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This article attempts to trace the internal state of the born outside of the homeland Ukrainian youth. We consider the outlook factors in the formation of new young generation emigration and its objectives in the fight of the Ukrainian people for independence by the example of the most active part of it, united in the Association of Ukrainian youth of n. M. Mychnovsky
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У статті робиться спроба простежити внутрішній стан народженої поза межами рідної землі української молоді. Розглядаються чинники формування світогляду нового молодого покоління в еміграції та його завдань у боротьбі українського народу за незалежність на прикладі найактивнішої його частини, об’єднаної в Товариство української студіюючої молоді ім. М. Міхновського
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of the born Ukrainians exile of his Ukrainian identity and its purpose in the fight of the Ukrainian people for independence.

2. Literature review

Unfortunately, not many scientific papers are devoted to various aspects of the fight of Ukrainian diaspora for Ukraine’s independence. A complex historical research of this problem made Ju. Neduzhko, who held a dissertation «The activities of Ukrainian Diaspora to restore the independence of Ukraine (mid 40’s – early 90’s of XX century)» [1, 2]. The issues that remain outside the scope of this and other researchers belongs to the question of how implementation of political organizations declared by Ukrainian diaspora tasks to restore the state independence of Ukraine after the defeat of national liberation [3, 4].

The «Appeal of all belligerents of Ukraine to Ukrainian exile» (1949) calling the Ukrainian youth to be at the forefront of the liberation struggle in exile, «give full itself for interests of warring Ukraine and be prepared for each of his call to become his next friends, that with weapons are fighting for the liberation of the Ukrainian people, the happiness, joy and creative work of Ukrainian youth in the Ukrainian state», and be highly active, to steel its ideology constantly and steadily to elevate their level of their general and professional knowledge and political elaborating, to use his stay among other nations for learning of all that they have good and useful in order to grasp their work experience in all areas of life and public construction, but diligently keep yourself «before corrupting influences» that would shake loose the ideological and undermine the moral stability, to use every opportunity and every means (personal acquaintances, relationships with other young people nations and international youth organizations) in order to acquaint foreigners with liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people, to kindle young people of all nations to fight lies and violence of Bolshevism, adequately to represent the Ukrainian science and culture to the outside world, etc. [5].

The problem of the appointment of the younger generation, especially of the students was of great importance by the supporters of the FS (Foreign Section) OUN that founded in December 1949 by Ukrainian Society Youth Studying of M. Mykhnovsky (USYS). As actual life guide, USYS considered the idea to devote to «The Resurrection of the People-Hero», to work in the direction that this Resurrection «would came quickly, as great and just act of the lasting new era».

As the honour and responsibility of young people in a foreign country, according to the founders of this student organization, was not only preserve the «sanctity of the unsullied ideas of the predecessors», but their renewal, strengthening and finding of the ways of their implementation. Its mission was considered by the students in Ukrainian something more than just the «saloon of education or Citizens Club of our crippled day». The students-nationalists realized that whether the right would be their answer to a number of topical issues of contemporary national life will depend on it the fate «of the entire national community in the present and the future» [6].

3. Aim and research problems

The main aim of the study is to analyze problems understanding of the born Ukrainians exile of his Ukrainian identity and its purpose in the fight of the Ukrainian people for independence.

To solve the problem, it should be implemented following research objectives:

1. Trace the internal state of the born outside of the homeland Ukrainian youth.
2. Consider the outlook factors in the formation of new young generation emigration.
3. Explore attitudes born in a foreign land Ukrainian youth by the example of the most active part of it, united in the Association of Ukrainian youth of n. M. Mychynovskiy.

4. Materials and methods

The members of the Association Ukrainian Studying Young University of M. Mykhnovsky in its research work sought to understand the greatness of our national heroes, to explore their activities and achievements for our nation in its struggle for «the highest level of its manifestation that called INDEPENDENT STATE LIFE», trying to understand the difference between those public men, «who fell on the battlefield, or the rest of his life standing on guard of their nation and those, who were living quietly and have finished their earthly journey because of old age».

A deep study of the history of Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement has also added essential knowledge for discussions with their teachers who based in their lectures on anti-Ukrainian publications [7].

5. Results of the research

Dynamics, enthusiasm, desire for action, devotion to implementation of proceedings liberation of Ukraine, self-sacrifice – these were the ideals and aspirations of the young generation of the 1950s, which was Ukrainian witnessed armed resistance of the people of that time. However, after fifteen years USYS in the heart attempts to analyze whether it was true by Ukrainian avant-garde young people in foreign lands.

Quite interesting thoughts appear of active members USYS, his head Toronto’s cell, a student of economics and political Toronto University, and the eldest daughter of Stephan Bandera – Natalya Bandera. In the article «Where goes the younger Ukrainian generation?» (1965) she wrote that the faith and hard conviction in his appointment was for the protection of young idealists of the 1950s against meanness, evil, deceit, materialism, pragmatism, against «solid, gray and prosaic reality» that surrounded the young man in the then foreign reality [8, p. 62]. «But how long the goal was clear, unsullied? Does it begin to turn in a vision that was hidden further each time? Does not later it began to turn into a utopian element, a desire which it seemed more and more impossible? Did our generation is no longer assigned to the exercising goal? ... Is it becoming a victim of assimilation andimmerged in a strange sea? If not, what prospects for
the younger generation in exile?» – was asking to yourself the following questions N. Bandera, trying to make a comparison between the young generations of 1950-1965s. With a implies some negative effects in the lives of young people in 1965, the author claimed that the clashes with brutal reality on immigration and the sobering up had to be very painful and oppressive, but imperceptible process of decomposition, of which warned the creators «Appeal of the warring Ukraine» in 1949, could be invisible, slow and painless [8, p. 62].

In 1965 N. Bandera could have seen at least two ways in which young activists went 15 years ago: 1) consistent «utopian-idealists» rushed into the maelstrom of the Ukrainian social, political, educational, and another organizational work and for 15 years together with the older generation raised on legs «imposing Ukrainian social unit»; 2) realist «with tendencies of the materialistic» realized opportunities of the ensuring privacy and happiness, though kept going to spread Ukrainian cases among foreigners, rising to a «responsible position» in foreign countries. According to the author, both ways are correct and useful for Ukrainian liberation of the case, but both of them could not be any «base for longer exist or guiding purpose for younger generation» [8].

N. Bandera considered that the new generation of the 1960s could not possibly see in these two «solutions» clearly the main goal direct path to the liberation of Ukraine, its purpose, which guided their older friends. This generation felt only «some pretensions to the ideas, some claim and duty in the name of something big», which gave him no instructions or inspiration for further action. Given that the main goal – getting a free, independent, sovereign and united Ukrainian state remained the same, but in a real daily struggle for existence and complete isolation from the Ukrainian nation, the aims for the younger generation «are shaded, remote, divorced from real capacity of youth». Unlike the generation of inflammatory 1950s, all young people in 1965 was more filled with doubt, anxiety for the future, and «in the sea of corrupting processes seeks real absolute truth» [8]. The youth of the 1950s sought to clear pure thought, action, to realize the ideal, and young people in 1965 sees the need for a solid and honest character that would stand the test would be commonplace and healed «Ukrainian intrigue decomposed society». The youth of the 1950s was saturated with faith, enthusiasm, dedication, idealist philosophy and world view, looking in particular work incentives among Ukrainian society. The youth in 1965 with «strong pragmatic circumstances» of life in the Americas, with a bias to the idealistic tendencies is too looking for orientation, compass and incentives. It tries to explore the Ukrainian culture and history objectively, comparing it with the heritage of other nations, find the values of Ukrainian, which would give a lasting basis to the Ukrainians in exile. However, it is increasingly turning away from «traditional guides» to the faith in intelligence, desire of the unlimited freedom. Disorientation of the youth caused by the internal faults in the Ukrainian foreign society, the lack of «directing centre “that would” bring up with planned aim and gave to the young people the guides». According to N. Bandera, the Ukrainian «society», on the one hand, was trying to pass the burden and responsibilities for continuation of Ukrainian life in exile on youth, and, on the other, it didn’t prepare and didn’t «attract» systematically to this aim. Thus, this phenomenon acted more as «anti-incentive», because the young people of 1960s were increasingly looking for incentives for training and life outside of Ukrainian society.

According to observations of N. Bandera, the active Ukrainian students in 1965 weren’t linking yourself with «holiness of the unsullied ideas of their predecessors», they were increasingly guided by antidogmatic and pragmatic ideas aimed at realistic vision of the Ukrainians future prospects. Unlike the young people of the 1950s who felt the burden of the national problems and solutions the academic Youth of 1960s years disregarded this burden, and did not feel that close connection with the Ukrainian nation, which «puts the decision of unit one global all national responsibility». Collective understanding of responsibility by contemporary students disappeared. Instead, the problem was concentrated around the individual responsibility, such as the development of individual skills within the constraints of environment and so on.

On the formation of the new outlook of the younger generation in exile, according to N. Bandera, crucial importance were also other factors that were not due to the political objectives of Ukrainian diaspora. In particular, this was concerned with the impact of non-Ukrainian people on Ukrainians that forms the western public life, standard of living, cultural interests, etc., somehow imprinted on children and assimilation grandchildren of Ukrainian immigrants. Now, faced with the problem rather than condemning older «Generation» manifestations of assimilation, not only to find ways to slow down the opposition and assimilation, but find convincing arguments to the question: «What every young Ukrainian should oppose assimilation and preserve their Ukrainian?». The answer to this «What?» was, according to the author’s article «very important psychological factor for the preserving of Ukrainian spirituality», because a unclear answer or skip by shielding general terms («the Ukrainian liberation causes»), through the declaration («because so it must be») did not really explain to the young man. Insolvency of the Senior to give a «satisfactory» response, their «outrage and offence» concerning setting itself the question by youth, raised doubts and disbelieving among them about the prospects of liberation of Ukraine in the near future. But the liberation of Ukraine, considered N. Bandera, was the only uniting factor forced to keep moral and ideological relationship in Ukrainian emigration of Ukrainian nation, and only a firm belief in the ultimate liberation of Ukraine Bolshevik oppression could keep Ukrainian identity and stop the terrible process assimilation [8].

N. Bandera considered that in the Western life was no place for idealism as synthesis of high spiritual ideals, and that was the philosophy of Ukrainian nationalism. The initial philosophy of the young Ukrainian became increasingly pragmatic life philosophy, i.e. implementation of practical needs and goals. Among the chaos of western ideological trends, among its own complex life processes, including options for ideological, cultural
and political values of the older generation of Ukrainians the young generation chose what it was more fit and pleasant to them and on selected factors it built a lifestyle that was far from the lifestyle of his parents. The younger Ukrainian generation could no longer base Ukrainians solely on their struggle for liberation of Ukraine (including the various means: political, military, revolutionary, cultural and scientific), for it though born of struggle, and has grown into a chaotic bifurcation, in which it sought to find creative force, support for spiritual existence and survival. According to N. Bandera, the conditions of life in exile of deepening creativity have limited the possibilities of deepening creativity, and therefore «never Ukrainian young generation of Ukrainians will not improve your so deep to give themselves a new, modern, clean current Ukrainian stream». In particular, the limited improvement of the Ukrainian language for Ukrainian youth in exile caused the reduction in the number of new writers and poetic talents [8].

With time the relationships between older and younger generations were becoming more complex: older Ukrainian citizens realized that in families and organizations it has not been educated, so youth that it would like to see that would have taken over themselves the burden of social work from them, and the younger generation was dissatisfied with existing organizations that they could not live and did not see possibilities and strength convert these organizations in their own way. Accordingly, one withdraw from active labour in Ukrainian society, others remained and in themselves abilities were following traces of elders. N. Bandera showed that among the younger generation it grew fewer enthusiasts who are ready to sacrifice their personal lives and material welfare for selfless work for the Ukrainian business. The work in Ukrainian society organizations in the eyes of the younger generation has lost its meaning as a form of struggle for liberation of Ukraine [8, p. 66–67].

The total internal state of Ukrainian youth in the early 1970s. In terms of «Carefree, easy, profitable, even pseudo-luxury life in exile» fixed an young activist USUS’s Askold Lozinski, «from time to time we review the works of Moroz and other «dissidents» and it seems that at the moment we are even some political or patriotic feelings, and perhaps even to feel duty. But it is for the short time, because quickly we reject these «Satan’s instigations» to reaction or even to the fight against those who are mocking of our brothers and sisters in their native land. This reaction is contrary to peace and peace and unfavorable and unpleasant and maybe it could damage to ourselves...» [9].

6. Conclusions
The Ukrainian youth in exile, according to a member of New-York’s cell of USUS Igor Rakowski, was on the verge of two worlds: the world Ukrainian and American. «Who we are, and where we belong to? Are we Americans or Ukrainians? Can we somehow reconcile both Worlds?» – on these issues throbbed the opinion of the author [10]. To become the only Americans it meant losing their own language, customs and culture, which «still kept us together and gave a strong sense that we belong to somewhere, we have our own identity». The living alone according to Ukrainian lifestyle, in his view, was limiting us to the «Ukrainian ghetto», outside American real life environment. The author believed that Ukrainian youth can’t lock in «our close circle of Ukrainians», they have to come to the outside world, there to achieve growth in American society and also take care of the Ukrainian business.

He said the final assimilation of Ukrainian settlers will come not just because they kept their culture not enough, and that completely lost contact with the outside environment. The reason for inactivity students of Ukrainian origin in the life of Ukrainian community and that many of them «disappear entirely and are left Americans» I. Rakowski saw that the general policy of the Ukrainian public organizations lost contact with American life. «Let be successful in our schools, let make progress to the higher circles of American life – called the young man – let be taking into consideration the fact that we are a part of American life, and in this way we would gain the esteem, respect for others and glory for the Ukrainian peoples» [10].
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