kuropas, 1991: 123)

Like the Ukrainian orientation within the Ruthenian population, the Russian and Carpatho-Rusyn orientation was the result of a social process in which elites promoted, encouraged, defined and articulated a distinct ethnonational identity.

Conclusion

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Ukrainian peasants left their homes because of economic pressures resulting from the decline of serfdom and the transition to a market economy. In most cases, those migrants became part of the working class in their new countries or settled on agricultural land to become farmers or a combination of farmer and worker. In terms of Cohen's typology, first-wave Ukrainians were, therefore, a labor diaspora insofar as they left home to seek wage labor and agricultural settlement opportunities in order to make a better living. Some left with the intention of returning, while others anticipated a more permanent separation from their homeland. A combination of chain migration and active recruitment by governments and employers resulted in the dispersal of Ukrainians to the far reaches of the Russian Empire, to other countries in Europe and to North and South America.

In the case of Brazil and Hawaii, the presumed 'whiteness' of Ukrainians was an advantage in that they were considered to be helping to bolster the European populations in these locations. In North America, however, Ukrainians tended to be cast as racial others by the dominant labor, political and economic elites. But that racialization did not necessarily lead Ukrainians to assert an identity based on their presumed 'whiteness'. Like other racialized eastern and southern Europeans at the time (Barrett and Roediger, 1999; Jacobson, 1998), Ukrainians seemed to abstain from the politics of whiteness.

The process by which Ukrainians first came to form a diaspora in North America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries points to a complex interaction between migration, social class and identity formation. As the literature on the social construction of ethnicity suggests, national, ethnic and racial identities and boundaries are socially constructed and are not primordial features of social life. Ethnic and national identities and boundaries are the result of a dialectical process involving internal and external opinions and processes, as well as an individual's self-identification and ethnic designations of outsiders (Nagel, 1994: 58). It is

important to emphasize, however, that those identities and boundaries were not created out of thin air (Isajiw, 1999: 199). Through the influence of nationalizing elites who were in competition for the identity of the new migrants and who helped work up the raw material of religion, culture, appearance, language and place of origin into ethnicity and nationality, the identity of a significant proportion of emigrants from Austro-Hungarian lands was transformed into a Ukrainian identity. In other words, the vast majority of first-wave Ukrainian emigrants became Ukrainian while in the diaspora. The Ukrainian case has certain parallels with that of other European groups at the time insofar as nationalizing elites played an important role in the formation and development of identity for peasants who became workers and farmers in their new host societies (Vecoli, 1964).

The next chapter considers the second wave of immigration, which roughly corresponds with the end of World War I and the beginning of the depression. It also begins to discuss in more detail the community life of the diaspora. The immigrants who left Ukraine and settled in North America after World War I confronted a community that had begun to define itself as 'Ukrainian'. The complex politics of the Ukrainian revolutionary era between 1917 and 1920 meant that much of the post-World War I diaspora community would be torn apart by conflicts over what kind of Ukrainian one was. If the first wave of Ukrainian immigration to North America witnessed a process of ethnic identity development, the second wave saw the process of diaspora fragmentation.

WHAT KIND OF UKRAINIAN ARE YOU?

Cleavages within the pre-World War II diaspora

World War I and the Russian Revolution resulted in dramatic changes in the geo-political configuration of Europe. The Habsburg Empire disintegrated and left behind the two emasculated states of Austria and Hungary. That disintegration, however, also resulted in the birth, and in some cases rebirth, of a number of other states. The Poles regained their statehood and the Czechs and the Slovaks united to form the state of Czechoslovakia. The peoples of the Russian Empire were not so lucky. That empire teetered on the brink of collapse between 1917 and 1920, but its boundaries remained more or less intact after its transformation into a federation of supposedly independent socialist republics. After the dust from war and revolution had settled, the reshuffling of political boundaries left Ukrainian territory divided between four different political units: eastern Ukraine was constituted as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic within the larger Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, while western Ukraine was divided between Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia.

The second wave of Ukrainian emigration continued to be made up of elements of a labor diaspora. Like their counterparts in the first wave, peasant migrants from rural areas were searching for land and various combinations of temporary and permanent wage labor. Because of existing regional, village and family networks, Canada attracted immigrants from Galicia and Bukovyna; the United States attracted immigrants from Transcarpathia, but also began to attract a smattering of Galicians and Bukovynians. In the 1920s, however, restrictive immigration policies in North America diverted some migrants to countries like Argentina, which continued to attract Galicians. Between the wars, Ukrainians continued to form part of large-scale labor, colonizing and involuntary migrations within the Soviet Union.

The interwar years also saw the emergence of a different kind of Ukrainian emigrant (Subtelny, 1994: 551). Urban, nationally conscious,

educated and politically aware, these emigrants were propelled into the diaspora because they had taken part in the various attempts to achieve Ukrainian independence in eastern and western Ukraine between 1917 and 1920. This new segment of the diaspora, which numbered close to 100,000, was made up of soldiers, officers, government functionaries, and nationally conscious members of the intelligentsia and their families (Subtelny, 1994: 551). At first they moved to various places in central and western Europe, partly to be close to the homeland, but many eventually emigrated to other places of Ukrainian settlement in North and South America.

As the twentieth century unfolded, some members of the first and second waves of migration became part of the burgeoning socialist and communist movements in North America. Others came to form various non-socialist and nationalist groups that hoped to see Ukraine as an independent state. The nationalist side of the diaspora was made up of earlier first-wave labor migrants and the political exiles who had left Ukraine in the wake of the various attempts to form a Ukrainian state. In this chapter, I want to trace the contradictory influences that war, revolution and the division of Ukrainian land between Soviet Ukraine, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania had on the socialist and nationalist segments of the Ukrainian diaspora in North America. For nationalists in the diaspora, these events provided the basis for political activity that was aimed at helping Ukraine achieve independence. But within the nationalist camp, these events also resulted in a number of political and ideological divisions. As Subtelny (1994: 551) puts it, 'like all political emigrants, these Ukrainians were prone to excessive fragmentation and infighting. Supporters of the various governments-in-exile often laid more blame on each other for their defeats than on the Bolsheviks.' Nationalists fought amongst themselves over ideology, strategy and the kind of independent state Ukraine should become, and with diaspora socialists over how to interpret the status of Soviet Ukraine. For members of the Ukrainian diaspora left, however, the events surrounding the formation of Soviet Ukraine led to a sense of solidarity with the 'newly liberated' Soviet Ukrainian people, precipitated a multifaceted return movement that was committed to helping build socialism in Soviet Ukraine, and led to struggles with Ukrainian diaspora nationalists who were attacking the good name of Soviet Ukraine. To set the context for this discussion, the following section describes briefly the Ukrainian efforts to form a state between 1917 and 1920.

Background: the Ukrainian revolutionary era

The period between 1917 and 1920 in Ukrainian territory within the Russian Empire was characterized by extraordinarily complex power

struggles that left no segment of society untouched. The Russian Bolsheviks, along with their Ukrainian supporters, eventually won the contest over eastern Ukraine in 1920, but not before three attempts had been made by both left- and right-leaning Ukrainians to establish an independent Ukrainian state. The Ukrainians who participated in these efforts entered into various alliances with surrounding powers and fought against various enemies. The politically active nationalist losers in these contests for Ukrainian statehood faced the choice of living under the Soviet system or leaving Soviet Ukraine to continue the battle for independent Ukrainian statehood from the diaspora. Many chose the latter.

The abdication of Tsar Nicholas II in March 1917 provided the first opportunity for left-leaning Ukrainian nationalists to express their vision of an independent Ukrainian state. In Kyiv, a number of organizations, among them the Executive Committee of the Council of Combined Social Organizations (which included former Tsarist supporters and organizations concerned with maintaining public order) and various left-leaning worker and soldier soviets, competed for the loyalties of the Ukrainian masses. The Central Rada, which was made up of a coalition of nationally conscious left-wing Ukrainians, eventually filled the vacuum created when Tsarist officialdom collapsed and the provisional government was established in Petrograd.

Members of the Central Rada elected as their leader a well-respected professor of history and president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, who had written one of the first comprehensive histories of Ukraine in Ukrainian. His scholarly work was undertaken with the 'express purpose of providing the idea of Ukrainian statehood with historical legitimacy' (Subtelny, 1994: 326). For that reason, he had been forced to live in Moscow under the watch of the Tsarist police since 1914. Between June 1917 and January 1918, the Rada issued four progressively more bold 'Universals', or proclamations, regarding Ukrainian statehood. At first the relationship between the Rada government in Kyiv and the provisional government in Petrograd was cooperative. The Rada's First Universal asserted that 'the Ukrainian people have the right to manage its own life on its own soil' and that an elected assembly should govern the affairs of Ukrainians. It did not, however, call for the dissolution of the Russian Empire; instead, it defined Ukraine as an autonomous country within a larger federated Russian state.

The provisional government in Petrograd was too busy trying to hold on to power to be able to react in a definitive way to this claim for Ukrainian statehood. This indifference eventually emboldened the Ukrainian nationalist cause, and during the course of 1917 the Rada issued progressively more radical proposals for independence. But Russian indifference

changed to hostility shortly after the Bolsheviks overthrew the provisional government in October 1917. At first the Rada and the local Bolsheviks in Kyiv had a cooperative relationship because they shared similar social revolutionary aims. Both supported the redistribution to peasants of land owned by the church and the nobility, the introduction of an eight-hour day for the urban proletariat and the nationalization of industry. But when the Central Rada proclaimed the Ukrainian National Republic in its Third Universal of November 1917 the Bolsheviks turned on the Ukrainian aspirations for statehood. Although the declaration left room for Ukraine to be a republic within a Russian socialist federation, it emphasized that the federation should be made up of 'equal and free peoples' (Magocsi, 1996: 480).

The Russian Bolsheviks saw this as a challenge to their authority over Ukrainian territory they had inherited from the Tsar. Shortly after the declaration, Ukrainian Bolshevik supporters denounced the Rada government, left Kyiv and established their own Soviet government farther to the east in Kharkiv. Eventually the Soviet Ukrainian government declared the Rada an 'enemy of the people' and prepared to take Kyiv by force; with the aid of Russian forces, the Ukrainian Bolsheviks were able to force the Rada out of Kyiv on February 9, 1918.

At the same time as the Bolsheviks were taking control of Kyiv, the leaders of the Rada agreed to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with the central powers. In the treaty, the central powers agreed to recognize the Ukrainian National Republic's independence from Russia and to help force the Bolsheviks out of eastern Ukraine. Their recognition of the existence of, and their military support for, the Ukrainian National Republic, was therefore exchanged for the Rada's help in securing food and raw materials from Ukrainian territory. With the help of the German army, the Rada pushed the Bolshevik forces out of Kyiv on March 1, 1918.

But the Rada's cooperation with the Germans came at a price, for the Ukrainian peasants both resented and resisted German requisitions of grain and other supplies. It quickly became clear to the Germans that the Rada was unable to deliver on its promise to help secure resources for their war effort. On April, 28, 1918, the occupying German forces deposed the leaders of the Central Rada and established their own 'Ukrainian' government. This new client government, known as the Hetmanate, signaled a rightward turn in Ukrainian efforts to form their own state. Pavlo Skoropadsky was installed as the Hetman, or monarch, of this government. Skoropadsky, who was of Cossack gentry lineage, had intimate connections with the Tsarists. He had been aide-de-camp to Nicholas II and a lieutenant general in the Tsarist army during World War I (Reshetar, 1952: 145). He was also one of Ukraine's largest landowners.

Shortly after taking power, Skoropadsky assumed dictatorial powers: governing authority resided exclusively in him; he made all cabinet appointments; and he gave himself veto power over all legislation that came from his appointed cabinet. In exchange for German support for keeping the Bolshevik forces at bay, the Hetman government agreed to a number of conditions, including the abolition of all restrictions on the export of raw materials and manufactured goods to Germany. The Hetman also undid many of the Rada's socialist reforms. Since 'the right of private ownership' was 'the foundation of culture and civilization', he restored the property rights of large landlords and required that peasants pay landlords for the redistributed land (Reshetar, 1952: 148).

The armistice on November 11, 1918 meant that the life of the Hetmanate was destined to be short: in fact it lasted only eight months. In a last-ditch effort to remain in power by currying favor with the western powers, Skoropadsky abandoned the idea of Ukrainian statehood and sought an alliance with the anti-Bolshevik White Russian forces. His new aim was to make Ukraine part of a greater non-Bolshevik Russian federation. This scheme was unsuccessful, and Skoropadsky was forced to abdicate.

Even before the German withdrawal from Ukraine in December 1918 socialist and social democratic forces were mobilizing against the Skoropadsky government and its German patrons. In the dying days of the war, Skoropadsky gave the Germans a free hand to requisition grain from the Ukrainian countryside. Ukrainian peasants who refused to hand over their produce paid heavy fines or were shot. The Ukrainian peasantry responded in kind, engaging in a guerrilla war against the German forces, and in July 1918 succeeded in assassinating Field Marshal Herman von Eichhorn, the highest-ranking German representative in Ukraine. At the same time, peasant organizations aligned themselves with the left-leaning organizations of the Central Rada to form a new organization called the Ukrainian National Union, whose aim was to reestablish a social democratic Ukrainian National Republic that was independent of the Russian Bolsheviks.

Skoropadsky's flight to Germany in December 1918 allowed the 'Directory' government of the Ukrainian National Union to lay claim to the Ukrainian state. Headed by Volodymyr Vynnychenko and its military commander Symon Petliura, the Directory government engaged in a nearly two-year struggle against the Russian and Ukrainian Bolsheviks and the Tsarist forces to assert control over Ukraine. For a time, the Directory was allied with Ukrainians in Galicia, who were engaged in their own struggle for statehood against Poland. However, faced with hostility from both Bolshevik and White Russian forces, the Directory eventually sought an

anti-Russian alliance with Poland, thereby alienating the Ukrainians in Galicia. Despite some early military successes, the Directory's Polish-backed effort to assert control over Dnieper Ukraine failed. By October 1920 the Bolsheviks controlled eastern and central Ukraine, had taken over the machinery of government and had embarked on the creation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Nationally conscious Ukrainian leaders in western Ukraine within the Austro-Hungarian Empire took seriously the assertion made in 1918 by Woodrow Wilson that future peace in Europe hinged on the principle of national self-determination. They also took seriously a manifesto issued on October 16, 1918 by Emperor Charles in which he proposed that the Austro-Hungarian Empire be transformed into a federal state where various nationalities would have certain autonomous decision-making powers. Responding quickly to Charles's invitation to relative autonomy within the empire, a number of Galicia's influential leaders (including Evhen Petrushevych, Iulian Romanchuk and Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky) met to form the Ukrainian National Council. In Lviv, on October 18, 1918, the newly elected President of the Council, Petrushevych invoked the principle of national self-determination and proclaimed a Ukrainian state on Austro-Hungarian lands (Magocsi, 1996: 513). A short time afterwards, Ukrainian leaders persuaded the Habsburg viceroy in Galicia to hand all government offices over to the Ukrainian National Council. On November 1, the Council proclaimed that the West Ukrainian National Republic (Zakhidno Ukraïnska Narodna Respublyka, or ZUNR) should from that time on be considered an independent country.

As in the east, this assertion of Ukrainian statehood was contested, this time by the Poles, who had just won their statehood and thought of eastern Galicia as their own. Thus, on the same day that Ukrainian statehood was proclaimed by the Ukrainian National Council, Poles in Lviv and other cities in eastern Galicia took up arms against the Ukrainians. The Council had a well-trained military force of its own called the *Sich* Rifleman, under the leadership of Evhen Konovalets. The Rifleman were made up of Ukrainian officers and enlisted men who had earlier served in the Austrian army (Motyl, 1980: 8). They were no match, however, for the superior Polish forces, and the Council was quickly pushed out of Lviv. The Council first set up operations in Ternopil and later in Stanyslaviv (Ivano-Frankyvs'k). But faced with the relative indifference of the west to the cause of Ukrainian statehood the Ukrainian leadership of the ZUNR was forced out of Galicia in July 1919 and went into exile in Kamianets-Podilskyi in Bukovyna.

Petrushevych and Konovalets, who became the leaders of the government-in-exile of the West Ukrainian National Republic, pinned their hopes on an earlier declaration of unity with Symon Petliura's Directory govern-

ment made in January 1919. Despite pledges of mutual assistance, the leaders of the two Ukrainian governments eventually formed alliances with each other's enemies. The leaders of the ZUNR government-in-exile sought the support of General Deniken's White Russian forces in their struggle to overthrow Polish rule in Galicia; Petliura, as noted earlier, sought Polish help to drive the Bolsheviks and White Russians out of eastern Ukraine. And so the temporary alliance between eastern and western Ukrainian political leaders broke down.

If success is measured by the establishment of a lasting free and independent state, then none of the struggles that followed World War I were successful. But though these assertions of Ukrainian statehood were short-lived they at least confirm that an independent Ukrainian state was not out of the question. After the defeats by Polish forces in the west and by Bolshevik forces in the east, many of the leaders, followers and functionaries of the West Ukrainian National Republic, the Rada, the Ukrainian National Republic and the Hetmanate dispersed throughout Europe and later into North and South America. For the next seventy years, nationalist Ukrainians pursued their claims for Ukrainian statehood from the diaspora.

Migration: the destinations

The Bolshevik consolidation of control over eastern Ukraine limited the opportunities for westward migration, for emigration to the west was frowned upon, and indeed prohibited, by Soviet authorities partly because they feared that the very existence of emigrants would send the wrong message about life in the emergent workers' paradise. However, the eastern, northern and southern movement of people within the Soviet federation between the wars was common, and Ukrainians formed a large part of both voluntary and involuntary migration. The earlier Tsarist efforts to colonize Siberia and Asiatic Russia were taken up by the Bolsheviks, who, in the mid-1920s, designated the Russian far east, Siberia, the Sakhalin Islands and the Karelian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic as resettlement locations for Ukrainians and others from what were deemed to be overpopulated 'European' parts of the Soviet Union.

The Bolsheviks also used the Tsarist weapon of deportation to check nationalist and other undesirable activities and sentiments. Left-leaning nationalistic cultural activists who remained in Ukraine after the Bolshevik takeover quickly ran foul of the authorities and were deported. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, priests and parishioners of the Ukrainian Autocephalis Orthodox Church, along with *kurkul* (*kulak* in Russian) households were deported to locations on the Volga River, and to Siberia, Kazakhstan, the far east and the Ural mountains. In 1926, the Soviet census

reported that 2.2 million Ukrainians were scattered across Soviet Asia alone; they made up 62 percent of the 3.5 million Ukrainian diaspora in the Soviet Union. Between 1926 and 1939, a further 2.8 million people from Ukraine (many of whom were ethnic Ukrainians) moved to these regions, either as voluntary settlers or as deportees (Naulko *et al.*, 1993: 11–15). As with the earlier wave, little has been written in English about the community life of the Ukrainians who settled in Siberia and the Russian far east. However, during the Ukrainian Revolution era, Ukrainians in the far east developed a number of links with the various governments that were asserting Ukrainian claims for statehood. Like their counterparts in the western diaspora, they formed their own organizations, made efforts to retain their language and ethnicity, published newspapers and pamphlets, and tried to teach their children the Ukrainian language and culture. Even after the Bolsheviks gained control of the Soviet Union, Ukrainians in the far east established schools, publishing houses and umbrella organizations to press for the Ukrainianization of their communities (Cipko, 1994: 131–2).

It is estimated that about 200,000 Ukrainians moved westward from Poland (Galicia, Lemko regions), Romania (Bukovyna) and Czechoslovakia (Subcarpathia) during the interwar period. As in the earlier wave, some Ukrainians from these regions moved to North and South America. Various European countries also became home to sizable numbers of Ukrainians. Between the wars, about 67,000 Ukrainians moved to Canada, 44,000 to Argentina, 36,000 to France, 12,000 to the United States, 8000 to Belgium and several thousand to each of Germany, Czechoslovakia and Poland.

Because of restrictive immigration policies in Canada and the United States during the 1920s, some Ukrainians were diverted to Argentina. This was a relatively new destination for Ukrainians, although some 10,000 Ukrainians from Galicia had settled there between 1897 and 1914. The first emigrants to Argentina had intended to move to the United States, but they were rejected by the American immigration officials in Hamburg on medical grounds and were persuaded by immigration agents to move to Argentina. Eventually they took up homesteads in the province of Misiones, which had just been opened to large-scale agricultural settlement. The majority of the 44,000 interwar Ukrainian arrivals were from Galicia, but others came from Bukovyna and Transcarpathia. They settled in the frontier areas, where they shored up the existing Ukrainian community in Misiones. They also formed new communities in the provinces of Chaco, Mendoza, Formosa, Córdoba, Entre Ríos and Río Negro. About half settled in and around Buenos Aires (Wasylyk, 1994: 426–7), where they formed part of the emergent working class.

The fractured politics of a political diaspora: between the wars

After the Bolsheviks and Poles had consolidated power over eastern and western Ukraine, the leaders of the various governments that had been established during the Ukrainian revolutionary era went into exile in various parts of Europe. The experience and politics of exile were characterized by a complex pulling apart and coming together of the Ukrainian diaspora community. The harsh interpretation of their activities is that 'more often than not the "governments-in-exile" fought amongst themselves rather than their enemies' (Motyl, 1980: 21–2), and 'in the end, each émigré political group blamed one or all of the others for the failure' (Reshetar, 1952: 328) to establish an independent Ukrainian state. However, despite the fragmentation of the nationalist groups, their members, as part of a victim diaspora, did maintain a strong ethnic group consciousness. This was seen in a variety of attempts from central and western Europe to further the cause of uniting western and eastern Ukraine and creating an independent Ukrainian state, and in the creation of political, educational and cultural organizations. These Ukrainians also tried to cultivate ties with the earlier wave of Ukrainian labor migrants who had moved to North America.

The first of the Ukrainian governments to go into exile was the government of Hetman Skoropadsky. After his abdication in 1918, Skoropadsky and his followers first fled to Vienna, but later moved to Wannsee, near Berlin. The Germans, who were in favor of a pro-landlord Hetmanate in Ukraine, at first supported Skoropadsky financially. Though small in number, Skoropadsky's group of well-connected intellectuals and former landlords cultivated conservative contacts in Germany and Britain, as well as with exiled Russian monarchists (Motyl, 1980: 24). As the Bolsheviks consolidated power in Soviet Ukraine in the 1920s, the Germans began to support the idea of a Ukrainian Hetman more publicly. In 1926, the German Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Education financed the creation by the Hetman of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute, which had five departments that dealt with various aspects of Ukrainian culture and history. The Hetmanites also controlled the *Ukrains'ka Hromda* (Ukrainian Community) in Berlin, which, at least publicly, was a non-political organization for Ukrainians living in Germany. It operated a publishing house and published a newspaper, *The Ukrainian Word*. The Hetmanites who remained in Vienna founded the Union for Ukrainian Statehood in 1920 and published a journal called *Agrarian Ukraine* until 1925 (Motyl, 1980: 25).

The chief ideologue of the Ukrainian monarchists was Viacheslav Lypynsky. While in Vienna, Lypynsky published his *Letters to Brethren-Agrarians*, a collection of reflections on what had gone wrong with the

Ukrainian Revolution and what should be done the next time (Reshetar, 1952: 325). Guided by Lypynsky's theories, the Ukrainian Hetmanites in Germany and Austria aimed to establish a 'Ukrainian State' and 'Ukrainian Nation' by unifying the 'Ukrainian agrarian class'. This unification of Ukrainian peasants with the 'morally healthy' Polonized and Russified Ukrainian nobles could only come about through the activities of a non-elected monarch – the Hetman (Motyl, 1980: 26–7).

Even though the Hetmanites did not have much support in the Ukrainian diaspora in Europe or among the peasantry in Ukraine, they did manage to make inroads in North America in the 1920s and 1930s (Kuropas, 1991: 202; Marunchak, 1982: 393–5). American monarchist organizations grew out of the earlier Ukrainian Athletic Association, or *Sich*. The first *Sich* branch was established in the United States in 1902. By 1918 there were fourteen chapters in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and Massachusetts; collectively they published their own newspaper (Kuropas, 1991: 204). By the mid-1920s, numerous branches of the Canadian *Sich* organization had been established, and they too published their own newspaper (Marunchak, 1982: 394). The organization was based on the assumption that a healthy physique was intimately linked with a healthy spirit, both of which were essential building blocks of a nation. Its newspaper *Sichovi Visti* ('Sich News') wrote:

There is hardly a national group . . . [in the United States] that doesn't recognize the value of physical drills and athletics . . . [T]hey know that physical drills build a healthy body, beautify it, build perseverance, and add years to one's life. If the children are healthy, so will be the nation. . . [T]he *Sich* organization . . . has as its purpose the training of Ukrainian youth, both physically and spiritually . . . The *Sich* organization answers all of the requirements of the Ukrainian nation.

(Kuropas, 1991: 204)

During World War I, there was a move to transform the *Sich* from a gymnastic youth organization into a paramilitary organization that would help prepare diaspora youth to participate in the struggle for Ukrainian statehood. According to the pro-militarists, 'we must unite into one fighting body, one *Sich* army unit . . . My *Sich* colleagues, children of Cossacks, the mother weeps for the father who was killed by Polish Jesuits . . . to arms for Ukraine and her people . . . Join the *Sich* rank and file! Become disciplined sons of Ukraine!' (Kuropas, 1991: 206). Eventually the pro-militarists won control of the organization, which at its 1920

convention adopted as its main objective 'to strive for the establishment of an independent and sovereign Ukrainian state' (Kuropas, 1991: 207).

By 1923, the *Sich*, with its pledge of allegiance to Hetman Skoropadsky, was moving towards monarchism, and the takeover by the Hetmanites reinforced the military orientation of the *Sich*. The men had uniforms that were patterned after those of the *Sich* Riflemen in Galicia; the women were organized into Red Cross units and learned first aid. *Sich* members took part in military drills and gymnastics, and also held Sunday field maneuvers in the country. These maneuvers were usually preceded by a church service in the morning and followed by a dance and social gathering in the evening. The *Sich* also purchased three airplanes, which they named *Ukraina*, *Lviv* and *Kiev*, and which were supposed to form the beginnings of a Ukrainian 'air corps'. The planes (two bi-planes and one four-passenger single-wing aircraft) were used to train *Sich* aviators in Chicago, Cleveland and Detroit (Kuropas, 1991: 216). *Sich* members also took advantage of a new American National Guard policy which allowed ethnic groups to form their own units under the command of an American officer. The Canadian *Sich* also had its own planes and air force detachments (Marunchak, 1982: 395). Canadians took part in regular maneuvers of the Canadian Military Districts (Marunchak, 1982: 395).

In 1930 after Lypynsky's denunciation of Skoropadsky, the Hetman *Sich* experienced an organizational crisis. Lypynsky alleged that the Hetman was becoming more and more autocratic and that he was being paid by the Hungarian government to renounce all future Ukrainian claims to Carpatho-Ukraine (Kuropas, 1991: 202). After the departure of several key supporters, the organization changed its name to the United Hetman Organizations (UHO). In the United States, this new organization was led by Skoropadsky's personal emissary, Colonel Shapoval, who was also the editor of the organization's newspaper, *Nash Stiah*. In an effort to bolster its sagging membership and decline in prestige within the North American Ukrainian community, the Hetman *Sich* hosted a four-month visit to North America by the Hetman's son, Danlyo. The Hetmanych, as he was known, was welcomed by the hierarchy of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and by UHO organizations and he also met with Henry Ford (Kuropas, 1991: 217–20). In Canada, the Hetmanych was reported to have been 'cordially received' by 'government ministers, bishops, generals, university professors and other high dignitaries' (Marunchak, 1982: 395). While in the United States, the Hetmanych was also a guest of Chicago's German Bund, something for which the organization paid dearly in light of American fears that 'foreign' immigrants were aligning themselves with Germany.

The second leader to go into exile was Evhen Petrushevych, of the West

Ukrainian National Republic. In July 1919 Polish forces took control of eastern Galicia, and the Paris Peace Conference later sanctioned the extension of Polish territory to the River Zbruch, which formed the border with Soviet Ukraine. Petrushevych and members of his government escaped to Vienna, where they continued to oppose Polish rule in Galicia until 1923. Among other things, they directed Ukrainians in Galicia to boycott the first elections to the Polish parliament in 1922.

Even before the ZUNR government went into exile, Ukrainians in North America had mobilized in support of the western Ukrainian cause. In 1916, both the left-leaning Federation of Ukrainians and the right-leaning Ukrainian Alliance of America lobbied President Woodrow Wilson to proclaim a nationwide 'Ukrainian Day'. During the war, Wilson did proclaim certain days that allowed groups of American Jews, Lithuanians and Armenians to solicit funds for war relief. Representatives of the Ukrainian Alliance of America worked with a New Jersey Democratic Congressman, James A. Hamill, and on April 21, 1917 'Ukrainian Day' enabled a number of Ukrainian-American organizations to collect over \$75,000 in support of war relief in Ukraine (Kuropas, 1991: 140–3).¹

In an attempt to try to shape American foreign policy, the Ukrainian Alliance of America established two information bureaus, one in Hamill's Washington office and one in New York. They also published two English-language books, *Ukraine on the Road to Freedom* and *Polish Atrocities in East Galicia*, helped organize a telegram campaign after the Polish invasion of western Ukraine and organized two nationwide days of protest (Kuropas, 1991: 151).

With Hamill's help, members of the alliance met with representatives of the State Department, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Secretary of State Robert Lansing. In November 1918 the association changed its name to the Ukrainian National Committee, but it continued to lobby on behalf of the western Ukrainians. The Committee tried to obtain an audience with Woodrow Wilson before he left for the Paris Peace Conference, hoping to convince the American delegation that they should recognize that Ukrainian ethnographic territory was indivisible, that the inhabitants of ethnographic Ukraine had a 'natural right and opportunity to self-determination', and that eastern and western Ukrainian should have an opportunity to form a larger federated democratic state along the lines of the United States. Though they did not succeed in meeting with Wilson, the Committee did persuade Hamill to introduce a congressional resolution calling for the American delegation to recognize the 'right to freedom, independence and self-determination of all Ukrainian territories, both in Austro-Hungary and Russia' (Kuropas, 1991: 147).

The resolution was defeated, but the Committee continued trying to

influence the American representatives by traveling to Paris to work the back rooms of the conference and by organizing activities in the United States to heighten public awareness of the Ukrainian cause. A fifteen-member Ukrainian delegation consisting of representatives of both the Directory and ZUNR governments was already in Paris. They were joined by Hamill, Dr Kyrillo Bilyk from the United States and a number of Ukrainian Canadians who had also gone to Paris to promote the western Ukrainian cause (Marunchak, 1982: 374; Kazymyra, 1983). The lobbying efforts did not appear to have much influence on either British or American officials. The American position was that it was in their best interests if eastern Ukraine remained part of Russia, while the British view was that Ukraine should make a choice between uniting with either Poland or Russia, but should not become independent. Eventually, the Ukrainian delegation broke apart when the representatives of Petliura's Directory renounced their claim to eastern Galicia in order to gain the support of the Poles against the Russians. This declaration led to the withdrawal of representatives of the West Ukrainian National Republic from the discussions and to the break-up of the lobbying effort.

Despite their lack of success at the Paris Peace Conference, between 1919 and 1923, Petrushevych, other Galician Ukrainians and his supporters in the diaspora nevertheless believed there was still a diplomatic opening for the establishment of a Ukrainian republic. Petrushevych pinned his hopes on the western powers, who he thought would favor an independent Ukrainian Galician state. The government-in-exile established diplomatic representatives in a number of European and North American cities where they tried to cultivate support. Though at first most of the funding for the government-in-exile came from Ukrainians in Galicia, Petrushevych turned increasingly to the North American diaspora, where several hundred thousand dollars were raised to support the diplomatic activities in Europe (Motyl, 1980: 37). In 1920 ZUNR missions arrived in the United States and Canada, and with the help of a number of Ukrainian Americans, the Ukrainian Defense Committee was formed. During the next three years it raised nearly \$140,000 to support the activities of the ZUNR government-in-exile (Kuropas, 1991: 153). At the same time, the Defense Committee organized a number of protests in front of the Polish embassy in Washington and the consulate in New York. Appeals for support from Petrushevych were printed in both English and Ukrainian in *Svoboda*, and the newspaper regularly published articles condemning Poland's treatment of Ukrainians in Galicia. In Canada, ZUNR solicited support from some organizations, but those efforts faltered because of in-fighting (Marunchak, 1982: 374-5).

At first, Petrushevych avoided the issue of a united Ukraine by

proposing that a smaller Ukrainian-ruled state in Galicia would be in the best long-term interests of the Allied powers (Motyl, 1980: 33). He and his followers had had the support of the British government, which was interested in protecting petroleum interests in Galicia and in finding an avenue for trade into Russia. But, in March 1923, the Council of Ambassadors confirmed that eastern Galicia should remain a part of Poland, thus crushing Ukrainian aspirations for statehood in Galicia. Poland then declared an amnesty for Ukrainians who had engaged in anti-Polish activities. As a result, nearly 50,000 Ukrainians who had left Galicia returned to Poland in 1923 (Subtelny, 1994: 551). Petrushevych, however, feeling betrayed by the western powers, and having lost the support of Ukrainians who had returned to Galicia, moved his government-in-exile to Berlin, where he began cultivating Soviet contacts. While in Germany, he maintained steadfast opposition to Polish rule in Galicia, eventually coming to believe that Galicia should be annexed by the Soviet Ukraine. By turning to the Soviet Union, he alienated his supporters in both the North American and the European diasporas and his German hosts. He and his supporters lived out their days in Berlin in relative obscurity.

In 1920 Symon Petliura's Ukrainian National Republic (UNR) Directory government was forced out of eastern Ukraine by the Red Army, and by 1922 over 40,000 eastern Ukrainians associated with the UNR government were living in Poland. After crossing into Polish territory, Petliura, along with other officials of the UNR government and their families, settled in Tarnow. Members of the UNR army, however, were interned in a number of camps throughout Poland (Subtelny, 1992: 7–8). In the early years of its exile, the UNR government tried to cultivate relations with Poles in an attempt to form an anti-Bolshevik alliance. During the early 1920s, the UNR government-in-exile encouraged a number of Ukrainian officers to serve in the Polish armed forces. Their hope was that the officers would form the nucleus of a Ukrainian officer corps, which in turn would help create a Ukrainian army that could challenge Bolshevik rule in eastern Ukraine (Motyl, 1980: 45). The Ukrainian UNR soldiers and their families also used camp life to promote a variety of Ukrainian educational, scholarly and cultural activities (Subtelny, 1992: 8).

By 1923–4, the Poles were content with their acquisition of eastern Galicia and had no interest in provoking further hostilities with the Soviet Union. Realizing that Polish support for the eastern Ukrainian cause was slipping, Petliura left Poland and eventually settled in Paris. Many of the UNR soldiers, however, moved to Czechoslovakia (Subtelny, 1992: 8), where they continued to articulate a social democratic critique of Soviet Ukraine. From Paris, Petliura published a bi-monthly journal *Tryzub* ('Trident') in which, having abandoned his socialist views, he argued that

Ukraine would not be saved by class struggle but rather by an anti-Russian national struggle (Motyl, 1980: 46).²

Petliura's 'turn to the right' (Motyl, 1980) did not meet with the approval of other émigré Ukrainian social democrats. Indeed, left-leaning members of the Ukrainian émigré intelligentsia were divided, partly by their different evaluations of what was happening in Soviet Ukraine. One side, which is discussed in more detail later in this chapter, believed that Ukrainian émigrés should help build socialism and return to Soviet Ukraine. And many left-leaning Ukrainians were in fact lured back to Soviet Ukraine from the diaspora in the early 1920s by Lenin's promise that republics like Ukraine would be 'socialist in form' but 'national in content'. The other side felt that the struggle against Bolshevism should continue in the diaspora. Led by Mykyta Shapoval, who operated out of Prague, the anti-Bolshevik Ukrainian social democrats argued that the only way to establish a united, independent and socially just Ukrainian state was through a social *and* national revolution (Reshetar, 1952: 325). In 1928, Shapoval went on a speaking tour of the United States, where he called on social democratic Ukrainian immigrants to support the struggle against Bolshevik-dominated Soviet Ukraine. In his speeches in America, he argued that 'the national revolution could not avoid becoming social because the casting off of alien rule would mean removing the ruling class, which was composed of Russians, Poles, Rumanians, Magyars and Jews' (Reshetar 1952: 325).

Like the other governments-in-exile, Petliura and his followers appealed to the North America diaspora. In 1919, a delegation representing the Directory government arrived in the United States to lobby the American government and build further links with the diaspora. But because of divisions in the American diaspora community, the delegation did not receive unanimous support. The mission was further handicapped by news that there had been massive Jewish pogroms while the Directory government was in control of eastern Ukraine and by allegations that the pogroms were tolerated, if not in fact organized, by Petliura and the Directory. An organization called Friends of Ukraine was formed to counteract the allegations against Petliura, but it was shortlived (Kuropas, 1991: 149).

In May 1926 Petliura was shot and killed in Paris by Samuel Schwartzbard, who claimed he was avenging the pogroms allegedly committed by Petliura's Directory soldiers in eastern Ukraine in 1919. Schwartzbard's trial in Paris in 1927 pitted Jewish and Ukrainian national narratives against one another. His defense argued that Petliura was an inveterate anti-Semite and *pogromchik* whose assassination 'could only be welcomed' (Motyl, 1980: 50). On the other hand, diaspora Ukrainians in Europe

and North America condemned the allegation of anti-Semitism and the assassination of Petliura as Soviet efforts to undermine the legitimacy of Ukrainian claims to statehood. For diaspora Ukrainians, Petliura was, and still is, a national hero, and his assassination elevated him to the status of a martyr. Many of them regarded the acquittal of Schwartzbard as a national tragedy (Motyl, 1980: 52).

As Alexander Motyl (1980: 52) argues, Petliura's assassination had a number of lasting consequences for Ukrainians in the diaspora. First, it led to the further poisoning of Jewish-Ukrainian relations which still has reverberations today. As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7, the part played by Petliura in the pogroms is still a cause of friction between diaspora Jews and Ukrainians. Second, the assassination led to an even more hard-line nationalism among diaspora Ukrainians, for it persuaded many nationalists that the only salvation of the Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian state was the Ukrainian people, and that it was futile to cultivate alliances with the west.

The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists

By the late 1920s, Ukrainians in Europe came to realize that their political effectiveness was diminished by the divisions that had formed earlier in the decade. New organizations and movements within both Polish-dominated Galicia and the Ukrainian émigré community in central Europe led to the formation of a more systematic nationalist ideology and efforts to form a more unified nationalist organization. A semblance of unity was achieved in the nationalist camp with the formation of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) in 1929. These 'integral nationalists' of the 1920s and 1930s flirted with fascist ideologies in which the prime objective was the glorification of the Ukrainian nation (Armstrong, 1963: 20, 37–8).³ The unity was shortlived, though, and by the end of 1939 the OUN split into a number of competing camps.

The creation of the OUN and the subsequent split within it had a profound effect on the Ukrainian diaspora. The movement to unite the various Ukrainian nationalist forces did not come so much from the leaders of the three governments-in exile as from Ukrainian nationalists in Czechoslovakia, young Ukrainian nationalists living in Galicia, and Evhen Konovalets and the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO).

One group that contributed to the formation of the OUN was made up of the Ukrainian nationalists in Czechoslovakia. As a major center of the Ukrainian diaspora, Prague attracted Ukrainians of different political and ideological stripes, not all of whom were connected to the various governments-in-exile that had left Ukraine after the Poles and Bolsheviks took

over their lands. In fact, there were at least fifty different Ukrainian organizations in Czechoslovakia in the mid-1920s (Motyl, 1980: 136). A large part of émigré society was made up of students, who gravitated to Prague, partly because of its favorable attitude to the idea of an independent Ukrainian state. The Czechs, who wanted to curb Polish power in central Europe, supported the idea of a Ukrainian state in Galicia. The Czech government helped support the Ukrainian Free University, the Ukrainian Agricultural Academy, the Ukrainian M. Drahomanov High Pedagogical Institute and the Ukrainian Gymnasium. In the early 1920s it provided stipends for some two thousand students at these Ukrainian institutions (Motyl, 1980: 88). By the late 1920s, though, the Czechs having become reconciled to Polish rule in eastern Galicia, withdrew their financial support from these organizations, most of which dissolved as a result (Motyl, 1980: 87–8).

One of the few groups that survived was the Group of Ukrainian National Youth (*Hrupa Ukraïns'koi National'noi Molodi* – HUNM). Established in 1922, it had the aim of establishing an independent Ukrainian state in Galicia as a prelude to uniting eastern and western Ukraine. Its ideology involved:

reliance on ‘our own forces’; a ‘strong holy faith in ourselves’; the inviolable national principle ‘I am supposed to live, I want to live, I must live’; eternal struggle as the means of attaining the right to life, because ‘life lives off life’; the acknowledgment of no rights or ‘limitations’ in waging the struggle for life; force as the ultimate arbiter of all conflicts; and the principle of the survival of the fittest.

(Motyl, 1980: 131)

After an unsuccessful attempt to unite Ukrainians in Czechoslovakia under the banner of the Union of the Ukrainian Emigration in the Czech Lands in 1926, HUNM joined forces in 1927 with another right-leaning organization, the League of Ukrainian Nationalists (LUN). The League had been formed in Czechoslovakia in 1925 from an amalgamation of the Ukrainian National Federation, the Association of Ukrainian Fascists and the Association for the Liberation of Ukraine (Motyl, 1980: 129–38; Kuropas, 1991: 236).⁴ Together, HUNM and the League founded the Union of Organizations of Ukrainian Nationalists, which was intended to be a new Ukrainian nationalist organization that united all like-minded nationalists both abroad and in Ukraine (Motyl, 1980: 138).

The second group that contributed to the formation of the OUN was the Ukrainian Military Organization (*Ukraïnska Viiskova Orhanizatsiia* –

UVO), which was an outgrowth of the *Sich* Riflemen in Galicia. As noted earlier, the Riflemen consisted of Ukrainian soldiers who had fought for Austria during World War I and who later supported the West Ukrainian National Republic in its struggle against Poland in 1918 and 1919. While Evhen Petrushevych was pursuing diplomatic activities in Germany in the early 1920s, Evhen Konovalets led the Riflemen in continual underground military operations against Polish rule in Galicia. In the early 1920s, the Polish government engaged in a campaign of repression against Ukrainians. Ukrainian *Prosvita* reading rooms were closed, as were a number of departments of Ukrainian studies at Lviv University. Several thousand Ukrainians were interned and dozens who were believed to have fought for the West Ukrainian National Republic were executed. In response, Konovalets and his *Sich* colleagues formed the Ukrainian Military Organization. During 1921 and 1922, the UVO burned a number of Polish estates, destroyed Polish government buildings and railway and telegraph lines, and carried out a number of political assassinations (Magocsi, 1996: 587). Their targets also extended to Ukrainians who were believed to be collaborating with Poland (Motyl, 1980: 111).

By the mid-1920s, the UVO in Polish Galicia had been decimated by numerous arrests. The leaders moved to Berlin, where they cultivated relations with the Germans. Two organizations established in the early 1920s, the Union of Ukrainian Officers in Germany and the Foreign Delegation of the Ukrainian Military Organization, promoted the interests of the UVO within the Germany military. German military and intelligence services supported the Ukrainians, in part by helping train UVO operatives. In the mid-1920s, at least four training courses for the UVO were organized with the help of the German army. Danzig became an important meeting point of UVO leaders and a transit point for weapons and couriers destined for Poland (Motyl, 1980: 124).⁵

Even though many of the leaders of the UVO had moved to Germany, Ukrainian students in Galicia remained sympathetic to the organization's objectives and tactics. The young Galicians were a third strand that contributed to the formation of the OUN. Ukrainian university students in Galicia turned to a form of integral nationalism, in part because of their experiences of discrimination, and because their opportunities for higher education and upward mobility were blocked. In 1926, a number of nationalist student organizations formed the Union of Ukrainian Nationalist Youth (Soiuz Ukrain's'koi Natsionalisychnoi Molodi – SUNM). SUNM tended to take an action-oriented, uncompromising attitude towards the idea of a Ukrainian state, although there were divisions over whether it should cooperate with legal Ukrainian political organizations in Galicia or eschew such cooperation in favor of underground guerrilla

activity (Motyl, 1980: 140–3). Several of its members, including Stepan Bandera, were interned in prison camps for their guerrilla activities in Poland.

By the late 1920s, Konovalts and others realized that little would come of the various localized struggles for Ukrainian independence unless they could unite the nationalist forces in the diaspora in Germany, Czechoslovakia and Austria and cultivate ties with nationally conscious Ukrainians in both Soviet Ukraine and Polish-dominated Galicia. The development of a more united political force, supplemented by a military unit, was seen as the only way to promote the cause of Ukrainian statehood (Motyl, 1980: 127). After two unsuccessful efforts to unite diaspora nationalist organizations in various parts of central Europe and in Galicia, a number of organizations meeting at the first Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists in Vienna in 1929 agreed to merge (Kuropas, 1991: 238). The delegates voted to establish the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), with Konovalts as leader. In electing Konovalts, the OUN took on much of the militant and military fervour of the UVO, but it also committed itself to renewed diplomatic efforts to convince western European powers that an independent Ukraine was in their best interests.

Shortly after the Congress, the OUN adopted the ‘Ten Commandments of the Ukrainian Nationalist (Decalogue)’, which every OUN member was expected to obey and commit to memory. The principles included the following:

You will attain a Ukrainian state, or die in battle for it; You will not permit anyone to defame the glory or the honour of Your Nation; Do not speak about matters with whom you can, but only with whom you must; Do not hesitate to carry out the most dangerous deeds, should this be demanded by the good of the Cause; Treat the enemies of Your Nation with hatred and ruthlessness; and Aspire to expand the power, wealth and glory of the Ukrainian State.

(Cited in Boshyk, 1986: 173)

Operating both inside and outside Poland, the OUN pursued a dual strategy of political lobbying and guerrilla operations. In the early 1930s, OUN members in Galicia carried out sixty actual and attempted assassinations, in addition to several hundred acts of sabotage against symbols of Polish authority. Among the more well-known victims of OUN assassinations were a Polish police commissioner, the Polish Minister of the Interior and a Soviet consular official in Lviv. Other assassination attempts were directed at Ukrainian ‘collaborators’ (Subtelny, 1994: 445). The

OUN actions provoked further reprisals from the Polish authorities, who closed down many Ukrainian charitable institutions, cooperatives, and athletic and educational associations. Leaders of the nationalist cause, including priests and duly elected deputies to the Polish Sejm, were arrested and jailed. Nevertheless, the OUN continued its guerrilla war against Polish rule.

On May 23, 1938 Konovalts was assassinated in Holland by a Soviet agent who had infiltrated the OUN (Kuropas, 1991: 241). The Soviets feared that Ukrainian nationalist activity in Poland might eventually spill over into Soviet Ukraine, and so, like their Polish counterparts, they took measures to stamp it out.

Konovalts had kept a lid on conflicts in the OUN between younger, action-oriented members in Galicia and the émigrés in Germany who were pursuing diplomatic channels, but the struggle to succeed him irrevocably split the OUN into an émigré faction (Melnyk, or OUN(M)) and a Galician (or Bandera, or OUN(B)) faction. At the 1939 Congress in Rome, the émigrés in Germany elected one of their own, Andrew Melnyk, to head the OUN. Melnyk's supporters claimed that Konovalts had chosen their man as his successor before his death. Melnyk and the émigrés remained committed to an alliance with Germany in the hope that it would support an independent Ukrainian state which would act as a buffer between Germany and Russia. The Galician faction, however, accused the émigré leaders in Germany of being too timid; they wanted to intensify the underground fight for Ukrainian independence in both Poland and Soviet Ukraine. With war on the horizon, they were also worried about the long-term political consequences of the continued cultivation of ties with Germany.⁶ The Galicians wanted the OUN to have closer relations with the European democracies, and they urged the leadership to move their headquarters out of Germany. But these and other demands were not met, and at a secret meeting in Krakow in February 1940 a breakaway group designated Stepan Bandera as the leader of a new, 'revolutionary' branch of the OUN; they came to be known as the 'Bandera' faction, or OUN(B) (Armstrong, 1963: 55-8; Martovych, n.d.).

The OUN in North America

Before his death, Konovalts and other OUN leaders in Germany had tried to solicit the support of Ukrainians in North America. In 1928 and 1929, he traveled to the United States to help create parallel organizations there and in Canada. In the US, Konovalts' 1929 visit led to the creation of a new nationalist organization, the Organization for the Rebirth of Ukraine (ODWU). By 1934, there were fifty branches of ODWU in the

United States, as well as a number of affiliated youth, women's and Red Cross organizations. By 1938, ODWU had a total membership of over 10,000 (Kuropas, 1991: 253).

ODWU was ideologically committed to the OUN integral nationalist project in which individuals should be subordinated to the nation. Both the OUN and ODWU had the motto 'the nation above all else'. Like the OUN, ODWU believed that Ukraine could be liberated only through the struggles of Ukrainians. The diaspora in North America was seen as an important piece of the strategy insofar as it would help keep the Ukrainian cause in the public eye and help OUN leaders cultivate relations with the American government.⁷

Like their Hetmanite counterparts, who refused to become part of the OUN/ODWU, ODWU also tried to prepare its members to become a battle-ready fighting force that could be put into service for the Ukrainian cause at the right time. Its members bought uniforms and rifles and engaged in military maneuvers; they also bought a plane (and named it *Natsionalist*) in order to train aviators for the 'preparation of a liberation army in America' (Kuropas, 1991: 258). They organized a variety of community events, established a press service in New York and published English- and Ukrainian-language newspapers throughout the 1930s.

In Canada, the OUN sought support from the Ukrainian War Veterans' Association (UWVA), which had been formed in 1925 by new immigrants who were part of the military forces of the various Ukrainian governments established between 1918 and 1920. In what is described as the 'first successful international political action undertaken by Ukrainian Canadians' (Woychenko, 1982: 183), the veterans' organization, shortly after its formation, lobbied the Canadian government and the League of Nations to persuade the Polish government to commute the death sentences of two Ukrainians who were unjustly accused of engaging in terrorist activities. The OUN also solicited the support of the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League, an organization formed in 1927 by Ukrainian nationalists who were promoting Ukrainian Orthodoxy in Canada (Gerus, 1991: 162–3). In 1928, Konovalts toured branches of the UWVA, and in the following years OUN delegations regularly came to Canada to meet with UWVA and USRL representatives to try to build support for the new European organization (Marunchak, 1982: 398). The Self-Reliance League eventually rejected the OUN's overtures because it could not condone the use of violence to achieve Ukrainian independence. It also feared that the OUN's cultivation of ties with Germany would put Ukrainian Canadians in an awkward political position in the event of another war (Gerus, 1991: 167).

In 1932, with the help of influential members of the first wave of

migration, the veterans were instrumental in establishing the Ukrainian National Federation (UNF) (Gerus, 1991: 169; Marunchak, 1982: 184). Formed as the Canadian arm of the OUN, the UNF was a non-denominational organization that attempted to unite all nationalist forces in Canada in order to help in the struggle for Ukrainian independence. Though there were tensions between the 'Canadian' and 'Ukrainian' factions in the organization, the UNF grew rapidly in Canada during the 1930s.

The Ukrainian socialists in the North American diaspora

Nationalism was not the only ideology in the political landscape of the pre-World War II Ukrainian diaspora. In the decades before the war, the Ukrainian diaspora also had a vigorous and active socialist movement. In many ways, socialists and nationalists formed two very different diasporas. Both laid claim to being Ukrainian and both developed an active social and cultural life in order to sustain group boundaries, and so they were nominally part of the same imagined community. However, they had divergent ways of understanding themselves as a diaspora, interpreting developments in Soviet Ukraine and relating to the homeland (Swyripa, 1993). The remainder of this chapter examines how socialists used expressive, Ukrainian-oriented cultural activities to sustain their sense of Ukrainian identity, how socialists defined life in Soviet Ukraine, how they engaged in a multifaceted return movement that was oriented towards helping build socialism in Soviet Ukraine, and how they defined their nationalist counterparts in the diaspora.

Since the first two waves of emigration were made up mainly of people who had left their homelands in search of wage labor and land, it was perhaps inevitable that diaspora Ukrainians participated in wider social democratic and socialist politics in their countries of settlement. Much of the early Ukrainian community life in North America was fashioned by people with socialist or social democratic leanings. This was due to the prominence of populist and radical traditions in Ukraine in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Woychenko, 1982: 173) and to the Ukrainophile clergy who came to the defense of the Ukrainian peasants who became workers after they moved abroad. In both Ukraine and the diaspora, priests and radicals were often the same people. For example, Father John Wolansky, America's first Ruthenian (Ukrainian) Catholic priest, was actively involved in labor issues. In the late nineteenth century, he helped organize the first Ruthenian mutual aid society, established cooperatives that enabled workers to circumvent the price-gouging company

stores and was the head of a Knights of Labor assembly in the Pennsylvania coal fields (Kuropas, 1991: 43–4). The Ruthenian (cum Ukrainian) newspaper *Svoboda* began as a social democratic organ that encouraged Ruthenians in America to reject both the Democratic and Republican parties in favour of the Socialists. The latter, *Svoboda* argued in 1900, was the only party that was truly interested in furthering the interests of the Ukrainian working class (Kuropas, 1991: 168).

There was also a material basis for diaspora Ukrainians' interest in socialism. Many Ukrainians who settled in North America recognized that they were going to be in the diaspora for a long time and that collective action was needed if they were to improve their circumstances. Those who had come as workers and farmers began to realize that the difficult conditions facing them in North America were obstacles to the realization of their aspirations. Immigrants, therefore, though they maintained an interest in the homeland, also recognized that they were becoming part of the American and Canadian proletariat. They had little choice but to try to improve their lives and opportunities while in the diaspora. Thus, like other European immigrants to North America at the time, members of the Ukrainian labor diaspora formed and joined organizations that attempted to improve wages and working and living conditions in the diaspora.

In the United States, by 1910 the loosely organized Ukrainian socialists had come under the auspices of the Socialist Party of America (SPA). However they and other European immigrants had an uneasy relationship with the SPA which they considered to be too dominated by American-born leaders. While sympathetic to the overall goals of the SPA, a number of ethnic groups began to form their own federations under a wider SPA umbrella. By 1917, the membership of the SPA was 80,126, but 32,894, or 40 percent, belonged to the various 'foreign-language' federations (Kuropas, 1991: 167). In 1915, Ukrainian immigrants formed their own federation (the Ukrainian Federation of Socialist Parties of America – UFSPA). By the time it held its third convention in April, 1919, the UFSPA had about 5700 members (Kuropas, 1991: 176; Kivisto, 1984; Dobbs, 1983; Draper, 1960).

At the Federation's 1919 convention, the Bolshevik wing sided with the Comintern in its call for the communist movement to come under Moscow's control. The UFSPA's recognition of the Third Communist International led to its expulsion from the SPA. Shortly afterwards, the delegates renamed their organization the Ukrainian Federation of Communist Parties of America (UFCPA) and, with a number of other ethnic federations that had been expelled, proceeded to form the Communist Party of America (CPA). The transition from a socialist to a communist party cost them some support among the Ukrainian-American

working class; nevertheless Ukrainians accounted for nearly 4000 of the 26,680 members when the CPA was established in August 1919 (Kuropas, 1991: 175–6). Another 7000 members were Russians; the two groups together made up 40 percent of the early members of the party.

As in the United States, Ukrainian socialists in Canada tended to be the first Ukrainians to form their own organizations. In Winnipeg the Taras Shevchenko Educational Association and the Ukrainian Free Thought Federation were founded by socialists in 1906 (Woychenko, 1982: 174). The first explicitly Ukrainian socialist society in Canada was founded by coal miners in British Columbia in June 1907, and at their inaugural meeting they affiliated with the Socialist Party of Canada. In November, 1907, a second Ukrainian socialist organization was formed in Winnipeg and, with the British Columbia branch, began to publish a newspaper, *Chervomyi Prapor* ('Red Flag'). The paper aimed to help create 'among Ukrainians in Canada cadres of socialist fighters for a new socio-economic order, for a better way of life for all people, a way of life which mankind cannot realize under the capitalist system'. The newspaper folded within months, but a second paper, *Robochyi Narod* ('Working People'), was launched in May 1909. In November 1909, representatives of the eleven Ukrainian socialist societies then in existence met in Winnipeg and formed the Federation of Ukrainian Social Democrats (FUSD). The federation was renamed the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party (USDP) in 1914, and by 1918 it had nearly 1800 members in fifty-four branches (Martynowych, 1990: xvii). *Robochyi Narod* had 3000 subscribers (Krawchuk, 1996: 28).

In both the United States and Canada, there was state repression of socialists and communists owing to the fear of communism that had gripped the elites since the Bolshevik Revolution. In the United States the Palmer Raids of 1920 resulted in the arrest of several thousand Americans of various nationalities, political stripes and ideologies (Kuropas, 1991: 177). Although ostensibly the raids were targeting 'extremists' who were alleged to be preparing to use force and violence to overthrow the American government, a variety of people who had simply criticized the American government were indiscriminately arrested. It is unclear how many Ukrainian Americans were involved, but the fear of arrest led to a considerable decline in membership in the UFCPA and other foreign-language communist federations. In Canada, in September 1918 an order-in-council prohibited the publication of 'enemy language' newspapers and outlawed fourteen 'radical' organizations, including the USDP and its newspaper (Avery, 1991: 274). In addition, a number of party activists were arrested and interned (Krawchuk, 1996: 32), and several more were deported.

Before the Canadian USDP was banned, the members had begun to

raise funds to construct a labor temple in Winnipeg. The temple was to consist of a meeting hall with office space and an auditorium (Martynowych, 1990: xix). Since, at the time, political parties in Canada were not allowed to hold property, the USDP formed the Ukrainian-Labor Temple Association, which acted as its real-estate-holding cultural and educational arm. After the USDP was banned, the ULTA took on greater importance in the life of the left. In 1919 and 1920, a number of labor temples were organized across Canada and slowly they began to take on a more political orientation to a variety of issues. At the first ULTA convention in 1920, the delegates decided to broaden the scope of the organization by moving into rural areas; by 1924 there were so many branches that catered to the interests of Ukrainian farmers that the name was changed to the Ukrainian Labor-Farmer Temple Association (ULFTA). The left-wing press was also reinigorated and *Ukrainski Robitnychi Visti* ('Ukrainian Labour News') began publication in March 1919 (Martynowych, 1990: xx).

In May 1921 the Workers' Party of Canada (WPC) was formed by a number of British and Jewish communists. The ULTA sent ten delegates to the founding congress in December 1921. At the first national convention in 1922, three members of the ULTA were elected to the party's Central Committee, and during the course of the 1920s the ULFTA became one of its largest 'language federations'. In 1924 the WPC was renamed the Communist Party of Canada. By 1929-30, Ukrainians, Finns and Jews made up approximately 95 percent of the members of the party; the one thousand Ukrainian members made up nearly a third of the total membership (Martynowych, 1990: xxiii).⁸

Social life and creative life

As a diaspora, one of the features of the prewar left was its ability to develop and sustain a vibrant cultural and educational life. The Ukrainian ethnic identity of socialists was sustained, in part, by the cultivation of a range of creative and expressive cultural activities. In its appeal to the Canadian government in 1944 for the return of property that had been confiscated under the War Measures Act, the ULFTA claimed that with its accumulated donations over a two-decade period it has managed to build 108 labor 'temples', and finance 210 orchestras, 190 drama groups, 150 folk dance schools and six brass bands, as well as innumerable embroidery groups, sports clubs, classes in English and children's clubs (Krawchuk, 1996: 77). The ULFTA's 'crowning achievement', recognized even within the nationalist community, was the National Festival of Ukrainian Music and Dance held in Toronto in 1939. At the festival some 1500 participants, consisting of orchestras, choirs and soloists performed for over 10,000

spectators during a day-long celebration of Ukrainian and Ukrainian diaspora culture.

In commenting on the vibrancy of the Ukrainian diaspora left in Canada during the interwar years, Orest Martynowych argues that 'although the overwhelming majority of Ukrainians remained in the anti-communist camp, not one of their associations . . . could rival the pro-communist associations in terms of membership, dedicated leadership, discipline and the range of services and activities offered' (Martynowych, 1990: xix). On the other hand, Markus (1977: 82) argues that Ukrainian communist organizations in the United States prospered in the 1920s and 1930s because of Soviet propaganda. Since most of the Ukrainians in North America were from western Ukraine, few had any personal or family ties with relatives on the Soviet side. Markus argues that, in the absence of direct contact with family members who were suffering under the heel of the Soviet boot, Ukrainian-American leftists were duped by the Soviet government into believing that the workers and peasants in Soviet Ukraine were living in paradise.

Be that as it may, socialist and communist organizations were also successful because they helped members of the diaspora meet some of their material and symbolic needs. In a retrospective analysis of the reasons for the success of socialist and communist organizations in the Ukrainian diaspora in the early twentieth century, John Kolasky, a communist turned nationalist, argues that one of the reasons was that these organizations were able to combine a politics of the homeland with a politics that tried to ameliorate the harsh conditions of life in Canada:

The communist leaders understood that the Ukrainian immigrants, cut off from their homeland and isolated from Canadian society, yearned for the native culture. It was needed to fill the void opened up by isolation and nostalgia and to establish their identity in a foreign land. Consequently, great emphasis was placed on educational, cultural and social activities as a means of disseminating the communist ideology.

(Kolasky, 1979: 10)

The Bolshevik Revolution

How did the diaspora left respond to revolutionary events in Russia in 1917 and the years immediately afterwards? At first, the Canadian USDP supported both the provisional government in Petrograd and the Rada government in Kyiv. At its convention in August 1917 the delegates agreed that branches should collect money to help fund the revolutionary press in

Ukraine. Between February and October 1917 the USDP also supported the Rada by publishing its deliberations, its first two ‘universals’ and appeals to members for financial help. Regarding the future of socialist Ukraine, the convention delegates resolved that:

the Ukrainian proletariat would now utilize all its energy and strength to secure true democratic rights for the Ukrainian people and that, in close association with the revolutionary proletariat of Russia and other countries, it would struggle toward the rapid advancement of the social revolution and socialism.

(Krawchuk, 1996: 28)

The national question was addressed at the convention, which resolved that:

We, Ukrainian social democrats in Canada, firmly uphold international solidarity of the revolutionary proletariat of all countries, and recognize the right of every people to self-determination; consider the complete liberation of oppressed people one of the tasks of socialism, on the road toward the liberation of all nations from social and economic oppression.

(Krawchuk, 1996: 28)

As the Rada came up against opposition from the Bolsheviks, the diaspora left began to distance itself from the idea of an independent Ukrainian state. After the Rada’s Fourth Universal of January 1918, which proclaimed the existence of an independent Ukrainian National Republic, Ukrainian socialists in the diaspora threw their support to the Bolsheviks. Taking its cue from Moscow, the ULTA denounced the alliance between the Rada and Germany as a counter-revolutionary measure in which Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian capitalists had aligned themselves against the Ukrainian working class (Krawchuk, 1996: 29). Diaspora socialists and communists further distanced themselves from the nationalist cause when the Germans appointed Skoropadsky as Hetman. Skoropadsky was accused by diaspora leftists of establishing a dictatorship of landlords and capitalists (Krawchuk, 1991: 228). Until well into the 1930s, the ULFTA continued to denounce Skoropadsky and his son Danylo as neo-fascist puppets who were intent on helping Hitler seize ‘Ukraine and transform . . . it into a colony of German imperialism’ (Kolasky, 1990: 219).

The leftists were no less enamored of Petliura’s Directory government. The ULFTA denounced the Directory and called Petliura a ‘mediocrity’, an ‘adventurer’ and a ‘traitor’ (Krawchuk, 1991: 269). *Ukrainski Robitnychi Visti* wrote sarcastically about Petliura’s attempt to form an alliance with

Poland,⁹ and Ukrainian leftists also helped fuel accusations that Petliura was an inveterate anti-Semite who was responsible for pogroms against the Jews in eastern Ukraine (Martynowych, 1991: 508).

Similar opinions were expressed by Ukrainian socialists in the United States. Ukrainian socialists in America adopted stances similar to those of their Canadian counterparts. Commenting on the anti-Bolshevism and 'Ukrainophilism' of both the Petliura and Skoropadsky regimes, the UFSPA newspaper *Robitnyk* argued in January 1919 that 'Every Ukrainian worker is fooled by the many beautiful words devoted to the blue and yellow flag, our famous past, the beauty of Ukrainian culture and so on.' It went on to ask: 'Why can't the worker see that all of this is a cover-up? The people who talk about such things want to get their nails into the body of Ukraine.' Adopting a broad, and non-Marxian, definition of the class enemy, *Robitnyk* argued that 'the Ukrainian bourgeoisie – Ukrainian professors, doctors, writers, priests, church cantors – are trying to embrace the Ukrainian peasant as they send him out to free Ukraine'.¹⁰

In a retrospective commentary about the various Ukrainian governments-in-exile operating in Europe in the 1920s, the Canadian communist, Peter Krawchuk, summarized the attitude of the Ukrainian-Canadian left in the following terms:

This Petliura adventure was the last straw and Ukrainians in Canada spoke out not only against Petliura but against all the other Ukrainian politicians who landed in exile in Vienna, Berlin, Paris and Prague, claiming they were representatives of the 'Ukrainian state' and 'offices' they called 'governments' and posing as 'ministers' and 'diplomats' of these 'governments' – on 'various foreign missions'. . . [In] all their comings and goings to Western European embassies and consulates . . . they were received only by the receptionists, or as a last resort by office staff.

(Krawchuk, 1996: 232–3)

The Bolshevik consolidation of power in Soviet Ukraine in 1920 met with widespread approval from the diaspora left, which for the next seven decades went to extraordinary lengths to defend the good name of the Soviet Union and Soviet Ukraine against 'slander' by their nationalist enemies, even in the face of compelling evidence that the Soviet regime was in fact persecuting members of their imagined community.

Relations with Soviet Ukraine

As noted earlier in this chapter, nationalists in the diaspora defined Soviet Ukraine as a place where the Ukrainian people continued to be oppressed.

The diaspora left, on the other hand, idealized the ancestral homeland in Soviet Ukraine. Though they recognized that more work was needed for Ukraine to fully realize its socialist potential, they nevertheless believed that the country was on the correct path of development and deserved their assistance.

During the 1920s and 1930s, diaspora leftists described Soviet Ukraine as a socialist society with national freedoms that was part of a large and powerful federation that would eventually overcome the dark forces of capitalism, imperialism and nationalism.¹¹ Among Ukrainian diaspora leftists, the euphoria at the Bolshevik consolidation of power led to a variety of fundraising efforts on behalf of Ukrainians in Soviet Ukraine and Polish Galicia, technical-assistance activities and a small but multi-faceted return movement to Soviet Ukraine.

In 1921, the ULFTA raised over \$65,000 for famine relief in the Volga River valley. In 1923 it established a Central Committee for Technical Aid to Soviet Ukraine which followed an earlier initiative by Ukrainians in New York City (Kolasky, 1990: 168). The purpose of the Committee was to send skilled tradesmen to Ukraine to help with specific projects, most of which seemed to be the construction of monuments to Taras Shevchenko. Other socialists helped agricultural institutes in Ukraine to make contact with Canadian agricultural institutions (Kolasky, 1979: 12). In support of Ukrainians in Galicia, the American-based United Ukrainian Toilers Organizations organized protests against Poland's control over Galicia and raised \$12,000 for Ukrainian communist activists there (Kuropas, 1991: 184–5). In 1931, the ULFTA organized the Association to Aid the Liberation Movement in Western Ukraine. Though the Association aimed to provide moral and material support to the socialist movement in Galicia, it also appears to have been meant as a vehicle to extend communist influence to second-wave diaspora Ukrainians who had fought for the West Ukrainian National Republic (Kolasky, 1979: 4–5). A year after its formation the Association had eighty-seven branches and 6675 members, over half of whom consisted of second-wave Ukrainian immigrants who had come to Canada after 1923–4 (Martynowych, 1990, xxi).

During the 1920s and 1930s, several prominent Ukrainian-Canadian and American activists studied at the Lenin School in Moscow and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Kyiv. Both were training schools for communist cadres (Kolasky, 1979: 8). Others regularly attended meetings of the Comintern in Moscow. They often traveled through Soviet Ukraine, reporting back to the diaspora about the favorable conditions they had encountered. Yet others quit the diaspora and moved to Soviet Ukraine. The return movement consisted of groups of Ukrainian workers, individual Ukrainians who left Canada voluntarily and people who were

deported from Canada and the United States because of their communist activities. Several leading members of the Ukrainian intellectual and political elite, such as Mykhailo Hrushevsky, who had gone into exile in Europe after the collapse of their governments, were also lured to Soviet Ukraine by the Bolshevik promise that the national republics would be 'self-determining'.

In the early 1920s, groups of Ukrainian-Canadian communists from Lethbridge, Montreal and Winnipeg decided to participate directly in the great Soviet experiment by moving to Soviet Ukraine and establishing communes there (Kolasky, 1979; Carynyk, 1991). The Montreal group, which called itself 'The Militant Detachment for Struggle with Ruin in the Soviet Republics', eventually joined forces with the Winnipeggers under the banner of 'The First Labor Agricultural Communist Group from Canada'. In March 1922 an initial group of forty men, four women and six children settled near Odessa. A year later they were joined by a second group of forty men, twenty-eight women and thirty-six children. They took nearly \$45,000 worth of tractors, seed drills, threshing machines, trucks, various farm implements, household items and clothing (Kolasky, 1990: 168). An earlier group from Lethbridge had done the same and had formed a commune near Odessa.

Though the diaspora communards were allotted a tract of land, partly because the Soviet government saw the potential for favorable propaganda, they soon became disillusioned. The Lethbridge commune disintegrated soon after it was established. Even though their passports had been taken from them after their arrival in Soviet Ukraine, some were able to flee to Galicia and other parts of Europe and eventually return to Canada. A Ukrainian-Canadian communist who visited the Lethbridge commune in its early days reported that its members told him to warn people back in Canada not to believe anything positive they might hear about life under the Soviets (Carynyk, 1991: 196).

As word spread about these unsuccessful return movements, Ukrainian socialist organizations in North America became less eager for their members to move to Soviet Ukraine lest they bring back more discouraging news. In an article published in *Ukrainski Robitnychi Visty* in February 1923, the ULFTA reported that 'many class-conscious workers are occupied with the idea of immigrating to the Soviet republics. The attraction of the proletarian fatherland is especially strong in Russian, Ukrainian and other workers who come from the former Russian Empire.' The article admitted that 'there is nothing strange in that, because everyone would like to go where he expects to live a free life, although not as good materially'. The article went on, however, to offer a number of reasons not to return to Soviet Ukraine. First, it suggested that 'normally the most class conscious

workers immigrate'; the drain on committed cadres would weaken the socialist movement in the diaspora. Second, a large-scale return movement to Ukraine would strengthen the hand of diaspora nationalists. 'The black hundreds', it claimed, 'are praying to God night and day that the class-conscious elements among Ukrainian workers perish. They would have a free hand in everything.'¹² Third, the article argued that the arrival of workers from the diaspora brought little material benefit to Soviet Ukraine unless the workers came equipped with all that they needed. More important, the ULFTA organ was opposed to a return movement because it would lose control over the dissemination of information about life in Soviet Ukraine to diaspora socialists: 'generally, when a person migrates to Ukraine who is not stable in his convictions, who, in a word, is not a revolutionary, he can become bitterly disappointed in his expectations and then become one of the greatest enemies of the Soviet regime'. The bottom line for the left, then, was that 'as regards the interests of Soviet Ukraine, the emigration of Ukrainian workers from Canada is not always desirable' (cited in Kolasky, 1990: 171).

This concern over the control of negative information intensified during the late 1920s and through the 1930s, when the Soviet government began its crackdown on Ukrainian social, intellectual and cultural life. Though the Ukrainians who moved back to Soviet Ukraine were at first welcomed by the Soviet authorities, they eventually became entrapped in the paranoia of the Soviet regime. In fact, their earlier brushes with life in the diaspora made their allegiance to Soviet Ukraine suspect, and many returnees were imprisoned, executed or sent into exile. The cases of Myroslav Irchan, Hryhorii Smook, Ivan Sembay and Mykhailo Hrushevsky are illustrative of the Soviet about-face.

Irchan had come to Canada in 1923 via Galicia and Czechoslovakia, and had spent nearly six years editing the communist magazine *Robitnytsia* (Working Woman) (Swyrypa, 1993: 294). A prominent Ukrainian socialist intellectual, while in Canada he wrote and directed a number of popular plays with socialist themes. Mathew Shatulsky, a leader of the ULFTA, celebrated Irchan's arrival in Canada by describing him as a 'writer-comrade' who is 'one of the most popular Ukrainian proletarian writers that Western Ukraine, the world war and the revolution have given the Ukrainian toilers this side of the ocean' (cited in Kolasky, 1990: 35). In May 1929, Irchan left Canada voluntarily to edit the Soviet Ukrainian journal, *Zakhidna Ukraina* ('Western Ukraine'). Smook, a ULFTA member from Ontario, moved to Soviet Ukraine in the early 1930s to work as a school principal. Hrushevsky, as noted earlier, had been appointed head of the Rada government in 1917. After the Bolshevik takeover he went into exile, but he returned to Soviet Ukraine in 1924 to take up a

position in the newly created Department of Ukrainian History at the University of Kyiv (Magocsi, 1996: 542). Sembay, who was born in Galicia, and who came to Canada as part of the first wave of emigration, was ordered to be deported from Canada in the 1930s for his communist activities. Rather than return to Galicia, he agreed to be sent to Soviet Ukraine.

In the early 1930s, the Soviets began to rethink their policy of national self-determination and to crack down on nationalist 'deviations'. People like Irchan, Sembay, Smook and Hrushevsky were eventually denounced as 'enemies of the people' for their 'counter-revolutionary' activities. Irchan was accused by Soviet authorities of being a member of 'the secret fascist terrorist conspiracy, the Ukrainian Military Organization'. He was arrested in 1930 and, according to unofficial accounts, was executed in 1937. Sembay was accused of being a member of the 'Union for the Liberation of Ukraine'. The Union's alleged aim was to reestablish capitalism in the Soviet Union, and Sembay was said to be involved in 'spying on behalf of imperialist countries'. The Union's existence was, in fact, fabricated by the Soviets to justify their repression of the Ukrainian intelligentsia. Sembay was killed by the Soviet authorities for his involvement in the non-existent Union in 1935 (Carynnyk, 1991: 198). Smook was imprisoned for twenty years and after his release was exiled to Kazakhstan (Kolasky, 1990: 195). Hrushevsky was forced back into exile in 1931 and died in 1934 in the Caucasus 'under mysterious circumstances' (Prymak, 1989: 10). Many other prominent Ukrainian academics, writers and politicians were also killed (Magocsi, 1996: 565).

Diaspora communist organizations followed the Soviet line and vigorously denounced their former friends and comrades. For instance, the Canadian ULFTA parroted the Soviet accusation that Irchan had been sent by nationalists to infiltrate and learn about the 'progressive' diaspora community and then return to Ukraine to 'prepare from inside, through sabotage and spying, for the eventual day when Germany and Poland would launch their second war against the Soviet Union' (cited in Kolasky, 1990: 36-7). Mathew Shatulsky, who had earlier praised Irchan as a 'writer-comrade', expressed full and unqualified faith in the 'Leninist Communist Party, the worker-peasant Soviet government [and] the dictatorship of the proletariat' in its accusations against Irchan. In a rather remarkable redefinition of who they 'really were', Irchan and Sembay were described by Shatulsky as being part of a group of 'national fascists who, serving German and Polish fascism, were international instigators of a new war and interventionists [who] conducted sabotage in Ukraine' (cited in Kolasky, 1990: 194). In his view, they deserved their fate at the hands of Soviet justice.

Conflicts with the nationalists

In their unqualified support for the Soviet Union, diaspora leftists battled with diaspora nationalists of various stripes about how to interpret social reality and social development in Soviet Ukraine. One of the left's caricatures of the nationalist vision for an 'independent' Ukraine was published in a 1934 article in *Ukrainski Robitnychi Visti*. The article posed the question 'What is a nation from the nationalist and Bolshevik perspectives?' Its answer was that to the 'Ukrainian national-fascist press and all the Ukrainian bourgeoisie', the nation consists of:

the Ukrainian intelligentsia – professor, directors, lawyers, priests, merchants, cooperators, landlords – this is the 'the salt of the Ukrainian nation', this is its brain, its leading force. Then follows another stratum of 'lesser lights' – teachers, smaller officials of various institutions, deacons and kulaks. These make up the audiences at meetings. The third stratum – the workers and poor and middle farmers – is the fertilizer on which grows 'the nation'. This third stratum should by the sweat of its brow not only feed (to be the fertilizer) these 'higher strata, but should maintain the schools, the various higher scientific, economic, and political institutions where the sons and daughters of 'the nation' are educated . . . as 'political, economic, cultural and spiritual leaders of the nation'.

(Cited in Kolasky: 1990: 212)

The article pointed out that 'the proletarians and Bolsheviks' have a quite different understanding of 'the nation':

For them the nation is the proletarians and the poor and middle peasants who have been oppressed for centuries and who feed and cloth everyone, but who live in 'cold and hunger' . . . This mass of toilers is not fertilizer but the basis of the nation, and all those that the national-fascists regard as 'the salt of the nation' are nothing more than parasites on the backs of the toilers living by their sweat and blood as direct exploiters or as faithful servants of large capital.

(Cited in Kolasky, 1990: 213)

Their hostility to the Soviet Union, coupled with some nationalists' cultivation of ties with Germany, led to repeated accusations that diaspora nationalists were fascists bent on reestablishing the rule of capitalists and landlords in Ukraine:

In their raging attacks on the Soviet Union and especially on Soviet Ukraine, the leaders of the Ukrainian fascist organizations consciously work to enslave and oppress the toilers of Soviet Ukraine as they enslaved the toilers of Western Ukraine for the Polish gentry, the Romanian landlords and the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie. Yes, the leaders of the Ukrainian fascist organizations are conscious that they are working for the complete obliteration of the working class, for the destruction of the liberation movement of the toiling masses. They are working out of fear of the growing forces of the working class . . . They regard the class enemy of capital as their enemy and for that very reason are ready to fight with all their might to maintain the capitalist class and its repressive order.

(ULFTA newspaper, cited in Kolasky, 1990: 215)

The dispute between the nationalists and communists over how to interpret Soviet Ukraine was more than just rhetorical, at times spilling over into physical violence, particularly in smaller communities where everyone knew the intimate details of each other's lives. Socialists and nationalists were also willing to use the power of the state to help settle political scores. In the United States, Ukrainians with socialist leanings seemed to have the ear of the House Un-American Activities Committee, or the Dies Commission. The Commission was struck in May 1938 in response to allegations that communist, fascist and other subversive organizations constituted a threat to American democracy. The Commission's mandate was to investigate the nature and diffusion of un-American activities and propaganda that came from both within and outside of the United States (Kuropas, 1991: 221).

In September 1939 the Dies Commission questioned Emil Revyuk, the associate editor of the newspaper *Svoboda*, and president of the left-leaning United Ukrainian Organizations of America (UUAO). At the time, Revyuk and the UUAO were at odds with the OUN, ODWU and the United Hetman Organization (Kuropas, 1991: 282). The Commission heard from two other representatives of the socialist camp regarding the activities of Ukrainian nationalists in America. While the testimony of these individuals was at times 'vague and contradictory' (Kuropas, 1991: 282), the Commission construed it as providing support for the idea that Ukrainian nationalists were cultivating relations with Nazi Germany and that these relations constituted a threat to American democracy.

After the first part of Revyuk's testimony, Commissioner Dies concluded that two organizations, the United Hetman Organization and ODWU, were little more than mouthpieces for 'foreign powers' (Kuropas, 1991: 283):

There are some 50 branches of ODWU in the United States, and they are affiliated with an international organization and the head of it is . . . in Berlin, and that are exchanging information between the groups at different times, reporting as to what is going on in other countries of the world as well as leaders going from the United States. All of this has its fountain head in Berlin, in Germany, where the Provid headquarters are and naturally, Germany would be getting any information that would come through this source . . . That is another way of saying that this whole thing is linked to Nazi Germany. The German Government would not tolerate the existence of this Ukrainian headquarters, however it is, unless the Nazi Government wanted to. In other words, they have complete control over the matter so that there is a strong link there – we do not know how strong – between the Nazi Government and this organization.

(Cited in Kuropas, 1991: 277)

One outcome of the hearings was the passage of legislation requiring all US organizations that carried on political activities for the control or overthrow of the American government, or which engaged in civilian and military drills in preparation for military action and which were subject to foreign control, to register with the American government. This legislation provided the government with the justification for expanding its investigation into subversive organizations in the United States (Kuropas, 1991: 222–3).

The left-wing press also fed on these allegations and engaged in a vicious denunciation of the Ukrainian nationalists. *The Hour* and *Friday*, both communist periodicals, were particularly vociferous in their character assassination of Ukrainian nationalists. They were also influential. Much of the information that the FBI collected on diaspora nationalist organizations at the time was based on material published in the two periodicals (Kuropas, 1991: 223). In 1942, Michael Sayers and Albert Kahn, the editors of *The Hour* and *Friday* respectively, collaborated to produce a bestseller called *Sabotage! The Secret War against America*, in which they drew upon Revyuk and other socialists' testimony before the Dies Commission:

Both ODWU and the Hetman [UHO] are international organizations with branches throughout Europe, Asia and North and South America. Their activities include spying, sabotaging, spreading pro-Axis propaganda and, not infrequently, committing assassinations. The United States leaders of ODWU have been in regular communication with German, Japanese and Italian

agents and with spies in south and Central America. In the spring of 1941, one of the confidential ODWU bulletins emanating from Berlin triumphantly described the sinking of several British ships sabotaged by ODWU members in Argentina and Brazil.

(Cited in Kuropas, 1991: 291)

Sayers and Kahn also described the apparently cordial relations that ODWU members enjoyed with Nazi officials in Berlin and Vienna; the warm reception they received from Nazis during their visits to Europe; the ways in which the United Hetman Organization cultivated ties with Hitler and the pro-fascist German-American Bund; and the ways in which Ukrainian nationalists were apparently being trained in espionage techniques (Kuropas, 1991: 291–3).

During the war, the campaign against the nationalists resulted in a decline in membership. Many members came to believe that the American government knew more about the activities of their organizations than they did. The UHO voluntarily disbanded in March 1942, partly because of the repeated allegations of disloyalty to America. In one of its final resolutions, the executive pledged the allegiance of its members to the American war effort and to the defeat of America's enemies (Kuropas, 1991: 226).

Conclusion

The question that was asked at the beginning of this chapter was how the different segments of the Ukrainian diaspora were affected by war, revolution and the division of Ukrainian lands among the Soviets, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania. Though these scarring events took on different meanings for nationalists and leftists, they did encourage the development of vibrant, creative and expressive organizational lives and the associated strengthening of Ukrainian identity. The differences, however, are probably more significant than the similarities. For leftists, the revolution and the constitution of Ukraine as a socialist republic within the Soviet Union was a dream come true, and when they returned to the ancestral homeland it was to help Soviet Ukraine fully realize its potential as a socialist society. For nationalists, these events formed part of the traumatic circumstances that propelled them into the diaspora in central Europe and North and South America. In this case, 'return' and involvement in Ukrainian issues was oriented to seeing the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the establishment of a truly independent and united Ukrainian state. There were also differences in how the ancestral homeland was idealized by the two segments of the diaspora. For nationalists,

Soviet Ukraine and other Ukrainian lands that were under foreign control were places where the Ukrainian language, culture and religion continued to be oppressed. For those on the left, Soviet Ukraine was the place where the Ukrainian language and culture would flourish, and one of their goals as members of a diaspora was to help protect Soviet Ukraine, and the Soviet Union, from attack by counter-revolutionary forces.

In terms of the typology of diasporas proposed in Chapter 1, the exiles who left Ukraine after the failed attempts to create a state bear some resemblance to a victim diaspora. Their dispersal may not have been rooted in mass genocide, as it was in the case of the Armenians, but the trauma of war, revolution, the incorporation of eastern Ukraine into the Soviet Union and the division of western Ukrainian lands among the Poles, Czechs and Romanians had a profound impact on emigration, and on the parameters of identity formation and political activity in the diaspora. Many of those who left at that time considered themselves to be temporary exiles. Moreover, their identities and political views were partly rooted in the fight against foreign domination of their homeland (and foreign could mean Polish, Romanian, Czechoslovak and Soviet) and in the struggle to establish an independent Ukrainian state.

One of the consequences of World War I and the Russian Revolution was that the years between the wars were marked by divisions within the diaspora about the kind of 'Ukrainian' one was. In many ways, the events in the Ukrainian diaspora in interwar Europe and North America raise the question whether the term diaspora accurately describes the Ukrainians. Segments of the diaspora did display a sense of comradeship with other like-minded individuals and groups, but in other respects those years were marked by deep divisions and disagreements about the ancestral homeland, the purpose of being in the diaspora and the interpretation of developments in Soviet Ukraine. The existence of the organizational divisions and social conflicts between different segments of the diaspora raise troubling questions about whether the Ukrainians who settled in North America were all part of the same diaspora and the same imagined community.

By the beginning of World War II, the Ukrainian diaspora was a fractured entity. Nationalists within the OUN were not able to overcome their differences; indeed, they eventually split into competing camps just as Germany had embarked on its mission to expand to the east. Socialists and nationalists continued to have dramatically different views of Soviet Ukraine and of their role as a diaspora. The arrival of the third wave of emigration after World War II further complicated an already messy situation.

THE THIRD WAVE

World War II and the displaced persons

Even a cursory listing of losses reflects the terrible impact that World War II had on Ukraine and its inhabitants. About 5.3 million, or one of six inhabitants, perished in the conflict. An additional 2.3 million had been shipped to Germany to perform forced labor. Over 700 cities and towns and 28,000 villages were totally or partially destroyed, leaving close to 10 million people homeless. A graphic indication of the extremes of Nazi brutality experienced in Ukraine was that for one village that was destroyed and its inhabitants executed in France and Czechoslovakia, 250 villages and their inhabitants suffered such a fate in Ukraine. Because Ukraine suffered more damage in the war than any other European country, the economic losses were staggering. The complete or partial destruction of over 16,000 industrial enterprises and 28,000 collective farms meant that Ukraine lost much of what had been gained at such great cost during the 1930s.

(Subtelny, 1994: 480)

Two decades after the horrors of World War I and the Russian Revolution and the formation of Soviet Ukraine, World War II was yet another catastrophe to befall Ukraine, and indeed much of the rest of the world. This chapter examines the impact that World War II had on the formation and development of the Ukrainian diaspora in North America.

First, it argues that whereas previous waves of westward migration consisted of a mixture of labor migrants, exiles and refugees, the third wave contained a greater proportion of political refugees, who formed part of a victim strand within the diaspora. Most of the 2.3 million Ukrainians who had left Ukraine between 1939 and 1945 were repatriated to the Soviet Union when the war ended. However, between 1945 and 1955, 250,000 eastern and western Ukrainians emigrated to North and South America, Australia and various parts of Europe. Between 1955 and the mid-1980s, there was virtually no westward migration of Ukrainians

because of Soviet restrictions on emigration, although considerable numbers of Ukrainians did move within the Soviet Union. While smaller in number than the first two waves of westward emigration, the third wave, known collectively as displaced persons (or derisively as ‘DPs’) had a long-lasting influence on the politics and social structure of the diaspora.

Second, this chapter shows that war had a number of contradictory consequences for the formation and development of the Ukrainian diaspora. The events surrounding the war enabled Ukrainians in the diaspora to mobilize in support of their compatriots who were stranded in Europe after the end of hostilities and to develop stronger ties with them. At the same time, however, the arrival of a new wave of migrants in the diaspora after the war contributed to the further factionalization of the diaspora. The anti-Soviet attitudes of the postwar refugees naturally brought them into conflict with diaspora socialists. But ironically the particular character of their victimization, and their attitudes towards being in the diaspora, also brought them into conflict with otherwise sympathetic members of the nationalist camp. Longer-settled members of the diaspora who were sympathetic to, and supported, the nationalist cause resented the upstart displaced persons for jeopardizing their newly won legitimacy as loyal citizens of their adopted countries. The DPs, on the other hand, believed that the collapse of the Soviet Union was imminent and that the diaspora condition was a temporary stop on their way back to an independent, non-communist Ukraine. Hence they criticized the longer-settled members of the nationalist community who had reconciled themselves to life in the diaspora. The displaced persons took over established diaspora community organizations or formed new ones along the ideological fault lines that had emerged in Europe, and their arrival produced new sources of emphasis, as well as conflict and friction, within the diaspora.

This chapter begins with a brief discussion of the countries of destination of postwar Ukrainian migrants. It then turns to an analysis of the effect of World War II on the process of emigration, the part that the displaced persons’ camps played in organizing the social, political and creative life of the internees, the mobilization of North American Ukrainians in support of displaced persons, and the conflicts between displaced persons and established immigrants.

Countries of destination

As noted in previous chapters, westward migration is only one part of the story of the dispersal of Ukrainians. Between the beginning of World War II and Ukrainian independence in 1991, Ukrainians continued to augment the already sizable eastern diaspora within the USSR. As before, the

Ukrainian community in other parts of the Soviet Union was made up of relatively voluntary agricultural pioneers and settlers, and deportees who were forced to leave Soviet Ukraine for political or strategic reasons. When the Germans advanced on the Soviet Union in 1941, for example, the Soviet army forcibly evacuated 3.5 million citizens of Ukraine to the Ural mountains in Russia and to Soviet Central Asia. The evacuees consisted of skilled Ukrainian and Jewish workers and professionals, as well as nationally conscious members of the Ukrainian clergy and intelligentsia. The Soviets feared that the Germans would exploit the technical skills of the workers and professionals and the ethnonational disenchantment of the Ukrainian intelligentsia. Many of these evacuees were prohibited from returning to Ukraine (Cipko, 1994: 129). Between 1944 and 1952 another 200,000 Ukrainians were deported to Siberia and other places in the far north. They included Jehovah's Witnesses, 'Banderites' and supporters of the underground Ukrainian Insurgent Army (Naulko *et al.*, 1993: 15).

These forced movements were accompanied by a number of organized agricultural resettlement programs that were intended to colonize Siberia and the far east. Between 1949 and 1953, 400,000 Ukrainians moved to frontier areas in Siberia, the Russian far east, Kazakhstan, the Volga region and the North Caucasus. The 'Virgin Lands Campaign' of 1954–6 took over 80,000 young Ukrainian men and women to Siberia and Kazakhstan, and between 1963 and 1965 another 40,000 Ukrainians moved to Kazakhstan. In addition, members of the Ukrainian urban working class moved around extensively within the Soviet Union. Ukrainian migrants augmented the population of several large Russian cities. By 1970 there were nearly 200,000 Ukrainians in Moscow, where they were the second-largest minority after the Jews, and there were nearly 100,000 Ukrainians in Leningrad (Naulko *et al.*, 1993: 19).

In many cases, Ukrainian emigration to the eastern and northern reaches of the empire was promoted by the Soviet authorities as a way of solidifying their control over the non-European republics and territories. The Ukrainians who moved as part of these colonizing efforts were in many ways similar to the Scots and Irish who moved to Canada and Australia as part of the wider British imperial diaspora. Though ethnically distinct from the dominant English, the Scots and Irish were nevertheless seen by others, and in many case by themselves, as part of the larger British presence. When Ukrainians moved to these places, they tended to be seen, and to define themselves, as part of a larger 'Russian' presence. In the non-Russian republics, some Ukrainians continued to think of themselves as Ukrainians, but most were incorporated through intermarriage and language assimilation into the Russian or Russian-speaking population (Laitin, 1998: 191). In fact, during the postwar period, Ukrainians were

called *sputniki russkikh* (Russian satellites) because they were considered to be Russian by the people indigenous to the other republics (Szporluk, 1975: 196).

Over half of the 250,000 Ukrainians who were in displaced persons' camps after the forced repatriations to the Soviet Union ended eventually settled in Australia, the United States or Canada. Between 1948 and 1951, approximately 21,000 went to Australia. This was more or less Australia's first contact with large numbers of Ukrainian immigrants for few had emigrated there in the first and second waves. Between 1947 and 1955, about 38,000 moved to Canada, and another 80,000 to the United States. Smaller numbers moved to other parts of the world. Between 1946 and 1950, about 5000 moved to Argentina, 7000 to Brazil and 1500 to Venezuela. Approximately 10,000 moved to each of France, Britain and Belgium. However, many of the Ukrainians who moved to Venezuela, Britain, France and Belgium eventually moved on to either North America or Australia (Stebelsky, 1991: 139–40). Another 25,000 Ukrainians were absorbed into Germany and Austria, and about 10,000 elderly, sick and infirm Ukrainians who were not wanted by any country either died in the displaced persons' camps or were taken care of by the German welfare state for the rest of their lives (Stebelsky, 1992: 37).

Conditions were different in each of the countries, but the overall circumstances surrounding the movement of Ukrainians to the west were created by the postwar economic boom (Castles and Miller, 1993: 65–97), for by the late 1940s, the governments of many western countries realized that their main economic problem was how to find enough workers to fuel an economic boom. That is the main reason that countries like Australia, Britain, Canada and the United States admitted Ukrainian immigrants, sympathetic to their plight as refugees though they may have been (Kay and Miles, 1992).

World War II and emigration from Ukraine

To understand why Ukrainians left their ancestral homeland in the late 1930s and early 1940s, it is necessary to understand how the war unfolded on Ukrainian territory.

When the Soviets invaded eastern Poland in 1939, they claimed that they were coming to the rescue of the Ukrainian people. The earlier German advance into western Poland had been the pretext for the Soviet attempt to begin to unite eastern and western Ukraine. When the Soviet army first set foot in Poland it tried to curry favor with the western Ukrainians by promising to expropriate the property of Polish landlords and redistribute it to Ukrainian peasants, promote the Ukrainian language

and culture and allow Ukrainians to attend Ukrainian schools and universities (Subtelny, 1986: 9).

The brief honeymoon between the Soviet forces and the western Ukrainians quickly gave way to Soviet repression. Ukrainians learned that the Soviets were not prepared to tolerate anything more than the promotion of symbolic aspects of Ukrainian ethnic identity. The more consequential expressions of that identity, especially in the form of nationalist aspirations for a truly independent Ukrainian state, were actively suppressed. The Soviets also reneged on their promise to redistribute expropriated land to peasant households, and instead began to reconstitute that land into the despised collective farms (Subtelny, 1986: 9).

Repression increased as Ukrainians expressed their dissatisfaction with Soviet methods and practices. Members of the western Ukrainian political elite were arrested and deported, and later the net was widened to include anyone who displayed even the faintest sympathy for Ukrainian nationalism. The deportees and their families were sent to Siberia and Kazakhstan to work as slave laborers (Subtelny, 1986: 10). When the Soviets began their retreat from western Ukraine in the face of the advancing German army in 1941, the secret police massacred some 10,000 Ukrainian political prisoners who were held in various jails throughout western Ukraine. According to Subtelny (1992: 10–11), ‘as the mounds of corpses were uncovered, many Western Ukrainians, overwhelmed by revulsion and hatred of the Soviets, resolved that they would never again accept Soviet rule’.

Some took their hatred of the Soviet regime a step further and joined the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (Ukrainksa Povstanska Armiia, or UPA), which had been formed by leaders of the previous UNR government-in-exile, then located in Warsaw. Led by Taras (Bulba) Borovets, the UPA began by conducting a guerrilla war against the Red Army in western Ukraine. At first, the anti-Soviet sentiments of the UPA and the advancing German army were complimentary. Despite the UPA’s successes against Soviet forces, the Germans eventually called upon it to dissolve. The leaders refused, and the army went underground. Eventually the UPA came under the control of the Banderites, who united a number of different partisan units under the leadership of Roman Shukhevych, an OUN(B) leader who had earlier served as an officer in the Wehrmacht’s *Nachtigall* unit. By 1943–4 the UPA’s partisan forces numbered between thirty and forty thousand. For the rest of the war, UPA partisans fought German and Soviet regular forces and Soviet partisans in northwestern Ukraine, Galicia and Belorussia (Subtelny, 1994: 475).

The speed with which the German army overran the Soviets on the eastern front caught most people by surprise. The German offensive had

begun on June 22, 1941, and in four months the Red Army had been completely driven out of Soviet Ukraine and hundreds of kilometers back into Russia. In many ways Ukraine was the Nazis' golden goose. In addition to being a central part of the Nazi plan to extend German *Lebensraum*, it was also seen as a source of human and natural resources which would help underwrite the German war effort. The Germans carved Ukrainian territory into four administrative units. The eastern boundaries of Ukraine were under the control of the German military administration – the Wehrmacht; central Ukraine, including its capital Kyiv, was administered by the *Reichskommissariat* Ukraine; Galicia was administered by the *Generalgouvernement*; and southwestern Ukraine, Bukovyna and Moldavia were given to Romanian administration and were collectively called Transnistria.

Though the stereotype of smiling Ukrainians welcoming the German armies with open arms is overdrawn (Krawchenko, 1986a: 17), in one respect many Galician and Soviet Ukrainians were relieved to see the German army in their midst. Ukrainian nationalists hoped that the Germans, as fellow anti-communists, would help them eliminate the collective farm, which was one of the most hated structures of Soviet rule. They also thought that the Germans would support their goal of an independent Ukrainian state that would act as a long-term counterbalance to their mutual Soviet enemy (Subtelny, 1992: 11). Many more believed that German rule could never be as cruel and inhumane as that of the Soviets. Under these circumstances, nationalists from western Ukraine accompanied the invading German forces, for whom they acted as interpreters and advisers (Armstrong, 1963: 103). Their purpose, however, was to help start the process of Ukrainian nation-building, construct Ukrainian social institutions and help instill a sense of Ukrainian national consciousness into the largely Russified eastern Ukrainian population.

At first, some circles within the Wehrmacht were sympathetic to the idea of at least a quasi-independent Ukrainian state, but the sympathy quickly changed to hostility when the Bandera faction of the OUN unilaterally declared Ukrainian independence and appointed Yaroslav Stetsko as premier, in Lviv on June 30, 1941. Shortly afterwards, the Nazis began a systematic campaign of repression against the Bandera faction that eventually spread to the general Ukrainian population. Bandera and a number of his colleagues were placed under house arrest in Berlin for the rest of the war (Armstrong, 1963: 83). Others were arrested or assassinated. Playing on the earlier conflict between the Bandera and Melnyk factions, the *Einsatzgruppen* at first used the latter to help carry out actions against Bandera's followers. The Melnykites were allowed room to maneuver in both the *Generalgouvernement* and the *Reichskommissariat* because they did not support the Banderite declaration of statehood (Armstrong, 1963).

Just as the OUN(M) made some headway in organizing Ukrainian life in the *Reichskommissariat*, however, it too began to be subject to Nazi repression (Armstrong, 1963: 106). In many ways, Nazi repression of Ukrainians in the *Reichskommissariat* was more brutal than in the *Generalgouvernement*. In the former in November and December of 1941, a number of OUN newspapers were closed, and their editorial staff arrested. Melnykite leaders suffered the same fate as their Banderite counterparts and were either arrested or executed (Armstrong, 1963: 116). Melnyk, who was living in Germany during the early years of the war, was arrested in January 1944 and interned at the Sachsenhausen concentration camp for several months (Armstrong, 1963: 178). Eventually, Nazi repression in the *Reichskommissariat* targeted not only Ukrainian nationalist leaders, but also the Ukrainian population in general.

According to Subtelny, 'rarely has an occupying power managed to turn an initially friendly, or at least expectant populace against it so quickly and completely as did the Nazis in Ukraine' (1994: 470). Within the Nazi racial cosmology, Ukrainians were *Untermenschen* who did not figure in the Germans' long-term plans for their territory. Ukrainian-language schools were closed, medical services were curtailed in order to preclude the unnecessary reproduction of the inferior Ukrainians, and Ukrainian city dwellers were starved in order to feed the German army (Subtelny, 1994: 468-9). Nor did the Germans keep their promise to destroy the collective farm system. Some modest land reforms were introduced (Armstrong, 1963: 120), but in reality the only thing about the collective farm system that changed was the name (Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 1949: 54; Armstrong, 1963: 120).

The quarter-million Ukrainians who formed the third wave of emigration to the west after World War II were made up of a combination of people who left Ukraine during the war in four sets of circumstances; and they were a mixture of labor migrants and refugees.

First, two groups of Ukrainians moved to Germany and to German-controlled Poland after the Soviet invasion of eastern Poland (western Ukraine) in September 1939. One of the groups, which moved to the *Generalgouvernement* in German-occupied Poland, consisted of between twenty and thirty thousand nationally conscious urban intellectuals and professionals who were involved with different nationalist social, cultural and political organizations in prewar Galicia (Subtelny, 1992: 9). Many were OUN activists or sympathizers who feared Soviet repression for their nationalist activities. Some went on to join forces with the Melnyk faction of the OUN in Berlin, and others formed a self-help organization called the Ukrainian Central Committee (UCC) in Krakow. The Committee aimed to help other western Ukrainian refugees as well as Ukrainian peasants

who lived in the Kholm, Podlachia and Lemko regions of Poland. With the consent of the Germans, the members of the UCC started Ukrainian schools, cooperatives and cultural, youth and religious organizations (Subtelny, 1992: 10). The second group of Ukrainians to flee the Soviets in 1939 were less well-educated members of the urban working class and rural peasantry who moved for economic rather than political reasons. By 1941, there were about 100,000 Ukrainian laborers in Germany. In the early years of the war this group of labor migrants was treated fairly well by the German authorities and employers: they earned the same pay as their German counterparts; their living conditions were spartan but bearable, and they enjoyed some cultural autonomy (Subtelny, 1992: 10).

Second, during the German occupation of central and eastern Ukraine between 1941 and 1944, Ukrainian *Ostarbeiter* were forcibly recruited to work in Germany. Within the *Reichskommissariat*, compulsion was increasingly used to recruit young Ukrainian men and women for the German war effort (Armstrong, 1963: 123). The conscripts were sent several thousand kilometers to Germany in cattle cars sealed with barbed wire. By the end of the war, about one-third of the German labor force was made up of foreign workers. Of the 2.8 million Soviet workers forced to work in German agriculture and industry between 1941 and 1944, 2.3 million were from Ukraine (Subtelny, 1994: 469). The *Ostarbeiter* were treated less well than the western Ukrainians who had volunteered to work in Germany in 1939 (Subtelny, 1992: 11). In the mid-1940s, *Ostarbeiter* were paid considerably less than German workers. They were also subject to strict curfews, and were prohibited from using public transport and entering certain German stores (Subtelny, 1992).

Third, some Ukrainians left Ukraine in the crossfire of the retreating German army and the advancing Soviet army in 1944 and 1945 (Subtelny, 1992).¹ The Soviet victories at Stalingrad and Kursk in the first half of 1943 signaled the beginning of the end of the German occupation of the Soviet Union. By October 1944 much of Ukrainian territory was once again in the hands of the Soviets. The Ukrainians who left in the wake of the German retreat were a combination of the intellectual elite and peasantry. The former, made up of clergy, artists and scholars, first made their way to Galicia but later moved farther west into Germany. The latter had been brutalized by the Soviet regime during the 1930s and feared persecution by the NKVD once Soviet authority was reestablished (Subtelny, 1992: 13). As Soviet forces advanced on western Ukraine, the clergy, intelligentsia, merchants, relatively well-off peasants, the families of members of the Galicia Division, staff of the UCC and Ukrainians who were part of the German administration in Galicia also escaped in between the German retreat and the Soviet advance (Subtelny, 1992: 13).

The fourth, and perhaps most controversial, component of Ukrainian westward emigration consisted of members of the Waffen-SS 14th Grenadier Division, also known as the 1st Ukrainian Division of the Ukrainian National Army, and more informally as the ‘Galicia Division’. The wartime activities of the Division, and the reasons for its formation, are still the subject of heated debate in diaspora politics. As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7, for many years after the war Soviet authorities and some Jews argued that Ukrainians who joined the Division did so because they were anti-Semitic and that the Nazis used the Division to carry out pogroms against Jewish communities in Ukraine. Ukrainians, on the other hand, argue that the Division was formed because of the Ukrainians’ hatred of the Soviet system.

When Hitler launched Operation Barbarossa in 1941, non-Germans were prohibited from bearing arms in the fight against the Soviets. Hitler ordered that ‘it must always remain a cast-iron principle that none but Germans be allowed to bear arms. Only the Germans must be permitted to bear arms, not the Slav, not the Czech, nor the Cossack, nor the Ukrainian’ (cited in Logusz, 1997: 50). The Nazis’ commitment to maintaining the racial purity and superiority of their armed forces began to break down as their losses mounted on the eastern front, and by 1943 they were recruiting non-Germans to bolster their forces. At war’s end, the Waffen-SS was made up of thirty-eight divisions, half of which were composed of various non-German eastern and western European ethnic groups (Yurkevich, 1986: 75).

The Nazis realized that their brutal repression of Ukrainians in the *Reichskommissariat* would mean that few eastern Ukrainians would be interested in joining them in their fight against the Soviets. Western Ukraine, however, where anti-Ukrainian policies were less severe, was seen as a potentially more fruitful recruiting ground. The German general-governor of Galicia, Dr Otto Wachter, suggested that the Germans could take advantage of the anti-communist sentiments of the western Ukrainians and defuse the nationalist aspirations of Ukrainian youth by creating a military division made up solely of Ukrainians who would fight the Russians on the eastern front (Logusz, 1997: 51). Though Wachter’s superiors in Berlin were troubled by the idea of organizing Ukrainians into a military unit, Heinrich Himmler eventually agreed to the formation of a division in April 1943.

Ukrainian nationalist leaders in Galicia were divided on the political wisdom of forming a Ukrainian division within the German armed forces. The Bandera faction of the OUN was neutral; the Melnyk faction, the Ukrainian Central Committee and the leadership of the UPA were in favor. Some nationalists argued that because of the defeat of the Germans

at Stalingrad, Ukraine would once again be overrun by the Red Army (Logusz, 1997: 60). Others argued – quite plausibly at the time – that both Germany and Russia would be so spent from their fight on the eastern front that neither would be able to assert effective control over Ukraine. In the event of such a vacuum, if Ukrainian statehood was to be maintained after the war, Ukraine would need a trained and armed military force. Though the supporters of the idea seemed to understand the dangers of aligning themselves with a discredited regime that was going to be on the losing side of the war, their fear of renewed Soviet Russian domination led them to support Germany so as to obtain both experience and *matériel* for their own impending fight against the Soviets.

The terms of Ukrainian involvement with the German armed forces were negotiated with Wachter by the Ukrainian Central Committee. The Ukrainians demanded that the division be part of the Wehrmacht and that it be used only against communist forces on the eastern front. In addition, they wanted Ukrainian officers, a Ukrainian name and patch for the division, religious freedom for its members, the release of certain imprisoned Ukrainian officers, the eventual incorporation of the division into the Ukrainian army, security for soldiers' families, and the formation of a Galician Military Board to protect the interests of the soldiers and their families (Logusz, 1997: 66). Wachter agreed to these conditions, but was overruled by Nazi officials in Berlin on a number of counts. The Division did not become part of the Wehrmacht but rather of the Waffen-SS; the senior officers were Germans; the Division's name did not contain any reference to Ukraine; and the insignia was not the Ukrainian trident but the Galician lion. The Nazis did, however, agree to use the Division only against Soviet forces on the eastern front (Yurkevich, 1986: 77).

Over 80,000 Ukrainians volunteered to serve in the Galicia Division (see Logusz, 1997: 74–5). Many were deemed unfit for military service,² but by August 1943 the Germans had called up 13,000 volunteers for training (Logusz, 1997: 126). In the subsequent months, thousands more were called up to act as reinforcements. The men were trained at the Heidelager camp in southeastern Poland and the Neuhammer camp in Silesia; officers were trained in a number of locations throughout Europe (Yurkevich, 1986: 77–8).

The Division's first major military engagement with Soviet forces was near the city of Brody in northwestern Ukraine in July 1944. Nearly 11,000 members of the Division were sent to shore up the Wehrmacht's 13th Army Corps, but both were routed in the Battle of Brody. Estimates of the losses vary, but sources quoted by military historian Robert Logusz (1997: 257–61) suggest that nearly one-quarter of the Division forces were killed or severely wounded in battle, between three and four thousand deserted

and joined the ranks of UPA partisans, and about five thousand mounted a successful retreat and regrouped. By September 1944 the Division's strength had returned to nearly 13,000, and for the rest of the war battle groups fought communist forces in Slovakia, southeastern Austria and northwestern Yugoslavia. When the Germans surrendered on May 8, 1945, the majority of the Division surrendered to the British forces in southern Austria and about 700 to the American forces in southern Germany.

The DP camps

At the end of the war there were between 2.5 and 3 million Ukrainians scattered throughout Germany and Austria. Of the 8.5 million foreigners in Germany at the time, Ukrainians were one of the largest ethnic groups. By 1947, the number of foreigners had dropped to a million, and the ranks of Ukrainians were reduced to a quarter-million. The disappearance of over 2 million Ukrainians from German and Austrian soil between 1945 and 1947 was not due to the inherent longing of a diaspora to return 'home' after a long and brutal war; rather, it was mainly due to forced repatriation.

In fact, repatriation had been on the minds of Allied leaders for much of the war, and the return of refugees to their countries of origin was the overriding objective of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) while it was in operation between 1943 and 1947. This commitment to repatriation was reaffirmed by the 1945 Yalta agreement, in which the Allies agreed to the repatriation of all Allied nationals who had been citizens of their respective countries on September 1, 1939 (Tolstoy, 1977). Between 1945 and 1947 the British and American authorities helped the Soviets arrange the return of 2 million Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians and others to the Soviet Union (Elliot, 1992: 341). Three million more were forcibly repatriated to the Soviet Union without the help of the British and Americans.

The Soviet Union put considerable effort into propaganda to lure the refugees back. Promises of secure jobs, residence in one's former dwelling, agricultural and building loans, educational opportunities and generous veterans' benefits for ex prisoners of war were made, alongside emotional appeals 'to return home' (Elliot, 1992: 351-4). In one film produced to entice Armenian refugees back, the narrator referred to Soviet Armenia as 'the last harbour for our wandering ships' (Elliot, 1992: 352). But few swallowed the propaganda and returned voluntarily (Elliot, 1992: 349). Even those who had gone to Germany as forced laborers and prisoners of war feared that the Soviets would regard them as traitors (Elliot, 1992: 342). Soviet repatriation efforts inevitably involved coercion, and getting

the refugees to return home was an ugly business. Refugees were pistol-whipped, beaten and physically dragged from camps and loaded onto transport trains headed for the Soviet Union. The Soviets also selectively kidnapped influential leaders (Boshyk, 1992: 372). Riots protesting repatriation were common. Some Ukrainians committed suicide rather than return home, while others escaped from the camps the night before Soviet repatriation teams were scheduled to take them away. Some temporarily changed their identity and found refuge in camps run by sympathetic Polish commandants; others tried to hide in the German countryside. Despite the warm promises, many who were repatriated were murdered or sent to concentration camps for allegedly having collaborated with the Germans or not having fought hard enough against them. The Ukrainians' resolve to avoid repatriation became stronger as news of the Soviet treatment of returnees filtered back to the camps in Europe.

The American and British authorities also began to have doubts about cooperating with the Soviet Union as they learned of Soviet coercion and the lengths to which refugees went to avoid being sent back (Elliot, 1992: 350). The eventual rejection by the west of repatriation is seen in the 1946 decision to replace the UNRRA with the International Refugee Organization (IRO), which was to begin operations on January 1, 1948. The mandate of the new organization shifted from repatriation to resettlement (Isajiw and Palij, 1992: xvii).

When forced repatriations ended in 1948, 1 million DPs, one-quarter of whom were Ukrainians, were still living either in displaced persons' camps or outside of the camps in Germany, Austria and Italy (Isajiw and Palij, 1992: xviii). It took time for the IRO to find countries willing to accept the refugees, and during that time Ukrainians in the camps created a vibrant political, cultural and intellectual life (Baran, 1992; Bohachevsky-Chomiak, 1992; Grabowicz, 1992; Revutsky, 1992; Struk, 1992). While much of the political activity revolved around the competition between the Banderite and Melnykite factions of the OUN, at least a dozen political parties that covered the political spectrum were active in the camps between 1945 and 1955 (Markus, 1992: 113). A centralized body of the Ukrainian DP community was created (the Coordinating Ukrainian Committee) to try to coordinate relief activities in the camps. Efforts to unite the various political factions were not particularly successful, however, and by some accounts much of the political life in the camps was under the control of the younger, and more militant, Bandera faction of the OUN (Boshyk, 1992: 366; Ciuciura, 1992: 98–100).

During the life of the camps, there were 266 schools and courses attended by nearly 14,000 students. There were kindergartens, elementary and secondary schools and a variety of courses for adults. The Ukrainian

scouting organization Plast had an active membership. There were at least eighteen theater groups that performed a variety of plays, operas and operettas on both Ukrainian ethnocultural and 'mainstream' themes. Over 1200 books and pamphlets were published, 250 of which were original works of poetry, prose and drama (Grabowicz, 1992: 242). Even though many were short-lived, at least 327 periodicals were published in the camps (Illytzyk, 1992: 271).

The camps were 'home' to some people for as long as eight years and inevitably the camp experience had a profound effect on the residents. According to Markus (1992: 194), part of the reason for the vibrant and creative cultural and intellectual life in the camps was that they provided the first taste of 'self-government' for the more nationally conscious western Ukrainians. Even though the American and British authorities regulated the kinds of activities that went on, the camps nevertheless provided the Ukrainians with a historically unprecedented opportunity for self-administration. Ukrainians had a free hand in how they organized their cultural and educational activities, and Ukrainian history, religion and literature could be taught without fear of political repercussions (Markus, 1992). For Ukrainians from Soviet Ukraine, the camps were their first contact with more nationally conscious western Ukrainians and their first systematic exposure to a specifically Ukrainian cultural, intellectual and social life. Like many members of the first wave of emigration described in Chapter 2, in many ways the workers and peasants who left Soviet Ukraine in 1943-4 became 'Ukrainian' and politically conscious of their 'Ukrainianness' outside of Ukrainian territory. Since much of camp life was organized by a politically active, anti-Soviet and stridently nationalist minority, there was much proselytizing on behalf of the Ukrainian national cause, which had a profound effect on everyone. Many of the *Ostarbeiter* from Soviet Ukraine and those who had escaped during the German retreat from the Soviet Union were not particularly nationalistic or politically active when they arrived in the camps, but by the time they left to resettle in the west they had become quite different people.

Getting the DPs out of Europe

As noted in Chapter 1, an important aspect of diaspora consciousness, identity and social organization is a sense of solidarity with co-ethnics. This feeling played an important role for Ukrainians in North America who came to the aid of displaced persons. Some diaspora Ukrainians were motivated by a humanitarian concern for the fate of their compatriots and by the prospect of having new blood augment the existing communities (Luciuk, 1992: 105). Individuals and organizations in the North American

diaspora tried actively to stop the forced repatriation of Ukrainians to the Soviet Union, organized relief, and lobbied governments and international organizations to have Ukrainians resettled in the west. In some cases, those who had settled in North America as part of a previous wave of migration and who learned that they had relatives in the camps, made use of immigrant sponsorship provisions to bring them to Canada or the United States. Collectively, these activities constituted one of the centripetal forces of Ukrainian diaspora formation.

In 1944, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, an umbrella organization created in 1940, lobbied the Canadian government to let it establish a welfare fund for Ukrainian refugees in Europe. At first, the request was turned down because the Canadian government did not wish to antagonize the Soviet authorities; a significant proportion of those Ukrainians were Soviet citizens, and the Canadians felt that the Soviets would want to 'take care' of their own. Eventually, the Committee was allowed to raise money for the Red Cross, which in turn agreed to distribute the relief specifically to Ukrainians in Europe. At the same time, a small group of overseas Ukrainian-Canadian servicemen organized the Ukrainian Canadian Servicemen's Association (UCSA). Based initially in Manchester, it later moved to London (England). The Association started out as a social-support group for Ukrainian Canadians who were serving in the armed forces (Panchuk, 1992: 498). After the D-Day invasions in June 1944 Ukrainian-Canadian soldiers began to meet destitute Ukrainian refugees in various parts of western Europe. One of the UCSA's founding members, Bohdan Panchuk, reported to Ukrainian Canadian Committee headquarters in Winnipeg on who, and what, he had found in Europe. In his June 1945 report he pleaded for the North American diaspora to be more active in relief and resettlement efforts on behalf of Ukrainian refugees. Panchuk argued that it was the duty of Ukrainians in North America to help the refugees since they were in grave danger of losing their sense of being 'Ukrainian' (Luciuk, 1992: 437).

Through Panchuk's initiative, the UCSA was turned into the Central Ukrainian Relief Bureau (CURB). CURB was made up of Ukrainian Canadian servicemen who remained on the continent after the war. Its goal was to help organize relief for Ukrainians, to help establish the national status of Ukrainians within organizations like the UNRRA, and to convince western authorities that Ukrainians should be recognized as refugees (Panchuk, 1992: 502). CURB was supported financially by the Ukrainian Canadian Relief Fund (UCRF), which was a fundraising arm of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, and by the United Ukrainian American Relief Committee (UUARC). Even though they cooperated in funding CURB, the Ukrainian Americans and Canadians had difficulty

working together on postwar refugee matters (Luciuk, 1992). Despite the joint funding arrangement, in practice CURB came to represent the Ukrainian-Canadian refugee resettlement efforts while the work of the Americans was organized through the UUARC, which eventually sent its own representatives to continental Europe.

When the UUARC was formed in October 1944, its mission was to raise funds for Ukrainian war relief. By the end of 1945, it had raised over \$100,000 for food and medical supplies, and had collected over \$200,000 worth of clothing for Ukrainian refugees. The Committee worked with organizations like the Unitarian Service Committee, UNRRA and CARE to distribute these items in Europe (Kuropas, 1992: 388). In the immediate aftermath of the war, it also lobbied the American government to stop supporting the forced repatriation of Ukrainians and other displaced persons to the Soviet Union.

The UUARC was encouraged by the IRO's commitment to honor the wishes of DPs who did not want to return to the Soviet Union. Working within the context of the IRO, the UUARC shifted its focus to the resettling of Ukrainians in America. By June 30, 1952, the UUARC had provided assistance to nearly 33,000 of the 80,000 Ukrainians who landed in the United States after the war. This assistance was concentrated on five interrelated activities. First, it helped find Ukrainian Americans who were willing to sponsor new immigrants, that is to sign assurances that the immigrants would be provided with housing and employment. Second, its European arm prepared prospective immigrants for life in the United States. Its fifty-eight paid employees and thirty volunteers were located in the main office in Munich and at branch offices in Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Bremen and Salzburg. Third, it tried to greet all Ukrainian DPs immediately upon their arrival in the US and to help them deal with the immigration bureaucracy, find temporary accommodation and reach their intended destinations. Fourth, it created a system of inland centers where newly arrived immigrants were taken care of until their working and permanent living arrangements were confirmed. Finally, it tried to persuade non-Ukrainian farmers in agricultural areas to sponsor and hire Ukrainian families on year-long labor contracts (Kuropas, 1992: 397-8).

On the Canadian side, diaspora Ukrainians lobbied for the inclusion of Ukrainian refugees in the government's 'bulk labor scheme'. Realizing that Canadian industry was faced with a serious labor shortage, the government in 1946 allowed employers in the lumber, mining, construction, agriculture and manufacturing sectors to recruit large numbers of DPs and other Europeans to work in Canada. The recruits signed labor contracts in which they committed themselves to working for a specific employer for a year in exchange for passage and settlement assistance (Satzewich, 1991).

After three years in Canada, refugees who came under the bulk labor scheme could also sponsor their relatives (Stebelsky, 1991: 136). Ukrainians also urged members of the community to sponsor relatives who were in the DP camps in Europe.

In 1946, in-fighting between CURB and its Ukrainian Canadian Committee sponsors led to the formation of the Canadian Relief Mission for Ukrainian Victims of War (CRM) in England. As an arm of CURB, the Mission's mandate was to help organize Ukrainian DP immigration to Canada and to provide assistance to the 8000 Ukrainians who were members of the Galicia Division and who had been admitted to Britain in 1947 (Momryk, 1992: 422).

Members of the Galicia Division had been interned in prisoner-of-war camps in Italy for two years after the end of the war. The Soviets desperately wanted them back, for they considered them to be traitors who should be dealt with by Soviet justice. The Allied forces, however, were reluctant to hand the members of the Division over to the Soviets until they could learn more about who they were, and what part they had played in the war in general, and whether they had committed atrocities against Jews. Members of the Division were thoroughly screened by British, American, Canadian and IRO officials. The British determined that, even though a majority had voluntarily joined the Division (and so were formally ineligible for IRO resettlement assistance), the Division members were not 'at heart, pro-German' (Refugee Screening Commission, 1947: 239). The British authorities argued that even though members of the Galicia Division were not eligible to be classified as displaced persons and hence could not obtain relocation assistance by the IRO, they had served in the German forces because they wanted to see the establishment of an independent Ukraine and feared living in a Soviet-ruled country (Refugee Screening Commission, 1947: 239). The Division was also cleared of any wrongdoing against Jews during the war.

Eventually the British government agreed to their classification as displaced persons, and under its European Volunteer Workers and Westward Ho labor programs arranged for Division members to enter England (Kay and Miles, 1992). After the members of the Galicia Division arrived in Britain, individual Ukrainian Canadians, and Ukrainian-Canadian organizations like the UCC, UCRF and CRM, along with the British government, requested the Canadian government to allow them to resettle in Canada. The Australian government was also lobbied. The Canadian government was reluctant to admit members of the Division since they had fought on the 'wrong side' during the war (Momryk, 1992: 423), but in March 1950 the decision was made to allow *Volkdeutsch* DPs and refugees who had acquired German citizenship after September 1,

1939, and German nationals who were first-degree relatives of Canadian residents to emigrate to Canada. After further lobbying by the UCC, Canada agreed to admit members of the Galicia Division, providing that they met the criteria for immigrants at the time.

In the end, ethnic lobbying may not have been necessary, for economic forces, along with the fact that they were considered to be 'white', were the two trump cards that they held. Before the war, neither Britain nor Australia had had Ukrainian communities of significant size; yet both accepted large numbers of Ukrainian refugees. Britain was in fact the first country to recruit refugees with its European Volunteer Worker Program. That program brought 77,000 displaced persons, 88,000 Polish war veterans, and 8000 Ukrainian members of the Galicia Division to Britain after the war (Avery, 1995: 151). Australia also became a popular destination for Ukrainian refugees after the war, and like Britain it lacked an already existing organized Ukrainian diaspora community (Seneta, 1994: 474). Ukrainians and other southern and eastern European groups were the beneficiaries of Australia's fear of being overrun by Asian migrants. The 'White Australia' policy gave priority to white immigrants from English-speaking countries, but in the postwar years it was made flexible enough for Ukrainians and other eastern and southern Europeans to be included. The Australian government also tended to import European refugees on labor contracts, although, unlike Canada, there was a two-year indenture before the immigrants could live and work where they wanted (Stebelsky, 1992: 36; Collins, 1991).³

Conflicts within the diaspora over the DPs

The resettlement of over 100,000 Ukrainian displaced persons in North America had contradictory implications for the formation and development of the Ukrainian diaspora. On the one hand, it enlarged the diaspora and provided an opportunity for the further development of relationships and solidarity between co-ethnics. But it also produced certain centrifugal tendencies insofar as it contributed to the further factionalization of an already divided community. The Ukrainian diaspora socialists and communists despised the DPs and were severely critical of them and of the nationalists who worked to bring them to North America. For the left, the unwillingness of the DPs to return to the Soviet Union was a sign of their political conservatism and their guilt for atrocities that had been committed against Jews in Ukraine. They also recognized they were not likely to net many new recruits among the anti-Soviet DPs. In addition, the presence of displaced persons would undermine their efforts to paint life in the Soviet Union in glowing terms for the rest of the North American working class.

Not surprisingly, diaspora leftists went on the attack by once again making the allegation that Ukrainian nationalists were Nazi sympathizers.

In the United States, the Ukrainian communist periodical *Ukrainski Shchodenni Visti* intimated that since the Soviets were already ‘taking care’ of Ukrainians in Europe, the UUARC was practicing ‘racketeerism’ by fundraising on behalf of Ukrainian refugees (Kuropas, 1992: 388). At the same time, the communist-controlled Russian War Relief organization alleged that ‘Ukrainians in America were planning to raise funds to assist Nazi war criminals and collaborators who had fled with the Germans to escape Soviet justice’ (Kuropas, 1992: 388).

In Canada, the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians (which was formed out of the dissolution of the ULFTA in 1946) repeatedly accused the Ukrainian displaced persons of being ‘quislings’ (Luciuk, 1992: 439). During the late 1940s, the Association worked hard to convince the Canadian government and the wider population that the Ukrainian DPs were pro-Nazi and that the nationalists in the diaspora were knowingly trying to bring war criminals into the country. At the hearings of the Standing Committee on Immigration and Labor, Ukrainian diaspora socialists in Canada characterized the DPs as being made up of: ‘(1) war criminals; (2) former collaborators with German occupation authorities in the Ukraine; and (3) a small group of people who have been beguiled into believing that they can escape the hardships of post-war restoration in their war shattered native land by emigrating to Canada’ (quoted in Luciuk, 1980: 96). In its newspaper, the Association was even more direct about the alleged political and ideological views of the DPs: ‘The admission of these Nazi zealots into Canada would be nothing less than a national disaster. They could no more be expected to be loyal citizens of this country than they were of their own native land’ (Luciuk, 1992: 439).

The allegation that the DPs in general, and members of the Galicia Division in particular, are ‘war criminals’ has dogged the third wave of emigration and the larger nationalist diaspora community ever since. As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7, the allegation that some third-wave Ukrainian refugees are inveterate anti-Semites and war criminals contributes to a certain lingering sense of Ukrainian victimization within their host societies.

In North America, longer-settled members of the diaspora who tended toward the nationalist camp were initially enthusiastic about the prospect of new blood that would help rejuvenate the community. However, as they learned more about the real and alleged politics and attitudes of the DPs, that enthusiasm quickly turned to hostility. One member of the pre-World War II Ukrainian Canadian community in Kingston, Ontario, ruefully noted:

We were hoping that we'd get new people for our groups. New blood to pick up our spirits, get new ideas into our movement and keep our organizations alive. But it didn't happen that way. The newcomers came to us at first but soon after troubles started. The old-timers swore that the newcomers were too inexperienced in Canada to be allowed access to executive positions. They, on the other hand, felt that theirs was the only right idea of what a Ukrainian was. And so it all went to nothing. Resentments set in, disillusionment. They, we called them the DPs because it was a bit insulting, forgot us and started to try and show us how superior they were. I wouldn't say that they proved it, they were not superior to me. Rather I think they were just a very different sort of beast from what we had become over time in Canada. They came from a Ukraine I have never known and one which most of us had no experience of. That's why they were like they were. On the other hand, they didn't have any idea about what things had been like here for those of us who emigrated well before World War II. So they weren't entirely correct in their comments about us. Just different ideas, two different worlds coming together I guess.

(Cited in Luciuk, 1980: 91)

According to Luciuk (1991: 122), 'before they came to know each other both groups had believed that, since they were all Ukrainians, they would get on well together. They came to realize how very different they were.' While the nationalists in the diaspora rejected the socialist accusation that the DPs were Nazis, collaborators and war criminals, they nevertheless began to feel that the newcomers might do more harm than good (Luciuk, 1991: 116). At the third congress of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, held in Winnipeg in February 1950, the main debate was over how the existing Ukrainian-Canadian community should rein in the newcomers. Several refugee delegates were ejected from the proceedings, and one account suggested that the DP's had to be reminded by the 'old timers' that 'Canada was not Galicia and Winnipeg not Lwow [Lviv]' (cited in Luciuk, 1991: 120).

Daria Markus traces the origins of the rift between the 'old' (pre-World War II immigrants) and the 'new' (DP) immigrants in the United States. First, there were differences in the social class and education of old and new immigrants. The new immigrants made much of the fact that earlier waves of immigrants tended to be from the lowest, economically depressed and educationally backward classes of Ukrainian society (Markus, 1977: 101). Even though the children of the earlier immigrants had achieved a

modicum of upward mobility, earlier immigrants' use of 'peasant Ukrainian' signaled to the postwar DPs the formers' social inferiority and low status. Second, there were differences in attitude to the homeland and countries of settlement between what were essentially a labor diaspora and a political diaspora. The old immigrants had a certain patronizing attitude towards the new arrivals. Called the 'we-know-it-here-better-than-you-do' syndrome, the old immigrants alienated the DPs by arguing that since they had lived in North America longer, they new best how to be a diaspora. The new immigrants, on the other hand, were disgusted by what they saw as the assimilation and unhealthy accommodations to life in North America of earlier waves of Ukrainian immigrants (Markus, 1977: 104). And, third, because of their relatively large numbers, coupled with a strong organizational base they had acquired in the displaced persons camps (Markus, 1977: 101), the more recent arrivals did not need the established community as much as the established community thought they did.

In North America, the rift between the new and old immigrants fractured further the organized life of the diaspora. Rather than fit into existing structures and organizations and defer to the longer-settled members of the community, the DPs imported the divisions and hostilities that had been percolating in Europe since the late 1930s. They began either to takeover existing organizations or to establish new organizations based on their old-world differences. In Canada, an assessment by Anthony Yaremovich, one of leaders of the UCC, intimated that the divisions were starting to alarm people both in and outside the Ukrainian-Canadian community:

The Banderites and Melnykites are locking horns on Canadian soil. They certainly are going at each other with typical Ukrainian vigour. No quarter is given by any side . . . We who are on the sidelines have quite a bit of fun watching them. There is spying and counterspying . . . It seems that the Ukrainians have some years to grow before they start reaching the age of maturity. This is not concealed from other people.

(Cited in Luciuk, 1991: 120)

When the Banderite and Melnykite factions of the OUN took over an existing organization, they marginalized members of the diaspora who had earlier worked on their behalf, thereby increasing the tensions and hostility. For instance, the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, an organization which was founded in part by Bohdan Panchuk, was eventually taken over by Banderites, who promptly expelled Panchuk from his position as second president (Luciuk, 1991: 119).

Conclusion

The events surrounding the movement of displaced persons to North America had consequences that are relevant to a number of issues that Cohen (1997) raises in his conceptual discussion of diaspora. First, despite the social and political chaos in Europe at the end of the war, and despite the terror caused by the forced repatriations back to the Soviet Union, the displaced persons' camps were sites of tremendous creativity. Because of state repression of Ukrainian language and culture in both eastern and western Ukraine in the 1930s, few Ukrainians could publicly be Ukrainian without significant political repercussions. But once repatriation to the Soviet Union stopped, displaced persons took advantage of the liberties that camp life afforded and produced a dynamic and vibrant cultural, intellectual and political life. Second, like earlier waves of migration, some of the displaced persons only became conscious of their ethnic identity while in the diaspora. Some of the eastern Ukrainians who would not have recognized themselves as Ukrainian while they were living in Soviet Ukraine were exposed to the Ukrainian culture, language and religion while in the camps. When they emigrated, they carried their new, and politicized, ethnic identities with them. Third, the existing diaspora mobilized in support of Ukrainian refugees in war-torn Europe. Clearly, raising money, lobbying governments and organizing the details of further migration to North America and elsewhere reflected a sense of solidarity with, and commitment to, a larger imagined community that at least initially was not limited by national boundaries or political ideology.

However, the migration of displaced persons to North America also reveals troubling problems with the concept of diaspora. The arrival of co-ethnics did not necessarily lead to a stronger, more united and coherent diaspora. In fact, during the postwar years, the diaspora was divided between socialists and communists, and between longer-settled nationalists and their descendants who, in turn, were made up of a combination of labor migrants and political refugees who had begun to accommodate themselves to life in the diaspora. It was also fractured by the new political refugees, for whom the struggle for an independent Ukraine, and eventual return, were the most important priorities of organized diaspora life. In other words, a common ethnicity was not enough in itself to bring Ukrainians in the diaspora together into a coherent and united front.

THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF THE POSTWAR DIASPORA

In 1976, a noted Ukrainian-Canadian academic provided the following 'insider's' account of the organized Ukrainian diaspora community:

What . . . is not evident to outsiders is the enervating disunity on the inside with the many splinter groups and, even more seriously, the lack of interest which Canadian-born youth have in the numerous organizations of their fathers. As a result, the Ukrainian community in Canada is top heavy with leadership, and everywhere one finds sincere, honest, and hardworking 'generals' in search of an army. The whole scene is rather bizarre, even surrealistic. The myriad of organizations and all the trappings of power and position give the leaders the illusion of power. There is much convocation and disputation which bears little fruit because the membership is largely 'the same old gang', and worse still the chronic shortage of funds makes any sustained, long-term co-ordination of efforts in a country as large as Canada very expensive, even if the will to co-operate could be found.

(Lupul, 1976: 279)

This kind of assessment of post-World War II ethnic organizational life is not unique to the Ukrainian diaspora in Canada. Indeed, similar laments can be found in other places where members of the Ukrainian diaspora have settled, and in the reflections of leaders of other ethnic groups. While this particular characterization may be unduly harsh, it does point to the proclivity of the Ukrainian diaspora to form organizations. There is no comparative research that examines whether the formation of multiple and overlapping organizations is unique to the Ukrainian diaspora. There may, however, be a sociological explanation for this social fact. For most of the twentieth century Ukraine was not a 'real' country. Much of its economic, political and cultural life was controlled from foreign capitals, and in

Polish-dominated Ukraine before World War II Ukrainians had few opportunities to participate in public decision-making. Their exclusion from government led Ukrainians to develop a tradition of participation in a variety of civil-society institutions such as churches, reading rooms and cultural organizations (Glazer, 1980: 9). Certainly, care needs to be taken to avoid simplistic 'transplanted culture' formulations of diaspora community formation (Li, 1988). At the same time, however, like other immigrant groups, Ukrainians did undoubtedly bring elements of their traditions, cultures and religions with them into the diaspora (Bociurkiw, 1992). In the case of Ukrainians, the traditions of self-help and participation in civil society were coupled with a sense of obligation to maintain and preserve some of the central elements of what were defined as ethnicity: religion, language, culture and historical memory. Since these were being actively suppressed in Soviet Ukraine, organizational life in the postwar Ukrainian diaspora developed, at least in part, within a political subtext, which involved the definition of the diaspora as the 'last stand' of Ukrainian language and culture.

This chapter examines how the formation of, and participation in, organizations were the means by which ethnic identity and ethnic group boundaries were developed and sustained in the North American Ukrainian diaspora after World War II. The Ukrainian diaspora organizations pursued a mixture of instrumental and expressive goals that helped, directly and indirectly, to sustain ethnic identity and ethnic group boundaries. Their activities reflected integration into North American society but at the same time the maintenance of a sense of ethnic distinctiveness with particular links to the homeland.

The chapter begins with a discussion of the concept of institutional completeness and suggests that the postwar Ukrainian diaspora was and to a certain extent continues to be, a fractured entity. While the differences between the different generations, between nationalists and leftists, and between the Catholic and Orthodox churches have lessened in recent years, divisiveness was a hallmark of the Ukrainian diaspora during much of the postwar period. However, despite the existence of various kinds of divisions, a number of efforts have been made to unite segments of the diaspora. These efforts have included the formation of umbrella organizations and, more recently, Internet web sites and discussion groups. In terms of the earlier conceptual discussion of diaspora, the attempts to unite different organizations under larger corporate structures reflect a continuing desire on the part of Ukrainians in the diaspora to achieve some level of co-ethnic inter-organizational and international solidarity, a continuing attachment to the ancestral homeland, and an ethnic group consciousness that has been sustained over time.

Institutional completeness and the maintenance of ethnic boundaries

There are many informal ways that individuals participate in ethnic community narratives in their everyday lives. Ethnic community life takes place on the street, in cafés and grocery stores, in dentists' chairs, lawyers' offices and doctors' waiting rooms. Most North American cities do not have identifiable Ukrainian enclaves like the highly commercialized 'Little Italys', 'Greektowns' or 'Chinatowns', but in towns that have more than a handful of Ukrainians it is usually possible to find butchers, bakers, book shops and restaurants that cater to people who define themselves as Ukrainians. Furthermore, many communities have entrepreneurial dentists, lawyers and real estate agents who use their Ukrainian heritage or knowledge of the language as a resource.¹ In late December and early January, community periodicals contain numerous bilingual and unilingual Christmas and New Year's greetings from professionals and business owners in the hope that the warm ties of ethnicity during the holidays will carry over into the marketplace at other times of the year.

In addition to the ways in which Ukrainians reinforce and draw on the ties of ethnicity through participation in an ethnic economy, ethnic identities and the boundaries of diaspora community life are also developed through ethnic organizations. The sociologist Raymond Breton (1964) developed the concept of institutional completeness to explain how ethnic boundaries and identities are established, maintained and undermined. Breton suggested that ethnic group boundaries are maintained through both formal and informal institutions and organizations. Such organizations not only provide a place for social interaction, but they also express, and help to create and recreate, shared meanings associated with ethnic identity. Institutional completeness therefore refers to the extent to which an ethnic community has its own set of institutions that help its members realize their needs and aspirations (Breton, 1964).

Building on these observations, Isajiw (1999) makes a distinction between expressive and instrumental ethnic organizations. Organizations, in his view, differ in the functions they perform in the ethnic community. Expressive organizations 'are those whose activities are aimed at expression and cultivation of a group's identity' (Isajiw, 1999: 214). These organizations tend to support a variety of cultural, educational and recreational activities. The activities of instrumental organizations, on the other hand, concentrate 'either [on] adapting members of the group to the larger society or [on] gaining for the minority group some increased benefits or certain rights and recognition from the larger society' (Isajiw, 1999: 215). As Isajiw recognizes, it is often difficult to separate the two

kinds of activities within a particular organization, for instrumental organizations often sponsor expressive activities and expressive organizations often pursue instrumental goals. While useful as a heuristic device, it is difficult to use these definitions to distinguish strictly between different kinds of organizations.

It is, moreover, difficult to find empirical research on the institutional completeness of the Ukrainian diaspora in a single country (Anderson, 1976: 108), let alone research that compares institutional completeness of Ukrainians in different countries and Ukrainians with other diasporas. Superficially, there are hundreds of Ukrainian organizations in the diaspora. But simple counts of the number of organizations can give a misleading picture of organizational vitality (Anderson, 1976). As in most other ethnic diaspora communities, the active participants in organizations are often only a small proportion of the total diaspora (Anderson, 1976: 108–9; Dershowitz, 1997). Furthermore, as noted in the introduction, some organizations consist of not much more than a leader and a few diehard members.² There are, however, a number of countries where the organizational life of the diaspora is both more vibrant and varied. The largest number of, and the most active, diaspora organizations are in Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Britain, Canada, France and the United States.³ Rather than discuss individual organizations in detail, which would be impossible, it is more meaningful to provide a broad overview of the kinds of organizations that exist in the North American diaspora.⁴

Churches

The organized religious life of Ukrainians in Ukraine and in the diaspora is extraordinarily complex. Unlike other diaspora communities that are at least nominally united by adherence to a single religion, members of the Ukrainian diaspora belong to various branches of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the Uniate (or Ukrainian Catholic Church), the Roman Catholic Church and a variety of Protestant denominations (see Isajiw and Makuch, 1994: 329; Markus and Wolowyna, 1994: 380–6; Maruniak, 1994: 257; Jenkala, 1994: 296–7; Seneta, 1994: 476–7 for selected country statistics). Historically, Ukrainian Catholicism and Ukrainian Orthodoxy have been the dominant religions in the Ukrainian diaspora, as they were in Ukraine, but the Roman Catholic Church and certain Protestant denominations appear to be growing at the expense of the Uniates and the Orthodox church (Isajiw and Makuch, 1994: 329, 337).

A thumbnail sketch of the history of Christianity in Ukraine can be provided by marking a number of important dates. A thousand years ago (in AD 988), the Ukrainian Grand Prince Volodymyr the Great looked to

Byzantium and adopted Christianity as the state religion. After the Great Schism of 1054, which split the Christian world into western (Roman Catholic) and eastern (Orthodox) churches, Ukrainians tended to side with Constantinople. At the Council of Brest in 1596, however, 'the Ukrainian Church united with Rome, on the condition that it would retain the eastern rite, its own metropolies and episcopates, the Julian calendar, and the right of clergy to marry if they chose' (Pawliczko, 1994: 37). This move led to the emergence of an enduring split between the Uniate and Orthodox believers on Ukrainian territory. Followers of eastern Orthodoxy were convinced that Ukrainian Uniates would eventually become Latinized and 'assimilated' into Roman Catholicism; Uniates believed that their association with Rome would help consolidate the power and position of their church on Ukrainian territory. Both churches, however, were eventually faced with repression from the Russian Empire. In 1686, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was subordinated to the Russian Orthodox Church, and in 1839 the Uniate Church in the Russian Empire was abolished and believers were forced to convert to Russian Orthodoxy. The Uniate Church was, however, able to exist under Austrian rule in Galicia in western Ukraine. After the fall of the Russian Empire in 1917, supporters of Ukrainian Orthodoxy were able to establish the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, but it was eventually dissolved by Soviet authorities in 1930, when its leaders were exiled or imprisoned (Luzhnytsky, 1987). After the Soviet occupation of western Ukraine in 1939, the Ukrainian Catholic Church was outlawed and church property was confiscated. When the Soviets reasserted control over western Ukraine in 1945, they arrested and imprisoned thousands of Ukrainian Catholic priests, monks, nuns and followers in Siberia, and forcibly merged the Church with Russian Orthodoxy (Lencyk, 1987).

Although both the Ukrainian Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholic churches led an underground existence in Soviet Ukraine after World War II, both were sustained by Ukrainian immigrants and their descendants in the diaspora. In many ways, however, the kinds of disputes that took place between Uniates and Orthodox after the Council of Brest in 1596 were reproduced when Ukrainian immigrants arrived in the diaspora. Ukrainian Catholics have had disagreements with Roman Catholic authorities over issues like married clergy and the place of the Byzantine rite in church services; Ukrainian Orthodox believers are divided over questions of autonomy and affiliation with larger Orthodox bodies; and Ukrainian Catholics and Ukrainian Orthodox believers have been at odds over which church is the more authentic 'Ukrainian' church.

During the twentieth century, much of the social life, and much of the maintenance of the ethnic identity of the non-communist diaspora

revolved around either the Ukrainian Orthodox Church or the Ukrainian Catholic Church (Yuzyk, 1982; Baran, 1992). Many parishes offered, and continue to offer, Saturday language schools and Sunday schools for the religious education of children. Many also have their own church halls that serve as venues for many of the symbolic and expressive activities and rituals that occur within the ethnic community such as 'plays, lectures, banquets, dances' and weddings (Markus and Wolowyna, 1994: 381). Churches also have their own seminaries where they train future clergy, and residences where young people can live while attending university. Most of them have choirs, as well as youth, women's and seniors' branches which organize various kinds of events; over the years women and seniors have been very successful in raising money for their churches by selling painted Easter eggs, other crafts and folk art, and popular Ukrainian food.

Like many other organized religions, the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox churches in the diaspora are deeply concerned about their futures, as congregations are faced with declining church attendance, difficulty in recruiting new members, and the aging membership (see, for example, Krawchenko, 2000 and Hadzewycz, 1998).

Leftists

Since the 1950s, left-leaning diaspora organizations have been in decline. In the US and Canada, the influence that left-wing organizations had during World War II diminished as the Cold War dragged on. At times, individuals and organizations on the left became targets of government surveillance on the suspicion that their support for the Soviet Union called into question their loyalty to their countries of settlement (Whitaker, 1987; Andrew and Mitrokhin, 2000: 373-4). The break-up of the Soviet Union and the hasty transformation of former communists into democrats and champions of market economics dealt a near fatal blow to left-wing diaspora organizations that had sung the praises of the Soviet system for more than half a century.

It would, however, be unfair to characterize postwar leftist organizations as completely moribund and ineffectual. In 1947, Ukrainian socialists in Canada and the United States raised over \$300,000 to buy gifts, food, clothes and medicine for war orphans in Ukraine. In Canada, the socialist Canadian Society for Cultural Relations with Ukraine collected some 5000 English-language books for Ukrainian universities (Krawchuk, 1996: 252). Their biggest successes, however, were in forging and maintaining contacts with Soviet Ukraine during the height of the Cold War. For the diaspora left, the promotion of Ukrainian culture and language was a symbolic recognition of their continuing solidarity with Soviet Ukraine.

Organizations on the left cultivated relations with Soviet Ukrainian artists and intellectuals in order to build international solidarity and counter the allegations that Ukrainian language and culture were being repressed. The left hosted a variety of artists, dance troupes and musical ensembles in order to demonstrate that the Ukrainian language and culture were thriving in Soviet Ukraine (Krawchenko, 1984). The cultivation of these relations also allowed for a certain amount of travel to Ukraine, though visitors were not allowed to travel to western Ukrainian villages around Ternopil, Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Chernivtsi and Rivne. In Peter Krawchuk's terms:

Many delegations from Ukraine visited Canada, and hundreds of Ukrainian Canadians . . . visited Soviet Ukraine in various delegations or as its representatives at various festive holidays and conferences. Scores of Ukrainian[-Canadian] students studied in the higher institutes of learning in Ukraine (conservatories, choreographic institutes, universities), numerous Ukrainian writers, composers, artists, and painters came to Canada as tourists or as guests of [our organizations]. A number of choreographic seminars were held in Canada and Kiev [Kyiv], instructed by Soviet Ukrainian choreographers and dancers. Scores of concerts were presented in Canadian cities by noted artists-soloists from Ukraine.

(Krawchuk, 1996: 256)

The Ukrainian Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (which became known as the Ukraina Society and which is widely believed to have been a KGB front organization whose mission was to spy on the diaspora) donated various statues and sculptures of Ukrainian poets and writers to diaspora socialist organizations. As Chapter 6 examines in more detail, many of these activities were controversial and brought the socialists into conflict with the anti-Soviet groups in the diaspora. These visits and events did, however, temporarily help raise the prestige of their organizations.

At the same time, though, the left never displayed the same organizational vitality that it had had in the first half of the twentieth century. Even though the postwar nationalists were fractured by their own divisions, they tended to be united in their opposition to communism and were very hostile towards leftist diaspora supporters of the Soviet regime.⁵ It is unclear whether it was the nationalist opposition to leftists, or postwar economic prosperity that took the wind out of the sails of the diaspora left. Despite benefiting from secret financial support from the KGB in Moscow

(Andrew and Mitrokhin and 2000: 374), and despite putting on a brave public face, by the 1970s diaspora communists began to acknowledge that their days were numbered. At a 1970 meeting of the National Executive Committee of the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians, for example, the national secretary delivered a sobering assessment of the organization's prospects:

We cannot seriously speak of stabilization and balance. Rather it is correct to indicate a constant active tendency of imbalance against growth, in other words, against the numerical strengthening of the organization which, in turn, reveals a tendency to the physical weakening of the organization. It is necessary to indicate that the tendency to the numerical decrease in our organization is not new . . . We will also touch very briefly on a generally widespread uneasiness which is often expressed through questions such as: 'How long will our organization continue to exist? What are its prospects or has it any prospects whatsoever for further work? Is it needed and so on'. These questions exist in the ranks of the older as well as the younger generation . . . In comparison with the press campaigns, the branches worked with significantly less success in the organization campaigns which we conduct annually for the financing of our diverse activities and . . . the recruitment of new members . . . In a number of localities there have been changes for the worse. The general result of these changes is such that in a number of branches even the lowered quotas for the organization fund are not fulfilled . . . With this we wish to make it known that the general inflow of organizational funds . . . for the work of the Central Executive Committee and the provincial committees has diminished and there are no prospects for increasing them . . .

(Cited in Kolasky, 1988: 119)

One way that at least some on the left are currently trying to address this organizational decline is to redefine the history of their support and involvement with Soviet Ukraine (Krawchuk, 1996: 257). As archives in post-Soviet societies have been opened (Andrew and Mitrokhin, 2000), and as Ukrainians and others have begun to speak and write more freely about oppression during Soviet times, even the leftists in the diaspora have started to acknowledge the truth of what had earlier been written off as Cold War, anti-Soviet propaganda, and they are now trying to distance themselves from the old Soviet regime. For instance, a long-time activist argued that:

it is clear that the leaders of the Ukrainian labor-farmer organizations in Canada 'did not accept as laudable' everything that was happening in Soviet Ukraine. True, not all of this was announced publicly, it circulated internally within the AUUC, which left the impression that all the manifest violations in Ukraine as regards the status of the Ukrainian language, national culture and civil rights, were submissively accepted by the AUUC leadership.

(Krawchuk, 1996: 264)

In a recent interview, Yuriy Moscal, the current president of the AUUC, echoed this sentiment, suggesting rather disingenuously that in 'communicating with Ukraine that was part of the Soviet empire at that time, we never shared *bilshovyk* [Bolshevik] ideology. And, certainly, we never desired to inherit it . . . Therefore, those accusing us of adherence to communist ideology are mistaken. We were developing ties not with them but with the people of Ukraine' (anon., n.d.).

Nationalists

As noted in the introduction to this chapter, the proclivity of post-war émigrés to form organizations was partly rooted in a lack of opportunity to participate in the political life of western Ukrainian society. However, it may also have been due to the émigrés' diminished social status after they emigrated (Isajiw, 1979: 92). Even though many of them arrived in the diaspora with a university education, because their degrees were foreign and their English halting, they had few opportunities for social mobility. For these declassed immigrants, ethnic organizations offered the means for reclaiming lost status, prestige and self-respect (Isajiw, 1979: 93).

In addition, when they arrived in the diaspora, particularly in North America, the postwar refugees found the previous waves of Ukrainians too complacent, too comfortably ensconced in their lives in the diaspora, and too dissociated from the harsh realities of life in both Polish and Soviet-occupied Ukraine to be of much use in the struggle for Ukraine's liberation. Their disappointment with longer-settled members of the organized diaspora community led them either to start their own or take over existing organizations in the diaspora. In fairly short order, representatives of both the Banderite and Melnykite factions of the OUN established their own youth wings, women's organizations, dance ensembles, orchestras, veterans' associations, newspapers and fundraising arms.⁶ The differences between the Banderite and Melnykite wings of the OUN, along with other nationalist-oriented groups, split many Ukrainian diaspora communities.

Each faction liked to portray itself as the vanguard of the Ukrainian

cause. In Canada the Melnykite faction of the OUN took over the Ukrainian National Federation, which had been formed in 1932 by first- and second-wave immigrants in Alberta. According to a member's account of the activities of the Hamilton, Ontario, branch of the UNF, in the first fifty years of its operation (1935–85), they

organized approximately 300 concerts, over 400 theatrical performances, over 200 lectures and addresses, sponsored various fund-raising campaigns, e.g., Ukrainian war invalids, political prisoners, Carpatho-Ukraine, the Canadian Red Cross, Ukrainian refugees in Europe and the like. The branch also arranged several rallies, protesting against Soviet oppression in Ukraine, and sent numerous telegrams to the federal government in defense of political prisoners in the USSR.

(Fedorowycz, 1988: 135)

Not to be outdone, a similar picture of organizational vitality was presented by the Banderite Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine. In the 1980s the League boasted '57 branches across Canada with 38 in Ontario, and between 10,000–12,000 members, supporters and sympathizers'. Like the Ukrainian National Federation, the League published its own newspaper, *Homin Ukrainy*, and had women's, youth and veterans' sections. 'The success story of the Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine', according to past president Oleh Romanyshyn (1988: 158), 'is due primarily to its monolithic nature, its internal organizational program, community activities and political activism'. In his account of the League's activities in Ontario, Romanyshyn reported that the number of local, provincial, regional and national conferences 'may easily reach 100' for the period 1949–88. In the same period, it published in both Ukrainian and English 'some ninety brochures and monographs' on Ukrainian history, politics and culture 'for use in its community and external political activities'. On the national and local branch levels, the League and the Women's Association 'have engaged in 3000–3500 community and political action projects since 1950'. These projects ranged from lobbying the Canadian government to introducing Ukrainian language programming in certain radio stations, organizing anti-Soviet rallies and demonstrations and protesting human rights abuses in Ukraine.

Even though these kinds of self-congratulatory portrayals painted pictures of organizational strength and vigor, critical assessments have pointed to a number of structural problems in the organizations. First, because of ideological divisions, it was difficult to pool resources to pursue collective interests. In the 1960s and 1970s, it was not uncommon for the

two groups to hold separate celebrations or commemorations for the same person, anniversary or historical event, even when they were held on the same day and in the same town.⁷ Second, and more seriously, the antagonisms that first developed in Europe in the 1930s and 1940s held little interest for many of the children of the displaced persons, and for the prewar immigrants and their descendants. The organizations therefore had considerable difficulty attracting members of the diaspora who were not part of the relatively small circle of first-generation postwar émigrés (Isajiw, 1979).⁸ In 1981, for instance, this problem was a topic of discussion at a 'weekend of sharing and communication' for leaders of Ukrainian-American youth organizations. According to a *Ukrainian Weekly* report, community divisiveness has:

turned off a lot of potentially active members. It's enough that we have assimilation contributing to our declining membership – today many young people are so disillusioned by the inter-organizational party squabbles, that they completely drop out of the Ukrainian community . . . If only those waging the quarrels realized what a dire effect their actions will have on the future of our community – we, the youth have to contend with the repercussions . . . There are so many factions, that allying oneself with any particular group only becomes counterproductive. Sometimes, I wish that Ukrainians could cut through all of the cumbersome stereotypes of the various political and religious camps, and get to the urgent issue.

(Quoted in Kuropas, 1996: 593)⁹

Third, the organizations' focus on symbols and on arguments about which group was most committed to the Ukrainian cause, led them to neglect concrete instrumental goals. According to Isajiw:

quite often it appears that the goal of many organizational activities is not so much to achieve a pragmatic solution to any specific problem as it is to have the names of the participants included in the ethnic papers so that they may be aggrandized by the community. This perhaps also explains the strongly non-instrumental character of most organizations of the new immigration.

(Isajiw, 1979: 93)

Fourth, and perhaps most important, for many of the organizations dominated by the postwar Ukrainian victim diaspora, fluency in Ukrainian

was one of the main markers of Ukrainian ethnic identity (Jupp, 1993: 20). Being Ukrainian, or at least being a 'good Ukrainian', meant being able to speak the language. The use of Ukrainian language fluency as a marker of ethnic identity and commitment to an ancestral homeland was arguably a strength of the postwar victim diaspora, for, as Benedict Anderson (1983) notes, nations are imagined communities, and one of the ways that group boundaries are maintained is through the use of a common language. In that respect, the continued use of Ukrainian was a means by which an attachment to ethnicity was made visible.

There were, however, costs to the use of language fluency as a marker of ethnicity, particularly in organizations dominated by postwar DPs. As noted earlier, many displaced persons were able to live in a nearly completely Ukrainian linguistic environment and so did not find it necessary to become fluent in the language of their adopted countries (Isajiw, 1979). Moreover, when fluency in the language was the main marker of ethnic authenticity and commitment to 'the Ukrainian cause', those who could not, or would not, maintain their language were often made to feel that they were letting the side down, and were less Ukrainian, by more fluent and committed members of organizations (Markus and Wolowyna, 1994: 403). The inability to converse fluently in Ukrainian led many second and later generations of Ukrainians to disengage from the organized diaspora life (Isajiw, 1979). Thus, while social closure around language ability helped to maintain a sense of identity and group boundaries for the post-war immigrant generation, it also helped to undermine the long-term viability of these organizations.

In his recommendations to the Ukrainian diaspora community in Australia in the early 1990s, James Jupp (1993: 29) argued that the adoption of a non-exclusive approach to defining ethnic group identity and boundaries is the key to the long-term survival of Ukrainian diaspora organizations. In his view, it is important that organizations accept some aspects of cultural change, including loss of language, and not set unrealistic standards of Ukrainian purity which will only alienate the locally born who are not fluent in Ukrainian.

Other organizations have seen the writing on the wall and have either become bilingual or use the language of their host society exclusively. They have done this to accommodate and attract people who do not speak Ukrainian well but who still think of themselves as Ukrainian and who are interested in taking part in organized community life. However, the adoption of a less exclusive approach to Ukrainian ethnicity is controversial. The *Ukrainian News*, one of the main Ukrainian diaspora newspapers in Canada, which currently publishes articles in both Ukrainian and English, is considering whether it should become an entirely English-

language publication. The rationale for the change is that most people of Ukrainian descent in Canada are no longer fluent in Ukrainian, and that by becoming an all-English publication it will reach a wider audience.

In an editorial in favor of further anglicizing the Canadian newspaper, the *Ukrainian Weekly*, which is published in New Jersey, argued against maintaining a definition of Ukrainianness that was rooted in fluency in Ukrainian. The editorial reminded its readers that when the Ukrainian National Association began publishing the English-language *Ukrainian Weekly* in 1933, its aim was to ‘inculcate’ into Ukrainian-American youth ‘the idea that, as Americans of Ukrainian descent, they are duty-bound to help their kinsmen in foreign occupied and oppressed Ukraine to win the national freedom for which they have been fighting and sacrificing for so many years’ (*Ukrainian Weekly*, August 1, 1999: 6). In arguing that Ukrainian identity should be uncoupled from fluency in the Ukrainian language, the editorial suggested that furthering the ‘Ukrainian cause’ should not be confined to those who are fluent in Ukrainian. In fact, it offered something of a primordial view of the nature of Ukrainianness when it suggested that the founding of the paper

demonstrated the belief that, in and of itself, language is not a determinant of one’s identification or concerns for one’s nation or homeland. The paper . . . became a pioneer in propagating the idea that one did not have to speak, read and write Ukrainian to be Ukrainian, that what mattered most was what was in one’s heart and mind. In doing so it preserved and sustained generations of Ukrainian Americans as influential members of our community.

(*Ukrainian Weekly*, August 1, 1999: 6)

While the issue of the Canadian newspaper remains unresolved, empirical research is probably on the side of anglicizing the paper. Despite the successes that the diaspora has had in teaching the Ukrainian language to its members it has not been able to stem what some sociologists see as the inevitable and irreversible decline in mother-tongue fluency among second and later generations of ethnic groups (Nahirny and Fishman, 1976; Anderson, 1976). There are, of course, debates about whether the descendants of immigrants ‘reject’, ‘return’ to or ‘rediscover’ the ethnicity of the immigrant generation (Isajiw, 1999). However, the reality is that fluency in, and use of, the Ukrainian language has declined by generation (Anderson, 1976; O’Bryan, Reitz and Kuplowska, 1976; Chumak-Horbatsch, 1999), although a number of factors can moderate the decline.

Even though subsequent generations may not be as fluent in Ukrainian

as their parents and grandparents, language is only one element of ethnic identity (Anderson, 1976; Isajiw, 1999). While use of, and fluency in, Ukrainian is on the decline in the diaspora, many diaspora Ukrainians nevertheless are strongly committed to maintaining the language and feel that its loss is a serious problem for the community (Reitz and Ashton, 1980: 43–4). Similarly, other aspects of Ukrainian ethnic identity have been maintained through the generations (Breton *et al.*, 1990: 82–6). Research conducted in Toronto in the late 1970s showed, for example, that even when they have lost the language, third-generation Ukrainians maintain certain Ukrainian customs, eat Ukrainian food and possess articles that reflect their ethnicity identity. Furthermore, Ukrainian dancing schools and choirs are flourishing. Some families with virtually no other connection to the organized Ukrainian community still send their children to learn the *hopak*, *kolomeyka* and other Ukrainian dances, and men and women who know only a smattering of Ukrainian join Ukrainian choirs and take courses in traditional Ukrainian cookery (Klymkiw, 2000).

Thus, many second and subsequent generations of Ukrainians in the diaspora continue to have a Ukrainian identity and feel that their Ukrainian heritage is important to them (Breton *et al.*, 1990: 82–6), even when they may not be fluent in the language. This ‘symbolic ethnicity’ is sometimes dismissed by those who are more active in organized community life, but organizations must be able to accommodate this non-fluent majority if they are to sustain themselves.

Fraternal benefit societies and credit unions

In the United States, ethnically based fraternal benefit societies play a larger role than in any other country of the Ukrainian diaspora. In the mid-1970s, four such societies had a combined membership of 130,000 and \$59 million in assets (Werstman, 1976: 122). ‘Fraternals’ were founded in the late nineteenth century in the United States by first-wave immigrants as mutual-benefit societies. Gradually they expanded into full-fledged insurance societies that now offer a variety of products to their members. As their membership and resources grew, their activity and influence extended into other aspects of community life. The Ukrainian National Association (UNA) continues to publish two community newspapers, the Ukrainian-language *Svoboda* and the English-language *Ukrainian Weekly*. In the 1960s, among other things, it helped raise funds for the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, the erection of a monument to Taras Shevchenko in Washington, DC, and the publication of an English-language encyclopedia of Ukraine (Werstman, 1976: 116). In 1952, the UNA purchased an estate in New York’s Catskill mountains, just on the

edge of the 'borscht belt' of holiday resorts. The Ukrainian Workingmen's Association bought the Verkovyna Resort Center shortly afterwards. Each resort has accommodation for adults, church chapels, swimming pools, cultural pavilions and summer camps that provide a Ukrainian cultural environment for children (Werstman, 1976: 105; Kuropas, 1996: 397). The Ukrainian Fraternal Association publishes the journal *Ukrainian Forum*, helps raise money for Chernobyl relief, and now owns the Verkovyna resort.

The fraternalists are also concerned about organizational sustainability, partly because of changes in the regulations governing the insurance industry in the United States. Membership in the UNA, for instance, peaked in the early 1970s at about 89,000; by 1994, it had declined to just under 64,000. One of the major problems is how to attract the 'uninterested' generation of Ukrainian Americans between twenty-five and forty-five (Kuropas, 1996: 628, 638). Other signs of organizational stress are that *Svoboda* went from daily to weekly publication in the mid-1990s, largely as the result of a cost-cutting measure. More recently, the *Ukrainian Weekly* let its Toronto correspondent go, again for financial reasons. The decision provoked an outcry from both sides of the border, because many Ukrainian Americans see Toronto as the heart and soul of the North American Ukrainian diaspora. However, Canadian subscriptions do not appear to be high enough to justify sustaining the position, and it does not appear that many people dug into their pockets to fund the Toronto bureau. There have also been discussions within the UNA about whether it should sell *Soyuzivka*, which has been running at a deficit for several years and is a drain on UNA resources. A younger generation has been recruited into the leadership of the organization and the hope is that they will be able to turn the situation around.

Professional organizations

Even though first-generation Ukrainian immigrants in each of the first three waves of migration were subject to a certain amount of discrimination and downward mobility when they arrived in the diaspora, later generations have been able to move up in the socio-economic hierarchy and into a variety of professional, academic and managerial positions in both the public and the private sectors (see, for example, Markus and Wolowyna, 1994, 370–1; Isajiw and Makuch, 1994: 330).

Ukrainians who are successful in their professions have created associations that blend their professional interests and expertise with their identity as members of the Ukrainian diaspora. Thus, within the diaspora there are Ukrainian organizations that represent journalists, physicians,

engineers, pharmacists, writers, architects, visual and theatre artists, university professors, teachers, accountants, librarians and lawyers.¹⁰ The majority of these associations are in Canada and the United States, but they also exist in Australia, Britain and France.

One of the more recent additions to the landscape of Ukrainian professional organizations is the Hollywood Trident Group. Made up of Ukrainian Americans who are in the entertainment industry, it has a mandate not unlike that of other professional organizations insofar as it displays an interest in promoting a combination of career, diaspora and relevant Ukrainian interests. At its inaugural meeting in Los Angeles in December 1999, its preliminary operational agenda was:

to gather together in one association members interested in promoting Ukrainian values and interests in Hollywood; to help create and promote more film, television programs and music which contain Ukrainian content, or are written, produced, directed or acted in by people interested in Ukrainian affairs; to support each other in the pursuit of career objectives in Hollywood; and to help the entertainment industry in Ukraine.

(Kaspersky, 1999: 3)

Membership in these organizations ranges from a handful to several hundred. Despite their relatively small size, they represent new and important ways of being Ukrainian in the diaspora. They also seem to be the most active, most successful in recruiting and retaining members, and most involved in providing assistance to Ukraine. In fact, their vitality is often seen as a challenge to some of the longer-standing nationalist organizations. 'Aid to Ukraine', in John Gregorovich's (1993: 81) terms,

is increasingly being organized by professionals and business people, many of whom have no Ukrainian ancestry or interests or, even if they are of Ukrainian heritage, are not active in any . . . [community] body. Are these professionals, community activists, and academics likely to conclude that where there is unity there is strength? Will they eventually form a new Ukrainian Canadian organization truly able and ready to represent their community before the external world? The answer is obviously, yes. The only unanswered question is when.

There are a number of reasons for the relative success of these organizations. They have been able to blend their members' professional skills with their continuing interest in, and identity as, members of the Ukrainian

diaspora. The members realize, for instance, that simply being of Ukrainian descent does not automatically qualify a person to provide sensible and useful assistance to Ukraine, and that they need to use their professional skills in order to work with, and seek funding from, government and non-governmental organizations. Furthermore, these organizations are less concerned with political ideology and fighting the battles of the past. The political divisions between different factions of the OUN seem to have little meaning for second and later generations in the diaspora. Though the duplication of organizational activities is still something of an issue within professional organizations, and while occasional splits and factions emerge, they do not tend to correspond to the older divisions that characterized the postwar wave of émigrés. Finally, these organizations seem less troubled by the loss of the Ukrainian language than the nationalist organizations. The ability to speak Ukrainian fluently is not, for them, the only significant marker of ethnic identity. They are therefore more willing to conduct business in English or the language of their country of settlement. Simply put, these organizations realize that people are not going to join if they cannot communicate with others, or are made to feel less Ukrainian because they cannot speak the language.

Diaspora academic life

Since the Ukrainian Revolution of the early 1920s, the diaspora has sought to lend legitimacy to the struggle for an independent Ukrainian state by promoting Ukrainian studies as an academic discipline. Between 1920 and the 1960s, the centers of Ukrainian studies were in Germany and Czechoslovakia in various gymnasia, institutes and scholarly societies. By the 1960s, this had shifted to North America and, to a certain extent, Australia (Marvan, 1986, 135; Wynar, 1992).

In many countries, people of Ukrainian descent have penetrated the ivory tower. Most academics with Ukrainian backgrounds work in areas or on topics that are not directly related to their ethnicity, but there is an active group of diaspora scholars who have placed various aspects of Ukrainian language, culture, history and the diaspora, at the center of their scholarly research. Some are affiliated with centers or institutes of Ukrainian studies; others conduct their research within the traditional disciplines and departments.¹¹

The Ukrainian diaspora participates in, and supports, a variety of university and non-university based research institutes and activities. Perhaps the most significant freestanding scholarly organization in the diaspora is the Shevchenko Scientific Society. The Society was founded in Lviv in December 1873, but because of war and various phases of Polish,

Soviet and Nazi repression, it was forced for much of its existence to promote scholarship on Ukrainian topics from the underground. During periods of repression, much of its property, archival and museum holdings, and scholarly acquisitions were confiscated and destroyed. In the Soviet Union during World War II, membership in the organization constituted grounds for imprisonment or deportation.

The Society was revived in 1947 in Munich by displaced persons. As Ukrainians left Germany to settle in the west, chapters appeared in the United States in 1947, in Canada in 1949 and in Australia in 1950. The executive, archives and library were eventually transferred to France, where they remain today. In 1991 the Society was reactivated on Ukrainian territory with the opening of a branch in Lviv. There are also branches in Poland and Slovakia.

Between 1873 and 1939 the Society published nearly 600 serial volumes, 352 monographs, textbooks and maps, over one hundred books of literary journalism and several informational publications (*Ukrainian Weekly*, September 20, 1998). The various chapters continue to promote scholarship about Ukraine and Ukrainians. The American branch has co-published a number of Ukrainian dictionaries and anthologies of Ukrainian literature. It also sponsored the publication of *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*, a 500-page edited collection that contains a detailed account of diaspora Ukrainian communities. The Society also promoted the publication of two English-language encyclopedias: *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* and *The Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. It is currently preparing an encyclopedia of Ukrainians in the diaspora in Ukrainian. The aim is to publish a separate volume for each continent where Ukrainians live. The Society also sponsors lectures, colloquia and scholarly conferences in both Ukrainian and English.¹²

The organized diaspora also helps support university-based academic institutes, programs and chairs of study. The most prominent institutes are the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute (HURI), which was founded in June, 1973, and the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS) at the University of Alberta. There are also Ukrainian Studies programs at Monash and Macquarie universities in Australia and chairs of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Toronto and the University of Ottawa.

HURI has three endowed chairs in Ukrainian Studies that are divided between the departments of history and Slavic languages and literature. The chairs and the Institute exist, in part, because of a significant fundraising effort within the Ukrainian-American community in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Ukrainian-American donors, both individuals and institutions, contributed nearly six million dollars by the time the Institute was founded (Subtelny, 1994: 562).

The community wanted to establish an institute at Harvard in order to capitalize on the cachet of having a Ukrainian Studies program at one of the world's leading universities (Pritsak, 1975: 346). Its original mandate was 'the advancement of knowledge about Ukraine in the United States through research and teaching'.¹³ Before Ukrainian independence, much of the scholarly work of the Institute concentrated on Ukrainian history, language and literature. Since Ukrainian independence in 1991, its focus has broadened to include contemporary political, economic and social issues. It has also tried to broaden the understanding of Ukraine by publishing research on its diverse religious and ethnic groups, and by acting as a bridge between Ukrainian Studies and studies of other eastern European countries like Poland, Russia, Belarus and Moldova.

The Institute supports a variety of research, educational and training programs. Among other activities, it has sponsored major research projects on the famine of 1932/3 and the millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine; it is also the host institution for a project on the preservation of archival material from the former Soviet Union. It maintains an active publication program that includes a scholarly journal, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, and three book series: the Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, the Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature and Harvard Papers in Ukrainian Studies. Since its inception it has organized over thirty conferences, colloquia and symposia.¹⁴ The Institute also offers a summer school at which students in various fields combine Ukrainian-language training with courses on specific aspects of Ukrainian society, and a Mid-Career Training Fellows program that allows professionals in business, journalism and government service an opportunity to further their knowledge about Ukrainian matters.

The founding of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta followed closely on the formation of the Institute at Harvard. Diaspora academics and community members were concerned that Ukrainian Studies was becoming marginal to mainstream academic life in Canadian universities. Furthermore, the Ukrainian language and culture were seen to be in a struggle for survival, partly because of the twin pressures of assimilation in Canada and persecution of Ukrainians in their homeland. In this context, Ukrainians in Canada took advantage of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism made in 1970 that universities should begin offering more courses and programs in non-English and non-French cultures and languages.

At the University of Alberta, Manoly Lupul, a historian, joined forces with the Ukrainian Canadian Professionals and Business Federation of Canada to spearhead the establishment of the Canadian Institute of

Ukrainian Studies Foundation (later renamed the Canadian Foundation for Ukrainian Studies) in 1973. The foundation raised funds from the Ukrainian-Canadian community to establish a scholarly Institute of Ukrainian Studies. As a result of this effort, coupled with lobbying by a number of influential Ukrainian Canadians, the Alberta provincial government committed \$350,000 in annual funding for the Institute.¹⁵

The Institute continues to rely on the financial and organizational support of the community. By 1996, for instance, it had thirty-two separate endowments from a variety of individuals of Ukrainian ancestry; contributions range from a few thousand to over three million dollars. The Institute's current programs, centers and projects include the Ukrainian Canadian Program, which promotes research on the Ukrainian experience in Canada; the Stasiuk Program, which serves as an information source for events in Ukraine; the Ukrainian Language Education Program, which is concerned with curriculum development for Ukrainian-language education; a legislative Reform Project whose aim is to help Ukrainian legislators and policy-makers promote democratic political reforms and a market economy; the Peter Jacyk Centre for Historical Research, which is coordinating the translation into English and publication of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's *The History of Ukraine-Rus'* as well as supporting a variety of archival projects in order to preserve documents relevant to Ukrainian history; and a Church Studies Program, which promotes research on the history of Ukrainian churches in Ukraine and the diaspora, the role of churches in the formation of the Ukrainian state and church-state relations.

Like its American counterpart, the Institute of Ukrainian Studies has a strong record of publications, conferences, research and program development. It publishes the *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* and monographs through the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press. It has also tried to make inroads into Ukraine by helping fund the Institute for Historical Research in Lviv, whose aim is to promote historical research on Ukraine in Ukraine, and which also funds research trips to the west for Ukrainians who wish to learn more about western business and professional practices (CIUS, 1996).

The two most ambitious projects in the Institute's publication program are the *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, published in conjunction with the Shevchenko Scientific Society of Europe, and the translation of Hrushevsky's *The History of Ukraine-Rus'*. The first volume of the new and enlarged encyclopedia was published in 1984, the second in 1988 and the final three in 1993. The *Encyclopedia* represented the collective effort of over 500 individuals, 'many of whom contributed their work as a labor of love' (CIUS, 1996: 24). The translation of Hrushevsky's *The History of Ukraine-Rus'* has also been an important goal of the Ukrainian diaspora, which

hoped that it would help to create a specifically Ukrainian national history. The translation of *The History of Ukraine-Rus'* was supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities in the United States, the Canadian Foundation for Ukrainian Studies and individual donors. A number of individuals donated \$100,000 each to sponsor the publication of one volume of the translated version of that multivolume history (CIUS, 1996: 26–7).¹⁶

For academics, however, fundraising by ethnic communities for academic chairs, institutes and programs can be a mixed blessing. While community support for some kinds of scholarly research is both valuable and necessary, the academics involved in such institutions have to navigate the sometimes treacherous waters of both university and community politics. For these scholars and their institutions cherish academic freedom and the scholarly pursuit of knowledge regardless of where the results might lead. While academic freedom and scholarship may also be valued on the ethnic community side, unofficially the academic institutions that rely on community support are often expected to promote the interests of the ethnic community and to help tell its 'side of the story'. Consequently, the academic institutions that rely on the support of the diaspora community have seen controversies over the kind of work undertaken by their members, the priorities of their publication programs, the part that their members play in promoting community interests, and appointments to prestigious university posts.

In the summer of 1999, for example, a number of issues were raised in the *Ukrainian Weekly* about the involvement of members of the HURI in the publication of *The Russian Chronicles: A Thousand Years That Changed the World*. Two members of the Institute, Professors H. Lunt and Omelijan Pritsak, along with their affiliation with HURI, were listed in a 'special acknowledgment' in the book. The book, which was described by another member of the Institute as a 'popularizing, Russocentric history of the East Slavs' (De Lossa, 1999), was seen by some diaspora Ukrainians as a ham-fisted attempt by Russians to undermine the legitimacy of independent Ukraine and to deny Ukraine its own history. In a letter to the editor of the *Ukrainian Weekly*, one writer recognized that while HURI and the two professors did not have any control over the book's final content, the 'damage has been done'. The writer argued that Russian claims to Ukrainian history had been legitimized by virtue of the Institute's association with the book. He suggested that the professors 'owe the Ukrainian American community an explanation of their role, if any, in this book', and demanded that the Institute issue an immediate retraction of its name from the special acknowledgment, lest it lend inadvertent support to 'false claims to Ukraine's history' (Melnyk, 1999: 9).

In his regular column in the *Ukrainian Weekly*, Myron Kuropas expressed a number of more general misgivings about HURI's link to the community. One question was why two histories of Ukraine (Subtelny, 1994; Magocsi, 1996) were published, not by the Institute, but by the University of Toronto Press. The second was the apparent lack of visibility of the Institute and its members during the community's battle about the part Ukrainians played in the Holocaust (see Chapter 7). The third was the apparent inability of graduates of the Institute to secure academic positions in American universities. As part of his suggestion that the Institute should better serve the needs of the community, Kuropas called for the formation of an advisory board to be made up of a representative pool of Ukrainian Americans. Its purpose would be to offer advice to the Institute and help with fundraising. Kuropas also recommended that donors be able to specify which projects their contributions would support, and that the Institute make a greater effort to communicate with the community (Kuropas, 1998).

Bitter disputes also surface occasionally about appointments to chairs and professorships. These conflicts tend to be bitter and the wounds take a long time to heal. In Canada, the controversy over the appointment of the first chair of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Toronto in the early 1980s still has reverberations. In the late 1970s, the Toronto branch of the Ukrainian Canadian Professional and Business Federation had established the chair of Ukrainian Studies Foundation as its fundraising arm. By 1980, the Foundation had amassed over \$600,000 from a combination of government, community and other sources, and in negotiation with the University of Toronto it was able to establish a Chair of Ukrainian Studies. Disagreements arose about the selection process and who the best candidate was; the Foundation eventually withdrew from the process in protest. The fundraising efforts of the Foundation have now broadened to include the Canada-Ukraine Parliamentary Program, which enables young Ukrainian university students to come to Canada to act as interns for members of parliament.

Part of the reason for the continued icy relationship between the University of Toronto chair and the wider community revolves around the apparent loyalties of the chair. According to one commentator, the chair's 'career in Ukrainian Studies has been marked by a certain amount of controversy since, although he traces his ancestry to Transcarpathian Ukraine, he rejects a Ukrainian ethnic identity and prefers to define himself as a Carpatho-Rusyn American' (Prymak, 1997: 27).¹⁷ That a chair of Ukrainian Studies does not seem to define himself as Ukrainian seems to rub at least some members of the diaspora the wrong way.

These disputes are certainly not unique to the Ukrainian diaspora.

Members of other ethnic groups have objected to the direction being taken by 'their' academic bodies and institutes and in some cases have scuttled academic appointments when an individual's research or ideological orientation have been deemed to be unsympathetic to the community.

Expressive organizations and activities

As noted above, many of the organizations discussed in this chapter considered the diaspora to be the last stand of Ukrainian language, culture and religion. For that reason they emphasized the promotion of the Ukrainian language and the symbolic aspects of ethnic culture, such as songs, folk art, dancing and the like. One of the areas into which considerable organizational resources were channeled, particularly during the postwar years, was the teaching of Ukrainian. On a formal level, Catholic and Orthodox churches and various nationalist and cultural organizations created, or helped create, a combination of community-sponsored supplementary schools and accredited language schools within the public school systems. Classes in the Ukrainian language, history and culture in supplementary schools are held outside of normal school hours, usually on Saturdays; language classes in accredited schools have formed part of the regular school curriculum in a number of countries. Enrollments have declined in most countries, but at their peak between the mid-1960s and early 1980s, thousands of young people in the diaspora took advantage of the opportunity to learn Ukrainian.¹⁸ The Ukrainian-Canadian Foundation of Taras Shevchenko helps fund curriculum development for Ukrainian-language education. The Ukrainian Language Education Centre at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies in Edmonton is involved with curriculum development specifically for Ukrainian children in the diaspora. Its approach is premised on the recognition that many second-, third- and fourth-generation children in the diaspora no longer speak or hear Ukrainian at home. The Centre developed a series of Ukrainian-language materials intended for primary grades in Alberta schools, but they are now also used in schools in the United States, Brazil, Australia, Poland, Slovakia, Latvia, France and Russia (CIUS, 1996: 30–1). A number of diaspora scholars like Professors George Duravetz (1993) and Roma Franko (1994) have also developed Ukrainian-language curricula for high school and university credit.

It is important to emphasize, however, that the expressive and creative life of the Ukrainian diaspora does not take place only in formal ethnic organizations. Even though most would probably reject the label of being 'ethnic' artists (see, for example, Shostak, 1984; Achtemichuk, 1984; Husar, 1984), many diaspora novelists, playwrights, poets, singers, musicians and

painters make use of Ukrainian historical events, symbols and themes, along with references to diaspora life in their work. In 1996, the pianist John Stech produced a CD entitled *Kolomeyka Fantasy* that blends Ukrainian folk music with modern jazz. Ron Cahute's innovative series of *Barabolya* (potato) musical recordings and concerts uses mainstream and top forty tunes to teach basic elements of the Ukrainian language. Through efforts like his, children of Ukrainian ancestry have learned a variety of Ukrainian words and phrases to the tune of *The Makarena* and Queen's *We Will Rock You*. The Yara Arts Group of New York brings Ukrainian and other forms of drama, dance and song together to explore a variety of issues and themes rooted in Ukrainian and other eastern cultures. Among other events, they have hosted Gogol Bordello, a Ukrainian Gypsy punk band, and have incorporated band members into their theatrical performances. The group also holds poetry and musical events featuring 'new music, poetry, and arts from New York's emerging Ukrainian-American arts underground'.¹⁹ The group has performed poetry readings and music at a number of community and other venues, including the Washington Groups' Leadership Conference, the Year 2020 conference, the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the Ukrainian Institute of America and the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. Diaspora iconographers like Vera Lazarowich-Senchuk interpret biblical themes for Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox churches around the world, and novelists like Vera Lysenko, Janice Kulyk-Keefer and Askold Melnyczuk depict Ukraine, Ukrainians and the Ukrainian diaspora experience to both Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian readers (Tarnawsky, 1999: 105; Mycak, 1998).

The complex motivation for including 'ethnic' themes, characters or symbols in various kinds of high and folk art cannot be reduced to a single factor. Hence it is inaccurate to say that all forms of language development and cultural and artistic expression developed by Ukrainians living abroad have reflected a 'diaspora as last stand' mentality. However, the work produced by many artists in the Ukrainian diaspora comments both on universal issues that are relevant to all people regardless of their ethnic identity, and on particular 'Ukrainian' and 'diaspora' issues related to identity, return and the meaning of ethnicity (Lerner, 1999). Whatever the motivation, one consequence is that these forms of cultural expression are one means by which historical memories and ethnic identities and boundaries are sustained. In many ways these expressive activities, which reflect complex connections between memories of the ancestral homeland, the Ukrainian ethnic identity and heritage, and life in both the Ukrainian diaspora and mainstream North American society, suggest that certain aspects of Ukrainian diaspora life are similar in form to what Cohen has described as a 'cultural diaspora'.

The ethnic polity and umbrella organizations

Despite different missions, political agendas and personality clashes, leaders of diaspora organizations have nevertheless recognized that they need power in order to advance both their particular interests and what they define as the collective interests of the diaspora. Power comes not only from numbers, but also from things like resources, commitment and organizational links. Thus, the Ukrainian diaspora, like many other diaspora groups (Isajiw, 1999: 215), has tried to form umbrellas, or larger federations of constituent organizations, in order to enhance its influence and prestige. Thus, the existence of these umbrellas signifies an effort on the part of Ukrainians to maintain lines of communication with different segments of the diaspora, to extend the bonds of solidarity with co-ethnics and to strengthen the social and political influence of their organizations.

Within the organized Ukrainian diaspora, there are at least three different levels of umbrella organization. The first consists of coordinating bodies that unite chapters and branches of particular professional, social or service organizations. There are dozens of these kinds of bodies; they include the Ukrainian Canadian Professional and Business Federation and the Federation of Ukrainian American Business and Professional Associations. These federations represent, respectively, the seventeen local professional and business associations in Canada and eleven in the United States. The Ukrainian Medical Association of North America represents eighteen local chapters throughout North America. The Ukrainian Catholic Women's Association is an umbrella organization that coordinates the activities of local Ukrainian Catholic Women's clubs. The Ukrainian National Women's League of America represents 102 branches in the United States (UNWLA, 1996: 25). The Ukrainian Canadian Students' Association is a national umbrella organization made up of fifteen member organizations at various universities in Canada.²⁰

The second level of umbrella tries to unite diverse Ukrainian organizations in a particular country. National umbrella organizations include the Association of Ukrainians of Great Britain, the Australian Federation of Ukrainian Organizations, the Ukrainian Canadian Congress, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the Association of Ukrainians in Poland and the Ukrainian Central Representation in Argentina.

Unity has been difficult to achieve in national level umbrella organizations, even in countries where the diaspora is relatively small and there has only been one major wave of migration. Even though some tensions have eased, religious and ideological cleavages continue to make themselves felt. In Britain, for instance, Jenkala argues:

The fact that pluralism is a prerequisite for democracy has not always been understood by leaders of these [diaspora] political groups; the resulting dissension has in the past diverted people's energies from solving some of the most urgent problems of the community. This state of affairs, together with mistrust and misunderstanding among the churches, has not made for a politically and socially cohesive society and has bred apathy and disaffection among many second generation Ukrainians. . . The situation has also left its stamp on Ukrainian community and social organizations.

(Jenkala, 1994: 303)

Perhaps the most bitter and long-lasting divisions have been in the United States. In that country there are two umbrella organizations that claim to represent the Ukrainian-American community: the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA) and the Ukrainian American Coordinating Council (UACC). The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America was formed in 1940, partly to combat allegations that Ukrainian nationalists and their organizations in America were disloyal to American ideals. In particular, an earlier umbrella organization, the UOAA, had repeatedly been accused of being a front for pro-German fascists. In order to put those allegations to rest, members dissolved the UOAA and formed the new, more broadly based UCCA (Kuropas, 1991: 284).

By 1960, the UCCA was made up of over fifty organizations. The four main fraternal benefit associations were represented, as were various political, scientific, religious, cultural, relief, women's, veterans', professional and youth organizations. The executive positions rotated between the fraternal, while its advisory body contained representatives of other organizations. Though conflicts over control of the organization simmered through much of the postwar period, the Banderite faction of the OUN in the United States, known as the Liberation Front, increasingly insisted that it was the most active segment of the Ukrainian-American community and that it should therefore control the UCCA. Its members also believed that other organizations were losing sight of what they considered the ultimate goal of the diaspora, namely, to fight for, and return to, a free and independent Ukraine. At the Thirteenth Congress, held in 1980 and termed 'the UCCA debacle' by the historian Myron Kuropas, the organization was taken over by supporters of the Liberation Front (Kuropas, 1996: 549-50), who wrested control of the national executive from the fraternal benefit associations. In response to the takeover, representatives of twenty-six organizations, including the Ukrainian National Association, the Ukrainian Fraternal Association, Plast and the Ukrainian National Women's League of America, left the organization.

Despite mediation efforts by the World Congress of Free Ukrainians, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, and the hierarchs of the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox churches in the United States, there was little movement on either side. In 1983, the breakaway group, led by the Ukrainian National Association and the Providence Association, joined thirty other organizations to form the UACC. This organization claims to represent more moderate, 'American-oriented' organizations that cater to second- and third-generation members of the diaspora. While there has been an uneasy accommodation between the two umbrellas, disputes still surface over things like invitations to, and seating arrangements at, dinners held to honor visiting dignitaries from Ukraine. In its promotional material, the UACC claims to represent 'democratic and inclusive forces in the Ukrainian community', a comment which seems intended as a back-handed swipe at the presumably 'anti-democratic and exclusive' UCCA.²¹

There is, however, a renewed effort underway to bridge the divisions and create a third 'representative' body of Ukrainian-American organizations. After the joint conferences of Ukrainian-American professional organizations held in Washington, DC in June 1999, representatives of fifteen groups met to discuss the formation of a Council of Presidents of Ukrainian American Organizations. The aims of this emergent Council are to 'strengthen the Ukrainian American community', to help coordinate conferences of different Ukrainian-American organizations and to serve as a communication network and consultative body for the discussion of matters of common interest among participating organizations. At an inaugural meeting in September 1999, nine organizations voted to join; they were the Ukrainian Medical Association of North America, the Ukrainian American Bar Association, the Ukrainian National Credit Union Association, the Ukrainian Institute of America, the Ukrainian Engineers Society of America, the Ukrainian Federation of America, the Ukrainian American Coordinating Council, the Association of Ukrainian American Architects and the Ukrainian American Community Network. Representatives of five other organizations, including the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America decided to consult with their members before making a commitment to join (Hadzewycz, 1999: 1, 4).

The Ukrainian Canadian Congress has been somewhat more successful at holding itself together, although there are also cracks in that unity. The precursor to the Congress was the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, which was formed in 1940 to unite the faction-ridden nationalist community, undermine the influence of diaspora leftists and help solicit Ukrainian-Canadian support for the war effort (Dreisziger, 1991; Gerus, 1982: 198). For the first thirty years, control over the Committee, which was renamed the Ukrainian Canadian Congress in the 1980s, rested in the hands of the

so-called 'big six' organizations: the League for the Liberation of Ukraine, the Ukrainian National Federation, the Ukrainian Professional and Business Federation of Canada, the Ukrainian Self Reliance League of Canada, the Brotherhood of Ukrainian Catholics and Ukrainian Canadian Veterans' Association (Gerus, 1982: 202). When the Veterans' Association stopped being active in the 1970s, its place was taken by the Council of Ukrainian Credit Unions of Canada (Gregorovich, 1993: 79).²²

A number of criticisms have been leveled at the Congress over the years, but perhaps the most consistent is that its original organizational structure is no longer suitable for the present-day community. Some of the organizations that were influential in the 1950s and 1960s are no longer the centers of community activity. With an aging leadership that seems reluctant to give up power, some of the organizations have had trouble attracting second, third and subsequent generations. One of the UCC's most trenchant critics²³ argued, for example:

Ethnic organizations often have a style of organization that functions to maintain the originally established leaders in power for as long as possible. The consequence is small generational turnover of leadership or at times virtually no change at all for as long as twenty or thirty years . . . The problem . . . is that this style of organization endangers the continuity of organized community life. Some organizations' leaders may not care. For them, community organizational life may be wrapped up mostly with their own status, prestige or fame. The younger generations often readily see this and after a while completely remove themselves from these organizations. This apparently has been the case with the UCC. In fact, the UCC's own constitution has substantially slowed generational change. It is hence imperative that the UCC democratize its own constitution and take steps to stimulate generational turnover among other Ukrainian organizations.

(Isajiw, 1993: 86)²⁴

At its triennial meeting in 1998, the Congress did change its constitution in ways that were intended to address at least some of the problems that have been identified. Until then twelve of the fifteen positions on the executive board were reserved for representatives of the 'big six' organizations, and only candidates proposed by the 'big six' could stand for election as president (Gerus, 1982: 203, 205). Now, the president is elected by the delegates at the triennial convention, and membership on the board and executive committee is more equally distributed among the twenty-eight member organizations. Elements of the old structure remain,

however, insofar as the 'big six' organizations are allowed to send twice as many delegates to the triennial congress as the twenty-two other 'Category B' organizations.

Finally, efforts are being made by two competing organizations to unite the worldwide Ukrainian diaspora: the World Congress of Ukrainians, whose headquarters are in Toronto, and whose current leader is Askold Lozynskij from New York; and the World Coordinating Council of Ukrainians, which is based in Kyiv and whose president is the poet Ivan Drach.

The Ukrainian World Congress (formerly the World Congress of Free Ukrainians – WCFU) was founded in 1967 by representatives of a number of organizations who had attended a pan-American conference of Ukrainians held in New York earlier that year (Kuropas, 1996: 475). As one of its original aims, the WCFU wanted to 'unite all the forces and resources of Ukrainians who are citizens or residents of various countries of the free world to secure closer cooperation among themselves' (Kuropas, 1996: 476). Before Ukrainian independence, the World Congress was the only organization that claimed to represent the interests of the worldwide Ukrainian diaspora, although in practice it tended to be dominated by a select group of North American organizations and personalities. After independence its name was changed to the Ukrainian World Congress, and it has made an effort to include Ukrainians from the eastern diaspora in its structure.

The Ukrainian World Coordinating Council (UWCC) originated during the grassroots euphoria surrounding Ukrainian independence in 1991; now, however, it seems to be a creature of the Ukrainian government. It was founded at the First World Forum of Ukrainians, which was held in Kyiv in 1992. At that forum, Ukrainian delegates from both the diaspora and Ukraine voted to establish the Ukrainian World Coordinating Council as an umbrella body representing Ukrainians in both Ukraine and the diaspora.

Despite superficial appearances of mutual support, the two organizations have been at loggerheads since shortly after the UWCC was formed. In August 1997, 650 delegates representing a variety of Ukrainian organizations in the western diaspora (that is, in North America, Europe, Australia and South America) the eastern diaspora (Ukrainians who live in former Soviet bloc countries), and Ukraine met in Kyiv at the Second World Forum of Ukrainians. The objective of the 1997 Forum was to begin to chart a course for diaspora organizational activity for the twenty-first century, and for a systematic involvement of the diaspora with Ukrainian society (Lew, 1997). By most accounts, the Forum was not a success. The Soviet-style authoritarian methods that were used to run the meetings were offensive to the North American and European delegates.²⁵

Admission tickets to some of the venues were printed in Russian rather than Ukrainian, and the addresses were in Russian, even though Kyiv street names had officially been converted to Ukrainian. While visiting other parts of Kyiv, members of the western diaspora were disappointed that many of the old Bolshevik symbols on the Verhovna Rada, the Ukrainian parliament building, were still very visibly in place.

But there were also organizational issues at stake. In the opinion of the western delegates, the UWCC organizers of the Forum fundamentally misunderstood non-governmental organizations such as the Ukrainian World Congress. The UWCC also had difficulties with accountability and reporting. Some members of the UWC were uncomfortable with the idea of having the coordinating body of the Ukrainian diaspora headquartered in Kyiv and funded in part by the Ukrainian government. The feeling was that an organization whose aim was to bring the organized diaspora and Ukraine into a closer relationship should be located in the diaspora and not the ancestral homeland; nor should it be beholden to the Ukrainian government. Later that year, the president of the Ukrainian World Congress called the Forum's resolutions 'unusable'. The UWC suspended its payment of dues to the UWCC until it received a 'report card' on its activities. Since that Forum, relations between the western-based Ukrainian World Congress and the Ukrainian-based Ukrainian World Coordinating Council have been cordial but strained.

Ukraine on the World Wide Web

Umbrella organizations, along with newspapers and periodicals, have been important means by which organizations have communicated with their members and the wider diaspora and have tried to maintain a sense of co-ethnic solidarity (Daschko, 1982; Hoerder, 1987a, 1987b). It is estimated that in North America alone, between 1886 and 1986, more than five hundred periodicals were published by the Ukrainian diaspora on a daily, weekly, bi-weekly, monthly or quarterly basis (Werstman, 1987: 349). Many of the periodicals were shortlived, and their existence reflected the factionalism of the diaspora community. In the early 1980s, some seventy diaspora periodicals with a combined circulation of 172,000, were being published in the United States, and sixty periodicals, with a combined circulation of about 100,000, were being published in Canada (Werstman, 1987: 349). Even though some periodicals had began to switch to English or had become bilingual, by the early 1980s there was a recognition that 'most Ukrainian [diaspora] newspapers serve mainly the needs of the [post-war] immigrants, even though they form a minority' within most communities (Daschko, 1982: 275).

More recently, diaspora Ukrainians have begun to make use of the Internet and electronic communication to share information and to link individuals and organizations with each other and with Ukraine. An Internet search for the terms 'Ukraine' and 'Ukrainian' yields no fewer than 25,000 results. On the Web, it is possible to find information about Ukraine's declaration of independence, traveling to Ukraine, sports scores, aid programs, arts and cultural activities, and dating and marriage brokers, as well as the sites of a range of community organizations.

Two of the most notable web sites that are specifically aimed at promoting communication and information-sharing within and about the Ukrainian diaspora are the Infoukes web site, based in Toronto, and the Brama web site, based in New York. Infoukes, which went on-line in April 1997, is intended 'primarily for anyone interested in Ukraine, Ukrainians and people of Ukrainian heritage', but with a special emphasis on 'people of Ukrainian descent, particularly English speaking North Americans, who wish to learn more about their heritage'. Brama, which also went on-line in 1997, describes itself as 'the vanguard of Ukrainian related sites'.

The origin of the Infoukes site goes back to disputes in Internet discussion groups in the early 1990s. According to Andrew Melnyk (1997), at the time of Ukrainian independence in 1991, the only Internet forums that discussed Ukrainian matters were the *talk.politics.soviet* and *soc.culture.soviet* lists. 'These groups', he claimed, 'became the hotbed of discussion and battles when Ukraine declared its intention to separate from the Soviet Union. Some Russians, who had emigrated to the United States in the 1980s did their utmost to impugn the legitimacy of Ukraine and the Ukrainian language and culture' (Melnyk, 1997: 6). A number of individuals of Ukrainian descent who participated in those discussions became so alarmed about their tone that they set up an 'invitation only' e-mail list to 'discuss tactics to counter disinformation in news groups' (Melnyk, 1997: 6). Eventually, the list became a forum for the discussion of more general matters about Ukraine and Ukrainians.

By the mid-1990s some of the participants in the early discussion groups decided that publishing information about Ukraine and Ukrainians on the Web was more effective than responding to 'disinformation' in the discussion groups. In fact, for the founders of Infoukes, the Web was seen as the partial solution to two problems: 'the inevitable assimilation of Ukrainian descendants in [North] America who want to maintain knowledge of their origins, and the general ignorance of [North] Americans about Ukraine' (Melnyk, 1997). In the mid-1990s, awareness of the possibilities of the Web tended to be limited to those who were already immersed in Internet culture. Thus, when the group sought financial support to help establish their web site, a number of the 'leaders of

Ukrainian organizations did not see the potential of the Internet'. Without money from the organized community, the group was forced to go ahead on its own and start a for-profit company in the hope that on-line advertising would generate enough revenue to sustain the operation (Melnyk, 1997: 8).

The Infoukes web site contains a number of home pages dedicated to promoting knowledge about Ukrainians in both Ukraine and the diaspora. Organizations such as the Canada-Ukraine Parliamentary Program, the Ukrainian Canadian Professional and Business Federation and the Veterans of the First Division of the Ukrainian National Army (the Galicia Division) use the Internet to disseminate information about their activities. The site also contains material on subjects like the famine-genocide of 1932-3 and the deportation of Ukrainians from eastern Poland after World War II. It also provides links to other sites, including those for Ukrainian organizations in other parts of the world.

As of November 2000, the Infoukes site had had over 300,000 hits. Sociologists who study the Internet are wary of lending too much credence to web counters that record the number of hits for a particular web site. It is, after all, easy for the owners of sites to inflate the number of hits by repeatedly accessing their own site. There is no evidence that this happens with the Infoukes site, or with any of the other sites that provide information on the Ukrainian diaspora. Thus, if the number of hits a site receives indicates the level of interest in a particular site or set of issues, there seems to be a significant amount of interest in Ukraine and the diaspora.

Infoukes also contains e-mail fora for the discussion of matters related to Ukraine and people of Ukrainian ancestry (Melnyk, 1997: 9). The discussion groups range from simple announcements to more esoteric discussions of art, business, computers, genealogy, history, humor, medicine, politics, sports and travel. As in other Internet discussion groups, many subscribers seem to be passive observers rather than active participants. But despite the limitations of the internet as a form of communication, Ukrainians do appear to be in the process of forming a virtual diaspora community.

Conclusion

Like other diaspora groups, Ukrainians have formed a variety of ethnically specific organizations in their countries of settlement. During the postwar period, those organizations were formed to solve the material, practical and social problems of life in the diaspora. While the emphasis varied, the activities of organizations were oriented to both their countries of settlement and to the ancestral homeland.

From the perspective of diaspora studies, there are at least three reasons why it is important to understand the formation and activities of ethnic organizations. First, organizations provide a context for social interaction for members of an ethnic community and are vehicles for the maintenance of ethnic identity. Ethnic identities are relational, and they are sustained not simply through the actions of individual actors, but through social interaction. Many of the criteria for the ideal-type of diaspora described in Chapter 1 could not be realized without organizations. In other words, the maintenance of a strong ethnic identity over time, the development of myths about the homeland and the promotion of a sense of victimization take place in and through organizations. Second, organizations are important because they are part of the processes by which ethnic groups draw social boundaries and maintain social closure. Ethnic social closure is, however, a tricky business, and organizations need to strike a balance between criteria that exclude non-members but admit potential new recruits. Those criteria need to be flexible enough to keep up with changing realities, material circumstances and identities that are part and parcel of diaspora life. Third, it is clear that through the formation of a multiplicity of umbrella organizations that try to unite particular professional, service and interest-based groups, diverse organizations within countries and diverse organizations in countries throughout the diaspora, Ukrainians have made considerable efforts to identify, and link themselves with, a larger imagined community of co-ethnics.

At the same time, however, the Ukrainian experience raises questions about the criteria used to define diaspora. Given the fractiousness of the Ukrainian diaspora for much of its life in North America, it is not clear whether Ukrainians necessarily recognized themselves as members of the same imagined community. The religious, political and ideological divisions that were highlighted in this chapter in many ways revolve around the issue of which individuals and organizations express the proper forms of Ukrainian diaspora subjectivity. Given that there is no agreement on what the appropriate form of that subjectivity is, disagreements within the diaspora are not likely to go away. Despite the appearance of unity that is implied by the notion of an 'umbrella' organization, the development of a sense of solidarity with co-ethnics still requires some work.

6

UKRAINE IN THE POSTWAR DIASPORA

Exposing human rights abuses

The subjugated nations are the 'Achilles heel' of every empire, and even more of the despotic Russian prison of nations and individuals.

(Yaroslav Stetsko, chairman of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations and former Prime Minister of Ukraine, 1972: 23)

During the postwar years, a dislike and suspicion of the Soviet Union was common in much of the non-socialist Ukrainian diaspora in the west. The ancestral homeland was seen by many individuals and organizations as a place where the Ukrainian language, culture and religion were being actively suppressed by Russocentric Soviet authorities. As in other eastern European diasporas, protests over developments in Ukraine formed one part of Ukrainian diaspora community life. There were, of course, variations in those protests. As noted in the previous chapter, some organizations in the diaspora maintained group boundaries and helped their members sustain and express their ethnic identity by blending North American occupational or professional interests with Ukrainian interests. Some did this by helping raise the profile of Ukraine and Ukrainian ethnicity, history and culture through various educational initiatives; others did it through the promotion of the symbolic aspects of ethnic culture.

This chapter examines how events in the ancestral homeland during the postwar years figured in the activities and organization of the postwar Ukrainian diaspora. In particular, it looks at the effect that the suppression of the Ukrainian language, culture and religion had on the Ukrainian diaspora in North America. As noted in Chapter 5, a significant proportion of the Ukrainians who migrated to the west after World War II were refugees. Part of the process of becoming a victim diaspora involved exposing the oppressive conditions that had propelled them to leave, that kept them separated from their ancestral homeland and that continued to victimize Ukrainians in Soviet Ukraine. The activities of many organizations in the Ukrainian diaspora consisted largely of exposing human rights

abuses and the suppression of the Ukrainian language and culture in Soviet Ukraine to other diaspora Ukrainians, to the general public in their various host societies and to politicians and governments. These activities provided yet another avenue for the expression of the Ukrainian identity and a continued attachment to the ancestral homeland. Before examining the way in which Ukrainians in North America responded to events in postwar Soviet Ukraine, it is first necessary to discuss Soviet policy on nationalities and the associated denial of human rights in the Soviet Union.

The nationality problem in the Soviet Union

When the Russian Bolsheviks seized power in October 1917, they inherited an enormous multilingual and multinational empire. One of the major strategic problems facing the Bolsheviks after the civil war was to consolidate their control over their non-Russian subjects. As Marxists, they were inherently suspicious of ethnic and national attachments, for nationalism, along with particularistic ethnic identities, was considered a bourgeois creation that led to artificial divisions between workers and thereby undermined the unity and cohesion of the international proletariat. However, the Bolsheviks also realized that national sentiments in the empire were strong, partly because of the second-class treatment and discrimination suffered by minority groups under the Tsar. In these circumstances, Lenin developed a dialectical formula for dealing with 'the national question'. His ultimate objective was a form of assimilation where there would be a fusion of ethnic cultures. However, in order to alleviate the short-term legacy of distrust and hostility inherited from Tsarist rule, Lenin and the Bolsheviks conceded that national languages, cultures and identities should be temporarily tolerated, if not encouraged. Social equality was believed to provide the material basis for the creation of new 'Soviet' men and women, and nationalist tendencies were expected to diminish once ethnic groups achieved equality with their Russian brothers and sisters (Connor, 1992, 31).

In the early years of Soviet rule, then, limited forms of ethnic pluralism were tolerated and promoted, not as ends in themselves but rather as part of a strategy to set the groundwork for a Soviet version of assimilation. Thus, the 1920s were comparatively good years for the Ukrainian culture and language in Soviet Ukraine. This period of *korenizatsiia* (or taking root) is widely regarded as the renaissance of Ukrainian language and culture in Soviet Ukraine. This renaissance entailed, among other things, state support for culture and social development, such as the introduction of Ukrainian in schools and the development of a standard literary Ukrainian (Ovcharenko, 1987: 17–18), the co-option of Ukrainian ethnic elites into

the Soviet system and the requirement that Soviet officials learn and use local languages (Subtelny, 1994: 387). As noted earlier, this renaissance also helped entice several prominent diaspora socialists and social democrats into returning to Soviet Ukraine.

The renaissance did not last very long. In the late 1920s, Stalin and the Soviet regime made an about-face and began a systematic attack on both the Ukrainian peasantry and the Ukrainian intelligentsia. The independent peasantry were believed to be the carriers of both ethnic particularism and bourgeois social and economic values, while the intelligentsia were seen to be responsible for the continued promotion of outmoded forms of nationalism. The goal of Soviet policy in the early 1930s was to eradicate both the 'head' (the intelligentsia) and 'the body' (the peasantry) of Ukrainian nationalism (Ovcharenko, 1987: 18). In what would now be euphemistically called 'ethnic cleansing', Stalin and the Soviet regime did this through a combined policy of collectivization, starvation and Russification.

Russification consisted of the confiscation of all Ukrainian-language books and dictionaries from schools, libraries and bookstores, and the imprisonment and execution of Ukrainian intellectuals whose work lent legitimacy to the idea of an independent Ukrainian language and culture. Ukrainian linguists were particular targets for repression because of their effort to 'dissociate' the Ukrainian language from the 'brotherly' Russian language. Efforts to eradicate Ukrainian extended to orthography, where Ukrainian spelling rules were gradually replaced by Russian rules (Ovcharenko, 1987: 20).¹

Suspicion of, and hostility towards, national minorities remained a central part of Soviet nationality policy throughout the rest of Stalin's rule. The early years of Nikita Khrushchev's term were characterized by a more conciliatory attitude towards non-Russian languages and cultures, but, in the late fifties, the Soviet policies of acculturation and assimilation intensified (Connor, 1992: 42). Non-Russian writers were put under pressure to publish their works in Russian rather than their national languages. Recalcitrant nationalists were deported to the far-flung reaches of the Soviet Empire, and Russian became even more the dominant language of work, politics, education and public life in general.

In the mid-1960s the assimilation pressures were briefly relaxed. Earlier official pronouncements of the Communist Party emphasized how the Soviet Union had 'solved the national question' 'completely', 'irrevocably' and 'definitively'. At the same time, however, Leonid Brezhnev argued that, while the Soviet Union had 'solved' the nationalities problems that it had inherited from the Tsar, the new 'nationality problems' in 'mature socialism' posed vexing challenges (Connor, 1992: 43). This recognition of the continued existence of ethnic attachments and the 'nationalities

problem' led to another brief period of relative tolerance and a revival of ethnic languages and cultures in the 1960s.

In Ukraine, this revival took place while Petro Shelest was First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine between 1963 and 1972. Shelest was a career bureaucrat who seemed to have little interest in promoting Ukrainian culture and language in Ukraine before he became First Secretary (Pelenski, 1975). However, in response to pressure from the Ukrainian intelligentsia, he began to champion the Ukrainian national cause. At the Fifth Congress of the Writers of Ukraine held in 1966, Shelest pleaded with Ukrainian intellectuals: 'Writers, take care of our beautiful native language. It is our treasure, our great heritage, and it is prime responsibility of our writers to preserve and develop it' (Ovcharekno, 1987: 25). Part of the wider revival of the Ukrainian language and culture involved demands that Moscow loosen its restrictions on national cultures and languages, particularly in the educational system.

By the early 1970s, Soviet policy towards minority languages and cultures had hardened once again. In 1972, Shelest was removed from his post as First Secretary; shortly afterwards he was forced to move to Moscow and was forbidden to return to Soviet Ukraine (Nahaylo, 1999: 38). His replacement, Volodymyr Shcherbytsky, was more subservient to Moscow and during his tenure other party officials who promoted Ukrainianization were purged and leaders of cultural and scientific institutions were dismissed because of their promotion of 'nationalism' (Alexeyeva, 1985: 46). The rest of Brezhnev's rule, according to Walker Connor (1992: 44), involved a renewed marshaling of forces against non-Russian minorities. The 1977 Constitution committed the state to 'enhancing the social homogeneity of society' (cited in Connor, 1992: 45), and social policies well into the 1980s aimed to further promote the Russian language, literature and culture at the expense of the others.

Despite the west's warm welcome of Mikhail Gorbachev and his policies of *perestroika* and *glasnost*, hostility to non-Russian minorities who were trying to promote their languages and cultures continued during the early years of his rule. On the one hand, the changes he introduced did afford Soviet citizens new opportunities to criticize Soviet society and its record on human rights. Certain restrictions on emigration were also relaxed, particularly for Soviet Jews, and a number of prominent political prisoners were released. On the other hand, however, intellectuals, workers, peace activists, nationalists and other dissidents continued to be harassed, imprisoned, incarcerated in psychiatric institutions and physically attacked (Kowalewski, 1987: 419–23). In 1986, however, a virtual moratorium was placed on political arrests in the Soviet Union, and the pace of public dissent accelerated.

Ukrainian resistance to Russification

Soviet efforts at Russification and the associated denial of human rights did not go unchallenged in Soviet Ukraine (Birch, 1975; Bociurkiw, 1975; Evrard, 1980; Hawkesworth, 1980; Romanenchuk, 1987; Stojko, 1987). As noted in Chapter 4, the Ukrainian nationalist movement was relatively well organized during World War II and was active in trying to undercut both German and Soviet authority in order to create an independent Ukrainian state. During the war, the main forms of organized Ukrainian resistance to Soviet Russian rule came from the two branches of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and from the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. After the Allied victory over Germany and the Soviet Union's consolidation of power over eastern and western Ukraine in 1945, Ukrainian opposition to Soviet domination went underground. The OUN and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) continued to carry out guerrilla operations in Soviet Ukraine, Poland and Czechoslovakia until the early 1950s. UPA units assassinated a handful of Russian, Polish and Czech officials and tried to sabotage Soviet deportations and efforts at collectivization (Martovych, n.d.: 127–68). In 1950, the supreme commander of the UPA, Roman Shukhevych, was killed by Soviet forces near Lviv; his son Iurii was imprisoned for the next thirty years for not having denounced the 'terrorist' activities of his father. After Shukhevych's death, the small number of remaining active UPA units were rooted out by the Soviet authorities. The Soviets also pursued nationalist leaders who were living in western Europe. In the late 1950s, Lev Rebet and Stepan Bandera were both killed by Soviet agents using special cyanide-spraying pistols (Nahaylo, 1999: 23).

During the 1950s and early 1960s, however, a variety of small-scale underground organizations were formed, mainly in western Ukraine, with the stated objective of freeing Ukraine from Soviet domination. Many of the clandestine groups had only a few dozen members, but they adopted names that expressed their commitment to Ukrainian independence: 'The United Party for the Liberation of Ukraine', 'OUN – North', 'The Ukrainian Union of Peasants and Workers' and 'The Ukrainian National Committee'. Many other groups remained unnamed and less formal, but they met surreptitiously in order to keep Ukrainian culture alive by reading banned poetry and other literary works, and to plot against Soviet control of their country. Members who were discovered by the Soviet authorities were imprisoned in Soviet labor camps or were shot (Alexeyeva, 1985: 27–8).

In the early 1960s, resistance to Russification and the denial of human rights began to take on a more public face in Soviet Ukraine. This

resistance was linked to the 'second Ukrainianization' that took place under the leadership of Shelest. Under Shelest, a number of new measures were undertaken to improve the status of the Ukrainian language, revive Ukrainian historical studies and make Ukraine more economically self-sufficient (Pelenski, 1975: 283–91). Various Soviet policies and practices began to be challenged publicly. An emboldened group of Ukrainian poets, artists, literary critics, historians and teachers tried to rekindle Ukrainian national pride and to revive various aspects of Ukrainian cultural life. Members of the 'sixties' generation' held poetry readings, cultural and dramatic performances in public buildings and private apartments, and commemorations to honor Ukrainians who had been persecuted in the 1930s. One of the leading figures of the sixties' generation, Ivan Dziuba, published, among other things, *Internationalism or Russification?* Dziuba called Russification a Stalinist deviation that was fundamentally at odds with Lenin's earlier policy of promoting tolerance and equality as a way of building international proletarian solidarity (Alexeyeva, 1985: 34).

Other groups were formed to protest the use of psychiatry as a political weapon, and to press for the rights of the disabled, free trade unions, religious freedom and the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union. Unsanctioned expressions of Ukrainian language and culture also became more frequent. In Ukraine, the anniversary of Taras Shevchenko's death provided nationally conscious Ukrainians with an opportunity to take part in public expressions of Ukrainianness through poetry readings, songs, dances and intellectual discussions on topics related to Ukrainian history and culture. Individual acts of resistance to Russification, such as self-immolation, were also common. In the late 1960s a number of Ukrainians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Crimean Tatars and Czechs set themselves on fire in fatal, public acts of protest over Soviet domination. One of the first public acts of self-immolation in the Soviet Union occurred in Kyiv in 1968, just before the anniversary of the October Revolution. A fifty-year-old teacher and father of two, Vasily Makukha, set himself on fire and ran down a busy Kyiv street shouting 'Long Live Free Ukraine' (Alexeyeva, 1985: 38). He died shortly afterwards.

According to Alexeyeva (1985), a hallmark of the sixties' generation was that they rejected socialist realism in literary and artistic work but nevertheless accepted many of the socialist-humanist values of their society. For them, socialism was 'inseparable from internationalism, democracy, and humanism'. They called for the democratization of Soviet society and an end to the Russification of ethnic minorities. But, at the same time, they remained committed to the wider egalitarian principles of socialism and brotherly internationalism.

In the mid-1970s, the first open public association in Ukraine without

official approval was formed. It was called the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote Implementation of the Helsinki Accords. Founded in Kyiv in November 1976, the Kyiv Helsinki Group was the largest of the five that were formed in the USSR at the time. It was founded by ten people, most of whom had been imprisoned for their earlier promotion of the Ukrainian national cause. Membership in the group eventually grew to thirty-seven. Unlike the other Helsinki Watch groups in the Soviet Union, the Kyiv group concentrated almost exclusively on the defense of the right of equality based on nationality (Alexeyeva, 1985: 52). It avoided entanglements in other human rights issues in Ukraine such as religious persecution, or the defense of social and economic rights (Alexeyeva, 1985: 52). Its single emphasis was both its strength and its weakness. It allowed the association to use its limited resources and contacts to promote the Ukrainian cause, but at the same time it limited the opportunities to form alliances with other groups in order to construct a more broadly based human rights movement in Ukraine.

An important part of the resistance to Russification in Ukraine and of the wider dissident movement in the Soviet Union in the postwar period was the publication of *samydav* literature (*samizdat* in Russian). As in other parts of the Soviet Union, an underground network of uncensored publications began to circulate in Ukraine in the early 1960s. In Ukraine, the early *samydav* publications contained copies of poetry or verse expressing national consciousness that was not published by the Soviet press or which was published only in very limited editions (Alexeyeva, 1985: 39). By 1965, *samydav* literature was being distributed more widely in Ukraine and began to take on a sharper edge.² For example, one search of homes conducted in 1970 in Lviv netted the authorities more than three thousand copies of *samydav* publications (Alexeyeva, 1985: 42). These later publications contained complaints about Russification; analyses of the discrepancies between the practice of Russification and official pronouncements of tolerance and comradeship between ethnic groups; descriptions of political trials of Ukrainian dissidents; autobiographical accounts of arrests, trials and imprisonment; and pleas by friends and relatives to government officials for the release of political prisoners.

Crackdowns on resistance

The Ukrainians' resistance, both organized and unorganized, to Soviet rule did not go unchallenged. In Ukraine and other republics, Soviet authorities were on the alert against both unauthorized expressions of nationalist sentiments and criticisms of the system. Though intolerance of dissent was a hallmark of the Soviet Union, there were two main waves

of crackdowns on Ukrainian dissidents in the postwar period. One wave coincided with the first stirring of dissident activity in 1965, and the other with the purging of Shelest and his colleagues from the Communist Party in 1972 and 1973.

In August and September 1965, the Soviet authorities began a crackdown on the 'sixties' generation': Ukrainian intellectuals who were promoting 'Ukrainianness' and who were critical of Soviet policies. Many were charged with, and eventually convicted of, engaging in anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (Alexeyeva, 1985: 37). The penalties were a combination of long terms of imprisonment, incarceration in psychiatric hospitals, loss of jobs, denial of places at universities and other institutes of higher education and expulsion from school.

In the face of Soviet persecution, some members of the sixties' generation recanted their earlier nationalist writings. Dziuba, for example, retracted his earlier allegation that Russification was antithetical to the principles of socialist internationalism and denounced his previous writings and that of his former colleagues as the work of 'bourgeois Ukrainian nationalists'. Others were less easily intimidated. A Ukrainian history teacher called Valentyn Moroz, who lived in western Ukraine, had his first brush with Soviet authorities in September 1965, when he was arrested for reading and distributing 'anti-Soviet propaganda and [engaging in] agitation [that] aided at subverting or weakening the Soviet regime' (Stetsko, 1969: 2). At his trial, Moroz admitted that he did possess certain banned literary material, but he refused to admit to any wrongdoing. He was convicted and served three years of hard labor in various prison camps in the USSR. While in prison he wrote *Report from the Beria Reserve*, which was a biting indictment of the Soviet gulag. In it, Moroz posed the simple, but provocative question: if Ukraine really was a sovereign and independent republic, as Soviet authorities claimed, then why were its political prisoners sent to another country (Russia) to serve their sentences? The *Report* was smuggled out of prison and published as *samydav* in both Russia and Ukraine. Copies also made their way into the anxious diaspora community in the west.

When Moroz was released in September 1969, he continued to write material that was critical of Soviet nationality policies and the status of the Ukrainian language and culture within the USSR. He also criticized some of his dissident colleagues who had recanted their earlier nationalist-oriented writings, speeches, poems and statements. Nine months after being released from his first term in prison, he was arrested again and convicted of possessing and disseminating anti-Soviet propaganda, and sentenced to nine years in prison and five years of banishment. Prisons in the Russian cities of Perm and Vladimir and in the Mordovian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic became home to hundreds of other

Ukrainians and other dissidents in the late 1960s and 1970s, many of whom died while serving in these harsh, soul-destroying institutions.

In the early 1970s, the *Ukrainian Herald* published numerous accounts of people who were disciplined for their 'Ukrainianness' and for possessing, distributing or writing *samydydav* literature. In addition to imprisonment, Soviet authorities began use psychiatry as a political weapon (Bloch and Reddaway, 1984; Holowinsky, 1987). Nationalists, peace activists, would-be emigrants, proponents of religions other than Russian Orthodoxy and other 'citizens inconvenient to the authorities' were diagnosed by Soviet doctors as mentally ill and incarcerated in psychiatric institutions (Bloch and Reddaway, 1984: 30). The Soviet logic was that since the Soviet Union was a classless society that was coming close to perfection on earth, anyone who was critical of that society must be mentally unbalanced and in need of psychiatric treatment.

In other cases, dissidents and those guilty of 'bourgeois nationalism' were expelled from universities and colleges, refused admission to higher education, dismissed from their jobs or subjected to strict interrogation (Jones and Yasen, 1977). According to the historian and dissident Ludmilla Alexeyeva, so many people lost their jobs at this time that a new social stratum of 'stokers with university education' emerged. They consisted of intellectuals who had been dismissed from their university or other posts and who were forced into blue-collar work. The regime's hope was that the discipline of wage labor would temper their nationalist inclinations and instill in them a suitable proletarian internationalist consciousness (Alexeyeva, 1985: 41).

The *Ukrainian Herald* also published a number of accounts of the other kinds of reprisals against Ukrainians who insisted on public and unsanctioned displays of Ukrainianness. One case concerned a choir, *Homin*, which was formed in the late 1960s by people who were interested in Ukrainian folk music, traditions and customs. Their outdoor performances of Ukrainian folk songs began to attract large audiences, and their popularity caught the attention of the Soviet authorities. The repertoire was branded a form of 'bourgeois nationalism', and in the early 1970s members of the choir began to be harassed. At one interrogation, a choir member was told by the party committee in her housing project that 'this is a nationalistic choir; it sings enemy songs. You got all tied up with nationalists and on top of that you brought your children with you!' (Jones and Yasen, 1977: 132). She, along with a number of other members of the choir were dismissed from their jobs. Others were 'worked with' by party officials and the KGB, who told them that if they continued to sing in the choir they would lose their jobs. One choir member was reprimanded by the party committee in the factory where she worked for having holidayed

in the Carpathian mountains in western Ukraine rather than in the Crimea. The choirmaster, Leopold Yashenko, was eventually expelled from the Composers' Union of Ukraine, and his compositions were no longer published or performed in public. His earlier compositions held in record libraries were removed. The choir disbanded in late 1971 because of the harassment (Jones and Yasen, 1977: 130–8).

According to Alexeyeva, in the 1970s Ukraine was home to a number of 'firsts' when it came to new forms of punishment for dissidents: 'new methods of persecution were first tested in Ukraine, and then extended to other republics' (Alexeyeva, 1985: 55). It was in Ukraine that the authorities first began to plant incriminating objects, such as pornography, American dollars and narcotics, in the homes of well-known dissidents. Ukraine was the first place where criminal charges were fabricated against members of the Helsinki Group. For instance, two of the founding members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group were accused of rape and sentenced to jail. Other dissidents were charged with 'hooliganism' and other criminal offenses. Ukraine was also the first Soviet republic to imprison a dissident's wife for campaigning for the release of her husband, and the first place to sentence a woman to a labor camp for being a member of the Helsinki Group (Alexeyeva, 1985: 54–5).

Alexeyeva notes that another innovative tactic first honed in Ukraine in the 1970s and then used in other republics was the use of physical, 'Mafia-style' beatings and assassinations. Two cases that captured the attention of Ukrainians both inside and outside Ukraine were that of Alla Hors'ka and Volodymir Ivasiuk. Hors'ka was a Ukrainian painter who was accused of 'ideological unreliability' for her part in creating a stained glass window at the University of Kyiv. According to a Ukrainian *samvydav* account, the window depicted 'an angry Shevchenko . . . who with one hand embraced a wronged woman – Ukraine, and in another raised hand, held a book. The inscription on the stained glass, taken from Shevchenko, read: "I shall glorify them, these mute slaves! I shall put WORD near them to guard them"' (Moroz, 1971: 65). The window was destroyed by the Communist Party Committee at the university, and Hors'ka and her colleagues were expelled from the Union of Artists of Ukraine (Moroz, 1971: 65). Shortly after her expulsion, Hors'ka was strangled by an unknown 'intruder' in her father-in-law's house in Kyiv. Her death was attributed, officially, to an attempted burglary, but many Ukrainians blamed the KGB.

Ivasiuk was a young composer who wrote songs in traditional Ukrainian folk styles. Shortly after refusing to become a KGB informer, he was found hanged from a tree in a forest near his home in western Ukraine. His death was termed a suicide by the authorities, but friends, relatives and many others believed that the KGB was responsible. His funeral was

attended by several thousand mourners, and his death came to symbolize the lengths to which Soviet authorities would go to suppress unsanctioned expressions of Ukrainian culture and language. Many Ukrainians in the diaspora were moved by Ivasiuk's death and his classic song, *Chervona ruta*, still brings tears to the eyes of many.

The diaspora and its role in exposing Russification and human rights abuses

How did these events in postwar Soviet Ukraine figure in the organized Ukrainian diaspora in North America? As before, there was a fundamental difference between how Soviet Ukraine was understood by nationalist organizations and by organizations on the left. During much of the postwar period, leftists in the diaspora tended to remain steadfastly committed to the Soviet Union. In their glorification of the ancestral homeland in Soviet Ukraine, they repeated the claim that Ukrainian culture, language and political autonomy were in fact flourishing under Soviet rule. According to a 1957 article in *Ukrainske Zhyyttia*, a weekly newspaper published by the left-leaning Association of United Ukrainian Canadians,

The October Socialist Revolution liberated the Ukrainian nation from slavery. It transferred the factories and the land to the people. It and only it infused the Ukrainian nation with national consciousness. Thanks to the October socialist revolution the Ukrainian nation received its statehood. Ukraine became a unified state.

(Cited in Kolasky, 1990: 321)

Some, like Matthew Shatulsky, a second-wave immigrant from western Ukraine, refused to countenance any criticism of the Soviet Union and Soviet Ukraine. He and others became darlings of the Soviet government and were rewarded for their loyalty with regular invitations to return to the Soviet Union for fraternal visits during which there were opportunities to meet with members of the Soviet Ukrainian intelligentsia (Krawchuk, 1991). However, some members of the diaspora left were more circumspect in their assessment of Soviet policy in relation to the Ukrainian language and culture. Others were aware of allegations that Ukrainian society was being Russified. However, they tended to argue that although the Soviet government may have made mistakes in the past in its dealings with the so-called 'national question', and that certain problems and 'incorrect' views had occasionally been expressed by Soviet authorities, the overall approach of the Soviet government to the issue of language and nationality was 'correct'.

During the 1950s and 1960s, a number of Canadian communists of Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian backgrounds visited Soviet Ukraine, either for further training as cadres or to investigate and report back to socialists in the diaspora about the allegations of Russification and repression of the Ukrainian language and culture. In 1967, a Communist Party of Canada delegation was given permission to conduct a first-hand investigation of the allegations of Russification in Soviet Ukraine. Four of the six members of the team were Ukrainian Canadians. They found some 'cause for concern' but not enough to shake their commitment to socialism or to the Soviet regime.

Some of the socialists who visited Soviet Ukraine in the 1950s and 1960s as part of their socialist training, however, did become disillusioned with what they saw. After gaining some first-hand experience of life in Soviet Ukraine, they concluded that Russification was widespread and that the Ukrainian language and culture were in a precarious situation. John Kolasky, a notable Ukrainian diaspora communist activist in Canada was selected in 1963 to attend the Higher Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine in Kyiv. During his visit, Kolasky became alarmed at the widespread use of Russian in the capital of what was supposed to be an independent Ukrainian republic. Upon his return he published *Education in Soviet Ukraine* in 1968 which recounted his disillusion with the widespread use of Russian in Ukrainian society. He quit the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians and later wrote *Two Years in Soviet Ukraine* (1970) and *The Shattered Illusion* (1979) which was a critical history of pro-communist organizations in the Ukrainian diaspora in Canada. For the rest of his life, Kolasky was aligned with the wider Ukrainian nationalist movement in the diaspora. He died in Kyiv in 1997.

Kolasky was reviled by leftists for his about-face. In both the diaspora and the Soviet Union communists engaged in systematic character assassination against him. In a Soviet review, which was reprinted by Canadian communists in English and Ukrainian, Kolasky was called a 'troubadour of imperialism' whose *Education in Soviet Ukraine* was a 'pretentious and slanderous book' (Kolasky, 1990: 338). The review concluded with the oft-repeated claim that 'experience has . . . demonstrated that socialism has brought our people everything that they dreamed of for ages: social and national emancipation, a happy and prosperous life, and [an] unprecedented flourishing of culture' (cited in Kolasky, 1990: 339).

For nationalists in the diaspora *Education in Soviet Ukraine* confirmed what they had known all along. Despite the minor ebbs and flows of Soviet nationality policy, the view within the various nationalist camps was that Soviet Ukraine was undergoing a widespread and systematic process of Russification, that the Ukrainian language and culture were suppressed

both officially and unofficially, and that abuses of human rights were rampant. They believed that the occasional tolerance displayed by the Soviet authorities towards the Ukrainian language and culture was simply a ploy to defuse dissent, and that the ultimate objective of Soviet nationalities policy continued to be the annihilation of Ukrainian language and culture and the creation of *Homo sovieticus*.

During the postwar period, the nationalists in the organized diaspora pursued two related strategies to help nationally conscious Ukrainians defend the Ukrainian language and culture from victimization by the Soviet system. First, they tried to inform the wider public and governments in the west of human rights abuses and the Soviet repression of the Ukrainian language and culture. And, second, they tried to help the development of a national liberation movement that would work in Soviet Ukraine, and the Soviet Union more generally, to undermine Soviet rule.

Exposing human rights abuses to the west

In the years before Ukrainian independence in 1991, the purpose of much of the political activity of various nationalist groups in the Ukrainian diaspora was to publicize the Russification of Ukraine and Soviet human rights abuses to a wider western audience. This audience consisted of Ukrainians who did not belong to particular organizations, the general public, and governments in various countries of settlement.

These efforts took a number of forms. As noted in Chapter 5, Ukrainians in the diaspora regularly organized protests, marches and demonstrations denouncing Russian imperialism, the Russification of Ukraine and the imprisonment of Ukrainian political prisoners. Protests were organized by Banderite and Melnykite factions of the OUN and a variety of other organizations in places as far afield as Ottawa, Toronto, Edmonton, Bonn, Munich, Canberra, London, Bradford, Buenos Aires and São Paulo. During the 1960s and 1970s, most of the cities where there were concentrations of Ukrainians saw regular rallies, demonstrations and commemorations of various Ukrainian-related human rights causes.

A second tactic was the disruption of events organized by leftist organizations that were supportive of the Soviet Union. After the war, Ukrainian diaspora communists sold Soviet literature in their bookstores, invited representatives of the Soviet embassy to appear and speak at public events and hosted Soviet Ukrainian artists, dancers and literary figures (Kolasky, 1979: 110–17). Nationalists took every opportunity to disrupt news conferences and performances of the Ukrainians who were visiting the west in order to showcase the supposed continued vitality of Ukrainian culture in Soviet Ukraine. In the 1970s and 1980s, numerous protests and

leaflet campaigns were organized both in Europe and in North America when groups like the Red Army ensemble and the Bolshoi Theatre Company were performing (Pokorny, 1972: 67–9). They also asked embarrassing questions of the Ukrainian visitors about the state of the Ukrainian language and culture in Ukraine, and the ‘Ukrainianness’ of their artistic and intellectual work. At a news conference in Toronto in 1966, for example, a celebrated Ukrainian writer from Soviet Ukraine was asked for the titles of his works and the writer was eventually forced to admit that he wrote in Russian and not Ukrainian. When he was asked similar questions in Winnipeg, he walked out of an interview (Kolasky, 1979: 118).

Members of the diaspora also lobbied western governments and cultivated ties with conservative politicians and organizations in order to strengthen support for the Ukrainian cause. Diaspora Ukrainians did have some success in playing on Cold War hostilities, and were able to reach out to wider conservative forces in their various countries of settlement. Perhaps the most successful lobbying endeavor of diaspora Ukrainians was their success in persuading the United States Congress to establish an annual ‘Captive Nations Week’. With pressure coming from the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Ukrainian National Association, the American Congress adopted a resolution proclaiming the third week of July Captive Nations Week. Since then, ‘every president from Eisenhower to George Bush, issued a Captive Nations Proclamation’ (Kuropas, 1996: 439), and in the United States the week provided a focal point for various Ukrainian diaspora community activities, demonstrations, rallies, lectures and the like.

The Central Committee of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), a Banderite organization with local chapters in the United States, Canada, Britain and Australia, also had some success in cultivating relationships with conservative, anti-Soviet politicians. The ABN supported the reelection of Ronald Reagan in the 1984 American presidential election on the grounds that he ‘personifies the best elements of the freedom loving American nation and its tradition of an anti-colonial war of liberation which brought this country independence’ (S. Stetsko, 1985: 220). Local chapters also had some success in recruiting conservative senators, congressmen and members of parliament into their cause. John Wilkinson, a Conservative member of the British parliament, who was also president of the European Freedom Council, took an active part in local ABN demonstrations and commemorations. During its fortieth anniversary celebrations in 1984, the ABN was able to recruit a number of high-profile conservative speakers at various events. Jeane Kirkpatrick, the American Representative to the United Nations, addressed the ABN delegates at a luncheon at the American Congress. General John Singlaub, the former

commander-in-chief of United Nations forces in Korea and chairman of the US Council for World Freedom, Congressmen Philip Crane and Gerald Solomon also spoke at the afternoon celebrations (S. Stetsko, 1985: 215). Alfonse D'Amato, the Republican senator from New York, sought the help of the ABN to organize a demonstration in front of the United Nations when he was refused an entry visa to the Soviet Union (S. Stetsko, 1985: 217). Congressman Henry Hyde was also an active supporter of the ABN's goals. Among other things, he pressed for the release of Iurii Shukhevych, the son of Ukrainian Insurgent Army general Roman Shukhevych, who had been imprisoned by Soviet authorities for over thirty-five years for failing to denounce his father's participation in the struggle for Ukrainian national liberation during the war. With Hyde's help, the US Congress passed a resolution that demanded Shukhevych's release and his right to 'emigrate to the free world'. A similar resolution was passed by the Australian parliament (Zwarycz, 1985: 121). The Ukrainian Americans also had some success with helping organize a wider 'Ad Hoc Committee for Baltic Nations and Ukraine', whose aim was the decolonization of the Soviet-Russian Empire and the reestablishment of freedom, democracy and sovereignty for all nations (Charkewycz, 1985: 132). The Canadian chapter of the ABN also made a few inroads into conservative circles. A delegation representing the ABN took part in the 1982 Progressive Conservative Policy Conference and presented a position paper to the delegates.

During the 1960s and 1970s, nationalists in the diaspora exposed and documented the Russification of Ukraine and the denial of human rights in the Soviet Union through conferences and a publication program. Much of the material was either written in, or translated into English, in the hope that it would reach a wider audience. For instance, in 1987 the Commission for Culture and Scholarship of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America published an edited collection of papers under the title *Moscow's Russification of Ukraine*. The collection gave details of the Russification of language, literature, 'psychological science' and the economy of Ukraine and the persecution of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic churches. In the editorial preface to the collection, Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky outlined the essence of the nationalist community's alarm over what was happening in Soviet Ukraine and the place that the diaspora had in the maintenance of Ukrainian language and culture. He argued that the 'newest onslaught of Russification began in 1979' with the Soviet policy of improving the teaching and use of the Russian language in the non-Russian republics, and charged that this was a deliberate attempt by Soviet authorities to undermine the national languages and cultures of the non-Russian peoples (Chirovsky, 1987: 5). In view of extensive Russification of Soviet Ukraine,

he suggested that 'the Ukrainian language, culture and civilization can develop freely only in the Free World, particularly in the United States' (Chirovsky, 1987: 6). He also explained that the UCCA's Commission for Culture and Scholarship had sponsored the conference and published the collection in order to 'portray to the Western reader another heinous aspect of the Kremlin leadership, who obsessed with Russian imperialism, under the guise of Marxist-Leninism to confuse the uninformed, want to conquer and Russify whomever they can – Afghanistan being the most recent victim' (Chirovsky, 1987: 6).

Efforts to appeal to a wider audience also took non-academic forms. Helsinki Watch groups were formed in the diaspora and in addition to monitoring abuses of human rights in the Soviet Union, they too lobbied western governments and wrote letters to the editors of newspapers.

In 1975, the Ukrainian National Women's League of America, in conjunction with the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners of New York, published a small pamphlet called *Women Political Prisoners in the USSR*. The pamphlet contained brief biographical sketches of six Ukrainian women political prisoners and a longer list of Ukrainian, Baptist, Russian, Jewish and other female political prisoners in the USSR. It also contained an 'Action Guide for Defending Women Political Prisoners', meant to help guide the activities of Ukrainian diaspora women and their organizations. It suggested writing letters of encouragement to political prisoners, and gave the addresses of a number of Soviet labor camps at which women were imprisoned. It also suggested that members organize a letter-writing campaign to Soviet government officials, including Communist Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, and to various Soviet ambassadors in the west. While the Action Guide recognized that the 'rallies, demonstrations and teach-ins' were valuable methods to inform the public about Soviet political prisoners, it recommended that a more 'quiet and calculated penetration of the media' would have greater public impact. It also suggested to diaspora women that they get involved with existing Ukrainian diaspora human rights organizations, as well as 'mainstream' organizations such as Amnesty International, to help publicize the plight of women political prisoners. It also recommended the cultivation of 'personal contacts' with various media personalities and the use of those contacts as channels for providing pertinent information to wider media organizations. The guide offered the realistic observation that 'writing to government leaders is worth a try, [but] one should not expect a president to overhaul his foreign policy for the sake of women political prisoners in the USSR'. Instead, it recommended cultivating relations with lesser-ranking government officials, particularly 'Congressmen and Senators who express reservations about the USA's policy of détente with the USSR'. Finally, it recommended that

Ukrainian diaspora women try to make contact with more broadly based feminist and women's organizations: 'approach those organizations you believe will work with you, establish contacts, and then urge them to take a public stand on the issue of women prisoners'. The Action Guide closed with a parenthetical comment: 'consider the impact of a well-timed article in Ms. magazine' (UNWLA, 1975: 15).³

An additional means by which the diaspora helped expose human rights abuses in Ukraine was by publishing, and helping mainstream publishers disseminate, *samvydav* material and other information about Ukrainian political prisoners. This included articles from the *Ukrainian Herald*, an underground journal published in Soviet Ukraine by dissidents who had been emboldened by the period of Ukrainianization under Shelest. A number of issues made their way to the west, where the articles were subsequently translated into English and published by Smolokyp Publishers of Baltimore. Smolokyp was founded in 1967 by Osyp Zinkewych, a third-wave immigrant in the United States who had been part of the nationalist underground in Ukraine during World War II and who, through his American publishing house, wanted to 'shine a light on human and national rights abuses in Ukraine' (Bihun, 1997).⁴ The aim of those translating that material into English was:

to affect the way wide circles in the West, private persons as well as government types, view present-day dissent in Ukraine . . . It is hoped that more people here will become less distant to the problem of human and national rights in Ukraine and in the rest of the Soviet Union, and will be moved to ask themselves the question, 'what might I be able to do?'

(Jones and Yasen, 1977: 12)

Issue 7–8 of the *Ukrainian Herald*, for example, contained a section called 'The Ethnocide of Ukrainians in the USSR: Demographic Statistics Exposing the Colonial Policy of Moscow's Occupation Forces in Ukraine'. In addition to providing data on the declining use of Ukrainian in the home, school and public life in Ukraine, the issue detailed the persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals in the 1970s and the destruction of Ukrainian historical monuments and both Catholic and Orthodox churches. North American profits from the publication went to the support of Ukrainian political prisoners in the USSR.

In addition, the dissident writings of Valentyn Moroz were published by the Ukrainian Information Service of London. The Service was an arm of the United Ukrainians of Great Britain, a Banderite-controlled organization active in Britain since the late 1940s. In the 1960s and 1970s, the

Service published numerous items, including *Among the Snows*, which was Moroz's response to Dziuba's retraction of earlier writings critical of Russification. In *Among the Snows*, Moroz called upon Dziuba to come back into the dissident fold and 'to burst again into pure flames of infatuation – for this is the greatest wealth in the present-day Ukrainian state of frozenness' (Moroz, 1971: 33). Some dissident writings were also published by mainstream publishers, although it is unclear whether they had been persuaded by members of the Ukrainian diaspora that there was a market for such material.

Finally, the Ukrainian diaspora cared for dissidents who were released from prison and who were subsequently allowed to leave the Soviet Union or were expelled. Dissidents who arrived in the west were regarded as heroes by the diaspora. They were often paraded in front of community meetings, where they were treated with reverence and respect by the hundreds who came to see them. Community newspapers praised their principled refusal to retract statements that were critical of Soviet nationalities policy and human rights abuses in Soviet Ukraine. Shortly after Valentyn Moroz's release from a Soviet jail and his subsequent arrival in the United States, a *Ukrainian Weekly* article explained:

A legend in his own time, Valentyn Moroz has in the face of fantastic pressure and torture – arrests, imprisonment, beatings, solitary confinement, psychiatric manipulation, poisoning, family intimidation – steadfastly defended his nation against Russification and in his personal way sought its independence. If there ever was a person in the latter half of the twentieth century who deserved the thanks of Ukrainians around the world for what he or she has done for the cause of Ukrainian independence, Valentyn Moroz is such a person.

(Cited in Kuropas, 1996: 540)

The diaspora also tried to use the dissidents to cultivate wider support for the cause of Ukrainian independence. In the United States, members of the diaspora arranged for dissidents to meet with senators, congressmen, White House officials and, in some cases, the President (Kuropas, 1996: 540).

Sometimes, though, dissidents became caught in the tug-of-war for influence and prestige between different factions in the diaspora. When Moroz was allowed to leave the Soviet Union in April 1979, Zbigniew Bryzinski, President Carter's National Security Advisor, met with representatives of the Ukrainian National Association, and when Moroz arrived in the United States, he was given into the care of representatives of

the UNA. But within days of his arrival, he was convinced by Slava Stetsko of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, along with members of the Banderite Liberation Front, that 'the future lay with them' (Kuropas, 1996: 540–1). Among other things, they offered him the services of a personal secretary to help coordinate his appearances and activities. Apparently at the prodding of UCCA members, he later denigrated the UNA for its apparent lack of militancy in support of Ukrainian causes. Moroz eventually fell out of favor with the UCCA and moved to Canada. Later he became disillusioned with life in the diaspora and returned to Ukraine in 1992, where he became a figurehead for ultra-nationalists in Lviv (Wilson, 2000: 154; Kuropas, 1996: 552).

The Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations and national liberation

Inspired by the success of anti-colonial movements in Africa in the late 1940s and 1950s, some members of the Ukrainian diaspora decided that the only way to fight Soviet Russian imperialism was by an armed struggle for national liberation. One of the more militant diaspora organizations that promoted the idea that Ukrainians had to engage in their own struggle for national liberation from within Soviet Ukraine was the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations. In the 1970s, the ABN had a number of chapters in the United States, Canada and Britain, mainly in cities like New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Rochester, Detroit, Toronto, Bradford, Coventry, Nottingham and London.⁵ While the organization's rhetoric and efforts were admittedly on the fringe of much of the organized diaspora community, its ultimate goals were similar to those of other individuals and organizations within the diaspora (Hunt, 1986).

The ABN was largely the brainchild of members of the Ukrainian diaspora, particularly the post-World War II émigrés linked to the Bandera faction of the OUN. One of the founding members was Yaroslav Stetsko, the Prime Minister of Ukraine during the Bandera faction's proclamation of Ukrainian independence in Lviv in 1941. Stetsko had been imprisoned by the Germans after the declaration of independence, but he returned to Ukraine after his release from Sachsenhausen concentration camp in 1943. Upon his return, he met with representatives of nationalist groups from the Baltics in order to discuss the formation of a wider anti-communist alliance. In 1944 a second conference of anti-Bolsheviks was held in Krakow, Poland, at which 'all the subjugated peoples [of the Soviet Union] were represented and the political program of the ABN was already drawn up in detail' (Nakashidze, 1960: 15).

Though the ABN was made up of individuals and organizations who claimed to represent all 'subjugated peoples' of the Russian empire and

other communist regimes, the organization bore the imprint of certain members of the Ukrainian diaspora. Yaroslav and Slava Stetsko were central figures in the ABN throughout the postwar period. Ukraine also seemed to be the best-represented of the 'subjugated nations' within the organization. At a joint conference of the ABN and European Freedom Council held in Brussels in 1970, for example, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia and Poland each had one official delegate, Belorussia and Romania each had two delegates, and Croatia had seven delegates, but Ukraine had twelve (ABN, 1972: 5; see also European Freedom Council, 1985). The delegates at these conferences consisted exclusively of émigrés who 'represented' their specific nations. Furthermore, much of the ABN's agenda seems to have been shaped by the Ukrainian diaspora (Pokorny, 1972: 68). According to Slava Stetsko, the ABN's objectives were to promote the national liberation struggle within subjugated nations and to be the

coordinating center for the national-liberation movements of the nations subjugated by Russian imperialism and communism. Its principal aim is to re-establish national, independent, democratic and sovereign states of the presently subjugated nations each within its ethnographic borders through the dissolution of the Russian empire and its concomitant communist system of slavery. The ABN seeks to accomplish this through coordinated and simultaneous revolutionary uprisings on the territories of the subjugated nations.

(S. Stetsko, 1985: 4)

The ABN itself saw its main goal as the 'psycho-moral, political and ideological revolutionization of all strata of society' (ABN, 1972: 21).

Within ABN thinking, the main enemy was not only communism but also Russian imperialism; indeed, communism and Bolshevism were simply 'the disguise' within which Russians masked their aspirations for world domination. In these circumstances, a 'change of regime in the Russian empire . . . is a short-sighted solution to the problem' (ABN, 1972: 73). The purpose of ABN's activity was to help the subjugated nations of the Russian Empire take their rightful place in Europe as independent nations. Yaroslav Stetsko explained why Ukraine and other countries within the Soviet orbit should be taken under the western European wing: 'Europe is where European ideals are defended by blood and life – and those ideals are: the idea of a nation and its independence, the idea of a man, his virtue, dignity and the heroic idea of Christianity.' 'The ideals of Europe', he claimed, 'have been defended in uprisings of Ukrainians,

Byelorussians, Caucasians and other prisoners in concentration camps of Siberia, in the Hungarian revolution of 1956, in Vorkuta in 1956, in Berlin in 1953, in Prague and Bratislava in 1968, and recently in Kyiv, Minsk, and Tblisi by underground fighters'. (ABN, 1972: 9).

For the ABN, there were two reasons why the west should support national liberation movements in places like Ukraine rather than provoke a Third World War against the Soviet Union. First, the ABN claimed that international wars have never been successful in curbing Russian imperialism. The only times that the Russian Empire's expansionist aims were ever successfully curbed was when colonized peoples in the empire challenged Russian hegemony from within. 'It is a historically proven fact that Russia was always defeated in internal revolutions, not in external wars' (Stetsko, 1972: 23). Second, the ABN argued that supporting national liberation struggles would be an alternative to nuclear war. Moscow would never resort to the use of nuclear weapons to suppress the national liberation movements within the Soviet Union because it 'would be tantamount to suicide'. Moscow would 'be destroying its own colonial forces and terror apparatus (the KGB, Russian occupational forces, and the Russian colonialist population in the subjugated nations) by which it is able to maintain their domination of the subjugated nations' (Zwarycz, 1985: 87). However, the ABN felt that Moscow would be prepared to sacrifice the people of Ukraine in the event of a war with the west. According to the ABN's analysis,

Moscow has deployed an overwhelming majority of its ominously huge nuclear arsenal on the territories of Ukraine and the other subjugated nations, thereby deftly maneuvering the NATO powers to primarily target these non-Russian ethnographic areas in their nuclear strategy. Hence, in the event of nuclear escalation of military hostilities, ethnographically Russian areas – the most significant power base of the imperialist regime – would be left relatively unscathed.

(Zwarycz, 1985: 118)

The other aspect of ABN thinking, however, was that national liberation movements should not rely solely on western governments. The ABN claimed that the main reason the Hungarian revolution had failed was that its leaders did not make links with the national liberation movements in other countries dominated by Russia. Such alliances were necessary because the liberal political and social environment in the 1970s in the west was conspiring against them. The ABN delegation in Canada, for example, complained bitterly about Prime Minister Trudeau's policy of

'flexibility' with respect to the USSR: 'it is this vicious political double standard and immorality that we must address ourselves to' (Steciw, 1985: 135). It argued that in pursuing détente and peaceful coexistence, the west was indirectly sanctioning Russian colonialism. The only way to stop Russian expansionism without resorting to nuclear war was to make it 'mandatory' for America and the west, 'to support the national liberation revolutionary process within the Russian Empire in order to bring about its dissolution from within and consequently the fall of Communism'.

Though the activities of the ABN could perhaps never hope to match its eloquence, as noted earlier, it could claim some success in making inroads into conservative political circles in North America and Europe. The ABN was closely aligned with another anti-Soviet organization, the European Freedom Council (EFC), which was a coalition of conservative forces in Europe. The mission of the EFC was to mobilize support within the 'Free World for the subjugated nations' liberation struggle; to promote the necessity of waging a Western political-psychological offensive against Russian imperialism and communism; and to combat Russian communist subversion and infiltration of Western free and democratic societies' (Stetsko, 1985: 3). Along with other Ukrainian diaspora organizations, the ABN organized protests over human rights violations and repression in Soviet Ukraine. It also called on Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, the Voice of America and the BBC World Service to broadcast more material that promoted the right of national independence of the nations subjugated by the Soviet Union (S. Stetsko, 1985: 147). According to Zwarycz (1985: 122), the émigré OUN, along with the ABN, made contact with the Mujahedeen after the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. The OUN sent representatives to Afghanistan in the 1980s to offer their support to 'the Afghan freedom fighters'. While there, representatives of the OUN distributed leaflets that tried to dissuade the Ukrainian and Russian soldiers in the Soviet army from attacking the 'heroic' Afghan people. The OUN also gave the Mujahedeen a mobile radio station, which was to be used, among other things, to broadcast anti-war messages to the Ukrainian soldiers in the Soviet army.

In 1984, the ABN chapter in Canada organized a 'Free Olympiad' in Toronto at which émigré athletes 'representing' Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia competed. At the end of the Toronto games, the flame of the 'Free Olympiad' was transported to Los Angeles. The ABN also published a position paper on the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics. For the ABN, the Soviets' boycott of the 1984 Olympics was an opportunity to use heightening international tensions to promote the idea of national liberation for the 'subjugated nations'. In order to do this, the International

Olympic Committee should select athletes 'from among the émigrés of the subjugated nations' (S. Stetsko, 1985: 221) to represent places like Ukraine. The proposal did not seem to have any influence in Olympic circles.

In Britain the ABN felt that it was fighting a rearguard action against an unsympathetic press. In its report on activities in the early 1980s, the ABN complained bitterly about a left-wing bias in the media, a claim that was echoed within wider Conservative circles in Britain at the time. The ABN charged that:

noisy, sometimes violent demonstrations of small groups, mainly communists, their 'fellow travelers' or just left wingers are given almost always full coverage and a lot of publicity . . . [even though] the Communists' chief objective is the destruction of Western Civilization, its national morals, and its religious, spiritual and social life with the final goal: world conquest and domination.

(Glinski, 1985: 129)

The British ABN activists felt that there was a double standard operating on Fleet Street: 'Our impressive mass rallies and demonstrations, sometimes 2-4 thousands strong were hardly mentioned at all, if ever, by the media' (Glinski, 1985: 130).

Even though the ABN's bark was louder than its bite, the organization, and the Stetskos in particular, were a thorn in the side of the Soviet authorities. The Soviets must have considered the ABN to be at least a potentially destabilizing influence because they continually tried to discredit it. In 1960, for example, the ABN Press and Information Bureau in Munich responded to such efforts with a pamphlet called *The Truth about ABN: An Answer to the Provocations of Moscow's Fifth Column in the West*. Written by Prince Niko Nakashidze, the Georgian secretary general of the ABN, the pamphlet described a publication called *What Is ABN?* which was first published in German at Stuttgart, and reprinted in England and France, and which was a clumsy effort on the part of the Soviets to discredit the ABN: 'The Russians are supported in their subversive activity in the West by the native Communists there, by the co-existentialists of every trend and by pro-Russians of every kind. By every means available they seek to undermine the ABN and paralyze its activity' (Nakashidze, 1960: 30). In the Soviet-inspired pamphlet, the ABN was vilified, basically for being made up of fascists, Nazis and anti-Semites.⁶

The Soviets continued to demonize Stetsko and the ABN well into the 1980s. On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the ABN, a press release written by communist authorities in Kyiv described Stetsko and the

ABN as Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists bent on destroying the Soviet Union (S. Stetsko, 1985, 225). Shortly afterwards, comments like the following appeared in newspapers throughout the Soviet Union:

In 1981, the US Congress gave a reception for a war criminal, leader of the terrorist foreign units of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, Yaroslav Stetsko, who, from his base in Munich, directs his OUN-ite terrorists in the USA. The sympathetic reaction from the Congress hawks to Stetsko's reproach about the West's weak spirit as a result of which the Soviet Union allegedly 'skillfully exploits the Western fear of nuclear war. . .' [sic]. Raising this hullabaloo about the rights of captive nations, about the liberation of socialist states, the US leaders do not limit themselves solely to propagating the cold, psychological or psycho political warfare.

(Cited in S. Stetsko, 1985: 225)

These kinds of Soviet attacks on the Ukrainian and other Soviet diaspora nationalists were a regular feature of postwar life.

Conclusion

Like other diasporas that were made up of postwar refugees who had left eastern Europe during the chaos of World War II, some segments of the postwar Ukrainian diaspora devoted their organizational activities to exposing abuses of human rights and linguistic, cultural and religious repression in the Soviet Union. The process of coming to the defense of oppressed Ukraine and Ukrainians was one of the ways in which ethnic identities and group boundaries were maintained in the diaspora. The existence of a common enemy in the form of the Soviet Union was one of the threads that helped to sustain organized diaspora life in North America. The heightened tensions between the west and the Soviet Union, between the end of the war and the early 1980s, provided the Ukrainian diaspora with one of bases for community-building, and the maintenance of ethnic boundaries, although, as we saw in the previous chapter, that common enemy was not enough to unite the different groups within the diaspora. Community mobilization around the denial of human rights in Ukraine was another way that the ethnic group consciousness of Ukrainians in the diaspora was expressed. That mobilization also reflected a sense of solidarity with co-ethnics within Ukraine, and, to a certain extent, within other diaspora locations. Community mobilization to protest events in Soviet Ukraine was not a return movement per se, but reflected an

idealization of the ancestral homeland that entailed the belief that Ukrainian people deserved to be free of foreign domination.

Despite material prosperity, social acceptance and assimilation in the west, there are elements of a victim consciousness in the diaspora community. Between the 1950s and the 1980s, that was because of the denial of human rights in Soviet Ukraine and the associated Russification of Ukrainian society. However, as noted in the next chapter, since the 1980s Ukrainian victim narratives have broadened to include the ways in which Ukrainians have been victimized in some of the host societies in which they have settled.

UKRAINIANS AND THEIR SENSE OF VICTIMIZATION

When the casualties of the civil war, collectivization, the famine, the purges of the 1930s and the 6.8 million who died during World War II are combined, it is estimated that *more than half the male and one-quarter of the female population of Ukrainian perished . . .* Such a mountain of skulls is unprecedented in human history . . . In summing up the 1930s it is no exaggeration to say that the Ukrainians' greatest achievement during that decade was that they outlasted it.

(Krawchenko, 1986b: 23)

In most of the western countries within which they have settled, Ukrainians are socially accepted, have assimilated, and have achieved levels of economic prosperity that are comparable to those of other European origin groups. Ukrainians have penetrated the ranks of the economic and political elite: they are employers, well-paid professionals, government bureaucrats and legislators at various levels of government. In sociological terms, one of the classic measures of social acceptance is intermarriage. On this dimension, Ukrainians in the diaspora also rank as well accepted. In fact, in most countries, 'mixed marriages' are so common that they are a serious cause for concern about the long-term survival of the ethnic community.

Whereas Ukrainians may be relatively well accepted in present-day North America,¹ in other countries they are often regarded with less enthusiasm. Ukrainians who are stranded minorities living in Russia or in countries on Ukraine's western borders are at times the objects of hostility, prejudice and discrimination. In 1947, some 150,000 Ukrainians from the Lemko, Boyko and Kholm regions of Poland were forcibly uprooted from their homes and resettled in various parts of the country. 'Operation Wisla', as the resettlement was code-named, was carried out by the Polish government in cooperation with Russian forces in order to punish Ukrainians for UPA partisan attacks on Polish forces after the war, to weaken the base of support for Ukrainian partisans in Poland, and to

facilitate the assimilation of the stranded Ukrainian minority in Poland. Entire villages were destroyed, as were churches and other symbols of Ukrainian culture and heritage. Over 1000 Ukrainians were killed during the operation, and 4000 more were imprisoned and tortured for their resistance (Olszanski, 1991). One contemporary report suggests that 'the negative stereotype of Ukrainians created during the Soviet period still exists in Poland. Ukrainians exist lower on the scale [of social acceptance] than Gypsies and Jews' (Lew, 1997). Another argues that the low level of social acceptance has implications for the social and cultural life of Ukrainians in Poland insofar as 'a considerable number of Ukrainian intellectuals do not take part in Ukrainian cultural life, largely because of opportunism in combination with the prevailing anti-Ukrainian atmosphere' (Truchan, 1994: 182). In a related vein, Luchenko (1994: 1992) argues that 'as a result of . . . degradation . . . Ukrainian children, youth, and undereducated adults [in Romania] are ashamed of their background, while the intimidated intelligentsia live in the cities, separated from the Ukrainian people, and are afraid to speak Ukrainian openly'. In Russia, too, Ukrainians face economic and religious discrimination.

There are other cases in which Ukrainians, as either stranded minorities or as a diaspora, have been victims of prejudice and discriminatory government action. What varies, of course, is the extent to which instances of victimization are remembered, form part of collective memories, and provide the basis for political mobilization in a community. Some instances of victimization are not well remembered and only play a minor part in community memory and mobilization.² Others, however, though rooted within particular national boundaries, transcended geography and provide threads that link together Ukrainians in the diaspora.

This chapter considers two instances of victimization that have transcended national boundaries and that have become important in the wider Ukrainian diaspora. The first concerns the allegation that some proportion of the postwar Ukrainians who ended up in the diaspora are anti-Semites who committed war crimes against Jews during World War II. The second is the west's relative indifference to the artificial famine in Soviet Ukraine in 1932-3. These two sets of events are interpreted by some segments of the diaspora as instances of victimization, and it is particularly important to understand them because they bring together a number of themes that are relevant to the criteria used to define diasporas noted in Chapter 1. Community mobilization around these issues links the Ukrainian diaspora with the homeland, signals the existence of a strong group consciousness that has been maintained over time and reveals an uneasy relationship with various host societies. Moreover, these events, and the associated development of a victim consciousness, may be helping

to establish a sense of comradeship within the Ukrainian diaspora that transcends long-standing political and ideological divisions.

**The Demjanjuk case: the demonization of Ukrainians
as racists and war criminals**

Like a tornado, the 'Einsatzgruppen' swept through the Jewish settlements of Eastern Europe in the summer of 1941, destroying age-old communities in a cyclonic upheaval. The German invasion found the Russians unprepared militarily and the civilian population disoriented and demoralized. Exploiting the superstitions and anti-Semitic prejudices of the Lithuanians, Balts and Ukrainians, and activating their accumulated hatred for the Soviets, the Germans harnessed the violent energies of these willing collaborators to round up and kill the Jews . . . In Lvov, the Germans and Ukrainians, in house-to-house hunts for Jews, shot them randomly on the spot. Belatedly, avenging the assassination by a Jew back in 1926 of Semyon Petliura, notorious anti-Semite and Ukrainian national hero, the Ukrainians staged mammoth pogroms, slaughtering thousands and carrying off other thousands to Einsatzgruppen headquarters.

(Dawidowicz, 1975: 279)

Ukrainians in both Ukraine and the diaspora figure prominently in recent narratives of the Holocaust. In fact, in Lucy Dawidowicz's controversial 1975 book, *The War against the Jews, 1933-45*, Ukrainians not only 'collaborated' with the Nazis against the Jews; they surpassed the Nazis in their depravity. Many Jews, according to Troper and Weinfeld (1988: 11-12), believe that the majority of the victims of the Holocaust came from Ukrainian, Latvian and Estonian lands and that Ukrainians were disproportionately involved in the murder of Jews during World War II. The 'measure of Ukrainian co-operation' with the Nazis, according to some Jews, 'is that an estimated 90 percent of Ukrainian Jewry was eventually murdered' during the war (Troper and Weinfeld, 1988: 11-12).

It was difficult to be a Ukrainian in the diaspora in the 1980s, particularly if one belonged to the third wave of migration. The fear that a husband, father, brother or uncle might be accused of being an anti-Semite and war criminal was palpable in many segments of the diaspora. As Serbs in the 1990s knew all too well, to be called a racist and a war criminal is to be seen as nothing short of an inhuman monster who is beyond the pale of civilization.

One source of the Ukrainian diaspora's sense of victimization is their

belief that they have been collectively, and unjustly, portrayed as inveterate racists, anti-Semites and war criminals. Ukrainians in the western diaspora feel in the pursuit of World War II war criminals beginning in the 1980s they have been unfairly portrayed by governments, by the former Soviet government and by individual Jews and Jewish organizations. The defense of individual Ukrainians accused of war crimes, and the defense of the wider ethnic group in both the diaspora and Ukraine against allegations of anti-Semitism has provided one focal point for Ukrainian diaspora community organization and mobilization over the past fifteen years.

Allegations that war criminals were among the DPs who had settled abroad surfaced soon after the end of the war. These allegations came from both leftists in the Ukrainian diaspora and from representatives of Jewish organizations. The Cold War was probably one reason why the possible presence of Nazi war criminals in the west did not become a public issue earlier. After the end of the war, historian Peter Novick (1999: 86) explains, the west's understanding of its enemies and allies changed 'with breathtaking speed'. 'The Russians were transformed from indispensable allies to implacable foes, the Germans from implacable foes to indispensable allies' (Novick, 1999: 86). Consequently, western governments were more worried by communist infiltration of their societies than infiltration by former Nazis and Nazi collaborators (Whitaker, 1987). According to Novick (1999), talk of the Holocaust and the pursuit of Nazi war criminals would only undermine the west's new West German allies and give undeserved legitimacy to the Soviet Union.

The relative silence on the issue of war criminals was broken in the early 1980s when the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles began to pressure a number of western governments to prosecute Nazi war criminals in their midst. The Center charged that 'thousands' of Nazis, Nazi sympathizers, collaborators and war criminals had emigrated as DPs to Australia, Britain, Canada and the United States after the war, and were now living in comfort, and with impunity, in those countries. These allegations touched directly on the Ukrainian diaspora, since Ukrainians formed about a quarter of the displaced persons who migrated to the west after the war.

By the mid-1980s, a number of western governments were pressed into taking action (Cesarini, 1992: 220-1; Aarons, 1989: 289; Troper and Weinfeld, 1988). Canada, Australia and Britain each established commissions of inquiry to examine allegations that Nazi war criminals and collaborators were living in their countries. The issues that the respective commissions were instructed to address were broadly similar: Did their respective governments knowingly facilitate the entry of Nazi war criminals into their countries after the war? Did Nazi war criminals and collaborators emigrate pretending to be genuine displaced person

refugees? Were war criminals and collaborators still living in these countries? What, if anything, should be done about their presence?

In Canada, a Commission of Inquiry into Alleged War Criminals in Canada was struck by the federal government in February 1985. Headed by Mr Justice Jules Deschenes, the Commission conducted hearings and heard from hundreds of witnesses. Among other things, the Commission determined that many of the claims made about the number of war criminals living in Canada were grossly exaggerated. In a 1986 *New York Times* article, for example, the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles claimed that there were 6000 war criminals living in Canada, although Saul Littman, the Center's Canadian representative, alleged that there were probably closer to 3000. After conducting a case-by-case review of more than 800 individuals who were accused of being war criminals, the Commission concluded that 600 files should be closed with no further investigation. Of those, it was determined that 341 of the people involved had never lived in Canada; 21 had lived in Canada for a time, but had since moved; 86 had died since arriving in Canada; 4 could not be found; and in 154 cases there was no prima facie evidence of war crimes against them (Deschenes, 1986: 269–70). The Commission decided that further inquiry was warranted in 200 cases, and it gave the government a confidential shortlist of twenty files for further investigation (Troper and Weinfeld, 1988: 297).

Deschenes outlined two main options for pursuing those cases. Like other countries dealing with the war crimes issue at the time, the problem was whether alleged war criminals could, and should, be tried for war crimes in the country they were currently living in and, in many cases, were citizens of; or whether their citizenship should be revoked, on the grounds that they had not fully disclosed their Nazi past to immigration authorities in the 1940s and 1950s; and whether they should then be deported on the assumption that they would stand trial in the country where they were alleged to have committed war crimes. The Canadian government at first rejected the latter 'denaturalization and deportation' strategy. This involved a commitment to prosecute individuals accused of war crimes in Canada under Canadian law. However, after a couple of highly publicized but unsuccessful prosecutions the government changed its tack and has more recently turned to denaturalization and deportation. A number of such cases are now before the courts.

In June 1986, the Australian government established an inquiry under the direction of Andrew Menzies, a former senior official of the Australian Attorney General's Office. Responding to allegations that Australian government officials had knowingly recruited Nazi war criminals to settle in Australia, Menzies found that there were 'no breaches of law, duty or

impropriety in the entry of Nazis into Australia' and that there was no government policy that allowed or assisted the entry of Nazis into Australia after the war. He did find, however, that there were a 'significant number' of suspected war criminals living in Australia, and that the government should 'take appropriate action under the law to bring to justice persons who have committed serious war crimes' (Aarons, 1989: 288). As a result of the findings of the Menzies inquiry, the government of Australia amended its 1945 War Crimes Act, which enabled military courts to prosecute war crimes committed against Australians in the Asian theater of war. The 1987 amendment allowed for the civil prosecution of Nazi war criminals in Australia (Aarons, 1989: 289).

In Britain, in August 1986, Grenville Janner, a Labour MP, asked British Home Secretary Douglas Hurd about the status of a 1971 extradition request from the Soviet Union (Cesarini, 1992: 195). In 1971, Ukrainian-born Kyrilo Zvarich had been tried *in absentia* in the Soviet Union for the murder of Jews in Soviet Ukraine. Zvarich was pronounced guilty by the Soviet court, and the authorities traced him to England. The Soviets requested his extradition in 1971, and then again in 1983 (Cesarini, 1992: 195-6). Britain did not comply with either request because it lacked an extradition treaty with the Soviet Union, because so much time had elapsed since the alleged crimes, and because it had doubts about the fairness of the original trial (Cesarini, 1992: 196-7).

At about the same time that Janner asked his question of the Home Secretary, the Simon Wiesenthal Center gave the British Consul General in Los Angeles the names of seventeen alleged Nazi war criminals who were living in Britain and requested that the list be passed on to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher for action. Shortly afterwards, an All-Party Parliamentary War Crimes Group was formed to press the British government to take action. After two years of lobbying, which attracted considerable press interest, a Commission of Inquiry, in February 1988, was struck to gather information about certain individuals living in Britain who were alleged to be Nazi war criminals. The Inquiry was headed by Sir Thomas Hetherington, a former Director of Public Prosecutions, and William Chalmers, a former Crown Attorney for Scotland. Like the inquiries in Canada and Australia, it was charged with advising the government on the appropriate course of action if it was determined that Nazi war criminals were in fact living in Britain (Cesarini, 1992: 211).

The Commission's report, which was published in June 1989, concluded that the seriousness of the allegations, coupled with evidence that suspected Nazi war criminals had in fact entered Britain after the war, warranted government action. The Commissioners rejected the option of extradition, and instead recommended legislation that allowed for the

prosecution, in Britain, of British citizens or residents of the United Kingdom who were suspected of having committed war crimes in Germany or German-occupied territory during the war. The results of the investigation into allegations against specific individuals were included in an unpublished second volume of the report. That volume suggested that there was enough evidence for three cases to be taken to trial almost immediately. Three other cases required more evidence before charges could be laid. It also recommended that investigations be conducted into the seventy-five other cases that the inquiry did not have sufficient time to deal with (Cesarini, 1992: 220–1).

In March 1990, the British government introduced the War Crimes Bill, which would allow the prosecution in Britain of Nazi war criminals who were living in the country (Cesarini, 1992: 230). The Bill was defeated in the House of Lords, but was reintroduced in March, 1991, and after acrimonious debates in both Houses was passed in May 1991.³

In many ways, though, what took place in Australia, Britain and Canada was overshadowed by earlier events in the US. In fact, the United States was the first western country to take action regarding the presence of alleged Nazi war criminals in the country, and it was in that context that one of the most highly publicized war crimes cases emerged – the case of John Demjanjuk. The American authorities had pursued alleged Nazi war criminals for at least ten years before Canada, Britain and Australia started taking action in the mid- to late 1980s. As early as 1946, allegations were made that some German scientists and eastern European anti-communists, some of whom were thought to have participated in war crimes, were covertly brought to the United States in order to further America's postwar anti-Soviet political and ideological objectives in Europe (Mandel, 1988: 46). In the early 1970s, two Democratic members of Congress, Elizabeth Holtzman from New York and Joshua Eilberg from Pennsylvania, were able to use newly declassified State Department documents to help put the issue onto the American political agenda. As more government documents surfaced, the American government began to take seriously the question of whether certain Nazis had been recruited on purpose to live in the United States.

Unlike Australia, Britain and Canada, the United States took action without first establishing an independent commission of inquiry. Also unlike the other three countries, it decided to go the route of denaturalization and deportation. This meant that, officially, no one was being prosecuted for war crimes; rather the individuals were accused of not having told the truth about their wartime activities when they sought entry to, and subsequent citizenship in, the United States. Between 1976 and 1979, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) established a

special litigation unit whose mandate was to gather evidence and organize the prosecution of the cases. The results of the early efforts to denaturalize and deport suspected war criminals were not very promising. The INS brought five cases before the courts. It lost three cases outright and in one case dropped the charges in mid-trial. It won one case but later lost on appeal. In that instance, the accused brought new evidence to support his claim that he had spent the war working as a farm laborer in Germany rather than as a member of the Gestapo in Poland (Mandel, 1988: 51).

The failure of these first denaturalization and deportation cases led the Carter administration to move the pursuit of alleged war criminals out of the INS and into the Justice Department. In 1979, the Office of Special Investigations (OSI) was created to initiate legal proceedings against individuals who were alleged to have entered the United States fraudulently after the war. At the same time, the US Attorney General Benjamin Civiletti concluded an agreement in which the Soviet Procurator General, Roman Rudenko, made 'a firm and explicit commitment' to help the Americans 'locate, investigate and deport proven participants in Nazi atrocities' (cited in Bilinsky, 1990: 395). The Soviets agreed to supply the Americans with the names of individuals suspected of war crimes and who were believed to be living in the United States, identification cards of former concentration camp guards, videotaped interviews with Soviet citizens who were eyewitnesses to wartime atrocities and transcripts of interviews with both victims and concentration camp staff. Some \$2.3 million were initially earmarked for the OSI to hire staff and conduct investigations.

By 1980, the OSI had compiled a list of 413 Americans who were suspected of having fraudulently gained entry to the United States by hiding their Nazi past. Many of those names had been given to them by the Soviets. By 1984, over half of those named were cleared. However, the OSI did launch proceedings against twenty-eight people. Defendants from a variety of ethnic backgrounds were accused of committing wartime atrocities against Jews in Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus and Estonia (Mandel, 1988: 54).

One of the first people that the OSI prosecuted was John Demjanjuk. A Ukrainian-born, naturalized American citizen, Demjanjuk was accused of being 'Ivan the Terrible', a sadistic prison guard responsible for the deaths of thousands of Jews at the Treblinka concentration camp in Poland. In June 1981, the retired Cleveland auto worker was found guilty of failing to reveal his Nazi past when he immigrated to the United States in 1952 and was stripped of his American citizenship. The OSI wanted to extradite Demjanjuk to the Soviet Union, but he successfully fought that effort on the grounds that there was a strong likelihood that he would be put to

death by the Soviet authorities. The OSI, along with a number of Jewish organizations, began to put pressure on the government of Israel to request his extradition. In 1986, an American court ruled that Demjanjuk should be sent to Israel and recommended that he be tried for crimes against humanity (Melman, 1997).

After a highly publicized two-year trial, Demjanjuk was convicted by an Israeli court and sentenced to death. He appealed the conviction on the grounds that the case against him was based on mistaken identity, and eventually his conviction was overturned by the Israeli court of appeal. Demjanjuk was able to return to the United States in September 1993, and in February 1998 a federal judge restored his American citizenship. The American government is currently reviewing whether it will file a revised case against Demjanjuk.

During the nearly two decades in which the allegations against Demjanjuk have been pursued in courts in the United States and Israel, Ukrainians in the diaspora (along with Demjanjuk's various defense teams) voiced many of the arguments and objections that have become part of a more general response to the west's pursuit of alleged Nazi war criminals. The diaspora's response to the Demjanjuk affair provides a glimpse into certain Ukrainian feelings of victimization by, and unease within, their host societies.

Many members of the Ukrainian diaspora attributed the Demjanjuk affair and the pursuit of war criminals in general, to the confluence of a number of forces which, for various reasons, wanted to politically discredit both Ukrainians in Ukraine and Ukrainians in the diaspora. This interpretation was supported by certain influential American conservatives; indeed, Patrick Buchanan, the noted *Washington Post* columnist and senior adviser to Ronald Reagan, described the Demjanjuk affair as 'an American Dreyfus case' (Buchanan, 1986). Specifically, the pursuit of Demjanjuk was interpreted to be the result of the activities of three sets of political actors. Each were seen by members of the diaspora as using Ukrainians' alleged mass participation in the slaughter of Jews as a way of advancing their own agendas. One interpretation questioned Soviet motives for their involvement in the pursuit of war criminals in the west. A second questioned Jewish motives for pursuing war criminals. And a third questioned the motives behind the OSI's dogged pursuit of Demjanjuk, even when it possessed evidence that undermined its own case.

Why, at the height of the Cold War, was the Soviet Union so eager to cooperate with the American government in its pursuit of alleged Nazi war criminals? As one commentator put it, *cui bono*? One possible explanation was that the Soviets were trying to undermine the cooperative relations that were developing between diaspora Jews and Ukrainians. Kupchinsky

argues that part of the rationale behind the Soviet disinformation campaign against Ukrainians in the late 1960s and early 1970s stemmed from a rapprochement that had begun to take place between the Ukrainian and Jewish diasporas and the state of Israel. The Soviets were concerned that the development of a common front between diaspora Jews, Ukrainians and the state of Israel to protest Soviet human rights abuses would destabilize their society. They therefore embarked on a conscious disinformation campaign that would undermine that cooperation. Thus, some diaspora Ukrainians alleged that the Soviet government painted Ukrainian émigrés as inveterate anti-Semites and war criminals in order to subvert contacts between the two communities (Kupchinsky, 1986: 140). The 'real Soviet aim', according to Kupchinsky, 'is to have the émigré communities defend a genuine war criminal and thus discredit themselves in the eyes of American and Canadian society' (Kupchinsky, 1986: 143; Kuropas, 1986: 151).

The second answer to the question of 'who benefits?' was that the KGB was feeding disinformation to the west about alleged Ukrainian war criminals as a way of distracting world attention from human rights abuses in the Soviet Union (Kupchinsky, 1986: 138):

Moscow wants, once again, to injure the Ukrainian nation with the help of the judicial system of the Jewish state, namely to show what 'bandits' Ukrainians are, and in this way to cover up before mankind and world history its abominable crimes against Ukrainians and other non-Russian nations in its evil empire.

(Daniliw, 1987)

Some diaspora Ukrainians alleged that the Eighth Section of the KGB's Fifth Directorate was organized in 1969 with the specific purpose of discrediting Ukrainian émigré groups in the west. The Institute for the Study of Foreign Countries was formed in Kyiv as a KGB front to study émigré communities. Through their scholarly exchanges, the Institute became directly involved with Soviet disinformation against Ukrainian Canadians (Kupchinsky, 1986: 138). Other directorates were organized for the Latvian and possibly Lithuanian communities. According to a former Latvian KGB operative who defected to the US in 1978, the Latvian Committee for Cultural Relations with Latvians Abroad was a KGB front whose aim

was also to discredit Latvian émigrés, particularly those who actively sought the end of the Soviet occupation. This was accomplished by the publication of books and articles purporting

to describe the war crimes and collaboration of which émigrés were guilty. The facts were often embellished and supplemented with forged documents, false testimonies and pure invention.

(Cited in Bilinsky, 1990: 396)⁴

In pursuing this argument, Ukrainian Americans were particularly suspicious of the evidence that the Soviets seemed so willing to supply to the American authorities (see Zumbakis, 1986). Diaspora newspapers rhetorically asked readers whether such information should be taken at face value. At a conference on Ukrainian–Jewish relations held in Toronto in 1983, an appendix to a paper delivered by University of Delaware political scientist Yaroslav Bilinsky (1990) outlined in detail why that information was suspect. Bilinsky charged that much of the material that was given to the American government was in fact fabricated by the KGB. He further argued that the KGB coerced witnesses into altering their testimonies before Soviet courts and investigators, doctored evidence and forged documents in order to place certain individuals at certain locations and times where atrocities had been committed against Jews.

Jewish motives for the pursuit of Demjanjuk were regarded with no less suspicion. The World Congress of Free Ukrainians felt that Jews in both the diaspora and Israel were using the Ukrainians in order to seek retribution for the Holocaust and to promote Holocaust remembrance for a generation of Jews who had no direct experience or connection to atrocities (Savaryn, 1987). An inflammatory statement by a member of the Israeli Knesset seemed to confirm this interpretation. In September 1986, Bozhena Olshaniwsky, president of Americans for Human Rights in Ukraine (AHRU), sent a letter to members of the Knesset outlining her organization's concerns over how the Demjanjuk case was being handled by the Israeli government. The letter noted that members of the AHRU had been monitoring Israeli newspapers 'for some time' and expressed concern over an 'intensification of accusatory statements made by representatives of your government regarding John Demjanjuk's guilt'. Demjanjuk, the letter also noted, had been held by the Israeli Justice Department for over seven months without any charges against him being laid, a situation that she claimed was contrary to his human rights. In closing, Olshaniwsky looked forward to the 'comments, cooperation and friendship' of the members of the Knesset.

It is not clear how many members of the Knesset either read or responded to the letter, but there was at least one response which received considerable play in the Ukrainian diaspora press (Troper and Weinfeld, 1988: 285), largely because it confirmed Ukrainian suspicions that they were being used to advance Jewish community-building interests. The

letter, which was described as a ‘bombshell’ by the World Congress of Free Ukrainians, was considered to be evidence of the true motives behind the pursuit of Demjanjuk. Dov Ben-Meir, Deputy Speaker of the Knesset, wrote back to the AHRU:

At first, I did not want at all to reply, because since the days of Bogdan Chelmenitzky [Bohdan Khmelnytsky], the Jewish people has a long score to settle with the Ukrainian people . . .

All along the years of the Nazi occupation of the Ukraine, uncounted numbers of your compatriots collaborated with the Nazi regime, especially in the annihilation of hundreds of thousands of Jews.

After the German defeat, part of these collaborators fled to the West and also escaped to the USA.

During more than four decades, not a single word was heard from your organization in favor of human rights of Ukrainians of the Jewish faith who were shot, burned and gassed by your fellow countrymen. All it is only the ‘worry’ whether the Israeli press will by its publicity prejudice the objectivity of Israeli justice, that keeps you awake at nights . . .

To you and your friends, I suggest that you go to church not only on Sunday but also every day of the week, and that you kneel there until bleeding at the knees in asking forgiveness for what your people has done to ours.

(Cited in *Ukrainian Weekly*, January 11, 1987)

The other explanation of Israel’s involvement was that Jews were using the Demjanjuk affair as an opportunity to fight Holocaust deniers and to educate a new generation of Jewish children in the horrors of the Holocaust (Savaryn, 1987). Myron Kuropas noted in the *Ukrainian Weekly* that Demjanjuk’s trial was held in a ‘converted theater’, implying that the setting was part of a drama that would play to the larger Israeli public:

As the trial progressed, thousands of Israeli schoolchildren were brought to the hall to view the proceedings (which began with a complete review of the Holocaust despite defense objections), while spectators freely yelled epithets against Mr. Demjanjuk from the gallery. Even the Jerusalem Post editorialized that if Mr. Demjanjuk is acquitted, it might somehow diminish the Holocaust in the eyes of the outside world.

(Kuropas, 1988)⁵

The belief that Jews are behind Canadian and American government efforts to pursue war criminals still receives some play within the diaspora.⁶

The third interpretation to circulate within the Ukrainian diaspora regarding the real motives behind the pursuit of Demjanjuk and other alleged Nazi war criminals focused on the organizational interests of the OSI. There was a sense within the diaspora that the OSI had run amok, and that its blind pursuit of 'feeble old men' was rooted in bureaucratic empire-building. In 1997, an article on Gilbert Merritt, the American judge who presided over the hearing that led to Demjanjuk's extradition to Israel, appeared in *Ha'artetz*, an Israeli newspaper. The article, which is also posted on the Infoukes web site, is an account of Merritt's subsequent interpretation of the Demjanjuk affair. According to the judge the OSI had been ordered by Congress and senior Justice Department officials to 'deliver the goods'. They either had to find and expose Nazi war criminals in the United States or lose at least some of their funding (Melman, 1997).

Even though Demjanjuk was exonerated by the Israeli Court of Appeal and was able to return to the United States, in some ways it was a hollow victory for both him and diaspora Ukrainians. The nearly two decades in which his name and his ethnicity were headlines in the world's press had done their damage.

Shortly after Demjanjuk was stripped of his American citizenship, Myron Kuropas argued that the Ukrainian-American community had handled the issue poorly. In a paper initially delivered at a symposium on 'Ukraine During World War II' held in Toronto in 1985, Kuropas argued that the community did three things wrong. First, Ukrainian Americans never 'clearly and unequivocally acknowledged that *some* Ukrainians were undoubtedly involved in the murder of Jews during the Nazi occupation of Ukraine. Second, Ukrainian Americans 'did not reach out' to groups like diaspora Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians who were subject to similar allegations, nor to Jews who disagreed with the Simon Wiesenthal Center's 'Ukrainian defamation campaign in both Canada and the United States'. Third, the community hoped that if it ignored the problem, it would go away. 'No one', he said, 'expressed outrage' or 'screamed' when the director of the OSI began to identify alleged war criminals by their ethnic origins (Kuropas, 1986: 151).

When allegations of Ukrainian anti-Semitism resurfaced in the mid-1990s in the United States on the CBS *Sixty Minutes* program 'The Ugly Face of Freedom', the diaspora seemed to have learned from its experiences. As noted in the introduction to this book, rather than simply grumble amongst themselves about the unfair portrayal of Ukrainians, diaspora Ukrainians 'screamed', sued and achieved a partial victory.

The Ukrainian Holocaust: the Famine of 1932–3

The famine in Soviet Ukraine in 1932–3 forms a part of contemporary Ukrainian diaspora consciousness, political organization and intergenerational collective memory. It is seen as ‘the Ukrainian genocide’ and the Stalinist equivalent to the Nazi’s ‘final solution’. However, the famine is important not only for what it says about the Soviets’ persecution of Ukrainians as Ukrainians. When it comes to the famine, some Ukrainians in the diaspora also regard themselves as being victimized by their respective host societies, and this sense of victimization contributes to a certain troubled relationship with their countries of settlement. Like some Jews who feel that the west did not do enough to rescue Jews from the Nazis, some segments of the diaspora feel that the west did not do enough about the famine; one scholar suggests that ‘Western governments were well informed about the horrors of the famine and yet turned a blind eye to murder’ (Carynnyk, 1986a: 111). And, perhaps more importantly, some resent the continued reluctance of governments in the west to recognize the famine as a form of genocide and to place ‘the Ukrainian Holocaust’ on the same footing as the Jewish Holocaust. There is a feeling in some segments of the diaspora that the sufferings of Ukrainians in Soviet Ukraine in 1932–3, and the atrocities committed against them, have not been fully acknowledged and condemned by governments and by those outside of the Ukrainian diaspora community.

At the same time, however, the efforts by some segments of the Ukrainian diaspora to place the famine at the center of collective memory is also the result of within-group dynamics. The famine provides a sense of legitimacy for the third-wave political refugees who left Ukraine during World War II. It reinforces the idea that they left Ukraine because of political and cultural persecution by the Soviets, and not for more mundane ‘economic’ reasons. And, during the Cold War, the publicity that it had been able to generate further reinforced the idea that the Soviet Union really was an evil empire that needed to be dissolved. In addition, though, it also seems to be a way that some individuals and organizations within the diaspora community have countered the allegation that Ukrainians are ‘inherently’ anti-Semitic and that they were overrepresented in the ranks of Hitler’s executioners. Whereas some Jews believe that Ukrainians played a disproportionate role in the Nazi Holocaust, some Ukrainians argue that Jews played a disproportionate role in the victimization of Ukrainians by the Soviets. Indeed, the prior victimization of Ukrainians by Jews is used, in part, to explain why some Ukrainians participated in pogroms against the Jews during World War II.⁷

Two Canadian scholars of Ukrainian origin organized one of the first

scholarly conferences on the famine on its fiftieth anniversary in 1983. With the support of two universities, the Shevchenko Foundation, the Montreal Branch of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee and the Canadian Institute for Ukrainian Studies, the conference was organized, in part, to help create public awareness about the famine (Serbyn and Krawchenko, 1986). The first, and probably still the most influential scholarly monograph on the famine in Soviet Ukraine in 1932–3 is Robert Conquest's *Harvest of Sorrow*. The research and subsequent publication of Conquest's monograph was financially supported by the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and the Ukrainian National Association. In it, Conquest argued that collectivization and the famine were rooted in the struggle by Stalin and the Communist Party with the peasantry as a particular socio-economic category and as the carriers of Ukrainian national consciousness (Conquest, 1986; see also Mace, 1983, 1986). In other words the Ukrainians who died in 1932–3 were killed by a regime that was hostile to them as peasants *and* as Ukrainians.

Marxist hostility towards the peasantry is legendary. Marx and Engels repeatedly spoke of the 'idiocy of rural life', peasants' conservative individualism and their opposition to social change. Russian Marxists later adopted this anti-peasant attitude with a vengeance. In a posthumous account of a conversation with Joseph Stalin in the 1930s, Nikita Khrushchev said that 'for Stalin, peasants were scum'. Others used less graphic ways of describing them, but nevertheless agreed that peasants were members of a dying class that would eventually be absorbed into one of the two great classes of capitalism. They predicted that the majority of peasants would become proletarianized and flood the ranks of the industrial working class, while some better-off peasants would emulate, identify with and politically side with capitalists.

Marxist hostility towards ethnic particularism is no less legendary. Marx and Engels predicted that as the contradictions of capitalism became sharper, ethnic and national identities would give way to broader class-based identities, loyalties and forms of political action. The persistence of ethnonational identities, like the stubborn individualism of the peasantry, was fundamentally at odds with the principles of proletarian collectivist internationalism. Lenin agreed with Marx, and in numerous statements before and after the 1917 Revolution expressed variations on the view that 'the interests of socialism are above the interests of the right of nations to self-determination' (cited in Conquest, 1986: 25).

Social reality, however, is never as tidy as social theory. As noted in the previous chapter, after the civil war, one of the practical problems facing Lenin and the Bolsheviks was what to do with the peasantry and the non-Russian peoples who were incorporated into the Soviet Union. Those

problems led to certain practical accommodations. Lenin and the Bolsheviks tried to create a system of rule that would enable them to control a vast multinational empire that was also diverse in its class composition (Mace, 1983). In Ukraine, Lenin's first two attempts to establish Soviet rule in 1918 and 1919 failed, partly because he underestimated the strength of Ukrainian national feeling (Conquest, 1986: 42). The third attempt in 1920 was successful because the New Economic Policy gave the peasantry a modicum of independence and security, and because Lenin recognized the importance of granting concessions to the national feelings of colonized minorities (Mace, 1986).

It is one thing to hope that ethnonational consciousness and peasant individualism will eventually die off in the course of social evolution. It is another to engineer a society in order to accelerate the disappearance of certain attitudes and the people who carry them. If one accepts materialist assumptions about the relationship between existence and consciousness, the options are relatively straightforward. One can either physically exterminate the people who hold those attitudes, values and 'tendencies' or one can eliminate the social conditions and positions that give rise to those attitudes and hope that as individuals become accustomed to their new circumstances their consciousness will change accordingly. Under Stalin, the Soviet Union adopted both options with a vengeance. By the late 1920s, they wanted to hurry social reality along and bring the social structure of the Soviet Union into conformity with wider socialist ideals. The first Five Year Plan, which covered 1928–32, saw the beginning of the forced collectivization of agriculture. In the 1920s and 1930s, the Soviet propaganda machine regularly produced photographs of happy peasants eager to join the collective farm and sign over their land, implements and livestock to the state. The reality was quite different. Peasants prized their land and saw the collective farm as a return to serfdom. Many therefore resisted the efforts to incorporate them into the new collective farm system. In the face of such resistance, a network of secret police worked with Committees of Poor Peasants (*komezamy*) and village soviets to remove the 'natural leaders of village life', to expropriate land and produce, and to identify individuals and families who should be deported and exiled (Mace, 1986: 4–5).

The attack on Ukrainian national consciousness in the late 1920s was partly fueled by the Russian communists' belief that Ukrainian nationalists were plotting against Moscow. The plotting, in Stalin's view, was the result of the activities of Ukrainian intellectuals who were sustaining ethnonational consciousness and institutions, and organizing the resistance to the creation of Soviet man and woman. One part of Stalin's 'solution' was to 'decapitate' the nation by physically annihilating intellectuals, who were

seen as the articulators of Ukrainian national consciousness. A part of that campaign in the late 1920s and throughout the 1930s consisted of the infamous show trials at which intellectuals and others were forced to admit to non-existent plots against the Soviet Union (Mace, 1986; Isajiw, 1986).

In that environment, the independent landholding peasants had two strikes against them. Stalin argued that ‘the nationality problem is, in its very essence, a problem of the peasantry’ (Conquest, 1986: 219), and that the economic individualism of the peasantry was undermining the efforts to collectivize Soviet agriculture. As in the case of the Ukrainian intellectuals, the Soviets not only physically annihilated individual members of the peasantry, but also sought to eliminate that ‘reactionary’ social class itself. The latter was accomplished through the quickening pace of forced collectivization, the former through the creation of an artificial famine.

The Soviets had gained experience with the use of famine as a political weapon in Kazakhstan in 1930. Rather than join the collective farms, Kazak herdsmen slaughtered their own livestock. Instead of extending aid to the Kazaks and moderating their commitment to collectivization, the Soviets ‘decided to teach them a lesson by letting them starve’ (Mace, 1986: 6). In Ukraine, the famine was created, in part, under the cover of Soviet grain procurement quotas. In the early 1930s, Soviet Ukraine was required to deliver unrealistic quotas that amounted to over one-third of total yearly harvests (Mace, 1986: 7). Officials were sent into the countryside to force the peasants to hand over grain, livestock, land and implements to the collective farm. Party activists and the secret police used pointed rods to search for grain that peasants were thought to have buried in the ground or under haystacks. Grain requisitions reached the point where all peasants’ food was taken away to storehouses and used to feed the urban proletariat. “‘Socialist property’” was declared inviolate, and anyone who so much as gleaned an ear of wheat or bit the root off a sugar beet was declared an enemy of the people who could be executed or sentenced to not less than ten years’ (Mace, 1986: 7).

According to Mace (1986: 8–9), the Harvard University Refugee Interview Project conducted in the early 1950s provides graphic evidence of how the famine was experienced in Ukraine. Survivors recall walking for miles through the countryside collecting bark, tumbleweeds and any other plant, animal or insect that could be used to beat the hunger back. Stories of people dying in the streets of hunger abound, as do accounts of cannibalism (Mace, 1986: 9). One ‘typical’ account said that:

We saw people die in the streets; it was terrible to see a dead man, when I close my eyes I can still see him. We had in our village a small church which was closed for services and in which we

played. And I remember a man who came in there; he lay down with his eyes wide open at the ceiling and he died there! He was an innocent victim of the Soviet regime; he was a simple worker and not even a kulak.

(Cited in Mace, 1986: 9)

Estimates vary of the number of people who died as a result of famine in Soviet Ukraine in 1932/3.⁸ In his testimony to the US Senate Committee on the Ukrainian Famine, Conquest said that the Soviet Union would have to shoot down a 747 airplane full of people every day for thirty years in order to match the death toll of the famine (quoted in Troper and Weinfeld, 1988: 252–3). Some estimates are as high as 14 million; others are between 5 and 7 million (Mace, 1986: 11).⁹ Some Ukrainians cite a figure of 6 million, seemingly because it makes the Ukrainian death toll comparable to that of the Jews during the Holocaust.¹⁰

If the defining catastrophe for Jews is the Nazi Holocaust, for diaspora Ukrainians it is the famine. Commemorations of the famine are a regular feature of Ukrainian organizational life in the diaspora. Every year, ceremonies are held in Washington, San Diego, Cleveland, Newark, New York, Toronto, Winnipeg, Edmonton and dozens of other communities throughout the world. Crowds ranging from a handful of elderly people to multigenerational gatherings of several thousand collect in parks, squares and churches to commemorate the victims of the terror-famine. University students of Ukrainian background set up display tables in their institutions in order to educate their peers about the famine. Churches have designated the last week of November as famine commemoration week; special services are held for those who died and for the ever-diminishing number of elderly survivors. One of the purposes of the Infoukes web site is to serve as an educational tool to help inform both Ukrainians and non-Ukrainians of the atrocities committed in the 1930s in Soviet Ukraine. The *Ukrainian Weekly* newspaper's official web site contains what it claims is the largest collection of Internet-based material on the great famine of 1932–3.¹¹ Ukrainians in the diaspora have also produced their own documentary on the famine. Created in 1985 by an ad hoc committee of academics and others affiliated to the Ukrainian Canadian Congress, *Harvest of Despair* was part of an effort to inform a wider audience of the persecution of Ukrainians in Soviet Ukraine in the 1930s. In some ways it was also an attempt to play catch-up with Jews, who have been able to use the mass media to educate much of the world about the Holocaust (Novick, 1999).¹²

But diaspora community politics have not been content simply to remember and commemorate the famine. Individuals and organizations in the diaspora have tried to persuade various levels of government and

international organizations to acknowledge the famine publicly and to recognize it as a form of genocide that constitutes 'the Ukrainian Holocaust'. In order to do this, the organized Ukrainian diaspora adopts and adapts much of the imagery and terminology used to describe the Jewish Holocaust. In 1986, a small group formed the Ukrainian Defense League (UDL), which was modeled 'in name and slogan' to the Jewish Defense League (Troper and Weinfeld, 1988: 277, 410). Later the UDL changed its name to the Ukrainian Anti-Defamation League. While shortlived, it was an obvious attempt to create an organization that at least in name would parallel the Jewish Anti-Defamation League. At the Ukrainian World Congress meeting in Toronto in November 1998, one of the comments from the floor to the panel debating the future of the Congress was that the community must have all the 'Holocausts experienced by Ukrainians' brought to light. Diaspora Ukrainians try to have the entire period of communist rule in the Soviet Union likened to Nazi rule in Germany in the 1930s and 1940s. 'No one', according to Andrew Fedynsky in a viewpoint article in the December 6, 1998 *Ukrainian Weekly*, 'familiar with the facts would dispute that the record of Nazi Germany and the Communist Soviet Union are comparable.' The author went on to detail the use of slave labor, concentration camps and political repression in the two cases (Fedynsky, 1998: 9). John Gregorovich (cited in *Ukrainian News*, 1999: 3), the chairperson of the Ukrainian Canadian Civil Liberties Commission, argues: 'This genocide . . . was probably the single-greatest crime against humanity perpetrated in 20th century Europe.'

The efforts of the diaspora have met with mixed results. Members of the Ukrainian diaspora have successfully lobbied city, provincial, state and federal governments in Canada and the United States to recognize and denounce the famine. On the sixty-fifth anniversary of the famine in 1998, the Governors of the states of Maryland and Virginia proclaimed November 8-9 as 'Ukrainian Famine Days of Remembrance', and the New Jersey Senate agreed to a resolution condemning the famine (*Ukrainian Weekly*, December 6, 1998). However, none of these acknowledgments actually use the term 'genocide'. Indeed, one of the goals of the Ukrainian World Congress is to have the United Nations General Assembly condemn the use of famine as an instrument of political repression (Wynnickyj, 1998: 8), which would open the way for official recognition of the Ukrainian famine as a form of genocide.

Ironically, one of the toughest nuts to crack for the Ukrainian diaspora has been the post-Soviet Ukrainian government. Soviet leaders since Stalin denied the existence of a man-made famine. Though Nikita Khrushchev admitted that Ukraine experienced certain 'demographic losses' in 1932-3 as a result of famine, he did not admit that it had been artificially created by

the Communist Party. In fact, for much of the postwar period, the Soviet Union maintained that Ukrainian diaspora organizations which promoted the idea of a state-produced famine were lying in order to advance their anti-Soviet agenda. Independence in 1991 did not result in an immediate change in approach on the part of Ukrainian government officials. The early presidential administrations in Ukraine trod softly when it came to outright attacks on the former Soviet government, its symbols and its activities. In 1998, however, the government of Ukraine announced that the fourth Saturday of November would be set aside as the annual 'National Day of Remembrance of Famine Victims' (*Ukrainian News*, January 1–26, 1999: 3).¹³ On that occasion, Valery Smolyt, the Deputy Prime Minister of Ukraine, made the following remarks:

Ukrainians abroad consistently . . . felt it a matter of honour and national dignity to let the world community know the truth about this unparalleled Stalinist crime. They put together titanic efforts so that all would realize – the Ukrainian Famine of 1933 stands on the level of the Armenian genocide and the Jewish Holocaust.

(*Ukrainian News*, January 1–26, 1999)

This announcement was a victory for the diaspora, which since independence had lobbied the Ukrainian government to acknowledge the famine as an act of genocide.

The effort to define the famine as a form of genocide and as the Ukrainian Holocaust has, however, brought the Ukrainian diaspora into conflict with the organized Jewish diaspora community.¹⁴ Some Jews worry that an acknowledgment of atrocities committed against other ethnic groups by either the Nazis or repressive communist regimes will weaken the significance of the horrors suffered by Jews during the war (Novick, 1999: 219). At the hearings of the President's Commission on the Holocaust in the late 1970s, which was established to advise President Carter on the mandate of a Holocaust museum that was proposed for Washington, DC,

the Director of the Ukrainian National Information Service wrote that Ukrainians also 'met Hitler's criteria for extermination' and were 'numerically the second largest group to be destroyed in . . . Auschwitz, Treblinka, and Dachau'. He asked that whatever was done [at the museum] 'reflect the various nationalities and the numerical proportions of the victims of the Nazi Holocaust'.

(Novick, 1999: 217)

While the Washington Holocaust Memorial was initially envisioned by President Carter to be a site where the 11 million victims of the Holocaust were to be memorialized (6 million Jews and 5 million 'others'), 'the "other victims" wound up receiving little more than perfunctory mention in the museum's permanent exhibition' (Novick, 1999: 22).

In Canada, Ukrainian-Canadian organizations in 1998 helped mount a campaign against the establishment of a Holocaust Gallery which was initially intended to be part of the National War Museum in Ottawa. A number of Jewish organizations and members of parliament had proposed that the museum create a Holocaust Gallery to educate Canadians about the horrors of the Jewish Holocaust. This proposal met with opposition from Ukrainian organizations and veterans' groups alike, albeit for different reasons. The veterans felt that a Holocaust Gallery in the National War Museum would detract from the sacrifices made by Canadians in the two world wars. Ukrainian-Canadian organizations feared that the gallery would present only a single example of a Holocaust, and make no mention of the atrocities that had been committed against Ukrainians and other groups in the twentieth century. Eventually, the federal government decided against a Holocaust Gallery, and now Ukrainian organizations have formed an alliance with a number of other ethnocultural organizations to lobby the government for a freestanding and more inclusive Genocide Museum. Their aim is to create a museum where Canadians could learn about various cases of genocide, including the Ukrainian famine of 1932/3, the Cambodian killing fields of the 1970s and the Nazis extermination of Jews.

Some individuals and organizations in the diaspora have taken the issue a step further, calling for the perpetrators of the genocide to be brought to justice. Like other aspects of the politicization of the Ukrainian famine in the diaspora, this position draws heavily on the experiences of the Jews, and seems to have originated in the context of the allegation that Ukrainians were disproportionately involved in war crimes against Jews. In the opinion of Yaroslav Bilinsky (1990: 386), speaking on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the famine in 1983, Ukrainians in the diaspora believed:

that the world owed them sympathy for the over seven million Ukrainians who had been the direct or indirect victims of Stalin's brutal collectivization drive. Many Ukrainians also feel that the world, which by and large ignored the fatal plight of the millions in 1933, is morally responsible to uncover and denounce those who decreed the man-made famine.

And, more recently, John Gregorovich (*Ukrainian News*, 1999) has called on the Ukrainian government to:

do whatever still can be done to bring those responsible for this atrocity to justice. Regrettably, many of those who were Stalin's willing executioners remain unpunished for their crimes, living in Ukraine and abroad . . . Certainly, some of these communist war criminals are still alive, hiding in North America, Israel, western Europe and Russia.

Given that the famine occurred nearly seventy years ago, an attempt to bring the perpetrators of the famine to justice is not likely to net many of Stalin's henchmen. It appears that the suggestion that the perpetrators of the famine should be brought to justice is intended to counteract what diaspora Ukrainians regard as an effort coming from a number of sources to portray Ukrainians as inveterate anti-Semites and ruthless oppressors of Jews during World War II. In fact, some diaspora Ukrainians have tried to draw attention to the apparent complicity of the Jews in the victimization of the Ukrainian peasantry in 1932/3. Obviously, Joseph Stalin is the main villain in the history of the famine. But, what about the rank-and-file killers, the lower-level Soviet officials and bureaucrats who helped carry out Stalin's plan? In this regard, some Ukrainians consider that Jews played a disproportionate part in the extermination of Ukrainian peasants in 1932 and 1933. Diaspora Ukrainians, and others, have pointed out, for example, that Lazar Kaganovich, the senior official in the Soviet Ukrainian government who enforced Stalin's edicts, was Jewish. In fact, after the war, Ukrainians in the diaspora tried repeatedly to have Kaganovich tried *in absentia* for the murder of Ukrainians in 1932-3 (Cesarini, 1992: 265). The Ukrainian World Congress called for the extradition of the aging Kaganovich so that he could be tried for crimes against humanity.

Some members of the diaspora also argue that Jews were over represented in the ranks of the NKVD (Bilinsky, 1990), which is considered the Soviet equivalent of the Nazi *Einsatzgruppen*. Members of the secret police took an active part in arranging grain requisitions, forcing peasants to join collective farms and carrying out orders to liquidate the Ukrainian peasantry. While care is taken to point out that not all Jews in the Soviet Union were hard-line communists and members of the NKVD, and that Ukrainian communists were also eager participants in the repression of members of their own ethnic group, 'the point' of such observations is that 'each national group is bound to ask pointed questions about the share of fault and that each national community may draw premature conclusions and erect stereotypes' (Bilinsky, 1990: 386-7).

At a scholarly conference on the relations between Jews and Ukrainians held in Hamilton, Ontario, in October 1983, which was in part supposed to help begin to build a bridge between the Ukrainian and Jewish communities, the final roundtable was a discussion of possible directions for future research. The co-chairs proposed a list of six possible areas, the most contentious of which was 'the Jewish role in the Ukrainian famine and collectivization' (see Pelenski, 1990: 479–80). Professor Shmuel Ettinger, who was Rosenbloom Professor of Jewish History and director of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, argued that a distinction had to be made between Jews as a people and the behavior of individual Jews. Jews, he suggested, may in fact have been overrepresented in the ranks of the NKVD and may have been active in enforcing Stalin's requisitions of grain. However, they did those things as individuals who were part of a heinous social system, not as Jews. 'Those individuals may have been born to Jewish mothers, but that did not necessarily make them Jews in a cultural, religious or ethnic sense.' It was inappropriate, and anti-Semitic, claimed Ettinger, to say that Jews, as Jews, participated in the famine in Ukraine.

Some of the diaspora Ukrainian participants, however, noted what appeared to be a double standard in Ettinger's calling the issue of 'Jewish participation in the famine' anti-Semitic:

You are analyzing your Holocaust and as a by-product presenting us with the bill of charges for complicity. Allow us equally to analyze the great famine since its impact on the Ukrainian community has been very grave and as a by-product allow us to present our bill of particulars. If we freely admit that some Ukrainian extremists were imitating Hitler, we would welcome an equally frank admission on your part that some Jewish radicals were over-zealous in furthering the interests of Stalin.

(Bilinsky (1990: 484)

Whether the famine in Ukraine will ever come to occupy the same place in the consciousness of non-Ukrainians that the Jewish Holocaust occupies in the consciousness of non-Jews is difficult to predict. There are no university chairs or professors of the Ukrainian Holocaust, whereas 'a growing number of colleges and universities now have endowed chairs in [Jewish] Holocaust studies' (Novick, 1999: 277).¹⁵ *Harvest of Despair* pales in comparison to *Schindler's List*, the 1978 TV docudrama *The Holocaust*, and the other ways that the Jewish Holocaust has become part of public consciousness. Nor are the scholarly investigations of the Ukrainian Holocaust likely to match those dealing with various aspects of the Jewish

Holocaust. At the same time, though, it is important to note there is a social history to how atrocities like the Holocaust come to occupy prominent places in the collective memory and political consciousness of people, and that history is full of such contingencies (Novick, 1999).

Conclusion

The previous chapter showed that Ukrainians in the diaspora had a troubled relationship with Soviet Ukraine. That troubled relationship was rooted in the realization that Ukrainians in Ukraine, along with their language and culture, were being actively repressed by the Soviet government. The community's mobilization around the victimization of its compatriots at the hands of the Soviets revealed a long-standing commitment to a distant homeland and a continuing solidarity with the compatriots in that homeland. However, one characteristic of diasporas that was noted in Chapter 1 is that they display a troubled relationship with otherwise tolerant host societies. More research is admittedly needed on how the war crimes issue and the famine are part of Ukrainian diaspora community life, how these events are understood by members of the Ukrainian diaspora, and how widespread a victim consciousness is among individual members of the ethnic community. However, the opinions and arguments expressed by both organizations and individuals about the pursuit of war criminals and about the famine do point to some troubling aspects of the relationship between diaspora Ukrainians and their societies of settlement. The reluctance on the part of some western governments to place the Ukrainian famine on the same plane as the Holocaust leads to a feeling of injustice and to the impression that there is a double standard at work in the failure to acknowledge Ukrainian historical suffering and mistreatment. However, the promotion of the Ukrainian famine as a defining element in the historical traumas experienced by the Ukrainian people is also part of a complicated effort to draw upon the success of the Jews in making the public aware of the atrocities committed during World War II and at the same time to combat the idea that Ukrainians are 'genetically' anti-Semitic and that their participation in war crimes was disproportionately high.

In Durkheimian terms, the development of a sense of victimization is an important part of diaspora consciousness because it may help to solidify group boundaries. Victim narratives, along with ethnic leaders' cultivation of a sense of unease within host societies, brings people together around a common cause and supplies some of the glue that sustains community identity and life. Clearly, the diaspora's commemoration of the famine reinforces a desire on the part of community leaders to create a further

basis for ethnic solidarity (Troper and Weinfeld, 1988: 253). The famine also provides Ukrainians with a common object of concern, and symbolizes the historical suffering of the Ukrainian people. It is important because it says to the wider diaspora community that millions of 'our' ancestors died because they were Ukrainian, that the Ukrainian people survived in the face of terrible atrocities and ordeals, and that therefore the spirit of Ukrainian ethnicity and identity must not die a natural death through assimilation. The famine and war crimes issues bridge most political and ideological divisions in the community, and so mobilization around them is part of the process of ethnic community-building. Mobilization around these events also builds a bridge between members of the diaspora who are dispersed through a number of countries of settlement. These dynamics are particularly important to understand considering the less-than-hoped-for benefits that Ukrainian independence was to bring to the organized Ukrainian diaspora.

THE DIASPORA AND THE CHALLENGES OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Since 1991, Ukrainians abroad stopped being a diaspora without a nation.

(Leonid Kuchma, President of Ukraine, 1997)

Few people foresaw the speed with which social and political changes would occur in the Soviet bloc after Mikhail Gorbachev came to power. Indeed, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of independent states in eastern Europe in the early 1990s caught most people by surprise. Neither Ukrainian dissidents nor members of the organized diaspora who longed for Ukraine's freedom were prepared to see their dreams realized in their lifetimes (Wilson, 2000: 152). When an overwhelming majority of Ukrainians voted in favor of independence in a national referendum held on December 1, 1991, a wave of collective euphoria swept through the diaspora. Ukraine was free and the mission was accomplished. Missions accomplished, however, often have unintended consequences. Sometimes they lead to new missions. At other times, though, they lead to a sense of loss, anomie and crisis. While Ukrainian independence has opened new opportunities for members of the diaspora to develop transnational ties with their ancestral homeland, independence has also raised questions about what it means to be a diaspora now that the country is free.

This penultimate chapter examines what happens when a substantial part of what a diaspora has longed for and worked toward actually comes to pass; in other words, what challenges and contradictions face the diaspora now that Ukraine has set out on the road to freedom. The chapter begins with a discussion of how social and economic conditions are contributing to a new fourth wave of labor migration from Ukraine. Next, it analyzes the notion of *Homo sovieticus*, a term used by some members of the diaspora as an uncomplimentary reference to the subjectivity of, and language spoken by,

some of the new fourth-wave immigrants from Ukraine. In doing so, it considers the disputes between longer-settled members of the diaspora and new-wave immigrants, and the broader tensions over language that exist between Ukrainians in the diaspora and Ukrainian society. It argues that some of those tensions can be attributed to different understandings that Ukrainians in the diaspora, and Ukrainians in Ukraine, have of what it means to be 'Ukrainian' now that the country is no longer under Soviet domination. And, finally, the chapter considers the question of what forms of return Ukrainians in the diaspora engage in now that they can travel to Ukraine. In doing so, it analyzes some of the dilemmas, tensions and contradictions associated with four modes of 'return' to an independent Ukraine.

Social and economic conditions and the generation of a 'fourth wave' of migration

Independence has been an economic disaster for Ukraine. Though the Soviet economy was showing signs of deterioration even before the union collapsed, the economic decay accelerated during the 1990s. Despite (or perhaps, because of?) western aid, some foreign investment and the opening of markets, economists remain puzzled by the question 'what makes Ukraine not grow?' (Havrylyshyn, 1999; see also Havrylyshyn, 1995). By most measures of economic and social well-being, Ukraine's post-independence performance has been extremely weak (Wilson, 2000: 254–6). Since 1991, life expectancy has declined and there have been increases in death rates, suicide, infant mortality, alcoholism and certain infectious diseases. Ukraine is one of the few countries of the world that enjoys the dubious distinction of having had an absolute decline in its population in the 1990s; it decreased from 52.2 million in 1992 to 50.1 million in 1998, with less than half of the decline due to net migration (Wilson, 2000: 255). In the economic realm, inflation peaked at 10,200 percent in 1993, though it has since dropped to between 10 and 20 percent (International Monetary Fund, 1999: 8–9). Unemployment has risen and real wages have fallen. Real GDP shrank by 10 percent in 1996, by 3 percent in 1997 and by a further 1.7 percent in 1998 (International Monetary Fund, 1999: 12). By the end of 1998, wage arrears were estimated at 6.7 billion *hryvnia*, or about 1.7 billion US dollars (International Monetary Fund, 1999: 21).

There has, moreover, been a dramatic rise in the importance of the informal economy. A staff report of the International Monetary Fund suggested that in 1995 the unofficial economy accounted for nearly half of Ukraine's total GDP (International Monetary Fund, 1999: 14–15). Since income from the informal economy is untaxed, its existence poses a significant problem for the government.

As in other countries where economic conditions are poor and show little sign of improvement, corruption is rampant, and bribery and providing 'gifts' to various officials, regulators and gatekeepers are important ways of getting things get done (Honore, 2001: B1; Zvigliyanich, 2000: 256–8). In fact, graft is so common that in the mid-1990s the World Bank was able to publish the going rates for bribes in Ukraine. Though partly tongue-in-cheek, the article did let potential investors know what to expect if they wanted to expedite the installation of a telephone line or to reduce the frequency of visits by tax collectors and health inspectors. One western economist estimated that a prospective businessperson might have to pay as many as fifty bribes for land, water and electricity hook-ups and 'police cooperation' (Zvigliyanich, 2000: 256). Some commentators have spoken of the 'Zaireization' of the Ukrainian economy, an uncomplimentary reference to the slow degeneration of the society to third-world status, and a leader of one of the main diaspora nationalist organizations referred to independent Ukraine as a 'predator society' (interview, April 8, 1998).

Ukraine is arguably undergoing a transition to capitalism and a market economy that is not unlike the transition that it began to experience in the late nineteenth century. That process of primitive accumulation resulted in significant economic displacement and had wide-ranging consequences for individuals, families and society. As we saw in Chapter 2, it also produced the first wave of Ukrainian peasant migration. The current transition to capitalism is producing yet another wave of labor migration. A study conducted immediately after the break-up of the Soviet Union found, for instance, that between 50 and 60 percent of the population of sixteen major cities expressed a willingness to emigrate (Shevstova, 1992), while another study estimated that Ukraine would see average yearly emigration of about 200,000 people (Shamshur, 1992). More recent comparative research shows that Ukraine ranks with the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Poland in its emigration potential (Wallace, 1998: 74).

At the moment, Ukrainians seem to prefer short-term, temporary and casual labor migration rather than permanent settlement abroad (Wallace, 1998: 74). One survey sponsored by the International Organization for Migration showed that 37 percent of Ukrainian respondents were willing to go abroad for a few weeks, 36 percent for a few months and 25 percent for a few years. Only 12 percent wished to leave Ukraine permanently. In that study, poor economic conditions were cited as the main 'push' factor, while better living conditions and the prospect of higher wages were the biggest 'pull' factors (Wallace, 1998: 74).

The irony for Ukrainians and other eastern and central Europeans is that at the same time as the old Cold War restrictions on emigration from their countries of origin have eased, the opportunities for migrating either

temporarily or permanently to prosperous western capitalist countries have become restricted. In Canada, economic immigrants are selected on the basis of their knowledge of English or French and the skills they bring to the labor market. While there are no formal quotas that regulate the amount of immigration from a particular region or country, the Canadian government informally controls the inflow through the unequal distribution of immigration officers in Canadian embassies and consulates around the world (Simmons, 1998:103; Luciuk, 1999; Mykytiuk, 1998). The Canadian embassy in Kyiv, for instance, has the resources to process only 750 successful applications for immigration per year. Since independence, this has resulted in a yearly movement of about 2000 individuals (the primary applicant and family members) whose country of last permanent residence was Ukraine. Between 1992 and 1997, a total of 107,916, or an annual average of about 18,000, people who had been born in Ukraine emigrated legally to the United States. Since 1997, however, the number of Ukrainian-born immigrants has dropped to less than 8000 per year.¹ In both cases, these figures include members of other ethnic groups who have emigrated from Ukraine.²

The Ukrainian diaspora in the west has lobbied their respective governments to be more proactive in recruiting immigrants from Ukraine. The Canadian Ukrainian Immigrant Aid Society and the Ukrainian Canadian Congress have called on the government to admit more Ukrainian immigrants to Canada (Luciuk, 1999: 8).³ In the United States Ukrainian organizations have also called on the government to allow more Ukrainians to join American society.

With limited prospects for legal emigration, Ukrainians have found various ways of leaving Ukraine and trying to make a better living. A seemingly large number of women (and a small number of men) between the ages of eighteen and fifty from Ukraine (as well as Russia and Belarus) are using the Internet to offer companionship, sex and marriage to partners in the west as a way of escaping the daily grind of poverty. The web sites that contain the advertisements for this new type of picture bride reflect a mixture of misery and hope, but few play explicitly on the ties of Ukrainian ethnicity, probably because women want to appeal to as wide a male audience as possible. Some Ukrainian diaspora newspapers do, however, carry personal advertisements from women in Ukraine who are looking specifically for partners of Ukrainian background in the hope that their potential mate is looking for a traditional woman who, among other things, can make cabbage rolls just like *baba*.⁴

Though some commentators have spoken of 'fortress Europe', the borders in countries that constitute the buffer zone between Ukraine and the European Community remain porous (Wallace, Chmouliar and

Sidorenko, 1997). Ukrainians currently make up significant elements of the undocumented casual workforce in the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland (Wallace, 1998: 74). Moreover, significant numbers of undocumented Ukrainian and other eastern European migrants are working in traditional low-paying jobs in farming and construction as far afield as Germany and Britain (*The Economist*, 2000).

It is not surprising that, in this climate, international criminal organizations have begun to take advantage of the combination of the restricted opportunities for legal immigration and the desperation to leave Ukraine (Carroll, 2000). Women from Ukraine and other former Soviet republics have arguably replaced Asian women as the commodities of choice in the international trafficking of women for the sex trade (Specter, 1998). The Thai embassy in Moscow, which processes visa applications from both Russia and Ukraine, reports that it receives almost 1000 visa applications a day, and the Italian government estimates that there are over 30,000 Ukrainian women working illegally in Italy (Specter, 1998) in prostitution, domestic service and the gray area in between. Another estimate suggests that as many as 400,000 women under the age of thirty left Ukraine between 1988 and 1998 to work in the sex industry in Europe, North America, Asia and the Middle East (Bihun, 1998: 3).

Criminal organizations often lure Ukrainian women and girls from small villages by promising them jobs with good wages in the west. According to a widely circulated article by Norman Specter which originally appeared in the *New York Times* in January 1998, one typical ad read:

Girls: Must be single and very pretty. Young and tall. We invite you for work as models, secretaries, dancers, choreographers, gymnasts. Housing is supplied. Foreign posts available. Must apply in person.

(Specter, 1998)

Most of the women end up being bought and sold as prostitutes and live as virtual slaves. Others end up working illegally as domestic servants in middle-class households. With little economic security and legal protection, their circumstances are often no better than those of women who work in the sex trade. The International Organization of Migration has documented cases in which Ukrainian and other women from former Soviet republics have had their passports confiscated by their employer or their employment agency, are paid less than the minimum wage and work long hours without the protection of labor legislation or medical and other benefits (Krill, 1998).

Though the women who are caught in these criminal webs exist on the

margins of the established Ukrainian diaspora community, the diaspora is beginning to mobilize politically around the trafficking of Ukrainian women. While it is unclear what role the diaspora played in helping put the issue onto the American political agenda, Hillary Rodham Clinton spoke out against international trafficking of women at a conference in Lviv, Ukraine, in November 1997, and a recent edition of *Marie Claire* magazine carried an article on the topic. In March 1998, President Clinton pledged that the United States would develop a joint strategy with the government of Ukraine to combat the trafficking of women from Ukraine (Bihun, 1998) and other former Soviet bloc countries. The Brama web site regularly posts material on the issue of trafficking in women. A number of Ukrainian-American organizations and institutions, including Brama, the World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations and the Ukrainian American Professionals and Businesspersons Association of New York and New Jersey, along with faculty members at the Women's Studies Department of Hunter College in New York, sponsored a Trafficking in Ukrainian Women conference in July 1998. The conference aimed to introduce to the Ukrainian diaspora community a delegation of Ukrainian government, justice, social service and law enforcement officials, who were working for a USAID-funded project, to familiarize the diaspora with the issues surrounding the trafficking of women from Ukraine, educate the diaspora about the actions being taken to deal with trafficking, and help establish a dialogue 'between the diaspora and Ukraine' that would lead to the development of joint programs to address the causes and effects of trafficking (Krill, 1998). At the conference, Katerina Levchenko, the president of La Strada Ukraine, invited Ukrainians in the diaspora to volunteer their vacation time to help Ukrainian anti-trafficking centers with counseling, translating material and working with victims (Krill, 1998).⁵

The Joint Conferences of the Ukrainian American Organizations held in Washington DC, in June 1999 also addressed the issue. A session organized by the Baltimore chapter of the Ukrainian National Women's League of America and The Washington Group (an association of Washington businesspeople and professionals) invited speakers from the embassy of Ukraine in the United States, the United States Department of State, La Strada and the Ukrainian National Women's League of America. At the session, Anita Botti of the office of the US Secretary of State told the 150 members of the audience that an estimated 50,000 women, mainly from Southeast Asia, Latin America and the former Soviet bloc enter the United States illegally every year. Half end up working in sweatshops, while the other half are forced into the sex trade. Natalia Zarudna, from the embassy of Ukraine in Washington, outlined a number of things that the Ukrainian-American community could do to help put a stop to the international

smuggling of Ukrainian women. She suggested that the diaspora help lobby state and federal governments to implement measures to protect, rather than prosecute, the victims of trafficking. She also called for the establishment of special shelters that would protect women who escape from the criminal gangs that control the sex trade, and hot lines that women could use to seek help without contacting the police directly. She also argued for more opportunities for legal immigration.⁶

***Homo sovieticus*: the fourth wave and language tensions**

Even though the diaspora is beginning to mobilize politically around the issue of trafficking in Ukrainian women, and is lobbying to increase the number of legal migrants allowed into their countries from Ukraine, there is an uneasy relationship between the established diaspora and the new fourth wave of legal immigrants. In spite of the modest number of Ukrainian immigrants who enter North America each year, some segments of the diaspora nevertheless see these new Ukrainian immigrants as a source of diaspora renewal and revitalization. Others, however, have trouble recognizing new-wave immigrants from Ukraine as members of the same imagined community. Not unlike the conflicts between the longer-settled second-wave labor migrants and their descendants, and the postwar refugees that were described in Chapters 4 and 5, the present relationship between the established diaspora and the new arrivals is characterized by a mixture of hope, suspicion, misunderstanding and, in some cases, outright hostility. In this context, the uncomplimentary term *Homo sovieticus* is used by some members of the diaspora to characterize the new wave of Ukrainian labor migrants.⁷

There is no systematic research on the relationship between new immigrants and the established diaspora community, but impressionistic evidence suggests that new immigrants have been subject to much criticism by members of the established diaspora. Part of the acrimony has to do with the language spoken by the recent arrivals and their cultural characteristics. Given the widespread use of Russian in Ukraine during the Soviet period, many of the new immigrants are more comfortable speaking Russian than Ukrainian. But Ukrainians in the diaspora bristle when they hear new Ukrainian arrivals speak what in the diaspora was defined as the language of oppression in Ukraine; nor do they understand why any 'good' Ukrainian would choose to use that language. Furthermore, the culture, attitudes and behavior of new arrivals are often at odds with what diaspora Ukrainians regard as appropriate modes of subjectivity. Recent arrivals have been criticized for believing that the streets in the west would be paved with gold, for expecting handouts from the organized diaspora

community, for being unwilling to join existing community organizations, and for lacking loyalty to, and interest in, Ukraine and ‘things Ukrainian’ (Sasyniuk, 1999). According to the editor of the *New Pathway* (*Novy Shliakh*) newspaper of Toronto, ‘many of the Ukrainians . . . [that members of the diaspora] meet, either . . . [in Ukraine] or those that have immigrated recently to Canada, are more like strangers than the “brothers and sisters” they expected’ (Kish, 2000: 7).

New immigrants, on the other hand, doubt how open the diaspora is to newcomers, and how willing the established members of the diaspora are to help them navigate the process of settlement. Jobs are difficult to come by, and many feel that the organized community could do more to help them find work. According to Peter Rybchuk, the New Jersey-based editor and publisher of *Zakordonna Gazeta*, a bi-weekly Ukrainian-language newspaper that is targeted principally to members of the fourth wave of immigration, ‘many . . . find jobs in Russian, Polish or Jewish businesses; they read the Russian-language press’ and ‘they find jobs and information elsewhere’ (quoted in Hadzewycz, 1998: 9). Upon arriving in North America, new immigrants have found that the organized Ukrainian diaspora is not as politically influential as they were led to believe, nor as willing to accept ‘new blood’ from Ukraine into their organizations. Again, according to Rybchuk, the diaspora ‘must share its power . . . leaders age 65 and over should step down [and] new immigrants must be given authority so that they can feel their own responsibility’ (quoted in Hadzewycz, 1998: 9).

A glimpse of the kinds of tensions that are present can be had from an exchange of letters to the editor of the *Ukrainian Weekly* in 1999. A recent arrival complained that the Ukrainian-American community has ‘a huge blind spot’, and that it tends to ‘look down your noses at recent arrivals, while you ostensibly have an exclusive right to live in the comfort and safety of your American homes and love Ukraine vicariously’:

Isn’t it time for the North American Ukrainian community to stop acting like an exclusive club and try to help and involve the new arrivals in Ukrainian life in America? This is going to be a difficult challenge, because the new arrivals are not well organized and not used to active involvement in social life. But a lot is at stake here – like the future of the North American Ukrainian community. Will it grow and become a powerful voice in the United States and Ukraine, or will it just linger on without the influx of fresh blood?

(Chikakov, 1999: 7)

The writer hoped to 'open a dialogue' with the longer-settled members of the diaspora. While response letters admitted that the organized diaspora could do more to help new immigrants adjust to their new lives and join existing organizations,⁸ other responses placed much of the blame for the negative relationship on *Homo sovieticus*.⁹

Language tensions between the diaspora and Ukraine

The tensions between the established diaspora and new-wave immigrants exist in a broader context in which language, and the politics of language, are a sensitive issue in both Ukraine and in the diaspora. This section analyzes some of the points of friction between the diaspora and independent Ukraine over the Ukrainian language.

Even before independence, the Soviet government made moves to Ukrainianize Ukraine. In October 1989, Ukrainian was recognized as the state language by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, and the plan on the part of Mikhail Gorbachev and his reformers was for Ukrainian slowly to replace Russian as the language of politics, education, business and bureaucracy (Nahaylo, 1999: 236). Nevertheless, Russian was still the dominant public language in the capital and in much of eastern Ukraine on the eve of Ukrainian independence in 1991.

Independence has not automatically resulted in the Ukrainianization of Ukraine. The linguistic situation in Ukraine is in transition, and remains complex (Kuzio, 1998: 180). There is improved access to Ukrainian language education, and there is some change in the use and predominance of Ukrainian. For instance, between 1991/2 and 1994/5, the percentage of school children taught in Ukrainian rose from 49 percent to 57 percent in Ukraine as a whole. Despite this overall increase, there is still a significant amount of linguistic polarization, particularly between eastern and western Ukraine. In the Ternopil and Ivano-Frankivs'k *oblasts* in western Ukraine, for example, almost all pupils are taught in Ukrainian, but in the Crimea and the eastern *oblasts* of Donetsk and Luhansk the percentage varies from 0.1 percent to 9 percent (Kuzio, 1998: 173). Between 1991 and 1993, the proportion of newspapers published in Ukrainian in Ukraine dropped from 60 percent to 27 percent. It has since rebounded, but Ukrainian-language newspapers still constitute less than 40 percent of all newspapers published in the country. While Ukrainian was reaffirmed as the state language of Ukraine in the 1996 Constitution, and while all official government documents sent from Kyiv to the provinces are in Ukrainian, 'the language dominant in the workplace and in higher education is still largely Russian' (Kuzio, 1998: 181). One set of surveys conducted in the mid-1990s suggests that approximately 44 percent of the population of

Ukraine used Ukrainian for day-to-day communication while 56 percent used Russian (Khmelko and Wilson, 1998: 74).

The politics of language in Ukraine is equally complex. According to Kuzio (1998: 196), in the post-independence period 'Ukraine has to reject two extremes, both of which would be damaging to its nation building project: rapid Ukrainianization, or the introduction of Russian as a second state language'. Leonid Kravchuk, the first President of independent Ukraine, was criticized for introducing a period of Ukrainian 'nationalization', whereas the current President, Leonid Kuchma, has been accused of promoting a return to Russification. Other assessments suggest instead that the major achievement of the first two presidential administrations in Ukraine has been their ability to steer a middle course and keep a lid on the potentially explosive issue of language (Kuzio, 1998).

Since independence, the status of the Ukrainian language in Ukraine has been a point of contention between the diaspora and Ukraine. One source of disagreement is the kind of Ukrainian spoken in Ukraine and in the diaspora. Some Ukrainians in Ukraine consider that the Ukrainian that was preserved in the diaspora is an archaic remnant of the turn-of-the-century Ukrainian spoken in villages in Galicia in western Ukraine (Wilson, 2000: 210). That version of so-called 'peasant' Ukrainian has also become replete with anglicisms that are incomprehensible to speakers of modern Ukrainian. Thus, when diaspora Ukrainians who consider themselves to be reasonably competent speakers of Ukrainian go to Ukraine, they are sometimes made to feel that they are using a quaint, but ossified and corrupted form of the language that has not kept up with the times. When diaspora Ukrainians become involved in politics in Ukraine, questions of accent and vocabulary assume even greater importance, particularly when it comes to those who claim to speak on behalf of the Ukrainian people. One Socialist Party leader, for instance, recently commented:

Who is a better patriot of Ukraine – me or Slava Stetsko [the leader of the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists who lived in the diaspora for many years before returning to Ukraine]? . . . Someone who has worked here all his life, or someone who has spent 50 years God knows where and then has the cheek to come back here and tell us how to speak, pronouncing 'narod' [people] 'narid' and other peculiar stuff?

(Wilson, 2000: 211)

Conversely, the Ukrainian language that has developed in modern-day Ukraine, particularly in the east, has been influenced by the widespread

use of Russian. In fact, switching between Russian and Ukrainian is so common on the streets of the capital and in cities in eastern Ukraine (Jackson, 1998: 110) that some argue that a new 'language' has emerged. While it is not clear whether *surzhyk* (which literally means a mixture of wheat and rye, and in this context refers to the combination of Russian and Ukrainian) is, or will ever become, a new language, it is arguably replacing 'pure' forms of both Ukrainian and Russian as the lingua franca of youth in these areas (Wilson, 2000: 220). This code-switching, on the other hand, sounds foreign to people from the diaspora. Similarly, many diaspora Ukrainians are disappointed at the continued and widespread use of Russian in much of eastern Ukraine and Kyiv. Those who have visited Kyiv complain about the widespread use of Russian or *surzhyk* on the streets, the ubiquity of Russian-language books, magazines and newspapers in the kiosks and shops and the associated scarcity of material in Ukrainian.

In a related vein, some diaspora Ukrainians have trouble understanding why the Ukrainian government has not pursued a more aggressive policy of Ukrainianization, and ask why it has trod so softly when it comes to promoting Ukrainian.¹⁰ In his capacity as president of the Ukrainian World Congress, Askold Lozynskyj wrote an open letter to the President of Ukraine in 1999 encapsulating many of the concerns that have been raised within the diaspora about the Ukrainian government's cautious approach to language issues. The letter, written on behalf of 'the long-suffering but invincible Ukrainian people in Ukraine and in the diaspora', referred to a series of presidential directives that, on the eve of the November 1999 elections, seemed to favor the promotion of the Russian language and culture. Lozynskyj argued that a number of directives were causing 'considerable anxiety in the diaspora'. They included the opening in Kyiv of a bookstore for Russian-language materials; the creation of a center for the study of Russian; the introduction of special radio and television broadcasts in Russian; state funding for a Ukrainian scientific, popular and literary journal on Russian culture; and a provision that allows students to write post-secondary entrance examinations in Russian. In Lozynskyj's opinion, such measures were 'entirely unnecessary' and would lead to the 'Russification of Ukraine in the future'. 'Of course, the President of Ukraine should not be an enemy of the Russian language', Lozynskyj offered, but he should 'in the first instance [be] an active defender of the Ukrainian language and culture' (Lozynskyj and Pedenko, 1999: 7-8).¹¹

The current tensions between the diaspora and Ukraine over the issue of language are partly historical; they relate to the manner in which many Ukrainians in the diaspora defined the purpose of being in the diaspora before the collapse of the USSR. They may also be partly due to differing

definitions of what it means to be a Ukrainian on the part of diaspora Ukrainians and some Ukrainians in Ukraine. As seen through this book, many Ukrainians living outside of Ukraine saw the diaspora as the place where the Ukrainian language, culture and religion were making their last stand. They therefore invested considerable energy and resources in maintaining the language, religions and symbolic elements of culture. Indeed, these became central to their understanding of what it meant to be Ukrainian. Many diaspora Ukrainians who feel that they and their ancestors made Herculean efforts to maintain the language and the symbolic elements of Ukrainian culture in the diaspora are now disappointed that at least some Ukrainians in Ukraine, some new-wave immigrants, and some segments of the Ukrainian government seem either unwilling or unable to take up the battle. These disappointments may become even less easy to bear if the political scientist Taras Kuzio (1998: 184) is correct in his assessment that ‘knowledge of the Ukrainian language [in Ukraine] should not . . . be recognized as the main criterion reflecting the degree of a person’s patriotism [towards Ukraine]’. As Kuzio (1998: 184) points out, in a multiethnic and multilingual society like Ukraine that is struggling to construct a certain sense of civic nationalism among a diverse population, it is ‘hardly the case’ that ‘the only definition of a “true Ukrainian” is one who speaks the Ukrainian language’.

Return to Ukraine: desire and disdain

The Cold War and the Iron Curtain reinforced the physical and ideological separation of most of the diaspora from Ukraine. As noted earlier, some leftists within the diaspora had direct contact with Ukraine and Ukrainians after the war, but the vast majority of diaspora Ukrainians did not have the option of returning to Ukraine, even for holidays or short family visits. The knowledge that the Soviet regime had murdered or imprisoned hundreds of thousands of people who were forcibly repatriated in 1945 and 1946 weighed heavily on the minds of the third wave, and many feared that they would be imprisoned or killed if they returned to Soviet Ukraine. The Soviet government itself was stingy with visitors’ visas, mainly because it feared that members of the diaspora would feed the flames of nationalist discontent.

Thus, before independence, much of the diaspora’s direct contact with Ukraine was confined to letters, which many suspected were opened and read by Soviet authorities. Some families also sent parcels containing blue jeans, wedding dresses, track shoes and other items to their relatives even though they suspected the packages were looted by postal officials. Telephone calls occasionally got through, but the connections often took

hours to establish and were expensive, unreliable and of poor quality. The suspicion was that the calls were bugged or listened to, and so even a phone conversation did not provide personal and intimate contact with friends and relatives in Ukraine.

In the latter years of Mikhail Gorbachev's rule, opportunities opened up for the diaspora to travel to Ukraine and other parts of the Soviet Union. In the late 1980s, members of the diaspora began to test the regime's commitment to 'openness', and people increasingly returned from visits to Soviet Ukraine reporting that they had not been harassed by the authorities. The fall of the Iron Curtain and the rise of independent states committed to freedom of movement has created new opportunities for members of the diaspora to interact with Ukraine and Ukrainians. Return to an ancestral homeland is no longer an unrealizable longing, but rather a practical possibility that members of the diaspora have taken advantage of.

For members of other eastern European diasporas who have 'gone back' to their ancestral homelands after several decades of separation, 'return' has been a deeply ambivalent experience. Daphne Winland (1997) argues that for diaspora Croats return to, and cultivation of ties with, Croatia in the 1990s has generated contradictory feelings of desire and disdain. Croats have a strong desire to travel to Croatia, renew relationships with relatives and provide assistance to Croatia in its transition to democracy and a market economy. However, the experience of return has also resulted in disappointments, misgivings about how much help can be provided from afar, and the emergence of a profound sense of difference between 'us' and 'them'. At worst, return has led to a sense of disdain for Croatia and Croatians and a decrease in engagement with the homeland.

What forms of return have diaspora Ukrainians engaged in now that Ukraine is independent and now that they are free to travel to the ancestral homeland? How do the dynamics of desire and disdain play themselves out among Ukrainians in the diaspora? This section examines some of the contradictions associated with four modes of 'return' to Ukraine: return to work either permanently or semi-permanently; return related to involvement with political parties and political process; return related to the organization of charitable aid; and return for the purposes of family reunification.

Kibbutzing in Ukraine: 'return' and settlement

When asked, the majority of Ukrainians in the diaspora seem to have little desire to return to Ukraine either permanently or semi-permanently. For the immigrant generation, age is a factor. Even though they were once in the forefront of diaspora struggles to expose human rights abuses and to

try to bring about Ukrainian independence, many immigrants who arrived in the diaspora after the war are now in their sixties, seventies or eighties. Some are unable to return to Ukraine for health reasons or because of concerns about being able to get good-quality health care; others are unwilling to return permanently because their entire adult lives have been spent in the diaspora.

However, an indeterminate number of second-, third- and fourth-generation members of the diaspora have gone to live and work in Ukraine semi-permanently.¹² The Canadian embassy in Kyiv estimates that there are about three hundred Canadians living in Ukraine, although not all of those would necessarily see themselves as part of the Ukrainian diaspora (interview, April 30, 1998). Figures from other embassies are not available, but there may be as many as two or three thousand diaspora Ukrainians from different parts of the world living and working in Ukraine at any one time.

There is no systematic research on this return movement, but the beginning of a picture can be gained from interviews that I conducted with a dozen 'returnees' in 1998 and 1999.¹³ Though it is not possible to make generalizations from such a small sample, the people who were interviewed were either semi- or highly skilled professionals who worked in the legal, financial services and academic sectors in Canada. Few of them intended to stay in Ukraine permanently, but some had been in the country since independence, were marrying and forming relationships with Ukrainians and had stayed longer than they originally expected.¹⁴ In most cases, they were in Ukraine not from a desire to help build a post-Soviet society, but rather because they were at a crossroads in their own careers or personal lives. One 'returnee' noted:

It was actually a bit of serendipity because . . . I split up with my wife so I was going through a personal crisis . . . I decided OK, I'm going to take a year off and do some traveling and you know, try to just gather myself and see what I'm going to do . . . At the very start of the trip I visited Ukraine with my father . . . I was sitting in a hotel having a beer and I heard some English and there were a number of engineers and scientists from Canada starting a program here . . . so I got acquainted with them and one thing led to another.

(Interview, April 27, 1998)

Some had reached the top of their careers in the west and were looking for new challenges and opportunities; others had lost their jobs or were about to be put out of work when a contact with a granting agency, a project

manager in Ukraine or a business acquaintance approached them with an offer to work there.

Generally, the returnees occupied positions in Ukraine that were of higher status and more influential than the ones they would likely have held if they had remained in the diaspora. Among these are legal advisors and consultants to the parliament of Ukraine and other Ukrainian government and non-government institutions, and heads of influential institutes or international organizations. Others provide various forms of technical assistance to a variety of Ukrainian and international organizations.

All were fluent in Ukrainian (or at least 'diaspora' Ukrainian) before they went to Ukraine. While there were exceptions, several returnees interviewed said that before going to Ukraine they had been on the margins of the nationalist-oriented diaspora community and did not have much interest in the political and ideological battles of their mothers and fathers. One interviewee suggested:

What I found was that my parents were living in the past, it was all irrelevant. They were always hoping that there would be a free Ukraine and that . . . it would prosper and everything else like that . . . I was always personally convinced that if you really wanted the people to take notice of Ukraine you have to achieve some sort of [*sic*], or have some accomplishments in your given career or profession and people would respect you because of what you achieved. You would have a lot more credibility than all these people who are either marching in the streets or you know having choirs and dances and things like that.

(Interview, April 29, 1998)

Most nevertheless grew up with a 'Ukrainian' identity and did many of the symbolic things that the children and grandchildren of Ukrainian immigrants did: they learned to dance the *hopak*, played the bandura, celebrated 'two' Christmases and went dutifully to Ukrainian language school on Saturdays.

For the Ukrainian Canadians, one consequence of 'return' is that their sense of difference with Ukrainians in Ukraine became accentuated. Before returning, most had a general sense that they were part of the same imagined community as Ukrainians in Ukraine. After living and working in Ukraine, many came to the realization that because they had been raised in dramatically different societies, their understanding of what it meant to be Ukrainian was quite different from that of Ukrainians in Ukraine. In fact, some have developed fairly sophisticated understandings of the differences between themselves, as members of the Ukrainian diaspora,

and Ukrainians in Ukraine. One interviewee discussed at length the cultural differences between diaspora Ukrainians and 'Ukrainian Ukrainians', and concluded that the two peoples 'are really two quite distinct ethnic groups' (interview, May 4, 1999).

The Ukrainian Constitution does not allow its citizens to hold dual citizenship, and so there is not a strong desire to become a Ukrainian citizen if it means having to renounce Canadian citizenship. There are simply too many material, practical and symbolic benefits of having a Canadian passport. While some saw dual Ukrainian-Canadian citizenship as desirable if it were available, Ukrainian citizenship is valued mainly for symbolic reasons:

Yes absolutely I would do it [take out Ukrainian citizenship]. I would consider it an honour. I'm not sure what you'd call it but it would sort of have this effect of going full circle. Here's my father who had to leave and basically was considered an enemy and lost his rights here, then it went around full circle and I was able to come back and pick up citizenship. I would do it for that kind of reason.

(Interview, April 27, 1998)

Thus, contrary to some of the literature on transnationalism that emphasizes the importance of notions of deterritorialized citizenship (Basch, Glick Schiller and Szanton Blanc, 1994), in this case transnationalism seems to reaffirm the importance of a single 'home'.

The political process

Since independence in 1991, some individuals and organizations in the diaspora have become involved in the politics of Ukraine. This involvement has taken the form of support for specific political parties, as well as for the wider process of democratization. Probably the first direct involvement in the political process in Ukraine was through Friends of Rukh, which was formed in 1990, and which had chapters in cities in North America, Europe and Australia. Friends of Rukh was a registered charity in the United States and Canada that raised money on behalf of the Popular Movement of Ukraine for Reconstruction (in Ukrainian, *rukh* means 'movement'). Rukh was the Ukrainian equivalent of the popular fronts that had formed earlier in Czechoslovakia, Lithuania and Latvia. In Ukraine, Rukh was formed in late 1988 and early 1989 because of the initiative of a number of Ukrainian writers and intellectuals, many of whom were dissidents. By the fall of 1989, Rukh had nearly 280,000

members (Nahaylo, 1999: 217). While Rukh initially advocated an ethnically inclusive 'cross between national Communism and Socialism with a human face' (Nahaylo, 1999: 174), it eventually came to formulate a more explicitly nationalist, non-communist vision for an independent Ukraine (Wilson, 1997b: 64–8).

The diaspora supported Rukh financially during the early years of its existence. It is difficult to determine the amount of money that was raised by the organization over the years. Shortly after the Toronto branch was formed it had amassed a \$200,000 war chest (interview, October 9, 1997). Some of the money was earmarked to support Rukh's efforts to create an independent press, while other funds were to be spent by Rukh in the run-up to the December 1, 1991 independence referendum (Gray, 1992: A18). Suitcases full of dollars from diaspora supporters were reportedly taken to Rukh's leaders in Ukraine to help advance its goals. It is, however, difficult for movements to account properly for money that is delivered in a suitcase. Some within the diaspora suspected that the dollars were not being used to advance the interests of the movement as a whole, and others were unhappy with what appeared to be a change in Rukh's political direction (Gray, 1992: A18). Suspicions about whether the money was spent improperly made it more difficult to raise funds for the movement and for other Ukrainian causes. Furthermore, when Rukh was registered as a political party in December 1992, members of the diaspora in the west no longer received government tax receipts for their donations. There were differences of opinion within Friends of Rukh about whether it should support the newly formed political party in Ukraine. Friends of Rukh did remain sympathetic to the goals of the party, but eventually it withdrew its financial support. Friends of Rukh was later renamed Friends of Ukraine, and now it raises money for small-scale projects such as stocking libraries in eastern Ukraine with English- and Ukrainian-language books and supporting teachers in eastern Ukraine who teach in Ukrainian (interview, October 9, 1997).

There have been other ways in which the diaspora has tried to influence the political process in Ukraine. Some individuals have worked behind the scenes to encourage their governments to adopt policies that are favorable to Ukraine's interests. Lobbying by influential members of the Ukrainian-Canadian community in 1991, for example, partially accounts for Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's speedy recognition of Ukraine's independence after the December 1 referendum (Kordan, 1998: 128).¹⁵

Individuals and organizations have also worked to help create the conditions for democratic decision-making and a market economy in Ukraine. In 1999 the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America received a US\$180,000 grant from the United States Agency for International

Development (USAID) to conduct 'a nationwide civic information program prior to the October 31, 1999 presidential elections in Ukraine'.¹⁶ The UCCA program, which was called 'The Makings of a President', involved the production of public service announcements that were aired on Ukrainian television and radio, as well as brochures that outlined the platforms of the fifteen presidential candidates and explained the position of president and the responsibilities of citizens in a democracy. In September 2000, the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta received a \$2.7 million grant from the government of Canada for the Canada Ukraine Legislative and Intergovernmental Project. In that project, Canadians work with Ukrainian legislators, government officials and policy experts in order to advance democratic transformations in Ukraine (*New Pathway*, November 11, 2000: 7).

Other segments of the diaspora, however, continue to be involved with political parties in Ukraine. It is an understatement to say that the political landscape in contemporary Ukraine is complicated (see Wilson, 1997b; Kuzio, 1998). In the 1994 elections, for example, there were fourteen nationalist, three leftist and at least two major centrist parties vying for seats in the Ukrainian parliament. In the 1990s, there were at least two political parties in Ukraine that seemed to have links to the organized Ukrainian diaspora, particularly the Bandera and Melnyk factions of the OUN. The Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists (KUN) was founded in 1992 by émigrés associated with the Bandera faction of the OUN. At first, the party played on the prestige of its direct association with the wartime underground movement in Ukraine, and according to Andrew Wilson (1997b: 79) it had 'considerable financial backing from the diaspora'. The Congress is led by Slava Stetsko, the former Banderite Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations crusader and one of the small number of third-wave emigrants who returned to Ukraine permanently after independence. KUN was founded in an attempt to unite right-wing groups under one roof (Wilson, 1997b: 79). Though it has not succeeded in doing that, it has tried to lead the fight for the more aggressive Ukrainianization of Ukrainian society. The Congress was 'a powerful political force in Galicia in 1993-94' (Wilson, 1997b: 79), but since then its influence has declined and it occupies a position on the fringe of Ukrainian politics.

The Melnyk faction of the OUN also became involved with Ukrainian politics. They built on their contacts with the 1970s' and 1980s' dissidents who first formed the Ukrainian Helsinki Union in 1988 and which was later renamed the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) in 1990 (Wilson, 1997b: 69, 79). The URP is more moderate and slightly more influential than their Banderite counterparts in the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists. During the late 1990s, the URP had some support in the Canadian

diaspora, particularly among third-wave emigrants in the Ukrainian National Federation (UNF). John Kolasky, the former Ukrainian diaspora communist who became a nationalist in the 1960s, worked to raise money for computers and printing equipment for the URP.¹⁷ In 1998, the Canadian UNF almost fell on its sword in order to sustain the party in Ukraine. A group of elderly members of the UNF who identified with the Melnyk faction of the OUN tried to gain control over the organization, and in what some have described as ‘a life and death struggle’ over the fate of the organization, their apparent aim was to dissolve the diaspora organization, liquidate its considerable assets (which consisted mainly of prime real estate in a number of Canadian cities) and give the money to the URP in Ukraine. Their argument was that since Ukraine had achieved independence, the UNF and other similar organizations had served their purpose and that the best thing they could do was send money to nationalist parties in Ukraine in order to help solidify Ukraine’s place in a post-Soviet world. They lost their battle for the UNF, and in the end the leadership passed to a younger, Canadian-born generation that was committed to reorienting the organization to emphasize the needs of Ukrainians in Canada.

Charitable aid to Ukraine

The explosion at the Chernobyl nuclear plant in April 1986 may have marked the beginning of the end of the Soviet Union (Ignatieff, 1993: 115). It was widely considered to be confirmation of the decrepit state of Soviet industry and technology. The Soviet attempt to downplay the scope of the disaster brought further discredit to a regime that was already strongly suspected of being both ethically and financially bankrupt. At first the Soviet government shunned western help to deal with the disaster, but it eventually accepted various kinds of support to aid in the clean-up and to deal with the health consequences of the explosion.

The Chernobyl catastrophe provided one of the first opportunities for the diaspora to play an officially sanctioned role in Ukrainian society. In the United States and Canada, chapters of Children of Chernobyl were established in the late 1980s and early 1990s by members of the Ukrainian diaspora as a way of providing assistance to the victims of the disaster. Since then various Chernobyl-related organizations have turned into massive fundraising machines with numerous chapters throughout the world. Since their inception, the chapters in the United States have raised money for twenty-two airlifts and seven sea shipments containing 1200 tons of humanitarian aid valued at over US\$40 million. The Children of Chernobyl Relief Fund has helped establish a blood diagnostic laboratory in Lviv, installed the first magnetic resonance imaging system in Ukraine

and has modernized a number of neonatal intensive care units. The fund also organizes training conferences and seminars for Ukrainian doctors, and helps bring children from Ukraine to North America for various kinds of treatment and respite.¹⁸ Between 1990 and 1997, the Children of Chernobyl Canadian Fund raised nearly \$7 million for a similar array of projects (CCCF, 1998: 3).¹⁹

In the United States, the fund receives grants from the US government under the Freedom Support Act to help defray transportation expenses. It has also been successful in recruiting high-profile non-Ukrainian entertainers and politicians to support the cause. In April 1999, the CCRF awarded Hillary Rodham Clinton a lifetime achievement award for promoting women's and children's health. The \$250-a-plate event held at the Ukrainian Institute of America in New York helped raise over \$90,000 for CCRF medical missions to Ukraine.²⁰

Since independence, hundreds of diaspora organizations have begun to provide other forms of humanitarian and technical assistance to Ukraine. Most projects are operated by individuals or organizations that are part of the Ukrainian diaspora, but some are run by people with no ostensible connection to the diaspora. A significant number of people of Ukrainian ancestry who are not connected to the organized diaspora – including physicians, lawyers, academics and accountants – also work through their non-ethnic work and professional associations to provide various kinds of assistance to Ukraine.

During the first years of independence, aid from the diaspora for the multiplicity of Ukrainian causes seemed mainly to take the form of cash. The assumption seemed to be that Ukrainians knew best how to spend the money, and the donations tended to come attached with few explicit strings. In many ways the experiences of these organizations mirrored those of Friends of Rukh. But soon misgivings began to be expressed about accountability and whether the money was really being used to support the stated objectives of the fundraising efforts:

The delivery of assistance . . . is not necessarily understood in the same way by the people in Ukraine as it is by the people in the diaspora. Each side tends to understand it in terms of the practices in the societies in which they live. Thus, much of the assistance may never get to the people it is expected to help. There is a problem of control and accountability. Many of those to whom assistance is transferred would like the diaspora to not ask any further questions. It is, however, essential that any assistance with resources be given rationally, according to western standards. Accountability to the donors is essential. Many people

from Ukraine have commented to travelers from the diaspora that their aid does not reach them and that 'it is used to support and maintain the old system', meaning the system that existed under the Soviet Union. This is somewhat demoralizing to the general population in Ukraine, since many people there will come to believe that the diaspora supports the old exploitative elite – whom they often label as the 'Mafia' – and to feel that it is doing little to help bring about real change that would benefit everyone. (Isajiw, 1993: 87).

Allegations of corruption and graft within Ukrainian government circles started to become more widely reported in the western press (Cohen, 2000) and culminated with the arrest in 1998 by Swiss authorities of Pavlo Lazarenko, the former Prime Minister of Ukraine, who was traveling on a Panamanian passport (Wilson, 2000: 265). By the mid-1990s individuals and organizations were becoming much more cautious about how they assisted and supported Ukraine. According to the leader of one diaspora organization that continues to provide aid to Ukraine:

We're trying to move towards more grass roots type of projects that might attract people because everyone is also very in tune with the state of corruption over there and anything that has a high profile, meaning a lot of money, is susceptible to corruption. We're trying to create a fund – it's not attractive or lucrative enough for the mob or the Mafia to be interested in it over there, but it's enough to provide moral and some financial assistance. (Interview, October 10, 1997)

Now it is more common for support from the diaspora to take the form of technical services and advice, goods that are purchased in the west and shipped to Ukraine and stipends for Ukrainian students and exchange programs.

Numerous stipend and exchange programs have been created by members of the Ukrainian diaspora to support Ukrainians in Ukraine. In the late 1960s, the Ukrainian National Women's League of America began providing small scholarships to needy students of Ukrainian ancestry in Brazil and Argentina. In 1989, the UNLWA began to provide scholarships to Ukrainian students in various countries in eastern Europe, and in 1992 it gave its first scholarship to students in Ukraine. Between 1987 and 1995, the UNWLA provided over US\$1.5 million in stipends to support Ukrainian students in South America and Europe, including Ukraine (UNWLA, 1996: 129). The chair of the Ukrainian Studies Foundation of

Toronto sponsors the Canada–Ukraine Parliamentary Program, which since 1991 has brought over 120 university students from all parts of Ukraine to study the Canadian system of government through three-month internships with Canadian members of parliament. Some of the young people have used the experience to find places in universities in Canada and the United States, others have successfully run for political office in Ukraine, and others have become civil servants in Ukraine.

Other forms of diaspora assistance include fundraising by the UNWLA to buy medical equipment for hospitals and other institutions in Ukraine, and to provide assistance to elderly Ukrainian women in Ukraine, Brazil, Poland and Germany (UNLWA, 1996: 121). Organizations like Ukrainian Canadian Social Services raise money to help fund soup kitchens in Ukraine. There a number of branches of Friends of the Ukrainian Olympic Committee in the United States, Canada and Australia, and their fundraising efforts are aimed at providing financial support and training opportunities to Olympic-level Ukrainian athletes. Individuals and organizations associated with the Ukrainian credit union movement in Australia, Canada and the United States have been instrumental in introducing credit unions into Ukraine. Since 1991, over fifty credit unions have been established in Ukraine with the help of various kinds of technical assistance, training programs and internships from credit unions in North America (Denysenko, 1998: 8). Other organizations like the Ukrainian Servicemen in the US Army volunteer their time to provide translation services for visiting delegations to and from Ukraine (Bodnarczuk, 1998).

Family reunification

Probably the most popular form of return to Ukraine consists of trips to meet long-lost relatives or to visit the villages or towns from which one's ancestors hailed. For second and subsequent generations, a trip to Ukraine usually involves a search for 'roots'. Many families were separated during the chaos of war and involuntary repatriation, and circumstances were such that some people ended up in the diaspora while their relatives remained in Ukraine. Family reunions after more than forty years of separation are obviously emotion-laden events. These reunions often entail filling gaps in family histories, learning what happened to friends, acquaintances or property after the war, and what it was really like to live under the Soviet regime (Kulyk-Keefer, 1998). Invariably the better-off relatives from the diaspora take gifts of cash, clothing, western music, electronic equipment and other commodities that are expensive or scarce in Ukraine. In some cases, after personal contact has been reestablished, relatives in the diaspora help finance the purchase of property, farm

equipment or vehicles for relatives in Ukraine. Indeed, there are businesses in New York, Chicago, Toronto, Edmonton and elsewhere that specialize in sending everything from food parcels to cash, cars and tractors to Ukraine. Even modest remittances of a few hundred American dollars from relatives in the west can constitute a substantial portion of yearly family income in Ukraine. In some cases, the family reunions in Ukraine result in sponsorship arrangements by which the family in the west is able to secure an immigrant visa for a Ukrainian relative.

But post-independence family reunions are riddled with many of the same contradictions as diaspora life. After the euphoria of meeting long-lost relatives has worn off, compassion fatigue often sets in. Though giving money or other forms of assistance to less well-off relatives may help relieve some of the guilt associated with being one of the lucky ones who did not have to spend their adults lives under the postwar Soviet boot, when more prosperous family members in the diaspora begin to give money to relatives in Ukraine, more distant relatives begin to ask for money and favors from what appear to be wealthy western relatives. Some members of the diaspora get the feeling that they are being taken advantage of and are little more than cash cows for desperate relatives. According to the leader of a Ukrainian-Canadian organization in Toronto: 'even within families [money] . . . has just sort of disappeared, and so, not in all cases, but too many cases, and so people now they've kind of backed off, say it's too hard, I've worked for my money and I don't want it to be ripped off' (interview, October 24, 1997). In other cases, investments and business deals with family members have gone sour, which also leads to hard feelings within newly reunited families (interview, March 25, 1998).

Ironically, despite the contribution that remittances from relatives could make to post-Soviet reconstruction, the Ukrainian government does not make it easy for members of the diaspora to arrange visits with their relatives in Ukraine. The expense and bureaucratic red tape involved in obtaining a visa is a major irritant for members of the diaspora who want to travel to Ukraine. One source of ill feeling within the diaspora stems from the persistence of a Soviet-style method of issuing visas. Applications for tourist visas must be accompanied by evidence that all hotel accommodation has been prepaid in foreign currency. While this benefits hotel owners in Ukraine who can charge top rates for mediocre rooms, it makes the arrangements for family and tourist travel to Ukraine more expensive than they should be. Furthermore, to go to Ukraine on a 'business' visa is complicated by the fact that the prospective traveler must have a formal invitation from an organization in Ukraine. Travelers staying in private accommodation are required to register with the local militia or at the local Office of Visas and Registration. As in many countries, a brush with Ukrainian

bureaucracy is rarely a happy experience; indeed, registering with the Kyiv Office of Visas and Registrations is described in one popular travel guide as a trip to ‘the hall of nightmares’ (*Let’s Go Eastern Europe*, 1999: 712).

Conclusion

This chapter has examined what happens when a diaspora’s hope for its homeland is realized. For much of the twentieth century, many Ukrainians in the non-communist diaspora dreamed that Ukraine might one day be free. Some segments of the diaspora, particularly the interwar émigrés and postwar refugees, took this longing further and became politically active in their countries of settlement in order to work towards the day that Ukraine would be free of Soviet domination.

Michael Ignatieff (1993: 142) says that ‘freedom itself is never the end of the road – only the beginning’. Ukrainians in Ukraine have realized the harshness of new beginnings insofar as freedom did not result in automatic and immediate improvements in their standards of living. Certainly much needs to be done in Ukraine before the material benefits of freedom reach the majority of the country’s population. But Ukraine’s newly won freedom is also a new beginning for the diaspora in North America and elsewhere. The old script for being a diaspora that involved, *inter alia*, protesting and exposing human rights abuses in Soviet Ukraine, the sentimental longing for Ukraine’s independence, the idealization of the ancestral homeland in the absence of direct contact with that homeland or with new immigrants, the promotion of language and the symbolic aspects of Ukrainian ethnic culture out of a sense of obligation to both the past and future of Ukraine is no longer entirely relevant in the post-Soviet period. Now that Ukraine is formally free of Soviet domination, opportunities for return have expanded, and so too have opportunities to meet with Ukrainians in Ukraine and with new Ukrainian immigrants. Under these circumstances, certain aspects of the Ukrainian diaspora experience need to be reinvented.

How that new script will read is difficult to predict. Inevitably, perhaps, the return and the new social interactions that are now possible are marked by disappointments and misgivings. After all, it is the very nature of idealized ancestral homelands that they do not live up to one’s expectations. One of the ironies of the Cold War and the Iron Curtain is that separation helped the diaspora to sustain an idealized vision of the homeland and of Ukrainians in Ukraine. Return to Ukraine, more often than not, seems to entail the realization that even with independence there is much work to be done. The challenge for the Ukrainian diaspora is to develop new ways of idealizing and returning to the homeland that are able to look beyond the many problems faced by Ukrainian society.

CONCLUSION

This book began by discussing whether the term ‘diaspora’ was an accurate description of the millions of Ukrainians who, since the late nineteenth century, left their ancestral homelands and formed communities in a number of places throughout the world. If one were to take a checklist approach, the Ukrainians who settled abroad do bear a strong resemblance to the ideal-typical features of diasporas that Cohen (1997) outlines in *Global Diasporas*.

In relation to the original reasons behind the dispersal of diaspora groups, Ukrainians moved both because of traumatic social and political events in their homeland and in search of work. Beginning in the late nineteenth century Ukrainians moved abroad in order to find opportunities for wage labor and farming. During World War I and the immediate interwar years, the diaspora was augmented by both labor migrants and by political refugees who left Ukraine because of the events associated with the various unsuccessful bids at independent state formation. Many of those political refugees settled first on the borders of Soviet Ukraine in east central Europe but later moved on to North America or tried to form organizational and ideological links with Ukrainians in Canada and the United States. After World War II most emigrants to North America were political refugees who left Ukraine during the chaos of war. For them the reasons for leaving were less economic than social, political and ideological, in that they left Ukrainian territory to escape the horrors of their earlier experiences of forced collectivization, the famine of 1932–3 and their fear of Stalinist terror. Their anti-Soviet attitudes and politics, along with the political divisions that they brought from Europe, had a significant influence on the organized life of the diaspora. Since Ukrainian independence, the majority of new migrants are once again labor migrants.

Within the Ukrainian diaspora there are collective memories of the ancestral homeland. However, those memories have been shaped by

CONCLUSION

certain competing understandings of both the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian state. For socialists in the diaspora, Soviet Ukraine was in the process of becoming a full-fledged communist society; it was a place not only where economic justice prevailed but where national and ethnic rights blossomed. As such, for much of the Ukrainian diaspora left, Soviet Ukraine, along with the larger Soviet Union, were models to be emulated, supported and idealized for the sake of Ukrainian workers in the diaspora, Ukrainian workers in Ukraine and the working class more generally. For diaspora nationalists, Soviet Ukraine was a colony of the Soviet Union and a political monstrosity whose social, political and economic structure was inimical to the true essence of Ukrainians. Within the contemporary diaspora in North America, one of the ways in which collective memories about the homeland continue to be sustained is through the promotion of the remembrance of the famine in Soviet Ukraine in 1932–3. The development of a consciousness about the famine in Soviet Ukraine in 1932–3 is important because it tends to bridge different organizational, ideological and religious divisions, and because it helps draw the generations born in North America into the larger Ukrainian imagined community.

Since the late nineteenth century, a varied return movement has thrived among diaspora Ukrainians. Among the first waves of labor migrants to North America were those who adopted a sojourner attitude to their time abroad. Although some were marginally enriched by their time spent working in the coal mines of the United States or on the farms and lumber camps in Canada, many of those labor migrants returned to Ukraine before World War I, disappointed that they and their families were not much better off than before they went. After the Bolshevik Revolution, a small number of diaspora socialists returned to Soviet Ukraine, either as individuals or as part of larger collective movements to help build socialism. Some were disappointed with their first-hand experience of the socialist experiment and were able to escape to the comparative safety and comfort of life in the diaspora. For others, return to Soviet Ukraine turned out to be a death sentence. For many of the Ukrainians who returned to Soviet Ukraine in the heady days of Ukrainianization in the mid-1920s were eventually accused of being part of complicated, and fake, conspiracies whose supposed aim was to undermine the Soviet Union. Several well-known returnees were either executed or sentenced to years of hard labor for their alleged political unreliability resulting from their prior lives in the diaspora. During the interwar years, some of the émigrés who lived in east central Europe on the borders of Soviet Ukraine and Polish-controlled western Ukraine fought both a political and a guerrilla war against both Polish and Soviet oppressors. Following World War II and during the Cold War, physical return to Ukraine was not an option for the most of the

CONCLUSION

diaspora, although small groups of socialists continued to make trips back and forth. With Ukrainian independence, return is once again possible and members of the diaspora have engaged in various forms of return that range from the organization of charitable aid, return for family visits and temporary and permanent settlement for the purposes of work.

Ukrainians in the diaspora also display a strong ethnic group consciousness, and that consciousness has been maintained over time. The issue of how group boundaries are formed, maintained and renegotiated has been central to much of organized Ukrainian diaspora life. During the early years of the twentieth century, part of the challenge faced by nationalizing elites within the emergent Ukrainian diaspora was how to instill in labor migrants a sense of Ukrainian ethnic identity. Like other immigrants to North America at the time, the labor migrants arrived in their new lands with little understanding of themselves as members of a larger Ukrainian imagined community. Depending on the circumstances, identities tended to be based on village or regional origins, religious affiliation or the country that issued their travel documents. However, part of the process of diaspora formation for Ukrainians involved coming to understand themselves as members of a particular Ukrainian ethnic group. Thanks to the work of nationalizing elites, Ukrainians came to understand what it meant to be 'Ukrainian'. This aspect of the process of diaspora formation also involved the drawing of boundaries to exclude those who were considered the 'other'. In the case of Ukrainians in North America, this involved the creation of a Ukrainian identity that was distinct from Russian, Rusyn and other ethnic designations.

During the 1920s, disagreements about the kind of Ukrainian that one was became more prominent. Thus, at the same time that Ukrainian identity and ethnicity came to be accepted as a legitimate way to define group boundaries, part of the subsequent process of diaspora formation and group boundary development involved differentiating between Ukrainians of different religions and of different political and ideological stripes. During the Cold War, some of the most important markers of ethnicity for diaspora organizations consisted of protesting human rights abuses in Soviet Ukraine, remaining fluent in Ukrainian, and maintaining the symbolic aspects of Ukrainian culture. But it is difficult for people who are two or more generations removed from the Ukrainian immigrant generation to remain fluent in Ukrainian. As a result, many organizations in the diaspora are beginning to reconsider whether the Ukrainian language should continue to be central to group identity and the maintenance of group boundaries. Some organizations have become bilingual or even use English only. Instead of language, they lay more emphasis on the symbolic and emotive aspects of ethnic attachments as a way of drawing

CONCLUSION

and maintaining group boundaries. Despite a picture of declining language fluency beyond the immigrant generation, many people outside of Ukraine still consider themselves to be Ukrainians, feel an attachment to Ukraine and continue to hold onto the symbolic aspects of Ukrainian ethnic culture.

Longer-settled members of the Ukrainian diaspora in North America no longer encounter much prejudice or discrimination. Indeed, rates of intermarriage are high, and many Ukrainians have achieved a level of upward mobility that is enviable compared to those of other immigrant ethnic communities. Nevertheless, some segments of the Ukrainian diaspora display elements of a troubled relationship with their otherwise tolerant host societies. Those troubled relations stem, in part, from the impression that in the course of pursuing Nazi war criminals, their governments and others have unfairly portrayed Ukrainians as anti-Semites and war criminals. There is also a feeling that countries like Canada and the United States have not done enough to acknowledge and condemn the atrocities that were committed against Ukrainians in the 1930s in the Soviet Union. For many Ukrainians in the diaspora the famine in Soviet Ukraine in 1932–3 is regarded as the Ukrainian genocide, and the feelings of victimization stem from the perception that the famine takes second place to the Jewish Holocaust.

Ukrainians also display a sense of solidarity with co-ethnic members in other societies. During the interwar years, Ukrainian nationalists who were living in east central Europe formed organizational links with Ukrainians in North America and drew upon their financial and moral support. During the Cold War, when Ukrainians in Ukraine were regarded as the victims of Soviet terror, many individuals and organizations in the diaspora worked politically to support the Ukrainian people generally, and the dissidents in particular. Ukrainians have also tried, with somewhat mixed results, to form umbrella organizations to link together Ukrainians within individual countries of settlement and in different countries. These efforts are not without their difficulties, but they show a commitment to co-ethnicity and a desire to widen the influence of the worldwide Ukrainian diaspora.

And, finally, the diaspora has been a place of creativity. While it is too simple to attribute the creativity of the Ukrainian diaspora solely to the belief on the part of many diaspora Ukrainians that the Ukrainian language and culture were making their last stand in the diaspora, some aspects of the creative life of the Ukrainian diaspora were infused with that larger political subtext. Certainly the creativity and organizational vitality of the post-war displaced persons' camps can be attributed to the fact that this was the first chance that many Ukrainians had to be Ukrainian and to express freely the symbolic aspects of their identity and heritage. Other

CONCLUSION

aspects of the creative life of the diaspora are, admittedly, less explicitly rooted in these kinds of political dynamics, but they nevertheless reflect unique ways in which multiple identities, attachments and perceptions of different homes are reflected in diaspora songs, dances, literature, artwork and popular culture.

It is clear that the Ukrainian diaspora conforms to a number of the broad features of diaspora outlined in Chapter 1. However, from the perspective of the definitions of diaspora the Ukrainian case also presents several anomalies. In fact, some elements of the Ukrainian diaspora experience push the boundaries of the concept of diaspora, and raise questions about whether the concept of diaspora needs to be further developed in order to help capture the true complexity of social life for groups like the Ukrainians.

First, diasporas are not homogeneous entities. The concept of diaspora, like the concept of community, may lead to an overemphasis on within-group solidarity and may give the appearance of a singleness of purpose to groups that are in fact politically, ideologically and economically diverse. Diasporas can be fractured along a number of lines, including political ideologies, class backgrounds, gender, religion and the circumstances of emigration. Different segments of a diaspora 'community' may view the ancestral homeland in different ways, may participate in different forms of return, and may use different ways to make the homeland relevant to the maintenance of group boundaries. Moreover, these divisions can often be bitter and entail complex perceptions of 'self' and 'other', and 'us' and 'them'. In fact, these kinds of divisions may generate as much in-group conflict as out-group conflict. In the case of the Ukrainian diaspora, 'others' have included both non-Ukrainians and other Ukrainians. In view of the divisions and conflicts within diasporas, one must ask whether ethnic diasporas are in fact one, or many. Put simply, it is not clear whether there is *a* Ukrainian diaspora, or whether there are *many* Ukrainian diasporas.

Second, the reasons for emigrating do not seem to determine what kind of diaspora a group becomes or what the social and political orientations of a diaspora will be. Before World War II, the Ukrainian diaspora was made up of a combination of labor migrants and political refugees. But the labor migrants did not all hold to the same political ideologies, nor did they all join the same organizations or view the Soviet Ukrainian homeland in the same ways. The labor migrants split into socialist and nationalist camps, which in turn led to different ways of defining what it meant to be in the diaspora, different views of the homeland, different idealizations of the homeland and different modes of return.

On this point, however, it is important not to throw the baby out with the bath water. The reasons for emigrating do help explain some of the

CONCLUSION

animosity that exists between different waves of migration. Historically, Ukrainians in the diaspora have had considerable difficulty integrating and welcoming new waves of immigrants into their organizations and visions of the purpose of diaspora life. This was true in the late 1940s and early 1950s when the third wave arrived in the diaspora, and seems to be true now that a new fourth wave of immigrants has arrived in the established diaspora. While the problem of integrating new waves of migrants may be a uniquely Ukrainian problem, it may be part of a wider difficulty that all diaspora groups have when they have to integrate emigrants who left the homeland for reasons different from theirs or those of their immediate ancestors. In the case of the problematic relations between the third and fourth waves of migration in North America, the central problem seems to be how a longer-settled combination of victim and cultural diaspora interacts with new migrants who left the ancestral homeland in search of work.

Third, for groups that have spent more than one generation in a host society as a ethnic community, it is difficult to see how the original conditions of exit continue to be relevant to contemporary diaspora life. Second- and third-generation immigrants often experience upward social mobility, even when the immigrant generation were peasants or wage laborers in the old country. Thus, the conditions of emigration may have little effect on later generations and how they understand their role as a diaspora, how they relate to the homeland and how they return to the homeland. Thus, the danger with typologies of different kinds of diaspora is that they may lead to certain static understandings of community life. In many ways, what the Ukrainian diaspora experience in North America shows is that the original conditions that led to the emigration of the immigrant generation may be important, albeit in different ways, for the ways that particular generation relates to both the homeland and the country of settlement, but that those conditions may be less relevant for the children and grandchildren of those immigrants.

Furthermore, at different points in its history in North America, the Ukrainian diaspora contained elements of a labor diaspora, a victim diaspora and a cultural diaspora. The kind of diaspora one sees Ukrainians as, then, depends very much on what one chooses to emphasize. Recent events and relations with Ukraine have meant that certain segments of the Ukrainian community in North America may be becoming less of a victim diaspora and more of a cultural diaspora, where the emphasis is on how to maintain Ukrainian ethnic identity and forms of involvement with Ukraine that are more symbolic, less infused with political identities, and less costly in terms of financial and other resources.

Fourth, one of the main challenges facing the longer-settled diaspora is how to draw second and subsequent generations into organized diaspora

CONCLUSION

life. In other words, processes of group boundary creation and maintenance may differ for different generations of a diaspora. The things that first-generation immigrants do to maintain their boundaries may not help to recruit new members and to maintain the boundaries of second, third and subsequent generations. In fact, the boundary-maintaining techniques used by first-generation immigrants may repel later generations. Different generations may use different combinations of ancestral origin myths and may have different ways in which victimization fits into the narratives of community life and different ways of understanding their roles as diaspora. Also, in this context, attention needs to be paid to ethnic elites within diasporas. Ethnic elites help set the agendas for diasporas, frame issues and cultivate certain forms of ethnic consciousness. The activities of these elites and their efforts to recruit new members, maintain boundaries and set agendas need to be the object of future research.

And, finally, the process of return can take many forms and may have unexpected and diverse consequences. Return can be symbolic or it can be physical. In the case of diaspora Ukrainians, return has variously involved protesting human rights abuses in Soviet Ukraine; physical return to help build the socialist homeland, visit relatives or organize charitable aid; participation in the political process; and return to live and work. Each of these forms of return have different meanings and consequences, and, as such, the discussion of modes of return of diasporas needs to be broadened to some of the more unexpected consequences. For instance, return to an ancestral homeland, and contact with co-ethnic members who have lived separate lives for several generations, may not necessarily strengthen the attachments with the ancestral homeland or with co-ethnics in that homeland. In some cases, it has led to the recognition that there are profound differences between those who have lived in the diaspora and those who remained in the ancestral homeland. Within the Ukrainian diaspora there is an emergent sense that the members of the ethnic community who lived under the old Soviet system are a different kind of people, even though there are links of ancestry and blood with individuals in the diaspora.

In addition, while some forms of diaspora return may reveal dual loyalties and multiple identities, contact with the ancestral homeland may in fact strengthen the attachment to the country of settlement and identification with it. There are complex connections between ethnicity and nationality, and, in some cases, people who were born and raised in the diaspora may realize, on visiting the homeland, that they are quite unlike the people who remained there. Return may in fact weaken the sense of ancestral ethnic identity and strengthen a sense of attachment to the nationality of the country of settlement.

If we take seriously the old sociological maxim that a situation that is

CONCLUSION

defined as real is real in its consequences, then the belief on the part of many Ukrainians both inside and outside of Ukraine that there is a 'Ukrainian diaspora' should put the matter to rest. If Ukrainians believe they are a diaspora, then they are a diaspora.

If only matters were that simple. Ironically, at the same time as the legitimacy of the concept of diaspora, or at least some version of the concept of diaspora, to describe Ukrainians seems to be without question, there is serious debate among Ukrainians in North America about the prospects for the long-term survival of the Ukrainian diaspora. In October 1998, an unprecedented meeting of Ukrainian Americans was held in a hotel conference center in East Hanover, New Jersey.¹ As noted in the introduction to this book, the Ukrainian American Professionals and Businesspersons Association of New York and New Jersey organized a 'Year 2020' conference that aimed to bring together leaders of the Ukrainian diaspora community in the United States and Canada² in order to discuss the future of the Ukrainian diaspora. The conference was organized around four main questions:

- 1 Will there be a North American Ukrainian diaspora in the year 2020? And does it matter – to us, to our descendants, to Ukraine?
- 2 Does an independent Ukraine enrich and invigorate the diaspora, or undermine its reason for being?
- 3 Will the 'fourth wave' of immigrants play a key role in the diaspora's future?
- 4 Are the futures of the Canadian and American diasporas tied to each other, or will their paths be shaped by markedly different circumstances?

The conference began with an impassioned speech by the association's president, Dr Bohdan Vitvitsky. Vitvitsky noted that 'to the extent that one does occasionally hear bits and fragments of attitudes or ideas about our collective future, what one hears is usually one of the following'. First, there is the 'don't worry, we are on automatic pilot' view. This consists of the 'assumption that somehow things will continue to be the way they have always been, and that, therefore there's no point in getting too exercised about the future'. A second view consists of the belief that the whole point of maintaining a Ukrainian diaspora was the preservation of the concept of an independent Ukraine, and now that Ukraine exists, there is really no point in the diaspora's continuation. Finally, a third view is 'the sky is falling' perspective where the diaspora is seen to be coming apart at the seams, and is doomed to extinction because organizations are unable to recruit new members. Vitvitsky outlined a number of reasons why all three

CONCLUSION

perspectives were wrong. However, the most powerful moment in his speech came when he argued that it does matter that the diaspora survives. In what he called ‘the footnote 16 reason’ for the diaspora’s continued survival, he said:

A half year ago I was reading a fascinating article about the campaign of terror that the Soviets launched against the Ukrainian population of Halychyna [Galicia] at the end of World War II. One of the footnotes in that article, footnote 16, told a story about a small contingent of UPA [Ukrainian Insurgent Army] fighters in 1954. In that year, four members of the UPA unit were betrayed by a fifth. The four, three men and a woman, came under siege while in a hideout on the ridge of a cliff overlooking a river in the Carpathian mountains. The four held out for more than a month, and then chose to commit suicide rather than surrender.

This story has stayed with me ever since I came across it. As many of you know, by 1954 most of the UPA had been crushed, and it was clear beyond hope or illusion that the West was not going to go to war against the Soviets in order to liberate Eastern Europe. So, to begin with, I’m amazed that there were still people willing to fight and die for what they must have realized was a near-hopeless cause. Then, it’s difficult to imagine surviving for more than a month in a small earthen hideout, without fresh water or food, without any normal sanitary conditions, and without any hope of escape. But they were still there in 1954, they were still fighting and dying under the most difficult of circumstances. And they were willing to sacrifice everything for Ukraine.

I think we owe it to that small contingent – and to all of the millions upon millions of other Ukrainians, whether in the 1940s and 1950s, or in the 1910s and 1920s, who fought and died to preserve that which was handed down to us – to stay the course and keep our blood- and tear-soaked heritage and traditions alive both for our children and our grandchildren.

(Vitvitsky, 1998: 12, 13)

Whether the Ukrainian diaspora will survive into the year 2020 and beyond is a question that time alone can answer. Though it is folly to think that scholarly social science research alone can change the course of community and social life, scholarship can help clarify what it means to be a diaspora and why ‘footnote 16s’ are relevant to the future of global diasporas.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

- 1 In Canada, the community was able to win an apology from CanWest Global, the network that broadcast the program. In its apology the network regretted 'any hurt or prejudice that the broadcast . . . may have caused the Ukrainian community'. This apology is posted on the Infoukes web site.

1 UKRAINIANS AND THE CONCEPT OF DIASPORA

- 1 Although in the post-modern age it is possible that people without any Ukrainian ancestry may subjectively define themselves as Ukrainian.
- 2 German Mennonites first moved to Ukrainian territory in 1789 when the Russian government offered Germans favorable terms in order to settle sparsely populated lands in the east. They were augmented by other settlers in the early nineteenth century. Many of the descendants of those settlers, however, eventually left Ukraine in the 1920s to settle in Canada (Magocsi, 1996: 344, 578). Thus, for some ethnic groups, Ukraine may simultaneously be one location where a diaspora has settled and a 'homeland' to which they have an emotional attachment.

2 EMIGRATION AND THE FORMATION OF A LABOR DIASPORA (1890-1914)

- 1 A somewhat different picture of the scale of Ukrainian eastward migration within the Russian Empire is gained from the 1897 Russian census. In the Briansk, Kursk and Voronezh *gubernias*, which were on Russia's western border with eastern Ukraine, Ukrainians constituted as many as 90 percent of the total population. In the Kuban *oblast* to the southeast of present-day Ukraine, the nearly 1 million Ukrainians formed 47.4 percent of the population. In one *oblast* in Kazakhstan, the 51,000 Ukrainians constituted about 7.5 percent of the population, in the Tomsk *gubernia* in Siberia the 100,000 Ukrainians made up 5.2 percent of the population, while in some *oblasts* in the Russian far east they were as many as 14.9 percent of the total population (Naulko *et al.*, 1993: 7).
- 2 Emigrants from Galicia were made up of a combination of Ukrainians, Poles and Jews.

- 3 This diaspora community has been able to maintain a number of institutions, and links are being formed between the community there and the community in North America, particularly through the work of the Ukrainian National Women's League of America.
- 4 The Society was formed in 1868 in order to help educate the Galician peasantry so that they could improve their socio-economic conditions (Kaye, 1964: 9–10).
- 5 While this explanation may be satisfactory in explaining the occupational choices of Ukrainians in America, it is not satisfactory when taken in a broader context. It is likely that material factors stemming from the different opportunity structures of the two societies may have had more to do with these different employment patterns. By the time Ukrainians arrived in the United States, much of the agricultural land in the west had already been settled. Opportunities for the acquisition of relatively cheap homesteads had disappeared by the 1880s. In the case of Canada, the arrival of Ukrainians coincided with the opening up of the Canadian west, and so Ukrainians who came to Canada faced a quite different opportunity structure than their American counterparts.

3 WHAT KIND OF UKRAINIAN ARE YOU? CLEAVAGE WITHIN THE PRE-WORLD WAR II DIASPORA

- 1 Of the \$53,189 collected by the Ukrainian Alliance of America, \$22,000 was sent to shore up the Rada government in Kyiv (Kuropas, 1991: 143).
- 2 An article in *Tryzub*, for example, argued that:

For us, all Russian governments are equally burdensome and oppressive for they do not reconcile themselves to the existence of Ukrainian political independence and shall always struggle with Ukraine by political and military means. We see no distinction between Tsarist and Communist Russia because both are merely different manifestations of Muscovite despotism and militarism. The ideal of Ukrainian statehood cannot be restricted within the narrow confines of federalism, confederation or autonomy either with Russia or with any other state.

(Cited in Reshetar, 1952: 330)

- 3 According to Armstrong (1963: 20), the 'integral nationalism' of the 1930s in Europe had the following characteristics:
 - (1) a belief in the nation as the supreme value to which all others must be subordinated, essentially a totalitarian concept; (2) an appeal to mystically conceived ideas of the solidarity of all individuals making up the nation, usually on the assumption that biological characteristics or the irreversible effects of common historical development had welded them into one organic whole; (3) a subordination of rational, analytic thought to the 'intuitively correct' emotions; (4) expression of the 'national will' through a charismatic leader and an elite of nationalist enthusiasts organized in a single party; (5) glorification of action, war, and violence as an expression of the superior biological vitality of the nation.
- 4 Its fascist leanings were evident in a public statement issued in 1926:

The only possible form of state rule, at the beginning and under the present conditions, can be a dictatorship of groups of organized Ukrainian patriots-nationalists, who have state-minded tendencies, [a dictatorship] which should be realized in the person of that national *vozhd'* [leader] who will organize and complete the liberation of the Ukrainian people.

(Cited in Motyl, 1980: 135)

- 5 The UVO's official journal, *Surma* ('The Trumpet'), explained their cultivation of German relations in the following way:

The UVO is an organization for which only the interests of the Ukrainian nation are and will be decisive in its activity . . . The UVO does not consider serving the interests of foreign peoples. At the same time, however, the UVO is aware that it has not only the task but also the responsibility to look for allies and to carry on propaganda among the peoples of the world in order to prepare the proper grounds and sympathy in the world for the general liberation of the Ukrainian people.

(Motyl, 1980: 125)

- 6 The Galicians' disillusionment with the émigrés' emphasis on diplomacy and their cultivation of relations with Germany was solidified by the Carpatho-Ukraine 'debacle' two years earlier. In the Munich Agreement of September 1938, Britain and France agreed to recognize Germany's claim over the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia. Non-German minorities were given the choice of living under the German or the Czechoslovak government. The Nazis, however, encouraged Ukrainian nationalists in the Czech province of Carpatho-Ukraine to agitate for autonomy from Czechoslovakia (Armstrong, 1963: 24). In October 1938 Ukrainian nationalists declared Carpatho-Ukraine to be a 'free' state within a larger Czechoslovakian federation. With the encouragement of the Germans, OUN activists from Germany went to Carpatho-Ukraine to help form a paramilitary organization, the Carpathian *Sich*, which was supposed to form the core of a Ukrainian army. In March 1939, however, the Germans invaded Bohemia and Moravia and advised the Ukrainians that Carpatho-Ukraine should submit to Hungarian rule. The Ukrainians refused and declared the complete independence of Carpatho-Ukraine. Carpatho-Ukrainian independence lasted for a few days until it was overtaken by Hungarian forces (Armstrong, 1963: 24).
- 7 The *raison d'être* of ODUWU was articulated at the 1935 All-American Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists where it was resolved that:

1. The Ukrainian Nation, on its own native soil, is presently experiencing horrible terror at the hands of its occupiers and is denied the right to freely and openly present its true national-political objectives and ideals before international political leaders of the world.
2. For that reason, this congress of representatives of the Ukrainian immigration and the Ukrainian Nationalist movement in general, raises its voice before the entire world for the purpose of expressing the unfalsified will and the true national-political posture of the Ukrainian nation on its native soil as well as in the immigration.
3. The Congress, therefore, wishes to announce to the entire political world that:

NOTES

- a) On the basis of its historical right and in complete agreement with the principles of President Wilson concerning the right of all peoples to self-determination, the Ukrainian Nation proclaimed and is still proclaiming its active will for the realization of an independent and sovereign state on its own ethnographic territory.
- b) In opposition to the above-mentioned rights and principles, the territory of the Ukrainian people and their state, renewed in the years 1917–1920, was forcibly partitioned by various international treaties, concluded by the Russian state, now known as the USSR, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia.
- c) The Ukrainian Nation considers all these international treaties acts of illegal force, does not recognize them as obligating in any way, and will use all avenues available to it to render them void, while, at the same time, striving to rid Ukraine of all foreign occupation in order to establish an Independent, Sovereign and Ukrainian State.
- d) Only that Sovereign Ukrainian state of the Ukrainian People will be competent to conclude legitimate treaties with other states of the world and to accept the responsibility for their approval by the Ukrainian People.
- e) As long as the Ukrainian Nation, consisting of forty-five million people, exists in a condition of foreign slavery, there can be no talk of a permanent peace in Europe, and the responsibility for all possible interference with peace in that area falls on those political forces which, in opposition to the will of the Ukrainian People, quartered their land in the past, and which today do not protest this state of affairs.
- f) The Congress calls upon the people and the leadership of American and European countries for their objective opinion and their support of the Ukrainian Nation and its struggle for the realization of its national rights and with that, to come closer to the complete and total settlement of the Ukrainian question in a way that will improve the present international, political atmosphere.

(Cited in Kuropas, 1991: 255–6)

8 Like their American counterparts, Ukrainian socialists in Canada began to organize mutual benefit societies that acted as insurance associations. In 1922, the Workers Benevolent Society was formed; it provided benefits to its members in the event of accident, sickness or death. The Society also built and operated an orphanage for Ukrainian children and a retirement home for workers in Winnipeg (Martynowych, 1990: xx).

9 The paper said:

That Petliura is sure putting up a good fight for Ukrainian independence! He has united with gentry-led Poland and imperialist Romania; the first along with him, has occupied eastern Galicia; the second, Bukovyna and Bessarabia . . . and now he is fraternizing with Deniken, a lackey of the Tsarist regime and the old ‘indivisible’ Russia . . . He has certainly found himself some select company! Aristocratic Poland, imperialist Romania, and the monarchist Deniken – all at Ukraine’s expense.

(Cited in Krawchuk, 1996: 232)

- 10 In stating its position on the relative importance of national liberation versus a socialist revolution, the USDP adopted the Bolshevik line that:

We want a free Ukraine but as long as Ukraine has one capitalist within its borders, it will not be free . . . Bourgeois Ukrainians will not achieve a free Ukraine. Ukraine will be free when it rids itself of capitalists and the bourgeoisie. Workers cannot go hand in hand with the bourgeoisie even to protect the homeland. Workers and peasants must first rid themselves of the bourgeoisie . . . then all the proletariat will be one and will stand in defense of a free, socialist Ukraine.

(Cited in Kuropas, 1991: 172)

- 11 This attitude was summed up in the answer that the *Ukrainski Robotnychi Visti* gave to the question, ‘What has the October Revolution given Ukrainian Toiling Masses?’:

First of all, national and social freedom and their own worker-peasant state, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

National Freedom: full recognition of Ukrainian culture and language. The free development of the Ukrainian working people, Ukrainian schools of all types from children’s crèches to public schools and universities.

Social freedom: the abolition of the hegemony of ownership capital, large and small landlord holdings, the confiscation of monastery and large church estates, the denial of all rights to non-laboring elements, the introduction of a firm dictatorship of the workers, the transfer of factories for the use of the workers . . .

On the basis of self-determination the Ukrainian toiling masses have created an independent Soviet republic which has voluntarily entered into a federation with the Russian . . . and other republics.

(Cited in Kolasky, 1990: 167)

- 12 The Black Hundreds were pro-Russian ultra-rightist groups that carried out pogroms against Jewish communities in Ukraine; the term was used as a way of discrediting the nationalist cause.

4 THE THIRD WAVE: WORLD WAR II AND THE DISPLACED PERSONS

- 1 For moving personal accounts of leaving Soviet Ukraine in these circumstances, see Khelemendyk-Kokot (1993) and Mirchuk (1976).
- 2 The reasons included their poor physical condition, the enforcement of strict height requirements, homosexuality or suspicions of homosexuality and age, and some volunteers were deemed to be political threats (Logusz, 1997: 74–5).
- 3 In the camps, Ukrainians who had heard of the Australian and Canadian bulk labor schemes learned that in addition to passing strict medical and security screening, they would also be subject to the ‘hand test’. The test, which simply involved an examination of an applicant’s hands for calluses and other signs of manual labor, was meant to see if an applicant was suited for the heavy labor for which they were being recruited. Among the refugees there are reports that intellectuals and professionals who hoped to get to Canada or Australia roughed up their hands in the days before the test.

5 THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF THE
POSTWAR DIASPORA

- 1 The Toronto Ukrainian Professionals and Businesspersons Association regularly publishes a directory of community organizations, as well as business and professional services and organizations, that are either run by, or cater in whole or in part to, the wider Ukrainian community.
- 2 One indication of the sometimes thin membership base for some organizations can be gained from an examination of the entries on organizational life in *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*. The thirty-five chapters provide country-based summaries of organized diaspora life. In nearly two-thirds of the chapters the authors indicate that many organizations have small and declining memberships. In Austria, of the twelve Ukrainian organizations that were alive in the early 1990s, five are assessed as being 'not very active, largely inactive, or practically ceased to exist' (Naklowicz, 1994: 206-9). West Germany had a very active diaspora in the early postwar years, but the period after 1952 is described by Maruniak (1994: 263) as one of 'downfall and crisis'. A small number of organizations continue to exist, but in Maruniak's (1994: 264-5) view, the 'Ukrainian community in the Federal Republic of Germany . . . [has] ceased to play an influential role in the political life of the Ukrainian diaspora'.
- 3 A recent count found over one hundred Ukrainian organizations in Canada (Isajiw and Makuch, 1994: 346-9), while in Chicago, Illinois, there were estimated to be between 122 and 180 existing Ukrainian organizations in the late 1980s (Markus, 1989: 17).
- 4 Certainly, it is difficult to make judgments about the health and vitality of different organizations, particularly without detailed data on membership, trends, demographic structure, and the activities and events that are sponsored by the organization. Sometimes, negative assessments come from ideological and political opponents who have an interest in undermining the influence and prestige of an organization, and so they should be treated with caution. However, critical assessments also come from within particular organizations and reflect deep-seated and genuine concerns over their future. This dialogue is mainly between community activists, but often academics also make forays into these debates. A sampling of some of the internal community assessments of these different kinds of organizations can be instructive.
- 5 In some localities the nationalist community takes credit for the decrease in power and influence of the leftists. In his study of Kingston, Ontario, Luciuk (1980: 117) argues that:

it can be said that their [the Banderite Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine] commitment to eliminating the 'left' in Kingston was total. Judging by the fact that the Association of Ukrainian Canadians and, to a lesser degree, the Workers' Benevolent Association [two left-leaning organizations] did go into a marked and irreversible decline shortly after the end of the Korean War, it would seem clear that the efforts of 'the league' were largely successful.
- 6 In Canada, the two factions also established their own credit unions. Bookstores and other places of business were known to be under the informal control of sympathizers of particular factions.
- 7 In some cases, because they did not have the resources to own their own community hall or meeting place, different factions held commemorations of

the same event, at the same time and in the same building – one faction held their event upstairs and the other downstairs (Luciuk, 1980).

- 8 According to Markus (1989: 14–15), after the war,

Ukrainian war refugees, the so-called DPs, were coming in hordes and either taking over or creating their own organizations and institutions at a dizzying pace. The church and fraternal organizations were best able to integrate in some way this new influx of immigrants. But though the newcomers have revitalized the American Ukrainian community on one hand, on the other, they have contributed to the greatly diminished participation of the American born generation of Ukrainians.

- 9 Markus (1989; see also Isajiw, 1979: 94) further argues that the DPs' uncompromising insistence on the use of Ukrainian at meetings, at community events and in their periodicals alienated members of the diaspora who were not fluent in the language.

The new immigrants were creating their own world, separate from that of the old Ukrainian American community. Separating the two groups was another barrier – language. While the children of the old immigrants already in the 1930's began to switch to English language, as evidenced by the publications of a number of periodicals targeted at the American born youth, the new immigrants were as inept in expressing themselves in English as the American born Ukrainians were in Ukrainian.

(Markus, 1989: 15; see also Kuropas, 1996: 384–5)

- 10 See [wysiwyg://57/http://www.brama.com/diaspora/prof.html](http://www.brama.com/diaspora/prof.html) for a list of organizations and their addresses.
- 11 Kuropas calls the scholars who conduct their research independently of the existing Ukrainian institutes and centers 'the grunts' of the Ukrainian academic community.
- 12 The Shevchenko Scientific Society in Canada, in conjunction with a number of other individuals and Ukrainian organizations co-sponsored a scholarly conference in English on the 'Problems of Development of Ukraine Since Independence in light of Western Theories'. Most of the speakers were scholars of Ukrainian origin who ply their trades at American, Canadian and British universities.
- 13 See Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University, Information about HURI, <http://www.sabre.org/huri/info.html>.
- 14 They have dealt with issues like the Ukrainian religious experience; peasant society in eastern Europe; Hasidism; the military tradition in Ukrainian history; the history of Ukrainian book printing; the Chernobyl nuclear accident; and the Ukrainian experience in the United States.
- 15 The initial objectives of the Institute were:

to encourage program development in Ukrainian Canadian and Ukrainian studies at the undergraduate and graduate levels; to serve as a resource for English and Ukrainian bilingual education; to encourage research and publication on Ukrainian Canadian and Ukrainian subjects; to facilitate coordination in program development in Ukrainian studies in Canada and avoid duplication in research and publications; to assist in the establishment of creative contacts

among professors, scholars, writers, scientists and librarians by promoting and organizing meetings, lectures, conferences and tours.

- 16 The initiative to further Ukrainian studies in Australia was undertaken at meetings in 1971 between students of Ukrainian origin and other community members with Professor J. B. Rudnyckyj, who was the founding head of the Department of Slavic Studies at the University of Manitoba in Canada. Other diaspora scholars also visited Australia in the 1970s in order to help push the idea of Ukrainian Studies forward, including Professor Volodymyr Janiw, the rector of the Ukrainian Free University of Berlin, and Omeljan Pritsak, the director of the Harvard Ukrainian Studies Research Institute.

By 1975, the Ukrainian Studies Foundation in Australia Limited (FUSA) had become the official trustee for the Australian Shevchenko Trust Fund, which was the main fundraising arm for Ukrainian Studies in Australia (Gordijew, 1986: 141). The Foundation was intended to act as an intermediary between the academic world and the community, but it was also seen as an organization that would help the Ukrainian-Australian community overcome its 'organizational isolation', become more 'mainstream' and educate other Australians about the problems, hopes and aspirations of Ukrainians in Australia, in Ukraine, and the rest of the world (Gordijew, 1986: 147). Between 1975 and 1983, the Foundation raised \$600,000 from individuals and organizations to fund Ukrainian Studies, but in addition it also coordinated the collection of resource materials including newspapers, periodicals, paintings, and musical recordings (Gordijew, 1986: 145).

In 1981, the Foundation negotiated with Macquarie University to incorporate Ukrainian Studies into the Slavonic Section of the School of Modern Languages. The Foundation agreed to fund Ukrainian Studies at the university, while the university agreed to establish a teaching and research component of Ukrainian Studies. Since then, a program in Ukrainian Studies has also been established at Monash University.

- 17 The link between ethnic groups and ethnic chairs and programs of studies is an area that is worthy of further scholarly research, particularly in a climate where Canadian universities are increasingly interested in fundraising within the wider community.
- 18 In the United States in the mid-1960s, for example, approximately 11,000 students were enrolled in 114 supplementary schools and another 10,000 in accredited schools (Markus and Wolowyna, 1994: 387-8). In Canada in the early 1980s, there were 15,046 children enrolled in nearly 300 schools (Balan, 1983: 279). In other countries, the number of students enrolled in accredited and supplementary schools was smaller but ranged between a few hundred and several thousand.
- 19 See [wsyswyg://134/http://www.brama.com/yara/music.html](http://www.brama.com/yara/music.html).
- 20 In addition to being tied to the ethnic community, these umbrella organizations are often affiliated with wider, 'mainstream' organizations. For example, the Ukrainian National Women's League of America is part of the National Council of Women in the United States and the American Federation of Women's Clubs. Members of the UNWLA are also part of the World Movement of Mothers, an NGO with representation at the United Nations; members also participated in the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995 (UNWLA, 1996: 25, 71). The twenty-two Ukrainian Credit Unions in the United States are part of the wider World Council of Credit

Unions. Plast, the Ukrainian scouting organization, is affiliated with the larger scouting movement.

- 21 See, for example, the UACC's advertisement in the *Ukrainian Weekly*, 2000, Volume I: 1939-1969 (*Ukrainian Weekly*, 2000: 240).
- 22 The Congress's long-standing conflict with the political left has yet to be resolved. The fledgling Association of United Ukrainian Canadians has never been part of the Congress, nor is there any interest in seeing it become part of it.
- 23 Another long-standing critic is John Gregorovich, past president of the Ukrainian Professional and Business Federation of Canada. In commenting on the organizational structure of the Ukrainian Canadian Congress, he argued that the 'takeover' of the UCC by DP-led organizations set Ukrainian organizational life back by two generations.

In the post-Second World War period, two trends shaped what became the Ukrainian Canadian Congress. The first amounted, in some cases, to a hostile takeover of several of the UCC's pre-war constituent organizations by postwar political refugees and émigrés. That is how the Ukrainian National Federation, originally a secular nationalist group that attempted to unite all Ukrainian Canadians in defense of Ukrainian independence, came to be dominated by postwar refugees affiliated with the nationalist movement headed by Colonel Evhen Melnyk. The second was the UCC's deliberate policy of concentrating on internal community relations as opposed to external affairs.

(Gregorovich, 1993: 80)

- 24 These critical assessments were widely shared in the late 1980s and early 1990s. According to Gregorovich (1993: 81),

The UCC has an aged membership and it is now, increasingly, the preserve of a constituency of aging immigrants; moreover, there is little apparent prospect for change because there is no impulse for change within the Congress structure itself. As a result, it has and will become increasingly irrelevant to the life of the community and, in time, will probably wither away.

According to Hryniuk and Luciuk (1993: 2),

It seems increasingly evident that some of the larger national organizations that were once the backbone of the Ukrainian-Canadian community, have become largely dated and redundant, or have even expired, like the Hetman movement, or are in the process of doing so. These supposedly influential organizations do have memberships, but they represent only a minority of a minority of the total Ukrainian-Canadian population.

At a conference in Toronto in November 1991, the organizers proposed:

a 'new commons', both a way of doing things and a way of representing collective Ukrainian-Canadian interests. It would involve Canadian Ukrainian professionals, regardless of background, generation, politics, or religion, in new or revitalized organizations tailored to meet specific goals within the Canadian and international political forums.

- 25 Plenary sessions started late and some speakers went well over time with their comments, leaving others with only a few minutes to address the audience. At the final plenary session, resolutions from various roundtable sessions were not debated individually; instead the Forum organizers typed out the various resolutions from the individual roundtables from the previous two days, and tried to have them adopted as a whole without prior approval of the Resolutions Committee. After reading the eleven-page document, which was described by the *Ukrainian Weekly* as 'more akin to a thematic essay on the use of the Ukrainian language, and vague calls on the diaspora to help improve the mother country's image worldwide' (*Ukrainian Weekly*, 1997: 'The Year in Review'), the organizers tried to have the resolutions adopted as a whole and without discussion. According to one report, the chair lost control over the session, individuals tried to make numerous additions and corrections to the main resolution, and at one point people's access to the microphone was blocked by others on the floor. In a last-ditch effort to put an end to the mayhem, the chair declared the end of both the plenary session and the Forum by singing the Ukrainian national anthem, *Shche Ne Vmerla Ukraina* ('Ukraine has not yet died').

6 UKRAINE IN THE POSTWAR DIASPORA: EXPOSING HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES

- 1 The central place of language in the Soviet attack on Ukrainian culture and nationality was reflected in the nature of some of the titles of the 'scholarly' journal articles published in Moscow at the time. Such value-neutral titles as 'Fight Against Nationalism on the Linguistic Front', 'Root Out, Exterminate Nationalistic Roots on the Front of Linguistics' and 'Linguistic Theory of Ukrainian Bourgeois Nationalism' were common and were indicative of the ways in which language became a central issue in the war against non-Russian peoples in the 1930s .
- 2 *The Ukrainian Herald*, which began in *samvydav* in 1970, but which operated openly in 1971 and 1972, was one of the main dissident publications in Ukraine in the early 1970s.
- 3 The Action Guide was less favorably disposed to the use of advertisements, posters and working through the government. It noted that advertisements 'take little effort and cost lots of money'. Furthermore, it cautioned that a poorly constructed ad could do more harm than good: 'remember that few things discredit a cause more than bad grammar, sloppy artwork, or hackneyed messages. So, if your group finally does decide to take an ad out, make sure it's literate and up to professional standards' (UNWLA, 1975: 15).
- 4 After Ukrainian independence, Zinkewych moved Smolokskyp Publishers to Kyiv, where he helps young Ukrainian writers, poets and activists get published (Yaro Bihun, 'Smolokskyp Publisher Receives Ukraine's Presidential Award', *Ukrainian Weekly*, April 6, 1997).
- 5 See the reports of the British, American and Canadian branches of the ABN presented at the ABN/EFC Conference in London, September 1982, in Stetsko (1985: 128-36).
- 6 The allegation that Ukrainians were Nazi sympathizers was easy to dismiss; how, Nakashidze asked, could Ukrainians be Nazis when they were regarded by the Nazi's as *Untermenschen*? Furthermore, Nakashidze argued that 'ever

since the origin of our peoples', the social and political structures, and their mentality and character, have always been democratic (Nakashidze, 1960: 33). Serfdom was a Russian invention and imposition. The allegation of anti-Semitism was particularly irksome to the ABN, and Nakashidze spent considerable time outlining the unjustness of the allegation. Its response, however, was not particularly well put. 'It is true', Nakashidze explained, 'that there are anti-Jews and persons who hate the Jews, but we do not belong to these categories. By this we do not mean to say that we love the Jews and admire them more than anyone else. One cannot expect a person to love and admire everyone. It suffices for him to be tolerant and humane and to respect every person as an individual' (Nakashidze, 1960: 34).

7 UKRAINIANS AND THEIR SENSE OF VICTIMIZATION

- 1 As noted in Chapter 2, Ukrainians were not always well accepted into North America. First-wave Ukrainian immigrants were racialized by dominant political, economic and labor elites and were regarded as a problematic presence. Furthermore, during World War I approximately 5000 non-naturalized Ukrainian immigrants in Canada were interned in 'concentration camps', and several thousand more were forced to register their whereabouts with the federal government. Since many non-naturalized Ukrainians were still nominally Austrian citizens, and since Britain and Canada were at war with Austria and Germany, the Ukrainians with Austrian citizenship were defined as enemy aliens whose loyalty to Canada and the wider British Empire was suspect. As part of the internment process, Ukrainians in Canada had their property confiscated, were constituted as 'unfree labor' (Cohen, 1987), and were denied a range of civil and political rights (Melnicky, 1983; Marunchak, 1982: 326; Luciuk, 1988).
- 2 The cases of the internment of Ukrainians in Canada during World War I, and Operation Wisla in Poland in 1947, have in fact become focal points for the political mobilization of Ukrainians in the diaspora. In Canada there is a 'redress' movement that is lobbying the federal government for an apology and a package of financial compensation (Luciuk, 1988). And, in both Poland and the diaspora, efforts have been made to press the Polish government to acknowledge the injustices that were inflicted on the Ukrainian population as part of Operation Wisla (Association of Ukrainians 'Zakerzonna', 1997). The ability of these instances of victimization to draw Ukrainians from different countries together may be limited, though, because they are rooted in local circumstances that may not have much meaning to Ukrainians in other parts of the world.
- 3 As of February 1999, only one person has been prosecuted under Britain's war crimes legislation (*Toronto Star*, February 9, 1999: A8).
- 4 This is actually a paraphrase by District Court Judge Dickinson R. Debovoise of the evidence given by the former KGB operative.
- 5 Kuropas closed his column stating that:

Hatred of Ukrainians by some Jews is legendary. In the words of Jewish American columnist Barry Farber of *The New York Tribune*: 'Many Jews feel it's impossible to grab any 70-year-old Ukrainian male and not have a notorious Jew killer or Jew-killing accomplice on your hands!' (Kuropas, May 29, 1988)

6 In the mid-1990s, the Canadian government abandoned its prior commitment to prosecute alleged war criminals in Canada. In place of that ‘made in Canada solution’, it hired former OSI director Neil Sher to devise a Canadian form of denaturalization and deportation. When speaking at a meeting of the St Nicholas Parish Ukrainian Catholic Brotherhood of Canada in May, 1998, Eugene Harasymiw, president of the Alberta Branch of the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League, implied that Canada’s new strategy was not based solely on considerations of ‘justice’. The *Ukrainian News* reported that he told the audience that:

the agenda of the Jewish ‘power lobby’ (B’nai Brith, Jewish Defense League, Simon Wiesenthal Centre) in its war crimes campaign is to boost the ‘holocaust industry’, ensure prolongation of massive cash aid to the state of Israel, deflect criticism of crimes against humanity being committed against Palestinian people and deflect from Jewish complicity in the most heinous crimes of the Stalinist period when Jews were effectively in control of state machinery in USSR. He added that Jews were leaders of secret police (GPU, OGPU, NKVD, KGB).
(*Ukrainian News*, June 3–16, 1998: 7)

When asked why a leader of an organization that is mainly made up of the descendants of first- and second-wave immigrants is leading a campaign on an issue that mainly affects third-wave immigrants and their descendants, Harasymiw replied: ‘The primary reason is what the nature of this exercise is all about and the nature is to discredit Ukrainian people and the concept of the Ukrainian nation’ (quoted in *Ukrainian News*, June 3–16, 1998: 7).

- 7 Contextualizing and explaining Ukrainian motives for participation in pogroms is a tricky business because there is a thin line between explaining and excusing.
- 8 Ukrainian deaths which were the result of the famine are estimated to have represented nearly 19 percent of the total Soviet Ukrainian population, and about one-quarter of its rural population (Maksudov, 1986).
- 9 Near the end of *Harvest of Sorrow*, Conquest (1986: 306) offers what he regards as a conservative estimate of the final death toll associated with dekulakization and denationalization. Five million Ukrainians died as a result of famine, and several million more died as a result of being transformed from landholding peasants into workers (dekulakization). Conquest’s (1986: 306) detailed estimate is as follows:

Peasant dead: 1930–7	11 million
Arrested in this period, dying in camps later	3.5 million
Total	14.5 million
Of these:	
Dead as a result of dekulakization	6.5 million
Dead in the Kazakh catastrophe	1 million
Dead in the 1932–3 famine:	
In the Ukraine	5 million
In the North Caucasus	1 million
Elsewhere	1 million
	} 7 million

- 10 According to Peter Novick, ‘the phrase “the six million” is a rhetorical stand-in for the “the Holocaust”’ (1999: 214).
- 11 See www.ukrweekly.com.

- 12 Troper and Weinfeld (1988: 252) argue that the documentary was also part of an attempt by Ukrainian Canadians to discredit Soviet evidence in war crimes trials. By showing how the Soviet Union lied about the famine, it was hoped that doubt would be cast on the veracity of the evidence they were willing to provide against Ukrainians.
- 13 The timing of this recognition may have played an important part in explaining why the government became more accommodating to the diaspora's concerns. Leonid Kuchma, presidential incumbent, was in a life or death struggle with resurgent socialists and communists, and the announcement may have been used as a way of trying to politically undermine support for the leftist forces by reminding voters of the horrors that had been committed by the Soviets in the name of socialism.
- 14 Indeed, it may actually come from the prior conflict between Jews and Ukrainians over the issue of Nazi war criminals.
- 15 In Novick's (1999: 277) view, there are 'thousands of full-time Holocaust professionals dedicated to keeping its memory alive'.

8 THE DIASPORA AND THE CHALLENGES OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

- 1 http://www.ins.usdoj.gov/graphics/public_affairs/newsreel/97Legal.pdf.
- 2 Even though legal emigration is relatively small, it tends to be made up of the most highly skilled segments of Ukrainian society. One estimate suggested that between 1991 and 1998 '5600 scientists have left Ukraine, including 500 [university] professors' ('Brain drain discussed at seminar', *Ukrainian Weekly*, October 18, 1998: 2).
- 3 See, for example, the resolutions on immigration at the nineteenth Congress of Ukrainian Canadians, October 9–12, 1998, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- 4 See, for example, the classified ads in newspapers like *Zakordonna Gazeta* and *Slovo*, bi-weekly newspapers published respectively in the United States and Canada.
- 5 La Strada Ukraine is a branch of La Strada, an international organization whose objective is to stop the international trafficking of women. Members of the Ukrainian diaspora helped form La Strada Ukraine.
- 6 Diaspora Ukrainians are also credited with helping put human trafficking onto the political agenda in Ukraine. In March 1998, the parliament of Ukraine adopted a law that provides for prison sentences of between eight and fifteen years for those individuals who are involved in trafficking as part of criminal groups (press release, April 23, 1998, Brama).
- 7 See, for example, Myron Kuropas, who commented at the Year 2020 conference in October 1998 that the new wave of emigration from Ukraine is an economic emigration like the first wave, but that is the only similarity. The first wave had an identity and church affiliation, but this wave is *Homo sovieticus* – the products of Soviet society' (*Ukrainian Weekly*, October 18, 1998: 9).
- 8 See also Myron Kuropas's editorial, 'Rejoice! We're gonna live!', *Ukrainian Weekly*, October 18, 1998. He argued that:

There is no organized attempt by Ukrainians to assist the Fourth Wave of immigrants . . . and no effort to allow qualified members to take on leadership positions so that they can do more than just belong to our organizations. When I think of the extensive help extended by

the United Ukrainian American Relief Committee to the third immigration in the 1950s, I must admit that the present immigration has a legitimate complaint.

9 One response suggested:

Start a dialogue? Great, let's get started. But, many (not all) are not interested in a dialogue or becoming involved in the community. In Chicago, some would come to the meetings, find out there were no giveaways and then leave.

(Golash, 1999)

- 10 Similar concerns were echoed in a letter from the American Association for Ukrainian Studies (AAUS). At the fourth annual World Convention of the Association for the Study of Nationalities held at Columbia University's Harriman Institute in April 1999, members of the executive of the AAUS sent an appeal to President Kuchma to 'adopt government measures that will strengthen the status of the Ukrainian language in the media, in the government, in the publication industry, in educational institutions, in scholarship and in research' (*Ukrainian Weekly*, August 15, 1999: 6).
- 11 The letter was also critical of the Ukrainian President's apparent lack of interest in the plight of Ukrainians in Russia and the lack of opportunities for Ukrainian-language education there. Despite 'the fact that there are over 10 million Ukrainians' living in Russia, the letter claimed that 'there is not a single Ukraine school or church permitted to function in the country'. It went on to berate timid Ukrainian government officials who have shown a 'complete lack of confidence in defending the interests of the Ukrainian minority in Russia' (*Ukrainian Weekly*, August 22, 1999: 7-8).
- 12 Some would also be part of the one and one half generation – people who were born abroad but who immigrated to Canada while they were very young. While technically first-generation immigrants, their primary socialization took place in the diaspora, and so they have a foot in each door.
- 13 Interviews were conducted with a dozen Ukrainian Canadians who were living and working in Ukraine. The interviews were conducted in Kyiv, in English, in April 1998 and May 1999. Much of what is reported here is exploratory in nature, and may not be generalizable to the larger population owing to the very small sample size.
- 14 There is also a small group of people whose return to Ukraine is motivated, at least in part, by business considerations. At the break-up of the Soviet Union in 1991, many experts predicted that Ukraine was an economic sleeping giant. Its size, coupled with its highly educated population, good resource base and strategic location, were seen as assets that could be quickly parlayed into economic growth and improved standards of living. There was also a considerable amount of optimism on both sides about the opening of markets and business opportunities. Many people thought that Ukrainians in the diaspora were well positioned to take advantage of the opening of the frontier to western investment and business; they were seen to have the cultural and linguistic skills to operate in Ukrainian society, and the technical and entrepreneurial skills to take advantage of new opportunities (Black, 1998: 323). Some diaspora Ukrainians have tried to establish businesses or invest in Ukraine in the hope that they would ride the wave of Ukrainian economic prosperity. The reality has been quite different. There are some notable successes among

NOTES

- businesspeople from within the Ukrainian diaspora who have successfully invested, or established businesses, in Ukraine. However, Ukraine is a challenging business environment, and many diaspora Ukrainians feel that they have got 'burned'. Hence, there seems to be considerably less optimism about the prospects for the diaspora to play a role in the economic reconstruction in Ukraine than there was at the time of Ukrainian independence.
- 15 In addition, an influential member of the Ukrainian-Canadian community donated a building that was used as Ukraine's first embassy in Ottawa.
 - 16 See <http://ucca.org/ukkr.html>: 'UCCA receives grant from USAID for election program'.
 - 17 In the late 1980s, Kolasky also cultivated ties with the American right, including Lyndon Larouche.
 - 18 Children of Chernobyl relief fund, 'Track Record' (updated May 15, 1999). Unpublished document distributed at the Washington Group Leadership Conference, Washington, DC, June 1999.
 - 19 The Ukrainian Fraternal Association in the United States has also raised a considerable amount of money on behalf of Chernobyl relief.
 - 20 Ukrainian American Professionals and Businesspersons Association of New York and New Jersey, newsletter, summer 1998, [wysiwyg://51/http:www.brama.com/uapba-ny-nj/summer99.html](http://www.brama.com/uapba-ny-nj/summer99.html).

CONCLUSION

- 1 Actually, by the mid-1990s, a number of organizations in the diaspora had begun to rethink what it meant to be a diaspora in view of Ukrainian independence. In particular, organizations came to focus more on internal community affairs. In October 1997, the Washington Group organized its annual Leadership Conference around the theme: 'We Can Do Better: Expanding Horizons for Ukrainian Americans'. In Canada, the soul-searching began earlier, in that organizations like the Ukrainian Canadian Professionals and Businesspersons Federation began organizing conferences with themes like 'Evolution or Extinction: Challenges for the Future' (editorial, 'We Can Do Better', *Ukrainian Weekly*, September 14, 1997).
- 2 Unfortunately, the triennial meeting of the Ukrainian Canadian Congress was held in Winnipeg, Manitoba, that same weekend, and so attendance by community leaders in Canada was less than what would otherwise have been expected. The 'double-booking' of two major conferences for the same weekend in October means that work still needs to be done to improve communication between the Canadian and American diasporas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aarons, Mark (1989) *Sanctuary: Nazi Fugitives in Australia*. Port Melbourne: William Heinemann.
- ABN (ed.) (1972) *Our Alternative: ABN and EFC Conferences Brussels, November 12–15 1970*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).
- Achtemichuk, Robert (1984) 'The Relevance of Ethnicity: A Personal Perspective', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *Visible Symbols: Cultural Expression Among Canada's Ukrainians*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Akenson, Donald (1995) 'The Historiography of English-Speaking Canada and the Concept of Diaspora: A Skeptical Appreciation'. *Canadian Historical Review*, 76, 3: 377–410.
- Alexeyeva, Ludmilla (1985) *Soviet Dissent: Contemporary Movements for National, Religious, and Human Rights*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
- Anderson, Alan (1976) 'Ukrainian Identity and Change in Rural Saskatchewan', in Wsevolod Isajiw (ed.), *Ukrainians in American and Canadian Society*. Jersey City: M. P. Kots Publishing.
- Anderson, Barbara A. (1980) *Internal Migration During Modernization in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Andrew, Christopher and Vasili Mitrokhin (2000) *The Mitrokhin Archive: The KGB in Europe and the West*. Toronto: Penguin Books.
- anon. (n.d.) 'Yuriy Moskal: AUCC is Moving Towards the Future and Changes its Address'. Publication unknown.
- anon. (1960) *Twenty Years of Devotion to Freedom: Survey of Purposes and Activities of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on the 20th Anniversary of its Existence*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
- Anthias, Floya (1998) 'Evaluating "Diaspora": Beyond Ethnicity?' *Sociology*, 32, 3: 557–80.
- Armstrong, John A. (1963) *Ukrainian Nationalism*, 2nd edition. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Armstrong, John A. (1975) 'Ukrainian Studies in the West: Problems and Prospects', in Peter J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Ukraine in the Seventies*. Oakville: Mosaic Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Association of Ukrainians 'Zakerzonnia' (1997) Pamphlet. Toronto: Association of Ukrainians 'Zakerzonnia'.
- Avery, Donald (1991) 'Divided Loyalties: The Ukrainian Left and the Canadian State', in Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (eds), *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Avery, Donald (1995) *Reluctant Host: Canada's Response to Immigrant Workers, 1896–1994*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Balan, Boris (1991) 'Urbanization and the Ukrainian Economy in the Mid-Nineteenth Century', in I. S. Koropecyjk (ed.), *Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretive Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Balan, Vasyl (1983) 'Ukrainian Language Education in Canada: Summary of Statistical Data', in Yaroslav Rozumnyj (ed.), *New Soil – Old Roots: The Ukrainian Experience in Canada*. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada.
- Balch, Emily (1969) *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*. New York: Arno Press.
- Baran, Alexander (1990) 'Jewish-Ukrainian Relations in Transcarpathia', in Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster (eds), *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, 2nd edition. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Baran, Alexander (1992) 'The Ukrainian Catholic Church', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Bardyn, Ihor (1993) 'Commentary', in Stella Hryniuk and Lubomyr Luciuk (eds), *Multiculturalism and Ukrainian Canadians, Polyphony*, 13: 69–73.
- Barrett, James and David Roediger (1999) 'In Between Peoples: Race, Nationality and the "New Immigrant" Working Class', in Norman Yetman (ed.), *Majority and Minority: The Dynamics of Race and Ethnicity in American Life*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Schiller and Christine Szanton Blanc (1994) *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. Basle: Gordon and Breach.
- Belendiuk, Arthur (1999) 'Interview', *Ukrainian Weekly*, May 23.
- Bida, C. (1975) 'Ukrainian Studies in the West: Problems and Prospects', in Peter J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Ukraine in the Seventies*. Oakville: Mosaic Press.
- Bihun, Yaro (1997) 'Smoloskyp Publisher Receives Ukraine's Presidential Award'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, April 6, no. 14, vol. LXV.
- Bihun, Yaro (1998) 'Clinton Pledges to Fight International Trafficking of Women'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, March 15, no. 12, vol. LXVI.
- Bihun, Yaro (2000) 'A Rare Success Story in the World of Trafficking in Women'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, March 12, no. 11, vol. LXVIII.
- Bilinsky, Yaroslav (1990) 'Methodological Problems and Philosophical Issues in the Study of Jewish-Ukrainian Relations During the Second World War', in Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster (eds), *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, 2nd edition. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Birch, Julian (1975) 'The Nature and Sources of Dissidence in Ukraine', in Peter J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Ukraine in the Seventies*. Oakville: Mosaic Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Black, J. L. (1998) *Canada in the Soviet Mirror: Ideology and Perception in Soviet Foreign Affairs, 1917–1991*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Bloch, Sidney and Peter Reddaway (1984) *Soviet Psychiatric Abuse: The Shadow over World Psychiatry*. London: Victor Gollancz.
- Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. (1975) 'Comments on Professor Julian Birch: The Nature and Sources of Dissidence in Ukraine', in Peter J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Ukraine in the Seventies*. Oakville: Mosaic Press.
- Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. (1992) 'The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in West German, 1945–50', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw *et al.* (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Bodnarczuk, Dmytro (1998) *Ukrainian American Veterans 1948–1998: Historical Analysis and Evaluation*. New York: Ukrainian American Veterans Inc.
- Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha (1992) 'The Women's Movement in the DP Camps', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw *et al.* (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Bohatiuk, N (1987) 'Russification and the Economy of Ukraine', in Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky (ed.), *Moscow's Russification of Ukraine*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
- Boruszenko, Oksana and Danyil Kozlinsky (1994) 'Ukrainians in Brazil', in Anne Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians around the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Boshyk, Yury (ed.) (1986) *Ukraine During World War II: History and its Aftermath*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Boshyk, Yury (1992) 'Repatriation: Ukrainian DPs and Political Refugees in Germany and Austria, 1945–8', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw *et al.* (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Bremmer, Ian (1994) 'The Politics of Ethnicity: Russians in the New Ukraine'. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 46, 2: 261–83.
- Breton, Raymond (1964) 'Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants'. *American Journal of Sociology*, 70, 2: 193–205.
- Breton, Raymond *et al.* (1990) *Ethnic Identity and Inequality: Varieties of Experience in a Canadian City*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Buchanan, Patrick (1986) 'Nazi Butcher or Mistaken Identity'. *Washington Post*, September 23.
- Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS) (1996) *Celebrating 20 Years*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
- Carroll, Rory (2000) 'Auditions for Sex: Europe's Thriving Slavery Industry'. *Guardian*, Tuesday, May 23: 6.
- Carynyk, Marco (1986a) 'Blind Eye to Murder: Britain, the United States and the Ukrainian Famine of 1933', in Roman Serbyn and Bohdan Krawchenko (eds), *Famine in Ukraine 1932–33*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Carynnyk, Marco (1986b) 'Making the News Fit to Print: Walter Duranty, the *New York Times* and the Ukrainian Famine of 1933', in Roman Serbyn and Bohdan Krawchenko (eds), *Famine in Ukraine 1932–33*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Carynnyk, Marco (1991) 'Swallowing Stalinism: Pro-Communist Ukrainian Canadians and Soviet Ukraine', in Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (eds), *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Castles, Stephen and Mark Miller (1993) *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Cesarani, David (1992) *Justice Delayed: How Britain Became a Refuge for Nazi War Criminals*. London: Heinemann.
- Chalk, Frank, and Kurt Jonassohn (1986) 'Conceptualizations of Genocide and Ethnocide', in Roman Serbyn and Bohdan Krawchenko (eds), *Famine in Ukraine 1932–33*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Charkewycz, Myroslaw (1985) 'ABN Chicago Chapter 1978–1982', in Slava Stetsko (ed.), *The West's Strongest Allies*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).
- Chikakov, Sergey (1999) 'What About Wave of New Immigrants?'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, August 15.
- Children of Chernobyl Canadian Fund (1998) Newsletter, Spring.
- Chirovsky, N (1987) 'The Ukrainian Insurgent Army as Anti-Russification Measure', in Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky (ed.), *Moscow's Russification of Ukraine*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
- Chumak-Horbatsch, Roma (1999) 'Language Change in the Ukrainian Home: From Transmission to Maintenance to the Beginnings of Loss'. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXXI, 2: 61–75.
- Cipko, Serhii (1994) 'Ukrainians in the Former Republics of the USSR Outside Ukraine', in Ann Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ciuciura, Theodore Bohdan (1992) 'Common Organizational Efforts, 1945–52: Structure and People', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Clem, Ralph S. (1991) 'Population Change in the Ukraine in the Nineteenth Century', in I. S. Koropecykj (ed.), *Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretive Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, James (1994) 'Diasporas'. *Cultural Anthropology* 9, 3: 302–38.
- Cohen, Ariel (2000) 'Ukrainian and Russian Organized Crime: A Threat to Emerging Civil Society', in Sharon Wolchik and Volodymyr Zvighyanich, *Ukraine: The Search for Identity*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Cohen, Robin (1987) *The New Helots: Migrants in the International Division of Labour*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Cohen, Robin (1997) *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Collins, Jock (1991) *Migrant Hands in a Distant Land: Australia's Post-war Immigration*, 2nd edition. Sydney: Pluto Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Connor, Walker (1992) 'Soviet Policies Toward the Non-Russian Peoples in Theoretic and Historical Perspective: What Gorbachev Inherited', in Alexander Motyl (ed.), *The Post-Soviet Nations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Conquest, Robert (1986) *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Danyliw, W. (1987) 'John Demjanjuk Accuses Israeli Prosecutors'. *New Perspectives*, May.
- Daschko, Yuri (1982) 'The Ukrainian Press in Canada', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Dawidowicz, Lucy (1975) *The War Against the Jews, 1933-45*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- De Lossa, Robert (1999) 'Skewed History at Harvard'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, June 13.
- Denoon, Donald (1983) *Settler Capitalism: The Dynamics of Dependent Development in the Southern Hemisphere*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Denysenko, Tamara (1998) 'The World Credit Union Movement: People Helping People'. *Credit Union Opinion: Rochester Credit Union Quarterly*, Summer: 8.
- Dershowitz, Allan M. (1997) *The Vanishing American Jew: In Search of Jewish Identity for the Next Century*. New York: Touchstone.
- Deschenes, Honourable Jules (1986) *Commission of Inquiry on War Criminals, Report, Part 1: Public*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- Dobbs, Farrell (1983) *Marxist Leadership in the U.S. Revolutionary Community: Birth of the Communist Movement 1918-1922*. New York: Monad Press.
- Draper, Theodore (1960) *American Communism and Soviet Russia: The Formative Period*. New York: Viking Press.
- Dreisziger, Fred (1991) 'Tracy Philips and the Achievement of Ukrainian-Canadian Unity', in Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (ed.), *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Duravetz, George (1993) *Ukrainian: Conversational and Grammatical, Level II*. Kyiv: Kobza International.
- The Economist* (2000) 'Europe's Immigrants: A Continent on the Move'. *The Economist*, May 6-12: 25-7.
- Elliott, Mark (1992) 'The Soviet Repatriation Campaign', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- European Freedom Council (1985) 'The Key to a Just and Lasting Peace', in Slava Stetsko (ed.), *The West's Strongest Allies*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).
- Evrard, John T. (1980) 'Human Rights in the Soviet Union: The Policy of Dissimulation'. *DePaul Law Review*, 29: 819-68.
- Ewanchuck, Michael (1986) *Hawaiian Ordeal: Ukrainian Contract Workers 1897-1910*. Winnipeg: Michael Ewanchuck.
- Ewanchuck, Michael (1998) *East of the Red: Early Ukrainian Settlements 1896-1930*, vol. 1. Winnipeg: Michael Ewanchuck.
- Fedorowycz, W. (1988) 'The Ukrainian National Federation of Canada: Its Presence in Ontario'. *Polyphony*, 10: 134-48.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Fedynsky, Andrew (1998) 'Viewpoint'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, December 6.
- Flis, John (1983) '13th Congress Aftermath: Our Struggle for Unity and Law and Order'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, October 23.
- Franco, Roma (1994) *Ukrainian for Speakers of English*. Calgary: Detselig.
- Gabaccia, Donna R. (2000) *Italy's Many Diasporas*. London: University College London.
- Gerus, Oleh W. (1982) 'The Ukrainian Canadian Committee', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Gerus, Oleh (1991) 'Consolidating the Community: The Ukrainian Self-Reliance League', in Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (eds), *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Glazer, Nathan (1961) *The Social Basis of American Communism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Glazer, Nathan (1980) 'Towards a Sociology of Small Ethnic Groups. A Discourse and Discussion'. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 12: 1-17.
- Gliniski, K. (1985) 'ABN Delegation in Great Britain', in Slava Stetsko (ed.), *The West's Strongest Allies*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).
- Golash, Roman (1999) 'Where are Those Tens of Thousands?', *Ukrainian Weekly*, August 22.
- Gordijew, Ihor (1986) 'The Ukrainian Studies Foundation in Australia: A Brief Survey', in Marko Pavlyshyn (ed.), *Ukrainian Settlement in Australia*. Melbourne: Department of Slavic Languages, Monash University.
- Grabowicz, George G. (1992) 'A Great Literature', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Gray, John (1992) 'Angry Canadians Ask for their Money Back'. *Globe and Mail*, March 19.
- Gregorovich, Andrew (1998) *Jews and Ukrainians: Analysis of the CBS 60 Minutes Program, the Ugly Face of Freedom, October 23, 1994*. Scranton: Ukrainian Fraternal Association.
- Gregorovich, John (1993) 'The Ukrainian Canadian Congress: Some Thoughts on its Past, Present and Future', in Stella Hryniuk and Lubomyr Luciuk (eds), *Multiculturalism and Ukrainian Canadians: Identity, Homeland Ties and the Community's Future*. *Polyphony*, 13: 79-81.
- Hadzewycz, Roma (1998) 'The 2020 Conference Says: Yes, the Diaspora will Survive'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, October 18.
- Hadzewycz, Roma (1999) 'Council of Presidents Moves Closer to Realization'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, September 26.
- Hahn, Sylvia (2000) 'A State of Many Peoples: Migration in the Multicultural Realm of the Habsburgs'. Paper presented at the *Recasting European and Canadian History* Conference, Bremen, Germany, May 18-21.
- Halich, Wasyl (1937) *Ukrainians in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harasymiw, Bohdan (1982) 'Political Participation of Ukrainian Canadians Since

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1945', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Harasym, Rose (1982) 'Ukrainians in Canadian Political Life', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Havrylyshyn, Oleh (1995) 'How Patriarchs and Rent-Seekers are Highjacking the Transition to a Market Economy'. *Perspectives on Ukraine*, 2, 3: 1–6.
- Havrylyshyn, Oleh (1999) 'What makes Ukraine Not Grow?: Political, Economic and Historical Factors that Hamper Economic Growth'. Paper presented at the *Problems of Development of Ukraine* Conference, Toronto, Ontario, November 5–7.
- Hawkesworth, Mary (1980) 'Ideological Immunity: The Soviet Response to Human Rights Criticism'. *Universal Human Rights*, 2, 1: 67–84.
- Hawrylyshyn, Bohdan and Ann Lenyck Pawliczko (1994) 'Ukrainians in Switzerland', in Ann Lenyck Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Herlihy, Patricia (1991) 'The South Ukraine as an Economic Region in the Nineteenth Century', in I. S. Koropecykj (ed.), *Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretive Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Higham, John (1955) *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1865–1925*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Hilton, Robert *et al.* (1978) *The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Himka, John-Paul (1982) 'The Background to Emigration: Ukrainians of Galacia and Bukovyna', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Himka, John-Paul (1990) 'Ukrainian-Jewish Antagonism in the Galician Countryside During the Late Nineteenth Century', in Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster (eds), *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, 2nd edition. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Hoerder, Dirk (1987a) 'An Internationally Mobile Working Class and its Press in North America: A Survey', in Dirk Hoerder (ed.), *The Immigrant Labor Press in North America, 1849s–1970s: An Annotated Bibliography, vol. 1: Migrants from Northern Europe*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Hoerder, Dirk (1987b) 'The Press of Labor Migrants from Eastern and South-eastern Europe: Introduction', in Dirk Hoerder (ed.), *The Immigrant Labor Press in North America 1840s–1970s: An Annotated Bibliography, vol. 2: Migrants from Eastern and Southeastern Europe*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Holowsky, I. (1987) 'Psychological Science and the Process of Russification in the Ukrainian SSR', in Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky (ed.), *Moscow's Russification of Ukraine*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
- Honore, Carl (2001) 'Ukraine Fatigue: For Canadians in Kyiv, Corruption Kills the Dream'. *National Post*, April 7: B1.
- Howard-Hassmann, Rhoda (1999) "'Canadian" as an Ethnic Category: Implications for Multiculturalism and National Unity'. *Canadian Public Policy*, 25, 4: 523–37.
- Hryniuk, Stella (1991) "'Sifton's Pets": Who Were They?', in Lubomyr Luciuk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- and Stella Hryniuk (eds), *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hryniuk, Stella and Lubomyr Luciuk (1993) 'Introduction', in Stella Hryniuk and Lubomyr Luciuk (eds), *Multiculturalism and Ukrainian Canadians: Identity, Homeland Ties and the Community's Future*. *Polyphony*, 13: 2-3.
- Hunt, Albert (1986) 'Bitter in Yorkshire'. *New Society*, November 16: 14-16.
- Husar, Natalka (1984) 'The Relevance of Ethnicity: A Personal Perspective', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *Visible Symbols: Cultural Expression Among Canada's Ukrainians*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta.
- Ignatieff, Michael (1993) *Blood and Belonging*. Toronto: Penguin Books.
- Ilnytzyk, Roman (1992) 'A Survey of Ukrainian Camp Periodicals, 1945-50', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- International Monetary Fund (1999) *Ukraine: Recent Economic Developments*. IMF Staff Country Report No. 99/42.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod (1976) *Ukrainians in American and Canadian Society: Contributions to the Sociology of Ethnic Groups*. Jersey City: M. P. Kots Publishing.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod (1979) 'Organizational Differentiation and Persistence of the Ethnic Community: Ukrainians in the United States', in Paul R. Magosci (ed.), *The Ukrainian Experience in the United States: A Symposium*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod (1982) 'Occupational and Economic Development', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod (1986) 'The Impact of the Man-made Famine on the Structure of Ukrainian Society', in Roman Serbyn and Bohdan Krawchenko (eds), *Famine in Ukraine 1932-33*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod (1992) 'Community, Class, and Social Mobility as Dynamic Factors in the DP Experience', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod (1993) 'The Ukrainian Canadian Community at a Historic Turning Point: Its Goals, Revisited', in Stella Hryniuk and Lubomyr Luciuk (eds), *Multiculturalism and Ukrainian Canadians: Identity, Homeland Ties and the Community's Future*. *Polyphony*, 13: 82-9.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod (1999) *Understanding Diversity: Ethnicity and Race in the Canadian Context*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishers.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod and Andrij Makuch (1994) 'Ukrainians in Canada', in Ann Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Around the World: A Demographic and Sociological Guide to the Homeland and Its Diaspora*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod W. and Michael Palij (1992) 'Refugees and the DP Problem in Postwar Europe', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Jackson, Louise (1988) 'Identity, Language and Transformation in Eastern Europe', in Taras Kuzio (ed.), *Contemporary Ukraine: Dynamics of Post-Soviet Transformation*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye (1998) *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jarosewich, Irene (2000) 'Recent Conferences at Yale, Columbia Reflect Tremendous Growth in Field of Ukrainian Studies'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, April 30, no. 18, vol. LXVIII.
- Jenkala, Marta (1994) 'Ukrainians in the United Kingdom and Ireland', in Ann Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jones, Lesya and Bohdan Yasen (eds) (1977) *Dissent in Ukraine, Ukrainian Herald, Issue 6*. Baltimore: Smolokyp Publishers.
- Jupp, James (1993) 'How Can Small Ethnic Groups in Australia Survive into the Future?', in Marko Pavlyshyn (ed.), *Ukrainian Settlement in Australia, Fourth Conference*. Melbourne: Department of Slavic Languages, Monash University.
- Kaspersky, Lewko (1999) 'Hollywood Ukrainians Form Media Group', *Ukrainian Weekly*, December 16, no. 52, vol. LXVII.
- Kay, Diana and Robert Miles (1992) *Refugees or Migrant Workers? The Recruitment of Displaced Persons for British Industry, 1946-51*. London: Routledge.
- Kaye, Vladimir J. (1964) *Early Ukrainian Settlements in Canada 1895-1900: Dr. Josef Oleskow's Role in the Settlement of the Canadian Northwest*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kazymyra, Nadia O. M. (1983) 'Ukrainian Canadian Response to the Paris Peace Conference, 1919', in Frances Swyrypa and John Herd Thompson (eds), *Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Khelemendyk-Kokot, Antonina (1993) *Kolkhoz Children and German Slavery: Memoirs*. Oshawa: self-published.
- Khmelko, Valeri and Andrew Wilson (1998) 'Regionalism and Ethnic and Linguistic Cleavages in Ukraine', in Taras Kuzio (ed.), *Contemporary Ukraine: Dynamics of Post-Soviet Transformation*. London: M. E. Sharpe.
- Kish, Walter (2000) 'Kyiv Joins the Big Leagues!', *New Pathway*, November 25: 7.
- Kivisto, Peter (1984) *Immigration Socialists in the United States: The Case of Finns and the Left*. London: Associated University Presses.
- Klymkiw, Walter (2000) 'Letter to the Editor'. *New Pathway*, November 18: 7.
- Kolasky, John (1968) *Education in Soviet Ukraine: A Study of Discrimination and Russification*. Toronto: Peter Martin.
- Kolasky, John (1970) *Two Years in Soviet Ukraine*. Toronto: Peter Martin.
- Kolasky, John (1979) *The Shattered Illusion: The History of Ukrainian Pro-Communist Organizations in Canada*. Toronto: Peter Martin.
- Kolasky, John (1988) 'The Decline of the Ukrainian Pro-Communist Organization'. *Polyphony*, 10: 119-20.
- Kolasky, John (1990) *Prophets and Proletarians: Documents on the History of the Rise and Decline of Ukrainian Communism in Canada*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Kolchin, Peter (1987) *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kordan, Bohdan (1998) 'Canadian-Ukrainian Relations: Articulating the Canadian Interest', in Lubomyr Hajda (ed.), *Ukraine in the World: Studies in the International Relations and Security Structure of a Newly Independent State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Papers in Ukrainian Studies.
- Kowalewski, David (1987) 'The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics', in Rhoda E. Howard and Jack Donnelly (eds), *International Handbook of Human Rights*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Krawchenko, Bohdan (1984) 'Cultural Exchanges with Soviet Ukraine', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *Visible Symbols: Cultural Expression Among Canada's Ukrainians*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Krawchenko, Bohdan (1985) *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth Century Ukraine*. London: Macmillan.
- Krawchenko, Bohdan (1986a) 'Soviet Ukraine under Nazi Occupation, 1941–4', in Yury Boshyk (ed.), *Ukraine During World War II: History and its Aftermath*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Krawchenko, Bohdan (1986b) 'The Man-Made Famine of 1932–1933 and Collectivization in Soviet Ukraine', in Roman Serbyn and Bohdan Krawchenko (eds), *Famine in Ukraine 1932–33*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Krawchenko, Oleh (2000) 'The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow'. *The Herald*, May 15–31.
- Krawchuk, Peter (1991) *The Life and Work of Matthew Shatulsky*. Toronto: Kobzar Publishing Company.
- Krawchuk, Peter (1996) *Our History: The Ukrainian Labour-Farmer Movement in Canada, 1907–1991*. Toronto: Lugus Publications.
- Krill, Hanya (1998) 'July 31, 1998, Conference Report'. [wysiwig://22http://www.brama.com/issues/hunterconf.html](http://www.brama.com/issues/hunterconf.html)
- Kulyk-Keefer, Janice (1996) *The Green Library*. Toronto: HarperCollins.
- Kulyk-Keefer, Janice (1998) *Honey and Ashes*. Toronto: Harper Flamingo.
- Kupchinsky, Roman (1986) 'Nazi War Criminals: The Role of Soviet Disinformation', in Yury Boshyk (ed.), *Ukraine During World War II: History and its Aftermath*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Kuropas, Myron (1986) 'Ukrainian Americans and the Search for War Criminals', in Yury Boshyk (ed.), *Ukraine During World War Two: History and its Aftermath*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Kuropas, Myron (1988) 'For the Record: A Fair Trial for Demjanjuk? Nonsense!', *Ukrainian Weekly*, May 29.
- Kuropas, Myron B. (1991) *The Ukrainian Americans: Roots and Aspirations 1884–1954*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kuropas, Myron B. (1992) 'Ukrainian-American Resettlement Efforts, 1944–54', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Kuropas, Myron B. (1995) *Scourging a Nation: CBS and the Defamation of Ukraine*. Kingston: Kashtan Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Kuropas, Myron B. (1996) *Ukrainian-American Citadel: The First One Hundred Years of the Ukrainian National Association*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs.
- Kuropas, Myron B. (1998) 'Follow Your Bliss: Harvard Revisited', *Ukrainian Weekly*, September 20.
- Kuzio, Taras (1998) *Ukraine: State and Nation Building*. London: Routledge.
- Laitin, David D (1998) *Identity in Formation: The Russian-speaking Populations in the Near Abroad*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lehr, John (1991) 'Peopling the Prairies with Ukrainians', in Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (eds), *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Lencyk, W (1987) 'The Ukrainian Catholic Church in Soviet Ukraine', in Nicholas L. Fr. Chirovsky (ed.), *Moscow's Russification of Ukraine*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
- Lerner, Loren (1999) 'Looking Back, Looking Forward: Canadian Artists of Eastern European Origin and Postmodern Feminist Remembering'. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, vol XXXI, 3: 44–71.
- Let's Go Eastern Europe (1999) *Let's Go Eastern Europe*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Lew, Khristina (1997) 'Poland's Ukrainians Have Few Expectations Regarding Second World Forum of Ukrainians'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, August 24, no. 34, vol. LXV.
- Li, Peter (1988). *Ethnic Inequality in a Class Society*. Toronto: Wall and Thompson.
- Logusz, Michael O. (1997) *Galicia Division: The Waffen-SS 14th Grenadier Division 1943–1945*. Atglen: Schiffer Military History.
- Lozynskyj, Askold (1999) 'Interview'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, May 23.
- Lozynskyj, Askold and Viktor Pedenko (1999) 'For the Record: UWC Writes to President Kuchma'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, August 22.
- Lucechko, John (1994) 'Ukrainians in Romania', in Ann Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Luciuk, Lubomyr (1980) *Ukrainians in the Making: Their Kingston Story*. Kingston: Limestone Press.
- Luciuk, Lubomyr (1988) *A Time for Atonement: Canada's First National Internment Operations and the Ukrainian Canadians, 1914–1920*. Kingston: Limestone Press.
- Luciuk, Lubomyr (1991) "'This Should Never Be Spoken or Quoted Publicly"; Canada's Ukrainians and their Encounter with the DPs', in Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (eds), *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Luciuk, Lubomyr (1992) 'A Troubled Venture: Ukrainian Canadian Refugee Relief Efforts, 1945–51', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Luciuk, Lubomyr (1999) 'Bohdan Mykytiuk: Tireless Advocate of Ukrainian Immigrants in Canada'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, October 17, no. 42, vol. LXVII.
- Luckyj, George S. N. (1975) 'Ukrainian Studies in the West: Problems and Prospects', in Peter J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Ukraine in the Seventies*. Oakville: Mosaic Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Lupul, Manoly (1976) 'Ukrainian Canadians: Their Precarious Situation Today', in Wsevolod Isajiw (ed.), *Ukrainians in American and Canadian Society*. Jersey City: M. P. Kots Publishing.
- Lupul, Manoly R. (1982) 'Ukrainian-Language Education in Canada's Public Schools', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Lupul, Manoly R. (1990) 'Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Canada', in Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster (eds), *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, 2nd edition. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Luzhnytsky, G. (1987) 'The Russian Persecution of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church', in Nicholas L. Fr-Chirovsky (ed.), *Moscow's Russification of Ukraine*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
- Mace, James (1983) *Communism and the Dilemmas of National Liberation: National Communism in Soviet Ukraine, 1918-1933*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mace, James (1986) 'The Man-Made Famine of 1933 in Soviet Ukraine', in Roman Serbyn and Bohdan Krawchenko (eds), *Famine in Ukraine 1932-33*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert (1983) *The Rusyn-Ukrainians of Czechoslovakia: An Historical Survey*. Vienna: Universitats-Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert (1994) *Our People: Carpatho-Rusyns and their Descendants in North America*. Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert (1996) *A History of Ukraine*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Maksudov, M. (1986) 'Ukraine's Demographic Losses 1927-1938', in Roman Serbyn and Bohdan Krawchenko (eds), *Famine in Ukraine 1932-33*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Mandel, Claire (1988) 'Commission of Inquiry into War Criminals: A Case Study - Background, Process, Problems'. Unpublished MA thesis, McMaster University.
- Markus, Daria (1977) 'Education of Ethnic Leadership: A Case Study of the Ukrainian Ethnic Group in the United States'. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University.
- Markus, Daria (1989) 'One Hundred Years of Ukrainians in Illinois', in Daria Markus (ed.), *Ukrainians in Chicago and Illinois*. Chicago: Millennium of Christianity in Ukraine Commemoration Committee, Illinois Chapter.
- Markus, Daria (1992) 'Education in the DP Camps', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Markus, Daria and Oleh Wolowyna (1994) 'Ukrainians in the United States of America', in Ann Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Around the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Markus, Vasyl (1979) 'The Ancestral Faith Transplanted: A Century of Ukrainian Religious Experience in the United States', in Paul R. Magocsi (ed.), *The Ukrainian Experience in the United States: A Symposium*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Markus, Vasyi (1992) 'Political Parties in the DP Camps', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Marples, David R. and David F. Duke (1995) 'Ukraine, Russia, and the Question of Crimea'. *Nationalities Papers*, 23, 2: 261–89.
- Martovych, Oleh (n.d.) *Ukrainian Liberation Movement in Modern Times*. Edinburgh: Scottish League for European Freedom.
- Martynowych, Orest (1990) 'Introduction', in John Kolasky (ed.), *Prophets and Proletarians: Documents on the History of the Rise and Decline of Ukrainian Communism in Canada*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Martynowych, Orest (1991) *Ukrainians in Canada: The Formative Period, 1891–1924*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Martynowych, Orest T. and Nadia Kazymyra (1982) 'Political Activity in Western Canada, 1896–1923', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Marunchak, Micheal (1982) *The Ukrainian Canadians: A History*, 2nd edition. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences.
- Maruniak, Wolodymyr (1994) 'Ukrainians in the Federal Republic of Germany', in Ann Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Marvan, Jiri (1986) 'Toward Ukrainian as an Academic Discipline in Australia: The Monash Contribution', in Marko Pavlyshyn (ed.), *Ukrainian Settlement in Australia*. Melbourne: Department of Slavic Languages, Monash University.
- Melman, Yossi (1997) 'Who Lied about Demjanjuk?', *Ha'aretz*, November 14.
- Melnycky, Peter (1983) 'The Internment of Ukrainians in Canada', in Frances Swyripa and John Herd Thompson (eds), *Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Melnyczuk, Askold (1994) *What is Told*. Boston: Faber and Faber.
- Melnyk, Andrew (1997) 'Infoukes'. *Forum: A Ukrainian Review*, 97, Fall.
- Melnyk, Leonid (1991) 'Industrial Development and the Expansion of Free Labor in the Ukraine during the First Half of the Nineteenth Century', in I. S. Koropeckyj (ed.), *Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretive Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Melnyk, Lew (1999) 'Harvard Must Clarify Ukrainian Chronicles'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, July 11.
- Miles, Robert (1987) *Capitalism and Unfree Labour*. London: Tavistock.
- Miles, Robert (1989) *Racism*. London: Routledge.
- Mirchuk, Petro (1976) *In the German Mills of Death 1941–1945*. New York: Vantage Press.
- Momryk, Myron (1992) 'Ukrainian DP Immigration and Government Policy in Canada, 1946–52', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Moroz, Valentyn (1971) *Among the Shadows: Protest Writings from Ukraine*. London: Ukrainian Information Service.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Motyl, Alexander (1980) *The Turn to the Right: The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism, 1919–1929*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Motyl, Alexander (1992) *The Post-Soviet Nations: Perspectives on the Demise of the USSR*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mycak, Sonia (1998) 'Simple Sentimentality or Specific Narrative Strategy? The Functions and Use of Nostalgia in the Ukrainian-Canadian Text'. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXX, 1: 50–63.
- Mykytiuk, Bohdan (1998) 'Immigration to Canada: Quota Provides Little for Ukrainians'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, February 22, no. 8, vol. LXVI.
- Nagel, Joane (1994) 'Constructions of Ethnicity: Creating and Reorienting Ethnic Identity and Culture'. *Social Problems*, 41: 152–76.
- Nahaylo, Bohdan (1999) *The Ukrainian Resurgence*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Nahirny, Vladimir and Joshua Fishman (1976) 'American Immigrant Groups: Ethnic Identity and the Problem of Generations', in Wsevolod Isajiw (ed.), *Ukrainians in American and Canadian Society*. Jersey City: M. P. Kots Publishing.
- Nakashidze, Niko (1960) *The Truth About A.B.N.: An Answer to the Provocations of Moscow's Fifth Column in the West*. Munich: ABN Press and Information Bureau.
- Naklowicz, Serji (1994) 'Ukrainians in Austria', in Ann Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Nandy, Ashis (1990) 'Dialogue and the Diaspora: Conversation with Nikos Papastergiadis'. *Third Text*, 11: 99–108.
- Naulko, Vsevolod, Ihor Vynnychenko and Rostyslav Sossa (1993) *Ukrainians of the Eastern Diaspora: An Atlas*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Novick, Peter (1999) *The Holocaust in American Life*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- O'Bryan, G., Jeffrey Reitz and Olga Kuplowska (1976) *Non-Official Languages: A Study in Canadian Multiculturalism*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- Olshaniwsky, Bozhena (1986) 'Open Letter to Dov B. Ben-Meir, Deputy Speaker of the Knesset'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, December 15.
- Olszanski, Tadeusz (1991) 'All About "Operation Wisla"'. *Ukrainian Quarterly*, 2, Summer.
- Onufrijchuk, Irka (1984) 'The Relevance of Ethnicity: A Personal Perspective', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *Visible Symbols: Cultural Expression Among Canada's Ukrainians*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Osborne, Bryan (1991) 'Non-Preferred People: Inter-war Ukrainian Immigration', in Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (eds), *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ovcharenko, M. (1987) 'The Plight of the Ukrainian Language in Ukraine', in Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky (ed.), *Moscow's Russification of Ukraine*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
- Panchuk, Bohdan (1992) 'Memoirs', in Wsevolod Isajiw, Yuri Boshyk and Roman Senkus (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Pawliczko, Ann Lencyk (ed.) (1994) *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Pelenski, Jaroslaw (1975) 'Shelest and His Period in Soviet Ukraine (1963–1972): A Revival of Controlled Ukrainian Autonomism', in Peter J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Ukraine in the Seventies*. Oakville: Mosaic Press.
- Pelenski, Jaroslaw (1990) 'Round Table Discussion', in Peter Potichnyj and Howard Aster (eds), *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
- Petryshyn, Jaroslaw (1991) 'Sifton's Immigration Policy', in Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (eds), *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Petryshyn, W. Roman (1984) 'Political Dimensions of Ukrainian Canadian Culture', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *Visible Symbols: Cultural Expression Among Canada's Ukrainians*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Plax, Martin (n.d.) 'Letter', quoted by Congressman Sander Levin (Michigan's 12th Congressional District), Cleveland, Ohio, available at http://www.infoukes.com/politics/cbs60minutes/jewish_reaction
- Pochoday, Bohdanna (1999) 'Interview'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, May 23.
- Pohorecky, Zenon (1984) 'Ukrainian Cultural and Political Symbols in Canada: An Anthropological Selection', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *Visible Symbols: Cultural Expression Among Canada's Ukrainians*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
- Pokorny, Ctibor (1972) 'Report on the Activities of ABN', in *Our Alternative: ABN and EFC Conferences, Brussels, November 12–15, 1970*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.
- Pritsak, Omeljan (1975) 'Ukrainian Studies in the West: Problems and Prospects', in Peter J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Ukraine in the Seventies*. Oakville: Mosaic Press.
- Procko, Bohdan P. (1979) 'The Rise of Ukrainian Ethnic Consciousness in America During the 1890s', in Paul R. Magosci (ed.), *The Ukrainian Experience in the United States: A Symposium*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
- Prymak, Thomas M. (1989) 'Hrushevsky and the Ukraine's "Lost History"'. *History Today*, 39, 1: 42–6.
- Prymak, Thomas M. (1997) 'The Toronto History of Ukraine', *Forum: A Ukrainian Review*, 97, Fall. Scranton, PA: Ukrainian Fraternal Association.
- Prymak, Thomas M. (1998) 'What Our Name is and Where We Come From? Thoughts on the Ukrainian Canadian Identity'. *Ukrainian News*, September 9–23.
- Refugee Screening Commission (1947) 'Report on Ukrainians in Surrendered Enemy Personnel (SEP) Camp No. 374 Italy', in Yury Boshyk (ed.), *Ukraine During World War II: History and its Aftermath*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Reitz, Jeffrey and Margaret Ashton (1980) 'Ukrainian Language and Identity Retention in Urban Canada'. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 12: 33–54.
- Reshetar, John Jr. (1952) *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1920: A Study in Nationalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Reshetar, John Jr. (1975) 'Ukrainian Studies in the West: Problems and Prospects', in Peter J. Potichnyj (ed.), *Ukraine in the Seventies*. Oakville: Mosaic Press.
- Revutsky, Valerian (1992) 'Theatre in the Camps', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw *et al.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Roberts, Barbara (1988) *From Whence They Came: Deportation from Canada 1900–1935*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa.
- Romanenchuk, B. (1987) 'Russification of Ukrainian Literature', in Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky (ed.), *Moscow's Russification of Ukraine*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
- Romanyshyn, Oleh (1988) 'The Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine and Its Women's Association'. *Polyphony*, 10: 153–66.
- Rudolph, Richard L. (1991) 'The East European Peasant Household and the Beginnings of Industry: East Galacia, 1786–1914', in I. S. Koropecykj (ed.), *Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretive Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Safran, William (1991) 'Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return'. *Diaspora*, 1, 1: 83–99.
- Sahaydak, Maksim (ed.) (1976) *Ukrainian Herald*, Issue 7–8: *Ethnocide of Ukrainians in the U.S.S.R.* Toronto: Smoloskyp Publishers.
- Sasyniuk, Michael E. (1999) 'About Our Waves of Immigration'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, October 10, vol. 41, no. LXVII.
- Satzewich, Vic (1991) *Racism and the Incorporation of Foreign Labour: Farm Labour Migration to Canada*. London: Routledge.
- Satzewich, Vic (ed.) (1998) *Racism and Social Inequality in Canada*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishers.
- Savaryn, Peter (1987) 'Poor Prospects for a Fair Trial'. *New Pathway*, February 7.
- Seneta, Eugene (1994) 'Ukrainians in Australia and Oceania', in Ann Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Serafyn, Alexander *et al.* v. Federal Communications Commission (1998) *United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia*. Argued, January 23; decided, August 11, 1998.
- Serbyn, Roman (1986) 'The Famine of 1921–1923: A Model for 1932–1933?', in Roman Serbyn and Bohdan Krawchenko (eds), *Famine in Ukraine 1932–33*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Serbyn, Roman and Bohdan Krawchenko (eds) (1986) *Famine in Ukraine 1932–33*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Shamshur, Oleg (1992) 'Ukraine in the Context of New European Migrations'. *International Migration Review*, 26, 2: 258–68.
- Shevchuk, Yuri I. (1996) 'Dual Citizenship in Old and New States'. *European Journal of Sociology*, xxxvii, 1: 47–73.
- Shevstova, Lilia (1992) 'Post-Soviet Emigration Today and Tomorrow', *International Migration Review*, 26, 2: 241–57.
- Shostak, Peter (1984) 'The Relevance of Ethnicity: A Personal Perspective', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *Visible Symbols: Cultural Expression Among Canada's Ukrainians*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Simmons, Alan (1998) 'Racism and Immigration Policy', in Vic Satzewich (ed.), *Racism and Social Inequality in Canada*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Singlaub, John (1985) 'The Liberation Alternative to Nuclear War', in Slava Stetsko (ed.), *The West's Strongest Allies*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).
- Smith, Graham and Andrew Wilson (1997). 'Rethinking Russia's Post-Soviet Diaspora: The Potential for Political Mobilisation in Eastern Ukraine and North-east Estonia'. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 49, 5: 845-64.
- Spechler, Martin C. (1991) 'Development of the Ukrainian Economy, 1854-1917: The Imperial View', in I. S. Koropec'kyj (ed.), *Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretive Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spector, Michael (1998) 'Traffickers' Cargo: Naïve Slavic Women'. *New York Times*, January 11.
- Stebelsky, Ihor (1991) 'The Resettlement of Ukrainian Refugees after the Second World War', in Lubomyr Luciuk and Stella Hryniuk (eds), *Canada's Ukrainians: Negotiating an Identity*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Stebelsky, Ihor (1992) 'Ukrainian Population Migration after World War II', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Steciw, O. (1985) 'ABN Canada, 1981-82', in Slava Stetsko (ed.), *The West's Strongest Allies*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.
- Stetsko, Slava (ed.) (1969) *Revolutionary Voices: Ukrainian Political Prisoners Condemn Russian Colonialism*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.
- Stetsko, Slava (1985) 'Our Activities: A General Report on the Work of the ABN, EFC, and Separate National Delegations', in Slava Stetsko (ed.), *The West's Strongest Allies*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).
- Stetsko, Yaroslav (1972) 'Can Thermonuclear War be Avoided?', in *Our Alternative*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.
- Stetsko, Yaroslav (1985a) 'The ABN's Political Strategy to Counter Russian Expansionism', in Slava Stetsko (ed.), *The West's Strongest Allies*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).
- Stetsko, Yaroslav (1985b) 'The Liberation Struggle of Nations - The Path to a Just Peace', in Slava Stetsko (ed.), *The West's Strongest Allies*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).
- Stojko, W. (1987) 'Trends in Historiography in the Ukrainian SSR', in Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky (ed.) *Moscow's Russification of Ukraine*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
- Struk, Danylo Husar (1992) 'Organizational Aspects of DP Literary Activity', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw et al. (eds) *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Strumins'kyj, Bohdan (1979) 'The Ukrainian Language in the Emigration', in Paul R. Magosci (ed.), *The Ukrainian Experience in the United States: A Symposium*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
- Subtelny, Orest (1986) 'The Soviet Occupation of Western Ukraine, 1939-41: An Overview', in Yury Boshyk (ed.), *Ukraine During World War Two: History and its Aftermath*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Subtelny, Orest (1991) *Ukrainians in North America: An Illustrated History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Subtelny, Orest (1992) 'Ukrainian Political Refugees: An Historical Overview', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw *et al.* (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Subtelny, Orest (1993) 'The Current State of Ukrainian Historiography'. *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 18, 1–2, Summer–Winter: 33–54.
- Subtelny, Orest (1994) *Ukraine: A History*, 2nd edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Suny, Ronald Grigor (1998) *The Soviet Experiment: Russia, the USSR, and the Successor States*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Swyrypa, Frances (1982) 'The Ukrainians and Private Education', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Swyrypa, Frances (1983) 'The Ukrainian Image: Loyal Citizen or Disloyal Alien', in Frances Swyrypa and John Herd Thompson (eds) *Loyalties in Conflict: Ukrainians in Canada During the Great War*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Swyrypa, Frances (1993) *Wedded to the Cause: Ukrainian-Canadian Women and Ethnic Identity 1891–1991*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Swyrypa, Frances (1998) 'The Forty-Ninth Parallel and Ethnic History: The Peculiarities of the Ukrainian Case'. Paper presented at the *Cross-Stitching Cultural Borders: Comparing Ukrainian Experience in Canada and the United States Conference*. Toronto, October 29–31.
- Swyrypa, Frances and Vladimir J. Kaye (Kysilewsky) (1982) 'Settlement and Colonization', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Szporluk, Roman (1975) 'Russians in Ukraine and Problems of Ukrainian Identity in the USSR', in Peter Potichnyj (ed.), *Ukraine in the Seventies*. Oakville: Mosaic Press.
- Szporluk, Roman (1998) 'Keynote Address'. *Year 2020 Conference*, organized by the Ukrainian American Professionals and Businesspersons Association of New York and New Jersey, East Hanover, New Jersey, October 10–11.
- Tarnawsky, Maxim (1999) 'What is Told in the Green Library: History, Institutions, Language'. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXXI, 3: 104–13.
- Tolstoy, Nikolai (1977) *Victims of Yalta*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Tolstoy, Nikolai (1986) *Trial and Error: Canada's Commission of Inquiry on War Criminals and the Soviets*. Toronto: Justinian Press.
- Toronto Star* (1999) 'First UK Nazi Trial to Visit Belarus'. *Toronto Star*, Tuesday, February 9: A8.
- Troper, Harold (1992) 'The Canadian Government and DPs, 1945–8', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw *et al.* (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Troper, Harold and Morton Weinfeld (1988) *Old Wounds: Jews, Ukrainians and the Hunt for Nazi War Criminals in Canada*. Markham: Penguin Books Canada.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Truchan, Myroslaw (1994) 'Ukrainians in Poland', in Ann Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (1949) *Ukrainian Resistance: The Story of the Ukrainian National Liberation Movement in Modern Times*. New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.
- Ukrainian National Women's League of America (1975) *Women Political Prisoners in the USSR*. New York: Ukrainian National Women's League of America.
- Ukrainian National Women's League of America (1996) *Souvenir Book, 24th Convention of the UNWLA*. Philadelphia: UNWLA.
- Ukrainian News* (1999) 'National Day of Famine Remembrance Announced in Ukraine'. *Ukrainian News*, January 1–26.
- Ukrainian Weekly* (2000) *The Most Significant News Stories and Commentaries Published in the Ukrainian Weekly*. Parsippany, NJ: Ukrainian Weekly.
- Ukrainian World Congress (1997) Newsletter, Autumn.
- Vecoli, Rudolph (1964) 'Contadini in Chicago: A Critique of the Uprooted'. *Journal of American History*, 51: 404–17.
- Verba, Lesya and Bohdan Yasen (eds) (1980) *The Human Rights Movement in Ukraine: Documents of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, 1976–1980*. Toronto: Smoloksky Publishers.
- Vitvitsky, Bohdan (1998) 'Opening Address at the Year 2020 Conference'. Published in *Ukrainian Weekly*, October 25, November 2, nos. 43, 44, vol. LXVI.
- Wallace, Claire (1998) *Migration Potential in Central and Eastern Europe*. Vienna: International Organization for Migration, Technical Cooperation Centre for Europe and Central Asia.
- Wallace, Claire, Oxana Chmouliar and Elena Sidorenko (1997) 'The Eastern Frontier of Western Europe: Mobility in the Buffer Zone'. *New Community*, 22, 2: 259–86.
- Wasylyk, Mykhailo (1994) 'Ukrainians in Argentina', in Ann Lencyk Pawliczko (ed.), *Ukraine and Ukrainians Around the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Weiss, Aharon (1990) 'Jewish-Ukrainian Relations in Western Ukraine During the Holocaust', in Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster (eds), *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, 2nd edition. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
- Wertsman, Vladimir (1976) *The Ukrainians in America, 1608–1975: A Chronology and Fact Book*. Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Publications.
- Wertsman, Vladimir (1987) 'Ukrainians', in Dirk Hoerder (ed.) *The Immigrant Labor Press in North America 1840s-1970s: An Annotated Bibliography*, vol. 2: *Migrants from Eastern and Southeastern Europe*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Whitaker, Reg (1987) *Double Standard: The Secret History of Canadian Immigration*. Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennis.
- Wilkinson, John (1985) 'Alternative to Thermo-Nuclear War', in Slava Stetsko (ed.), *The West's Strongest Allies*. Munich: Press Bureau of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Willems, Emilio (1955) *Brazil: The Positive Contributions of Immigrants*. New York: UNESCO.
- Wilson, Andrew (1997a) 'Myths of National History in Belarus and Ukraine', in Geoffrey Hosking and George Schopflin (eds), *Myths and Nationhood*. London: Hurst.
- Wilson, Andrew (1997b) *Ukrainian Nationalism in the 1990s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, Andrew (2000) *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*. London: Yale University Press.
- Winland, Daphne N. (1997) 'Contingent Selves: The Croatian Diaspora and the Politics of Desire'. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Toronto, Ontario.
- Woychenko, Ol'ha (1982) 'Community Organizations', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Wynar, Lubomyr R. (1992) 'Ukrainian Scholarship in Postwar Germany, 1945–52', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw *et al.* (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Wynnyckyj, Andrij (1998) 'Ukrainian Canadian Congress Meets at 19th Triennial Conclave'. *Ukrainian Weekly*, November 1.
- Yurkevich, Myroslav (1986) 'Galician Ukrainians in German Military Formations and the German Administration', in Yury Boshyk (ed.), *Ukraine During World War Two: History and its Aftermath*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Yurkevich, Myroslav (1992) 'Ukrainian Nationalists and DP Politics, 1945–50', in Wsevolod W. Isajiw *et al.* (eds), *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Yuzyk, Paul (1982) 'Religious Life', in Manoly R. Lupul (ed.), *A Heritage in Transition: Essays in the History of Ukrainians in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Zumbakis, S. Paul (1986) *Soviet Evidence in North American Courts: An Analysis of Problems and Concerns with Reliance on Communist Source Evidence in Alleged War Criminal Trials*, Canadian edition. Toronto: Canadians For Justice.
- Zvighyanich, Volodymyr (2000) 'State and Nation: Economic Strategies for Ukraine', in Sharon Wolchik and Volodymyr Zvighyanich, *Ukraine: The Search for Identity*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Zwarycz, Roman (1985) 'The ABN Alternative to Thermo-Nuclear War', in Slava Stetsko (ed.), *The West's Strongest Allies*. Munich: Press Bureau of the anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.

INDEX

- academic freedom 127–8; life of diaspora 123–9
- Ad Hoc Committee for Baltic Nations and Ukraine 154
- Afghanistan 155, 161
- Africa, anti-colonial movement in 158
- Agrarian Ukraine* 57
- aid to Ukraine 122, 208–10; misgivings about 209–10
- Akenson, Donald 14
- Alberta 37, 127, 129
- Alexeyva, Ludmilla 145, 149–50
- All-American Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists 225
- All-Party Parliamentary War Crimes Group 170
- American: government 6, 61, 96, 153, 157, 177; political culture 17
- American Circle 42
- American Federation of Labor 35
- American Jewish Congress of Cleveland 3
- Americans for Human Rights in Ukraine 175
- Amnesty International 155
- Among the Snows* 157
- Anderson, Barbara 31
- anglic* 41
- Anthias, Floya 14, 16–18
- Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations 140, 153, 158–63, 207, 232
- Anti-Defamation League 183
- anti-Semitism 1, 6, 63–4, 94, 103, 166, 177–8, 217
- anti-Soviet attitudes 11, 184
- Argentina 56, 84, 110
- Armenia 96
- Armenians 14–15, 60, 85, 96, 184
- armistice 53
- Armstrong, John 224
- assimilation 13, 17, 22, 40, 105, 111, 125, 137, 141–2, 165–6
- Association for the Liberation of Ukraine 65
- Association of Ukrainian American Architects 133
- Association of Ukrainian Fascists 65
- Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain 105, 131
- Association of Ukrainians in Poland 131
- Association of Ukrainians 'Zakerzonnia' 233
- Association of United Ukrainian Canadians 103, 114–15, 150–1, 228, 231
- Association to Aid the Liberation Movement of Ukraine 77
- Auschwitz 184
- Australia 88–9, 101, 122–4, 129, 154, 168, 230
- Australian Federation of Ukrainian Organizations 131
- Austria 49, 66, 89, 228
- Austro-Hungary 22, 27–30, 48, 49, 54, 60; revolution of 1848 28
- baby boomers, 4
- Bandera, Stepan 67–8, 88, 144
- Banderites (OUN(B)) 68, 91–4, 97, 105, 156 158; in North America

INDEX

- 115–18, 132, 152; in independent
 Ukraine 207–08
 bandura 204
 BBC World Service 161
 Belarus 19, 90, 125, 159, 172
 Belendiuk, Arthur 4
 Belgium 56, 89
 Ben Meir, Dov 176
 Berlin 66, 83, 84, 91, 95, 160, 230;
 Wall 190
 ‘big six’ organizations 134–5
 Bilinsky, Yaroslav 175, 185–6
 Black Atlantic 14
 Black Sea 31
 Bleich, Yaakov 3
 block settlements 37–9
 Bolsheviks 51–5, 57, 62–4, 71–2,
 77, 81, 115, 136, 141, 159, 179, 227
 Bolshoi Theatre Company 153
 Bonn 152
 Botti, Anita 195
 Boyko 165
 Bradford 152, 158
 Brama 137–8, 195
 Brazil 84, 129; emigration to 33–4, 35,
 36, 47; organizations in 110
 Breton, Raymond 109
 Brezhnev, Leonid 142–3, 155
 bribes 192
 Britain 122, 168
 British Columbia 37
 British government 61–2, 96–7, 101,
 153, 162, 170–1, 225
 British imperial diaspora 15, 88
 Brody 95
 Brotherhood of Ukrainian Catholics
 134
 Bryzinki, Zbignew 157
 Buchanan, Patrick 173
 Buenos Aires 152
 Bujak, Franciszek 30
 Bukovyna 27, 32, 35, 49, 54, 56, 91
 Bukovynian immigrants in North
 America 39, 41, 49
 Bulgaria 159
 Bund 59, 84
 Bush, George 153

 Cahute, Ron 130
 Cambodia 185

 Canada, Ukrainian emigration to 34,
 36, 56, 93, 98–102
 Canada–Ukraine Parliamentary
 Program 128, 138
 Canadian: census 41; ethnicity 41;
 government 6, 10, 177, 193;
 political culture 17; war veterans
 185
 Canadian Institute of Ukrainian
 Studies 124–7, 179, 207
 Canadian League for the Liberation of
 Ukraine 116–18, 134
 Canadian Relief Mission for
 Ukrainian Victims of War 101
 Canadian Society for Cultural
 Relations with Ukraine 112
 Canadian Ukrainian Immigrant Aid
 Society 193
 Canadians, in Ukraine 203–5
 Canberra 152
 cannibalism 181
 CanWest Global 223
 Captive Nations Week 153
 Cardinal Lubachevsky 1
 Caribbean 16
 Carpathian mountains 35, 149
 Carpatho-Rusyns 42, 44–7
 Carpatho-Ukraine 32, 225
 Carter, Jimmy 157, 172, 184
 Caucasus 80
 Central Committee for Technical Aid
 to Soviet Ukraine 77
 Central Rada *see* Rada
 Central Ukrainian Relief Bureau 99,
 101
 chain migration 35, 47
 chairs of Ukrainian Studies 128–9
 Chalmers, William 170
 Chernivtsi 113
 Chernobyl 208–9
Chervonyi Prapor 72
 Chicago 158, 228
 Children of Chernobyl 208–9,
 237
 China 32, 34
 Chinese diaspora 15
 Chirovsky, Nicholas L. Fr. 154
 Christmas 109, 204
 church life 110–12, 129–31, 156, 182;
 attendance 112

INDEX

- citizenship 38, 173, 205
 civil war 141, 165
 Civiletti, Benjamin 172
 Cleveland 158, 182
 Clinton, Bill 195
 Clinton, Hillary Rodham 195, 209
 Cohen, Robin 14–19, 47, 130, 214
 Cold War 6, 10, 112, 114, 153, 178, 192, 201–2
 collective farms 90, 142
 collectivization 181–2
 Commission of Inquiry into Alleged War Criminals in Canada 169
 Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners of New York 155
 Committees of Poor Peasants 180
 communes 78
 Communist Party of America 71–2
 Communist Party of Canada 73, 151
 Communist Party of the Soviet Union 10, 142
 Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists 207
 Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists in Vienna 67
 Connecticut 58
 Connor, Walker 143
 Conquest, Robert 179, 234
 Constitution of Ukraine 198, 205
 corruption 192, 210
corvee 28
 Council of Ambassadors 62
 Council of Brest 111
 Council of Presidents of Ukrainian American Organizations 133
 Council of Ukrainian Credit Unions of Canada 134
 Coventry 158
 credit unions 211, 228, 230
 Crimea 22, 24
 Crimean Tatars 24, 145
 Croatia 159, 202
 Czech Republic 22, 192
 Czechoslovakia 22, 49, 56, 64, 66, 123, 144, 159

 Dachau 184
 D'Amato, Alfonse 154
 Danzig 66
 Dawidowicz, Lucy 167

 Demjanjuk, John 167–78; Ukrainian diaspora's response 173–7
 Democrats 171
 denaturalization and deportation 169–77
 Dershowitz, Alan 10
 Deschenes, Jules 169
 Detroit 158
 diaspora: as a site of creativity 106, 217; comparisons between 9–13; critique of 218–20; definitions 9, 13–19, 214–22; formation 5, 18, 216; left 11; nationalists 11; typologies 15–16
 diasporas: cultural 7, 16, 23, 130, 219; imperial 15, 88; labour 15, 23, 26–48, 49, 219; trade 15–16; victim 7, 15, 23, 85 118, 140, 219
 Dies Commission 82–3
 Directory government 53–4, 61–3, 75
 discrimination 121, 166, 217
 disinformation 174–5, 235
 Displaced Persons 87–106, 168; camps 96–8; in North America 115–20, 168–57, 229
 dissidents 6, 10, 143, 156–8, 190
 Don River Valley 34
 Donetsk 198
 Drach, Ivan 135
 Duranty, Walter 2
 Duravetz, George 129
 Durkheim, Emile 188
 Dzuiba, Ivan 145, 147, 157

 Easter 109
 eastern diaspora 9, 87
 Edmonton 37, 152, 182
Education in Soviet Ukraine 151
 Eilberg, Joshua 171
Einsatzgruppen 91, 167, 186
 elections 207
 'Eleven National Commandments' for Ukrainians 43
 emigration: from Ukraine 6, 11, 26–48, 143, 192–6, 235; from the Austro-Hungarian empire 32–8; to Argentina 56, 89; to Australia 89; to Brazil 33, 89; to Britain 89, 101, 194; to France 56, 89; to North America 33, 56, 89; to Venezuela

INDEX

- 89; within the Russian empire
31–2, 49, 55–6, 223
- émigrés 13, 215, 225
- Encyclopedia of Ukraine* 120, 124, 126
- endowments 126
- Estonia 159, 161, 167, 172, 177
- ethnic: artists 129; authenticity 7,
118; boundaries 4, 163, 220;
cleansing 142; community versus
group 21; elites 19, 44, 48, 88, 141,
216, 220; essentialism 16;
organizations 107–39, 216, 228
- ethnic identity 4, 14, 16–18, 47, 108,
163; of Ukrainians 24, 27, 41–7,
57, 70, 90, 111–12, 118, 139, 204,
219
- ethnographic definitions of Ukrainian
territory 22, 60
- Ettinger, Shmuel 187
- European Community 193
- European Freedom Council 153, 159,
161
- European Volunteer Workers 101–2
- exchange programs 210–11
- Executive Committee of the Council
of Combined Social Organizations
51
- expressive activities 73, 84, 97, 106;
organizations 109, 129–31
- extradition, to Soviet Union 170, 172,
186
- family visits to Ukraine 201, 211–13
- famine, in Soviet Ukraine (1932–3) 6,
10, 166, 178–89, 217, 234;
commemorations of 182–3, 215
- farmers 37
- fascism 64, 80, 224–5
- FBI 83
- Federal Communications Commission
(USA) 4
- Federation of Ukrainian American
Business and Professional
Associations 131
- Federation of Ukrainian Social
Democrats 72
- Federation of Ukrainians 60
- feudal relations 27–30, 47
- Fifth Congress of the Writers of
Ukraine 143
- First Labor Agricultural Communist
Group from Canada 78
- Five Year Plan 180
- ‘footnote 16’ 221
- France 56, 100, 122, 129, 225
- Franko, Ivan 43,
- Franko, Roma 129
- fraternal benefit associations 42, 46,
120–1, 132, 229
- Free Olympiad 161
- Friday* 83
- Friends of Rukh 206, 209
- Friends of the Ukrainian Olympic
Committee 211
- Friends of Ukraine 63, 206
- Galicia 27–30, 35, 42, 49, 53, 56, 60–8,
77, 104, 222; size of peasant
landholdings in 30
- Galician Division 1, 93–6, 101–2,
138
- Galician immigrants in North America
38, 41, 49
- Galician Military Board 95
- gender 17–18
- Generalgouvernement* 91
- generations 18, 23, 119, 203, 205,
219–20, 236
- genocide 181, 184, 217; Museum
185
- Georgia 159
- German Army 52, 56, 66; *Wehrmacht*
90–6
- Germans 40, 57, 66; in Ukraine 24;
recruitment of scientists to the
West 171
- Germany 12, 54, 62, 68–9, 81–2, 89,
123, 194, 228
- globalization 16
- Gorbachev, Mikhail 143, 190, 198,
202
- grain procurement quotas 181
- Great Schism (1054) 111
- Greek Catholic Union 42, 44–5
- Gregorovich, Andrew 2
- Gregorovich, John 122, 186, 231
- Group of Ukrainian National Youth
65
- guerilla warfare 66–8, 144, 215
- Gypsies 166

INDEX

- Ha'aretz* 177
 Habsburgs 26
 Halich, Wasyl 35
 Hamill, James 60–1
 Hamilton, Ontario 116, 177
 Harasymiw, Eugene 234
 Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute
 120, 124–5, 127–9, 179, 229–30
 Harvard University 8; Refugee
 Interview Project 181
Harvest of Despair 182, 187
Harvest of Sorrow 179, 234
 Hawaii, emigration to 34–5, 47
 Hawaiian Board of Immigration 34
 Hebrew University of Jerusalem 187
 Helsinki Watch groups 146;
 persecution of in Ukraine 149–50,
 155
 Hetherington, Sir Thomas 170
 Hetmanate 52, 55
 Hetmanites 56–7, 59, 69, 82, 231
 Higher Party School of the Central
 Committee of the Communist
 Party of Ukraine 151
 Himmler, Heinrich 94
History of Ukraine-Rus', The 126
 Hitler, Adolph 75, 84, 178
 Hollywood Trident Group 122
 Holocaust 6, 10, 128, 168, 175, 178,
 182–7, 217, 235; deniers 176;
 Museum 184; remembrance
 175–7
 Holtzman, Elizabeth 171
Homin choir 148
Homo sovieticus 11, 152, 190, 196–8, 235
 Hors'ka, Alla 149
 Hrushevsky, Mykhailo 51, 78–80, 126
hrywnia 191
 human rights 6, 11; abuses in Soviet
 Ukraine 140–52, 174; exposing
 abuses of 152–63, 202, 216
 Hungarians 11, 35
 Hungary 49, 159–60, 192
 Hunter College 195
 Hurd, Douglas 170

 idealization of the homeland 84, 218
 Ignatieff, Michael 213
 imagined community 17, 118, 139, 204
 immigrant recruitment 35

 Immigration and Naturalization
 Service 171–2
 immigration policy 31, 37, 56, 193–4,
 227
 indentured laborers 34
 inflation 191
 Infoukes 137–8, 182
 Institute for Historical Research 126
 Institute for the Study of Foreign
 Countries 174
 Institute of Contemporary Jewry
 187
 Institute of Marxism-Leninism 77
 institutional completeness 108–10
 instrumental organizations 109–10,
 117–20
 integral nationalists 64, 66, 224
 intermarriage 13, 88, 165
 International Monetary Fund 191–2
 International Organization for
 Migration 192, 194
 International Refugee Organization
 97, 100–1
Internationalism or Russification? 145
 Internet 108, 137–8, 182; use of for
 relationships 193
 internment of Ukrainians in Canada
 10, 233
 interviews 203–5, 236
 investment 191, 236
 Irchan, Myroslav 79–80
 Irish 15, 40, 88
 Isajiw, Wsevolod 109, 134
 Israel 9, 24; trial of Demjanjuk in
 173–7
 Italian government 194
 Ivan the Terrible *see* John Demjanjuk
 Ivano-Frankyvs'k 54, 113, 198
 Ivasiuk, Volodymyr 149–50
 Janiw, Volodymyr 230
 Janner, Grenville 170

 Japan 34
Jerusalem Post 176
 Jewish Defense League 183, 234
 Jews 1–3, 9–11, 14–15, 60, 63–4, 73,
 88, 101–2, 143, 166–89, 233; in
 Ukraine 24
 Joint Conferences of the Ukrainian
 American Organizations 195

INDEX

- Kaganovich Lazar 185
 Kahn, Albert 83–4
 Karelian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic 55
 Kazakhstan 32, 55, 80, 88, 90, 181
 KGB 2, 113, 148–9, 160, 174–5, 233–4
 Kharkiv 52
 Khmelnytsky, Bodhan 22, 176
 Kholm 165
 Khrushchev, Nikita 22, 142, 179, 183
 Kingston 103, 228
 Kirkpatrick, Jeane 153
 Knessett 175–6
 Knights of Labor 71
 Kolasky, John 74, 151–2, 208, 237
 Konovalts Evhen 54, 64, 66–9
korenizatsiia 141
 Krakow 68, 92, 158
 Kravchuk, Leonid 199
 Krawchuk, Peter 76, 113
 Kuban 19, 22, 31, 32
 Kuchma, Leonid 3, 190, 199, 235–6
 Kulyk-Keefer, Janice 130
kurkuls (kulaks) 55
 Kuropas, Myron 2, 37, 42, 128, 132, 176–7, 229, 235
 Kursk 93
 Kuzio, Taras 201
 Kyiv 34, 51, 74, 77, 113, 135, 145, 151, 160, 174, 193, 198, 200
- La Strada 195
 labor migrants 13, 23, 26–48, 192–3, 214
 landlords 28
 language: 89, 129–31, 141, 216: loss 13, 88, 125; maintenance 40, 56, 126, 129 141–2, 204, 216, 230; as marker of ethnic authenticity 118–20, 123, 200–1, 216, 229; schools 230; tension between the diaspora and Ukraine over 198–201
 Lansing, Robert 60
 Latin America 195
 Latvia 12, 129, 159, 161, 167, 172, 174
 Latvian Committee for Cultural Relations with Latvians Abroad 174
 Latvians 11, 145, 174, 177
- Lazarenko, Pavlo 210
 League of Nations 69
 League of Ukrainian Nationalists 65
 Lebanese diaspora 15
Lebensraum 91
 Lemkos 23, 35, 41, 165
 Lenin School, Moscow 77
 Lenin, Vladimir 63, 141–2, 145, 179
 Leningrad 88
 Lethbridge 78
 Levchenko, Katerina 195
 libraries 206
 literacy 31, 37
 Lithuanians 11, 60, 145, 161, 172, 174, 177
 Litman, Saul 169
 Logusz, Robert 95
 London 99, 152, 158
 Los Angeles 122, 161, 168
 Lozynskyj, Askold 3–4, 135, 200
 Luciuk, Lubomyr 228, 231
 Luhansk 198
 Lupul, Manoly 9, 107, 125
 Lviv 1, 35, 42, 54, 66–8, 91, 104, 113, 123–24, 126, 144, 146, 158, 162, 195, 208
 Lypynsky, Viacheslav 57–9
- Mace, James 181
 Macquarie University 124, 230
 Magyarophiles 44–6
 Magyars 63
 Makukha, Vasily 145
 Manitoba 37
Marie Claire 195
 Markus, Daria 74, 98, 104, 229
 Martynowych, Orest 74
 Marx, Karl 29, 141, 155, 179
 Massachusetts 58
 Melnychuk, Askold 130
 Melnyk, Andrew 68, 137
 Melnykites (OUN(M)) 68, 91–2, 94, 97, 105; in independent Ukraine 207; in North America 115–18, 152, 231
 Mennonites, in Ukraine 24, 223
 Menzies, Andrew 169–70
 Merritt, Gilbert 177
 Militant Detachment for Struggle with Ruin in the Soviet Republics, The 78

INDEX

- millennium of Christianity in Rus'-
Ukraine 125
- Minsk 160
- Moldova 23, 91, 125
- Moldovans, in Ukraine 24
- Monash University 124, 230
- Montreal 78
- Mordovian ASSR 147
- Moroz, Valentyn 147, 156-8
- Moscal, Yuriy 115
- Moscow 51, 71, 77, 88, 113, 174, 180,
194, 232
- Moscow's Russification of Ukraine* 154-5
- Ms. Magazine* 156
- Mujahedeen 161
- Mulroney, Brian 206
- Munich 124, 152, 162
- Nachtigall* unit 90
- Nakashidze, Prince Niko 162, 232-3
- narcotics 149
- Nash Stiah* 59
- National Day of Remembrance of
Famine Victims 184
- National Endowment for the
Humanities in the United States
127
- National War Museum 185
- nationalism 64, 70, 89; civic 201
- nationalists: fragmentation of 57;
protests against Soviet artists
152-3; 'turn to the right' 63-5;
Ukrainian 16-17, 57, 144, 158,
215, 225
- Nazi Germany 82-3, 94, 167
- New Economic Policy 180
- New Jersey 2, 183, 221
- New Pathway (Novy Shliakh)* 197
- new wave migrants 17; relationships
with established diaspora
community 196-8, 235-6; *see also*
fourth wave of migration
- new year 109
- New York 2, 58, 60, 61, 135, 137, 154,
158, 182, 195, 221
- New York Times* 2, 169, 194
- Newark, 182
- newspapers 69, 83, 118-20, 136, 175;
Ukrainian language in Ukraine 198
- Nikolyszyn, Oleg 4
- NKVD 93, 186-7, 234
- Nor'Wester* 39
- Novick, Peter 168, 182, 234-5
- Odessa 34, 78
- Office of Special Investigations 172-3,
177, 234
- Office of Visas and Registration 212
- Oleskiw, Joseph 35
- Olshaniwsky, Bozhena 175
- Olympic Games 161; *see also* Free
Olympiad
- Ontario 37
- Operation Barbarossa 94
- Operation Wisla 165-6, 233
- Organization for the Rebirth of
Ukraine 68-9, 82-3, 225
- Organization of Ukrainian
Nationalists (OUN) 2, 64-8, 85,
92, 144, 158; assassinations 67;
divisions within 68; in North
America 68-70, 82, 105, 115-18,
123, 152
- Orthodox churches 17, 133; in
Canada 110-12
- Ostarbeiter* 93, 98
- Ottawa 152, 185, 237
- Palestinians 14, 234
- Panchuk, Bohdan 99, 105
- Paris 61-3; Peace Conference 60-1
- partisans 96, 165
- passports 194
- peasants 27-30, 31, 89, 142, 179-82
- Pedley, Frank 36
- Pennsylvania 58, 171
- Perm 147
- Petliura, Symon 53-5, 61-3, 66, 75-6,
167, 226
- Petrograd 51, 74
- Petrushevych, Evhen 54, 59, 61
- Plast 98, 132, 231
- Plax, Martin 3
- Pochoday, Donna 4
- pogroms 63, 178, 234
- Poland 5, 22, 49, 53, 56, 60-8, 124-5,
129, 144, 159, 165, 172, 192
- Poles 10, 35, 45, 57, 64, 85; in Ukraine
24
- Polish war veterans 102

INDEX

- political exiles 31
 political mobilization of diaspora
 Ukrainians 6, 11, 100, 166, 183,
 189, 196, 206
 political prisoners 146–8
 Poltava 34
 pornography 149
 Prague 64, 160
 ‘predator society’ 192
 President’s Commission on the
 Holocaust 184
 Pritsak, Omelijan 127, 230
 Progressive Conservative Party of
 Canada 154
Prosvita (Enlightenment) Society 36, 43,
 66
 Prymak, Thomas 13
 psychiatry, as a political weapon 145,
 147–8

 ‘race’ 31, 38–9, 92
 racialization, of Ukrainians 38–41, 47
 racism 40, 167
 Rada 51–3, 55, 74–5, 79, 224
 Radio Free Europe 161
 Radio Liberty 161
 reading rooms 43
 Reagan, Ronald 153, 173
 Rebet, Lev 144
 recruitment agencies 33
 Red Army 62, 89, 95; ensemble in
 North America 153
 Red Cross 69
 referendum, in Ukraine 190, 206
 refugee camps 12
 refugees 23, 86, 100, 106, 115, 163,
 178, 214, 229
Reichskommissariat Ukraine 91–4
 repatriation of Ukrainians to Soviet
 Union 86, 96–8, 201
Report from the Beria Reserve 147
 return to Ukraine 6–7, 11–12, 19, 50,
 63, 70, 76–80, 163, 220; following
 independence 191, 201–13
 Rievuk, Emil 82–3
 Rivne 113
Robiŭnyk 76
Robochyi Narod 72
 Rochester 158
 Roman Catholic Church 42, 110–12
 Romanchuk, Iuliiian 54
 Romania 22, 49, 56, 159, 166
 Romanians, in Ukraine 24, 63, 85
 Romanyshyn, Oleh 116
 Royal Commission on Bilingualism
 and Multiculturalism 125
 Rudenko, Roman 172
 Rudnykyj, J. B. 230
 Rukh 205–6
 Russia 5, 11, 22, 60, 125, 129
 Russian Brotherhood Organization 46
*Russian Chronicles: A Thousand Years That
 Changed the World, The* 127
 Russian diaspora 24
 Russian empire 27, 50; migration
 within 31–2
 Russian language 11; in Ukraine
 196–201, 236
 Russian orthodoxy 46–7, 111, 148
 Russian Revolution 5, 49, 86, 179,
 215, 227
 Russians: in Ukraine 24, 63, 236; in
 North America 42–8, 72, 137, 216
 Russification 10, 24, 27, 58, 142–58,
 199–200; resistance to in Ukraine
 146–50
 Rusyns 23, 42, 216
 Ruthenian National Union 42–3
 Ruthenians in North America 37–9,
 42, 46, 70
 Rybchuk, Peter 197

Sabotage! The Secret War against America
 83
 Sachsenhausen concentration camp
 92, 158
 Safer, Morely 1
samvydav literature 146–50, 232;
 publication in the West 156–7
 San Francisco 46
 Sao Paulo 152
 Saskatchewan 37
 Sayers, Michael 83–4
Schindler’s List 187
 Schwartzbard, Samuel 63
 Scots 15, 40, 88
 self-immolation 145
 Sembay Ivan 79
 Serafyn, Alexander 4
 Serbs 167

INDEX

- serfdom *see* feudal relations
sex trade 194–6
Shapoval, Colonel Mykyta 59
Shattered Illusion, The 151
Shatulsky, Mathew 79–80, 150
Shelest, Petro 143, 145, 147, 156
Sheptytsky, Andrei 54
Sherbytsky, Volodymyr 143
Shevchenko Scientific Society 8, 51,
123–4, 126, 130, 229
Shevchenko, Taras 43, 145 149;
monuments 17, 120
Shukheyvych, Iurii 144, 154
Shukheyvych, Roman 90, 144, 154
Siberia 24, 31, 32, 34, 55–6, 87–8, 90
Sich riflemen 54, 59, 66; in North
America 58
Sichovi Visti 58
Sifton, Clifford 38–9
Sikh diaspora 15
Simon Wiesenthal Center 168–70,
177, 234
Singlaub, General John 153
Sitka, Alaska 46
‘sixties generation’ 145, 147
Skoropadsky, Danylo 59, 75
Skoropadsky, Pavlo 52–3, 57, 59, 75
Slovakia 22, 124, 129, 192
Smolyl, Valery 184
Smook, Hryhorii 79–80
social acceptance 165, 233
socialism with a human face 188
Socialist Party of America 71
Socialist Party of Canada, 72
socialists 17, 40, 49, 62, 87, 215;
conflicts with nationalists 81–4,
102–5, 215; emigration to Soviet
Ukraine 77–80; and the national
question in Soviet Ukraine 150–1;
in North America 70–85;
organizational decline 114–15;
post-war organizational life 112–15
solidarity with co-ethnics 106, 188, 217
South America 24, 33,
Soviet census 19, 21, 55
Soviet government: approach to
defining diaspora 8; cooperation
with the West in the pursuit of war
criminals 173–5; restrictions on
emigration 87, 192
Soviet Ukraine 22, 50, 62, 68, 140–64,
182, 198; artists 152; emigration
from 26, 93–4
Soviet Union 8, 11, 49, 67, 124:
breakup 24, 190, 236; nationality
problem 141–50, 179–81
Soyuzivka resort 121
Specter, Michael 194
sputnik russiskh 89
Stalin, Joseph 3, 10, 179–81, 183
Stalingrad 93, 95
Stalinism 178, 234
state peasants 28
Stech, John 130
stereotyping, of Ukrainians 165–6,
186
Stetsko, Slava 158–9, 199, 207
Stetsko, Yaroslav 91, 158–63
stranded minorities 22, 165
Subtelney, Orest 50, 90, 92
sugar plantations 34
Surma 225
surzhyk 200
Svoboda 42–4, 61, 71, 82, 120–1
Swyripa, Frances 17–18
symbolic ethnicity 120, 140, 217
Szporluk, Roman 8, 89
Taras Shevchenko Educational
Association 72
Tarnow 62
taxation of peasantry 29
teachers 206
temporary migrants 33
Ten Commandments of the Ukrainian
Nationalist 67
Ternopil 54, 113, 198
Thai Embassy in Moscow 194
Thatcher, Margaret 170
The Hour 83
*The Truth About ABN: An Answer to the
Provocations of Moscow’s Fifth Column
in the West* 162
The Ugly Face of Freedom, CBS 1–4, 177
The Washington Group 130, 195, 237
Third Communist International 71
Third World War 160
Toronto 137, 152, 158, 175, 182, 206,
231
Toth, Father Alexis 46

INDEX

- trafficking in Ukrainian women
194–6, 235
- Transcarpathia 56
- transnationalism 14, 205
- Transnistria 91
- Treaty of Brest-Litovsk 52
- Treaty of Pereyaslav (1654) 22
- Treblinka 172, 184
- Troper, Harold 167, 235
- Trudeau, Pierre Elliot 161
- Tryzub* 224
- Tsar Alexander II 28
- Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich 22
- Tsar Nicholas II 51–2
- Tsarist government 46, 53, 141, 142, 226
- Turks 15
- Two Years in Soviet Ukraine* 151
- Ukraina Society 113
- Ukraine: diasporas participation in contemporary politics in 205–8; economic performance since independence 191–2; elections in 207, 235; ethnic groups in 23–4, 201; population of 20, 183, 191
- Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* 124
- Ukraine and Ukrainians Throughout the World: A Demographic and Sociological Guide to the Homeland and its Diaspora* 8–9, 21, 124, 228
- ‘Ukraine During World War II’, symposium 177, 187
- Ukrainian Agricultural Academy 65
- Ukrainian Alliance of America 60, 224
- Ukrainian American Bar Association 133
- Ukrainian American Community network 133
- Ukrainian American Coordinating Council 132, 133, 231
- Ukrainian American Professionals and Businesspersons Association of New York and New Jersey 8, 195, 221, 237
- Ukrainian Anti-Defamation League 183
- Ukrainian Autocephalis Orthodox Church 55
- Ukrainian Canadian Civil Liberties Association 10, 183
- Ukrainian Canadian Committee 99, 101, 104, 133, 179, 231; *see also* Ukrainian Canadian Congress
- Ukrainian Canadian Congress 131, 133–5, 182, 193, 235, 237; *see also* Ukrainian Canadian Committee
- Ukrainian Canadian Foundation of Taras Shevchenko 129
- Ukrainian Canadian Professionals and Business Federation 125, 128, 131, 134, 138, 237
- Ukrainian Canadian Research and Documentation Centre 2
- Ukrainian Canadian Servicemen’s Association 99
- Ukrainian Canadian Social Services 211
- Ukrainian Canadian Students Association 131
- Ukrainian Canadian Studies Foundation 126
- Ukrainian Canadian Veterans’ Association 134
- Ukrainian-Canadian women 18
- Ukrainian Catholic Church 1, 17, 41, 59, 110–12, 133
- Ukrainian Catholic Women’s Association 131
- Ukrainian Central Committee 92–5
- Ukrainian Central Representation in Argentina 131
- Ukrainian Congress Committee of America 3, 4, 131–3, 153–4, 158, 206, 237
- Ukrainian Day of Sorrow and Memory 10
- Ukrainian Defense Committee 61
- Ukrainian Defense League 183
- Ukrainian diaspora: size 12–13, 19–22
- Ukrainian Engineers Society of America 133
- Ukrainian Federation of America 133
- Ukrainian Federation of Communist Parties of America 71–2, 76
- Ukrainian Federation of Socialist Parties of America 71
- Ukrainian Forum* 121

INDEX

- Ukrainian Fraternal Association 121, 132, 237
- Ukrainian Free Thought Association 72
- Ukrainian Free University 65, 230
- Ukrainian government 10
- Ukrainian Gymnasium 65
- Ukrainian Helsinki Union 207
- Ukrainian Herald* 148, 156, 232
- Ukrainian Holocaust *see* famine in Soviet Ukraine (1932-3)
- Ukrainian identity: in North America 41-8
- Ukrainian independence 5, 7, 9, 18, 87, 125, 135, 184, 214; consequences for the diaspora 190-213, 221-2, 226
- Ukrainian Institute of America 130, 133, 209
- Ukrainian Insurgent Army 88, 90, 92, 144, 154, 165, 222
- Ukrainian-Jewish Relations conference 175, 187
- Ukrainian Labor Temple Association, 73
- Ukrainian Laborer Farmer Temple Association 73-4, 77-8, 80, 103
- Ukrainian M. Drahmanov High Pedagogical Institute 65
- Ukrainian Medical Association of North America 131, 133
- Ukrainian Military Organization 64-7, 80, 225
- Ukrainian National Association 119-21, 132-3, 153, 157-8, 179
- Ukrainian National Committee 60
- Ukrainian National Council 54
- Ukrainian National Credit Union Association 133
- Ukrainian National Federation 65, 70, 116, 134, 208
- Ukrainian National Information Service 184
- Ukrainian National Republic 52, 55, 90
- Ukrainian National Union 53
- Ukrainian National Women's League of America 131-2, 155, 195, 210-11, 224, 230
- Ukrainian News* 13, 118-19, 234
- Ukrainian Public Group to Promote Implementation of the Helsinki Accords 146
- Ukrainian Republican Party 207
- Ukrainian revolutionary era 48, 50-5
- Ukrainian Self Reliance League 69, 134, 234
- Ukrainian Servicemen in the US Army 211
- Ukrainian Social Democratic Party 72-4, 227
- Ukrainian Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries 113; *see also* Ukraina Society
- Ukrainian Studies Foundation 128, 211
- Ukrainian War Veterans' Association 69
- Ukrainian Weekly* 117-19, 121, 127, 157, 176, 182-3, 197, 232
- Ukrainian Word* 57
- Ukrainian Workingmen's Association 121
- Ukrainian World Congress 3, 9-10, 135-6, 183, 186, 200
- Ukrainian World Coordinating Council 9-10, 135-6, 232
- Ukrainianization, in Soviet Ukraine 142-46, 156, 198, 215
- Ukrainians in: Argentina 23; Australia 9, 23-24; Belarus 19, 23; Brazil 23; Bulgaria 23; Canada 2, 9, 12-13, 23, 36-41, 102-5, 107-40, 165-89, 221; Czech Republic 23; Finland 23; former Soviet Union 23; Hawaii, 34-5; Italy 23; Kazakhstan 19, 23; Kyrgyzstan 23; Moldova 23; Poland 23; Romania 23; Russia 19, 23, 88, 165, 236; Slovak Republic 23; South America 9; United States 2, 12-13, 23, 35-47, 102-5, 107-40, 165-89, 211, 224; Uzbekistan 23; western Europe 9
- Ukrains'ka Hromada* 57
- Ukrainske Zhyttia* 150
- Ukrainski Robitnychi Visti* 73, 75, 78, 81, 227
- Ukrainski Shchodenni Visti* 103
- umbrella organizations 6, 108, 131-6
- unemployment 191

INDEX

- Union for Ukrainian Statehood 57
 Union of Artists of Ukraine 149
 Union of the Ukrainian Emigration in
 the Czech Lands 65
 Union of Ukrainian Nationalist Youth
 66
 Union of Ukrainian Officers in
 Germany 66
 United Hetman Organization 59, 82–4
 United Nations 153–4, 183
 United Nations Relief and
 Rehabilitation Administration
 96–7, 100
 United States: Congress, 153;
 emigration to 34, 37, 56, 98–102,
 193; Senate Committee n the
 Ukrainian Famine 182; Ukrainians
 in 68–85, 102–4, 110–39
 United Ukrainian America Relief
 Committee 99–100, 103, 236
 United Ukrainian Organizations of
 America 82
 United Ukrainian Toilers
 Organizations 77
 United Ukrainians of Great Britain
 156
 universals of the Central Rada 51–2,
 75
 University of Alberta 207
 University of Kyiv 80, 149
 University of Manitoba 230
 University of Montreal 12
 University of Ottawa 124
 University of Toronto 13, 124, 128–9
 university students 131, 182, 210–11
Untermenschen 92, 232
 upward mobility 165, 217, 219
 Ural Mountains 88
 USAID 195, 207, 237

 Verhovna Rada 136
 Verkovyna Resort 121
 victimization 7, 19, 57, 87, 103, 139,
 164–89, 219
 Vienna 57, 60
Viestnik 44–5
 Vike-Freiberga, Vaira 12
 Virgin Lands Campaign 88
 visas 201; diaspora complaints about
 acquiring Ukrainian 212

 Vitvitsky, Dr Bohdan 221–2
 Vladimir 147
 Vohlynia 33
 Voice of America 161
 Volga River 55
 Volodymyr the Great 110
 von Eichhorn, Herman 53
 Vynnychenko, Volodymyr 53

 Wachter, Otto 94, 95
 Waffen SS 94
 war crimes 166; trials 6
 War Crimes Act (1945) 170
 War Crimes Bill 171
 war criminals 103–4, 217; in Australia
 169–70; in Britain 170–1, 233; in
 Canada 169; pursuit of in the
 West 167–77; in the United States
 171–8
 War Measures Act 73
 Washington, DC 2, 17, 60, 61, 120,
 182, 184, 195
Washington Post 173
 waves of migration 17, 23, 26, 219:
 first wave 26–48, 69; forth wave 7,
 191–8, 235; second wave 49–85;
 third wave 85, 86–106, 167, 178
 Wehrmacht 91–6
 Weinfeld, Morton 167, 235
 West Ukrainian National Republic
 54–5, 60–1, 66, 77
 western diaspora 9
 Westward Ho 101
What is ABN? 162
 White Australia policy 102
 White Russians 53, 55, 226
 whiteness 34, 47
 Wilkinson, John 153
 Wilson, Woodrow 54, 60
 Winland, Daphne 202
 Winnipeg 17, 37, 78, 99, 104, 153,
 182, 226, 237
 Wolansky, Father John 70
Women Political Prisoners in the USSR 155
 women's organizations 43
 Workers' Benevolent Society 226,
 228
 Workers' Party of Canada 73
 working class 40, 71
 World Bank 192

INDEX

- World Congress of Free Ukrainians
133, 135, 175–6
- World Federation of Ukrainian
Women's Organizations 195
- World Forum of Ukrainians 10, 135,
232
- World War I 5, 10, 22, 33, 35, 42, 48,
49, 52, 58, 85, 214
- World War II 1, 6, 8, 11, 15, 26, 124,
140, 178, 214, 218; and emigration
from Ukraine 89–96; impact on
Ukraine 85–96
- Yalta agreement 96
- Yara Arts Group of New York 130
- Yashenko, Leopold 149
- 'Year 2020' conference 8, 130, 221
- youth organizations 43
- Zakhidna Ukraina* 79
- Zakordonna Gazeta* 197, 235
- Zarudna, Natalia 195
- Zbruch River 60
- Zinkewych, Osyp 156, 232
- Zvarich, Kyrylo 170