СЕРІЯ «Педагогіка»

УДК 39:572](477)-043.86

[https://doi.org/10.52058/2708-7530-2021-11\(17\)-412-420](https://doi.org/10.52058/2708-7530-2021-11(17)-412-420)

Fedorov Oleksandr Volodymyrovych Candidate of Pedagogic Sciences (Ph. D), Associate Professor at the Department of the Humanities and Natural and Economic Sciences, Central Ukrainian Institute of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Varshavska St., 2, Kropyvnytskyi, 25026, tel.: (095) 901-85-74, e-mail: fov.1961@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0458-3587>

Kolisnichenko Roman Mykolajovych Doctor of Political Science, Associate professor, Director, Central Ukrainian Institute of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Varshavska St., 2, Kropyvnytskyi, 25026, tel.: (066) 768-96-52, e-mail: rmk7@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2418-402X>

Tsumariyev Marat Ivanovych Candidate of Political Science, Deputy Director, Central Ukrainian Institute of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Varshavska St., 2, Kropyvnytskyi, 25026, tel.: (066) 112-47-80, e-mail: zumar_ua@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3638-4117>

POLITICAL-LEGAL, SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS OF ETHNOANTHROPOLOGY FORMATION IN UKRAINE

Abstract. The article is devoted to elucidating the influences on the formation and development of ethnoanthropology in Ukraine of non-scientific - political, legal, socio-psychological and economic - factors. Ethnoanthropology is one of the most important components of ethnopoltics, on which the real possibilities of the modern state largely depend. The importance of ethnoanthropology for the development of the country is determined by two levels of issues: national and "personal". First, for Ukraine - as for the vast majority of modern countries - are important issues of interethnic relations, coordination of interests and goals of various ethno-national organizations, movements, parties among themselves and with the goals and interests of the state. And secondly, at the level of living standards of an individual citizen, the issues of ethno-political behavior of citizens based on humanitarian principles are important for the Ukrainian polyethnic society. Accordingly, it is necessary to form in citizens such ethnopolitical consciousness - ideas, knowledge, beliefs - which, on the one hand, provides a full ethnocultural identity, and on the other - is the key to interethnic relations, free from extremism, chauvinism, national or ethno-religious intolerance.

The conclusion is drawn about a significant deformation of the theory and methodology of the ethnological researches in Ukraine under the influence of political factors in the 1930s-1960s. The consequence of the substitution of the ethnoanthropological methodology itself with a peculiar ethnopolitical approach was the thing that the research of the Ukrainian anthropological expedition of 1956 – 1963 didn't embrace the fifth part (20,7%) of the territory of the Ukrainian SSR – the Ukrainian South or the Steppe ethnographical region of Ukraine. Also, political factors themselves defined the contemporary condition of Ethnic Anthropology in Ukraine, in which Ethnic Anthropology remains not institutionalized as a scientific discipline (scientific-research and educational establishments do not exist).

Keywords: Ethnoanthropology, Ethnopolitical science, Politics, Law, Socio-psychological and economic factors

Федоров Олександр Володимирович кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри психології та соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін, Центральноукраїнський інститут Приватного акціонерного товариства «Вищий навчальний заклад «Міжрегіональна Академія управління персоналом», вул. Варшавська, 2, м. Кропивницький, 25026, тел.: (095) 901-85-74, e-mail: fov.1961@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0458-3587>

Колісніченко Роман Миколайович доктор політичних наук, доцент, директор, Центральноукраїнський інститут Приватного акціонерного товариства «Вищий навчальний заклад «Міжрегіональна Академія управління персоналом», вул. Варшавська, 2, м. Кропивницький, 25026, тел.: (066) 768-96-52, e-mail: rmk7@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2418-402X>

Цумарєв Марат Іванович кандидат політичних наук, заступник директора, Центральноукраїнський інститут Приватного акціонерного товариства «Вищий навчальний заклад «Міжрегіональна Академія управління персоналом», вул. Варшавська, 2, м. Кропивницький, 25026, тел.: (066) 112-47-80, e-mail: zumar_ua@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3638-4117>

ПОЛІТИКО-ПРАВОВІ, СОЦІАЛЬНО-ПСИХОЛОГІЧНІ ТА ЕКОНОМІЧНІ ЧИННИКИ СТАНОВЛЕННЯ ЕТНОАНТРОПОЛОГІЇ В УКРАЇНІ

Анотація. Стаття присвячена з'ясуванню впливів на становлення і розвиток етноантропології в Україні позанаукових – політико-правових, соціально-психологічних та економічних – чинників.

Етноантропологія – один з найважливіших складників етнополітики, від якої значною мірою залежать реальні можливості сучасної держави. Важливість етноантропології для розвитку країни детермінована двома

рівнями проблематики: загальнонаціональним та «персональним». По-перше, для України – як і для переважної більшості сучасних країн – є важливими питання міжнаціональних відносин, узгодження інтересів і цілей різних етнонаціональних організацій, рухів, партій між собою і з цілями та інтересами держави. А по-друге, на рівні рівні життя окремого громадянина, для українського поліетнічного суспільства важливими є питання етнополітичної поведінки громадян, заснованої на гуманітарних принципах. Відповідно – необхідними є формування у громадян такої етнополітичної свідомості, – уявлень, знань, переконань, – яка, з одного боку, забезпечує повноцінну етнокультурну ідентичність, а з іншого – є запорукою міжетнічних взаємин, вільних від проявів екстремізму, шовінізму, національної чи етноконфесійної нетерпимості.

Робиться висновок про суттєву деформацію теорії та методології етнологічних досліджень в Україні під впливом політичних факторів у 1930-х – 1960-х роках. Наслідком підміни власне етноантропологічної методології своєрідним етнополітичним підходом було те, що дослідженнями Української антропологічної експедиції 1956 – 1963 рр. не було охоплено п'яту частину (20,7%) території Української РСР – український Південь чи Степовий етнографічний район України. Також саме політичні чинники визначили сучасний стан етнічної антропології в Україні, за якого етнічна антропологія залишається не інституціалізованою як наукова дисципліна (відсутні науково-дослідні та навчальні заклади).

Ключові слова: етноантропологія, етнополітологія, політика, право, соціально-психологічні та економічні чинники.

Statement of the Problem. Today Ukrainian Ethnoanthropology exists in the latent state: neither scientific-research, nor educational establishments exist, that means that as a scientific discipline it is not institutionalized.

Back to the first third of the XXth century Ethnoanthropology was a plenipotentiary field of the Ukrainian science, and the decade of 1921 – 1931 became the time of the intense ethnoanthropological research in Ukraine. In the year of 1931 the fourth and the last issue of the edition “Anthropology. The yearbook of the Cabinet” came out. In 1934 the collections of the leading establishment of this field, the Cabinet of Anthropology named after F. Vovk, were conserved, and the members of this institution were repressed.

From the beginning of 1930s and up to the mid-1950s Ethnoanthropology was not mentioned in Ukraine. Some movements began in connection with the campaign of 300-year celebration of the “reunion” of Ukraine with Russia (1956 year). In April, 1956 in the Institute of Art, Folklore and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR an anthropological meeting was held. “An anthropological research of the Ukrainian nation is noticeably behind other sections of the ethnological complex. If according to the archeology of Ukraine and the

craniology of its ancient population, science has a wide and well-developed material, a large number of remarkable publications, then on the anthropology of the modern population one can count only a few works, limited in content” [1, c.14.]. And further : “Much attention should be paid primarily to the development of the question of choosing research points and the order of passage of separate routes. Of significant importance is the fact that systematic research on the Anthropology of the Russian people is gradually unfolding in our time” [1, c.14.], – we read in the speech of Professor V. Bunak, Head of the Soviet Anthropology of that time, at the Anthropological meeting. In 1956 – 1963 the territory of Ukraine was investigated by the Ukrainian Anthropological Expedition (hereinafter referred to as UAE), from 1960 the annual publication “Materials on the Anthropology of Ukraine” began to be published (and was published until 1973 – that is, this time frame coincides with the time of the liberalization of the Soviet regime, the so-called “thaw” and several years of “liberal inertia” (1968 – 1972)).

It would seem that Ethno-Anthropology in Ukraine in the mid-50s of the twentieth century revived. But in 1995 the well-known Ukrainian anthropologist S. Seheda stated: “Now in our country there is only one scientific center of physical Anthropology – the sector of Paleoanthropology of the Institute of Archeology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. There is no influx of young forces at all, that is because after the pogrom of the 30s not a single Ukrainian university has resumed training of specialists-anthropologists (this fact is particularly striking compared to European countries, among which there is at least one, where there isn’t the Department of Anthropology” [2, p.5.]. S. Seheda’s statement remains valid now. The “revival” of the Ukrainian Ethnoanthropological science in the Ukrainian SSR in the mid-1950s was peculiar. To “revive” in the context of the history of social processes means nothing else than to bring to life what has already “taken place”, but disappeared, vanished. In the case of “rebirth” we should talk about some degree of succession. Having tried to compare the data of F. Vovk, the founder of scientific ethnic Anthropology in Ukraine (1916) with the results of the UAE (the monograph of V. Dyachenko, the expedition leader, 1965), we immediately see that various methods for selecting the material (in particular, determining areas for research) and the actual research methodology makes such a comparison almost impossible. If the goal was to preserve the continuity of the anthropological research in Ukraine, it would be possible to find an option in which the comparability of data would be achieved.

So, in the 50s – 60s of the twentieth century really large-scale ethnoanthropological studies were conducted in Ukraine, the consequence of which, however, was not the revival of Ukrainian Ethnoanthropology as a full-fledged scientific branch. Because of this UAE of 1956 – 1963 was similar to the Statistical and Ethnographic Expedition to the West-Russian Territory of 1869 – 1870: the tasks of the expedition were also determined outside Ukraine, by the centers of science of the parent state, and the conclusions were largely predetermined.

What prevented the revival of Ethnoanthropology in Ukraine (if to understand that in the sense that the necessary prerequisite for this is the institutionalization of the discipline)? The answer is unequivocal: political factors. Due to the nature of its subject ethnic Anthropology, like Ethnology as a whole, has always been one of the most politicized social sciences. The history of its scientific and organizational and theoretical formation is a vivid example of the social conditionality of science. The anti-monarchical, national and liberation movement of the 18th and 19th centuries sharply raised the question of the correlation between the state and the nation, the individuality and society. The humanities were called upon to find answers – to provide a theoretical justification for these socio-political realities.

The general trends in the development of science in Ukraine were combined with the peculiarities of the formation of the scientific elite under conditions that developed as a result of the long stateless status of the Ukrainian ethnos and assimilation pressure.

“If the work of a researcher in a region that has just been discovered, unknown, where at every step he encounters something new, unexpected for him, is difficult, then the work of a conscientious researcher is no less difficult in that region where, due to circumstances that are not needed to repeat, everything is darkened and confused” said P. Galagan on March 6, 1873 at the second meeting of the South-Western Department of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society in Kiev [3, p. 32.]. Ukrainian researchers of the Ukrainian ethnos, who dared to talk about the “peculiar features” of the Ukrainians, that is, the differences of the latter from other ethnic groups, were suspected of separatism. So, about the founder of Ukrainian Ethnology, F. Vovk, we read: “A very significant difference in the works of F. K. Volkov and his school ... was their pronounced political orientation ... the main idea of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism is the opposition of the Ukrainians to Russians and Belarusians – it is carried out by him with the same perseverance as by his predecessors” [4, p. 216-217.].

The presentation of the main material. The political motivation was very prominent in the organization of the mentioned Ukrainian Anthropological Expedition (UAE) of 1956-1963. This expedition is a vivid example of abandoning even things that are very important for the scientific methodology of this discipline in favor of interests far from science. First of all, we are talking about the rejection of the so-called anthropo-geographic approach to the organization of ethno-anthropological research.

In his admonitions on the next tasks of the anthropological study of the Ukrainian SSR at the meeting on the eve of the expedition prof. V. Bunak noted that in Ukraine the method of the continuous regional research of the territory cannot be applied. This is inexpedient, given the large territory, but the point, they say, is not only in this. The method of continuous research in Ukraine also “does not justify the history of the settlement of the country ... the choice of research points should be determined by historical and ethno-genetic tasks. The task is not to evenly cover the entire territory of the country, but to explore the areas that promise to provide the

greatest material for solving the problems of the origin of the Ukrainian people. It is clear that anthropological studies in the Kherson, Dnipropetrovsk regions or in the Donbass region are less important for clarifying these problems than studies in Volyn, Podolie, Galicia or Bukovina” [1, p. 16]. V. Bunak, the head of the Russian anthropological expedition, which was expanding its work at the same time, emphasizes at the meeting in Kiev that “it is most appropriate to adapt the collection of materials to specific routes or lines”, given the “need to coordinate planned research with the works of the Russian anthropological expedition” [1, p. 16]. V. Bunak proposed eight preliminary routes-lines: 1) “Severovolynskaya line” – from the western borders of Ukraine to the eastern borders of the Chernihiv region, where it interlocks with one of the lines of work of the Russian anthropological expedition; 2) “Yuzhnovolynsko-Kiev line”; 3) “Carpatho-Dnieper line (Podolsko-Umanskaya)”; 4) “Galician line”; 5) “Poltava line”, from Pereyaslav to the south-east; 6-7) two “lines of Sloboda Ukraine”, of which the northern line closely approaches the southern route of the Russian anthropological expedition; 8) “Southern line, Odessa-Berdyansk.” Judging by the materials of the UAE, a certain compromise version of V. Bunak’s proposals was taken as a basis for determining the expedition’s routes: instead of “lines”, the expedition explored “areas” (this term, used by V. Dyachenko, is conditional, since we are talking about localities, which are, as a rule, regional centers; V. Dyachenko concurrently uses the term “groups”, which seems more appropriate).

During eight field seasons, “more than 10,550 people, men and women, were investigated” [5, p. 17.]. As a result of applying the technique of the so-called “wide anthropological study of the people”, the fifth part of the territory of Ukraine fell out of the view of UAE research: the area of the regions of the South (without Crimea) and East of Ukraine that were not surveyed by the expedition — Kherson, Odessa, Nikolaev, Zaporozhye, Donetsk, Dnipropetrovsk – 20,7% of the area of the Ukrainian SSR. (Apparently, according to the organizers of the UAE, these 20.7% of the territory of the Ukrainian SSR were “non-Ukrainian”). What to say about the Ukrainian ethnic territory, which, as we know, is far from the state borders of the Ukrainian SSR. The area of settlement of the Ukrainians reached its apogee at the beginning of the twentieth century. “For 1914, the area of the continuous Ukrainian ethnic territory was approximately 740 thousand square kilometers, of which in the Russian Empire – 665 thousand square kilometers, in the Austro-Hungarian – 75 thousand square kilometers (calculations by V. Kubiiovich). For comparison: the area of the territory of an independent Ukrainian state in 1917–1920 together with all its temporary annexations was approximately 690 thousand square kilometers, and modern Ukraine covers an area of 603.7 thousand square kilometers” [6, p. 11–12.]. Half a century before the time when “districts” and “groups” were defined for UAE studies, ideas about the resettlement of the Ukrainians seemed to be much more objective - “nine provinces, whose Ukrainian population strongly prevails over other nations” - this is Poltava (Ukrainians make up 97%), Chernihiv (68.1%) (and in 11

southern districts of it, except for Surozh, Starodubsky, Novozybkovsky and Glinsky, Ukrainians make up 94.9%), Kiev (86.8%), Kharkiv (85.9 %), Podolskaya (84.7%), Yekaterinoslavskaya (74.8%), Volynskaya (74.3%), Kherson (68.4%), Tavrichesk (50.1%). “It is worth noting that the Ukrainians populated with the compact mass parts of the neighboring provinces adjacent to the nine stated provinces, namely: in the south – part of the Bessarabian province, in the north-west – the Lublin and Sedletsk provinces (Kholmshchina), as well as Grodno province, then in the northeast – Kursk and Voronezh, in the south-east – the Don region, the Kuban region and the Stavropol province ...”. Further, the author of the article, O. Golitsynskaya, quotes the “Literary and Scientific Bulletin” for 1907, where the material “The National territory Boundaries of Ukraine and the Territories of Other Regions of Russia” was printed: “in the north-west, in the Kholm region, the border (of Ukraine) approximately passes near the rivers Syana, Vepra and Western Buh, and in the Grodno province on the cutwater between the rivers Narev and Piena; in the north – along the River Pripyat across the Dnieper and further along the River Iputi; in the north-east – in the Kursk province, approximately at the upper courses of the rivers Seym and Psla, and in the Voronezh province this border reaches the River Don, above the mouth of the River Bituga and then in this province and the Don region turns to the south, passing the River Don or not reaching it; then to the south-east, approximately at the mouth of the River Seversky Donets it crashes into the Kuban and Stavropol province along the River Manych to the lower reaches of the River Kuma and turns to the Black Sea along a conventional straight line from Kislovodsk to Sochi ... in the South Ussuri region (the so-called “Green Wedge”) the number of the Ukrainians reaches 31.8% ...” [2, p. 21-29].

We must dwell on one of two assumptions: either such sources were inaccessible to the organizers of the UAE, or something quite far from the history of the people and its ethnogenesis is hidden behind the “historical and ethnogenetic tasks” that determined the choice of research points. The first is unlikely. Then what were the organizers guided by, bypassing the attention of the former Kharkov province with 85.9% of the Ukrainian population, Yekaterinoslav (Zaporozhia region of the Ukrainian SSR) with 74.8%, Kherson region with 68.4%, Tavricheskaya region with 50.1%, cutting down the Ukrainian ethnic lands already cut off by the “state” borders of the Ukrainian SSR.

The “regions” (groups), studied by the UAE, are distributed by V. Dyachenko between four so-called “zones”: “Left Bank”, “Right Bank”, “Galicia and Transcarpathian region”, “Polesye and Southern Volyn”. It is striking that the division of the territory of Ukraine into such parts does not fully meet either the modern historical-ethnographic, or physical-geographical, or dialectological division. What are “Right Bank”, “Left Bank”, “Galicia and Transcarpathia” in each of these contexts? These terms acquire some content only when it comes to the political history of these regions. It can be assumed, however, that the basis for the selection of these “zones” is the idea – in general, the right one – about the formation

of the Ukrainian ethnic group in the forest-steppe zone from the medieval population of the Polissya-Kiev and Galicia-Volyn lands. The ideas are correct, but, so to speak, far from complete, since the ethnogenesis of the Ukrainians at that stage, in the XIVth century, was not completed.

The south of Ukraine is one of the most important – in terms of its role in the ethnic history of the people – regions of Ukraine (and it's still a question of whether there can be secondary regions if the people didn't move to these lands in some relatively recent past, if the processes of interaction between the substrate and superstratum haven't yet begun).

The south of Ukraine is one of the historical and ethnographic regions, which includes the current central and south-eastern parts of the Nikolaev region, the south-eastern part of the Kirovohrad region, and the right bank part of the Dnepropetrovsk region (without the cities of Verkhovtsevo, Dneprodzerzhinsk and part of the city of Dnepr (Dnepropetrovsk), located on the right bank of the River Dnieper), Zaporozhye region, the southern part of the Donetsk region, Odessa region (except for the north-western part, related to Podolia), Kherson region and Crimea.

One of the main criteria, used in the historical and ethnographic zoning, the division of the ethnic territory into separate parts, is the existence in these parts of the dialects that make up the "linguistic territory" of the ethnos. And the South of Ukraine, together with part of the Trans-Dnieper region (Kirovohrad region), Slobozhanshchina (Dnepropetrovsk, Donetsk and part of the Luhansk region), part of the Rostov region and the Krasnodar territory of the Russian Federation is the region of one of the most common Ukrainian dialects; on the dialectological maps the boundaries of this historical and ethnographic region are clearly outlined by the spread of the steppe dialects of the south-eastern subgroup of the southern Ukrainian dialects.

The organizers of the UAE deliberately ignored the very "stripe" of F. Vovk, – the south one, with which the latter linked the main direction of the ethnogenetic relations of the Ukrainians. It turns out that the Ukrainian Soviet anthropologists, unlike the Ukrainian "bourgeois" scientist F. Vovk and his staff, who, before coming to some conclusions, examined almost the entire Ukrainian territory, already knew in advance exactly where to look, and where – not to, for such connections. We remember that the "promising" areas were identified before the start of the expedition.

Findings. Ukrainian Ethnoanthropology is not institutionalized as a scientific discipline (there are no scientific and research and educational institutions). However, more important thing is, perhaps, another: under the influence of political factors the methodology and theory of ethno-anthropological research was subjected to deformation. Thus, in the ethno-anthropological studies of the Ukrainian ethnos in the Soviet time the anthropogeographic approach was not used, it was replaced with a kind of "ethno-political" approach, which allowed to speculate on the ethnocultural kinship of the three East Slavic peoples and to draw conclusions that

the Ukrainians, they say, do not differ anthropologically from the Russians and Belarussians. The consequence of ignoring the anthropogeographic principle was that during large-scale studies of the Ukrainian anthropological expedition of 1956-1963 the fifth part (more precisely, 20.7%) of the territory of the Ukrainian SSR – the Ukrainian South or the Steppe ethnographic region of Ukraine – was not covered.

The methodology of ethno-anthropological research in Ukraine was shaped in the grip of the Soviet militant dogmatism and requires emancipation and updating no less than the problematics and research topics. With a large volume of specific observations and constructions, the Ukrainian ethnic Anthropology in the Soviet time more illustrated the general regulations of historical materialism and great-power directions, than was set up for the independent consideration of its own subject. This impoverished the understanding of ethnic processes, discolored it, deprived its versatility. The need for the critical rethinking of the methodological foundations of Ukrainian Ethnic Anthropology remains relevant.

Література:

1. Бунак В.В. Сучасний стан і чергові завдання антропологічного вивчення Української РСР. Матеріали з антропології України. Вип.1 . К.,1960.
2. Сегеда С. Основи антропології. К.,1995.
3. Русова С. К 40-летнему юбилею Юго-западного Отдела Императорского Географического Общества. Украинская жизнь. 1913. №11. С.32.
4. Дебес Г.Ф. Этническая антропология в работах русских антропологов конца XIX и начала XX века (петербургская и московская школы). ОИРЭФА. II. М., 1963. Т.85. – С.216 - 217.
5. Зиневич Г.П. Человек изучает человека. К.,1988.
6. Лоза Ю. Коментарі до серії мап “Із історії української державності”. К.,1994. – С.11-12.
7. Голицынская Е. Украина и ее колонии. Украинская жизнь. 1914. №1. С.21-29.

References:

1. Bunak V.V. Suchasnyi stan i cherhovi zavdannia antropologichnoho vyvchennia Ukrain's'koi RSR. Materialy z antropologii Ukrainy. Vyp. 1. Kyiv, 1960 [Modern state and regular tasks of the anthropological research of the Ukrainian RSR. Materials on the anthropology of Ukraine. Issue 1. Kyiv, 1960] [in Ukrainian].
2. Sehed S. Osnovy antropologii [Foundations of Anthropology. K., 1995] [in Ukrainian].
3. Rusova S. K 40-lietniiu iubiliiu Iugo-zapadnogo Otdiela Impieratorskogo Geografichieskogo Obshchiestva. Ukrainskaia zhizn'. 1913. №11. S.32. [To the 40th anniversary of the South-Western Division of the Imperial Geographical Society // Ukrainian life. 1913. №11. P.32] [In Russian].
4. Debets G.F. Etnicheskaiia antropologiia v rabotakh russkikh antropologov kontsa XIX i nachala XX vieka (pietierburgskaia i moskovskaia shkoly) [Ethnic Anthropology in the works of Russian anthropologists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (St. Petersburg and Moscow schools). OIREFA. II. M., 1963. V.85. P. 216 – 217]. [In Russian].
5. Zinevich G.P. Chieloviek izuchaet chielovieka [A person studies a person. K., 1988] [In Russian].
6. Loza Yu. Komentari do serii map “Iz istorii ukrains'koi derzhavnosti” [Comments on the series of the maps of “From the History of the Ukrainian Sovereignty”. K., 1994. P.11-12] [in Ukrainian].
7. Golitsynskaia E. Ukraina i eio kolonii. Ukrainskaia zhizn'. 1914. №1. S.21-29 [Ukraine and its colonies. Ukrainian life. 1914. №1. P. 21-29] [In Russian].