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Beginning with his departure from Kiev in 1876 until his death in Sofia in 1895, Mykhailo Drahomanov's twenty years as a political émigré encompassed a wide range of publicistic activity directed against tsarist autocracy. Perhaps the least known of his writings in this area are those dealing with the Ems Ukase.1 Introduced secretly through the censorship committees of the government bureaucracy, the ukase was virtually unknown outside Ukrainian circles in Russia. Drahomanov's articles on the suppression of the Ukrainian language and culture, written in several languages and scattered throughout various newspapers and journals, constituted the first attempt to inform the European world of the draconian measures initiated by St. Petersburg against what was perceived to be the threat of Ukrainian "separatism."

Arriving in Vienna in late February or early March of 1876, Drahomanov began his publicistic work with a long article in the Viennese daily Neue freie Presse.2 Simultaneously, he published his Po voprosu o malorusskoi literature (Vienna, 1876), analyzing the hostile attitude in Russia toward all attempts by Ukrainian literature to establish itself as an independent entity. Drahomanov raised the issue of the Ems Ukase again in 1880 on the occasion of the unveiling of Pushkin's memorial and in 1881 during the International Literary Congress in Vienna.3 His most ambitious effort, however, was a special report

---

1 The Ems Ukase (18/30 May 1876) prohibited: (1) importation of Ukrainian books and brochures into Russia from abroad; (2) publication, with the exception of historical documents and belles lettres, of all original works and translations into Ukrainian; (3) all theatrical performances and lectures in Ukrainian; and (4) further publication of the newspaper Kievskii telegraf. For the full text of the ukase as well as other pertinent documents, see Roman Solchanyk, "Lex Jusephovicia 1876," Suchasnist' 16, no. 5 (May 1976): 36-68.
2 "Russische Nivellirungs-Politik," Neue freie Presse, 19 July 1876, pp. 2-3.
3 "Russkim pisaletiam v den' otkrytiia pamiatnika A.S. Pushkinu 26 maia 1880 g."

---
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prepared for the first International Literary Congress convened by the Société des gens de lettres de France in Paris, 11-29 June 1878.4

The existing literature characterizes this episode in various ways. Some historians, including both Western and Soviet scholars, argue that Drahomanov did, in fact, present his report to the congress.5 Others maintain that although Drahomanov himself was unable to address the delegates, Turgenev, one of the vice-presidents of the congress, briefly summarized his main points.6 This latter view was upheld by Professor Il’ko Borshchak, a specialist in Franco-Ukrainian relations. Based in large part on Drahomanov’s reminiscences of Turgenev, Borshchak wrote that “Turgenev in fact succeeded, albeit briefly, in relating the contents of Drahomanov’s protest to the congress, and added an expression of regret on his own behalf regarding this kind of behavior by the Russian government.”7 The only occasion on which Drahomanov spoke, according to Borshchak, was a “tenne blanche” meeting of French masons at the Grand Orient de France on June 22.8

It appears that to date no one has utilized the stenographic report of the 1878 International Literary Congress as a source for Dra-

---


7 Il’ko Borshchak, Drahomanov u Frantsii (za nevydanymi dokumentamy) (Munich, 1957), p. 30. Borshchak’s article was first published in Ukraïns’ka literaturna hazeta (Munich), vol. 3, nos. 9-12 (September-December 1957).

8 Borshchak, Drahomanov u Frantsii, p. 30.
homanov's activities in Paris. This material sheds new light on the Ukrainian question as raised and dealt with by the congress.

In his reminiscences of Turgenev, Drahomanov writes that his decision to attend the congress was made hastily, without adequate preparation:

Having read in the newspapers that an international literary congress would be held under the patronage of persons such as V. Hugo and I.S. Turgenev, I decided to utilize this occasion to protest against an outrageous fact: the near total suppression of Ukrainian literature in Russia, and had no doubts as to the sympathetic response of the members of the congress. In a few days my brochure *La Littérature oukrainienne proscrite par le gouvernement russe* was improvised and published. The first ready copies along with appropriate letters were sent to the bureau of the congress and especially to V. Hugo and Turgenev—and after that I ran off to Paris with a trunk filled with copies of this brochure as well as with my Russian and Ukrainian publications.10

At the border, however, the trunk was confiscated and temporarily transferred to censorship officials in the French Ministry of the Interior. Moreover, en route to Paris, Drahomanov learned that the main item on the congress's agenda was to draft a law protecting authors' literary rights rather than to discuss cultural or political matters, which was a further setback for his plans.11 Nonetheless, upon arriving at the congress, Drahomanov came to an agreement with Turgenev according to which the Russian writer was to distribute the brochures among the participants after these were released by the French authorities. They would then choose an appropriate session to address the congress and, depending on circumstances, propose a resolution for adoption. In the meantime, the few copies that Drahomanov managed to bring with him were given to chosen delegates.

One of the most interesting passages in Drahomanov's recollections concerns the Italian writer Mauro-Macchi. Its contents are also crucial for clarifying the confusion surrounding Drahomanov's activity at the congress. He writes:

---

9 Borshchak mentions the report but does not cite it. His conclusions do not indicate that it figured in his research.


11 For a discussion of the congress and its activities by one of the Russian delegates, see L. Polonskii, "Literaturnyi kongress v Parizhe," *Vestnik Evropy* 12, no. 8 (August 1878): 674-716.
This Italian, a former follower of Garibaldi and one of the vice-presidents of the congress, read my brochure and was filled with sympathy toward our Ukrainian cause and, in every way, attended to me and took me under his wing, grabbing me by the hand and acquainting me with the most well-known members of the congress, relating, as far as possible, the contents of my protest. "Turgenev spoke about your brochure," Mauro-Macchi told me. "What do you mean? We agreed, after all, that there would be a report after I am able to distribute the brochures among the members of the congress!" I told Mauro-Macchi, who knew the story of my trunk. "Yes, he spoke. He related its contents and added an expression of regret on his own behalf regarding the actions of the Russian government, but he did not propose any kind of resolution. Then, I submitted that your brochure be reproduced in the full proceedings of the congress.”

From the above passage it is clear that Dragomanov was not present during the session at which Turgenev spoke. Until now all of our information about what occurred has been based on Mauro-Macchi's description, which, however, was highly inaccurate, as can be seen from the stenographic report of the congress:

M. Le Président [Turgenev].—J’aurais à dire quelques mots sur trois brochures qu’on a mises entre mes mains. La première porte pour titre: La Littérature oukraïnienne. Le nom est bizarre; l’auteur, homme très distingué, a préféré ce nom à celui beaucoup plus connu de littérature petite russe. Il critique avec raison la façon de procéder de notre gouvernement vis-à-vis de la littérature oukraïnienne, qu’il suppose, à tort, je crois, entachée de séparatisme. L’auteur, M. Dragousand [sic], ne demande pas que nous prenions des mesures qu’il n’est pas en notre pouvoir de prendre; il désire seulement que sa brochure soit déposée dans les archives du Congrès pour qu’elle puisse servir à quelque chose dans les temps futurs. Je crois qu’il faut obéir à son vœu, et j’ai l’honneur de vous proposer le dépôt de la brochure dans les archives de notre Congrès.

L’assemblée consultée décide que la brochure sera déposée dans les archives du Congrès.

M. Mauro-Macchi.—Il en sera fait mention dans le compte-rendu de la séance, et je pense que la place de cette petite brochure est dans le procès-verbal de la séance à titre d’annexe.
(Marques unanimes d’assentiment.)

13 Mr. President [Turgenev].—I should say a few words about three brochures which have been given to me. The first is entitled: La Littérature oukraïnienne. The name is strange; the author, a very distinguished man, preferred this name to that of Little Russian literature which is much better known. He justifiably criticizes the way our government acts vis-à-vis Ukrainian literature which, it feels—wrongly, I think—is tainted with separatism. The author, Mr. Dragousand [sic], does not ask that we take
In the end, Drahomanov succeeded in retrieving his brochures from the French Ministry of the Interior and was able to distribute them at the congress. However, at no point in the proceedings did he appear as a speaker, nor was his brochure included in the stenographic report.
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measures which are not in our power; he desires only that his brochure be deposited in the archives of the congress so that it may be used in the future. I think that his wish should be complied with and I have the honor of proposing that the brochure be deposited in the archives of our congress.

The consulted assembly decides that the brochure be deposited in the archives of the congress.

Mr. Mauro-Macchi.—This will be mentioned in the proceedings of the session, and I think that this little brochure belongs in the stenographic report of the session as an appendix.

(Unanimous agreement.)