STUDIA WARMIŃSKIE 62 (2025)
ISSN 0137-6624
DOI: 10.31648/sw.11969

Tetiana Meleshchenko [1]
Faculty of History
Ukrainian State Dragomanov University

Andrii Karabardin [2]
Faculty of History
Ukrainian State Dragomanov University

Support of Ukraine by Western European Partners: A Historical Retrospective of Assistance for the Ukrainian People's Republic in Exile During the 1920s–1930s – Based on Materials from the Periodical "Tryzub"

[Wsparcie dla Ukrainy ze strony partnerów zachodnioeuropejskich: historyczna retrospekcja pomocy dla Ukraińskiej Republiki Ludowej na uchodźstwie w latach dwudziestych i trzydziestych XX wieku – na podstawie materiałów periodyku „Tryzub"]

Streszczenie: Autorzy analizują wsparcie udzielone Ukraińskiej Republice Ludowej (URL) na uchodźstwie przez partnerów zachodnioeuropejskich w latach dwudziestych i trzydziestych XX w. Na podstawie materiałów periodyku „Tryzub" omówiono kluczowe obszary działalności rządu URL na uchodźstwie po klęsce walk narodowowyzwoleńczych w latach 1917–1921. Autorzy skoncentrowali się na dyplomatycznych, informacyjnych i organizacyjnych działaniach ukraińskiej emigracji politycznej, zmierzających do uzyskania poparcia państw europejskich w celu przywrócenia państwowości ukraińskiej. W artykule ukazano, jak „Tryzub" przedstawiał kontakty z Europą, w tym historię Ukrainy, przeciwdziałanie propagandzie bolszewickiej oraz integrację ze strukturami międzynarodowymi. Zwrócono uwagę na trudności wynikające z rozdrobnienia politycznego i wpływu sił zewnętrznych, a także ukazano sukcesy w utrzymaniu sprawy ukraińskiej na arenie międzynarodowej. Wykazano także podobieństwa między historycznymi doświadczeniami URL a obecnymi potrzebami Ukrainy w zakresie wszechstronnego wsparcia w kontekście wojny rosyjsko-ukraińskiej,

[1] Tetiana Meleshchenko, Faculty of History, Ukrainian State Dragomanov University, Osvity 6, 03037, Kyiv, Ukraine, tetmel@ukr.net, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1562-2932.

[2] Andrii Karabardin, Faculty of History, Ukrainian State Dragomanov University, Osvity 6, 03037, Kyiv, Ukraine, a.v.karabardin@npu.edu.ua, https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9545-5900.

podkreślając znaczenie lekcji płynących z przeszłości w celu wzmocnienia dzisiejszej pozycji państwa.

Summary: The article examines the support provided to the Ukrainian People's Republic (UPR) in exile by Western European partners during the 1920s and 1930s. Drawing on an analysis of materials from the periodical Tryzub, the article explores the key activities of the UPR government in exile following its defeat in the national liberation struggles of 1917–1921. The author examines the diplomatic, informational, and organizational efforts of the Ukrainian political émigrés aimed at securing the support of European states to restore Ukrainian statehood. The article illustrates how "Tryzub" portrayed engagement with European countries, including its coverage of Ukrainian history, efforts to counter bolshevik propaganda, and steps toward integration into international structures. It also addresses the challenges posed by political fragmentation and external influences, alongside the achievements in maintaining the Ukrainian cause on the international stage. The article draws parallels between the historical experience of the UPR and Ukraine's present need for comprehensive support amid the Russo-Ukrainian War, underscoring the relevance of past lessons for bolstering the state's position today.

Słowa kluczowe: URL na uchodźstwie, „Tryzub", wsparcie zachodnioeuropejskie, emigracja ukraińska, dyplomacja.

Keywords: UPR in exile, "Tryzub", Western European support, Ukrainian emigration, diplomacy.

Introduction

Nowadays, in the context of the active phase of the Russian-Ukrainian war, which began in 2014, and the ongoing processes of globalization and integration, the importance of support for Ukraine from our allies in European countries is gaining considerable attention.

This support manifests itself in various areas. The most prominent is military or defense assistance, through which Western European states supply Ukraine with weapons and military equipment to protect against aggression, while also providing active training and professional development for our military personnel. An equally important component is financial support, delivered in the form of loans and grants, which enables the functioning of critical sectors of life. Western countries are also actively engaged in imposing economic sanctions, restricting the enemy's access to financial markets, technologies, and other resources, thereby weakening its combat capabilities. Political support remains significant, aimed at facilitating our country's integration into the European Union and NATO, as well as advocating for Ukraine in various international organizations where our enemy also exerts influence.

Additionally, humanitarian aid deserves mention, encompassing not only assistance to Ukrainians remaining in their homeland but also support for internally displaced persons, who receive care thanks to the so-

cial policies implemented by European countries. Europe also supports us culturally by actively promoting Ukrainian culture within its territories.

It should be noted that, as long as the war continues, European support remains a key factor in sustaining our combat capability, and there is always potential for further development in this regard. After all, the sooner the war in the Old World ends in Ukraine's favor and a just peace is established, the sooner security concerns for our Western partners will be resolved.

In this context, to build friendly and effective partnerships with European countries, we, as historians, must analyze how Ukraine was previously supported by our European allies. This analysis helps identify recurring trends and lessons that can inform future actions.

One of such periods is the 1920s and 1930s, when the government of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UPR) was in exile but did not abandon its struggle for independence. The defeat in the national liberation struggles of 1917–1921 forced Ukrainian leaders to shift tactics: armed resistance within Ukraine was effectively suppressed, but diplomatic, informational, and organizational channels remained active. The UPR government in exile sought to enlist the support of European states, taking into account post-war international changes that, in the view of government officials, could create favorable conditions for restoring Ukrainian statehood.

Despite challenging conditions and limited resources, Ukrainian émigrés established and maintained contacts with political figures in Europe, actively highlighting the issue of Ukrainian independence in the press and at various events. However, the absence of a unified leadership, political fragmentation, and the dominance of an external enemy prevented Ukraine from achieving independence during this period. Nevertheless, the idea of resistance persisted, and it was through the persistent efforts of the émigré community that the question of Ukrainian statehood remained alive in the international arena.

A key source of information about those events is the official publication of the UPR in exile – the periodical Tryzub. Founded in 1925 by Symon Petliura, then head of the UPR, it operated until 1940. The periodical covered the activities of the government, as well as the lives of Ukrainians both in the Ukrainian SSR and in emigration. One recurring theme in its publications was interaction with Western European states, as this cooperation influenced both the recognition of independence and the potential for the nation's existence within the new political paradigm of Europe at that time. This thematic focus allows us to explore not only the political and diplomatic dimensions of support but also the cultural, educational, and economic aspects of assistance from our European partners.

Such a historical retrospective enables us to draw parallels between the past and the present, when Ukraine once again requires international support and can leverage historical experience to strengthen its position. Studying this historical experience offers valuable lessons and demonstrates how the international community can contribute to preserving national identity and supporting the struggle for independence.

Ukrainian Statehood in Exile: From the First Emigration Governments to the Activities of the UPR in the 1920s and 1930s

From the outset, it is important to understand what the Ukrainian People's Republic (UPR) in exile represented during that period and why its support mattered. History provides examples of legitimate governments forced to leave their country's territory, finding themselves, along with some of their citizens, in political exile on foreign soil. As historian Vasyl Yablonskyi notes, the functionality of such a government lies in continuing to perform some of its duties, albeit under unfavorable and often unpredictable conditions in exile. These duties primarily involve representative and mobilization functions. In various historical periods, governments in exile existed in Belarus, Bulgaria, Georgia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, France, and other countries. Ukraine, too, has such historical experience.

Ukraine first encountered this experience in the 18th century, following the defeat of the Ukrainian-Swedish coalition on July 7, 1709, in the Battle of Poltava. At that time, Ukrainian Hetman Ivan Mazepa crossed the Turkish border with the remnants of his army and settled near the Moldavian town of Bendery. Organized and systematic efforts by a government in exile began only in the spring of the following year, under the leadership of Hetman Pylyp Orlyk, who was elected on April 5, 1710, after resolving a series of inter-estate and property disputes following Ivan Mazepa's death on September 22, 1709. In Ukrainian history, this marked the first instance of electing a high-ranking official outside the state's borders. Soon after, the hetman gained recognition from the Swedish king and the Turkish sultan. With Pylyp Orlyk's death in 1742, this initial experience of a Ukrainian government in exile came to an end.

Another instance of a Ukrainian government in exile emerged after the defeat of the national liberation struggle of 1917–1921. Perhaps the most challenging period within this timeframe was during the Directory, which restored the Ukrainian People's Republic in 1918. Amid highly unfavorable foreign policy circumstances, existing internal problems escalated into insurmountable conflicts (Yablonskyi V., 2021, p. 61–62).

Following the defeat of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UPR) in its struggle for independence during the national liberation efforts of 1917––1921, parts of the Ukrainian government and military were forced to emigrate to Western Europe. Political emigrants, who constituted the majority of Ukrainian émigrés at the time, quickly adapted to new conditions and actively engaged in public and political life. From this milieu emerged numerous leaders of political, civic, educational, and cultural organizations within the Ukrainian diaspora (Rohozha M., 2011, p. 31).

The UPR government in exile officially continued its activities abroad, particularly in Poland, France, and Czechoslovakia. We align with historian Vasyl Yablonsky's view that the government's tasks at the time included establishing a mobilization system to rebuild the army; maintaining stable ties with the insurgent movement; studying the real situation in Ukraine across national, social, and economic dimensions; training civilian specialists to support the operations of the State Center of the UPR in exile; and preparing for the restoration of state life in a future independent Ukraine. Additionally, key areas of the government's work involved fostering a positive global perception of Ukrainian independence and statehood, as well as building connections with Ukrainian populations under Polish, Romanian, and Czechoslovak rule (Yablonskyi V., 2021, p. 129–130).

The primary printed organ of the UPR in exile during this period was Tryzub, published in Paris from 1925 to 1940. The magazine was founded by Symon Petliura, the first head of the UPR in exile (Yablonskyi V., 2023). Tryzub served as the official information center of the UPR in exile, striving to provide objective and comprehensive coverage of Ukrainian life across different parts of the world.

Above all, the periodical should be regarded as the official gazette of the UPR in exile, with one of its primary focuses being political information about Ukrainians' aspirations for state independence. This is evident in the editorial of the first issue, which explains why the Ukrainian symbol – the tryzub – was chosen as the publication's title and what it signified for its founders: "In launching our publication, we consciously operate under the sign of the Tryzub, a symbol of Ukrainian statehood. This symbol will always guide our work, serving as its criterion and the goal we strive toward, as we articulate the content of Ukrainian state ideology and clarify the methods and approaches to national construction... Ukraine, as an independent state, will become a reality both in the life of our people and in the eyes of the wider world..." (Karabardin A., 2020, p. 587–589).

"Tryzub" sought to convey to its readers the ideology of achieving independence and building a Ukrainian state. The periodical addressed the stance of the Ukrainian state center abroad on various events and phe-

nomena related to Ukrainian issues. This is precisely why we selected this source for our analysis of the support provided by Western European partners during that period.

UPR in Exile in the Context of European Realities: From Geopolitical Challenges to Gradual Integration

The magazine Tryzub, while forming the ideological basis of the struggle for Ukrainian statehood, simultaneously reflected the position of the Ukrainian political center on the key events and challenges of that era. In this context, the periodical also served as a platform for addressing pan-European issues. The question of stability on the European continent as a whole, and in Eastern Europe in particular, concerned everyone at the time. The continent had gradually moved beyond the horrors of the "Great War" and was finalizing the construction of a new geopolitical system, which, as history would later show, proved short-lived. One of the culminating moments of this process was the Locarno Conference in Switzerland in October 1925, which coincided closely with the initial issues of the periodical we have described. The introductory article in the second issue, dated October 25, 1925, provided an immediate analysis of its consequences, while a separate article in the same issue, written by a special correspondent "from the conference venue", detailed the proceedings. In the introductory article, the author (or authors) noted that the „understanding reached on such painful and contentious Western issues" would pave the way for addressing "the problem of the East, and thus the issue of Ukrainian statehood, because without us there can be no peace in Europe". Naturally, the "problem of the East" was tied to the emergence of the Soviet Union, described by the Swiss Journal de Genève as "the only great unknown in our continent's future". The authors of Tryzub and the leaders of the UPR government in exile at the time firmly believed that security was directly linked to the existence of Ukraine and its statehood – a sentiment echoed today by modern Ukrainian political leaders and European officials (Br. de M., 1925, p. 9–11).

Europeans themselves expressed similar views on security in Eastern Europe during this period. A month later, Tryzub published commentary on an article by Constantin Bacalbașa, a former colonel in the Romanian General Staff and journalist, which appeared in the Romanian newspaper Dimineața. The article focused on the active Ukrainization process unfolding in the Ukrainian SSR during those years. According to Bacalbașa, this Ukrainization, orchestrated by Moscow, aimed to foster revanchist sentiments among the local population and lay claim to neighboring territories. To support his argument, he cited a so-called "call of Ukrainians from

Vienna" published in the Soviet newspaper Izvestia, which served as a manifesto demanding the return of Ukrainian territories ceded to European countries after the First World War. This appeal claimed that Ukraine had been fragmented by the Entente, with its population and culture now oppressed in these new states, and thus called for the reunification of these lands – strikingly, with Soviet Ukraine. Bacalbașa argued that this "call of Ukrainians from Vienna" was, in fact, a Bolshevik fabrication rather than an initiative of the Ukrainian émigré community. He viewed the newly formed USSR as a security threat, asserting that the union "stubbornly proclaims its intent to impose its dictates on everyone". While Western Europeans were increasingly convinced of an inevitable disarmament process, Bacalbașa warned that Romanians and other neighbors of the USSR must remain vigilant and prepared to defend their countries (Herodotus, 1925, p. 9–11).

Recognition of the UPR in exile faced immense difficulties – Europe had no intention of acknowledging Ukrainian territories as independent or recognizing the Ukrainian nation as a distinct entity among European nations. For the European political elite, stability took precedence. The Ukrainian émigré community eventually recognized this reality and sought to pursue its struggle for independence strategically, particularly by integrating into European and international organizations.

In October 1926, an issue of "Tryzub" reported on the cooperation between the Ukrainian émigré community and the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation at the League of Nations. This committee, a specialized body within the newly established international organization, aimed to foster integration and establish ties between countries in the scientific, literary, and artistic spheres. The League's leadership believed such collaboration would bring nations closer together and promote peace. At various times, the committee included luminaries such as Dutch physicist Hendrik Lorentz, Polish chemist Marie Skłodowska-Curie, German physicist Albert Einstein, and French mathematician Paul Painlevé. In January 1926, the committee established the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation in Paris.

The Ukrainian Academic Committee in Prague, an association of Ukrainian schools and scientific institutions in exile, began collaborating with this body. At one point, the committee's chairman, Oleksandr Kolessa, and its secretary-general, Oleksandr Shulhyn, participated in an international congress on intellectual cooperation, though relations between the two entities remained informal.

Even before the institute's creation, the committee had called on nations to establish "national committees of intellectual cooperation" for collaboration. This initiative proved successful, with over 40 such national committees formed by October 1926. Initially, Ukraine in exile lacked

a centralized scientific body, but the Ukrainian Academic Committee later emerged and raised the issue of its recognition as the representative of a Ukrainian national committee for intellectual cooperation at a committee session. Secretary-General Oleksandr Shulhyn prepared and delivered a special report on the history and current state of Ukrainian science at the committee's July session in Geneva.

During the session, the committee displayed no hostility toward Ukraine, though some members suggested that Ukrainian and Russian committees could be established within the USSR. Shulhyn, however, argued that such a decision would isolate Ukrainian science from the world, given the antagonistic relationship between the League of Nations and the Soviet Union at the time. A former UPR diplomat, Shulhyn insisted that the Ukrainian Academic Committee in exile was uniquely positioned to fulfill its mission of representing Ukrainian science globally, pending changes in political and cultural circumstances. His report garnered enthusiastic support from Swiss writer Gonzague de Reynold, leading the majority of the committee to officially recognize the Ukrainian Academic Committee as the Ukrainian national committee within the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation at the League of Nations. This recognition by prominent scientists within such a significant international body suggests that, despite limited awareness of the Ukrainian situation, the intelligentsia of the time acknowledged the objective circumstances and the importance of preserving the national intellectual heritage of our ancestors (O.S., 1926, p. 2–4).

As for Shulhyn, "Tryzub" also reveals that, as Ukraine's permanent delegate to the League of Nations from 1928 to 1930, he defended Ukrainian rights in refugee matters. For 20 years, he led the Ukrainian Society of the League of Nations' Supporters, leveraging international platforms to protect Ukrainian national rights (Stadnyuk T., 2000, p. 43–44). For instance, in 1930, at the assembly of the Union of League of Nations Societies in Geneva, a resolution against terror and religious persecution in the Ukrainian SSR was adopted – albeit with some difficulty. In his speech before the vote, Shulhyn underscored its significance: "...you will provide moral satisfaction to those victims of terror who, facing their executioners, can say: you have power and weapons, you can torture and kill us, but it is not we who are condemned – it is you, judged by the court of the entire civilized world, on which you still depend". The resolution gained support from various delegations and passed unanimously. The assembly also approved a proposal to establish study groups under the Union to examine the history of Eastern European countries beyond the League's influence, particularly Ukraine, the Caucasus, Central Asian republics, Belarus, Karelia, and others (Zhenevets, 1930, p. 9–15).

During the Holodomor of 1932–1933, Shulhyn was notable not only for political manifestos and appeals but also for his interview with the Parisian newspaper Le Figaro about the famine in Ukraine. In it, he explained the political leadership's motives for implementing punitive measures, clarified why French radical Édouard Herriot portrayed a different reality during his visit to the USSR, and outlined why the Soviet government refrained from seeking international aid to address the famine. As evidence, Shulhyn brought a folder of eyewitness letters to the interview, translating them for the journalist, Madame Le Lasserre. She remarked that, from this information, she could "hear the hopeless cry of poor people who, risking what little remained of their lives before death, describe the regime of terror strangling them and plead with Ukrainian émigrés for help" (Interview with Prof. O. Shulhyn in "Le Figaro", 1933, p. 9).

Reflection of the Ukrainian Problem in the European Press: Views and Positions Through the Prism of "Tryzub"

In the context of this study, we note that European journalism showed interest in Ukrainian issues, and we concur with researcher Alina Tymoshik-Sudarykova that such coverage was tendentious rather than isolated incidents (Tymoshyk-Sudarykova A., 2012, p. 110–111). For instance, the press responded when Oleksandr Shulhyn submitted a note to Arthur Henderson, head of the International Disarmament Conference, in February 1932. In this note, the diplomat urged attention to the fact that the Soviet Union, a state that understood only force while projecting a pacifist image, had been invited to a conference aimed at strengthening peace. He supported his argument by pointing to the occupation of Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, and other countries. Shulhyn advocated for sanctions against the USSR, which he believed would significantly curb its potential (Shulhyn O., 1932, p. 23–26). The press took notice – the Geneva-based Journal des Nations, in covering this political event, highlighted the contrast between the occupied nations and Bolshevik claims of peace-lovingness, reprinting Shulhyn's note to expose myths propagated by Soviet propaganda (From the Press, 1932, p. 13–15). We cannot help but draw parallels with contemporary Western media, for whom the Ukrainian issue remains as significant and relevant to the political world as it was 80 years ago.

In this context, it is worth mentioning the series of articles titled "German Press on Ukraine", published in "Tryzub". The first set of three articles appeared between late August and early September 1927, followed by a second set in February-March 1929. All five articles were authored by someone identified only as "G. Ch." In our view, this could like-

ly be Hanna Chykalenko-Keller – a journalist, translator, diplomat, and daughter of Yevhen Chykalenko. Chykalenko-Keller was fluent in foreign languages, well-versed in local affairs, and actively involved in efforts to secure Ukraine's independence (Matiash Iryna, Starovoitenko I., 2021, p. 79–80). This makes it plausible that she gathered such insights and wrote about the German press's interest in Ukraine, noting, for example, "a great interest in Ukrainian affairs has been observed in the German press over the last month" in August 1927, and later, in February 1929, "several major articles about Ukraine have appeared alongside smaller notes, with the Ukrainian question occupying a central place in every political review of Eastern Europe" (G. Ch., 1927a, p. 16–17; G. Ch., 1929a, p. 4; G. Ch., 1929b, p. 9).

The titles of these publications were telling: "The Ukrainian Question – A European Problem", "Free Ukraine", "The Kremlin is Tottering! Ukraine's Struggle for Independence", "A 50-Million People in Europe Without a State", and "Eastern European Rebellion: Ukraine as a Central Point". However, for the sake of objectivity, it should be acknowledged that not all supported Ukrainian independence, and some publications were, to put it mildly, less than anti-Bolshevik. For instance, an author in Ostpreußische Zeitung argued that advocating for Ukrainian independence was undesirable and risky for Germans, stating, "the friendship of Russia is more important to us than Ukrainian sympathies". Similarly, an author identified as "B. v F." in Pommersche Tagespost claimed a historical bond existed between Ukraine and Russia, suggesting that separatist ideas in Ukrainian society would eventually give way to autonomy once "Great Russia is revived" (G. Ch., 1927b, p. 18).

Nevertheless, German commentary generally emphasized support for Ukrainian independence, grounded in historical and pragmatic considerations. For example, an article titled "The Kremlin is Tottering! Ukraine's Struggle for Independence" in Basler Anzeiger argued that, following the 1917 revolution, Ukrainians sought complete separation from Russia due to their proximity to the West: "The Ukrainian population, with its strong sense of private property, is fundamentally different from and consistently hostile to Moscow Bolshevism...". The author asserted that even Bolshevik occupation could not extinguish the Ukrainian people's struggle for independence (G. Ch., 1927c, p. 19). Meanwhile, in "The Ukrainian Question – A European Problem", published in Politische Wochenschrift by E.C. Schepky, the author highlighted Ukraine's critical economic role within the Soviet Union, noting that its secession would spell collapse for the Bolsheviks. This, in turn, could prevent conflicts in Europe and stabilize its eastern region (G. Ch., 1927b, p. 15–17). German publications also covered news of separatist sentiments among Ukrainians in the

Ukrainian SSR, criticized the Entente's policies for the short-lived Ukrainian state, underscored the role of Ukrainian émigrés in promoting independence, and emphasized that the Ukrainian issue transcended a single nation, holding significance for both Germany and Europe as a whole.

Ukrainian History and Reality in European Discourse: The Struggle for Truth and Support for the UPR in Exile

An essential component of support for the UPR in exile was the objective coverage of Ukrainian history. Both then and now, Bolshevik and russian propaganda has sought to present Europe and the world with a distorted vision of history concerning Ukrainian lands. In this context, while acknowledging the contributions of foreign scholars, political figures, public and cultural activists, and other Western allies who are currently striving to convey an accurate picture of the past to their compatriots, we believe it is equally important to preserve the memory of similar figures from history. For instance, one issue of "Tryzub" includes a translation of an article from the Swiss daily Journal de Genève by an unnamed but prominent publicist, titled "The Great Crime (Ukraine and the USSR)". Describing the contemporary situation in the USSR – which, according to the communists, aimed to "cover the whole world with Soviet republics federated with Russia and governed from Moscow" – the author portrays Ukrainians as one of the enslaved nations. "A Ukrainian is a Slav, but he is closer to the West than a Russian. In love with freedom, an individualist, and infinitely hostile to the mindset of Muscovy", the author writes. He emphasizes that the Muscovite-Ukrainian conflict has persisted for three centuries, intensifying during the liberation struggle, which Moscow ultimately won. The article also outlines preceding events – the establishment of the Ukrainian SSR, the famine of 1921–1922, the NEP policy, and "Ukrainization". It further details the ongoing suppression of all things Ukrainian, manifesting in three spheres: political, economic, and cultural. Politically, dependence on Moscow has grown stronger, with few Ukrainians remaining in government; culturally, the intelligentsia, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, school education, and the Ukrainian language face destruction amid pervasive propaganda; economically, collectivization has led to the repression of approximately 200,000 "wealthy landlords", culminating in famine, with Ukraine as its primary victim.

The article concludes poignantly: "Ukraine, a great nation of forty million souls, is fighting for its independence. Moscow, having acknowledged this right, seeks to strangle and destroy the Ukrainian nation. It employs every means, while an indifferent Europe prepares to welcome the Soviets into the League of Nations!". This piece reveals the true con-

ditions of Ukrainian existence during that period and demonstrates that some Europeans endeavored to share this reality with the world, urging their compatriots to take action (P.-E. B., 1934, p. 2–4).

Historians also played a role in illuminating Ukrainian history and disseminating their works among their peers. For example, an article in "Tryzub" titled "Foreigners About Ukraine" mentions two such historians who published books on Ukraine: the Finn Herman Humerus and the Romanian Ion Nistor.

Herman Humerus, a professor primarily interested in the history of the Roman Empire, developed an interest in the Ukrainian question even before the national liberation struggles of 1917–1921. As early as 1917, he published a book in Ukrainian about the Finnish struggle for independence. Humerus supported Ukrainians during the UPR's exile period, visiting Ukrainian scientific institutions in Prague and Berlin in 1930 and delivering public lectures there. During the liberation struggle, he served as head of the Finnish diplomatic mission in Kyiv from August 1918 to January 1919. His 1931 book, Turbulent Times of Ukraine: My Memories of My Activities as Chief of Mission in Kyiv, reflects these experiences. Written as memoirs, it recounts the historical events, meetings with Ukrainian political figures, and his firsthand observations. Published in Swedish and Finnish, the book aimed to inform readers across Scandinavia – not just Finland – about Ukraine and its liberation struggles. According to the article's author (under the apt pseudonym "Knyholyub" –"Book Lover"), Humerus was a staunch friend of Ukraine, deeply sympathetic to its cause, and his goal was less about sharing personal recollections and more about raising awareness of Ukraine's plight.

In contrast, the Romanian Ion Nistor offered a different perspective. His 1934 book, The Ukrainian Problem in the Light of History, where he served as Romania's Minister for National Minorities, explored Ukrainian-Romanian relations and analyzed the potential for a Ukrainian state beyond the Dniester. Nistor supported the idea of such a state as a buffer against Bolshevism. However, regarding Ukrainians within Romania, he argued they had no rights to these lands, asserting that they were part of the Romanian people and that a distinct Ukrainian nation did not exist in Romania. His book, though politicized, attempts to prove that Ukrainians lack a historical claim to independence within Romania. It is valuable for its use of Ukrainian sources and literature – carrying weight with Romanian readers – while also incorporating lesser-known Romanian sources, which are of interest to Ukrainian researchers. Yet, when addressing modern history, Nistor shifts from scholar to "ordinary political publicist", presenting events chaotically and with distortion, including key moments of the national liberation struggles. This illustrates how historical manip-

ulation served political ends then, much as it does today, with narratives shaped to support specific agendas (Knyholyub, 1934, p. 4–6).

Another notable figure in this context is the Italian Enrico Insabato. In the 1920s and 1930s, this journalist, publicist, and diplomat significantly influenced Italian perceptions – particularly among politicians – of Ukraine and Ukrainians. Insabato maintained ties with Ukrainian political forces, including the OUN, while undertaking assignments for the Italian leadership, giving him insight into the principles, needs, and goals of Ukrainian émigrés (Kovalchuk V., 2008, p. 114). In 1938, "Tryzub" published an article titled "Italy and Ukraine", discussing Insabato's short work "L'Ucraina – popolazione ed economia". Having already authored several pieces on Ukraine, Insabato pragmatically outlined its potential as a future national state, framing it through geographical, ethnographic, historical, and economic lenses. Highlighting Ukraine's natural resources, he argued that, upon gaining independence, it "would be able to export numerous raw materials and agricultural products, wielding significant influence on the international market". He further suggested that Italy and Ukraine should pursue economic agreements, as "the two economies – Italian and Ukrainian – are complementary". Insabato concluded that such a unique partnership deserved thorough study by experts who would examine it "in all its technical details" (Italy and Ukraine, 1938, p. 6–7).

Conclusions

Thus, the historical experience of support for the Ukrainian People's Republic (UPR) in exile by Western European partners, particularly in the 1920s and 1930s, offers valuable lessons for modern Ukraine and our Western European allies. By analyzing the materials of the periodical "Tryzub", we can identify the specific challenges that hindered unified support, as well as highlight the significant efforts that bolstered it. Based on this analysis, several key conclusions can be drawn.

First, despite challenging political and economic conditions, the UPR in exile strove to maintain international support and communicate its stance to European countries. This support on the international stage was not merely a diplomatic tool but a critical factor in the struggle for independence and the preservation of the nation's identity.

Second, both then and now, engagement with European states has been vital for Ukrainian independence. The UPR actively sought allies in Western Europe, which helped keep the issue of Ukrainian statehood alive within the political discourse of the time.

Third, "Tryzub" addressed not only the political dimensions of support but also cultural and educational assistance. This underscores the im-

portance of multidimensional support, where culture and education serve as instruments for safeguarding national identity.

Fourth, the experience of supporting the UPR in exile serves as a guide for contemporary Ukraine. It demonstrates that international support must be comprehensive – encompassing political aid, cultural diplomacy, and more. The lessons of the past can help avoid pitfalls and shape an effective strategy for collaboration with international partners under modern circumstances.

In conclusion, a retrospective analysis of the UPR's experience in exile highlights the necessity of an active and multifaceted foreign policy that leverages international support to achieve Ukraine's goals of independence and security.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Matiash Iryna, Starovoitenko Inna, 2021, *Chykalenko-Keller Hanna: The First Ukrainian Woman-Diplomat – Participant of the International Forum*, Foreign Affairs, No. 31(5), pp. 74–81 [in Ukrainian].

Br. De M., 1925, *Locarno (from our correspondent)*, Tryzub, No. 2(2), pp. 9–11 [in Ukrainian].

G. Ch., 1927a, *German press about Ukraine*, Tryzub, No. 35(93), pp. 16–19 [in Ukrainian].

G. Ch., 1927b, *German press about Ukraine*, Tryzub, No. 37(95), pp. 16–18 [in Ukrainian].

G. Ch., 1927c, *German press about Ukraine*, Tryzub, No. 38(96), pp. 17–20 [in Ukrainian].

G. Ch., 1929a, *German press about Ukraine*, Tryzub, No. 9 (165), pp. 4–7 [in Ukrainian].

G. Ch., 1929b, *German press about Ukraine*, Tryzub, No. 11(167), pp. 9–11 [in Ukrainian].

Herodot Dmytro, 1925, *Strength lies not in conferences*, Tryzub, No. 6(6), pp. 15–18 [in Ukrainian].

Zhenevets, 1930, *Ukrainian appearances on the international stag*e, Tryzub, No. 26(234), pp. 9–15 [in Ukrainian].

From the Press, 1932, Tryzub, No. 10 (316), pp. 13–15 [in Ukrainian].

Interview with professor Oleksandr Shulhyn in Figaro, 1933, Tryzub, No. 42 (400), p. 9 [in Ukrainian].

Italy and Ukraine, 1938, Tryzub, No. 17–18 (617–618), pp. 6–7 [in Ukrainian].

Karabardin Andrii, 2020, *Analysis of the coverage of the UPR's political activities in the emigre publication "Tryzub"*, International Scientific Integration, No. 04–01, pp. 587–590, doi: 10.30888/2709–2267.2020 [in Ukrainian].

Knyholyub, 1934, *Foreigners about Ukraine*, Tryzub, No. 16 (422), pp. 4–6 [in Ukrainian].

Kovalchuk Volodymyr, 2008, *Enrique Insabato's mission in establishing contacts between Ukrainian political emigration and the italian political sphere (1930s–1950s),* Scientific Notes of the National University "Ostroh Academy", Issue 11, pp. 113–118 [in Ukrainian].

O.S., 1926, *The League of Nations intellectual cooperation commission and Ukraine*, Tryzub, No. 37(48), pp. 2–4 [in Ukrainian].

P.-E. B., 1934, *The great crime: Ukraine and the USSR (reprint of an article from "Journal de Genève"),* Tryzub, No. 16(422), pp. 2–4 [in Ukrainian].

Rohozha Mariia, 2011, *History of the Ukrainian diaspora*: PP Zhovtyy O.O., Uman, 150 p. [in Ukrainian].

Stadnyuk Tetiana, 2000, *Oleksandr Yakovych Shulhyn and Ukrainian State-Building*, Ethnic History of European Peoples, Issue 7, pp. 40–45 [in Ukrainian].

Tymoshyk-Sudarykova Alina, 2012, *Editorial policy of the paris journal "Tryzub" (1925–1940)*, dissertation for the degree of candidate of science in social communications: 27.00.04, Kyiv National Shevchenko University, Kyiv [in Ukrainian].

Shulhyn Oleksandr, 1932, *On the activities of the government of the Ukrainian People's Republic*, Tryzub, No. 8(316), pp. 23–26 [in Ukrainian].

Yablonskyi Vasyl, 2023, *The state center of the UPR in Exile: three quarters of a century for return*, https://localhistory.org.ua/texts/statti/derzhavnii-tsentr-unr-v-ekzili-tri-chverti-stolittia-na-povernennia/ (20.02.2025) [in Ukrainian].

Yablonskyi Vasyl, 2021, *Activities of the State Center of the UPR in Exile (1920––1992)*, dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Historical Sciences: 07.00.01, Institute of History of Ukraine, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv [in Ukrainian].