

ARCHIVE

Recognised as the intellectual patron of the conservative ideological current, Viacheslav Lypyns'kyi (1882–1931) ranks amongst the most interesting Ukrainian historians and political thinkers. A Pole by birth (born Wacław Lipiński), and a Roman Catholic subject of the Russian Empire, he assumed Ukrainian national identity during his school years spent in Zhytomyr and Kiev. He completed his tertiary studies at the Jagiellonian University in 1908. In his historical and journalistic pieces published in Polish and Ukrainian during the few subsequent years, Lypyns'kyi elaborated an innovative interpretation of the 1648 Khmelnytsky Insurrection and a related sociological theory of nation.¹ In the course of the First World War, following a short frontline service (as a Russian reserve officer), he joined the attempts to create a Ukrainian statehood, offering his support to the rule of Hetman Pavlo Skoropads'kyi. After the Bolsheviks prevailed, Lypyns'kyi spent the rest of his life as an émigré in Vienna, publishing profusely and contributing to the organisation of Ukrainian conservative and monarchical groups or factions.

Lypyns'kyi's ideas stood out against the then-dominant interpretations of Ukrainian history, which linked Ukrainianness with the popular element and with democratism. In contrast to the great historian statesman Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, Lypyns'kyi identified in his country's past a detrimental deviation from the European standard, which was made evident through the loss of native knightly and, subsequently, nobility elites. Khmelnytsky's revolt was, in his opinion, an attempt at resuming the appropriate developmental path of the national idea. Lypyns'kyi demonstrated that the Polish-Ukrainian conflict in the seventeenth century was not a class conflict but a national clash that affected all the social strata. The functions of importance in Khmelnytsky's camp were held by Ruthenian noblemen, whose purpose was to establish a country of their own, as the only path to national sovereignty. Completion of the nation-forming process

¹ Lypyns'kyi's influence on Ukrainian historiography is discussed in Omeljan Pritsak, 'V. Lypyns'kyj's Place in Ukrainian Intellectual History,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, ix, 3-4 (1985), 245–62. The essay was contained in a special monographic issue of HUS, devoted to Lypyns'kyi (*The Political and Social Ideas of Vjačeslav Lypyns'kyj*), whereon V. Lypyns'ky's essay published below is based. Of Polish authors, Tomasz Stryjek deals with Lypyns'ky in his excellent study on the Ukrainian national idea in the interwar period (*Ukraińska idea narodowa okresu międzywojennego. Analiza wybranych koncepcji*, Wrocław, 2000, 61–109).

would have called for a similar act of emancipation from the Russian dominance and, above all, a change in Ukraine's social structure. To meet the latter goal, the elites had to be retrieved, the historian argued. The measures to fulfil the task were described by Lypyns'kyi in much more a generalised manner, compared to his diagnoses of the earlier defeats or setbacks. Putting it in simplified terms, he foresaw a reintroduction of elites through enlargement of the landowner stratum by way of a limited agricultural reform. According to his concept, the Ukrainian nobility should have realised their obligations toward their native land (in some measure, as he himself had done some time earlier on). The inflow of new landed property owners, of affluent peasantry background, was expected to ensure this most active social class strength and vitality.

Lypyns'kyi was, in a sense, a mouthpiece of the ideas appearing in the nineteenth and twentieth century almost all across East Central Europe. Wherever the higher social classes were separated from the lower ones by language, apart from wealth and culture, 'national wakeners' appeared who deliberately assumed the identities of the peoples that formulated their political programmes. Lypyns'kyi's conservative views seem quite interesting in this context: this author consistently (also in the article whose English translation is published below) criticised the exalted idealisation of the peasantry among activists of the elitists background. His view of the 'Provençalism', the term he used to describe the cultivation of cultural, and not political, sense of national identity, was no less critical. The significance he ascribed to state and complete social structure has led him to rejection of ethnic nationalism. Ukraine, he believed, had become a colony, and would remain one until, and unless, at least a part of the colonial elite assumed the stance of self-reliance, in statehood terms.

In his appraisal of the importance of this man to the development of Ukrainian national movement, Dmytro Doroshenko, an illustrious Ukrainian historian and friend of Lypyns'kyi's, referred "not exactly to his plans or practical formulas but basically, to the new principles upon which he has developed his conception of Ukrainian statehood; the new prospects he has opened to the Ukrainian thought; and, in particular, the high elevation of the spirit that is, one and only, capable of kindling the hearts, filling the exhausted human souls with hope, and stimulating a new grapple for one's ideals".² Our Editorial Board, however, took into account somewhat

² Dymitr Doroszenko [Dmytro Doroshenko], 'Wacław Lipiński. Kilka wspomnień i uwag,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* ix, 3-4 (1985), 466-76; quote 476.

different premises in making their choice for this issue's Archive section. In our opinion The tragedy of the Ukrainian Sancho Panza is, above all, an immensely interesting contribution to the discussion on the peculiar roads of historical development. Although the essay shows its author's own view of the history of Ukraine, in the form of a literary metaphor, the problems it raises are the crucial and critical ones to the history of East Central Europe – with the singularities of local social structure and nation-formation process standing out. For scholars embarking on the subject-matter of regional 'multiple Sonderwegs' Lypyns'kyi is a grateful topic in itself – and an elder professional colleague.

The present translation has been based on the Ukrainian text as published in a 1985 Harvard Ukrainian Studies issue, dedicated to the output of Viacheslav Lypyns'kyi. The Author's notes appearing at the bottom of the pages are not footnotes, but marginal glasses that are written alongside the main body of the original text.

Maciej Górny