

реса жителей Украины к сложным вопросам истории украинско-еврейских отношений в XX веке (в особенности в 1930–1940-х гг.). Насколько мне известно, в настоящее время Химка работает над монографией, посвященной политике ОУН(б) по отношению к евреям. Уверен, что такая книга будет интересной и полезной. Она обязательно должна быть также переведена на украинский язык. Хочется также надеяться, что будущие исследования Скиры будут более аналитическими, с соблюдением необходимой дистанции между историком и объектами его исследования.



Trevor ERLACHER

Україна на історіографічній мапі міжвоєнної Європи: матеріали міжнародної наукової конф. (Мюнхен, Німеччина, 1–3 липня 2012 р.) = *Ukraine on the Historiographic Map of Interwar Europe: Proceedings of the International Conference (Munich, Germany, 1–3 July, 2012)* / ред. Я. Мельник та ін. Київ: Інститут історії України НАНУ, 2014. 250 с. ISBN: 978-966-02-6810-4.

Ukraine on the Historiographic Map of Interwar Europe is a stimulating collection of thirteen essays by some of the foremost historians of modern Ukraine. Edited by Yaroslava Melnyk, Serhii Plokhyy, Valerii Smolii, and Frank E. Sysyn, this book is the product of a conference held in July 2012 at the Ukrainian Free University in Munich, Germany. Andreas Kappeler's opening lecture "What Is Ukraine? What Is Europe? What Is a Historiographic Map?" set the gathering's agenda with a series of questions about a heretofore neglected aspect of the Ukrainian experience between the world wars in Europe: the historical profession. Leaving the situation in the Soviet Union to a subsequent conference (held in Kyiv the following year), Kappeler's address asked the attendees to consider the lives and works of the Ukrainian histo-

rians who, by choice or necessity, emigrated to Central and Western Europe. Who should be included in this group? What institutions and schools of thought did they join or create? How did the political and historiographical situation in their host societies affect their intellectual labors? Did the Soviet world they left behind nevertheless shape their worldview? What became of those scholars who chose to return and take part in the construction of a communist Ukraine? What were the parameters and chief concerns of interwar Ukrainian studies? In what sense and to what extent were the Ukrainian historians who relocated to Prague, Warsaw, Vienna, or Lviv as “European” as the cities they adopted and the universities that employed or rejected them?

The crux of the matter is Ukraine’s location on the map of “Europe,” then and now. Of course, this is not a geographic, but a cultural or civilizational distinction; one that places the Soviet and Russophile aspects of the Ukrainian past outside of Europe, within Moscow’s sphere and the “Eurasian” alternative. The conference’s focus on the Europeaness of Ukraine and its exiled historians continues a perennial debate among Ukrainian intellectuals about their place in the world vis-à-vis East and West. The interwar period – which witnessed the partitioning of the Ukrainian lands into Soviet, Polish,

Romanian, and Czechoslovak regions after numerous failed attempts to achieve independence – set this dilemma into sharp relief for Ukrainians. If Ukraine is Europe, what makes it so?

Such questions seem all the more urgent in light of events since the conference took place in 2012. But *Ukraine on the Historiographic Map of Interwar Europe* already feels like an artifact from a different era; before the Maidan Revolution, the annexation of Crimea, the Russo-Ukrainian war, and the international ascendance of Euroskeptical right-wing populism. Now, after six years of bloodshed with no end in sight, the fundamental question of Ukraine’s orientation – toward Europe or with Russia – is as bitterly contested as ever. The writers in this volume examined the problem from a vantage point of relative peace, when Ukraine, despite its many domestic problems, seemed at least externally secure and free to follow its own path, quite possibly into a brighter, more European future. With these hopes frustrated, much as they were a century ago, it is unsurprising that interwar events and personages loom large in the historical and political debates of contemporary Ukraine. It would appear that no other era has given modern Ukrainians more heroes to praise, villains to condemn, tragedies to lament, or sacrifices to honor. The interwar period weighs

heavily on historians of Ukraine today, so it makes sense to ask: how did their predecessors – the ones who lived and worked through those grim years – understand their own times and the past up to that point?

Opening this collection is an essential piece of writing by one of the pioneers of modern Ukrainian historiography, Mark von Hagen, who passed away in September 2019. His contribution to the book – an exploration of the life and thought of the Ukrainian historian, political activist, and statesman Pavlo Khrystiuk – is a version of his introduction to the English translation of Khrystiuk's four-volume *Notes and Materials on the History of the Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1920*, a publication that von Hagen edited in his final years. In addition to shedding much-needed light on the pivotal, chaotic period of the Ukrainian Revolution, in which Khrystiuk was a key eyewitness-participant, von Hagen's analysis makes several important interventions in Ukrainian historiography. He situates these events in the global twentieth-century phenomenon of anticolonial movements at the peripheries of collapsing empires. Von Hagen underscores the originality and sophistication of Ukrainian revolutionaries, showing that we have as much to learn from history's

"losers" as its "winners." In doing so, he uncovers the leftist roots and convictions of major leaders in the Ukrainian national movement, an implicit challenge to the Ukrainian diaspora's fixation on right-wing actors, such as the conservative-monarchist supporters of Pavlo Skoropadskyi or the integral nationalists of the OUN and UPA, as the only true defenders of Ukraine from Russian and Polish aggression. The victory of the Red Guards and the understandably anti-Soviet attitudes of many Ukrainian émigrés led to an underestimation of the traditions and accomplishments of Ukrainian socialists, who were just as radical as the Bolsheviks, yet saw no contradiction in carrying out a struggle against both socioeconomic and national forms of oppression (P. 16). Soviet historiography was also eager to diminish and obscure Ukraine's national communists.¹ Von Hagen recovers a strand of left-wing Ukrainian anticolonialism beyond Wilsonian "national self-determination" (which Khrystiuk rejected as veiled imperialism) and Leninism (whose adherents harbored too much residual Great Russian chauvinism). Ultimately, Khrystiuk reconciled himself to the Bolshevik experiment, returned to Soviet Ukraine in 1923, and fell victim to the terror of the following decade.

¹ This group has attracted more scholarly attention lately. See Stephen Velychenko. *Painting Imperialism and Nationalism Red: The Ukrainian Marxist Critique of Russian Communist Rule in Ukraine, 1918–1925*. Toronto, 2015.

Then as now, the writing of Ukrainian history was an inherently political endeavor. Schools of émigré Ukrainian historical thought overlapped with political parties and ideologies, and historians played leading roles in the Ukrainian revolution. Their conceptions of the past informed their political behavior in the present. After the revolution failed and its defenders had either fled to safety or been captured, the blame for defeat had to be apportioned. Vladyslav Verstiuk outlines these mutual recriminations in his contribution, "The Ukrainian Revolution in Reflections of Interwar Émigré Historiography." He focuses on three key figures: Mykhailo Hrushevskyy, the first president of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR); Viacheslav Lypynskyy, a conservative monarchist of noble Polish extraction who served Skoropadskyy during his brief tenure in the revived office of "Hetman of Ukraine" in 1918; and Volodymyr Vynnychenko, the UNR's first prime minister and a critic of the revolution from the far left. Verstiuk reflects on how these academic polemics reinforced political rifts that have persisted into the present. As the leading representative of the populist school of Ukrainian history, Hrushevskyy emphasized the power of mass movements and social forces rather than state actors, lauding Ukraine's peasantry rather than its hetmans. According to this account, it is the common people who possess the

power to create states and nations, not the elites. In the opposing camp stood the statist school, led by Lypynskyy, which held the opposite view that only a ruling class (in Ukraine's case, the Cossack officers and other sympathetic members of the Polonized or Russified gentry) could build a state and lead a nation.

Oleh Pavlyshyn's essay shows how these and other historians viewed their ostensibly academic interpretations of the revolution as a continuation of the struggle from abroad. Despite a general commitment to realizing the ideal of unifying all Ukrainian lands in one state, they diverged sharply on whom to blame and thus how to proceed. There was a tendency to focus "exclusively on subjective factors: The 'treason' of the leaders, a fatal 'difference of cultures,' and the consciousness of the population on either side of the Zbruch." Pavlyshyn concludes that "the politicization of Ukrainian history" left "historical objectivity" as a casualty of these polemics (Pp. 72–73).

Interwar Ukrainian émigré politics were entangled with the study of more distant historical epochs, especially the period of the Cossack Hetmanate (1649–1775). Frank Sysyn's essay, "Hrushevskyy against Lypynskyy: The Historian's Final Thoughts on Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytskyi and His Era," revisits the division of Ukrainian histori-

ography into irreconcilable populists and statist. Sysyn shows that Lypynskyi placed greater emphasis on nonstate actors and evaluated great Cossack leaders more critically than is often supposed. Lypynskyi carried on friendly, even agreeable, debates with Hrushevskyi. Political differences aside, their historical work served the same function: just as Hrushevskyi's work undermined the imperial Russian paradigm, so too did Lypynskyi's regarding traditional Polish historiography.

Like Khrystiuk, Hrushevskyi returned to Soviet Ukraine after years in exile in order to resume his academic work. His defection was a blow for émigrés who nurtured hopes of someday overthrowing the Soviet state and reclaiming power in Kyiv. These and other national heroes-turned-Sovietophiles – those who did not conform to the presumed dichotomy of nationalism and communism – left complicated legacies. Oksana Iurkova's essay sketches this balancing act through the prism of obituaries, memorial services, and other tributes to Hrushevskyi across Europe in the wake of his death in 1934.

This volume includes a number of essays on lesser-known figures, too. Guido Hausmann writes on "The Life and Work of Stepan Rudnytskyi in Vienna and Prague, 1921–1926," concluding that Rudnytskyi's cool reception by German and Austrian peers drove the esteemed geographer

to move to Soviet Ukraine. Yaroslav Hrytsak examines "The Ukrainian Dimension of Franciszek Bujak," a Polish historian aligned with the French Annales School who was sympathetic to the independence aspirations of East Galicia's Ukrainians. As a professor at Lviv University from 1920, Bujak oversaw the creation of an ideologically diverse academic circle that included non-Poles who developed a transnational approach to the region's social and economic history. Were it not for Soviet repression and isolation after World War II, Hrytsak ventures, Ukrainian historiography would likely have followed the same course as its Polish counterpart in the second half of the twentieth century.

Other contributions to the book focus on individual texts and archives. Zenon Kohut traces and compares the torturous destinies of two posthumously published biographies of Hetman Petro Doroshenko; one by his progeny, Dmytro Doroshenko, the other by the Polish scholar Jan Perdenia. Tetiana Boriak describes the formation of the Ukrainian Historical Cabinet and the Prague Archive depositories of Ukrainian historical documents and artifacts, under the leadership of Arkadii Zhyvotko. Vadym Adadurov uncovers the archival fabrications of Ilko Borshchak, whose specious account of French-Ukrainian ties in Napoleon's era was enthusiastically

taken up by interwar historians. Michael Moser's analysis of Ivan Ohienko's *History of the Ukrainian Literary Language* concludes that the latter's historical-linguistic claims, particularly with regard to Galician Ukrainians, do not withstand close scrutiny. As with the other essays in the volume, Serhii Plokhly underscores the extent to which texts, ideas, and individuals defied the borders of interwar Europe, recounting Hrushevskyy's transnational lifepath and the cross-border debates of his Soviet and non-Soviet admirers concerning the mysterious authorship of the apocryphal *History of the Russes*.

The institutions and political contexts that émigré Ukrainian academics had to navigate are another feature of the historiographic map outlined here. Leonid Zashkilniak's piece, "Ukrainian Historiography in Interwar Poland: Paths of Legitimization of the National History," demonstrates the essential function of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and the Ukrainian Scientific Institute (UNI) in redirecting national politics from armed resistance to "organizational work," and cultivating the Ukrainian historical profession despite hostile Polish authorities and material scarcities. Zashkilniak focuses on Lypynskyy's followers (the so-called statist school), who gave an optimistic assessment of Ukraine's prospects for victory over the Eurasian steppe and its "horde,"

and hence the attainment of a nation-state after the European model. Andrii Portnov also probes the political motivations of and obstacles faced by Ukrainian historians working at the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw. He concludes that their salvation came in the form of assimilation in Polish academic life and an alignment with the Prometheists (supporters of Józef Piłsudski who envisioned Poland as a liberator of the oppressed nations of the Soviet Union). Fully funded by Warsaw, the UNI helped to counter the Soviet Union's "Piedmont" strategy, which tried to seduce western Ukrainians and émigrés with promises of prosperity and unfettered cultural development in Soviet Ukraine. Although the radicalization of Polish politics and the death of Piłsudski led to renewed repression of minorities and the closure of the UNI, for a time the institute provided a home and support base for wide-ranging Ukrainian scholarship.

In the conference's closing roundtable, the participants agreed that "many questions have not been addressed despite the productive discussion," and "gaps remain on both empirical and theoretical levels" that call for further research (P. 13). Nevertheless, this book provides an excellent overview of the topic. Anyone interested in the intellectual history of Ukrainians in interwar Central and Eastern Europe will find much of value here.