



MAREK WOJNAR

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7639-8321>

Institute of Political Studies of the
Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw

THE THOUGHT OF YAROSLAV STETSKO COMPARED WITH THE VIEWS OF VOJTECH TUKA TO 1941: ON TWO VARIANTS OF INTEGRAL NATIONALISM IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE*

Abstract: The inter-war period and the first years of the Second World War were a period when integral nationalism and Fascism were triumphant throughout Europe. The Ukrainian and Slovak national movements were no exception in this regard. These ideologies developed primarily within the framework of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Hlinka's Slovak People's Party, respectively. This article compares the thought of representatives of the more radical factions within these two organizations: Yaroslav Stetsko and Vojtech Tuka.

Keywords: integral nationalism, Fascism, Central and Eastern Europe, Yaroslav Stetsko, Vojtech Tuka.

Yaroslav Stetsko and Vojtech Tuka were in many ways different, and yet had much in common. Although these nationalist activists belonged to two different generations, they played an analogous (albeit not identical) role in the history of two integral nationalisms: Slovakian and Ukrainian. Stetsko was a key figure of the more radical faction of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, which in 1940 became the separate Bandera faction of the OUN (hereinafter OUN-B (Banderites)), headed by Stepan Bandera. On 30 June 1941, he read the Act of Restoration of the Ukrainian State from the balcony of a tenement house in the Market Square of Lwów (Lviv), at once declaring the independence of Ukraine and announcing its

* The present text was written as part of a research project of the National Science Centre, entitled 'Integral nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe in the inter-war period. Slovakia in the context of the Ukrainian analogy' (financed by a grant in the MINIATURA 4 competition), Reg. no. 2020/04/X/HS3/01913.

cooperation with the Third Reich. In the planned state, Stetsko was to assume the position of Prime Minister. The Banderites' initiative, however, had not been discussed with the Germans, whose plans did not anticipate the establishment of any variant of the Ukrainian state. Bandera and Stetsko were duly arrested, and then sent to the camp in Sachsenhausen, where they remained until 1944. After the war, Stetsko found himself in Munich, and participated actively in the nationalist émigré milieu. Tuka — a generation older — was one of the most important figures of Hlinka's Slovak People's Party (hereinafter HSL'S) in the inter-war period.¹ Later, during the war, he served as the Prime Minister of the puppet Slovak state, which collaborated with the Third Reich. At the same time, he was the most important figure of the radical national-socialist wing of the HSL'S, engaged in an internal struggle for power with the clerical-authoritarian milieu of the President, Father Jozef Tiso. In the first half of the 1940s, he played a key role in Slovak political life as the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister. After the fall of the Slovak state, he was arrested, tried and executed in 1946.

This article compares the life paths of Stetsko and Tuka, and their political views. A comparison of these individuals is dictated by the desire to juxtapose the most important representatives of the radical wings of two organizations promoting integral nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe: the OUN and the HSL'S. In the case of the former, it would seem that the analysis should focus on the thought of Stepan Bandera. Before 1945, however, this activist remained virtually uninterested in ideological issues. Whereas Stetsko first served as the ideological officer of the Homeland Executive of the OUN (hereinafter HE OUN), and was subsequently authorized by the head of the OUN, Ievhen Konovalets, to elaborate the ideological principles of the organization's Second Congress. Further, when he took up the position of Bandera's deputy in the OUN-B in 1940, he became the most important of the activists who dealt with ideological issues in their writings. The decision to select Tuka as the principal representative of the radical HSL'S was also not obvious. The main methodological problem concerns his early activity among the Slovakian Ludaks (before his arrest in 1929). While working within the Slovak national movement, Tuka simultaneously served as a spy for Hungary, which makes the relationship between his Slovakness and Hungarianness at the time (further considering his Magyar past) unclear. Despite this reservation, it should be remembered that Tuka's double game was not

¹ In 1925, the Slovak People's Party changed its name to Hlinka's Slovak People's Party.

known to the activists of the HSL'S, and the texts which he authored played an important role in the formation of the party's ideological image. His political significance was therefore greater than that of other activists of the radical wing of the HSL'S.

In general, Stetsko's writing was limited to journalistic texts for nationalist periodicals and separate publications printed as brochures. It is worth noting here that although he published in official magazines, most of his texts appeared in the clandestine press (this was due to the nature of the organization in which he operated). Tuka's literary activity included both press articles and journalistic brochures, and scholarly texts. His legacy from the years 1938–41 is distinguished by the fact that it includes publications of public speeches. In the present text I have focused on an analysis of separate publications,² while press articles were of a supplementary nature.³ To a small extent, I have made use of documents printed by other researchers.⁴ Finally, I have decided to include Stetsko's papers gathered in

² [Iaroslav Stets'ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, Terebovlia, 1941; Iaroslav Stets'ko, *Nashi shliakhy*, [s.l.e.a.]; Iaroslav Stets'ko, *Za zmist derzhavnoho zhyttia*, Haluzevyi derzhavnyi arkhiv Sluzhby Bezpeky Ukraïny [Arkhiv vyzvol'noho rukhu], (hereinafter HDA SBU [AVR]), fond 13, case 372, vol. 12, fol. 215–71. Vojtech Tuka, *Kristoví bojovníci: Slávnostná reč ktorú povedal na sjezde katolickeho študentstva slovenského v Žiline 14 aug. 1921*, Brno, 1921; Vojtech Tuka, *Autonomia Slovenska*, Ružomberok, 1935; [Vojtech Tuka], *Rodobranecký katechizmus*, Bratislava, 1928; Vojtech Tuka, *Slovenský národný socializmus*, Bratislava, 1940; Vojtech Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko: Reč predsedu vlády dr. Vojtecha Tuku povedaná na zasadnutí snemu Slovenskej republiky dňa 30 novembra 1939*, Bratislava, 1940.

³ I made use of articles from the following titles: *Slovák, Gardista, Students'kyi shliakh, Novyi shliakh*. I also utilized Stetsko's articles published in the *Na sluzhbi natsiï* almanac (Paris 1938), which was something in between a periodical and a collective work.

⁴ Alexander Manfred, 'Proces s Vojtechom Tukom zo spravodajstva nemeckého konzulátu v Bratislave (Dokumentačne prílohy)', *Historický časopis*, 1992, 6, pp. 714–30; Iaroslav Stets'ko, 'Mii zhyttiepys', in Karel Berkhoff and Marco Carynnyk, 'The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and Its Attitude Toward Jews: Iaroslav Stets'ko Zhyttiepys', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 1999, 3/4, pp. 158–63; Controversies have arisen regarding the latter document, and specifically concerning its alleged falsification by Soviet intelligence (see Taras Hunchak, 'Problemy istoriohrafii: istoriia ta dzherela', *Ukraïns'kyi vyzvol'nyi rukh*, 2005, 4, pp. 252–62). But I am inclined to consider the life history as authentic. First, its contents correspond with other texts by Stetsko. Secondly, Taras Hunchak's crowning argument boils down to the assertion that during his stay in Italy in the years 1939–40 Stetsko could not have edited the periodical titled *Ideia i chyn* because its first number was published only in June 1942, which inclined him to think that the whole story was fabricated by a KGB agent. However, we find information about the periodical *Ideia i chyn* published in 1940 in Italy with Stetsko's participation in the correspondence gathered in the Archive of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists in Kyiv (thus, there were two magazines with the same name), *Lyst Ievhena Onats'koho do Andriia Mel'nyka*, 8 July 1940, Arkhiv Organizatsiï Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv in Kyiv (hereinafter AOUN), Documents of Mykhailo Seleshko, unnumbered sheets.

the OUN archive in Kyiv, and in particular materials concerning preparations for the organization's Second Congress.⁵ I omitted Tuka's scholarly papers. In the case of sporadic situations where Stetsko or Tuka did not raise some of the issues constituting the subject of comparison, I have cited other activists of the OUN or the HSL'S — primarily representatives of the radical factions of both movements, among them Mykhailo Kolodzyn's'kyi, Dmytro Myron, Alexander Mach and Karol Murgaš. I finish my analysis in July 1941, that is, at the last date when Ukrainian nationalists still associated the issue of independence with cooperation with Germany. In subsequent years, the trajectories of development of the political thought of the OUN and HSL'S diverged so dramatically that their comparison no longer seems useful. When analysing the listed sources, I attempted to reflect on the extent to which the political thought of these figures corresponded to the categories of integral nationalism and Fascism.

Categories (integral nationalism and Fascism)

In the study of Ukrainian and Slovak nationalism in the inter-war period and the first years of the Second World War, the categories of integral nationalism and fascism are useful. The former was first defined in a scholarly manner already before 1939 by Carlton Hayes, who interpreted it as follows:

Integral nationalism is hostile to internationalism preached by humanitarians and liberals. It makes the nation, not a stepping-stone to a new world order, but an end in itself. It puts national interests alike above those of the individual and above those of humanity. It refuses cooperation with other nations except as such cooperation may serve its own interests real or fancied. It is jingoistic, distrusts other nations, labours to exalt one nation at the expense of others, and relies on physical force. It is militarist and tends to be imperialist [...] Besides, in domestic affairs, integral nationalism is highly illiberal and tyrannical.⁶

Hayes' category was broad, or indeed even too broad, because the researcher included therein not only German Nazism and Italian Fascism, but also the authoritarian regimes of Poland and Hungary, and even Bolshevism. The concept which Hayes first proposed in the 1950s was

⁵ The decision to utilize these archival materials was taken because it is more difficult to access press articles than in the case of Tuka, for the degree of preservation and availability of illegal periodicals of the OUN leaves much to be desired.

⁶ The quotation is from the fifth edition of Carlton J. Hayes' *The historical evolution of modern nationalism*, New York, 1955, pp. 165–66.

later developed by John Armstrong,⁷ who used it, among others, in an article devoted to Ukrainian, Croatian and Slovakian nationalisms during the Second World War,⁸ and subsequently also by Peter Alter.⁹ These scholars refined the category of integral nationalism in various aspects, however without changing its essential features. Currently, Oleksandr Zaitsev is attempting to define this phenomenon in Ukrainian scholarship.¹⁰

In contemporary research into Fascism, the most popular definition is that proposed by Roger Griffin, who described Fascism as ‘a genus of political ideology whose mythic core in its various permutations is a palingenetic form of populist ultra-nationalism.’¹¹ The central category in Griffin’s interpretation was ‘palingenesis’, that is, rebirth following a period of decline, which postulate the British scholar viewed as central to Fascist thought. After all, only its fusion with the populist form of ultra-nationalism gave rise to Fascism proper. Griffin’s theory became the foundation of the school of the ‘new consensus’ in the study of Fascism.¹²

Another representative of this school is Stanley Payne, who defined Fascism in a more comprehensive way. He identified three groups of traits characterizing Fascism. These were: ideology and goals, Fascist negations, and style and organization. At the level of ideology and goals, Payne noted the presence of an ‘idealistic, vitalist and voluntaristic philosophy’ – the striving to create an authoritarian state that would not harness traditional values and at once be based on an integrated economic structure. In the external dimension, Fascism affirmed war, violence, expansion and a radical change in relations with other states. Among the negations, it distinguished anti-liberalism, anti-Communism and anti-conservatism. The Fascists’ organization and style were characterized by, among others features, mass mobilization and militarization, an emphasis on the aesthetics of assemblies and symbols, laying stress on emotional and mystical aspects, an affirmation of masculinity and youth,

⁷ John Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism 1939–1945*, New York, 1955, p. 20.

⁸ See John Armstrong, ‘Collaborationism in World War II: The Integral Nationalist Variant in Eastern Europe’, *Journal of Modern History*, 1968, 3, pp. 396–410.

⁹ Peter Al’ter, ‘Zvil’nennia vid zalezhnosti i pryhnooblennia: do typolohii natsionalizmu’, in *Natsionalizm: Teorii natsii ta natsionalizmu vid Iohana Fikhte do Ernsta Gel’nera: Antolohiia*, ed. Oleh Protsenko and Vasyl Lisovyi, Kyiv, 2010, pp. 507–24.

¹⁰ Oleksandr Zaitsev, *Natsionalist u dobi fashyzmu: L’vivs’kyi period Dmytra Dontsova: 1922–1939 roky: Nacherk intelektual’noi biohrafii*, Kyiv, 2019, pp. 296–97.

¹¹ Roger Griffin, *The Nature of Fascism*, London and New York, 1993, p. 26.

¹² For a broader treatment, see Rodzher Griffin, ‘Segodniashnee sostoiianie i budushchie napravleniia sravnitel’nykh issledovaniia istoricheskogo fashizma i neofashizma’, *Forum noveishei vostochnoevropetskoi istorii i kul’tury*, 2010, 2, pp. 257–77.

and a charismatic leadership style.¹³ Summing up his deliberations, Payne defined Fascism as:

a form of revolutionary ultra-nationalism for national rebirth that is based on a primarily vitalist philosophy, is structured on extreme elitism, mass mobilization, and the *Führerprinzip*, positively values violence as end as well as means and tends to normalize war and/or the military virtues.¹⁴

Finally, Payne succeeded in creating a *sui generis* tripartite division in the study of authoritarian nationalism in the inter-war period. He divided authoritarian nationalists of the era into three groups: Fascists, the far right, and the conservative (authoritarian) right.¹⁵ According to Payne, the last group was noticeably more moderate, conservative, and immersed in the existing social order. A different role was played by the representatives of the extreme right, who were no less radical than the Fascists, but showed a stronger attachment to the traditional elites and structures, for example, the monarchy and the Church. Thus, they were noticeably less inclined to introduce new forms of authoritarianism using the revolutionary path.¹⁶ In the present text, I will interpret Payne's proposed category of authoritarian nationalism as identical with integral nationalism as defined by Hayes. Therefore, integral nationalism shall be taken to include Fascism, the far right and the conservative (authoritarian) right, but not Bolshevism.

Non-parallel lives

Yaroslav Stetsko was a representative of the younger and at once more radical wing of the OUN. This group was formed by activists of the HE OUN operating in the south-eastern voivodeships of the Second Polish Republic (primarily in those of Lwów (Lviv), Tarnopol (Ternopil) and Stanisławów, and to a lesser extent in that of Volhynia). In contrast to the exiled activists of the older generation of nationalists, who formed the organization's administration (the Provid of the Ukrainian Nationalists), members of the HE OUN engaged in activities that were illegal in nature, and they did not shy away from using terror.

Stetsko was born on 19 January 1912 in Tarnopol to a Greek Catholic priest.¹⁷ He attended the local secondary school, and then enrolled at the

¹³ Stanley Payne, *A History of Fascism 1914–1945*, Madison, WI, 1995, p. 7.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁵ It is worth noting that Payne distinguished this latter group from moderate forms of parliamentary conservatism.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 14–19.

¹⁷ Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, *Bandera: Faszyzm, ludobójstwo, kult: Życie i mit ukraiń-*

University of Lwów, where he studied law and philosophy. Already in Tarnopol he became involved with the nationalists. Initially, he was active in the OUN's sub-section for youth labour brigades, while in 1932 he was appointed deputy to the HE OUN's head for political and ideological affairs; following the further division of this structure, he became the officer in charge of ideological affairs.¹⁸ As a person involved in ideological matters, he took part in editing the underground writings of the OUN: *Iunak*, *Iunatstvo* and *Biuleten' KE OUN na ZUZ*, while his texts also appeared in the journal *Students'kyi shliakh*.¹⁹ The nationalist activist Mykola Klymyshyn, who at the time lived with Stetsko, noted in his memoirs that his companion wrote incessantly, and also corrected typescripts and pronounced monologues on the topic of ideology.²⁰ In June 1934, Stetsko was arrested for his activities in the OUN, and in 1936 he was indicted in the Lwów trial, during which he was locked up in a punishment cell for shouting 'glory to Ukraine' and making Fascist salutes.²¹ Although he was sentenced to five years in prison, he was released in 1937 following an amnesty. Soon after, he went abroad. At the time, Konovalets appointed him as the person responsible for preparing the Second Congress of the OUN. During the OUN Congress in Rome in August 1939, Stetsko served as secretary, and was also a member of several committees.²² By the end of the 1930s, the friction between the 'young' and 'old' OUN members — existing since the early 1930s — had become increasingly acute. In May 1938, Konovalets, who enjoyed unquestioned authority in the organization, was assassinated by a Soviet agent. He was succeeded by Andrii Mel'nyk, who had not been previously active in the OUN and did not enjoy the respect of the younger generation of nationalists. This situation resulted in an intensification of internal discord, and eventually, in February 1940, led to the break-up of the OUN into two factions: the Banderites and the Melnykites.

skiego nacjonalisty, Warsaw, pp. 105, 131; Oleh Bahan, *Ideia i chyn Iaroslava Stets'ka*, Kyiv, 2008, p. 18; Iaroslav Stets'ko, *Spohady (Vidredahovanyi tekst rozmov dostoinoho Iaroslava Stets'ka z d-rem Anatoliem Bedriem i zapysanykh na 12 kasetakh vid 17 do 23 chervnia 1985 roku*, p. 1 <<https://ounuis.info/library/handwritten-manuscripts-typed-manuscripts/566/spohady-yaroslava-stetska.html>> [accessed 6 March 2022].

¹⁸ Stets'ko, *Spohady*, p. 7; Petro Mirchuk, *Narys istorii Orhanizatsii Ukraïns'kykh natsionalistiv*, vol. 1: 1920-1939, ed. Stepan Lenkav's'kyi, Munich, London and New York, 1968, pp. 295, 323.

¹⁹ Mirchuk, *Narys istorii*, pp. 125, 409.

²⁰ Mykola Klymyshyn, *V pokhodi do voli: Spomyny*, 2 vols, Detroit, MI, and Toronto, 1987-1998, vol. 1, 1987, p. 94.

²¹ Rossoliński-Liebe, *Bandera: Faszizm, ludobójstwo, kult*, pp. 233-34, 239.

²² Mirchuk, *Narys istorii*, pp. 573-75.

Most of the younger and more radical activists of the OUN, including Stetsko, gave their support to the former. At the OUN-B Congress held in Cracow in April 1941, Stetsko was appointed Bandera's deputy.²³ Although he was groomed for the position of Prime Minister of the 'reborn Ukrainian state', he ultimately failed to play the role. In the face of German opposition, Bandera and Stetsko were sent to prison, and thence to the camp of Sachsenhausen, where they remained until 1944. After the war, Stetsko settled in Munich. He remained active among the nationalist émigrés. He died in 1986 and was buried at the Waldfriedhof cemetery in Munich.

Vojtech Tuka was born on 4 July 1880 in Piarg in southern Slovakia, the son of Anton Tuka, a Slovakian teacher. He attended primary school and the first classes of secondary school in Banská Štiavnica. He completed his secondary education with a school-leaving examination taken in Levice.²⁴ Tuka studied at the University of Budapest, where in 1901 he received the title of Doctor of Legal and State Sciences.²⁵ During his studies, he was active in several organizations, most of which were predominantly Catholic in character.²⁶ After graduation, thanks to the support of the Hungarian Ministry of Education and Worship, he received scholarships to Berlin (1902–03) and Paris (1903).²⁷ He began his professional career as a lawyer with the District Police Department in Budapest, and in 1901–07 served as an assistant lawyer at the Criminal Department of Police Headquarters in Budapest.²⁸ From 1907, he was employed as a Professor of Constitutional Law and Legal Sciences at the Bishop's Secondary School of Law in Pécs. Four years later, he was awarded his habilitation at the University of Budapest.²⁹ In his habilitation thesis, entitled *A Szabadság: Politikai tanulmány* (Freedom: A Political Study), he affirmed a strong Hungarian nation with a conservative, monarchist and centralist form of authority. Tuka opposed universal suffrage and the award of voting rights to women. He argued that 'only strong nations have the right to exist', because only they can educate humanity.³⁰ In August 1914, Tuka

²³ Grzegorz Motyka, *Ukraińska partyzantka 1942–1960: Działalność Organizacji Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów i Ukraińskiej Powstańczej Armii*, Warsaw, 2006, pp. 78–79.

²⁴ Jan Bor, *Vojtech Tuka Úvod do života a diela*, Turčiansky Svätý Martin, 1940, pp. 39–40; Maroš Hertel, 'Činnosť profesora Vojtecha Tuku pred jeho vstupom do Slovenskej ľudovej strany roku 1922', *Historický časopis*, 2002, 2, pp. 257–79 (p. 257).

²⁵ Bor, *Vojtech Tuka*, p. 42.

²⁶ Hertel, 'Činnosť profesora', p. 258.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Bor, *Vojtech Tuka*, p. 44.

³⁰ 'Len silné národy majú právo na existenciu', Hertel, 'Činnosť profesora', p. 259.

became a Full Professor at the University of St Elizabeth in Bratislava.³¹ Politically, Tuka was on the whole passive before the war.³² This changed after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, when he became a collaborator and informer of the Hungarian authorities. The exact date when he began working for them is not, however, clear.³³ In April 1920, having been charged with working for Hungary, Tuka was interned first in Ilava and then, in 1921, in Zlaté Moravce.³⁴ The Slovak scholar Maroš Hertel has presented the following explanation for Tuka's motivations:

The threat of Bolshevism, the loss of influence by the Church, the real threat of separation of Church and State, the penetration of 'progressive' and democratic thought from Bohemia to Slovakia, and the inability to cope with the changes taking place in post-war Europe may well have led the strongly Catholic-oriented Tuka to take this step.³⁵

Culturally, he was at the time a typical proponent of Magyarism. In 1921, during the census, he declared fluency in Hungarian, German and French, but not 'Czechoslovakian.'³⁶ He declined to join the Slovak Motherland or the Slovak Scientific Society.³⁷ At the same time, unlike the majority of scholars at the University of St Elizabeth, Tuka decided to stay in Slovakia, and even sought employment at the newly created Comenius University, but was refused due to his lack of involvement in the field of Slovak science.³⁸ In 1921, Tuka established close contacts with representatives of the SLS, for whom he wrote the article *Autonomia Slovenska* (The Autonomy of Slovakia), published in the *Slovák*. In March 1922, he became the editor-in-chief of this magazine.³⁹ He soon advanced to the vice-presidency of the party, and in 1925 was elected to the Czechoslovak

³¹ Ibid.

³² Bor, *Vojtech Tuka*, p. 47.

³³ Maroš Hertel, 'Neúspešne aktivity Vojtecha Tukú', *Nová História: Revue o dejinách spoločnosti*, 2001, 3, pp. 15–17.

³⁴ Hertel, 'Činnosť profesora', p. 262; Juraj Kramer, *Slovenské autonomistické hnutie v rokoch 1918–1929*, Bratislava, 1962, p. 173.

³⁵ 'Hrozba bolševizmu, strata vplyvu cirkvi, reálna možnosť odluky štátu od cirkvi, prenikanie "pokrokárskych" a demokratických myšlienok z Čiech na Slovensko, neschopnosť vyrovnáť sa s prebiehajúcimi povojnovými zmenami v Európe mohli viesť silnie katolícky orientovaného Tuku k takémuto kroku', Hertel, 'Činnosť profesora', p. 270.

³⁶ [Ivan Déer], *Tukova vlastizrada v osvetlení jeho vlastného priznania*, Bratislava, 1937, p. 4.

³⁷ Zuzana Illyová and Michal Malatinský, *Dva procesy z Vojtechom Tukom*, Prague, 2017, p. 78.

³⁸ Hertel, 'Činnosť profesora', pp. 263–64.

³⁹ Ibid.

Parliament.⁴⁰ The SLS considered Tuka a valuable asset due to his high intelligence.⁴¹ In 1923, the SLS established the Rodobrana, a formation that was intended to keep guard at the party's meetings. Tuka was its spiritual father, and played a central role in the development of its programme, which included anti-Czech and anti-Hungarian nationalism, a primitive anti-Semitism, militant intolerance modelled on Italian Fascism, and religious demagogy.⁴² The Rodobrana was quickly banned by the Czechoslovak authorities. It was renewed, however, in 1926, and included in the HSL'S on Tuka's initiative.⁴³ During the second period of its activity, which lasted until 1929, the Rodobrana gained a more Fascistic character.⁴⁴ At the time, Tuka continued to collaborate with Hungarian politicians, and also published, in Vienna from 1924, the radically anti-Czechoslovak journal *Correspondence Slovaque*.⁴⁵ In view of these facts, a significant part of his activity in the ranks of the SLS/HSL'S and the Rodobrana should be viewed as a function of his pro-Hungarian involvement. By inspiring the development of Slovak integral nationalism, Tuka strengthened decentralist tendencies within Czechoslovakia, which led to a weakening of the state's cohesion. To this we should add his plans to use the Rodobrana in a revolutionary rebellion in Slovakia, which could be utilized politically and militarily by Budapest.⁴⁶

To a large extent, his contacts with the nationalist international served the cause of the revolution. In the autumn of 1923, he found himself in Munich. While there, Tuka tried to get in touch with the Nazis, hoping to copy their experiences in preparation for the revolution in Slovakia (this did not come about due to the failure of the Beer Hall Putsch). From 1923, Tuka maintained ties with the Italian Fascists, and his main contact was the Italian diplomat Attilio Tamaro, who was in charge of the Danubian Section of Italian Fascists Abroad Organization (*Fasci italiani all'estero*).⁴⁷ In 1926, Radola Gajda, a leading activist of the

⁴⁰ Illýová and Malatinský, *Dva procesy*, p. 9.

⁴¹ Manfred, 'Proces s Vojtechom Tukom', pp. 714–30; [Dérer], *Tukova vlastizrada*, p. 6; Jozef Hanzalik, *Tuka: Ohlas ľudáka ku všetkým ľudákom*, Bratislava, 1931, pp. 9–10. Stets'ko, 'Mii zhyttiepys', pp. 158–63.

⁴² Miloslav Čaplovič, *Branné organizácie v Československu 1918–1939 (so zreteľom na Slovensko)*, Bratislava, 2001, pp. 84–85.

⁴³ Miloslav Čaplovič, 'K niektorým otázkam vzniku a organizačného vývoja Rodobran v rokoch 1923–1929', *Vojenské obzory*, 1996, 1, pp. 53–65 (p. 63).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

⁴⁵ [Dérer], *Tukova vlastizrada*, p. 5; Hanzalik, *Tuka: Ohlas ľudáka*, p. 23.

⁴⁶ Illýová and Malatinský, *Dva procesy*, pp. 54–55.

⁴⁷ Anton Hruboň, *Alexander Mach: Radikál z povolania*, Bratislava, 2018, pp. 68–70.

Czech National Fascist Community, discussed plans for the co-ordination of a revolutionary rising in Czechoslovakia.⁴⁸ He maintained ties with Croats: both with Stjepan Radic and the Croatian nationalists, who in 1929 formed the Ustaše organization.⁴⁹ He had more limited contacts in the White Russian émigré milieu.⁵⁰

On 1 January 1928, Tuka published a text in the *Slovák* entitled *Vacuum Juris*, in which he argued, basing on the supposedly existing secret clause of the Martín Declaration,⁵¹ that all agreements between the Slovaks and the Czechs had been concluded for a period of ten years, after which they expired, and that the relationship between the two nations needed to be re-regulated.⁵² This article provoked the launching of legal proceedings against Tuka, who was accused of anti-state activity. At the trial, he was sentenced to fifteen years in prison.⁵³ According to documents found after the war by Juraj Kramer in Hungarian archives, the sentence was fully justified.⁵⁴ At the same time, it endowed Tuka with an aura of martyrdom for the Slovak cause.

On 3 June 1937, President Eduard Beneš granted an amnesty to Tuka. Under its conditions, he was not to leave Czechoslovakia and to remain under constant supervision. The activist took up residence in Plzeň.⁵⁵ After returning to Slovakia in October 1938, he initially found himself in Piešťany, where he was regularly visited by representatives of mainly the younger and more radical wing of the HSLŠ, associated with its paramilitary formation — the Hlinka Guard.⁵⁶ Soon, Tuka's

⁴⁸ Čaplovič, 'K niektorým otázkam', p. 61.

⁴⁹ Tuka asked the Croatian nationalists to provide instructors who would train the Rodobrana, Stanislav Chytka and Zdeněk Vališ, 'Obvinený z velezrady: Tukovo memorandum a jeho pozadie', *Historická revue*, 1993, 8, pp. 19–20 (p. 20); Hruboň, *Alexander Mach*, p. 88.

⁵⁰ Chytka and Vališ, 'Obvinený z velezrady', p. 20.

⁵¹ The document dated 30 October 1918 (its exact name was 'the Declaration of the Slovak Nation'), which was issued by the Slovak National Council, and which constituted a declaration of independence from Hungary, and provided for the integration of Slovakia with Bohemia in a common Czechoslovak state.

⁵² Vojtech Tuka, *V desiatom roku Martinskej deklarácie*, Trenčín, 1992.

⁵³ Michal Lukeš, 'Kauza Tuka: Pohľad do zákulisia procesu z roku 1929', *Historická revue*, 2000, 5, pp. 16–17. For a broader treatment, see Peter Fedorčák, *Tuka proti republike Proces z roku 1929*, Bratislava, 2018.

⁵⁴ Kramer, *Slovenské autonomistické hnutie*, pp. 169–76, 306–18.

⁵⁵ Michal Lukeš, 'Cesta k amnestii Vojtecha Tuku', *Historický časopis*, 1998, 4, pp. 663–72 (pp. 670–71); Robert Arpáš, 'HSLŠ a amnestia Vojtecha Tuku v roku 1937', *Studia Historica Nitriensia*, 13, 2006, pp. 151–57 (p. 156).

⁵⁶ Tuka was proclaimed the honorary leader of the Hlinka Guard, and soon became the informal leader of the entire radical wing of the HSLŠ, which was grouped around the Hlinka Guard's periodical *Gardista*, Lukeš, 'Cesta k amnestii', p. 672.

pro-German orientation was unequivocally revealed. He met with Arthur Seyss-Inquart, Wilhelm Keppler, Hermann Göring and, finally, with Adolf Hitler himself.⁵⁷ In January 1939, Tuka brought about the establishment of the German-Slovak Society in Bratislava, and was chosen as its first president.⁵⁸ Following the creation of an independent Slovakia, he served as Deputy Prime Minister to Jozef Tiso and Minister without Portfolio. In October 1939, he became Prime Minister, in early 1940 he was appointed Vice-Chancellor of the Slovak University in Bratislava, while after the Salzburg negotiations in July 1940 he took up the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs. In 1939, he participated in preparatory work on the constitution of the Slovak state, and in the following year he was the main initiator of the creation of a secret political police — the State Security Headquarters.⁵⁹ Later, he was directly involved in the deportations of the Jewish population to concentration camps. From 1942 on, due to the deteriorating situation, his participation in public life was reduced. In 1944, he was dismissed as Prime Minister. Tried as a war criminal, he was executed in August 1946.⁶⁰

(Almost) parallel thoughts

It seems that it is impossible to compare all aspects of Stetsko's and Tuka's thought, and thus I have decided to limit myself only to certain of them. First, I have tried to display the differences in their approaches to the category of the nation. Secondly, I was interested in the presence in the thought of both activists of Fascist negations (anti-Communism, anti-liberalism, anti-conservatism). Further, an analysis of Stetsko and Tuka's approach to the category of revolution, which may be conjoined with the postulate of palingenesis — central to Fascism — was extremely important. I also compare the thought of both figures regarding issues of expansion and imperialism. I analyse their approach to Germany as the main factor of change in contemporary Europe, and devote considerable space to Stetsko's and Tuka's approach to national minorities. An element of the latter was anti-Semitism, often associated with the problem of Freemasonry. Another aspect that deserves comparison is the attitude

⁵⁷ Michal Procházka, 'Politická činnosť Vojtecha Tuku od návratu na Slovensko na jeseň 1938 až po vyhlásenie slovenskej samostatnosti 14. marca 1939', *Acta historica Neosoliensia*, 2016, 2, pp. 98–118 (pp. 103, 106–09); Illýová and Malatinský, *Dva procesy*, p. 15.

⁵⁸ Illýová and Malatinský, *Dva procesy*, p. 15.

⁵⁹ 'Snem schválil ústavu Slovenskej republiky', *Slovák*, 22 July 1939, 166, p. 1; Martin Lacko, *Dwuramienny krzyż w cieniu swastyki: Republika Słowacka 1939–1945*, Lublin, 2012, p. 76.

⁶⁰ Natália Krajčovičová, 'Politické ambície Vojtecha Tuku', *Historická revue*, 1992, 5, pp. 23–24 (p. 24).

towards the Russians, who, admittedly, were a minority only in Ukraine. Finally, both nationalisms expressed reservations about marriages with representatives of national minorities, and promoted pro-natalist policies. Finally, I discuss the activists' approach to issues of religion, and briefly describe their approach to economic issues.

The category of the nation was interpreted by Stetsko in a strictly organic way.⁶¹ He claimed that the nation is actually a species, fighting for existence, growth and domination. He stressed that human species are at a higher stage of development and have a historical character, which distinguishes them from plant and animal species.⁶² It seems that the definition proposed by Tuka was somewhat more inclusive. Namely, the HSL'S activist wrote that the Slovak nation 'is a group of people who speak and feel in Slovakian'.⁶³ At the same time, he explicitly opposed the preservation of 'remnants of the old regime' under the slogan of unification within the nation (a topic touched upon more broadly below).⁶⁴

The thoughts of both men were noticeably anti-liberal and anti-Communist. Stetsko argued that an important element of the OUN's thought should be the elaboration of arguments aimed against 'demoliberalism', and especially against Marxism identified with the world-view of Russian imperialism.⁶⁵ He opposed the theory of atomism, which he considered characteristic of Communism. According to it, people were atoms, while the nation constituted their mechanical union, established in order to accomplish certain objectives.⁶⁶ Stetsko denied the individualism typical of democracy and liberalism.⁶⁷ He criticized property relations in Communism and capitalism, opposing both collective ownership and unlimited private property, for which 'national property' was to be the alternative.⁶⁸ Further, he negated the 'demoliberal' concept of wage-work and the external compulsion to work present in Communism.⁶⁹ At

⁶¹ [Stets'ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, p. 8.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁶³ 'súhrnom slovensky hovoriacich a cítiacich ľudí', Vojtech Tuka, *14 bodov slovenského národného socializmu vyhlásených V. Tukom 21. 1. 1941 v Trenčianskych Tepličiach* <<https://www.herder-institut.de/digitale-angebote/dokumente-und-materialien/themenmodule/quelle/1872/details/2796.html>> [accessed 6 March 2022].

⁶⁴ 'pozostatky starého režimu', Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko*, p. 20.

⁶⁵ Stets'ko, *Nashi shliakhy*, p. 18.

⁶⁶ [Stets'ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, p. 8.

⁶⁷ Mykhailo Podoliak [Iaroslav Stets'ko], 'Suspil'nyi zmist natsionalizmu', in *Al'manakh: Na sluzhbi natsii*, Paris, 1938, p. 43.

⁶⁸ Zynovii Karbovych [Iaroslav Stets'ko], 'Koly mynaie odne desiatylittia', in *Al'manakh: Na sluzhbi natsii*, p. 54; Stets'ko, *Za zmist*, HDA SBU [AVR], fond 13, case 372, vol. 12, fol. 230.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, fol. 219.

the same time, he argued that in nationalism, unlike capitalism, exploitation is impossible, and this led him to postulate opposition to socialist manifestations of the anti-nationalist struggle, such as strikes and lockouts.⁷⁰ Finally, Stetsko believed that, unlike nationalism, both ‘socialist Communism’ and ‘demoliberalism’ underestimated the role of the family.⁷¹

Anti-liberalism played a noticeable role in Tuka’s thought. He argued that the underlying assumptions of liberalism, namely, that everyone knows how to best arrange their lives and that competition between individuals leads to their enrichment, and thus to the greater prosperity of the nation as a whole, had been proved to be false. In his opinion, ‘competition led to the victory of property over labour’, and of ‘greater property over lesser’, which reduced productivity and thus decreased the material welfare of society. His criticism of liberalism was accompanied by a criticism of democracy, which he saw as incapable of opposing the invincible energy of National Socialism.⁷² Tuka argued that democracy and liberalism led to the division of society into two parts: the employees and the employers.⁷³ His anti-liberalism was accompanied by anti-Communism, which in his view brought about the discrimination of personal entrepreneurship.⁷⁴ He postulated a ban on the propagation of Communist ideology in Slovakia, believing that the state could not afford social experiments involving the liquidation of private ownership.⁷⁵ Tuka’s approach to Communism in the USSR was more nuanced as is discussed below.

An important concept in Stetsko’s thought was the revolution. The OUN activist argued that ‘revolution is the negation of the old existing world, with the objective being to establish a new life in its place’.⁷⁶ The revolution, according to Stetsko, had two important elements: it was total and at once permanent. He argued that its regulatory action was to cover the entirety of social life, starting from the Church and ending with the economy.⁷⁷ Its national and social aspects were to be conjoined.⁷⁸ At the

⁷⁰ Ibid., fol. 248.

⁷¹ Ibid., fol. 220.

⁷² ‘vířazstvu majetok nad řácou’, ‘že vřčší majetok zvířazil nad menřím’, Tuka, *Slovenský národní socializmus*, pp. 9–10.

⁷³ Tuka, *14 bodov*.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Tuka, *Slovenský národní socializmus*, p. 15.

⁷⁶ ‘Revoliutsiia tse zaperechennia staroho isnuiuchoho svitu z ioho bezladiam, shchob na ioho mistse stvoryty nove zhyttia’, [Stets’ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, p. 11.

⁷⁷ [Iaroslav Stets’ko], *Zamitky do referatu pro kul’turu (t. Svientsitskomu)*, AOUN, fond 1, op. 2, case 25, fol. 214; Karbovych [Stets’ko], ‘Koly mynaie odne desiatylittia’, p. 50.

⁷⁸ Karbovych [Stets’ko], ‘Koly mynaie odne desiatylittia’, p. 50.

same time, Stetsko emphasized the permanent nature of the revolution, stressing that it would continue also after the acquisition of statehood.⁷⁹ He predicted a three-step trajectory of the revolution. The first stage was rebirth following the period of decline, that is, the palingenesis.⁸⁰ Out of the chaos, a new type of Ukrainian was to emerge. Stetsko considered this element as fulfilled (he saw representatives of the new type in the activists of the OUN).⁸¹ In the second phase, this *sui generis* 'initiating minority' would engage in a struggle for the soul of the masses. During the third period there would be a manifestation of the 'people's will to live', which would manifest itself in the realization of the imperial idea.⁸²

Tuka claimed that the age in which he lived invented a new kind of revolution — the permanent revolution. He argued that a revolution of this kind was being implemented in Italy, Germany, Spain and the Soviet Union. For Tuka, the permanent revolution was not limited to the overthrow of foreign rule.⁸³ It was supposed to continue after independence had been won, until the final destruction of the remnants of the old system — which was associated with the postulate of palingenesis.⁸⁴ It should be emphasized that, according to Tuka, the revolution also had its social dimension, being directed against poverty.⁸⁵

Stetsko's and Tuka's palingenetic thinking about the revolution should lead us to a reflection as to where they saw the golden age of

⁷⁹ 'Naïvno zvuzhuvaty revoliutsiiu do psykholohichnoho, nezasovanoho kypinnia — tse znachyt' uzahali ťi v samii zasadnychii kontseptsii ne skhopliuvaty i tezh pryimaty tezu nacheb revoliutsiia kinchalasia z mentom zdobuttia derzhavy. Todi zh vona iakraz shchoino koly ide pro vnutrishniu intensyvniť nabiraie na syli, bo usunuvshy zovnishni perepony mozhe prysviatytysia peretvoriuvanniu ukraïns'koho zhyttia vid osnov' (It is naive to narrow the revolution down to some psychological, unexplained turmoil — this would be tantamount to its fundamental disapproval and to the acceptance the thesis that the revolution ends once the state is achieved. At that very moment it — if we are discussing the matter of internal intensity — gains strength, for after removing the external obstacles it can devote itself to the transformation of Ukrainian life from scratch), Stets'ko, *Nashi shliakhy*, p. 12.

⁸⁰ Podoliak [Stets'ko], 'Suspil'nyi zmist natsionalizmu', pp. 35, 39.

⁸¹ Stets'ko, *Nashi shliakhy*, p. 12.

⁸² [Stets'ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, pp. 10–11; Karbovych [Stets'ko], 'Koly mynaie odne desiatylittia', p. 51.

⁸³ Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko*, pp. 20–21.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4; Tuka, *Slovenský národný socializmus*, pp. 18–19.

⁸⁵ Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko*, p. 5. In the work *Slovak National Socialism* Tuka divided the revolution into two stages: that of the political revolution, which was implemented between October 1938 and July 1940, and of the social revolution, which was to commence following the Salzburg conference, Tuka, *Slovenský národný socializmus*, pp. 18–19.

Ukraine and Slovakia, respectively. For Stetsko, this had undoubtedly been the period of Kyivan Rus' (and, to a limited extent, also that of the Cossack semi-autonomy).⁸⁶ Tuka did not engage in historiosophical reflection at all. Other activists of the radical wing of the Slovak Ludaks, such as Karol Murgaš and Alexander Mach, referred to the times of the Principality of Nitra and the Great Moravian Empire.⁸⁷ It is worth noting that while the Ukrainian nationalists sought confirmation for Ukraine's dominant role in Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, their Slovak counterparts viewed the time as a period of amicable Slovak-German cooperation.

The approach of both activists, and indeed of both nationalisms, to territorial issues was completely different. As has already been mentioned, according to Stetsko, the final phase of the revolution would manifest itself in imperialism. For Stetsko, this was a monumental concept, and he saw Ukraine as the future centre of life in Eastern Europe.⁸⁸ In 1937, he criticized the proposals put forward by Mykhailo Kolodzins'kyi, who advocated an enormous expansion of Ukraine's eastern border, which would extend to the Altai mountains in Central Asia and Dzungaria in Northwest China. Stetsko thought that his colleague's demands were too modest, and that Ukraine should become a global empire. Accordingly, he suggested its expansion to India, which would be achieved by spreading Christianity there, and securing access to the Baltic and Mediterranean seas.⁸⁹ Unlike Stetsko, Tuka harboured no imperial ambitions — which would in any case have been strange for the representative of a small nation. For most of the inter-war years, the HSLŠ staunchly supported autonomism. It is worth mentioning that Tuka's view of autonomism was particularly radical.⁹⁰ Published in the

⁸⁶ The set of symbols used by Stetsko to describe the Ukrainian idea is significant: 'perehorodyty svit ukrains'kymy shchytamy, prybyty tsi shchyty na murakh Tsarohrodu, opanuvaty put' iz Variah u Hreky, [...] sholomom napytysia z Donu, diity do Volhy [,] staty na storozhi Kavkazu' (to enclose the world with Ukrainian shields, to nail these shields to the walls of Tsargrad, to take control of the route from the Varangians to the Greeks, [...] to drink water from the Don in a helmet, to reach the Volga [,] to stand guard over the Caucasus), in which there are references to Old Ruthenian literature (*The Song of Igor's Campaign*), to the contemporary trade route, and to the expeditions of princes Oleg and Sviatoslav, [Stets'ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, pp. 3–4, 6.

⁸⁷ Karol Murgaš, *Narod medzi Dunajom a Karpatmi*, Turčiansky Svätý Martin, 1940, pp. 13–16; 'Krv martýrov, krv hrdinov je najväčšia moc sveta', *Slovák*, 29 March 1940, p. 3.

⁸⁸ Stets'ko, *Nashi shliakhy*, p. 4; [Stets'ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, p. 6.

⁸⁹ [Stets'ko], *Zamitky do vstupu do Voiiennoi Doktryny*, AOUN, Dokumenty Mykoly Kapustians'koho, unnumbered sheets.

⁹⁰ The German consul in Bratislava, Gerhardt K. O. Schellert, described him as 'najextrémnejšieho autonomistu' (the most extreme autonomist), Manfred, 'Proces s Vojtechom Tukom', p. 720.

Slovák in 1921, his project of Slovakian autonomy went much further than the competing concepts of Ludak activists Ferdinand Juriga and Ľudovít Labaj — as well as the official project of the SL'S that was adopted in 1922. Tuka envisioned the division of Czechoslovakia into two parts that would be virtually independent of each other: The Czech Republic, comprising Bohemia proper, Moravia and Silesia, and Slovakia (the issue of Carpathian Ruthenia was to be resolved later). According to his project, Slovakia was to have its own government, national assembly, army, administration and courts. Tuka also anticipated that the economy, agriculture, industry, trade, the railways, the postal service, education, religious policy and the provision of foodstuffs would all be governed autonomously. Whereas the countries would have a common president (alternately a Czech and a Slovak), general staff (headed alternately, again, by a Czech and a Slovak), foreign and customs policy, foreign trade, national debt, currency, treasury notes and statistics, and issues jointly concerning both parts of the republic (patents, units of measure, monopolies).⁹¹ Pro-independence motifs appeared in Tuka's thoughts as early as 1927, although at the time they probably constituted a function of his activity within the Hungarian irredenta.⁹² In the second stage of his activity, he quickly (already in December 1938) put forward the postulate of Slovak independence.⁹³ After taking office as Prime Minister, Tuka began to voice the need for a revision of borders. It is not surprising that he was happy with the return to Slovakia of the fragments of Spiš and Orava that had been lost to Poland in 1938,⁹⁴ and that he based himself on the national principle (*völkisch*) to make claims with respect to territories which pursuant to the First Vienna Arbitration had been taken over by Hungary.⁹⁵

In the thought of virtually almost all integral nationalists in Central and Eastern Europe during the inter-war period, the postulate of a radical change in relations with other states related to an external orientation towards Nazi Germany. The OUN was no exception. The orientation of the Ukrainian nationalists had two trends: the political and the political-ideological. The first, expressed by Konovalets, viewed Germany

⁹¹ Tuka, *Autonomia Slovenska*, pp. 3–4.

⁹² Already earlier in the *Slovák*, Tuka had alluded to independence, writing 'Klio berie mramorovú tabulu a po menách De Valera, Ghandi začína písať Hli... [Hlinka — M. W.]' (Klio takes a marble plaque and, after the names De Valera and Gandhi, begins to write Hli...), Vojtech Tuka, 'Irsko, Egypt, India...', *Slovák*, 28 March 1922, pp. 1–2 (p. 2); Krajčovičova, *Politické ambície Vojtecha Tuku*, p. 24.

⁹³ Procházka, 'Politická činnosť Vojtecha Tuku', p. 104.

⁹⁴ Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko*, p. 25.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 26–27.

as the most important of the states seeking to revise the political order of the Old Continent, and thus as the main political ally of the Ukrainian cause in Central and Eastern Europe, while its attitude to National Socialism was indifferent. The second trend, represented primarily by the younger generation of activists originating from the HE OUN, shared this political calculation, however combining it with the approval of (sometimes passing into a fascination with) the National Socialist idea. By and large, Stetsko belonged to the second group, although extant sources emphasize chiefly the political aspect of cooperation. In his biography, he argued that only a victory by Germany could lead to the reconstruction of Ukraine. Because he believed that their defeat would be tantamount to the collapse of Ukrainian independence aspirations, he demanded that Ukraine provide 'full economic support for Germany by all possible means'. In connection with Germany's involvement in the struggle against the USSR, Stetsko envisaged financial or economic compensation from Ukraine for the German people. He also declared that the Ukrainian army would maintain an anti-Moscow front, thus allowing the Germans to establish order among nations which were hostile to them.⁹⁶ At the same time, it is important to emphasize the independence displayed by the young generation of Ukrainian nationalists in their relations with Germany, as exemplified by the views of Kolodzins'kyi, who unequivocally rejected German claims towards Eastern Europe, concluding that the region had room only for the Ukrainian empire.⁹⁷

Tuka was an unequivocal supporter of the German orientation, which was both political and ideological in its nature. Even before his arrest, during a meeting with the German Consul in Bratislava on 15 March 1928 he assured his interlocutor about the pro-German sentiment in Slovakia, and the admiration of the Slovak people for German culture.⁹⁸ Tuka's views became distinctly pro-German after his release from prison. During a meeting with Hitler in March 1939, he entrusted him with the fate of the Slovak

⁹⁶ 'povnoi [...] hospodars'koï pidderzhky vsimy mozhlyvymy zakhodamy z boku Ukraïny', Stets'ko, 'Mii zhyttiepys', p. 163.

⁹⁷ This fragment was omitted (probably to avoid a conflict with the Germans) from the abbreviated version of his work published in 1940 in Cracow, which was directed to the broader ranks of the OUN. The complete typescript was known only to a narrow group of the leading nationalist activists, Mykhailo Kolodzins'kyi, *Voïenna doktryna Ukraïns'kykh natsionalistiv*, AOUN, fond 1, op. 2, case 466, fol. 25–27; Mykhailo Kolodzins'kyi, *Ukraïns'ka voïenna doktryna. Chastyna I*, HDA SBU [AVR], fond 13, case 372, vol. 44; Oleksandr Zaitsev, 'Voïenna doktryna Mykhaila Kolodzins'koho', *Ukraïna Moderna*, 2013, 20, pp. 245–56 (p. 249).

⁹⁸ Manfred, 'Proces s Vojtechom Tukom', p. 717.

nation and declared that Slovaks under the leadership of the Third Reich wanted to fight for European civilization.⁹⁹ In 1940, he supported the implementation of a Slovak variant of National Socialism, which was to be in some respects different from the German prototype see below.¹⁰⁰ Tuka's views contained a one-sided apologia of Hitler. While outlining the objectives of the HSL'S, he argued that it would act in the spirit of Hlinka, but using Hitler's methods¹⁰¹ ('Hitler-Hlinka — one and the same line').¹⁰² He described the leader of the Third Reich thus: 'our great friend, our noble protector'.¹⁰³ In addition, he claimed:

His [Hitler's — M. W.] multifaceted genius manifests itself by him seeing what he must do, what historical forces have prepared, and indeed almost predicted, and what irresistibly and inexorably comes and will come. He is only taking these steps, and because he is being joined by these historical forces — invisible and thereby even more powerful — he has his successes.¹⁰⁴

Looking for a theoretical basis for the specific postulates formulated by Stetsko in relation to national minorities in the future Ukrainian state, it is worth referring to a text published in 1934 in the journal *Students'kyi shliakh*:

The national fighter desires not the death of a man, but the victory of the national idea. He removes not the man, but the personification of hostile rule over his own nation. He does not yearn for 'the happiness of the knife and blood', but for the happiness engendered by the victory of the idea. When the road to victory leads through blood and corpses and holy knives, the blood, corpses and swords are but means for attainment of the goal.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁹ Procházka, 'Politická činnosť Vojtecha Tuku', p. 111.

¹⁰⁰ Tuka, *Slovenský národný socializmus*, pp. 12–15.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹⁰² 'Hitler-Hlinka — jedna linka.'

¹⁰³ Tuka, *Slovenský národný socializmus*, p. 20.

¹⁰⁴ 'Jeho mnohostranná genialita sa prejavuje aj v tom, že vidi, čo sa musí robiť, čo historické silly pripravily a takmer predurčovaly, čo nedolateľne a nezadržiteľne prichádza a príde. On robí len tieto kroky a keďže sa k nemu pridávajú tieto historické neviditeľné, ale tým mohutnejšie sily má svoje úspechy', Tuka, *Usmievané Slovensko*, p. 23.

¹⁰⁵ 'Natsional'nyu borets' prahne ne smerty liudyny, a peremohy natsional'noï ideï. Vin usuvaie ne liudynu, a personifikatsiiu chuzhoho panuvannia nad ioho natsiieiu. Ne tuzhyt' vin za "shchastiam nozha i krovny", a za shchastiam peremohy ideï. Koly shliakh peremohy vede kriz' krov i trupy v sviachenii nozhi, tak krov, trupy i mechi — tse zasoby dlia zdiisnennia mety', Ievhen Orlovs'kyi [Iaroslav Stets'ko], 'Za tvortsiv novoï diisnosity', *Students'kyi shliakh*, 1934, 5–6, pp. 147–53 (p. 151).

This idea was inspired by the postulates of active nationalism of Dmitro Doncov.¹⁰⁶ Later, Stetsko made specific demands. In 1937, as the person authorized to prepare the ideological principles of the Second Congress of the OUN, he argued that the issue of minorities might be solved through assimilation, deportation or 'physical means'.¹⁰⁷ He distinguished three types of minorities. The first were those of 'the nations that enslave us', the second were the minorities 'acting hand in hand with the occupiers' (the Jews in the West Ukrainian lands), and the third were those who cooperated with the Ukrainians against the 'occupiers', but nonetheless had their own separatist tendencies (the Crimean Tatars). Different policies had to be followed with respect to each. The activist did not describe the exact directions to follow; however he noted that Ukraine could provide the latter with conditions for development that would not collide with the integrity and sovereignty of the state.¹⁰⁸

Tuka had already presented his views on the matter of national minorities in the *Rodobranecký katechizmus* (Rodobrana Catechism), published in 1928. At the time, Tuka's criticism of their representatives was not very strongly marked. The author argued that the nation must be defended against both open and hidden enemies, and he also called for the distrust of 'strangers'.¹⁰⁹ Tuka declared that a Christian attitude would be maintained toward minorities, but only on condition of fidelity to 'our state' and recognition by them of 'the primacy of the Slovaks in Slovakia and of the Slovakian national character of the country'.¹¹⁰ Further, Tuka advocated the Slovakization of the press and educational system; foreigners were to speak Slovakian, while an ambiguously worded warning

¹⁰⁶ In *Nationalism*, published in 1926, Doncov affirmed the concept of the national will, from which he derived the six requirements of active nationalism. These were: a) voluntarism, b) bellicosity, c) romanticism, dogmatism and illusoriness, d) fanaticism and 'amorality', e) a synthesis of nationalism and internationalism, f) creative violence and an initiating minority. In practice, Doncov's thought was reduced to a commendation of activism undertaken for the benefit of the nation, which was not limited by moral principles; for a broader treatment, see Zaitsev, *Natsionalist u dobi fa-shyzmu*, pp. 125–39.

¹⁰⁷ 'fyzycznymi zasobamy', [Iaroslav Stets'ko], Orhanichnyi zovnishnyi reflieks i vysnovok ta postava zovnishnykh syl i do nykh, AOUN, fond 1, op. 1, case 118, unnumbered sheets (p. 9 of the quoted text).

¹⁰⁸ 'ponevoliuiuchykh nas narodiv', 'shcho idut' ruka v ruku z okupantamy', *ibid.*, unnumbered sheets (p. 11 of the quoted text).

¹⁰⁹ [Tuka], *Rodobranecký katechizmus*, pages unnumbered. Points 5 and 9 of the catechism.

¹¹⁰ 'prvenstvo Slovákov na Slovensku a slovenský národný ráz krajiny', *ibid.*, point 14.

was addressed to those who did not respect Slovak language rights or Slovak national feelings. In the event of it being ignored, he postulated a 'Rodobrana-style' intervention.¹¹¹

Tuka's views underwent a noticeable radicalization in the second phase of his activity (post-1938). The theoretical foundation of his thinking was like that of Stetsko, in that he recognized the primacy of the interests of the nation even over the welfare of his closest relatives (not to mention the representatives of other nations).¹¹² His attitude towards members of other nationalities in Slovakia was two-fold, for he distinguished national minorities and 'foreign elements'. The first group was historical in nature, while the second consisted of immigrant elements. Tuka separated the issue of national minorities from current politics, claiming that it would be solved in the historical process (variants of which were changes of borders, assimilation and resettlement). He demanded loyalty from their representatives, and stressed the principle of reciprocity, that is, making the state's policy toward a particular minority dependent on the position of the Slovaks in the home state of that minority (this concerned mainly Slovak-Hungarian relations).¹¹³ At the same time, Tuka propagated the necessity of maintaining friendly relations with the Germans residing in Slovakia, emphasizing the historical ties of the two nations and their common understanding of life according to the principles of National Socialism.¹¹⁴

By the term 'alien elements', Tuka meant 'anything that had not grown from the Slovak soil'. In this category he included Czechs, Jews, Freemasons, Bolsheviks, international capitalism and supporters of Czechoslovakianism. Tuka proclaimed the need to cleanse Slovakia of these elements. This process, which he believed had begun during the period of autonomy, should be continued.¹¹⁵ He further rejected the categories of Christian love, recognizing that foreigners could remain in Slovakia only if they strove to achieve the good of the Slovak nation.¹¹⁶ In practice, this reservation applied to the Czechs, but not to other 'foreign elements'.¹¹⁷

¹¹¹ Ibid., points 14 and 16.

¹¹² Vojtech Tuka, 'Do nového roku slovenskej revolúcie', *Gardista*, 1 January 1941, p. 1.

¹¹³ Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko*, pp. 11–12.

¹¹⁴ Tuka, *14 bodov*.

¹¹⁵ 'všetko čo nevyrástlo zo slovenskej pôdy', Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko*, pp. 13–14.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 14–15.

¹¹⁷ 'Minister dr. V. Tuka v Hlochovci: V Kristiovi Spasiteľovi hľadajte prameň sily a útechy', *Slovák*, 1 July 1939, p. 3.

Anti-Semitism was a particularly emotive element of integral nationalism. It can be seen clearly in the views of Stetsko, who in 1939 in the émigré Canadian magazine *Novyi shliakh* argued thus:

It [Jewry — M. W.] has taken over trade, and through lies and exploitation, acting as the lackey of the enemies of Ukraine, lives on the Ukrainian lands. A nation of selfish, materialist egoists who demoralize and decompose the nations of the world, a nation without the heroism of life, without a great idea, which knows only personal gain and pleasure in satisfying the basest instincts, wants to decompose the heroic culture of warrior nations. Unattached to the land, a nation of nomads and scroungers, it lives off the toil and sweat of the people of the land. Scattered all over the world, it has adopted the internationalist-Communist, Marxist-socialist ideology as its own, and helps Moscow to break down the West.¹¹⁸

He emphasized that not only Communism, but also capitalism is supported by the Jews.¹¹⁹ Stetsko proposed concrete ways of sorting out the 'Jewish question'. The activist declared that due to their numerical strength (approximately three million people), the physical destruction of the Jews would have been impossible,¹²⁰ while assimilation should be excluded because the Jews would have weakened the 'artistocratism' of the Ukrainian people. Thus, Stetsko proposed a complete separation from

¹¹⁸ 'Vono zakhopylo torhivliu v svoï ruky ta obmanom, vyzyskom, vysluhovanniam voroham Ukraïny — zhyve na ukraïns'kykh zemliakh. Narod shkurnykiv, materialistiv, egoïstiv, iaki demoralizuiut' ta rozkladaiut' narody svitu, narid bez heroïky zhyttia, bez velychnoi idei, iaka rvala b do posviaty, narid shcho znaie til'ky osobystu nazhyvu i nasolodu v zaspokoiuvanni nainyzhchyykh instynktiv, khoche rozlozhyty i heroïchnu kul'turu narodiv-bortsiv. Nezviazanyv zo zemleiu narid kochovnykiv i halapasiv — zhyve z trudu i potu liudei zemli. Rozkynenyi po vs'omu svitu pryiniav za svoiu internatsionalistychno-komunistychnu, marksiv's'ko-sotsialistychnu ideolohiiu i neiu dopomahaie Moskvi rozkladaty Zakhid', Iaroslav Stets'ko, 'Zhydistvo i my', *Novyi shliakh*, 1939, 8 travnia, p. 3, in Marco Carynnyk, 'Knife in the Back of Our Revolution': A Reply to Alexander J. Motyl's 'The Ukrainian Nationalist Movement and the Jews: Theoretical Reflections on Nationalism, Fascism, Rationality, Primordialism, and History', p. 13 [photocopy of the article] <https://www.academia.edu/6313351/A_Knife_in_the_Back_of_Our_Revolution_A_Reply_to_Alexander_J._Motyls_The_Ukrainian_Nationalist_Movement_and_the_Jews_Theoretical_Reflections_on_Nationalism_Fascism_Rationality_Primordialism_and_History> [accessed 1 February 2022].

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ In this respect, Stetsko's views were not unequivocal. In the work *Za zmist derzhavnoho zhyttia* (About the Essence of State Life), he excluded the possibility of pursuing an exterminatory policy against national minorities. However, he took a different stance in *Mii zhyttiepys* (My Life), in which he proposed the application in Ukraine of the methods used by Germans to exterminate Jews, Stets'ko, *Za zmist*, HDA SBU [AVR], fond 13, case 372, vol. 12, fol. 262–63; Stets'ko, 'Mii zhyttiepys', p. 162.

the Jews and their ghettoization in the spiritual, social and economic dimensions. He further proposed a ban on the acquisition by Jewish residents of the ownership of land, a ban on Jews working together with Ukrainians, and an order for the publication of certain vital documents only in the Jewish language.¹²¹ He also considered the expulsion of Jews, preferably to a 'Jewish Autonomous Region'.¹²²

Tuka believed 'the Jew must be an implacable enemy of National Socialism because the Jews are either capitalists or Communists. We must also resolve the Jewish question radically, otherwise our plans will fail'.¹²³ While acknowledging the humaneness of the Jews (*sic*), he believed that it was intolerable for the 'Jewish spirit' to further poison the Slovakian economy, trade, literature and art.¹²⁴ Tuka summarized these views in the *14 bodov slovenského národného socializmu* (14 Points of Slovak National Socialism), where in the ultimate point he postulated 'to finally resolve the Jewish question'.¹²⁵

The conviction as to the significant negative influence of Freemasonry played a minor role in the thought of Ukrainian integral nationalism.¹²⁶ It would seem, however, that Stetsko was the activist who emphasized this issue the most. He stressed that Freemasonry was looking to assert its influence in Ukraine, and gave as an example the activities of the 'Freemason-Rudnycki Jews from "Dilo"'.¹²⁷ Nearly in parallel, in an unpublished article written in 1938, Stetsko argued that in democracies, governments are under the control of the financial bourgeoisie, Freemasonry, and the internationalist mafia led by Jews.¹²⁸ This issue played a more important role in Slovak nationalism, which, firstly, was more closely related with religion, and secondly, was oriented primarily against the liberal and secular Czechoslovakia.¹²⁹ In *Usmievavé Slovensko*

¹²¹ He did not specify whether this was to be Hebrew or Yiddish.

¹²² [Stets'ko], *Zamitky do referatu pro kul'turu* (vol. Svientsitskomu), AOUN, fond 1, op. 2, case 25, fol. 217.

¹²³ 'Žid musí byť niesmierteľným nepriateľom národného socializmu lebo Židia sú buď kapitalisti buď komunisti. Aj židovskú otázku musíme preto riešiť radikálne, inakšie naše plány stroskotajú', Tuka, *Slovenský národný socializmus*, p. 15.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹²⁵ 'Vyriešiť konečne židovskú otázku', Tuka, *14 bodov*.

¹²⁶ Carynyk, 'Kníže in the Back of Our Revolution', p. 10.

¹²⁷ 'masonry-zhydy Rudnyts'ki z "Dila"', [Stets'ko], *Zamitky do referatu pro kul'turu* (vol. Svientsitskomu), AOUN, fond 1, op. 2, case 25, fol. 218; this concerns representatives of the well-known family from Lwów: Iwan Kedryn-Rudnycki and (probably) his sister Milena Rudnycka.

¹²⁸ Carynyk, 'Kníže in the Back of Our Revolution', p. 6.

¹²⁹ It is no coincidence that this element was strongly imprinted in the thoughts of the clergymen who associated themselves with Slovak nationalism, Miloslav Szabó,

(Smiling Slovakia), Tuka underlined the ties of Tomáš Masaryk and Eduard Beneš with Freemasonry.¹³⁰ Whereas in the *14 bodov slovenského národného socializmu* he argued that in certain countries candidates for parliament were approved by Masonic lodges.¹³¹

Yaroslav Stetsko did not concretize his attitude toward the Russians, considering them as representatives of the nation enslaving Ukraine. It should be emphasized, however, that the OUN perceived Russians unequivocally as a hostile nation, and not only as representatives of a hostile empire.¹³² In the writings of some Ukrainian nationalists, racial arguments were put forward against the Russians. Dmytro Myron spoke out against the mixing of blood with Russians, which followed from the conviction ingrained in Ukrainian political thought that the Russian people were descended from the Finno-Ugric tribes.¹³³ In contrast Tuka's thought contains no chauvinistic, anti-Russian elements. He clearly differentiated Bolshevism from the Russian nation,¹³⁴ considering the latter 'brotherly'.¹³⁵ He also wished the peoples of the Soviet Union success in arranging their lives according to the principles of Communism (while at the same time postulating a ban on its propagation in Slovakia). Tuka held a negative view of pan-Slavism, however considering it a means of luring Slovaks to Communism.¹³⁶

Stetsko unequivocally opposed mixed marriages, considering them a 'crime of national betrayal'. He called for the creation of special offices that would control the health, cleanliness and legality of marriages.¹³⁷ Tuka also spoke out against mixed marriages. He unambiguously opposed matrimony between Slovakian women and Czech men, opining that any woman who married a representative of the other nation would be lost for Slovakness. Tuka's attitude towards marriages in the reverse order (that is, between a man of Slovak nationality and a woman of Czech nationality) was not entirely clear. On the one hand, he seemed to believe that in this variant the woman would accede to

Klerofašisti: Slovenskí kňazi a pokušenie radikálnej politiky (1935–1945), Bratislava, 2019, pp. 68, 151–52, 181.

¹³⁰ Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko*, p. 21.

¹³¹ Tuka, *14 bodov*.

¹³² [O. Bojdunyk], *Nasza walka, jej cele i metody*, July 1931, Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv u L'vovi, fond 113, op. 1, case 46, fol. 15.

¹³³ Maksym Orlyk [Dmytro Myron], *Ideia i chyn Ukraïny*, no place and date of publication, HDA SBU [AVR], fond 13, case 376, vol. 13, fol. 360–61.

¹³⁴ Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko*, p. 13.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹³⁶ Tuka, *Slovenský národný socializmus*, p. 15.

¹³⁷ 'zlochyn natsional'noi zrady', [Stets'ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, pp. 13–14, 16.

the Slovak nation¹³⁸ while on the other he doubted the national loyalty of children from such unions.¹³⁹

However, opposition to these marriages did not stop him from supporting an active pro-natalist policy. In 1941, Stetsko argued thus:

The family (father-mother) is to give birth to as many children as possible, so that we are as numerous as we can be. More and still more millions, thanks to this Holy Law, the fertility of our women, Ukraine was able not only to repel the Tatar flood, but also to grow several times over and enter the ranks of the largest nations in the world. [...] This task is the sacred duty of women.¹⁴⁰

In order to achieve this ideal, he advocated paid maternity leave, providing mothers with medical care, and the payment of financial bonuses to large families.¹⁴¹

Tuka believed that the number of Slovaks could be two or three times higher, and considered abortion an obstacle to the achievement of this goal. In his opinion, the threat to the health of mothers was no more than an excuse for the performance of 50,000–60,000 abortions per year. He vowed to fight against the practice.¹⁴² At the same time, Tuka postulated family allowances in the form of wage supplements for employees who had wives and children. And if in each workplace there was a majority of childless workers, the money thus saved would go to the state compensatory fund, which would transfer it elsewhere.¹⁴³

Stetsko's understanding of religious policy was based on the fundamental conviction that God is most fully worshipped 'by the nation and in the name of the nation'.¹⁴⁴ Accordingly, he proclaimed the complete Ukrainization of the Church, and demanded that the clergy recognize the primacy of Ukrainian identity over the principles of faith.¹⁴⁵ Further, he criticized Caesaro-papism and asceticism (as an anti-social

¹³⁸ Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko*, p. 15.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁴⁰ 'Rodyna (bat'ko-maty) maiut' rodyty iaknaibil'she ditei shchob nas bulo iak-naibil'she. Shchoraz novi mil'iony, zavdiaky ts'omu Sviatomu zakonovi, rodiuchosti nashykh zhinok Ukraïna zumila vidbyty ne lyshe tatars'ku potopu, a pobil'shyty sebe kil'ka raziv ta vyity v chyslo naibil'shykh narodiv v sviiti. [...] Tse zavdannia sviatyi obov'iazok zhinok', [Stets'ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, p. 15.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁴² Tuka, *Usmievavé Slovensko*, p. 17.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 17–19.

¹⁴⁴ 'cherez natsiui i v imia natsii', [Stets'ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, p. 19.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

phenomenon),¹⁴⁶ and assumed limited religious tolerance, at once opposing the propagation of atheism. Stetsko also advocated an autocephalous Orthodox Church, whose centre would be the patriarchate in Kyiv.¹⁴⁷ The activist's views on the issue of the separation of the Church from the state were inconsistent.¹⁴⁸

Unlike Stetsko, Tuka did not formulate precise postulates concerning religious policy, even though Catholicism played a key role at every stage of his intellectual development, and the subject of religion appears regularly in his works. He strongly emphasized the importance of Christianity in the 1921 pamphlet titled *Kristoví bojovníci* (Warriors of Christ). In this work, Tuka argued that Christianity makes nations eternally young. At the same time, Tuka had a close affinity with militant Christianity, referencing the ideal of the Crusader and the slogan 'I have brought you not peace, but struggle'.¹⁴⁹ The activist called for a comprehensive fight against sin.¹⁵⁰ He associated the creation of a cultural and free state with the introduction of Christianity.¹⁵¹ In his pamphlet *Slovenský národný socializmus* (Slovak National Socialism), Tuka argued that Slovakian National Socialism would be distinguished from its German forerunner by emphasizing the role of Christianity. While stressing the central role of Catholicism in the struggle for national and religious identity, he did not belittle the achievements of the Protestant clergy.¹⁵² Tuka maintained that National Socialism, thanks to its social policy, had led to the eradication of poverty in Germany, thus realizing the Christian ideal. He explained the conflicts between the Church and the state in the Third Reich by the fact that in the 1920s the clergy had acted together with the Communists against the National Socialists.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁶ Stetsko did not expound this thread, while as regards the future Ukrainian state, the OUN admitted of the existence of only such monasteries (exclusively Ukrainian) that would administer a socio-cultural or charitable institution, Mykola Vikul, 'Do tserkovnoho pytannia na Ukraïni', *Rozbudova natsii*, 1929, 12, pp. 383–85 (pp. 384).

¹⁴⁷ [Stets'ko], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, p. 19.

¹⁴⁸ Stetsko approved the postulate in the pamphlet *Natsiia iak spetsiies* (The Nation as a Species), while in the work *Za zmist derzhavnoho zhyttia* (For the Content of State Life) he opposed it, *ibid.*; Stets'ko, *Za zmist*, HDA SBU [AVR], fond 13, case 372, vol. 12, fol. 252.

¹⁴⁹ This is an inaccurate reference to a passage from the Gospel of St Matthew: 'Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth. I did not come to bring peace, but a sword.' (Matthew 10:34), Tuka, *Kristoví bojovníci*, pp. 3–4, 8.

¹⁵⁰ He saw the opponent 'v pornografickej literatúre, v hriešnej zábave, v každej nespravodlivosti, vo využití nevedomých, v otravujúcich heslách' (in pornographic literature, in sinful games, in every injustice, in the exploitation of the ignorant, in poisoned slogans), *ibid.* p. 4.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁵² Tuka, *Slovenský národný socializmus*, p. 14.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 12–14.

Stetsko did not pay much attention to issues of economic policy. He viewed farmers as forming the basis of the Ukrainian nation, speaking in favour of medium-sized private farmsteads.¹⁵⁴ At the same time, Stetsko stressed the need to industrialize the state and apply the principle of national autarky.¹⁵⁵ Slovak nationalism accentuated these aspects somewhat differently. Tuka considered agriculture to be the fundamental basis and backbone of national life.¹⁵⁶ He further believed that medium-sized individual farms with an area of around seventy acres were the optimal economic model.¹⁵⁷ The salaries of agricultural workers were to be partly dependent on the number of children they had.¹⁵⁸ As opposed to Stetsko, and thus even more unlike other Ukrainian nationalists, Tuka made no clear postulates for the industrialization of Slovakia.

A summary: Fascists in Central and Eastern Europe

Stetsko's life path was fundamentally distinct from Tuka's. An interpretation of the differences between generations and the fates of the revolutionary activist and scholar is additionally complicated by the question of Tuka's unclear, partly Hungarian and partly Slovakian national identity in the period before 1929.¹⁵⁹ When analysing the thought of Tuka and Stetsko, we notice several similarities. Both men viewed the nation in an organic way. Both affirmed two of the three Fascist negations, namely, anti-liberalism and anti-Communism (the latter was more pronounced in Stetsko's writings). Extant sources lack a direct criticism of conservatism, while it should be remembered that the thought of both activists was to a certain degree a polemic with the less radical currents within the OUN and the HSL'S. Stetsko and Tuka made their approach to national minorities dependent on the attitude of the latter toward the Ukrainian and Slovak national movements (in practice toward the aspirations of the OUN and the HSL'S. They both presented a clear anti-Semitism, and went as far as to advocate physical elimination. Further, Stetsko and Tuka strongly opposed mixed marriages,

¹⁵⁴ [Iaroslav Stets'ko], *Ukraïns'ka natsional'na revoliutsiia abo Ukraïna na shliakhu vidnovy i tvorennia svoïkh novykh vnutrishnykh vartostei i vstanovliuvannia svoïei velykoderzhavnoi ratsiï v Evropi ta sviti*, AOUN, fond 1, op. 1, case 118, unnumbered sheets (pp. 3–4 of the quoted text).

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, unnumbered sheets (p. 5 of the quoted text).

¹⁵⁶ Vojtech Tuka, *Slovenský národný socializmus a roľníctvo: Reč predsedu vlády dr. Vojtecha Tuku na kurze roľníckych pracovníkov v Pezinku 17 februára 1941*, Bratislava, 1941, p. 5.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁵⁹ Hanzalik, *Tuka: Ohlas ľudáka*, p. 23.

while at the same time supporting active pro-natalist policies. Finally, both activists similarly interpreted the revolution as a permanent phenomenon, simultaneously emphasizing its social dimension.

But differences were also noticeable. Representatives of the two nationalisms perceived the Russians differently. Tuka, although critical of pan-Slavism and Communism, described the Russian people as 'brotherly', which in the case of Stetsko and other OUN activists was unthinkable. The question of the negative role of Freemasonry was more significant for Tuka. Further differences can be seen in their approaches to cooperation with Germany. Although both nationalisms were oriented toward the Third Reich, they differed in terms of the intensity of this orientation. For Tuka, it was noticeably stronger in both the political and ideological aspects. The two leaders further differed on economic matters. Tuka viewed agriculture as by far the most important basis of national life, whereas Stetsko more clearly accentuated the role of industry (other activists of the OUN strongly emphasized this role). Finally, a fundamental difference can be seen regarding territorial issues: the Ukrainian nationalism propagated by Stetsko was imperialist, while Tuka limited himself to the postulate of regaining the lands lost by Slovakia in November 1938.

It would seem that above contains visible elements of integral nationalism: a hostility to internationalism represented by humanitarians and liberals, chauvinism toward other nations (especially open anti-Semitism), placing national interests above the interests of the family, and especially the individual (the question of mixed marriages and pro-natalist postulates), and the praise of imperialism and expansion (only in the thought of Stetsko). However, the key element in the thought of both Stetsko and Tuka, regarding which we do not find any significant differences, was the revolution. In the thinking of both activists, it would not end after the acquisition of statehood, but continue as a constant/permanent phenomenon. Roger Griffin notes: 'the Fascist revolution was viewed by its proponents not as an end in itself, but as a consequence of the regenerative process through which society was to be cleansed of decadence'.¹⁶⁰ This is exactly how Stetsko and Tuka thought about the revolution. In their thinking, populist ultra-nationalism was complemented by postulates calling for the revival of national life following a period of decline. Therefore, I think, it should not be considered controversial to describe these figures as Fascists of Central and Eastern Europe, at least in relation to the period 1938–41, however calling their thoughts from earlier years 'Fascist' appears much more problematic. Leaving aside any discussion about the

¹⁶⁰ Griffin, *The Nature of Fascism*, pp. 44–45.

Fascist character of the Rodobrana,¹⁶¹ we should keep in mind that Tuka's activity in this organization was to a large extent a function of his intelligence work on behalf of Hungary (in accordance with Payne's approach, this would make him a representative of the Hungarian extreme right). In the case of Stetsko, we do not have enough sources to perform an unequivocal classification, but the ones that are available (texts published in the journal *Students'kyi shliakh*) show that already then, he was at least partially on the path to Fascism. The instances of Stetsko and Tuka appear to suggest that at the turn of the 1940s Fascist factions had formed within both the OUN and the HSL'S, and were fighting for influence with other, non-Fascist groupings in these organizations. However, a confirmation of this hypothesis requires additional research, which would include the thought of figures such as Kolodzins'kyi, Myron, Mach, Murgaš and others.

(Translated by Maciej Zakrzewski)
(Proofreading Jan Czarniecki)

Summary

The present article attempts to compare the thought of two representatives of nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe: Yaroslav Stetsko and Vojtech Tuka. In the first part of the text, I discuss the research categories, these being integral nationalism and Fascism, in the second I compare the biographies of the two men, and in the third and final part I juxtapose selected aspects of their thought. The analysis demonstrates a fundamental difference between their respective life paths. While Stetsko was an ideological nationalist of the younger generation, Tuka, a generation older, went from being a proponent of Magyarism and a Hungarian agent of influence to a Slovakian National Socialist. There are more similarities between their thinking. Stetsko and Tuka had an organic interpretation of the category of the nation, and displayed both anti-liberalism and anti-Communism. They had a similar approach to national minorities, making their conduct towards them dependent on their attitude toward the Ukrainian/Slovak national movement (in practice toward the HSL'S/OUN). Further, both espoused a similarly radical anti-Semitism, an opposition to mixed marriages, and active pro-natalist policies. But differences were also noticeable. Only Stetsko's thought contained a clear imperialist streak, while Tuka limited himself to demanding the return of territories lost to Hungary in November 1938. What is more, the former attributed a much more important role to industrialization. On the other hand,

¹⁶¹ Anton Hruboň, 'Slovenský fašizmus', in Anton Hruboň et al., *Fašizmus náš slovenský: Korene, podoby a reflexie fašizmu na Slovensku (1919–1945)*, Bratislava, 2021, pp. 40–52.

Tuka displayed a much stronger pro-German orientation in both political and ideological terms. The analysis demonstrates that the two activists satisfied the definitional requirements of the category of integral nationalism. At the same time, their approach to the revolution had a clear palingenetic element, which proves that they can also be viewed as representatives of Fascism.

(Translated by Maciej Zakrzewski)

(Proofreading Jan Czarniecki)

Abbreviations

- HSLŠ — Hlinka's Slovak People's Party
 HE OUN — the Homeland Executive of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists
 OUN — the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists
 OUN-B — the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Banderites)
 SLŠ — Slovak People's Party
 ZUZ — West Ukrainian lands

Bibliography

Printed sources

Al'manakh: Na sluzhbi natsii, Paris, 1938.

'Krv martýrov, krv hrdinov je najväčšia moc sveta', *Slovák*, 29 March 1940, p. 3.

'Minister dr. V. Tuka v Hlochovci: V Kristiovi Spasiteľovi hľadajte prameň sily a útechy', *Slovák*, 1 July 1939, p. 3.

Klymyshyn, Mykola, *V pokhodi do voli: Spomyny*, 2 vols, Detroit, MI: Ukraïns'ka knyharnia; Toronto: Mykola Klymyshyn, 1987–1998, vol. 1, 1987.

Murgaš, Karol, *Narod medzi Dunajom a Karpatmi*, Turčiansky Svätý Martin: Kompas, 1940.

'Snem schválil ústavu Slovenskej republiky', *Slovák*, 22 July 1939, p. 1.

[Stets'ko, Iaroslav] Ievhen Orlovs'kyi, 'Za tvortsiv novoï diisnosti', *Students'kyi shliakh*, 1934, 5–6, pp. 147–53.

Stets'ko, Iaroslav, 'Mii zhyttiepys', in Karel Berkhoff and Marco Carynnyk, 'The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and Its Attitude Toward Jews: Iaroslav Stets'ko Zhyttiepys', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 1999, 3/4, pp. 158–63.

[Stets'ko, Iaroslav], *Natsiia iak spetsiies*, Terebovlia, 1941.

Stets'ko, Iaroslav, *Nashi shliakhy*, [s.l.e.a.].

Stets'ko, Iaroslav, *Spohady (Vidredahovanyi tekst rozmov dostoinoho Iaroslava Stets'ka z d-rem Anatoliem Bedriem i zapysanykh na 12 kasetakh vid 17 do 23 chervnia 1985 roku*

- <<https://ounuis.info/library/handwritten-manuscripts-typed-manuscripts/566/spohady-yaroslava-stetska.html>> [accessed 6 March 2022].
- Tuka, Vojtech, *14 bodov slovenského národného socializmu vyhlásených V. Tukom 21. 1. 1941 v Trenčianskych Tepliciach* <<https://www.herder-institut.de/digitale-angebote/dokumente-und-materialien/themenmodule/quelle/1872/details/2796.html>> [accessed 6 March 2022].
- Tuka, Vojtech, *Autonomia Slovenska*, Ružomberok: Lev, 1935.
- Tuka, Vojtech, 'Do nového roku slovenskej revolúcie', *Gardista*, 1 January 1941, p. 1.
- Tuka, Vojtech, 'Írsko, Egypt, India...', *Slovák*, 28 March 1922, pp. 1–2.
- Tuka, Vojtech, *Kristoví bojovníci: Slávnostná reč ktorú povedal na sjezde katolickeho študentstva slovenského v Žiline 14 aug. 1921*, Brno: Nákladom vlastným, 1921.
- [Tuka, Vojtech], *Rodobranecký katechizmus*, Bratislava: Ústredie Rodobrany, 1928.
- Tuka, Vojtech, *Slovenský národný socializmus*, Bratislava: Generálny sekretariát Hlinkovej slovenskej ľudovej strany, 1940.
- Tuka, Vojtech, *Slovenský národný socializmus a roľníctvo: Reč predsedu vlády dr. Vojtecha Tuku na kurze roľníckych pracovníkov v Pezinku 17 februára 1941*, Bratislava: Roľnícka osveta, 1941.
- Tuka, Vojtech, *Usmievavé Slovensko: Reč predsedu vlády dr. Vojtecha Tuku povedaná na zasadnutí snemu Slovenskej republiky dňa 30 novembra 1939*, Bratislava: Úrad propagandy, 1940.
- Tuka, Vojtech, *V desiatom roku Martinskej deklarácie*, Trenčín: Plánografia VD, 1992.
- Vikul, Mykola, 'Do tserkovnoho pytannia na Ukraïni', *Rozbudova natsiï*, 1929, 12, pp. 383–85.

Monographs

- Al'ter, Peter, 'Zvil'nennia vid zalezhnosti i pryhnoblennia: do typolohii natsionalizmu', in *Natsionalizm: Teorii natsiï ta natsionalizmu vid Iohana Fikhte do Ernsta Gel'nera: Antolohiia*, ed. Oleh Protsenko and Vasyl Lisovyi, Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim 'Prostir' — Smoloskyp, 2010, pp. 507–24.
- Armstrong, John, 'Collaborationism in World War II: The Integral Nationalist Variant in Eastern Europe', *Journal of Modern History*, 1968, 3, pp. 396–410.
- Armstrong, John, *Ukrainian Nationalism 1939–1945*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
- Arpáš, Robert, 'HŠĽ S a amnestia Vojtecha Tuku v roku 1937', *Studia Historica Nitriensia*, 13, 2006, pp. 151–57.
- Bahan, Oleh, *Ideia i chyn Iaroslava Stets'ka*, Kyiv: Naukovo-ideolohichnyi tsentr imeni Dmytra Dontsova, 2008.
- Bor, Jan, *Vojtech Tuka Úvod do života a diela*, Turčiansky Svätý Martin: Kompas, 1940.
- Carynnyk, Marco, 'Knife in the Back of Our Revolution': A Reply to Alexander J. Motyl's 'The Ukrainian Nationalist Movement and the Jews: Theoretical Reflections on Nationalism,

- Fascism, Rationality, Primordialism, and History* <https://www.academia.edu/6313351/A_Knife_in_the_Back_of_Our_Revolution_A_Reply_to_Alexander_J._Motyls_The_Ukrainian_Nationalist_Movement_and_the_Jews_Theoretical_Reflections_on_Nationalism_Fascism_Rationality_Primordialism_and_History> [accessed 1 February 2022].
- Chytka, Stanislav, and Zdeněk Vališ, 'Obvinený z velezrady: Tukovo memorandum a jeho pozadie', *Historická revue*, 1993, 8, pp. 19–20.
- Čaplovič, Miloslav, *Branné organizácie v Československu 1918–1939 (so zreteľom na Slovensko)*, Bratislava: Ministerstvo obrany Slovenskej republiky, 2001.
- Čaplovič, Miloslav, 'K niektorým otázkam vzniku a organizačného vývoja Rodob-rany v rokoch 1923–1929', *Vojenské obzory*, 1996, 1, pp. 53–65.
- [Dérer, Ivan], *Tukova vlastizrada v osvetlení jeho vlastného priznania*, Bratislava: Slovenská Grafia, 1937.
- Fedorčák, Peter, *Tuka proti republike Proces z roku 1929*, Bratislava: Marenčin PT, 2018.
- Griffin, Roger, *The Nature of Fascism*, London and New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Griffin, Rodzher, 'Segodniashnee sostoianie i budushchie napravleniia sravni-tel'nykh issledovanii istoricheskogo fashizma i neofashizma', *Forum noveishei vostochnoevropskoi istorii i kul'tury*, 2010, 2, pp. 257–77.
- Hanzalík, Jozef, *Tuka: Ohlas ľudáka ku všetkým ľudákom*, Bratislava: Nákladom vlastným, 1931.
- Hayes, Carlton J., *The historical evolution of modern nationalism*, New York: Macmil-lan Company, 1955.
- Hertel, Maroš, 'Činnosť profesora Vojtecha Tuku pred jeho vstupom do Sloven-skej ľudovej strany roku 1922', *Historický časopis*, 2002, 2, pp. 257–79.
- Hertel, Maroš, 'Neúspešne aktivity Vojtecha Tukú', *Nová História: Revue o dejinách spoločnosti*, 2001, 3, pp. 15–17.
- Hruboň, Anton, *Alexander Mach: Radikál z povolania*, Bratislava: Premedia, 2018.
- Hruboň, Anton, 'Slovenský fašizmus', in Anton Hruboň et al., *Fašizmus náš slovenský: Korene, podoby a reflexie fašizmu na Slovensku (1919–1945)*, Bratislava: Premedia, 2021.
- Hunchak, Taras, 'Problemy istoriohrafii: istoriia ta dzherela', *Ukraïns'kyi vy-zvol'nyi rukh*, 2005, 4, pp. 252–62.
- Illýová, Zuzana, and Michal Malatinský, *Dva procesy z Vojtechom Tukom*, Prague: Wolters Kluwer, 2017.
- Krajčovičová, Natália, 'Politické ambície Vojtecha Tuku', *Historická revue*, 1992, 5, pp. 23–24.
- Lukeš, Michal, 'Cesta k amnestii Vojtecha Tuky', *Historický časopis*, 1998, 4, pp. 663–72.
- Lukeš, Michal, 'Kauza Tuka: Pohľad do zákulisia procesu z roku 1929', *Historická revue*, 2000, 5, pp. 16–17.
- Kramer, Juraj, *Slovenské autonomistické hnutie v rokoch 1918–1929*, Bratislava: Vyda-vateľstvo Slovenskej Akadémie Vied, 1962.

- Lacko, Martin, *Dwuramienny krzyż w cieniu swastyki: Republika Słowacka 1939–1945*, Lublin: Oficyna Wydawnicza El-Press, 2012.
- Manfred, Alexander, 'Proces s Vojtechom Tukom zo spravodajstva nemeckého konzulátu v Bratislave (Dokumentačne prílohy)', *Historický časopis*, 1992, 6, pp. 714–30.
- Mirchuk, Petro, *Narys istoriï Orhanizatsiï Ukraïns'kykh natsionalistiv*, vol. 1: 1920–1939, ed. Stepan Lenkavs'kyi, Munich, London and New York: Ukraïns'ke vydavnytstvo, 1968.
- Motyka, Grzegorz, *Ukraïnska partyzantka 1942–1960: Działalność Organizacji Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów i Ukraińskiej Powstańczej Armii*, Warsaw: Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN; Oficyna Wydawnicza Rytm, 2006.
- Payne, Stanley, *A History of Fascism 1914–1945*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995.
- Procházka, Michal, 'Politická činnosť Vojtecha Tuku od návratu na Slovensko na jeseň 1938 až po vyhlásenie slovenskej samostatnosti 14. marca 1939', *Acta historica Neosoliensia*, 2016, 2, pp. 98–118.
- Szabó, Miloslav, *Klerofašisti: Slovenskí kňazi a pokušenie radikálnej politiky (1935–1945)*, Bratislava: Sloart, 2019.
- Rossoliński-Liebe, Grzegorz, *Bandera: Faszyzm, ludobójstwo, kult: Życie i mit ukraińskiego nacjonalisty*, Warsaw: Prószyński Media, 2018.
- Zaitsev, Oleksandr, 'Voïenna doktryna Mykhaila Kolodzins'koho', *Ukraïna Moderna*, 2013, 20, pp. 245–56.
- Zaitsev, Oleksandr, *Natsionalist u dobi fashyzmu: L'vivs'kyi period Dmytra Dontsova: 1922–1939 roky: Nacherk intelektual'noi biohrafii*, Kyiv: Krytyka, 2019.

Biography: Dr Marek Wojnar — Lecturer at the Department of Central and Eastern Europe and Post-Soviet Research of the Institute of Political Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences. His research interests focus on issues of integral nationalism, political thought and politics of memory in Central and Eastern Europe, with particular emphasis on Ukraine and, more recently, Slovakia. Contact: marek.wojnar@isppan.waw.pl.