The Ukrainian Legal Press of the General Government: The Case of *Krakivski Visti*, 1940-1944

by

Ernest Gyidel

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

History

Department of History and Classics

University of Alberta

Abstract

The dissertation is a narrative history of *Krakivski Visti* (Cracow News), the leading legal Ukrainian newspaper of the General Government, which was created out of German-occupied Poland after September 1939 and headed by a prominent Nazi party member Hans Frank until the end of World War II. Unlike most of the legal press in the General Government *Krakivski Visti* was not published by the occupational authorities directly. Instead it was an unofficial organ of an umbrella organization allowed by Germans, the Ukrainian Central Committee, headed by Ukrainian geographer Volodymyr Kubijovyč throughout the war. The newspaper was born out of Kubijovyč's desire to have a press organ similar to *Dilo*, the largest Western Ukrainian daily newspaper during the interwar period. The daily edition of *Krakivski Visti* appeared in Cracow (January 1940 – October 1944) and Vienna (October 1944 – April 1945). With exception of the first month its chief editor was Mykhailo Khomiak (Michael Chomiak after his immigration to Canada in 1948) for entirety of its existence. Compared to other Ukrainian legal press of the General Government the newspaper enjoyed slightly more freedom, attracted more (and better) contributors among whom were the most prominent Ukrainian cultural figures of the 20th century. It still had to follow Nazi ideological imperatives of the German occupiers, but it also contained its own ideological layer of Ukrainian nationalism (not to be equated with OUN nationalism), which was realized primarily through two groups of original texts. The first was anti-Polish, anti-Russian/Soviet and anti-Jewish materials, which

identified the "historical enemies" of the Ukrainian nation. On the surface these texts appear as a reflection of the official ideology, but the authors of *Krakivski Visti* had their own Ukrainian-specific reasons, which had nothing to do with National Socialism, to write them. The second group was texts on Ukrainian history, historical memory and national identity, which were aimed at promoting and strengthening Ukrainian national consciousness. Thus, the ideological space under German occupation was monolithic only on surface and in reality it was multi-layered. *Krakivski Visti* also proves that besides OUN it is important to recognize the role of other actors in the history of Ukrainian nationalism during the war.

Acknowledgements

It may sound trivial, but this dissertation would not have been completed without my Ph.D. supervisor Prof. David R. Marples and my MA supervisor Prof. John-Paul Himka. Both have helped me beyond count through my years in master and doctoral programs at the University of Alberta and made those years warmer in my memory even though Edmonton has a reputation of a cold city. For my work on the dissertation Prof. Himka has trusted me for over three years with his own set of *Krakivski Visti* – that set of the daily edition which he inherited from his father-in-law, Mykhailo Khomiak, who was the chief editor of the newspaper. Anyone who knows the true value of this primary source will be able to understand how much it mattered for my research.

Prof. Marples has been an exemplary supervisor (a *Doktorvater* in the literal sense of the word) and always generous with his time and support. Frankly, without him I would have failed to make this far in the doctoral program. It is no secret that finishing a Ph.D. program in North America is becoming increasingly less of a mental and more of a financial challenge. I know a few Ph.D. candidates who failed in the final years of their programs and even more whose programs took extra two or three years to complete because of funding issues. Compared to them I have been more fortunate: for the past three years Prof. Marples has employed me as his research assistant which kept me afloat financially (and mentally probably too). In addition, my research was supported by Ivan Lysiak Rudnytsky Memorial Doctoral Fellowship, Neporany Doctoral Fellowship (twice)

and a research grant from the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Canada. Two research trips to Ukraine were covered by Dianne Samson Graduate Student Travel Award, FGSR Graduate Travel Award and David Marples Eastern European Graduate Research Travel Award.

Both Profs. Himka and Marples have offered numerous comments and corrections to my dissertation draft, improving it immensely. But in the end all responsibility for opinions and accuracy of facts lies with me entirely.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

OUN Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists

PAA Provincial Archives of Alberta

TsDIAL Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv

UAA University of Alberta Archives

UCC Ukrainian Central Committee

UNDO Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance

Note of transliteration, proper names and translation

The dissertation uses a simplified version of Library of Congress' romanization of Cyrillic characters. Apostrophe has been omitted everywhere except in quotations and bibliographic records which originally had it. As a rule, I have used spelling of names which reflects their current status, for example Podlasie instead of Pidliashshia or Lviv instead of Lemberg/Lwów. Exceptions have been made for several names with established or preferred spelling in English – Cracow (instead of Kraków), Kubijovyč (instead of Kubiovych) etc. All translations, unless indicated otherwise, are mine.

Introduction

In 1977 an authoritative Polish-Jewish historian, Lucjan Dobroszycki (1925-1995), writing about the Polish legal press in the General Government, noted that "there is a surprising paucity of work [in the Polish historiography] concerned with the assumptions, methods, and special practices used by the Nazis to influence public opinion. The lack is especially striking on the topic of so important a means of modern communication as the press."[1] At the time when he made this claim only the Polish underground press had been studied, while the legal press published directly or under supervision of the German occupational authorities in the General Government received little attention.

The primary reason for such a historiographical situation was the assumption that the phenomenon of the legal press was insignificant and marginal in Polish society, which allegedly followed the Resistance in boycotting the public sphere of the General Government. It took Dobroszycki more than a decade to disprove this assumption and make a convincing claim "that the [Polish] reptile press was well-nigh universally bought and read, despite being published by the detested occupying power."[2] Subsequent studies of the General Government's legal press support Dobroszycki's conclusion.[3] There is, however, a gap in the

[1] Lucjan Dobroszycki, *Reptile Journalism: The Official Polish-Language Press under the Nazis, 1939-1945* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), 1.
[2] Dobroszycki, *Reptile Journalism*, ix.
[3] See: Klaus-Peter Friedrich, "Publizistische Kollaboration im sog. Generalgouvernement: personengeschichtliche Aspekte der deutschen Okkupationsherrschaft in Polen (1939 - 1945),"

historiography: the Polish and German language legal press of the General Government have been studied relatively well, while the Ukrainian language legal press has not been so fortunate. My dissertation seeks to correct this imbalance at least partially, focusing on the most important Ukrainian legal newspaper of the General Government, *Krakivski Visti* (Cracow News), which was published by the Ukrainian Central Committee (1939-45), a legal Ukrainian umbrella organization in the General Government.

Primary Sources

The dissertation is based primarily on the editorial archive of *Krakivski Visti*, which is located at the Provincial Archives of Alberta among the papers of Ukrainian journalist, editor and community activist Mykhailo Khomiak. A lawyer by education, Khomiak was one of the editors of the most important Western Ukrainian newspaper before World War II – *Dilo* (Deed) and shortly after its closure in September 1939 became the deputy editor and then the chief editor of

Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung 48 no. 1 (1999): 51-89; Klaus-Peter Friedrich, "Die deutsche polnischsprachige Presse im Generalgouvernement (1939-1945): NS-Propaganda für die polnische Bevölkerung," *Publizistik: Vierteljahreshefte für Kommunikationsforschung* 46 no. 2 (2001): 161-188; Grzegorz Hryciuk, "*Gazeta Lwowska*" *1941-1944* (Wrocław: Wydaw. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1996); Lars Jockheck, *Propaganda im Generalgouvernement: die NS-Besatzungspresse für Deutsche und Polen 1939-1945* (Osnabrück: Fibre, 2006); Józef Lewandowski, "*Goniec Krakowski*" *(27.X.1939 - 18.I.1945): próba monografii* (Warszawa: [s.n.], 1978); Jolanta Rawska, "*Sprawa polska*" *w prasie* "*gadzinowej*" *(lipiec 1944-styczeń 1945)* (Warszawa: [s.n.], 1980); Maria Świstak, *Nowy Kurier Warszawski: próba monografii* (Warszawa: [s.n.], 1978); Tomasz Andrzej Uchman, *Gazeta Lwowska 1941-1944: próba monografii* (Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 1977); Krzysztof Woźniakowski, *Polskojęzyczna prasa gadzinowa w tzw. Starej Rzeszy* (1939-1945) (Kraków: Wydaw. Naukowe AP, 2001); Władysława Wójcik, *Prasa gadzinowa Generalnego Gubernatorstwa: (1939-1945)* (Kraków: Wydaw. Naukowe WSP, 1988).

Krakivski Visti in 1940-1945. In 1948 he (as Michael Chomiak) and his family immigrated to Canada. After his death in Edmonton in 1984 the family donated his papers to the Provincial Archives the next year.[4] The editorial archive of *Krakivski Visti* is a unique collection. According to one estimate the Ukrainian legal press under German rule had at least 365 titles.[5] Yet out of all of them the editorial archive of *Krakivski Visti* is the only one known to survive almost entirely, covering the development of the newspaper from the very beginning to the very end. Only the last year (the Vienna period) of the newspaper's history is represented rather poorly in the papers. The Polish legal press of the General Government survived only slightly better in terms of its archival trail. It seems that the destruction of the last war years was only partially responsible for this lack of editorial archives: most likely they were deliberately destroyed by the newspapers' staff in 1944-45, who might have believed that they would be used against them after the war.[6]

The editorial archive of *Krakivski Visti* makes up more than half of Khomiak's papers. It consists of his notebooks in which he noted daily meetings with other editors, journalists, German and the Ukrainian Central Committee's officials; German daily information bulletins; business files (salaries, remunerations etc.); correspondence with journalists and contributors who did not

[4] Provincial Archives of Alberta (PAA), Michael Chomiak (1905-1984) collection, accession no. 85.191.
[5] Kostiantyn Kurylyshyn, *Ukrainske zhyttia v umovakh nimetskoi okupatsii (1939-1944 rr.): za materialamy ukrainomovnoi lehalnoi presy* (Lviv: Lvivska natsionalna naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka, 2010), 5.
[6] Dobroszycki, *Reptile Journalism*, 5-6.

live in Cracow (the largest part of the editorial archive); a collection (selected issues) of other legal press in German, Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian languages; materials about religious affairs in the General Government, primarily on the Ukrainian Orthodox and Greek Orthodox Churches; the Katyn massacre; the Waffen-SS division *Galizien* (primarily official announcements and newspaper articles); *Ostarbeiter* (articles from *Krakivski Visti* and Khomiak's notes from his tour of the Ukrainian worker camps in Germany in 1943); and last but not least the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (pamphlets, newsletters, communiqués etc.). Besides the editorial archive important information about the newspaper is scattered through Khomiak's voluminous post-war correspondence. The papers of Ukrainian historian Ivan L. Rudnytsky at the University of Alberta Archives have also been useful for my research on the newspaper. In addition to archives in Edmonton the dissertation also utilized archival material from Osyp Nazaruk's papers (fond 359) from the Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv.

The second most important primary source is the newspaper itself. *Krakivski Visti* appeared in two editions, daily (January 1940 – April 1945) and weekly (November 1940 – October 1944). The daily edition ranged from 4 to 8 pages, though it was not uncommon for holiday issues (Easter, Christmas etc.) to extend to 20 pages. In terms of production quality *Krakivski Visti* was not consistent. Like most newspapers it was not published on quality paper in the first place, but after 1943 it was lowered even further. In terms of content *Krakivski Visti* was also uneven: its worst years were the first and the last. Arguably, the newspaper

peaked in 1942-1943 in terms of intellectual quality, variety of topics, and the number of contributors.

It is worth mentioning that after the war Khomiak several times expressed an intent to write memoirs about his journalistic career at *Dilo* and *Krakivski Visti*, but he never realized it.[7] In the 1970s one of Khomiak's daughters, Chrystia Chomiak, recorded an audio interview with her father. It deals mostly with family history and stops at the events of the Polish-Soviet war of 1920.[8] In 2010 another daughter, Maria Hopchin, and her husband Bruce Hopchin videotaped an interview with Khomiak's first cousin, Benedict Blawacky (1920-2014). Both Chrystia and Maria were kind enough to make the interviews available to me: without a doubt they are important sources for Khomiak's biography and family history, but unfortunately, they contain very little about *Krakivski Visti* per se.

Historiography

As a primary source *Krakivski Visti* has been used by researchers of Ukrainian wartime history since the 1950s. A renowned American political scientist whose early work focused on Ukrainian nationalism, John A. Armstrong was the first to remark on its quality and importance: "[it] stood head and shoulders above any other Ukrainian publication in the German-dominated areas.

[7] See for example: Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Kost Pankivskyi March 29, 1959. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 13, Item 208; Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Volodymyr Kubijovyč September 13, 1960. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.

[8] The interview was recorded in December of either 1975 or 1977. Personal communication from John-Paul Himka.

Krakivs'ki visti ... was one of the few papers which did not become a party organ but consistently served as a forum for a broad variety of Ukrainian viewpoints. ... it is an invaluable witness of the events of the war years."[9] Four decades later another researcher, Karel C. Berkhoff, pointed out the importance of the Ukrainian legal press as a primary source for the history of Ukrainian lands under German occupation and noted that this is "especially the case" with *Krakivski Visti*.[10]

While as a primary source *Krakivski Visti* has enjoyed attention and recognition, as an object of study for a long time it did not. The very first account of the newspaper's history appeared thirty years after its closure – in Volodymyr Kubijovyč's history of the Ukrainian Central Committee.[11] The author planned to write a full history of the Committee (1939-1945) but managed to finish only the first volume covering the period of 1939-1941.[12] Kubijovyč reviewed the circulation of the newspaper in 1940-41, changes in its editorial board, commented on the most prominent figures among its journalists and contributors, as well as on the relationship of the editorial board with German censorship. In this short account (seven pages) he also made two important claims about the newspaper. First, he confirmed that *Krakivski Visti* was an organ of the Committee (when the

[9] John Alexander Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism* 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1963), 52.
[10] Karel C. Berkhoff, "Ukraine under Nazi Rule (1941-1944): Sources and Finding Aids: Part I," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 45, no. 1 (1997): 93.
[11] Volodymyr Kubijovyč, *Ukraintsi v Heneralnii Hubernii, 1939-1941: istoriia Ukranskoho tsentralnoho komitetu* (Chicago, IL: Vyd-vo Mykoly Denysiuka, 1975), 272-278.
[12] Letter from Volodymyr Kubijovyč to Mykhailo Khomiak March 1, 1976. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 185.

newspaper appeared it never officially acknowledged its connection with the Committee). Second, he set *Krakivski Visti* apart from the rest of the legal press that appeared in the General Government: it was not "a German newspaper [published] in Ukrainian, but a Ukrainian newspaper edited under German reality."[13] The question to what degree *Krakivski Visti* served the political goals of the German occupational regime and reflected Nazi ideology in its content, in particular that of antisemitism, he avoided completely. It is interesting that Kubijovyč did not reveal the source of his account: it was based almost entirely on the short history of the newspaper which Khomiak prepared for him in 1960.[14]

A far richer and more nuanced account of *Krakivski Visti*'s history was produced by the Canadian historian John-Paul Himka two decades later. He has written three articles on the subject, providing an overview of the newspaper[15] and two detailed studies of specific episodes from its history: the antisemitic campaign of 1943[16] and how the newspaper reported in 1941 and 1943 about the NKVD murders in Western Ukraine and Vinnytsia respectively.[17] Himka's articles were

---

[13] Kubijovyč, *Ukraintsi v Heneralnii Hubernii,* 276.

[14] In his letter from August 13, 1960 Kubijovyč asked Khomiak to write an entry about *Krakivski Visti* – "12 sentences" – for the *Entsyklopedia Ukrainoznavstva*. In response Khomiak prepared a twelve-pages long untitled typescript which he sent to Kubijovyč with a letter from September 13, 1960. Both letters and the typescript are located in: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.

[15] John-Paul Himka, "*Krakivs'ki visti*: An Overview," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* Vol. 22 no. 1/4 (1998): 251-261.

[16] John-Paul Himka, "*Krakivski visti* and the Jews, 1943: A Contribution to the History of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations during the Second World War," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 21, no. 1-2 (Summer-Winter 1996): 81-95.

[17] John-Paul Himka, "Ethnicity and the Reporting of Mass Murder: *Krakivs'ki visti*, the NKVD Murders of 1941, and the Vinnytsia Exhumation," in *Shatterzone of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands*, ed. Omer Bartov and Eric D. Weitz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 378-98.

the first research directly based on the newspaper's editorial archive, which allowed him to explore the behind-the-scenes process of editorial thinking and decision-making.

The third author who produced original research on *Krakivski Visti* is Ukrainian historian Larysa Holovata, who wrote an excellent history of Ukrainian legal publishing in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia and the General Government.[18] Her work draws a lot from Canadian, Polish, Russian and Ukrainian archives, though she had no access to Khomiak's papers. One of the central subjects of Holovata's book is the "Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo" (Ukrainian Publishing House), which published *Krakivski Visti*. Holovata discussed in detail the early history of the newspaper (1940-1941), its relationship with the Ukrainian Central Committee, its main correspondents and other contributors.[19] Unfortunately, she paid little attention to the newspaper's content.

Two more studies deserve to be mentioned though they do not deal with *Krakivski Visti* directly. Nonetheless, they provide important context to the newspaper's history. The first is "Reptile Journalism" by the Polish historian Lucjan Dobroszycki, which I quoted at the beginning of this introduction. Dobroszycki was a Holocaust survivor best known for his work on the chronicle of the Łódź ghetto.[20] It took him almost fifteen years to write "Reptile Journalism,"

---

[18] Larysa Holovata, *Ukrainskyi legalnyi vydavnychyi rukh Tsentralno-Skhidnoi Ievropy, 1939-1945* (Kyiv-Lviv, 2013).
[19] Holovata, *Ukrainskyi legalnyi vydavnychyi rukh*, 293-319.
[20] Lucjan Dobroszycki, ed., *The Chronicle of the Łódź ghetto, 1941-1944* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984).

which appeared in German (1977) and English translation (1994).[21] Incidentally, it still has not been published in its original Polish, in Poland (perhaps, due to the sensitivity of the subject of collaboration in his home country). Though narrow in focus – it dealt exclusively with the Polish language press published for the Poles – it is an indispensable work for anyone interested in the legal press of the General Government.

Some of the conclusions that Dobroszycki reached on the basis of the Polish material are worth examining against the Ukrainian legal press, including *Krakivski Visti*. For example, Dobroszycki believed that though Nazi propaganda was not successful among Poles, it did not mean that it had no harmful and lasting effect on consciousness and attitudes of the Polish population in the General Government. One of those influences, which he argued survived the occupation and was acutely felt in the immediate postwar years, was antisemitism.[22]

The second work is by the Ukrainian historian Kostiantyn Kurylyshyn.[23] In his book he attempted to summarize what one could learn from reading the Ukrainian legal press of the General Government and *Reichskommissariat* Ukraine about Ukrainian national life in those territories. His work is not similar to

[21] Lucjan Dobroszycki, *Die legale polnische Presse im Generalgouvernement, 1939*-1945 (München: Selbstverlag des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte, 1977); Lucjan Dobroszycki, *Reptile Journalism: The Official Polish-Language Press under the Nazis, 1939-1945* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994).
[22] Dobroszycki, *Reptile Journalism*, 118-120.
[23] Kostiantyn Kurylyshyn, *Ukrainske zhyttia v umovakh nimetskoï okupatsii (1939-1944 rr.): za materialamy ukrainomovnoi lehalnoi presy* (Lviv: Lvivska natsionalna naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka, 2010).

Dobroszycki's: Kurylyshyn was not concerned with the history of the Ukrainian legal press, how occupational authorities shaped it and what effect it might had had on the local population. His book is largely descriptive and reads as an assortment of paraphrased newspaper articles structured by thematic rubric. Kurylyshyn chose not to discuss the antisemitic materials that appeared in the Ukrainian legal press and outright denied that these materials could had been original Ukrainian submissions. In his view, they were German propaganda simply translated into Ukrainian: so, the subject of Ukrainian antisemitism in the Ukrainian legal press did not exist for him.[24]

Neither Dobroszycki nor Kurylyshyn dealt with *Krakivski Visti* (the former did not mention it at all, the latter mentioned it only in passing), but they both addressed the important question whether the legal press under German occupation should be regarded as collaborationist on respectively Polish and Ukrainian material. Dobroszycki had no issues with regarding it as collaborationist and throughout the whole book he applied the term used by the Polish Resistance, "reptile press," to describe the Polish legal press.[25] This was also the position of the Polish government-in-exile and of the Polish state after 1945 which put staff and contributors of the legal press on trial as German collaborators: transcripts of those trials actually made for an important primary source for

[24] Kurylyshyn, *Ukrainske zhyttia*, 97, 118.
[25] The term also had other, somewhat different, meanings in a prior period. Originally it was coined in the Bismarck era of German politics to denote newspapers which were funded from secret government funds, *Reptilienfonds*. See: Dobroszycki, *Reptile Journalism*, 2-3.

Dobroszycki.[26] However, he was also quick to make two reservations. The first was that "in the true sense of the word" only a tiny minority of the Polish extreme Far Right collaborated with the Germans; for the remainder work in the legal press was "quite simply a well-paid job offering relative security and a sense of stability in difficult times" and their "collaboration was based neither on firm conviction nor on ideological motives."[27] His second reservation was that the German occupiers, not the occupied Poles, defined the nature and scope of the collaboration. A Polish analogue of Quisling never happened during the war not because of the staunch Resistance character of the Polish nation as Polish patriots would like to believe, but because "the Germans never seriously attempted to produce" something of the kind.[28]

Kurylyshyn paid even greater attention to the question whether the legal press under German occupation was a form of collaboration, dedicating a special chapter to the issue.[29] Based on the definition proposed by the prominent Ukrainian historian Iaroslav Dashkevych (1926-2010), which equates collaboration to state treason, Kurylyshyn categorically denied that Ukrainian legal activities under German occupation, including the legal press, could be termed as collaboration.[30] Since a Ukrainian state did not exist at the time, there were no

[26] Dobroszycki, *Reptile Journalism,* 6-7, 18.
[27] Dobroszycki, *Reptile Journalism*, 75.
[28] Dobroszycki, *Reptile Journalism,* 152.
[29] Kurylyshyn, *Ukrainske zhyttia*, 11-26.
[30] Kurylyshyn, *Ukrainske zhyttia*, 24; Iaroslav Dashkevych, "Vstupne slovo, abo pro problemy kolaborantstva," in *Persha Ukrainska dyviziia Ukrainskoi natsionalnoii armii: istoriia stvorennia ta*

formal, legal grounds for any implication in treason. Thus, according to Kurylyshyn, by definition the Ukrainian legal press and organizations under the German occupation could not be classified as collaborationist. This conclusion, he added, also applied to those Ukrainians who volunteered to serve in the Wehrmacht (in the battalions *Nachtigal* and *Roland*) and the Waffen-SS (division *Galizien*).[31] However, the Polish case according to him was different. Poles had their own state which they had lost due to the German invasion in 1939. Hence those Poles who cooperated with German occupiers in the General Government were collaborators, whereas Ukrainians on the other hand were not.[32]

How was the question of collaboration tackled by the three authors who wrote about *Krakivski Visti*? Most likely, Kubijovyč would have agreed with Dashkevych and Kurylyshyn: his history of the Ukrainian Central Committee implied that Ukrainian legal activities under German occupation did not constitute a form of collaboration (a topic to which he, as the head of the Committee, was quite sensitive). Himka offered no opinion on the question, but the factual material presented in his research – participation of *Krakivski Visti* in the ideological campaigns of the German authorities with original contributions – would imply that it was. Holovata took a somewhat complex stand on the question. On the one hand, she rejected the portrayal of the Ukrainian legal press

natsionalno-politychne znachennia. Materialy naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii. Dopovidi ta povidomlennia, ed. Iaroslav Dashkevych (Lviv: Novyi chas, 2002), 9.

[31] Kurylyshyn, *Ukrainske zhyttia,* 22.

[32] Kurylyshyn, *Ukrainske zhyttia*, 17.

as "reptile" in the sense that it was betraying Ukrainian national interests.[33] On the other hand, unlike Kurylyshyn, she recognized that the Ukrainian legal press contained original antisemitic materials and "spread the ruling [Nazi] ideology" which was a "payment for the legal status."[34]

Research Agenda

At base level my dissertation is a narrative history of the newspaper with a focus on its original content. The first chapter provides an overview of the newspaper's history, its editors, contributors, distribution and reception. My central argument is that *Krakivski Visti*, even though it was a legal newspaper under German occupation, had its own ideology due to its unique background (it was not published by the occupational authorities). On the one hand, the ideology was made of Polonophobia, antisemitism, Russophobia and anticommunism. On the surface these components may appear as a reproduction of Nazi propaganda, but in reality the authors of *Krakivski Visti* had their own reasons, which had little or nothing to do with Nazi ideology, for writing those texts. Though framing them in Nazi ideological language might have had a radicalizing influence and made them look more volatile, the parts of the chemical reaction were in place before the Germans arrived in 1939. The second chapter covers this side of the ideology. On the other hand, the newspaper's ideology was a loyalist Ukrainian nationalism,

[33] Holovata, *Ukrainskyi legalnyi vydavnychyi rukh*, 51-52.
[34] Holovata, *Ukrainskyi legalnyi vydavnychyi rukh*, 48, 57.

that is advancement of the Ukrainian national cause as far as possible within the legal framework allowed by German occupiers. This loyalist nationalism was realized in the newspaper through articles on Ukrainian history, historical memory and nation, which are covered in the third chapter.

I also see my dissertation as a contribution to the ongoing debate about collaboration and German occupation policies in Polish and Soviet territories. The collaboration remains a hotbed issue due to its sensitive nature and challenges to historical memory. The most recent debate in *The Slavic Review* in 2005-2006 showed how polarized historians are on this subject.[35] The very definition of what constituted collaboration and what did not in Nazi-occupied Europe remains highly contested despite some of the definitions being literally a page in length (their length, I must add, confuses rather than clarifies the issue).[36] I argue that *Krakivski Visti* was a collaborationist newspaper due to the simple fact that its existence was allowed, controlled, and directed by the German occupation regime. The newspaper served the regime's ideological and political goals in its **content** and in the **form** of its presentation.

I recognize that the newspaper's staff and contributors most likely did not intend to work for the Nazis. But that sentiment could also be applied to the two classical examples of German collaborators – the French Marshall Pétain and the

[35] See: *Slavic Review*, Vol. 64, No. 4 (Winter, 2005): 711-798. The discussion was followed by some highly critical letters: *Slavic Review*, Vol. 65, No. 4 (Winter, 2006): 885-893.
[36] A good overview of the current stage of the debate on collaboration in Nazi-occupied Europe is provided in: Leonid Rein, *The Kings and the Pawns: Collaboration in Byelorussia during World War II* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2011), 11-55.

Soviet General Vlasov – none of whom envisioned in 1939 their future collaboration with the Third Reich. The intentions of collaborators should be noted, but in Nazi-occupied Europe the limits and essence of collaboration were set by the occupiers, not the occupied. By regarding the legal press and other legal activities that served political and ideological goals of Nazism as collaboration I do not seek to pass a moral judgment or engage in virtue signaling. For me it just stresses two facts. First, collaboration, not resistance, was a norm in Hitler's New Europe. Second, it reflects the unique and unprecedented brutal character of the German occupation of Polish and Soviet territories, where Nazi racial policies reached heights of physical oppression and extermination.

In addition, I would argue that we need to divorce the issue of collaboration during World War II from the association with state or national treason because it limits our understanding of the phenomenon and how widespread it was. The association mainly echoes the political results of the war's outcome when the victors decided who was a "traitor" and who was not. Equating collaboration with treason of national or state interests (or resistance with loyalty to them) has been one of the most significant obstacles for frank and dispassionate studies of the phenomenon in World War II historiography. It promotes a collectivist perspective, neglecting that many (if not most) people are guided by individual, not group, interests. This equation is also one of the reasons why in the Ukrainian case such scholars as Dashkevych and Kurylyshyn would rather engage in mental gymnastics, which would allow them to claim that Ukrainian collaboration was

non-existent, without ever bothering to address the fact that German civilian and military administrations in the occupied Polish and Soviet territories never experienced a shortage of Ukrainian helpers throughout the war. The argument of Ukrainian scholars that Ukrainians were not collaborators because they had no state of their own reminds me of the argument that a wife cannot be raped by her husband. The underlying motivation behind both arguments is to distort the character of engagement and to avoid responsibility for actions. Another frequent argument is that Ukrainian nationalists were not collaborators because they pursued their own national interests in working with German occupiers. This is a simple non sequitur: the one does not exclude the other. As a matter of fact, this dissertation is a study of Ukrainian nationalists who pursued their own interests *through* working for and cooperating with the occupiers. In the wider historiographical context this dissertation falls in the same group as Dobroszycki's study of the Polish legal press in the General Government in the sense that it does not reduce the legal press under German occupation to merely propaganda and approaches its texts as written with a degree of ideological and intellectual autonomy.

Chapter I

The General Government, the Ukrainian Central Committee and *Krakivski Visti* in 1940-1944

The General Government and its legal press

The Second World War started on September 1, 1939 with the German invasion of Poland, which was followed by the Soviet invasion of the country from the east on September 17. By the end of the same month the Polish campaign was finished. The two victors partitioned Poland primarily between themselves with Slovakia and Lithuania being two other, minor beneficiaries. Moscow and Berlin divided the conquered territory with ethnic lines in mind: an absolute majority of Poles ended up under the German occupation, and an absolute majority of minorities (primarily Ukrainians and Belarusians) under the Soviet one. A resettlement commission was created promptly for ethnic Germans who wished to live in the German-occupied rather than the Soviet-occupied parts of the former Polish state. By the end of October 1939 Moscow incorporated its new conquests, Western Ukraine and Western Belarus, into the Soviet Union, where they legally became ordinary Soviet provinces.[37] The German policy was more nuanced: a smaller part similarly to the Soviet case became integral part of the Third Reich, but from the rest they created the so called *Generalgouvernement* (General

[37] Vladyslav Hrynevch, *Nepryborkane riznoholossia: Druha svitova viina i suspilno-politychni nastroi v Ukraini, 1939 – cherven 1941 rr.* (Kyiv-Dnipropetrovsk: Vydavnytstvo "Lira," 2012), 208-233.

Government), often colloquially referred to by Germans during the war as *Restpolen* (the rest of Poland).[38]

This new entity, without any geographical designations (unlike the previous German acquisition, the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia), in its character was more akin to an early modern colonial dominion with its ruler having the authority of a viceroy. The Nazi leadership was primarily interested in economic exploitation of the General Government.[39] The Third Reich required food and workers. As long as that task was fulfilled it cared little about internal affairs of the territory. The task was assigned personally by Hitler to Hans Frank (1900-1946).[40] A veteran of World War I and *Freikorps*, Frank belonged to the "old fighters" (*alter Kämpfer*) of the NSDAP, joining the party just two months before the Beer Hall Putsch of November 1923 in which he also participated. He obtained a law degree in 1926 and quite quickly became Hitler's personal legal adviser and

[38] Jan Tomasz Gross, *Polish Society under German Occupation: the Generalgouvernement, 1939-1944* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), 45-53.

[39] See section 3 in: Diemut Majer, *"Non-Germans" under the Third Reich: The Nazi Judicial and Administrative System in Germany and Occupied Eastern Europe, with Special Regard to Occupied Poland, 1939–1945* (Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University Press in Association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2013).

[40] Hans Frank does not have a good, impassionate biography written by a professional historian. Former high-ranking German police officer, Dieter Schenk, wrote two books about Hans Frank, focusing mostly on his war years: Dieter Schenk, *Hans Frank: Hitlers Kronjurist und Generalgouverneur* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 2006); Dieter Schenk, *Krakauer Burg: Die Machtzentrale des Generalgouverneurs Hans Frank, 1939-1945* (Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag, 2010). The most famous (and perhaps the most biased) biographies of Hans Frank were written by his son, Niklas Frank, who turned it into his life's cause to expose his father as a Nazi criminal: Niklas Frank, *Der Vater: eine Abrechnung* (München: C. Bertelsmann, 1987); Niklas Frank, *Bruder Norman!: "Mein Vater war ein Naziverbrecher, aber ich liebe ihn"* (Bonn: Dietz, 2013). There is also an amateurish account based on published secondary (mainly) and primary sources with a sensationalist title: Garry O'Connor, *Butcher of Poland: Hitler's Lawyer Hans Frank* (Stroud, United Kingdom: Spellmount Publishers Ltd, 2013). It is quite erratic and can be safely ignored.

main lawyer of the party in its court battles before seizure of power in January 1933. At time of his appointment as the General Governor he was often referred to as the Nazi lawyer no. 1 since he was the head of both the National Socialist Association of German Legal Professionals (*Nationalsozialistischer Rechtswahrerbund*) and the Academy for German Law (*Akademie für deutsches Recht*).

Contemporaries and later scholars often regarded Hans Frank as a weak figure, whose only defining feature was his unconditional loyalty to Hitler. Weakness, however, is a relative term. Perhaps he appeared so in the presence of such a dominant figure as the Fuehrer, but far away from him he was hardly a weakling. Given a free hand in the General Government as long as he met Berlin's quotas (mostly agricultural produce) Frank developed and implemented policies in his domain without looking for Berlin's approval. His first main decision was to have Cracow, the former capital of the medieval Polish kingdom and an important Habsburg city in 1846-1918, as the capital of the General Government.[41] Within the city he chose Wawel, the castle of the Polish kings built in the 14th Century, as his residence. The famous Italian journalist Curzio Malaparte described his impressions from visiting Frank in the castle in 1940:

[41] For a general history of the General Government see somewhat outdated but still an important work: Jan Tomasz Gross, *Polish Society under German Occupation: The Generalgouvernement, 1939-1944* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979).

Before me sat Frank, on his high stiff-backed chair in the old Polish royal palace of the Wawel in Cracow, as if he were sitting on the throne of the Jagiellons and Sobieskis. He appeared to be fully persuaded that the great Polish traditions of royalty and chivalry were being revived in him. There was a light of innocent pride on his face, with its pale, swollen cheeks and the hooked nose suggesting a will both vainglorious and uncertain. His black glossy hair was brushed back revealing a high ivory-white forehead. There was something at once childish and senile in him: in his full pouting lips of an angry child, in his prominent eyes with their thick, heavy eyelids that seemed to be too large for his eyes, and in his habit of keeping his eyelids lowered – thus cutting two deep, straight furrows across his temples. A slight film of sweat covered his face, and by the light of the large Dutch lamps and the silver candlesticks that ranged along the table and were reflected in the Bohemian glass and Saxon china, his face shone as if it were wrapped in a cellophane mask. 'My one ambition', said Frank thrusting himself back against his chair by propping his hands against the edge of the table,' is to elevate the Polish people to the honour of European civilisation.'[42]

The Poles were seen by Frank as the most serious threat to the German occupation due to their numbers (around 12 million) and historical tradition of rebelling against foreign occupiers.[43] The three largest ethnic minorities of the General Government were treated each in their own way. The local Germans, *Volksdeutsche*, had to be brought up to the Nazi standards of Germanhood and rapidly go through the same process of Nazification that German society had been

[42] Curzio Malaparte, *Kaputt* (Marlboro, VT: Marlboro Press, 1982), 68-69.
[43] The occupiers understood the importance of history well. For example, the head of SS, Heinrich Himmler, ordered all SS commanders in the General Government in 1940 to study the memorandum "Polish Methods of Preparation and Conduct of the Uprising Against the Russians in 1863. The Manner of Russian Defense." As the title suggests, the memorandum covered a history of the 1863 Polish rebellion against Russian rule and how it was suppressed. Himmler believed that the history of the Russian suppression contained valuable lessons for the German occupation of Poland. See: Gross, *Polish Society under German Occupation*, 3-4.

subjected to since 1933. The Jews were treated the worst: for the time being they had to be moved to ghettos and contained there until a comprehensive solution could be found for them. The Ukrainians, while regarded as racially inferior to Germans, were put in a privileged position compared to Poles and Jews. Frank decided to exploit existing ethnic antagonisms of the defeated Poland to Germany's favor. The interwar Polish state had failed to promote loyalty among its national minorities. At the time when Poland fell to German arms the Ukrainians were one of the most dissatisfied minorities.

Frank considered Ukrainians "the born deadly enemies of the Poles" because, as he believed, more than a million of them had perished under the interwar Polish rule.[44] He summarized his political line with regard to Ukrainians in his diary on August 5, 1942: "It is in the interest of the German policies [in the General Government] to maintain strained relations between Poles and Ukrainians. Those 4 or 5 million of Ukrainians who live here are very important as a counter-weight to Poles. That is why I always try to keep them [Ukrainians] politically content to prevent their union with Poles."[45] Frank was not the only one who regarded Ukrainians as a buffer against Poles. The SS, who most of the time

[44] Martyn Housden, *Hans Frank: Lebensraum and the Holocaust* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 125. The figure of over one million of Ukrainians was also repeated in the official German propaganda in the General Government, see: "1,220.000 ukraintsiv zhertvamy polskoho teroru," *Krakivski Visti* no. 19 March 13, 1940, 6. This article, which originally appeared in *Krakauer Zeitung* (March 7, 1940), claimed that "even according to the Polish statistic 1,200.000 Ukrainians, or 21,6% of their total, had perished [zhynulo] as a result of 21 years of the Polish rule."

[45] Quoted after Iaroslav Halan, *Tvory v triokh tomakh. Tom 2: Proza. Publitsystyka.* (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnystvo khudozhnioi literatury, 1960), 453.

operated independently in the General Government (much to Frank's anger), did so as well. For example, during the *Aktion Zamosc*, which was a forcible removal of Polish population from a part of the Lublin district to clear the territory for German resettlement in 1942-1943, the SS also settled some Ukrainians around the German colonies which in their mind would provide anti-Polish security to the German settlers.[46]

Frank also developed his own policies for the press in the General Government. The public sphere was severely narrowed under the pretext of a paper shortage. Another feature of the General Government's legal press was parcellation of information along ethnic lines. Germans, Poles and Ukrainians (and briefly even Jews) had their own legal newspapers in their respective languages (the press for Jews was, however, published in Polish). While some content was universal for all of them, they also had differences. All of them praised Axis victories and wrote about the blessings of German rule. German and Ukrainian newspapers were allowed to publish anti-Polish pieces, but the Polish legal press was not allowed to return the favor or engage in polemics with them. Frank's own policy regarding the press led to clashes with Reich Minister of Propaganda and Public Enlightenment Joseph Goebbels, who believed that media policies belonged to his domain not only within Nazi Germany, but in conquered

[46] Housden, *Hans Frank*, 188, 192.

territories too. This bureaucratic squabble between Goebbels and Frank was never fully resolved.

The Ukrainian Central Committee and its publishing program

Cracow became a point of convergence for thousands of Ukrainians who in October-November 1939 opted to live in the German rather than in the Soviet zone of occupation of the Polish territories (they saw the former as a lesser evil).[47] By the end of 1939 the city had a sizable colony of Ukrainian intelligentsia, politicians and public figures. Besides them there were other Ukrainians in the General Government, though the Cracow émigrés did not regard them as fully developed in the national sense. These were the Eastern Slavic inhabitants of Chełm, Podlasie and Lemko regions: territories that the Ukrainian national project since the 19th century had regarded as part of imagined Ukraine. These regions were viewed by the Ukrainian intelligentsia as heavily Polonized and denationalized. That "Ukrainians" here often were not aware of their "true" identity and typically identified themselves as "locals" (*tuteishi*) or with some kind of regional identity (*boiky, lemky*) was often lamented by the Ukrainian national leaders in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.[48]

[47] By one estimate around 30,000 Ukrainians arrived in the General Government fleeing Soviet-occupied Western Ukraine in 1939. See: N. V. Antoniuk, *Ukrainske kulturne zhyttia v "Heneralnii Hubernii" (1939-1944 rr.): Za materialamy periodychnoi presy* (Lviv: Naukovo-doslidnyi tsentr periodyky, Lvivska naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka, 1997), 18.
[48] Volodymyr Kubijovyč, *Ukraintsi v Heneralnii Hubernii, 1939-1941: Istoriia Ukrainskoho Tsentralnoho Komitetu* (Chicago, IL: Vydavnytsvo Mykoly Denesiuka, 1975), 20-31.

The ethnic composition of the General Government had changed again after June 1941, significantly increasing its Ukrainian population due to the German invasion of the Soviet Union. Berlin took into account the former Habsburg borders. Though the Habsburg empire was despised by the Nazis and by Hitler personally, nonetheless its legacy – Germanizing influence – was valued by them. The Third Reich created the *Reichskommissariat* Ukraine from the Ukrainian territories of the Soviet Union, except for the Western Ukrainian regions of Bukovyna and Galicia (*Halychyna*), both of which had been part of the Habsburg Empire until 1918.[49] Galicia was incorporated into the General Government as a separate, fifth, district. Galician Ukrainians were regarded by the Cracow émigrés as proper, nationally conscious Ukrainians, which is not surprising since almost all of the émigrés were Galician Ukrainians themselves.

The Ukrainians were in a privileged position in the General Government compared to the Poles and especially to the Jews, though in the Nazi racial hierarchy they were still beneath the boot of *Reichsdeutsche* and *Volksdeutsche*. Nonetheless, German policy vis-à-vis Ukrainians in the General Government, with some degree of perversion, can be termed affirmative action: Ukrainian identity was promoted and relatively privileged. Initial Ukrainian expectations of Germans were favorable. The horrors of the Nazi regime were yet to be revealed. Most Western Ukrainians, from all sectors of society, based their expectations on

[49] Romania acquired Bukovyna in November 1918 and surrendered it to demands of the Soviet Union in June 1940. In 1941 Hitler returned it back to Bucharest (as a sign of allied relations) despite the province's Habsburg legacy and *Volksdeutsche* minority.

their past experiences with German (this includes what we would call today Austrian) order and culture before World War I. A genuine Germanophilia, both political and cultural, was widespread among Western Ukrainians on the eve of World War II. As Ivan L. Rudnytsky put it: "Germany was traditionally the one country of Western Europe which had represented the West for the [Western] Ukrainians. For one [Western] Ukrainian who knew French or English, there were a hundred who knew German. Germany stood for European civilization. This might seem paradoxical, thinking of what happened [during the war]. But this was the historical experience of the [Western] Ukrainian people."[50]

By the end of the 1930s high hopes for German liberation from both Polish and Soviet rule were held not only by Western Ukrainian nationalists, but also Western Ukrainian democrats. Prominent Ukrainian interwar female activist and democrat Milena Rudnytska, according to her son, was among them too: "My mother and I did not belong to enthusiasts of the Third Reich, we were more skeptical than the majority of our countrymen [zemliakiv], but even we thought that following its own interests Germany would have to allow, if not for the creation of an independent Ukraine, then for a more or less autonomous 'protectorate,' which compared with the Bolshevik regime would still be progress."[51] Young Ukrainian journalist Mariia Strutynska reflecting in 1943 on

[50] "Round-Table Discussion," in *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective* ed. Howard Aster and Peter J. Potichnyj 2nd ed. (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1990), 489.
[51] Letter from Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytskyi to Mykhailo Dobrianskyi, February 1, 1950. University of Alberta Archives (UAA), Rudnytsky papers, Box 48, Item 751.

the reality of German occupation wrote with sadness in her diary that in 1939 "we did not expect this [German] devil, but the arrival of a cultured state."[52] Even laymen expected German conquest to be some sort of solution and an event to be desired and called for. Ukrainian historian Lev Bilas remembered how in summer 1939 (he was 17 at the time) while touring Galician countryside a Ukrainian peasant had suddenly asked him when "uncle Hitler is going to come?" Bilas prophetically replied that he would come soon.[53]

However, after the German arrival Ukrainians were not in an advantageous political situation. They were without any political representation except one, underground organization – the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN). On September 22, 1939 when the Red Army seized Lviv all Ukrainian legal parties (who had their headquarters in the city) disbanded under the pretext that they did not want to operate under the Soviet regime.[54] An unintended consequence of this step was that even those who did not sympathize with the OUN had to turn towards it since now it was the only organized Ukrainian political force. Some of the OUN leaders were already thinking about creating a legal façade through which to deal with Germans. Also, in some localities where Polish power had already left, but German not yet established, Ukrainian activists in October 1939 organized their local, ad hoc committees to fill the power vacuum.

---

[52] Mariia Strutynska, *Daleke zblyzka* (Winnipeg: Vydavnycha Spilka "Tryzub," 1975), 185.
[53] Lev Bilas, *Ohliadaiuchys nazad. Perezhyte 1922-2000 i peredumane* (Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy, 2005), 63.
[54] Ivan Nimchuk, *595 dniv sovietskym viaznem* (Toronto: Vydavnytsvo i Drukarnia OO. Vasyliian, 1950), 25-26.

Eventually the Ukrainian émigrés in Cracow under the influence of Melnyk's faction of the OUN (formally still a single organization) offered the Germans an opportunity to unify these committees under a central one – the Ukrainian Central Committee (*Ukrainischer Hauptausschuss*) – which was supposed to serve as an umbrella organization representing the entire Ukrainian population vis-à-vis the occupational authorities. Frank gave his blessing for its creation in November 1939 during a meeting with a Ukrainian delegation led by Roman Sushko (1894-1944), a prominent OUN member and Melnyk sympathizer. It was Sushko whom the delegation proposed for the head of the Committee, but Frank told them to pick a different candidate because of political reasons.[55]

The selection was decided in favor of Volodymyr Kubijovyč (1900-1985) – a scholar, Ukrainian nationalist (but without any political affiliation) and soon-to-be German collaborator. Sushko was appointed his deputy. Kubijovyč was an odd choice for such a political position as the head of the Ukrainian Central Committee.[56] He was an offspring of a mixed, Polish-Ukrainian marriage.[57]

---

[55] Kubijovyč, *Ukraintsi v Heneralnii Hubernii*, 61-70; Oleksandr Kucheruk, "«… Vse, shcho zviazane z vyzvolenniam Ukrainy» (Do genezy vidnosyn Orhanizatsii Ukrainskykh Natsionalistiv ta Ukrainskoho Tsentralnoho Komitetu na pochatku Druhoi svitovoi viiny)," *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh* no. 18 (2013): 27-28.

[56] Kubijovyč's own speculation was that three factors played in favor of his candidature. He was a renowned scholar with connections to the German universities. During the interwar period he was not a member of any Ukrainian parties and thus stood above any political rivalries. And last but not least Kubijovyč was a "native" of the General Government since he was born and lived almost all of his life in that part of Poland which came under the German occupation in 1939. See: Volodymyr Kubijovyč, *Meni 70* (Munich: Logos, 1970), 38-39; Volodymyr Kubijovyč, *Meni 85* (Munich: Molode zhyttia, 1985), 89-90.

[57] Like his father, Kubijovyč also married a Polish woman. He had two daughters from this marriage. However, unlike him who under a Polish mother became Ukrainian his daughters chose to become Poles. Kubijovyč regarded this identity choice as the biggest tragedy of his personal life and estranged himself from his daughters. He and his first wife became separated after 1940, and

According to people who knew him personally he spoke Ukrainian with a Lemko accent.[58] In 1918-1919 Kubijovyč served in the Ukrainian Galician Army and fought against the Poles.[59] After the war he received a doctorate in geography from the Jagiellonian University (1923, habilitation in 1928), specializing in the anthropogeography of the Carpathian Mountains.[60]

In the 1930s he turned his academic activity to the "national cause" and worked on statistics and mapping of Ukrainian ethnicity primarily focusing on its Western borders. This displeased the Polish authorities who saw in Kubijovyč's scholarship a political threat to Poland's eastern borders. Kubijovyč had received plenty of warning signs in the Polish press that his work was not perceived as politically harmless or innocent.[61] He either was oblivious to those warnings or decided to ignore them. In the end, the Polish authorities forced his expulsion from the Jagiellonian University in Cracow on June 16, 1939 (he had taught there since 1928).[62] However, he did not remain unemployed for too long. The war soon

she kept the children and stayed in Poland after the war. Later in his life Kubijovyč married for the second time – to Dariia Siiak, a Galician Ukrainian.

[58] Inna Zabolotna, "Roky nimetskoi okupatsii na Zakhidnii Ukraini za spohadamy Ivana Krypiakevycha," *Ukrainskyi arkheohrafichnyi shchorichnyk* vol. 10 no. 7 (Kyiv – New York: Vydavnytstvo M. P. Kots, 2002): 405; Roman Kolisnyk, "Moie znaimostvo z profesorom Volodymyrom Kubiovychem," in *Profesor Volodymyr Kubiovych*, ed. Oleh Shablii (Lviv: Vydavnychyi tsentr LNU imeni Ivana Franka, 2006), 357.

[59] Kubijovyč, *Meni 70*, 13; Kubijovyč, *Meni 85*, 32.

[60] Kubijovyč, *Meni 70*, 19, 22.

[61] Paweł Markiewicz, "Volodymyr Kubijovych's Ethnographic Ukraine: Theory into Practice on the Western *Okraiiny*," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 64, no. 2 (April 2016): 237.

[62] A good biography of Kubijovyč in English (or even in Ukrainian) has yet to be written. His two memoirs, *Meni 70* and *Meni 85*, still remain the best source on his life and work.

would provide him the greatest opportunities of his life and from a jobless professor he would rise to a leader in charge of millions of people.

As a scholar Kubijovyč had a solid reputation, but he never worked as an institution organizer or administrator. Educated in a Polish school and university within Polish ethnic territories, Kubijovyč was somewhat at odds with Galician Ukrainians. He also had a character that was easier to respect than to like. Galician Ukrainian historian Ivan Krypiakevych (1886-1967), who knew Kubijovyč personally, described him as "ambitious," "power-hungry," "energetic," and "cold."[63] According to him Kubijovyč enjoyed a "good reputation among the Germans. He knew how to talk to them because he himself had the German cold character and as a type was close to a German, and that is why he often achieved what he wanted."[64]

It seems that the occupational regime was indeed satisfied with Kubijovyč because he remained the head of the Ukrainian Central Committee until its very end in 1945. In his memoirs Kubijovyč claimed that as the leader of the Ukrainian Central Committee he was not under the influence of any Ukrainian party and painted an image of an impartial leader in the most difficult times. He did recognize that Melnyk's faction of the OUN played a key role in the Committee's inception and its early development, but still wrote that the Committee's reputation as a "Melnykite" organization was "not entirely deserved."[65] But

[63] Zabolotna, "Roky nimetskoi okupatsii," 406.
[64] Zabolotna, "Roky nimetskoi okupatsii," 406.
[65] Kubijovyč, *Meni 70*, 44.

Kubijovyč was not entirely honest about his cooperation with the faction and what he wrote in his memoirs is more reflective of his postwar efforts to avoid any political associations, which could harm his project of the Ukrainian encyclopedia – *Entsyklopediia Ukrainoznavstva*. The documents from that time reveal him actively pursuing the faction's involvement in the Committee affairs: at his meeting with Melnyk in Berlin in December 1940 Kubijovyč was convincing his counterpart to allow "as many nationalists as possible" to be employed by the Committee and that "95% of the OUN's work can be done" through the Committee's legal framework.[66] Most likely, Kubijovyč's insistence on the faction's involvement with the Committee was primarily motivated by the latter's lack of cadres.

The influence of Melnyk's faction on the UCC was only strengthened after the OUN split into two factions in February 1940: the other faction, Banderites, and their sympathizers were purged from all positions within the Committee.[67] In his memoirs Kubijovyč implied that after the German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941 the role of Melnyk's faction in the Committee had diminished since many Melnykites left the "public work," that is the Committee's administration.[68] The drain of Melnykites was certainly the case, but it also should be noted that continued overlap of the general political line of Melnykites in the General

[66] Kucheruk, "«… Vse, shcho zviazane," 30.
[67] See: "Bilians ukrainskoi polityky za chas viiny," 17. This interesting document, a mixture of political analysis with historical reference, was originally written by Ivan L. Rudnytsky for "American Ukrainians" in July 1945 and then, according to the note attached to it, revised by Ivan Kedryn and Milena Rudnytska by January 1946. UAA, Rudnytsky papers, Box 36, Item 513.
[68] Kubijovyč, *Meni 70*, 45.

Government and that of Kubijovyč's till the very end of the war – maintaining and developing Ukrainian national life within legal boundaries set by the occupational regime – was hardly a coincidence. At least, the Security Service (Sluzhba bezpeky) of Banderites did not think so: already in 1941 it became convinced that Kubijovyč was not just a figure associated with the Melnykites, but was one of their primary leaders.[69]

Kubijovyč shaped his managerial style somewhat on the Nazi fashion, calling himself *Providnyk*[70] and issuing orders that did not tolerate any objections and overall ran the Ukrainian Central Committee according to the principle *Ein Fuehrer, Ein Organisation* and did not tolerate opposition to him within the organization. "He liked authoritarian order" recalled Krypiakevych.[71] While the Germans were pleased with Kubijovyč, the same cannot be said about the Galician Ukrainian establishment for whom he was a little-known professor from Cracow who suddenly pretended to play the role of the nation's father. In developing the Committee's cadres Kubijovyč avoided appointing known prewar figures, especially from the UNDO camp.[72]

Naturally, the UNDO establishment was displeased at the fact that life continued without them: "the candidature of Kubijovyč … turned out to be

[69] O. Ie. Lysenko and I. K. Patryliak, eds., *Materialy ta dokumenty Sluzhby bezpeky OUN(B) u 1940-kh rr.* (Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2003), 95.
[70] In translation into Ukrainian it means simply "leader," but it the context of the 1930s-40s it meant specifically Fuehrer. The leaders of either OUN were also called *Providnyk*.
[71] Zabolotna, "Roky nimetskoi okupatsii," 406.
[72] The Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance (UNDO) was the largest Ukrainian legal political party in interwar Poland.

terribly unfortunate. The whole UCC suffered from the fact that its head had no prior knowledge of Ukrainian political relations, did not understand them, lived away from them and was not interested in them, did not know the people and approached them on the basis of his own first impression, was totally deaf to counsel of older and experienced public figures (regardless, he did not allow them near himself), but completely fell under the influence of individuals who played no role or played a negative one in prewar Ukrainian life."[73]

The speed with which the Ukrainian Central Committee developed its infrastructure was remarkable. To a large extent this was due to the German confiscations of Jewish properties, some of which were acquired by the Committee. The occupation authorities allowed the Committee to purchase the former press of the Polish Jewish newspaper *Nowy Dziennik*, for which Kubijovyč alone managed to collect necessary funds. Though he bought the press for the Committee he also ensured that the larger part of the shares (13 out of 20) would belong to him personally. This provided him with another option of control over the Committee and could had been financially beneficial to him. The press was officially founded on December 27, 1939 and received the name "Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo" (literally Ukrainian Publishing House).[74] The occupational authorities never allowed the creation of another Ukrainian press, thus making

[73] "Bilians ukrainskoi polityky," 17.
[74] The most extensive history of "Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo" is: L. V. Holovata, *Ukrainskyi legalnyi vydavnychyi rukh Tsentralno-Skhidnoi Ievropy, 1939-1945* (Kyiv-Lviv, 2013).

"Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo" a monopolist in publishing Ukrainian-language newspapers and books in the General Government.[75]

We do not know much about Kubijovyč's political or social views in the interwar period (in his memoirs he never touched on this subject). But he was quick to adopt the Nazi symbolic culture (in public appearances with German officials we see Kubijovyč typically with the Hitler salute)[76] and he was, at least outwardly, quite loyal toward the occupation authorities. While those public displays of loyalty to the German officials and Nazi symbols can (and most likely will) be dismissed as superficial the evidence of Kubijovyč's racial thinking cannot be disregarded that easily because it comes from his postwar years. Shortly after the war he became the head of Scientific Shevchenko Society in Europe. In 1949 the Society published "Vstup do rasovoi budovy Ukrainy" (Introduction to Racial Structure of Ukraine) by Rostyslav Iendyk (1906-1974).[77] Iendyk was a Ukrainian nationalist, writer, antisemite and racial theorist, who before the war wrote a praising biography of Hitler[78] and admired work of German "racial scientist" Hans F. K. Günther (1891-1968), whom he translated into Ukrainian.[79]

---

[75] Kubijovyč, *Ukraintsi v Heneralnii Hubernii*, 254.

[76] Per Anders Rudling, "«They Defended Ukraine»: The 14. Waffen-Grenadier-Division der SS (Galizische Nr. 1)," *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies*, 25:3 (2012): 341.

[77] Rostyslav Iendyk, *Vstup do rasovoi budovy Ukrainy* (Munich: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1949). About Iendyk see: Oleksandr Zaitsev, *Ukrainskyi integralnyi natsionalizm (1920-1930-ti) roky: narysy intelektualnoi istorii* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2013), 342-343, 359-361. Iendyk's racial views on Ukrainians were summarized in: "Rasovi probliemy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 120 (275) June 6, 1941, 5. According to the summary, in Iendyk's opinion Jews were a group whose "great harmfulness [velyka shkidlyvist] is evident."

[78] Rostyslav Iendyk, *Hitlier* (Lviv, 1934).

[79] Rostyslav Iendyk, "Hans F. K. Ginter," *Krakivski Visti* no. 39 (195) February 24, 1941, 6.

"Vstup do rasovoi budovy Ukrainy" reads as if it was almost written in Nazi Germany of the 1930s which adopted "racial science" as an academic discipline and as a political practice: the book, which presented itself as a scientific work, praised European racial theorists (especially Gobineau and Günther), advocated for racial worldview, racial purity and racial determinism. Kubijovyč liked the book but external factors forced him to stop it from circulating: "Without a doubt it is a good book, but he [Iendyk] also put in it some comments about Jews, which now offend oversensitive Jews."[80] In other words, the book was not wrong, it was merely untimely. Kubijovyč ordered to move all its printed copies to a basement, but news about a forbidden book made it popular so "certain people have been stealing it and selling it in America," where it caused a scandal in the "socialist and Orthodox [Ukrainian] newspapers." As a result, the whole print of the book was "destroyed" according to Kubijovyč (presumably on his orders). The whole affair – "Iendykiada" in his words – showed to him absurdity of the US press which may write any "stupidities" about everyone including the President, "but is not free to touch Jews-Masonry [zhydiv-masonerii]."[81]

Nominally the Ukrainian Central Committee was one of the three social aid organizations Germans allowed to Ukrainians, Poles (*Rada Główna Opiekuńcza*), and Jews (*Jüdische Soziale Selbsthilfe*). In reality the Ukrainian Central Committee

[80] Letter from Volodymyr Kubijovyč to Mykhailo Khomiak November 17, 1952. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.
[81] Letter from Volodymyr Kubijovyč to Mykhailo Khomiak November 17, 1952. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.

had much more authority over its own ethnic group than the Polish and Jewish committees over theirs. Due either to Frank's trust or his desire to unload certain functions from the German administration (or both) Kubijovyč and the UCC received unprecedented power to enforce their own views on many aspects of Ukrainian life under German occupation. Culture, education, healthcare and many other aspects of everyday life of Ukrainians in the General Government came under total control of the Ukrainian Central Committee. This had certain benefits for Ukrainians compared to Poles and Jews, but also had disadvantages like widespread corruption.[82] Throughout the war the apparatus of the Ukrainian Central Committee grew into "a big bureaucratic machine."[83] Its power also expanded spatially. After Galicia became the fifth district of the General Government the Ukrainian Central Committee was no longer limited in its activities just to Chełm, Podlasie, and Lemko territories. The peak of the Ukrainian Central Committee's influence came in 1943 when it became directly involved in military recruitment for the Waffen-SS division *Galizien*.[84]

Kubijovyč cared about expansion of his power not only within the Committee, but also about widening the Committee's power (and thus his own) within the General Government. He had an ambitious program of developing and elevating Ukrainians as an ethnic group under the occupation into a modern nation. On several occasions he tried to persuade Hans Frank to expand pro-

[82] "Bilians ukrainskoi polityky," 16.
[83] "Bilians ukrainskoi polityky," 16.
[84] Rudling, "They Defended Ukraine," 339.

Ukrainian policies and the Committee's authority, turning the latter into a quasi-government for Ukrainians. On June 21, 1941 (just one day before Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union) Kubijovyč proposed to Frank to establish a purely ethnic Ukrainian enclave in the General Government, which would be free of "the Polish and Jewish element by resettlement."[85] Naturally, his Committee would be in charge of the proposed enclave. A month later, on August 29, he submitted another proposal, this time regarding the Jewish properties:

> Considering that all Jewish property originally belonged for the most part to the Ukrainian people and only through ruthless law-breaking on the part of the Jews and through their exploitation of members of the Ukrainian people did it pass into Jewish possession, we deem it a requirement of justice, in order to make restitution to the Ukrainian people for moral and material damages, that a very considerable portion of confiscated Jewish property be returned to the Ukrainian people. In particular, all Jewish land holdings should be given to Ukrainian peasants.[86]

None of these proposals were implemented. At that time Kubijovyč had not realized yet that though Germans treated Ukrainians favorably compared to Poles and Jews there were also limits to this positive discrimination. There was a certain duality in the pro-Ukrainian policies of the occupational authorities – the advancement of Ukrainians at the expense of Jews and Poles was encouraged as long as it did not threaten the superior position of German minority in the General

---

[85] Wasyl Veryha, comp., *The Correspondence of the Ukrainian Central Committe in Cracow and L'viv with the German Authorities 1939–1944*, 2 vols., Research Report No. 61 (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2000), vol.1: 242. Cited after: Himka, "Ethnicity and the Reporting," 396.

[86] Veryha, comp., *The Correspondence*, vol.1: 342. Cited after: Himka, "Ethnicity and the Reporting," 397.

Government. The best illustration of this attitude was the relation between the occupational censorship and "Ukrainske Vydavnystvo." The censors eagerly allowed publication of primers, school textbooks, classics of Ukrainian fiction, collections of folk songs and tales and various practical brochures related to agriculture, veterinary etc.[87] But when the "Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo" tried to publish more sophisticated literature it usually received a refusal from the censors (typically under the pretext of lacking paper). Similar to the racial hierarchy it was important for Germans to maintain a hierarchy of cultures. The forms of higher cultural expressions were reserved primarily for them – Ukrainians needed to be educated, but only sufficiently to understand their German superiors and follow their orders. Any intellectual, cultural parity between the two groups – Germans and Ukrainians – was unthinkable for German occupiers.

Eventually Kubijovyč grasped this duality of German policy when the censors did not allow publication of the book on medieval Halych by the Ukrainian archeologist Iaroslav Pasternak (1892-1969). In the end, the book did appear, but only after Kubijovyč's personal appeal to a high-ranking German official in the occupation administration with whom he developed a good relationship.[88] The whole episode taught Kubijovyč a lesson: science and scholarship "was for Germans only."[89] In due time he also received a warning

[87] The "Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo" started its history with the publication of two primers: Kubijovyč, *Ukraintsi v Heneralnii Hubernii*, 252-253.
[88] Iaroslav Pasternak, *Staryi Halych: arkheolohichno-istorychni doslidy u 1850-1943 rr.* (Krakiv-Lviv: Ukrainske vydavnytstvo, 1944).
[89] Kubijovyč, *Meni 85*, 170.

from his other German connection, SS-*Obersturmbannführer* Fritz Arlt. This officer of the SS is best known for his leading role in *Aktion Saybusch*, a mass expulsion of ethnic Poles in 1939-1940 from the Polish territories annexed to the Third Reich in 1939.[90] When the Ukrainian Central Committee was founded it was Arlt who wrote its charter – he knew how to speak National Socialism well. After studying national relations in the General Government Arlt came to the conclusion that *immediate* German interests would benefit from supporting Ukrainians, to which extent he himself wrote an instruction brochure on the Ukrainian question for German officials in the General Government. In addition, when it came to appointments in the occupational administration, he would use his influence in favor of a pro-Ukrainian candidate. When Arlt was transferred from the General Government back to the Third Reich he met with Kubijovyč before leaving and parted with a lesson about German interests and friends: "I like Ukrainians and will be glad to help them, but if I received an order to destroy you [Ukrainians] I would have carried it out. Keep this in mind."[91]

Indeed, Frank's pro-Ukrainian policies were purely tactical and designed to last only as long as the occupational authorities found them useful against the Poles and Jews in the General Government, whose removal he estimated (March 1941) would take from fifteen to twenty years.[92] Once they were no longer useful

[90] See: Maria Wardzyńska, *Wysiedlenia ludności polskiej z okupowanych ziem polskich włączonych do III Rzeszy w latach 1939-1945.* Warszawa: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, Komisja Ścigania Zbrodni przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu, 2017.
[91] Kubijovyč, *Meni 85*, 168.
[92] Housden, *Hans Frank*, 142.

the Ukrainians would share the same fate as the Poles: in March 1942 Frank noted in his diary that both ethic groups would have to be removed from the General Government in the postwar decades[93] and in January 1944, at a meeting with the Cracow district officials Frank declared that when the war is over "as far as I am concerned, we can make mincemeat of the Poles and the Ukrainians and all the other people hanging around here."[94]

Krakivski Visti: origins, content and distribution

After becoming the head of the UCC Kubijovyč quickly realized that to represent the Ukrainian population of the General Government his organization needed not just German approval but also the means to reach out to that population on a regular basis. For its official news the Committee published "Visnyk Ukrainskoho Tsentralnoho Komitetu" (Herald of the Ukrainian Central Committee). Kubijovyč's ambition however was bigger: he wanted to have a major Ukrainian-language newspaper for the Ukrainian population of the General Government. This newspaper was to replace *Dilo* (Deed), the most known and popular newspaper in Western Ukraine before the Soviets technically closed it down in September 1939 by confiscating its printing press and offices, which they used for the newspaper which they decided to publish instead – *Vilna Ukraina* (Free Ukraine).[95] *Dilo* was founded in Lviv in 1880 making it one of the oldest

[93] Housden, *Hans Frank*, 148.
[94] Housden, *Hans Frank*, 198.
[95] Nimchuk, *595 dniv*, 24, 29.

Ukrainian newspapers. It was also the first Ukrainian daily newspaper (since 1888). In the history of the Ukrainian national project newspapers played an important though somewhat underappreciated role, which explains why they have been studied so poorly in historiography. Besides their primary function – news – they also focused on "awakening" and later affirming and spreading Ukrainianhood. By the beginning of the 20th Century *Dilo* had become more than just a leading Ukrainian newspaper, but the Ukrainian **national** newspaper, demonstrating that a high culture with its articulated, sophisticated expressions and forms was possible in Ukrainian too.[96]

The newspaper which Kubijovyč had in mind in 1939 was to play a similar nationalizing role. The guidelines which the Committee prepared for the future editors of the planned newspaper stated unambiguously that the primary (and only) ideology of the newspaper was to be "Ukrainian nationalism."[97] Commitment to the national cause was shown even in the smallest of details – for example, throughout the war all official correspondence within the Committee and its agencies was signed with *Slava Ukraini* (Glory to Ukraine).[98] Initially even the newspaper's name was supposed to be either *Ukrainski Visty* (Ukrainian News) or *Ukrainskyi Holos* (Ukrainian Voice), but the occupational authorities did not allow ethnonyms in titles of periodicals.[99] The next name choice was *Iaroslavskyi*

[96] For a history of *Dilo* see: Iu. H. Shapoval, *I v Ukraini sviatylos te slovo* (Lviv: PAIS, 2003).
[97] PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 28. The guidelines do not list an author.
[98] For some reason the slogan is mainly associated with one faction of the OUN, namely Banderites. In reality it was ubiquitous in the 1930s-1940s and was used even by Hetmanites.
[99] Ie. Iu. Pelenskyi, "Pered dvoma rokamy," *Krakivski Visti*, no 1 (448) January 2, 1942, 3.

Visnyk (Iaroslav Herald) after town of Iaroslav (Polish Jarosław) where the initial seat of the Ukrainian Central Committee was expected to be. But since it was decided that the Committee would instead have its headquarters in Cracow the name of the newspaper was changed to *Krakivski Visty* (Cracow News).[100] Due to an orthography reform that Ukrainian cultural activists and educators passed in March 1940 in the General Government *visty* now had to be spelled as *visti*. The newspaper changed its name from *Krakivski Visty* to *Krakivski Visti* on May 6, 1940.[101]

The newspaper's first issue appeared on January 7, 1940. Initially *Krakivski Visti* appeared two times per week, from May 1, 1940 three times per week and from November 1, 1940 daily. To expand the Committee's reach to the rural population of the General Government a weekly edition of *Krakivski Visti* was also established.[102] The two editions were supposed to differ in the selection of texts and in the sophistication of their presentation: at a higher level in the daily edition (for city dwellers) and lower in the weekly one (for peasants). In reality, the weekly edition served as a dumping ground for those texts that were deemed publishable but for various reasons did not make it into daily edition. A typical daily issue of *Krakivski Visti* looked as follows. If there were any speeches by the Nazi leaders (Hitler, Goebbels, Göring etc.) republished, then they opened the issue.

[100] Ie. Iu. Pelenskyi, "Pered dvoma rokamy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 1 (448) January 2, 1942, 3.
[101] Ivan Zilynskyi, "Chomu zmineno nazvu «Krakivskykh Vistei»?" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 38 May 6, 1940, 1-2.
[102] Himka, "*Krakivs'ki visti*: An Overview," 252.

Interestingly enough, the speeches were paraphrased rather than fully translated, typically with only two or three paragraphs being a direct translation.

The next important block was reports on the course of the war. These were the largest and the most unoriginal content published in the *Krakivski Visti*, typically translated or paraphrased from German information bulletins. It was not rare for an issue to have up to two thirds of its space filled with war reports. Next in importance was political news and opinion pieces. There was a clear distinction in reporting on the Axis and the Allied powers. News about the former was purely informative (minister Ciano arrived in Budapest on such a date, met with such officials etc.). News about the latter, on the other hand was always packaged with negative stamps borrowed from Nazi propaganda. Besides news political analysis was also frequent, and these entries were more original.

The next regular block of materials concerned identity politics: articles on national issues, religious affairs, language, and history of the Ukrainians. These were the most original and sophisticated pieces published in the newspaper. This cultural legacy, which remains mostly unknown in contemporary Ukraine, was written by the Ukrainian intellectual elite of the 20th century. They included the following: Dmytro Doroshenko, Panas Fedenko, Damian Horniatkevych, Myron Korduba, Iurii Kosach, Hryhorii Kostiuk, Ivan Krypiakevych, Zenon Kuzelia, Bohdan Lepkyi, Denys Lukiianovych, Iurii Lypa, Evhen Malaniuk, Vasyl Mudryi,

Oleksander Ohloblyn, Ievhen Onatskyi, Sofiia Parfanovych, Iuliian Revai, Lev Shankovskyi, Iurii (George Y.) Shevelov, and Mykhailo Vozniak.[103]

These three blocks - war, politics and culture - featured in the newspaper throughout its whole existence. In addition, the newspaper published articles on a wide variety of topics, from personal hygiene to Galician yoga. The last page of *Krakivski Visti* was usually reserved for advertisements, which are quite insightful about everyday life in the General Government.

Chronologically the history of *Krakivski Visti* can be split into four periods: 1) January 1940 – June 1941; 2) June 1941 – Spring 1943; 3) Spring 1943 – October 1944; 4) October 1944 – April 1945. This periodization reflects changes in Nazi press policy, in the quality of *Krakivski Visti* as a newspaper, and in its general ideological direction. During the first period *Krakivski Visti* focused mostly on the local matters (Chełm, Podlasie and Lemko regions) and was not allowed by the censorship to publish any negative materials about the Soviet Union which at that time was a quasi-ally of Nazi Germany.

The second period was the height of *Krakivski Visti* in terms of its intellectual and cultural value. In this period *Krakivski Visti* also fully exhibited two of the most known features of Nazism – antisemitism and anticommunism. The latter in *Krakivski Visti*'s version was focused strictly on the Soviet Union and overlapped with Russophobia. Spring 1943 marked significant changes in the policies of the

[103] Himka, "*Krakivski visti* and the Jews," 84.

occupational authorities towards non-Germans in the General Government. Germany was losing the war and some steps were made by the authorities to increase loyalty among non-Germans and boost their participation in the war effort.[104] Ukrainians were allowed to create their own military formation, the Waffen-SS division *Galizien*, the campaign for which was widely reflected in *Krakivski Visti*. Anti-Soviet propaganda and praise for Nazi Germany as the only bulwark against "Judeo-Bolshevik hordes" became ever more fervent. With the advance of the Red Army into Poland the newspaper and its staff were transferred from Cracow to Vienna in October 1944 marking its fourth and last period. The weekly edition was terminated, but the daily one was resumed after a very short delay.[105]

Nonetheless, the move to Vienna proved to be a heavy blow for the newspaper's quality since it lost majority of its authors – some stayed behind, some were determined to move as far West as possible, some started to write for other Ukrainian newspapers in the Third Reich. Within the General Government *Krakivski Visti* was undoubtedly the main Ukrainian newspaper, which made her gravitational pull of authors the strongest. By moving to the Third Reich, to Vienna, it became just one of dozens of Ukrainian newspapers and had to compete with other popular periodicals from Berlin and Prague. As a result, *Krakivski Visti* in terms of content became a semi-official bulletin. As one of its last employees,

[104] More on this change see: Dobroszycki, *Reptile Journalism*, 125-128.
[105] The last Cracow issue no. 227 (1260) appeared with the date October 8, 1944, the first Vienna issue – no. 228 (1261) with the date October 10, 1944.

Sviatoslav Hordynskyi, wrote in a letter to Arkadii Liubchenko from December 23, 1944: "I sit alone in the editorial office of *Kr. Visti*, where I am supposed to work as a copy editor, but in fact all I am doing is translating and correcting the language of government communiques."[106]

At the end of the war *Krakivski Visti* also changed affiliation: it became the official publication of the Ukrainian National Committee (created officially on March 17, 1945 in Weimar), a Ukrainian proto-government sanctioned by German authorities. General Pavlo Shandruk (1889-1979) became its head with Kubijovyč assuming the position of his deputy. The newspaper was renamed *Ukrainskyi shliakh* (Ukrainian path) on March 30, 1945. Despite adopting a new name, it continued its numeration from *Krakivski Visti*. The last, 1406th issue of *Krakivski Visti* (daily edition) or the fifth issue of *Ukrainskyi shliakh* had appeared in Vienna on April 4, 1945.[107]

Before moving to Vienna copies of *Krakivski Visti* were mainly distributed in the General Government. Despite significant inflation all issues published in Cracow – from no. 1 on January 7, 1940 to no. 1260 on October 8, 1944 – had the same price of 30 *sotyky* (0.3 of one złoty) per issue.[108] The price of issues published in Vienna was 20 pfennigs per issue. The print run of the daily edition of *Krakivski Visti* initially was smaller than that of *Dilo* in 1939 (10,000 on average per issue) but it steadily increased throughout the war: its circulation was 7,177 in 1940,

[106] Holovata, *Ukrainskyi legalnyi vydavnychyi rukh,* 318.
[107] PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.
[108] For comparison the price of *Dilo* in 1939 was 20 *sotyky* per issue.

10,350 in 1941, 10,210 in 1942, 15,000 in 1943, 17,000 in 1944 and 22,450 in 1945 on average per issue.[109] The print run of the weekly edition was 6,500 in 1940, 7,120 in 1941, 17,700 in 1942, 18,660 in 1943 and 26,950 in 1944 on average per issue.[110] This data should be considered carefully because print runs of newspapers do not necessarily reflect their real (un)popularity, especially of newspapers published under Nazis (or Soviets). On the surface it seems that *Krakivski Visti* at the end became twice (or four if one combines both daily and weekly editions) as popular as *Dilo*, but in reality it most likely meant that the UCC was spending on the former much more than the UNDO on the latter (in the interwar period *Dilo* was an unofficial organ of the UNDO).

Outside the General Government *Krakivski Visti* was regularly received in the Third Reich, primarily in Berlin and Prague which after 1920 became two largest centers of Ukrainian emigration in Europe. The distribution in other Axis countries – Croatia, Hungary, Italy, Slovakia, Romania – was irregular and often interrupted by censorship both of the General Government and of the receiving countries.[111] Remarkably the most difficult Axis territory for *Krakivski Visti* to penetrate was the *Reichskommissariat* Ukraine, where Ukrainians constituted an absolute majority among almost 17-million large population (German census from

[109] PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.
[110] PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.
[111] For example, in September 1943 Khomiak had to stop sending *Krakivski Visti* to Iuliian Revai because the Slovak authorities banned all legal press from the General Government from circulating in Slovakia. See: Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Iuliian Revai September 24, 1943. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 4, Item 41.

January 1943).[112] In the spirit of the German policy of compartmentalizing information newspapers from the General Government were banned from circulation in the *Reichskommissariat*. Kubijovyč and Khomiak attempted at least once, in March 1943, to convince the occupational authorities to change this policy in the case of *Krakivski Visti* but they were not successful. As Emil Gassner, the General Government's press chief, explained to them, the ban was implemented both by the Reich Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories and by the authorities of the *Reichskommissariat*.[113]

Khomiak also attempted a different approach to circumvent the ban – he tried to get *Krakivski Visti* into the *Reichskommissariat* through a publication exchange with Ukrainian newspapers published there so at least his newspaper would reach their editors, but it succeeded only a few times and in general failed.[114] Another Axis-occupied territory with sizeable Ukrainian population inaccessible to *Krakivski Visti* was the Transnistria Governorate (*Guvernământul Transnistriei*), which during the war was administered by Romania in a similar manner to the General Government by the Third Reich. Russian-language press from the latter freely circulated in the Governorate, but newspapers in the Ukrainian language had to be smuggled in, including *Krakivski Visti* which in

[112] Karel C. Berkhoff, *Harvest of Despair: Life and Death in Ukraine under Nazi Rule* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004), 36-37.
[113] Himka, "*Krakivs'ki visti*: An Overview," 253-254.
[114] Himka, "*Krakivs'ki visti*: An Overview," 254.

"large numbers" was brought into Odesa by the *pokhidni hrupy* (expeditionary groups) of OUN(b).[115]

Initially *Krakivski Visti* was also distributed to neutral countries – Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, Southern America (mainly Argentina), and even Manchukuo and China. In the latter the newspaper was sold at such an exorbitant price that one Ukrainian reader from Shanghai wrote to Khomiak in March 1941 asking whether he could subscribe through paying in Lipton tea.[116] However, in 1942 authorities of the General Government banned "Ukrainske Vydavnytsvo" from distributing its publications, including *Krakivski Visti*, to neutral countries.[117]

Apparently, the newspaper had also reached the Soviet Union. At least Iaroslav Halan (1902-1949), the prominent pamphleteer and Galician Ukrainian communist who ended up in the Soviet Union during the war, had access to some issues of *Krakivski Visti* as evident from his invective "Smerdiakovy na dosuge" (1942). In the article besides his usual epithets directed at Ukrainian nationalists ("yellow-blue mold") he somehow, just through reading *Krakivski Visti*, had grasped that the newspaper was an attempt to revive *Dilo* with which he was familiar from his life in interwar Poland: "There [in Cracow] «Dilo» from Lviv has been turned into «Krakivski Visti»."[118]

---

[115] Lev Shankovskyi, *Pokhidni hrupy OUN: prychynky do istorii pokhidnykh hrup OUN na tsentralnykh zemliakh Ukrainy v 1941-1943 rr.* (Munich: Ukrainskyi samostiinyk, 1958), 238.
[116] PAA, Chomiak papers, Box 3, Item 34.
[117] PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.
[118] Holovata, *Ukrainskyi legalnyi vydavnychyi rukh*, 296.

Editors

The first chief editor of *Krakivski Visti* was Borys Levytskyi (1915-1984).[119] He was an intellectual and at that time still a member of OUN (after the split in the organization he briefly joined the Banderite faction after which he left OUN for good). He lasted less than a month as the editor, falling a victim to his own assumptions which cost him the job. When *Krakivski Visti* featured a short article about the Soviet-Finnish War in January 1940 this led to the first clash with German censorship of the General Government. Since the article was composed from German official sources Levytskyi assumed that it required no censor's approval. He either missed or did not grasp that German press policy in the General Government was based on parcellation of information – separate news for each ethnic group. The issue was resolved by firing him.[120]

He was replaced by Mykhailo Khomiak (1905-1984). Khomiak studied jurisprudence at Lviv university in 1926-1931 and graduated with a master's degree (*magister juris*) on July 9, 1931.[121] Thanks to his father-in-law's (also a lawyer) connections he was able to find legal work quickly. Khomiak worked at

[119] He spelled his last name as Lewytzkyj in German. About him see: Bogumiła Berdychowska, "Od nacjonalisty do lewicowca (Przypadek Borysa Łewyckiego)," *Zeszyty Historyczne* 145(524) 2003: 214-230. This biographical sketch mainly deals with Levytskyi's relationship with the Polish émigré Jerzy Giedroyc and his journal *Kultura*. It says little about other aspects of his life. For example, it does not even mention that he worked at *Krakivski Visti*.

[120] Kubijovyč, *Ukraintsi v Heneralnii Hubernii*, 274. "Zmina u provodi Redaktsii," *Krakivski Visti,* no. 4 January 17, 1940, 1. After the war Levytskyi settled in Munich. Throughout the Cold War he published extensively on the Soviet affairs in German, earning him reputation of one of the leading Sovietologists in Western Germany.

[121] The biographical data is compiled from various personal documents in: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 1, Item 20.

Bibrka district court (1931-1932) where he received his first and lasting impression of the Polish court system. After public service he continued at private law firms in Lviv (1932) and Sanok (1932-1934). In April 1934 he changed his career accepting an invitation to join the editorial staff of *Dilo* where he worked until its closure in September 1939.[122] With the beginning of the war and closing of *Dilo*, Khomiak at first became unemployed, and then after the Soviet invasion (from which he fled) a refugee in the General Government. As a former *Dilo* editor he was an attractive candidate for Kubijovyč's project of a major newspaper, so when *Krakivski Visti* was being formed he accepted the offer to become its deputy chief editor. After Levytskyi was fired Khomiak was invited to be the chief editor instead which, according to him, he reluctantly accepted under strong pressure from Kubijovyč.[123] In this "reluctant" position Khomiak worked until the very end of the newspaper in April 1945. For a short period, he was also the chief editor of the weekly edition of *Krakivski Visti* until it received its own editorial staff and became essentially a separate newspaper though with the same title.

Three features distinguished Khomiak from Levytskyi. First, he knew well the business of running a daily, especially the purely technical, production aspects. Second, he was not a member of any Ukrainian political party or organization. Third, he was not an intellectual which perhaps made him an ideal candidate for the position of chief editor at a legal newspaper published under German

[122] PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 1, Item 20.
[123] Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Arkadii Zhukovskyi December 30, 1980. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 172.

occupation during World War II. The editorial archive of *Krakivski Visti* fails to show Khomiak's intellectual imprint (if there was any) on the newspaper. People who knew Khomiak fairly well – such as Kubijovyč and Kedryn – never wrote about him in intellectual terms.[124] Ukrainian historian Ivan L. Rudnytsky who met Khomiak in February 1940 described him to Osyp Nazaruk as "a good guy, but completely without his own individuality."[125] Khomiak's widow, Alexandra Khomiak (1915-2005), in an interview to John-Paul Himka in 1999 described her husband as more of a courier between German censorship and editorial office, rather than a real editor during his work at *Krakivski Visti*.[126]

It is worth noting that through all his time at *Krakivski Visti* Khomiak, it seems, had written only one article for the newspaper.[127] His private correspondence during and after the war reveals him as a man of simple, unsophisticated views who perceived much (if not all) of surrounding reality through the lenses of ethnic politics. After immigrating to Canada in 1948, he, like many Ukrainian emigres, continued to live in the past. He worried about preparing a documentary collection exposing interwar Poland's anti-Ukrainian policies (he never progressed beyond planning it) and feared that his daughters

---

[124] Besides Kedryn's and Kubijovyč's memoirs see their correspondence with Khomiak in PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 177 (Kedryn) and Item 184 (Kubijovyč).

[125] Letter from Ivan Rudnytskyi to Osyp Nazaruk, February 9, 1940. Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv (TsDIAL of Ukraine), f. 359, op. 1, spr. 309, ark. 5-5 (zv.). I am grateful to Larysa Holovata for helping me to locate the letter.

[126] John-Paul Himka, Email to author, November 18, 2015.

[127] Khomiak's last name is mentioned in the honorarium list for April-May 1941. See: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 32. However, none of the articles in *Krakivski Visti* for April-May 1941 are signed with his name or initials.

would not marry ethnic Ukrainians (two of them indeed married non-Ukrainians).[128] The danger of mixed, interethnic marriages for the Ukrainian nation was one of the important themes in *Krakivski Visti* (see chapter 3). My impression from reading his postwar correspondence is that Khomiak belonged to those in the Ukrainian diaspora who were taken out of interwar Galicia but never took interwar Galicia out of themselves.[129]

Khomiak's primary concern in running the newspaper was to establish a good connection with the German censorship. He was successful in this endeavor. Later Kubijovyč wrote that Khomiak had a useful ability "to sense how and what could be written under the strict German reality, and he gained some trust among the German officials, without which his [editorial] work would have been impossible."[130] This appraisal seems genuine: after the war, in 1946, Khomiak willingly testified in favor of the press chief Gassner, describing him as reasonable and helpful individual, who helped Ukrainian and Polish journalists in their troubles with the Gestapo.[131] Nonetheless, both Khomiak and Kubijovyč complained about the heavy German censorship after the war. Kubijovyč, who also highly regarded Gassner for his "good understanding of Ukrainian issues,"

---

[128] About Khomiak's plans for the documentary collection see: Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Ivan Kedryn, January 29, 1976. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 177. On his daughters and fears of mixed marriages see: Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Mykhailo Ostroverkha, November 20, 1968. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 13, Item 204; Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Kost Pankivskyi, November 30, 1966. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 13, Item 208; Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Sofiia Parfanovych, January 24, 1968. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 13, Item 209.
[129] Most of the postwar correspondence is located at: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12 and 13.
[130] Kubijovyč, *Ukraintsi v Heneralnii Hubernii*, 277.
[131] See Khomiak's "Eidesstattliche Erklärung" (1946) on Emil Gassner in: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 1, Item 3.

wrote in his history of the Ukrainian Central Committee that Gassner did not hesitate to ban a text from publication in *Krakivski Visti* even on suspicion of a hidden message.[132]

However, the most serious threat to Khomiak's position came not from the occupation authorities, but from within. In November 1940 he came into serious conflict with the head of "Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo" Ivan Kotsur (1895-1971). Kotsur was a man of military background, a veteran of the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen and the Ukrainian Galician Army. He was good at following orders but knew nothing about running a publishing house and even less about business of a daily newspaper. Kotsur disliked the fact that Khomiak was insubordinate and would often go over him directly to Kubijovyč to solve newspaper matters. In return, Khomiak disliked Kotsur's attempts to control and micro-manage him and saw it as a sign of personal distrust. Kotsur demanded strict accountability and paper trail for any editorial decision even if it concerned just an article. Eventually, he ordered Khomiak to give him in advance daily reports on every issue of *Krakivski Visti* with summaries of important articles. Khomiak responded that such a system was incompatible with running a daily – if he was to comply with these demands he would have no time to manage the newspaper. Khomiak's disobedience enflamed Kotsur even more and Kubijovyč had to intervene.[133]

---

[132] Kubijovyč, *Ukraintsi v Heneralnii Hubernii*, 273.
[133] See letters between Kotsur and Khomiak in November 1940 – April 1941: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 28.

Kubijovyč resolved this long-lasting conflict in May 1941 by appointing Vasyl Mudryi (1893-1966) as de facto chief editor of the newspaper. [134] Khomiak was to keep his title and salary but was limited only to overseeing technical aspects of the newspaper's publishing. But in the end, Khomiak came out victorious from this episode of office politics. At first, for reasons unclear Kotsur resigned from "Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo" and was replaced by a known Ukrainian linguist Ivan Zilynskyi (1879-1952), then Mudryi (also, for reasons unclear) just after three weeks being the chief editor quit the newspaper and Khomiak was back in his old job.[135] Khomiak had no issues in working with Zilynskyi. Kubijovyč and Khomiak never mentioned this episode in their personal postwar correspondence (it lasted until the early 1980s) and the former made no mention of this conflict neither in his memoirs nor in his history of the Ukrainian Central Committee.

The editorial staff of *Krakivski Visti* suffered from a rapid turnover of personnel throughout the war. Many editors quit the newspaper after working months, some – even after mere weeks. After the move to Vienna and till its last issue the newspaper had nine editors (including Khomiak). The majority of the editors were little known figures at the time. In chronological order of beginning of their employment they were Ivan Durbak, Vasyl Kachmar, Vasyl Ryvak, Lev Lepkyi, Roman Holian, Marian Kozak, Petro Sahaidachnyi, Ivan Kedryn, Ivan Nimchuk, Bohdan Nyzhankivskyi, Ostap Tarnavskyi, Mykola Tvorydlo, Fedir

[134] Mudryi was the chief editor of *Dilo* in 1927-1935 and leader of the UNDO in 1935-1939.
[135] Himka, "*Krakivs'ki visti*: An Overview," 255.

Dudtko, Bohdan Halaichuk, Oleksandr Mokh, Vitalii Levytskyi, Ia. Zaremba, Ihor Shkrumeliak, Kost Kuzyk, Fedir Kovshyk, Damian Horniatkevych, Denys Savaryn, Borys Kriukov, V. Chaikivskyi, Bohdan Hoshovskyi, Sviatoslav Hordynskyi, Omelian Masikevych, Mstyslav Dolnytskyi.[136]

Besides Khomiak one of the longest serving editor was Marian Kozak, who worked at the newspaper from November 1, 1940 till August 4, 1944. It was Kozak who managed intellectual aspects of the newspaper primarily, at least the editorial archive inclines the reader towards this impression. Most of the correspondence with authors about the content of their pieces was handled by Kozak. Very little is known of him. Before the war Kozak was a sympathizer of the Hetmanate movement, studied and wrote about Lypynskyi,[137] and was fascinated (like many others from the interwar Ukrainian intelligentsia) with the works of Oswald Spengler, especially his *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*. During the war Kozak, like many educated Ukrainians, hastily started to learn English, presumably either to read the Allied press or to listen to their radio broadcasts. Unlike Khomiak Kozak wrote for *Krakivski Visti* – most of its editorials were written by him – and some of his articles like one on the ghettoization threat to Ukrainian culture make for an interesting reading even today.[138] With the approach of the Red Army in summer 1944, Kozak like thousands of others was preparing for a major life change. In his

[136] Established on the basis of: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.
[137] Marian Kozak, "Z zhyttia i dialnosti Viacheslava Lypysnkoho," *Dzvony* no. 6 (1932): 420-428; Marian Kozak, "Za zrozuminnia ukrainskoi diisnosty. V 13-ti rokovyny smerty Viacheslava Lypynskoho (14 chervnia 1931 r.)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 128 (1161) June 15, 1944, 3.
[138] Marian Kozak, "Kulturne getto: sproba analizy," *Iliustrovani Visti* no. 5 1941, 9-11.

notes about *Krakivski Visti* Khomiak dryly wrote that Kozak "departed" from his job on August 4th.[139] Kubijovyč was more expressive and implied that Kozak became a national renegade and stayed in post-war Poland: "You were asking me about the fate of Kozak. In summer of 1944 he left the editorial staff of «KRAKIVSKI VISTI», severed [contacts] with Ukrainians and stayed among Poles in Cracow. It is a pity, because he was a talented and smart man, but a coward in life."[140]

After the German invasion of the Soviet Union and creation of the district Galicia "Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo" kept its headquarters in Cracow but also created a large branch in Lviv, center of the new district. *Krakivski Visti* soon followed suit and also created its own editorial branch in Lviv. Ivan Nimchuk (1891-1956), the last chief editor (1935-1939) of *Dilo*, became head of the branch and ran it until the end of its existence in 1944. Besides him, Bohdan Nyzhankivskyi, Ostap Tarnavskyi, Mykola Shlemkevych and Roman Kupchynskyi (all – prominent figures of Galician Ukrainian cultural scene) worked at the branch.[141]

Contributors

The factor that influenced the quantity and availability of contributors to *Krakivski Visti* the most was the war. In this regard the history of the newspaper

[139] PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.
[140] Letter from Volodymyr Kubijovyč to Ivan L. Rudnytsky, September 23, 1960. UAA, Rudnytsky papers, Box 50, Item 768.
[141] PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.

again can be divided into four periods. In the first, from January 1940 to June 1941, the pool of potential authors was limited to those who lived on the territory of the future General Government before the war started and those who managed to evacuate or escape from the Soviet zone of occupation by early 1940 when the Soviets made the German-Soviet border too dangerous to cross. During this period many contributors, though they were available and willing to write, were afraid to work with the legal press in the General Government fearing that their texts might endanger their relatives in Galicia under Soviet rule. Ironically, during this period *Krakivski Visti* was barred by the Germans from publishing any anti-Soviet or anti-Russian materials. In the second period, from June 1941 to summer 1943, the newspaper received a significant boost of contributors both in terms of quantity and quality due to the German occupation of Galicia and its subsequent incorporation into the General Government.

The third period, from summer 1943 till October 1944, saw another boost as many *skhidniaky* (literally "Easterners," but in this and other cases it meant non-Western Ukrainians) arrived from the *Reichskommissariat* Ukraine fleeing the advancing Red Army. Among the arrivals were people regarded as the leading Ukrainian intellectual and cultural figures of the 20th Century. Galicians, many of whom believed that the purges of the 1930s erased most of the Soviet Ukrainian intelligentsia, were amazed by the new arrivals. Mariia Strutynska, a journalist working for *Lvivski Visti*, asked in her diary on November 7, 1943 how could it be possible that the Soviet Ukraine after "all Bolshevik purges and deportations" still

had so many "worthy people." "And they were so different! Reserved, very European, with a note of self-irony Shevelov, dynamic Bahrianyi, purebred [rasova] Kovalenko, Humenna, who resembles a Kalmyk: she has quite a character! Modest, with smart eyes Hr. Kostiuk"[142] – all of them became contributors to *Krakivski Visti* which now could claim an all-Ukrainian character thanks to them. In the fourth period, from October 1944 till April 1945, the newspaper lost up to two thirds of its pre-evacuation contributors due to relocation to Vienna. Its content suffered immensely from this loss and the newspaper lost much of the intellectual and cultural character it had managed to acquire before the evacuation. During 1940-1944 besides authors from within the General Government *Krakivski Visti* always had a number of contributors from the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia and Germany proper but they were a minor group and for the most of its content the newspaper always relied on "internal" contributors. *Krakivski Visti* never had any authors who were residents of the *Reichskommissariat* Ukraine.

Besides a basic human need to express themselves (somewhat more intense among intellectuals) there were at least three more specific reasons to write for *Krakivski Visti*. The first, and perhaps the most important was the severe narrowing of the public scene by the occupational authorities. In 1940-1941 *Krakivski Visti* was the only major Ukrainian-language publication in the General Government. The

[142] Strutynska, *Daleke zblyzka*, 191.

situation slightly improved after June 1941 when the Germans created *Lvivski Visti* (Lviv News), which became the second largest Ukrainian legal newspaper under the occupation, and allowed for *Nashi dni* (Our days), the only journal (though a thin one) in Ukrainian. There was a weak underground Ukrainian press run by the Banderites – it was intellectually primitive in its discourse, poorly circulated, paid nothing and could result in a very unpleasant time with the Gestapo.[143] Thus for anyone living in the General Government in 1940-1944 and looking for a printed organ to express him/herself in Ukrainian *Krakivski Visti* became often the first and only consideration.

The second reason was income. Many Ukrainian literati found themselves in precarious situations under the occupation. Germans closed not only the majority of newspapers and journals, but also a number of institutions where intellectuals could have found employment before the occupation. While the Soviets were Ukrainianizing Lviv University in 1939-40 Germans at the same time were liquidating universities in their zone (and killing their Polish professors). The occupational society was restructured by the Germans in such a way that sooner or later anyone from the educated class had to face the possibility of either working (directly or indirectly) for the Germans or simply starve. As Ukrainian journalist Ivan Kedryn (who lived in Cracow in 1940-1944) wrote in his memoirs "it is no surprise that under such exceptionally difficult […] conditions [of the occupation]

[143] On the underground press see: Oleksandra Stasiuk, *Vydavnycho-propahadyvna diialnist OUN (1941-1953 rr.)* (Lviv: Tsentr doslidzhen vyzvolnoho rukhu, Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 2006).

people sought ways to survive better. You cannot demand from everyone to be heroes and have steel characters."[144] For an absolute majority of Ukrainian intellectuals this translated into working either for German civil or military administration.

There was also an element of Germanophilia, especially at the beginning, in that Germans had never experienced a lack of Ukrainians seeking administrative work, but in the end the decisive factor was the occupational economy. Writing for the legal press in this situation would not be enough for a living income (with some exceptions), but nonetheless it was an income. The same Kedryn, despite his dislike of Nazi propaganda (Kedryn was half-Jewish), had to seek in his own words "additional income" and decided to write for *Krakivski Visti* "partly due to [financial] necessity, partly due to a real desire [to write]."[145] The newspaper paid relatively well, on average 15 zloty for an article in 1940 (due to inflation it rose to 100 zloty in 1943).[146] This was also one of the reasons why Ukrainian authors from the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia were looking to write for *Krakivski Visti* – their legal Ukrainian press paid less.

The third reason was identification. The occupied learned quick enough that under German rule having an ID and even more having a certain kind of ID could make a crucial difference in life (and in death). For example, freedom of

[144] Ivan Kedryn, *Zhyttia – podii – liudy. Spomyny i komentari* (New York: Chervona Kalyna, 1976), 360.
[145] Kedryn, *Zhyttia – podii – liudy*, 349.
[146] See honoraria in: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 32.

movement was severely restricted under German occupation, especially by train – an ID of a correspondent could be used to alleviate most of these difficulties. *Krakivski Visti* was bombarded by unknown Ukrainians from all over the Nazi New Europe claiming to be brilliant writers, journalists and scholars who wanted to become the newspaper's correspondents, which of course would lead to their accreditation through either the Ministry of Propaganda and Public Enlightenment in Berlin or the respective occupational authorities. Some of these ID seekers did not even hide their motives. A certain Vasyl Veresh-Sirmiansky from Slovakia was begging Khomiak to issue him a correspondent ID, promising in return to write for free "about political and cultural life of Slovakia and its Ukrainian emigration."[147]

Despite external factors of occupation and censorship, editors of *Krakivski Visti* also had other difficulties with their contributors. A significant problem plaguing the existence of the newspaper throughout its whole history was that some authors intentionally put little effort into writing their texts, considering them as "acceptable" or "good enough" for the newspaper. At least one author did not even conceal that she was simply going to produce compilations from German publications. Olena Kysilevska, a contributor to the rubric "Zhinocha storinka" (Women's Page) in *Krakivski Visti*, openly wrote to Khomiak that she was going to write for the rubric on the basis of two German women journals to which she

[147] Letter from Vasyl Veresh-Sirmiansky to Mykhailo Khomiak December 9, 1942. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 31.

subscribed.[148] Apparently Khomiak had to accept her offer, because Kysilevska became one of the most prolific authors of the newspaper, writing mostly about women issues and general hygiene.

In their turn, the authors' constant complaint was lack of response or belated response from the editors. The editorial staff was never large enough to read all the received correspondence not to mention replying to it. This led to a curious effect as some reacted with writing even more letters to editors. A certain Oleksandr Honta-Skrypchenko wrote to Khomiak criticizing the newspaper for not writing about … him.[149] Presumably Khomiak ignored his letter because eleven months later Honta-Skrypchenko wrote again asking the same question.[150] A certain Oleksandr Nedilko, after his letters got ignored, wrote to Khomiak again with a whole treatise on ethics of correspondence (based on German culture) scolding the chief editor for the lack of any.[151]

Another main issue many contributors had with *Krakivski Visti* was a systemic one, specifically the nature of the organ. For many of them this was their first (and often negative) experience of writing for a daily. As scholars and writers who usually wrote for thick journals they were used to a different mode of

[148] Letter from Olena Kysilevska to Mykhailo Khomiak July 20, 1940. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 3, Item 33.
[149] Letter from Olesksander Honta-Skrypchenko to Mykhailo Khomiak January 4, 1940. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 3, Item 33. The date on the letter – January 4 – must be a mistake since the first issue of *Krakivski Visti* appeared on January 7, 1940.
[150] Letter from Olesksander Honta-Skrypchenko to Mykhailo Khomiak November 5, 1940. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 3, Item 33.
[151] Letter from Oleksandr Nedilko to Mykhailo Khomiak January 26, 1941. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 3, Item 34.

operation – sending texts in, corresponding on their content, receiving galleys and finally submitting the end product. Daily newspapers do not operate like that and many authors were displeased with how their texts appeared in the newspaper. Usually they were hastily edited, which frequently led to factual errors and poor style. Ukrainian historian Myron Korduba complained to Khomiak that his article in the newspaper was edited so poorly and appeared with so many errors that he felt his reputation as a scholar was tarnished.[152] Such complaints quickly became routine in correspondence received by the editors and lasted until the newspaper's demise.

Reception

The reception of *Krakivski Visti* throughout the war was mostly a negative one. The majority of its readers compared the newspaper unfavorably either to the pre-war Ukrainian press (*Dilo* in most cases) or to the current German-language press such as *Krakauer Zeitung*, which the occupation authorities published for Germans in the General Government. Most criticisms were expressed privately, in letters and diaries. Milena Rudnytska described the first issues of the newspaper as "very miserable" in her letter to Osyp Nazaruk from January 12, 1940.[153] Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytskyi in his meeting with a certain "Dr. Frédéric" (most likely it was the French historian and journalist René Martel) in September

[152] Letter from Myron Korduba to Mykhailo Khomiak June 22, 1940. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 3, Item 33.
[153] Milena Rudnytska, *Statti, Lysty, Dokumenty* (Lviv: Misioner,1998), 592.

1943 was more descriptive, giving his opinion on the whole Ukrainian legal press in the General Government: "Our newspapers are German [newspapers], translated into Ukrainian. They write about Southern America, about Paraguay, about Australia, [but] this does not interest our peasants, one cannot find in them anything about our provincial life, and only topics about the latter would be of interest to the average [Ukrainian] reader."[154] The metropolitan told "Dr. Frédéric" that he would like the Ukrainian press in the General Government to be more like the current "French newspapers, edited by French for French, having clear European direction, but with national framing."[155]

Another important cleric critical of *Krakivski Visti* was Ilarion (secular name Ivan Ohienko), the Orthodox Archbishop of Chełm and Podlasie regions. The Archbishop believed that the Ukrainian Central Committee and Kubijovyč personally were biased in favor of Greek Catholicism and hostile to the Ukrainian Orthodox faith and church. Ilarion complained in his letters to Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytskyi that his church had not been allowed to receive the Orthodox press, but the region in his ecclesiastical jurisdiction, Chełm, had been "flooded" by the "Greek-Catholic" *Krakivski Visti*, which "stubbornly" failed to report about his region, its Orthodox church and hierarchy. But at the same time *Krakivski Visti* was writing at lengths about "Greek-Catholic" hierarchs and their activities. This

[154] Liliana Hentosh, "Pro stavlennia mytropolyta Sheptytskoho do nimetskoho okupatsiinoho rezhymu v kontektsi dokumenta z kantseliarii Alfreda Rozenberga," *Ukraina Moderna* no. 20 (2013): 311.
[155] Hentosh, "Pro stavlennia mytropolyta Sheptytskoho," 311.

whole situation of under-representation, wrote Ilarion, could lead to "very bitter thoughts" about Greek Catholics among Orthodox intelligentsia of Chełm region.[156]

Besides these critical opinions expressed in private exchanges, there was no lack of criticisms of *Krakivski Visti* addressed to Khomiak and Kubijovyč directly. Though those letters did not point any fingers, nonetheless they provided an unnerving critique. Hennadii Kotorovych, Ukrainian journalist and contributor to *Krakivski Visti*, was writing somewhat diplomatically to Khomiak in November 1940 that the first issues of the newspaper made a very poor impression on the Ukrainian colony in Berlin.[157] Another journalist and contributor, Anatol Kurdydyk, writing to Khomiak in May 1941, was blunter and harshly characterized *Krakivski Visti* as an intellectually underperforming publication considering the role it should have been playing in Ukrainian national life as the main Ukrainian newspaper of the General Government.[158] Khomiak was apologetic in his replies but never gave a convincing answer to these letters. Eventually this critique from the newspaper's own correspondents came to

---

[156] See two letters from Ilarion to Andrei – from January 20, 1942 and from November 17, 1942 – in the special issue of journal *Pamiatky*: *Pamiatky* no. 2: Epistoliarna spadshchyna Ivana Ohiienka (mytropolyta Ilariona) (1907-1968) (2001): 300, 307. Ironically, almost a year before the first letter the newspaper felt a need to publish an editorial explaining why it had been writing so much about the Orthodox Church but so little about the Greek Catholic Church in the General Government: "Chomu pro odnykh bahato – pro druhykh malo?" *Krakivski Visti* no. 21 (177) February 1, 1941, 1-2.

[157] Letter from Hennadii Kotorovych to Mykhailo Khomiak, November 13, 1940. PAA, Chomiak papers, Box 3, Item 33.

[158] Letter from Anatol Kurdydyk to Mykhailo Khomiak, May 18, 1941. PAA, Chomiak papers, Box 3, Item 34.

Kubijovyč's attention. Rather than downplay these criticisms or reject them, he fully acknowledged their validity. On August 8, 1941 he issued an internal memorandum for the UCC staff with the following statement: "*Krakivski Visti* has received various wishes [of change] from everywhere. These reproaches are more or less justified. But the correspondents need to realize existing conditions. Thus, our only periodical on this side of the [river] San needs to be valued and not undermined."[159]

The newspaper was also criticized publicly. Strangely enough, the leading source of public criticisms was the Ukrainian legal press of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. For example, the Ukrainian journal *Proboiem* in its November 1941 issue published an anonymous letter "Odvertyi lyst do ukrainskykh pysmennykiv" (An open letter to Ukrainian writers).[160] Its author, hiding behind the pseudonym "Ukrainian writer," called people working at "Ukrainske Vydavnystvo" and *Krakivski Visti* Galician "parvenus" who imagine themselves "giants."[161] *Krakivski Visti*, the letter claimed, has been playing a destructive role in Ukrainian national life and was continuously engaged in a campaign of "self-spitting, self-shaming, self-abasement." Its short feuilletons were "stupid" and its editorials were nothing but "disparagement" of Ukrainians,

[159] Holovata, *Ukrainskyi legalnyi vydavnychyi rukh*, 314. The newspaper also addressed criticisms in an editorial: "Gazeta prosyt u Chytachiv zrozuminnia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 71 (227) April 2, 1941, 1-2.
[160] Ukr. pysmennyk, "Odvertyi lyst do ukrainskykh pysmennykiv," *Proboiem* 8, no. 11 (November 1941): 658-662.
[161] Ukr. pysmennyk, "Odvertyi lyst do ukrainskykh pysmennykiv," 659.

according to this letter. Judging from its language the piece most likely was written by a Ukrainian émigré, not a Galician Ukrainian.[162]

Another example of public criticism coming from the Ukrainian legal press of the Protectorate was an attack on *Krakivski Visti* and Khomiak personally by the known historian and Galician Ukrainian, Mykola Andrusiak, who wrote that he could understand degradation of the Ukrainian press in the General Government because of the wartime conditions, but in the case of *Krakivski Visti* he assigned full blame for the newspaper's poor quality on its chief editor Mykhailo Khomiak, turning his piece into an ad hominem attack. Khomiak, wrote Andrusiak, is a "khlopchyk-terminator" who simply should not have been in charge of anything let alone a major Ukrainian newspaper. "Khlopchyk" (little boy) could allude to either Khomiak's inexperience or his height (159 cm) or both. "Terminator" has no relation to the killer robots of Canadian filmmaker James Cameron. In pre-war Galicia the term meant "apprentice," usually of master artisans. Khomiak ignored the anonymous letter, but in response to Andrusiak's article he wrote a piece, which in tone was very similar and full of ad hominem attacks against Andrusiak accusing him of national disloyalty and servility towards the interwar Polish regime. In that time and place this was not a light accusation.[163]

But while Galicians and Ukrainian émigrés compared *Krakivski Visti* to their pre-war press, *skhidniaky* (non-Western Ukrainians) had a different scale of

[162] Ukr. pysmennyk, "Odvertyi lyst do ukrainskykh pysmennykiv," 660.
[163] Andrusiak's criticisms are quoted from Khomiak's unpublished response: PAA, Chomiak papers, Box 2, Item 29.

reference. Iurii Shevelov, before his arrival into the General Government just two months before Sheptystkyi's meeting with his French visitor, had read only Soviet and legal Ukrainian newspapers of the *Reichskommissariat* Ukraine. Upon arrival he devoured local newspapers and formed a remarkably different impression about the Ukrainian legal press in the General Government. He found *Lvivski Visti* a "factually German organ" and as much *pustoporozhni* (literally "double empty") as legal newspapers in the *Reichskommissariat*, though slightly more liberal since German rule in the General Government was a bit more liberal than in the *Reichskommissariat*.

Krakivski Visti had made upon him a much more favorable impression: "[the newspaper] was edited by Mykhailo Khomiak. I have never met him in person. The newspaper was in Ukrainian hands. It gave general information from German sources, [but] its Ukrainian material was honest, though completely not suitable for a newspaper and entirely accidental … The newspaper could not become a center attracting intellectual forces (and, perhaps, did not even want to) because it was based in Cracow and even more importantly due to its general objectively-indifferent character."[164] After reading the Soviet press for two decades Shevelov's main criticism of *Krakivski Visti* was its uncontemporary character reflected in its "long articles, often with continuation in subsequent issues, many of them had scholarly value, but they were far from [current] problems, lively

[164] Iurii Shevelov, *Ia – mene – meni – i dovkruhy* vol. 1 (Kharkiv: Vydannia chasopysu "Berezil," 2001), 368.

discussion and painful [questions]. Quite often these articles were typical *prychynky* – an old Galician word, describing publications reflecting reality factually, but without any living thought behind them."[165]

Reception of the newspaper changed drastically soon after the war. People now saw in it less of polluting Nazi influence and more of survival of Ukrainian thought and culture. As early as 1947 Khomiak started to receive praises and requests for borrowing issues of *Krakivski Visti*.[166] With time these requests, which continued till the end of Khomiak's life, only multiplied. Ironically, the war had to end for people to appreciate him and his work as the chief editor.

Conclusions

One of the major results of the German occupation of Poland in September 1939 was the creation of the General Government, a German colony that until the end of the war was headed by a prominent Nazi figure Hans Frank, who developed a set of policies which exploited and furthered pre-existing ethnic tensions in his domain between Jews, Poles and Ukrainians, favoring the latter. Each of the three ethnic communities came to be represented vis-à-vis the occupational authorities by umbrella organizations with headquarters in Cracow. In the case of Ukrainians, it was the Ukrainian Central Committee led through the war by the prominent Ukrainian geographer Volodymyr Kubijovyč. Melnyk's

[165] Shevelov, *Ia – mene – meni – i dovkruhy* vol. 1, 368.
[166] See for example the letter from Stepan Baran to Mykhailo Khomiak November 20, 1947. PAA, Chomiak papers, Box 1, Item 9.

faction of the OUN played an important role both in founding and functioning of the Committee. Though Kubijovyč was not a member of the faction or any other political organization, he was a Ukrainian nationalist who sought to elevate Ukrainians as a nation within legal boundaries set by the occupational authorities. Kubijovyč and people like him were situational, not ideological, collaborators: they worked with and for their German occupiers primarily because of the situation over which they had no control (war and invasion) and not because of some ideological sympathies towards National Socialism.

One of the points of Kubijovyč's national program was to have a strong pro-Ukrainian newspaper. Its goal was to replace the daily *Dilo* which closed down with the Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine in September 1939. The first issue of the new newspaper, which received the name *Krakivski Visti* and was a semi-official organ of the UCC until the end of the war, appeared on January 7, 1940. From November 1, 1940 it was issued as a daily and continued in this format until the very last, 1406th issue on April 4, 1945 (the last five issues appeared under the name *Ukrainskyi shliakh*). A weekly edition of the newspaper was also published from November 1940 until October 1944. With the exception of the first month the chief editor of the daily edition was a former *Dilo* editor, a lawyer by education, Mykhailo Khomiak.

The three major blocks of content in *Krakivski Visti* were war, politics and culture. In regard to the first two the newspaper, like any other legal newspaper under German occupation, had to reflect Nazi views, most prominently

antisemitism and anticommunism. But with the third block the newspaper always enjoyed a considerable degree of freedom. From June 1941 up until October 1944 *Krakivski Visti* was able to attract contributions from the most prominent Ukrainian intellectuals and cultural figures. Due to the advance of the Red Army the newspaper was transferred to Vienna in October 1944. This move proved to be detrimental for *Krakivski Visti* as it lost two thirds of its authors. Throughout the war its reputation was rather negative due to lower intellectual and production quality compared with *Dilo*, but after the war it became valued as an important source for studying of Ukrainian history during the war.

Chapter II

A School of Hate: Images of Poles, Russians/Soviets and Jews in *Krakivski Visti*.

After conquering Poland, the first ideological campaign of the German occupational authorities was directed at the defeated state. It had to be portrayed as unjust, corrupt and ineffective. The campaign's main goal was to present the Polish state as unviable and artificial creation of the Versailles system and to frame the German occupation as a natural course of history. Propaganda is most effective when it taps into reality. What made the Nazi propaganda so powerful and insidious is that it always included a portion of truth and in this case, as it happened, the Polish interwar state was indeed quite unjust, corrupt and ineffective. Its policy of aggressive assimilation of minorities (Belarusians, Germans, Lithuanians and Ukrainians) or squeezing them out of the country (Jews) made real loyalty (not public declarations of it) to the state a rare occurrence among these national groups by the end of the 1930s.

The Ukrainian case was somewhat special as from their point of view they were the only minority in Poland who lost their statehood – the short-lived Western Ukrainian People's Republic (WURP) of November 1918 – July 1919 – because of the reborn Polish state which with the Western (mainly French) help

won the war against the WURP.[167] Most Ukrainian memoirs describe their experience of living under the interwar Polish regime as that of second-class citizens, especially after the Polish "pacification" of Galicia in 1930.[168] One of childhood memories that Lev Bilas carried through his life was how a Polish policeman humiliated his aunt when she dared to ask him in Ukrainian for directions in Lviv in the 1930s: the policeman took offense at the very language he was asked the question. Bilas responded to this incident by singing loudly "haidamak" songs, that celebrated anti-Polish Ukrainian rebels from the 18th century, in the presence of his Polish neighbors.[169] The anti-Polish feelings were the strongest among the Galician Ukrainian youth: "all of us truly hated the Polish regime" wrote Roman Volchuk (1922-2014) in his memoirs.[170] It is worth noting that neither Bilas nor Volchuk were members of the OUN.

By the end of the 1930s the Polish-Ukrainian relations had become deeply antagonistic. The mere assertion of the Ukrainian national identity was viewed with suspicion of disloyalty to the Polish state, who came to consider its Ukrainian

---

[167] For a history of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic see: Vasyl Kuchabsky, *Western Ukraine in conflict with Poland and Bolshevism, 1918-1923* (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2009). Though the book originally appeared in German in 1934 and its factual material is somewhat outdated it remains one of the best works on the subject. Another important history of the WURP is: Torsten Wehrhahn, *Die Westukrainische Volksrepublik: zu den polnisch-ukrainischen Beziehungen und dem Problem der ukrainischen Staatlichkeit in den Jahren 1918 bis 1923* (Berlin: Weissensee, 2004.).

[168] About the "pacification" see: Roman Skakun, *"Patsyfikatsiia": polski represii 1930 roku v Halychyni* (Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Ukrainskoho katolytskoho universytetu, 2012).

[169] Bilas, *Ohliadaiuchys nazad*, 18-19.

[170] Roman Volchuk, *Spomyny z peredvoiennoho Lvova ta voiennoho Vidnia* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2002), 35.

minority as a security risk for its rule over Galicia and Volyn.[171] The state dealt with this risk in the 1930s through measures of assimilation, denationalization and limitation of civil rights aimed at Ukrainians. Even the legal Ukrainian politicians, members of UNDO, who tried to find a modus vivendi with the Polish state in the early 1930s admitted after 1939 that their attempts to normalize the relations had failed.[172] Violence in the relations and perception of the relations through violence became a norm. The feelings of antagonism were powerful enough to reach even Ukrainian folk culture: a Ukrainian Christmas carol celebrated Myroslav Sichynskyi, the Ukrainian student who assassinated Polish count Andrzej Potocki, the Habsburg viceroy of Galicia, in 1908 for the fact that his victim was a Pole.[173]

By the end of the 1930s conflicts between Poles and Ukrainians were routinely assumed to be ethnic conflicts. Bilas wrote in his memoirs about a horrible murder outside his hometown of Truskavets in August 1939. Five Ukrainian peasants were murdered and their bodies showed signs of torture and mutilation. There was no evidence who killed them or why but for Bilas there was no doubt that it was a hate crime committed by Poles.[174] In March 1939 the Polish state secretly murdered several hundred of its own citizens, Galician Ukrainians,

---

[171] For the opposite view, arguing that the ethnic conflict between Poles and Ukrainian was minimal in Ukrainian Galicia, see: K. K. Fedevych, *Halytski ukraintsi u Polshchi. 1920 – 1939 rr. (Intehratsiia halytskykh ukraintsiv do Polskoi derzhavy u 1920 – 1930-ti rr.)* (Kyiv: Osnova, 2009).
[172] "Bilians ukrainskoi polityky za chas viiny," 2. UAA, Rudnytsky papers. Box 36, Item 513.
[173] See memoirs of the Galician lawyer and OUN judge: Volodymyr Horbovyi, *Pohoda sovisti* http://avr.org.ua/index.php/viewDoc/22336/ The carol went "Sichynskyi shoots, Potocki falls, miracle, miracle greets us."
[174] Bilas, *Ohliadaiuchys nazad*, 64.

who were returning to Poland after the Hungarian occupation of Carpatho-Ukraine, where they had served in the local self-defense force "Carpathian Sich." The executions took place at the Polish-Hungarian border where the Hungarian forces handled over the captured *sichovyky* (members of the "Carpathian Sich") to the Polish side.[175]

During the German-Polish war in September 1939 the Polish state authority disintegrated in the countryside. As a result, it witnessed cases of violence between retreating Polish units and Ukrainian peasants. In some cases, the perpetrators were the Polish soldiers who destroyed property and murdered individual peasants, in other cases Polish soldiers were the victims as their stranded and disoriented units were robbed of weapons and occasionally killed by Ukrainian peasants.[176] When German occupiers arrived in this environment after September 1939 they did not have to plant seeds of ethnic hatred between Ukrainians and Poles. That tree had been growing for at least a decade. The Polish government-in-exile continued to have a strong anti-Ukrainian bias and regarded its Ukrainian subjects at best as disloyal and at worst as hostile.[177]

---

[175] Oleksandr Pahiria, "Polska storinka teroru v Karpatskii Ukraini (1938-1939 rokiv)," in *Ukrainophobia iak iavyshche ta polittekhnolohiia*, ed. Ia. Harasym et al. Vyp. 1 (Lviv, 2014), 34-59.

[176] I. I. Iliushyn, *OUN-UPA i ukrainske pytannia v roky Druhoi svitovoi viiny (v svitli poskykh dokumentiv)* (Kyiv: Instytut Istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2000), 15-16.

[177] Anti-Ukrainian sentiment dominated Polish émigré officials as evident from various memoranda on the Ukrainian question they submitted to the Polish government-in-exile. The majority of them called not for abandoning the prewar policies – denationalization, assimilation and limitation in civic rights – against Ukrainians in Poland, but for their strengthening. One memo even debated the very name "Ukrainian" and argued for its suppression, and the most radical memo offered to solve the Ukrainian question once and for all through a program of forcible resettlement of all Ukrainians into "Soviet Russia" after victory over the Nazi Germany. See: Iliushyn, *OUN-UPA i ukrainske pytannia*, 144, 159, 194.

When *Krakivski Visti* started in January 1940 it received strong encouragement from the occupational authorities to pursue Polish-Ukrainian relations or any other Polish topics as long as their depiction would cast a negative light on the defeated state and nation. In seeking potential authors for articles on these subjects on January 28, 1940 Khomiak wrote to one of the most renowned Ukrainian journalists of the time, Osyp Nazaruk (1883-1940), who similarly to thousands of other Galician Ukrainians fled into the German-occupied part of Poland from the advancing Red Army in September 1939 and ended up eventually in Cracow. Nazaruk was a conservative and clerical journalist, famous in Ukrainian circles for his literary talent and eccentric views.[178]

Khomiak asked Nazaruk to write a series of articles on "what was the main reason for decline of Poland," paying principal attention to "the whole politics of the [former] Polish government against our [Ukrainian] people in the past 20 years." The series had to showcase what lessons Ukrainians could draw from the experience of the second Polish Republic. On the one hand Khomiak expected Nazaruk to show "how we have to act in establishing our state in the near future," that is how in the aftermath of World War I Poland had succeeded in gaining independence while Western Ukraine failed. On the other hand, Nazaruk was to show how "not to undermine our own state from within and push our nation to a

[178] Ivan L. Rudnytsky's article on history of friendship and conflict between Lypynskyi and Nazaruk still provides the best biography of the latter: Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, "Nazaruk i Lypynskyi: istoriia iikhnioi druzhby ta konfliktu" in *Lysty Osypa Nazaruka do Viacheslava Lypynskoho*, ed. Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytskyi (Philadelphia: W. K. Lypynsky East European Research Institute, 1976), xv-xcvii.

brink." At the end of his letter, Khomiak hinted that *Krakivski Visti*, at least for time being, was quite limited in the topics it may pursue but on Polish subjects the newspaper has been allowed to publish "infinite" number of texts. [179]

It is not clear what Nazaruk responded to Khomiak's offer. In any case he died soon afterward, on March 31, 1940.[180] By that time the task of writing the anti-Polish series was picked up by Khomiak's colleague from *Dilo* and member of UNDO establishment – Ivan Rudnytskyi (pen name Ivan Kedryn, 1896-1995). In terms of journalistic fame and talent Kedryn was Nazaruk's closest rival at the time. In a sense, Kedryn was better prepared to write about the second Polish republic and its Ukrainian question than Nazaruk. Among Ukrainian journalists of the interwar Poland Kedryn was a unique figure. He was not only a journalist and editor who observed and analyzed political life, but also a known political activist who was privy to inner workings of the Polish state, especially in the early 1930s during the so-called normalization which his party, the UNDO, had facilitated.[181]

Under the pseudonym *Homo politicus* (political human) he wrote a series of 27 articles titled "Prychyny upadku Polshchi" (Causes of Poland's Fall) which

---

[179] Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Osyp Nazaruk January 28, 1940. Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv (TsDIAL of Ukraine), f. 359, op.1, spr. 333, ark 5-5zv.

[180] "D-r Osyp Nazaruk," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 26 April 7, 1940, 1, 7; "Pokhoron d-ra O. Nazaruka," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 27 April 11, 1940, 7;

[181] The most important, though also flawed, biography of Kedryn is: Mariusz Sawa, *Ukraiński emigrant: działalność i myśl Iwana Kedryna-Rudnyckiego (1896-1995)* (Lublin: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej - Komisja Ścigania Zbrodni przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu, Oddział w Lublinie, 2016). See Ola Hnatiuk's review where she points out some of the issues with the book: Ola Hnatiuk, "Conditio sine qua non," *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* IV, No. 2 (2017): 275-290, http://dx.doi.org/10.21226/T20D1V

appeared in *Krakivski Visti* from March 27 to August 7, 1940.[182] Kedryn started the series with a rather contentious claim that the breakdown of the Polish state after the German invasion in a matter of "couple of days" was "unprecedented" in world history. But it would be false to explain this "downfall," he argued, only by the German military triumph over the Polish troops.[183] The Polish state was rotten from inside beginning from its re-emergence in 1918. It was Poles – "not Germans, not Ukrainians and not Russians [moskali]" – who "prepared destruction of their own state by their own hands." The state's faulty domestic, foreign, military policies resulted in rule of greed, corruption, nepotism and incompetence. This "house of cards" only needed a slight external blow – the German invasion – to fall apart and disperse like "smoke."[184]

By giving this story of the "real" Poland, wrote Kedryn, he was not trying to treat Poles in the same way they treated Ukrainians for two decades of the interwar period – with harm and nastiness, taking pleasure in their suffering and impotence of the "Ukrainian fury." On the contrary, the goal of the series was twofold: first, to establish historical truth since Polish society had already started

---

[182] Homo politicus [Ivan Kedryn], "Prychyny upadku Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 3; no. 24 March 31, 1940, 3-4: no. 25 April 4, 1940, 3-4; no. 26 April 7, 1940, 3; no. 27 April 11, 1940, 3-4; no. 28 April 14, 1940, 3; no. 29 April 17, 1940, 3-4; no. 30 April 21, 1940, 3-4; no. 32 April 28, 1940, 8-9; no. 34 May 6, 1940, 3; no. 38 May 15, 1940, 3-4; no. 39 May 17, 1940, 3-4; no. 41 May 22, 1940, 3-4; no. 43 May 27, 1940, 8; no. 45 May 31, 1940, 3-4; no. 48 June 9, 1940, 3-4; no. 49 June 11, 1940, 3-4; no. 51 June 15, 1940, 3-4; no. 54 June 21, 1940, 3-4; no. 56 June 26, 1940, 3-4; no. 61 July 8, 1940, 3-4; no. 62 July 10, 1940, 3-4; no. 65 July 17, 1940, 3-4; no. 67 July 22, 1940, 3-4; no. 70 July 29, 1940, 3-4; no. 73 August 5, 1940, 3-4; no. 74 August 7, 1940, 3-4.

[183] Homo politicus [Ivan Kedryn], "Prychyny upadku Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 3.

[184] Homo politicus [Ivan Kedryn], "Prychyny upadku Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 3.

to construct myths about what happened to their state from 1919 to 1939; second, "to show how *not* to govern over a state!"[185] That does not mean, continued Kedryn, that he was interested in "lecturing" Poles so that they could avoid repeating the past mistakes in the future. "I do not believe," wrote Kedryn, that the famous Polish proverb "mądry Polak po szkodzie" (a Pole is wise after harm has been done) is "true." For "even if fate would smile on Poles once more" and they would regain their state in the prewar borders – they would commit the same, if not worse, mistakes again.[186]

After this passionate introduction Kedryn proceeded to look in detail at specific subjects to support his claims: Polish mentality; political structure of the Polish state; role of Józef Piłsudski in Polish politics; Polish political parties; internal Polish political anarchy; political roles of Wincenty Witos, Ignacy Mościcki, Edward Rydz-Śmigły, Kazimierz Bartel, and Walery Sławek; the authoritarian and chauvinistic character of the interwar Polish state; attempts to reach Polish-Ukrainian compromise in 1918-1939, Polish pacification, normalization and lost opportunities of Polish-Ukrainian relations; Polish policies against other national minorities – Germans, Belarusians, Lithuanians, Jews and Russians; Polish foreign policy, relationship with Germany, "Russia"(Soviet Union), Britain; role of Polish military in the Polish state and political life; press in

[185] Homo politicus [Ivan Kedryn], "Prychyny upadku Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 3.
[186] Homo politicus [Ivan Kedryn], "Prychyny upadku Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 3.

interwar Poland and state censorship; corruption and financial machinations of Polish state officials; the German-Polish war in September 1939; disintegration of the Polish state during the war and the Polish legend of "Ukrainian betrayal."

The last, 28th article – conclusions – was not published in *Krakivski Visti*. Instead it appeared with the rest of the series, which was republished as a book (297 pages of text plus illustrations and maps) by "Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo" in fall 1940.[187] In the conclusions Kedryn charged the "Polish society" with inability to accept hard lessons of history, which in regards to the interwar Polish state in his opinion were two: 1) in foreign policy it should have followed "Great Germany" since a strong Germany would have re-emerged in any case and Poland would never have been able to prevent it; 2) from the very outset the Polish state should had recognized the multinational character of its subjects and instead of doomed attempts to absorb 10 million of national minorities it should have offered them autonomy and adopt federalism as its political foundation. The reason why Poles, in Kedryn's opinion, would not be able to grasp those lessons is because "99,9%" of them believe in the ideal of "a great and mighty Poland." This belief and Polish propensity to act upon it rather than on political reality, concludes Kedryn, is proof that Poles are politically immature as a nation.[188]

[187] Homo politicus [Ivan Kedryn], *Prychyny upadku Polshchi* (Krakiv: Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo, 1940).
[188] Homo politicus [Ivan Kedryn], *Prychyny upadku Polshchi* (Krakiv: Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo, 1940), 286-297.

According to Kedryn's memoir a Polish translation of the book was also prepared with an introduction by the Polish conservative politician Piotr Dunin-Borkowski (1890-1949), his good personal acquaintance.[189] However, German censorship did not allow for its publication because the book was a "political literature and there is no place for Poles in politics."[190] It is also interesting that in this memoir, which was written more than thirty years after the publication of "Prychyny upadku Polshchi," Kedryn denied that the series was, as some Poles claimed, an "anti-Polish diatribe." His counterargument – "I wrote it under fresh impressions … using rich source materials" – did not really address the accusation.[191]

The series also had an effect on Kedryn's career though a short-lived one: he was offered to join the editorial board of *Krakivski Visti*, which he accepted. However, after working as an editor for a month he was dismissed from the newspaper. Kedryn believed that the reason for the dismissal was his Jewish background which was revealed to the occupational authorities by his Ukrainian enemies.[192] Besides the series Kedryn published several more articles in *Krakivski Visti*, but none of them contained as strong an anti-Polish message as the series.[193]

---

[189] Kedryn, *Zhyttia – podii – liudy*, 349. On Dunin-Borkowski see: Ola Hnatiuk, "Piotr Dunin-Borkowski," *Zeszyty Historyczne* no. 155 (2006): 188-225.
[190] Kedryn, *Zhyttia – podii – liudy*, 349.
[191] Kedryn, *Zhyttia – podii – liudy*, 349.
[192] See letter from Ivan Kedryn to Jerzy Giedroyc, May 11, 1952 published in: Bogumila Berdykhovska, ed., *Iezhy Gedroits ta ukrainska emigratsiia: lystuvannia 1950-1982 rokiv* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2008): 705-706.
[193] For example: I. Kedryn, "Bilshe sertsia dlia zemliakiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 4 (472) Rizdvo Khrystove (January 6?), 1943, 13.

Another important figure who contributed anti-Polish material was Galician Ukrainian Stepan Baran (1879-1953). Like Kedryn, Baran belonged to the UNDO establishment and too knew Polish political life well from inside, serving as MP in the Polish parliament in 1928-1939. By education Baran was a lawyer (Ph.D. in law, 1909), but his intellectual interests were primarily in Ukrainian church matters.[194] A series of articles which he published under his real name dealt with the history of the Orthodox Church in Poland.[195] The series provided a sober critique of the interwar Polish political elites and their domestic policies against Orthodox Ukrainians.

Legally, reminded Baran, by its two constitutions of 1921 and 1935 respectively, interwar Poland guaranteed equal rights to all of its citizens notwithstanding their national, religious or racial identity. But in practice, this legal norm was routinely and intentionally violated. For the second Polish republic, wrote Baran, was founded on "self-deception": around 40% of its population were non-Poles and yet not only Polish "national extremists" but even governing circles regarded "Poland [as] a Polish nation[-state]." This self-

---

[194] Baran was one of the first biographers of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptystkyi, see: Stepan Baran, *Mytropolyt Andrei Sheptytskyi: zhyttia i dialnist* (Munich: Vernyhora, 1947).

[195] The titles of articles were different, but it was one continuous series: Stepan Baran, "Tserkovne pytannia u b. Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 30 April 21, 1940, 4-5; "Avtokefaliia Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy u b. Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 31 April 24, 1940, 4; "Pravni osnovy Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy u b. Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 33 May 4, 1940, 3-4; "Z tserkovnoi istorii Kholmshchyny i Pidliashsha," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 34 May 6, 1940, 5-6; "Kholmskyi tserkovnyi ziizd ta ioho postanovy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 39 May 17, 1940, 4; "Za unormuvannia vidnosyn Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 40 May 19, 1940, 3-4; "Statut pro tymchasovu upravu pravoslavnykh parokhii zatverdzhenyi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 47 June 6, 1940, 3-4; "Vykhidna tochka do dalshoi organizatsii Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy u General-Gubernatorstvi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 49 June 11, 1940, 5-6.

deception and policies of ignoring the national needs of minorities prevented "internal consolidation" of the country and made the national question the weakest link of Polish statehood. For Baran this served as a definite proof of the Polish inability to maintain a viable state: Poland once again showed that it had "neither prominent strategists, nor prominent politicians." Polish statesmen were *mirnoty* – petty people – who are not worthy to be called *derzhavni muzhi* (statesmen). "They learned nothing from their own history" and could not even learn from the surrounding reality because their own "megalomania and self-deception" obscured it from them.[196]

Baran argued that all Ukrainians suffered in interwar Poland because of their nationality, but some Ukrainians suffered more than others because of their Orthodox religion. Officially Orthodox believers were the second largest religious group (11.8%) in the second Republic but both in terms of Polish law and the Polish reality they fared worse than Greek Catholics, Protestants, followers of Judaism, and even Muslims. No other group of believers suffered so much persecution in interwar Poland, which "took away and destroyed Orthodox churches, changed them into Roman Catholic kościoły, illegally seized church lands and transferred them to Polish colonists."[197] In addition, the Polish state forcibly Polonized education in the Orthodox educational institutions and pushed for linguistic Polonization of the Orthodox church, including the liturgy, despite the fact that

[196] Stepan Baran, "Tserkovne pytannia u b. Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 30 April 21, 1940, 4.
[197] Stepan Baran, Tserkovne pytannia u b. Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 30 April 21, 1940, 4.

there were almost no ethnic Poles among the Orthodox faithful. Some Poles did convert to Orthodoxy, but in most cases, according to Baran, they did so only to get a divorce, which the Polish Roman Catholic church had refused them. The Polish army chaplains were the vanguard of this Polonization. In 1938 two Poles were ordained as Orthodox bishops – both of them were army chaplains. If war did not happen and things continued in the same way then it was only a matter of time, wrote Baran, that the next Orthodox metropolitan would be a Pole as well. This campaign of linguistic Polonization of the Orthodox church, Baran concluded, had a far-reaching goal of national Polonization of its faithful, most of whom were ethnic Ukrainians.[198]

The main shortcoming of Baran's articles was lack of solid evidence; for example he could not even provide an approximate number of Ukrainian Orthodox churches that were closed down by the Polish state or turned into kościoły. This task was accomplished by other articles. The article "Kilko tserkov znyshchyly poliaky na Kholmshchyni?" (How many churches were destroyed by Poles in the Chełm region?) estimated that in 1919 Chełm and Podlasie regions had 383 Orthodox churches. By spring and summer of 1938 115 of the churches were destroyed (one dating to the 12th century) by the Polish "vandalism." By September 1, 1939 out of 383 only 51 were still in Orthodox hands (13,47%), 149 were turned into kościoły (38,9%), and 183 completely destroyed or burned down

[198] Stepan Baran, "Pravni osnovy Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy u b. Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 33 May 4, 1940, 3-4.

(47,73%). The number of Orthodox parishes dropped from about 250 to 51 (80% decline).[199]

An important event in the history of Orthodox faith in the Chełm region – transfer of the Chełm cathedral back to the Orthodox church in May 1940 – was also used as an opportunity for the anti-Polish campaign. The history of this cathedral encapsulated the history of Christianity in these parts of Europe. The first Chełm cathedral was allegedly built in the time of Volodymyr the Great, who Christianised Kyivan Rus in 988.[200] After the Union of Brest 1596 the cathedral was changed from Orthodox to Greek Catholic. In 1875 the Russian imperial authorities returned it to Orthodox. In 1918, after the occupation of the Chełm region by re-emerged Poland, the Orthodox cathedral was changed into a Roman Catholic kościół.[201]

Hans Frank announced his decision to return the cathedral to Orthodox again on April 19, 1940 during his meeting with a Ukrainian delegation headed by Kubijovyč (such April visits to Frank became a yearly tradition for the UCC leadership). The delegation arrived on the eve of Hitler's birthday (April 20) to congratulate Frank as the personification of "the Fuhrer of the Great Germany" in these lands and to thank him (Hitler) for "taking under his care" the Ukrainian

[199] "Kilko tserkov znyshchyly poliaky na Kholmshchyni?" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 31 April 24, 1940, 2-3.
[200] "Peredacha soboru v Kholmi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 31 April 24, 1940, 1.
[201] "Velychave sviato v Kholmi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 43 May 27, 1940, 3.

population in the General Government.[202] The ceremony of the cathedral's return occurred a month later, on May 19.[203]

Krakivski Visti devoted almost a whole issue to the event.[204] Reports and articles in the issue on the one hand praised the German occupation authorities for their just and orderly rule, and on the other hand framed Poland and Poles as antithetical to exactly those values of justice and order. The event was attended by many Ukrainian notables and high-ranking German officials (though not by Frank), including Kubijovyč who echoed this contrast of German justice and order vis-à-vis "Polish barbarians" in his speech at the transfer ceremony.[205] A short piece "Polska protyaktsiia" (Polish counter-action) in the same issue of *Krakivski Visti* complained that the event was not attended by many Ukrainians because of heavy rain and "criminal agitation of Poles." The latter, claimed the article, spread rumors and leaflets (in Ukrainian and Polish) in neighboring villages that Germans planned to seize attending peasants and ship them as laborers to Germany or to confiscate their horses.[206]

Besides sophisticated and well-written articles by Ivan Kedryn and Stepan Baran there were numerous (over one hundred by my count) shorter pieces filled with anti-Polish rhetoric and statements in *Krakivski Visti*. Quite often these articles were devoted to a variety of mundane topics such as reporting about local

[202] "Peredacha soboru v Kholmi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 31 April 24, 1940, 1.
[203] "Peredacha soboru," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 43 May 27, 1940, 4.
[204] *Krakivski Visti*, no. 43 May 27, 1940.
[205] "Promova prof. d-ra V. Kubijovyča," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 43 May 27, 1940, 5.
[206] "Polska protyaktsiia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 43 May 27, 1940, 3.

developments and Ukrainian celebrations in villages and towns of the General Government, but they were also used for an anti-Polish message to contrast the difference between the Polish and German rule. Such articles were regularly published in *Krakivski Visti* from the second issue until June 1941 when the newspaper made an important ideological turn from an anti-Polish to an anti-Soviet direction. The first article to set this pattern was "Pevnym krokom vperid!" (March ahead in confidence!) by a certain V. Nemyrych. Though the main theme of his piece was the future potential of Ukrainian national development in the General Government (Nemyrych advocated for looking up to Germans and their culture in this regard) he also made negative comments about Poland and Poles, ridiculing the second Polish republic as an "artificial" country and claiming that Polish culture amounted to nothing more than *khamstvo* (boorishness). For him, the Polish belief in their "cultural and civilized superiority [*vyshchist*]" was a manifestation of their "true [national] infantilism."[207]

The main themes of these short anti-Polish pieces were the following. First, the most important and widespread theme was the Polish national oppression of Ukrainians in the second Polish republic expressed primarily in Polonization of Ukrainian education and children,[208] persecution and destruction of Ukrainian

[207] V. Nemyrych, "Pevnym krokom vperid!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 2 January 11, 1940, 2.
[208] See: M. Slavych, "«Uchitesia – braty moi» … Perelomove znachinnia v zhytti narodu – vidkryttia narodnikh shkil," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 2 January 11, 1940, 4; "Vistky z poludnevoi Kholmshchyny," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 2 January 11, 1940, 5; "Veselishe stalo zhyty," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 5 January 21, 1940, 3; Batko, "Naimenshi dity svoim batkam," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 8 February 4, 1940, 2; R. Samota, "Iaki oboviazky maie zhinka selianka?," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 10 February 11, 1940, 3; M. D., "Nikomu ne vbyty dushi narodu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 12 February 18, 1940, 2; St. Var., "Khochemo ukrainskoi

national institutions and churches,[209] and Polish brutality against Ukrainians.[210] Virtually any vice experienced by Ukrainians in interwar Poland was blamed on the Polish authorities or Polish society. For example, one anonymous article blamed the Polish state for the massive unemployment of Ukrainians before the war.[211]

Special attention was given to crimes allegedly committed by the Polish state, army and police against Ukrainians on the eve of the war or during its course. Among the topics were executions of Galician Ukrainians who served in the "Carpathian Sich,"[212] physical extermination of Ukrainian prisoners in the first days of the war,[213] ethnic cleansing of Ukrainian villages in Stryi region,[214] and

shkoly," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 2; Iurii Tarkovych, "«Liubliu ia ditei i libliu ikh uchyty»," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 32 April 28, 1940, 12; Andrii Kachor, "Kladim tverdi osnovy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 42 May 24, 1940, 5.

[209] M. L., "Teperishnii stan i vymohy nashoho hospodarskoho zhyttia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 5 January 21, 1940, 2-3; H. Ia., "Iak Iaroslavshchyna pratsiuie," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 6 January 25, 1940, 3; Svii, "Naselennia Volodavshchyny znovu u svoii tserkvi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 12 February 18, 1940, 4; V. Ostrovskyi, "Dvi vesny natsionalnoho vidrodzhennia Kholmshchyny," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 25 April 4, 1940, 1; Bohorodchanyn, "Molod sela Bohorodytsi pratsiue," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 25 April 4, 1940, 2; S., "Nas ne zlomyv teror!," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 28 April 14, 1940, 2; Iza, "Pratsiumo vperto i poslidovno," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 34 May 6, 1940, 10; Roman Huchvanovych [Hennadii Kotorovych], "Rozdumalysia liudy dobri," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 35 May 9, 1940, 3-4; "Literaturno-mystetskyi vechir z nahody vikryttia biblioteky «Prosvity» u Krakovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 38 May 15, 1940, 7; "Pobut arkhyiep. Serafyma v Liublyni i v Kholmi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 36 May 11, 1940, 3-4.

[210] S. Nukvyt, "Viter iz Volodavshchyny," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 7 January 31, 1940, 5; Iaroslav Naddnistrianskyi, "Na storozhi zakhidnioi mezhi (reportazh z Lemkivshchyny)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 13 February 21, 1940, 2; M.B., "Nas ne rozbyv polskyi piastuk," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 19 March 13, 1940, 2; "Polska vulytsia huliaie," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 22 March 24, 1940, 2; Ia. H., "Selo Krasivka ne darmuie," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 21 March 20, 1940, 2; "Kulturno-osvitnia pratsia v seli Poturzhyni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 35 May 9, 1940, 4; "Pidliashshia ide vpered," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 40 May 19, 1940, 6.

[211] "Zapomohy dlia bezrobitnykh," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 4 January 17, 1940, 6.

[212] Oles Bystrenko, "Oprychnyky z «KOP»-u," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 37 May 13, 1940, 5.

[213] "Vbyvstva na sygnal," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 11 February 14, 1940, 4;

[214] Ivan Pakhal, "Strashni zvirstva poliakiv u Stryishchyni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 26 April 7, 1940, 4; no. 29 April 17, 1940, 4.

murder of innocent Ukrainian civilians by retreating Polish troops.[215] In addition, *Krakivski Visti* published short memoirs of those Ukrainians who survived Polish arrests and imprisonment in the 1930s.[216]

The second theme was portrayal of Polish culture, the Polish state and Poles in a ridiculing, demeaning manner, and as a historically inferior phenomenon: Polish culture lacked any substance, the Polish state was artificial, incompetence is in the Polish nature,[217] Poles are incapable of creating anything lasting and they possess no stable values, [218] Poles never fight fairly,[219] Polish Roman Catholic church is chauvinistic,[220] and Polish obsession with titles (*tytulomania*) shows their mental emptiness.[221] It was not uncommon for these articles to brand Poles with nasty epithets ("scum")[222] and to overdramatize conditions of the Polish rule, calling it a "yoke."[223] A certain Kost Shumoskyi even wrote a play "Pid hnetom Polshchi" (Under oppression by Poland), which dramatized life in a Ukrainian village in the Chełm region on the eve of the war.[224]

---

[215] o. T., "Kryvavyi veresen u Starosambirshchyni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 40 May 19, 1940, 4-5; H. S. D., "Koly rozlitalosia «motsartvo» …," Krakivski Visti, no. 49 June 11, 1940, 4-5.
[216] M. Kholodnyi, "Dopyty na stanytsi «KOP-»u," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 16 March 3, 1940, 4; no. 17 March 7, 1940, 4-5; no. 19 March 13, 1940, 4-5.
[217] H. R., "Iak khliborob povynen pryity do hospodarskoi rivnovahy?" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 6 January 25, 1940, 4; Petro Stelmashenko, "Rozbudovuimo hospodarsku kulturu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 26 April 7, 1940, 1-2.
[218] "Miska spozhyvcha kooperatsiia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 4 January 17, 1940, 4.
[219] Iu. Tarnovych, "Kult poliahlykh," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 52 June 17, 1940, 4-5.
[220] "Polskyi manastyr hnizdom nenavysty ta brudu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 10 February 11, 1940, 3; "Oraty i siiaty musymo perelih," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 40 May 19, 1940, 6.
[221] Mamai, "Tytulomania," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 16 March 3, 1940, 7.
[222] "Shkilnyi kontsert v Lubni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 43 May 27, 1940, 9.
[223] "Selo Horky pratsiuie," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 20 March 17, 1940, 2.
[224] Teo, "Kholmshchyna vidrodylysia i pratsiue!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 31 April 24, 1940, 7.

The majority of these texts ascribed permanent features to the Polish identity and their narratives excluded any redemption option for Poles. For example, Mykhailo Ostroverkha in his article with a telling title "Nevylikuvalna neduha" (Incurable disease) argued that on the one hand there are nations destined to produce culture and heroes and on the other hand there is the Polish nation – a nation of loud self-promoters, worthless, dirty and destructive *hochstapler* (German for fraudsters). The Polish state through history was never able to sustain itself, it survived only as long as it managed to sap the vitality of neighboring peoples.[225] Another article compared Poland's war against Germany with Finland's war against the Soviet Union. In both cases smaller nations lost but Finns demonstrated exemplary valor while Poles once again showed how dishonorable they are.[226]

Some articles carried not only accusations about Polish behavior in the past, but also warnings about Poles in the present and in the future. For example, an anonymous piece "Za hlybynu zhyttia" (For depth of life) wrote that collapse of Poland in 1939 was a triumph of historical justice, but the author called for vigilance: Poland is gone, but its legacy is not. Ukrainians still need to get rid of Polish influences and habits they acquired during the interwar period.[227] This view of Ukrainians and Poles as two, antithetical, sides being locked in some sort of

[225] M. Tybrskyi [Mykhailo Ostroverkha], "Nevylikuvalna neduha," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 19 March 13, 1940, 1-2.
[226] Skat, "Finlandiia zderla masku z Anglii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 1-2.
[227] "Za hlybynu zhyttia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 3 January 14, 1940, 5.

existential struggle was present in many texts in *Krakivski Visti*. O. Ottokar in his piece wrote that the "wind of history" blew Poland away, but "Poles still remain." And Ukrainians need to continue to fight them "at every step."[228] Another article wrote that to deal with those Poles who remained (*nedobytky*) in the Ukrainian villages and towns after 1939 Ukrainians need to have their own police force, which would keep this Polish threat in check.[229] The other author advocated for increased representation of Ukrainians in the occupied administration, which at lower levels was almost fully staffed by Poles. These Polish officials were attempting to drive a wedge between the German regime and local Ukrainian population and continued their pre-1939 chauvinistic treatment of Ukrainians. The author called on Ukrainians to apply for positions in the occupied administration.[230] The subject of the Polish officials who stayed in their positions after September 1939 and continued to behave as if little had changed was also raised in the anonymous piece against S. Barna, *soltys* (elder) of village Voroblyk. The article accused the *soltys*, a Pole, of "terrorizing" the Ukrainian population of the village before the war and continuation of his anti-Ukrainian sabotage after the German arrival.[231]

Yet another article essentially advocated for an extension to Polish businesses the measures that occupational authorities had already placed on

[228] O. Ottokar, "Vyprostuimo kryzhi!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 3 January 14, 1940, 5-6.
[229] "Volodavshchyna vidrodzhuetsia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 5 January 21, 1940, 3.
[230] B. Halit, "Ukrainskyi viit v ukrainskii volosti," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 54 June 21, 1940, 5-6.
[231] "Chomu Voroblyk ne mozhe rozvyvatysia?" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 55 June 24, 1940, 11.

Jewish ones: it argued that for the benefit of Ukrainian credit and cooperative organizations Polish "elements" must be removed from trade in the General Government and large Polish firms should receive Ukrainian commissars (a hint about Ukrainian commissars already appointed by Germans to run former Jewish businesses). As for the Polish colonists the author favored the idea of their resettlement back into ethnic Polish lands because they had shown themselves to be poor proprietors (*hospodari*) when it came to agriculture. Some articles pointed out that the Ukrainian population still lives in fear of Poles, so deeply had two decades of Polish rule marked their psyche.[232] The article "Polske dykunstvo" (Polish savagery) warned that Poles were still attempting to treat Ukrainians in the same manner as before the war and pointed to an incident in village Horbiv where a group of Poles armed with axes and pitchforks tried to intimidate a Ukrainian procession to the local cemetery. The Polish mistake was, according to the article, to also call on the local police which was staffed by Germans. The latter arrived accompanied by a Gestapo officer who took the Ukrainian side in the incident and ordered policemen to disperse the Polish *shumovynnia* (mob).[233]

Poles were portrayed not only as a dangerous national or religious element, but also as a criminal one. Reports about criminal activities in the General Government often emphasized the Polish ethnicity of their perpetrators and implied a link between the Polish identity and crime/disorder. Other ethnicities

[232] "Pratsia v seli Bonchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 2; Mistsevyi, "Chesanivshchyna klyche," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 2.
[233] "Polske dykunstvo," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 45 May 31, 1940, 6.

were not named in crime reports. One report wrote about a Polish criminal who committed an armed robbery in October 1939 but was eventually caught and sentenced by the German court in Cracow to death. The report concluded: "Perhaps he [the criminal] forgot that this is no longer Poland and that German authorities punish severely for thievery and robbery."[234] The article "Spadshchyna polskoi demoralizatsii" (Legacy of the Polish Demoralization) happily reported about series of recent German trials over "Polish" criminal gangs and praised the trials as triumph of order. The eliminated gangs were the "sad legacy of the Polish rule, under which honest people were persecuted, but bandits could walk around without fear of punishment."[235] The article "Liubartiv uvilnenyi vid bandytiv" (Lubartów liberated from bandits) wrote that before the war town of Lubartów was ruled by criminal gangs but thankfully Germans had cleared them out.[236] The article "Vbyv matir svoei liubky" (Killed his lover's mother) reported about a Masurian (Polish subethnic group) who killed his lover's mother. "Obviously, only a Masurian could commit such a crime" explained the article, which concluded that this crime proved a "lack of culture among Poles-Masurians."[237]

Almost all anti-Polish pieces were original texts written for *Krakivski Visti* by Galician Ukrainians. As far as I could identify the authors' background none of

[234] "Novynky," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 11 Feb 14, 1940, 11.
[235] "Spadshchyna polskoi demoralizatsii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 13 February 21, 1940, 7.
[236] "Liubartiv uvilnenyi vid bandytiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 21 March 20, 1940, 7.
[237] "Vbyv matir svoei liubky," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 54 June 21, 1940, 7.

them were from the so called Petliurite emigration.[238] The newspaper also republished fully or summarized articles critical about Poland and Poles from the foreign press, primarily German and Italian.[239] Some articles were also taken from the Allied press if they fit the anti-Polish message. For example, "Tvereza dumka pro poliakiv" (A sober opinion on Poles) from May 1940 was a summary of an article from a French periodical. Its author argued that Polish politicians (meaning the Polish government-in-exile) should base their political goals on reality rather than history: they dream of restoring pre-war Poland but their chances of achieving it were as realistic as France's chances of restoring Charlemagne's empire.[240]

The Ukrainian Central Committee planned to culminate the anti-Polish campaign in *Krakivski Visti* with a book collection of articles about Polish interwar rule in Western Ukraine. The book was announced in the newspaper[241] and eventually titled "Dvadtsiat rokiv polskoi samovoli u Zakhidnii Ukraini" (Twenty years of Polish arbitrary rule in Western Ukraine). It was fully prepared and edited by Milena Rudnytska, a former leadership member of the UNDO (she was expelled from the party in 1935) who was also Kedryn's sister. But for some

[238] Petlurite emigration (or just petlurites - *petliurivtsi*) were Ukrainians who arrived in Poland in 1920 with the retreating army of the Ukrainian People's Republic (headed by Symon Petliura – hence the moniker) fleeing the advance of the Red Army. Life experience of petlurites in the interwar Poland was quite different (to better) from that of Galician Ukrainians which perhaps explains why anti-Polish sentiment was weak among them.
[239] "Italiiska presa pro peresliduvannia ukraintsiv u b. Polshchi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 27 April 11, 1940, 7; "Stattia pro ukraintsiv v nimetskomu shchodennyku," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 34 May 6, 1940, 11.
[240] "Tvereza dumka pro poliakiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 36 May 11, 1940, 5.
[241] *Krakivski Visti*, no. 38 May 15, 1940, 3.

reasons the book was never published.[242] After Nazi Germany invaded the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941 anti-Polish content in *Krakivski Visti* visibly diminished both in terms of quantity and hostility of its tone. The enemy no. 1 was now the Soviets.

It is interesting to see how Ukrainians who were directly or indirectly involved into the anti-Polish campaign changed their attitude towards Poles and Poland after the war. Their milieu and political conditions changed: they became émigrés, settling in Western Europe and Northern America. After 1948 Poland was under firm communist rule and a Soviet satellite. Western Ukrainian lands were now a part of the Soviet Ukraine, formally a Ukrainian state, but the Ukrainian émigrés regarded it under the Soviet control just as the Polish émigrés regarded their own country under it as well. A common enemy is a good recipe for reconciliation. All this plus a natural flow of time soothed whatever wounds life in the interwar Poland inflicted upon their souls. Some of them forgave. Some of them forgot. Both Kedryn and Kubijovyč wrote memoirs critical of the interwar Polish *state* (but not of Polish *people*) and its policies towards Ukrainians.[243] Both developed contacts with Polish émigrés (*Kultura* circle foremost) and pursued

[242] Letter from Ivan L. Rudnytsky to Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, November 12, 1980. UAA, Box 57, Item 824. The only known typescript copy of the anti-Polish book is located in Milena Rudnytska's papers at UVAN Archives in New York (fond 71). I had no access to it. During the war Rudnytska also prepared and edited a book collection on Soviet rule in Western Ukraine in 1939-41, but it too failed to appear at the time and was published much later when she emigrated to the US: Milena Rudnytska, ed., *Zakhidnia Ukraina pid bolshevykamy* (New York: Ameryka, 1958).
[243] Volodymyr Kubijovyč, *Meni 70* (Munich: Logos, 1970); Volodymyr Kubijovyč, *Meni 85* (Munich: Molode zhyttia, 1985); Ivan Kedryn, *Zhyttia – podii – liudy. Spomyny i komentari* (New York: Chervona Kalyna, 1976).

rapprochement between two nations.[244] Milena Rudnytska never wrote a memoir despite the constant persuasion of her son to do so. But she too developed contacts with Polish émigrés and welcomed their invitations to participate in Polish events. Her correspondence with her son shows genuine interest in Polish matters and lack of anti-Polish bias.[245]

But there was one who neither forgave nor forgot – Mykhailo Khomiak. In the 1960s-70s he became an amateur historian with the ambition to complete several book projects. He realized none of them, one of which was a collection of secret Polish documents exposing the anti-Ukrainian nature of the interwar Polish regime. Khomiak claimed that he came in possession of secret Polish documents in 1940. Both Kedryn and Kubijovyč were quite skeptical about this project because of their lack of faith in Khomiak's scholarly abilities: the latter took on faith any anti-Polish information if it was coming from a Ukrainian source. For example, Khomiak was a firm believer in the typhus conspiracy – the theory that Poles spread typhus among soldiers of the Ukrainian Galician Army in 1919 and that this was the first use of a bacteriological weapon in the 20th century.[246] In 1971 Kubijovyč asked Khomiak to review drafts of two articles for *Entsyklopediia Ukrainoznavstva* – "Poliaky" (Poles) and "Poliaky na Ukraini" (Poles in Ukraine). Khomiak's review showed that his anti-Polish feelings were still strong which

[244] See correspondence between Ivan Kedryn and Jerzy Giedroyc: Bogumila Berdykhovska, ed., *Iezhy Gedroits ta ukrainska emigratsiia: lystuvannia 1950-1982 rokiv* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2008): 705-717.
[245] After settling in Munich in 1959 she became an active member of local Polish-Ukrainian club.
[246] Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Ivan Iarema July 9, 1963. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 170.

Kubijovyč noted in his reply. "Your valuable remarks show a combative attitude towards Poles and Poland. [You are] Correct: they buried us and buried themselves. … But a lot of blame was on Ukrainians too. … There was no lack of mutual killings in 1943-44. *Now [all] this is ash* [Emphasis is mine]. There are almost no Poles in Ukraine and no Ukrainians in Poland: political border aligns with ethnic and … both peoples are part of the Sov[iet] Empire."[247]

The Soviets/Russians

When Polish rule over Western Ukraine was liquidated in September 1939 by invading German and Soviet army both invaders were welcomed by local Ukrainian population, though in the German case that welcome was undoubtedly more warm and sincere. The two occupiers – Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union – occupied very different places in Western Ukrainian imagination both in general terms and vis-à-vis their relationship to Ukrainians. Nazi Germany was perceived in a far more positive light and was considered a friendlier power to Ukrainians. The Soviets enjoyed a similar reputation with many Western Ukrainians in the 1920s during their policy of indigenization (*korenizatsiia*) within the Soviet Union which in the Ukrainian case translated into Ukrainianization (*ukrainizatsiia*) in the Soviet Ukraine. However, that positive image was shattered and reversed in the 1930s when the Soviet Ukraine went through Stalinist policies: forced

[247] Letter from Volodymyr Kubijovyč to Mykhailo Khomiak, February 26, 1971. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.

collectivization, Holodomor, purges and Russification, which resulted in significant demographic, intellectual and cultural losses for Ukrainians as an ethnic group. All of those developments were reported in the Ukrainian press of interwar Poland, foremost by *Dilo*. So, when Western Ukrainian population welcomed the Soviet troops in September 1939 it was for their liberation from the Polish rule, not because of some pro-Soviet sympathies which at that time were extremely rare (figures like Iaroslav Halan) in Western Ukrainian society. The Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine in September 1939 – June 1941 reinforced the anti-Soviet attitude among local Ukrainian population: the General Government received a steady influx of Ukrainian refugees from the Soviet-occupied territories up until January 1940 when the Soviets tightened the border control. No Ukrainians were fleeing in the opposite direction.

Prior to the German attack on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941 *Krakivski Visti* did not pay much attention to the Soviet Union and carefully avoided expressing any (especially negative) opinion on it: most of the texts were dry reports about the course of the Soviet-Finnish war, visits and statements of Soviet leaders etc. The one exception was an article by Andrii Turskyi (pseudonym of Atanas Mylianych) "Pid znamenem hospodarstva" (Under the banner of economy) which compared economic development of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union in the 1930s.[248] One can easily construe the article as unfavorable to

[248] Andrii Turskyi [Atanas Mylianych], "Pid znamenem hospodarstva," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 32 April 28, 1940, 18. Authorship established on the basis of honoraria records. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 32.

the Soviets or Stalin: it gave all of its praise to Hitler whose measures in the author's opinion rejuvenated the German economy and improved the well-being of German citizens. Stalin's industrialization on the other hand led to an unprecedented drop in living standards for the people of the Soviet Union. This veiled criticism was the only negative statement about the Soviet Union between January 7, 1940 (first issue) and June 22, 1941.

Openly anti-Soviet materials started to appear in the newspaper from June 23, 1941, beginning with the Ukrainian translation of Adolf Hitler's speech from the previous day in which he declared Germany's war on the Soviet Union.[249] In contrast to the anti-Polish comments in which the main discourse concerned justice and order, with the Soviets it was about civilization or, to steal the title of a famous book, of the "clash of civilizations." Poles and Poland, despite their portrayal as disorderly and unjust, were never othered as non- or anti-European entities. The Soviet Union on the other hand was described in such terms. Interestingly, German propaganda reflected quite accurately the inner views of the Nazi leadership on the Soviet Union as an arch-enemy of European civilization, Western tradition and Aryan race. In the Nazi view, the Soviets were a completely alien entity capable of inhumane levels of cruelty and crimes.[250] Hence focus on the abominable nature of the Soviet regime and its crimes dominated Nazi

[249] Adolf Hitlier, "Viina z Moskvoiu! Prokliamatsiia Firera do nimetskoho narodu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 133 (288) June 23, 1941, 1-2.
[250] The issue of Nazi leadership's views on the Soviet Union has a rich historiography. One of the most recent works discussing it in detail is: Stephen G. Fritz, *Ostkrieg: Hitler's War of Extermination in the East* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2011), 7-11.

propaganda after June 1941. *Krakivski Visti* followed these two themes but its authors, even when they used Nazi tropes, did so for specific Ukrainian reasons as the Soviet Union by 1941 already had a record of crimes against its Ukrainian population: forced collectivization, Holodomor of 1932-33, Stalinist purges and Russification of the 1930s, imprisonment and deportations of thousands of Western Ukrainians in 1939-41, and most recently mass murder of Western Ukrainian prisoners in summer 1941.

There was also a significant divergence point between Nazi anti-Soviet discourse and that of *Krakivski Visti*. In Nazi discourse the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union were two separate, quite distinct historical entities: the former in their views was heavily Germanized (which for Nazis explained its successful Westernization) while the latter was heavily Jewified (in Nazi eyes the Bolshevik revolution was a Jewish uprising against this Germanic Westernization, which began with Peter the Great). But the anti-Soviet discourse of *Krakivski Visti* regraded both polities as having essentially the same inner structure with different façades. Hence, the newspaper never distinguished between Russian Empire and the Soviet Union as both were oppressive towards Ukrainians and in both cases the identity and language of the oppressors were mostly Russian. Thus, editors and authors of *Krakivski Visti* did not distinguish between *Russian* and *Soviet*. Initially, the newspaper used a Ukrainian derogatory term for Russians – *moskali* to describe the Soviets, their armed forces etc. However, already in the second week of existence it dropped *moskali* and *moskalskyi* and began to use *rosiiskyi*

(Russian) and *sovitskyi* (Soviet) instead.[251] This practice continued until June 1941 after which *moskali* and its derivatives made a return and all of the above terms were used interchangeably afterward. Statements like the following were commonplace in the newspaper: "the Muscovite [tsarist] imperialism is factually equal to Bolshevism."[252] This was also the view of many Ukrainian émigrés in the West after the war including Kubijovyč, who regarded both Treaty of Perpetual Peace (1686) between Muscovite Tsardom and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Riga Treaty between Soviet Russia and Poland (1921) as "building stages of the Russian Empire – white [tsarist] or red."[253]

An opportunity to expose the murderous nature of the Soviet regime from both Nazi and Ukrainian perspectives presented itself in just two weeks after the German invasion of the Soviet Union. By then the Soviet regime had ruled over former eastern Poland for nearly 22 months. Ukrainians in Soviet Galicia and Volyn, similarly to Ukrainians of the General Government, were on the receiving end of a positive discrimination. These lands were now a part of the Soviet Ukraine, hence public space (street names etc.), healthcare, local administration, press and education were Ukrainianized and de-Polonized.[254] For example, the dream of several generations of Galician Ukrainians to have a Ukrainian

[251] See: "Sovity peresterihaiut Shvetsiu i Norvehiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 4 January 17, 1940, 8.
[252] M. Danko, "Nevtralni derzhavy i bolshevyzm," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 9 (747) January 19, 1943, 1.
[253] Letter from Volodymyr Kubijovyč to Mykhailo Khomiak, February 26, 1971. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 184.
[254] Christoph Mick, *Lemberg, Lwów, L'viv, 1914-1947: Violence and Ethnicity in a Contested City* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2016), 264-265.

university in Lviv was finally realized by the Soviet authorities in 1940 who renamed Jan Kazimierz University after the Ukrainian writer Ivan Franko and steadily increased the percentage of ethnic Ukrainians among its students and faculty.[255] This process was stopped by the German arrival in June 1941, which resulted in the closure of the university. But those 22 months of the Soviet rule were also a period of speedy Stalinization with all its hallmarks: liquidation of public sphere and ideological diversity, communal apartments, fake elections, deportations and arrests of thousands.[256]

The exact number and ethnic divide of inmates in prisons in Soviet Western Ukraine at the time of the German invasion is still debated.[257] Ukrainians constituted a majority among prisoners, which for many contemporary Ukrainians and later for Ukrainian scholars was a clear indication of the anti-Ukrainian agenda of the Soviets. Other prisoners were Poles and Jews, who in terms of percentages to total population, were over-represented. Politically the largest groups of prisoners were Polish and Ukrainian nationalists – by early 1941 the NKVD had effectively infiltrated and dismantled both the Polish and Ukrainian nationalist underground in Galicia and Volyn.[258] But there were also non-Soviet Leftists (Trotskyists etc.) in the prisons as well. In the situation of the

[255] Mick, *Lemberg, Lwów, L'viv*, 266.
[256] See for example: Oleksandr Lutskyi, "Lviv pid radianskoiu okupatsieiu 1939 – 1941 rr.," *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh* no. 7 (2006): 89-119.
[257] By one estimate the Soviets arrested 66,653 people from September 1939 to May 1941. Mick, *Lemberg, Lwów, L'viv*, 271.
[258] I. I. Iliushyn, *Protystoiannia UPA i AK (Armii Kraivoi) v roky Druhoi svitovoi viiny na tli diialnosti polskoho pidpillia v Zakhidnii Ukraini* (Kyiv: Instytut Istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2001), 5-46.

German rapid advance and hectic Soviet evacuation the NKVD had to decide what to do with the political prisoners. On the one hand, it could not evacuate them. On the other hand, it considered it too dangerous just to leave them in prisons for eventual German liberation. Unsurprisingly, it decided to kill them. Estimates of murdered political prisoners range between 10,000 to 40,000 with Ukrainians comprising up to two thirds of the victims.[259] Their bodies were usually discovered in the very first days of Germans entering Western Ukrainian cities and towns.

The legal Ukrainian press started to report on these findings almost immediately. German troops reached Lviv on June 30, 1941 and the reports about the murdered prisoners appeared in the very first issue of the Lviv daily *Ukrainski Shchodenni Visti* (Ukrainian Daily News) on July 5, 1941.[260] *Krakivski Visti* reported on the matter the following day with three articles.[261] It continued to publish materials on the murdered prisoners in almost every issue until early August 1941. The last item on this subject appeared in the August 24 issue.[262] Besides texts the

[259] Ksenya Kiebuzinski and Alexander Motyl, eds., *The Great West Ukrainian Prison Massacre of 1941: A Sourcebook* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017), 31.
[260] "U lvivskykh tiurmakh NKVD," *Ukrainski Shchodenni Visti*, no. 1 July 5, 1941, 3; "Muchenytsvo ukrainskoho dukhovenstva," *Ukrainski Shchodenni Visti*, no. 1 July 5, 1941, 3; "Velyka zhaloba ukrainskoho narodu," *Ukrainski Shchodenni Visti*, no. 1 July 5, 1941, 3; I. Hrytsynenko, "Kryvavi dni Lvova," *Ukrainski Shchodenni Visti*, no. 1 July 5, 1941, 3. The occupational authorities closed down *Ukrainski Shchodenni Visti* on August 24, 1941 and transferred its editors and staff to the newspaper which they created instead – *Lvivski Visti* (Lviv News).
[261] KTV [Hennadii Kotorovych], "Zhakhlyvi bolshevytski masakry u Lvovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 146 (301) July 6, 1941, 1; "Podii na zakhidno-ukrainskykh zemliakh (Interviu z dots. d-rom H.I. Baierom)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 146 (301) July 6, 1941, 2-3; "Bolshevytskyi pohrom u Lvovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 146 (301) July 6, 1941, 6.
[262] Lvovianyn [Ivan Nimchuk], "Zi Lvova i z kraiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 186 (341) August 24, 1941, 3-4.

newspaper also featured photos of the victims, prisons and grieving relatives.[263] On at least one occasion German censors stopped *Krakivski Visti* from publishing the most gruesome images: they were considered too sickening to be released for public eyes.[264] The majority of these articles were original materials (twenty six pieces),[265] others were translations from foreign, primarily Axis press (fifteen

[263] "Iak skazhenily katy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (303) July 9, 1941, 3; "Iak skazhenily katy v Dubni. Ponad 1500 zhertv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 149 (304) July 10, 1941, 3; "Bezimenni muchenyky," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 150 (305) July 11, 1941, 6; "Zhertvy kryvavoi masakry u Lvovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 151 (306) July 12, 1941, 5.

[264] Inna Fedushchak, "Do 65-i richnytsi komunistychnoho zlochynu (cherven 1941 r.)," *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh*, no. 7 (2006): 138.

[265] KTV [Hennadii Kotorovych], "Zhakhlyvi bolshevytski masakry u Lvovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 146 (301) July 6, 1941, 1; "Podii na zakhidno-ukrainskykh zemliakh (Interviu z dots. d-rom H.I. Baierom)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 146 (301) July 6, 1941, 2-3; Volodymyr Kubijovyč, "Pered maiestatom nepovynnoi krovy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 147 (302) July 8, 1941, 1-2; KTV [Hennadii Kotorovych], "Svit klonyt holovu pered trahedieiu Ukrainy (vid nashoho korespondenta)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 149 (304) July 10, 1941, 2-3; M. K. [Marian Kozak], "Peklo bolshevytskykh viaznyts. Ochevydets pro kryvavu masakru ukraintsiv u Lutsku," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 152 (307) July 15, 1941, 2-3; "Uryvky z lystiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 155 (310) July 18, 1941, 5; "Muchenyky Zhovkivshchyny," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 155 (310) July 18, 1941, 5; "Ukrainski hekatomby," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 156 (311) July 19, 1941, 2; "Nema porivnan," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 156 (311) July 19, 1941, 2; "Ochevydets iz Sambora pro dni zhakhu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 157 (312) July 20, 1941, 3; Anatol Kurdydyk, "Kryvava propahanda Ukrainy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 159 (314) July 23, 1941, 1-2; "700 muchenykiv u Dobromylshchyni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 159 (314) July 23, 1941, 2; "Uryvky z lystiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 160 (315) July 24, 1941, 2; "Pravdyve oblychchia Moskvy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 160 (315) July 24, 1941, 3; "Zhertvy NKVD," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 163 (318) July 27, 1941, 2; "Zalishchyky i Stanyslaviv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 163 (318) July 27, 1941, 4; B. Halit, "Ne rydai, a zdobuvai," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 164 (319) July 29, 1941, 1-2; "Zhertvy NKVD v Drohobychi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 169 (324) August 3, 1941, 4; "Bolshevytskyi pohrom u Dobromylshchyni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 171 (326) August 6, 1941, 2; "Vistky z kraiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 171 (326) August 6, 1941, 3; "1500 ukraintsiv zamorduvaly bolshevyky u Kremiantsi," Krakivski Visti, no. 171 (326) August 6, 1941, 5; "Rikamy plyly trupy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 173 (328) August 8, 1941, 5; "Zhertvy bolshevytskoho teroru v Horodku," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 173 (328) August 8, 1941, 5; "Z kraiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 179 (334) August 15, 1941, 3; "Bolshevytski strakhittia v Halychyni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 183 (338) August 21, 1941, 5; Lvovianyn [Ivan Nimchuk], "Zi Lvova i z kraiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 186 (341) August 24, 1941, 3-4.

pieces),[266] or republished from *Ukrainski Shchodenni Visti* (three pieces).[267] After the 1941 campaign *Krakivski Visti* kept returning to the June 1941 murders with commemorative pieces in 1942[268] and 1943,[269] but for some reason not in 1944.

Descriptions of the prisons and victims found in the 1941 texts were quite graphic – "blood splattered up to ceiling" – if one allows to run his/her imagination.[270] Many articles stressed that corpses showed signs of gruesome torture and missing body parts. But most of the texts went beyond reporting on murders per se (locations, numbers, names etc.) and were dominated by two trends. The first was to essentialize the crimes as representative of the true nature of the "Judeo-Bolshevik" state. These inhuman acts were its natural behavior

---

[266] "Bolshevytskyi pohrom u Lvovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 146 (301) July 6, 1941, 6; "Zhakhlyvyi pohrom ukraintsiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 147 (302) July 8, 1941, 2; "Masakra u viaznytsi NKVD v Dubni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 147 (302) July 8, 1941, 2-3; "Kryvavi bolshevytski zvirstva u Lvovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (303) July 9, 1941, 2; "Zhakhlyva masakra 1500 ukraintsiv u Lutsku," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (303) July 9, 1941, 2; "Zakord. zhurnalisty pro bolshevytskyi teror u Lvovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (303) July 9, 1941, 4; "Z bolshevytskoho pekla u Lvovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (303) July 9, 1941, 6; "Taki potvory ie soiuznykamy Anglii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 149 (304) July 10, 1941, 1; "Zaslona opadaie," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 149 (304) July 10, 1941, 4; "Kryvavyi teror na ukrainskykh zemliakh. Ukrainske naselennia vitaie nimetske viisko," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 149 (304) July 10, 1941, 6; "Chervonyi teror liutuie i and ukrainskymy selamy. Nimetska presa ne vmovkaie pro zhakhlyvi zvirstva bolshevykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 150 (305) July 11, 1941, 2; "Strakhittia zolochivskoi tsytadeli," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 154 (309), July 17, 1941, 4; "Zhakhlyvi bolshevytski zlochyny v Zakh. Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 160 (315) July 24, 1941, 4; V. Grendzha-Donskyi, "Slovatska ta khorvatska presa pro bolshevytski zvirstva nad ukraintsiamy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 164 (319) July 29, 1941, 4; KTV [Hennadii Kotorovych], "Pid shkaralushcheiu rosiiskoho imperializmu. Prof. d-r Pavlo Rorbakh ta inshi nimetski publitsysty pro znachchinnia Ukrainy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 165 (320) July 30, 1941, 2.

[267] "Vistky zi Lvova," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (303) July 9, 1941, 2; "Vistky zi Lvova," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 151 (306) July 12, 1941, 6; "Vistky z kraiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 172 (327), August 7, 1941, 2-3.

[268] MK [Marian Kozak], "Naibilsha zahroza. U rokovyny bolshevytskykh zvirstv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 137 (584) June 26, 1942, 1-2.

[269] P. B. [Bohdan Halaichuk], "Tsina krovy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 138 (876) June 30, 1943, 1-2; (N), "Pered dvoma rokamy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 138 (876) June 30, 1943, 2; Sv., "Iak masakruvaly viazniv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 138 (876) June 30, 1943, 3; "Panakhydy po zhertvakh bolshevytskoho teroru," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 140 (878) July 2, 1943, 3; "Pomynky zhertv NKVD u Berezhanakh," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 156 (894) July 21, 1943, 3.

[270] "Kryvavi bolshevytski zvirstva u Lvovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (303) July 9, 1941, 2.

rather than an aberration: "The massacre in Lutsk prison is not something exceptional. It shows the diabolical methods of Bolshevism, which has not changed since the revolution of 1917. It proves what kind of ENEMY AND MONSTER is fighting against an orderly and clean Europe."[271] The second trend, as John-Paul Himka noted in his detailed article about the campaign, was to ethnicize both the victims and the perpetrators, who in reality were ethnically diverse – Jews, Poles, and Ukrainians for the former and Jews, Russians and Ukrainians for the latter.[272] But in the newspaper reports this diversity was erased. Whenever reports mentioned the ethnicity of victims they declared it to be Ukrainian, creating an image of the purely anti-Ukrainian crime: "they … perished only because they were conscious Ukrainians and loved Ukraine above all else."[273] In reality, at least one third of murdered were non-Ukrainians.[274]

The perpetrators were initially characterized as "Bolshevik," "Judeo-Bolshevik" or by some other generic names such as *zviri* (beasts).[275] The very first article about the murders blamed them on "NKVD sadists" and "the bestial

[271] "Zhakhlyva masakra 1500 ukraintsiv u Lutsku," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (303) July 9, 1941, 2. Capitalization in the original.
[272] John-Paul Himka, "Ethnicity and the Reporting of Mass Murder: *Krakivs'ki visti*, the NKVD Murders of 1941, and the Vinnytsia Exhumation," *Shatterzone of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands*, ed. Omer Bartov and Eric D. Weitz (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2013), 378-98.
[273] B. Halit, "Ne rydai, a zdobuvai," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 164 (319) July 29, 1941, 1.
[274] Kiebuzinski and Motyl, eds., *The Great West Ukrainian Prison Massacre of 1941*, 31. On Lviv specifically see: Mick, *Lemberg, Lwów, L'viv*, 288.
[275] One article argued against comparing Bolshevik murderers to "beasts": the former was "apocalyptic monsters" and calling them "beasts" is offensive to animals, which are incapable of such cruelty: "Nema porivnan," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 156 (311) July 19, 1941, 2.

Jewish-Polish mob."[276] This was the only time when Poles were explicitly identified among perpetrators. Volodymyr Kubijovyč himself contributed a piece early on titled "Pered maiestatom nepovynnoi krovy" (Facing the majesty of innocent blood).[277] He too avoided specifying the ethnicity of the perpetrators simply referring to them as "the eternal enemies of the Ukrainian people" and "a whole league of our eternal enemies" and called for "resolute ruthlessness" against them in the future. John-Paul Himka believes that by "the eternal enemies" Kubijovyč meant "the Russians, Jews, and Poles."[278]

Beginning from July 15 articles started to focus more on the identity of perpetrators, identifying them to the larger extent as Russians, to the lesser – as Jews or as a mixture of both ("Muscovite-Jewish executioners") which was actually a term directly borrowed from Nazi propaganda. There was only one mention of a Ukrainian perpetrator, who was a local Galician Ukrainian from Sambir district.[279] But there must have been more than one Ukrainian among the perpetrators. Most of the Soviet administration, especially on lower levels, arrived to Western Ukraine from the rest of the Soviet Ukraine in 1939-41.[280] They were referred to by locals as *skhidniaky* (Easterners) and appear in diaries and letters at

[276] KTV [Hennadii Kotorovych], "Zhakhlyvi bolshevytski masakry u Lvovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 146 (301) July 6, 1941, 1.
[277] Volodymyr Kubijovyč, "Pered maiestatom nepovynnoi krovy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 147 (302) July 8, 1941, 1-2.
[278] Himka, "Ethnicity and the Reporting," 386.
[279] "Ochevydets iz Sambora pro dni zhakhu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 157 (312) July 20, 1941, 3.
[280] Hrynevch, *Nepryborkane riznoholossia*, 238-263.

the time and later memoirs of Western Ukrainians, but in *Krakivski Visti* as John-Paul Himka rightfully pointed out they were "invisible."[281]

This narrative of ethnic Ukrainians as martyrs and Russians/Jews as perpetrators was repeated again two years later when *Krakivski Visti* ran series of articles on the Vinnytsia murders. In 1937-1938, during the Great Terror in the Soviet Union, the NKVD executed around 10,000 people in Vinnytsia, a city in Central Ukraine.[282] Their bodies were buried in almost 100 mass graves within the city. Vinnytsia was occupied by Germans from July 1941 to March 1944. Locals started to ask for the exhumation of mass grave sites immediately after the Germans established their administration in the city, but it was allowed only in May 1943 when Nazi Germany began one of its most famous (and quite successful) propaganda campaigns against the Soviet Union with regards to Katyn murder site. The Nazi campaign on the Katyn murders was directed both for internal and international consumption. Internationally its primary goal was to drive a wedge between the Allies and the Soviet Union and to some extent it was achieved. Though the anti-Hitler coalition did not fall apart, the campaign led to the severing of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the Polish government-in-

[281] Himka, "Ethnicity and the Reporting," 387.

[282] On the Vinnytsia murders see: Ihor Kamenetsky, ed., *The Tragedy of Vinnytsia: Materials on Stalin's Policy of Extermination in Ukraine during the Great Purge 1936–1938* (Toronto-New York: Ukrainian Historical Association in cooperation with Bahriany Foundation Inc. and Ukrainian Research and Documentation Center, 1989); Oleh Romaniv, ed., *Narodovbyvstvo v Ukraini: ofitsiini materialy pro masovi vbyvstva u Vinnytsi* (Lviv: Lvivska oblasna istoryko-kulturolohichna orhanizatsiia "Memorial," 1995); Valerii Vasyliev and Roman Podkur, *Radianski karateli. Spivrobitnyky NKVS – vykonavtsi "Velykoho teroru" na Podilli* (Kyiv: Vydavets V. Zakharenko, 2017).

exile on one hand and strengthened those in the British and American political establishment who believed in a tough stance against the Soviet Union – the future Cold War warriors – on the other hand.

Krakivski Visti started to report on the Vinnytsia murders and its international investigation (invited by the Germans to the site) rather late – the first article on the murders appeared on June 23, 1943.[283] By that time the Ukrainian legal press of the *Reichskommissariat* Ukraine had been writing on the matter for almost a month.[284] The exact reason for such a delay is not known. In the case of the June 1941 prison murders in Western Ukraine *Krakivski Visti* began reporting on them *after* the subject was picked first by the Reich's German newspapers (*Berliner Börsen-Zeitung* and *Berliner Illustrierte Nachtausgabe*). Perhaps the expectations were the same in 1943 and the editors of *Krakivski Visti* (and maybe even their superiors – the press authorities of the General Government) waited for the German press in the Third Reich to start off the campaign on the Vinnytsia murders. The letters of *Krakivski Visti*'s two most important contributors from the Third Reich – Hennadii Kotorovych (a letter from July 1, 1943) and Anatol Kurdydyk (a letter from July 10, 1943) – to the newspaper's editors suggest that the Vinnytsia murders' campaign was initially delayed in the Reich's press to avoid overlapping with or coming out so close after the Katyn murders'

[283] "Masove vbyvstvo ukraintsiv bilia Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 132 (870) June 23, 1943, 1.
[284] Himka, "Ethnicity and the Reporting," 380.

campaign.[285] Eventually *Krakivski Visti* received the green light and it ran its own series of articles appearing in almost every issue between July 9 and August 10, 1943, after which the number dropped significantly with only a few appearing before September 29 when the last item on Vinnytsia murders was published.

But unlike with June 1941 murders in Western Ukraine, which the newspaper's correspondents were able to investigate themselves by visiting the murder sites and interviewing locals, *Krakivski Visti* had no direct access to Vinnytsia as the *Reichskommissariat* authorities were much stricter than those of the General Government and restricted not only physical travel between two occupational entities but also travel of any information between them. Apparently, one of the reasons was the unfriendly relationship between Hans Frank and Erich Koch (head of the *Reichskommissariat*): the former despised the latter, who once used to be his subordinate, and privately referred to him as a *Schweinhund* ("pig dog").[286] Due to this information curtain *Krakivski Visti* had to rely on articles from other newspapers in running its own campaign on the Vinnytsia murders. As a

[285] Himka, "Ethnicity and the Reporting," 380. The letters are located in: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 4, Item 41.
[286] Kubijovyč, *Meni 70*, 56.

result, unlike in 1941, original submissions were in a minority (twelve pieces)[287] against texts taken from other newspapers (thirty-one pieces).[288]

[287] MK [Marian Kozak], "Holovna prychyna," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 135 (873) June 26, 1943, 1-2; MK [Marian Kozak], "Bez niiakykh oman," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 136 (874) June 27, 1943, 1-2; P. H., "Nad vidkrytymy mohylamy u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 149 (887) July 13, 1943, 1-2; D. S. [Denys Savaryn], "Pidstava bolshevytskoho teroru," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 151 (889) July 15, 1943, 1-2; P-ia-k, "Poklin vynnytskym zhertvam," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 159 (897) July 24, 1943, 2; V. Osadchuk [Bohdan Osadchuk], "«Bolshevyzm – smert narodam» Opovidannia d-ra Stefanovicha, serbskoho pysmennyka j polityka. (Vid nashoho korespondneta)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 163 (901) July 29, 1943, 3-4; H. K., "Na mistsi zlochynu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 164 (902) July 30, 1943, 4; A. Kurdydyk, "Vynnytsia i chuzhozemna presa," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 165 (903) July 31, 1943, 1; Ievhen Onatskyi, "Vynnytski strakhittia v italiiskii presi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 167 (905) August 3, 1943, 3; E. M. [Ievhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 168 (906) August 4, 1943, 3; Kent [Bohdan Kentrzhynskyi], "Finskyi uchenyi pro vynnytski vbyvstva. Interviu z profesorom Niilo Pesonenom," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 170 (908) August 6, 1943, 2-3; B. O. [Bohdan Osadchuk], "Kryvava propahanda Ukrainy. Vynnytsia v evropeiskii presi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 171 (909) August 7, 1943, 2;

[288] "Masove vbyvstvo ukraintsiv bilia Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 132 (870) June 23, 1943, 1; "30 masovykh hrobiv bilia Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 146 (884) July 9, 1943, 1; "Dokumenty bolshevytskoi zhadoby nyshchennia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 147 (885) July 10, 1943, 1; "Vynntski mohyly," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (886) July 11, 1943, 1; "Dalshi podrobytsi zvirstva NKVD bilia Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (886) July 11, 1943, 1, 4; "Oburennia i vidraza u vsikh ukraintsiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (886) July 11, 1943, 4; "Dalshi podrobytsi pro masovi mohyly u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 149 (887) July 13, 1943, 5; "Masovi mohyly pid hoidalkamy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 150 (888) July 14, 1943, 2; "Belhiets pro Vynnytsiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 151 (889) July 15, 1943, 2; "Vynnytski zhertvy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 152 (890) July 16, 1943, 2; "«Vyna» vynnytskykh zhertv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 153 (891) July 17, 1943, 2; "U vsikh ukrainskykh sertsiakh palaie sviatyi vohon pomsty (Holos ukrainskoi presy)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 154 (892) July 18, 1943, 2; "Pratsia komisii dlia rozslidu vynnytskoho dushehubstva," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 155 (893) July 20, 1943, 2; "Frantsuzki holosy pro Vynnytsiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 156 (894) July 21, 1943, 2; "Finskyi professor pro vyslidy rozslidiv u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 156 (894) July 21, 1943, 2; "Reporter rumunskoho radiia pro Vynnytsiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 156 (894) July 21, 1943, 2; "Mizhnarodna likarska komisiia u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 159 (897) July 24, 1943, 2; "Kamera tortur NKVD u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 161 (899) July 27, 1943, 2; "Predstavnyky bolharskoho j danskoho uriady u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 161 (899) July 27, 1943, 2; "Tserkovni dostoinyky Rumunii pro svoi vrazhennia z Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 162 (900) July 28, 1943, 2; "Mizhnarodni komisii u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 164 (902) July 30, 1943, 2; "Nimetski robitnyky nad masovymy mohylamy u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 167 (905) August 3, 1943, 2; Pier Sone, "Valonets pro Vynnytsiu. Shcho ia pobachyv u Vynnytsi, novomu Katyni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 173 (911) August 10, 1943, 2; "Bolharyn pro vrazhinnia z Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 178 (916) August 15, 1943, 5; "Hretskyi zhurnalist pro svoi vrazhinnia z Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 185 (923) August 24, 1943, 5; "Mistse zhakhu ta smerty," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 187 (925) August 26, 1943, 3; I. Zhurlyvyi, "Z taiemnyts Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 188 (926) August 27, 1943, 3; "Shvedskyi profesor medytsyny pro Vynnytsiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 197 (935) September 7, 1943, 5; "Pamiatnyk na bratskykh mohylakh u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 198 (936) September 8, 1943, 4; "Masovi bolshevytski vbyvstva v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 207 (945) September 18, 1943, 2; "Serby vidvidaly mistsia masovykh vbyvstv u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 208 (946) September 19, 1943, 5; "Vynnytski pokhorony," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 216 (954) September 29, 1943, 4.

Despite such disproportion of original and borrowed materials the pattern of reporting was almost identical to the 1941 campaign. Just as then the 1943 articles in *Krakivski Visti* provided their readers with gruesome details about how prisoners were murdered, some of which were claimed to be buried alive. Female victims were often emphasized to underscore the Bolshevik inhumanity: their bodies were found "completely naked, without underwear. … We can say with certainty that the chekists, before murdering these unfortunate women, threw macabre orgies with them."[289]

Similarly to the 1941 articles, victims and perpetrators were ethnicized. The German forensic investigation could not identify all victims, but its findings demonstrated sufficiently enough that one third of them were not Ukrainians. The newspaper however presented victims as almost exclusively Ukrainian (one article mentioned an ethnic German). Perpetrators following the Nazi propaganda once again were identified as either Russian or Jewish and their deed was testament to the murderous nature of the Bolshevik regime: "The mass graves in Vinnytsia are a new, frightful proof of the system of methodical physical destruction to which Muscovite Bolshevism adheres. Jewish Bolsheviks and their lackeys introduced this policy of ruthless physical destruction in Ukraine from the first moment they came to power."[290]

---

[289] Kent [Bohdan Kentrzhynskyi], "Finskyi uchenyi pro vynnytski vbyvstva. Interviu z profesorom Niilo Pesonenom," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 170 (908) August 6, 1943, 2. Translation by John-Paul Himka.
[290] "Vynnytski mohyly," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 148 (886) July 11, 1943, 1. Translation by John-Paul Himka.

For Marian Kozak, the Vinnytsia murders proved continuity between tsarist Russia and the Bolshevik regime: the latter absorbed Russian imperialism but at the same time unshackled it from constraints of Christian morality thus unleashing a brutality which tsars could not even imagine.[291] Another author blamed the whole Russian people: "The Russian people is responsible for sheltering and handing over power to a gang of international killers. Other peoples will never forgive the Russians for this… The third year of gigantic struggles with the wild Bolshevik beast in the East makes it clear what a terrible threat will continue to hang over Europe until the monster is broken. If Bolshevism were to triumph, all of Europe would turn into one great Vinnytsia… Whoever does not want to see that moment come must stand up on the side of Germany, which has gone alone into this great historical battle."[292]

The identity of this author, hiding behind initials P. H., is an important question. John-Paul Himka believes that it was written by Ivan L. Rudnytsky because according to the archival evidence an honorarium for the piece was sent to him.[293] Normally I would agree that being paid for a newspaper article proves authorship but in this specific case there are several more considerations. What exactly does the archival evidence tell us? There are two entries for Rudnytsky in the honoraria list which *Krakivski Visti*'s editors kept for texts published in the

[291] MK [Marian Kozak], "Bez niiakykh oman," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 136 (874) June 27, 1943, 1-2.
[292] P. H., "Nad vidkrytymy mohylamy u Vynnytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 149 (887) July 13, 1943, 2. Translation by Marco Carynnyk.
[293] Himka, "Ethnicity and the Reporting," 387-388, 397.

newspaper – the first entry is for the article mentioned above and the second one is for the article "Voeinne znyshchennia ta vidbudova" (War destruction and reconstruction). Rudnytsky was sent 48 and 57 złoty respectively. Both entries provide his correct Berlin address, but the first entry has him as "Lysiak" and the second entry lists him as "Lysiak Iu."[294] Legally, "Lysiak" was Rudnytsky's last name after his father, Pavlo Lysiak (1887-1948), under whose name the second article had appeared in the newspaper.[295] In 1940-1944 Pavlo Lysiak resided in Cracow. During the war and until his death in 1948 he supported his son financially.

It is possible that both articles had been written by Pavlo Lysiak and honoraria for them was sent to Ivan L. Rudnytsky as part of that financial support. In the latter's correspondence for 1943 (or for any other years) there is no mention of an article about the Vinnytsia murders for *Krakivski Visti*. As a matter of fact, there is a letter from Marian Kozak to Rudnytsky from July 14, 1943 ("Nad vidkrytymy mohylamy u Vynnytsi" appeared in July 13, 1943 issue) in which the latter was notified that his article, whose topic is not specified, has been rejected.[296] Rudnytsky kept a meticulous bibliography of his own publications, which included pieces that appeared during the war. "Nad vidkrytymy mohylamy u

[294] PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 32.
[295] Pavlo Lysiak, "Voienne znyshchennia ta vidbudova," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 271 (1009) December 2, 1943, 1-2.
[296] Letter from Marian Kozak to Ivan L. Rudnytsky July 14, 1943. UAA, Rudnytsky papers. Box 47, Item 742.

Vynnytsi" is not listed among them.[297] The initials under which that article was signed – P. H. – never show in Rudnytsky's papers. I would consider the authorship of this piece as an open question.[298]

It is hard to assess the effectiveness of the 1941 and 1943 propaganda campaigns about the Soviet murders. The former happened in Western Ukraine, the home of most staff of the UCC and *Krakivski Visti*. The 1941 tragedy hit them and the rest of the Western Ukrainian population hard: they have lost either relatives or people whom they knew in the massacre. Two years later, when the UCC campaigned for the Waffen-SS Division *Galizien*, which was reflected in *Krakivski Visti*, many young Galician Ukrainian men enlisted because images of the prison murders from summer 1941 – which was their first exposure to the Soviet mass brutality – became entrenched in their minds.[299]

On the other hand, the Vinnytsia massacre happened in a region rather distant from Galicia and the population in the General Government already had been living for two years under war conditions and exposure to anti-Soviet propaganda, so news about a new Soviet crime, even such a massive one as

---

[297] See: UAA, Rudnytsky papers. Box 61. The items in the box are not numbered.

[298] Personal communication from John-Paul Himka (April 5, 2019): "Rudnytsky told me he regretted what he wrote for *Krakivksi Visti*. This was years before I started working on the newspaper. Rudnytsky died 1984; I started working on *Krakivski Visti* in 1988. It's possible he meant he regretted the article that was not accepted, but I think this unlikely."

[299] A Galician Ukrainian Bohdan Stasiv in his short memoir why he enlisted for the Waffen-SS Division *Galizien* among the reasons mentioned: "The horrifying images of our innocent (and unsentenced!) people murdered in prisons by chekists during their flight in June-July 1941 were still fresh in our memory [in 1943]." See: Bohdan Stasiv, "Chomu my ishly do dyvyzii «Halychyna»?" in *Persha Ukrainska dyviziia Ukrainskoi natsionalnoii armii: istoriia stvorennia ta natsionalno-politychne znachennia. Materialy naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii. Dopovidi ta povidomlennia*, ed. Iaroslav Dashkevych (Lviv: Novyi chas, 2002), 56.

Vinnytsia, may have been a product delivered to an oversaturated market. Human emotions have limits and after a certain amount of exposure to horrors they no longer horrify us: not because they became less horrific but because our capacity to be horrified has been exhausted. Judging by the correspondence of *Krakivski Visti*'s main editors, Khomiak and Kozak, in summer 1943 both of them were more concerned with news of ethnic massacres between Poles and Ukrainians in Volyn, rather than with distant Vinnytsia.[300] Kozak even wrote to Anatol Kurdydyk that the newspaper would continue to accept materials on the Vinnytsia murders, but he could not guarantee that they would be published because "people are already fed up with the subject."[301] The article Kurdydyk submitted did appear eventually. Ironically, it celebrated coverage of the Vinnytsia tragedy in the foreign press: the news about the crime put Ukraine and Ukrainians on the mental map of many foreigners who had never heard about them before.[302]

Naturally, the Western Ukrainian murders of 1941 and Vinnytsia tragedy of 1937-1938 were not the only anti-Russian/Soviet materials in *Krakivski Visti*, which published hundreds of anti-Soviet texts after June 22, 1941. However, the articles about those two events stand out because they were a result of organized campaigns with specific goals about how to portray victims and perpetrators. Among other articles – on the Bolshevik conquest of Ukraine in 1918-1920; the

[300] See correspondence between editors and contributors in: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 4, Item 41.
[301] Letter from Marian Kozak to Anatol Kurdydyk July 29, 1943. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 4, item 41.
[302] A. Kurdydyk, "Vynnytsia i chuzhozemna presa," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 165 (903) July 31, 1943, 1.

famine of 1921-1922; collectivization of 1928-1933 and Holodomor; purges and Russification of the 1930s – one was remarkable not because it was the first to tie all those events into one narrative martyrology, but because it did so superbly. Its author was a brilliant Ukrainian poet and essayist Evhen Malaniuk (1897-1968).[303] The article was one of the original submissions for the newspaper's campaign on the Vinnytsia murders in 1943, but Malaniuk used the murders as a departure point for a larger topic – the Bolshevik terror against the Ukrainian nation.[304]

The European press, wrote Malaniuk, reported with shock about the uncovering of mass graves in Vinnytsia but for Ukrainians this news was "not surprising" since they had been suffering from the Soviets from the very beginning of their "acquaintance" in 1917. The first Ukrainian encounter with the Bolshevik terror in 1917-1918 appeared as random killings of Ukrainian intelligentsia. Some Ukrainians naively considered them "misunderstandings," but in Malaniuk's opinion they clearly followed a pattern: systemic elimination of the "nation's most important sons" whom Ukrainian culture and state so desperately needed. The Bolshevik war against Ukraine in 1918-1920 unleashed this terror openly accompanied by the "loud Jewish … Soviet propaganda." Already back then the

[303] Malaniuk has been studied mostly as a literary figure though in terms of intellectual value his essays rival his literary legacy. However, there is not a single study on Malaniuk which looks in detail at his life (and writings) during World War II. See: Taras Salyha, *Vohon, shcho ne zhasa...* (Kyiv: Lybid, 2017); Leonid Kutsenko, *Kniaz dukhu: statti pro zhyttia i tvorchist Ievhena Malaniuka* (Kirovohrad: [s.n.], 2003). Note that Malaniuk spelled his first name as Evhen, not as Ievhen.
[304] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 168 (906) August 4, 1943, 3; no. 169 (907) August 5, 1943, 4; no. 170 (908) August 6, 1943, 4.

Soviet terror showed that it was not an excess, but a normal practice without which the functioning of the "Soviet state machinery" would be hard to imagine.[305]

The terror did not end with the Bolshevik victory in the war in 1920 and continued until the closure of the Bolshevik policy of war communism in 1923. By then the terror had claimed "hundreds of thousands" of Ukrainian lives, whom "post-Versailles Europe wanted neither to see nor to know."[306] Malaniuk claimed that Ukrainians made up 70—75% of the so called "victims of Bolshevism in Russia" because they fought against Bolshevism in the White forces as well. But the "Kremlin Sanhedrin" was still not satisfied with "rivers of [Ukrainian] blood" because 30 million Ukrainians not only continued to reject Bolshevization but also served as a "living wall" against "spreading of communist revolution to the West – first of all to Poland, to Romania, to Hungary, then to Germany and Italy."[307] To break this wall, to undermine Ukrainian people biologically Bolshevism through "the Jewish mind of its leadership" came to the idea of man-made famine, which it organized in Ukraine in 1921-1922. A decade later the Bolsheviks repeated this "experiment … in much improved and wider form."[308]

---

[305] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 168 (906) August 4, 1943, 3.
[306] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 169 (907) August 5, 1943, 4.
[307] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 169 (907) August 5, 1943, 4.
[308] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 169 (907) August 5, 1943, 4.

Malaniuk believed that whereas during the first famine in 1921-1922 the Soviets officially recognized that Ukraine had 3 million starving people, then during the second famine of 1932-1933 that figure, "according to experts," must had been six-seven million all of whom "certainly died from hunger."[309] The period between the two famines, accompanied by the NEP and Ukrainization (a Bolshevik provocation in Malaniuk's opinion) in Ukraine, was just an "armistice" which the Bolsheviks used for "stabilization" of their power and accumulation of wealth. The Bolsheviks broke the "armistice" in 1929 and unleashed their "terror apparatus" again because they feared the "organic growth of defeated, but unbroken" Ukraine.[310]

According to Malaniuk the source of this growth was the Ukrainian peasantry. It was the only Ukrainian social group strong enough to cause "stress" for Bolsheviks, who had already eliminated whatever tiny Ukrainian aristocracy and bourgeoise existed before 1917 during the Ukrainian "Liberation War" of 1918-1920.[311] But the peasantry continued to be the source from which Ukrainian working class and national intelligentsia regenerated. Malaniuk implied that the preventive Bolshevik terror in Ukraine after 1929 targeted these three Ukrainian social groups – peasantry, workers and intelligentsia – because the Soviets feared

[309] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 169 (907) August 5, 1943, 4.
[310] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 169 (907) August 5, 1943, 4.
[311] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 170 (908) August 6, 1943, 4.

Ukrainian nation which would eventually rise if they would be allowed to progress unchecked.

Terror was not the only crime committed by Bolsheviks in Ukraine. "Let's admit to ourselves," wrote Malaniuk, that through their propaganda the "enemy demoralized our masses." Ukrainians should not be ashamed of this fact because the "enemy deceived the whole world."[312] But after June 22, 1941 when Germany broke into the Soviet Union through its Western "gate rusted from Ukrainian blood," Europe and the whole world were finally able to see that what few Ukrainian émigrés were saying about the Bolshevik terror and "organized famine" in the 1930s was true. After revelations about Katyn and Vinnytsia murders "now nobody has a moral right to say" that it was an "émigré fantasy" and "now the whole of Europe has seen with what monster our people were left one on one … for a long quarter century [1918-1943]."[313] It is remarkable how the main themes from the Malaniuk's article in 1943 – Ukrainians shielded Europe from Bolshevism; terror is essence of Bolshevism; the famines of 1921-1922 and 1932-1933 were man-made; Bolshevik actions against various Ukrainian social groups were part of a single anti-Ukrainian policy – became cornerstones of Ukrainian martyrology developed in the Ukrainian diaspora in the West during the Cold War.

---

[312] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 170 (908) August 6, 1943, 4.
[313] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Z istorii bolshevytskoho teroru v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 170 (908) August 6, 1943, 4.

Jews

In the Nazi discourse Jews were the most dangerous and mortal enemy to the Aryan race because of their deeply subversive nature: on the surface they appeared unthreatening and even useful yet underneath they were so alien and corrupting.[314] Nazi propaganda of antisemitism attacked both the liberal West and the Stalinist Soviet Union as incarnations of the same enemy – "world Jewry." The term "Judeobolshevism" was ubiquitous in the Nazi ideology and propaganda in which "Jews" and "Bolshevik/Soviet" were overlapping terms.[315]

However, for *Krakivski Visti* the term "Soviet" overlapped primarily with "Russian" not "Jewish." The term Judeobolshevism appeared in the newspaper as well, but mostly in those materials which were taken from the foreign, primarily Axis press. At the ideological core of original antisemitic texts written for *Krakivski Visti* or at least most of them was nativism (or to be more specific – the nativist component of the Ukrainian nationalism), not biological racism. Even those original texts which used Nazi terminology should not be assumed as just a Ukrainian variation of Nazi propaganda as one could engage with Jewish subject through Nazi terms but for different (not racial) reasons. Another general

[314] The literature about Nazi views on Jews is immense. For a concise treatment of the subject see: Doris Bergen, *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust* 3rd ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016), 52-56. For a book-length: Alon Confino, *A World Without Jews: The Nazi Imagination from Persecution to Genocide* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014).

[315] The term itself was not a Nazi invention, but of the Russian Whites during the Civil War of 1918-1920. On their antisemitism see: Peter Kenez, "The Ideology of the White Movement," *Soviet Studies* 32, no. 1 (1980): 77-80; Peter Kenez, "Pogroms and White Ideology in the Russian Civil War," in *Pogroms: Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian history* ed. John D. Klier and Shlomo Lambroza (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 293-313.

reservation is that one also must be aware of the context in which this antisemitic content was produced: all of the legal newspapers in the General Government had to dive into antisemitism, but some went deeper than others. For example, *Lvivski Visti,* controlled more tightly by the occupational authorities, was much more vehemently antisemitic (and came closer to the Nazi version of antisemitism) than *Krakivski Visti.*[316]

The antisemitic texts of *Krakivski Visti* may be split into three groups based on how they originated. First, there were materials that were either translations or summaries of antisemitic articles from Axis press, primarily German and Italian. Second, there were Ukrainian articles which were commissioned by the occupational authorities in summer 1943 for an antisemitic campaign. Third, there were original Ukrainian texts which were not solicited by the editors: they were submitted by Ukrainian authors on their own volition. In terms of content antisemitic pieces of *Krakivski Visti* again may be divided into three groups: first, Jews as allies or beneficiaries of the interwar Poland and its policies to denationalize Ukrainians; second, Jews as carriers of Bolshevism and agents of its crimes against Ukrainians; and third, Jews as the embodiment of values or features inimical to either European, or Christian or Ukrainian identity and interests (in the authors' understanding of those identities and interests).

---

[316] I base this claim on my reading of 1943 issues from both newspapers. About *Lvivski Visti* see: Henry Abramson, "«*This is the Way it Was!*» Textual and Iconographic Images of Jews in the Nazi-sponsored Ukrainian Press of Distrikt Galizien," *Why Didn't the Press Shout? American & International Journalism and the Holocaust*, ed. Robert Moses Shapiro (New York: Yeshiva University Press, 2003), 537-556.

The antisemitic content from the Axis press appeared in *Krakivski Visti* frequently. The newspaper following the example of *Krakauer Zeitung*, the main legal newspaper of the General Government, regularly republished or summarized speeches (often peppered with antisemitism) of leading Nazi figures from the Reich and the General Government.[317] Besides speeches *Krakivski Visti* also featured articles and news pieces from the Axis press – German, Italian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Croatian and even Japanese. Typically, these were short texts, translations or summaries, usually tucked away at the end of an issue. By my count, over 200 of them appeared between January 1940 and October 1944.[318]

Their titles were quite self-explanatory. The following three examples were typical. "Na zhydiv spadaie vidpovidalnist za viinu" (Responsibility for the War falls on Jews) was a summary of an article from the leading Italian newspaper *Il Regime Fascista*, which argued that the current war was to be blamed primarily on Jews as they benefited the most from it.[319] "Nova mova Evropy" (New Language of Europe) was a summary of an article by Alfred Rosenberg, the most important Nazi ideologue after Hitler, from the *Völkischer Beobachter*, in which he argued that one of the ways how Jews controlled press and academia was through introducing terminological ambivalences and provided three examples of such terms which according to him Jews stripped of their true meaning – Europe, morality and

[317] For example: "Istorychna promova Hitliera v raikhstagu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 68 July 24, 1940, 1-3.
[318] My estimate does not include the weekly edition of *Krakivski Visti* since I had no access to it.
[319] "Na zhydiv spadaie vidpovidalnist za viinu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 6 January 25, 1940, 5.

peace.[320] "Zhydivski pliany panuvannia nad svitom" (Jewish Plans to Dominate the World) was a summary of an article from the *Völkischer Beobachter* which "exposed" the Jewish conspiracy to achieve global dominance.[321]

In May 1943 *Krakivski Visti* received an order from the occupation authorities to publish a series of original antisemitic articles. The exact reasons and intentions behind the order are unknow. John-Paul Himka speculates that the occupational regime might have had several goals in mind: distraction from situation of Ukrainians in the *Reichskommissariat* Ukraine; preventing Ukrainians from sympathizing with Jews in the ghettos; bolstering Ukrainian loyalty towards the Germans, change of policies towards local population after Stalingrad etc.[322] Stalingrad seems the most likely explanation – in the aftermath of their defeat at that city Germans intensified Jewish extermination and antisemitic propaganda. So perhaps the legal press of the General Government, including *Krakivski Visti*, was simply ordered to add its voice to this antisemitic chorus.

How did editors at *Krakivski Visti* reacted to this German order? There is evidence for only one editor's reaction: Marian Kozak in his letter to Ukrainian poet and essayist Iurii Lypa wrote that "when there is an opportunity to remind people of the harmfulness of Jewish influences, we have to do it so that the understanding will not be lost that the Jews continue to be an important factor in

[320] "Nova mova Evropy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 55 June 24, 1940, 5-6.
[321] "Zhydivski pliany panuvannia nad svitom," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 160 (898) July 25, 1943, 2.
[322] John-Paul Himka, "*Krakivski visti* and the Jews, 1943: A Contribution to the History of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations during the Second World War," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 21, no. 1-2 (Summer-Winter 1996): 85-86.

international life. They might still have more than one chance to do us harm."[323] The letter proves that Kozak was not a blind tool of German propaganda, but someone who used ideological space allotted within the propaganda for pushing forward Ukrainian interests (as he understood them).

Krakivski Visti turned to a number of Ukrainian intellectuals and public figures to submit texts for this campaign. Five agreed – Oleksandr Mokh, Kost Kuzyk, Olena Kysilevska, Luka Lutsiv (all four – Western Ukrainians), and Oleksandr Mytsiuk (the only non-Western Ukrainian). All of them requested their texts to be published under pseudonyms. Besides their contributions *Krakivski Visti* received one more antisemitic submission – "An Old Enemy" by Anatol Kurdydyk, but the editors decided against publishing it.[324] At least four invited contributors refused to write for the campaign: Stepan Baran (a Western Ukrainian), Iurii Lypa, Evhen Malaniuk, and Levko Lukasevych (the last three were non-Western Ukrainians).[325]

Oleksandr Mokh (1900-1975) was a Galician Ukrainian journalist, literary critic and publisher with religious inclinations. His lifelong cause was popularization of Catholicism among Ukrainians.[326] Mokh's piece was the first

[323] Letter from Marian Kozak to Iurii Lypa May 26, 1943. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 4, Item 40. Translation by John-Paul Himka.
[324] The title of Kurdydyk's article is mentioned in a letter from Marian Kozak to Anatol Kurdydyk, July 22, 1943. PAA, Chomiak papers, Box 4, item 41.
[325] Himka, "*Krakivski visti* and the Jews," 89.
[326] About Mokh see: Tetiana Shprinher, "Oleksandr Mokh iak literaturnyi krytyk, zhurnalist i vydavets," *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriia zhurnalistyka*. Vyp. 36 (2012): 168-178. The article makes no mention of Mokh's antisemitism or his contributions to *Krakivski Visti*.

and the least original contribution for the campaign. It appeared as a series of nine articles (each with a different title) under the initials M. L.[327] Mokh's text was essentially a compilation of long quotations from Italian, French, British, German and Russian antisemitic authors, who portrayed Jews as an anti-European and anti-Christian force seeking global domination through economy (financial capitalism), ideology (liberalism and Bolshevism) and media control. Mokh's antisemitism had primarily religious, not racial, reasoning.

He mentioned no Nazi antisemitic authors and literature though it is safe to assume, judging from his interest in antisemitism, that he was aware of it. For him Jews were spiritual rebels against the Christian order (how dared they reject Christ?) in the same sense as Satan rebelled against God's. The two archenemies of contemporary Christianity – Masonry and Bolshevism – were Jewish creations. Jews are a primordial chaotic force in the world, they are antithetical to any order and structure, and if allowed within will inevitably work towards their disruption. This Jewish irritability, wrote Mokh, was well spotted by Ukrainians in the past which is proved by the old Ukrainian saying describing someone with idiosyncratic behavior – "vertytsia iak zhyd u tserkvi" (twists like a Jew in a

[327] M. L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "U dzeherel vsesvitnoi zmovy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 109 (847) May 25, 1943, 2; M. L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "Taina vplyviv i uspikhiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 114 (852) May 30, 1943, 2; M. L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "Za dushu inteligenta," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 117 (855) June 3, 1943, 2; M. L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "Natsia desperadiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 118 (856) June 4, 1943, 2; M. L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "Zhydy depravaiut Evropu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 119 (857) June 5, 1943, 2; M. L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "Idealy i nosii rozkladu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 121 (859) June 8, 1943, 3-4; M. L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "Iak spomahaly bolshevykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 122 (860) June 9, 1943, 2; M. L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "Spravedlyvi u Sodomi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 123 (861) June 10, 1943, 3; M. L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "Pered naizdom Dzhingiskhana," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 124 (862) June 11, 1943, 3.

church).[328] The most interesting passage in the series was Mokh's discussion of the antisemitic classic – *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. He was not afraid to admit that this text was likely a forgery – but even in that case *The Protocols* were still a prophetic description of the Jewish peril. Therefore, it warned about Jews accurately in either case.[329]

The little-known Sambir-based journalist Kost Kuzyk (a regular contributor to the newspaper) submitted two pieces for the campaign. The first one was published under initials K. K. and looked at writings of Ivan Franko (1856-1916), the most famous Western Ukrainian writer, about Jews.[330] Kuzyk challenged the mainstream interpretation of Franko as a "zhydofil" (Judeophile), which according to him was constructed by the Ukrainian socialists (Franko was a socialist) on the basis of his literary works such as the poem "Moses" and the novel "Boryslav is Laughing." This reputation of Judeophile, according to Kuzyk, was further cemented both by Ukrainian liberal circles and the Bolsheviks. The latter used Franko for their own ideological agenda as it became evident during the 25th commemoration of Franko's death in Soviet Galicia in 1941. Kuzyk regarded this reputation as one sided and brought attention to Franko's journalistic work in which he viewed Jews "realistically," specifically three articles (two in German,

---

[328] M.L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "Natsia desperadiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 118 (856) June 4, 1943, 2.
[329] M.L. [Oleksandr Mokh] "U dzeherel vsesvitnoi zmovy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 109 (847) May 25, 1943, 2.
[330] K. K. [Kost Kuzyk], "Ivan Franko i zhydivske pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 112 (850) May 28, 1943, 3-4. The Ukrainian historian Iaroslav Hrytsak in his biography of Ivan Franko erroneously attributes the authorship of this article to Anatol Kurdydyk: Iaroslav Hrytsak, *Prorok u svoii vitchyzni: Franko ta ioho spilnota, 1856-1886* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2006), 526.

one in Polish) that Franko published in the 1880s. They appeared in Ukrainian for the first time in 1914 in Franko's collection of texts that he wrote for Polish- and German-language periodicals.[331] The fact that Franko himself selected those three pieces and republished them in 1914 proved to Kuzyk that he had not changed his views about the "Jewish issue."

Kuzyk went on to summarize the three articles providing occasional quotations. The first of Franko's pieces, according to him, exposed a conspiracy of the Viennese Jews to acquire large landholdings in Galicia through a façade of a Jewish educational society. Such conspiratorial methods, Kuzyk quotes Franko, exemplify "Jewish tactics within our society which under cover of emancipation wants to achieve factual hegemony."[332] Franko drew a parallel between this land-grabbing tactic in Galicia with the story of the Jewish conquest of Canaan from the Book of Judges (Old Testament) and came to the conclusion that soon the majority of Galician land would become Jewish property, turning the crownland into the "homeland of Judas."[333] In reply to Franko's claims the Jewish Lviv newspaper *Der Israelit* published an article calling his piece a "disgusting crime." Franko responded with an article (the second piece summarized by Kuzyk) citing land statistics to prove his claim about Jewish land-grabbing in Galicia, adding that

[331] Ivan Franko, *V naimakh u susidiv: zbirnyk prats pysanykh polskoiu ta nimetskoiu movamy v perekladi z poiasnenniamy ta dodatkamy avtora* (Lviv, 1914).
[332] K.K. [Kost Kuzyk], "Ivan Franko i zhydivske pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 112 (850) May 28, 1943, 3
[333] K.K. [Kost Kuzyk] "Ivan Franko i zhydivske pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 112 (850) May 28, 1943, 4.

Jews were not only trying to take over the land but had already taken over the Galician economy and commerce through dishonest competition forcing Ukrainian peasantry into economic dependency on Jewish businesses.[334] Kuzyk used Franko's third article, "Semitism and anti-Semitism in Galicia," to prove that its author looked at the "Jewish question" not only as a social-economic issue, but as a moral one as well. In this text Franko praised the apostle Paul for breaking away with the Jewish tradition through "liberating the Christian ethic from Jewish formulas and Jewish formalism."[335] Kuzyk ended his piece by quoting Franko's warning from the third article that if Jews will ignore the growing dissatisfaction of Galician non-Jewish population against them then both the region (Galicia) and its Jews may face "untold threats" in the future. "Life showed that Franko's predictions were correct" ended Kuzyk, which may be interpreted as a hint at ghettoization and extermination of Galician Jews by summer 1943.[336] It is worth noting that the subject of Franko's antisemitism still remains an issue of intellectual and public controversy.[337]

Kuzyk's second contribution to the campaign was published under the pseudonym "Boiko." In this text, "Tin Ahasfera nad Boikivshchynoiu" (Ahasver's

---

[334] K.K. [Kost Kuzyk] "Ivan Franko i zhydivske pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 112 (850) May 28, 1943, 4.
[335] K.K. [Kost Kuzyk] "Ivan Franko i zhydivske pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 112 (850) May 28, 1943, 4.
[336] K.K. [Kost Kuzyk], "Ivan Franko i zhydivske pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 112 (850) May 28, 1943, 4.
[337] See a recent collection of articles: Alois Woldan and Olaf Terpitz, eds. *Ivan Franko und die jüdische Frage in Galizien Interkulturelle Begegnungen und Dynamiken im Schaffen des ukrainischen Schriftstellers* (Wien: Vienna University Press; Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2016). The Ukrainian edition was published in the same year.

shadow over the Boiko region), he tried to answer the old question of Ukrainian poverty: how come Ukrainians are so poor despite living in a land so rich with natural resources?[338] Kuzyk's answer was quite straightforward – Jews were one of the main reasons for Ukrainian poverty. The title of the article was somewhat misleading since Kuzyk looked beyond the Boiko region in his argument. He started with a brief historical outline of how Jews came to live in Ukraine pointing out that their rise to economic dominance was rooted in the medieval Polish kingdom, when both Polish royals and lords passed collection of taxes and management of land estates into Jewish hands. From there he immediately jumped to the late 19th-early 20th century and described relations of Jews to Ukrainian population as economic exploitation (*vyzysk*). The most successful tool of this exploitation in Ukrainian villages was the Jewish tavern. It was from these taverns that Boikos primarily got their alcohol which kept them demoralized and impoverished. After Jewish taverns spread through Ukrainian villages - and Kuzyk described this expansion as the spreading of an infectious disease - Jews took over the best lands in the region, forests, commerce and crafts.[339]

But the largest profits off Ukrainians, in Kuzyk's opinion, were made by Jews during the oil boom in Eastern Galicia before World War I. Here Ukrainians served as white slaves to Jewish masters in the same manner as Europeans

[338] Boiko [Kost Kuzyk], "Tin Ahasfera nad Boikivshchynoiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (851) May 29, 1943, 2-3.
[339] Boiko [Kost Kuzyk], "Tin Ahasfera nad Boikivshchynoiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (851) May 29, 1943, 2.

exploited colonial populations overseas. In support of his point Kuzyk quoted from the fiction of two Ukrainian writers - Ivan Franko and Stefan Kovaliv. Both wrote short stories about the oil industry in Boryslav (the center of this Galician oil boom) and social conditions surrounding it. But, continued Kuzyk, Jews were not satisfied with their traditional dominance in commerce and crafts. They also expanded into so called free professions, especially law and medicine, leading to a Jewish monopoly among lawyers and doctors. The number of Jews registered as lawyers in Eastern Galicia rose from 40.1% in 1890 to 60.8% in 1910.[340]

That so many Jews pursued law and medicine, wrote Kuzyk, was not a problem per se. The problem was that they lacked any moral principles and entered those fields purely for profits. This resulted in further exploitation of Ukrainian peasants as Jewish lawyers encouraged them to pursue even the most hopeless cases giving them false hopes and, in the process, milking them of their savings. Jewish lawyers rightfully had the reputation of being the most corrupted lawyers in Galicia since they were not shy to suggest to their clients to bribe the judge. Jewish doctors were no better either in Kuzyk's opinion: they pushed out non-Jewish competition through charging the least per doctoral visit so most people naturally went to the cheapest doctors, the only doctors that they could afford. But on the other hand, Jewish doctors recovered their losses as they persuaded the same clients to come much more often, and in addition always

[340] Boiko [Kost Kuzyk], "Tin Ahasfera nad Boikivshchynoiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (851) May 29, 1943, 2.

charged for various useless injections during these visits. The Jewish work ethic, surmised Kuzyk, is profit-oriented and built around the exploitation of goys (non-Jews).[341]

But when it came to specifically Jewish-Ukrainian relations the harmful effect of Jewish influence was not limited to economic exploitation alone. According to Kuzyk Jews were always hostile to "our people and our culture." During World War I many Ukrainian peasants and members of intelligentsia ended up in Thalerhof internment camp because of Jewish denunciations, claims Kuzyk. During the interwar period, Jews on the one hand served Polish interests and were carriers of the Polish culture in Eastern Galicia. On the other hand, Jews were also responsible for spreading of communist ideas thus contributing to lack of national unity among Ukrainians.

But it was during the Soviet occupation of 1939-1941 that the Jewish presence among Ukrainian society reached new heights. Jews eagerly took positions in Soviet institutions, including the NKVD. It is thanks to these local Galician Jews and their knowledge of the Ukrainian community that the Bolshevik terror in the Boiko region was so devastating. Kuzyk ended his article on an optimistic note: "today [May 1943] our national organism has shaken off Jewry."[342] As a result, the Ukrainian economy, culture and public life will continue to grow

[341] Boiko [Kost Kuzyk], "Tin Ahasfera nad Boikivshchynoiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (851) May 29, 1943, 3.
[342] Boiko [Kost Kuzyk], "Tin Ahasfera nad Boikivshchynoiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (851) May 29, 1943, 3.

because the "Boiko region will never be Jewish again."[343] Both Kuzyk's articles were the most sophisticated and best written contributions to the antisemitic campaign in *Krakivski Visti*.

The third contributor was Luka Lutsiv (1895-1984), a well-educated (Ph.D. in literature from Charles University in Prague) Ukrainian journalist and literary critic.[344] He wrote two articles for the campaign published under his usual pseudonym "L. Hranychka." Both dealt with literary themes. The first one was on the role of laughter and humor in literature.[345] Lutsiv reminded readers that Ukrainian national literature started as a humorous experiment, meaning Ivan Kotliarevskii's *Eneida*. But contemporary Ukrainian literature, according to him, contained more lamentations than laughter. In wrong hands laughter can do more harm than good as we can see, wrote Lutsiv, from Jewish control over press, cinemas and theatres, which were used by Jews to promote a new "progressive" human being, liberated from any moral "chains." Jews made fun of religion (Lutsiv meant Christianity), national traditions, the noble character of some nations (which ones Lutsiv did not specify), and most importantly of marital fidelity. Instead Jews praised religious indifference, cosmopolitanism, liberal

[343] Boiko [Kost Kuzyk], "Tin Ahasfera nad Boikivshchynoiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (851) May 29, 1943, 3.
[344] The most detailed study of Luka Lutsiv is a Ph.D. dissertation by Solomiia Kovaliv: Solomiia-Mariia Kovaliv, "Literaturoznavchi kontseptsii Luky Lutsiva. Dysertatsiia na zdobuttia naukovoho stupenia kandydata filolohichnykh nauk" (PhD diss., Lvivskyi Natsionalnyi Universytet imeni Ivana Franka, 2018). The dissertation makes no mention of Lutsiv's antisemitic articles in *Krakivski Visti*.
[345] L. Hranychka [Luka Lutsiv], "Pro smikh, zhydiv, radnyka Shchypku i Makolondru Miska (Nashym humorystam pid uvahu)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 115 (853) June 1, 1943, 3-4.

permissiveness, and sexual depravity. Jews never had access to "our [Ukrainian]" press to preach this message directly, but there were always Ukrainian journalists and writers willing to spread their "demoralizing" influence under disguise of "Western" ideas. Lutsiv ended his article with a call to "Let's make fun of our sins and praise our virtues! Not the other way around!"[346]

Lutsiv's second article, "Deshcho pro roliu zhydivskykh pysmennykiv" (Something about the role of Jewish writers), was perhaps the most primitive text in the whole campaign.[347] He claimed that any national literature accepting Jewish authors would eventually suffer from their demoralizing influence. To prove his point, Lutsiv went on to list a number of writers, who published as Germans, Russians, and Italians but in reality all were Jewish and should be regarded as such. "This national incognito was used to lull national sensitivity of some peoples."[348] Writings of these authors, often praised, "only demoralized our people." For example, Erich Maria Remarque, whose most famous novel Lutsiv mistitled as "Na zakhodi bez zmin" (No changes in the West), deserved none of the praise lavished on him as the novel celebrated "defeatism" and made a mockery out of "real heroism and true […] patriotism." The reason why Jewish writers did not penetrate Ukrainian literature as much as German or Russian

[346] L. Hranychka [Luka Lutsiv], "Pro smikh, zhydiv, radnyka Shchypku i Makolondru Miska (Nashym humorystam pid uvahu)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 115 (853) June 1, 1943, 4.
[347] L. Hranychka [Luka Lutsiv], "Deshcho pro roliu zhydivskykh pysmennykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 136 (874) June 27, 1943, 4.
[348] L. Hranychka [Luka Lutsiv], "Deshcho pro roliu zhydivskykh pysmennykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 136 (874) June 27, 1943, 4.

literatures was because Jews "pushed" into literatures with a large readership where they could make "good money" from sales. "Ukrainian books before the world war [that is, before 1914] had very low print runs so no Jew wanted to be our writer."[349] Jewish authors – those "Shchupaks, Pervomaiskyis, Holovanivskyis and Stebunys" – started to write in Ukrainian only when the Soviets started to mass publish Ukrainian-language books for "propaganda purposes." According to Lutsiv, "these «Ukrainian» writers made a good profit on [writing] Ukrainian books and at the same time served Muscovite imperialism."[350]

The fourth contributor was Olena Kysilevska (1869-1956), one of the most frequent authors of *Krakivski Visti* who specialized in "women" topics and general hygiene. For the campaign she submitted one article – "Khto ruinuvav Hutsulshchynu?" (Who ruined the Hutsul region?) – which was published under the initial "Kh."[351] The article had quite telling subheadings – *Iak zhydy znyshchyly bahatstvo hutsuliv* (How Jews destroyed Hutsul wealth); *Iak zhydy vykydaly hutsula z khaty* (How Jews threw out the Hutsul from his home); *Iak zhydy nyshchyly kylymarstvo* (How Jews destroyed carpet-making); *Iak zhydy obmotuvaly hutsula* (How Jews wrapped up the Hutsul); *Zhydy i poshyriuvannia bolshevyzmu* (Jews and the spreading of Bolshevism). According to Kysilevska, Hutsuls (a Ukrainian

[349] L. Hranychka [Luka Lutsiv], "Deshcho pro roliu zhydivskykh pysmennykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 136 (874) June 27, 1943, 4.
[350] L. Hranychka [Luka Lutsiv], "Deshcho pro roliu zhydivskykh pysmennykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 136 (874) June 27, 1943, 4.
[351] Kh. [Olena Kysilevska], "Khto ruinuvav Hutsulshchynu?" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 126 (864) June 16, 1943, 2; no. 127 (865) June 17, 1943, 2.

ethnic group which still lives in the Carpathian Mountains) out of all Ukrainians suffered the most from Jewish economic exploitation because they were totally uneducated and had no own intelligentsia. This allowed Jews – those "cunning, flattering, greedy, unscrupulous in methods, insolent and inquisitive" people – quickly to become "false" friends of Hutsuls after settling in the region.[352]

Just as the British colonizers drove Australian aboriginals to ruin through alcohol Jews did the same to Hutsuls, who were a well-to-do people before Jewish arrival in the region, wrote Kysilevska. In Jewish taverns Hutsuls lost their memory, reason, houses and lands. Jewish alcohol drove this primitive but innocent Ukrainian tribe even to visible physical deterioration – cretins, retards or physically deformed children became common among Hutsuls.[353] According to her, efforts of Ukrainian priests, including Metropolitan Sheptystkyi, to stop this plague of alcoholism bore little results. Through control of moneylending and trade in the region Jews made slaves out of Hutsuls in all but the name. They took over each of the economic activities in which Hutsuls engaged – sheep breeding, carpet-making, fruit growing – and pushed out any non-Jewish competitors, especially Ukrainian cooperatives and stores. Jews actively encouraged Hutsuls to buy on credit and drive themselves into debt. In addition, during the interwar period Jews contributed further to the worsening of Hutsul life by spreading

[352] Kh. [Olena Kysilevska], "Khto ruinuvav Hutsulshchynu?" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 126 (864) June 16, 1943, 2.
[353] Kh. [Olena Kysilevska], "Khto ruinuvav Hutsulshchynu?" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 126 (864) June 16, 1943, 2.

Bolshevik propaganda. Like Kuzyk in his article about Boikos, Kysilevska ended her article on the optimistic note that the "Jews are gone [now] from the [Carpathian] mountains" which meant that the "old owners [Hutsuls]" finally had a chance at economic and societal revival.[354]

John-Paul Himka discovered that after the war Kysilevska – now an émigré – wrote another article on the Jews. Originally titled "Do spravy zhydivsko-ukrainskykh vidnosyn" (On the issue of Jewish-Ukrainian Relations) and then renamed as "Za dobre imia ukrainskoho narodu" (For the Good Name of the Ukrainian People) the article claimed that "the Jews were the enemies of the Ukrainians in Galicia – they exploited them and got them drunk, and they actively collaborated with their oppressors; nonetheless, Ukrainian peasants helped and fed Jews during the war."[355]

The fifth and the last contributor to the campaign was Oleksandr Mytsiuk (1883-1943), the only non-Western Ukrainian and the most outstanding figure out of all five contributors. He was a prominent Ukrainian Socialist-Revolutionary before and during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1920 and served briefly (for almost two months) as the Minister of Internal Affairs in the government of the Ukrainian Directory in 1918-19. After 1920 Mytsiuk, like the majority of his party colleagues, became an émigré, settling in Czechoslovakia where he made a good career at the Ukrainian Free University in Prague, eventually becoming its rector

[354] Kh. [Olena Kysilevska], "Khto ruinuvav Hutsulshchynu?" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 127 (865) June 17, 1943, 2.
[355] Himka, "*Krakivski visti* and the Jews," 87-88.

in 1938-1941. Unlike other contributors Mytsiuk had a record of writing about the Jews before the war and under his real name: in 1931-1933 he wrote a series of articles on "agrarianization of Jewry" for the official journal of the OUN *Rozbudova Natsii* (Nation Building).[356] For the campaign in *Krakivski Visti* Mytsiuk wrote a series of articles under one title – "Zhydy v Ukraini" (Jews in Ukraine). *Krakivski Visti* published them in six parts under the initials O. M.[357]

According to Mytsiuk, the Jewish psyche had lost any notion of fatherland or homeland. Jews have the mentality of nomads rather than settlers - they stay in one place only as long as it suits their needs and leave promptly once it does not. They are quintessential stateless people, for they feel no need of state or state borders. Their ideal environment is an open world without any borders and nation-states. This is the reason why international socialism and communism attracted so many Jews, wrote Mytsiuk: the Jewish leading role in Bolshevism is not the result of some conspiracy, but a natural outcome of their predisposition. The Jewish drive to global dominance comes from their self-perception as "the chosen people" accompanied by arrogant attitudes to goys, whom Jews treat very differently from their fellow tribesmen. When it comes to economy the Jewish

[356] The articles were republished in a small book: Oleksandr Mytsiuk, *Ahraryzatsiia zhydivstva na tli zahalnoi ekonomiky* (Prague, 1933). Taras Kurylo and John-Paul Himka consider it "one of the most serious anti-Jewish publications that ever came out of Ukrainian intellectual tradition." See: Taras Kurylo and Ivan Khymka, "Iak OUN stavylasia do ievreiv? Rozdumy nad knyzhkoiu Volodymyra Viatrovycha," *Ukraina Moderna* no. 13 (2008): 256.

[357] O. M. [Oleksandr Mytsiuk], "Zhydy v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 125 (863) June 12/15, 1943, 7-8; no. 137 (875) June 29, 1943, 2; no. 144 (882) July 7, 1943, 2; no. 175 (913) August 12, 1943, 2; no. 176 (914) August 13, 1943, 4; no. 201 (939) September 11, 1943, 4.

ideal is to have as little state regulation as possible, but in the communist Soviet Union Jewry pursues an opposite course – regulation of everything (Mytsiuk did not bother to explain this logical contradiction).[358]

The rest of Mytsiuk's series dealt with Ukrainian Jews specifically. He described them as unwelcome arrivals who were never invited by Ukrainians to come to their lands but came on the invitations of the Polish landlords to help exploit the Ukrainian people. Since then the Jewish presence among Ukrainians had been a source of economic hardships. Here Mytsiuk provided a traditional list of grievances against the Jewish role in the economy of Ukrainian lands: control over trade; merciless exploitation of Ukrainian peasants for the Polish benefit; impoverishing of the Ukrainian population through the Jewish taverns etc. After surveying the economic role of Jews Mytsiuk arrived at a powerful conclusion: the reason why Ukrainians never fully developed, never acquired their own burgher class, was because of Jewish competition. Jews, he added, would win in economic competition with anyone for they are an utterly dishonest and corrupt people. They even managed to turn two peasant emancipations – Habsburg of 1848 and Romanov of 1861 – into their own favor, further exploiting Ukrainian peasants in the both empires through usury.[359]

As for demographic distribution of Jews in the Ukrainian ethnic lands, Mytsiuk found their highest percentage in Transcarpathia (up to 14%). This fact in

---

[358] O. M. [Oleksandr Mytsiuk], "Zhydy v Ukraini," no. 125 (863) June 12/15, 1943, 7-8.
[359] O.M. [Oleksandr Mytsiuk], "Zhydy v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 137 (875) June 29, 1943, 2; no. 144 (882) July 7, 1943, 2; no. 175 (913) August 12, 1943, 2; no. 176 (914) August 13, 1943, 4.

his view was not a coincidence: Jews gravitate to live near settlements that are least resistant to their demographic penetration. Mytsiuk measured this resistance in poverty: the poorer a village was the easier it was for Jews to gain a foothold in it. This explains, wrote Mytsiuk, why most Transcarpathian Jews live in the poorest villages of the region since it is harder for them to take advantage over wealthier and better educated peasants.[360]

Though Mytsiuk saw no need in conspiracy theories to explain either Jewish competitiveness or their affinity to Bolshevism he did come up with his own conspiracy theory about research on Jews. According to him, any study of Ukraine's history, economy, statistics, folklore and demography would reveal a negative figure of the Jew. Such studies showing "real" Jews were undertaken in the Russian Empire in the 19th century by Mykhailo Drahomanov, Fedir Vovk and Pavlo Chubynskyi. But in the early 20th century such works stopped appearing. The first generation of Ukrainian socialists, argued Mytsiuk, people like Drahomanov, Podolynskyi, Pavlyk, and Navrotskyi openly professed anti-Jewish feelings since as true socialists they were against any exploitation, including exploitation of Ukrainians by Jews. But later socialists did not tolerate critical views about Jews, such people were regarded as antisemites and expelled from the parties. Fiction went through a similar path as well. Nineteenth century authors – Pushkin, Gogol, Shevchenko, Saltykov-Shchedrin and Dostoevsky –

[360] O.M. [Oleksandr Mytsiuk], "Zhydy v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 125 (863) June 12/15, 1943, 7-8.

portrayed Jews as they really were. But in the early 1900s such negative depictions of Jews became taboo. Why? Mytsiuk explained this shift by successful infiltration of Russian and Ukrainian scholarship and literature by Jews in the early 20th century, who then directed their developments away from Jewish issues.[361]

Mytsiuk ended his series with the strong claim that emancipation of Jews should have never happened, because when the same rules apply to Jews and to the local population the former will always outcompete the latter. This thesis, according to him, was demonstrated the best in Transcarpathia whose local Ukrainian population ended up "in death throes" under the "Jewish yoke" which was well described in the famous Egán report.[362] Egán died in Transcarpathia in 1901 under mysterious circumstances (most likely killed by local bandits). But Mytsiuk had no doubts – local Jews murdered him for telling the truth about their exploitation.[363]

The difficult question to answer is about the reception of the anti-Semitic campaign of 1943. The editorial correspondence contains no hints whether the occupational authorities were (dis)satisfied with the articles. As for the Ukrainian public, there is very little evidence – just two letters by Mykhailo Khomiak from

[361] O.M. [Oleksandr Mytsiuk], "Zhydy v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 201 (939) September 11, 1943, 4.
[362] Ede Egán (1851-1901) was a Hungarian official and economist, who wrote a lengthy report on the social and economic conditions of Transcarpathia in the 1890s. On Egán and his report see: Paul Robert Magocsi, *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus', 1848-1948* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978), 71, 384.
[363] O.M. [Oleksandr Mytsiuk], "Zhydy v Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 201 (939) September 11, 1943, 4.

1943. In the first one, from July 10, Khomiak defended the publication of articles about Jews, though in his own words their reception was negative:

"I have to confess that we have written enough on the Jewish subject, and we [also] have heard enough of disapprovals from many people that we are conducting or, rather, justifying the action against the Jews, also for our dishonesty and provincialism, and our escape from reality and responsibility, but that is a minor matter. To us it seems that we are approaching every matter in the most objective way and that we strive to cover those problems which the very life pushes onto us or throws at us. We strive to do this «sine ire et studia» [without anger and zeal]. As for how good we are at that, let history issue its harsh judgment someday."[364]

More than one month later, in a letter from August 20, Khomiak's described the reaction to the "Jewish" articles as mixed: "Many people are upset that we are touching upon this sensitive theme in such conditions in which we are now forced to live. It is also true that very many people express their approval of the good manner in which the authors approach this painful problem."[365]

After the war Khomiak returned to the subject of Jewish-Ukrainian relationship at least once more. In 1958 he wrote to Vasyl Kosarenko-Kosarevych (1891-1964), a Galician Ukrainian nationalist and émigré who at that time lived in New York. In the letter Khomiak praised Kosarenko-Kosarevych's book published

[364] Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Volodymyr Levynskyi, July 10, 1943. PAA, Chomiak papers, Box 4, item 41. John-Paul Himka translates this fragment in a slightly different way, making Khomiak's awkward Ukrainian into coherent English. See: Himka, "*Krakivski visti* and the Jews," 89.
[365] Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Oleksandr Mytsiuk, August 20, 1943. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 4, Item 41. Translation by John-Paul Himka.

a year earlier – "Moskovskyi sfinks: mit i syla v obrazi Skhodu Evropy" (Moscow Sphinx: Myth and Power in the Image of Eastern Europe).[366] The book was an anti-Russian/Soviet treatise, but it was its penultimate chapter – "Zhydy i Skhid Evropy" (Jews and Eastern Europe) – that drew Khomiak's attention. The chapter provided a historical review of Jewish-Ukrainian relations from Kyivan Rus to World War II and like many other Ukrainian nationalist writings on the subject it tried to accomplish two seemingly unrelated tasks.

On the one hand the chapter blamed Jews for various hardships that Ukrainians suffered through history and on the other hand it attempted to exonerate Ukrainians from accusations in antisemitism. It is curious how Kosarenko-Kosarevych applied victim blaming in the case of Jewish suffering but did the opposite for Ukrainian suffering. Besides that, Kosarenko-Kosarevych repeated a number of usual antisemitic tropes: the Soviet Union was a Jewish state, Jews were a nation of exploiters, Jews exploit other nations because they consider themselves "chosen people," Jews control the media, Jews dream of global domination etc.[367] Khomiak praised the author for his "bravery" in writing the chapter which showed the "decisive influence of Jewry" (Khomiak did not specify influence on what) and recommended its expansion into a separate book.[368]

---

[366] Vasyl Kosarenko-Kosarevych, *Moskovskyi sfinks: mit i syla v obrazi Skhodu Evropy* (New York, 1957).
[367] Kosarenko-Kosarevych, *Moskovskyi sfinks*, 409-429.
[368] Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Vasyl Kosarenko-Kosarevych March 31, 1958. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 12, Item 170.

The third and final group of antisemitic content in *Krakivski Visti*, after republished texts from the Axis press and the commissioned pieces of 1943, consisted of articles submitted by willing Ukrainian authors. Not all of them dealt exclusively with Jews and some mentioned them only in passing, but the general message was clear enough – Jews should be regarded as a hostile group who at most supports Ukrainian enemies or at least benefits and profits from Ukrainian suffering. Before June 1941 Jews were linked with the Polish oppression of Ukrainians or interwar Poland in general. It was not uncommon for these articles to associate Jews with dirtiness, bad smells, infectious diseases and visual repugnance.[369]

The article by V. Nemyrych, which I discussed earlier in this chapter in the framework of anti-Polish content, was the first text in *Krakivski Visti* which contained a negative, though in passing, comment on Jews. Expressing his contempt at interwar Poland as an "artificial" country, Nemyrych also injected a note of disgust at Poland by adding that it was densely populated by the "Jewish infection [zaraza]."[370] The article "Miska spozhyvcha kooperatsiia" (City grocery cooperatives) argued that Poles by their nature are incompetent in matters of

[369] For example, a series of articles on typhus singled out Jews as primary carriers ("90%") of the disease: "Nuzhda, holod i brud – vyklykuiut tyf," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (269) May 27, 1941, 5; "Berezhitsia zhebrakiv, zhydiv i volotsiuh!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 115 (271) May 29, 1941, 7; "Vidokremlennia khvorykh i chystota – tse zbroia proty tyfu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 116 (272) May 31, 1941, 5.
[370] V. Nemyrych, "Pevnym krokom vperid!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 2 January 11, 1940, 2.

economy which allowed "Jewish exploiters" to easily run the Polish economy until Germans arrived in 1939.[371]

These comments about Jews were often accompanied with calls of opportunity-seizing. Iu. Radievych in his article called for a revival of Ukrainian handicraft, trade and small industry since Jewish "leeches," which had prevented their development for centuries are now gone from Ukrainian towns and villages.[372] "Za sylnu organizatsiu ukrainskoho kupetstva" (For a strong organization of Ukrainian merchants) pointed out that German dejewification (*vidzhydivlennia*) of trade in the General Government is an opportunity which Ukrainian merchants should take full advantage of.[373] Bohdan Halit noted that now is the time, thanks to the dejewification of cities, for Ukrainians to move in and urbanize themselves.[374] The Ukrainian takeover of the former Jewish properties was regarded as a positive development which needed to be encouraged. Slava Holovinska praised how quickly Ukrainians were recovering under the German order from the previous Polish rule and gave an example of such recovery: the best shops in the former Jewish market in city of Belz were now in Ukrainian hands.[375]

---

[371] "Miska spozhyvcha kooperatsiia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 4 January 17, 1940, 4.
[372] Iu. Radievych, "Za nashu hospodarsku samovystarchalnist," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 5 January 21, 1940, 4.
[373] "Za sylnu organizatsiu ukrainskoho kupetstva," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 5 January 21, 1940, 4.
[374] Halit, "Za torhovelnu osvitu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 13 February 21, 1940, 3.
[375] Slava Holovinska, "Ne vmirae dusha nasha," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 35 May 9, 1940, 7.

There were also calls for intensifying German anti-Jewish policies. For example, Iurii Tarkovych complained that German dejewification of economy was not going fast enough: yes, the Jewish "leeches" have lost their monopolizing position and can no longer impoverish Ukrainians, but there are still too many Jewish shops around. The German order to mark them with David's star made their presence even more visible and thus in Tarkovych's eyes even more irritating since Ukrainians had suffered the Jewish presence for long enough during the two interwar decades of the "Polish-Jewish rule" that even in purely Ukrainian villages by the end of the 1930s "we could only see a Jew, a Pole, a Jew and once more a Jew."[376] In his another article Tarkovych explained more what he meant under the "Polish-Jewish rule": according to him in interwar Poland both Poles and Jews worked hand in hand to keep Ukrainians backward. Poles hindered the national and cultural development of Ukrainians and Jews did the same for their economic advancement.[377]

Besides texts that linked Jews with either Polish or Soviet/Russian rule over Ukrainians, *Krakivski Visti* also published a number of *pure* antisemitic pieces: in other words, articles that regarded Jews in their relationship to Ukrainians as a hostile element on their own, without Poles or Soviets/Russians. The most interesting case of this pure antisemitism was the figure of Carpatho-Ukrainian

[376] Iu. Tarkovych, "Za rozbudovu kredytovykh kooperatyv na Lemkivshchyni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 6 January 25, 1940, 5.
[377] Iurii Tarkovych, "Iak pratsiuie «Lemkivskyi Soiuz Kooperatyv» u Sianotsi?" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 12 February 18, 1940, 3.

writer and journalist Vasyl Grendzha-Donskyi (1897-1974).[378] In terms of national consciousness Grendzha-Donskyi went through a short path from a Margaryized Rusyn in the 1910s to a Carpatho-Ukrainian nationalist in the 1930s. Initially he leaned to the left politically: in 1919 he served in the Red Hungarian Army. In the interwar period he made his living as a bank clerk in Uzhhorod, but his ambition was in journalism and writing fiction (some of which he self-published). In the all-Ukrainian cultural context he was a second-rate, maybe even third-rate, writer, but within the confines of his home region, Transcarpathia (or Carpatho-Ukraine as his generation preferred to call it), he grew into a titan of local Ukrainian journalism and literature. The highlight of his life occurred in 1938-1939 when Carpatho-Ukraine received autonomy within Czechoslovakia and he worked as an editor for its autonomous government.

Grendzha-Donskyi's conversion to antisemitism did not occur overnight. His writings from the 1920s show no trace of it. It started to develop in him in the 1930s in a rather disturbing way – not from reading antisemitic literature, but from observing Jews in their relations with the local population in Transcarpathian villages and towns as he travelled through almost all of them collecting material for his journalist articles. A prejudice formed through real-life interactions is much stronger and deeper than one formed by reading a brochure or watching a movie. By the end of the 1930s his antisemitism was not yet public, but his diary showed

[378] Grendzha-Donskyi's daughter, Zirka, has written a biography of him: Zirka Hrendzha-Donska, *"My ie lyshen korotki epizody": zhyttia i tvorchist Vasylia Hrendzhi-Donskoho* (Uzhhorod: Sribna zemlia, 1993). It makes no mention of her father's antisemitism.

clear signs that it had taken root. By that time Grendzha-Donskyi's Ukrainian nationalism radicalized as well. He also developed a strong nativist attitude, according to which all of Transcarpathia was a property of Rusyns and whatever wealth was made by other ethnic groups – Czechs, Hungarians and Jews – living in the region was actually owed to Rusyns. In other words, their gains were Rusyns' losses. In his mind he established a causal link between destitution of Rusyn villages and the Jewish presence within them.

In his diary he noted his impressions about two Transcarpathian villages in the 1930s. The one with Jews was "forsaken by God and people, poor, enslaved and unhappy."[379] In the other village local peasants refused to deal with Jewish traders and now "they are making profits themselves." The peasants in this village were also in favor of temperance so local Jewish taverns had to close down. The next development, in Grendzha-Donskyi's eyes, was a natural outcome: unable to trade and sell alcohol "all Jews fled [this village], they have nothing to do here, there is nobody here whom they can cheat out of the money."[380] Thus the absence of Jews meant better economic opportunities for Ukrainians. But the very demographic presence of Jews also felt alienating for Grendzha-Donskyi. In his diary he noted that he had never liked Mukachevo or "Palestine" as he called it: a dirty town with a Jewish majority, which made it look like an "oriental" place: for

[379] Vasyl Grendzha-Donskyi, *Shchastia i hore Karpatskoi Ukrainy: Shchodennyk. Moi spohady* (Uzhhorod: Zakarapattia, 2002), 99.
[380] Grendzha-Donskyi, *Shchastia i hore*, 135.

him the Jewish presence made a place non-European.[381] But all those thoughts remained confined to the diary.

In summer 1941 Grendzha-Donskyi published three pieces in *Krakivski Visti* in which he publicly voiced his antisemitism.[382] The first two made antisemitic comments only in passing: "Judeobolshevism has to disappear from the face of the earth so no trace will be left of it"[383] and "Instead of Judeo-Bolshevik Marxism we must give full rights to our national culture."[384] But it was the third article – "Na vlasnykh sylakh" (Using our own strength) – which made it clear what Grendzha-Donskyi thought of Jews in relation to Ukrainians. The article was written and published at the time – August 1941 – when German troops were rapidly advancing into Soviet Ukraine. In the article Grendzha-Donskyi, still uncertain about German plans for the "liberated" territories, advocated a nativist approach to their reconstruction – Ukrainians must rebuild Ukraine themselves. He warned against allowing Jews into any sphere of economy, even on a temporary basis: "under no circumstances should Jews be allowed into any sector of economy. A

[381] Grendzha-Donskyi, *Shchastia i hore*, 56.
[382] V. Grendzha-Donskyi, "Slovatska ta khorvatska presa pro bolshevytski zvirstva nad ukraintsiamy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 164 (319) July 29, 1941, 4; V. Grendzha-Donskyi, "Vidpovidalnist pered istorieiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 165 (320) July 30, 1941, 1; V. Grendzha-Donskyi, "Na vlasnykh sylakh," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 189 (344) August 28, 1941, 4.
[383] V. Grendzha-Donskyi, "Slovatska ta khorvatska presa pro bolshevytski zvirstva nad ukraintsiamy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 164 (319) July 29, 1941, 4.
[384] V. Grendzha-Donskyi, "Vidpovidalnist pered istorieiu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 165 (320) July 30, 1941, 1.

Jew may not engage in trade, openly or not, because he is an element difficult to safeguard against – he will get in anywhere, will elbow in to exploit."[385]

Conclusions

One of the goals of the German authorities in the General Government was to put its multiethnic population through a "school of hate" – propaganda of ethnic hatred aimed at dividing the population along ethnic lines and forming attitudes based on group identity. Historically speaking such a policy was not original – already ancient rulers understood that is easier to rule over population that is divided. However, in the General Government this German task was made easier by pre-existing ethnic tensions that Polish policies of aggressive assimilation and denationalization produced by 1939.

Antisemitism constituted the core of the German propaganda in the General Government throughout the war. At the beginning of the German occupation the propaganda also engaged against Poles, primarily to convince them that their prewar state was unviable. The Soviets were a blind spot until June 22, 1941 after which they were returned into their usual category of Judeobolshevism – the mortal enemy of the Aryan race. On the surface *Krakivski Visti* followed Nazi propaganda: it also attacked Jews, Poles and Soviets and even republished some Nazi propaganda (it had no choice). However, it would be

[385] Vasyl Grendzha-Donskyi, "Na vlasnykh sylakh," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 189 (344) August 28, 1941, 4.

superficial to assume, just on those grounds, that *Krakivski Visti* was a "Nazi" newspaper as some commentators declared it in Spring 2017 when Chrystia Freeland's grandfather – Mykhailo Khomiak – became a hot subject in the Canadian media.[386] Nuance matters: *Krakivski Visti* engaged in campaigns against Jews, Poles and Soviets for reasons that had little or nothing to do with National Socialism. It has become a truism to say that not everyone who fought on the Nazi side during World War II was a Nazi. If this claim is true for combatants who fought under Nazis it is even truer for people who wrote for newspapers under Nazis. History dealt to many people under the German occupation, especially in the General Government, a choice between horrible and terrible.

Krakivski Visti's first campaign was directed at Poles and to a large extent this was simply revenge for the previous two decades of Ukrainian life under the Polish rule, which treated them as second-class citizens. Ironically, the leading role in the campaign was played by members of the Ukrainian party – UNDO – which before the war attempted to reach a modus vivendi with the Polish state (normalization of 1935). Two prominent UNDO members, Ivan Kedryn and Stepan Baran, wrote a series of anti-Polish articles each. Kedryn's series was also republished as a book. Another former UNDO leader, Milena Rudnytska, prepared and edited a book of anti-Polish materials on commission from the

[386] See for example: Robert Fife, "Freeland knew her grandfather was editor of Nazi newspaper," *The Globe and Mail*, March 7, 2017, https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/freeland-knew-her-grandfather-was-editor-of-nazi-newspaper/article34236881/ I must note that this article contains some severe factual inaccuracies: it seems its author did not even read carefully the John-Paul Himka's article he references several times throughout the text.

Ukrainian Central Committee (the book was not published for some reason). Besides the sophisticated pieces of Kedryn and Baran *Krakivski Visti* also published plenty of primitive texts which were vehemently anti-Polish and often reduced to name-calling. Attacks on Poles were often framed in terms of justice and order, that is the lack of either under the Polish rule. Some authors essentially wanted a reversal of the prewar situation and advocated anti-Polish measures just for the sake of Ukrainian benefit.

Anti-Polish materials were significantly reduced in frequency after June 1941 when the primary focus shifted to anti-Soviet propaganda. Again, *Krakivski Visti*'s authors had their own reasons to attack the Soviets: two famines (1921-1922 and 1932-1933), collectivization, Stalinist purges and Russification of the 1930s in Soviet Ukraine; deportations of 1939-1941 and the June 1941 Soviet massacre of prisoners in Western Ukraine. Unlike Nazi propaganda, which identified the Soviets mostly with Jews, *Krakivski Visti* identified the Soviets mostly with Russians. The main themes of the anti-Soviet materials were the civilizational divide between Ukrainians and Russian/Soviets and their inhumane crimes against Ukrainians. On two occasions *Krakivski Visti* ran specific campaigns covering such crimes – the Soviet prison murders of 1941 and the Vinnytsia massacres of 1937 – in July-August 1941 and June-September 1943 respectively. Both campaigns ethnicized victims and perpetrators: the former as Ukrainians and the latter as Russians and Jews. In reality, at least one third of victims were non-Ukrainians and some Ukrainians must have been among perpetrators. Besides the

two campaigns *Krakivski Visti* had published hundreds of anti-Soviet articles by the end of war. Among them was a remarkable series on the history of Bolshevik terror against the Ukrainian nation by an outstanding Ukrainian poet and essayist Evhen Malaniuk.

Anti-Jewish materials appeared in *Krakivski Visti* throughout the war. They can be divided into three groups. First, republished texts from the foreign press (usually Axis), often from *Völkischer Beobachter*. Second, commissioned materials. In Summer 1943 the newspaper was ordered by the occupational authorities to publish series of antisemitic materials. Five Ukrainian authors took part in the campaign – Oleksandr Mokh, Kost Kuzyk, Olena Kysilevska, Luka Lutsiv, and Oleksandr Mytsiuk (all five wrote under pseudonyms). Third, articles which were submitted by Ukrainian authors on their own will, for example by the Carpatho-Ukrainian writer Vasyl Grendzha-Donskyi. Most of the original antisemitic texts used historical or socio-economic, not racial, arguments against Jews. Interestingly enough, antisemitic materials published in *Krakivski Visti* made no reference to Jewish pogroms in Ukraine in 1919 or to the murder of Symon Petliura in 1926.

Chapter III

"A nation aware of its glorious past and national strength, will never disappear": Ukrainian history, historical memory and nation in *Krakivski Visti*

Two main ideological trends dominated *Krakivski Visti*'s original materials throughout its existence. The first, which I termed a "school of hate" (see chapter 2), taught readers of the newspaper who were Ukraine's historic enemies: Poles, Jews and Russians. Images of enemies, the Others, can be quite useful (though not obligatory) for any project of nationality construction: they frame that which should be excluded or eliminated. But the success of any national project is determined through assertion, not negation. If the "school of hate" was the negative construction (what our nation is not) then the second ideological trend was the positive construction (what our nation is or should be), reflected in articles about Ukrainian history, historical memory and national issues. In this regard *Krakivski Visti* was an important part of the larger program pursued by the Ukrainian Central Committee and Kubijovyč personally to elevate Ukrainians as a nation: raise their educational and cultural level in the direction of widening and deepening national consciousness. This is also quite evident through the publication catalog of the "Ukrainske Vydavnystvo," which included primers, textbooks, popular fiction and nonfiction,[387] though the latter appeared in lesser

[387] See: L. V. Holovata, *"Ukrains'ke vydavnytstvo" u Krakovi-L'vovi, 1939-1945: Bibliohrafichnyi dovidnyk* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2010).

numbers than Kubijovyč wanted due to the German censorship restrictions (see chapter 1).

Krakivski Visti's official mission statement, contained in a short editorial ("Vid redaktsii") in the very first issue, was rather vague.[388] It declared that the majority of its subscribers (in reality, it had none at the time) were peasants. Therefore, the newspaper would focus on publishing practical texts for their agricultural needs. The editorial also promised to write about "general" and "legal-professional" (*pravno-fakhovi*) subjects. Ukrainian scholars and writers were to be involved in the "literary-scholarly" weekly supplement to *Krakivski Visti*.[389] The editorial was a stark contrast to the Ukrainian Central Committee's internal memorandum for the newspaper's editors which defined its role in the Committee's program of national elevation. The document is unsigned and undated, but most likely it was prepared in 1940 since most of dated files in the folder are from that year.[390] Unlike the editorial the memorandum was a well-formulated, precise outline of general ideological direction of the newspaper. The latter was to serve interests of "Ukrainian nationalism" (this should not be equated to the ideology of either branch of the OUN) and make its best content about Ukrainian history, culture and language.[391] Why did the newspaper publicly

[388] "Vid redaktsii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 1 January 7, 1940, 2.
[389] "Vid redaktsii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 1 January 7, 1940, 2. The Literary and Scholarship supplement (Literaturno-naukovyi dodatok) appeared only in four issues of the newspaper – no. 3, 7, 11, and 15 (1940).
[390] "Pravylnyk dlia Redaktsiï shchodennyka *Krakivski visti*," PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 28.
[391] "Pravylnyk dlia Redaktsiï shchodennyka *Krakivski visti*," PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 28.

position itself as a practical publication for agricultural needs of non-existing subscribes but in the internal documentation stressed its national-patriotic character? My hypothesis is that the editorial was aimed not so much at potential readers, but at the German censorship.

Articles on Ukrainian history appeared in *Krakivski Visti* frequently and after texts about the war and politics they constituted the largest block of content in the newspaper. Among the contributors were both professional and amateur historians. In terms of literary style and presentation of historical material the articles were quite uneven. An absolute majority of them were of inferior intellectual and literary quality, but one must take into account that these texts (or even the whole newspaper) were not aimed for a sophisticated public: their purpose was not to stimulate nuanced thinking or enrich understanding. The primary goal of these articles was to tell Ukrainians in simple language who they had been in the past, so they knew what directions to follow in the future. Due to the large numbers of these materials I will limit myself to discussion of three historians and a selection of texts which I found typical of this general ideological line.

The first two professional historians to collaborate with the newspaper were Mykola Andrusiak (1902-1985) and Myron Korduba (1876-1947).[392] Both were Galician Ukrainians and reputable historians by 1940. To a degree,

[392] On Andrusiak see: Maryna Cheban, *Mykola Andrusiak: istoria istoryka* (Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 2015). On Korduba: Oleh Pikh, *Myron Korduba (1876-1947)* (Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 2012).

Andrusiak was Korduba's protégé, at least during the late 1920s – early 1930s. Under the German occupation both found themselves in financial need, especially Andrusiak who even before the war struggled to secure income. When in 1934 Korduba tried to help young Andrusiak with employment a Polish official told him that Poland had enough unemployed historians to fill teaching positions in the whole of Europe and even after that there would still be a significant leftover.[393] Unsurprisingly, both turned to *Krakivski Visti* primarily to improve their income situation. Before the war Andrusiak wrote for *Dilo*: according to Maryna Cheban's estimate he wrote thirty articles and book reviews for the newspaper in 1929-1937. In 1937 Andrusiak stopped writing for *Dilo* due to a conflict with its chief editor, Ivan Nimchuk.[394]

For *Krakivski Visti* Andrusiak wrote a series of twelve articles vaguely titled "Istorychni narysy" (Historical Sketches).[395] It surveyed Ukrainian history from the settling of Slavs until the Union of Lublin (1569). At the time of writing the series Andrusiak was working on a book-long general history of Ukraine. The articles, most likely, were based on that project. It is interesting that Andrusiak started the series by briefly discussing the relationship of Slavic and Germanic peoples to the Aryan race. Both groups of peoples and their languages, according

[393] Oleh Pikh and Maryna Cheban, "Myron Korduba and Mykola Andrusiak: do istorii vzaiemyn," *Ukraina-Polshcha: istorychna spadshchyna ta suspilna svidomist* no. 5 (2012): 164.
[394] See: Cheban, *Mykola Andrusiak*, 76.
[395] N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 7; no. 25 April 4, 1940, 7; no. 29 April 17, 1940, 7; no. 30 April 21, 1940, 7; no. 36 May 11, 1940, 7; no. 39 May 17, 1940, 7; no. 40 May 19, 1940, 10; no. 41 May 22, 1940, 7; no. 42 May 24, 1940, 4, 7; no. 43 May 27, 1940, 11; no. 44 May 29, 1940, 7; no. 45 May 31, 1940, 7.

to him, originated from the same "Aryan root."[396] The implication of this claim was quite significant: in other words, Germans and Slavs were both equally Aryan and thus racially on the same level. Curiously enough, the German occupational authorities of the General Government never took a clear, official stance whether Ukrainians and Poles constituted Aryans or not.[397] In any case, they allowed Ukrainians to identify as Aryans, which many of them, especially educated ones, did.[398]

Andrusiak placed the historical fatherland of Aryans somewhere between the Ukrainian steppe and ancient German forests. Over time Aryans divided into peoples who migrated out of the ancestral lands. But Germans and Slavs forever remained neighbors. At the time of their earliest history even their languages were much closer to each other than they are now. From this introduction Andrusiak moved to the Kyivan Rus (*kyivsko-ruska*) state. He followed the usual narrative of its history: rise of the state in the 9-10th centuries, adoption of Christianity by Volodymyr the Great, fragmentation after the 11th century and separation of one Rus into several Ruses, subsequent Mongolian invasions, and finally the decline and disappearance of Rus principalities. As we can see Andrusiak made no changes to the established grand narrative. But he did make several important

[396] N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 7.
[397] For example, Himmler considered "racially valuable Poles" as suitable candidates for "Germanization." See: Doris L. Bergen, "The Nazi Concept of «Volksdeutsche» and the Exacerbation of Anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe, 1939-45," *Journal of Contemporary History* 29, no. 4 (1994): 574.
[398] See CVs of potential contributors submitted to *Krakivski Visti*: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 31. After 1941 many of them began with "Arier, Ukrainer" (I am an Aryan, a Ukrainian).

claims on specific issues. The fact that the earliest Rus chronicles made no mention of Slavic tribes on the territory of contemporary Western Ukraine did not mean for him that it was not a part of Kyivan Rus. The chronicles made no mention of the tribes because at the time when they written (mid-11th century) "tribal names in Western Ukraine had completely perished."[399] Andrusiak strongly objected to the popular claim of the Polish historiography that before 981 (Volydymyr's conquest of the so called Cherven towns) the Galicia and Chełm regions belonged to the Polish state of Mieszko I. The claim is based on the confusion of the name *liakhy* with Poles. Andrusiak agreed with another authoritative Ukrainian historian, Stepan Tomashivskyi (1875-1930), that *liakhy* was originally a name of the Eastern Slavic tribe neighboring with Dulibs. The term *liakhy* began to mean exclusively Poles only later.

Moreover, Andrusiak claimed that the Polish region of Mazowsze (Mazovia) and its people were originally Eastern Slavic. Thus, in his opinion, not only was Galicia, without a doubt, a historical Ukrainian region from the very beginning of Slavic history, but the historical border between Ukraine and Poland lay through the river Vistula. In terms of racial divisions within Slavdom, Andrusiak claimed that Ukrainians were closest not to Russians and Belarusians, but to Bulgarians, Serbians and Croatians.[400] The name Ukraine, stressed Andrusiak, has nothing to do with *okraina* (borderland). The Ukrainian folk songs

[399] N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 23 March 27, 1940, 7.
[400] N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy. Slavianski plemena v skhidnii Evropi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 25 April 4, 1940, 7.

clearly show usage of *ukraina* in the meaning of "land" and "country." In the same way, it was used by Rus chronicles beginning from the 12th century. Use of *ukraina* in the meaning "borderland" Andrusiak blamed on the Polish and Lithuanian officials from the 15-16th centuries.[401]

According to Andrusiak, Christianity first entered Ukraine from the west: it started to spread in Western Ukraine from Great Moravia soon after the latter received the mission of St. Cyril and Methodius. Prior to the adoption of Christianity there was very little of linguistic and ethnic difference between Slavic tribes, who were separated primarily by their pagan gods. Prince Volodymyr chose Christianity primarily because he saw in it a unifying ideology for various tribes in his state.[402] Though Volodymyr adopted Christianity from Byzantium his vision was to follow European kingdoms of the time.[403] "Already in the Kyiv state there was a contest of influences between Byzantine and Western European cultures."[404]

This European orientation of Volodymyr was followed by his most famous son, Yaroslav the Wise, who paid special attention to the western border of the Kyiv state. As soon as circumstances allowed, he reconquered lands lost to the

[401] N. Andrusiak [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy. Nazva narodu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 36 May 11, 1940, 7.
[402] N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy. Khrystianstvo na Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 29 April 17, 1940, 7.
[403] M. Andrusiak, "Istorychni narysy. Nazva narodu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 39 May 17, 1940, 7.
[404] N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 44 May 29, 1940, 7.

Polish kingdom in 1018.[405] But it was in the successor state, Halych-Volyn, where the Europeanizing trend of the Ukrainian medieval history manifested the most, wrote Andrusiak. When Galician boyars demanded privileges from their princes, they only followed the examples of the Hungarian magnates who made similar demands to their kings. The Halych-Volyn state also became entangled in the European politics – already at the end of the 12th century the kingdoms of Poland and Hungary, and the Holy Roman Empire were involved into its internal affairs.[406] The arrival of the Mongols in the 1240s further strengthened the European connection as both the Halych-Volyn and European states now had a powerful common enemy.[407] By the end of the 13th century this connection was solidified by dynastic ties with the Hungarian, Polish, Czech, and Austrian dynasties.[408]

On the significance of the Halych-Volyn state in Ukrainian history, Andrusiak not only agreed with Stepan Tomashivskyi that it was the first truly Ukrainian state but went further. His claim was that without the Halych-Volyn state there would be no "contemporary national-political and cultural, and partially linguistic independence of Ukraine among Slavs."[409] First, the historical

[405] [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy. Rozvytok i rozpad kyivskoi derzhavy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 40 May 19, 1940, 10.
[406] [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy. Halytsko-Volynska derzhava," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 41 May 22, 1940, 7.
[407] N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy. Halytsko-Volynska derzhava," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 42 May 24, 1940, 7.
[408] N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy. Halytsko-volynska derzhava," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 43 May 27, 1940, 11.
[409] N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 44 May 29, 1940, 7.

experience and legacy of the state was so profound that even though it died with its last ruler in 1340 it secured the Ukrainian character of its lands (Western Ukraine) for the next seven centuries. Second, its resistance to the Polish "onslaught" for two centuries shielded Ukrainian territories east of it, allowing them to develop and expand for the "benefit of the Ukrainian nation."[410] Facing the problem of how to continue Ukrainian history after the end of the Halych-Volyn state in 1340 Andrusiak, like many Ukrainian historians before and after him, changed his focus from states and rulers to culture and language. The solution was to emphasize "Ukrainization" of the foreign dynasties and states that came in possession of the Ukrainian lands in the 14-15th centuries by adopting "Ukrainian" culture and language in a similar way to how Rome was influenced by Greek culture after the conquest of Greece.

Traditionally Ukrainian historians concentrated on the Lithuanian dynasty of Gediminids to showcase this process of transfer from state to culture. But Andrusiak mentions it only in passing. He offered a different case to make a claim about the gravitational attraction of Ukrainian culture – Moldavia. In Andrusiak's view, the Ukrainian population was culturally superior to Wallachians, so it was no surprise that the latter, he claimed, started to adopt the culture of the former. Besides Ukrainian culture, Wallachians also experienced Bulgarian cultural influence. Together, according to Andrusiak, these two cultures Slavicized

[410] N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 44 May 29, 1940, 7.

Wallachians and their rulers, who adopted Ukrainian as the official language of "the new Moldavian state."[411] This Ukrainization manifested itself, wrote Andrusiak, among other things by the very title of Moldavian rulers – *hospodar* (a Ukrainian word which usually means "owner") – and by the name which they favored – Bogdan.[412]

The Lithuanian princes who came to rule Ukrainian lands also soon Ukrainianized and from representatives of the foreign dynasty in these lands they evolved into representatives of local nobility vis-à-vis Poland and Lithuania. Eventually they rebelled against both Polish kings and Lithuanian grand dukes, but none of them were successful. As a result, the Ukrainianized princes and their principalities (*udilni kniazivstva*) were liquidated. They were replaced by land magnates, who were Polonized "at first politically, and then nationally" after the Union of Lublin (1569). With their Polonization "they stopped being carriers of the Ukrainian statehood idea, but [at the same time] it appeared among Cossackdom."[413]

Besides "Istorychni narysy" Andrusiak also submitted for *Krakivski Visti* a review of a history of Ukraine, written by a professional Ukrainian historian Borys Krupnytskyi (1894-1956) for the German reading public.[414] In general, Andrusiak

---

411 N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 44 May 29, 1940, 7.
412 N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 44 May 29, 1940, 7.
413 N. A. [Mykola Andrusiak], "Istorychni narysy. Chuzhi dynastii na Ukraini," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 45 May 31, 1940, 7.
414 Borys Krupnyckyj, *Geschichte der Ukraine* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1939). On Krupnytskyi see: Borys Krupnytskyi, *Zi spohadiv istoryka* (Kyiv: Instytut ukrainskoi arkheohrafii ta dzhereloznavstva im. M. S. Hrushevskoho, 2017).

praised the book, primarily because "our [Ukrainian] national propaganda" had been in dire need of such a general history of Ukraine in German or any other world language since 1918. He criticized Krupnytskyi for not paying enough attention to Western Ukraine and omissions of several historical figures important for Galician Ukrainian history. The review also made some strange claims. For example, Andrusiak criticized the book for minimizing the development of Ukrainian national orientation in Transcarpathia. The latter, claimed Andrusiak, was ahead of Galicia in the mid-19th century in this regard because it had more of "our [Ukrainian] secular intelligentsia." Another strange criticism was that in discussing the Ukrainian liberation struggle of 1917-1921 Krupnytskyi overlooked the "struggle for state [derzhavni zmahannia] among Ukrainians in the [Russian] Far East at the time."[415]

It is not clear whether Andrusiak intended to end *Istorychni narysy* with the Union of Lublin. He developed a strong personal conflict with the newspaper's chief editor Mykhailo Khomiak and after issue no. 45 stopped his collaboration with *Krakivski Visti*. The next year he published a philippic against the newspaper and Khomiak (see chapter 1).[416]

Unlike Andrusiak's general *Istorychni narysy* Myron Korduba's contributions to the newspaper dealt with narrow and specific themes. Korduba was one of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's students at Lviv University in the 1890s and

[415] N. Andrusiak, "Novi knyzhky," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 35 May 9, 1940, 7.
[416] PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 29.

in Ukrainian historiography he is regarded as a historian belonging to the Hrushevsky school. He was one of very few Ukrainian historians in interwar Poland who managed to make a career at Polish universities. He taught at Warsaw University from 1929 until its closure by German occupational authorities in 1939. Korduba specialized in the medieval history of Western Ukraine and wrote to the newspaper on related subjects. Unlike Andrusiak, Korduba developed a good working relationship with Khomiak, though he was occasionally displeased with proofreading errors in his pieces that appeared in the newspaper.[417]

Korduba began to write for *Krakivski Visti* shortly after Andrusiak severed ties with the newspaper. His first submission was a series of articles titled "Boleslav-Iurii II. Ostanni samostinyi volodar Halytsko-Volynskoi derzhavy. Z nahody 600-littia ioho smerty" (Bolesław-Iurii II. The last independent ruler of the Halych-Volyn state. On the occasion of 600 years since his death). The title was somewhat misleading as the series was not so much a biography of the last ruler of the Halych-Volyn state, but a study of the state during his rule (1323-1340).[418] Compared to Andrusiak's *Istorychni narysy* which were quite popular in style, the series was closer to an academic text, with quotations in original Latin and their translation into Ukrainian.

---

[417] Letter from Myron Korduba to Mykhailo Khomiak June 22, 1940. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 3, Item 33; Letter from Myron Korduba to Mykhailo Khomiak August 30, 1943. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 4, Item 41.

[418] Myron Korduba, "Boleslav-Iurii II. Ostanni samostinyi volodar Halytsko-Volynskoi derzhavy. Z nahody 600-littia ioho smerty," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 52 June 17, 1940, 6-7; no. 53 June 19, 1940, 4-5; no. 54 June 21, 1940, 4-5; no. 55 June 24, 1940, 4-5.

This series is important for two reasons. First, it fit the newspaper's general trend before June 1941 to focus on Ukrainian lands within the General Government. Second, it looked at the crucial moment in Ukrainian history – the loss of their medieval state. The series explained how Ukrainians lost their state in 1340 in the same way as Kedryn's series "Prychyny upadku Polshchi" published at the same time in the newspaper explained how Poles lost theirs in 1939. Both series pointed at leadership as the main reason: both peoples lost their states because of choices made by their leaders. Incidentally, the hero of Korduba's series was a Pole. Before becoming Iurii II, the last ruler of the Halych-Volyn state was named Bolesław, a Roman Catholic princeling from the neighboring principality of Mazovia, who converted to Orthodoxy and took a new name after taking the throne. We do not know whether the prince was elected by local nobility or chosen by foreign powers. Korduba's own theory was that Bolesław won the competition for the crown (two other contenders were Polish and Lithuanian princes) because he was favored by local boyars, burghers and the Golden Horde to whom rulers of the Halych-Volyn state had been oathbound since 1245.[419]

The main attraction of Bolesław to these three parties, speculated Korduba, was his political weakness. He was tied neither to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, nor to the kingdoms of Poland and Hungary – mighty powers and neighbors of the Halych-Volyn state at the time. Instead, he was a petty prince from a small

[419] Myron Korduba, "Boleslav-Iurii II. Ostanni samostinyi volodar Halytsko-Volynskoi derzhavy. Z nahody 600-littia ioho smerty," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 52 June 17, 1940, 7.

principality and thus politically unthreatening. But why had no Rus princes competed for the vacant seat in 1323? Korduba's answer is that the Halych-Volyn state became a victim of its own success: it was ruled by the local dynasty of Romanovychi for so long (nearly 150 years) that other Riurikids no longer considered it a part of their common dynastical house. This dynastical separation was also facilitated by the fact that the Romanovychi over the course of their rule increasingly intermarried not only with neighboring Polish and Hungarian royals, but also with distant Austrian and Lithuanian ones. The last time a Romanovych had married another Riurikid, pointed out Korduba, was in 1259![420] Later on, *Krakivski Visti* published alarmist articles on how interethnic marriages threatened Ukrainian national survival (discussed further in this chapter).

In discussing Bolesław-Iurii's foreign policy, Korduba emphasized that he always sought out positive or at least neutral relations with the Teutonic Order, or the *German* Order as Korduba preferred to call it. In this regard, Bolesław-Iurii faithfully continued the foreign policy of previous rulers of the Halych-Volyn state.[421] On the other hand, his relationship with Poland, even though Bolesław-Iurii was an ethnic Pole, eventually turned from neutral to hostile, resulting in an open conflict. In 1337 Bolesław-Iurii went to war with the Polish king Casimir III the Great who was his relative (both belonged to the Piast dynasty). The two rulers

[420] Myron Korduba, "Boleslav-Iurii II. Ostanni samostinyi volodar Halytsko-Volynskoi derzhavy. Z nahody 600-littia ioho smerty," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 52 June 17, 1940, 7.
[421] Myron Korduba, "Boleslav-Iurii II. Ostanni samostinyi volodar Halytsko-Volynskoi derzhavy. Z nahody 600-littia ioho smerty," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 53 June 19, 1940, 4-5; no. 54 June 21, 1940, 4-5.

warred over Lublin and neighboring lands – taking them was an "old temptation" for the Halych-Volyn rulers according to Korduba. The war was not successful for Bolesław-Iurii: after besieging the city for twelve days Rus troops had to withdraw because their Tatar allies, whose commander was killed on the 12th day, left the siege.[422] Korduba spent a lot of attention on how Casimir III the Great managed to secure an alliance with Hungarian king Charles Robert (Károly Róbert) in 1339 against Bolesław-Iurii.[423] The latter failed to counter this diplomatic combination with one of his own.

He also failed to foresee a domestic threat which eventually cost him his life: a year later he was poisoned by the "enemy party." Korduba wrote that this "work of Cain" against the "great ruler" was completed with the help of the "neighboring state" (hint at Poland).[424] It is puzzling why Korduba was reluctant to clearly name the "enemy party" (according to most sources – local boyars) and that neighboring state. But what is even more interesting is how carefully Korduba minimized the importance of the sovereigns of the Halych-Volyn state – the Golden Horde – in the history of this Rus principality, mentioning it only in passing. He did not explain how and why after 1340 this sovereign allowed Hungary and Poland to partition the Halych-Volyn state, which was an important

[422] Myron Korduba, "Boleslav-Iurii II. Ostanni samostinyi volodar Halytsko-Volynskoi derzhavy. Z nahody 600-littia ioho smerty," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 54 June 21, 1940, 4.
[423] Myron Korduba, "Boleslav-Iurii II. Ostanni samostinyi volodar Halytsko-Volynskoi derzhavy. Z nahody 600-littia ioho smerty," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 54 June 21, 1940, 4-5; no. 55 June 24, 1940, 4-5.
[424] Myron Korduba, "Boleslav-Iurii II. Ostanni samostinyi volodar Halytsko-Volynskoi derzhavy. Z nahody 600-littia ioho smerty," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 55 June 24, 1940, 5.

staging ground for Tatar raids into those two kingdoms. In the end, Korduba's narrative implied that the Halych-Volyn state disappeared not because of a simple dynastical crisis, but because its last ruler stood alone against enemies foreign and domestic. The historical lesson here was clear: the Ukrainian nation had strong enemies against which she required strong allies. Korduba's series mentioned only one such ally – the German Order.

Besides writing articles on the medieval Rus rulers Korduba also engaged in one of the most thankless tasks for a professional historian – correcting amateur historians. There was no lack of the latter in *Krakivski Visti*. For example, Volodymyr Ostrovskyi wrote a series of articles under the title "Cherhovi zavdannia Kholmshchyny" (The next tasks for the Chełm region). In the third article of the series, "Tochni poniattia ĭ tochni nazvy" (Precise terms and names) he argued against describing "Pidliashshia" as a separate region from "Kholmshchyna."[425] The former was a part of the latter in the same way as "Hutsylshchyna" was a part of Ukrainian Galicia. (This was a poor analogy since a large part of the Hutsul region is actually located in Transcarpathia.) In addition, the very term "Pidliashshia" claimed Ostrovskyi was a copy of the Polish name Podlasie. Instead of using both dividing terms, "Kholmshchyna" and "Pidliashshia," Ostrovskyi argued for one single term – "Kholmska Ukraina" (the term *Karpatska Ukraina* was used in a similar way for Transcarpathia at the time).

[425] Vol. Ostrovskyi, "Cherhovi zavdannia Kholmshchyny. III. Tochni poniattia j tochni nazvy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 54 June 21, 1940, 4-5.

In response Korduba wrote a correction to the "erroneous" statements of Ostrovskyi.[426] The Ukrainian name "Pidliashshia" according to him, predated the Polish Podlasie. Thus, the former could not be a copy of the latter. Most likely, the opposite is true. Both terms – "Pidliashshia" and "Kholmshchyna" – had a distinctive usage in the past. They also do not overlap geographically and there is a part of "Pidliashshia" which never belonged to "Kholmshchyna." So, both terms, concluded Korduba, are of equal historical importance and one should not supplant the other.[427]

Perhaps this correction attracted Kubijovyč's attention (he was a careful reader of the newspaper) because soon after its publication he commissioned Korduba to write a short and popular history of the Chełm and Podlasie regions, proving that they were historical Ukrainian lands. The UCC conducted a campaign of depolonization and Ukrainization in these two regions: Kubijovyč wanted Korduba to provide them with historical legitimacy. The book appeared next year.[428] It was praised in *Krakivski Visti* for demonstrating that the medieval "Ukrainian state … was equal in might and value [sic] to other states of that time."[429]

The third major historian to collaborate with *Krakivski Visti* was Dmytro Doroshenko (1882-1951), perhaps the most eminent Ukrainian historian to write

[426] M. Korduba, "Kholmshchyna i Pidliashshia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 58 July 1, 1940, 4-5.
[427] M. Korduba, "Kholmshchyna i Pidliashshia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 58 July 1, 1940, 5.
[428] Myron Korduba, *Istoria Kholmshchyny ĭ Pidliashshia* (Krakiv: Ukrainske Vydavnytsvo, 1941).
[429] I. Iruk, "Perehliad knyzhok," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 39 (195) February 24, 1941, 6.

for the newspaper.[430] His most notable contribution was a series of eight articles on Viacheslav Lypynskyi (1882-1931).[431] Both Doroshenko and Lypynskyi were original Ukrainian historians and conservative thinkers. At one point, the latter was a subordinate of the former: in 1918, when Doroshenko served as the minister of the foreign affairs for the Skoropadskyi regime, Lypynskyi served as its ambassador to Austria-Hungary. As politicians both had failed: the Ukrainian governments for which they worked had lost its quest for Ukrainian independence by 1920. Both were important figures in the Hetmanate movement during the interwar period. Lypynskyi was the main ideologue of the movement until falling out with Pavlo Skoropadskyi in 1930. That movement failed too. It never came close to its primary goal, which was the restoration of the Ukrainian state as a monarchy with Skoropadskyi's dynasty. But as historians they succeeded tremendously: their works are still widely read by Ukrainian historians and a number of their interpretations, especially on the role of Cossack elite, have entered mainstream Ukrainian historiography.

Doroshenko's series on Lypynskyi was primarily a memoir about the life of his political ally and former diplomatic colleague, but it also contained tidbits of

---

[430] On Doroshenko see: Thomas M. Prymak, "Dmytro Doroshenko: A Ukrainian Émigré Historian of the Interwar Period," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (Spring 2001): 31-56.

[431] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 136 (874) June 27, 1943, 3; no. 139 (877) July 1, 1943, 3; no. 140 (878) July 2, 1943, 4-5; no. 141 (879) July 3, 1943, 4; no. 142 (880) July 4, 1943, 4; no. 143 (881) July 6, 1943, 3-4; no. 186 (924) August 25, 1943, 3-4; no. 187 (925) August 26, 1943, 3-4. On Lypynskyi see: Jaroslaw Pelenski, ed., *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* vol. 9 no. 3/4 (December 1985): The Political and Social Ideas of Vjačeslav Lypyns'kyj; I. H. Perederii, *Viacheslav Lypynskyj: etnichnyj poliak, politychnyj ukraiinets* (Poltava: PoltNTU, 2012).

historiographical and political analysis. But foremost it was a sympathetic portrayal of the man who according to the author was one of the "greatest Ukrainian intellects in the last decades," but whose biography still had not been written.[432] To provide at least some materials for one in the future (Doroshenko had no doubts that it would be written) was the author's goal. According to Doroshenko the most defining feature of Lypynskyi as a character and as a thinker was his "Western Europeanness," which the author attributed to his Polish upbringing and connections.[433] This was a rare instance when Polishness was described as something positive in *Krakivski Visti*. Compare this statement to the articles from 1940 which equated Polish culture with brutality, abuse and oppression (see chapter 2).

Doroshenko and Lypynskyi met for the first time in 1909 and that is when the series begin. By then Lypynskyi was already known in the Ukrainian national circles due to his efforts to turn Polish and Polonized nobility in Ukraine towards the Ukrainian national cause.[434] Doroshenko was somewhat humble when describing these activities of his hero before World War I. He made no mention that he was doing almost exactly the same, though much less publicized, work among the Russified nobility in Ukraine. How successful was Lypynskyi in this

[432] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 136 (874) June 27, 1943, 3.
[433] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 136 (874) June 27, 1943, 3.
[434] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 139 (877) July 1, 1943, 3.

Ukrainophile campaign? Doroshenko praised his efforts – lectures and publications – but had to recognize that it failed or in his own words "it was not met with great sympathy."[435] Most of the Polish and Polonized circles to which Lypynskyi directed his pro-Ukrainian propaganda looked at him as some sort of Trojan horse, designed to undermine from within Polish superiority over Ukrainians. *Przegląd Krajowy*, the biweekly which Lypynskyi published for the "Ukrainians of Polish culture" to publicize his program, failed to attract financing and subscribers so only 14 issues appeared. The campaign attracted even less followers among the nobility – Doroshenko could gave only three names. According to him, this fiasco ("disappointment") prompted Lypynskyi to move from politics and public affairs to studying and writing history. After their encounters in 1909-1912 the two men would see each other again in 1918.[436]

By diving into historical research Lypynskyi wanted to prove to the Polonized nobility in Ukraine that their ancestors in the 17th century were "carriers of the Ukrainian state idea."[437] This academic endeavor, wrote Doroshenko, was aimed at spreading the call of "blood and soil" (a rather curious choice of words which directly echoed the Nazi slogan of *Blut und Boden*) among the nobility. Only by heeding this call would they manage to stop feeling like

[435] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 140 (878) July 2, 1943, 4.
[436] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 140 (878) July 2, 1943, 5.
[437] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 141 (879) July 3, 1943, 4.

"colonists" in their native land and become its "citizens." In Doroshenko's eyes, Lypynskyi represented the third generation of the Polonized nobility in Ukraine to heed the call. The first one was the Polish romantics at the beginning of the 19th century. They "idealized historic Poland, but also loved Ukraine," leading to the creation of so called "Ukrainian school" in Polish literature. The second was *khlopomany* of the mid-19th century, who were drawn to the Ukrainian national cause by populism (*narodoliubstvo*), the idea that the educated class must help and serve the lower masses (*narodni masy*). Neither generation, pointed out Doroshenko, created a "political program" or some "wider movement." Politicization was achieved in the third generation, which Lypynskyi personified for him. But Lypynskyi and his few followers were not just another step in this "tradition of return of Polonized nobility to the Ukrainian nation." They represented a "certain finale," bringing with them a firm conviction towards "regaining … [Ukrainian] statehood."[438]

When Lypynskyi and his followers entered Ukrainian national scene the idea of Ukrainian independence was not popular. Most Ukrainian activists were socialists and "subjugated political and national aspirations to social issues." Their ideal was an autonomous Ukraine within a socialist Russian republic. The idea of independent Ukraine, wrote Doroshenko using the famous phrase of Ivan Franko, in their eyes was "beyond the bounds of the possible" (*poza mezhamy*

[438] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 141 (879) July 3, 1943, 4.

mozhlyvoho).[439] Doroshenko blamed the generation of *khlopomany* for this lack of appreciation for having their own state. It was they who injected into the Ukrainian idea this naïve belief that national existence can (and should) be achieved "without serfs or lords" (*bez khlopa i pana*). This meant pursuit of social justice at the expense of all other goals, including national independence. Doroshenko also accused *khlopomany* and Ukrainian "democratic historians" of falsifying the history of Cossack Ukraine and idealizing its (alleged) democratic character. Doroshenko believed that Mykhailo Drahomanov was right, when he wrote that democracy in Cossack Ukraine existed only at the very bottom level of society, but at the top level of hetman and *starshyna* (upper echelon of Cossacks) it was a monarchy.[440]

Doroshenko credited Lypynskyi for revealing a completely different picture of Cossack *starshyna* – not as exploiters of peasantry (the view of the *khlopomany*), but as Ukrainian state-builders. Lypynskyi's research (*Z dziejów Ukrainy*, 1912) proved that most of Bohdan Khmelnytskyi's colonels, including those that were believed to come from the lower classes, belonged to Polish and Rus *szlachta*. "Together with the great hetman Bohdan they were co-creators of the Ukrainian Cossack State" according to Doroshenko. They directed the revolutionary tide into a constructive, state-building direction. Unfortunately, in

[439] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 141 (879) July 3, 1943, 4.
[440] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 141 (879) July 3, 1943, 4.

the end the tide proved to be too strong for them: the steppe nature of Cossackdom, with its "unlimited drive to freedom," combined with the unlucky geographical location of the Cossack state – between Poland and Muscovy – led to the territorial division of Ukraine between Warsaw (Right-Bank) and Moscow (Left-Bank). The Cossack *starshyna* of the two halves, seeking to be co-opted into the ruling elites, over time respectively Polonized and Russified itself.[441]

This "historical experience," digressed Doroshenko from discussing *Z dziejów Ukrainy*, should warn Polonized Ukrainians that there is no future for them among Ukrainians if they persist in identifying as Poles. They can find "salvation" only in returning back to their people. Otherwise, the next "great social or political cataclysm will sweep them away."[442] These were prophetic words, considering that they were written before the Volyn massacre and published on July 4, just a week before UPA attacked en masse Polish villages in Volyn on July 11, 1943.[443] The importance of *Z dziejów Ukrainy* and its reassessment of the Cossack elite in the Khmelnytskyi uprising was recognized right away by leading Ukrainian historians, for example by Ivan Krypiakevych and Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, though the latter in his political and social views was the antithesis of Lypynskyi. *Z dziejów Ukrainy* received the coolest reception from its intended audience: the Polonized

[441] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 142 (880) July 4, 1943, 4.
[442] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 142 (880) July 4, 1943, 4.
[443] Grzegorz Motyka, *Od rzezi wołyńskiej do Akcji "Wisła": konflikt polsko-ukraiński 1943-1947* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2011), 137-138.

Ukrainian nobility for whom Lypynskyi produced this volume simply ignored it.[444]

After 1912 Doroshenko lost track of Lypynskyi. They met again, randomly, on a street in Kyiv in January 1918. The city had just been occupied by the Bolsheviks and Lypynskyi was visibly depressed. The conversation was brief: Doroshenko recalled that they said farewell to each other as people who did not expect to see each other "for a century." But thanks to changing circumstances – Ukraine's peace with the Central Powers, arrival of their troops to drive the Bolsheviks out, a coup d'état with German assistance which removed the Socialist Ukrainian government and replaced it with Conservatives and Liberals (many of whom were Russified Ukrainians) – they met again in Kyiv in May 1918. Doroshenko was offered a position of deputy foreign minister in the new government. Upon learning that the ministerial position was to be given to the former Russian ambassador to Vienna in 1913-14, Nikolai Shebeko (1863-1953), Doroshenko categorically refused. The problem, in his eyes, was that Shebeko was an ethnic Pole and thus incapable of representing Ukrainian interests: "how could such a [Polish] minister defend the interests of Western Ukrainian lands?"[445]

---

[444] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 143 (881) July 6, 1943, 3.

[445] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 143 (881) July 6, 1943, 3. In fact, even if Shebeko's ethnic background was indeed Polish, he was deeply Russified and his national sympathies were on the Russian, not on the Polish, side. During the Russian Civil War, he supported the Whites and served in Denikin's regime. After 1920 Shebeko, together with thousands of Russian Whites, settled in France where he was a member in an organization of Russian monarchists. See: S. V. Volkov, *Ofitsery rossiiskoi gvardii: Opyt martirologa* (Moskva: Russkii put, 2002), 531-532.

According to Doroshenko, when Hetman Pavlo Skoropadskyi learned about the reasons behind Doroshenko's refusal he changed his mind and instead offered the ministerial position to Doroshenko. When the latter accepted it, one of his first tasks was to appoint a new Ukrainian ambassador to Vienna. In turn, Doroshenko offered the position to Lypynskyi, who agreed on condition that he would select all diplomatic staff for the embassy. Doroshenko eagerly accepted the condition, but when Lypynskyi presented him with the list of candidates – "I confess, I was in doubt."[446]

All of the candidates were Roman Catholics and hence "Poles" in the eyes of the Ukrainian public, which Doroshenko did not want to antagonize. (It is hard not to get an impression that this sudden concern for the Ukrainian public was just a veil for his own concern over Lypynskyi's choices.) After a heated discussion with Lypynskyi he understood, wrote Doroshenko, what motivated the selection. Lypynskyi chose those people because he wanted to prove in political practice what he had argued before the war with his journalism and historical research: Polonized *szlachta* could be turned towards the Ukrainian cause (*ukrainstvo*). "It must be acknowledged that Lypynskyi's candidates have proven themselves good Ukrainians and skilled diplomats."[447]

---

[446] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 143 (881) July 6, 1943, 4.
[447] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 143 (881) July 6, 1943, 4.

At this point – issue 143 (July 6) of *Krakivski Visti* – the publication of Doroshenko's series was interrupted by the German censorship. From the correspondence between Khomiak and Doroshenko in July 1943 it is not clear what exactly was the issue.[448] One thing is certain: the chief editor was not a completely powerless figure. Khomiak liked the series and wanted to finish its publication, so after a couple of attempts he received permission to continue. The publication of the series was resumed in issue no. 186 (August 25).

For Lypynskyi's service as a diplomat Doroshenko had nothing but praise. He represented Ukraine with aplomb: in Vienna "Lypynskyi was known and respected."[449] As a politician and diplomat he had the ability to see a bigger picture. When negotiating with Habsburg officials regarding the division of the Austrian crownland Galicia into Ukrainian and Polish halves, Lypynskyi advised his superiors to agree with the Austrian proposal, which left Chełm region in the Polish half. Doroshenko quoted a letter from Lypynskyi: "It is better for us, in the case it is necessary to give something up, to give up Kholmshchyna rather than to give up dividing [crownland] Galicia." Lypynskyi's reasoning was that the state borders of Ukraine must be determined not only from ethnic, but also geographical considerations. Losing Chełm region for the sake of Galicia would also provide it with the natural border of the Carpathian Mountains. But most importantly, this matter must be solved "so we can turn all our strength towards

[448] See: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 4, Item 41.
[449] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 186 (924) August 25, 1943, 3.

the fight (which will be very difficult) with East [Russia]." It is not Lypynskyi's fault, suggested Doroshenko, that these negotiations resulted in nothing.[450]

After the conservative regime of Skoropadskyi was overthrown by the socialist Directory in December 1918, Lypynskyi offered his resignation but was convinced to stay in the position. Instead of the Ukrainian Hetmanate he now represented the Ukrainian People's Republic in Vienna. In April 1919 he was ordered to visit Ukraine, to meet with the head of Directory, Chief Otaman Petliura. The meeting, in Lypynskyi's eyes, was a complete disaster. Lypynskyi, who assumed that he was called to discuss some important political matter, in fact was only treated to a social chat (20-25 minutes) with Petliura and then told to return to Vienna. Doroshenko believed that Petliura simply wanted to take a personal look at Lypynskyi, who was considered an exotic figure in Ukrainian circles. Naturally, Lypynskyi was furious with Petliura for this pointless, in his eyes, trip: he had travelled with great personal risk through "Bolshevized Hungary, Galicia and Volyn" to meet him. During the returning trip he ran into Doroshenko. In a conversation, both agreed in their pessimism regarding the statesmanship skills of Petliura and his Directory: they would bury "the cause of Ukrainian statehood."[451] In the end Lypynskyi resigned after a Ukrainian commander, whom he valued, Otaman Bolbochan, was executed on Petliura's

[450] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 186 (924) August 25, 1943, 3.
[451] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 186 (924) August 25, 1943, 4.

order in June 1919. He settled in the Austrian countryside to treat his "old lung illness" (tuberculosis), in Reichenau an der Rax, a small town in Lower Austria.

Doroshenko arrived in this sleepy Austrian town as well, attracted by its cheap rental rates. He had almost "daily" conversations with Lypynskyi, discussing at length questions of Ukrainian history and politics. Lypynskyi argued strongly against democracy as a form of political order, regarding it as "ineffective," especially for emerging states. (Most likely this was an allusion to failings of the young Ukrainian democracies in 1917-20.) In his view, the next most important task for Ukrainian politics was regeneration of the "leading class" (*providna verstva*) from the Right- and Left-bank Ukrainian nobility. Without them Ukrainian statehood would not be restored, said Lypynskyi. And without their own state "Ukrainians will never become a real nation."[452] The values of having your own state and political elite were highlighted in the last two major works of Lypynskyi, which he completed in Reichenau – the historical monograph "Ukraina na perelomi 1657-1659" (Ukraine at the Turning Point 1657-1659, 1920) and the political treatise "Lysty do brativ-khliborobiv" (Letters to Fellow Farmers, 1926). The latter was to serve as a political Bible of the Hetmanate movement, which Lypynskyi joined in 1920, becoming its main ideologue. "He poured into this movement all his strength and, one can say, [because of that] burned out like

[452] D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 187 (925) August 26, 1943, 3.

a candle, shining with the fire of love and devotion to the Ukrainian cause."[453] In 1926 Lypynskyi left Reichenau for Berlin, to be closer to the court of Pavlo Skoropadskyi. This relocation led to complication of his health issues: a year later he left again for Austria, this time for Badegg (a small village not far from Graz). Doroshenko saw him for the last time in fall 1930. Lypynskyi was bedridden and depressed: he was tormented by doubts whether the path he had chosen in life was for nothing. He died the next year.[454]

Doroshenko's series on Lypynskyi, especially when compared to their correspondence and his other writing about the man, to a certain degree was hagiographical.[455] Certain key topics – the question of Lypynskyi's mental illness, explosive conflicts with fellow Hetmanites (Osyp Nazaruk) and Ukrainian conservatives (Stepan Tomashivskyi), the falling out with Skoropadskyi in 1930 – Doroshenko, despite having the first-hand knowledge, avoided completely. These three historians and their articles showcase the use of history for the general political line of the newspaper, which stressed the primary importance of the state and strong leadership for national survival and provided reminders about historical friends and enemies of Ukrainians.

---

453 D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 187 (925) August 26, 1943, 3-4.

454 454 D. Doroshenko, "Pamiati Viacheslava Lypynskoho (Storinka z moikh spomyniv)," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 187 (925) August 26, 1943, 4.

455 See: M. Zabarevskyi [Dmytro Doroshenko], *Viacheslav Lypynskyi i ioho dumky pro ukrainsku natsiiu i derzhavu* (Vienna: Vyd. zakhodamy O. Zherebka, 1925); Ivan Korovytskyi, ed., *Lysty Dmytra Doroshenka do Viacheslava Lypynskoho* (Philadelphia: W. K. Lypynsky East European Research Institute, 1973).

The editorial archive of *Krakivski Visti* reveals that publications on Ukrainian history were not some sentimental interest. At least one of the editors, Mykhailo Khomiak, thought in historical terms. For example, in a letter to Volodymyr Levynskyi (1880-1953) Khomiak explained that the newspaper would not wage a campaign, demanded by some Ukrainian nationalists, against Mykhailo Drahomanov's reputation in the Ukrainian history: though Drahomanov did not support the idea of Ukrainian independence nonetheless his activity and writings were a significant contribution to the development of the Ukrainian nation.[456] In another letter to Vsevolod Petriv (1883-1948) Khomiak essentially asked him to write an article against the Ukrainian nationalist "partisans," which had started to operate in the General Government, that is against the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), though Khomiak did not use the term. Again, his argument was historical: during the Ukrainian liberation war of 1918-1920 (in which Petriv fought, by the way) reliance on Ukrainian guerillas had proven to be disastrous.[457]

History was evoked in the newspaper for political, social, national, agricultural and other causes. For example, the excerpt from the Halych-Volyn chronicle was published to prove that Chełm region was originally a Ukrainian land.[458] An anonymous series on Bohdan Khmelnytskyi's uprising was to

[456] Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Volodymyr Levynskyi July 10, 1943. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 4, Item 41.
[457] Letter from Mykhailo Khomiak to Vsevolod Petriv August 25, 1943. PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 4, Item 41.
[458] "Zasnuvannia Kholmu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 3 January 14, 1940, 6.

demonstrate that the Ukrainian state may again rise like a phoenix and strike down its enemies, i.e. the Poles.[459] Readers were reminded that Ukrainian merchants were the economic backbone of Kyivan Rus and the Halych-Volyn state, therefore it was a matter of national importance to develop a Ukrainian merchant class in the General Government.[460] There was no lack of publications stressing the importance of knowing Ukraine's "glorious" history just for the sake of patriotism or national dignity. As one anonymous author put it in his article about the education of Ukrainian youth: "a nation [narod] aware of its glorious past and national strength, will never disappear."[461]

Calls for commemorating Ukrainian history routinely appeared in the newspaper before Pentecost (*Zeleni Sviata*). For example, an article with the same title praised Ukrainians because they had developed "pietism" towards the "creators of our statehood, fighters for freedom." Ukrainian "glory" is undying, argued its author, despite the fact that so many Ukrainian historical monuments and sites had been destroyed beginning with Mongolian invasion in the 13th century and ending with the destruction of princely tombs in the Kholm Cathedral by "barbarous ruin" (a hint at the Polish authorities).[462] Another article reminded

[459] "Pryhadaimo sobi nashi mynule," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 13 February 21, 1940, 4; no. 14 February 25, 1940, 2; no. 15 February 28, 1940, 4; no. 16 March 3, 1940, 4; no. 17 March 7, 1940, 3; no. 19 March 13, 1940, 4; no. 20 March 17, 1940, 4; no. 21 March 20, 1940, 4; no. 22 March 24, 1940, 4; no. 23 March 27, 1940, 4; no. 24 March 31, 1940, 4; no. 26 April 7, 1940, 4.
[460] Mykola Derevianko, "Mozhemo buty hordi z nashykh starokupetskykh tradytsii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 46 June 3, 1940, 4-5; no. 47 June 6, 1940, 4.
[461] "Za vykhovannia molodi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 46 June 3, 1940, 9.
[462] L., "Zeleni sviata," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 52 June 17, 1940, 1.

readers about "the dear graves of [Ukrainian] heroes, which densely cover our land" and how their presence infuses "stronger faith into the great mission of Ukrainian life." The graves guaranteed Ukrainian "national eternity" and its values, "sanctified by blood of our heroes." The article's author – Bohdan Hoshovskyi (1907-1986) – welcomed their sacrifices: in 1917-1918 they gave birth to the "Myth of the Great Warrior" (*Mit pro Velykoho Voina*), who will lead Ukrainians on the Great March (*Velykyi Pokhid*).[463]

Iulian Tarnovych in his article "Kult poliahlykh" (Cult of the Fallen) used similar symbolic language. "All cultured people," he claimed, honor their fallen, because there is no greater national "treasure" than to die for your fatherland. So many Ukrainian heroes sacrificed themselves for the sake of their homeland that their cumulative sacrifices make Ukrainians a nation "wealthy with glory" (slavni bahachi). Tarnovych also overdramatized an extremely obscure event from recent Ukrainian history – the battle at Łupków Pass in 1918 where "less than hundred" paramilitary Ukrainians fought unsuccessfully against "at least" 800-strong Polish troops – and declared "those were our Thermopylae!"[464]

The theme of national glory and sacrifice dominated articles and notices about honoring Ukrainian military graves, which started to appear in the newspaper after June 1940. One of the first was "Sviato heroiv u Krakovi" (Holiday of heroes in Cracow) which was remarkable because it specifically

[463] [Bohdan Hoshovskyi], "Mohyla – Zapovit," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 52 June 17, 1940, 2.
[464] Iu. Tarnovych, "Kult poliahlykh," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 52 June 17, 1940, 4-5.

mentioned the Ukrainian Galician Army, whose fighters were honored at the event, rather than the usual nonspecific category of "fallen," and presence of Vasyl Kuchabskyi (1895-1971), one of the most original Ukrainian political thinkers in the 20th Century, who spoke at the event. The article stressed that for the first time in 21 years such an event was held by Ukrainians without the surveillance of the Polish police.[465]

In July 1940 *Krakivski Visti* introduced a regular rubric "Sviato poliahlykh" (Holiday of the Fallen) to report on this type of events, which became common in the General Government.[466] Quite often this ritual of grave honoring was enacted even in places where no Ukrainian military graves existed at the time, instead of real graves symbolic ones were prepared for "fighters for freedom" or the "Unknown Sharpshooter" (Nevidomyi Strilets)."[467] According to *Krakivski Visti*, commemorations of fallen heroes were also held by Ukrainians at German military graves (from World War I).[468]

But it seems that these kinds of events did not evolve into a genuine care for graves. Evhen Malaniuk in his essay "Na nevchasnu temu" (On an untimely topic) published in the journal *Nashi dni* praised Ukrainians for their love of burials: "no other nation in Europe reached such perfection as ours … in the art of

[465] "Sviato heroiv u Krakovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 53 June 19, 1940, 7.
[466] "Sviato poliahlykh," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 58 July 1, 1940, 10; no. 59 July 3, 1940, 6; no. 60 July 5, 1940, 6.
[467] See for example: "Sviato heroiv u Dubrivtsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 64 July 15, 1940, 9; "Sviato mohyl u Chulchytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 65 July 17, 1940, 6; "Sviato mohyl u Bohorodytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 66 July 19, 1940, 6; "Sviato mohyl u Vanivtsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 68 July 24, 1940, 7.
[468] "Z kniazhoho horoda Iaroslava," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 68 July 24, 1940, 7.

burying." But after burials are done, Ukrainians usually forget their graves. This was most evident, according to Malaniuk, in the cemeteries where both Roman and Greek Catholics were buried. When you enter such cemeteries, he wrote, even if you knew nothing about the Polish-Ukrainian divide, you would notice a stark visual difference. The "Roman" part would be ordered and well-cared for, but the "Greek" would be usually covered with wild grass and flowers conquering the surface.[469]

Commemorations of specific events and persons were also reported, for example of General Myron Tarnavskyi (1869-1938) and of the Chortkiv Offensive (1919), which was the last major operation of the Ukrainian Galician Army in the Polish-Ukrainian war of 1918-1919.[470] Initially, the newspaper reported on commemorations of Symon Petliura (1879-1926) and Ievhen Konovalets (1891-1938), who were both assassinated (the latter by a Soviet agent for certain), without mentioning their names. Instead, *Krakivski Visti* alluded to them as "Parisian" and "Rotterdam" tragedies – the cities where Petliura and Konovalets were murdered respectively.[471] Curiously, the newspaper also reported on the commemoration of

[469] E. M. [Evhen Malaniuk], "Na nevchasnu temu," *Nashi dni* no. 10 October 1, 1943, 7.
[470] "U druhi rokovyny," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 58 July 1, 1940, 5; "Pomynky po gen. Tarnavskim," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 59 July 3, 1940, 2.
[471] "Dvi akademii v Kholmi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 51 June 15, 1940, 6; "V rokovyny paryskoi trahedii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 63 July 12, 1940, 6; "Spivpratsia dvokh sil," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 63 July 12, 1940, 6.

Petro Bolbochan (1883-1919), the Ukrainian military commander executed on Petliura's orders.[472]

Despite this militaristic and heroic pathos in the newspaper, Ukrainian historical figures featured the most in it were not generals or hetmans, but three writers: Taras Shevchenko (1814-1861), Ivan Franko (1856-1916) and Markian Shashkevych (1811-1843). Such focus on literary figures was not accidental: Ukrainian literature was not just an important, but a crucial, factor in developing and propagating Ukrainianhood, especially in the 19th century. Any comprehensive history of the Ukrainian national movement, besides political programs, parties, personalities and ideologies, must also deal with Ukrainian literature because the two were often intertwined. In this regard Taras Shevchenko arguably deserves the most important place in the history of the Ukrainian national "awakening": it is not an exaggeration to say that without his poetry it most likely would not have happened.

The cult of Shevchenko started to form in Austrian Galicia in the 1860s (almost at the same time as it was formed in Russian Ukraine) and since then played an important role in the symbolic culture of the Ukrainian national movement in this region.[473] Articles about Shevchenko in *Krakivski Visti* always

[472] For example: "V nediliu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 64 July 15, 1940, 11. On Bolbochan and his death see: V. Sidak, T. Ostashko, T. Vronska, *Polkovnyk Petro Bolbochan: trahedia ukrainskoho derzhavnyka* 2nd ed. (Kyiv: Tempora, 2009).

[473] Ostap Sereda, "«As a Father among Little Children»: The Emerging Cult of Taras Shevchenko as a Factor of the Ukrainian Nation-building in Austrian Eastern Galicia in the 1860s," *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal* no. 1 (2014): 159–188.

appeared in March (the month in which he was born and died), typically with one issue fully devoted to the poet. In 1940 there was an additional reason to commemorate Shevchenko – it was the centenary of the publication of *Kobzar* (1840), his first poetic collection and the whole issue of *Krakivski Visti* – no. 18 (March 10) 1940 – celebrated *Kobzar*. The tone of most articles in the newspaper about this truly great Ukrainian poet ranged between eulogical and over-eulogical. An anonymous author claimed that for Ukrainians celebration of Shevchenko's birthday should be equal to the celebration of Christ's birth to Christians.[474] Shevchenko was described as a national genius,[475] awakener,[476] and prophet.[477] The newspaper ran numerous reports on the commemoration of Shevchenko's life and work by Ukrainians in the General Government and beyond,[478] for some time even running a specific rubric "Krai u pokloni Shevchenkovi" (Land bowing to Shevchenko) for this kind of reports.[479]

---

[474] "Poklin Tarasovi Shevchenkovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 18 March 10, 1940, 2.
[475] Volodymyr Horbovyi, "Nevmirushchist Genia Ukrainy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 33 May 4, 1940, 2; "Selo Terepcha – henievi Ukrainy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 34 May 6, 1940, 10.
[476] Svii, "Probudytelevi Ukrainy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 35 May 9, 1940, 2; Prysutnyi, "Probudytelevi Ukrainy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 35 May 9, 1940, 6.
[477] "Prorokovi Ukrainy," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 37 May 13, 1940, 7.
[478] See: "Shevchenkivska akademia v Krakovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 22 March 24, 1940, 1; "Pidliashsha vshanovue pamiat T. Shevchenka," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 34 May 6, 1940, 2; Poinformovanyi, "Horlychchyna Kobzarevi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 35 May 9, 1940, 2; "Volia Myhova Tarasovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 37 May 13, 1940, 11; "Pratsia v seli Krasnii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 39 May 17, 1940, 2; "Shevchenkivske sviato u Vidni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 40 May 19, 1940, 11; Iaroslav Naddnistrainskyi, "Velychavyi kontsert v chest Tarasa Shevchenka v ukrainskii Krynytsi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 42 May 24, 1940, 4; "Zhidlyva pratsia u seli," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 42 May 24, 1940, 6; "My vyderzhaly polsku nevoliu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 42 May 24, 1940, 6; H., "Z zhyttia ukrainskoi hromady u Brni," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 46 June 3, 1940, 4; "Pratsia v seli Dubrivka," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 62 July 10, 1940, 6.
[479] "Krai u pokloni Shevchenkovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 24 March 31, 1940, 2; no. 25 April 4, 1940, 2; no. 26 April 7, 1940, 2; no. 27 April 11, 1940, 2; no. 29 Apr 17, 1940, 2; no. 30 Apr 21, 1940, 2.

Sophisticated articles about Shevchenko were rare. The real Shevchenko was a complicated figure and so were his writings. In the past he was claimed as "our own" by Ukrainophiles and "Little Russians" in the 19th century; atheists and religious activists, Ukrainian nationalists and Soviet patriots in the 20th century.[480] For *Krakivski Visti*'s authors it was important to reclaim Shevchenko only for the Ukrainian national cause. Thus, the prominent Ukrainian socialist Antin Chernetskyi (1887-1963) in the article "Prysud bolshevykiv na Shevchenka" (The Bolshevik Judgement of Shevchenko), argued that the Soviets had been using Shevchenko for their ideological campaigns in Ukraine not because of sympathy towards his views, but because of the popularity of his name among the Ukrainian masses.[481] The Bolsheviks had proven to be the "masters of demagogy," claimed the author, by converting popular historical Ukrainian figures such as Khmelnytskyi, Shevchenko and Franko into "heralds" of their policies.

According to him, the steps that the Bolsheviks had taken to commemorate Shevchenko – the opening of his museum, publication of doctored editions of his writings, numerous monuments and "bombastic" celebrations on his grave in summer 1939 – served their political needs only. Moscow's main goal was to deceive and manipulate Ukrainians, especially those naïve and simpleminded "malorosy" (Little Russians) among them. This Soviet deceptive use of

---

[480] A recent biography of Shevchenko by Ivan Dziuba makes excellent analysis of these and other (mis)uses of the poet, see: I. M. Dziuba, *Taras Shevchenko. Zhyttia i tvorchist* (Kyiv: Kyevo-Mohylianska Akademia, 2008).

[481] A. Ch. [Antin Chernetskyi], "Prysud bolshevykiv na Shevchenka," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (851) May 29, 1943, 4.

Shevchenko was directed both outward and inward. To foreigners the Soviets wanted to show how much they valued this "genius of Ukrainian people" so that reports about their anti-Ukrainians policies would not be taken as credible. Against Soviet Ukrainians this glorification served to "dull" their enmity towards the Bolshevik regime, which used the history of Shevchenko's contacts with the Russian revolutionary democrats to frame Russification as something beneficial for "Ukrainian culture."[482]

The real Shevchenko, claimed the article, would be an inconvenient figure to Bolsheviks since his poetry can be easily interpreted in an anti-Bolshevik way. But Shevchenko's fame among Ukrainians was too great for the Bolsheviks to ignore or turn against him. Thus, their laudation of Shevchenko as a "great Ukrainian poet" and "fighter for the exploited peasant masses" was just pure agitation. To prove his point the author quoted the 1934 theses on Shevchenko by the Department of culture and propaganda of Leninism at the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b) of Ukraine.[483] The theses (one can only wonder how the author got hold of this rare Soviet publication) revealed what the Bolsheviks really thought about Shevchenko. They described him as a representative of "bourgeois democrat" and "nationalist" positions and as someone who never got

[482] A. Ch. [Antin Chernetskyi], "Prysud bolshevykiv na Shevchenka," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (851) May 29, 1943, 4.
[483] *T. H. Shevchenko 1814-1934: Tezy viddilu kultury i propahandy leninizmu TsK KP(b)U do 120-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia T.H. Shevchenka* (Kharkiv, 1934).

rid of his "petty bourgeois illusions."[484] In the contemporary Soviet Union such words would constitute a death sentence according to the author. He had no doubt that if Shevchenko would be still alive the fate of Khvyliovyi and Zerov would await him under the Bolsheviks.[485] Only naïve "khakhly," concluded Chernetskyi, can believe that Bolsheviks "truly honor" Shevchenko.[486]

It is puzzling that *Krakivski Visti*, a newspaper run by Galician Ukrainians, paid much less attention to arguably the most important Galician Ukrainian writer, Ivan Franko, than to Shevchenko. For example, in the first half of 1940 the newspaper published 19 texts on the latter, but only 3 on the former. Though Franko had certainly lost to Shevchenko in the number of articles written about him in *Krakivski Visti*, he was somewhat ahead in terms of their quality. The first large article on Franko in *Krakivski Visti*, "Velykyi syn halytskoi zemli" (The Great son of Galician land), appeared on May 29, 1940 to commemorate 24 years since his death on May 28, 1916.[487] It was better written than half of the laudatory articles on Shevchenko. The author recognized that as a national poet Shevchenko was greater than Franko, whom he called the "Great Teacher of the [Ukrainian] nation." The article drew parallels between Franko and the biblical prophet Moses,

---

[484] A. Ch. [Antin Chernetskyi], "Prysud bolshevykiv na Shevchenka," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (851) May 29, 1943, 4.
[485] Mykola Khvyliovyi (1893-1933) was a Soviet Ukrainian writer and essayist who committed suicide in protest against Stalinist policies in Ukraine. Mykola Zerov (1890-1937) was a Soviet Ukrainian literary critic and translator who was arrested in 1935 and executed two years later by the Soviets.
[486] A. Ch. [Antin Chernetskyi], "Prysud bolshevykiv na Shevchenka," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 113 (851) May 29, 1943, 4.
[487] V. K., "Velykyi syn halytskoi zemli," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 44 May 29, 1940, 1-2.

about whom Franko wrote one of his most famous poems (the article's author regarded it his best poem). Both – Moses and Franko – loved their peoples (the article's author carefully avoided to specify who were Moses' people), but at the same time were not blind to their shortcomings. Franko saw that centuries of *nevoli*,[488] meaning not having a state of their own, left negative marks on Ukrainians, turning them into "voluntary slaves, serving without resistance to anyone" who owned their chains. According to the article, to strike out this "slavery of mind and body" Franko became through his writings a blacksmith of Ukrainian consciousness, molding it as "a Ukrainian Moses" and showing to the Ukrainian people their ultimate goal – "Ukrainian statehood."[489] The latter would be attained through hard work and struggle, in which Ukrainians as Franko wrote in one of his poems would have to achieve "either victory or death!"[490] It is worth mentioning that the author slightly manipulated quotations from Franko. For example, the following passage was quoted as a single verse:

> Або смерть, або побіда! Either death or victory!
>
> Це наш оклик боєвий, That is our battle cry,
>
> Хто ненавидить кайдани, Those who hate chains,
>
> Тому війни нестрашні.[491] Are not afraid of wars.

[488] The word is usually translated as slavery, but it literally means non-freedom.
[489] Most likely this was also an allusion to Franko's father, who was a village blacksmith.
[490] V.K., Velykyi syn halytskoi zemli," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 44 May 29, 1940, 1.
[491] V.K., Velykyi syn halytskoi zemli," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 44 May 29, 1940, 1.

But the lines come from two different poems of Franko: the first and second from "Konkistadory" (1904), the third and fourth from "Velyki rokovyny" (1898).[492]

That Franko was more than just a literary figure was the subject of a speech by one of *Krakivski Visti*'s editors, Lev Lepkyi (1888-1971), at the concert commemorating Ivan Franko in Cracow.[493] In Lepkyi's opinion Franko was not merely a Ukrainian poet, but a "great citizen and statesman," which is a strange claim since Franko's involvement in politics was hardly prominent (he thrice, unsuccessfully, ran in elections). Lepkyi also called for protection of Franko's legacy from those (unspecified) who try to "de-bronze" (*vidbronzovuiut*), that is de-mystify, his image.[494] In the history of Ukraine and Ukrainian literature Franko is rightfully regarded as one of the most mythologized figures, contending for the first place in that category only with Taras Shevchenko.

One of the myths, which Franko himself created and propagated, was of his peasant origin (his mother belonged to *szlachta*).[495] Another myth, or rather self-image, was that of a working-class man, mason (*kameniar*).[496] Both myths regularly featured in the newspaper. For example, Bohdan Hoshovskyi in his article "Pisnia i pratsia" (Song and work), inspired by the eponymous poem by Ivan Franko from

[492] For an interesting comparison between the two poems and their appeals to heroism see: Ievhen Nakhlik, "Frankovi «Konkistadory»: poetyzatsia zdobuvnytskoho heroizmu," May 28, 2018 https://zbruc.eu/node/80144

[493] Lev was brother of the famous Ukrainian writer Bohdan Lepkyi (1872-1941).

[494] "Kontsert u chest Ivana Franka u Krakovi," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 57 June 28, 1940, 7.

[495] See: Iaroslav Hrytsak, "Ivan Franko – selianskyi syn?" *Ukraina: kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist* no. 15 (2006-2007): 531-542.

[496] See: Tamara Hundorova, *Franko ne kameniar. Franko i kameniar* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2006).

1883,[497] described him as a "son of Ukrainian peasant depths," born of peasant parents, and as the "Mason," whose "testament" to the next generations of Ukrainians was the "law of unceasing labor-struggle," because in words of Franko "nations gain nothing for free."[498] Hoshovskyi also described Franko as a "Giant of Ukraine," "the Moses of the Ukrainian people" and assigned him equal significance in the "great cult of the [Ukrainian] past" with Taras Shevchenko, whom he called the "immortal sovereign [volodar] of Ukraine." Hoshovskyi presented Ukrainians as a people strongly inclined towards myths: commemoration of historical events and figures gained among them "specific, often deep and unique forms." For Ukrainians the "cult of the past" with such figures as Franko and Shevchenko was not just an expression of "love" towards the fatherland, but also "proof of the vitality [zhyvuchosty]" of them as a nation.[499]

The Galician Ukrainian writer Markian Shashkevych (1811-1843) had neither Shevchenko's talent nor Franko's industriousness (but to be fair, he died prematurely from tuberculosis). His most famous accomplishment was the literary almanac "Rusalka Dnistrovaia" (The Dniester Nymph, 1837), which he compiled with Iakiv Holovatskyi (1814-1888) and Ivan Vahylevych (1811-1866). All three were Greek Catholic priests and were known collectively as the Ruthenian Triad (no relation to Chinese triads). Only Shashkevych is commemorated by Ukrainians: Holovatskyi later chose Russian national identity, converted to

[497] "Pisnia i pratsia" (1883).
[498] B. Danylovych [Bohdan Hoshovskyi], "Pisnia i pratsia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 44 May 29, 1940, 2.
[499] B. Danylovych [Bohdan Hoshovskyi], "Pisnia i pratsia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 44 May 29, 1940, 2.

Orthodoxy and moved to the Russian Empire;[500] Vahylevych converted to Lutheranism and closely worked with Polish national and cultural organizations, for which he was ostracized by contemporary Ukrainian circles as a Polonophile.[501]

"Rusalka Dnistrovaia" did not produce the same cultural and emotional impact as Shevchenko's "Kobzar" in Ukrainian history. Already by the 1860s Shashkevych was semi-forgotten in Galicia. But since the almanac was published in vernacular Ukrainian in phonetic script and Shashkevych never joined either the Polish or Russian orientation in Galicia (maybe thanks to his early death) in the 1890s he was rediscovered by the Galician Ukrainian national movement and coopted as a founder figure. The first large demonstration of the movement in 1893 was the commemoration of fifty years since Shashkevych's death.[502] Shashkevych and his almanac served as a proof that the Ukrainian national movement in Austrian Galicia developed sui generis. This was an important counter-argument to claims, which evoked feelings of cultural inferiority among the Galician Ukrainian activists, that the Ukrainian national idea was imported into Galicia from "Greater Ukraine" (*Velyka Ukraina*).

---

[500] On Holovatskyi see: Zynovii Matysiakevych, *Ukrainskyi istoryk Iakiv Holovatskyi* (Lviv: Litopys, 2002); F. I. Steblii, *Spodvyzhnyk Markiana Shashkevycha: Iakiv Holovatskyi – diach ukrainskoho natsionalnoho vidrodzhennia* (Lviv: In-t ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 2004).

[501] On Vahylevych see: Peter Brock, "Vahylevych and the Ukrainian National Identity," *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia*, ed. Andrei Markovits and Frank Sysyn (Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982), 111–148.

[502] Lidia Lazurko, "Sviatkuvannia ukraiinskykh natsionalnykh iuvileiiv u Halychyni (kinets XIX – pochatok XX st.)," *Z istoriii zakhidnoukraiinskykh zemel* no. 10-11 (2015): 191; Ihor Chornovol, "Markian Shashkevych: mekhanizmy kultu," *Krytyka* no. 1-2 (2005): 1-2.

Since the choice of Shashkevych for the national pantheon was based on a formal criterion (the vernacular language of "Rusalka Dnistrovaia") rather than on the actual content of his output his cult lacked substance. Commemorations of Shevchenko and Franko could be easily fitted into Ukrainian national framework just through quotes from their writings – on Ukraine, heroism, work, sacrifice etc. Commemoration of Shashkevych offered no such opportunity. This is quite evident from the articles which *Krakivski Visti* published to commemorate 100 years since his death. Two examples: Ivan Pankevych (1887-1958) in his article "Markian Shashkevych na tli zakhidno-evropeiskykh idei" (Markian Shashkevych against the background of Western European Ideas) said little about Shashkevych per se: most of the text dealt with Herder, Goethe and Šafárik and how Shashkevych *may* had been inspired by their works when he was compiling the almanac. In fact, the way in which Pankevych wrote the article can be easily interpreted as a depiction of Shashkevych as some sort of second-rate imitator despite all the praise he lavished on him.[503] Most likely Pankevych understood that Shashkevych's place in the Ukrainian national canon, on literary merit alone, is at best questionable. He defended him against the Galician Ukrainian literary

[503] Ivan Pankevych, "Markian Shashkevych na tli zakhidno-evropeiskykh idei," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 170 (908) August 6, 1943, 3; no. 171 (909) August 7, 1943, 3; no. 172 (910) August 8, 1943, 3-5; no. 175 (913) August 12, 1943, 3. Pankevych was a talented Ukrainian linguist who specialized in Carpathian Ukrainian dialects. About him see: P. M. Fedaka, ed., *Materialy naukovoi konferentsii, prysviachenoi pamiati Ivana Pankevycha (23-24 zhovtnia 1992 roku)* (Uzhhorod: Uzhorodska typohrafia, 1992); Mykola Mushynka, ed., *Ivan Pankevych ta pytannia literaturnoi movy. Statti ta materialy* = Mikuláš Mušinka, ed., *Ivan Paňkevyč a otázky spisovného jazyka. Štúdie a materiály* (Priashiv, 2002).

critic Mykola Ievshan (1889-1919), who regarded Shashkevych as a figure of little (national or literary) importance, calling him the poet of "sadness and weeping" (smutku i plachu).[504]

For Ievshan, Shashkevych was not an example of national awakening, but of Galician literary parochialism (*zahuminkovosty*). Pankevych argued (with no evidence, but with a lot of emotion) the opposite: Shashkevych was "our first [Ukrainian] poet in Galicia," who nationally "awakened" Galician Ukrainians through the publication of "Rusalka Dnistrovaia" just as Shevchenko did with "Kobzar" for Ukrainians in the Russian Empire.[505] This claim is hard to tie with the facts: the almanac played little to zero role in turning Galician Ruthenian intelligentsia towards Ukrainian idea in the 1860s-80s. It was other texts that accomplished this turn.[506]

The second example was the article "Talant, shcho zhas peredchasno" (The talent which was extinguished prematurely) by Luka Lutsiv.[507] Unlike Pankevych who was a linguist, Lutsiv was a literary critic.[508] In this sense he was better prepared to write about Shashkevych and his place in the history of Ukrainian literature, but similarly to Pankevych he dealt more with other matters than with

---

[504] On Ievshan see introduction to a volume of his collected writings: Natalia Shumylo, "Mykola Ievshan (1889-1919)," in Mykola Ievshan, *Krytyka. Literaturoznavstvo. Estetyka* ed. Natalia Shumylo (Kyiv: Osnovy, 1998), 3-11.
[505] Ivan Pankevych, "Markian Shashkevych na tli zakhidno-evropeiskykh idei," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 175 (913) August 12, 1943, 3.
[506] See: Ostap Sereda, "Shaping of a National Identity: Early Ukrainophiles in Austrian Eastern Galicia, 1860–1873" (PhD diss., Central European University, 2003), 63-70.
[507] L. Hranychka [Luka Lutsiv], "Talant, shcho zhas peredchasno," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 174 (912) August 11, 1943, 3-5.
[508] See chapter 2 for discussion of his antisemitic articles.

Shashkevych per se. Lutsiv admitted that Shashkevych as a writer and historical figure is much less exciting than other leading authors of Ukrainian literature, which perhaps is the reason why he had been studied so poorly. As a result, there was little to be said about Shashkevych, so Lutsiv focused on his reception instead. The last two commemorations related to the poet – the centenary of the publication of "Rusalka Dnistrovaia" in 1937 and the centenary of his death in 1943 – Lutsiv described as underwhelming, or in his own words as "too humble" (zaskromno). The commemoration which preceded them – the centenary of Shashkevych's birth in 1911 – in his view was much more "celebratory."

Lutsiv's explanation for this difference in commemorative intensity was not political: he did not point out that political regimes under which the commemorations were held in 1911, 1937 and 1943 were quite different from each other. Instead, as a literary critic, he offered an explanation rooted in literary criticism. Nineteen-eleven was the year when Mykola Ievshan published his famous article against the commemoration of Shashkevych, strongly questioning his significance. In Ievshan's view he was not worthy to be called a poet and as a literary figure he lacked originality. There was nothing to commemorate, argued Ievshan, so the centenary of Shashkevych's birth should be just another day in the calendar.[509]

[509] L. Hranychka [Luka Lutsiv], "Talant, shcho zhas peredchasno," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 174 (912) August 11, 1943, 3.

In response to such a devastating critique from the influential critic, Lutsiv listed opinions on Shashkevych by other authors who described him as an important figure – Iakiv Holovatskyi, Ivan Franko, Serhii Iefremov, Bohdan Lepkyi and Mykola Hnatyshak. The latter described Shashkevych in 1937, who according to Ievshan was a poet of "lamentations," as an embodiment of "spiritual strength … and pathos of struggle." In the end, Lutsiv refused to take Ievshan's criticism of Shashkevych seriously and simply dismissed it as "weird."[510]

History was evoked in the newspaper not only for defining the geographical borders of Ukraine (Vistula etc.), but also the borders of the national body too. Who is Ukrainian? Where does Ukrainianhood begin and where does it end? In this regard *Krakivski Visti* published one of the most interesting articles in its history – on the so-called *latynnyky* and mixed marriages. The three largest ethnic groups of Galicia – Ukrainians, Poles and Jews – had a very high degree of correlation between religion and nationality. By knowing the former you could usually tell the latter and vice versa: Greek Catholics were typically Ukrainians, Roman Catholics – Poles, and followers of Judaism – Jews.[511]

However, as often happens when diverse groups coexist, hybrids begin to appear. By the end of the 19th century two groups became numerous enough in

[510] L. Hranychka [Luka Lutsiv], "Talant, shcho zhas peredchasno," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 174 (912) August 11, 1943, 3, 5.

[511] There was also a social aspect to this triangle – most of the nobility were Poles, most of the tradesmen were Jews and most of the peasants were Ukrainians. See: John-Paul Himka, "The Galician Triangle: Poles, Ukrainians and Jews under Austrian Rule," *Cross Currents: A Yearbook of Central European Culture* no. 12 (1993): 125-146.

Galicia to attract public, political and academic attention – Greek Catholics who used Polish in everyday life and Roman Catholics who used Ukrainian in the same way. The latter group became commonly known as *latynnyky* since they were people of the Latin (Roman Catholic) rite. Their population size and exact origins remain a contentious subject in historiography. One of the highest estimates put them at over 500,000 in 1914.[512] Some consider them Poles who acculturated to the Ukrainian environment, others consider them Ukrainians who converted or were converted to Roman Catholicism. Both theories have concrete historical evidence behind them.[513] But, most importantly, they are not mutually exclusive.

Though *latynnyky* spoke Ukrainian in daily life, very few of them had Ukrainian national consciousness. In the battle of Polish and Ukrainian national projects over Galicia this group was caught in the cross-fire: their language pulled them towards Ukrainian identity, but their religion, since churches were becoming increasingly nationalized, towards Polish identity. Both Polish and Ukrainian nationalists looked at *latynnyky* with a mixture of hope and suspicion because they were an important demographic gain for either national project, but from their perspective they also stood with one leg (language or religion) in the enemy camp. This group also raised complex questions of national identity for Polish and

[512] Oleh Pavlyshyn, "Dylema identychnosty, abo istoria pro te, iak «latynnyky» (ne) staly ukraintsiamy/poliakamy (Halychyna, seredyna XIX – persha polovyna XX st.)," *Ukraina Moderna* no. 21 (2014): 191.
[513] See: Oleh Pavlyshyn, "Dylema identychnosty, abo istoria pro te, iak «latynnyky» (ne) staly ukraintsiamy/poliakamy (Halychyna, seredyna XIX – persha polovyna XX st.)," *Ukraina Moderna* no. 21 (2014): 179-186.

Ukrainian nationalists, who preferred simple answers to questions of national identity.

The issue of *latynnyky* was also important to Kubijovyč personally. Though he did not belong to them, but similarly to the majority of *latynnyky* he was an offspring of a mixed Polish-Ukrainian marriage and himself was married to a Polish woman at the time. The Ukrainian Central Committee under his leadership made certain efforts to turn *latynnyky* to the Ukrainian side. For example, it was for them that the "Ukrainske Vydavnystvo" published a special edition of Shevchenko's "Kobzar." The book was in the Ukrainian language, but in Latin script so that *latynnyky*, most of whom by 1939 experienced only Polish schooling and thus had little exposure to the Cyrillic script, could read the text.[514] The group was a recurring theme in *Krakivski Visti*. Interestingly, the very first article about them avoided the term *latynnyky*. Instead, it referred to the group as "Ukrainian Roman Catholics" (*ukraintsi rymo-katolyky*) though it was clear from the text that it meant *latynnyky*.[515] The author claimed that Roman Catholic Ukrainian peasants in Podlasie want to be regarded as Ukrainians: his proof was that they come "almost daily" to register themselves with local branches of the Ukrainian Central Committee. These registrations most likely had more to do with material assistance provided by the UCC to "Ukrainians" only (Poles and Jews would be

[514] This Latinized "Kobzar" was advertised in: *Krakivski Visti*, no. 64 July 15, 1940, 3.
[515] -Ia-, "Ukraintsi rym.-kat. na Pidliashshi tverdo zaivliaiut svoie ukrainstvo," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 11 February 14, 1940, 3.

turned away and directed towards their national committees), but the article makes no mention of that.

According to the author, more Roman Catholic Ukrainian peasants would register as Ukrainians if not for two obstacles. First, many of them are afraid of retaliation from their Polish neighbors and Polish officials in the occupied administration. This fear was "nonsense," because "Poland will not rule over Ukrainian lands ever again!!!"[516] Second, Poland achieved great successes in spreading within its borders the conviction that "every Roman Catholic is a Pole." The author argued that who is Ukrainian and who is not should be determined through "only belonging by blood, only lineage and internal feelings" (*lyshe krovna prynalezhnist, lyshe pokhodzhennia i vnutrishnie vidchuttia*) – notice the order of the criteria and absence of either language or religion in them. For a thousand years Podlasie had suffered demographic losses to "Polishness," but now thanks to "contemporary favorable conditions" (i.e., the German occupation) the presence of Ukrainian population in this region could be "strengthened."[517] The implication of this suggestion was clear: the shortest path to increase Ukrainian demographic presence in Podlasie was through drafting these Roman Catholic peasants into the Ukrainian nation.

[516] -Ia-, "Ukraintsi rym.-kat. na Pidliashshi tverdo zaivliaiut svoie ukrainstvo," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 11 February 14, 1940, 3.
[517] -Ia-, "Ukraintsi rym.-kat. na Pidliashshi tverdo zaivliaiut svoie ukrainstvo," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 11 February 14, 1940, 3.

The article which made the strongest case that identifying as a Roman Catholic did not exclude identifying as a Ukrainian was written by a priest with initials D. N. The author openly recognized that it would be difficult to integrate *latynnyky* into the Ukrainian nation, and not only because of the Polish propaganda that "you are Poles because you are Roman Catholics."[518] Ukrainians are guilty of this assumption as well: "how many times, perhaps unconsciously our intelligentsia – teachers, officials, cooperators – pushed away a latynnyk-Ukrainian with words: «You are a Pole! [So] go to the Poles!»" As a result, "we have done nothing to [nationally] save those Roman Catholics, former Ukrainians." And so *latynnyky* found themselves between the hammer and the anvil: on the one hand, Polish priests and bureaucrats kept telling them that they are Poles because they are Roman Catholics, and on the other hand "we [Ukrainians] are doing" the same. "So how will this unfortunate latynnyk become a Ukrainian?" The author warned that if this Ukrainian attitude continued, *latynnyky* would inevitably become Poles. But where was the root of this attitude, he asked?[519]

The author blamed it on the Russian state: to think that faith defined national identity was an "old Muscovite habit" (*davnia moskovska navychka*). *Latynnyky* in Chełm region, claimed the author, were a product of the Russian persecution of Uniates. Those among the latter who refused to convert to

[518] D. N., "Nashi zavdannia na zakhid vid Kholmshchyny," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 56 June 26, 1940, 5.
[519] D. N., "Nashi zavdannia na zakhid vid Kholmshchyny," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 56 June 26, 1940, 5.

Orthodoxy were regarded by the Russian officialdom as Poles and thus "hundreds of thousands" of them were pushed into Roman Catholicism. "We must not tread this old path." Depolonization should not mean losing one's faith, in this case Roman Catholicism, argued the author. He used the example of Lithuanians who too were once Polonized through the Roman Catholic Church, but eventually they reversed this process of denationalization by removing Polishness (*polshchyna*) from "parishes, churches, sermons, and … schools." The author also appealed to Ukrainian and German historical experiences. Zaporozhian Cossacks, according to him, accepted anyone who believed in God[520] and in contemporary Germany faith played no role in determining whether someone was a German.[521] So if religion could (and should) no longer be a valid tool for deciding one's national identity, then what was?

In his answer D. N. went much further than the previous author who still took into account lineage and blood relations. According to D. N. the only thing that mattered, the foundation on which we build "life and progress of a nation" was not faith or *even* language, but a "conscious feeling of national belonging," that is national consciousness. This approach to national identity disregarding

[520] D. N., "Nashi zavdannia na zakhid vid Kholmshchyny," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 56 June 26, 1940, 5. I assume that the author meant the Christian God, because the Cossacks allowed in only Christians. That said, until its very end the Zaporozhian Host was on the side of Orthodoxy and protected and supported financially only Orthodox churches and monasteries. It was not uncommon for Zaporozhian Cossacks to kill Greek Catholic and Roman Catholic clergy in Ukraine on religious grounds alone.

[521] D. N., "Nashi zavdannia na zakhid vid Kholmshchyny," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 56 June 26, 1940, 5. Faith indeed no longer played a major role in defining Germanhood in Nazi Germany but race most certainly did.

ethnicity, language and faith was essentially identical to the concept of Viacheslav Lypynskyi's "political Ukrainian" (*politychnyi ukrainets*) from the 1910s-20s: the true Ukrainian is not someone born of Ukrainian parents, or fluent in Ukrainian, or who regularly goes to Ukrainian church, but someone who identifies with Ukraine and is willing to work or fight towards its independence.[522] However, the author of the article made no mention of Lypynskyi or his works. Today this idea seems trivial but at that time and place it was revolutionary since the majority of people thought about identity in biological terms.

Finally, the author's definition of national identity followed a very practical goal. Besides *latynnyky* he was also interested in so called Zaveprianska Ukraine, that is the region by the river Wierpz (one of Vistula's tributaries). According to Ukrainian historians, whom the author believed, this region was once a part of the Halych-Volyn state but was lost to the Polish kingdom in 1302. The local population of this region, according to him, was ethnically Ukrainian, but it had been Polonized and Latinized already by the beginning of the 19th century. They no longer remembered the Ukrainian language and most Ukrainian traditions, and only a vague sense of distinct identity separated them from neighboring Masurians. Yet through "our theater, our song, our press, and … our cultural, ideological work" they and their "orphaned" land could be returned to Ukraine,

[522] See: Eugene Pyziur, "V. Lypyns'kyj's Idea of Nation," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 9 no. 3/4 (December 1985): 302-325.

thus restoring Ukrainian-Polish border alongside the Vistula which was a "just and natural boundary" (*spravedlyva i pryrodna mezha*) between the two nations.[523]

The anonymous author of "Pidliashshia nashe" (Podlasie is ours) was writing about the same group – Roman Catholic Ukrainian peasants – in a much more pessimistic tone despite the assertive title. Since the Roman Catholic church in the region was dominated by the Polish clergy, a religious conversion from Orthodox or Greek Catholic to Roman Catholic faith usually resulted in a national conversion from Ukrainian to Pole. The Polish ksiądzy would teach the converts "that becoming a Catholic is becoming a Pole, which means becoming an enemy of everything non-Catholic and non-Polish." Thus our "blood brothers" would turn against the Ukrainian national cause. The article implied that as long as *latynnyky* remained Roman Catholics they would remain an easy prey for Polonization. The author warned that if these "confused" (*zbalamucheni*) converts will not return "to their own people" they will disappear "in the Polish sea."[524] It is worth mentioning that most of the time *Krakivski Visti* described the Polish Roman Catholic church as a stronghold of anti-Ukrainian sentiment in interwar Poland: a Polish monastery was a "nest of [anti-Ukrainian] hate,"[525] the Polish Felician Sisters were more Polish chauvinists than nuns etc.[526]

[523] D. N., "Nashi zavdannia na zakhid vid Kholmshchyny," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 56 June 26, 1940, 5.
[524] "Pidliashshia nashe," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 64 July 15, 1940, 9.
[525] "Polskyi manastyr hnizdom nenavysty ta brudu," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 10 February 11, 1940, 3.
[526] "Oraty i siaty musymo perelih," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 40 May 19, 1940, 6.

While most authors who wrote about *latynnyky* used the term in the established sense – Roman Catholic peasants who used Ukrainian in everyday life – at least one author, Ivan Nimchuk (1891-1956), for some reason tried to expand it to the urban population as well. In a series of four articles under the misleading title "Shche pro lvivskykh rymo-katolykiv" (Once more about Lviv Roman Catholics) he wrote about Greek Catholics, presumably all Ukrainians, who converted to Roman Catholicism in 1919-1939.[527] In his opinion, they were *latynnyky* as well, which was rather strange claim since these converts lived in the city and Nimchuk had no proof that they kept their everyday communication in Ukrainian.[528] Most of the text is a close reading of statistics from three Lviv Greek Catholic parishes during the abovementioned period, showing per year how many Greek Catholic faithful officially changed to the Latin rite.

The point of this exercise in arithmetic was revealed in the last article of the series in which Nimchuk tried to extrapolate his findings (10,139 converts) onto seven other Greek Catholic parishes of Lviv for which he had no data. By his estimate at least 15,000 Lviv Greek Catholics converted to Roman Catholicism in the interwar period. He guessed that for the period of 1880-1919 the number would be at least 10,000, so for two periods combined the total was at least 25,000. Taking into account possible demographic growth from these converts, which he also

[527] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Shche pro lvivskykh rymo-katolykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 73 (811) April 7, 1943, 2; no. 78 (816) April 14, 1943, 2; no. 80 (818) April 16, 1943, 2; no. 82 (820) April 18, 1943, 2-3.
[528] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Shche pro lvivskykh rymo-katolykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 73 (811) April 7, 1943, 2.

based on a guess, he doubled it to at least 50,000. "Now let's remember," finally Nimchuk got to the point, that contemporary Lviv had around 80,000 Ukrainians and 150,000 Poles. If Ukrainians could regain those "lost" 50,000 the numbers would be respectively at 130,000 and 100,000, meaning that Lviv would have a Ukrainian demographic majority and thus the city would be under its control.[529]

Could Ukrainians regain those "lost" converts? Nimchuk was not optimistic: the fight for the national identity of these people was "essentially a competition between two cultures," Polish and Ukrainian, and he implied that the latter was a much weaker contender. This was evident from a broad list of changes he thought it needed to go through just to reach an equal footing in the competition, which involved book publishing, theatre, sports, philanthropy etc. But most importantly, Ukrainians in his opinion had to get rid of their "primitive, parochial approach" to matters of great importance and lose their strong feelings of "inferiority."[530] The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church too must get involved in this reclamation process, because its negligence was one of the reasons why so many Ukrainians had converted to Roman Catholicism in the first place.[531]

The issue of *latynnyky* was closely tied with discussions of mixed marriages between Ukrainians and Poles in Galicia. Historically such intermarriages were a

[529] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Shche pro lvivskykh rymo-katolykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 82 (820) April 18, 1943, 2
[530] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Shche pro lvivskykh rymo-katolykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 82 (820) April 18, 1943, 2
[531] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Shche pro lvivskykh rymo-katolykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 82 (820) April 18, 1943, 3.

significant phenomenon, steadily increasing through the Habsburg period. A Ukrainian author in the early 1900s estimated that one-third of Roman Catholics in Galicia came from mixed marriages between Poles and Ukrainians.[532] This reality was reflected by a slightly exaggerated contemporary statement that the Polish-Ukrainian border in Galicia lay not through geographical space, but through the marriage bed.[533] In Lviv alone, on the eve of World War I, marriages between Greek Catholics and Roman Catholics constituted almost 17% of all marriages in the city. As Polish-Ukrainian relations in Galicia took a turn for worse after 1918 due to the war between Poland and Western Ukrainian People's Republic and subsequent Polish occupation of Galicia, so did the rate of marriages between the two ethnic groups, dropping to 5% in Lviv in 1922. But the mutual gravitation between the two groups must have been too strong to break because even in the unfavorable conditions of the interwar Poland, which treated Ukrainians (and other minorities) as second-class citizens, the rate of mixed marriage between Ukrainians and Poles kept rebounding, eventually reaching 12% in Lviv on the eve of World War II.[534]

A discussion about the mixed marriages developed on the pages of *Krakivski Visti* in 1943, that is in the same year when Polish-Ukrainian enmity exploded into mutual ethnic cleansings and assassinations. In this paroxysm of

[532] Pavlyshyn, "Dylema identychnosty," 186.
[533] Ivan L. Rudnytsky, *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* ed. Peter L. Rudnytsky (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), 326.
[534] Mick, *Lemberg, Lwów, L'viv*, 212.

violence mixed families were often singled out.[535] Based on the editorial archive, it does not seem that these submissions were instigated or orchestrated by the editors: they were written out of genuine concern for the issue of mixed marriages. In terms of tone, the articles ranged from calm and measured to alarmist, but all of them described mixed marriages as a negative phenomenon in Ukrainian national life. Five authors – Denys Savaryn, Antin Chernetskyi, Myron Konovalets, Ivan Mirchuk and Ivan Nimchuk – took part in the discussion.

The first article, "Deshcho pro prychyny denatsionalizatsii" (A comment on the reasons of denationalization) by Denys Savaryn, was somewhat autobiographical since the author grew up in a mixed family with a nationally conscious Ukrainian father and Polonized German mother.[536] Following the rule of such marriages he was baptized in his father's faith (Greek Catholicism), while his sisters – in his mother's (Roman Catholicism), which automatically made them "Poles in the understanding of that time."[537] *Krakivski Visti* usually described Polonization as a top down process enforced by "cunning" and "brutal" Polonizers (priests, officials, teachers etc.) on Ukrainian masses. But this article is surprising by its candid and calm view on Polonization from below. The author

[535] Witold Szabłowski in his book "Sprawiedliwi zdrajcy. Sąsiedzi z Wołynia" (2016) describes cases when UPA soldiers in Volyn in 1943, upon encountering mixed families, often ordered Ukrainians from these families to murder their Polish relatives. See: http://www.istpravda.com.ua/articles/57ec59cac001f/ (last accessed October 16, 2018)
[536] D. S. [Denys Savaryn], "Deshcho pro prychyny denatsionalizatsii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 3 (741) January 5, 1943, 2.
[537] D. S. [Denys Savaryn], "Deshcho pro prychyny denatsionalizatsii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 3 (741) January 5, 1943, 2.

strongly felt "Polonizing influences" both inside and outside of his family while growing up, but none of those influences were, according to his view, enforced on him. It was "usual," he wrote, that in mixed Polish-Ukrainian families one half assimilated the other, but both his mother and sisters respected his choice of Ukrainian identity and none of them tried to "tug" him over to their national side. Similarly, nothing was forcing Polish identity on him in his social life.

The author's experience of those "Polonizing influences," came, as we would say today, from exposure to the soft power of Polonization: Polish culture (especially literature), which the author in no vague terms described as far superior to Ukrainian both in terms of literary quantity and entertainment value. Since he was from a mixed family, both worlds – Polish and Ukrainian – were equally open to him. But the former was far more "attractive." His Ukrainian school friends were less "polished" and less "cultured" compared to the Polish ones. Polish books were even more superior: there was a wider selection of them (including translations), they were better written, more interesting and "passionately patriotic." Most Ukrainian literature, on the other hand, fell into the victimhood genre: look how "we have been abused" for all these centuries. It offered no "higher ideas" to its readers. So how in the end, despite having a Polish mother, sisters, friends and books, the author ended up choosing Ukrainian

identity? The author was honest: if not for the Ukrainian revolutionary events of 1918 he most likely would not have remained a "conscious Ukrainian."[538]

Antin Chernetskyi wrote about mixed marriages in the context of urban environment. In his article "Denatsionaliztsia i urbanizatsia" (Denationalization and urbanization)[539] he described mixed families as a major factor of Ukrainian denationalization in Galician cities: their children usually were not only "lost" for Ukrainianhood (*ukrainstvo*), but often would become its "most ardent enemies."[540] Chernetskyi wrote that he could understand why Ukrainians of the "old age" (most likely, he meant the pre-1848 period) allowed themselves to marry non-Ukrainians, but he could not comprehend how such a "marvel" continued to happen in recent decades, "even among participants of the liberation struggle [of 1917-1920] and so called nationalists." Here Chernetskyi hinted at Ukrainian socialist leader Volodymyr Vynnychenko (1880-1951), who married a Jewish woman, and several prominent OUN members who were married to non-Ukrainians. Mixed families provided easier access to "alien language, press and books, alien culture, leading to ideas that were alien [and] hostile to us." Cities had always been "mostly an alien environment" for Ukrainians, stressed Chernetskyi,

---

[538] D. S. [Denys Savaryn], "Deshcho pro prychyny denatsionalizatsii," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 3 (741) January 5, 1943, 2.
[539] A. Chernetskyi, "Denatsionaliztsia i urbanizatsia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 11 (749) January 22, 1943, 1-2. This was not the only article that Chernetskyi wrote for *Krakivski Visti*. Interestingly enough, in his memoir written after the war he made no mention of his wartime articles or even of the newspaper. See: Antin Chernetskyi, *Spomyny z moho zhyttia* (Kyiv: Osnovni tsinnosti, 2001).
[540] A. Chernetskyi, "Denatsionaliztsia i urbanizatsia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 11 (749) January 22, 1943, 2.

and "[Ukrainian] family and tradition" were the only means through which they could be "shielded" against urban denationalizing influence.[541]

Chernetskyi's article prompted a reaction from Ukrainian education activist Myron Konovalets (1894-1980), brother of Ievhen Konovalets.[542] In his article "Mishani podruzhzhia" (Mixed marriages) Konovalets agreed that mixed marriages between Poles and Ukrainians, with extremely rare exceptions, had always worked in favor of the Polish nation and "contributed the most" towards Polonization of "our cities." In either case, whether the wife or husband was Roman Catholic, the result was usually the same – Polonization of the new family. The major difference was only in longevity of the process: it usually happened faster in families with a Roman Catholic husband since normally the wife would convert to his faith even before the marriage. It is no surprise, wrote Konovalets, that Polish society historically has always been in favor of mixed marriages with Ukrainians: this was how the latter lost its "princes and boyars, shliakhta and petty bourgeoise" and became a nation of peasants.[543]

Konovalets, however, did not settle for yet another description of how the poor Ukrainians have been taken advantage of by their neighbor. He was

---

[541] A. Chernetskyi, "Denatsionaliztsia i urbanizatsia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 11 (749) January 22, 1943, 2. On the subject of how Ukrainian national movement failed to spread in cities he also wrote in his memoir, see: Chernetskyi, *Spomyny z moho zhyttia*, 157.

[542] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 68 (806) April 1, 1943, 2; no. 69 (807) April 2, 1943, 2. It is curious that in their internal documentation the newspaper's editors referred to Myron Konovalets as "Komisar Myron" (Commissar Myron). See: PAA, Chomiak papers. Box 2, Item 32.

[543] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 68 (806) April 1, 1943, 2.

interested in finding the root cause: why in the urban environment mixed marriages always worked in Poles' favor? Konovalets suggested that the major, underlying reason was the Ukrainian feeling of "inferiority" in the Polish presence. This could be seen through language practice: when in a city a group of Ukrainians was joined by just one Pole, they would find it absolutely natural to switch the whole conversation "immediately to the Polish language." The social status of these Ukrainians was irrelevant – simple workers or members of intelligentsia with university degrees – all would drop the Ukrainian language in Polish presence. The same applied to mixed marriages in cities. As a rule, all of them "almost exclusively" spoke Polish at home. Only in villages, "among the people," did Ukrainians continue to retain their language.[544]

Konovalets also blamed past leaders of the Ukrainian national movement and Greek Catholic church for this dire situation with mixed marriages. "During the Austrian times" the national activists and clergy were so focused on the "village" that they neglected Ukrainization of the "city." They did not oppose mixed marriages which allowed for slow Polonization of "our cities." Ukrainian leaders awoke to this problem only after they lost the Polish-Ukrainian war of 1918-1919. What Konovalets meant here was that during the war most Galician

[544] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 68 (806) April 1, 1943, 2.

cities and towns, due to their demographic composition, were on the Polish side or were easily swayed to it.[545]

The interwar Polish regime rendered the situation with the mixed marriages even worse for Ukrainians, wrote Konovalets. "Under Austria" one of the principal customs that regulated mixed marriages between Greek and Roman Catholics was that sons followed their father's faith, daughters – their mother's. Under the Polish regime this custom was broken: in most cases children of both genders from mixed marriages were baptized in the Roman Catholic church. But even those that were baptized as Greek Catholics would usually convert later: normally one of the parents would raise them "in the Polish spirit, in disdain for everything Ukrainian," but even without parent(s) Polish-speaking "school, street, workplace and so on" would accomplish just that. Those exceptions which against all currents would somehow grow up into conscious Ukrainians often had to deal with Polish "chauvinism" of their close and distant relatives leading to family tragedies.[546]

Besides Polish relatives, mixed families also suffered "misery" from their children, who were "embarrassed" by the fact that one of their parents was a Greek Catholic. Such children would emotionally "terrorize" their parent into conversion, so they did not have to live in "shame." Konovalets told a story of a

[545] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 68 (806) April 1, 1943, 2.
[546] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 68 (806) April 1, 1943, 2.

funeral he witnessed in a Galician town not long before September 1939. The deceased, whom the whole town knew as a Pole, was buried by Greek Catholic priests to the surprise of the locals. It turned out that he was a closet Greek Catholic and only pretended to be a Roman Catholic under pressure from his wife and sons. The latter, officers of the Polish Army, and other Polish relatives of the deceased in the funeral procession seemed to Konovalets more distressed (*prybyti*) by the revelation of his true religious affiliation than by the fact of his death.[547]

The next question pondered by Konovalets was what made Ukrainians eager to marry Poles. He did not consider love or cultural proximity of the two ethnic groups (some cultures are closer than others); instead he offered the three following explanations. First, the naivete and emotional inexperience of young Ukrainian men, who arrived from Ukrainian villages to study in cities. In most cases such students would end up with Polish landladies, who often had daughters. Clever Polish mothers often used this renting situation to select a suitable husband for their daughters. This was how many Ukrainian men were "lost," wrote Konovalets, as if he was describing a battlefield. Konovalets' first explanation repeated a very popular trope from Ukrainian accounts on the history of Polish-Ukrainian relations: cunning Poles taking advantage of naïve Ukrainians.[548]

---

[547] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 69 (807) April 2, 1943, 2.

[548] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 69 (807) April 2, 1943, 2.

The second reason why Ukrainians sought marriages with Poles, according to Konovalets, was rooted in a desire of titles and stable income. "We are not a wealthy nation, even poor in comparison to some nations, but we have more … directors, doctors, colonels and so on than the wealthiest state nations [derzhavni narody]." This obsession with titles (tytulomania) made young Ukrainian women in cities consider a Polish official or policeman a more desirable candidate than a Ukrainian artisan even if the latter was doing well financially. But marrying him would be considered by Ukrainian women as a "great misfortune" (velyke neshchastia) because an artisan had neither title nor guaranteed state pension. During the interwar period Galicia was densely covered by Polish military garrisons, claimed Konovalets. As a result, many Ukrainian women chose to marry Polish NCOs rather than Ukrainian men. The former had a title and a stable income, while the latter suffered from a high rate of unemployment.[549]

The situation could have been rectified by marriages of these women with Greek Catholic priests, but at this time they were under orders of celibacy. Here Konovalets referred to the decision of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic hierarchs on September 20, 1919 to make celibacy mandatory for priests in the church. However, the decision was not enforced in all eparchies.[550] But Konovalets claimed that it affected the whole priesthood of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic

[549] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 69 (807) April 2, 1943, 2.
[550] Oleh Iehreshii, *Iepyskop Hryhorii Khomyshyn: portret reliihno-tserkovnoho i hromadsko-politychnoho diacha* (Ivano-Frankivsk: Nova Zoria, 2006), 54.

Church. Historically, he added, Greek Catholic priest families produced the best "Ukrainian intelligentsia."[551] The third reason why Ukrainians married Poles was a direct result of the Polish regime's policy of transfers. The regime intentionally took out the best cadres of Ukrainians – teachers and officials – out of Western Ukraine and transferred them into ethnic Polish provinces where they naturally ended up marrying Polish locals. Konovalets advocated for a reversal of this policy of transfers so that these Ukrainians and their children could be "saved for the Ukrainian nation." Otherwise, they would disappear into the "Polish sea."[552]

The negative effects of mixed marriages on the Ukrainian nation, according to Konovalets, went beyond the usual claims of denationalization and Polonization. The marriages cost "us" material wealth – Ukrainian women marrying Poles often came with real estate and financial capital, accumulated by several generations of Ukrainian petty bourgeoisie. Thus, mixed marriages became a contributing factor towards pauperization of Ukrainians turning them into "grey proletarianized masses," more and more financially dependent on Poles and Jews. Konovalets concluded the article on a pessimistic note: Ukrainians still suffer from an "inferiority complex" and mixed marriages would continue to pose a "depopulating" threat "for a long time." To become an urban nation Ukrainians

[551] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 69 (807) April 2, 1943, 2. On the connection between Greek Catholic and Ukrainian identity in Galicia see: John-Paul Himka, *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine: The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement in Galicia, 1867-1900* (Montreal; Kingston, Ontario; London; Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999).
[552] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 69 (807) April 2, 1943, 2.

would have "to remove" previous "failures," among which Konovalets counted "mixed marriages."[553]

The fourth contribution to the discussion of mixed marriages was "Nemalovazhne pytannia" (An important question) by Ukrainian philosopher Ivan Mirchuk (1891-1961), written in direct response to Myron Konovalets' article discussed above.[554] The author agreed with Konovalets on everything, especially with his thesis of the "inferiority complex" as the primary reason why most of mixed marriages turned out to be a national loss to Ukrainians. Since Konovalets had limited his discussion on the subject of marriages to "Western [Ukrainian] lands," Mirchuk sought to complement the thesis and demonstrate that Ukrainians suffered from an "inferiority complex" in relations not only with the "closest neighbor" (Poles), but "other nations" as well. He proposed to look at Ukrainian male students who studied at major centers of Ukrainian interwar emigration – Berlin, Vienna and Prague. "Thousands" of these students could not return back to their "native lands" so they stayed in Western Europe and married local women (chuzhynky). Mirchuk, who taught at Ukrainian émigré institutions in all three cities, claimed that he observed "hundreds" of these marriages, and they allowed him to postulate a "law," from which he saw "almost no exceptions."[555]

---

[553] Myron K. [Myron Konovalets], "Mishani podruzhzhia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 69 (807) April 2, 1943, 2.
[554] I. M. [Ivan Mirchuk], "Nemalovazhne pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 122 (860) June 9, 1943, 1-2.
[555] I. M. [Ivan Mirchuk], "Nemalovazhne pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 122 (860) June 9, 1943, 1.

Mirchuk's "law" was simple: young Ukrainian men did not have the ability to make a good marital choice. The "foreign women" they chose were "neither pretty, nor educated" and usually they were not from families of higher "material or social" standing. According to Mirchuk this was not a minor issue, because these poor marital choices had "long-term consequences for the future fate of the whole nation." It was an "absolute need" for the "stateless [Ukrainian] nation" to develop "connections" in political, art and academic circles of foreign countries. But the poor marital choices of Ukrainian young males ignored this "need."[556] Ukrainians often excused a poor marital choice by saying that marriage was an "individual thing." Mirchuk claimed that this "individualism" was born out of "Ukrainian spirituality," but in his opinion individualism had no place "in the present time or under our [national] conditions." Both demanded subordination of individual desires to collective need: "a human being does not live a separate life, it can develop only as a part of collective, whose needs must be an internal imperative for an individual."

Mirchuk clarified further that he did not propose for the Ukrainian society to force marital choice on individuals, only that "education must go in the direction … of individual desires attuning to collective need."[557] Unfortunately, achieving such attunement in his opinion would be difficult because of the key component of Ukrainian national character – "the superiority of the emotional

[556] I. M. [Ivan Mirchuk], "Nemalovazhne pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 122 (860) June 9, 1943, 1.
[557] I. M. [Ivan Mirchuk], "Nemalovazhne pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 122 (860) June 9, 1943, 2.

element over pure rationality." It was normal to follow your heart in pursuit of marriage, wrote Mirchuk, but that should not mean ignoring your reason (*rozum*). Emotions often deceive and lead to delusions, while "intellect" offers a "sober and realistic" look at the world. Ignoring the "voice of reason" was "dangerous not only for an individual, but for a [national] collective too" and on the issue of mixed marriages Ukrainian youth, concluded Mirchuk, must learn to care for their individual desires without abandoning the needs of the national collective.[558]

Mirchuk's article elicited the fifth and last contribution to the discussion – "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" (It is time to stop the loss of blood!) by the same Ivan Nimchuk.[559] The author agreed with the Mirchuk's "law" that young Ukrainian males indeed make poor marital choices when it comes to foreign women and repeated his words about their lack of beauty, education, social status or wealth. Nimchuk lamented these marriages (the whole article is rather emotional) and blamed on them alienation of "not hundreds or thousands, but dozens of thousands" of talented and educated Ukrainians from the "Ukrainian nation." Nimchuk's proof of this alienation was the contribution of these men to the "treasury of Ukrainian culture" – "none" in his words. You could not find these Ukrainians abroad, wrote Nimchuk, among financial donors for "Ukrainian national goals" or even among subscribers to Ukrainian periodicals. During the interwar period the main Galician newspaper *Dilo* (Nimchuk was its last chief

[558] I. M. [Ivan Mirchuk], "Nemalovazhne pytannia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 122 (860) June 9, 1943, 2.
[559] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 129 (867) June 19, 1943, 1-2.

editor in 1935-39) had around 10 subscribers in Vienna, and even less in Prague or Berlin. If such men could not bring themselves to support the "Ukrainian cause," what could we expect from "their children"? Nimchuk believed that they looked "with disdain" on the "Ukrainian nation," or at very best they were "indifferent" towards it.[560]

From lamentation Nimchuk proceeded to explanation. Why did so many Ukrainian young men living or studying abroad end up marrying foreign women, that in all aspects – from physical attractiveness to social status, stood "lower" than them? Nimchuk provided the same answer he did in his article about Lviv Roman Catholics[561] and other authors did in the discussion about mixed marriages – "feelings of [Ukrainian] inferiority." Nimchuk claimed to know "many examples" of talented Ukrainian young men, who were expected to become "leading individuals" of Ukrainian life abroad and who married the "first available" foreign woman – "waitress, florist or seamstress" – sometimes even with "not the best fame among informed youth" (most likely, this was a hint about their sexual reputation). All appeals to "reason" against such mésalliance usually would be turned away by the "stubborn Rusyn."[562] In other words, Nimchuk here repeated Mirchuk's argument about emotion subjugating reason as a primary feature of the

[560] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 129 (867) June 19, 1943, 1.
[561] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Shche pro lvivskykh rymo-katolykiv," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 82 (820) April 18, 1943, 2.
[562] "Stubborn Rusyn" is a phrase from Ivan Franko's play "Uchytel" (1893).

Ukrainian psyche. After marrying these women Ukrainian men would separate themselves from "our organized life" and "disappear" in the foreign nation.[563]

To illustrate this point Nimchuk told a personal story of his acquaintance, a Ukrainian medical doctor who studied in Vienna before World War I and stayed in the city afterwards. After the war, when Vienna and his native Galicia ended up in different states, he decided to organize other Ukrainian doctors in the city into a local chapter of the Lviv-based Ukrainian Medical Association (Ukrainske Likarske Tovarytsvo). All of the doctors, around twenty, were married to foreign women and none had any interest in belonging to or participating in a Ukrainian professional organization. "Their Ukrainianhood extended only to their last names," wrote Nimchuk.[564] According to him, most of these doctors were sons of wealthy Galician Ukrainian priests and peasants: their parents had spent their life savings to give them an education in such expensive city as Vienna.

For Nimchuk this story of how hard-earned Ukrainian wealth and educated talent were so easily lost because of marriages to foreign women exemplified the whole tragedy of mixed marriages for the Ukrainian national cause.[565] Why had none of these doctors and other Ukrainians like them married Ukrainian women, who were studying in Vienna (in smaller numbers) at the same time? What made them go after a "waitress or florist" rather than an educated Ukrainian woman? Nimchuk's answer was that "a Ukrainian [man] abroad avoided [such women] –

[563] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 129 (867) June 19, 1943, 1.
[564] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 129 (867) June 19, 1943, 2.
[565] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 129 (867) June 19, 1943, 2.

he simply was afraid and ran away from an intelligent [Ukrainian] woman." He did not unpack this answer, but it generally fitted with the diagnosis of an "inferiority complex."[566]

From explanation Nimchuk moved to solution. "This damned law [of mixed marriages] must be broken." Like other authors in the discussion Nimchuk perceived mixed marriages as a dangerous enough threat to Ukrainian national development that they needed to be taken seriously. "Uneven" mixed marriages of Ukrainians abroad with lower women or mixed marriages abroad in general "should not be allowed to happen." Nimchuk proposed two policies. First, "both at home and school, we need to reeducate … Ukrainian youth" in the sense that "any sense of inferiority, of being somehow lower, timidity, stupefaction [zaturkanosty] must be eliminated among them."[567] Their education must be focused towards raising a "sense of national pride, we need to teach the younger generation not only to love, but to treasure the Ukrainian past and our cultural values."[568] His second policy recommendation was far less theoretical. Nimchuk proposed that two Ukrainian institutions, which financed education of many Ukrainians abroad – the Ukrainian Students' Aid Commission (KoDUS) and its parent organization, the Ukrainian Central Committee – should start monitoring "this matter [of mixed marriages] with the utmost attention" for Ukrainian students receiving their stipends and steer their marital choice in the correct

[566] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 129 (867) June 19, 1943, 2.
[567] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 129 (867) June 19, 1943, 2.
[568] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 129 (867) June 19, 1943, 2.

direction "just as Bulgarians and Japanese do with their own youth abroad."[569] Ultimately, this was a matter of Ukrainian national welfare both figuratively and literally. "We [as a nation] are too poor to allow … this decades-long blood loss [of mixed marriages] to continue. It is time to stop it!"[570]

Krakivski Visti returned to the subject of mixed marriages with a big article once more in 1944. Marriages of young Ukrainians (male or female) were a matter of national importance, claimed Iurii Koshelnyk in his article "Mitsna simia – mitsna natsiia" (Strong family – strong nation).[571] A "national organism" was nothing more than a collective of families – "national cells." The stronger and healthier these "cells" were the stronger and healthier was the nation made of them. This was the reason, wrote Koshelnyk, why marital choice could not be left "to follow a natural course [na samoplyv]," that is to allow young people to marry whomever they want. The author turned to old and recent history to stress his point. The "cultured people" understood the need "to regulate marriages" from "ancient times" and so did the Christian Church throughout its history. According to him, it was no accident that Bolsheviks propagated unlimited "free love" and "freedom of marriage": the ruin of families meant the ruin of nations, which was the goal of "their internationalism." These Bolshevik policies resulted in the "reduction of the birthrate, an increase in homeless population, prostitution and venereal diseases" in the Soviet Union.

---

[569] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 129 (867) June 19, 1943, 2.
[570] I. N. [Ivan Nimchuk], "Pora spynyty opust krovy!" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 129 (867) June 19, 1943, 2.
[571] Iu. Koshelnyk, "Mitsna simia – mitsna natsiia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 108 (1141) May 20, 1944, 1-2.

On the other hand, Soviet marriages became "internationalized": Ukrainians marrying "Russians, Poles, Jews" became a common thing. "[Soviet] Jews especially promoted love and marriages between individuals of different nations and races." Koshelnyk looked at "international" families as an aberration in a world where nations are supposed to be the norm: these families according to him almost never lived in harmony because they had conflicts within themselves about their national belonging. "Children from such families are very difficult to raise in a national spirit."[572]

The author compared the Soviet practice of "international" family with the Nazi practice of "national" family. The latter received high praise from him: "the German people understood a long time ago the anti-national character of mixed marriages." Contemporary Germany, reminded Koshelnyk in reference to the Nuremburg laws of 1935, even has a law regulating marriages, forbidding unions between Aryans and non-Aryans. The author advocated the same measure of top-down marriage regulation for the Ukrainian nation too: "we … would benefit from borrowing this foreign experience." Unfortunately, he wrote, since Ukrainians did not have their own state at the time, they could not pass any state laws by definition. "But this does not mean that such an important question as marriages of our youth should be left to fate." Marital choices of Ukrainian youth needed to

[572] Iu. Koshelnyk, "Mitsna simia – mitsna natsia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 108 (1141) May 20, 1944, 1.

be controlled, concluded Koshelnyk, because some among them still did not understand the "anti-Ukrainian character of mixed marriages."[573]

Were the articles on the mixed marriages dealing with a genuine issue or were they a Ukrainian echo of the pan-European paranoia about "blood mixing" which peaked in Nazi Germany where it was elevated to an official policy? My answer is that they were both. Western Ukrainian society certainly did not escape general European trends before the war and there is evidence to support Mirchuk's and Nimchuk's accusation that *some* Ukrainian men preferred non-Ukrainian women. Roman Volchuk wrote in his memoir that "wider intellectual interests were an exception rather than the norm between our [Western Ukrainian] young women."[574] For some men, "intelligence is the ultimate aphrodisiac" (attributed to Timothy Leary).

A contemporary of Volchuk, Ivan L. Rudnytsky, was harsher: "With regard to Ukrainian girls from the intelligentsia … They say that the German woman is uninteresting. But from my student years I recall German female classmates [tovaryshky] who were truly extremely interesting young women, real ladies, true world-class intellectuals, girls of immense energy and ability («Tüchtigkeit»), again others possessed a genuine culture of the heart («Innerlichkeit»). The type of young Galician [Ukrainian] female is something dreadfully goosey and provincial, undeveloped both in brain and in heart, uninteresting even

[573] Iu. Koshelnyk, "Mitsna simia – mitsna natsia," *Krakivski Visti*, no. 108 (1141) May 20, 1944, 1.
[574] Roman Volchuk, *Spomyny z povoennoi Avstrii ta Nimechchyny* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2004), 83.

«spoiled».”[575] In another letter, written six years later, Rudnytsky argued that there was a systemic reason why at least some Ukrainian men were not interested in Ukrainian women of their generation: “The Ukrainian intelligentsia as a stratum [verstva] is very young, un-crystallized, and its lack of tradition and style shows even more in the female half than in the male half.”[576] In other words, the two halves were not equally matched.

Conclusions

Ideologically *Krakivski Visti* was a multi-layered product. On its surface level the newspaper was glazed with the Nazi ideology of the German occupiers, but below it contained its own original ideological layer of Ukrainian nationalism (not to be equated with OUN ideology). This second layer was represented by numerous articles on Ukrainian history, historical memory and national issues. This content, even though it often evoked and appealed to emotions, was not produced to satisfy sentimental needs. Behind it stood a rational and calculated understanding of nation-building, which was the primary (though not openly declared) goal of the Ukrainian Central Committee’s leadership. Kubijovyč wanted to make Ukrainians into a nation ready for statehood even though it had

[575] Letter from Ivan L. Rudnytsky to Nazar Iasinchuk February 26, 1947. UAA, Rudnytsky papers. Box 47, Item 745.
[576] Letter from Ivan L. Rudnytsky to Bohdan Tsymbalistyi June 23, 1953. UAA, Rudnytsky papers. Box 49, Item 755.

become clear to him quickly enough that the occupational authorities had no plans for a Ukrainian state.

Within this second ideological layer Ukrainian history played a major role. In a narrow sense, it served the immediate political goals of the Ukrainian Central Committee, providing historical legitimacy to its claim over Chełm and Podlasie regions as "Ukrainian territories" (*Krakivski Visti* reminded its readers about this in almost every issue in 1940-1941) in the General Government. It is curious that the Lemko region figured noticeably less in this type of content compared to those two regions. There is no explanation for this disparity in the editorial archive so I can only speculate on this matter: perhaps the UCC and Kubijovyč (who was of Lemko background) felt that their claim over the Lemko region was more secure. In a wider sense, Ukrainian history was used for instilling in the readers a sense that they belonged to a nation with long, rich and glorious past. It was true that this nation had lost its state, but since then it made several attempts to regain it. What was not said, but was implied in the newspaper: when the next opportunity comes Ukrainians should be better prepared to seize a state.

Of all Ukrainian states of the past the medieval Halych-Volyn state was emphasized the most in *Krakivski Visti*, which is somewhat surprising. The Cossack state, Hetmanate (Hetmanshchyna), was a better candidate for glorifying the Ukrainian past, especially in terms of military history. Perhaps, the authors of *Krakivski Visti* preferred the medieval Halych-Volyn state to the Hetmanate because most of them were Western Ukrainians. Historically speaking, the

Cossackdom was not a significant phenomenon in the history of Western Ukraine. But on the other hand, and this is even more puzzling, the newspaper mentioned the Western Ukrainian People's Republic of 1918-1919 far less than the Ukrainian Cossacks though the history of the Republic would have fitted nicely into the anti-Versailles system narrative which *Krakivski Visti* followed.

Both amateur and professional historians contributed historical material to the newspaper. Among the latter were Mykola Andrusiak, Myron Korduba and Dmytro Doroshenko whose contributions are discussed in greater detail in this chapter. The first submitted an overview of Ukrainian history from early Slavic settlement to the Lublin Union (1569), the second – a history of the Halych-Volyn state under its last ruler Bolesław-Iurii II (1323-1340), the third – a memoir about Viacheslav Lypynskyi, Ukrainian historian and political thinker. Though their submissions were different in subject, style and genre all three underscored the importance of the state in Ukrainian history: they implied that a national collective can fully realize itself only within its own state and to achieve it Ukrainians would need strong leadership and reliable allies. *Krakivski Visti* also paid significant attention to Ukrainian historical memory with articles about the cult of sacrifice for the national cause, Ukrainian graves (both real and symbolic) and commemoration of Ukrainian historical figures such as Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko and Markian Shashkevych—though the latter's inclusion into the Ukrainian pantheon was questionable and had to be defended.

The importance of history and historical memory for the Ukrainian nation remained a constant factor in *Krakivski Visti*. Bu on the nation itself, its boundaries and criteria of inclusion and exclusion (ethnic background, consciousness, language and religion) the newspaper offered mainly two different views. June 1941 was a visible watershed line in these discussions. Prior to the inclusion of Galicia into the General Government, *Krakivski Visti* argued that the Vistula river constituted a historical border between Ukrainian and Polish nations and favored the inclusion of *latynnyky* (Roman Catholics peasants who used Ukrainian in everyday life) into the Ukrainian national body. There was a clear attempt to widen the national net and prioritize Ukrainianhood not through religion, language or ethnic background but through attitude – in other words, anyone who felt Ukrainian and wanted to help Ukrainian national efforts should be considered a part of the Ukrainian nation.

Most likely, this trend reflected (at least to a degree) attempts of the UCC leadership to expand its horizontal and vertical power within the General Government before the German-Soviet war (see chapter 1). The war changed these discussions profoundly. The subject of the Vistula as westernmost border of the Ukrainian nation had disappeared completely and by 1943 there were even reminders that not sacrificing the Chełm region in 1918 for the sake of Ukrainian control over Galicia had resulted in losing both to Poland. The same happened to the call for an inclusive approach to the Ukrainian nation. Instead, the 1943

discussion over mixed marriages as an existential threat showed a return to the biological, or ethnic understanding of the Ukrainian nation.

Conclusions

The German occupation of Poland in September 1939 resulted in the creation of the General Government (*Generalgouvernement*), a German colonial entity that until the end of the war was headed by a prominent Nazi figure, Hans Frank. The latter developed a set of policies in his domain which exploited and furthered pre-existing ethnic tensions between Jews, Poles and Ukrainians, favoring the latter. Each of the three ethnic groups came to be represented vis-à-vis the occupational authorities by umbrella organizations with headquarters in Cracow. In the case of the Ukrainians, it was the Ukrainian Central Committee (unofficially created in November 1939), led through the war by the prominent Ukrainian geographer Volodymyr Kubijovyč.

The OUN (mostly Melnykites) played an important role both in the founding and functioning of the Committee (at least until June 1941). Though Kubijovyč was not a member of the OUN or any other Ukrainian political force, he was a Ukrainian nationalist who sought to elevate Ukrainians as a nation within the legal boundaries set by the occupational authorities. Kubijovyč and people like him were situational, not ideological, collaborators: they worked with and for their German occupiers primarily because of a situation over which they had no control (war and invasion) and not because of some ideological sympathies towards National Socialism, though that also should not imply that they were free of racial or ethnic bias (Kubijovyč certainly was not). One of the important points of

Kubijovyč's national program was to have a strong pro-Ukrainian daily newspaper, which would replace the daily *Dilo* that closed down in September 1939 due to the Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine. The first issue of this new newspaper, which received the name *Krakivski Visti* and was a semi-official organ of the UCC until the end of the war, appeared on January 7, 1940. From November 1, 1940 it was issued as a daily and continued in this format until the last, 1406th issue on April 4, 1945 (the last five issues appeared under the name *Ukrainskyi shliakh*). A weekly edition of the newspaper was also published from November 1940 until October 1944. With the exception of the first month the chief editor of the daily edition was a former *Dilo* editor, a lawyer by education, Mykhailo Khomiak (Michael Chomiak after his immigration to Canada in 1948). However, the main intellectual force among the editors of *Krakivski Visti* was Marian Kozak, who wrote the most of the newspaper's editorials in 1940-1944.

The three major blocks of content in *Krakivski Visti* were war, politics and culture. The newspaper was able to attract contributions from the most prominent Ukrainian intellectuals and cultural figures, especially in 1942-1943. The majority of authors wrote for *Krakivski Visti* for the sake of self-expression, income and status. Due to the advance of the Red Army the newspaper was transferred to Vienna in October 1944. This move proved to be detrimental for *Krakivski Visti* as it lost up to two-thirds of its authors. Throughout the war the newspaper's reception in Ukrainian public was rather negative due to its lower intellectual and production quality compared with *Dilo*, but after the war it has been recognized

as an important source for the history of Western Ukrainian lands under German occupation.

Ideologically *Krakivski Visti* was a multi-layered product. On the surface level the newspaper was glazed with the official content of the German occupiers: antisemitism, anticommunism, glorification of Germany and other Axis powers (mainly Japan and Italy), praise of National Socialism and its leaders (mostly Hitler), and whatever short- or long-term ideological campaigns were pursued at a given time. Publication of these texts, often translated or summarized from the Axis press, was a price which the newspaper paid for its existence under German occupation. In general, *Krakivski Visti* did not deviate from the official ideological direction set by the German authorities. However, underneath it contained its own original ideological layer—to be fair it existed only because the Germans allowed it—of Ukrainian nationalism (not to be equated with the ideology of any of the OUNs), which was realized primarily through two groups of texts. The first was texts which informed and reminded readers of the newspaper about historical enemies of the Ukrainian nation – Poles, Jews, Russians/Soviets. The second comprised texts that educated readers on Ukrainian history, historical memory, historical figures (Shevchenko, Franko, Shashkevych) and discussed national issues (such as *latynnyky* or mixed marriages).

The first group of texts overlapped with one of the primary goals of the German authorities in the General Government: to put its multiethnic population through a "school of hate," that is propaganda of negative ethnic stereotypes and

ethnic hatred aimed at dividing the population along ethnic lines and forming attitudes based on group identity. Antisemitism constituted the core of German propaganda in the General Government for the entirety of its existence. At the beginning of the German occupation official propaganda also engaged against Poles, primarily to convince them that their prewar state was unviable. The Soviets were a blind spot until June 22, 1941 after which they were returned into their usual Nazi category of Judeobolshevism – the mortal enemy of the Aryan race. On the surface, original texts of *Krakivski Visti*, texts that represented its own ideological layer, followed Nazi propaganda: they also attacked Jews, Poles and Soviets. However, it would be superficial to assume, just because of this, that *Krakivski Visti* was a "Nazi" newspaper. Nuance matters: these original texts engaged in campaigns against Jews, Poles and Russians/Soviets for reasons that had little or nothing to do with National Socialism.

Krakivski Visti's first campaign was directed at Poles and to a large extent this was a release of resentment for the previous two decades of Polish rule over Western Ukrainians, which treated them as second-class citizens. Ironically, the leading role in the campaign was played by members of the Western Ukrainian party – UNDO – which before the war had attempted to reach a modus vivendi with the Polish state (the normalization of 1935). Two prominent UNDO members, Ivan Kedryn and Stepan Baran, wrote a series of anti-Polish articles each. Kedryn's series was also republished as a book. Another former UNDO leader, Milena Rudnytska, prepared and edited a book of anti-Polish materials, commissioned by

the Ukrainian Central Committee (the book did not appear). Besides the sophisticated pieces of Kedryn and Baran, *Krakivski Visti* also published plenty of primitive texts that were vehemently anti-Polish and often reduced to name-calling. Polishness was presented as antithetical to values of justice and order. Some Ukrainian authors essentially desired a reversal of the prewar situation and advocated anti-Polish measures just for the sake of Ukrainian benefit.

Anti-Polish materials were significantly reduced in frequency after June 1941 when the primary focus was shifted to anti-Soviet propaganda due to the German invasion of the Soviet Union. Again, *Krakivski Visti*'s authors had their own reasons to attack the Soviets: two famines (1921-1922 and 1932-1933), collectivization, Stalinist purges and Russification of the 1930s, deportations of 1939-1941 and the June 1941 Soviet massacre of prisoners in Western Ukraine. Unlike Nazi propaganda the original Ukrainian texts identified the Soviet Union with Russians in the first place, not Jews, though the latter also appeared in them. The main themes of the anti-Soviet materials were the civilizational divide between Ukrainians and Russians/Soviets and the inhumane crimes, which they committed against Ukrainians. On two occasions *Krakivski Visti* ran specific campaigns covering such crimes – the Soviet prison murders of 1941 and the Vinnytsia massacres of 1937 – in July-August 1941 and June-September 1943 respectively. In both campaigns victims and perpetrators were ethnicized: the former as Ukrainians and the latter as Russians and Jews. In reality, at least one

third of victims were non-Ukrainians and some Ukrainians must have been among the perpetrators.

Besides the two campaigns *Krakivski Visti* had published hundreds of anti-Soviet articles by the end of war. Among them was a remarkable series on the history of Bolshevik terror against the Ukrainian nation by an outstanding Ukrainian poet and essayist Evhen Malaniuk. The main themes of his series – Ukrainians shielded Europe from Bolshevism; terror is the essence of Bolshevism; the famines of 1921-1922 and 1932-1933 were man-made; Bolshevik actions against various Ukrainian social groups were part of a single anti-Ukrainian policy – became cornerstones of the Ukrainian martyrology developed in the Ukrainian diaspora in the West during the Cold War.

While anti-Polish texts appeared in *Krakivski Visti* mostly before the German invasion of the Soviet Union and anti-Russian/Soviet texts only after the invasion, the anti-Jewish materials were printed throughout the whole time. Again, besides the official antisemitic propaganda, mostly republished from the foreign (usually Axis) press the newspaper featured original solicited and unsolicited articles written by Ukrainian authors. The primary case of the solicited materials was the campaign in Summer 1943, when *Krakivski Visti* was ordered by the occupational authorities to publish a series of antisemitic materials. Five Ukrainian authors contributed to the campaign – Oleksandr Mokh, Kost Kuzyk, Olena Kysilevska, Luka Lutsiv, and Oleksandr Mytsiuk. But even without the campaign the

newspaper featured enough original antisemitic content submitted by Ukrainian authors, for example Vasyl Grendzha-Donskyi, on their own volition.

Besides ascertaining the fact of the original Ukrainian antisemitism in *Krakivski Visti* it is also important to determine its typology. It would be inaccurate to equate it with Nazi antisemitism. To use an African analogy, the two were different in a similar fashion to how contemporary anti-White rhetoric of postcolonial Black nativism in Africa differs from the anti-Black racism of South African apartheid. Most of the original antisemitic texts in the newspaper were filled with anticolonial rhetoric driven by nativist attitude and directed against those who were identified as alien exploiters – Jews. It is remarkable how many of these pieces would be indistinguishable from the Black nativist rhetoric if "Jews" were to be replaced with "Whites." It is important to note that original articles against Poles, Jews, and Russians/Soviets continued prewar trends of Ukrainian nationalism. *Krakivski Visti* might have amplified them, but it certainly did not start them.

The second group of the original ideological layer – numerous articles on Ukrainian history, historical memory and national issues – was prompted by a rational and calculated understanding of nation-building, which was the primary (though not openly declared) goal of the Ukrainian Central Committee's leadership. Kubijovyč wanted to make Ukrainians into a nation ready for statehood even though it became clear to him quickly enough that the occupational authorities had no plans for a Ukrainian state. Ukrainian history

played a major role in this pursuit. In a narrow sense, it served the immediate political goals of the Ukrainian Central Committee, providing historical legitimacy to its claim over Chełm and Podlasie regions as "Ukrainian territories" (*Krakivski Visti* reminded its readers about this in almost every issue in 1940-1941) in the General Government. It is curious that the Lemko region figured much less compared to those two regions. In a wider sense, Ukrainian history was used for instilling in the readers a sense that they belonged to a nation with a long, rich and glorious past, implying that their future could be the same. Of all the past Ukrainian states the medieval Halych-Volyn state was emphasized the most in *Krakivski Visti*, followed by the Cossack state, Hetmanate (*Hetmanshchyna*). Surprisingly, the Western Ukrainian People's Republic of 1918-1919 was mentioned less, though the history of the Republic would have fitted nicely into the anti-Versailles system narrative of official propaganda that *Krakivski Visti* followed.

Articles on Ukrainian history varied widely in subject, style and genre, but most of them underscored the importance of statehood in Ukrainian history and implied that a national collective could fully realize itself only within its own state and to achieve it Ukrainians would need strong leadership and reliable allies. *Krakivski Visti* also paid significant attention to Ukrainian historical memory with articles about the cult of sacrifice for the national cause, Ukrainian graves (both real and symbolic) and commemoration of Ukrainian historical figures (primarily Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko and Markian Shashkevych).

On the Ukrainian nation itself, its boundaries and criteria of inclusion and exclusion (ethnic background, consciousness, language and religion) the newspaper offered mainly two different views. June 1941 was a visible watershed line in these discussions. Prior to the inclusion of Galicia into the General Government, *Krakivski Visti* argued that the Vistula river constituted the historical border between the Ukrainian and Polish nations and favored the inclusion of *latynnyky* (Roman Catholics peasants who used Ukrainian in everyday life) into the Ukrainian national body. There was a clear attempt to widen the national net and prioritize Ukrainianhood not through religion, language or ethnic background but through attitude – in other words, anyone who felt Ukrainian and wanted to help Ukrainian national efforts should be considered part of the Ukrainian nation.

Most likely, this trend reflected (at least to a degree) attempts of the UCC leadership to expand its horizontal and vertical power within the General Government before the German-Soviet war. The war, which led to incorporation of Galicia as the fifth district into the General Government, changed these discussions profoundly. The subject of the Vistula as the westernmost border of the Ukrainian nation had disappeared after June 1941. The same happened to the call for an inclusive approach to the Ukrainian nation. The 1943 discussion of mixed marriages as an existential threat to Ukrainian nation demonstrated the dominance of the biological, or ethnic understanding of the national body.

The importance of *Krakivski Visti* and of other Ukrainian legal press in the General Government extends beyond ideological matters. Historians who study ethnic killings between Poles and Ukrainians in the General Government (especially in 1943-1944) mostly search for their reasons in the prewar history of Polish-Ukrainian relationship. Perhaps, these killings would be better understood if the anti-Polish materials of the Ukrainian legal press were added into explanatory framework. Those materials perfectly embodied the logic of ethnic hatred. They only lacked a direct call for violence. The same applies to anti-Jewish and anti-Russian/Soviet materials in the legal press: they might provide additional insight into Ukrainian participation in the Holocaust and postwar anti-Soviet insurgency in Western Ukraine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Krakivski Visti. 1940-1944 (Cracow)

Archives

Chomiak, Michael. Accession no. 85.191. Provincial Archives of Alberta (Edmonton).

Rudnytsky, Ivan L. Accession no. 84-155. University of Alberta Archives (Edmonton).

Nazaruk, Osyp. Fond 359. Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine in Lviv (TsDIAL of Ukraine).

Audio interview with Mykhailo Khomiak (1975 or 1977). Private archive, Chrystia Chomiak (Edmonton).

Video interview with Benedict Blawacky (2010). Private archive, Maria Hopchin (Edmonton).

Horbovyi, Volodymyr. *Pohoda sovisti*. Digital Archive of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement http://avr.org.ua/index.php/viewDoc/22336/

Published sources

Berdykhovska, Bogumila, ed. *Iezhy Gedroits ta ukrainska emigratsiia: lystuvannia 1950-1982 rokiv*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2008.

Bilas, Lev. *Ohliadaiuchys nazad. Perezhyte 1922-2000 i peredumane*. Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy, 2005.

Chernetskyi, Antin. *Spomyny z moho zhyttia.* Kyiv: Osnovni tsinnosti, 2001.

Grendzha-Donskyi, Vasyl. *Shchastia i hore Karpatskoi Ukrainy: Shchodennyk. Moi spohady*. Uzhhorod: Zakarapattia, 2002.

Halan, Iaroslav. *Tvory v triokh tomakh. Tom 2: Proza. Publitsystyka.* Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhnioi literatury, 1960.

Hentosh, Liliana. "Pro stavlennia mytropolyta Sheptytskoho do nimetskoho okupatsiinoho rezhymu v kontektsi dokumenta z kantseliarii Alfreda Rozenberga," *Ukraina Moderna* no. 20 (2013): 296-317.

Homo politicus [Kedryn, Ivan]. *Prychyny upadku Polshchi*. Krakiv: Ukrainske Vydavnytstvo, 1940.

Kamenetsky, Ihor, ed. *The Tragedy of Vinnytsia: Materials on Stalin's Policy of Extermination in Ukraine during the Great Purge 1936–1938*. Toronto-New York: Ukrainian Historical Association in cooperation with Bahriany Foundation Inc. and Ukrainian Research and Documentation Center, 1989.

Kedryn, Ivan. *Zhyttia-podii-liudy*. New York, NY: Chervona Kalyna, 1976.

Kolisnyk, Roman. "Moie znaimostvo z profesorom Volodymyrom Kubiovychem." In *Profesor Volodymyr Kubiovych*, edited by Oleh Shablii, 356-360. Lviv: Vydavnychyi tsentr LNU imeni Ivana Franka, 2006).

Korovytskyi, Ivan, ed. *Lysty Dmytra Doroshenka do Viacheslava Lypynskoho*. Philadelphia: W. K. Lypynsky East European Research Institute, 1973.

Krupnytskyi, Borys. *Zi spohadiv istoryka*. Kyiv: Instytut ukrainskoi arkheohrafii ta dzhereloznavstva im. M. S. Hrushevskoho, 2017.

Kubijovyč, Volodymyr. *Meni 70*. Munich: Logos, 1970.

Kubijovyč, Volodymyr. *Meni 85*. Munich: Molode zhyttia, 1985.

Liakhotskyi V.P. et al., eds. *Pam'iatky. Tom 2: Epistoliarna spadshchyna Ivana Ohienka (mytropolyta Ilariona) 1907-1968*. Kyiv: Ukrainskyi derzhavnyi naukovo-doslidnyi instytut arkhivnoi spravy ta dokumentoznavstva, 2001.

Lysenko O. Ie. and Patryliak I. K., eds. *Materialy ta dokumenty Sluzhby bezpeky OUN(B) u 1940-kh rr.* Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2003.

Malaparte, Curzio. *Kaputt.* Marlboro, VT: Marlboro Press, 1982.

Romaniv, Oleh, ed., *Narodovbyvstvo v Ukraini: ofitsiini materialy pro masovi vbyvstva u Vinnytsi*. Lviv: Lvivska oblasna istoryko-kulturolohichna orhanizatsiia "Memorial," 1995.

Rudnytska, Milena. *Statti, Lysty, Dokumenty*. Lviv: Misioner,1998.

Shevelov, Iurii. *Ia – mene – meni – i dovkruhy* vol. 1. Kharkiv: Vydannia chasopysu "Berezil," 2001.

Strutynska, Mariia. *Daleke zblyzka*. Winnipeg: Vydavnycha Spilka "Tryzub," 1975.

Volchuk, Roman. *Spomyny z peredvoiennoho Lvova ta voiennoho Vidnia*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2002.

Volchuk, Roman. *Spomyny z povoennoi Avstrii ta Nimechchyny*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2004.

Wasyl, Veryha, comp. *The correspondence of the Ukrainian Central Committee in Cracow and Lviv with the German authorities, 1939-1944*. 2 vols. Edmonton, AB: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2000.

Zabolotna, Inna. "Roky nimetskoi okupatsii na Zakhidnii Ukraini za spohadamy Ivana Krypiakevycha." *Ukrainskyi arkheohrafichnyi shchorichnyk* 10 no. 7 (Kyiv – New York: Vydavnytstvo M. P. Kots, 2002): 389-410.

Secondary Literature

Articles

Abramson, Henry. "«This is the Way it Was!» Textual and Iconographic Images of Jews in the Nazi-sponsored Ukrainian Press of Distrikt Galizien." In *Why Didn't the Press Shout? American & International Journalism and the Holocaust*, edited by Robert Moses Shapiro, 537-556. New York: Yeshiva University Press, 2003.

Berdychowska, Bogumiła. "Od nacjonalisty do lewicowca (Przypadek Borysa Ławyckiego)." *Zeszyty Historyczne* 145 (524) 2003: 214-230.

Bergen, Doris L. "The Nazi Concept of «Volksdeutsche» and the Exacerbation of Anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe, 1939-45." *Journal of Contemporary History* 29, no. 4 (1994): 569-82.

Berkhoff, Karel C. "Ukraine under Nazi Rule (1941-1944): Sources and Finding Aids: Part I." *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 45, no. 1 (1997): 85-103.

Brock, Peter. "Vahylevych and the Ukrainian National Identity." In *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia*, edited by Andrei Markovits and Frank Sysyn, 111-148. Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982.

Chornovol, Ihor. "Markiian Shashkevych: mekhanizmy kultu." *Krytyka* no. 1-2 (2005): 1-2.

Dashkevych, Iaroslav. "Vstupne slovo, abo pro problemy kolaborantstva." In *Persha Ukrainska dyviziia Ukrainskoi natsionalnoii armii: istoriia stvorennia ta natsionalno-politychne znachennia. Materialy naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii.*

Dopovidi ta povidomlennia, edited by Iaroslav Dashkevych, 7-9. Lviv: Novyi chas, 2002.

Fedushchak, Inna. "Do 65-i richnytsi komunistychnoho zlochynu (cherven 1941 r.)." *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh*, no. 7 (2006): 120-154.

Fife, Robert. "Freeland knew her grandfather was editor of Nazi newspaper." *The Globe and Mail*, March 7, 2017. https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/freeland-knew-her-grandfather-was-editor-of-nazi-newspaper/article34236881/

Friedrich, Klaus-Peter. "Publizistische Kollaboration im sog. Generalgouvernement: personengeschichtliche Aspekte der deutschen Okkupationsherrschaft in Polen (1939-1945)." *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 48 no. 1 (1999): 51-89.

Friedrich, Klaus-Peter. "Die deutsche polnischsprachige Presse im Generalgouvernement (1939-1945): NS-Propaganda für die polnische Bevölkerung." *Publizistik: Vierteljahreshefte für Kommunikationsforschung* 46 no. 2 (2001): 161-188.

"D-r Osyp Nazaruk." *Krakivski Visti*, no. 26 April 7, 1940.

Himka, John-Paul. "Ethnicity and the Reporting of Mass Murder: *Krakivs'ki visti*, the NKVD Murders of 1941, and the Vinnytsia Exhumation." In *Shatterzone of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands*, edited by Omer Bartov and Eric D. Weitz, 378-398. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Himka, John-Paul. "*Krakivski visti* and the Jews, 1943: A Contribution to the History of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations during the Second World War." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 21, no. 1-2 (Summer-Winter 1996): 81-95.

Himka, John-Paul. "*Krakivs'ki visti*: An Overview." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 22, (1998): 251-261.

Himka, John-Paul. "The Galician Triangle: Poles, Ukrainians and Jews under Austrian Rule." *Cross Currents: A Yearbook of Central European Culture* no. 12 (1993): 125-146.

Hnatiuk, Ola. "Piotr Dunin-Borkowski." *Zeszyty Historyczne* 155 (2006): 188-225.

Hnatiuk, Ola. "Conditio sine qua non." *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* IV, no. 2 (2017): 275-290, http://dx.doi.org/10.21226/T20D1V

Hrytsak, Iaroslav. "Ivan Franko – selianskyi syn?" *Ukraina: kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist* no. 15 (2006-2007): 531-542.

Kenez, Peter. "The Ideology of the White Movement." *Soviet Studies* 32, no. 1 (1980): 58-83.

Kenez, Peter. "Pogroms and White Ideology in the Russian Civil War." In *Pogroms: Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian history*, edited by John D. Klier and Shlomo Lambroza, 293-313. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Kozak, Marian. "Z zhyttia i dialnosti Viacheslava Lypysnkoho." *Dzvony* no. 6 (1932): 420-428.

Kozak, Marian. "Kulturne getto: sproba analizy." *Iliustrovani Visti*, no. 5 1941.

Kozak, Marian. "Za zrozuminnia ukrainskoi diisnosty. V 13-ti rokovyny smerty Viacheslava Lypynskoho (14 chervnia 1931 r.)." *Krakivski Visti*, no. 128 (1161) June 15, 1944.

Kucheruk, Oleksandr. "«… Vse, shcho zviazane z vyzvolenniam Ukrainy» (Do genezy vidnosyn Orhanizatsii Ukrainskykh Natsionalistiv ta Ukrainskoho

Tsentralnoho Komitetu na pochatku Druhoi svitovoi viiny).” *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh* no. 18 (2013): 25-38.

Kurylo, Taras and Ivan Khymka. “Iak OUN stavylasia do ievreiv? Rozdumy nad knyzhkoiu Volodymyra Viatrovycha.” *Ukraina Moderna* no. 13 (2008): 252-265.

Lazurko, Lidiia. “Sviatkuvannia ukraiinskykh natsionalnykh iuvileiiv u Halychyni (kinets XIX – pochatok XX st.).” *Z istoriii zakhidnoukraiinskykh zemel* vyp. 10–11 (2015): 184-206.

Lutskyi, Oleksandr. “Lviv pid radianskoiu okupatsieiu 1939 – 1941 rr.” *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh* no. 7 (2006): 89-119.

Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, Ivan. “Nazaruk i Lypynskyi: istoriia iikhnioi druzhby ta konfliktu.” In *Lysty Osypa Nazaruka do Viacheslava Lypynskoho*, edited by Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, xv-xcvii. Philadelphia: W. K. Lypynsky East European Research Institute, 1976.

Markiewicz, Paweł. “Volodymyr Kubijovych's Ethnographic Ukraine: Theory into Practice on the Western Okraiiny.” *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 64, no. 2 (April 2016): 228-259.

Nakhlik, Ievhen. "Frankovi «Konkistadory»: poetyzatsiia zdobuvnytskoho heroizmu." May 28, 2018 https://zbruc.eu/node/80144

Pahiria, Oleksandr. "Polska storinka teroru v Karpatskii Ukraini (1938-1939 rokiv)." In *Ukrainophobia iak iavyshche ta polittekhnolohiia*, edited by Ia. Harasym et al, 34-59. Vyp. 1. Lviv, 2014.

Pavlyshyn, Oleh. "Dylema identychnosty, abo istoria pro te, iak «latynnyky» (ne) staly ukraintsiiamy/poliakamy (Halychyna, seredyna XIX – persha polovyna XX st.)." *Ukraina Moderna* no. 21 (2014): 179-218.

Pelenskyi, Ie. Iu. "Pered dvoma rokamy." *Krakivski Visti*, no 1 (448) January 2, 1942.

Pikh, Oleh and Maryna Cheban. "Myron Korduba and Mykola Andrusiak: do istorii vzaiemyn." *Ukraina-Polshcha: istorychna spadshchyna ta suspilna svidomist* no. 5 (2012): 158-178.

"Pokhoron d-ra O. Nazaruka." *Krakivski Visti*, no. 27 April 11, 1940.

Prymak, Thomas M. "Dmytro Doroshenko: A Ukrainian Émigré Historian of the Interwar Period." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 25, no. 1/2 (Spring 2001): 31-56.

Pyziur, Eugene. "V. Lypyns'kyj's Idea of Nation." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 9 no. 3/4 (December 1985): 302-325.

"Round-Table Discussion." In *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective* edited by Howard Aster and Peter J. Potichnyj, 479-512. 2nd ed. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1990.

Rudling, Per Anders. "«They Defended Ukraine»: The 14. Waffen-Grenadier-Division der SS (Galizische Nr. 1)." *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies*, 25 no. 3, (2012): 329-368.

Sereda, Ostap. "«As a Father among Little Children»: The Emerging Cult of Taras Shevchenko as a Factor of the Ukrainian Nation-building in Austrian Eastern Galicia in the 1860s." *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal* no. 1 (2014): 159–188.

Shprinher, Tetiana. "Oleksandr Mokh iak literaturnyi krytyk, zhurnalist i vydavets." *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriia zhurnalistyka*. Vyp. 36 (2012): 168-178

Shumylo, Natalia. "Mykola Ievshan (1889-1919)." In Ievshan, Mykola. *Krytyka. Literaturoznavstvo. Estetyka*, edited by Natalia Shumylo, 3-11. Kyiv: Osnovy, 1998.

Stasiv, Bohdan. "Chomu my ishly do dyvyzii «Halychyna»?" In *Persha Ukrainska dyviziia Ukrainskoi natsionalnoii armii: istoriia stvorennia ta natsionalno-politychne znachennia. Materialy naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii. Dopovidi ta povidomlennia*, edited by Iaroslav Dashkevych, 56-62. Lviv: Novyi chas, 2002.

Ukr. pysmennyk. "Odvertyi lyst do ukrainskykh pysmennykiv." *Proboiem* 8, no. 11 (November 1941): 658-662.

Zilynskyi, Ivan. "Chomu zmineno nazvu «Krakivskykh Vistei»?" *Krakivski Visti*, no. 38 May 6, 1940.

"Zmina u provodi Redaktsii." *Krakivski Visti,* no. 4 January 17, 1940.

Books

Antoniuk N.V. *Ukrainske kulturne zhyttia v "Heneralnii Hubernii" (1939-1944 rr.): Za materialamy periodychnoi presy*. Lviv: Naukovo-doslidnyi tsentr periodyky, Lvivska naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka, 1997.

Armstrong, John Alexander. *Ukrainian Nationalism*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Baran, Stepan. *Mytropolyt Andrei Sheptytskyi: zhyttia i dialnist.* Munich: Vernyhora, 1947.

Bergen, Doris. *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust.* 3rd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016.

Berkhoff, Karel C. *Harvest of Despair: Life and Death in Ukraine under Nazi Rule.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004.

Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha. *Feminists despite themselves: women in Ukrainian community life, 1884-1939*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, University of Alberta, 1988.

Cheban, Maryna. *Mykola Andrusiak: istoria istoryka*. Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 2015.

Confino, Alon. *A World Without Jews: The Nazi Imagination from Persecution to Genocide.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014.

Dobroszycki, Lucjan. *Die legale polnische Presse im Generalgouvernement, 1939-1945.* München: Selbstverlag des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte, 1977.

Dobroszycki, Lucjan. *Reptile Journalism: The Official Polish-Language Press under the Nazis, 1939-1945*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.

Dobroszycki, Lucjan, ed. *The Chronicle of the Łódź ghetto, 1941-1944.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984.

Zabarevskyi M. [Doroshenko, Dmytro]. *Viacheslav Lypynskyi i ioho dumky pro ukrainsku natsiiu i derzhavu*. Vienna: Vyd. zakhodamy O. Zherebka, 1925.

Dziuba I. M. *Taras Shevchenko. Zhyttia i tvorchist*. Kyiv: Kyevo-Mohylianska Akademia, 2008.

Fedaka P. M., ed. *Materialy naukovoi konferentsii, prysviachenoi pamiati Ivana Pankevycha (23-24 zhovtnia 1992 roku)*. Uzhhorod: Uzhorodska typohrafia, 1992.

Fedevych K. K. *Halytski ukraintsi u Polshchi. 1920-1939 rr. (Intehratsiia halytskykh ukraintsiv do Polskoi derzhavy u 1920-1930-ti rr.).* Kyiv: Osnova, 2009.

Frank, Niklas. *Der Vater: eine Abrechnung.* München: C. Bertelsmann, 1987.

Frank, Niklas. *Bruder Norman!: "Mein Vater war ein Naziverbrecher, aber ich liebe ihn."* Bonn: Dietz, 2013.

Franko, Ivan. *V naimakh u susidiv: zbirnyk prats pysanykh polskoiu ta nimetskoiu movamy v perekladi z poiasnenniamy ta dodatkamy avtora*. Lviv, 1914.

Fritz, Stephen G. *Ostkrieg: Hitler's War of Extermination in the East*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2011.

Gross, Jan Tomasz. *Polish Society under German Occupation: The Generalgouvernement, 1939-1944*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Himka, John-Paul. *Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine: The Greek Catholic Church and the Ruthenian National Movement in Galicia, 1867-1900*. Montreal; Kingston, Ontario; London; Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.

Holovata, Larysa. *"Ukrainske vydavnytstvo" u Krakovi-Lvovi, 1939-1945: Bibliohrafichnyi dovidnyk*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2010.

Holovata, Larysa. *Ukrainskyi legalnyi vydavnychyi rukh Tsentralno-Skhidnoi Ievropy, 1939-1945* (Kyiv-Lviv, 2013).

Housden, Martyn. *Hans Frank: Lebensraum and the Holocaust*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Hundorova, Tamara. *Franko ne kameniar. Franko i kameniar*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2006.

Hrendzha-Donska, Zirka. *"My ie lyshen korotki epizody": zhyttia i tvorchist Vasylia Hrendzhi-Donskoho*. Uzhhorod: Sribna zemlia, 1993.

Hryciuk, Grzegorz. "*Gazeta Lwowska" 1941-1944*. Wrocław: Wydaw. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1996.

Hrynevch, Vladyslav. *Nepryborkane riznoholossia: Druha svitova viina i suspilno-politychni nastroi v Ukraini, 1939 – cherven 1941 rr.* Kyiv-Dnipropetrovsk: Vydavnytstvo "Lira," 2012.

Hrytsak, Iaroslav. *Prorok u svoii vitchyzni: Franko ta ioho spilnota, 1856-1886*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2006.

Iehreshii, Oleh. *Iepyskop Hryhorii Khomyshyn: portret reliihno-tserkovnoho i hromadsko-politychnoho diiacha*. Ivano-Frankivsk: Nova Zoria, 2006.

Iliushyn I. I. *OUN-UPA i ukrainske pytannia v roky Druhoi svitovoi viiny (v svitli poskykh dokumentiv)*. Kyiv: Instytut Istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2000.

Iliushyn I. I. *Protystoiannia UPA i AK (Armii Kraivoi) v roky Druhoi svitovoi viiny na tli diialnosti polskoho pidpillia v Zakhidnii Ukraini.* Kyiv: Instytut Istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2001.

Jockheck, Lars. *Propaganda im Generalgouvernement: die NS-Besatzungspresse für Deutsche und Polen 1939-1945*. Osnabrück: Fibre, 2006.

Kiebuzinski, Ksenya and Alexander Motyl, eds. *The Great West Ukrainian Prison Massacre of 1941: A Sourcebook*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017.

Kosarenko-Kosarevych, Vasyl. *Moskovskyi sfinks: mit i syla v obrazi Skhodu Evropy*. New York, 1957.

Korduba, Myron. *Istoria Kholmshchyny ĭ Pidliashshia*. Krakiv: Ukrainske Vydavnytsvo, 1941.

Krupnyckyj, Borys. *Geschichte der Ukraine*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1939.

Kubijovyč, Volodymyr. *Ukraintsi v Heneralnii Huberni, 1939-1941: istoriia Ukrainskoho tsentralnoho komitetu*. Chicago, IL: Vyd-vo Mykoly Denysiuka, 1975.

Kuchabsky, Vasyl. *Western Ukraine in conflict with Poland and Bolshevism, 1918-1923.* Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2009.

Kurylyshyn, Kostiantyn. *Ukrainske zhyttia v umovakh nimetskoi okupatsii (1939-1944 rr.): za materialamy ukrainomovnoi lehalnoi presy*. Lviv: Lvivska natsionalna naukova biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka, 2010.

Kutsenko, Leonid. *Kniaz dukhu: statti pro zhyttia i tvorchist Ievhena Malaniuka.* Kirovohrad: [s.n.], 2003.

Lewandowski, Józef. "*Goniec Krakowski*" *(27.X.1939 - 18.I.1945): próba monografii*. Warszawa: [s.n.], 1978.

Magocsi, Paul Robert. *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus', 1848-1948*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Majer, Diemut. *"Non-Germans" under the Third Reich: The Nazi Judicial and Administrative System in Germany and Occupied Eastern Europe, with Special Regard to Occupied Poland, 1939–1945.* Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University Press in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2013.

Matysiakevych, Zynovii. *Ukrainskyi istoryk Iakiv Holovatskyi*. Lviv: Litopys, 2002.

Mick, Christoph. *Lemberg, Lwów, L'viv, 1914-1947: Violence and Ethnicity in a Contested City*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2016.

Motyka, Grzegorz. *Od rzezi wołyńskiej do Akcji "Wisła": konflikt polsko-ukraiński 1943-1947*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2011.

Motyl, Alexander J. *The Turn to the Right: The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian nationalism, 1919-1929.* Boulder, CO: East European quarterly; New York, NY: distributed by Columbia University Press, 1980.

Mushynka, Mykola, ed. *Ivan Pankevych ta pytannia literaturnoi movy. Statti ta materialy* = Mušinka, Mikuláš, ed. *Ivan Paňkevyč a otázky spisovného jazyka. Štúdie a materiály*. Priashiv, 2002.

Mytsiuk, Oleksandr. *Ahraryzatsiia zhydivstva na tli zahalnoi ekonomiky*. Prague, 1933.

O'Connor, Garry. *Butcher of Poland: Hitler's Lawyer Hans Frank.* Stroud, United Kingdom: Spellmount Publishers Ltd, 2013.

Pasternak, Iaroslav. *Staryi Halych: arkheolohichno-istorychni doslidy u 1850-1943 rr.* Krakiv-Lviv: Ukrainske vydavnytstvo, 1944.

Pelenski, Jaroslaw, ed. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* vol. 9 no. 3/4 (December 1985): The Political and Social Ideas of Vjačeslav Lypyns'kyj.

Perederii I. H. *Viacheslav Lypynskyj: etnichnyj poliak, politychnyj ukraiinets*. Poltava: PoltNTU, 2012.

Pikh, Oleh. *Myron Korduba (1876-1947).* Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 2012.

Rawska, Jolanta. "*Sprawa polska*" *w prasie* "*gadzinowej*" *(lipiec 1944-styczeń 1945)*. Warszawa: [s.n.], 1980.

Rein, Leonid. *The Kings and the Pawns: Collaboration in Byelorussia during World War II*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2011.

Rudnytska, Milena, ed., *Zakhidnia Ukraina pid bolshevykamy*. New York: Ameryka, 1958.

Rudnytsky, Ivan L. *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*, edited by Peter L. Rudnytsky. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987.

Salyha, Taras. *Vohon, shcho ne zhasa...* Kyiv: Lybid, 2017.

Sawa, Mariusz. *Ukraiński emigrant: działalność i myśl Iwana Kedryna-Rudnyckiego (1896-1995).* Lublin: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej - Komisja Ścigania Zbrodni przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu, Oddział w Lublinie, 2016.

Schenk, Dieter. *Hans Frank: Hitlers Kronjurist und Generalgouverneur.* Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 2006.

Schenk, Dieter. *Krakauer Burg: Die Machtzentrale des Generalgouverneurs Hans Frank, 1939-1945*. Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag, 2010.

Shankovskyi, Lev. *Pokhidni hrupy OUN: prychynky do istorii pokhidnykh hrup OUN na tsentralnykh zemliakh Ukrainy v 1941-1943 rr.* Munich: Ukrainskyi samostiinyk, 1958.

Shapoval, Iu. H. *I v Ukraini sviatylos te slovo*. Lviv: PAIS, 2003.

Sidak V. et al. *Polkovnyk Petro Bolbochan: trahedia ukrainskoho derzhavnyka*. 2nd ed. Kyiv: Tempora, 2009.

Skakun, Roman. *"Patsyfikatsiia": polski represii 1930 roku v Halychyni*. Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Ukrainskoho katolytskoho universytetu, 2012.

Stasiuk, Oleksandra. *Vydavnycho-propahadyvna diialnist OUN (1941-1953 rr.)*. Lviv: Tsentr doslidzhen vyzvolnoho rukhu, Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 2006.

Steblii F. I. *Spodvyzhnyk Markiana Shashkevycha: Iakiv Holovatskyi – diach ukrainskoho natsionalnoho vidrodzhennia*. Lviv: In-t ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 2004.

Świstak, Maria. *Nowy Kurier Warszawski: próba monografii*. Warszawa: [s.n.], 1978.

T. H. Shevchenko 1814-1934: Tezy viddilu kultury i propahandy leninizmu TsK KP(b)U do 120-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia T.H. Shevchenka. Kharkiv, 1934.

Uchman, Tomasz Andrzej. *Gazeta Lwowska 1941-1944: próba monografii*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski, 1977.

Vasyliev, Valerii and Roman Podkur. *Radianski karateli. Spivrobitnyky NKVS – vykonavtsi "Velykoho teroru" na Podilli*. Kyiv: Vydavets V. Zakharenko, 2017.

Volkov S. V. *Ofitsery rossiiskoi gvardii: Opyt martirologa*. Moskva: Russkii put, 2002.

Wardzyńska, Maria. *Wysiedlenia ludności polskiej z okupowanych ziem polskich włączonych do III Rzeszy w latach 1939-1945.* Warszawa: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, Komisja Ścigania Zbrodni przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu, 2017.

Wehrhahn, Torsten. *Die Westukrainische Volksrepublik: zu den polnisch-ukrainischen Beziehungen und dem Problem der ukrainischen Staatlichkeit in den Jahren 1918 bis 1923*. Berlin: Weissensee, 2004.

Woldan, Alois and Olaf Terpitz, eds. *Ivan Franko und die jüdische Frage in Galizien Interkulturelle Begegnungen und Dynamiken im Schaffen des ukrainischen Schriftstellers*. Wien: Vienna University Press; Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2016.

Wójcik, Władysława. *Prasa gadzinowa Generalnego Gubernatorstwa: (1939-1945)*. Kraków: Wydaw. Naukowe WSP, 1988.

Woźniakowski, Krzysztof. *Polskojęzyczna prasa gadzinowa czasów okupacji hitlerowskiej 1939-1945: studia i szkice zebrane*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scriptorium, 2014.

Woźniakowski, Krzysztof. *Polskojęzyczna prasa gadzinowa w tzw. Starej Rzeszy (1939-1945)*. Kraków: Wydaw. Naukowe AP, 2001.

Woźniakowski, Krzysztof. *W kręgu jawnego piśmiennictwa literackiego Generalnego Gubernatorstwa (1939-1945).* Kraków: Wydawn. Naukowe WSP, 1997.

Zaitsev, O. Iu. *Ukrainskyi integralnyi natsionalizm (1920-1930-ti) roky: narysy intelektualnoi istorii.* Kyïv: Krytyka, 2013.

Dissertations

Kovaliv, Solomiia-Mariia. "Literaturoznavchi kontseptsii Luky Lutsiva." Dysertatsiia na zdobuttia naukovoho stupenia kandydata filolohichnykh nauk. Lviv: Lvivskyi Natsionalnyi Universytet imeni Ivana Franka, 2018.

Sereda, Ostap. "Shaping of a National Identity: Early Ukrainophiles in Austrian Eastern Galicia, 1860–1873." PhD diss., Central European University, 2003.