

ADVANTAGE OF BELONGING TO THE U.N.A.

"What advantages does the Ukrainian National Association hold for me over those of any life insurance company?" was the question recently asked by one of the Weekly's readers.

The question is pertinent, and it strikes at the very core of the differences between the U.N.A. and the commercial life insurance companies.

These differences, it should be realized, do not lie in the type of insurance, but rather in the nature of the body granting them.

Non-Profit

A commercial life insurance company, for example, is just a business concern that for a certain consideration, known as the premium, provides various forms of life insurance protection to its policy-holders. It is operated purely for profit. Outside his policy, the insured has no other connection with the company or with other policy-holders. Likewise he has no voice in its management.

Democratic

The Ukrainian National Association, on the other hand, is a fraternal order. As such its primary aim is not only to provide various forms of life insurance protection for its members, but also to unite them on a fraternal basis. It is organized into a system of subordinate assemblies, more commonly known as branches or lodges. Through the medium of these branches, its members elect and guide its representative form of government. It is not operated for profit, but for the sole benefit of its members. And finally, it is mutual and cooperative in every respect.

Fraternal

In the light of these differences between the U.N.A. and any commercial life insurance company, the superior advantages of belonging to the U.N.A. are perfectly manifest. For in addition to having life insurance protection at no greater cost than that of an ordinary life insurance company, a member of the U.N.A. also reaps the many benefits arising from its fraternal nature. He is, furthermore, a constituent part of a nationwide association, composed of people of his own race, which throughout the 46 years of its steady growth has played a leading part in organizing our people, in promoting their social, cultural, business and political development, in giving them aid during times of need and distress, and in helping our kinsmen in their native Ukraine win their national freedom.

Helpful

All this, of course, has benefited the younger generation as well as it has the old. In fact, the young people are beginning to receive more from the U.N.A. than did their parents. Every year, for example, the U.N.A. gives student aid to those of its young members who are in need and deserving of it. Also those of its members who are sport-minded, can take advantage of the material assistance the organization is offering them. Their cultural activities have now been fully encouraged. And finally, the U.N.A. makes it possible for our young people to receive the "Ukrainian Weekly," now in its eight year of outstanding service to them and their development, to American principles, and to the Ukrainian national cause.

An Unholy Alliance

Every war must have its battle-cries. But let's be honest and not call them principles. Take, for example, this matter of Democracy. Constantly we hear that Great Britain is fighting mainly to preserve Democracy and that our country must support her on that account. Yet, according to press dispatches this week, both the British and American governments are moving heaven and earth to ally, somehow, their countries with the most anti-democratic, the most autocratic, and the most brutal power the world has ever seen—Soviet Russia.

If these press reports are true, then surely Democracy is not a principle over which this war is waged. Surely it's just a battle-cry, a slogan, to be discarded at will and replaced with one more suitable and timely, without compromising one's honor and self-respect and without disillusioning (not very much) those who have relied upon it.

If, however, Democracy is a principle in this war, if thousands upon thousands suffer and die daily for it, in the belief that thereby it will be made to endure on this earth, then those leaders of our country and of England who are trying to promote 'collaboration' between the two countries and the Soviets, are about to betray Democracy. Likewise they are about to deal a terribly disillusioning blow to those countless multitudes throughout the world who believe that the English-speaking peoples are Democracy's last and strongest bulwark.

Worse yet, such an unholy alliance, if ever effected, will reveal that the democracies are capable of the cynical compromise and betrayal of their principles of which the Nazis and the Reds were guilty last year when they concluded their infamous pact.

We realize, of course, that Great Britain is in a very tight spot, that American support may not be enough, and that she could use Soviet aid very much. However, let her leaders be frank and honest to admit as much, that it's not for Democracy she is fighting now but for her national existence. Then their present overtures to Russia will be justified.

Likewise, we well understand that against the Nazi threat in the Atlantic and against the Japanese threat in the Pacific, Soviet collaboration with our country may appear attractive to some. To them, therefore, it would appear 'realpolitik' for America to shunt the question of Democracy aside and try to ally herself with the Soviets.

Actually, however, such a move by America would not be a realistic policy but quite a naive one. For America and Russia have never been and never can be friends. One has always been a democracy, the other always an autocracy. The American system upholds Freedom and Democracy, while the Soviet system is out to destroy them. And thus, how can the twain ever meet?

Furthermore, Stalin, like Hitler, regards any treaty as just a scrap of paper, to be thrown into the wastebasket whenever it becomes inconvenient. And Stalin, like Hitler, has also demonstrated time and again his readiness to cast aside all moral considerations in the interest of political expediency, on the principle that the end justifies the means. How then can America enter into any 'collaboration' or partnership with him and his tools, and at the cost of Democracy?

All this and more should be realized by those who think of linking up the two great democracies, America and England, with the autocratic, brutal, and terroristic Soviet Russian regime.

Concluding, we cannot help but exclaim: Poor Democracy! She was wooed, then used, and finally ignored during the last war. And now, during the present Armagedon, a similar fate seems to face her. For those who have professed such great love and devotion to her, now seem to be forgetting her.

DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICAN APPOINT UKRAINIAN HEADS

Michael Piznak, New York attorney, was recently appointed by Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, as the chairman of the Ukrainian Section of the Foreign Language Division of the Democratic Party in the present presidential campaign.

A similar position on the Republican side is occupied by Dmytro Halychyn of New York and Jersey City, who was recently appointed to it by the Republican National Committee. Albert H. Dachuk, attorney, was appointed executive of the Ukrainian division.

CHORUS HONORS ITS DIRECTOR

A banquet in honor of Theodosius Kaskiw, director of the Boyan Choral Society of St. John's Ukrainian Catholic Church of Newark, N. J., was given last Saturday night by the members of the chorus, which is composed entirely of young people.

Held at the commodious Ukrainian Centre on William Street and attended by well over three hundred friends, the banquet marked the 35th anniversary of Mr. Kaskiw's career as chorus director, teacher, and public man. After several years spent in various communities, Mr. Kaskiw came to Newark in 1909 and organized in that year the Boyan chorus, which he has directed to this day.

Principal speakers at the banquet were Prof. Alexander Koshetz, Dr. Longin Cehelsky, and Reginald Parnell, former Commissioner of Newark. Stephen Shumeyko was toastmaster. Greetings were received from Michael Hayvoronsky and others.

During the banquet the chorus presented its director with an oil painting portrait of him.

CHESTER BOY GETS COLORADO SCHOLARSHIP

Paul Tyman, of Ukrainian descent, a graduate of class of June, 1940, of the Chester High School, Chester, Pennsylvania, was recently awarded a scholarship to the Colorado School of Mines, at Golden, Colo., having received the only one of the scholarships awarded to high school graduates in Pennsylvania, according to the Chester Times.

Paul is only 17 years old. He is the son of John and Mary Tyman, both of whom are members of the Ukrainian National Association.

Paul was selected as the year's recipient of the scholarship by Dr. Francis B. Haas, superintendent of public instruction of Pennsylvania. In June, he received the High School Alumni-Faculty scholarship of \$100, as the honor student of a class of 298 graduates, the Chester Times says. In addition, he received the faculty award for the student excelling in scholarship and leadership, the Kiwanis KBI scholarship award, the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute award for science and mathematics, the Science Club award for excellence in science, and delivered the valedictory address at the commencement.

"DOWBUSH"

Fedkovich's 4 act drama, "Dowbush" (Ukrainian Robin Hood), will be presented this Sunday evening, 8 o'clock, at Washington Irving High School (bet. 16 and 17 Sts.), New York City, by the newly formed Ukrainian National Theatre and Dramatic Studio. M. Skorobohach will direct. Music especially arranged for the drama is by Michael Hayvoronsky. Tickets—75c. After its New York premiere, the play will be shown in other communities.

The Muscovites And Ukraine

Several months ago Selwyn and Blount of London published a book entitled "The Ukraine—A Russian Land." It was written originally in French about a year ago by M. Pierre Brégy and Prince Serge Obolensky and was translated into English by George Knupffer, secretary of the Young Russian League in England.

This book contains a complete exposition of the Russian Imperial point of view with respect to Ukraine. The authors have as their object the proof that Ukraine is essentially a Russian land. Moreover, they wrote at a time when it was generally believed that Germany intended to attack Russia with the object of separating Ukraine and establishing there a puppet government. The authors' choice of material and the tone of presentation is, therefore, strictly subservient to the preconceived purpose and to the time or writing.

Origin of Name "Ukraine"

M. Brégy and Prince Obolensky begin by discussing the origin of the word Ukraine. They seem to come to the conclusion that, philologically, it is derived from the Russian word "okraina," meaning borderland. We hold this conclusion to be wrong; the word Ukraine is of Ukrainian origin as witnessed by the prefix—"U-kraina, V-kraina"—which are characteristic of the Ukrainian but not of the Russian language, and is derived from the old Slavonic root, "kra," meaning a separate piece of land. In any case, the origin of the word is not important. But it is important that in the 12th century, that is before there was a Muscovy much less a Russia as we understand it to-day, the Ukraine was popularly used to describe the country inhabited by Ukrainians.

The authors then spend nine pages in an effort to decide what territories they are going to include under the name Ukraine. They could have avoided this difficulty by referring to a political map of the Soviet Union where, to a large extent, the frontiers of Ukraine coincide with the ethnographic frontiers with the exception of the Kuban region and certain districts between the rivers Don and Donets.

The burden of their argument here is that, since Ukraine has few natural frontiers in the north, she must rightly be considered a geographic, and by implication, a political part of Russia. It is no less true, however, that between all the countries north of the Alpine and Carpathian Ranges there are no definite natural frontiers. To sanction the subjugation of peoples on the pretext of lack of physical frontiers, is to put a premium on the very practices against which the British Empire is at war.

The authors modify their argument somewhat when they admit that the forest zone between Muscovy and Ukraine was, at one time, a stable political boundary, but, they say, today it represents nothing either from the ethnical or political point of view. This natural forest frontier was, however, very real until the middle of the 17th century and, on either side of it, there developed distinct and separate ethnic and political practices and concepts. Though the forest has disappeared, the two peoples remain as distinct as ever.

Continuing the argument of geographical unity, they maintain that the Dnieper was another natural link between Muscovy and Ukraine. However, we know that this link was seldom used by the Russians and that their chief waterway was the Volga. As Mirsky says in his "Social History of Russia," this contention is corroborated by archaeological evidence.

In their treatment of the ethnology of Ukraine, the authors appear to argue that its racial elements include everything from the descendants of Noah to the Avars of Central Asia. Nowhere do they

offer any proof. Archaeological evidence, on the other hand, shows that although several elements—Dinaric, Alpine and Eastern European, in the order of their importance—went to make up the population of Ukraine, the process of blending was completed by approximately 500 A. D., and virtually nothing has been added since. We do not presume that the Ukrainian type—call it mongrel if you like—is better or worse than the Russian, but we know that the two types are composed of different racial elements, the Dinaric and Alpine predominating in Ukraine, the Eastern European and the Lapponoid, with some Nordic admixture in the north-west, predominating in Russia.

Origin of Word "Rus"

There follows a discussion as to the origin and the proper application of the word "Rus." According to them, "during the most flourishing epoch of the Kiev State it was already applied to the basin of the Dnieper as well as to Novgorod, to Galicia and to the north-eastern territory in which Great Russia was formed." But from 12th century records in the Ipatiev Chronicle we know that the name was applied strictly to the territories around Kiev settled by the Poliany tribe, and when the name was used in connection with other territories, it was in an imperial sense in that those territories were politically subservient to the Grand Prince of Kiev. Their effort to prove, by quoting one sentence from the Ukrainian-Lithuanian Chronicle to the effect, that the people of Ukraine regarded Muscovy also as "Russian Land," is not convincing. The particular sentence reads: "Great terror reigned in the Russian land; Moscow and Smolensk have been burnt." But there is a wealth of data in the Chronicles to show that the territories of Kiev, Chernigov and Pereyaslav alone were Rus proper and the outlying regions only its dependencies. Thus in the Novgorod Chronicle, No. 1, it is recorded: "That year (1145) the whole land of Rus went against Halich (Galicia) and laid waste to many its territories." Thus Halich was not considered to be Rus. The same Chronicle refers to a journey made in 1135 by Burgomaster Myroslav and Archbishop Niphont "from Novgorod into Rus," and mentions that in 1221, "they showed the road to Prince Vsevolod, saying: 'We do not want you: go where you please—go to your father in Rus.'" Thus it is evident that Novgorod was not Rus. Again, it is recorded in the Chronicles: "And Sviatoslav came with the people of Suzdal, Smolensk and Polotsk to Rus." Under the year 1167 the Chronicle mentions another Muscovite prince as having gone from Moscow to Rus. Thus it is plain that Suzdal, Smolensk, Polotsk and Moscow were not Rus. The fact that Ivan III in 1493 chose to call himself Sovereign of all Russia, has no bearing on the issue. For that matter Polish Kings and Lithuanian Dukes often styled themselves kings and dukes of all Russia. So did Ukrainian Kings and Princes who reigned in Western Ukraine after the collapse of the Kieven State. The fact remains that when Ivan III proclaimed himself sovereign of all Russia, not a square inch of truly Rus territory was under his rule. His use of the title, then, could not have "tended to acquire a singularly realistic meaning," as is suggested by the authors.

Rise of Despotism in Muscovy

M. Brégy and Prince Obolensky pay a fine tribute to the learning and tolerance which prevailed in Ukraine in mediaeval times. Unfortunately, it was Polish and Russian political incursion which brought intolerance, religious bigotry and despotic rule. The rise of absolutism in Muscovy at the beginning of the 16th century can only be attributed to the Asiatic influence. Muscovy remained under

the Golden Horde from 1280 to 1500 and in the interest of self-preservation acquired the political acumen of the Asiatics. During that period of servitude she lost all traces of liberal and democratic government which she acquired earlier under the influence of Ukraine. It was because the latter did not have to endure Tartar rule but early fell under Western influence through Lithuania and Poland and managed to maintain her long-standing contact with Byzantium, that the far-reaching differences between Ukraine and Muscovy became accentuated. Thus, "the typically Slavonic method of government" of which the authors speak, and which was prevalent to some extent in Muscovy while the latter was under the Kiev State, passed out completely during the period when Muscovy was under Tartar rule.

Shifting of Population

The authors adopt the view of the imperial Russian historian, Kliuchevsky, that following the Tartar invasions, there was a great exodus from Ukraine to the north and to the west. By this they aim to prove that there was constant interblending between Ukrainians and Muscovites and that, as a result, the two people are virtually identical. Modern historians, however, maintain that this depopulation of Eastern Ukraine was very slight and the movement was only in a westward direction because it is unthinkable that Ukrainian peasants would have left the fertile soil of Ukraine for the mud and sand of Muscovy. This view is supported by archaeologists, among them Professors Spitsin and Volkov.

A few pages further on the authors seem to change their minds and lean towards the Ukrainian point of view. They admit that "the greater part of the population withdraws to the north-west into the principality of Galicia-Volynia, which remains more sheltered and enjoys a stable and wise government." But the next statement: "Henceforth the great question is whether the State of Galicia-Volynia can maintain itself between the Tartars and the Poles and the Lithuanians and continue the Great Russian tradition in the south-west," is singularly meaningless since there never was "a Great Russian tradition" in Ukraine. Again the authors contradict themselves in the next paragraph when they admit that there were great differences of conception between the Princes of the south-west (Ukrainian Princes) and the Muscovite Princes under the Tartars.

Bonds Between Ukraine and Muscovy Weak

Throughout the book, but especially in Chapter 2, the authors shun clarity of expression and insist upon grouping Ukraine and Muscovy under the one heading, "Russia." They overlook the fact that the imperial bonds between the Kiev State and outlying Muscovy which were weak in any case, broke in the 12th century, and that from then on to the middle of the 17th century, Ukraine's political, cultural and religious life had the minimum of contact with Muscovy. When in 1713 Peter I ordered that henceforth Rus, the ancient political name of Ukraine, will be the name of his Muscovite Tsardom, he did not automatically do away with the inherent differences between the Muscovites and Ukrainians. Ukrainians cannot prevent the Muscovites from appropriating their name, but they refuse to recognize in this an identification of themselves with the Muscovites or Russians. One illustration of this confusion is their use of the term "Russian Church." On page 51 they say: "In return for the aid against the Tartars the Russian Church would recognize the Papal supremacy but would maintain its Eastern rite and its Slavonic language." This is, of course, misleading, because the authors are actually speaking of the Orthodox hierarchy in Ukraine during the reign of King Daniel of Galicia. There was never any question of the Orthodox hierarchy in Muscovy conducting similar ne-

gotiations with Rome. On page 50 the authors provide us with an illustration on this point. In discussing preparations for the Florentine Oecumenical Council in 1439, which was to arrange the union of the Orthodox and Catholic Churches, they say that Metropolitan Isidor, who was a fervent partisan of the Union, was received with enthusiasm by the population of Ukraine and was proclaimed Metropolitan of All Rus when he arrived in Kiev. But when he took the glad tidings to Moscow, "the Grand Prince did not receive Isidor but proclaimed him the killer of souls, and a heretic and imprisoned him."

They believe that "since the end of the 16th century their Church (meaning the Ukrainian Church) was no longer dependent upon the Patriarch of Constantinople but on that of Moscow." As a matter of historical record we know that the Ukrainian clergy did not tolerate Muscovite interference in the affairs of the Ukrainian Church and this Church did not lose its independent status until 1686 when Dionisiy, the Patriarch of Constantinople, sold the Kiev Metropolia to Moscow, upon his own admission, for "thrice forty sables and two hundred pieces of gold."

The confusion arising from the unrestricted use of the word "Russian" is again evident in connection with language. Speaking of the 15th century, the authors say: "Notwithstanding the existence of a common sovereign, they cling, as in the past, to the use of the Russian language as the sole language of the state." But, according to such Russian philologists as Piupin, Korsh, and Pogodin, the differences between the Ukrainian and the Russian language were as great then as they are now. Evidently the authors had in mind the Ukrainian language, but for purposes of this book, they choose to group both languages, Ukrainian and Muscovite, under the one heading, "Russia."

Treaty of Pereyaslav

In reference to the Ukrainian Kozak Republic their data is inordinately eclectic. They leave out all historical material which indicates that Hetman Khmelnytsky was a great State-builder and deserved the name of "The Cromwell of the East," attributed to him by the French historian, Pierre Chevalier. They cling to the fact that Khmelnytsky sought an alliance with Moscow and regard it as an indication that there is a natural affinity between Ukraine and Muscovy. In reality the Treaty of Pereyaslav, 1654, whereby Ukraine accepted the personal protection of the Tsar—not Muscovy—was only a political act forced upon Ukraine by the exhausting wars with Poland. The Kozaks contemplated such an alliance with Turkey and would have preferred it had it not been for the barrier of religion. The treaty was an agreement between an independent State and a sovereign ruler and nothing else "was understood" when the treaty was signed. Exhaustive treatment of this phase of Ukrainian history can be found in Professor Lepinsky's "Ukraine at the Cross-Roads." We might only point out that according to the treaty, Ukraine retained her frontiers, her judiciary, her church autonomy and the right to conduct her own foreign relations. In short, she retained her political identity.

Nor can it be said that the Ukrainian people or the Church condoned this Treaty with Moscow. It did not take them long to discover that they had made a bad bargain. Moscow broke the terms soon after the treaty was signed and Vyhovsky, who succeeded Hetman Khmelnytsky, repudiated it and made an alliance with Turkey. In 1660 the Kozaks again renounced Muscovy and accepted a union with Poland. In revenge for this new alliance with Poland, the Russian general, Sheremetiev, surrendered the Kozaks in his army to the Tartars. According to Hrushkevsky, this base act caused great anger

WHO IS A CITIZEN

To make clear who is a citizen and who is an alien, the Common Council for American Unity (formerly Foreign Language Information Service), 222 Fourth Avenue, New York City, has issued a 63-page Manual of Information for Aliens and Those Advising Them (price 15 cents) from which the following excerpt is reprinted below for the benefit of our young readers and their parents.

SINCE the Alien Registration Act of 1940 requires practically all aliens to register, it is important to know exactly who is an alien, and who is a citizen. Many persons who have believed themselves to be citizens, and who may even have voted in this country, are now discovering that they are aliens.

In general, any person who was born in the United States or who was born abroad of citizen parents, or who has been naturalized, or who has acquired citizenship as a minor through the naturalization of his or her parents or through marriage to a citizen before September 22, 1922 is a citizen.

In general, any person who is not a citizen is an alien. Persons who were not born citizens can acquire citizenship only in certain ways prescribed by law. Long residence in the United States does not make an alien a citizen, and a person who has applied for naturalization does not become a citizen until he or she has taken an oath of allegiance to the United States and has been sworn in as a citizen.

Any person who has lost United States citizenship in any way—such as a woman who married an alien on or after March 7, 1907 and before September 22, 1922—and who has failed to regain it, is also an alien.

The above paragraphs describe only the more common, general rules concerning citizenship. There are many exceptions and special cases which must be taken into account. Therefore this article outlines the principal ways in which a person acquires United States citizenship.

HOW A PERSON ACQUIRES UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship by Birth in U. S., Alaska, Hawaii, Virgin Islands

A person is a citizen, irrespective of race, and irrespective of the citizenship or non-citizenship of his or her parents provided neither parent was a foreign diplomatic officer or foreign sovereign, if he or she was born:

- (1) in any one of the forty-eight states;
- (2) in any incorporated territory which subsequently became a state;
- (3) in the District of Columbia;
- (4) in Alaska, provided the birth was on or after June 20, 1867;
- (5) in Hawaii, provided the birth was on or after August 12, 1898;
- (6) in the Virgin Islands of the United States, provided the birth was on or after January 17, 1917.

Citizenship by Birth in Canal Zone, Panama, Puerto Rico

A person is a citizen if he or she was born:

- (1) in the Canal Zone, provided the birth was on or after February 26, 1904, if one or both parents were at the time of such birth citizens of the United States;
- (2) in the Republic of Panama, provided the birth was on or after February 26, 1904, if one or both parents were at the time of such birth citizens of the United States employed by the Government of the United States or by the Panama Railroad Company;
- (3) in Puerto Rico, provided the birth was on or after March 2, 1917, if both parents were Spanish subjects who had been residing in Puerto Rico on April 11, 1899, who did not choose to preserve their allegiance to the Crown of Spain or their political status as citizens only of Puerto Rico, and who were citizens of Puerto Rico on March 2, 1917;
- (4) in Puerto Rico, provided the birth was on or after June 27, 1934, if at such birth he was not automatically a citizen, subject, or national of any foreign country.

Citizenship by Birth Outside the United States to Citizen Parents

A person is a citizen even if he or she was born outside the United States, provided either his father or mother, or both, was a citizen at the time of his birth, under certain conditions. These conditions are different for a person born before May 24, 1934, than they are for a person born on or after that date, because the law was revised at that time. As a result of the law before and after May 24, a person is a citizen if he or she falls into any of the following three categories:

- (1) A person who was born abroad before May 24, 1934, is a citizen if his father was a citizen of the United States at the time and had previously resided in the United States.
- (2) A person who was born abroad on or after May 24, 1934, is a citizen if both parents were citizens of the United States at the time, provided one of them had previously resided in the United States.

(3) A person who was born abroad on or after May 24, 1934, is a citizen if either his father or mother was a citizen of the United States; however, a person who acquires citizenship in this way loses it unless he (a) comes to the United States to live before he is thirteen years of age and remains until he is eighteen and (b) takes an official oath of allegiance to the United States within six months after his twenty-first birthday.

Citizenship by Illegitimate Birth Outside U. S. to Citizen Mother

An illegitimate person born abroad since May 24, 1934 is a citizen if at that time of his or her birth the mother was a citizen of the United States who had previously resided in the United States, irrespective of the nationality, race or residence of the father.

Citizenship by Naturalization

A person who has been naturalized—that is, sworn in as a citizen in open court—is a citizen. However, anyone who has merely applied for naturalization is still an alien, even if he or she has received "first papers" or has filed a petition for naturalization. An alien does not become a citizen until he has completed all the steps of naturalization, and been officially admitted to citizenship.

Citizenship by Marriage to a Citizen or by Naturalization of Husband before September 22, 1922

A foreign born woman is a citizen if she was eligible to naturalization—that is, if she belongs to the white or to the black race—and married a citizen before September 22, 1922.

Before September 22, 1922, the wife of a man who became a citizen also became a citizen. Thus a foreign born woman is a citizen if she was eligible to naturalization and her husband was naturalized before September 22, 1922, provided she married him before that date.

Since September 22, 1922, marriage has not affected a woman's citizenship status according to the law of the United States. Every alien woman, married or unmarried, must now secure citizenship for herself.

Citizenship by Marriage of Mother to a Citizen

A foreign born person is a citizen if while the person was a minor his or her mother acquired citizenship by marriage to a citizen before September 22, 1922, if the person either (a) at the time of such marriage resided permanently in the United States or (b) was admitted to the United States for permanent residence before reaching the age of twenty-one.

Citizenship by Acquisition of Citizenship by Mother

A foreign born person is a citizen if while the person was a minor his or her mother acquired citizenship through the naturalization of her husband before September 22, 1922, provided that the person either (a) resided permanently in the United States at the time of such acquisition of citizenship by the parent or (b) was admitted to the United States for permanent residence before reaching the age of twenty-one.

Citizenship by Naturalization of Parent

Before May 24, 1934, foreign born children under the age of twenty-one as a general rule derived citizenship only through the naturalization of their father (or mother, if she had the sole legal custody of the child due to death of the father, or divorce), and only if they were under twenty-one years of age and legally residing in the United States at the time their father was naturalized, or were legally admitted for permanent residence after the naturalization and while they were still under twenty-one years of age.

An act adopted on May 24, 1934, made important changes in the naturalization law. Since then, a foreign born child may derive American citizenship through the naturalization of either parent; it has not been necessary for the mother to be widowed or divorced. However, since May 24, 1934, a foreign born child cannot become an American citizen through naturalization of his father or mother unless he comes to the United States while he is under sixteen years of age and unless he lives in the United States for five years before reaching the age of twenty-one; but if both parents of a foreign-born child become American citizens while he is under twenty-one, it is necessary only that he come here to live before he is twenty-one.

The act of May 24, 1934, is not retroactive. Its provisions do not in any way affect the citizenship of foreign born people who acquired citizenship before May 24, 1934, through naturalization of their father (or mother if she had sole custody).

Thus, as a result of the law before and after May 24, 1934, a foreign born person is a citizen if he or she falls into any of the following four categories:

- (1) A foreign born person is a citizen if while the person was a minor and before May

24, 1934, his father (or mother if she had the sole legal custody of the child) was naturalized, provided that the person either (a) resided permanently in the United States at the time of such naturalization or resumption of citizenship by the parent or (b) was admitted to the United States for permanent residence before reaching the age of twenty-one.

(2) A foreign born person is a citizen if while the person was a minor and on or after May 24, 1934, one of his parents was naturalized, provided the person came to the United States while he was under sixteen years of age and lived here for five years before reaching the age of twenty-one. A foreign born person in the process of acquiring citizenship in this way is an alien until he has fulfilled all the requirements; that is, until he has lived here for five years before reaching the age of twenty-one.

(3) A foreign born person is a citizen if while the person was a minor both parents, or the surviving parent if one parent is dead, were naturalized, provided that the person either (a) resided permanently in the United States at the time of the naturalization of both parents, or the surviving parent, or (b) was admitted to the United States for permanent residence before reaching the age of twenty-one.

(4) A foreign born person is a citizen if at the time of his birth one parent was a citizen and, one an alien, if the alien parent was naturalized while the person was a minor, provided that the person either (a) resided permanently in the United States at the time of the naturalization of the parent or (b) was admitted to the United States for permanent residence before reaching the age of twenty-one.

Citizenship by Naturalization of Mother of Illegitimate Child

An illegitimate foreign born person is a citizen if while he or she was a minor the mother was naturalized, irrespective of the nationality, race, or residence of the father, provided that the person either (a) resided permanently in the United States at the time of the naturalization of the mother or (b) was admitted to the United States for permanent residence before reaching the age of twenty-one.

Citizenship Conferred by Law on Certain People of Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Virgin Islands

United States citizenship has been conferred by law upon certain people who have resided in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or the Virgin Islands. The conditions under which such citizenship is granted are as follows:

(1) A person is a citizen if he or she was a Spanish subject residing in Puerto Rico on April 11, 1899, if he did not choose to preserve his allegiance to the Crown of Spain, provided he was a citizen of Puerto Rico on March 2, 1917, and did not choose to preserve his political status as a citizen only of Puerto Rico. A person is a citizen if he was born to such parents on or after April 11, 1899.

(2) A person is a citizen if he or she was born in Puerto Rico on or after April 11, 1899, if on June 27, 1934, he was not a citizen, subject or national of any foreign power or residing abroad as a citizen or subject of any foreign power, and if prior to June 27, 1934, he had not renounced or lost United States citizenship under the treaties or laws of the United States.

(3) A person is a citizen if he or she was a native of Puerto Rico who was temporarily absent from Puerto Rico on April 11, 1899, if he thereafter returned, and if on March 2, 1917, he permanently resided in Puerto Rico and was not a citizen of any foreign country, and if he did not choose to preserve his political status as a citizen only of Puerto Rico.

(4) A person is a citizen if he or she was a citizen of the Republic of Hawaii on August 12, 1898.

(5) A person is a citizen if he or she is a former Danish citizen who resided in the Virgin Islands on January 17, 1917, and who resided there or in the continental United States or Puerto Rico on February 25, 1927, provided that either (a) he did not choose to preserve his Danish citizenship or (b) having chosen to preserve Danish citizenship, he later renounced such choice.

(6) A person is a citizen if he or she is a native of the Virgin Islands who, having resided there on January 17, 1917, resided there or in the continental United States or Puerto Rico on February 25, 1927, and was not a citizen of any foreign country.

(7) A person is a citizen if he or she is a native of the Virgin Islands who, having resided in the continental United States on January 17, 1917, resided in the Virgin Islands on February 25, 1927, and was not a citizen of any foreign country.

(8) A person is a citizen if he or she is a native of the Virgin Islands who on June 28, 1932, resided in the continental United States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, or any other insular possession or territory of the United States and was not a citizen or subject of any foreign country.

AND CHRONICLE SMALL BEER

AN ODE IN SEASON

Now that the series has ended
And the ball-players have wended
Their way to their winter retreats,
Much less consideration
Gets the state of the nation
Than the ball-game that's played
with the feet.
Each fresh-water college
Is serving up knowledge
As a side-dish for helmets and
cleats;
And our most profound scholars
Are paying five dollars
To holler in stadium seats.
They call it a gayhem—
But it looks like mass-mayhem
To tunes by the varsity band;
And ears and patellas
And jawbones of fellas
Are scattered all over the land.
When the Bears play the Romans,
They kick in their abdomens—
This system will most always win—
And the line always buckles
When the backs use brass
knuckles
And the guards kick the end in
the shin.
Right now life's elixir
Costs a fiver or sixer
For seats on the forty yard line;
And to sit on concrete
With frost-bitten feet
May be thrilling—but I'll just
resign.
Now you can act balmy
And freeze for the Almy—
With thousands of others enthus-
ing;
But I'll be a loafer
And stay home on the sofa,
And get the games digested by
Husing.

PROF. DUMBKOPF'S QUESTION BOX

Dear Prof. Dumbkopf: What is a preposition? (signed) Grammarian.

Dear Grammarian: A preposition is when a guy goes up to a girl and—excuse me, I was thinking of the wrong word. A preposition is a word you should never end a sentence with.

Dear Prof. Dumbkopf: For the past two years a young man has been dropping in to see me. He never makes a date ahead of time, never calls to say he is coming but makes it a point to see me at least once or twice a week. In all that time he has never taken me anywhere—not even for a ride or to the neighborhood movie. All he wants to do is sit on the sofa, drink my father's wine and smoke his cigars. I know this young man has a good job and is fairly well-to-do. However, I can't seem to make any progress. What shall I do? (signed) Hoboken Isolde.

Dear Hoboken Isolde: Your father is passing out the wrong kind of cigars. Get the kind that explode. You can get them by mail from the Johnson Smith Co. (advt.). Also, don't serve wine. Wine is a soporific and an aphrodisiac. It gives this young man a feeling which is half restful, half desirous. He is content to drowse and let his fancy play on you. Serve whiskey—three or four stiff shots in rapid succession. Then his mind will come alive and range about a bit and he will realize that there is more to life than SITTING AROUND in the same room with you. If all else fails, move away from Hoboken. What's so special about living in Hoboken, anyway?

THE PASSING SCENE

...The Democratic machine is going to need a lot of new parts to replace all those Willkie for president bolts.

...And the feeling seems to be growing of "No third term for Roosevelt, and no second term for Willkie—as president of Commonwealth & Southern."

...The average American is someone who phones in a dozen votes during the week for radio amateurs—then forgets to register for election day.

...What the Republicans dread the most is the idea of spending

YOUTH and THE U.N.A.

The Get Acquainted Club

This week we have another member for our Get Acquainted Club... a girl by the name of Anastazia 'Ann' Kurdyna from Hartford, Conn. Ann writes that she is 5 feet 5 inches, tall, has reddish-blond hair, blue eyes, and is a member of branch 277 of the Ukrainian National Association. She is a junior at the Connecticut State Teachers' College, and has taken Ukrainian dancing lessons. Ann is a member of the Ukrainian Choir in Hartford, and also of the Children of Mary, a church sodality. She loves to dance, and is very much interested in dramatics; she is fond of all sports, especially football and basketball. Ann writes: "I would like to hear from everywhere and I promise to answer all letters—I'll even exchange snapshots. Here's hoping I hear from someone!"

The purpose of our club is to acquaint U.N.A. members with each other on a national scale. Simply write us a letter giving information about yourself and we'll print it here for you minus your address. Readers wishing to write to you will write to us for your address. We will give addresses to all U. N. A. members who ask for them.

So, if you would like to write to Ann, send us a card, giving your U.N.A. branch number, and we'll be glad to send you her address.

We have five members to date... one fellow and four girls. We urge our members to have their letters reprinted if the first results were not satisfactory.

If you're interested in our new club please write and let us know. We would greatly appreciate comments and would consider any suggestions that may be offered. Why not write to us and let us know what you think? All communications intended for the Get Acquainted Club should be addressed to Theodore Lutwiniak, P. O. Box 88, Jersey City, N. J.

ARE YOU A PACK RAT?

When it comes to accumulations of useless odds-and-ends which are found in profusion in many homes, here's an excellent motto: "Burn the junk up—before it burns you up!"

A good many of us have characteristics of the pack rat. We hate to throw anything away. Old clothes, old magazines, old furniture, even old newspapers—all go into informal storage in attic or basement or closet. They may stay there for years, collecting dust and mold, with nothing dangerous happening. Again, they may not—fire, which feeds on such accumulations, may find them. And then all your possessions, no less than the junk, may go up in smoke.

Once or twice a year it would be an excellent idea to make a little tour of your home to ferret out such hazards. Charities will be glad to have old clothes, furniture and reading matter. Anything that is useless can go to the junkman or be destroyed in the incinerator. Be especially alert in going through workshop and garage—it is a common habit to leave cans of paint, varnish and other inflammable liquids open. Cleaning rags should always be kept in closed metal containers. Spillage or gasoline or oil should be at once mopped up.

Perhaps your home is free of such dangers. If it is, it is very much the exception. The chances are that hazards exist of which you know nothing—hazards that can be easily eliminated once discovered. Look for them now. Don't put it off until tomorrow—for tomorrow could be too late. Fire can strike tonight as easily as next week or next year.

another four years at constructive criticism.

...And Roosevelt's main point is that he is merely obeying the will of the people. We assume that we will be told at the proper time what our will is.

ETAOIN SHRLDU

THE MUSCOVITES AND UKRAINE

(Concluded from page 2)

against Muscovy throughout Ukraine. The Ukrainian masses rose against the Muscovite officials in their midst and massacred them or drove them out."

Treaty of Hlukhiv

When in 1665, Ukraine west of Dnieper, freed itself from Poland, it would have nothing to do with Russia but instead sought assistance from the Tartars. In Ukraine east of the Dnieper even the warmest sympathisers of Moscow insisted the latter must respect Ukrainian autonomy. According to Hrushevsky, "the Muscovite Government knew through its Voevods in Ukraine that the demands set forth by Hetman Doroshenko and Mnohohrishny were the same as those of the whole population of Ukraine which did not want Muscovite armies or officials, nor any trace of Muscovite interference... But Moscow had already decided on complete centralisation and utilised every Ukrainian difficulty to extend and entrench her position in Ukraine." Thus the Treaty of Hlukhiv concluded in 1669 between Moscow and Ukraine, was drawn up and ratified as between two independent countries. Here, again, Moscow promised to respect the rights of the Ukrainian Republic. But Moscow regarded each promise as a temporary arrangement to be broken at a convenient moment; and the authors are quite right when they tell us on page 102 that all the lands of Ukraine "were no more than simple provinces of the Russian Empire... until the Revolution of 1917."

In their section on the Russo-Swedish war they do not miss the pleasure of insinuating that, "the idea of independence had then already appeared as a foreign inspiration." We accept this use of innuendo as a typical Russian practice.

Although the main chapter is headed, "The Ukraine or 'Russia Minor'?" the authors, curiously enough, leave their rhetorical question unanswered so that we are at pains to understand why this heading was used at all.

The Russian Imperial Viewpoint

In their discussion of the language question the authors tread the beaten paths of Russian "one and indivisible" imperialists. They disregard the opinions of outstanding Russian philologists such as Shakhmatov, Pogodin, Yagir, Piupin, Korsh, Lavrovsky and Levshin, they ignore the considered opinion of the Russian Academy of Science, and of such disinterested scholars as Bandtke, Shafarik, Thompson, Dahl, Mikloschin and Schleicher; and they come forth with the pan-Russian hypothesis which was never accepted by science, Russian or otherwise, but was only a political tool of the Russian Imperial Government.

Ukrainian National Information Service, London.

NOVEMBER 9, 1940
Elizabeth New Jersey

BASKETBALL and DANCE Every Friday Evening—Starting Friday, Oct. 25, Ukrainian Center A.A. vs. Lionel Ukrainian Center Girls vs. Outstanding Team to be held at Ukrainian Center, 180-186 William St., Newark, N. J. Commencing 7 P.M. Admission 30 cents. Music before and after games. Oley Bros. Orchestra.

LISTEN to the Ukrainian Youth Radio Program every Saturday from 3:45 to 4:00 P.M., from station W.B.N.X., 1400 kc, New York City. Special youth features, guest stars, music, etc. Guest Star this week "Bromo Seltzer" in person.

DON'T BUY LIFE INSURANCE!

It may not be necessary for you to buy life insurance.

You may be one of those few lucky ones who, at retirement age, have a tidy fortune invested in grade A securities sufficient to provide you with an adequate income for the rest of your life. Or, if you die in the meantime, you may have accumulated enough by then to make certain that your dependents will never know want.

That may happen—if you are the man in a thousand who is successful in making and keeping money. If, however, you are the average man, you will never attain that rarefied degree of economic independence unless you follow some fixed savings plan, such as life insurance offers.

The moral to all this is: Don't buy life insurance, if you're willing to take a long shot be on your own and your family's future.

UYL—NA BOWLING

Several bowling matches indicative of the calibre of teams in the East were played in Philadelphia, Sunday, September 29. A Wilkes Barre girls team won over the Philadelphia Youth Chorus girls team, while a male contingent from the Philadelphia Youth Chorus won two out of three games over a pick-up team representing the N.Y.—N.J. Youth Chorus.

In a week the Ukrainian Eastern Bowling League (UYL-NA) will open its season. Philadelphia, Chester, and Wilmington have six teams in it. Other teams may still enter. Write to:

PETER ZAHARCHUK
706 North 24th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

POLITICAL LECTURES FOR BALTIMORE YOUTH

In order to give the young voter a better understanding of the actual set-up of government and in order to discuss problems and responsibilities of young voters, the Advisory Council of the International Center, Y.W. C.A., Baltimore, Md., has planned three Friday evenings beginning today, when practical problems will be discussed with experts in the field of political science and sociology. These Friday evening programs are open to everyone. They are particularly planned for the young voter but we hope anyone interested in making democracy work will attend. Political issues are not to be discussed, only democratic procedures.

HELEN GARVIN
Executive Secretary
International Center, YWCA
26 South Broadway, Baltimore, Md.

PHILADELPHIA

HALLOWEEN FROLIC sponsored by Phila. U. N. A. Youth Club at Ukrainian Hall, 849 N. Franklin St., Phila., Saturday, October 26, 1940. Commenting 8 p.m. Nick Boley & His Casa Del Rey Orch.; also Ukr. Orch. Admission 40¢ inc. taxes.

BANQUET & DANCE

— presented by —
Ukrainian Athletic Club
Chester, Pa.

Basketball & Bowling Champs of U. Y.L.A. celebrating their Tenth Anniversary, Sunday, October 20, 1940 at the Ukrainian Hall, 4th and Ward Sts., Chester, Pa. Speakers: Mayor, Coaches, other Celebrities. Catering Service by McCallister & Sons. Banquet and Dance \$2.00 per person. Dance only 75¢ per person. Music by: AL Zahler and his Orchestra. Direct from Log Cabin Inn, Washingtons-Crossing-on-the-Delaware. Banquet 6:00 P.M. Dancing 9 to 1. Dress Optional. 238

BID THE BOYS GOODBYE! Con-
scription Dance sponsored by The Uk-
rainian-American Youth Club to be held
at Ukrainian Sitch Ballroom, 506-508
—18th Ave., Newark, N. J., Saturday
Evening, November 2nd, 1940. Com-
mencing 8 P.M. Admission 40 cents.
Music by Oley Bros. Orchestra.

NEW YORK!

DANCE UKRAINE. Open House.
Friday, October 18th, 8 P.M. Webster
Manor, 119 E. 11th St. Music by
Tommy Eliassen. Admission 50¢ In-
cluding tax. 233, 238