historian, sociologist, and poet who was killed on the Maidan and became one of the “Heavenly Hundred.”

Constraints of space necessarily means that certain topics are somewhat neglected. For instance, it could have been beneficial to focus more on the World War II period, on the complexity of the pre-war ethnic relations in Western Ukraine, massacres and ethnic cleansings. However, it is obviously impossible to avoid historical simplification in an overview that covers one thousand years. In general, the book provides a well-balanced vision of the process of Ukraine’s development. It narrates well-known historical aspects in a clear and professional way, and at the same time it introduces new orientation markers and enriches the factual knowledge with a novel cultural approach. The author has succeeded in creating a concise story oriented towards an English-speaking audience. The book is highly recommended as an introductory text for students dealing with Ukrainian studies, and for all general readers seeking to understand the background of the present conflict in Ukraine.

**Alina Zubkovych**

Centre for Baltic and East European Studies, Södertorn University


The history of the Holocaust in the border territories of Central and Eastern Europe remains an especially dynamic field of study. A case in point is this monograph by Israeli historian Raz Segal, Assistant Professor of Holocaust and Genocide Studies at Stockton University. This ambitious study examines events in the territory of what is now the Zakarpats’ka oblast’ in Ukraine, with a focus on the relations between the different ethnic and religious groups residing in that region before the end of World War II. At the center of Segal’s study are the relations between Jews and non-Jews—Ukrainians (Rusyns) and Hungarians. He also discusses the tragic fate of the Roma population of Subcarpathian Rus’ (Carpatho-Ukraine, Zakarpattia in
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Ukrainian) during World War II. This timeframe is well suited for demonstrating the tragic events in this region.

The author begins his narrative with World War I, the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian, German, and Russian empires, and the formation of a series of independent states, including Czechoslovakia, of which Subcarpathian Rus’ became part, on a whim of fate, in 1919. He ends with the period when Zakarpattia became part of Ukraine, and the events of World War II drastically changed the ethnic composition of the region’s population. The main part of the study examines the persecution, plundering, and murder of Jews on the territory of Zakarpattia by Hungarian authorities in 1939–44. A significant part of the monograph is devoted to descriptions of the relations between Zakarpattia’s Ukrainians and Jews. Segal discusses in some detail the period of existence of autonomous Subcarpathian Rus’ and the short-lived independent Carpatho-Ukraine. He describes how different the relations between Jews and local Ukrainians (Rusyns) were in that period. At the same time, he refers to Ukrainian aggressive anti-Semitism (evidently only in the form of the ideology of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, OUN) as an “export” from Galicia. According to Segal, relations between local Ukrainians (Rusyns) and Jews were quite neutral, and “violence … came with Ukrainian nationalism from the other side of the Carpathian Mountains” (p. 62).

Segal’s book has already received a number of positive reviews. Maastricht University historian Ferenc Laczó has written that the book “elaborates convincing critiques of key concepts of its broader field such as antisemitism, collaboration, or bystanders”.¹ Hana Kubátová from Charles University notes that before the publication of Segal’s book, “Subcarpathian Rus’ has been rather neglected in historiography of twentieth-century” Hungary and

Czechoslovakia. In my review, I would like to take the somewhat unconventional approach of focusing on a number of important aspects of this topic that are missing from Segal’s study. These relate primarily to a significant set of additional sources, which Segal does not cover, but which have the capacity to shed greater light on the events in question.

Segal writes of the negative attitude to local Jews held by OUN members arriving in Zakarpattia; he also discusses the anti-Jewish operations carried out by the government of Avhustyn Voloshyn and the armed forces of Carpatho-Ukraine: the Carpathian Sich (pp. 56-57). But the author has not made use of a large body of Ukrainian-language sources—for instance, Ukrainian newspapers and the memoirs of OUN activists. We know from other documents that the slogans about the independence struggle were combined, amongst the majority of ideologists of Carpatho-Ukraine, and especially amongst those OUN members coming from Galicia, with anti-Semitism and Ukrainian imperialism. Segal does not write about one of the ideologues of this movement, Mykhaylo Kolodzyns’kyi. Kolodzyns’kyi was an opponent of German colonial policy in Ukraine, but at the same time he wished to build a “Ukrainian empire.” In the first part of his book, Military Doctrine, written in the late 1930s, Kolodzyns’kyi stated that:

In Mein kampf Hitler links the existence of the German People with the acquisition of the East of Europe, and thereby renders this issue a matter of the National Socialist worldview. We ought to be outraged by this expansionism of Hitler. What have these searchers for “raums” contributed to Eastern Europe? How much blood have they shed for her? They are international bandits who wish to turn Ukraine into an international brothel, so as to realize their predatory plans here.  

---

The author of *Military Doctrine* warned that the Nazis viewed Ukraine “as a European Abyssinia, called upon to serve as a place for Hitler to resettle his excess German population without the slightest recognition or understanding of the fact that in Eastern European space there lives a large people which has been fighting for centuries for its rights, for its right to life...”\(^4\)

This does not mean, however, that Kolodzyns’kyi was opposed to imperialism *per se*. On the contrary, he believed that there was room for only one empire in the east of Europe: a Ukrainian empire. According to Ukrainian historian Oleksandr Zaytsev, “expansion and imperialism are constant themes of *Military Doctrine*.” Kolodzyns’kyi constantly emphasized the fact that the OUN, in preparing its plans for statehood, must not limit itself to ethnic Ukrainian lands: “Ukraine should not be built only on the Dnister or the Dnipro, instead Ukraine should be built on the scale which the Creator measured for her when he created the current geographic form of the Earth. The East of Europe must be ours, such is the covenant made for us by our great-grandfathers.”\(^5\)

Kolodzyns’kyi’s *Military Doctrine* also envisaged the complete “cleansing” of West Ukrainian lands of Poles ("the Polish element should be chopped off at the root in the W[estern] U[krainian] L[ands] ... thereby putting a stop to Polish claims about the Polish nature of these lands"), and the partial extermination of other “hostile” minorities. He wrote for example that “The OUN uprising must destroy the living hostile forces on Ukr[ainian] lands... these forces include apart from the regular army, the hostile population as a whole and all those minorities with a hostile attitude towards Ukr[ainian] independence"). He singled out the Jews in particular, asserting that “the more Jews perish during the uprising, the better this will be for the Ukrainian state.”

Unfortunately, Segal does not mention the fact that anti-Semitic and pro-German slogans rang out at the public events organized by the bureaucrats of Carpathian Ukraine. On 22 January 1939 a rally was held in Khust in honor of Unity Day (*Den’*

---

\(^4\) *Cited in Zaytsev, “Voenna doktryna.”*

Officials of Carpathian Ukraine and the commanders of the Carpathian Sich addressed the rally. When Voloshyn spoke, Sichmen greeted him with the words: “Glory to the Father of the Nation!” The speakers at the rally included Ivan Rogach. By this point he was a member of the OUN Provid (leadership), a member of the Chief Command and military clerk for the Carpathian Sich; later, he served as Voloshyn’s secretary. In Nazi-occupied Kiev in the fall of 1941 Rogach was appointed to the post of editor-in-chief of the weekly Ukrainian Word (Ukrains’ke Slovo), which published a mass of anti-Semitic articles. Eventually in February 1942 he fell victim to the Nazis. But back then, in 1939, Rogach declared:

The Jews who live on our land and off our land, have shown their hostility in connection with the news about the arrival of Prchala [general Lev Prchala, sent from Prague to Zakarpattia – Y. R.]. We remember this.

A Ukrainian empire is being built.

The Great Chancellor Hitler is rebuilding Europe. The Ukrainian People shall march with the German People shoulder to shoulder.

The Ukrainian Empire will come, whether some people want this or not! We’ve all been consumed by this idea!

Long live the vozhd’s of Ukraine!

Long live the Provid of the Organization of Ukr. Nationalists!

Long live Father Voloshyn!

Long live the government of Carpatho-Ukraine!

The newspaper Nastup, official organ of the OUN and Carpathian Sich, offers additional evidence of the aggressive anti-Semitic mood of the OUN fighters coming to the region. For example, Nastup approvingly published speeches by Hitler in which he demanded colonies for the Third Reich and called for European
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6 The Ukrainian equivalent of the German “Führer” or the Italian “Duce.”
7 Nastup, 1 February 1939.
Jews to be killed “in the event” of a new war on the continent. Thus, in particular, in an article entitled “The Vozhd’ of Germany says...,” a report was provided on the NSDAP leader’s 30 January 1939 speech in the Reichstag:

In his speech chancellor Hitler touched upon the matter of Jewry as a destructive force which with the help of communism, Freemasonry and will-less democracy was gradually destroying the system and order brought by strong nations adhering to a nationalist worldview. And since Jewry would not cease to provoke the world, then let it be prepared for the punitive hand of nations to strike them throughout the whole globe in the eventual future war.8

On the pages of Nastup Jews were accused of carrying out the economic exploitation of Ukrainian Zakarpattia. In one article published in early March 1939 it was reported that in villages in mountains:

The Liatoritsia firm and swarms of Jewish exploiters rule supreme over the country’s wealth... All the land belongs to this firm ... and the best of the rest has been taken from the drunk peasants by the Jews as payment for debts. The yids have become so rich on peasant injustice that they’ve become counts now, while the peasants find themselves facing an abyss of hopeless need.9

Many of these theses were repeated by OUN activist Yevhen Stakhiv. Reflecting on the events of the late 1930s in Galicia and Zakarpattia, he recalled:

The young generation, in particular, the Ukrainian Galician student body, was much influenced by the works of Dontsov, which popularized various fascist movements in Europe at the time. There were masses of this kind of literature in Galicia—Mykhaylo Ostroverkha’s Mussolini, Rostyslav Endyk’s Hitler, there were books about Franco, de la Rocque—the French fascist,

---


9 Nastup, 8 March 1939.
Degrelle—the Belgian fascist. I remember very well how the people sang at the celebration on 22 January 1939:

We’ll be helped by uncle Hitler

And father Voloshyn

To fight the Czechs...\(^{10}\)

All these examples demonstrate how much additional light the use of Ukrainian-language sources can shed on the events of fall 1938—spring 1939 in Zakarpattia.

It is interesting to see that when Segal writes about the local Slavic population in Zarkapattia, he always refers to them as Carpatho-Ruthenians, despite the fact that in the interwar period a significant part of the population had begun to call themselves Ukrainians. Moreover, on the force of old habits, a section of the population called themselves not only “rusyny” (Rusyns), but also “rusnaky” (“Rusnaks”) or “sloviaky” (“Sloviaks”). The term runey (Ruthenen) was an invention of the Austrian bureaucracy and was never used as a means of self-identification. It is telling that even when Segal writes about the killings of members of the Carpathian Sich by Hungarian troops in March 1939, he continues to call them “Carpatho-Ruthenians.” This is despite the fact that the members of this formation included a significant number of Galician Ukrainians, for whom the label “Carpatho-Ruthenian” is incorrect. This is even more striking given the fact that in the next line Segal cites the memoirs of rabbi Yehoshua Grinwald, who, reporting on these events, wrote that “Hungarian soldiers killed numerous Ukrainians” (p. 58).

A significant part of Segal’s study is devoted to the ghettoization, plundering, and deportations of Jews of Zakarpattia to death camps in 1944. Against this background, he analyzes the attitudes taken by Carpathian Ukrainians with regard to these actions of the Hungarian authorities. The author concludes that,

---

\(^{10}\) Yevhen Stakhiv, *Kriz’ tiurmy, pidpillia i kordony. Povist’ mogo zhyttia* (Kyiv: Rada, 1995), 56.
compared to the situation “in the German occupied Soviet territories, where many people attacked their Jewish neighbors and murdered them, Carpatho-Ruthenians rarely turned against the Jews and, in general, preferred not to cooperate with the occupiers of their homeland” (p. 111). This thesis is quite debatable, if only because “the German occupied Soviet territories” were very extensive and included highly diverse zones of control, where attitudes towards Jews were often strikingly varied. This has been shown, for example, by Diana Dumitru’s comparative study of Bessarabia and Transnistria.\footnote{Diana Dumitru, “The Attitude of the Non-Jewish Population of Bessarabia and Transnistria toward the Jews during the Holocaust: A Survivors’ Perspective,” \textit{Yad Vashem Studies} 37, no. 1 (2009): 53–83.}

One additional point regarding presentation: it is a little disappointing to see how Segal transliterates the names of the independent Ukrainian state’s archives. In the bibliography, the title of the State Archive of Zakarpats’ka oblast’ has been transliterated into Latin script from the Russian rather than from the Ukrainian (p. 194). This is despite the fact that according to the archival rules in operation in Ukraine, archival materials must be cited in Ukrainian (in either Cyrillic or Latin).

These minor flaws by no means diminish the contribution that Raz Segal has made to the study of the important problems discussed in this book. It is to be hoped that this work will inspire other scholars to take up the history of the Holocaust in Central and Eastern Europe in the context of inter-ethnic relations, and in doing so, to draw upon the multitude of new sources now available in a range of different languages.

Yuri Radchenko

Center for Research on Inter-Ethnic Relations in Eastern Europe, Kharkiv