

European History Quarterly

<http://ehq.sagepub.com/>

Review Article : Modern Ukrainian History (II)

David Saunders

European History Quarterly 1991 21: 81

DOI: 10.1177/026569149102100104

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://ehq.sagepub.com/content/21/1/81.citation>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *European History Quarterly* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://ehq.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://ehq.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Jan 1, 1991

[What is This?](#)

Review Article

David Saunders

Modern Ukrainian History (II)

Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, University of Toronto Press/Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988; xii + 666 pp., CAN\$49.95.

Volodymyr Kubijovyč, ed., *Encyclopedia of Ukraine: Vol. I: A–F*, Toronto, Buffalo and London, University of Toronto Press, 1984; xv + 952 pp., £70.00; *Map and Gazetteer*, 1984; 30 pp. + map (included in the price of Vol. I); *Vol. II: G–K*, 1988; 737 pp.; £87.50.

Paul Robert Magocsi and Geoffrey J. Matthews (cartographer), *Ukraine: A Historical Atlas*, Toronto, Buffalo and London, University of Toronto Press, 1985; [vi] + [53] pp.; £22.50.

Paul Robert Magocsi, *Carpatho–Rusyn Studies: An Annotated Bibliography: Vol. I: 1975–1984*, New York and London, Garland Publishing, 1988; viii + 143 pp.; US\$30.00.

John-Paul Himka, *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century*, Macmillan/Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988; xxxvi + 358 pp.; £35.00.

Ivan L. Rudnytsky, *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies/Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1987; xxvi + 497 pp.; CAN\$39.95.

Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster, eds, *Ukrainian–Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, Edmonton, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988; x + 531 pp.; CAN\$34.95.

Patricia Herlihy, *Odessa: A History, 1794–1914*, Cambridge MA, Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1986; xviii + 411 pp.; no price given.

Zenon E. Kohut, *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate 1760s–1830s*, Cambridge MA, Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1988; xv + 363 pp.; no price given.

Thomas M. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture*, Toronto, Buffalo and London, University of Toronto Press, 1987; xlv + 323 pp.; CAN\$40.00.

Marc Carynyk, Lubomyr Y. Luciuk and Bohdan S. Kordan, eds, *The Foreign Office and the Famine: British Documents on Ukraine and the Great Famine of*

European History Quarterly (SAGE, London, Newbury Park and New Delhi), Vol. 21 (1991), 81–95.

1932–1933, Kingston, Ontario, and Vestal, NY, Limestone Press, 1988; lxiv + 493 pp.; \$45.00.

Lubomyr Y. Luciuk and Bohdan S. Kordan, eds, *Anglo-American Perspectives on the Ukrainian Question 1938–1951: A Documentary Collection*, Kingston, Ontario, and Vestal, NY, Limestone Press, 1987; xxx + 242 pp.; no price given.

David R. Marples, *The Social Impact of the Chernobyl Disaster*, Basingstoke and London, Macmillan, 1988; xviii + 313 pp.; £27.50.

At the beginning of the twentieth century the 'Ukrainian Piedmont' was east Galicia. Where history books are concerned it is now North America, or more specifically the University of Toronto, the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (University of Alberta), and the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. All the authors listed above are connected in one way or another with these places. Four months before this review was written, the publication of 'The Programme of Ukraine's Popular Movement for Perestroika' (*Literaturna Ukraina*, 16 February 1989) showed that things were beginning to change in Ukraine itself, but Soviet Ukrainian historians will need time to catch up with their western colleagues. More important than the startling quantity of the new western literature is its quality. The first instalment of this review (*ante*, Vol. 18 [1988]: 473–9) had the melancholy duty of reporting on the final volume of Nicholas Chirovsky's *Introduction to Ukrainian History*, which belonged to the age of the dinosaurs. Homo sapiens has arrived in the shape of Orest Subtelny's *Ukraine: A History*, which will be the standard outline for the foreseeable future.

Subtelny's two main themes are 'statelessness' and 'modernization' (page xi). Many Ukrainians have given the impression they consider statelessness a virtue and modernization a snare. Subtelny is not of their number. He does not go so far as to lay the entire blame for Ukrainian statelessness on Ukrainians themselves, but he is not afraid to make clear that there have been internal as well as external reasons for Ukraine's inability to establish itself as a distinctive entity. On occasion this approach has the effect of making Ukraine's condition look worse than it was. Although the Decembrist and Polish uprisings of 1825 and 1830, for example, took place partly on Ukrainian soil, they involved few Ukrainians. For Subtelny, this is 'a telling indication of how vague and emasculated the political significance of Ukraine and Ukrainians had become in the Russian Empire in the early 19th century' (page 210). Ukrainians' cultural significance, however, had far from evaporated at this time, and might even be said to have been growing. Subtelny finds peasant support for Ukrainian autonomy in 1906 'somewhat unexpected' (page 298), and says of the contemporary language question that 'If present trends continue, the future of Ukrainian certainly appears grim' (page 524). Other examples could be cited of the book's tendency to look on the black side. The chapter on the most recent history of Soviet Ukraine, for example, takes a much less hopeful view of Ukrainians' prospects than the last part of Bohdan Krawchenko's *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine* (1985). Subtelny's clear intention, however, is to eschew the tub-thumping of Ukrainian nationalist historiography, and for this he is to be congratulated. Readers will welcome the book's clear periodization of Ukrainian history; its coverage of political, social, and cultural phenomena in discrete chapters; the often brilliant summaries with which the chapters conclude; the concentration on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (remarkable in a scholar whose earlier work has been almost

entirely on the early modern period); the maps; and the thirty-page English-language bibliography. With Subtelny in hand, one can turn to the specialist literature on Ukraine without fear of disorientation.

'The truth about Soviet Russia', wrote an official of the British Embassy in Moscow in 1932, 'is best apprehended not by facile generalisation but by the merciless impact of multitudinous fact' (Carynnyk et al.: 104). 'Multitudinous facts' are the province of Kubijovyč's *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. Scheduled for completion in five volumes, this work is from the same stable as *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia* (2 vols, 1963–71, reprinted 1988), but it is much bigger and, by virtue of being arranged alphabetically rather than thematically, much easier to use. The Ukrainian original began appearing in Paris and New York in 1955, and provoked the Soviet authorities into launching a competitor (see Subtelny, page 501). Born in west Galicia in 1900, Volodymyr Kubijovyč was a university lecturer in geography before the Second World War and headed the Ukrainian Central Committee in Cracow in the days of the Reich. He died in November 1985, just after his magnum opus started appearing in print. His encyclopedia is a revision rather than a translation of the original, and should be bought by all self-respecting academic libraries. The present reviewer found it immediately useful for checking minor points in *Ukraine: A History*. The value of *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, however, goes way beyond the corroboration of trivia. Ukrainian regions, towns, rivers, individuals, peoples, institutions, history and religion attract the bulk of the entries. To take one example of each, the first two volumes contain succinct accounts of Galicia, Kiev, the Dnieper, Hrushevs'kyi, Jews, the Communist Party of Ukraine, collectivization and 'Church, history of the Ukrainian'. Few of these things are of interest only to Ukrainians. The contributors do not present them in a narrowly Ukrainian light. Only in respect of collectivization have they been tested beyond endurance. No one denies that Ukrainians suffered greatly during the first and second five-year plans, but whether they suffered because they were Ukrainians or because they were peasants is an issue that requires very careful handling. It gets it in the articles entitled 'Collectivization' and 'Grain procurement', but not in those headed 'Famine' and 'Genocide' – especially the latter, which declares unequivocally that 'Ukrainians have been subjected to genocide under the Soviet regime'. Few topics, however, raise such hard questions. Kubijovyč's encyclopedia should be judged not by its handling of this one issue, but by the wealth of information and references which it provides. It is built to last.

The remarkably clear map of contemporary Ukraine which accompanies Volume I of *Encyclopedia of Ukraine* may be supplemented, for historical purposes, by Magocsi's *Ukraine: A Historical Atlas*, which consists of a one-page preface, twenty-five 'openings' (explanation on the left, map on the right), and a one-page list of sources. Magocsi says that his work is only 'modest in scope' and that it concentrates heavily on 'political and administrative boundary changes' (Preface). By assigning fewer than nine of his maps to the years before 1400, the author could have made more space for the period when Ukrainians became distinguishable from their neighbours. Nevertheless, the atlas contains enough detail for most purposes. Map 11, the one on the largest scale, gives a clearer picture of the various locations of the Zaporozhian Sich than is to be found anywhere. At the opposite end of the 'scale spectrum', maps 16 and 19 show Ukrainians in the context of the nineteenth-century Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires.

Despite their generality, even these have a specific use. Employed in conjunction with one another, they help to explain why east Galicia was such an obstacle to good Austro-Russian relations in the period immediately preceding the First World War. Map 18, 'Minority populations in 19th century Ukraine', helped this reviewer to understand George Liber's study of the Ukrainian law of 1918 on national-personal autonomy (*Nationalities Papers*, XV [1987]: 22-42). All the maps serve practical purposes of this kind, and all students of eastern Europe will profit from them.

In *Ukraine: A Historical Atlas* Professor Magocsi does not give voice to his controversial belief that the Ukrainians about whom he knows most, those of Transcarpathia, are (or were) not really Ukrainians but 'Carpatho-Rusyns'. He treats the Transcarpathian Ukrainians as a separate entity, however, in *Carpatho-Rusyn Studies: An Annotated Bibliography*. This work, a continuation of the author's 'Historiographical Guide to Subcarpathian Rus' ' (*Austrian History Yearbook*, IX-X [1973-4]: 201-65), claims that 'the decade beginning in 1975 . . . saw the beginnings of a process which in retrospect can be described as a renaissance in Carpatho-Rusyn studies worldwide' (page vii). The 649 entries in eighteen languages support Magocsi's view. Further volumes of the bibliography are to appear at ten-year intervals. The uncommitted may feel that they can postpone coming to terms with Carpatho-Rusyn studies until they have a better understanding of Ukrainians as a whole, but they should bear in mind that the people to whom Professor Magocsi devotes so much of his attention live in four countries (not counting countries of emigration), and that, so far as three of these are concerned, the bibliography includes items pertaining not just to Carpatho-Rusyns, but to all aspects of the areas in which they live. The book is therefore of somewhat wider interest than its title implies.

In 'Prolegomena to the National Awakening of the Ukrainians during the Nineteenth Century' (Roland Sussex and J.C. Eade, eds, *Culture and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Eastern Europe*, 1985: 96-110), Professor Omeljan Pritsak, until recently the head of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, divided Ukraine into 'six different cultural zones': Transcarpathia, Galicia, the two banks of the river Dnieper ('left' and 'right', or east and west), New Russia (Novorossia) in the south, and the area around Kharkiv in the east (the Slobozhanshchyna). Of these, Transcarpathia is perhaps the one with which non-Ukrainians are least familiar. To judge by Magocsi's *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographic Guide* (1983), the region adjacent to Transcarpathia is the part of Ukraine on which most ink has been spilt. Innovative work can still be done, however, as John-Paul Himka demonstrates in *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century*. A prize-winner in the United States, this is the most remarkable book under review. It draws on and illuminates the most sophisticated approach to nineteenth-century 'national awakenings', that of Miroslav Hroch, and it constantly encourages the reader to turn from the peasants of east Galicia to the other peasants with whom they are comparable. Ukrainian studies have been bedevilled both by a lack of precision and by a certain parochialism. Himka is not prey to these afflictions. By keeping in mind the relationship between the particular and the general, he is able to give point even to events in which his own ancestors figured prominently (pages 40-8). 'An obstacle to studying the diffusion of national consciousness among the peasantry', he says, 'has been the lack of appropriate sources' (page xxv). He has solved this problem by focusing

on letters published in the L'viv newspaper *Bat'kivshchyna*, concentrating, for convenience, on the years 1884 and 1885. Appendices list the letters, the occupation of their authors, Ukrainian 'activists' (i.e. both the authors of the letters and others to whom the letters refer), and the activists' occupations. '[P]easants contributed more than half the items of correspondence . . . and . . . cantors, burghers, teachers and priests accounted for most of the rest' (page 85). This main source is supplemented by manuscript material from L'viv (described in another appendix) and secondary literature in English, German, Polish and Ukrainian.

To explain why the Ukrainian peasants of late nineteenth-century east Galicia were able and willing to write letters to newspapers (which their compatriots in the Russian Empire were not), Himka delves deeply into the background of the period on which he concentrates. The first of his four chapters covers the hundred years from Austria's acquisition of Galicia in 1772 to the multiplication of political possibilities in the wake of the *Ausgleich*. The abolition of serfdom in Galicia in May 1848 gave rise to friction between Ukrainian peasants and their Polish ex-landlords on the subject of the peasants' 'servitudes', which were their rights to wood and pasture. Vienna's refusal to back the peasants had such an inflammatory effect that, by the 1860s, it was causing them to shift their affections from the Habsburgs to the tsar. The constitutional changes of 1867 gave Ukrainians renewed hope in Austria, but their hope was tempered by the memory of injustice. Himka demonstrates that 'the vast majority of peasants in [his] . . . list of activists could be considered veterans of the servitudes struggle' (page 52, note 252). In chapters two and three the author describes the 'cultural revolution' which took place in Galician villages after the alterations in the empire's constitution. Because of the earlier economic struggle, the small Ukrainian intelligentsia cast its seed on fertile soil. *Prosvita* (Enlightenment), the Ukrainian cultural organization founded in 1868, created a network of village reading clubs which gave rise to the first generation of peasant Ukrainian letter-writers. From there, it was but a step to the emergence of national consciousness.

This important book occasions two comments. Its emphasis on social and economic considerations has the effect of greatly playing down the role of the Greek Catholic clergy in the Galician Ukrainian awakening; and its focus on a single region leads one to ask whether a national or a particularist movement was under way. So far as the first issue is concerned, Himka makes plain that his relegation of the priests to a relatively subordinate role is deliberate. Since he promises to devote his next book to the church, judgement on his 'secularization' of the east Galician awakening ought to be held over. The second issue is partly a semantic one. Well aware that 'The Ukrainians of Galicia in the late nineteenth century called themselves *rusyns*' (page xxvii), Himka translates *rusyn* and its German and Polish equivalents as 'Ruthenian'. When he is not translating, however, he calls the peasants of east Galicia 'Ukrainian'. This standard practice has both advantages and drawbacks. It reminds readers that the sub-groups of a people who extend from the Carpathians to the Kuban were related to each other even when they were unaware of the fact. Projecting the word 'Ukrainian' on to the past is probably as valid as speaking of 'the French' when dealing with periods of French history before that covered by Eugen Weber's *Peasants into Frenchmen* (1976). Regionalism, however, is a key feature of Ukrainian history, and has to be borne in mind when the use of a generic term tends to diminish its significance. For Professor Magocsi, after all, the inhabitants of the eastern Carpathians were

not really Ukrainians in the century prior to the end of the Second World War. Magocsi's idea has not found general acceptance, but it raises the possibility that 'Ruthenians', too, had more in common with each other than with Ukrainians elsewhere. The peasants who wrote to *Bat'kivshchyna* certainly did not spend much time thinking about their cousins in the Russian Empire.

Differences between the different parts of Ukraine constitute only one of the themes of the late Ivan L. Rudnytsky's *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*, a collection of twenty-three papers dating from 1952 to the early 1980s. Professor Rudnytsky was the most level-headed Ukrainian academic of his generation. The abuse to which he was subjected in the recent Soviet account of Ukrainian historiography (I.S. Khmel' et al., ed., *Istoriografiia istorii Ukrainskoi SSR*, [1986]: 187) amounted to a backhanded confirmation of his standing. The distinguished Polish historian Stefan Kieniewicz has appraised him respectfully in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. XI (1987), 522–8. Because Rudnytsky never wrote a book, even specialists on Ukraine will welcome this opportunity of seeing his work in the round. The new collection is more wide-ranging than its predecessor, *Mizh istoriiu i politikoiu* (1973).

Students of east European history who have not paid much attention to Ukraine may know only three of Rudnytsky's essays: 'The Role of Ukraine in Modern History' (pages 11–36), 'The Ukrainians in Galicia under Austrian Rule' (pages 315–52) and 'The Fourth Universal and Its Ideological Antecedents' (pages 389–416). The first of these, the most wide-ranging study in the book, was held by 'one who has too often clashed with Ukrainian nationalist scholars' to be 'both refreshing and encouraging' (Arthur E. Adams, 'The Awakening of the Ukraine', *Slavic Review* XXII [1963]: 217); the second remains a valuable introduction to a large body of scholarship; and the third goes a long way towards explaining why the Ukrainian leaders of 1917 and 1918 had difficulty with the idea of complete separation from Russia. These three essays reflect Rudnytsky's three main preoccupations: conceptualizing Ukrainian history as a whole; the relations between Ukrainians and Poles; and the development of Ukrainian political thought. Chronologically, Rudnytsky devoted himself mainly to the period from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries. Geographically, his prime interests lay in Galicia and the area between Galicia and the Dnieper (the 'Right Bank'). His discussion of the work of Magocsi, however (pages 353–73), takes the reader into Transcarpathia, whilst the three essays on Mykhailo Drahomanov (pages 203–97) require mention of Drahomanov's origins on the 'Left Bank', in the lands of the former Ukrainian Hetmanate. Only the extreme south and the extreme east of Ukraine (New Russia and the Slobozhanshchyna) make relatively few appearances.

The most attractive feature of Rudnytsky's essays is their tenor. Not many Ukrainians have stressed the importance of law. In one of his rare excursions into Soviet history, Rudnytsky wrote of the mainstream Ukrainian dissidents of the Brezhnev era: 'All of their writings and pronouncements are permeated by the idea of the rule of law. This is a novel phenomenon in the history of Ukrainian political thought' (page 483). It was novel in that, under Brezhnev, it occupied the centre ground, but it had been anticipated, up to a point, in the writings of Drahomanov (1841–95) and Viacheslav Lypyn's'kyi (1882–1931). Not surprisingly, these were the two Ukrainian political thinkers in whom Rudnytsky was most interested. They make an odd pair. As Rudnytsky observed, 'They represent two

poles in Ukrainian thought – the left and the right, the social-democratic and the conservative' (page 446). A diplomat among scholars, Rudnytsky dedicated himself to bringing the left and the right together. He knew that the task was not easy, for Ukrainians have numbered many extremists among their ranks. The social democrat Volodymyr Vynnychenko, for example, 'belonged to that species of human being that cannot live without a utopia' (page 431). This was not the sort of person with whom Rudnytsky found himself in sympathy. His claims for Ukraine were not excessive. In 1981 he acknowledged that 'It is debatable whether Ukraine even today can be considered a complete nation' (page 46). He admired politics which manifested a capacity for compromise and individuals who crossed cultural boundaries. What Ukrainians need, he wrote, is the 'type of mentality which makes it possible to find in London monuments to both Charles I and Oliver Cromwell' (page 122). Tantalized by the abortive Polish-Ukrainian agreements of 1658, 1848, 1914 and 1920, Rudnytsky lamented the two peoples' inability to put their relations on a firmer footing and believed that the consequences were damaging for them both. All the intellectuals to whom he devoted special attention were receptive to the culture of more than one nation. His previously unpublished essay on Hipolit Vladimir Terlecki (pages 143–72) describes a man who at different times in his life belonged to three peoples and three religions. By not denying that Ukraine is a cultural palimpsest, Rudnytsky encouraged a greater broadmindedness among his fellow-countrymen than many of them have been prepared to welcome. The picture of the Ukrainian past which emerges from these essays is so far from being commonplace that re-publication is to be applauded.

Rudnytsky gave his last paper to a conference on Ukrainian-Jewish relations at McMaster University, the proceedings of which have now been edited by Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster. To judge by the round-table discussion with which *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations* concludes, the gathering was stormy. As Roman Serbyn points out, scholars who devote themselves to the history of Ukrainian-Polish or Ukrainian-Russian relations have the advantage of knowing who was the master and who the underdog. In respect of relations between Ukrainians and Jews, however, 'the situation is much more complex'. Both were underdogs, but 'each community viewed the other as part of the oppressor' (page 485). The papers by Weiss and Bilinsky illustrate the different attitudes of an Israeli and a Ukrainian to one of the most harrowing periods of their common past. Weiss opens by pointing out that only 2 per cent of the 870,000 Jews in western Ukraine (east Galicia and Volhynia) survived the German occupation of 1941–4. According to Weiss, the deaths cannot be wholly blamed on the Nazis. On the contrary, the pogroms which broke out immediately after the German invasion have to be put down to 'the traditional anti-Semitism among various layers of the Ukrainian population and the fostering of Nazi ideology by the Ukrainian extremists' (page 413). Later, 'the Ukrainian police became an integral part of the extermination process' (page 416). Bilinsky places the emphasis elsewhere. Without denying that Ukrainians participated in wartime atrocities against Jews, he feels that the Nazis incited them, that their anti-Semitism has been exaggerated, and that fabricated Soviet evidence has been allowed to play too large a part in the pursuit of Ukrainian war criminals. He points out that, 'justifiably or not, some Ukrainians felt that some Jews were in the employ of the Stalinist secret police' (page 376), and he implies, without saying it, that there was a degree of Jewish involvement

in the procurement campaigns which gave rise to the Ukrainian famine of 1932–3. The discussion to which these claims gave rise is not edifying.

Other parts of the book, however, offer better prospects of defusing the long-standing tension between Jews and Ukrainians. Omeljan Pritsak paints an almost idyllic picture of Jewish life in eastern Europe before the expulsion of the Jews from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1495. Shmuel Ettinger admits that 'there is no evidence of persecution of Jews by Cossacks before the 1630s' (page 29). Jaroslaw Pelenski makes an effective plea for eliminating 'Holocaust' terminology from discussions of Ukrainian attacks on Jews in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. John-Paul Himka points out that the relatively sophisticated Ukrainians of nineteenth-century east Galicia never employed violence against Jews. Alexander Baran describes the remarkable case of Transcarpathia, which was 'the only Ukrainian territory . . . where anti-Semitism was unknown among the Ukrainian population and where the Jews never took the side of the oppressors of the Ukrainian community' (page 159). Roman Serbyn makes plain that conflict between Jewish and Ukrainian intellectuals at the time of Alexander II's reforms owed its origins not to visceral distaste but to the different restrictions imposed on the two nationalities by the Russians. Israel Kleiner recognizes that the Ukrainian-language press was strongly supportive of Mendel Beilis when he was being prosecuted for ritual murder just before the First World War. In perhaps the most sophisticated and certainly the most heartening contribution to the book, Zvi Gitelman presents evidence derived from interviews with Soviet émigrés which shows that, whilst Soviet Jews take an 'extremely negative abstract view of Ukrainians', they tend to offer a 'more benign response to concrete questions regarding them' (page 454). Jewish animosity towards Ukrainians may therefore be 'a case of consciousness lagging behind reality'. If it is, relations between the two peoples may improve.

Unintentionally, Patricia Herlihy's *Odessa: A History, 1794–1914* illustrates why, in the nineteenth century, Ukrainians and Jews found it difficult to come to terms with each other. The former lived in the countryside, the latter in the towns. According to the 1897 census of the Russian Empire, only 5.66 per cent of the inhabitants of Odessa spoke Ukrainian as their mother tongue, whereas 32.5 per cent spoke Yiddish (page 242). The equivalent figures for Ukraine as a whole (both Russian and Austrian) were 69.9 per cent and 9.2 per cent (extrapolated from data for 1897 and 1910 in Magocsi, *Atlas*, text accompanying map 18). Poltava 'was the only [Ukrainian] city with over 50,000 inhabitants [in 1897] . . . in which Ukrainians constituted a majority' (Steven L. Guthrie, 'Ukrainian Cities during the Revolution and the Interwar Era', in Ivan L. Rudnytsky, ed., *Rethinking Ukrainian History*, 1981: 157). The student of nineteenth-century urban history, therefore, is not likely to be a student of Ukrainians. *Odessa: A History* clearly demonstrates the incompleteness of the Ukrainian nation in the years before the collapse of the Russian and Austrian Empires. Without a significant urban presence Ukrainians could hardly make much of an impression on their masters.

The fruit of many years' labour (Dr Herlihy received her PhD, on a related subject, in 1963), *Odessa: A History* is based on manuscript material in the United States, Britain, France, Italy and the Soviet Union, and on a wide range of printed matter. The book is too detailed. Most of the administrators of Odessa do not deserve the biographical treatment they receive, whilst the physical descriptions

of the city seem to be aimed at the holiday-maker rather than the historian. A more concise and more comparative account of Odessa's administration and urban environment is to be found in Frederick W. Skinner's 'Odessa and the Problem of Urban Modernization' (in Michael F. Hamm, ed., *The City in Late Imperial Russia*, 1986: 209–48). Herlihy's book is essential reading, however, for the student of the Russian Empire's commerce. 'Odessa was a port twice-over, looking out to the empty sea, looking inward to the seemingly empty land' (page 10). The parts of the book to do with trade range over the length and breadth of New Russia and set the province's capital in the context of the ports of the world. Odessa boomed in the first half of the nineteenth century because its hinterland was being exploited for the first time and St Petersburg was prepared to give the city some freedom of action. It declined in the second half of the century, relatively speaking, because the centre's concern for integration began to stifle it and other countries found improved ways of getting their goods to the market-place. Within seventy years of its foundation Odessa was the Empire's fourth-largest centre of population, but it failed to generate an industrial base comparable with those of St Petersburg and Moscow. Its lifeblood was trade, and the goods in which it traded – above all, grain – became less desirable to the outside world. 'My story', says Herlihy, 'ends somewhat sadly'.

Odessa may have been rather more Ukrainian in character than appears from the 1897 census data. Many 'Odessans' seem to have been Ukrainians who failed to acknowledge the fact. Herlihy points out that 'In 1880, according to one observer, one-third of the family names in the city were Ukrainian', and she draws attention to Vladimir Zhabotinskii's belief that 'half of the so-called Russians [in Odessa] were actually Ukrainians' (pages 248 and 250). Why Ukrainians in the Russian Empire often identified themselves as Russians is a mystery clarified by Zenon Kohut's *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy*.

Kohut's book deals with the disappearance, in the late eighteenth century, of the Ukrainian Hetmanate, an entity which emerged from a mid-seventeenth-century Cossack revolt against Poland. The revolt's leader, Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, asked for Moscow's help against the Poles and agreed to the first formal treaty between Ukrainians and Russians. At the outset Khmel'nyts'kyi's polity looked capable of dominating central Ukraine, but the Poles recovered some of the ground they had lost and the Hetmanate was confined to a small area on the left bank of the Dnieper. There it survived, in uneasy association with Russia, for more than a hundred years. Because seventeenth-century Ukrainians were culturally superior to Russians, the early stages of their involvement with Moscow have sometimes been seen as the penetration of an Asiatic society by a western 'Trojan horse'. In the long run, however, the boot was on the other foot. After introductory chapters on Russian centralism and the many ways in which the Hetmanate differed from Russia prior to the accession of Catherine the Great, Kohut devotes the central sections of his study to the enforced resignation of the last Hetman in 1764, the integrationist activities of the Russian governor who replaced him, Ukrainian expressions of resistance to integration at the pan-imperial Legislative Commission of 1767–8, and the application to the Hetmanate of Catherine's Statute on the Provinces of 1775. The last full-length chapter describes a mopping-up process which continued into the 1830s. The thesis of the book is consonant with that of Edward C. Thaden's *Russia's Western Borderlands, 1710–1870* (1984). Although Thaden did not cover Ukraine east of the Dnieper,

he argued, as does Kohut, that Russia dealt with peripheral peoples by co-opting their elites into the fabric of imperial society. By the time Catherine the Great decided to do away with the Hetmanate, the descendants of Khmel'nyts'kyi's Cossacks had turned themselves into local gentry. Reluctantly, Catherine and her heirs accepted them into the ranks of the Russian nobility. In the main, they welcomed the empress's largesse and concentrated on taking advantage of their new opportunities. Once the leaders of Ukrainian society within the Russian Empire had been bought off by the tsars, the prospects for Ukrainian culture began to look bleak. Having completed the process of administrative integration, St Petersburg maintained a determined hostility to Ukrainians in the second half of the nineteenth century. It was unsurprising, therefore, that in 1897 many Ukrainians in Odessa (and other places) called themselves Russians.

Kohut's book is clearly written and makes exhaustive use of the (printed) literature. Isabel de Madariaga was almost wholly reliant on the PhD from which it derives for the Ukrainian parts of her *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great* (1981). His book is nevertheless rather conventional and, in one respect, problematic. The conventions which Kohut adopts are those of the late nineteenth-century populist school of Ukrainian historiography, a school which tended to think of the eighteenth-century Ukrainian gentry as renegades from the national cause. Whether they were is debatable. Kohut is well aware of the debate, but he is prevented, by the general tenor of his argument, from answering the questions which it raises. He accepts, for example, that the supposedly pro-Russian Vasyli' Kapnist travelled to the court of Frederick the Great in 1791 to ask whether Prussia would back a Ukrainian revolt against the tsar. On the other hand, he finds it strange that the author of 'the most comprehensive, the most important, and the last political tract of Cossack Ukraine' may have originated in the circle of Catherine the Great's Ukrainian functionary Oleksander Bez'borodko (pages 271–2). Bez'borodko, whom Kohut presents as an arch-assimilator, was probably no less duplicitous than Kapnist. In the face of Russian pressure for integration, late eighteenth-century Ukrainians would have been foolish to carry their resistance too far. They were better advised to make what they could of their situation. Becoming 'Little Russians', however (to use the terminology of the day), was not the same as becoming Russian. Some Little Russians could feign a Russian identity without accepting it wholeheartedly. If the centre relaxed its grip or pursued policies which militated against its own interest in imperial unity, Little Russians could turn (or turn back) into Ukrainians. Kohut goes some way towards admitting this possibility in a recent article ('The Development of a Little Russian Identity and Ukrainian Nationbuilding', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10 [1986]: 559–76), but the Whiggish tone of his book tends to obscure it. There are still Little Russians in Ukraine, whom the chronicler of the Chernobyl disaster, Iurii Shcherbak, believes to be the principal obstacle to a late twentieth-century Ukrainian revival (*Literaturnaia gazeta*, 18 January 1989). In the current Soviet climate they may be persuaded to do what Shcherbak hopes they will do – take their eyes off Russia and focus them on their homeland.

This, after all, is what many Ukrainians did at another time of uncertainty, the time of the Romanovs' demise. In the article cited earlier, Steven L. Guthrie draws attention to a census taken in Kiev in September 1917. The city's Ukrainians were few in number (22.2 per cent of the population in 1897, 16.4 per cent in 1917), but in 1917 nearly three-quarters of them identified themselves by the

national name. Guthrie draws attention to those who called themselves Little Russian, a minority which, in view of the Ukrainian revolution, he considers surprisingly large. The emphasis should be placed, however, on the number who thought they were Ukrainian. Given Ukraine's fragmentation and its long-standing domination by outsiders, the proportion was remarkable. Part of the explanation for its size lay in the activities of Ukrainian intellectuals in the two generations before 1917, one of whom has now found his first scholarly biographer.

Thomas Prymak's *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture* deals with the controversial figure who led the Ukrainian Central Rada in 1917 and became President of the Ukrainian People's Republic a year later. Hrushevsk'kyi was the last and greatest of the Ukrainian populist historians and the author of the longest and shortest significant accounts of Ukrainian history. Prymak's work, however, 'is not a historiographical study, but rather a kind of political biography with an emphasis upon the interaction between broadly political and fundamentally cultural questions' (page 6). The book is arranged chronologically. More than thirty photographs precede the text. Prymak was refused access to Soviet archival holdings when he visited Kiev in 1981, with the result that his immaculately organized bibliography refers almost entirely to printed matter.

Hrushevsk'kyi's appointment to a professorship at L'viv in 1894 seems to have galvanized him. As a young citizen of the Russian Empire he had believed in cultural gradualism, but in Austria-Hungary he fell in with the socialist Ivan Franko and moved to the left. He turned the L'viv-based Shevchenko Scientific Society into something like a Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. In 1898 he founded *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk*, a journal whose appeal extended far beyond the groves of academe. He played a large part in the creation, in 1899, of the Ukrainian National Democratic Party (though he quickly withdrew from it). He wrote popular as well as academic history. He carried his 'pan-Ukrainian mission' (page 63) westwards to Paris and eastwards to the land from which he had come. From 1905 he spent an increasing amount of time in Kiev. In the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the First World War he was 'undoubtedly the most famous and most vilified Ukrainian in the Russian Empire' (page 89). By then he had left many of the Galician Ukrainians behind. Soon after the outbreak of the First World War he made his way back to Kiev, but had to see out the following two-and-a-half years in Simbirsk, Kazan and Moscow. When his chance came in 1917 and 1918, he proved to be less good at politics than at propagandizing. His 'commitment to principles and . . . propensity for theory . . . prevented him from becoming a practical revolutionary politician' (page 178). In 1919 he went into exile, but five years later made his peace with the Soviet Union, returned to Kiev, and engaged in another great burst of cultural and academic activity. Stalinism brought his career to an end. In 1931 he was obliged to leave Ukraine for Moscow, and in 1934 he died, in rather mysterious circumstances, at a spa town in the north Caucasus.

Hrushevsk'kyi's life had been a mixture of great success and great failure. He contributed hugely to the idea that Ukraine was a separate country, but lacked political sensitivity. His 'dogmatic parliamentarianism and insistent populism' (page 266) rendered him unfit for the power game of 1917. Some Ukrainians have never forgiven him for failing to proclaim Ukrainian independence six months earlier than he did, and for not using Ukrainian troops at the point when they were ready to support the cause of separatism. Prymak succeeds admirably in

stepping through the minefield of opinions to which Hrushevs'kyi gave rise. If the biography has a failing, it is that the format requires relegation of many controversial issues to footnotes, which then become somewhat distracting. But from a level-headed author in the field of Ukrainian studies one would rather have too much than too little.

The Foreign Office and the Famine, a collection of documents from the Public Record Office in London, chronicles the disastrous consequences for Ukraine as a whole of the Stalinism which ended Hrushevs'kyi's career. Before the 1920s, the British Foreign Office had taken Ukrainians seriously only when compelled to do so by military necessity (David Saunders, 'Britain and the Ukrainian Question (1912–1920)', *English Historical Review* 103 [1988]: 40–68). Between 1926 and 1930, however, British imports of Ukrainian wheat quadrupled in value. Then, because of the slump, Britain abandoned her commitment to free trade and adopted the principle of imperial preference. Soviet grain ceased to be an attraction and started to look like a menace. Britain needed to know whether Stalin's economic transformation of the Soviet Union posed an additional threat to the West's already troubled economies. By chance, the effort she put into answering this question gave rise to what may be the best available record of the Ukrainian famine of 1932–3. Recent Soviet revelations (notably I.E. Zelenin, 'O nekotorykh "belykh piatnakh" zavershaiushchego etapa sploshnoi kollektivizatsii', *Istoriia SSSR* 1989 (2): 3–19) are only sketches for the full discussion which Gorbachev may allow. Robert Conquest's *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine* (1986) was hardly impartial. The volume under review contains information and observations from people who had no particular interest in Ukrainians as a national group. Readers will ask of these documents whether they confirm or refute the hypothesis 'that the famine of 1933 was organized specially for Ukraine' (Ivan Maistrenko, *Istoriia moho pokolinnia* [1985]: 254).

The first document seems to provide confirmation. On 28 March 1932 Britain's Ambassador reported:

There are stories going about Moscow to the effect that traffic between the Ukraine and the consuming regions lying to the north of it is closely controlled, no one being allowed to bring more than 1,000 roubles out from the Ukraine, and all grain in the possession of private persons entering the Ukraine being confiscated (page 3).

Robert Conquest might have made a lot of this. Ukrainian–Russian border controls were one of the high points of his argument (see *Harvest*: 327). The British Ambassador hardly speaks of the subject with confidence, however, and *The Foreign Office and the Famine* contains few further hints that the Soviet regime's 'terror-famine' had a preconceived geographical focus. Although a London official admitted in September 1933 that 'there is reason to suppose that the starvation of the population in certain districts . . . has been something like a deliberate policy' (page 308), Britain seems not to have believed that Stalin was engaged in genocide. Ukrainian émigrés put it to the Foreign Office 'that we are faced with a well thought out plan that aims to depopulate the country and colonize it with the Muscovite population' (page 320), but their views did not make much of a mark.

This is not to say that British officials denied the Ukrainian famine was taking place. On the contrary, they probably knew more about it than anyone in the world

apart from those who experienced it. Conquest had difficulty finding 'absolutely contemporary first-hand testimony from those actually suffering the famine as they wrote' (*Harvest*: 282). He cited letters from Volga Germans, but *The Foreign Office and the Famine* contains letters from Ukrainians (pages 224 and 236–8). The book's most striking documents are three long reports written by Andrew Cairns in mid-1932 on, respectively, western Siberia and Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and the Volga (pages 28–78, 104–65, 174–94). Cairns, a Canadian employed by the Empire Marketing Board, refused to be fobbed off by Soviet attempts to make out that agricultural difficulties were superficial and transitory. He found things out for himself, and reported that they were much worse than he expected them to be. After receiving his reports, British diplomats never doubted the extent of the famine or the fact that it resulted from Soviet policy. They condemned Walter Duranty's attempts to obfuscate the issue ('he is a conscious humbug' [page 428]), and applauded the accounts of Malcolm Muggeridge and W.H. Chamberlin. They analysed the social engineering which accompanied, intensified and explained the famine: the law on the theft of 'socialist property', the introduction of internal passports, the creation of the All-Union procuracy, the steps taken to increase the number of Ukrainian Communists, the establishment of a Committee of Migration to fill depopulated villages, the introduction of 'political sections' on the collective farms. When, in September 1934, Britain's Ambassador naively reported from Moscow that Soviet food exports were considerable, the head of the Northern Department in London sarcastically minuted: 'Does Lord Chilston really think that there is now no famine, or no prospect of famine, in the Soviet Union, because grain is being exported?' (page 426).

Why, then, did Britain make no official protest? The blanket explanation given by the British for their refusal to condemn the Soviet Union turned on the fact that they were 'in normal . . . relations with the Soviet Government' (page 364). But the traditional diplomats' penchant for avoiding a fuss concealed Britain's real reasons for remaining on good terms with the Soviet Union. These were her continuing need to monitor the Soviet Union's capacity to export grain; her fear of Germany; her enthusiasm, in the light of German developments, for Soviet membership of the League of Nations; and her feeling that, if the Soviet Union were for some reason to disappear, stable and western-orientated successor states would be unlikely to emerge. The British Foreign Office was not short of anti-Bolsheviks in the 1930s, but it believed that friendly relations with a strong east European power were essential. Only one of the documents in *The Foreign Office and the Famine* hinted that Ukraine might become such a power. '[W]e have to face the evidence', wrote Colonel Cecil Strange Malone in 1934, 'that there is a growing Ukrainian independence movement probably stronger than ever before' (page 378). Malone did not suggest, however, that Ukrainians ought to be encouraged, as he thought they were more likely to look to Germany.

By the end of the 1930s British officials no longer suspected that a significant 'Ukrainian independence movement' was gaining ground. The second documentary collection under review, *Anglo-American Perspectives on the Ukrainian Question 1938–1951*, reveals that in January 1939 the Moscow Embassy thought there was no prospect of 'An internal independence movement in the Soviet Ukraine to which the Soviet Government would not be able to oppose effective resistance' (page 35). After the shock of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, Britain might have been expected to look on Ukrainians with more favour. Rex Leeper, however, argued

at this time that 'The British and French Governments in 1917 played with the Ukrainian question and burnt their fingers' (page 64). His alternative to backing Ukrainians was a pipe-dream: attempting to undermine the Russo-German alliance by means of joint action on the part of Ukrainians and Poles. Between 1941 and 1945 Britain abandoned all thought of Ukrainian nationhood in her anxiety for Soviet success against Hitler. Then she fell out with Stalin. At the height of the Cold War, an official in the Foreign Office Research Department went so far as to say that 'the institution of an independent Ukrainian national state would be feasible though attended by considerable difficulties' (page 226). In 1951 the pendulum swung back again, when another official minuted that breaking up the USSR into its component parts was 'an attempt to put the clock back some 400 years' (page 236). Britain was well informed about the activities of Ukrainian partisans in the 1940s (*Anglo-American Perspectives* contains the information she collected), but in the end she felt obliged to deal with the big battalions of the Muscovites.

These collections of documents, the first more fully introduced, better annotated and less diffuse than the second, make clear one of Ukrainians' fundamental difficulties: their inability to attract outside aid. If they could not attract it in the 1930s, when they were dying of hunger, or between 1939 and 1941, when Stalin's foreign policy was anathema to the West, they are unlikely to do so in any foreseeable circumstances. According to Hrushevs'kyi, writing in 1907, '*Ukraina fara da se!*' (Prymak: 86). Whether Ukraine will eventually prove able to 'go it alone' is extremely uncertain. Apart from the absence of outside interest, the main features of Ukrainian history to which the works under review bear witness seem to be the differences between Ukraine's different parts, the rivalries between the various peoples who have inhabited Ukrainian territory, the lack of a significant Ukrainian presence in Ukrainian towns, the shortage of politically experienced Ukrainian leaders, and the tendency of many Ukrainians to adopt non-Ukrainian cultures. In view of these problems, most of them chronic, it is surprising that there is still a 'Ukrainian question' to be answered. Ivan Dziuba, the celebrated Ukrainian dissident of the 1960s who was obliged to recant in 1973, produced in 1988 a rather pessimistic account of the prospects for Ukrainian culture ('*Osoznaem li my natsional'niui kul'turu kak tselostnost'?*', *Kommunist* 1988 (18): 51–60 [first published in Ukrainian earlier in the year]). If Dziuba is pessimistic, are there any reasons for optimism?

The last chapter of *The Social Impact of the Chernobyl Disaster* shows that there are. The author of this book was hilariously described in *The Times Literary Supplement* of 17–23 March 1989 as 'a Ukrainian Canadian scientist'. He is in fact an economic historian from Chesterfield, though it is true that he works at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. *The Social Impact of the Chernobyl Disaster* deals with the human, environmental, economic, political and literary repercussions of the April 1986 accident. Based on newspapers and on interviews conducted in the Soviet Union, it is strongly critical of the Soviet authorities. Marples believes that 'Chernobyl may have been both the pioneer of glasnost under General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and then subsequently its first casualty' (page 57). In the author's opinion, 'the Soviet leadership and the Soviet Academy of Sciences have not varied in their interpretation of Chernobyl other than to play down its impact' (page 148). Most of the book is devoted to pointing out the deleterious consequences of this Soviet approach to the management of

information. The ray of light comes at the end. In August 1987 a number of Ukrainian writers objected publicly to the construction of a nuclear plant at Chyhyryn. The writers' protest reflected an antipathy to nuclear power which was already surfacing elsewhere in the Soviet Union. According to Marples, the new Soviet 'Green' movement may win its argument with the regime. Meanwhile, Ukrainian writers have gone beyond the energy question. Ecology was only the fifth of the seven substantial sections in their 'Programme of Ukraine's Popular Movement for Perestroika' (referred to at the beginning of this review). The latest disaster to befall Ukraine thus seems to have played a notable part in awakening Ukrainians from sleep. The 20,000 people who marked the third anniversary of Chernobyl by marching through Kiev and gathering at the Dynamo football stadium probably did not confine their exchanges to the problems posed by power stations. Developments in Ukraine between 1987 and 1989 were best covered, in English, in the London-based quarterly *Soviet Ukrainian Affairs*. The books under review go far towards enabling readers to relate the present to the past. With the assistance of Patricia Kennedy Grimsted's monumental work of reference, *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Ukraine and Moldavia* (1988), historians should be able to fill more of the gaps in our understanding of Ukrainian affairs.

David Saunders

is Senior Lecturer in History at the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and author of *The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture 1750-1850* (Edmonton 1985).