Ukrainian emigration to Germany after WWII: Formation and Self-Representation of a Transnational Community (1945–1991)¹

by Kateryna Kobchenko

The article presents a general overview of Ukrainian emigration in West Germany in its development after WWII during two periods – first as Displaced Persons (1945-early 1950s) and then as an exile group in the Federal Republic of Germany. It focuses on the Ukrainian transnational community's cultural self-representation as well as the peculiarities of Germany as a country of its residence. The community's existence was centered around political activities, and the cultural and intellectual aspects of its life formed the basic precondition for its self-identification as a national group.
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Introduction

The post-war wave of Ukrainian emigration holds a special place not only in the Diaspora's past, but also in Ukrainian history of the 20th century as a whole. The activities of the very large transnational community of Ukrainians had an impact on both the “inner” life of the emigrants themselves and the multi-faceted representations of Ukraine and Ukrainians in their countries of residence. The latter task was especially important in the period, when the citizens of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic had few possibilities for such self-representations abroad and Ukraine as a part of the USSR possessed only a limited political and national legitimacy on the international level.

Similarly, to the previous inter-war wave of emigration, which left Ukraine in the early 1920s after the defeat of the national state-building, the emigration in the post-WWII period was distinctly political in its nature and clearly anti-Soviet. Unlike their political predecessors, those of the post-war wave of the Ukrainian emigration had an experience of living under two totalitarian regimes, Soviet and National-Socialist, so they harbored no illusions as to the nature of the Soviet power in Ukraine. This political experience rendered impossible any cooperation or middle ground with the Soviet regime, like “Changing of Signposts” of the interwar time.² Thus, the principled anti-Soviet stance and strong public criticism of the USSR mostly within the anticolonial discourse brought competing parties and circles of expatriates to a common political position and influenced their activities. All their differences notwithstanding, all of them shared the same
double aim – Ukraine’s independence and liberation from the communist power and ideology. At the same time, the conceptual differences predominantly about the ways and strategies for achieving these key aims turned various parties into irreconcilable opponents. A crucial one was their attitude to the Ukrainian SSR and its interpretation either as a form of incomplete national statehood (by the left or liberal parties\textsuperscript{3}) or as a stateless nation occupied by Moscow Bolshevism (by the revolutionary part of the nationalists\textsuperscript{4}).

The Ukrainian emigrants’ shared double aim was achieved in 1991 with the declaration of the independence of Ukraine and with the fall of the Soviet regime and its ideological and political domination over Ukraine. That is why it makes sense to speak about the whole longue durée period after WWII, from 1945 until 1991, as a time characterized by interconnected political and ideological processes, despite some significant changes including the generational one. It also aligns with the period of the Cold War as an international political framework of the emigrants’ activity.

The after-war wave of emigration influenced greatly the political and cultural life of the Ukrainian Diaspora, including the previous groups and generations of emigrants all over the world, first of all, in Europe and in the countries of the American continents. Their ideas and deeds determined the overall nature of activity of the whole transnational Ukrainian community during the second half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. One of the main peculiarities of their situation was the fact that under conditions of Western democracy they were able to enjoy all the advantages of political plurality not possible in Soviet Ukraine. Thus, Ukrainians “in the Free World” played the role of an alternative Ukrainianness and a model of pluralistic political life, contributing to the further development of nation state idea.

Not only the political nature and activities of emigrants themselves, but also international political circumstances, above all the Cold War, helped the emigrant groups from the Soviet Union and satellite countries become actors in the global anti-communist movement. As members of both national and international political bodies with different political views, like the State Center of the Ukrainian Peoples’ Republic\textsuperscript{5} including the Ukrainian National Council (UNRada) as a parliament in exile or the international Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN) initiated by the Ukrainian nationalists, Ukrainian emigrant organizations tried to be independent participants in international politics and aspired to assert Ukrainians’ political interests and national self-sufficiency.

In the cultural sphere, Ukrainian intellectuals and artists saw their mission in the preservation of the Ukrainian language, heritage and entire national existence during a time, when Soviet Ukrainians were under the pressure of Russification. They also contributed to the creation of the modern non-Soviet Ukrainian culture – the literary scholar and post-war emigrant Yuri Sheveliov even saw exile as an opportunity for further developing national culture through closer contacts with
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world traditions and losing its previous provincial features.

Germany played a special role in the history of post-war Ukrainian emigrants as well as other groups of refugees and expatriates from the Soviet Union and Central and Eastern Europe. Immediately after WWII, the Western Occupied Zones of Germany together with Austria became the refuge for millions of Displaced Persons, who tried to escape returning to their home that was ruled by the Soviets or one of their satellite regimes. Later, during the Cold War, the Federal Republic of Germany also became an important player in the geopolitical system and the international activity of anti-Soviet emigrant communities was a part of it.

**DP time: between national consolidation and self-representation**

The history of the Ukrainian community in post-war Germany can be divided into two periods of different duration and with the partly different nature and intensity of the cultural and political life taking place within them. The period from 1944 to the early 1950s, when the Western Allies found millions of Displaced Persons under their control, played a significant role in both the internal consolidation of Ukrainians and their external actions for defending the status and rights as a separate national group. This short period was also crucial for the further development of the entire post-war Ukrainian Diaspora all over the world, because the main organizational structures as well as key ideas, which determined the further existence of the transnational Ukrainian community, were (re)-produced during the DP period.

By 1948, the number of Ukrainian Displaced Persons decreased from several million to about 300 thousand persons, who managed to avoid the forced repatriation to the Soviet Union. Two thirds of the Ukrainian DPs in Germany found themselves in the American occupation zone in Bavaria, a smaller part was located in the British zone in North-Western Germany and only the smallest group was in the French zone.

These people formed a heterogeneous community, which included political opponents of the Soviet Regime, refugees and UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army) soldiers, who fled Ukraine before the Red Army’s counter-offensive, and former forced laborer, prisoners of war and concentration camps, as well as representatives of the “old” emigration, who in the inter-war time resided in different European countries. Still, this community does not lend itself to being a “miniature Ukraine” abroad, mostly because of the non-proportional representation of different regions: Western Ukrainians from previously Polish territory constituted two-thirds of all post-war emigrants, which was reflected in the numbers of supporters of nationalist parties, first of all the Bandera wing (OUNr) and parishioners of the Greek-Catholic Church compared to the Orthodox Church.

A considerable share of intellectuals (scientists, teachers, writers, and
journalists) among Ukrainian emigrants turned the community into a source of cultural products alternative to those created in the Ukrainian SSR and, since they were opponents of the Soviet regime, into an important actor in the ideological anti-communist resistance. Already at the DP stage, significant numbers of intellectuals made it possible to (re)establish many national scientific, educational and cultural institutions, among them the Ukrainian Free University (which moved from the Czech Republic to Munich) and the Ukrainian Technical and Husbandry Institute (in Regensburg, later in Munich) as well as to establish other higher and secondary schools, scientific societies, publishing houses and editorial offices of influential media.

The politically and culturally diverse national press played an important communicative role. By the number of national DP groups' periodicals, the Ukrainians with about 300 newspapers were among the leaders. Although most of these printed media outlets existed only for a short time, “there was a small group of newspapers in the proper sense of the word that appeared weekly or biweekly for free of five years (a few of them even longer) and were read not only in all Western zones, but also in other European countries and even overseas.”

Ukrainian emigrants paid significant attention to the national education of youth, not only by opening schools of different levels, but also by founding other youth and sport institutions modeled mostly after their pre-WWII prototypes in Western Ukraine, first of all the national Scout organization (Plast). Both traditional denominations – Greek-Catholic and Orthodox – showed positive examples of cooperation primarily through the establishment of the tradition of joint religious services along important political or cultural events.

Many Ukrainians, who went through the DP camps in their preschool or school years, despite all disadvantages of their life of those days, later remembered this period as mostly positive in the sense of cultural practices offered by the community to the young generation. One of such schoolboys was Taras Hunczak, later a historian in the USA, who attended Ukrainian upper-secondary schools in the DP camps in Bavarian towns Füssen and Landshut. In his memoirs, he noted: “Life in the camps was diverse and very interesting. In them the Ukrainians proved capable of developing and perfecting themselves, not just surviving, in the most complex of situations.”

Outstanding examples of such small national communities were DP camps, which were organized after the national principle and consisted mostly of Ukrainians like those in the Bavarian towns Mittenwald, Berchtesgaden and in the city of Regensburg, as later described in published memoirs of their former inhabitants. The Ukrainian “model” DP camp in the Ganghofersiedlung in Regensburg, which in December 1947 was the refuge for about 4.5 thousand Ukrainians, now draws strong interest of German researchers and publicists.

At the same time, despite some successful actions, the community’s life was full of troubles and conflicts. Decades and even centuries of living in different
countries and particularly different experiences of political life in the pre-war and war times often led to a lack of understanding between the former “Soviet” and “Polish” Ukrainians and their mutual distrust. To some of the outnumbered Western Ukrainians, their compatriots from “Big Ukraine” looked susceptible or even were accused of being “Soviet spies”. By contrast, most Ukrainians coming from the Ukrainian SSR did not accept the nationalist ideology because of its dictatorial nature similar to the Soviet totalitarian regime’s principles.

This situation complicated both the political cooperation and attempts to bring together cultural and scientific societies. It also led to the parallel re-establishment of duplicate institutions with similar aims such as the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences and the Taras Shevchenko Scientific Society, which followed the scholarly traditions of the Big (Soviet) and Western Ukraine, correspondingly, or two journalists’ societies. These regional and ideological factors prevented deeper cooperation, especially because of active political positions of many emigrants. Among Ukrainians, the anti-communist refugees constituted 30 to 40 %, and in the first post-war years, most of them hoped to return to the homeland soon because of the expected war between the Western Allies and the USSR.

The internal consolidation of different representatives of the heterogeneous society was not the only challenge it had to confront. Another challenge was the non-recognition of the Ukrainian emigrants as an independent national group by the Western authorities, which first classified Displaced Persons by their citizenship, not nationality. Due to this attitude and based on the Yalta Agreement, they undertook to assist the USSR in the repatriation of its citizens. In this situation, only “Polish Ukrainians” were in a somewhat better position. Meanwhile, the Soviet Ukrainians faced the danger of forced repatriation, especially during the first months and years after World War II. Only their strong protests led to the Western alliance’s gradual revision of this attitude, and these changes became a part of the overall growing antagonism between them and the USSR at the initial stage of the Cold War.

As a part of ideological resistance to the Soviet policy of forced repatriation, the Ukrainian writer and politician Ivan Bahrianyj published his brochure “Why I don’t want to return to the USSR?,” which made a big impression and, according to Bohdan Osadczuk, became a “catechism” for those Ukrainian Ostarbeiter, who hesitated whether to return home or not. At the same time, the Ukrainians endeavored to make a good impression on the occupation authorities as highly disciplined, lawful people and good workers. Ukrainians also actively used cultural events organized in the DP camps like the exhibition of folk art in Regensburg in 1947 as an important act of their national self-representation.

The Ukrainian identity of the non-returners brought them no advantages, but rather difficulties; that is why being part of the Ukrainian community was in many cases the result of a conscious personal choice. An alternative possibility for some...
Western Ukrainians was to call themselves Poles to escape repatriation for sure. Meanwhile, some refugees from Soviet Ukraine opted to join the bulk of Russian emigration by sharing their federalist political positions and adopting the “Little Russians’” identity. The use of the Ukrainian language along with the idea of the national independence from Russia served as the key markers of belonging to the Ukrainian exile community, which renounced all forms of double-identity or compromise in the question of Ukraine’s political future. That is why the Ukrainian emigrants saw the shared position of different groups of Russian emigration, the liberation from Bolshevism without the division of the USSR along the national boundaries, as unacceptable and this made their contacts with the Russian exile circles impossible or strongly limited.

Although the Ukrainian refugees shared the general conditions and style of life with other national DP groups, they still needed to assert their national sovereignty: in the first after-war years, this was a precondition for survival as a national unit. At this point, the Ukrainians’ achievements were “rather the result of their persistent struggle for it”; the vibrant process of the Ukrainian nation-building was taking place in DP camps. That is why the stage of being Displaced Persons became a “melting pot” of sorts, in which diverse ideas and structures met, interacted and received new impetuses for further development in the countries of residence of the Ukrainian emigrants on different continents.

The Ukrainian emigrant community in Federal Republic of Germany

The mass resettlement to other countries, mostly overseas, had considerably reduced the number of Ukrainian emigrants in Germany – down to about 20 thousand persons, who since 1951 received the official status of stateless foreigners (Ger. heimatlose Ausländer). Even after the huge decrease compared to the DP period, the Ukrainian exile community in Western Germany remained one of the largest and most significant in Europe: “Despite the relatively low number of Ukrainian emigrants in Germany, their role and the role of Munich as the center of political and cultural life of the whole Ukrainian emigration is very big”, noted the members of one of the German-Ukrainian partnerships in the mid-1950s. Not all of its members stayed in Germany voluntarily, and some were unable to leave for the USA, Canada or other countries due to health or political reasons. At the same time, some political activists intentionally preferred to stay in Germany in hopes of better contacts with Ukraine.

The Bavarian metropolis Munich was the “capital” of political emigration from the countries of the entire Eastern Bloc, including Ukraine: about half of the Ukrainian community members settled in Bavaria, mostly in Munich or nearby. At the same time, West Germany, as any other Western country, was a Cold War battlefield in both the ideological and literal sense and that is why Munich itself turned into a
“powder keg” due to activities of the hostile secret services. The official German policy towards stateless foreigners included financial support for the emigrants’ organizations and social help to their members, both under the mandate of the Federal Ministry of Displaced Persons, Refugees and War Victims, which existed until 1969. However, this policy of guardianship did not provide for integration into the German society. Unlike the USA or Canada, post-war West Germany did not have yet its own tradition of mass immigration and faced enough problems as to overcoming the consequences of National-Socialism. Hence, the problems of the various groups of emigrants, especially of such less-known as Ukrainians remained at the margins of the society’s interests. At the same time, most representatives of the older generation of former Displaced Persons did not aspire for integration themselves: some of them never gave up their official “stateless” status and their hope of returning to Ukraine. Meanwhile, their children’s generation (who came to Germany as infants or were born there) by preserving their Ukrainian identity usually were able to receive education, successfully integrate into Germany’s social and economic life and obtain citizenship.

In Germany, the nationalist pool of political parties was represented by two wings of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists – the Revolutionary OUN under Bandera’s rule and OUNz (OUN abroad), which split from it in 1954 and was also known as Dvijkari. Another important political actor was the parliament in exile, UNRada, an association of several more or less small democratic parties. One of the most influential of them was the left URDP founded in 1946 by Ivan Bahrianyj, a writer. After the long and complicated processes of political negotiations and crises, UNRada managed to bring together most parties, including Dvijkari and OUN-M (Melnyk-led wing of OUN), but not the Revolutionary OUN and Hetmanists (supporters of the Hetmanate). Up to the end of the 1970s, UNRada’s sessions took place in Munich (except for the sixth one of 1972 in London).

The non-political coordinating center of the Ukrainian community was the Central representative of Ukrainian emigration in Germany (TsPUEN). Founded in 1945, this organization was not only an important form of national representation, but also a necessary intermediary between Ukrainian DPs and the occupation authorities. After the end of the Displacement period, this national representative continued coordinating community life, organizing cultural and social events and publishing a news bulletin. Other forms of public activity included youth and students’ unions, a women’s association, Plast as a Ukrainian version of Scouting and the school society Ridna Schkola (Native School). Nowadays, almost all of them continue working more or less actively.

As mentioned above, a substantial part of the emigration community were intellectuals, including those, whose activities went beyond the national boundaries, like political analyst and journalist Bohdan Osadczuk (German pen-name Alexander Korab) or the specialist on East-Central Europe and Sovietologist...
Borys Lewytzkyj. Both of them contributed significantly to the study of the USSR and satellite countries in the German-speaking area.

The tradition of printed media beginning in the DP period continued, although the number of the titles went down to several dozen. Some of the media outlets published under the aegis of different parties like the newspapers Ukrainski visti (Ukrainian news) of URDP, Shliakh peremohy (Way to the victory) of OUNr or the magazine Suchasnist (Modernity) of OUNz existed at least until 1980-90s or moved to the independent Ukraine. The periodical of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic church Khrystyjanskyj holos (Christian voice) is still published in Munich.

The national periodicals’ success and influence can be attributed to their journalists and publishers, such as Zenon Pelenskyj, Roman Ilnytskyj (until his departure to the USA in 1957) and later Bohdan Kordiuk, who significantly contributed to the development of the Ukrainian exile periodicals and their content. The Ukrainian community’s publishing capacities even served some other emigrant groups, as in 1950s:

> in the Federal Republic of Germany there are about 20 newspapers and journals, they are published in three Ukrainian print shops in Munich, in one in Neu-Ulm or in one in Augsburg. The emigrants of many other nations have no printers of their own in Germany and print their newspapers in Ukrainian print shops.\(^{19}\)

Therefore, cultural, intellectual and public activities of the Ukrainian emigration took various forms with different goals and target groups. They can be also roughly divided into three levels – (trans)national or “internal”, German, and international, although their main actors could be the same. Scientific and research institutions were responsible for the further development of the Ukrainian humanities abroad. Interaction between Ukrainian and German intellectuals as well as the spread of popular historical and cultural information about Ukraine was under the mandate of several bilateral organizations, most notably the German-Ukrainian Society. An important part of the emigrants’ intellectual activities consisted of their participation in the international anti-Soviet projects, one of them was Radio Liberty broadcast from Munich. Each of these cases can be illustrated in more detail.

**House of Ukrainian Sciences**

After the departure of most Displaced Persons overseas, educational institutions like the Ukrainian Free University and the Ukrainian Technical and Husbandry Institute lost most of their students and a significant share of their faculty. The scientists that stayed in Germany searched for opportunities to continue their research, above all, in Ukrainian studies, and together with the German authorities tried to find a suitable model for the further existence of the Ukrainian scientific institutions.
Unlike the USA and Canada, which incorporated Ukrainian scientific institutions into their general research-and-educational structures, in Germany such institutions kept their private character: with all the official recognition and support of these organizations, the German authorities had no intention to integrate them into the state’s educational and research system. This attitude, however, coincided with the vision of Ukrainian intellectuals, who wanted to retain its structural autonomy.

For Germans, the support of the emigrants’ institutions and their “free science” served as a kind of moral compensation for the crimes of the Nazis and, at the same time, their contribution to the ideological competition with the Soviet system. The Professor of Slavic philology Dr. Erwin Koschmieder convinced the Bavarian authorities of the necessity to maintain the Ukrainian Free University. He argued that UFU possessed a very special character and although it was incompatible with any of about 20 major German state universities, its meaning for Ukrainians, and not only emigrants, was huge, because it was the only scientific institution free from the Bolsheviks’ influence. At the same time, he called the exile scientists Germany’s “natural allies” who help to inform their Western partners about the real situation in their country and generally in the Slavic world.

The German-Ukrainian Society suggested one of the projects to restructure the Ukrainian scientific organizations. Accordingly, all Ukrainian research, educational, cultural, youth and religious institutions in Munich were to be united in one structure and place named the Shevchenko House. However, during conversations with two Bavarian Ministries – for Education and Culture and for Work and Social Care – this idea was deemed unrealistic because of the very different nature and goals of all these organizations. Thus, the idea was finally reduced to a more attainable form of the House of Ukrainian Sciences, which gathered under its roof (in all senses) three scientific institutions – the Ukrainian Free University, the Ukrainian Technical and Husbandry Institute and the Taras Shevchenko Scientific Society (its German branch). This new structure received financial support from the Bavarian government and was directed by the joined managing and controlling body with a rather complicated name – the Working and Promotion Community of the Ukrainian Sciences, which consisted of Ukrainian and German scientists as well as representatives of the Bavarian officials and published its own periodicals.

The House of Ukrainian Sciences held its official opening in the rented building on La Place Str. 24 in Munich on May 24, 1963. The official ceremony continued in the Inauguration Hall of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and ended with a reception at the Munich residence. The House of Ukrainian Sciences used the above-mentioned building until 1974, when UFU and its satellite institutions moved into its own premises on Pienzenauer Str. 15 in Munich.

The Ukrainian Free University was the only one of the three members united in the House of Ukrainian Sciences which managed to re-establish its teaching activities in 1965, while the two other institutions worked as research entities.
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with significant publishing activity. While officially accepting UFU, the German authorities repeatedly emphasized its private nature. Therefore, its doctoral degrees were not equivalent to those from German universities. Despite its limited possibilities, the Ukrainian Free University for decades successfully fulfilled its mission to carry on the tradition of Ukrainian studies, enabling many outstanding scientists to make an impact on the development of national humanities and making them known in the West through publications in foreign languages. The Ukrainian scholarly institutions in Germany at different times were a place of work for such prominent “old school” scholars as historians Dmytro Dororshenko, Ivan Mirchuk, Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko, Vadym Scherbakivskyj, Borys Krupnytskyj, philosopher and psychologist Olexandr Kultchytskyj, literary scholars Yurij Sheveliov and Yurij Boiko-Blokhyn. Most of them cooperated with the Ukrainian scientific institutions all over the world as well as with German and international scientific organizations.

Most of their studies and publications have retained their scientific significance until now and even made an impact on the intellectual sphere of independent Ukraine, especially during the first years after the collapse of the USSR, by compensating for the absence of non-Soviet literature. Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko’s “History of Ukraine” published in Ukraine in 1992 became one of the first national textbooks in the independent state. The Taras Shevchenko Scientific Society prepared and published a fundamental project – “Encyclopedia of Ukrainian Studies” - edited by Volodymyr Kubijovysh and written by Ukrainian scientists worldwide, including those in Germany, and it still enjoys its role as an important lexicon in Ukrainian humanities.

**German-Ukrainian Society**

Probably the most prominent example of German-Ukrainian cooperation was the activity of the German-Ukrainian Society (Ger. Deutsch-Ukrainische Gesellschaft – DUG) re-founded in 1948. First established in 1918 in Berlin by two researchers and publishers of Baltic-German origin Paul Rohrbach and Alex Schmidt, this society stood for Ukraine’s separation from Russia, as this coincided with the then political and economic interests of Germany, and supported Ukrainian politicians from the circles of the Ukrainians Peoples Republic (UNR).26

German solicitor Dr. Friedrich Roeder helmed the re-established German-Ukrainian Society as President, Ukrainian art historian Dr. Gregor Prokoptchuk served as Secretary, and Paul Rohrbach remained the Honorary President until his death in 1956. In November 1960, DUG united with the German-Ukrainian Herder Society (DUHG),27 which was founded in 1954 with a similar purpose. The renewed DUG formed the joint executive board with the representative of both organizations and the member of DUHG Prof. Dr. Ivan Mirchuk was elected as an
Honorary President of the united society.\textsuperscript{28}

DUG’s declared aim was to unite the democratic-oriented supporters of German-Ukrainian cooperation by distancing itself from any political parties or movements.\textsuperscript{29} The society’s founders also saw as their purpose in strengthening the economic and cultural relations between the two nations represented from the Ukrainian side by the emigration circles. This activity encompassed publications, lectures, other public events\textsuperscript{30} as well as exhibitions and concerts. As the organization, whose members, both German and Ukrainian, mostly belonged to the pre-war generations, the German-Ukrainian Society, which was very fruitful in the two postwar decades, wound down its activity after the 1960s.

Despite the Society’s declared apolitical nature, its leaders did not shy away from political points either in publications or in public discussions; one of the examples of this was the report by Mykoka Livytskyj, a member of the UNRada and later UNR’s President in Exile, titled “Coexistence or Liberation policy.”\textsuperscript{31} The emigrants’ activity was unavoidably political, as even cultural actions were understood as political, especially under conditions of the Cold War and ideological confrontation with the Soviet regime. In this case, the mere promotion of the Ukrainian culture was used as a form of protest against the Soviet politics of Russification. In the brochure devoted to DUG’s 50\textsuperscript{th} anniversary, its leaders made a political statement emphasizing historical and national differences between Ukrainians and Russians, declaring the rule of the Soviet regime over the Ukrainian SSR to be imperialistic and committing to the democratic state tradition of Ukraine in the form of the Ukrainian Peoples’ Republic (UNR).\textsuperscript{32}

In 1952–1968, one of the Society’s key activities was the publication of the quarterly almanac \textit{Ukraine in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart} (Ukraine in the Past and the Present). It contained materials about Ukrainian history and culture and political articles like criticism of the Soviet politics against the Ukrainian Churches or biographies of Ukrainian politicians like Evhen Konovalets. Among the Ukrainian exile politicians the Society honored for achievements in cooperation between Germans and Ukrainians, there were activists from both camps – democratic and nationalistic, Mykola Livytskyj and Yaroslav Stetsko.\textsuperscript{33} DUG also undertook several fundamental publishing projects like “Ukrainian Painter in Germany,” which became possible due to the editorial work of its Secretary – art historian Gregor Prokoptchuk.\textsuperscript{34}

One of the Society’s main objectives was to inform Germans about the Ukrainian cultural and historical heritage. However, its achievements in this sphere should not be overestimated, as they reached relatively narrow circles of the educated public. The main reason was the lack of general knowledge about Ukraine in Germany and its perception as a part of Russia. The members of the German-Ukrainian Herder Society, who later joined DUG, found for this the following explanation:
The fact that Ukrainians and Russians are two different nations and that the Ukrainians have their own history, culture and language is not understood by most people in the West. The reason of this is that in the entire world false information about Ukrainians has spread and scientific mistakes can be found in almost all Western historical books about the so called "Russian history."\(^{35}\) On top of all these reasons, Ukrainians remained just one among the diverse emigration communities in Germany, and thus their life and activities in most cases stayed a “thing in itself”.

One of the most successful cultural actions organized by DUG was the exhibition of modern Ukrainian artists from Europe and the USA named “Ukrainian Christian Art (Painting and Plastic)” which took place in July and August 1960. As the organizers carried out the exhibition simultaneously to the World Eucharistic Congress and organized it under the honorable patronage of Apostolic Exarch and Bishop of Greek-Catholic Ukrainians Dr. Palton Kornylia, it attracted a lot of visitors, who were impressed by the continuation of the “old Russian icon tradition” in the paintings of Svjatoslav Hordynskyj from New York or mosaics and paintings by Severyn Boraczek and sculptures by Gregor Kruk.\(^{36}\) Both artists, Severyn Boraczek and Gregor Kruk, lived in Munich, where they “found their spiritual motherland” and German newspapers also registered in their creative works the combination of old and new, Eastern and Western artistic traditions.\(^{37}\)

Another occasion to bring Ukrainian topics to the fore was the 100th anniversary of Taras Shevchenko’s death in March 1961. The Society organized the celebration’s program with events like a public lecture about Taras Shevchenko by art scholar Prof. Volodymyr Zalozetskyj from Vienna, and concerts with the participation of a prominent opera singer of Ukrainian origin Iryna Malaniuk.\(^{38}\) These cultural actions evoked some public interest and became for a short time a publication topic in local and regional press, but could not form a long-term cultural narrative. This manifested itself, among other things, in the case of the publication of the art book “Taras Shevchenko as a painter”\(^{39}\) in 1964, namely in an attempt to procure state funding for it. The Bavarian State Ministry for Education and Culture inquired an expert opinion of the main director of the Bavarian State Painting Collections, art historian Dr. Kurt Martin, whose answer caused the Ministry to decline the request for funding. Neither the Director himself nor his colleagues knew of the painter Taras Shevchenko and his works, but based on the brief information about him from art lexicons, the expert assumed the painter was not known outside the emigrants’ circles. This opinion was in no way a prejudice towards emigrants: the review stated, “as German painter, he would be probably just as unknown as he is as a Ukrainian painter in Germany.”\(^{40}\) The head of one of the biggest world art collections evaluated the painter unknown to him in the dimension of world art, not from the point of view of a stateless nation or its little exile community standing for its cultural sovereignty.
Thus he was unable to be a “advocate” of Ukrainians as Prof. Koschminder was towards UFU. The little circle of Germans interested in Ukraine consisted mostly of persons, who either had their own experience with it or were working with it due to scholarly interest or political reasons.

**Ukrainian emigrants in international anti-Soviet actions**

The international dimension was central for Ukrainian emigrants. Their activism in this sphere was multifaceted and consisted mostly of participating in the international anti-communist movements as well as in the attempts to inform the world community about the Soviet regime’s crimes against Ukrainians. The most successful examples of such international cooperation were the activity of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations initiated by the Ukrainian nationalists from Bandera-led wing and helmed by Yaroslav Stetsko or participation in organizations like the League of the Liberation of the Peoples of the USSR (Paris Bloc) founded by the exile Governments of non-Russian Peoples of the USSR and represented from the Ukrainian side by the Executive Committee of the Ukrainian National Council (UNRada). These activities merit a separate study, but here we consider other examples, when the Ukrainians were not the initiators, but joined the actions and organizations working in Germany under American rule. These projects offered Ukrainians a place next to other emigrant groups in the joint anti-Soviet campaign. At the same time, such activities caused additional strife between different political camps of the Ukrainian emigrants.

The most important opportunity for such cooperation came with Radio Liberty (RL) working in Munich, but the idea of broadcasting in Ukrainian from the very beginning encountered certain problems due to the differences in political positions of the Ukrainians and the American organizers.

Radio Liberty (initially, Radio Liberation) was founded by the private American organization and initially called the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia (which, as it became known later, at its initial stage was connected to CIA). This interpretation of all nations gathered in the USSR as “Russians”, as reflected in the American organization’s name, was unacceptable for Ukrainian exiled politicians of all political circles as well as for convinced independents. Furthermore, as to the future status of the Soviet Republics, the Americans held a position known as non-predetermination, which meant that the decision about the republic’s political future as an independent state or as a part of a federation was up to its citizens in due course and with uncertain prospects. On the contrary, the Ukrainians expected of their potential partners a more consistent declaration of their support not only to the anti-Soviet, but also to the national-liberation struggle. Discussions between the American Committee and the Ukrainian representatives from the democratic camp were complicated and postponed the
The participation in Ukrainian broadcasting became an important part of activities of the Ukrainian community, involving exile intellectuals and actors as speech writers, editors or announcers. There were some prominent figures among them, like poet and painter Emma Andijewska, who was the Ukrainian “voice” of RL for a long time, or poet Ihor Kachurovsky, who in 1969 moved from Argentina to Germany to become the literary observer for the Ukrainian broadcast.

For decades, Ukrainian history and culture including the protection of the national language, religious and church issues, and later – the dissident movement, human rights and samizdat (dissident underground press) were the main topics of Radio Liberty’s Ukrainian programs. However, as it targeted the Ukrainians in the USSR and caused significant troubles for the Soviet authorities, due to technical reasons it was not accessible for the Ukrainians in Germany or other countries “on this side of the Iron Curtain”. Thus, the authors were not sure whether their programs reached the listeners and if their work had any impact.

AMCOMLIB’s other project was the Institute for Study of the USSR, which existed in Munich from the mid-1950s until 1972, and unlike Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, it targeted the Western public. Like RL, it was also divided into national Departments specializing in the analysis of different aspects of the Soviet realia, including national ones. The institute’s researchers were supposed to contribute to Sovietology, which emerged during the Cold War as the interdisciplinary analysis of the Soviet realities. Similarly to the situation with RL, the Ukrainian exile intellectuals and politicians held different attitudes towards this institution. For the liberally-oriented of them, cooperation with the institute meant an opportunity for scientific publications, which were very important in their situation of economic indigence. Due to the cooperation with the Institute, some important publications appeared, among them Natalia Polonska-Vasylenko’s two-volume study “The Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (A historical outline)."

The motivation for participants to cooperate with the Institute were not only pragmatic, but also conceptual: they found in it a timely opportunity to win the support of democratic anti-communist circles and to bring the Ukrainian question to the agenda of the international anti-communist struggle. Following this logic, the rejection of such work as well as self-ghettoization seemed unwise. Mykhaylo Dobrianskyj, Head of the Ukrainian office Radio Liberty, argued that every opportunity offered by the anti-communist and democratic forces should be used to make Ukrainian voices heard; he also meant that as long as the interests of Western anti-communist powers and Ukrainian emigrants are
similar, the cooperation is expedient. However, some of nationally oriented emigrants abstained from cooperation with the Institute because of its American organizers’ “Russophilia”, that is, because their position was similar to that of the Russian emigrants: anti-communist resistance without a certain declaration of the independence of the non-Russian Nations of the USSR. The Institute’s opponents Professors Jurij Boiko, Vasyl Orletskyj and Petro Savitzkyj organized an alternative Independent Association of Sovietologists, which had very limited opportunities and influence compared to the Institute.

In the course of cooperation with American institutions, the Ukrainian scientists and activists of Ukrainian organizations continued cooperating with the Kersten Committee, which aimed to collect testimonies of Soviet crimes in Ukraine, first of all, statements and memoirs about the Holodomor, Collectivization and political repressions against national intellectuals. Published as a separate issue, this report became a public act of both historical and political meaning. The Committee’s report translated into German was published as a separate book and one of the statements as a separate Ukrainian edition.

Conclusions

In the article, I briefly discussed the diverse directions and general tendencies of the activities of Ukrainian post-war emigrants. The content, nature and scope of these activities, on the one hand, reflected the emigrants’ attempts to find their place on the global “chessboard” of the Cold War among its big political players and to include the Ukrainian question to the international policy agenda.

On the other hand, these activities reflected the complicated internal processes of establishing a transnational community influenced by the opposing tendencies of consolidation and separation. It was characterized by the concurrence between persons, ideologies and parties in their search for ways to achieve the national liberation in the changing political landscape. The destructive tendencies and internal concurrence of different groups were typical for most emigrant communities from the Eastern Bloc, but in the case of Ukrainians, they sometimes took dramatic forms, which to a significant degree came as a result of their previous political experience. Unlike the political sphere, the cultural sphere was less controversial and, in many cases, served as a kind of basic common ground in the elaboration of the common identity including the forms of cultural memory, which managed to overcome regional, religious or political differences. The post-war Ukrainian Diaspora is thus a complicated phenomenon; in its concentrated form, it accumulated the previous political experiences of the first half of the 20th century represented by different persons, ideas or institutions, and this, figuratively speaking, national “time-and-space continuum” underwent the “tectonic” process of elaborating new concepts and structures for national existence suitable for the
post-war reality. A very important stage of this process was a relatively short age of the Displacement, because most processes of the national life, which continued later in different places of the residence of the Ukrainian emigrants, originate from the DP period. This observation emphasizes both the similarity of the cultural and political processes taking place in different Ukrainian communities worldwide and their interconnectedness. As the same time, each of the emigrant communities in different countries, in our case, the German one, had its own peculiarities linked above all to the situation in the country itself. This is why a proper study of such communities should take into consideration both the national and local conditions as well as the global context.
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Endnotes

1 This article was prepared thanks to a scholarship of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Germany, which enabled the author’s research work in German archives and libraries.

2 As was the case with Mykhailo Hrushevsky, who reconciled with the Soviet regime and returned from abroad to Soviet Ukraine.

3 This opinion was typical for Ivan Bahriany’s Ukrainian Revolutionary-Democratic Party (URDP) and the liberal wing of the nationalists represented by “Dvijkari”, or OUNz (Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists abroad) founded by Lev Rebet and Zenon Matla.

4 The revolutionary OUN (Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists revolutionary) also known as ŽČ OUN (Foreign Parts of the OUN) under the leadership of Stepan Bandera.

5 The Ukrainian People’s Republic existed in Ukraine in 1917-1921; afterwards, its political leaders and structures acted as the exile government until 1992.


11 Although most Ukrainian exile scientists cooperated with both of these scientific academies, this duplicated structure of the Ukrainian exile science exists until now, and in the USA, as well.

12 The Union of the Ukrainian Journalists, which remained with the UNRada positions, and the National Democratic Organization of the Ukrainian Journalists, whose members belonged to the nationalist circles. See: Volodymyr Maruniak, Ukrajinska Emigratsija v Nimeččini i Avstriji po druhih svitovij vijni Tom I. Roky 1945-1951 (München: Fremdsprachendruckerei Dr. Peter Belej 1985): 207-209.


14 This issue was especially urgent in the period of mass repatriations in 1945 and 1946, as the majority of Ukrainians had to return to the USSR. At the same time, most of them, first of all former “Ostarbeiter”, returned home voluntarily.


16 One of the most prominent representatives of this group was Fedor Bohatyrytschuk who was born in Kyiv, joined General Vlasov’s Russian Liberation Army and after WWII became one the leaders of the Ukrainian federalist movement deeply connected to the Russian emigration. See: F.P. Bohatyrychuk, Moj žyznennyj put’ k Vlasovu i Pražskomu manifestu (San Francisco: Globus Publishers 1978).
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