NEW PRIMARY SOURCES FOR THE STUDY OF POST-WWII UKRAINIAN REFUGEES

On 26 September 1945, Anthony Hlynka, a Member of Parliament representing Vegreville, Alberta, appealed to the House of Commons to regard “the problems of providing food, clothing, shelter, and medical supplies, [and] finding refuge for millions of displaced persons” in war-torn Europe, as “matters of great magnitude and extreme urgency.” Any problem of such gigantic scale, which involves millions of people living in former concentration and army camps, among them Ukrainians, Jews, Czechs, Slovaks, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Finns, Poles, and others, “cannot and must not be lightly dismissed or brushed aside.” Hlynka deemed Canada’s responsibility as a member of the United Nations, and as a signatory of the United Nations Charter, a moral and humanitarian one.

Hlynka also had a personal interest in the plight of Ukrainian refugees. He was born in western Ukraine before moving to Canada in 1910 at the age of three, where his family homesteaded in Alberta’s Delph district. In his 1945 address to Parliament, he spoke for the uprooted Ukrainians, approximately 250,000 of whom refused repatriation to the Soviet Union out of fear of penal servitude, concentration camps, or even violent death.

The Honorable Member for Vegreville gave several speeches in the House of Commons on behalf of Ukrainian displaced persons (DPs), and advocated for the liberalization of Canada’s immigration policy. In time, his efforts took hold. In 1947, Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King granted able-bodied displaced persons from Europe the right to immigrate to Canada. By the end of the following year, Canada admitted the first one hundred Ukrainian and Polish refugees. Eventually, 35,000-40,000 Ukrainians settled here between 1949 and 1952, mostly in the urban centres of Quebec and Ontario.

Two recent acquisitions by the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library provide further
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context to the plight of Ukrainian displaced persons as described by Hlynka. The new material supplements our special collections on refugee life post-World War II, particularly the John Luczkiw Collection of D.P. Publications, 1945-1954, which now numbers 1770 titles (over 1400 books and 360 journals), as well as material on displaced Belarusians donated by Paul Pashkievich and Evva McCarvill in 2010.

The first of the two acquisitions arrived as a gift. In May 2017, Dr. Eva Pip, Professor Emerita of the Department of Biology, University of Winnipeg, donated her parents’ records associated with their time spent in the displaced persons’ Camp Korigen, near Kiel, in the northern German state of Schleswig-Holstein. The gift includes personal documents, photographs, a few DP camp periodicals, scripts for plays, and poems. The material captures the rich cultural life of the Ukrainians residing at Korigen. Both of Dr. Pip’s parents, a poet and artist, took part in transforming the camp into a centre of social, artistic, and educational activity, before they immigrated to Canada.

When Nazi Germany invaded Ukraine in 1941, the occupying forces took Dr. Pip’s mother, Nadija Jaremenko, from her native village of Shpola in Cherkasy province to Germany to work as an Ostarbeiter (Eastern Worker), a form of slave labour. Nadija ended up in a prison camp in Itzehoe. Following liberation by British forces, she was sent to Wagenfeld, and then Korigen. At the latter camp, Nadia composed poetry describing her contemporary living conditions and feelings, took part in amateur plays, and taught at the makeshift school. She also contributed to Camp Korigen’s journal Na chuzhyni (In a Foreign Country). While there, Nadija Jaremenko met her eventual husband, Ivan Pip. Ivan was born in the village of Koniushky in the Lviv region.

He enlisted with the Polish cavalry in 1938 and, during the September Campaign of 1939, was wounded and captured by German armed forces. Ivan spent the rest of the war moving from one forced labour camp to another in the Hamburg region. Afterwards, he passed through several displaced persons camps in Lower Saxony and Schleswig-Holstein. Ivan, an artist and musician, participated actively in the cultural life of Camp Korigen. He painted icons for the camp church, created stage sets for the performances staged there, and designed the costumes and makeup for the actors, crafted dolls for children, and played the violin both solo and with the camp orchestra, which he organized. In addition, Ivan illustrated camp journals, including Dzhamil’ (Bumblebee), a satirical-humorous publication.

The second collection we acquired as a purchase from Lorne Bair Rare Books. It is a set of fifty-nine pencil and ink portraits of Ukrainian refugees from the Mannheim Camp. The portraits offer faces to some of the thousands of displaced persons who lived in refugee camps between 1945 and 1952. The (so far) unknown artist captioned each portrait in pencil, either below the image or on the verso. With a bit of research, one can discover more about some of these individuals. Among those featured are: Fedir
Hlián’ko (1879-1955), co-founder of the Ukrainian Workers’ Theatre in Kharkiv and member of the Central Rada; Stepan Baran (1879-1953), member of the Ukrainian National Rada of the Western Ukrainian National Republic and of the Polish Sejm; Olimpia Podubyn’ska, professor of Ukrainian language at Kyiv University; Anatol’ Kurdydyk (1905-2001), editor of Krakiv’s’ki visti; and Il’liian Revi (1899-1979), minister and prime minister of Carpatho-Ukraine.

Despite the positive attributes added to a few of the captions—including such phrases as “one of the most honest citizens of Mannheim” (Iurii Tyshchenko, 1880-1953); “another of the most honest citizens of Mannheim” (Tymofei Bondar); “an outstanding chorister” (Olia Prots); and “one of the warmest personalities in Mannheim” (Iurii Sobolevs’kyi)—the portraits hint at the DP camp’s dark side.

Initially, the policy of the occupation armies, in accordance with the 1945 Yalta Agreement, was to repatriate refugees without regard to their political status in their home countries. This policy particularly affected Ukrainian refugees, but also Poles, Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians. Of some three million Ukrainians living in displaced persons’ camps in the two years following Armistice, less than ten percent of them won political asylum. Military authorities repatriated the majority to the Soviet Union. Soviet agents searched for Ukrainian emigrants in the British and American zones and often took them by force (sometimes with the use of firearms), and loaded them onto trucks for the journey ‘home.’ Another method employed by the Soviet agents involved ‘educational campaigns’ by which propaganda was distributed or screened to the refugees depicting ‘happy life’ under communism. They also resorted, with the cooperation of UNRRA officials (the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration), to ‘voluntary repatriation by incentive.’ The refugee and relief organizations lowered DP food rations, and moved refugees from camp to camp several times per year, to break their morale. Nonetheless, those refugees who refused to return to new Soviet occupied territories (i.e. those lands east of the Curzon line), facing pressure from American, British, and Canadian soldiers, and from Soviet officers, would sometimes resort to drastic action rather than be forced to leave against their will. Individuals jumped from buildings, others slashed their wrists. Groups would resist violently. Such was the case of the Mannheim camp.

The camp was “especially notorious [for] the forcible repatriation of Ukrainians [...] a number of people were killed, committed suicide or were taken to hospitals with serious injuries,” as a result of their efforts to resist being returned to the Soviet Union (Holowinsky, The Refugee Experience, 484). The Ukrainian Weekly, a Jersey City based newspaper, reported “eight self-murders” at Mannheim on 22 December 1945. Most of those under threat of forcible repatriation “are preparing to die and have received Holy Sacraments.” Anthony Hlynka cited first-hand testimony in his speech to the House of Commons on 25 March 1946:
characterizations could have been tainted by personal conflicts between the artist and other refugees residing at the camp. Still, the wordings reveal the tense atmosphere of camp life during the period of active repatriation.

Fortunately, we can find more information about the Mannheim camp, as well as displaced persons elsewhere, including Nadija Jaremenko and Ivan Pip, through the International Tracing Service (ITS). In 2015, the ITS launched a new electronic resource by which researchers can search post-war registrations (CM/1 applications for assistance) of displaced persons in various DP camps in Germany and Austria. This module is searchable by names of persons or places. Additionally, one can look up documents by camp. These include reports on numbers of DPs, changes in the camp population, repatriation, etc. However, I pass on two cautionary observations. Many refugees altered their years and places of birth in their registration records to make themselves less identifiable as candidates for repatriation. Spellings of surnames can be quite creative too. To access the ITS records, visit: https://digitalcollections.its-arolsen.org

Ksenya Kiebuzinski
**Prof. T. Lahusen’s Collection on Vasilii Azhaev’s “Far From Moscow”**

The Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library at the University of Toronto recently acquired a remarkable collection of materials pertaining to Vasilii Azhaev’s novel Daleko ot Moskvy (Far from Moscow, 1948). The collection was donated in October 2016 by Prof. Thomas Lahusen of the Department of History at the University of Toronto. It consists of materials from Azhaev’s personal archive given to Lahusen in 1992 by Azhaev’s wife, Irina Liubimova-Azhaeva, as well as documents from the State Archives of Khabarovsk Region. Prof. Lahusen collected and used these materials when writing his book *How Life Writes the Book: Real Socialism and Socialist Realism in Stalin’s Russia* (1997).

While considerable critical attention has been paid to Daleko ot Moskvy, Azhaev remains relatively unknown as a writer. Vasilii Nikolaevich Azhaev (1915-1968) was born 1915 in the village of Sotskoe, today in Moscow oblast. He was arrested in 1934 for alleged “counter-revolutionary activities” after he published his first work, and sentenced to four years in the Corrective Labour Camp of the Baikal-Amur Mainline (railway) of the People’s Commissariat of Internal Affairs (BAMLAG NKVD) in Svobodny, Amur oblast, in the Far East. Following his early release in March 1937, Azhaev remained in camp as a “free labourer.” During his time in prison, he contributed essays, short stories, reports, and plays to labour camp literary journals and newspapers. Upon his release, he became chief editor of Putearmeets (Soldier of the Railway Tracks), one of the camp literary journals. At BAMLAG, he also completed his Daleko ot Moskvy, which won the 1949 Stalin Prize for literature, in 1950 was made into a Soviet film, and in 1954 turned into a Soviet opera. The novel depicts the construction of a pipeline in the Far East. Azhaev died in 1968 in Moscow.

The Vasilii Azhaev archive consists mostly of photocopied materials: drafts of manuscripts, articles, readers conference reports, notebooks, photographs, and personal correspondence, as well as official documents pertaining to Azhaev’s imprisonment and further employment in the Corrective Labour Camp of the Baikal-Amur Mainline. This collection should be of interest to researchers and students working not only on Azhaev’s biography and his literary works, but also on scholarly projects devoted to the history of literary production in 1930s USSR and on the culture of labour camps. The collection’s highlights include handwritten readers’ comments about the book from employees in factories and library patrons, as well as photocopies of rare periodicals (produced and disseminated within Soviet labour camps), which were not allowed to circulate beyond camp borders.

*Natallia Barykina*

Stalin: Man of Letters • The Stalin Digital Archive

Joseph Stalin (1878-1953) is remembered through history in a number of diverging guises. He has been hailed as a revolutionary, condemned as a mastermind of cruelty and genocide, and revered as sovereign. Rarely amongst the annals of history, however, is he acknowledged as a man of letters.

A new acquisition by the University of Toronto Libraries helps bring this epithet into focus. The Stalin Digital Archive (SDA) is made up of Stalin’s personal papers, manuscripts, and a sizeable portion of his library. Thanks to a collaboration between the Russian State Archive of Social and Political History (RGASP) and Yale University Press, scholars now have access to over 400,000 documents. This unprecedented insight to Stalin’s inner life is carefully curated, and to a great extent translated into English, by a team of leading international academics.

Within the ranging discussions of these materials surface the anticipated topics of the Great Purges, agricultural collectivization, and foreign policy. Between the lines, however, and equally abounding in their margins, are handwritten notes and comments jotted by a man whose ideological veracity was met in kind by reverence for the written word.

Stalin was an avid reader throughout his life, a fact clearly demonstrated through Geoffrey Roberts’ curation of Fond 558, Opis’ 3 – Stalin’s Personal Library. The Soviet leader was attracted to Russian and Western classics of literature from an early age, evident through the inclusion of works by L. N. Tolstoy, F. M. Dostoevsky, William Shakespeare, Friedrich Schiller, and Victor Hugo, to name but a few. The course of revolution and history would shape the focus of his reading, though literary passion remained. At its peak, Stalin’s personal library held an estimated 20,000 works. The annotated condition of many of these volumes gives cre-

Figure 1
dence to the tale that he once judged as “illiterate” anyone who did not read several hundreds of pages a week.

As the years passed and ideology became fixed, reverence for the written word was upheld in true Stalinist fashion; it retained its hallowed status only until its utility expired. According to the records of the State Social-Political Library, his reading tended to focus on works written by Bolsheviks or other varieties of Marxists and Socialists. The most favoured authors, in descending order, were Lenin (243 publications), followed by his own works (95), then G. E. Zinoviev (55), N. I. Bukharin (50), Karl Marx (50), and Leon Trotsky (28). As a stark example of the word’s vulnerable temporality, Zinoviev and Bukharin were subsequently purged in 1936 and 1938, and Trotsky was assassinated by a Soviet agent in Mexico in 1940. Their volumes, nevertheless, retained their place amongst Stalin’s inner quarters, but the voice which lost favour could enjoy no such protection.
Thanks to the scanned copies of these books uploaded to the SDA, there emerges a sharp sense of what kind of reader and thinker Stalin was. In many cases, one can find the foci of Stalin’s attention by tracing his underlined passages as key to the text. As Figure 1 illustrates, Mikhail Bragin’s military biography Polkovodets Kutuzov (Field Marshal Kutuzov, 1941) is condensed to the centrality of education in national military matters: “The strength of the Russian army is in the soldier. One just needs to train the soldier, and the soldier who loves to learn will prove of sound mind.”

Figure 2 provides a more detailed instance of Stalin’s marginalia, with pencil again serving to draw out a single thread from the final volume of the Bol’shaia sovetskaiia entsiklopediia (Great Soviet Encyclopedia, 1926-1947). Accompanying notes and thoughts bring the topic of Japhetic theory into context and celebrate the historical role of languages within the Marxist dialogue of class struggles.

The SDA is equally valuable in demonstrating how Stalin’s scholastic devotion had its limits. Figure 3 illustrates a curious mental impasse for the leader upon reading A. N. Tolstoy’s play, Ivan Groznyi (Ivan the Terrible, 1944). The unintelligible scribbles are a rare instance of blotted confusion, ripe for Rorschachian testing.

Figure 4 shows an alternate and perhaps more readily recognizable method Stalin had when confronted with the unsatisfactory: addressing errors with unforgiving rigidity. Whole pages have been crossed out (corrected) and rhetorical questions directed to unknown editors of G. I. Ivanov’s 1937 geography textbook. There are many other textbooks in the SDA that have been extensively ‘edited’ by Stalin.

Stalin’s interactive reading is not always as fancifully innocent as with the given literary examples. Within the SDA are thousands of documents that passed across his desk, recording in bold detail the conflicts presented to him and the iron measures he considered to resolve them. Whatever the scholar’s focus, this digital archive provides unparalleled opportunities to glimpse the inner workings of one of history’s most influential figures.

Barnabas Kirk
On 1 January 1682 (O.S.), Russian Tsar Feodor III Alekseevich issued a patent (see above), for services rendered, to his postel’-nichii (groom of the bedchamber), Aleksei Timofeevich Likhachev. It granted him properties following the Treaty of Bakhchisarai (1681), which ended hostilities between Muscovy and the Ottoman Empire. This grant was for all perpetuity, including Likhachev’s children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, etc. Although he was married, Likhachev had no descendants. The properties, most likely, reverted back to the Tsar.

This patent and five others from the late 1680s, all issued to Likhachev, make up a recent gift that the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library received from Anne C. Landry and her brother, William H. Landry. The patents are from the collection of their late father, Peter Landry, a man who was “curious about the world.”

Twenty-year-old Tsar Feodor died of scurvy 27 April 1682 and within days there was an uprising in Moscow. Likhachev, who sided with the faction supporting Tsar Peter the Great, was exiled to Siberia. Soon the decree was countermanded and he was able to return. For his loyalty and support of Tsar Peter, Likhachev was made an okol’nichii (a close personal advisor of the young Tsar) in 1683. In 1700, Likhachev was appointed to the newly created position of Minister of Mining in Russia. He retired to live on his Ukrainian estate in the Pereiaslav region, southeast of Kyiv. Biographers mention that he was a writer, book lover, and collector of rare tomes and manuscripts.

As a historical artifact, the 1682 patent has many noteworthy features. It was printed in the Tsar’s ‘upper’ print shop in the year 7190 (since the world was created by God). This is indicated with Cyrillic numerals: 7190. (7000+100+90). By subtracting the original year of creation (5508 BCE), it is possible to date the document to 1682 CE. A more specific date of 1 January 1682 is also provided: year 168- (168-), indiction 1 (1682), month of January, day 1 (1). The titlo (-) signifies that the letters beneath it are numbers. The handwritten 1 (1), is missing the titlo.
Printing included a two-colour process, whereby two woodblock designs and the first line of text were initially printed in red. Then the rest of the text and borders were printed in black, leaving blanks to enter by hand the name of the recipient, what was being granted, and the date. One of the other patents has a seal attached to it. This one has only a signature on the reverse. Is this the signature of Tsar Feodor?

Considering how expensive it was to print documents in mid-17th-century Moscow, it is surprising that these patents are printed. The cost of printing paper was astronomical because it had to be imported from Europe. Was the Tsar in the habit of handing out so many patents that it was necessary to print them as forms? Or, were there clever counterfeiters producing handwritten copies galore? Yet one of the patents is actually handwritten. It provides us with a wonderful sample of 17th-century Russian cursive chancery script. As such, it is not the easiest document to read. Fortunately, there are books in the University of Toronto Libraries that can help decipher such manuscripts. One of the best is a book by I. S. Beliaev, Prakticheskii kurs izuchenii drevnei russkoi skoropisi dlia chteniia rukopisei XV-XVIII stoletii (A practical course for the study of ancient Russian cursive writing for reading manuscripts of the 15th-18th centuries, Moscow: 1911).

The handwritten patent is written on several pieces of paper that have been glued together. On the reverse, the joints are marked and signed to prevent any tampering with the document. Handwriting experts will vouch that a wide left margin is indicative of someone keen to move on, embrace the future, and willing to take risks. So, is this the writing of a mere court scribe or that of a Russian Tsar? It is, in fact, a patent from two Tsars: Ivan V and Peter the Great!

The University of Toronto Libraries would like to thank all of its donors for the wonderful gifts that we receive. Without their generosity our collections would not be as rich and diverse as they are today.

Wasyl Sydorenko
Online research guides @ PJRC. (2008). *PJRC update*, 1, 4.
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