

Roman Lekhniuk*
(Lwów)

Ukrainian Christian social movement in Galicia at the end of the XIX – the first quarter of the XX centuries: ideology and political practices

Abstract: Ideological pursuits and political practices of Ukrainian Christian social movement in Galicia at the end of the XIX century – the first quarter of the XX century that was an important element of Ukrainian conservative tradition is analyzed in the article. This movement, headed by Oleksandr Barvinsky, emerged as a response to the rejection of the Polish-Ukrainian rapprochement, the “new era” of 1890–1894, by members of Ukrainian political movement of Narodovtsi (Ukrainophiles). The movement not only supported but also promoted conservative principals of national development in the Ukrainian society of Galicia. The principal motto of Christian social movement was created under the influence of a Krakow-based group of Polish conservatives known as “Stańczycy”. The principal core of the movement was the refusal from what they believe to be ineffective oppositional politics and implementation of “organic labour” concept with further contribution to raising political consciousness as well as the economic and educational level of the Ukrainian society in Galicia. Members of the Christian social movement paid considerable attention to religiosity and insisted on an important role played by the Greek Catholic Church in raising young people and political life. Following the ideals of the “New era”, Oleksandr Barvinsky and his followers attempted to find the Ukrainian-Polish path for understanding in Galician atmosphere that was becoming more and more strained. In practice, Christian social movement ended up attempting to create a functional political organization which turned out a disaster. Political failures of the movement were caused by adverse ideological and political climate of that time and the inner weakness of the very movement. Despite the termination of political activity of movement at the beginning of the First World War, Oleksandr Barvinsky fruitlessly tried to breathe new life into political structures of the movement during the war and until the early 1920s. Taking into consideration the new interwar reality where different radical movements proliferated, a conservative and moderate Christian social movement which remained a creation of the Habsburg era had no chance for success.

Keywords: Christian social movement, conservatism, Oleksandr Barvinsky, Galicia

Słowa kluczowe: Ruch Chrześcijańsko-społeczny, konserwatyzm, Oleksandr Barwinsky, Galicja

* Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Faculty of History Department of modern Ukrainian history; e-mail: r.lekniuk@gmail.com

On both the intellectual and political maps of the Central and Eastern Europe, conservatism was a notable and often decisive factor from the time it emerged as a separate political philosophy on the verge of XVIII and XIX centuries. Territories that belonged to the Habsburg or Austrian Empire (Austro-Hungarian Empire from 1867) were not an exception. This ideological system also had a considerable impact on social, political, economic, and cultural processes in the province referred to as the Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria, or simply Galicia. Moreover, conservatism played an important role in these territories after the social circumstances changed in 1918 when an independent Polish state reestablished its authority on these territories. As a part of the research dedicated to intellectual history of Galicia at the end of XIX – the first quarter of the XX century, Ukrainian conservatism stays in the shadows of Polish conservative through and practice as well as other ideological systems that were present in Ukrainian, Polish, and Jewish communities in the area – nationalism, socialism, and communism.

However, Ukrainian conservative movements in the region, among which was the Christian social movement, made a significant contribution to the ideological heritage of that time. The poor research of this movement is caused not least by the universal methodological problem – conservatism as an object of the research may be a complicated issue due to its heterogeneity and the absence of clearly defined concepts. The movement in question is not an exception: as the members of the Christian social movement did not have accurately elaborated ideological principles and theorists, the only way to thoroughly study this movement is to deduce its theoretical principles from its practical implementations. Due to this reason, a comprehensive analysis of not only theoretical principles that were used by the members of Christian social movement but also their political practices needs to be performed.

Ukrainian Christian social movement may be viewed as the “right” branch of an old Galician movement of Narodovtsi. It was created in the 90s of the XX century and the main difference between these two movements was the attitude to the “new era” – the politics of Ukrainian-Polish rapprochement of 1890–1894. Headed by Yulian Romanchuk, Narodovtsi were disappointed by the politics of compromise and joined other Ukrainian political movements, such as the Russophiles and Radicals, in their opposition to the Polish majority in the Galician Sejm (Diet) and the politics of the central government in Vienna as well as the local authorities in Galicia. The union between Romanchuk’s group and the Russophiles movement was one of the reasons that led to fraction among Narodovtsi as such partnership was unacceptable for the conservative branch because the Russophiles denied the existence of the national Ukrainian identity.

The smaller part of Narodovtsi continued to consider the “new era” useful for Ukrainian national life and, therefore, supported the idea to pursuit mutual compromises. They called such politics the “real” one and their opponents from other Ukrainian political camps called it “agreed upon” meaning the one which ignores interests of Ukrainians. This minority which in future will become

Christian social movement was headed by Oleksandr Barvinsky, a prominent Ukrainian politician, pedagogue, cultural and educational activist, popularizer of Ukrainian history, a years-long member of the Viennese Parliament (1891–1907) and the Galician Sejm (1894–1904) as well as the member of the Regional School Council (1893–1918). It will be demonstrated further in the article that O. Barvinsky was a crucial figure for Christian social movement.

Other well-known representatives of this movement besides Barvinsky are also worth mentioning: Anatole Vakhnianyn – a famous composer and politician, the first head of the Prosvita Society; Kyryl Studynsky – a prominent member and later the head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society; Osyp Makovei – a popular writer who wrote the poem “Revun” that can be called a manifesto of Christian social movement. Sources used to research Ukrainian Christian social movement are, first of all, the unpublished materials from the fund of the Barvisnki family from the Department of Manuscripts of Vasyl Stefanyk Lviv National Scientific Library. The materials from the Vakhnianyn and Studynsky funds in the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Lviv are another group of valuable resources that remain unpublished. The same as memoirs of Oleksandr Barvinsky. The published part, used in this article, covers the period between 1850-s and early 1888¹. The unpublished part about events from late 1895 to 1908 is preserved in the Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies of Shevchenko Institute of Literature that belong to the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine and also deserves to be mentioned. These manuscripts contain important information about the establishment and activity of Catholic-Ruthenian People’s Union, “Rus’ka Hromada” (Ruthenian Council), “Ruslan” newspaper, how Barvinsky evaluated his contemporaries and his activity in the Parliament and Sejm. His journalistic legacy that is preserved on the pages of “Ruslan” is of crucial importance for the research. Created by Barvinsky, this newspaper remained a long-term institution during the studied historical period and contains information on the ideological principles of the movement and, to a lesser extent, on its practical implementations. Materials published in the “Vidrozhennia” newspaper in April-July 1918 in Vienna are a precious source of information about the principles of people who supported Christian social movement and Barvinsky in particular as well as the ideas on how to establish an independent Ukrainian state. On the contrary, the articles in the “Ukrainskyi Holos” magazine, the principal Christian social magazine in Przemysl, provide an opportunity to study Barvinsky’s views in his recent years. Among his individual publications, the work under the pseudonym “Verax”, should be singled out. It is dedicated to the Ukrainian question in the First World War and focuses on German and Austro-Hungarian governments². Osyp Makovei’s poem “Revun” has also to be paid attention to as it is an example of how members of Christian social movement treated the low level of political culture of Ukrainian society³.

¹ O. Barvinsky, 2004.

² O. Stauf von der March, 1915.

³ O. Makovei, 1990.

Scientists have already been studying Ukrainian Christian social movement. Taras Antoshevsky made one of the first attempts to provide a brief review about the main ideas of the movement, but the scholar used only periodical materials without handwritten manuscripts, let alone the archive of Oleksandr Barvinsky, what limited his opportunity to cover this issue thoroughly⁴. Yet, this work remains the only attempt to create a comprehensive analysis of the movement even till nowadays. Other researchers, on the contrary, paid attention to separate periods in the history of Ukrainian Christian social movement or its key figures. Andriy Klish concentrated his attention on the end of the XIX and beginning of the XX century, the period when Catholic-Ruthenian People's Union formally existed⁵. Olena Arkusha researched the circumstances of the movement's establishment and the second attempt to institutionalize Christian social movement, the organization known as "Rus`ka Hromada"⁶. Marjan Mudryi analyzed the handwritten materials from the Barvinskys' fund in Vasyl Stefanyk Lviv National Scientific Library that covers the history of the Christian Social Union (CSU)⁷. All these researchers made a contribution to biography studies: M. Mudryi is the author of the only scientific research about a significant member of the movement – Tyt Revakovysh⁸, and O. Arkusha investigated the life of Oleksandr Barvinsky⁹. Her research is a bibliographical outline about the leader of the movement and presentation of his primary ideological ideas. Along with the articles of Ihor Chornovol, who analyses different aspects of Oleksandr Barvinsky creativity¹⁰, this is the most thorough attempt to analyze this historical figure.

Despite a great number of publications, their authors primarily focus on institutional and organizational moments and not the ideological aspects of the movement, which means that there has not been a full-fledged and efficient analysis of this matter. The aim of this research is to provide such an analysis in conjunction with the research of the political practices implied by Oleksandr Barvinsky and of his followers. The author intentions are to review their ideas in the context of the popular tendencies of that time in different fields – sociopolitical, socioeconomic, and religious. Other important aspects that need to be taken care of are the place of the researched movement within the conservative movements of that time, trace ideological interactions, and reveal examples of practical cooperation with other conservative movements in Central and Eastern Europe.

Chronological framework of the article was chosen in accordance with the fact that at the end of the XIX century – the first quarter of the XX century modern ideas like nationalism, socialism, secularization, etc, spread rapidly

⁴ T. Antoshevsky, 1997.

⁵ A. Klish, 2016; A. Klish, 2015.

⁶ O. Arkusha, 2004.

⁷ M. Mudryi, 2004.

⁸ Idem, 2006.

⁹ O. Arkusha, 1997; eadem, 2009.

¹⁰ I. Chornovol, 2004; idem, 2017.

among Ukrainians, Poles, and Jews in Galicia. These ideas threatened traditional values and everyday rituals, hence threatening the conservative perception of the world. In the light of this situation, conservatism in the Galician society of that time took a defensive position and eventually lost. On the whole, this also can be applied to Christian social movement. But this fact makes this theme even a more interesting object for research since it gives an opportunity to study ideas and practices of this movement as an unimplemented alternative to the dominating concepts in intellectual and political spheres of those times. It is necessary to emphasize that conservative members of Christian social movement were an integral part of that period and deserve to be researched rigorously and in detail.

Main principles

From the ideological viewpoint, Christian social movement was a conservative force that tried to adjust traditional values to the conditions and challenges of that time – clericalism, social structuring of the society, making a difference through unhasty decisions and compromises as well as rejecting confrontation as a method and a goal in itself. This movement aimed at catching with the all-European wave launched by the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII “*Rerum Novarum*” – it initiated establishing of Christian Social parties in different European countries. Barvinsky used the Austrian Christian Social Party headed by Karl Lueger as a successful example to follow (except for Lueger’s anti-Semitic views)¹¹. Their concepts were built on different principles than of other Ukrainian conservative movement, the Russophiles, due to the fact that Barvinsky’s followers supported Western cultural tradition¹². These divergences resulted in an inevitable antagonism of these two secular conservative movements: for Barvinski and members of Christian social movement, the Russophiles were enemies of the Ukrainian nation, whereas the Russophiles considered Occidentalism of Christian social movement to be hostile to their “all-Ruthenian idea”. Thus, the ideological differences between these two kinds of Ukrainian conservatism in Galicia at the end of the XIX – first quarter of the XX century were more significant than, for instance, between Polish conservative movements – Krakow’s “*Stańczycy*” and the East-Galician “*Podolacy*” – which were distinguished mostly by their practical politics.

From the end of the XIX century, members of Christian social movement tirelessly criticized the Ukrainian National Democratic Party (UNDP, created by the oppositional majority of *Narodivtsi* in 1899) for their occasional contacts with the Russophiles and oppositional politics in the Sejm and Parliament. The ideological platform of conservatives was based on the principle of “organic labour”, a daily labour in the field of education and economics and first and

¹¹ Shche odna zamitka pro “*Khrytyiansko-suspilnyi Soiuz*”, “*Ruslan*” (Lviv), 1911, no. 162, 25 (12) July.

¹² *Kulturna borotba na evropeiskim Zakhodi*. “*Ruslan*” (Lviv), 1906, no. 188, 27 August (9 September).

foremost, aimed at educating a society prepared for the economic and political struggle. The word “educating” is not applied accidentally as it conveys the ideas of the movement in the finest way. Members of this movement treated viche (people’s assembly), a traditional tool of political agitation widely used by Ukrainian National democrats and Radicals, very sceptically¹³. According to Oleksandr Barvinsky, “our society is deceived by newspapers ... we need to pay less attention to popularity. Society needs to be taught that politics is based on compromises”¹⁴. In addition, he emphasized that “wild nature of the old “mob” should be treated carefully as, in his opinion, it had repeatedly become an obstacle to the development of the Ukrainian society”¹⁵. Therefore, it is impossible that Oleksandr Barvinsky would support Yevhen Olesnytsky, one of the leading figures of the UNDP, who addressed to Barvinsky with the words that “the Ruthenian deputies cannot and must not make decisive steps without an agreement with the whole nation, without its voice and authority”¹⁶. This was not a conservative method of making politics and this was not the way of Oleksandr Barvinsky.

Necessary attribute of the “organic labour” was increasing the number of educational institutions and new university departments with Ukrainian as a language of teaching. For Oleksandr Barvinsky, the most suitable way to achieve their goals would be a pragmatic cooperation based on compromises with the Sejm and the parliamentary majority. His membership in the Imperial Council in 1897–1900 is a bright example of this politics. This time also witnessed the attempt of this politician to implement in practice his ideas of the “real politics” as based on permissible compromises in the parliament. This means cooperation between the group of Ukrainian politicians headed by Oleksandr Barvinsky with conservative Slovenian and Croatian deputies that resulted in a common political party called the Slavic Christian People’s Union (SCPU) which existed in the Imperial Council from 1897 till 1900. It is important to emphasize that the existence of the SCPU had become a practical confirmation of the ideological similarity between Ukrainian Christian social movement and Slovenian Catholic movement headed by Oleksandr Barvinsky and Ivan Shustershich respectively. For Ukrainian partners, the success of Slovenian conservatives in practical politics was an example to follow¹⁷. On

¹³ Po vichu, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 243, 25 October (6 November).

¹⁴ Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Lviv (further: CSHAU in Lviv), fond 11 (Barvinski), op. 1, spr. 10 (Protocols of meetings of the “Ruthenian Club” in the Imperial Council, written by Vakhnyanyn A., 1891–1902), 72 reverse.

¹⁵ The Lviv National Vasyl Stefanyk Scientific Library of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Manuscripts department (further: LSNL. Manuscripts department), fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5386 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. Letter to Romanchuk Yulian, 1915), 4.

¹⁶ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 2012 (Olesnytskyi Yevhen. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych 1879–1914), 24.

¹⁷ Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies (further: TSIL, Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies), f. 135 (Barvinky O. H.), spr. 34 (Barvinky O. H. “Memoirs of my life”, part VI, notebook XXXIII), 701–702.

the contrary to neo-Slavic ideas of the Russophiles, the founders of the SCPU on the constitutional assembly made it understandable that the cooperation is not grounded on “Slavic commonness” but focuses on protection of national interests of each nation by joint efforts¹⁸.

The program of the SCPU declared that their primary tasks were to regulate and improve, in a Christian manner, religious, cultural, and socioeconomic issues of the society as well as to do their best to increase influence of the Church and the general national equality of peoples living in the Empire¹⁹. To enhance their chances of success, the SCPU joined the parliamentary majority on a compromise basis, which also included the Polish faction (Oleksandr Barvinsky was bitterly criticized by Ukrainian opposition for this partnership), Czech politicians, Austrian Christian Social Party and a number of smaller conservative parties.

The chances for success were weak even taking into account the fact that the SCPU belonged to the majority in the Imperial Council. Due to the language decree of the President-Minister Kasimir Badeni for Bohemia and Moravia in the recent years of the XIX century – equalized status of the Czech language and the German language in governmental institutions – the Czech-German national antagonism severely exacerbated. It not only paralyzed the parliament in Vienna but also led to the dismissal of several government cabinets. This clearly demonstrated the negative tendencies in the relationships between different nations in the whole Cisleithania. Ukrainian Christian social movement and its political partners in such situation accused German nationalists, all types of socialists, and their partners in the parliamentary coalition – Poles and Czechs. For example, the leader of the Czech National Party František Rieger was criticized in “*Ruslan*” for his politics during the “*Taaffe era*” (1879–1893, when Count Eduard Taaffe occupied the position of the President-Minister) when Rieger defended the equality of all Slavic peoples of Cisleithania in words and at the same time refused to help Ukrainian politicians²⁰. The dismissal of the parliament after a stormy cadence of 1897–1900 was a logical consequence which meant the failure of the SCPU. But even under such circumstances, the “real politics” had positive outcomes – the opening of a Ukrainian Franz Josef gymnasium in Ternopil²¹.

The influence of the philosophy of Krakow-based conservatives on ideological principles of Christian social movement and their leaders is pretty obvious. They were the first to proclaim and successfully implement the idea of “organic labour” in Galicia. The example of “*Stańczycy*” also influenced other political movements in this region as they were dominant in Galicia. Taking into consideration the abovementioned analysis of Ukrainian Christian social

¹⁸ CSHAU in Lviv, fond 818 (Anatol Vakhnianyn), op. 1, spr. 10 (Protocols of meetings the “*Ruthenian Club*” in the Imperial Council, written by Vakhnyanyn A., 1891–1902), 68.

¹⁹ *Z Rady derzhavnoi, “Narodna Chasopys”* (Lviv), 1897, no. 68, 25 March (6 April).

²⁰ *Dr Riger a Rusyny, “Ruslan”* (Lviv), 1897, no. 136, 18 (30) June.

²¹ TSIL, Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies, fond 135 (Barvinky O. H.), spr. 37 (Barvinky O. H. “*Memoirs of my life*”, part VII, notebook XXXVI), 130–136.

movement principles, it will not be a mistake to claim that like nobody else, they adopted the practices of Krakow-based conservatives. Thus it is hardly surprising that some researchers call Oleksandr Barvinsky “the Ruthenian Stańczyk”²².

Oleksandr Barvinsky considered opposition policy to be ineffective for the Ukrainian society of those times in the Habsburg Monarchy. According to the politician, opposition could succeed only if it had conscious and independent society as the one in Hungary. But even fulfillment of these conditions and having own aristocracy could not guarantee a favourable outcome. It can be illustrated by the example of the Czech longstanding non-involvement in the parliamentary sessions²³. The way “Ruslan” treated the politics of Ukrainian oppositional politicians can be found in the article dedicated to the first session of the parliament elected by universal suffrage in 1907. The newspaper emphasizes that the opposition politics of National democrats and Radicals didn’t achieve anything except the isolation in the Imperial Council. It was also indicated that Ukrainian politicians should join the majority coalition headed by the Austrian Christian Social Party (despite the “Polish faction” presented in that coalition)²⁴.

Olena Arkusha suggested an idea that on the verge of the XIX and XX centuries there were no fundamental ideological differences between national democrats and members of Christian social movement except for the question of political tactics and the possibility of an agreement with the Russophiles²⁵. This statement can be used only for the first years of the XX century since in the middle of the first half of the decade contradictions that went beyond the traditional dilemma of “real vs. opposition politics” can be traced.

Nationalism was the main reason. Ukrainian Christian social movement on the contrary to the Russophiles, had no problems with a modern Ukrainian identity. It was Oleksandr Barvinsky who initiated the addition of the term “Ukraine” to the ancient name “Rus”²⁶. Yet, nationalism contained not only national self-identification. “Ruslan” criticized this ideology for societal radicalization and viewed it as such that “produces narrow-minded chauvinism”²⁷. When discussing nationalistic movements in a broad context, the editorial board considered nationalism of the “all-German” party of Georg Ritter von Schönerer and Polish National Democrats to be the worst examples of nationalism in the Habsburg Empire²⁸. Members of the Christian social movement heavily criticized what they believed to be negative

²² Shche izza vyboriv do parlamentu, “Hromadskyi Holos”, 1901 (Lviv), no. 7, 7 February; I. Chornovol, 2006.

²³ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5387 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. Speech at the meeting of “Ruska Hromada”, 1903), 1–2.

²⁴ Stanovyshche ruskykh posliv v derzhavnii radi a obiektyvnist “Dila”, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1907, no. 180, 11 (24) August.

²⁵ O. Arkusha, 2004, p. 70.

²⁶ I. Chornovol, *Halytski viiny za istoriiu*, URL: <http://zbruc.eu/node/5444> (22.01.2016)

²⁷ Perepyska uchenykyv, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1903, no. 20, 25 January (7 February).

²⁸ Natsyonalno-politychna zahorilist, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1907, no. 54, 8 (21) March.

manifestations of both Ukrainian and Polish nationalism²⁹. But this was not an obstacle to its rapid expansion around Galicia and the intensification of multicultural relationships. The most striking cases of antagonism were the struggle for the Ukrainian university, agricultural demonstrations in 1902, murder of the governor Andrzej Potocki, debates on the reform of Sejm electoral ordinance, and others.

With the increasing number of various political processes, these tendencies encouraged radicalization in politics and heated discussions, promoted populism and declined the level of political culture as well as “heroized” politics to an extent that even the smallest ill-considered and pointless act would enjoy undeserved popularity. Following the correspondence of conservatives, it can be easily traced that the reaction to such state of affairs was negative. A proper illustration of the way members of Christian social movement treated the politics of the UNDP, the Radical Party, and their longing to exacerbate conflicts is the letter from Osyp Makovei to Oleksandr Barvinsky: “Are those who do not shoot at others or do not die from a bayonet unworthy of a kind word? Are the plebs supporting only those who conduct insane experiments with them?”³⁰

A deep ideological difference between the Ukrainian National Democrats and Christian social movement was caused by the change of generations within the UNDP. Although, Kost` Levytsky, Y. Olesnytsky, and Y. Romanchuk still remained the leaders of their political parties, younger and more radical generation of the National Democratic environment represented by Viacheslav Budzynovsky, Lonhyn Tsehelsky, and Mykhailo Lozynsky had significant political influence. What unites these three political activists is their work in the editorial board of the newspaper “Dilo”, the main published source of the UNDP and the most influential Ukrainian newspaper of that time. Members of Christian social movement used them as their favourite targets for criticism. It is stated in one of the articles in “Ruslan” that “Dilo” turned into a socialist or even anarchist newspaper when these people had a significant influence on its editorial board³¹. Though there is a bit of exaggeration, this idea can be proved. Viacheslav Budzynovsky wrote about his speech in the parliament in May, 1908, when he actually approved murder of Andrzej Potocki, as madness³². The same refers to Lonhyn Tsehelsky’s article “Ad maiorem Poloniae gloriam” in which he accused Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky in the treason of Ukraine, “Wallenrodism”, and sabotage in favour of Polish authorities. It is difficult to come across actions similar to these practices in the previous history of people’s movement. The evaluation of such political behavior by

²⁹ Durdella Hr., o. *Shche kilka zamitok pro natsyonalizm i Tserkvu*. “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 57, 14 (1) March.; *Shesty lyst do liudyi dobroyi voli*. “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 279, 16 (3) December.

³⁰ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvynski), spr. 1802 (Makovei Osyp. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1908–1910), 105.

³¹ *Druhyi lyst do liudyi dobroyi voli*, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 275, 11 December (28 November).

³² V. Budzynovskyi, 1909.

members of Christian social movement makes it possible to distinguish the attitude of conservatives towards Levytski, Olesnytsky, and Romanchuk on the one hand, and to Budzynovsky, Tsehelsky, and Lozynsky on the other. The latter provoked only negative emotions while the first three, if to leave aside mutual insults, were treated with respect by their political opponents³³. It may be deduced that “Ruslan” was rather sympathetic to the older generation that was facing an increasing number of attacks from the younger leaders of the UNDP for the lack of militancy and ultimatism³⁴.

One of the crucial aspects of Christian social’s conservatism was the education of the youth and issues related to the authority of the older generation. They argued against the participation of young people in political processes highlighting that the primary task of the youth was to obtain necessary knowledge and skills to be able to keep situation in their hands in the future³⁵. The attitude of the members of Christian social movement towards politically active young people can be illustrated by the necessity to create Ukrainian university. Barvinsky claimed that sufficient scientific forces in the society are the most significant precondition to establishing such university and all the powers should be directed to achieve this aim without wasting them on futile actions³⁶. This explains scepticism of O. Barvinsky and K. Studynsky when Ukrainian students withdrew from Lviv University in 1901³⁷.

The teacher played a decisive role in the education of young people in accordance with the principles of the Christian social movement. Among the characteristic traits of an “ideal” teacher, there should be religiousness, abidance of church rites, cooperation with clergy about educational questions, respect to the authorities, and the Regional School Council. As a result, such teacher will bring up a generation of moral Christians that respect societal principles³⁸. In general, this had to be achieved through “Christianization” of the educational system, primarily in schools. Conservatives suggested that the Church should teach not only religion but also a number of secular subjects. The Church had the right to play this role in the process of education due to the importance of the Greek Catholic Church for Ukrainian national life³⁹.

Members of Christian social movement had a broad set of ideas concerning the role of the Church and religion in general in the life of Ukrainian society. The amount of respect towards the Greek Catholic Church clearly demonstrates to what extent conservatives were attached to traditions and the rule of ancient institutions. But in many ways, considerable attention was paid

³³ O. Barvinsky. *Shche kilka sliv*, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 103, 13 May (30 April).

³⁴ Dukh ruiny, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 288, 28 (15) December.

³⁵ Zadachy ruskoi shkilnoi molodizhy, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1905, no. 184, 18 (31) August, no. 185, 19 August (1 September).

³⁶ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5387 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. Speech at the meeting of “Ruska Hromada”, 1903), 9–10.

³⁷ Ibid., spr. 2483 (Studynsky Kyrylo. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1891–1905), 54 rev., 56

³⁸ “Uchytel”. *Shkola a tserkov*, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1905, no. 70, 26 March (8 April).

³⁹ Shkola, tserkva i derzhava, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 92, 25 April (7 May).

to this issue due to a strong personal religiosity of Oleksandr Barvinsky. The son of a priest, Barvinsky had an opportunity to observe the different roles of priests – political leaders, advisers, and assistants in everyday life – from the very childhood⁴⁰. Thus, when young Ukrainians at the beginning of the XX century underestimated the Church and achievements of past generations of clergy in different fields, he reacted very painfully⁴¹.

The outcomes of these ideas were the manifestations of reliance in practice on Christian tradition⁴² and the denial to view religion as a private affair of every person. Propagation of this idea was attributed to the intentions of “socialist international” to separate the nation from the Church to use it in utopian socialist structures⁴³ and to liberalism, the motto of which was a complete freedom and materialism⁴⁴. Followers of Oleksandr Barvinsky considered these ideologies to be a threat to the Christian outlook.

In terms of the analyzing the viewpoints of representatives of Christian social movement, discussion between O. Barvinsky and Y. Romanchuk in 1911 about the role of the Church rite and nationality is extremely interesting. Barvinsky objected to Romanchuk’s thesis that the loyalty to religion beyond the loyalty to the nation can lead to fanaticism and develop against the interests of people’s affair. As an example, Romanchuk pointed to social democrats that were so blinded by the idea of the class that they neglected the national feature⁴⁵. In turn, Barvinsky claimed that a person becomes the member of the church community the moment they are baptized and their national consciousness is formed during their whole life⁴⁶. To support the advantage of the church rite over the national identity, he wrote that people who had given up the church tradition are lost for the national cause too⁴⁷.

Socioeconomic questions were in the focus of attention of Christian social movement. Mostly because of the ideas of O. Barvinsky and A. Vakhnianyn who promoted positive experience of other countries. One of the principal measures to prevent peasant from poverty and debts was the establishment of agricultural unions to defeat the main socioeconomic problem of that time in Galicia was mass emigration⁴⁸. Barvinsky wrote an in-depth article in “Ruslan” dedicated to this question with examples of a productive struggle with peasant

⁴⁰ O. Barvinsky, 2004, p. 62–78.

⁴¹ Idem, p. 74.

⁴² Z Rizdvom Khrystovym! “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, number for review.

⁴³ Religiia ne ye richyiu pryvatnoiu, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 61, 15 (27) March.

⁴⁴ Nashi namiry, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 6, 9 (21) January; Borba o khrystyianskyi svitohliad, Ruslan” (Lviv), 1912, no. 42, 24 (11) February.

⁴⁵ O. Barvinsky, *Strakh pered “klierykalnoiu” partyieiu*, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1911, no. 106, 16 (2) May.

⁴⁶ Ibidem.

⁴⁷ Idem, *Chy khrystyianska osnova mozhe dovesty do ponekhuvannia narodnoi spravy?* “Ruslan”, 1911 (Lviv), no. 111, 21 (8) May.

⁴⁸ Berim sia spilno do ekonomichnoi roboty! “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1899, no. 54, 9 (21) March; Potreba khliborobskoi organizatsyi i reprezentatsii, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 186, 19 (31) August.

debts in Europe⁴⁹. A. Vakhnianyn was the pioneer of an important innovation in the country – founding of loan associations based on the Raiffeisen system. Despite the support from the regional authorities, this project was not fully implemented due to several reasons including the opposition of the UNDP⁵⁰. Representatives of Christian social movement never deviated from their conservative principles despite the forced proclamation, from the standpoint of the Ukrainian society structure in Galicia, of the middle class and peasantry as the foundations of the societal order. This was explained by the attachment of Ukrainian peasants to their traditions.⁵¹

Conservative principles of the movement are also reflected in their reaction to the aggravation of Ukrainian-Polish relationships in Galicia. Even in the first years of the XX century, when they were looking for a common ground with the Ukrainian National Democrats, which meant that the critique of Polish politics doubled at least at half, their reaction to the agricultural demonstrations of 1902 was more reasonable than the one demonstrated by the UNDP. Publishers of “Ruslan” pointed up socioeconomic reasons for those demonstrations⁵² while the national basis was slightly written about⁵³. And publishers of “Dilo” almost immediately emphasized the national nature of the event⁵⁴.

Another event, that was a direct consequence of the demonstrations and intensified international tension in Galicia, was an agitation visit of Włodzimierz Kozłowski, the deputy head of the Polish Central Election Committee with an aim to strengthen “Polishness” in the Eastern Galicia, form an array of local cells, and undermine the growth of the Ukrainian movement. This visit was condemned by Christian social movement⁵⁵, yet something else gained a great deal of their attention. That was an active participation of Latin clergy in Kozłowski’s visit. Catholic priests took part in the events organized by the Polish Central Electoral Committee and supported actions of Polish politicians the goal of which was to construct new churches and chapels in the Eastern Galicia. This triggered a wave of protests and complaints in Ukrainian press. “Ruslan” did not betray its moderate views. Members of Christian social movement condemned Polish intentions but, on the pages of “Ruslan”, they attacked rather Polish press than the Church⁵⁶. On the contrary, Ukrainian National Democrats and the Russophiles explicitly disputed the chauvinistic

⁴⁹ O. Barvinsky, *Proiekt viddovzhenia selianskoi posilosty zemelnoi*, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1905, no. 205, 13 (26) September.

⁵⁰ A. Klish, 2015, p. 59.

⁵¹ Pryntsyp natsionalnosti, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 21, 26 January (7 February).

⁵² Rilni straiky v Halychyni, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1902, no. 157, 16 (29) July.

⁵³ Rilnychi straiky, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1902, no. 155, 13 (26) July.

⁵⁴ Khlopski straiky, “Dilo” (Lviv), 1902, no. 158, 17 (30) July.

⁵⁵ Agitator dr. V. Kozlovskiyi, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1903, no. 3, 4 (17) January; Agitatsyina poizdka d-ra Kozlovskoho, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1903, no. 48, 28 February (13 March).

⁵⁶ Lytsemiry, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1902, no. 63, 17 (30) March; Polska diaka, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1902, no. 105, 11 (24) April.

(from their point of view) intentions of the Roman Catholic clergy, in particular of Lviv Archbishop Józef Bilczewski⁵⁷.

Moderate views of those politicians from Christian social movement in comparison with other Ukrainian movements towards Polish-Ukrainian conflict can be explained by them following the model of the “New era” according to which rapprochement between nations is the best politics⁵⁸. This is an exemplary tactic. They claimed that both sides can benefit from the Polish-Ukrainian agreement. And the main condition of this rapprochement was the broadening of Ukrainian educational institutions network, according to the author of “Ruslan”. In this context, the position of “Ruslan” against the separation of Galicia in Ukrainian and Polish parts was unconventional for Ukrainian political forces. The division was considered to be nothing more than a romantic idea that steals attention from the “positive work”⁵⁹. Oleksandr Barvinsky argued that an urge for compromises was not an aim in itself but an efficient method to improve the position of Ukrainians in Galicia. Narodovtsi and Russophiles regularly criticized these views in their press saying that was a mere subservience and the lack of principles⁶⁰. This stigma followed members of the movement throughout the whole period in question, although for them it was an effective tactic to achieve the same goals as the National Democrats – the comprehensive development of the Ukrainian nation in the Habsburg Empire. Looking through “Ruslan” newspaper, it is possible to come across the criticism against Polish movements for their anti-Ukrainian activity and in some cases, this critique was as bitter as in “Dilo”⁶¹. The statement of a historian, Ihor Chornovol, about this politics of compromises of O. Barvinsky is very accurate – “he was not a Polonophile, he just was not a Polonophob”⁶². But that was enough in a tense atmosphere in Galicia at the end of the XIX – first quarter of the XX century to determine the future political destiny of Christian social movement.

Practical politics dilemmas

The history of political organizations that belong to Christian social movement is a good illustration of the problems faced by conservative environments at the turn of the XIX and XX centuries not only in Galicia but also in the whole Austro-Hungarian Empire. The greatest dilemma was how to attract the attention of the general public to the sociopolitical processes. The traditional method used by conservatives to solve political

⁵⁷ Ks. artsybiskup hakatystom, “Dilo” (Lviv), 1903, no. 20, 25 January (7 February); Latynstvo ydet, “Halychany” (Lviv), 1903, no. 15, 19 January (1 February).

⁵⁸ Poliak o Rusynakh, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1898, no. 169, 30 July (11 August).

⁵⁹ Podil Halychyny, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 116, 24 May (5 June).

⁶⁰ *Nashi khrystyianski suspilnyky*, Lviv: Nakladom redaktsyi “Dila”, 1910; Ot napasty ne propasty! “Halychany” (Lviv), 1900, no. 45, 25 February (9 March); Smikhotvortsy, “Halychany” (Lviv), 1900, no. 136, 17 (30) June.

⁶¹ Shesty lyst do liudyi dobroy voli, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 279, 16 (3) December.

⁶² I. Chornovol, 2004, p. 27.

problems in Cisleithania was to group into political interest clubs without a clear structure rather than in the form of political parties. Compromises, reciprocal adjustments, usage of private influence and contacts – these were the conservative methods that rose from the idea about politics as an elite affair. But elite does not always mean the highest class⁶³. This is a very accurate notion for the Ukrainian society which was deprived of aristocracy and role of the elite was played by Greek Catholic clergy and secular intellectuals. Due to the social structure of Ukrainian society in Galicia, members of the Christian social movement had to fight for the same peasant voter base as Radicals, National democrats, and other parties. Therefore, conservative movement actively supported the introduction of universal suffrage in Cisleithania as this was the only path to increase the number of Ukrainian representatives in the Viennese parliament and to implement their own political and socioeconomic programs⁶⁴.

For the conservative movement to be prolific in the context of mass politics, the formation of modern parties with a clear structure was a necessary condition. At the turn of the XIX and XX centuries, Christian social movement made three attempts to institutionalize their movement. Foundation of the Catholic-Ruthenian People's Union (CRPU) was the first one. As there were no organizations of that kind, the founders understood the necessity to create an organization the program framework of which would be based on the declaration of 1890 from the "New era". When Narodovtsi and Russophiles united before the parliamentary elections in 1897, O. Barvinsky finally understood that the pursuit of understanding with former partners was futile⁶⁵. Thus, he decided to create their own political organization.

The establishment of the CRPU was officially announced on an assembly in Lviv on October 14, 1896. The gathering was attended by the clergy, including the future Przemyśl bishop Konstantyn Chekhovych, and representatives of secular intellectuals⁶⁶. As the number of priests prevailed, it clearly indicated that the future organization planned to rely on the Church. The first head of the CRPU, Ivan Chapelsky, was also from the clergy. Such politics was logical given the ideological principles of Christian social movement and the open support it received from the Metropolitan Sylvester Sembratovych⁶⁷. But even under such favorable conditions, the movement did not manage to spread their influence on the entire clergy that mostly supported Narodovtsi and Russophiles.

According to their statutory objectives, the organization promises to "take care of religious, moral, national, political, and economic problems of the

⁶³ M. Król, 1982, p. 20.

⁶⁴ O vyborchu reformu v Avstriji, "Ruslan" (Lviv), 1905, no. 242, 28 October (10 November).; Shcho dalshe robyty? . "Ruslan" (Lviv), 1906, no. 261, 26 November (9 December).

⁶⁵ TSIL, Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies, fond 135 (Barvinky O. H.), spr. 32 (Barvinky O. H. "Memoirs of my life", part VI, notebook XXXI), 524–533.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 524–533.

⁶⁷ TSIL, Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies, fond 135 (Barvinky O. H.), spr. 32 (Barvinky O. H. "Memoirs of my life", part VI, notebook XXXI), 528.

Ruthenian nation in Galicia". They had a plan on how to reach their goals – to increase the level of education among the people, society's legal consciousness, and conduct meetings to explain current political and economic questions⁶⁸. It was published in the statute that any adult Ukrainian who was the citizen of the Austro-Hungary could become the member of their organization. But not all the members were satisfied with such broad limits. A priest and future depute of the Imperial Council, father Ivan Hrobelskyi, claimed that the regulations of the statute would give the opponents of Christian social ideas (Russophiles, Radicals, Liberals) the possibility to join their organization and destroy it from the inside. Moreover, he was outraged by the absence of a clear statement that members should be faithful to the Greek Catholic Church and acknowledge national independence of the Ukrainian people without any doubts⁶⁹.

The CRPU did not become an influential institution mostly due to the poor organization. As a matter of fact, they were active only during the first couple of months till the parliamentary elections of 1897. Although six deputies representing the program principles of the CRPU were chosen to the Imperial Council (O. Barvinsky, A. Vakhnianyn, Modest Karatnytsky, Ksenofont Okhrymovych, Kornel Mandachevsky, and I. Hrobelsky) the organization officially withdrew from the pre-election campaign on its eve⁷⁰. In fact, the elections of 1897 were the first and the last effective activity of the CRPU. If de jure their organization existed until 1901, de facto it did not – the only evidence of their further existence was the publications in "Ruslan". In many respects, this is due to the weak leadership, for instance, I. Chapelsky admitted in 1901 that he could not run the organization in such difficult political situation⁷¹.

"Rus`ka Hromada" was the political organization created to replace the CRPU. The first mention of this organization dates back to the beginning of 1901, but its origin and nature remained unsettled⁷². The first official statement of "Rus`ka Hromada" took place on the pages of "Ruslan"⁷³. Its statute and program principles went along with the ones of the CRPU⁷⁴. According to Tyt Revakovich, this new organization emerged as it was no longer possible to tolerate Russophiles and their denial of Ukrainian identity, Radicals with their anti-Church views, and the UNDP with their urge to make an alliance with Russophiles and the absence of a clear aim⁷⁵. But that was rather "Rus`ka

⁶⁸ Ibid., 533–534.

⁶⁹ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 1015 (Hrobelskyi Ivan. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych 1894–1898), 58–58 rev.

⁷⁰ Zaiavlenie, "Ruslan" (Lviv), 1897, no. 45, 25 February (9 March).

⁷¹ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 2720 (Chapelsky Ivan. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1889–1906), 30.

⁷² LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 886 (Herasymovych Mykola. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1901), 5 rev.

⁷³ "Ruska Hromada". Politychne tovarystvo u Lvovi, "Ruslan" (Lviv), 1901, no. 134, 15 (28) June.

⁷⁴ CSHAU in Lviv, fond 362 (Kyrylo Studynsky), op. 1, spr. 196 (Statutes of Ukrainian cultural, educational and political societies in Galicia, 1868–1928), 29–33.

⁷⁵ O. Arkusha, 2004, p. 74.

Hromada” that could be characterized by the absence of a clear aim and methods to its achievement.

The history repeated – as the CRPU, a new institution lacked proper organization, activity, and followers. And most of their problems were caused by a heavy dependence on the leader. When National democrat Andriy Kos gave a speech in the Imperial Council saying that O. Barvinsky has no support from the Ukrainian society, the leader of Christian social movement expected a reaction from his followers, but he hoped in vain. The important member of “Rus`ka Hromada” Evhen Huzar wrote about his intentions to protest against that situation but considered himself to be an insignificant figure thus transferring responsibility to other members of the organization⁷⁶. Father Mykola Herasymovych, an authorized representative of O. Barvinsky in Brody district who organized his election campaigns, was also reluctant to act without the instructions from the head⁷⁷.

The role of father Mykola Herasymovych is important in terms of the information he sent to O. Barvinsky during their correspondence as it allows to trace in practice the problems faced by “Rus`ka Hromada” and the influence of this unfavourable situation on the destiny of O. Barvinsky and his movement. The first category includes Herasymovych’s initiative to create a local organization of Christian social movement in Brody district since the support of the movement by local population was the highest. However, fear of Herasymovych to take the responsibility and lack of accurate instructions from Lviv stood in the way and the idea was not implemented⁷⁸.

Another political situation that turned out to be completely disadvantageous for Christian social movement and escalated Polish-Ukrainian relationships was the assignment of Leon Pininsky to the position of the governor. Regional administration and the Polish majority of the Galician Sejm clearly demonstrated their adverse attitude towards Ukrainians during the strikes of 1902 and the adoption of the land law on the basis of the draft made by Yan Hupka in 1901. The last event even triggered secession of Ukrainian deputies from the Sejm as they believed this law creates a way for Poles from the Western part of the region to colonize Eastern Galicia. Symbolically, the speech about the secession on the behalf of Ukrainian deputies was given by O. Barvinsky. In this way, he made an attempt to get closer to the UNDP but failed as they once again put a stake on cooperation with Radicals and Russophiles. Moreover, Polish community set against O. Barvinsky for taking part in the secession⁷⁹.

This change of attitudes demonstrated by the Poles and local administration to O. Barvinsky turned out to be catastrophic as he lost the additional elections to the Sejm in 1904 to the Russophile candidate, father Teodoziy Effynovych.

⁷⁶ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 1041 (Huzar Yevhenii. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych 1885–1918), 78.

⁷⁷ Ibid., spr. 886 (Herasymovych Mykola. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1901), 5–5 rev.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 3.

⁷⁹ Rusini ugodowcy. “Gazeta Narodowa” (Lviv), 1900, no. 284, 14 October.

Herasymovych recorded how the local administration changed its mood during the pre-election campaign as well as rapid reactivation of Russophiles who enjoyed significant popularity in Brody count. Yet, despite the warning signs, Herasymovych was certain of their victory⁸⁰. Only after the defeat, he admitted the existence of the alliance between Poles and Russophiles as well as financing of the priest Effynovych's election campaign by a leading Polish politician Tadeusz Ceński⁸¹.

The second stroke that undermined "Rus`ka Hromada" was the secession from the organization of T. Revakovych, a close friend of O. Barvinsky. In the provided explanations, Revakovych emphasized the falsity of the political strategy and tactics of Christian social movement that tried to achieve compromise with Polish politicians⁸². Taking into account the growth of the national struggle, Revakovych advocated the idea of an open struggle as the only way for Ukrainians to achieve their goals⁸³. These events diminished Barvinsky's confidence in his strength⁸⁴ so the organization practically stopped its activity, although it was mentioned for the last time on the pages of "Ruslan" in May, 1905⁸⁵.

Between the decline of "Rus`ka Hromada" after 1905 and establishment of the Christian-Social Party in summer of 1911, this movement was not institutionalized. Yet, in 1907 Barvinsky attempted to return during the first parliamentary elections by universal suffrage. He had an intention to traditionally become a candidate of Brody district, which also covered Radekhiv, Sokal, and Zboriv districts according to new electoral law. First of all, he strived to gain the support of the clergy with the help of father Herasymovych. But the clergy of the Brody district greeted his intentions unfavourably⁸⁶. The situation in Sokal district was the same. Some members of the clergy did support Barvinsky but considered that his nomination was too late as the election campaign has already been in full swing. Priests from the Narodovtsi movement had already declared their support to the candidate of the UNDP Yevhen Petrushevych and did not want to be accused of the deliberate disorganization of Ukrainian forces⁸⁷. As a result, even with the support expressed on the pages of "Ruslan", O. Barvinsky did not dare to officially take part in the elections to the Imperial Council as chances for success were minimal.

⁸⁰ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 887 (Herasymovych Mykola. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1902–1904), 59 rev.–60.

⁸¹ Ibid., 65–66.

⁸² Ibid., spr. 2201 (Revakovych Tyt. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1901–1914), 40–41, 47–48 rev.

⁸³ Ibid., 41.

⁸⁴ CSHAU in Lviv, fond 362 (Kyrylo Studynsky), op. 1, spr. 236 (Letters from Barvinsky Oleksandr, 1894–1934), 6 rev.

⁸⁵ Zizd muzhiv doviria, "Ruslan" (Lviv), 1906, no. 103, 16 (29) May.

⁸⁶ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 888 (Herasymovych Mykola. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1905, 1912, 1913, 1914), 19.

⁸⁷ Ibid., spr. 1619 (Levytskyi Vasyl. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych 1895, 1896, 1900–1903, 1906–1908, 1916–1918), 27–27 rev.

The abovementioned support expressed by “Ruslan” to O. Barvinsky is an illustration of proper arguments in favour of their leader that explain why this conservative movement failed under the conditions of mass politics. The author of “The Article from Brody District” wrote: “Some even present this [electoral] agitation as a merit of those people who became candidates during the electoral wave that are said to move the masses (good moving!) but reprehend Barvinsky that he does not take any steps [...] and even do not visit his district [...] Forty years ago, Barvinsky did the same work that they do now [...] but much better because he did not cry from behind his mandate on gatherings but created reading halls, travelled across Ternopil region giving lectures, and also visited Brody district. Let our candidates “move” the people for at least twenty years as he did, then they will have legitimate claims to get a mandate. If such pioneers of national affairs like Romanchuk or Barvinsky [...] had to visit all the villages and towns, using terrible and destroyed roads, speak to the assembly in cold and damp room, hurting their health and allowing desperate young agitators to attack them [...] that would be a great shame not only for them but also for us, their voters”⁸⁸. From this viewpoint, the modern methods of political agitation, which were often connected with a considerable decline in the level of political culture, are pretty visible. This view shows unwillingness and inability to win by means of insulting the opponent and populism, ignorance of those who “cry”, deserve both respect and sympathy, as it made political success impossible at the beginning of the XX century.

After a long pause, O. Barvinsky and his followers made the third attempt to create an effective political organization with a lot of members. And this time their preparation was much more serious. Before making an announcement about creation of the Christian Social Union in 1911, conservatives expanded the volume and informativity of “Ruslan” and launched a pretty serious agitation campaign in favour of their new organization on its pages. The stature of the CSU indicated the main principles of their organization as well as its structure as opposed to their previous attempts⁸⁹. Another evidence of a more responsible approach is a detailed instruction on what organizational and promotional activities their members should do at the local level⁹⁰. In an address to the Ukrainian society, the founders of the party declared their main tasks to be the awakening and expansion of the national consciousness, adherence to the Christian principles, defense of the rights of the Greek Catholic Church, development of legal consciousness among the people, and intensification of economic development⁹¹. These measures resulted in the higher number of members than the CRPU and “Rus`ka Hromada” ever had. If to assume that the maximum number of members of the first two organizations equaled the number of people present at the founding meeting – 56 people at times of

⁸⁸ Dopys. Z Bridshchyny, “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1907, no. 78, 5 (18) April.

⁸⁹ Statut “Khrystyiansko-Suspilnoho Soiuzu” u Lvovi, Lviv, 1911.

⁹⁰ Khrystyiansko-suspilnyi Soiuz. Vkazivky i spys chleniv dlia vidporuchnyka, Lviv, b.d.

⁹¹ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5153 (Christian-social Union. Proclamation with an appeal to join the party “Christian-social union”, 1911), 1.

the CRPU (and 30 more sent greetings)⁹² and a couple of dozens during the existence of “Rus`ka Hromada”⁹³ – then the CSU as of 1912 had 253 members among which 152 priests⁹⁴. This speaks for the desire of the founders to rely on the clergy the same as it was with the CRPU.

Even having conducted such a thorough preparatory work, a newly-found organization met with challenges from the very beginning. The first problem was the refusal of O. Barvinsky’s two long-time partners to join the party – Y. Huzar and T. Revakovykh⁹⁵. The latter justified his position in a letter to bishop Konstantyn Chekhovych, his relative: “It is a pity that Barvinsky has to work on his own. He is left with his 10 generals and no army at all. That’s a shame because he is a hard-working man and after all heart beating in his chest belongs to a Ukrainian man. But his hope to settle things with Polish and other “masters” contradicts our entire history”⁹⁶. And Revakovykh had a point as the Polish-Ukrainian relationship, when the CSU was founded, grew worse due to the question about the opening of Ukrainian university and the electoral reform. Although, the members of Christian social movement postponed the official announcement about the party till the end of the parliamentary elections on purpose (to avoid accusations that they divide Ukrainian forces) and declared the desire to cooperate with UNDP, they right away faced the continuous attacks from “Dilo”, the main newspaper of the UNDP. Following their tradition, “Dilo” labeled them and their leaders “opportunists”, careerists, “Polish intrigue”, etc.⁹⁷

An active and brutal campaign to discredit the CSU was successful. For example, what happened to their attempt to strengthen their position in the province. Father Ivan Plaviuk, the member of the party, wrote that his initiative to agitate the clergy from the Tovmach county to join the CSU was met with fierce opposition, prejudice, and fear⁹⁸. There are the grounds that demonstrate the reluctance to trigger difficulties with the UNDP. O. Makovei emphasized similar phenomena while writing about the image of the members of Christian social movement as “deuces”⁹⁹.

But the attitude of national democrats to the CSU was not the only reason for their failure, although it played a crucial role. Their organization was suffering from the same organizational diseases as the CRPU and “Rus`ka

⁹² A. Klish, 2016, p. 57.

⁹³ O. Arkusha, 2004, p. 75.

⁹⁴ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5159 (Christian-social union in Lviv. List of members).

⁹⁵ Huzar explained his position in the letter to O. Barvinsky: Ibid., (Huzar Yevhenii. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych 1885–1918), 123.

⁹⁶ Letter from T. Reavkovych to Bishop Konstantyn Chekhovych, 3 July 1911, [in:] A. Krochmal, 1998, s. 114.

⁹⁷ *Nashi khrystyianski suspilnyky*, 1910; M. Mudryi, 2004, p. 439–440.

⁹⁸ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5292 (Plaviuk Ivan, priest. Letters to editorial office of “Ruslan” newspaper, 1909–1913), 18 rev.

⁹⁹ Ibid., spr. 1803. (Makovei Osyp. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1911–1922), 139 rev.

Hromada” – first and foremost, their unconditional dependence from their leader. K. Studynsky was one of the key figures of the movement. But he admitted without any dissembling that the party authorities did not want to make any actions without O. Barvinsky and the very organization continued its existence only if it was headed by the old leader¹⁰⁰. The lack of experienced politicians was another important reason why they did not succeed. Except for O. Barvinsky, no member of the CSU had experience in the Sejm or the parliament, hence he was the only person that could be considered a professional politician. The CSU also abated to other Ukrainian parties in this regard. Members of the organization clearly realized the absence of proper political qualities among themselves¹⁰¹. Even principal members of the movement could be characterized by the scarcity of political ambitions. For instance, O. Makovei was frightened by the low level of political methods and discussions in the Ukrainian society¹⁰².

Despite extremely unfavorable external and internal circumstances, members of the CSU invested efforts to expand their party first and foremost seeing their perspective in “interception” of the clergy and intellectuals dissatisfied with an excessive radicalism of national democrats. Father Modest Lukashevych who used to actively organize the UNDP was a proper example for other members of the party demonstrating an arrangement of effective Christian social community¹⁰³. O. Makovei, who while holding the position of the director of Teacher’s Gymnasium in Zalishchyky promised to add new members to the CSU, believed that the further struggle had a lot of sense¹⁰⁴. It remains a mystery what would be the destiny of the party if not the beginning of the First World War that put an end to the CRPU (important members of the party, particularly O. Makovei and the editor of “Ruslan” Semen Goruk, took part in fights on the Eastern Front).

Although during the war the CSU did not show any activity as a party, O. Barvinsky tried to act on its behalf. As a representative of the party, he strived to take part in the work of Supreme Ukrainian Council (HUR) – a joint representation of Ukrainian forces in Galicia – and addressed its head Kost Levytsky with a corresponding proposal¹⁰⁵. Yet, the CSU got a refusal due to their seemingly complete unpopularity in the society while the Social Democratic Party which did not enjoy wide popularity actively participated in the organization. Y. Romanchuk proposed O. Barvinsky to disband the CSU and

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., spr. 2484 (Studynsky Kyrylo. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1906–1913), 79 rev.

¹⁰¹ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 2484 (Studynsky Kyrylo. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1906–1913), 12 rev.

¹⁰² Ibid., spr. 1801 (Makovei Osyp. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1893–1907), 61 rev.

¹⁰³ Ibid., spr. 5134 (Lukashevych Modest, priest. Letters to leadership of party „Christian-social union; 1911, 1912).

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., spr. 1803 (Makovei Osyp. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1911–1922), 139 rev.

¹⁰⁵ K. Levytskyi, 1929, p. 493–494.

join National democrats as the right wing¹⁰⁶. In return leader of the Christian social movement accused the largest Ukrainian party of contradicting to the democratic principles they declare, attempting to subdue other parties when the circumstances required the unification of all Ukrainian forces. It is worth mentioning that under the unification O. Barvinsky meant not the absorbing of the CSU by the UNDP, which was desired by Y. Romanchuk and the UNDP, but cooperation through federacy¹⁰⁷. The attempts of O. Barvinsky to join the general public of Ukrainian politicians in the summer of 1915 also failed.

Despite the circumstances and health problems, O. Barvinsky made an effort to conduct an effective political activity. He participated in the work of the Constitutional Commission and applied his old personal contacts, particularly with governor of Galicia Witold Korytowski¹⁰⁸. After being given the title of the member of the House of Lords by Emperor Karl I in 1917, leader of Christian social movement tried to use his position to defend Ukrainian interests. His speech from July 29, 1918, is an excellent example of his intentions. In his speech, O. Barvinsky, having a polemic with Polish politicians L. Pininsky and S. Starzynski, paid attention to pro-Russian interests of some Polish movements, rejected the thesis about entirely Polish Lviv, and advocated for the separation of Galicia (this viewpoint differed from the pre-war attitude to this question)¹⁰⁹.

His attempt to popularize Ukrainian question among the Austro-Hungarian and German government circles had a significant meaning. To achieve this aim, O. Barvinsky published the work "The World War and the Ukrainian Question" under the pseudonym "Verax" where the author provided a brief outline of Ukrainian history, showed the hostility of the Russophiles and pro-Russian part of Polish movements for the Ukrainian affairs and the interests of the Habsburgs and the Hohenzollerns. At the same time, O. Barvinsky defined principal claims of Ukrainians and their sacrifice on the battlefields not only as a struggle for the sake of the future of the Austro-Hungary but also for the future of Ukraine¹¹⁰. Using connections in the influential circles of which other Ukrainian politicians could not boast, he sent this book to the Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs Leopold Berchtold, his successor Stephan Burian, the former and future President-Minister of Cisleithania Ernest Koerber, Hungarian Prime Minister Istvan Tisza, and others¹¹¹.

O. Barvinsky and the part of Christian social movement became more active as a result of signing The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk between The Ukrainian

¹⁰⁶ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 2242 (Romanchuk Yulian. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1875–1926), 45 rev.

¹⁰⁷ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5386 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. Letter to Romanchuk Yulian, 1915), 2–3.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, spr. 133 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. Letters to son Bohdan Oleksandrovych Barvinsky 1916–1925), 32–32 rev.

¹⁰⁹ Z Derzhavnoi Rady, "Dilo" (Lviv), 1918, no. 171, 31 (18) July.

¹¹⁰ O. Stauf von der March, 1915.

¹¹¹ CSHAU in Lviv, fond 362 (Kyrolo Studynsky), op. 1, spr. 236 (Letters from Barvinsky Oleksandr, 1894–1934), 50 rev.

People's Republic and the Central Powers. According to the Treaty, German and Austrian troops entered the territory of Ukrainian People Republic. On April 1, 1918, the first issue of a new newspaper "Vidrodzhennia" was published. It can be deduced from numerous articles of O. Barvinsky that his influence on the paper and the content were significant. The paper advocated close cooperation between The Ukrainian People's Republic and Austro-Hungary and emphasized multiple positive aspects of Austrian and German presence on the territory of Ukraine¹¹². They also refuted the reproaches of militarism and imperialism of the countries of the Triple Entente against Germany and the Habsburg Monarchy and the main bearer of these features was claimed to be Great Britain with its administration in Ireland¹¹³.

The main importance of this newspaper within the context of analyzing the conservative ideas of Christian social movement lies in the fact that it gives a possibility to understand a classic conservative vision of state building. Here are the elements of the "organic labour" concept, particularly in the article of O. Barvinsky dedicated to fundamentals of an independent Ukraine. The leader of Christian social movement accentuated that the key to the strength and stability of Ukraine should be an inner order and discipline, strong army, regulated finances, and development of education¹¹⁴. Conservatives criticized the land policy of The Ukrainian People's Republic that aimed at terminating the private property¹¹⁵. Therefore, it does not come as a surprise that the editorial board of "Vidrodzhennia" and O. Barvinsky personally positively treated Pavlo Skoropadsky's accession to power¹¹⁶. In general, the fundamental principles of building a country from the viewpoint of conservative Christian social movement can be summarized with a quotation from one of the articles in "Vidrodzhennia" which reflects the abovementioned analysis of ideological foundations of this movement: "Whoever wants to have rights must also take the responsibilities... Beautiful words on the assembly do not mean anything. It is and remains an idle talk of several heroes of the phrase that enjoy the audience and thunderous applause but who remain indifferent whether something reasonable is going on... We need to realize once and for all: we need order... And for this to happen, one condition should be improved – discipline"¹¹⁷.

The following stage in the history of Christian social movement was the existence of the West Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR). In spite of the

¹¹² Vyzvolenie chy okupatsiia? Vidrodzhenne, "Vidrodzhennia" (Vienna), 1918, no. 1, 1 April (19 March); Avstro-Uhorshchyna y Ukraina, "Vidrodzhennia" (Vienna), 1918, no. 9, 24 (11) April.

¹¹³ Borotba Irliandii za samostiinist, "Vidrodzhennia" (Vienna), 1918, no. 5, 11 April (29 March).

¹¹⁴ O. Barvinsky, *Pidvalyny samostiinoi ukrainskoi derzhavy*, "Vidrodzhennia" (Vienna), 1918, no. 22, 18 May.

¹¹⁵ Zemelne pyttanie na Ukraini, "Vidrodzhennia" (Vienna), 1918, no. 10, 25 (12) April.

¹¹⁶ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvynski), spr. 133 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. Letters to son Bohdan Oleksandrovych Barvinsky 1916–1925), 37 rev.

¹¹⁷ Ukrainska osnova, "Vidrodzhennia" (Vienna), 1918, no. 38, 12 June.

past misunderstandings, six members of the CSU were included into the temporary parliament – the Ukrainian National Council: Oleksandr Barvinsky and his son Bogdan, K. Studynsky, Yaroslav Hordynsky, Yulian Dzerovych, and Spyrydon Karkhut¹¹⁸. The leader of the movement also became a member of the first government of ZUNR as a State Secretary of Education and Religious Affairs¹¹⁹. Principal educational laws of ZUNR were accepted in February 1919, when O. Barvinsky had already resigned. Nonetheless, we can agree with O. Arkusha that his participation in creation of draft laws was of supreme importance¹²⁰.

After the Polish rule was established in Galicia, O. Barvinsky tried to revive the CSU. At first, he wanted to collaborate with representatives of the former UNDP that changes its title to the Ukrainian National Labor Party but after the negotiations failed, he decided to make it on his own. He created a program of the party called “Program of Christian Ukrainian Narodovtsi”¹²¹. There also is the draft of his letter to Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky asking for an apostolic blessing for his organization¹²². According to B. Barvinsky, this project did not succeed due to the obstacles from the former National Democrats¹²³. Nonetheless, O. Barvinsky and K. Studynsky took part in the political life of Ukrainians in Galicia, particularly in the Cross-Party Council and the first and second Cross-Party congresses. In solidarity with most Ukrainian parties, Christian social movement boycotted the census of population of 1921 and elections to the Sejm in 1922¹²⁴. But organizational troubles, the final accession of the Eastern Galicia to Poland in 1923, and the further radicalization of Ukrainian society ultimately ended the political career of O. Barvinsky whose figure was the symbol of Christian social movement of the first quarter of the XX century.

After 1923 O. Barvinsky concentrated on his scientific activity but despite leaving an active political life he continued his journalistic activity. His texts were published mostly in the Przemyśl newspaper “Ukrainskyi Holos”. Among the most memorable is his article against an old ally of the pre-war SCU, the bishop Hryhoriy Khomyshyn, to introduce a forced celibacy among the Greek Catholic clergy of his diocese. Occidentalism of O. Barvinsky did not spread as far as bishop`s. Moreover, he viewed this problem to be more national-political than religious. His main argument was that the right of the priests to create families is one of the most important aspects of Ukrainian national life

¹¹⁸ M. Lytvyn, K. Naumenko, 1995, p. 83–87.

¹¹⁹ *Zakhidno-Ukrainska narodna respublika 1918–1923. Dokumenty i materialy*. Tom 2, p. 14.

¹²⁰ O. Arkusha, 2009, p. 64.

¹²¹ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 4371 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. “Program of Christian Ukrainian Narodovtsi” – project, 1923).

¹²² *Ibid.*, spr. 4416 (Barvinsky O. H. Letter to Sheptytsky An. [1923]), 1.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, spr. 4371 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. “Program of Christian Ukrainian Narodovtsi” – project, 1923), 5.

¹²⁴ M. Moskaliuk, 1998, p. 12–15.

in Galicia. O. Barvinsky used his father as an example¹²⁵. Other publications from his recent years speak for this loyalty to old principles especially when it comes to educating the youth, unacceptability of socialism, and the necessity to strengthen the moral pillars of society¹²⁶.

During the postwar period, the attempts to reanimate the activity of Christian social movement did not succeed and one of the reasons was the personal crisis that O. Barvinsky experiences. Pessimism and sometimes nostalgia characterized his letters of the recent years. His letters to his relative, father Isydor Hlynsky, who remained one of the closest person to O. Barvinsky, can serve as an example. Complicated financial circumstances, as well as his own health problems and of his family, were intensified by a painful adaptation to the new era. Being a person born and raised in the Habsburg Monarchy, O. Barvinsky felt nostalgia even in such small issues as the choice of paper for letters¹²⁷. One of the most disturbing consequences of the war for O. Barvinsky was the destiny of his own village of *Shliakhtyntsi* which was completely destroyed during the war. His letters to father Hlynsky about his first visit to the destroyed village are full of gloomy and fatalistic thoughts¹²⁸. The destiny of his village can be viewed as the quintessence of changes and those insurmountable difficulties they caused to such conservative minds as O. Barvinsky.

Conclusions

In the history of Galicia of the first quarter of the XX century the first evoked association with Christian social movement is the missed opportunities. This can be applied to various fields. The projects of gradual reforms in the social and economic fields, in particular, to improve the situation of peasants, proposed by the members of the movement and above all O. Barvinsky were more thorough and potentially more effective than the program of the Russophiles and to some extent of other parties. A similar situation was with education and, in general, the intellectual field, where conservatism of Christian social movement with its clear national identity could balance socialist, nationalistic, and liberal views of the Radical Party and the UNDP. A distinctive demonstration of Christian social conservatism was the intention, by defending all the principal demands of the Ukrainian movement, to come to an interethnic compromise in Galicia made it stood out from the gradual radicalization of Ukrainian and Polish parties. The characteristic feature of the conservative worldview of this

¹²⁵ O. Barvinsky, *Obrazets sviashchenychoho podruzhia*, "Ukrainskyi Holos" (Przemyśl), 1924, no. 37, 14 September.

¹²⁶ Idem, *Kilka dumok pro zavdannia akademichnoi molodizhy*, "Ukrainskyi Holos" (Przemyśl), 1921, no. 31, 31 July; Idem, *Zanepad sotsiializmu i bezvyhladnist sotsiialistychnoi hospod,y v Nimechchyni i hroza dlia Evropy*, "Ukrainskyi Holos" (Przemyśl), 1922, no. 49, 10 December; Idem, *Doroha do vidrodzhennia iz zanepadu*, "Ukrainskyi Holos" (Przemyśl), 1922, no. 29, 16 July.

¹²⁷ LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 159 (Hlynski), spr. 49 (Barvinskyi Oleksandr. Letters to Hlynsky Isydor, 1884–1922), 47.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 27–27 rev.

group was the resistance to the aggressive nationalism from both sides. It also became one of two main reasons of their failure as in the political discourse in Galicia of those times tendency to the compromise made the movement the one that can be agreed with and pro-Polish for the Ukrainian general public and, at the same time, unacceptable for Poles where all Ukrainian aspirations were treated as “haidamacks”. Another not less important reason for their failure except for the political situation was their undesired and inability to adjust to the demands of the political struggle of that period. It is clearly shown in their ignorance of mass political and agitation events and inability to create a well-structured and effective political organization according to a modern pattern. Another factor that contributed to the failure was the fact that the political peak of an irreplaceable leader of the movement had already gone. All these factors made a considerable intellectual potential of the conservative Ukrainian Christian social movement in the first quarter of the XX century unfulfilled. After O. Barvinsky withdrew from the movement, it continued to exist but with new leaders and under new circumstances.

Bibliography

Sources

Abbreviations

CSHAU in Lviv – Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Lviv

LSNL – the Lviv National Vasyl Stefanyk Scientific Library of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Manuscripts department

TSIL – Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies

Manuscripts

CSHAU in Lviv, fond 362 (Kyrylo Studynsky), opys 1, sprava 196 (Statutes of Ukrainian cultural, educational and political societies in Galicia, 1868–1928).

CSHAU in Lviv, fond 362 (Kyrylo Studynsky), op. 1, spr. 236 (Letters from Barvinsky Oleksandr, 1894–1934).

CSHAU in Lviv, fond 818 (Anatol Vakhnyanyn), op. 1, spr. 10 (Protocols of meetings of the “Ruthenian Club” in the Imperial Council, written by Vakhnyanyn A., 1891–1902).

LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 133 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. Letters to son Bohdan Oleksandrovych Barvinsky 1916–1925).

LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 886 (Herasymovych Mykola. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1901).

LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 887 (Herasymovych Mykola. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1902–1904).

LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 888 (Herasymovych Mykola. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1905, 1912, 1913, 1914).

- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 1015 (Hrobelskyi Ivan. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych 1894–1898).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 1041 (Huzar Yevhenii. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych 1885–1918).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 1619 (Levytskyi Vasyl. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych 1895, 1896, 1900–1903, 1906–1908, 1916–1918,).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 1801 (Makovei Osyp. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1893–1907).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 1802 (Makovei Osyp. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1908–1910).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 1803. (Makovei Osyp. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1911–1922).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 2012 (Olesnytskyi Yevhen. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych 1879–1914).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 2201 (Revakovych Tyt. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1901–1914).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 2242 (Romanchuk Yulian. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1875–1926).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 2483 (Studynsky Kyrylo. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1891–1905).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 2484 (Studynsky Kyrylo. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1906–1913).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 2720 (Chapelsky Ivan. Letters to Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych, 1889–1906).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 4371 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. “Program of Christian Ukrainian Narodovtsi” – project, 1923).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 4416 (Barvinsky O. H. Letter to Sheptytsky An. [1923]).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5134 (Lukashevych Modest, priest. Letters to leadership of party “Christian-social union; 1911, 1912).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5153 (Christian-social Union. Proclamation with an appeal to join the party “Christian-social union”, 1911).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5159 (Christian-social union in Lviv. List of members).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5292 (Plaviuk Ivan, priest. Letters to editorial office of “Ruslan” newspaper, 1909–1913).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5386 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. Letter to Romanchuk Yulian, 1915).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 11 (Barvinski), spr. 5387 (Barvinsky Oleksandr Hryhorovych. Speech at the meeting of “Ruska Hromada”, 1903).
- LSNL. Manuscripts department, fond 159 (Hlynski), spr. 49 (Barvinskyi Oleksandr. Letters to Hlynsky Isydor, 1884–1922).

TSIL, Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies, fond 135 (Barvinky O. H.), spr. 32 (Barvinky O. H. "Memoirs of my life", part VI, notebook XXXI).

TSIL, Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies, fond 135 (Barvinky O. H.), spr. 34 (Barvinky O. H. "Memoirs of my life", part VI, notebook XXXIII).

TSIL, Department of Manuscripts and Textual Studies, fond 135 (Barvinky O. H.), spr. 37 (Barvinky O. H. "Memoirs of my life", part VII, notebook XXXVI).

Published sources

Barvynskiy O. *Spomyny z moho zhyttia*. T. 1. / Upor. A. Shatska, O. Fedoruk, red. L. Vynar, I. Hyrych. Kyiv, 2004.

Budzynovskyi V, *Po smerty Pototskoho: „bozhevilna” promova V`iacheslava Budzynovskoho v palati posliv derzhavnoi rady vyholoshena dnia 22-ho maia 1908 „na zamovlenie Poliakov!”*, Lviv, 1909.

Khrystyiansko-suspilnyi Soiuz. Vkazivky i spys chleniv dlia vidporuchnyka, Lviv, b.d.

Krohmal A., (oprac.), *Konstantyn Czechowicz: korespondencja grekokatolickiego biskupa przemyskiego z lat 1897–1914*, Przemyśl 1998.

Nashi khrystyianski suspilnyky, Nakladom redaktsyi "Dila", Lviv, 1910.

Statut "Khrystyiansko-Suspilnoho Soiuzu" u Lvovi, Lviv, 1911.

Stauf von der March O., *Der Weltkrieg und das ukrainische Problem. Ein Beitrag zur Aufklärung der gegenwärtigen politischen Lage*, Berlin, 1915.

Zakhidno-Ukrainska narodna respublika 1918–1923. Dokumenty i materialy, t. 2, (eds.) O. Iu. Karpenko, K.P. Mytsan, V.S. Velykochy, et al., Ivano-Frankivsk, 2003.

Press

"Dilo" (Lviv), 1902, no. 158, 17 (30) July.

"Dilo" (Lviv), 1903, no. 20, 25 January (7 February).

"Dilo" (Lviv), 1918, no. 171, 31 (18) July.

„Gazeta Narodowa" (Lviv), 1900, no. 284, 14 October.

"Halychanyn" (Lviv), 1903, no. 15, 19 January (1 February).

"Halychanyn" (Lviv), 1900, no. 45, 25 February (9 March).

"Halychanyn" (Lviv), 1900, no. 136, 17 (30) June.

"Hromadskyi Holos" (Lviv), 1901, no. 7, 7 February.

"Narodna Chasopys" (Lviv), 1897, no. 68, 25 March (6 April).

"Ruslan" (Lviv), 1897, number for review.

"Ruslan" (Lviv), 1897, no. 6, 9 (21) January.

"Ruslan" (Lviv), 1897, no. 16, 21 January (2 February).

"Ruslan" (Lviv), 1897, no. 21, 26 January (7 February).

"Ruslan" (Lviv), 1897, no. 45, 25 February (9 March).

"Ruslan" (Lviv), 1897, no. 61, 15 (27) March.

- “Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 92, 25 April (7 May).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 116, 24 May (5 June).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 136, 18 (30) June.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 186, 19 (31) August.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1897, no. 243, 25 October (6 November).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1898, no. 169, 30 July (11 August).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1899, no. 54, 9 (21) March.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1901, no. 134, 15 (28) June.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1902, no. 63, 17 (30) March.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1902, no. 105, 11 (24) April.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1902, no. 155, 13 (26) July.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1902, no. 157, 16 (29) July.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1903, no. 3, 4 (17) January.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1903, no. 20, 25 January (7 February).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1903, no. 48, 28 February (13 March).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1905, no. 70, 26 March (8 April).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1905, no. 184, 18 (31) August.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1905, no. 185, 19 August (1 September).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1905, no. 205, 13 (26) September.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1905, no. 242, 28 October (10 November).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1906, no. 103, 16 (29) May.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1906, no. 188, 27 August (9 September).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1906, no. 261, 26 November (9 December).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1907, no. 54, 8 (21) March.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1907, no. 78, 5 (18) April.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1907, no. 180, 11 (24) August.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1911, no. 106, 16 (2) May.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1911, no. 111, 21 (8) May.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1911, no. 162, 25 (12) July.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1912, no. 42, 24 (11) February.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 57, 14 (1) March.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 103, 13 May (30 April).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 275, 11 December (28 November).
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 279, 16 (3) December.
“Ruslan” (Lviv), 1913, no. 288, 28 (15) December.
“Ukrainskyi Holos” (Przemyśl), 1921, no. 31, 31 July.
“Ukrainskyi Holos” (Przemyśl), 1922, no. 29, 16 July.
“Ukrainskyi Holos” (Przemyśl), 1922, no. 49, 10 December.
“Ukrainskyi Holos” (Przemyśl), 1924, no. 37, 14 September.

“Vidrodzhennia” (Vienna), 1918, no. 1, 1 April (19 March).

“Vidrodzhennia” (Vienna), 1918, no. 5, 11 April (29 March).

“Vidrodzhennia” (Vienna), 1918, no. 9, 24 (11) April.

“Vidrodzhennia” (Vienna), 1918, no. 10, 25 (12) April.

“Vidrodzhennia” (Vienna), 1918, no. 22, 18 May.

“Vidrodzhennia” (Vienna), 1918, no. 38, 12 June.

Secondary works

Antoshevskiy T., 1997, *Do istorii khrystyiansko-suspilnoho rukhu v Halychyni (90-i rr. XIX st. – 1914 r.)*, Lviv.

Arkusha O., 1997, *Oleksandr Barvynskiy (do 150-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia)*, Lviv.

Arkusha O., 2009, *Oleksandr Barvynskiy*, [in:] *Zakhidno-Ukrainska narodna respublika. 1918–1923. Uriady. Postati*, (eds.) Mykola Lytvyn, Ivan Pater, Ihor Soliar; Yaroslav Isaievych. Lviv, p. 48–66.

Eadem, 2004, *Ukrainskyi khrystyiansko-suspilnyi rukh u Halychyni na pochatku KhKh stolittia: politychne tovarystvo “Ruska hromada”*, [in:] *Shliakhamy istorii. Naukovyi zbirnyk istorychnoho fakultetu LNU im. Ivana Franka. Na poshanu profesora Kostiantyna Kondratiuka*, Lviv, p. 63–99.

Chornovol I., 2004, *Tiahar prahmatyzmu, abo Oleksandr Barvynskiy u svitli suchasnosti*, [in:] *Barvynskiy O. Spomyny z moho zhyttia*, (eds.) A. Shatska, O. Fedoruk, L. Vynar, I. Hyrych, Kyiv, p. 17–35.

Idem, 2006, *Syn “Ruskoho stanchyka”: Bohdan Barvynskiy*, [in:] *Wielokulturowe srodowisko historyczne Lwowa w XIX i XX w.* Tom IV, (eds.) J. Maternicki, L. Zaskilniak, Lviv-Riashiv, p. 421–434.

Idem, 2016, *Halytski viiny za istoriiu*, plik URL: <http://zbruc.eu/node/5444> (22.01.2016).

Idem, 2017, *Rivni ratsionalizmu, abo O. Barvynskiy y I. Franko v konteksti polityky “novoi ery”*, [in:] *Narysy z istorii Halychyny*. Lviv, p. 308–324.

Klish A., 2015, *Selianske pytannia u politytsi khrystyianskykh suspilnykiv naprykintsi XIX–na pochatku XX st. (za materialamy hazety “Ruslan”)*, ”Visnyk ahrarnoi istorii”, 13–14, p. 54–68.

Idem, 2016, *Zasnuvannia Katolytskoho Rusko-narodnoho soiuzu v “Spomynakh z moho zhyttia” Oleksandra Barvynskoho*, [in:] *Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka. Serii: Istorii*, (ed.) I. S. Zuliak, Ternopil, 2 (part 3), p. 56–60.

Król M., 1985, *Konserwatyci a niepodległość. Studia nad polską myślą konserwatywną XIX wieku*, Warszawa.

Levytskyi K., 1929, *Istoriia vyzvolnykh zmahani halytskykh ukraintsiv z chasu svitovoi viiny 1914–1918. Chastyna druha*, Lviv.

Lytvyn M., Naumenko K., 1995, *Istoriia ZUNR*, Lviv.

Makovey O., 1990, *Revun*, [in:] *Makovei O. S. Tvory: T. 1*, Kyiv, p. 268–330.

Moskaliuk M., 1998, *Ukrainskyi khrystyiansko-suspilnyi rukh Halychyny v 20-kh rr. XX st*, Kyiv.

Mudryi M., 2004, *Rukopysni dzherela do istorii Khrystyiansko-suspilnoho soiuzu v Halychyni*, [in:] *Do dzherel. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats na poshanu Oleha Kupchynskoho z nahody yoho 70-richchia*, t. 1, Kyiv-Lviv, p. 421–440.

- Mudryi M., 2006, "Zghadky z zhyttia svoho i svoiei rodyny": Spohady Tyta Revakovycha yak dzherelo do istorii Halychyny KhIKh stolittia, [in:] *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, CCLII: Pratsi Komisii spetsialnykh (dopomizhnykh) istorychnykh dystsyplin, Lviv, p. 708–762.
- Ustrzycki M., 2000, *Pomiędzy konserwatyzmem, a nacjonalizmem Podolacy wobec kwestii narodowej na wsi wschodniogalicyskiej na przełomie XIX i XX wieku (do roku 1908)*, „Przegląd Wschodni”, 6 (3), s. 477–498.