

Volodymyr Vynnychenko. *Shchodennyk, 1929–1931*. [Diary, 1929–1931.] Vol. 4. Kyiv, Edmonton, and New York: Smoloskyp, 2012. 342 pp. Index. \$34.95, cloth.

The goal of publishing all the works of Volodymyr Vynnychenko (1880–1951), the prominent Ukrainian writer and politician, is steadily moving forward. This is the fourth volume of his diary, produced with the support of the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature at the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, the Vynnychenko Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Science in the USA, and the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. The first three were published in 1980, 1983, and 2010, covering the years 1911–20, 1921–25 and 1926–28 respectively. Vynnychenko’s diaries are unique in exposing his inner, private states of mind, as uncomfortable as they may be. His openness in the diary under review presents a striking contrast to those autobiographies that Vynnychenko called “autofilms for the public” (81).

Volume 4 covers Vynnychenko’s life in emigration in France from 1929 to 1931, the period that reflects escalating global tensions, a world economic crisis, and Vynnychenko’s own personal dilemmas as a writer, politician, and Marxist ideologist. The diary notes include Vynnychenko’s reflections on his writing and publishing; his views on the Ukrainian emigration, and political and cultural life in France; his responses to the drastically changing situation in the Soviet Union; his philosophical and ideological contemplations; as well as systematic daily observations on his private life, which contain numerous details, such as weather and health reports.

Most of Vynnychenko’s prose and many works about him are already in print. Does the current volume add anything new? Yes, it does. For many, Vynnychenko embodies the Ukrainian revolutionary movement of the early twentieth century and a philosophy of personal freedom (the concept of “honesty with oneself”). Surprisingly, in his philosophy Vynnychenko appears as a supporter of the “good” dictatorship: “The dictatorship that would bring happiness to humankind is blessed” (174). Being critical of Stalin for his anti-Ukrainian national stance, Vynnychenko, however, shows his solidarity with the Bolshevik tyrant’s attack on the *kurkuls* (village middle class), whom he similarly views as a stumbling block to the ultimate communist future: “If [the kurkul] does not provide bread and holds on to his petty selfishness, it might lead to a sad result” (195). It is for this reason that at first, Vynnychenko did not even believe in the fabricated character of Stalin’s show-trials, such as the Industrial Party Trial (215).

Within this ideological paradigm, the author continues to speak about “an inevitable demise of capitalism” (294) and “the world revolution” as the

only medicine to cure humankind (241). “The end of the division of people into [social] groups,” as Vynnychenko notes in his diary, “will bring harmony to all egotisms—individual, collective, and universal” (47). Vynnychenko’s worldview was still determined by a romantic vision of Marxism: “A bourgeois does not produce anything” (183); “a bourgeois politician cannot be honest with himself, sincere, or consistent” (279). In his utopian view of a communist society, Vynnychenko even foresees that laziness and a ban from social activity will become a person’s worst punishment (48). He also remained critical of the League of Nations as “a company of imperialists” (52).

Although a former leader of the Ukrainian revolution and Ukraine’s most popular writer at the time, Vynnychenko suffered from being banned from his homeland. As the diary shows, he followed current developments in the USSR very closely and still mulled over his return or at least the possibility of visiting his homeland (313). In his letter to Ukraine’s leading politician, Mykola Skrypnyk, he confesses that he “had considered himself a member of the Communist party in spirit for the last seven years” (304).

Meanwhile, Vynnychenko was still actively present in the Ukrainian literary discourse, mostly due to the enormous success of his utopian novel *Soniachna mashyna* [The Solar Machine], which saw second and third editions published in 1929–31, not to mention his other works (for example, the collection of children’s stories *Namysto* [The Necklace] and the play *Nad*). He actively corresponded with the Rukh publishing house, as well as writers and politicians in Ukraine (a correspondence certainly monitored by the Soviet intelligence service), and received the latest press from Ukraine, including the journals *Komunist* [The Communist], *Pluh* [Plough], *Hart* [Tempering], *Nova generatsiia* [The New Generation], and *Chervonyi shliakh* [The Red Pathway] (119).

The likelihood of a return home, however, became more elusive with the rapid move toward totalitarianism and whitewashing of history. Vynnychenko discovered that he was labelled “a torturer of Ukrainian workers and peasants” in the Soviet press (273) and his image was cut from documentaries (36). Furthermore, his newer works, such as the play *Prorok* [The Prophet], the novel *Poklady zolota* [The Deposits of Gold], and the philosophical treatise *Shchastia* [Happiness], which ideologically contradicted Soviet views, were rigorously censored and eventually denied publication. That was a severe blow for the writer, leading him to consider, as he noted in a letter to Skrypnyk, joining “a foreign literature” (280).

The diary also gives valuable insight into émigré life of the Ukrainian community, of some Russian groups and of certain aspects of French society. Vynnychenko was quite suspicious of political intrigues and tried to avoid active political involvement (among his contacts were Stepan

Perepelytsia, Il'ko Borshchak, Oleksandr Sevriuk, and Volodymyr Stepankivs'kyi). Instead, he preferred to engage more in artistic life and keep the company of such painters as Mykola Hlushchenko and Mykola Krychevs'kyi, the filmmaker Ievhen Slabchenko, and the writer Sofiia Iablons'ka. He kept in touch with some Russian émigrés (for example, Illia Bakal was his literary agent in Germany), read the Russian émigré press (*Poslednie novosti* [Latest News], *Dni* [Days], *Sotsialisticheskii vestnik* [Socialist Bulletin], and *Biulleten' oppozitsii* [Opposition's Bulletin]), and followed current events in the Russian community, such as the kidnapping of the general Aleksandr Kutepov and the escape of the secret agent Georgii Agabekov.

Being critical of French “bourgeois” society, Vynnychenko still tried to adjust by applying to join the Union of Journalists (246) and the International Circle of Intellectuals (280). However, his numerous attempts to publish *The Solar Machine* in French translation or stage his plays were unsuccessful. He managed to publish only one story for children, “Viiut' vitry, viiut' buini” [The Winds Blow, the Wild Winds]. He also rejected the proposal of the State Publisher of Ukraine to write a story about children's life in Western Europe (he lacked the sensibility, he said) and advised them to approach a French writer (56, 63).

In addition to providing these fascinating facts about Vynnychenko's life, the current volume also brings to light numerous details of his personal evolution, especially as a displaced person caught between his homeland and hostland. Furthermore, the diary shows his hope for a world revolution and portrays the realities of interwar capitalist society, as well as the challenges he faced as a writer and thinker.

Vynnychenko enjoyed life in the world's cultural capital, Paris. He built a house, attended exhibitions, theatre, and cinema (including films by Oleksandr Dovzhenko and Charlie Chaplin), and read contemporary French and German literature (Emmanuel Berl, Erich Maria Remarque, the philosophers Jean-Marie Guyan and Hermann Keyserling, as well as the psychoanalyst Wilhelm Stekel). At the same time, he felt increasingly alienated, seeking escape at one time at a nudist island near Paris (85, 166), practised swimming in ice water, vegetarianism, and a simple way of life. He became irritated with the habits of the local public—sitting in cafés and restaurants, listening to modern music (106), engaging in sports (which, in his opinion, stirred up “chauvinism” [181])—and contrasted them to the healthy nudists (95).

As an example of “stream of consciousness” writing, Vynnychenko's diary is a lively read, revealing not only a complex character but also giving a broad perspective on his time, people, and society. This volume can be recommended as a source for all readers interested in Ukrainian literature,

history, arts, cultural studies, as well as the study of displacement and memoirs.

Mykola Soroka
Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta