

UDC 94:314.151.3-054.7:334.73(477+430+436)“1945/1952” DOI <https://doi.org/10.26661/2414-0287-2021-2-50-22>

ECONOMIC LIFE OF UKRAINIAN EMIGRANTS IN THE CAMPS FOR DISPLACED PERSONS OF GERMANY AND AUSTRIA IN 1945-1952

Sarnatsky O.P., Bondarenko B.V.

Zaporizhzhya National University

Ukraine, 69600, Zaporizhzhya, Zhukovsky str., 66

asarnackiy54@gmail.com, vobondarenko10@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-7654-4897, 0000-0001-5463-7638

Key words:

refugees, displaced persons, World War II, third wave of Ukrainian emigration, cooperative movement, secondary emigration, economic life.

Economic life of Ukrainian emigrants in the camps for displaced persons of Germany and Austria in 1945–1952 is analyzed the article. After the World War II millions of Ukrainians found themselves in the territory of Germany and Austria. According to the agreement between the USSR, USA and Great Britain, Soviet citizens should have been repatriated to the USSR. The secret agreement also envisaged forced repatriation. A significant group of displaced persons were Ukrainians. They were prisoners, ostarbeiters, members of collaboration groups, refugees. Many Ukrainians did not want to return to the USSR due to political and national reasons. Despite forced repatriation, about 450,000 Ukrainians did not return to the USSR. They formed the so-called third wave of Ukrainian emigration. Statistical data from documents of that time, memoirs and periodicals of 1945–1952 formed the source base of the article. The historiography of the problem has been considered. The problem of repatriation, activity of internment camps, resettlement to new host countries, socio-political activities of the new wave of emigration have become the subject of researchers' studies. It should be noted that the acute politicization of the topic and the lack of access to archival sources did not facilitate its study by Soviet historians until the late 1980s. However, individual Soviet historians studied the repatriation of Soviet citizens after the war and the emergence of new emigration. The collection on Soviet-French relations also mentioned the agreement with France on repatriation and the problems of its implementation [1]. Soviet scientists, while studying the fate of war prisoners and ostarbeiters, paid attention to their return to the USSR [2]. Attempts have been made to refute the research of Western historians. For example, an article devoted to the research of Mykola Tolstoy, which repeated propaganda allegations of voluntary repatriation, absence of repressions against repatriates, obstruction from Western allies [3]. The attention of researchers is attracted to M. Pavlenko's monograph, which despite the involvement not only examines the repatriation policy of the USSR and the allied states, but also describes the new wave of Ukrainian emigration [4]. Thus, Soviet historians did not make a significant contribution to investigation of the “third wave” of Ukrainian emigration. But emigrant historians began to study the history of the new wave of Ukrainian emigration in the 1950s–1980s. Being the direct participants of the events they tried to estimate number, social composition, countries of settlement and features of this wave of Ukrainian emigration [5]. The activities of Ukrainian political parties in 1945–1952 and their influence on emigration and relations with foreign governments were studied in detail [6]. The monograph of Volodymyr Marunyak [7] was the most fundamental and thorough work. Western historiography, analyzing the fate of collaborationist armed groups after the war, drew attention to the problems of repatriation, life in the camps of displaced persons, the formation of a new wave of anti-Soviet emigration [8]. Thus, foreign Ukrainian and Western historiographies have made some progress in studying the problem, although they have had shortcomings, including a limited source base and ideological restrictions. Previously closed archives became available to researchers in the late 1980s. Documents from Soviet repatriation bodies, diplomatic missions and state security agencies became available. Russian historian Viktor Zemskov was among the first to study the problem [9–12].

He not only carefully analyzed the statistics and directions of Soviet policy on repatriation, but also paid attention to the emergence of the new wave of emigration. Although the scholar acknowledged the violation of human rights by the USSR against repatriates and repressions against them, he noted their limitations and compulsions in the conditions of that time. V. Zemskov proved the violation of agreements by the Western allies of the USSR and their obstacles to repatriation. The author was one of the first to disclose the number, composition, and countries of residence of emigrants after the World War II. He highlighted interesting statistical material about Ukrainian emigration in his works. We find a different position in the works of Pavel Polyak, who unequivocally condemns forced repatriation and repressions, identifies the causes of the new wave of emigration and considers the actions of the Soviet leadership as a brutal violation of human rights [13–15]. The statistics given by him do not coincide with the data of V. Zemskov in some figures. The definitions, in addition, also differ. In conclusion, Russian historiography has paid much attention to the repatriation of Soviet citizens and much less to the emergence of the new wave of emigration. There are also no comprehensive studies of postwar emigration from the USSR. Ukrainian researchers studied the “third wave” of Ukrainian emigration in the 1990s based on new archival sources. Special researches on the repatriation of Ukrainian refugees and displaced persons, their residence in camps, and resettlement to the countries of America and Australia appeared only at the turn of the 20-th – 21-st centuries. Lyudmyla Strilchuk in her dissertation and articles identified the number, composition, features of the new wave of Ukrainian emigration and the activities of international organizations in work with them [16–18]. Serhiy Rudyk considered the policy of Western countries regarding the resettlement of Ukrainian emigrants to the USA and Canada in his dissertation [19]. Mikhail Kunitsky’s dissertation analyzes the causes, procedure and consequences of forced repatriation of the USSR citizens [20]. The historian studies the struggle between countries of the anti-Hitler coalition over the repatriation problem. He investigates further fate of repatriates in the USSR and abroad. In our view, the “third wave” of Ukrainian emigration needs further careful study by Ukrainian historians, especially after the resettlement of displaced persons had been completed. After examining the sources, the author in the article came to the following conclusions. In the camps for displaced persons Ukrainian emigrants revived the traditions of cooperative movement in Ukraine and the cooperatives played a significant role in financing the cultural and educational life of the camps and providing social assistance. Handicrafts and folk crafts found further development among emigrants and helped them not only to survive physically but also to develop spiritually. After the departure of the most emigrants from Germany and Austria and the transfer of the camps to the German government, economic life in the camps declined. The experience that Ukrainian emigrants gained in economic activities in the camps for displaced persons they transferred to the new countries of their settlement.

ГОСПОДАРСЬКЕ ЖИТТЯ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ЕМІГРАНТІВ У ТАБОРАХ ПЕРЕМІЩЕНИХ ОСІБ НІМЕЧЧИНИ ТА АВСТРІЇ У 1945–1952 РР.

Сарнацький О.П., Бондаренко Б.В.

Запорізький національний університет

Україна, 69600, м. Запоріжжя, вул. Жуковського, 66

Ключові слова:

біженці, переміщені особи, третя хвиля української еміграції, Друга світова війна, кооперативний рух, вторинна еміграція, господарське життя.

У статті аналізується господарське життя українських емігрантів у таборах переміщених осіб Німеччини та Австрії у 1945–1952 рр. Після Другої світової війни мільйони українців опинилися на території Німеччини та Австрії. Згідно до угоди між СРСР, США та Великою Британією. Радянські громадяни підпадали під репатріацію СРСР. Таємна угода передбачала і примусову репатріацію. Значну групу переміщених осіб

складали українці. Це були полонені, оstarбайтери, учасники колабораціоніських формувань, біженці. З політичних та національних причин багато українців не бажали повертатися до СРСР. Незважаючи на примусову репатріацію біля 450 тис. українців не повернулися до СРСР. Вони склали так звану третю хвилю української еміграції. Джерельною базою статті стали статистичні дані з документів того часу, спогади, періодична преса 1945–1952 років. Розглядається історіографія проблеми. Проблема репатріації діяльності таборів інтернованих, переселення в нові країни перебування, громадсько-політична діяльність нової хвилі еміграції стали предметом вивчення дослідниками. Зазначимо, що гостра заполітизованість теми й відсутність доступу до архівних джерел не сприяли вивченню її радянськими істориками до кінця 1980-х рр. Усе ж таки, окремі радянські історики вивчали репатріацію радянських громадян після війни та виникнення нової еміграції. У збірнику, присвяченому радянсько-французьким відносинам, згадувалося й про угоду із Францією про репатріацію і проблеми її проведення [1]. Радянські вчені, досліджуючи долю військовополонених і оstarбайтерів, приділяли увагу і їхньому поверненню до СРСР [2]. Робилися спроби спростувати дослідження західних істориків, прикладом є стаття, присвячена дослідженню Миколи Толстого, у якій повторювалися пропагандистські твердження про добровільність репатріації, відсутність репресій щодо репатріантів, перешкоди західних союзників [3]. Незважаючи на заангажованість, увагу дослідників привертає монографія М. Павленка, у якій не тільки розглядається політика СРСР і союзних держав щодо репатріації, але й дається характеристика нової хвилі української еміграції [4]. Отже, радянські історики не зробили значного внеску у вивчення «третьої хвилі» української еміграції. У 1950–1980-х рр. історію нової хвилі української еміграції почали досліджувати історики-емігранти. Безпосередні учасники подій намагалися оцінити чисельність, соціальний склад, країни поселення й особливості цієї хвилі української еміграції [5]. Детально вивчалася діяльність українських політичних партій у 1945–1952 рр. і їхній вплив на еміграцію та стосунки з урядами зарубіжних країн [6]. Найбільш фундаментальною й ретельною працею була монографія Володимира Маруняка [7]. Західна історіографія, аналізуючи долю колабораціоністських збройних формувань після війни, звертала увагу на проблеми репатріації, життя в таборах переміщених осіб, утворення нової хвилі антирадянської еміграції [8]. Отже, зарубіжна українська і західна історіографії зробили певний поступ у дослідженні проблеми, хоча мали недоліки, серед яких обмежена джерельна база й заідеологізованість. Наприкінці 1980-х рр. для дослідників стали доступними раніше закриті архіви. З'явився доступ до документів радянських репатріаційних органів, дипломатичних установ та органів державної безпеки. Одним із перших, проблему почав досліджувати російський історик Віктор Земськов [9–12]. Він не тільки ретельно проаналізував статистичні дані та напрями радянської політики щодо репатріації, але й звернув увагу на зародження нової хвилі еміграції. Науковець хоча й визнавав порушення прав людини з боку СРСР щодо репатріантів і репресії проти них, але зазначав їхню обмеженість і вимушеність в умовах того часу. В. Земськов доводив порушення угод з боку західних союзників СРСР і їхні перешкоди в репатріації. Автор одним з перших висвітлив чисельність, склад, країни перебування емігрантів після Другої світової війни. Цікавий статистичний матеріал у його працях є і про українську еміграцію. Іншу позицію ми знаходимо у працях Павла Поляна, який безумовно засуджує примусову репатріацію й репресії, визначає причини нової хвилі еміграції, і вважає дії радянського керівництва brutальним порушенням прав людини [13–15]. Наведені ним статистичні дані не збігаються з даними В. Земськова в деяких цифрах до того ж відрізняються й дефініції. Підсумовуючи, зазначимо, що російська історіографія багато уваги приділила репатріації радянських громадян і значно менше зародженню нової хвилі еміграції. Відсутні комплексні дослідження післявоєнної еміграції

із СРСР. У 1990-х рр. українські дослідники вивчали «третю хвилю» української еміграції на основі нових архівних джерел. Спеціальні дослідження з проблеми репатріації українських біженців і переміщених осіб, їхнього проживання в таборах, переселення у країни Америки і Австралії з'явилися тільки на зламі ХХ–ХХІ ст. Людмила Стрільчук у дисертації і статтях визначила чисельність, склад, особливості нової хвилі української еміграції та діяльність міжнародних організацій щодо роботи з ними [16–18]. Політику західних країн щодо переселення українських емігрантів до США і Канади розглянув в дисертації Сергій Рудик [19]. У дисертації Михайла Куницького проаналізовані причини, порядок та наслідки примусової репатріації громадян СРСР [20]. Історик вивчає боротьбу між країнами антигітлерівської коаліції щодо проблеми репатріації. Він досліджує подальшу долю репатріантів у СРСР та за її межами. На наш погляд, «третя хвиля» української еміграції потребує подальшого ретельного вивчення українськими істориками, особливо після завершення переселення з таборів переміщених осіб. Дослідивши джерела автор у статті дійшов до наступних висновків. Що у таборах переміщених осіб українські емігранти відродили традиції кооперативного руху в Україні при чому кооперативи відіграли значну роль у фінансуванні культурно-освітнього життя таборів та наданні соціальної допомоги. Кустарні та народні промисли знайшли подальший розвиток серед емігрантів і допомогли не тільки вижити їм фізично але і розвиватися духовно. Після від'їзду більшості емігрантів з Німеччини та Австрії та передачі таборів до управління владою ФРН, господарське життя в таборах занепадає. Досвід який українські емігранти набули у господарській діяльності у таборах переміщених осіб вони перенесли до нових країн свого поселення.

Statement of the problem

Having analyzed the historiography of the problem, it should be noted that the main attention of researchers was focused on the study of socio-political problems in the camps for displaced persons. Scientists have also paid considerable attention to resettlement in North and South America and Australia. Aspects of the problem of US, British and French resettlement and forced repatriation to the USSR policies remain poorly studied. Scientists have paid insufficient attention to the adaptation of displaced persons in the countries of the settlement. Among the aspects of the problem that remain insufficiently investigated is the economic life of displaced persons in the camps in Germany and Austria.

After the World War II millions of Ukrainians found themselves in the territory of Germany and Austria. According to the agreement between the USSR, USA and Great Britain, Soviet citizens should have been repatriated to the USSR. The secret agreement also envisaged forced repatriation. A significant group of displaced persons were Ukrainians. They were prisoners, ostarbeiters, members of collaboration groups, refugees. Many Ukrainians did not want to return to the USSR due to political and national reasons. Despite forced repatriation, about 450,000 Ukrainians did not return to the USSR. They formed the so-called third wave of Ukrainian emigration [16; 19]. They found themselves in so-called camps for displaced persons located in the western occupation zones of Germany and Austria. There were cultural and educational organizations in the camps, political parties and Ukrainian newspapers. It is clear that

Ukrainian emigrants had to support their families and provide certain living standards. Despite international charitable assistance, the camps lacked food, clothing, and household items. Therefore, displaced persons were forced to participate in the economic life of the camps or work outside them. Our article is devoted to this aspect of the problem.

The aim of the article is to analyze economic life of Ukrainians, representatives of the third wave of emigration in the camps for displaced persons in Germany and Austria in 1945–1952.

Analysis of recent studies and publications

Ukrainian historians began to research the third wave in the second half of the 1950s. The first researchers were representatives of the Ukrainian emigration. V. Marunyak paid considerable attention to the life of Ukrainian emigrants in the camps for displaced persons in his work [7]. Investigations of M. Dychok should be noted among other researchers [21]. Contemporary Ukrainian historians have continued the studies of Ukrainian emigration representatives. The dissertation work of Russian historian O. Kosovan is among the latest researches [22].

The main material of the research

During the World War II, the Nazi occupation policy forcibly relocated large masses of the Ukrainian population to Germany. These were prisoners of war, ostarbeiters, refugees and evacuated by German authorities. Under the influence of military events, armed collaborationist formations retreated with German troops and found themselves in Germany and Austria. Interwar Ukrainian

emigrants, trying to avoid repressions by Soviet state security agencies and communist regimes in Eastern Europe, also retreated with the Nazis to Germany. OUN and UPA members after the defeat in their struggle were forced to emigrate to avoid repressions. Thus, a set of reasons caused the new wave of Ukrainian emigration. In contrast to the interwar period, it was purely political in nature and forced. As in the 1920s and 1930s it had national-political character.

The number of emigrants from the USSR after the World War II is controversial. P. Polyani estimates the number of Soviet citizens who found themselves on the territory of Germany and its occupied countries at the end of the war as 8.7 million people. Ostarbeiters in quantity of 3.2 million people from the territories of the USSR before September 1, 1939, the so-called "Easterners", were the main groups of which. Forced workers from the Baltic States, Western Belarus, Western Ukraine and Bessarabia constituted 850,000 people. "Refugees" and "evacuated" during the retreat of German troops were up to 1 million people. Prisoners of war, both those who remained in the camps and those who served in collaborationist formations reached up to 2.3 million people. And 3/5 of them were in the western occupation zones. There were 3 million people in the zones of Soviet occupation. This accounted for 56% of all repatriates to the USSR, including 2,135,000 civilians (60.5%) and 866,000 prisoners of war (47.4%). It is clear that only a few from the Soviet zones were able to pave their way to the west and avoid repatriation. According to the researcher, only 2,353,000 people were repatriated from the western zones, 960,000 of which were prisoners of war (44.0%) and 1,393,000 civilians (39.5%). Thus, according to P. Polyani, 61.5% of the total number were repatriated to the USSR, 8.1% avoided repatriation. Internal repatriates and repatriates from allies of Nazi Germany were those who made up the remainder to 100% of those who found themselves in Germany and other countries after the war. According to Soviet data provided by P. Polyani in 1952, 411,561 people became emigrants. The author himself estimates that the number of emigrants who did not return to the USSR was 700,000 people [15; 24]. V. Zemskov gives slightly different figures, and he specifies them in each of his subsequent works. The historian gives a total figure of 5 million people, of whom 4,199,488 returned to the Soviet Union by March 1, 1946. And in one of his works he gives a figure of 2,654,185 civilians among them and 2,660,013 persons in another work. The same is repeated with prisoners of war. The first figure is 1,545,303 people, and the second is 1,539,475 people. The division into zones from which repatriates returned is as follows: 1,846,802 people from the Soviet zone and 2,352,686 people from the western zones.

550,000 Soviet citizens had not returned to the Soviet Union by March 1946, but 29,074 Soviet citizens, including 20,386 from the western zones, were repatriated between 1946 and 1952. V. Zemskov estimates the total number of those who did not return to the USSR as 620,000 people [10; 11].

The number of Ukrainians in the postwar emigration was a peculiar feature of the "third wave" of Ukrainian

emigration. This problem remains debatable. V. Zemskov presented the total number of repatriated Ukrainians by March 1, 1946 again in different ways. The first link provides only 1,650,135 Ukrainians, and the second about 1,650,343. They accounted 37.16% from the total number of repatriates. By groups it consisted of 1,190,135 civilians and 460,208 prisoners of war [10; 11]. Soviet repatriation authorities provided a figure of Ukrainians who did not return to the USSR as 144,934 people. P. Polyani, considering the ethnic composition of new emigrants, gave the following figures: 144,934 (32.1%) Ukrainians, 109,214 (24.2%) Latvians, 63,401 (14.0%) Lithuanians, 58,924 (13.0%) Estonians, 9,856 (2.2%) Belarusians, 31,704 (7.0%) Russians [15; 24]. Thus, in contrast to the 1920s and 1930s, Ukrainians were the largest ethnic group in the new wave of emigration from the USSR, and Russians were much inferior not only in comparison with them but also with the Baltic peoples.

Representatives of the Ukrainian emigration gave other figures for the number of the "third wave" emigration in Germany and Austria. According to the statistical department of the Central Representation of Ukrainian Emigration in the Western Occupation Zones (CRUE) by the end of March 1946: 104,024 people in the American zone in Germany; 54,580 in British, 19,026 in French zones respectively. Totally – 177,630 people. There were 29,241 people in all zones of Austria. In total – 206,871 people [25].

Many of them, fearing repatriation, did not register in Ukrainian organizations. Therefore, most researchers believe that the figure of 250,000 emigrants of the "third wave" is real, which significantly exceeded the number of emigrants in the interwar period. The educational level of new emigrants was higher than in the interwar period, and therefore it may be called intellectual emigration. Only 3.2% were illiterate, and 13% were people with higher and secondary special education. For example, there were 136 journalists; more than 300 teachers of higher education schools; 1,103 secondary school teachers; 266 medicine doctors; 900 engineers [25]. This allowed to have significant intellectual resources for socio-political activities.

The number of Ukrainians in the camps in Germany and Austria began to decline from 1946 to 1952, and by the end of this period no more than 25,000 persons left there. They were mainly disabled, sick, women with children. Most of the emigrants were relocated and a small portion of postwar Ukrainian emigrants remained in Western Europe. According to Soviet data, 31,774 Ukrainians remained in Germany; 39,971 in Great Britain; 5,385 in France and 5,238 in Belgium. Thus, Great Britain was the center of Ukrainian emigration in Europe. Much more of them were accepted by the United States, according to various estimates from 80,000 to 120,000 people, 40,000 by Canada, 30,000-40,000 by Australia. In fact, the center of Ukrainian emigration was moved from Europe to North America, and Australia became one of the new centers. Resettlement of Ukrainian emigrants from Europe and secondary emigration from Latin America were very difficult [23].

The factors that shaped political life in the camps of displaced persons and countries of new stay after resettlement from the camps were among the most important that influenced the peculiarities of economic life after the World War II. First, the concentration of the most active and politically engaged emigrants in the camps, the sharp struggle during the recent war between political groups, the danger of forced repatriation, and attempts to continue the anti-communist struggle contributed to active political activity in displaced persons' camps. From 9,000 to 10,000 party activists and more than 15,000 supporters were a clear manifestation of this activity. This political affiliation affected economic life in the camps. Political organizations and parties tried to provide source of livelihood for themselves. Therefore, they tried to create various private enterprises and cooperatives. In addition, taking over the leadership of the camps into their own hands, certain political parties tried to subjugate any economic life. At the same time, various methods were used from convictions and agitation to racketeering. Physical massacres were not uncommon. Therefore, economic entities were forced to participate in political life in one or another way.

In our opinion, the report of the American diplomat Landref Harrison "The Ukrainian people as a factor in the struggle against the Soviet regime", which was prepared in the summer of 1952 in Paris for the American government, is interesting. The author devoted one of the chapters to the state of Ukrainian emigration, its opportunities and tasks in the fight against communism. The American diplomat believed that emigration had absorbed historical problems and confusion in the international situation of Ukraine in the past. On the one hand, the pre-war division of Ukraine and the emigration of formally different countries – Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, the USSR – imparted the problem of Ukrainian emigration an international character. On the other hand, emigrants contested both from anti-communist and anti-Russian positions, and also against Poles. A significant problem, according to the American's opinion, were differences between Western and Eastern Ukrainians in their interpretations of the essence of the communist regime, the main enemies, the purpose of the struggle. L. Harrison denoted internecine struggle, inconsistency in tactics, lack of clear programs and ideological institutions, conflicts with Russian emigration and Poles among the shortcomings of Ukrainian emigration. He mainly focused on Western Ukrainian emigration and recognized it as the most influential and one that subjugated the natives of Over-Dnieper Ukraine. The American diplomat considered the attempts to transfer the methods of struggle against the Polish government in the interwar period to the opposition to the regime in the USSR as the great problem of Western Ukrainian emigration. Concentration of attention of Western Ukrainian emigration representatives only on the western regions was also incorrect. The author further emphasized on the differences in views of Over-Dnieper and Western Ukrainians on problems of the essence of the Soviet regime and building of an independent state, but saw no contradictions in social issues. L. Harrison called chauvinism, nationalism and

the idea of the great power as unifying ideas for the entire Ukrainian emigration. These ideas, in his opinion, repelled other peoples of the USSR from the Ukrainian movement, but on the other hand, helped to consolidate it and support the people's faith in their own victory. A separate section of the report was devoted to the possibilities of emigration in the struggle on the territory of the USSR [26].

The camps for displaced persons in postwar Germany and Austria existed in the conditions of destroyed economy and black market. There was a lack of raw materials and equipment. The camps also had the status of extraterritoriality. Under these conditions, economic life in the camps in 1945–1946 had many obstacles and developed gradually. In addition, the emigrants themselves were not interested in economic activities because they received food and medicine in the camps, and charities provided clothing and footwear. That's why many people didn't want to work. And even considered it offensive to themselves.

The situation began to change in 1947, when nutrition deteriorated significantly and the help of philanthropists was severely limited. Ukrainian emigrants started to work. Some of them worked in camps and were paid for it. Others worked outside the camps. Ukrainians worked in international organizations, in the institutions of the occupying armies and in the enterprises of the German economy. The situation was also aggravated by the fact that there was inflation, and monetary reform was carried out.

Ukrainian emigration moved to the planned development of economic activity. Vegetable gardens and farms appeared in the camps. Trade was also developed, private and cooperative shops were appeared. Ukrainians established production workshops that belonged to private capital and cooperatives. Each camp began to specialize in certain economic spheres and pursued its own financial policy. There were more than 80 Ukrainian camps. Unfortunately, their economic activities were not coordinated and they did not want to be subordinated to any central international or Ukrainian institutions.

Most production workshops did not go beyond the camp economy. Their products were distributed among emigrants. Only a few companies were able to set up manufacturing, mainly applied art products, for sale on the German or international market.

Cooperation played the greatest role in economic activity. It was based on the experience that Ukrainians gained in cooperatives during 1920s and 1930s, both in Western Ukraine and within the USSR. Cooperatives had many obstacles, including low profitability, currency devaluation, lack of regulations and the refusal of German courts to register their Statutes. Nevertheless, since September 1945, Ukrainian cooperation has acquired organizational forms. On June 9, 1946, at the first congress of Ukrainian cooperators in Munich the Central Union of Ukrainian Cooperatives in Emigration – the Central Union – was founded. Unfortunately, the Central Union remained only a representative and advisory body and was unable to establish trade and advertising for the products of cooperatives abroad including the United States and Canada. Cooperative centers: the Society of Ukrainian

Table 1 – Numerical State of Ukrainian Cooperation in Germany

	1945	1946	1947	1948	1950
American zone	7	24	29	30	15
British zone	–	1	6	11	4
French zone	–	–	2	2	–
Total	7	25	37	43	19

Source: [7, p. 315–316]

Cooperatives and the Farmer's Association, were also established in Austria.

Private shops also played a significant role in late 1947, with their number of 47 in Germany: 37 in the United States and 10 in the United Kingdom zones respectively. Sometimes they belonged to individuals, sometimes to public associations or even political parties. Financially, these institutions can be described on the example of the KOS cooperative in Munich for the period from September 1945 to June 1947. According to disposable data, turnover of the cooperative with 922 members and 63 retained employees for 2 years amounted to 2.7 million Reichsmarks.

Handicrafts played an important role in economic activity. They mainly focused on applied arts and folk art. Well-known crafts were embroidery, doll making, wood carving and others. Handicrafts were exhibited both in camps and intercamp and also international exhibitions. Women played a significant role in these crafts, especially in embroidery. Famous folk masters of the Ukrainian diaspora were brought up in the camp handicrafts. Among them are such masters of embroidery and Hutsul carving as M. Dzyndra, P. Klaschuk, S. Shvedkzh, S. Lutsyk, Rydash. Their products can be seen in museums and private collections in the United States, Canada, France and the United Kingdom. 3,347 workers worked in 513 workshops during 1947–1948.

The enterprises were small from 2 to 10 people. 62% of those Ukrainian emigrants who were able to work worked in the camps [7, p. 316–317]. If we define the areas of activity, most enterprises specialized in the field of soap production, carving, construction, publishing, light industry, repair of household appliances. Outside the Ukrainian camps, Ukrainians found work in agriculture and industrial enterprises. Unfortunately, their working conditions were terrible and the attitude of German

workers hostile. They received low wages, unlimited working hours, lack of control over labor protection. All these did not stimulate the employment of Ukrainian emigrants outside the camps. The best situation was only in the British-occupied zone, where the leadership promoted employment, controlled working conditions and even issued rations in addition to wages. Moreover, it was provided in addition to the camp ration and doubled it. Therefore, in 1948–1950 unemployment among Ukrainian emigrants was high.

Since 1948 displaced persons began to emigrate to the United States, Canada, Latin America, and Australia. As a result, the economy began to degrade as the number of workers began to decline. Ukrainians left the camps en masse. Ukrainian companies were deprived of financial resources due to monetary reform in West Germany. After the transfer of the camps to the social security services of Germany in 1951–1952, any economic activity declined. Only single mothers with children, disabled people and pensioners remained in Germany.

Conclusions

It is necessary to note that Ukrainian emigrants in the camps for displaced persons revived the traditions of the cooperative movement in Ukraine, with cooperatives playing a significant role in financing cultural and educational life of the camps and providing social assistance. Handicrafts and folk crafts found further development among emigrants and helped them not only to survive physically but also to develop spiritually. After the departure of most emigrants from Germany and Austria and the transfer of the camps to the German government, economic life in the camps declined. The experience that Ukrainian emigrants gained in economic activities in the camps for displaced persons they transferred to the new countries of their settlement.

References

1. USSR-France: from the history of political, economic and cultural relations. Moscow : PIR Publishing House, 1960. 92 p.
2. Slynko I.I. Draw away of the population of Ukraine into fascist slavery. // German-fascist occupation regime (1941–1945). Moscow : Politizdat, 1965. P. 219–230; Semiryaga M.I. Soviet people in Europe resistance / USSR Academy of Sciences, Inst. of history of the Ministry of Defense of the USSR. Moscow : Science, 1970. 351 c.; also, his. The prison empire of Nazism and its collapse. Moscow : Legal. lit., 1991. 381 p.
3. Vasiliev V., Sokolov V. About one fake. *International Life*. 1978. № 8. P. 124–128.
4. Pavlenko M.I. Refugees and displaced persons in the policy of the imperialists' states 1945–1949. Kyiv : Naukova Dumka, 1979. 123 p.
5. Kossar V. Sixty years in Canada. Calendar-almanac “New Way” for 1951. Winnipeg : Printing and Circulation of the New Way, 1950. P. 127–153; Mudryi V. New Ukrainian emigration // Ukrainians in the free world: anniversary book of the Ukrainian People's Union (1894–1954) / [edited by L. Mishuga, A. Dragan]. New York : UNS Edition, 1954. P. 115–136.
6. Markus V. Ukrainian political parties in exile in 1945–1955. *Modernity*. 1984. № 10. P. 64–79; № 12. P. 66–81.

7. Marunyak V. Ukrainian emigration in Germany and Austria after World War II. Vol. 1. Years 1945–1951. Munich : Academic Publishing House of Dr. Peter Beleya, 1985. 429 p.
8. Bethell N. The last secret: the delivery to Stalin of over two million Russians by Britain and the United States. New York : Basic Books, 1974. 224 p.; Bethel N. The last secret: [about the repatriation of soviet prisoners of war in the years of the World War II] / [preface by H. Trevor-Roper; translated from English by I. Golomshtok]. Moscow : News, 1992. 256 p.
9. Zemskov V.N. On the repatriation of Soviet citizens 1944–1951. *History of the USSR*. 1990. № 4. P. 26–41.
10. Zemskov V.N. Birth of the “second emigration” (1944–1952). *Sociological Research*. 1991. № 4. P. 3–24.
11. Zemskov V.N. Repatriation of Soviet citizens and their future (1944–1956). *Sociological Research*. 1995. № 5. P. 3–13; № 6. P. 3–13.
12. Zemskov V.N. Repatriation of displaced Soviet citizens // War and Society, 1941–1945: In 2 books. / [Resp. ed. G.N. Sevostyanov]; Inst. Of Russian history. Moscow : Science, 2004. Book. 2. 2004. P. 331–358.
13. Polyan P.M. Victims of two dictatorships: ostarbeiters and prisoners of war in the Third Reich and their repatriation. Moscow : “Your choice CIRZ”, 1996. 442 p.
14. Polyan P.M. Victims of two dictatorships: life, work, humiliation and death of Soviet prisoners of war and ostarbeiters abroad and at home. Moscow : ROSSPEN, 2002. 894 p.
15. Polyan P.M. Soviet citizens in the Reich: how many were there? *Sociological Research*. 2002. № 5. P. 95–110.
16. Strilchuk L.V. Ukrainian political refugees and displaced persons after the World War II : dis. ... cand. hist. sciences: 07.00.02. Lutsk, 1999. 174 p.
17. Strilchuk L.V. Emigration from Ukraine during the World War II and after its end: political, national and religious aspects. The World War II and the fate of the peoples of Ukraine : materials of the 2nd All-Ukrainian scientific conference, Kyiv, October 30–31, 2006. Kyiv : “Foreign Trade Publishing House of Ukraine”, 2007. P. 211–216.
18. Strilchuk L.V. Ukrainian political refugees at the end of World War II and after its completion. The World War II and the fate of nations of Ukraine : abstracts of reports of the 3rd All-Ukrainian scientific conference. Kyiv : “Foreign Trade Publishing House of Ukraine”, 2008. P. 56–57.
19. Rudyk S.Y. Resettlement of Ukrainian refugees and displaced persons to USA and Canada after the World War II: causes, features, consequences (1945–1953) : dis. ... cand. hist. sciences: 07.00.02. Kyiv, 2003. 177 p.
20. Kunitsky M.P. Forced repatriation of Soviet citizens to the USSR after the World War II (Ukrainian vector) : dis ... cand. hist. sciences: 07.00.02. Lutsk, 2008. 240 p.
21. Dyczok M. The grand alliance and Ukrainian refugees. Basingstoke (Hants.): Macmillan press; London : St. Martin's press, 2000. 277 p.
22. Kosovan E.A. Ukrainian emigration to Germany (19-th-early 21st centuries.) : dis. ... cand. hist. sciences. Federal state budget educational institution of higher professional education; “Russian State University for the Humanities” (RSUH). Moscow, 2015. 297 p.
23. Bondarenko V.G. Ukrainian Free Cossack movement in Ukraine and in emigration (1919–1993) : monograph. Zaporizhzhya: Zaporizhzhya National University, 2016. 600 p.
24. Polyan P.M. Emigration: who and when in the twentieth century left Russia. Russia and its regions in the 20-th century: territory-settlement-migration / [ed. by A. Glaser and P. Polyana]. Moscow : OGI, 2005. P. 493–519.
25. Mudryi V. New Ukrainian emigration. Ukrainians in the free world : anniversary book of the Ukrainian People’s Union (1894–1954) / [edited by L. Mishuga, A. Dragan]. New York : UNS Edition, 1954. P. 115–136.
26. Edemsky A.B. Ukraine and Ukrainians in the assessments of American diplomacy of early 1950s. *Slavonic Studies*. 1995. № 6. P. 35–45.