Marek Wojnar
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7639-8321
Department of Central and Eastern Europe,
Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences

A minor ally or a minor enemy? The Hungarian issue in the political thought and activity of Ukrainian integral nationalists (until 1941)

Zarys treści: Artykuł stanowi próbę analizy roli, którą Węgry i Węgrzy odgrywali w myśli politycznej i działalności ukraińskich nacjonalistów integralnych w okresie od początku lat dwudziestych po 1941 r. W tekście koncentruję się na myśli politycznej i działalności Organizacji Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów, ale omawiam również poglądy Jurija Łypy na kwestię węgierską. Przeanalizowany materiał prowadzi do wniosku, że stosunek ukraińskich nacjonalistów integralnych wobec Węgier i Węgrów wahał się pomiędzy traktowaniem ich jako drugorzędnego sojusznika i drugorzędnego wroga. Czynnikiem zbliżającym strony było dążenie do rewizji traktatów pokojowych, z kolei punktem spornym, pretensje terytorialne względem Zakarpacia. Na poziomie taktycznym działacze OUN dawali prymat relacjom z Pragą nad stosunkami z Budapesztem. Pewna zmiana w tej kwestii zaszła dopiero w 1933 r., kiedy pozycje OUN nad Wełtawą uległy pewnemu zachwianiu. Po zajęciu Ukrainy Karpackiej przez wojska węgierskie w marcu 1939 r. stosunek ukraińskich nacjonalistów wobec Węgier stał się jednoznacznie wrogi.

Outline of contents: The article is an attempt to analyze the role that Hungary and the Hungarians played in the political thought and activity of Ukrainian integral nationalists in the period from the early 1920s to 1941. The text focuses on the political thought and activities of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), but I also discuss the views of Yurii Lypa on the Hungarian issue. The analyzed material leads to the conclusion that the attitude of Ukrainian integral nationalists towards Hungary and Hungarians ranged from treating them as a minor ally to a minor enemy. One factor bringing the sides together was the attempt to revise peace treaties, while a point of contention was the territorial claims on Carpathian Ruthenia. At the tactical level, OUN activists gave relations with Prague primacy over relations with Budapest. There was only a change in this regard in 1933, when the OUN's positions on the Vltava were somewhat shaken. After the occupation of Carpathian Ruthenia by the Hungarian army in March 1939, the Ukrainian nationalists' attitude towards Hungary became unequivocally hostile.

Słowa kluczowe: ukraiński nacjonalizm, Węgry, Węgrzy, Czechosłowacja, Zakarpacie, Organizacja Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów

eISSN 2353-6403 http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/SDR.2018.3.07

Keywords: Ukrainian nationalism, Hungary, Hungarians, Czechoslovakia, Carpathian Ruthenia, Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists

Ukrainian national identity in the broad sense of the word was created in direct opposition to Polish identity and Russian identity. The same was true of the political thinking of Ukrainian integral nationalism, whose origins are most often dated to the 1920s.[1] In addition to its two main adversaries, Ukrainian integral nationalism had to determine its attitude towards several lesser enemies. This category includes Romania, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. The presence of the first two countries raises no particular doubts here; both Romania and Czechoslovakia were, in the eyes of Ukrainian nationalists, occupiers of ethnic Ukrainian lands whom they wished to eventually see within the borders of an Independent United Ukrainian State (Ukrainian: *Samostiina Soborna Ukrainska Deržava*). At the same time, due to the fact that the issues of Bukovina, Bessarabia and Carpathian Ruthenia played a smaller role than that of Eastern Galicia and Volhynia or the territories of Soviet Ukraine, the Ukrainian nationalists were ready to make tactical concessions to Bucharest, and especially to Prague (due to the government there being relatively liberal towards minorities). Relations with Hungary were more complex. Just like the Ukrainian nationalists, the Hungarian state, which lost over two-thirds of its territory in the Treaty of Trianon (4 June 1920), was on the side of the forces seeking a revision of the state of affairs determined at Versailles. At the same time, both sides had territorial claims on Carpathian Ruthenia, which before 1918 had been part of the Lands of the Crown of Saint Stephen. Thus, Hungary seemed to be playing a double role – that of a potential ally and at the same time of a possible enemy. This duality makes the issue of the attitude of Ukrainian nationalists towards Hungary and Hungarians particularly interesting as a subject of research. And yet, no article discussing this issue has yet been written.[2] This paper is an attempt to fill that gap.

---

[1] The leading Lviv researcher on Ukrainian integral nationalism, Oleksandr Zaitsev, recognises the publication in Lviv of the first issue of the fortnightly *Zahrawa* (1 April 1923) edited by Dmytro Dontsov, as the beginnings of integral nationalism. The American historian John Armstrong sought the beginnings of integral nationalism in part in the activities of the Ukrainian Military Organisation and, elsewhere, in the Ukrainian Nationalist Youth Association (Soiuz ukrainskoi nacionalistychnoi molodi), which was under the ideological influence of Dontsov; cf. О. Зайцев, *Украинский інтеґральний націоналізм (1920–1930-ті роки). Нариси інтелектуальної історії*, Київ, 2013, pp. 164–165; J. Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism 1939–1945*, New York, 1955, p. 21.

[2] Taras Marsykevych dedicated a few pages to relations between the OUN and Hungary in his more general study on the relations of Ukrainian nationalists with "small" countries, i.e. Hungary, Romania, Lithuania, Finland and Austria. This is probably the only treatment of this topic to date, Т. Марсикевич, "Зовнішньополітичні зв'язки ОУН з 'малими' європейськими державами та організаціями праворадикального спрямування", *Наукові зошити історичного факультету Львівського університету*, 12 (2011), pp. 80–98.

* * *

The end of World War I and the associated breakup of Austria-Hungary forced Ukrainian activists to redefine how they regarded Hungary and the Hungarians. The Hungarian part of the Habsburg monarchy had to be perceived negatively by nationality-conscious Ukrainians. In 1867–1918, the Carpatho-Ruthenian administration (the komitats of Bereg, Ung, Ugocsa and Máramaros) was dominated by Hungarians. A national policy of Hungarisation was pursued, and all attempted Ukrainian national agitation from Bukovina, or especially from Galicia, was opposed.[3] After the end of World War I, faced with the choice, emigrants from Carpathian Ruthenia decided to join the region to Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia pledged to provide Carpathian Ruthenia with autonomy, which it did only in 1938.[4]

And despite the fact that the situation of the Ruthenian population was better in the Czechoslovak state than under Hungarian rule, the new political position of Hungary as a country that no longer controlled territories inhabited by Ruthenians or Ukrainians led some Ukrainian activists to see Budapest as a potential ally in their cause. In 1921, the future creator of one of the branches of Ukrainian integral nationalism (so-called "active nationalism") Dmytro Dontsov published *Pidstavy nashoi polityky* (*The Fundamentals of our Policy*) in Vienna. Although the book is not usually attributed to the nationalist period of Dontsov's work,[5] its radically-occidentalist and anti-Russian orientation is no different from his later views. In identifying Russia as the unquestionably greatest threat to future Ukrainian statehood, the ideologue was looking for potential allies in Central Europe. He wrote: "It would be in our interest to create a solid bloc of countries from the Baltic to the Black Sea. That is why we have a strong interest in Romania, **Hungary** [emphasis M.W.] and Poland".[6] The Patron of this anti-Russian bloc was to be Great Britain. Dontsov thus agreed to incur "temporary territorial concessions" to Western neighbours (especially Poland), because this could save the chance to create an independent Ukrainian state. Otherwise, all Ukrainian lands would be united under Russian rule, but Ukrainian independence activists would have to give up their dreams of gaining independence.

The issue of relations with the Hungarians played a certain role in the thinking of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN). We already see the first signs of interest in this issue in the activities of the Leadership of Ukrainian Nationalists (Provid of Ukrainian Nationalists , PUN) in the period preceding the creation of the single OUN. In February 1928, PUN member Petro Kozhevnykiv sent a letter to the Ukrainian nationalists, asking them to express their opinions

---

[3] І. Мандрик, "Національна політика на території Закарпаття в кінці XIX – на початку XX ст.", in: *Україна-Угорщина: спільне минуле та сьогодення. Матеріали міжнародньої наукової конференції (Київ 14–16 квітня 2005 р.)*, ed. В. Смолій, Київ, 2006, pp. 177–189.

[4] J. Tomaszewski, *Czechy i Słowacja*, Warszawa, 2008, p. 26.

[5] О. Зайцев, *Український інтегральний націоналізм*, p. 163.

[6] Д. Донцов, *Підстави нашої політики*, Відень, 1921, p. 95.

on specific issues in the programme of the future OUN. The second point on the list of issues concerned foreign policy problems. They included the subsection: "Ukraine and neighbouring countries", which included Hungary.[7] Unfortunately, we do not have responses to the letter sent by Kozhevnykiv. In the archives in Kiev, a list of papers for the first OUN congress is preserved. The informational part was to deal with Ukraine's relations with its western neighbours, among whom Hungary was listed.[8] This document made no reference to the actual programme of the later congress, but undoubtedly proved that the issue of relations with Hungary was not inconsequential to Ukrainian nationalists.

The Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists held from the end of January to the beginning of February 1929 did not specify Ukrainian nationalists' attitudes towards Hungary. The adopted decisions declared that, despite rejecting aligning with "historical enemies of the Ukrainian Nation, Ukrainian foreign policy would be carried out via alliances with those nations hostile to the invaders of Ukraine".[9] Such a formulation might suggest that the nationalists saw a potential ally in Hungary, because this country was hostile to Czechoslovakia, Romania and the Soviet Union. However, if we look at other Congress documents, the matter will turn out to be far less clear. During the plenary meeting of the Congress, the leader of the organisation, Yevhen Konovalets, said:

> Czechoslovakia has a special position: it is an occupation, [but] there was an arrangement between Ukr[ainians], and Czechoslovakia, where [Carpathian Ruthenia] joined voluntarily, unlike other forced occupations – Czechoslovakia accepted commitments towards Subcarpathia […] Provid took [the position] that a willing[ly] associated Subc[arpathian] Ukraine has a separate meaning: it was necessary to convince Czechoslovakia that only the implementation of obligations is in both our interest and the Czechs', because a barrier between Poland and Hungary is being created.[10]

Konovalets ended his speech by saying that the Congress should analyze the position of the Provod. As for the results, no information is available. Nor did Petro Kozhevnykiv, who gave a lecture on the organisation of the OUN during the congress, probably see any possibility of agreement with the Hungarians. This activist designed an organisational structure for the OUN in both Ukrainian lands and beyond. One of the areas where Ukrainians were supposed to be active abroad

---

[7] П. Кожевників, „Лист до українських націоналістів про підготовку Конґресу Українських Націоналістів", in: *Документи і матеріали з історії Організації Українських Націоналістів*, vol. 1, 1927–1930, eds. Ю. Черченко, О. Кучерук, Київ, 2005, p. 55.

[8] *Список рефератів для 1 Конґресу ОУН "Реферати на Конґрес Українських Націоналістів"*, in: *Документи і матеріали…*, vol. 1, p. 93.

[9] "Устрій Організації Українських Націоналістів 1929 р., [2–3 лютого]", in: *Конґрес Українських Націоналістів 1929 р.: Документи і матеріали*, ed. В. Муравський, Львів, 2006, p. 289.

[10] "Протокол пленарних засідань, запись В. Мартинця 1929 р., 27–29 січня, 2–3 лютого", in: *Конґрес Українських Націоналістів*, p. 64.

was the "Central European area". Kozhevnykiv included in that Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, and even Spain and Portugal.[11] Not a word about Hungary. It is known, however, that Hungary was perceived as an ally of the Ukrainian issue by Zenon Pelensky, who was the author of a paper on foreign policy during the congress. The activist claimed that Ukraine should implement its foreign policy in three separate geopolitical areas: the Galician Balkans, the Belarusian Baltic and the Caspian Caucasus. In the Galician Balkan region, Pelensky believed that Ukrainians should align themselves with countries hostile to Poland and the countries of the Little Entente. Pełeński postulated that, primarily, close relations should be established with Bulgaria and Hungary.[12] This would bring into effect a "southern arm" of Ukrainian policy running through Sofia and Budapest to Berlin and Rome. This concept, complemented by the "northern arm" implemented in the Baltic area and running through Lithuania and Belarus to Germany, was clearly anti-Polish and, indirectly, anti-French. It seems that the concept of cooperation with Hungary was more an original idea of Pelensky's than the position of the entire organisation.

The bulk of information about the place of Hungary in the political thought and activity of the OUN is contained in the Rome records of Jevhen Onatsky, the organisation's representative in this area. It is no coincidence that attempts at a *rapprochement* took place in Italy. Benito Mussolini's regime was the first and for a long time the only major player in Europe to maintain good relations with Hungary. Rome and Budapest were brought together by their animosity towards the countries of the Little Entente and by their striving to weaken French influence along the Danube. Italy also showed support for certain Hungarian revisionist postulates. Hungary's attempt to reach the Italian elite appears to have been initiated in Budapest through the periodical *Il Corriere del Danubio*[13] issued by the Revisionist League (created in 1927).[14] In the same year (on April 5) mutual relations were normalised by the signing of a Hungarian–Italian treaty of friendship, which broke the isolation of Budapest.[15]

Perhaps another circumstance that made the OUN activists pay more attention to Hungary was the rumours about the restoration of the Habsburgs that were regularly appearing in the European press. On 20 November 1934, the

---

[11] П. Кожевників, "Орґанізація Українських Націоналістів [1928 р., листопад]", in: *Конґрес Українських Націоналістів*, p. 201.

[12] З. Пеленський, "Міжнародня політика України [Друге півріччя 1928 – початок 1929] Тези реферату про зовнішню політику України, виготовлений для Конґресу Українських Націоналістів в січні 1929 р.", in: *Конґрес Українських Націоналістів*, p. 270.

[13] Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті – III*, p. 293.

[14] It was a structure that initially grouped several dozen Hungarian parties, organisations, unions, societies, social and economic organisations, and more than 500 by the end of the 1920s. It strived to convince the public of the major countries of the world as to the injustice of the Treaty of Trianon and the need for a revision of borders.

[15] J. Kochanowski, *Węgry. Od ugody do ugody 1867–1990*, Warszawa, 1997, p. 79.

eldest son of the former Emperor Charles, the prince and heir Otto, was to reach the Habsburg age of majority (twenty).[16] The idea of restoration was favourably regarded primarily in Italy, which tried to prevent the *Anschluss* of Austria and, consequently, the domination of Central Europe by Germany. OUN activists were also aware of it. From Onatsky's correspondence, we know that in June 1933 the head of the Italian branch informed Konovalets of the Italian diplomatic position on the hypothetical return of the Habsburgs.[17] The restoration of the dynasty and the establishment of an Austro-Hungarian state joined by a personal union would constitute the emergence of a significant new player in Central Europe. It cannot be unequivocally ruled out that OUN activists did not think of how to insure against such an eventuality. This may be indicated by the fact that in 1933 the OUN entered into cooperation with Wilhelm Habsburg (Vasyl Vyshyvany).[18]

For the first time on 4 February 1933,[19] Onatsky wrote to Konovalets that more attention should be paid to Hungary while paying attention to good relations between Hungary and Italy, as well as the growing influence of Budapest on the British Isles.[20] Four days later, the OUN leader in Italy met for the first time with a Hungarian journalist, Dr Bajai. Onatsky described the Hungarian as a correspondent for the semi-official magazine *Magyarság* who was taken prisoner in Kiev during the First World War and only released in 1923, and who then repeatedly travelled to Ukraine and Russia as a journalist.[21] In a subsequent letter, Onatsky characterised the Hungarian as a member of the "nationalist party, which [is] in opposition to the Gömbösa government" and which hopes to take power after its fall.[22]

---

[16] T. Snyder, *Czerwony Książę*, Warszawa, 2010, p. 171.

[17] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 18 червня 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 226.

[18] During the revolution of the civil war this Habsburg prince from the Żywiec line of the Habsburgs (son of Karol Stefan) became associated with the Ukrainian national movement. Because of his own descent, Habsburg had much better contacts in Vienna and Budapest than other Ukrainian activists. For example, the American historian Timothy Snyder writes that the brothers Tamas and Móric Esterházy, who came from a well-known Hungarian aristocratic family, lent money to the relatively loose-living Wilhelm, in: T. Snyder, *Czerwony Książę*, p. 148.

[19] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 4 лютого 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 46.

[20] The Hungarians had had a certain base in Great Britain since the late 1920s. During an official visit, Prime Minister István Bethlen was hosted by King George V. There was also a strong Hungarian lobby in the parliament. Members of the House of Lords, Thomas Wodehouse and Harold Sidney Harmsworth, 1st Viscount of Rothemere, raised the Hungarian issue at sittings of the British Parliament. The latter initiated the campaign "Justice for Hungary" in the *Daily Mail* by publishing an article in 1927 entitled Hungary's Place in the Sun, J. Kochanowski, Węgry. Od ugody do ugody, p. 79; cf. V. Rothemere, My campaign for Hungary, London, 1939.

[21] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 8 лютого 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 59; „Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 13 лютого 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 71.

[22] Considering that the Hungarian electoral system effectively ensured that the Unity Party would win all elections, we may assume that Bajai was not a member of an opposition party, but of

Following the meeting, in which Bajai assured Onatsky that Hungary's territorial appetites for Carpathian Ruthenia did not even reach Uzhgorod, he wrote to Konovalets:

> Given the influence that Hungarians have in Italy, I think that this relationship should be maintained. Particularly if it is possible to obtain official reassurances that the Hungarians truly make no claims to Carpathian Ruthenia. That would be unexpected and quite pleasant news. Because on the revisionist front, the Hungary–Carpathian Ruthenia issue was the most dangerous for us.[23]

During the next meeting with Bajai, Onatsky pointed out that cooperation between OUN and Hungarians was possible, but on the condition that the influence of Hetman Pavel Skoropadski on Hungary[24] be removed and that of the Russophile tendencies of Magyarons[25] in Carpathian Ruthenia (or at least that Hungary present a clear plan on how to eliminate this phenomenon).[26] Onatsky's contact with Bajai ceased at some point. In a letter to Konovalets on 28 July 1933, the OUN representative referred to his Hungarian interlocutor as "undoubtedly a Hungarian agent".[27] Onatsky came to this conclusion based on the fact that Hungary was very keen on his contact with the Hungarian military attaché in Rome. Subsequent letters from the OUN representative in Italy show that his hopes for an agreement with Hungary waned. In May 1933, Onatsky met with the Italian diplomat Pietro Quaroni in Rome. The latter asked the OUN representative in Italy whether in the face of the Polish–Czechoslovak *rapprochement*[28] Ukrainian nationalists were not

---

a faction within the ruling party in opposition to Gömbös (nb. Bajai during his first meeting with Onatsky referred to the Hungarian prime minister as his own friend); "Лист Є. Онацього до Є. Коновальця від 24 лютого 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 82; "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 8 лютого 1933 р., in: Є. Онацький, У вічному місті III", p. 59; J. Kochanowski, *Węgry. Od ugody do ugody*, pp. 72–73, 85–89.

[23] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 8 лютого 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 59.

[24] In January 1929, urgently in need of money for the operation of his party, Hetman Skoropadski went to Budapest, where in exchange for Hungarian subsidies he ceded Carpathian Ruthenia to the Hungarians and undertook not to raise territorial claims against the region (the Hetman acted invocating his dynastic rights to Ukrainian lands), A.A. Zięba*, Lobbing dla Ukrainy w Europie Międzywojennej. Ukraińskie Biuro Prasowe w Londynie i jego konkurenci polityczni (do roku 1932),* Kraków, 2010, p. 303.

[25] The term was used to describe Hungarianised Slovakians and Ruthenians.

[26] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 13 лютого 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 71.

[27] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 28 липня 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 310.

[28] The short-lived Polish-Czechoslovak *rapprochement* in fact took place after the announcement of the idea of the Four-Power Pact (perceived by both countries as a threat), which resulted in plans for a visit by Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs Józef Beck to Prague in March 1933. In the end, the visit did not take place because the Czechs did not want to go against the direction of French policy, J. Tomaszewski, *Czechy i Słowacja*, p. 63.

considering transferring the organisation's official periodical "Rozbudova Natsii" (*Expansion of the Nation*) from Czechoslovakia to another country. Onatsky replied that one might consider Vienna, Sofia or possibly Budapest. Regarding the last city, he had reservations:

> Budapest is an uncomfortable place due to claims on the Carpathian lands […] It is true that in conversations with Hungary it turns out that they do not want all the Ukrainian Carpathian lands, but only "those needed for strategic improvement of the borders", but this is an unclear and dangerous formulation.[29]

The OUN representative in Italy did not completely abandon the idea of cooperating with the Hungarians. During talks with the Italian diplomat Enrico Insabato, Onatsky suggested that the Italian side should become an intermediary for the Ukrainians and Hungarians, while stressing that "it must be done in such a way that **in no case** [emphasis in original] should the Hungarians be able to work out that we were asking Insabato to take a look at this matter, or that we were making any 'advances' to them at all".[30] Despite this objection, Onatsky soon came into contact with the Hungarians again. But with others and in different circumstances. From August 24 to September 2, 1933, the Congress of the International Confederation of Students (Confédération internationale des étudiants) took place in Venice, with Ukraine represented by the Central Union of Ukrainian Students (CESUS). In Venice, Onatsky surfaced seemingly unexpectedly.[31] The OUN representative made numerous contacts at the congress in Italy. He also met with the Hungarian delegation. As Konovalets reported: "We had very cordial relations with the Hungarians. The chairman of the Hungarian delegation, d-r Menyhárt, who seemed to be an employee of the ministry for foreign affairs, simply never left my side."[32] In Venice, it was agreed that one Ukrainian student (probably a member of the OUN) would leave to Budapest to hold meetings between Hungary and Ukrainians. The Hungarian side was to release him from university fees and provide other concessions. Everything indicates that the plan never got off the page.

---

[29] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 5 травня 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 188

[30] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 28 липня 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 310.

[31] Lacking people able to communicate freely in foreign languages (while Onatsky was fluent in Italian and Russian and communicative in English and French), CESUS turned to Onatsky to request his involvement. In Italy, the representative of the OUN himself wrote ironically in a letter to the editor of *Svoboda* (a Ukrainian newspaper in the US), Luka Myshuha: "if the vice-president of the Italian government, Mr. Rossoni, a member of the Italian delegation and two officers of the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs could become a student, […] why cannot I too become 15 years younger?"; "Лист Є. Онацького до Л. Мишуги від 25 серпня 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 355.

[32] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 3 вересня 1934 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, pp. 365–366.

In the second half of 1933, a plan to send Onatsky to Hungary appeared. Konovalets asked that for such a trip he should ask for appropriate recommendations from the Italians, and at the same time assured that he would arrange a letter of recommendation from Vasyl Vyshyvany.[33] Because Onatsky repeatedly indicated in the correspondence that before leaving he would have to know "what he would do there",[34] it can be hypothesised that neither PUN nor Konovalets had a precisely worked out strategy for such a trip. After all, Onatsky was not particularly eager to go to Hungary. Although the OUN activist emphasised his readiness to leave, he regularly indicated the riskiness of the venture, the need to receive the most precise of guidance, and his own financial problems.[35] The OUN's plans became more precise in December 1933. At that time Konovalets was in Paris discussing with Vyshyvany the issue of sending to Budapest a delegation that was to be joined by Onatsky and one of the activists of the organisation who dealt with the military – Viktor Kurmanovych. The case was to be announced to the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Vyshyvany was certain that the nationalists would be received by Gyula Gömbös and the foreign minister, Kálmán Kánya.[36] The trip was planned for February, anticipating that by that time the nationalists would have been able to leave Czechoslovakia. Ultimately, neither assumption was implemented. In April 1934, Konovalets returned to the problem of the Ukrainian delegation's trip to Hungary. The OUN leader also asked Onatsky, possibly on the basis of an earlier memorandum sent by the OUN to the Japanese, to arrange a comparable document to be addressed to the Hungarians.[37] Konovalets also asked the political clerk of PUN, Dmytro Andriievsky, for his opinion on what form the planned memorandum should take.[38] The document was probably never created – in any case Onatsky avoided writing it.[39]

---

[33] "Лист Є. Коновальця до Є. Онацького від 14 вересня 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 375. Onatsky replied that he could easily obtain a letter of recommendation from the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs official, Menyhárt, if necessary; "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 25 вересня 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 382 .

[34] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 16 вересня 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 376.

[35] Ibid; "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 5 лютого 1934 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті IV*, p. 32; As a matter of interest, it can be stated that Onatsky even drew attention to the low temperature prevailing in Budapest in winter, which would require him to buy a new coat, as well as the expiring date of the passport, which would require it be renewed. "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 2 січня 1934 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті IV*, p. 4; "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 24 квітня 1934 р.", in: *У вічному місті IV*, p. 97.

[36] "Лист Є. Коновальця до Є. Онацького від 27 грудня 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 483.

[37] "Лист Є. Коновальця до Є. Онацького від 13 квітня 1934 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті IV*, , p. 97.

[38] At the same time, Konovalets did not know whether the memorandum was to be purely informative (as he wrote in a letter to Andriievsky), or was perhaps to address any concrete postulates to the Hungarians (he did not reject this possibility in the above-quoted letter to Onatsky). "Лист

The last time the OUN activists' letters make mention of sending a delegation to Hungary comes from the end of April.[40] Later, we find no references to the topic. From the memoires of Dmytro Andriievsky published after World War II, it can be concluded that the idea was not brought to fruition (probably due to the general deterioration of the OUN's international standing after the attack on Bronisław Pieracki in June 1934). The OUN political consultant described a broad plan for his organisation, which was to rely on using European nations' revisionist movements to serve the Ukrainian cause. Andriievsky believed that there was a plan for Ukrainian military action that would start in the Balkans and expand through Dobrudja to Ukraine, where a war with the USSR would begin. As Andriievsky went on to argue:

> To this end, it was planned to create a Ukrainian corps in the Balkans that was made up of expatriates, but not without the participation of Croatians, Bulgarians and Macedonians. The weapons would be delivered by Italy. The Hungarians, or at least the revisionists, were considered to be an uncertain factor by the author of the plan, due to the claims on Transcarpathia. In order to neutralise the Hungarians, it was planned to send a separate delegation to Budapest.[41]

These plans were to include the idea of organising a conference of nations subjugated to the USSR and then a conference of representatives of nations seeking a revision of the Versailles system. A study of the correspondence between OUN activists shows that virtually all elements of the aforementioned plan were actually discussed by nationalists in 1933–1934. There is no sign, however, that they were part of a broader plan.

On the sidelines of the organisational issue of sending a delegation to Hungary, Onatsky made a lot of comments on the subject of Hungary. In August 1933, during the visit of Prime Minister Gömbös to Rome, the OUN activist noted, not without reason that:

> Apart from Ukraine, there is no more revisionist nation in Europe than Hungary. Even Germans are not as stubborn on this point as the Hungarians, because the Germans admit that they can also live within the territorial boundaries that the Treaty of Versailles left them, and the Hungarians proclaim that Hungary cannot live in such a state at all, and that their current economic situation attests to this fact.[42]

Є. Коновальця до Д. Андрієвського від 14 квітня 1934 р.", in: *Документи і матеріали*, vol. 2, part 2, p. 421.

[39] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 17 квітня 1934 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті IV*, p. 100.

[40] "Лист Є. Коновальця до Д. Андрієвського від 25 квітня 1934 р.", in: *Документи і матеріали*, vol. 2, part 2, p. 424.

[41] Д. Андрієвський, "Міжнародня акція ОУН", in: *Організація Українських Націоналістів 1929–1954*, Париж, 1955, pp. 151–152.

[42] Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 323.

The head of the OUN in Italy showed a lot of understanding for the Hungarian demands, but also wrote in the diary that "we Ukrainians would like more understanding for our national ideal – the unification of all parts of our national territory and our nation."[43] Onatsky was clearly afraid of the powers supporting Hungarian revisionism and at the same time bound certain hopes up in it. Both pushed him to the idea of needing to communicate with Hungary. In November 1933, he wrote to Konovalets:

> I would like to draw your attention to the fact that in England 168 MPs have signed a statement on the need to review the Treaty of Trianon and give Hungary back their territories. With the coming to power of the Labour government led by Henderson (it seems that the matter is already decided), Hungary's chances will increase even more. Italy has long had the idea of a plebiscite on these former Hungarian lands. It is a great danger to us that in the event of a plebiscite, the population of Subcarpathia will vote for Hungary. If it came to a plebiscite without our having previously agreed it with Hungary, it would be necessary to cross these lands off forever. If we come to an agreement with Hungary, these lands can serve as a wonderful, much-needed bridgehead.[44]

Onatsky proposed a double game in the Carpatho-Ruthenian affair. On the one hand, he argued that support for Hungarian revisionism should be declared, with the proviso that the ultimate national statehood of Carpathian Ruthenia would be established in a separate agreement between Hungary and the future Ukrainian State. A representative of the OUN in Italy added that, in conversations with the Hungarians, the local Ruthenian/Ukrainian population should be recognised as part of the Ukrainian nation, which would entail the granting of appropriate linguistic, educational and governmental participation rights in the country (which shows that Onatsky expected that Carpathian Ruthenia would first come under Hungarian rule). Meanwhile, Onatsky also intended to use the game with Budapest to blackmail Czechoslovakia, whose authorities proposed to issue an ultimatum that "either you recognise Subcarpathia as part of ethnic Ukraine with all the consequences thereof, or we will fight for Subcarpathia to be temporarily annexed to Hungary."[45] Onatsky not only wanted to use the menace of Hungarian revisionism as an element of pressure on Prague, but also to use it to internationalise the Carpathian Ruthenia problem.[46] The OUN representative in Italy undoubtedly

---

[43] Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 294.

[44] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 28 листопада 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 439.

[45] "Лист Є. Онацького до Є. Коновальця від 28 листопада 1933 р.", in: Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, p. 439.

[46] In his notes Onatsky referred to a series of lectures that the former Hungarian Prime Minister István Bethlen had given in Great Britain at the end of 1933. From the content of the politician's speeches, it appeared that the Hungarians wanted to annex Hungarian-populated areas to their state. In addition, Transylvania was to be transformed into an independent state and plebiscites were planned for Banat and Baczka, while Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia would

overestimated the possibility of the Ukrainians putting an ultimatum to Prague. Nevertheless, the very strategy of winning Carpathian Ruthenia for the Ukrainian cause on the discrepancies between Czechoslovakia and Hungary appeared to be relatively rational.

The idea of establishing cooperation with Budapest was not popular among OUN activists. The reason for this was quite prosaic: the OUN's growing closer to Hungary would not be warmly received in Prague. Czechoslovakia, which in rhetoric was often referred to by the Ukrainian nationalists as "the occupier"[47] of Carpathian Ruthenia in fact allowed the OUN to operate quite broadly along the Vltava (until 1934). In Czechoslovakia there were five branches of the OUN (in Prague, Brno, Poděbrady, Liberec and Příbram).[48] In the Czech capital the official publication of PUN, *Rozbudova Natsii* was issued, and *Surma*, the official periodical of the Ukrainian Military Organisation was also edited there. Prague was also the seat of the propaganda office headed by the secretary of the OUN, Volodymyr ets. While the plans to establish close relations with high-ranking Hungarian politicians remained on paper, the relations between Ukrainian nationalists and the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs were real. In June 1928, Mykola Stsiborski met with Edvard Beneš's deputy, Kamil Krofta.[49] In May 1930, the same activist reported to Konovalets: "the [political] office maintains permanent links with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which can be characterised as a loyal and unofficial friendship".[50] During the OUN's Prague conference in July 1932, D. Andriievsky expressed concern about Hungarian revisionism and proposed a consistent alignment with Prague:

> We have to be very watchful of the Czech area and not neglect our positions there. This is important for us politically, diplomatically and militarily. For now, the issue of Carpathian

gain autonomy. Onatsky commented on these postulates as follows: "For us, the Hungarians' propaganda is important, in that it also raises the issue of full autonomy for the Ukrainians of Subcarpathia, while Count Bethlen explained at one of his lectures that after reaching full autonomy, the Ukrainians would decide for themselves which countries would join. In this way, the matter of Subcarpathian Ukraine has been brought to the attention of all the countries of the world, and Ukrainian patriots should now make efforts to resolve it in accordance with the interests of the Ukrainian people". Є. Онацький, *У вічному місті III*, pp. 474–475.

[47] "Листівка ОУН [1931 р.]", in: *Документи і матеріали з історії Організації Українських Націоналістів*, vol. 2, part 1, ed. Ю. Черченко, Київ, 2010, p. 169; "Лист від провідних діячів ОУН до Управи Української стрілецької громади від 30 грудня 1932 р.", in: *Документи і матеріали…*, vol. 2, part 1, p. 266.

[48] "Звіт М. Сціборського голові Проводу українських націоналістів про діяльність Проводу за час від 15 квітня по 30 травня 1930 р.", in: *Документи і матеріали*, vol. 1, p. 321

[49] "Лист Є. Коновальця до Д. Андрієвського від 6 червня 1928 р.", in: *Документи і матеріали…*, vol. 2, part 2, p. 90; Information about Stsiborski's contacts in the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs is also found in the memoirs of Oleksy Boykiv, О. Бойків, "Моя співпраця з полковником", in: *Євген Коновалець та його доба*, Мюнхен, 1974, p. 629.

[50] "Звіт М. Сціборського голові Проводу українських націоналістів про діяльність Проводу за час від 15 квітня по 30 травня 1930 р.", in: *Документи і матеріали*, vol. 1, p. 322.

> Ruthenia can and must be used as a force for *rapprochement*, not struggle. The appetite of the Hungarians for that region is equally dangerous for both the Czechs and us.[51]

OUN activists in Carpathian Ruthenia (OUN Zakarpatta, OUN Z), which from 1932 were divided into legal and illegal sectors, approached the issue of relations with Hungary in a similar way at that time.[52] In December 1933, the first issue of the monthly *Probojem* published an article with the eloquent title of "Schoby bulo yasno" ("To make it clear"). Its author was Stefan Rosokha, head of the legal sector of OUN Z and also the monthly's editor-in-chief. Thus, the article was actually a manifesto of sorts. The nationalist activist declared a growth in revisionist tendencies on the international arena and the activation of pro-Hungarian activities among Magyarons in Carpathian Ruthenia. Rosocha was anxious about these phenomena. In relation to them, he declared: "Magyaron revisionist action threatens the state as it threatens the Ukrainian people in Subcarpathia. Every Ukrainian knows that Subcarpathia can only stay within the boundaries of the Czechoslovak Republic".[53] Rosocha criticised the attitude of the Czechoslovak authorities towards the Ukrainian movement and called for opposition to Russophiles, whom he identified with Hungarian propaganda:

> Czech politicians and Czech government offices must once [and for all] understand that the danger is not where they are looking for it, but on the opposite side. They should clean out the administrative apparatus of the Subcarpathian region, sweep away everything dirty and make it healthy again […] Czech government offices should stop supporting the Russophile movement and leave it to its own fate.[54]

Criticism of Hungarian revisionism and the activities of ethnic Hungarians was also to be heard in the demands of the Second Nationalist Youth Congress that was convened by the underground sector of the OUN Z, and which took place on 1 July 1934 in Mukachevo.[55] The attitude of nationalists from Carpathian Ruthenia to Hungary and Czechoslovakia was not devoid of a certain populism.

---

[51] Д. Андрієвський, *Міжнародні в'язання і Україна*, NA, z. RUESO, karton 13, svazek 3, strana 102.

[52] The OUN Z had in fact been in operation in Carpathian Ruthenia since the late 1920s. The importance of nationalists had been small until 1938. The OUN considered Russophile circles to be its main opponent, as was expressed in the unsuccessful attempt carried out by Fedir Tatsynts on the life of Yevmentii Sabov, the chairman of the Duchnovych Society, on 1 June 1930. The activities of the OUN Z were renewed two years later, and the organisation was divided into a legal section (Stepan Rosokha) and an clandestine one (Yulian Khymynets). The certainty of the above findings is debatable, because the existing studies are largely based on the memories of the nationalists themselves, О. Пагіря, М. Посівнич, "Воєнно-політична діяльність ОУН у Закарпатті (1929–1939)", *Український визвольний рух*, 13 (2009), pp. 45–55.

[53] С. Росоха, "Щоби було ясно", *Пробоєм*, 1 (1933), pp. 2–3.

[54] Ibid., p. 4.

[55] "Другому зїзду народовецької молоді в Мукачові", *Пробоєм*, 7 (1934), p. 101.

One example of this was given by Rosocha, who threatened revisionism on the one hand, and on the other criticised Prague for introducing trade restrictions against Budapest in the field of agricultural goods. This regulation was intended to deprive the Ukrainian population of the Prešov region of the possibility of selling timber in Hungary and to contribute to its impoverishment.[56]

Ideas of tactical cooperation with Czechoslovakia dominated the political thinking of the OUN in the first half of the 1930s. The emergence of a different stance that assumed cooperation with Hungary was only possible once there appeared the threat that OUN activity in Czechoslovakia would be liquidated.[57] Nor does it seem to have been by chance that these ideas rang particularly loudly in Rome, where Hungary had a stronger position than in other European capitals.

The issue of relations with Hungary was also considered by OUN activists in the second half of the 1930s. In a 1937 work, *For the teeth and claws of the nation*, Volodymyr Martynets believed that the OUN did not consider Hungary or the Hungarians in terms of ally-or-enemy. The activist criticised the Ukrainians for their inability to assimilate, compared to representatives of other nationalities living on the Dnieper and Dniester. According to Martynets, the Hungarians were an example of an effective policy in this area:

> Do you remember Christ's parable of the judiciousness of the man who, having lost one lost sheep, left the 99 other sheep in the desert? Or that they welcome one repentant sinner into heaven with far greater joy than they do 99 righteous people who need no repentance? With that same joy ethnic Hungarians welcomed every neophyte. And not only did they welcome him at first: not only did they not disdain or avoid him, nor look [on him] as a stray, but they constantly showed him favour, giving him preference over the 'ninety-nine righteous' ethnic Hungarians, advancing him to positions of prominence, including up to prime ministers and supreme military commanders. Please look through the names of the greatest Hungarian politicians, commanders, etc. of the last 100 years, and you will encounter many Slovakian names among them.[58]

This admiration for the Hungarians did not mean that the OUN activist would prefer that after the First World War Carpathian Ruthenia had remained under

---

[56] С. Росоха, "Кроваве повстання", *Пробоєм*, 3–4 (1935), pp. 29–33.

[57] Although the Polish-Czechoslovak *rapprochement* proved to be short-lived, it enabled the intensification of military cooperation, which significantly contributed to the liquidation of the Czechoslovak arm of the OUN. The cooperation that had existed since 1928 between Poland and Czechoslovakia in exchanging military information on Germany was extended in February 1933 to issues of Ukrainian emigration. The Polish and Czechoslovak intelligence services should be linked first to searches carried out in October 1933 in apartments of OUN activists in Czechoslovakia, and then the liquidation of the Czechoslovak arm of OUN after the murder of Bronisław Pieracki (15 June 1934) in September 1934, cf. В. Муравський, "Документи Міністерства закордонних справ Чехословаччин про так званий 'Архів Сеника'", *Український визвольний рух*, 6 (2006), pp. 5–29.

[58] В. Мартинець, *За зуби й пазурі нації*, Париж, 1937, p. 54.

Hungarian rule. On the contrary, Hungarisation was in his view far more dangerous than Czechisation. He made this view clear in his memoirs published in 1949:

> It cannot be denied: it is better that Carpathian Ruthenia went to Czechoslovakia than it be in Poland, Romania or Hungary, let alone Sowdepia. Moreover, in Carpathian Ruthenia there was at that time not so much a Czech danger as a Hungarian danger, so widespread were the cultural and political influences of Hungary there. Is it not significant that after ten years of belonging to Czechoslovakia, students at the Ukrainian gymnasium in Uzhgorod spoke only Hungarian!?[59]

At the end of the 1930s, Carpathian Ruthenia began to play an increasingly important role in the political activity of the OUN, which was associated with the Third Reich raising the issue of Sudeten Germans, and thus also a re-emergence of the problem of other national minorities in Czechoslovakia. In November 1937, Konovalets convened a PUN conference in Munich on the future policy for Carpathian Ruthenia. A few months later, in February 1938, the leader of the OUN proposed the creation of a separate policy headquarters in Carpathian Ruthenia, which eventually included Richard Yary (head, foreign policy), Yaroslav Baranovsky (internal affairs) and Orest Chemerynsky (information and press). Military issues were not in the staff's remit, but remained the prerogative of the military management of the OUN directed by Mykola Kapustiansky (in which Carpathian Ruthenia affairs were handled by Mykhailo Kolodzinsky).[60] Together with these initiatives by the Ukrainian nationalists one should add the efforts of the PUN military offices in Paris in publishing a booklet on Carpathian Ruthenia authored by Chemerynsky.[61] This young activist in the OUN press office in Berlin considered it to be of crucial importance for the Ukrainian issue in Carpathian Ruthenia that the creation of a Hungarian–Polish border should be prevented. To prevent this, the Ukrainians of Carpathian Ruthenia should, according to Chemerynsky, stand together with the Slovaks and Sudeten Germans in a united anti-Czech front. This pressure on Prague would lead to the implementation of the "Carpatho-Ruthenian idea", which was supposed to consist in the division of the single Czechoslovak state into three separate countries: the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Carpatho-Ruthenian Ukraine (the latter would at some unspecified

---

[59] Id., *Українське підпілля. Від УВО до ОУН. Спогади й матеріали до передісторії та історії українського організованого націоналізму*, Вінніпег 1949, pp. 277–278.

[60] В. Стахів, "Почалося в Ужгороді, а закінчилося в Мармароському Сиготі", *Вісті братства кол. вояків 1 УД УНА*, 11–12 (1954), p. 7.

[61] A number of scholarly studies mention the existence of a German-language translation of the booklet (О. Паіря, М. Посівнич, *Воєнно-політична діяльність*, pp. 51–52.). These claims are not entirely reliable. The nationalists actually published the work *Karpaten Ukraine* (*Ukrainian Carpathia*), but it was a collection of articles edited by Chemerynski (one of the authors was Kolodzinsky); В. Стахів, *Почалося в Ужгороді*, nos. 11–12, p. 7; М. Капустянський, "Військова підготовка ОУН", in: *Організація Українських Націоналістів*, pp. 131–132.

time unite with an independent Ukrainian state). Territories in Czechoslovakia inhabited by a Hungarian minority were to pass under the rule of Budapest. In turn, Czemerynski made the transfer of Cieszyn Silesia to Poland dependent on … joining Eastern Galicia, Volyn, Chełmszczyzna, Polesie and Podlasie to Carpatho-Ruthenian Ukraine. This vision was to be realised by obtaining guarantees of independence for the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Carpatho-Ruthenian Ukraine from Great Britain, Germany and Italy. Chemerynsky also predicted that the territories inhabited by Sudeten Germans would be annexed to the Third Reich, although this fact was to be carried out independently of the implementation of the "Carpatho-Ruthenian idea".[62] Chemererynski's book was foundational to PUN's *Platforma Zakarpattia* (*Platform of Transcarpathia*), which was created in the summer of 1938 and consisted of ten points. This document was intended as a specific plan of action for nationalists in the region.[63]

Mychajlo Kolodzinsky devoted some attention to the problems of Ukrainian–Hungarian relations in *Voienna doktryna ukraiinskykh nacionalistiv* (*The War doctrine of Ukrainian nationalists*). The activist described the prospects for Ukrainian–Hungarian relations after Ukraine gained statehood and status as a political power. Kolodzinsky regarded Hungary as an aggressive and militant neighbour, but dangerous to Ukraine only in the event that it allied itself with other states. However, in the event of a conflict between the two sides, the OUN activist saw favourable prospects for Ukraine. According to Kolodzinsky, even if the Ukrainian army suffered defeat in Carpathian Ruthenia, the previously created chain of fortifications would stop the Hungarians at the line of the Carpathians.[64] In turn, if the situation on the front turned in favour of Ukraine, its armed forces would have an open road to Budapest. Kolodzinsky also described the course of a future Ukrainian–Hungarian border. The activist sketched it on the basis of geostrategic arguments, which largely coincided with ethnographic postulates (which he borrowed from the nationalising geographers Stepan Rudnytsky and Volodymyr Kubiiovych).[65] Kolodzinsky was concerned with controlling the railway line running from Košice through Chop and Velykyi Bychkiv to Borșa. As a result, some of the Hungarian areas (probably including Berehove) would remain on the other side of the

---

[62] Я. Оршан [О. Чемеринський], *Закарпаття*, Париж, 1938 pp. 26–27.

[63] О. Пагіря, М. Посівнич, *Воєнно-політична діяльність*, p. 52.

[64] М. Колодзінський, *Воєнна доктрина українських націоналістів*, АОУН, no. 1, op. 2, s. 466, ark. 53. As he explicated in another text: "In strategic terms, Carpathian Ruthenia would be invaluable for the defense system of the Ukrainian state. The Carpathians are our Maginot line, behind which we will be able to prepare ourselves to defend our country and to expand our cultural and economic life. A strongly fortified Carpathian range will be able to stop an enemy invasion from both the south and the west". Бурун [М. Колодзінський], "Воєнне значення і стратеґічне положення Закарпаття", in: *Війна і техніка. Воєнно-науковий збірник*, Париж, 1938, p. 45.

[65] Cf. С. Рудницький, *Наш рідний край*, Львів, 1921, pp. 11–12; В. Кубійович, *Територія і людність українських земель*, Львів, 1935, p. 15.

border. The OUN military theoretician was not consistent. In the article *Voienne znachennia i strategichne polozhennia Zakarpattia* (*The Wartime Significance and Strategic Location of Transcarpathia*), he described the course of the border on the Hungarian section slightly differently. It was to run along the Michalovce–Prešov–Berehove–Sighetu Marmației line. Although Kolodzinsky's views on this issue lacked precision, it should be stated that he allowed that areas of Carpathian Ruthenia might be ceded to the Hungarians where they were ethnically dominant.[66]

The theoretical plans of the nationalists were soon to face a brutal reality. The decisions of the Munich conference that transferred the areas inhabited by Sudeten Germans to the Third Reich brought with them an avalanche of events. On 30 September 1938, on the premise of ethnicity, Poland demanded the return of Zaolzie by Czechoslovakia. Prague accepted the ultimatum, and two days later the Polish Army took the disputed territory. In the following days, the First Czechoslovak Republic ceased to exist, and in its place was a Czecho-Slovakian federation consisting of Czechia, Slovakia, and Carpathian Ruthenia. The new state was soon to experience a new shock. On 2 November 1938, as a result of the decision of Germany and Italy brought about by Vienna arbitration, Hungary received southern parts of Slovakia with Košice, and Carpathian Ruthenia with Uzhgorod, Mukachevo and Berehove (the capital of the autonomy was transferred to Khust). In the latter region, Hungarian gains exceeded the boundary line sketched by Rudnytski and Kubiyovych to which OUN activists had adhered.

The autonomous Carpathian Ruthenia was formally established on 11 October 1938. The Autonomy of Carpathian Ruthenia came into being as the implementation of the aspirations of Russophile and Ukrainophile communities remaining in a tactical alliance. The head of the autonomous government was the Russophile Andriy Brodiy, and its members included Ivan Pieshchak, Stefan Fentsik, Edmund Bachynsky (Russophiles), and Avhustyn Voloshyn and Yulian Revay (Ukrainophiles).[67] This situational alliance quickly disintegrated. The Russophile community did not have a clear plan of action, and Brody and Fentsik were being financially subsidised by the Hungarians. The prime minister in fact aimed to conduct a plebiscite in Carpathian Ruthenia, convinced that the result would go as Budapest thought. Years later, under Soviet interrogation, he confessed that he was in favour of a plebiscite to prevent the division of Carpathian Ruthenia along ethnic lines.[68] Brody was dismissed and arrested by the Czechs on 26 October 1938, on the basis of documents provided by Ukrainians to the authorities in Prague

---

[66] Бурун [М. Колодзінський], *Воєнне значення і стратеґічне положення Закарпаття*, p. 45.

[67] M. Jarnecki, P. Kołakowski, *"Ukraiński Piemont". Ruś Zakarpacka w okresie autonomii*, Warszawa, 2017, pp. 130–133.

[68] All of Carpathian Ruthenia under Hungarian rule seemed to Brody a better solution than an autonomy deprived of the largest urban centres, most industry and transport routes, which were located in the Tisza Valley, with its mainly Hungarian population, M. Jarnecki, P. Kołakowski, *"Ukraiński Piemont"*, pp. 154–156.

that testified to his espionage activities. Fentsik fled to Budapest. The leadership of a new Ukraine-oriented government was assumed by Voloshyn, and ministerial functions were taken by Revay and Bachynsky. The new government made the administration and education Ukrainian and closed many Russophile press publications.[69] Political parties were liquidated, and in their place the Ukrainian National Union (UNO) was established in January 1939. In far-from-democratic elections to the parliament (*Sojm*), this group of "national unity" in February 1939 received 92.4% of the votes.[70] The armed forces of the autonomous region were a paramilitary created on 9 November 1938 – the National Defense Organisation, "The Carpathian Sich" (ONOKS), headed by Dmytro Klympush and Ivan Roman.[71] The authorities of autonomy had no authority to conduct a foreign policy. In reality, however, they attempted to. Carpathian Ukraine maintained good relations with Romania, but in fact Berlin was the main point of reference for Khust.[72]

The process of creating a Ukrainian autonomy actively entailed émigrés from Czecho-Slovakia and the diaspora from across the America. Many Ukrainians living in the Second Polish Republic decided to cross the border in the Carpathians illegally, purely to take part in creating the "Ukrainian Piedmont". According to Michał Jarnecki and Piotr Kołakowski, the number of these latter is cautiously estimated at 1,200 to 1,500.[73] Roman Wysocki gives a higher number of 2,000.[74] Among them were numerous OUN activists, i.a. Roman Shuchevych, Zenon Kossak, Yevhen Stakhiv, Yevhen Vretsiona.[75] Others, more important nationalists like Kolodzinsky, or head of the PUN cultural office, Oleh Olzhych, were sent to Carpathian Ruthenia directly upon their return from emigration. Nationalists primarily left their mark in shaping ONOKS. Kolodzinsky became the head of the general staff of ONOKS, and Kossak and Shuchevych became his assistants.[76] The influence of the OUN on the formation of the ideological face of the autonomous region cannot be ignored. The influence of nationalist ideology betrayed the programme of the Ukrainian National Union (the slogan "Ukraine above all!"), And especially the ONOKS press body *Nastup*.[77] Nationalists treated the autonomy as a "stepping stone" towards the greater purpose of creating a Great Ukraine (Independent United Ukrainian State). A utilitarian attitude towards autonomy was certainly more typical of Galicians. But Carpatho-Ruthenian nationalists were

---

[69] Ibid., pp. 154–156.
[70] Ibid., p. 211.
[71] Ibid., pp. 165–165.
[72] Ibid., pp. 194–199.
[73] Ibid., p. 191.
[74] R. Wysocki, *Organizacja Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów w Polsce w latach 1929–1939*, Lublin, 2003, p. 390.
[75] Ibid., p. 391; M. Jarnecki, P. Kołakowski, *"Ukraiński Piemont"*, pp. 164–165.
[76] П. Мірчук, *Нарис історії Організації Українських Націоналістів*, Мюнхен–Лондон–Ню-Йорк, 1968, p. 553.
[77] M. Jarnecki, P. Kołakowski, *"Ukraiński Piemont"*, p. 160.

also becoming radicalised. Hopes about the role that was to fall to Carpathian Ruthenia were well synthesised by the OUN Z's statement of August 1938. It had nothing in common with Rosocha's claims of loyalty of nearly five years previously:

> A great time is coming! Carpathian Ruthenia must become the embryo of one Independent Ukrainian State from Poprad and the Tatra Mountains to the Caspian Sea and the Caucasus! We will be proud that we will be the first to start rebuilding the Ukrainian state. That we will help our brothers to throw off the yokes of Moscow, Poland and Romania. Only the unity of the nation, great faith in our own strength and faith that God has appointed us to lead our people to Freedom will help us in this reconstruction![78]

One of the leading Carpatho-Ruthenian nationalists, Ivan Rohach saw the creation of autonomy as the first stage in the construction of a Ukrainian empire that would be created with the help of the Third Reich.[79] Others wanted "only" to be a political power operating in concert with other powers.[80] In the OUN circles at the time, a popular saying was "It began in Uzhhorod, it will end in Kiev".[81] It should be noted, however, that these maximalist plans were not shared by some political activists in Carpathian Ruthenia.

The above dreams of Ukrainian nationalists and part of the Carpatho-Ruthenian elite under their influence were completely contrary to Hungarian plans. Budapest, however, was not so much afraid of expanding the Ukrainian issue beyond Carpathian Ruthenia (which disturbed Poland), as seeking to restore its historic heritage. Wishing to regain pre-Trianon borders, the Hungarians sought to eliminate Carpatho-Ruthenian autonomy. The implementation of this goal was two-fold. At the diplomatic level, there was lobbying, primarily in Berlin. In January 1939, Minister of Foreign Affairs Istvan Csáky went to Berlin, where he was received by Hitler, which broke a certain cooling in relations. An alliance with Italy was cultivated, as seen in the visit of Galeazzo Ciano to Budapest in December 1938. Rome expressed support for Hungarian aspirations; Berlin was more restrained. The Hungarians also probed reactions in Paris and London to a possible reclaiming of Carpathian Ruthenia.[82] At the same time, actions aimed at the region itself were undertaken. The situation was dynamic. Initially, when Czech–Slovak–Hungarian talks were held on 9–13 March 1938 in Komarno to discuss the course of the border on its Slovak and Carpatho-Ruthenian sections (with the participation of the Ruthenian representative, Bachynsky), Hungary

---

[78] М. Посівнич, "Закарпаття у концепціях ОУН у 1937–1938 рр.", *Дрогобицький Краєзнавчий збірник*, 2 (2015), p. 176

[79] "Свято соборности в Хусті", *Наступ*, 5 (1939), p. 1.

[80] "'Карпатська Січ' і сучасне політичне положення (Реферат виголошений на II зїзді ОНОКС)", Наступ, 11–12 (1939), p. 3.

[81] В. Стахів, "Почалося в Ужгороді, а закінчилося в Мармароському Сиготі", *Вісті братства кол. вояків 1 УД* УНА, 1–2 (1955), p. 6.

[82] M. Jarnecki, P. Kołakowski, *"Ukraiński Piemont"*, pp. 184–185.

began moving diversionary groups across the border. These actions lasted until November 20, when they were stopped by pressure from Berlin.[83] After this date, propaganda and disinformation activities were intensified. Thousands of leaflets against the autonomous authorities were distributed. Disinformation was used; although Brody's office had been dismissed, espionage was still used.[84]

The OUN tried to counteract Hungarian policy on both the political and the military level. Here, on the one hand, there were diplomatic activities in the delegations of various countries, and on the other, members of the organisation participated in expanding paramilitary army structures capable of opposing Hungarian saboteurs in Carpathian Ruthenia. This article focuses on the first aspect of the problem.[85]

The main place where the OUN tried to counteract Hungarian policies in Carpathian Ruthenia was Berlin, where the OUN representation operated under the name of the Ukrainian Press Service (UPS). The UPS office was led by Volodymyr Stakhiv, and Ivan Gabrusevych, Bohdan Kordiuk and Orest Chemerynski were involved in his work.[86] According to the very detailed though not unbiased memoirs of Stakhiv himself, the UPS had the appearance of an unofficial representative of Carpathian Ukraine that had been set up in talks between the PUN and Prime Minister Voloshyn. During their stay in Khust in November to December of 1938, Stakhiv, Kordiuk and Chererynski were to receive guidelines for their activities from the milieu of Voloshyn, Homeland Executive of the OUN, and the Central Headquarters of the Carpathian Sich. The Minister of Economic Affairs, Yulian Revai, initially opposed cooperation with the nationalists.[87] Whether this was the case in reality is difficult to say unequivocally. One argument in favour of such an interpretation is the fact that in July 21, 1939 in Venice a cooperation agreement was signed between the PUN and the Voloshyn government.[88] It is difficult, however, to consider this argument as conclusive.

In Berlin, there was a group of German politicians sympathetic to the Ukrainian cause, among whom Stakhiv mentioned, i.a.: a clerk at the foreign affairs office of the NSDAP, Peter Kleist; head of the eastern department of Auswärtiges Amt (the Federal Foreign Office), Martin Schliep; and, above all, former Polish MP, Kurt Graebe. The political circles of the Wehrmacht Supreme Command, with Admiral Wilhelm Canaris at the fore, also had a positive attitude towards the Ukrainian issue.[89]

---

[83] Ibid., pp. 184–185; For more detail cf. О. Пагіря, "'Гібридна війна' Угорщини та Польщі проти Карпатської України, *Український визвольний рух*, 21 (2009), pp. 292–323.

[84] Ibid., pp. 186–188.

[85] Discussing the military aspect would require the entire history of ONOKS's formation to be presented, which is impossible in a single article.

[86] В. Стахів, "Почалося в Ужгороді, а закінчилося в Мармароському Сиготі", *Вісті братства кол. вояків 1 УД УНА*, 11–12 (1954), p. 6.

[87] Ibid.

[88] П. Мірчук, *Нарис історії*, p. 561.

[89] Ibid.

Most often the meetings held by OUN activists in Berlin essentially involved receiving information about prevailing moods in the German power elite. If one were to believe Stakhiv, in December 1939 he received information from Kleist that the invitation of Minister Revay to Berlin for talks on economic cooperation was a political demonstration directed against Warsaw and Budapest.[90] Then, on March 9, 1939, Kleist informed Stakhiv that Hitler had decided to hand over Carpathian Ukraine to the Hungarians.[91]

Sometimes OUN activists tried to play intermediary between Germany and the state and military structures of Carpathian Ukraine. An example of this was the planned visit of an ONOKS delegation presided by Dmytro Klympush in Berlin in January 1939. The delegation was to become acquainted with the work of the *Hitlerjugend* and educational institutions, and to learn about the activities and organisation of the *Sturmabteilung* (SA) and the organisation for civic and military indoctrination of youth, the *Arbeitsdienst*.[92] The visit by the Ukrainian delegation was planned by the Germans and was a means to counteract Hungarian (and Polish) diplomacy in the capital of the Third Reich. OUN activists were among those to implement this plan. Stakhiv was to become the delegation's advisor for political affairs, and Kolodzinsky for military affairs. The delegation's subsequent history reveals the weakness of the OUN's position and, more broadly, of Carpathian Ukraine in the face of Hungary's position. When the Ukrainians were in Vienna they received information about the visit of the head of Hungarian diplomacy, Csáky, to Berlin. The delegation stopped in the city on the Danube, waiting for the situation to develop further. On 17 January 1939 the Ukrainians received a notification: "The Sich delegation must immediately return to Khust; otherwise it will be taken under political protection to Bratislava".[93] The information on the presence of Ukrainians on the Danube is said to have been provided by the Berlin newspaper *Die Berzen Zeitung*. The remainder of the memoirs is probably a confabulation by Stakhiv in an attempt years later to transform the diplomatic defeat into a moderate OUN success: "Later, interested German activists told us that Hitler went into a rage when Ribbentrop showed him this small excerpt from the newspaper, stuck on a sheet of paper and roughly circled in red with a pencil".[94] Regardless of Hitler's reaction, the OUN's failure was evident. Frustrated, Kolodzinsky was said to have declared:

> The problem of Carpathian Ruthenia has shifted from the diplomatic and political plane to the military plane. Mek [the pseudonym for Volodymyr Stakhiv – M.W.], tell the respected politicians of the PUN: now, it is not memoranda and deliberations that will decide, but

[90] В. Стахів, *Почалося в Ужгороді*, 1955, nos. 1–2, p. 8.
[91] Ibid., nos. 7–8, p. 17.
[92] Ibid., nos. 3–4, p. 8.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Ibid., pp. 8–9.

> weapons. We must fight for Carpathian Ruthenia by arms. I must be in Khust. If they do not let me, I will go against their will on my own. You gentlemen, politicians, hide your papers and files. Now, the soldiers will speak.[95]

Kolodzinsky's thesis that it was possible to use weapons as a potential or real measure to counteract Hungarian politics was a truism. The problem was that the Carpathian Sich had no arms. A certain symbol of the OUN's helplessness was a visit to Carpathian Ruthenia by PUN members in November 1938, during which ONOKS received 10 pistols, 2 automatic machines and 3 shotguns. Therefore, attempts were also made to get weapons from the Germans. The first attempt to obtain arms was made by the head of the Sich and HE OUN staff and training department Hryhorii Barabash "Chornyi". The efforts in both Breslau and in Berlin ended in fiasco.[96] Barabash worked on his own without the agreement of the PUN. In mid-February, the deputy commander of the Carpathian Sich and OUN sympathiser Ivan Roman made a similar mission. He also failed to achieve anything substantial.[97]

The OUN also tried to take political action in Vienna, where, on September 29, 1938, the OUN Z activist Yulian Khymynets created the Foreign Delegation of Carpathian Ukraine at the recommendation of the PUN. The delegation included political activists from Carpathian Ruthenia and Ukrainian *émigrés* from North America.[98] A press department was set up alongside the delegation, which informed foreigners about Carpatho-Ruthenian matters in various languages. On 9 and 10 October, the delegation sent telegrams to Germany, Italy, France and the United Kingdom in which it highlighted the Hungarian threat, and asked for a peace mission to Carpathian Ruthenia and to allow Ukrainians to form military units in those countries.[99] A week later, on 16 October, the delegation sent a memorandum on the self-determination of Carpathian Ruthenia to Hitler, the head of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Joachim von Ribbentrop, and the political elite of Germany. It contained criticism of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland, and postulated independence for a future Ukrainian state along the Carpathians with guarantees from the existing powers.[100] The last manifestation of the delegation's activity was the protest against the second Vienna arbitration:

> The Carpathian Ukraine delegation has most regretfully learned of the decision of the commission regarding the borders of Carpathian Ukraine in Vienna on 2 November 1938.

---

[95] Ibid., p. 9.

[96] В. Стахів, *Почалося в Ужгороді*, 1955, nos. 7–8, pp. 14–15.

[97] Ibid., p. 15.

[98] They were Yevhen Skochko; director of the Ukrainian Press Service in New York, Yurii Habovda of Detroit; the deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Diplomatic Youth in America, professor Mykola Benio; member of the Provod of the Carpathian Ruthenia Defense Committee and OUN Z activist Ivan Rohach, Ю. Химинець, *Мої спостереження із Закарпаття*, Ню-Йорк, 1984, pp. 60–61.

[99] Ibid., pp. 65–66.

[100] Ibid., p. 66.

> We believe that giving Uzhhorod and Mukachevo with their Ukrainian surroundings to Hungary […] does not correspond to the ethnographic principles that have been at the basis of the policy that was to be initiated after the Munich Conference.[101]

Immediately after this declaration was made, the delegation was dissolved. Unfortunately, we do not know the result of the lobbying by Khymynets and his collaborators. It seems, however, that the over-stated postulates did not correspond to political reality and thus the role of the delegation turned out to be negligible.

Within the modest possibilities open to them, the OUN activists tried to interest other countries in the matter of Carpathian Ruthenia. The OUN's activities were typically aimed at lobbying or sounding out. In September 1938, Stakhiv was instructed to "sound out the Berlin embassy about the attitude of British diplomacy to the Carpatho-Ruthenian matter and the revisionist wishes of Hungary".[102] In late September to early October, the head of the UPS met with the secretary of the British embassy Ivone Kirkpatrick and the British Attaché Noel Mason-MacFarlan. Both British politicians persuaded Stakhiv that Carpathian Ruthenia was not threatened by Hungarian revisionism, and that Budapest could only count on a small correction of the border based on the ethnographic principle.[103] In October 1938 in the diplomatic missions of Japan and Lithuania in Berlin, Kolodzinsky and Khymynets filed memoranda asking for support for the Ukrainian cause in Carpathian Ruthenia.[104] Diplomatic activity for Carpathian Ukraine was conducted by OUN members in other capitals. In London, Stepan Davydovych was active, and Yevhen Onatsky in Rome.[105] The result of the latter's activity was the appointment of a Ukrainian sympathiser, Insabato, to the position of consul in Khust.[106] However, it is difficult to suppose that in Rome, where Hungarian positions were traditionally strong, Ukrainian nationalists managed to achieve greater success.

Some information about the OUN attitude towards Hungary between October 1938 and March 1939 is provided by the press associated with the organisation. The Paris weekly *Ukraiinske Slovo* (*The Ukrainian Word*), formally published by the Ukrainian National Association in France but actually controlled by the OUN, wrote in January 1939:

> Only recently, as part of the Ukrainian lands fell under the Hungarian yoke, the press immediately reported whole columns of news of Hungarian abuses of the Ukrainian population […] This sad fate, which there has not yet been the strength to resist, has again

---

[101] Ibid., pp. 73–74.
[102] В. Стахів, *Почалося в Ужгороді*, 1955, nos. 5–6, p. 9.
[103] Ibid., pp. 9–10.
[104] Ю. Химинець, *Мої спостереження…*, pp. 72–73.
[105] Ю. Боржава, *Від Угорської Русі до Карпатської України*, Филаделфія, 1956, p. 46.
[106] М. Посівнич, *Воєнно-політична діяльність ОУН у 1929–1939 роках*, Львів, 2010, pp. 195–196.

> given part of the Ukrainian population over to the animalised Hungarians, on whose hands the blood they shed for centuries, and especially during the World War, has not dried.[107]

This new opening of a hostile tone towards Hungary was novel in comparison with before the first Vienna arbitration. The current political situation was analyzed in the pages of the *Ukrainske Slovo*. Ukrainian nationalists claimed that the threat of autonomy being liquidated by joint Hungarian–Polish actions was still real. It was claimed that this would happen via the establishment of an independent Slovak state, which would be under the influence of Warsaw and Budapest. Therefore, if Slovakia were to declare independence, Carpathian Ukraine would first have to declare independence and then demand guarantees of independence from Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy.[108]

On 14 March 1939, with the consent of the Germans, the Hungarian army crossed the Czechoslovak border, and then smashed the weak Ukrainian troops of the Carpathian Sich and within a few days had occupied the entire territory of Carpathian Ukraine (the declaration of independence by its authorities was of purely propaganda value). Supremacy over the territory was accompanied by numerous abuses. Myths devoted to the events at the Veretsky Pass were particularly numerous; there, Hungarians and Poles were said to have committed crimes against 600 members of the Carpathian Sich (there is no documentation supporting this). By July 1,200 Ukrainians had been detained in the Varjúlapos camp near Nyíregyháza.[109] According to data from the Hungarian Ministry of Internal Affairs, from March to December 1939, some 4,500 residents of Carpathian Ruthenia were repressed.[110] The progress of the Ukrainian national movement from the times of Czechoslovakia was undone. Last but not least, while Carpathian Ukraine was occupied many OUN activists were taken prisoner (usually for a short term), but Kolodzinsky and Kossak were shot.[111]

In the face of information about Hungarian aggression, the OUN activists tried to inform the world press that the government of Carpathian Ukraine was asking the Germans for military protection of the new state.[112] These actions were intended to make the UPS a target of attack by the German-language daily *Pester*

---

[107] "Мадярщина ще один кат українського народу", *Українське слово*, 290 (1939), p. 2.

[108] "Карпатській Украині ще все грозять небезпеки!", *Украинске слово*, 289 (1939), p. 1.

[109] Р. Офіцинський, *Окупація та анексія Карпатської України*, in: *Закарпаття 1919–2009 років (україномовний варіант українсько-угорського видання)*, eds. М. Вегеш, Ч. Фединець, Ужгород, 2010, p. 195.

[110] In addition to Ukrainian national movement activists, there were also communist activists in this number, О. Пагіря, *Між війною та миром. Відносини між ОУН і УПА та збройними силами Угорщини 1939–1945*, p. 29.

[111] М. Відейко, С. Кот, *Невідома Україна. Наукова спадщина Олега Ольжича,* Київ, 2008, p. 170–171 ; В. Яшан, "Полковник Михайло Колодзінський", *Сурмач*, 3–4 (1979), p. 27.

[112] В. Стахів, *Почалося в Ужгороді*, 1955, nos. 9–10, p. 9; M. Jarnecki, P. Kołakowski, "*Ukraiński Piemont*", p. 311.

Lloyd – an organ of the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs being published in Budapest.[113] Stakhiv also tried to intervene in the Carpatho-Ruthenian affair at the Italian and Japanese embassies. The Italians practically did not engage with the issue. The Japanese were more active. At the end of March, a delegation came to Budapest and lodged a protest against the repression in Carpathian Ukraine with the head of the Hungarian general staff. Ambassador Hiroshi Ōshima was to intervene with Ribbentrop himself.[114] The above information from Stakhiv needs to be verified and compared against other sources.

The dissolution of Carpathian Ukraine further increased the negative perception of Hungarians in the political thinking of the OUN. On 17 March 1939, *Ukrainske Slovo* wrote of the beginning of a war against "Mongol Hungary, the enraged enemy of Ukrainianness".[115] A tone openly hostile to Hungary soon appeared in the works of major activists of the younger generation of OUN, thus marking the radicalisation of that milieu that took place at the turn of the 1940s. One of the most important new elements was the postulation that mass violence be used against Hungarians living on so-called ethnic Ukrainian lands. In his work *Ideia i chyn Ukraiiny* (*The Idea and deed of Ukraine*) of 1940, Dmytro Myron declared:

> Ukrainian nationalism will seek to cleanse the Ukrainian land of a newfound foreign element hostile to Ukraine and originating from the occupying nations: Poles, Muscovites, Hungarians, Romanians and Jews. We will fight against the Jews as an instrument of the hostile occupying countries, as bringers and defenders of the Bolshevik oppression and seedlings of the communist doctrine. Ukrainian nationalism opposes any mixing of blood with Jews, Muscovites or Hungarians.[116]

In truth Myron admitted that the problem of race in Ukraine "should not be considered in terms of racism", and his attitude towards Hungarians, Jews and Russians was openly racist. The OUN activist did not specify what he meant when he wrote about "purification", so the wording leaves much scope for speculation. The leader of the left-wing faction within the OUN-B, Ivan Mitrynga, proposed a more "concrete" concept in a booklet published in a similar period: Borotba za *za novyi lad u sviti i problema derzhavnoho vyzvolennia Ukraiiny* (*The fight for a new world order and the problem of the state liberation of Ukraine*).[117] The activist described the Hungarians (as well as the Poles, Czechs and Slovaks)

---

[113] Ibid., p. 9.

[114] Ibid., p. 10.

[115] К. Бондаренко, Ю. Киричук, *Трагедія і велич Карпатської України*, http://www.vox-populi.com.ua/rubriki/istoria/operacia-visla/tragediaivelickarpatskoieukraieniavtoribondarenkokostkiricukurij (access: 20.02.2018).

[116] М. Орлик, [Д. Мирон], *Ідея і чин України*, Київ, 2001, p. 200.

[117] The note about the left-wing nature of Mitrynga's views refers mainly to his economic views, for more detail cf. Ю. Радченко, *Про український "радикальний націоналізм", "фашизм", "націонал-більшовизм" та культуру дискусії,* http://uamoderna.com/blogy/yurij-radchenko/liebe-bandera (access: 22.01.2017).

as nations that were unfit to live and that could successfully inhabit vast areas of Asia instead of disturbing the development of great and healthy nations,[118] among whom Mitrynga counted Germans and (implicitly) Ukrainians above all. The political and geopolitical conditions of relations with Hungary in the period after March 1939 did not really affect the OUN activists. Only Ivan Gabrusevych, in the manuscript of his never-printed work *Ukraine's place in the world*, claimed that Ukraine's location in the Danube region was very difficult. The OUN activist saw Romania, Hungary and Slovakia as enemies of Ukraine, and Bulgaria as the only ally.[119] Gabrusevych did not develop this concept.

The question of Ukraine's relations with Hungary was discussed in 1940 by Yurii Lypa. This non-OUN ideologue, although generally considered to be within the trend of Ukrainian integral nationalism, devoted a small fragment of the work *Black Sea Doctrine* to this issue. Lypa described the Hungarians in an extremely negative way. According to the ideologue, Hungary was a pseudo-national state without a history:

> For millennia [of existence – M.W.] the Hungarians have contributed nothing to the world and its culture. Their destruction of physically and spiritually perfect [things] cannot be described even as hecatombs. Besides Attila, the greatest destroyer that Europe has ever seen, they have no outstanding figures.[120]

The first centuries of Hungarian history were claimed to have passed under the comprehensive influence of Old Ukrainian culture.[121] According to Lypa, despite this "beneficial influence", even in the thirteenth century, the Hungarians led a partly nomadic lifestyle. Although they abandoned it, nomadism was to be preserved in their traditions (the cult of Attila) or the manner in which they conducted foreign policy. The Ukrainian ideologue's aversion to Hungarians went so far that he even wrote approvingly of "the Ukrainian count Paskiewicz's rally in 1849".[122] Lypa also saw no prospects of Hungarian statehood in his time. The reduced Hungarian state created in 1918 seemed to him weak and unfit to oppose the expansion of Slavic nations and the Germans. As he stated, "Hungary now only has an increasingly inferior role".[123] From this it was possible to draw the logical

---

[118] The booklet was in all likelihood put together between the fall of France or Bessarabia and Bukovina being joined into the USSR, and the beginning of the German–Soviet war; І. Мітринґа, *Боротьба за новий лад у світі і проблема державного визволення України*, 1940?, p. 7.

[119] І. Ґабрусевич, *Місце України в світі*, ЦДАВОВ, f. 4465, op. 1, s. 819, ark. 17 ob.

[120] Ю. Липа, *Чорноморська доктрина*, Варшава, 1940, pp. 58–59.

[121] Perhaps Lypa had thought similarly previously. In the July–August 1938 text "Kiev, the Eternal City" originally published in the journal *Dzwony* (*Bells*), he noted the great cultural advantage of Kievan Rus' over the Kingdom of Hungary, Ю. Липа, "Київ, Вічне Місто", in: *Твори*, vol. 4, ed. Д. Сапіґа, Львів, 2012, p. 264.

[122] Lypa referred to the expedition to Hungary by the Russian commander Ivan Paskievich in 1849 to help the Austrians suppress the Hungarian uprising during the Spring of Nations.

[123] Ibid., p. 60.

conclusion that if the nations postulated by Lypa and the Ukrainian-dominated Black Sea confederation[124] did not establish some form of control over Hungary, then Germany would. In a subsequent work, *Atlas of the Black Sea* (created with the librarian Lev Bykovski), Lypa supplemented the negative image of the Hungarians with a critique of their racial qualities. He argued that "Hungarians as a nation [are] an element even more alien to Black Sea nations than Romanians – they belong to the itinerant Finnish–Hungarian race and are related to North Russian hunter nations".[125] Thus, to the ideologue, the Hungarians were in opposition to the agricultural, sedentary Dynaric race, which he described in a particularly positive way (it included, i.a., Ukrainians and Southern Slavs).[126]

* * *

The Hungarian question never played a primary role in the political thought and activity of Ukrainian integral nationalism in the period in question. Despite the revisionist orientation of Hungarian politics, for as long as possible, Ukrainian nationalists gave primacy to appropriate relations with Prague. We only see increased interest in relations with Budapest when OUN positions in Czechoslovakia began to waver. Active cooperation was not even established with Hungary after the dissolution of the Czechoslovak branch of the OUN in 1934. This may have been partly due to the growing trend towards revisionist tendencies in Hungary in the latter half of the 1930s (including in relation to Carpathian Ruthenia). It is probably explained, however, by the general weakness of the OUN in this period, and this was conditioned by: the significance of German territory being limited by the January 26, 1934 signing of the Polish–German declaration of non-violence; the organisation being weakened in Poland following arrests after the murder of Interior Minister Bronisław Pieracki; the very strong Czechoslovak branch being dissolved (except for the weak structures of the OUN Z); and, last but not least, the significance of the Soviet Union in European policy increasing in the mid-1930s (the accession of the Soviets to the League of Nations, and agreements with France and Czechoslovakia) Nevertheless, until Western European, American and Canadian archives can be thoroughly examined we are limited to speculation by the relatively modest source material for the years in question.[127] We know

---

[124] This refers to the imperial concept of Ukraine, in which a confederate union of Belarus, Bulgaria, Turkey, Idel-Ural and a united Caucasian state would group together around the power of Ukraine, cf. M. Wojnar, "Idea konfederacji czarnomorskiej Jurija Łypa na tle geopolitycznych koncepcji ukraińskiego nacjonalizmu integralnego", in: *Ukraina: narracje, języki, historie*, ed. M. Gaczkowski, Wrocław, 2015, pp. 139–150.

[125] Ю. Липа, Л. Биковський, *Чорноморський простір. Атляс*, Варшава, 1941, p. 25.

[126] Cf. Ю. Липа, *Українська раса*, Львів, 1937; Ю.Липа, *Призначення України*, Львів, 1938.

[127] This primarily concerns the archival legacy of Yevhen Onatsky in New York (Shevchenko Scientific Society) and Winnipeg (Ukrainian Cultural and Education Centre). On 4 September 1971, Onatsky himself wrote in a letter to Lubomyr Vynar about preparing for print eight volumes of his records covering the years 1931–1938. In the end, four volumes appeared, covering the

relatively little about the attitude of Ukrainian nationalists towards Hungary during the period of Carpatho-Ruthenian autonomy. Surviving memoirs are marred by blatant subjectivity in this matter, and documents derived from the OUN are not accepted in academic circles. After the annexation of Carpathian Ukraine by Hungary, the idea appeared among Ukrainian integral nationalists to use mass violence against the Hungarian population living in so-called ethnic Ukrainian lands. A new feature that first emerged during this period was the perception of the Hungarian population through the prism of racial categories. Thus, the critical attitude of Ukrainian nationalists towards Hungarians and Hungary reached its peak. In subsequent years, the perception of the Hungarian issue became more liberal. But that topic has already exceeded the chronological limits of this article.

Bibliography

Archive materials

Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists Archive in Kiev (Архів Орґанізації Українських Націоналістів у Києві – АОУН)
fond. 1, opys 2, sprava 466
Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of the Government and Administration of Ukraine in Kiev (Центральний Державний Архів Вищих Орґанів Влади та Управління України – ЦДАВОВ)
fond 4465, opys 1, sprava 819
National Archive in Prague (Národní archiv, NA)
fond RUESO (Ruské emigrantské spolky a organizace v ČSR po 1918), karton 13, svazek 3

Other sources and secondary literature

Armstrong J., *Ukrainian Nationalism 1939–1945*, New York, 1955.
Jarnecki M., Kołakowski P., *"Ukraiński Piemont". Ruś Zakarpacka w okresie autonomii*, Warszawa, 2017.
Kochanowski J., *Węgry. Od ugody do ugody 1867–1990*, Warszawa, 1997.
Rothemere V., My campaign for Hungary, London, 1939.
Shkandrij M., *Ukrainian nationalism. Politics, Ideology, and Literature, 1929–1956*, New Haven–London, 2015.
Snyder T., *Czerwony Książę*, Warszawa, 2010.
Tomaszewski J., *Czechy i Słowacja*, Warszawa, 2008.
Wojnar M., *Idea konfederacji czarnomorskiej Jurija Łypy na tle geopolitycznych koncepcji ukraińskiego nacjonalizmu integralnego*, in: *Ukraina: narracje, języki, historie*, ed. M. Gaczkowski, Wrocław, 2015, pp. 139–150.

---

period 1930–1934. It can be presumed that the remaining materials are in the above-mentioned institutions, M. Shkandrij, *Ukrainian nationalism. Politics, Ideology, and Literature, 1929–1956*, New Haven–London, 2015, pp. 291–292; "Лист Є. Онацького до Л. Винара від 4 вересня 1971 р.", in: Л. Винар, *Євген Онацький – чесність з нацією (1894–1979)*, Нью Йорк–Мюнхен–Торонто, 1981, p. 21.

Wysocki R., *Organizacja Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów w Polsce w latach 1929–1939*, Lublin, 2003.
Zięba A.A., *Lobbing dla Ukrainy w Europie Międzywojennej. Ukraińskie Biuro Prasowe w Londynie i jego konkurenci polityczni (do roku 1932),* Kraków, 2010.
Бойків О., *Моя співпраця з полковником*, in: *Євген Коновалець та його доба*, Мюнхен, 1974, pp. 621–653.
Бондаренко К., Киричук Ю., *Трагедія і велич Карпатської України*, http://www.vox-populi.com.ua/rubriki/istoria/operacia-visla/tragediaivelickarpatskoieukraieniavtoribondarenkokostkiricukurij (access: 20.02.2018).
Боржава Ю., *Від Угорської Русі до Карпатської України*, Филаделфія, 1956.
Відейко М., Кот С., *Невідома Україна. Наукова спадщина Олега Ольжича,* Київ, 2008.
Винар Л., *Євген Онацький – чесність з нацією (1894–1979)*, Нью Йорк – Мюнхен – Торонто, 1981.
Документи і матеріали з історії Організації Українських Націоналістів, vol. 1 1927–1930, eds. Ю. Черченко, О. Кучерук, Київ, 2005.
Документи і матеріали з історії Організації Українських Націоналістів, vol. 2, part 2, ed. Ю. Черченко, Київ, 2007.
Документи і матеріали з історії Організації Українських Націоналістів, vol. 2, part 1, ed. Ю. Черченко, Київ, 2010.
Донцов Д., *Підстави нашої політики*, Відень, 1921.
"Другому зїзду народовецької молоді в Мукачові", *Пробоєм*, 7 (1934), pp. 100–103.
Зайцев О., *Украинский інтеґральний націоналізм (1920–1930-ті роки). Нариси інтелектуальної історії*, Київ, 2013.
"'Карпатська Січ' і сучасне політичне положення (Реферат виголошений на II зїзді ОНОКС)", *Наступ*, 11–12 (1939), p. 3.
"Карпатській Украині ще все грозять небезпеки!", *Украинске слово*, 289 (1939), p. 1.
"Конґрес Українських Націоналістів 1929 р.": in: *Документи і матеріали*, ed. В. Муравський, Львів, 2006.
Бурун [Колодзінський М.], "Воєнне значення і стратеґічне положення Закарпаття", in: *Війна і техніка. Воєнно-науковий збірник*, Париж, 1938, pp. 34–48.
Кубійович В., *Територія і людність українських земель*, Львів, 1935.
Липа Ю., "Київ, Вічне Місто", in: *Твори*, vol. 4, ed. Д. Сапіга, Львів, 2012, pp. 257–277.
Липа Ю., *Призначення України*, Львів, 1938.
Липа Ю., *Українська раса*, Львів, 1937.
Липа Ю., *Чорноморська доктрина*, Варшава, 1940.
Липа Ю., Биковський Л., *Чорноморський простір. Атляс*, Варшава, 1941.
"Мадярщина ще один кат українського народу", *Українське слово*, 290 (1939), p. 2.
Мандрик І., "Національна політика на території Закарпаття в кінці XIX – на початку XX ст.", in: *Україна-Угорщина: спільне минуле та сьогодення. Матеріали міжнародньої наукової конференції (Київ 14-16 квітня 2005 р.)*, ed. В. Смолій, Київ, 2006, pp. 177–189.
Марсикевич Т., "Зовнішнополітичні зв'язки ОУН з 'малими' європейськими державами та организаціями праворадикального спрямування", *Наукові зошити історичного факультету Львівського університету*, 12 (2011), pp. 80–98.
Мартинець В., *За зуби й пазурі нації*, Париж, 1937.
Мартинець В., *Українське підпілля. Від УВО до ОУН. Спогади й матеріали до передісторії та історії українського організованого націоналізму*, Вінніпег, 1949.
Мітринґа І., *Боротьба за новий лад у світі і проблема державного визволення України*, 1940 (?).
Муравський В., "Документи Міністерства закордонних справ Чехословаччин про так званий 'Архів Сеника'", *Український визвольний рух*, 6 (2006), pp. 5–29.

Орлик М., [Мирон Д.], *Ідея і чин Укрїни*, Київ, 2001.
Онацький Є., *У вічному місті III. Записки українського журналіста 1933 рік*, Торонто, 1985.
Онацький Є., *У вічному місті IV. Записки українського журналіста 1934 рік*, Торонто, 1989.
Оршан Я. [Чемеринський О.], *Закарпаття*, Париж, 1938.
Організація Українських Націоналістів 1929–1954, Париж, 1955.
Офіцинський Р., "Окупація та анексія Карпатської України", in: *Закарпаття 1919–2009 років (україномовний варіант українсько-угорського видання)*, eds. М. Вегеш, Ч. Фединець, Ужгород, 2010, pp. 191–198.
Пагіря О., "'Гібридна війна' Угорщини та Польщі проти Карпатської України", *Український визвольний рух*, 21 (2009), pp. 292–323.
Пагіря О., *Між війною та миром. Відносини між ОУН і УПА та збройними силами Угорщини 1939–1945*, Торонто-Львів, 2014.
Пагіря О., Посівнич М., "Воєнно-політична діяльність ОУН у Закарпатті (1929–1939)", *Український визвольний рух*, 13 (2009), pp. 45–88.
Посівнич М., *Воєнно-політична діяльність ОУН у 1929–1939 роках*, Львів, 2010.
Посівнич М., "Закарпаття у концепціях ОУН у 1937-1938 рр.", *Дрогобицький Краєзнавчий збірник*, 2 (2015), pp. 173–178.
Росоха С., "Кроваве повстання", *Пробоєм*, 3–4 (1935), pp. 27–33.
Росоха С., "Щоби було ясно", *Пробоєм*, 1 (1933), pp. 2–5.
Рудницький С., *Наш рідний край*, Львів, 1921.
Свято соборности України в Хусті, *Наступ*, 5 (1939), pp. 1–2.
Стахів В., "Почалося в Ужгороді, а закінчилося в Мармароському Сиготі", *Вісті братства кол. вояків 1 УД УНА*, 11–12 (1954).
Стахів В., "Почалося в Ужгороді, а закінчилося в Мармароському Сиготі", *Вісті братства кол. вояків 1 УД УНА*, 1–2, 3–4, 5–6, 7–8, 9–10 (1955).
Химинець Ю., *Мої спостереження із Закарпаття*, Ню-Йорк, 1984.
Яшан В., "Полковник Михайло Колодзінський", *Сурмач*, 3–4 (1979), pp. 24–29.

Marek Wojnar (born 24 September 1985), Masters in history, assistant at the Institute of Political Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences, PhD student at the Department of Eastern European History at the Institute of History of the Jagiellonian University. Interested in political thought, nationalism and historical memory in Eastern Europe, with particular emphasis on Ukraine. Cooperate with the *Nowa Konfederacja* and *Nowa Europa Wschodnia*.

Submitted 4.03.2018; accepted 21.05.2018