

UDC 94 (477) (092)  
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.10.159219

**Taras BATIUK**

*PhD (History), Assistant Professor of Department of Ukrainian History, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (tbatyuk@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4159-5226>

**Researcher ID:** C-1506-2019 (<http://www.researcherid.com/rid/C-1506-2019>)

**Ivan ZYMOMRYA**

*PhD hab. (Philology), Associate Professor, Head of Theory and Practice of Translation Department, Uzhhorod National University, 14 Universytetska Street, Uzhhorod, Ukraine, postal code 88000 (zimmok@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3211-8268>

**ResearcherID:** E-7674-2019 (<http://www.researcherid.com/rid/E-7674-2019>)

**Тарас БАТЮК**

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету, вул. Івана Франка, 24, Дрогобич, Україна, 82100 (tbatyuk@gmail.com)*

**Іван ЗИМОМРЯ**

*доктор філологічних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри теорії та практики перекладу, Ужгородський національний університет, вул. Університетська, 14, Ужгород, Україна, 88000 (zimmok@ukr.net)*

**Бібліографічний опис статті:** Batiuk, T. & Zymomrya, I. (2019). Journalism of Myron Korduba on pages of «Hromadska Dumka». *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 10, 118–128. doi 10.24919/2518-058x.10.159219

**JOURNALISM OF MYRON KORDUBA  
ON PAGES OF «HROMADSKA DUMKA»**

**Summary.** *The purpose of the reseach is to analyze the journalism of M. Korduba on the pages of the Lviv newspaper «Hromadska Dumka». The research methodology is based on a combination of principles (historicism and objectivity) and methods (general scientific and special-historical) of scientific work. The scientific novelty of the article consists in an attempt to comprehend the phenomenon of historian's journalistic heritage in «Hromadska Dumka» («Public Opinion»). Conclusions.* *The journalism of M. Korduba on the pages of «Hromadska Dumka» was devoted to the comprehensive analysis of the most important issues for Ukrainians of national life during the early 1920s. First of all, it was a difficult problem to overcome a wide range of consequences of the defeat of the national struggle in the Galician and Transdnestrrian lands. The historian urges against national self-humiliation, showing the subjective and objective reasons for Ukrainians to lose their own statehood. He proposes to make the right conclusions from defeat and move further to gaining independence. M. Korduba convinces that Ukrainians have the fate of their own hands, soberly assess*

the unfavorable foreign political situation, and urges to step aside from internal conflicts and to give a clear signal to the western countries about the presence of a consolidated vision of the national perspective. As M. Korduba claims, only unity of the Ukrainian nation will gain the respect of European partners and will establish constructive relations. This optimism also marked articles on the relations of Ukrainians with their eternal rivals – the Polish and Russians. He stresses at the need to seek consensus with the neighbors by establishing an equitable national dialogue and rejecting the policy of escalating national atrocities. In general, the analyses of M. Korduba's writings prove him to be a talented publicist, who was able to diagnose the problems of Ukrainians of his times and offer effective recipes for national recovery.

**Key words:** M. Korduba, «Hromadska Dumka», journalism, Ukrainian-Polish relations, Ukrainian-Russian relations.

### ПУБЛІЦИСТИКА МИРОНА КОРДУБИ НА СТОРІНКАХ «ГРОМАДСЬКОЇ ДУМКИ»

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* – проаналізувати публіцистику М. Кордуби на сторінках львівської газети «Громадська думка». **Методологія дослідження** спирається на традиційне для історіографічних праць поєднання принципів (історизму й об'єктивності) і методів (загальнонаукових та спеціально-історичних) наукової праці. **Наукова новизна** статті полягає у спробі цілісного осмислення феномену публіцистичної спадщини історика в «Громадській думці». **Висновки.** Публіцистика М. Кордуби на сторінках «Громадської думки» була присвячена всебічному осмисленню найбільш важливих для українців питань національного буття початку 1920-х рр. Насамперед це була складна проблема подолання широкого спектру наслідків поразки національних змагань на галицьких і надніпрянських землях. Історик відкидає деструктивні заклики до національного самоприниження, розкриваючи суб'єктивні та об'єктивні причини втрати українцями власної державності. Він пропонує зробити належні висновки з поразки і рухатися далі шляхом здобуття незалежності. М. Кордуба переконував, що слід самим взяти долю у власні руки, тверезо оцінити несприятливу зовнішньополітичну ситуацію, обличити внутрішні чвари та дати чіткий сигнал західним країнам про наявність консолідованого бачення національної перспективи. Тільки така поведінка, твердить М. Кордуба, поверне до нас повагу європейських партнерів та уможливить налагодження конструктивних взаємин. Цим оптимізмом були позначені і його дописи, присвячені стосункам українців з одвічними суперниками – поляками та росіянами. Він наголошує на потребі пошуку консенсусу з сусідами шляхом побудови рівноправного діалогу та відмови від політики колекціонування національних кривд. Загалом, проаналізовані дописи М. Кордуби показують його як талановитого публіциста, котрий проникливо діагностував проблеми сучасного йому українства та пропонував дієві рецепти національного одужання.

**Ключові слова:** М. Кордуба, «Громадська думка», публіцистика, українсько-польські взаємини, українсько-російські стосунки.

**Problem statement.** The leading tendency of modern «Korduba studies» (the scientific study of Myron Korduba's works) is a consistent expansion of historiographical analysis issues. In addition to the traditional attention to the diverse scientific heritage of the outstanding Galician historian, researchers have been talking about the need to analyze other aspects of his intellectual biography more and more often. At the same time, more and more attention is devoted to M. Korduba's public service and his political journalism first of all. It is devoted to the problems of the Ukrainians existence in a rapidly changing world, the search for the most effective models of civil consent and relations with the nearest neighbours. This journalism sometimes affects the relevance of the observations made.

**The analysis of sources and recent researches.** In the light of the foregoing, M. Korduba's journalistic heritage has been in the focus of attention of the researchers of his creative legacy for more than once (Batiuk, 2013; Batiuk, 2016; Batiuk, 2018; Telvak, Pedych, 2016,

p. 16–21, 48–52, 85–87, 154–162, 184–187, 269–273). At the same time, the theme of «Korduba-publicist» is still far from its somewhat full coverage, as most of its topical issues have still been waiting for an independent reflection. In particular, too little is known about the cooperation of an outstanding historian with many Ukrainian periodicals being published in Galicia in the interwar period.

**The purpose of the article** is to analyze the journalism of M. Korduba on the pages of the Lviv newspaper «Hromadska Dumka».

**Presentation of the main material.** As it is known, in 1919 M. Korduba moved to Lviv together with his family, having left Chernivtsi, which was occupied by the Romanians at that time. In the former capital of the ancient Austrian province, he plunged into the hectic social life of the Galician Ukrainians immediately and very actively. At that time they suffered painfully from the loss of short-term statehood and were fully exhausted from the pressure of the Polish invaders. Wielding an exquisite journalistic pen, the famous historian joined the understanding of the current situation on the pages of the Ukrainian publications of that time. During the whole 1920, which had a lot of important events in our history, he collaborated with the newspaper «Hromadska Dumka» («Public Opinion»). It emerged as one of the media-«clones», instead of «Dilo» («Business»), which was banned by the Polish invaders. The significance of M. Korduba's publicistic voice of that time is proved by the fact that his articles had always been published as editorials. Another sign of that difficult time that characterizes the Polish newly-formed «democracy» was the thing that the historian had to sign his texts with cryptonyms, for the fear of persecution by the new government, which deprived its opponents of labour and even freedom in a categorical way.

M. Korduba took topics for his publicistic messages from the life of that time, which was full of disturbing news for the Ukrainians. The most striking event of the end of 1919 was the fact that in November the World Peace Council in Paris made a decision to give the Eastern Galicia under the leadership of Poland for 25 years, while providing for the rights of the Ukrainians in a separate legislative charter. This decision was a real shock for the representatives of the Ukrainian Galician intellectual class, as it marked the irrevocable defeat of the national liberation struggle in Zazbruchany territory in the eyes of East European politicians. Among the shower of emotional publications, which portrayed the mentioned decision of the ambassadors as a real national catastrophe, a sober analysis of the situation was indicated by M. Korduba's reflections.

Pointing to the destructiveness of appeals to ignore the obvious, the scientist suggested figuring out the essence of the matter calmly instead. In his opinion, «it will be no harm to look around closer in the region, which was ordered by the World Peace Council to be a self-governing part of the Polish state for a longer or shorter period» (Korduba, 1920, p. 4). First of all, the historian proposes to try to give the name to a part of the Western Ukrainian lands appointed by the European ambassadors to be self-governing. Comprehending this problem, M. Korduba, as a well-known specialist in the field of *toponomastics* (place-name study), reveals the fact of a largely appropriate definition of the Ukrainian expanses that would have intended to be autonomous. Taking the above text into account, the scientist says, «there is nothing to call it Galician Ukraine, because its borders are much narrower than the borders of the Ukrainian-inhabited territory in the ancient Austrian province called Galicia» (Korduba, 1920, p. 4). It is impossible, as the publicist points out, to call this territory the Eastern Galicia too, because its western border is considered to be the Sian River. In view of this – «for the lack of a better name» – M. Korduba, with a certain witticism, calls

the projected autonomy the Lviv Republic. The author considers its boundaries to be «very bizarre» and adds to the mentioned arguments a few no less expressive ones, proving that the authors of the project ignore historical, ethnographic and historical realities completely. In fact, the above-mentioned resolution occupies the self-governing city of Lviv and 45 political counties.

The next problem that M. Korduba draws attention to is an attempt to reconstruct the ethnic composition of the planned autonomy. As a criterion the scientist proposes to choose the religion of the population. Thus, out of the total number of residents of the newly formed autonomy, which should be about 5 million people, the number of the Ukrainians, according to the scientist, accounts for a clear majority of about 3 million or 63.6 %. The distribution by nationality of the remaining inhabitants of the autonomy is as follows – 1 071 000 poles (22.7 %), 592,000 Jews (12.5 %), 44,000 Germans (1 %). M. Korduba points out that according to these estimates 2/3 of the seats in the future parliament of such an autonomy should belong to the Ukrainians, whereas only 1/5 – to the Poles. However, knowing the realities of the Polish «democracy» of that time, the publicist adds explicitly «if only the elections were conducted without abuses» (Korduba, 1920, p. 5). But M. Korduba's complaints of the injustice of the projected autonomy boundaries turned out to be futile, since, as it is known, Polish politicians fully ignored the assumed foreign policy commitments.

In the situation of uncertainty about the Galician Ukrainians' future, M. Korduba, as an analytical observer of «Hromadska Dumka» («Public Opinion»), devoted more attention to the consideration of new geopolitical realities that have developed as a result of the decisions taken at the post-war peace conferences. It is expected that the starting point of his discussion were Ukrainian interests. An experienced politician rightly stressed that «the war in the East and the solution of the East European issue, is now undoubtedly the most important thing of the European, or even world politics. The eyes and attention of prominent diplomats and state leaders of the Western Europe are now drawn to this problem» (the Problem of Eastern Europe. I, 1920). To prove this thesis, M. Korduba cites the evidence of dozens of local conflicts that continue in the region with various intensity.

The scientist determines the unresolved local social, political and national problems to be the reason for these armed conflicts. After all, the removal of the Romanov and Habsburg dynasties from the political scene only «demolished the wall», which had been obscuring the problems of Central and Eastern Europe by that time. Then M. Korduba lists and analyzes the most biting problems: «1) liberation from centuries of enslaved peoples, 2) regularizing social life on the same foundations for minorities as for the national majorities, 3) change of the medieval subdivision into classes and means of production in modern and democratic spirit, 4) the formation of economic federations without occupying the national life of individual States» (the Problem of Eastern Europe. I, 1920).

None of these problems, the historian sums up his analysis, has been solved in the East of Europe. That's because the western politicians, who were poorly guided in the situation that has developed on the territory of the former Habsburg and Romanovs empires, in their conclusions relied entirely on the opinion of Polish politicians. Thus, Poland in the eyes of the Western World became the follower of Austria-Hungary and Russia. However, according to M. Korduba, the new state had become the successor of not only the territories of both states, but also of their «fatal disease». Explaining the last point, the publicist says: «When looking around in the region, lined by the Polish army now [...] we will see that the proportion between the dominant and the enslaved nation here is even less useful for the dominant,

as it was in Austria-Hungary and Russia. [...] If only Polish politicians had really wished to have attached all those lands to Poland, would it be possible to predict a different destiny and a different end to the state like the one, which Austria-Hungary and Russia had recently encountered?» (Problem of Eastern Europe. II, 1920, p. 3).

Thus, M. Korduba, being one of the first among the contemporaries, predicted the rapid crisis of the new world order, which was created by the winners and based on the formation of states including a significant number of foreign-ethnic population, in a very shrewd way. With the knowledge of trends in the development of historical events on the European continent, the scientist proves the futility of creating new empires on the site of the states, which had already been destroyed by the revolutionary upheavals. He gives a piece of advice to the new masters of the situation: «Only recognition of the full independence of all captive nations and ability to put everything in order on genuinely democratic principles and to carry out desirable social and economic reforms will give the solution» (the Problem of Eastern Europe. II, 1920, p. 3).

M. Korduba expressed his conviction about the finiteness of the fair definition of interstate borders in post-war Europe in the article on negotiations between Poland and Soviet Russia. In fact, the Ukrainian lands on the right side of the Dnieper, which were planned to be included into the Second Polish Republic (Polish: Rzeczpospolita Polska), should have been the subject of these negotiations. The Galician historian strongly condemned the appeals of some Polish politicians and publicists to return the state borders of 1772 to their country, because it would mean the restoration of its imperial character. M. Korduba convinces that such negotiations should take into account the opinion of the local Ukrainian population: «The main ground of future negotiations between Poland and «bolsheviks» (*representatives of the political movement (fraction) in the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party*) should be a statement from the last mentioned of complete disinterestment in the lands that have lied to the West from the borders of the historic Poland since 1772. Poland was to decide the fate of those lands according to the will of the local population» (the Borders since 1772, 1920).

However, the publicist claims, the imperial ambitions of the new Polish authorities do not allow looking at the problem of its new borders objectively – in the light of the local population interests. M. Korduba states, that, on the contrary, the new Polish state sets up a claim to a significant part of the Right-Bank Ukraine expanses, which will mean the resumption of national oppression to these lands. «[...] As we see, – writes M. Korduba – the non-polish lands, which future and fate the Polish government is going to decide, exceed the imperious Poland almost three times in space and twice in population» (Borders from 1772, 1920). The historian warns the Polish government, emphasizing that such «expansionist appetites» would lead to acute national antagonism, which will eventually cause irreparable harm to the Polish state formation.

The Ukrainian lands of Bessarabia, occupied by Romania, also fell into the situation similar to Galicia. The same World Peace Council in Paris gave its consent to annex Bessarabia to Romania. Since the Bessarabian case had been rather resonant in the whole Eastern Europe for a long time and, as M. Korduba points out, «falls partly into the sphere of the Ukrainian interests», he introduces this issue to the readers of «Hromadska Dumka» («Public Opinion»). First of all, the scientist gives his thoughts on the name of the region, its territorial boundaries, natural conditions, history and ethnic structure (M. Korduba has 21% of the Ukrainians in Bessarabia, who have an advantage over the Romanians in two counties (Khotyn and Akerman)). As a result, the publicist comes to the conclusion that it is precisely these two mentioned counties from the entire expanse of Bessarabia that should receive full national-territorial autonomy.

Expressing these theses, M. Korduba enters into polemics with Polish journalists, who insisted on the identity of the Galician and Bessarabian situations and thus justified the capture of Galicia. The historian explains: «When «Gazeta Wieczorna» («Evening Newspaper») (of March 27th) wanted to draw a parallel between the capturing of Bessarabia by the Romanians and the Eastern Galicia by the Poles, we have nothing against it. When it comes to substantive justification, we should note that according to Russian population census there are 48 % of the Romanians in Bessarabia, and according to the Polish population census there are only 21 % of the Poles (Roman Catholics) in the Eastern Galicia» (Bessarabia, 1920).

Along with the analysis of the foreign policy situation, M. Korduba paid much attention to the understanding of the domestic political problems that befell the Ukrainians at the end of the First World War. It is fully expected that he paid most of his attention to the Polish-Ukrainian relations of that time. With an undisguised anxiety he registered numerous attacks on the civil liberties of the population of the Zazbruchany territories by the Polish occupation authorities. In a desperate tone of the article under the eloquent title «To everyone!» the scientist showed the unattractive face of the new landlords by giving numerous examples.

The historian pointed out that the situation in the educational sphere, which threatened to be the real humanitarian catastrophe to most of the natives of the East-Galician lands, was a particularly sensitive problem. Describing it, M. Korduba emotionally wrote: «A hundred Ukrainian youths, absolvents (Author's note: «absolvent» in the Ukrainian usage means a person who has completed a certain course of education; graduate of this or that educational institution) of gymnasiums and real schools have been languishing for two years without studying and any ability for further education. Without studying and the ability for further education, because all the necessary things were made, so that to close the access to all cultural means and sources of knowledge behind seven locks. Admission to studies in higher schools was made dependent on the service in the Polish army [...]» (To everyone!, 1920).

Moreover, the occupation authorities have banned the Ukrainians from accessing the university library, which for hundreds of years in any regime has always been open to the educated public. M. Korduba makes disappointing forecasts, that such a policy will lead to the intellectual degradation of the Ukrainians and will have «catastrophic consequences for decades», since the intellectual class, noticeably exterminated by the fire of World War I, will not have natural sources for its recovery. This explains the emotionality of his appeal to the peoples of the cultural world: «We appeal to all who understand the value of culture – in the name of the ideals of modern times. We appeal to the whole cultural world, to everyone. We appeal to those who were able to get knowledge from the well, as well as those whose way to it was immured. Do not let us fall into ruin, do not let to the gloomy darkness! Do not let our youth fade away and perish. We want to get only freedom and light on the land of our forefathers» (To everyone!, 1920).

Another reason for understanding Polish-Ukrainian relations for M. Korduba was the Warsaw agreement between S. Petliura and Y. Pilsudskii. Like most other political observers, the historian was anxious about the mystery of the Ukrainian representatives, who hid the course of negotiations from the general public and imposed a fait accompli to signing extremely unfavourable conditions for the Ukrainians. The greatest shock for the national intellectual class was the voluntary renunciation of the signatories of the Galician territories in favour of the Polish state. Expressing general indignation, M. Korduba noted: «But it is unprecedented and unnatural that a people, beginning their state life, had to exclude the most important part of their land, renounce the region where the population is the most developed

nationally, the area which for the last 50 years had been the heart of cultural and political life, which in the liberation struggle gave the best thoroughly trained intellectual workers, and the best army. Without any doubt Galicia has always been such a part of Ukraine as mentioned above. And no matter how preposterous and unnatural the German concept of Poland without Western Galicia and Poznań Voivodeship, without Kraków and Poznań looked, Ukraine looks even more preposterous without Eastern Galicia» (Polish-Ukrainian Condition. I, 1920).

The Galician publicist emphasizes that being a sober politician he understands the fact when the weaker side is completely inferior to the stronger one. Therefore, the Ukrainians cannot but lose making an agreement with Poland, which had won the war with the support of the western states. Yet there should be a limit to concessions, and the losses should be within the people's strength. M. Korduba claims that Ukraine might have been able to overcome the loss of Kholmshchyna (Ukrainian: Холмщина) or Pidlissia (Ukrainian: Підляшшя; Polish: Podlasie, Podlasze), Transcarpathian Ukraine, or Pre-Caucasian region (Ukrainian: Підкавказзя). But it will never be able to compensate the loss of Eastern Galicia, which has remained to be the «National Piemonte» of Ukraine for a long time. «Such a treaty will carry on the stigma of compulsion on the one hand and extreme indulgence on the other» – the historian emphasizes. «It will not bring the fraternization, but will become the nucleus of further persistent conflicts» (Polish-Ukrainian condition, II, 1920).

In view of the above text, M. Korduba raises a completely logical question if Poland needs a real mutual understanding of the people with each other, the state with each other, or whether it requires only the fiction of the treaty to disguise imperial goals. The historian states that if it is all about the sincere desire to establish Polish-Ukrainian relations undermined by the war, then the Polish elites should unanimously abandon their plans to incorporate the East-Galician territories. M. Korduba gives the following advice to political elites by accumulating the mood of Zazbruchany intellectual class at that time: «Therefore, you shouldn't put the requirements impossible to conduct, shouldn't tighten the strings! It is better to carry out the basic revision of agreement in advance from April 22, than suffer unwanted accidents afterwards and blame the Ukrainians for its disregard. To tell the truth, we considered it as the duty of national honour. Wisdom, moderation, understanding of possible and impossible! This way we appeal today to the Polish people, Polish governing, Polish state makers» (Polish-Ukrainian condition, II, 1920).

M. Korduba continued the criticism of April agreement in his following editorials of «Hromadska Dumka» («Public Opinion»). The appearance of his articles was caused by the successful headway of Polish troops to the Right-Bank Ukraine. Looking into the reasons for such an unexpected development of events, the scientist points out to Bolsheviks' systematic ignoring of past mistakes made by the imperial power, which dismissed the Ukrainians from the new Russian hosts in the short run. So the historian warns the Poles against the behaviour of the previous occupiers, showing their sad fate. The historian emphasizes the necessity of building an equitable interethnic dialogue: «Only frank, sincere and clear agreement of one people with the other one, secured by certain guarantees and fundamental change of the former policy and tactics can still make an impression. The Warsaw Pact since April 22 has encountered the one-sided denunciation of the whole Ukrainian people and all parties. On it, building a new era of Polish-Ukrainian relations would be a punishment worthy utopia, petty tyranny, a naive self-deceit. The current campaign of the Polish troops to Ukraine can create veritable grounds for Polish-Ukrainian terms for further goal» (Above the Dnieper!, 1920).

Equally painful for the Ukrainians was their relationship with the eastern neighbours, which became the subject of M. Korduba's journalistic reflections. As befits a historian, the

scientist first of all plunges into the history of Ukrainian-Russian contacts. Like the rest of the intellectuals of that time, he described the transition of Khmelnytsky under the Russian protectorate as the milestone event, calling it «a fatal wave for Ukraine» (Ukraine and Moscovia. I, 1920). He explains this fatalism by the incompatibility of the civilization codes of the Ukrainians and Russians, since «ossified» Moscow could not imagine a different way of life but its own one: «Muscovites have never been able not even to understand the local political and cultural interests of the peoples attached to their country, but at least to get along with them in their everyday life» (Ukraine and Moscovia. I, 1920).

After that M. Korduba analyzes the attitude to the «Ukrainian question» among the Russian intellectuals of the XIX – early XX century in brief. His conclusion is disappointing – even Russian romantics (Herzen and Bakunin) perceived the political ambitions of their Slavic brothers for their manifestation of frivolity. Their intellectual descendants from the second half of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century reacted rather hostile to the Ukrainian political aspirations, and this hostility was only increasing with the institutional formation of the Ukrainian movement. «Since the time when Russian revolutionary groups have stood upon more sure ground», M. Korduba noted, «since from the abstract theories they have begun to shift to practical life and activity their attitude toward Ukrainianness has been turning into more and more negative and hostile» (Ukraine and Moscovia. II, 1920).

The purpose of his excursus into the history of the «Ukrainian question» in Russia was to object the most popular theses of the local *Moscowphils* and *Little Russians of Over Dnieper land* (Author's note: «moscowphil» is a representative of one of the trends of the Ukrainian national liberation movement in the second half of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, who supported the idea of the union with Russia; «Little Russian» an official archaic name of the Ukrainians in Russian Imperia, which takes its origin from Little Russia – a part of the Ukrainian land around the ancient capital of Rus Kyiv): «We have dwelled on the review of programs and tactics of the most left-wing, most progressive circles of the Great Russian society in the Ukrainian case much longer so that to break naive illusions and groundless hopes to the support of those circles in solving the Ukrainian issue and the construction of Ukrainian statehood» (Ukraine and Moscovia. III, 1920). M. Korduba, completing his historical review, claims that the Great Russian Revolution did not change the orientation of the Great Russian society in the Ukrainian case, but even «if we see the changes in the attitude, it is not for the better, but rather for the worse» (Ukraine and Moscovia. III, 1920). Taking this into account, the historian says, *moscowphil* orientations among the Ukrainian politicians should be overcome in every possible way. In his opinion, the belief in the commitment to the Ukrainians by the «Moscow liberal» is not only naive, but also extremely dangerous considering the historical moment that the Ukrainians have been experiencing.

In the situation of that time as to the defeat of the national liberation struggle, a significant part of the intellectual class began to propagandize the idea of federative association of the Ukrainians with other, first and foremost, neighbouring peoples. These appeals for the conclusion of various kinds of real and fantastic unions became a real political fashion of the early 1920s. Therefore, it is not coincidence that M. Korduba, with his own analytical approach to solving any problem, turned to this question, analyzing the historical and legal aspects of federalism in details. First of all, he deconstructs the idea of federalism as a universal political remedy for non-state nations. In his firm belief, the popularity of federal slogans in the Ukrainian case has always been a product of disbelief. M. Korduba emphasizes that federal slogans «are mainly propagated by those politicians who are not quite accustomed to working on the



awareness of the national masses and looking for fortitude to fight the political winners among them. And all appropriateness of their policy they saw sooner in conditions with government officials, in pacts, concessions, new eras... » (Federation or Independence? I., 1920).

The historian is especially surprised by those Ukrainian politicians who, despite the hundred years' experience of national enslavement, have still been looking for a Federal connection with Russia, which in the Bolshevik edition adopted all the imperial instincts of the Romanov state. Sharing his misunderstanding of such figures with the reader M. Korduba notes: «There are also such types that consider the federation with Russia not only as a temporary salvation, but as a «malum necessarium» (Author's note: in Latin «malum necessarium» means inevitable evil), but such a solution of the Ukrainian question they pose a much better one than the complete independence of Ukraine, saying that we are too weak, too little politically worked out to keep our entirely separate statehood» (Federation or Independence? I., 1920).

Convincing the reader of «Hromadska Dumka» («Public Opinion») in the unreality of the conclusion of an equal union with the Eastern neighbour, M. Korduba states that the Federation of Ukraine with Moscovia, that is, the restoration of ancient Russia in the form of a federal state, at least on the most advantageous initial conditions, would have caused a sharp internal struggle for victory from the very beginning. Describing the course of this struggle and appealing to the sad experience of the eternal Ukrainian-Russian confrontation, the historian wrote: «And due to the fact that except of economic and political contradictions between Moscovia and Ukraine there are also national ones, the struggle would manifest itself in all three areas, on the latter, obviously, the strongest. Like everything and everywhere, practical life would have moved over a paperwork condition to a day-to-day order very quickly. At every step one would have to compete not only because of the violation of the competences of the regional legislative and executive power, but also for the smallest everyday affairs. In addition, the national struggle should be conducted not only outside, but also inside, with yourself, taking into account the existence of *moscowphil* ideas in our literature, which deny our national freestanding segregation and which would find strong support from the Moscow centre. This struggle would require a terrible tension of strength, would eat up all our energy, would stop our natural development. And it's not so difficult to predict the ending, knowing the relationship of both sides. There is no need to be a prophet, to say in advance that the times of Ruin would happen again, possibly at a speeding pace» (Federation or Independence? II, 1920).

Aware of these real risks, M. Korduba asks if there can be at least a moment for a doubt, why Ukrainians should compete in this turbulent time and what to fear most? Responding to political romantics, he stressed: «Federation is not an evil thing, but only between equal contractors. The union of the weak and strong will end with the enslaving of the weak» (Federation or Independence? II, 1920).

In these conditions of general scepticism regarding the state-building capabilities of the Ukrainians, the historian was one of the few who propagated the slogan of orientation exclusively on their own. He insisted that we should take fate into our own hands, soberly assess the unfavourable foreign policy situation, leave internal conflicts aside and give a clear signal to the western countries in the presence of a consolidated vision of the national perspective. M. Korduba claims that only this behaviour will bring back the respect of European partners and enable a constructive political dialogue: «The Entente is waiting for our political maturity exam, looking now attentively from the side, how strong we manifest our state-forming force, and after that will say its hard word. But if we miss this useful moment, if we break the building of Ukraine only because this is the case now, when people and factors are somewhat

less likable, with which we have large settlements – then this case will obviously end up unsuccessfully and the world will pass over us to the day-to-day order» (England and East of Europe. II, 1920).

**Conclusions.** The journalism of M. Korduba on the pages of «Hromadska Dumka» was devoted to the comprehensive analysis of the most important issues for Ukrainians of national life during the early 1920s. First of all, it was a difficult problem to overcome a wide range of consequences of the defeat of the national struggle in the Galician and Transdnies-trian lands. The historian urges against national self-humiliation, showing the subjective and objective reasons for Ukrainians to lose their own statehood. He proposes to make the right conclusions from defeat and move further to gaining independence. M. Korduba convinces that Ukrainians have the fate of their own hands, soberly assess the unfavorable foreign political situation, and urges to step aside from internal conflicts and to give a clear signal to the western countries about the presence of a consolidated vision of the national perspective. As M. Korduba claims, only unity of the Ukrainian nation will gain the respect of European partners and will establish constructive relations. This optimism also marked articles on the relations of Ukrainians with their eternal rivals – the Polish and Russians. He stresses at the need to seek consensus with the neighbors by establishing an equitable national dialogue and rejecting the policy of escalating national atrocities. In general, the analyses of M. Korduba's writings prove him to be a talented publicist, who was able to diagnose the problems of Ukrainians of his times and offer effective recipes for national recovery.

The perspective direction of researching M. Korduba's journalism is the clarification of peculiarities of the historian's cooperation with other Ukrainian newspapers during 1920<sup>th</sup> – 1930<sup>th</sup> years.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors express their gratitude to the PhD (History), associate professor of Ivan Franko Drohobych SPU Lidia Lazurko for advice during the study.

**Funding.** The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

#### REFERENCES

- (OO) [Korduba M.]. (1920). Anhliia i Skhid Evropy. II. [England and the East of Europe]. *Hromadska dumka*, 137 (13 chervnia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian].
- Batiuk, T. (2013). Spivpratsia Myrona Korduby z hazetoiu «Bukovyna» [Cooperation of Miron Korduby with the newspaper «Bukovina»]. *Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu «Ostrozka akademiia»*, 20, 147–151. [in Ukrainian].
- Batiuk, T. (2016). Publitsystychne kredo Myrona Korduby (vidensko-bukovynskyi period) [The journalistic credo of Miron Kordubi (Viennese-Bukovinian period)]. *Scriptorium nostrum*, 2 (5), 26–47. [in Ukrainian].
- Batiuk, T. (2018). Myron Korduba's cooperation with the newspaper «Dilo». *Skhidnoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk*, 7, 40–45. doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.7.131615. [in English].
- Batiuk, T. (2017). «Ne gasit` svitla!»: osvityna polity`ka Drugoyi Rechi Pospoly`toyi v publicy`sty`ci My`rona Korduby [«Don't put out the light!»: educational policy of the Second Rzeczpospolita Polska as mirrored in Myron Korduba's publicistic works]. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk*, 7, 80–93. doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.5.116966 [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]. (1920). Besarabiia [Besarabiia]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 80 (3 kvitnia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]. (1920). Hranytsi z 1772 r. [Borders since 1772]. *Hromadska Dumka*. Ch. 75 (28 bereznia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]. (1920). Do vsikh! [To all!]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 97 (25 kvitnia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian]

- Korduba, M.** (1920). Lvivska respublyka [Lviv republic]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 24 (29 sichnia), 4–5. [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]**. (1920). Nad Dnipro! [Above the Dnieper!]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 106 (7 maia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]**. (1920). Polsko-ukrainska umova. I. [Polish-Ukrainian condition. I]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 101 (30 kvitnia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]**. (1920). Polsko-ukrainska umova. II. [Polish-Ukrainian condition. II]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 102 (1 maia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian].
- [Korduba M.]**. (1920). Problema Skhidnoi Yevropy. I [Problem of Eastern Europe. I]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 58 (8 bereznia), 1. [in Ukrainian].
- [Korduba M.]**. (1920). Problema Skhidnoi Yevropy. II [Problem of Eastern Europe. II]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 59 (10 bereznia), 2–3. [in Ukrainian].
- Telvak, V., Pedych, V.** (2016). *Lvivska istorychna shkola Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Lviv historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]*. Lviv, 440 p. [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]**. (1920). Ukraina i Moskovshchyna. I. [Ukraine and Moscow Region. I]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 125 (29 maia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]**. (1920). Ukraina i Moskovshchyna. II. [Ukraine and Moscow Region. II]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 126 (30 maia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]**. (1920). Ukraina i Moskovshchyna. III. [Ukraine and Moscow Region. III]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 127 (31 maia 1920), 1–2. [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]**. (1920). Federatsiia chy samostiinist? I. [Federation or independence? I]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 150 (28 chervnia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian].
- (OO) [Korduba M.]**. (1920). Federatsiia chy samostiinist? II. [Federation or independence? II]. *Hromadska Dumka*, 151 (30 chervnia 1920), 1. [in Ukrainian].

*The article was received on January 01, 2019.  
Article was recommended for publishing 28.02.2019*