

COLLABORATIONISM AND COMPLICITY IN THE HISTORY OF MANKIND REFLECTED IN SCHOLARS AND WRITERS WORKS

Andrii Shaikan

Professor, DSc, Kryvyi Rih Economic Institute of Kyiv National Economic University
named after Vadym Hetman,
e-mail: director@kneu.edu.ua, orcid.org/0000-0002-4088-6518, Ukraine

Valentina Shaikan

Professor, DSc, Kryvyi Rih Economic Institute of Kyiv National Economic University
named after Vadym Hetman,
e-mail: shaikan_vo@kneu.dp.ua, orcid.org/0000-0001-9408-9154, Ukraine

Abstract. A significant number of innocent people got into the post-war repression and their fates were crippled by war and totalitarianism. The author of this paper does not in any way desire to justify activities of collaborators or enemy aiders, as certain historian critics sometimes consider by mistake. The research aims to show – but not to justify – motives of misdeeds of a person in crucial social situation and incentive factors, which may under certain conditions align one's behavior with a specific course of action.

Keywords: Second World War, Ukraine, occupational regime, collaboration, subsidiary, deviant behavior.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23856/3011>

Introduction

The history of mankind has left many examples of cooperation with the enemy not only of individuals, but of entire states or large strata of society.

Nowadays this phenomenon is called collaborationism in scientific literature. History shows that the problem of collaborative work has been existing as long as humanity exists. Moreover, it remains actual today in the studies of philosophers, psychologists, political scientists, historians in view of the world wars in the twentieth century, hybrid wars in the XXI and not only.

It is not in the absence or lack of the informational sources that hampers the research, but rather the psychological and ethical aspect of this problem. A history scientist is unlikely to be recognized by his compatriots, if he proves that their ancestors cooperated with the oppressors in the past. And it is obvious, since in all the previously and still existing societies, the very basis of national consciousness, is founded upon love to one's homeland and patriotic feelings aimed at protecting their land, their people, their state. It is common knowledge that "a collaborationist" is defined as a traitor, collaborating with the enemies of his fatherland during her occupation (for example, Hitler's troops during the Second World War). As for Ukraine and the Ukrainians during the Second World War, according to the statements of contemporary historians, collaborationism, first and foremost, was expressed in working of certain representatives of Ukrainians for the occupation authorities. This cooperation at the individual level was reduced to participation in local government or German-controlled police subsidiaries. The most notorious form of collaboration was serving as bodyguards at Nazi concentration camps.

According to Professor Volodymyr Kosik, "cooperation on the individual, personal level existed in Ukraine. However, there was no collective political cooperation under orders from the Ukrainian government or some Ukrainian political party" (*Kosik, 1993: 178*).

Modern historians, as a rule, associate collaborationism with the events of the Second World War. In addition, some Ukrainian historians claim that collaborationism in the years of the Second World War occurred on an individual level, and there was no mass collaboration in Ukraine. At the same time, nowadays there is still no single point of view on this problem.

Orest Subtelny, a modern Canadian historian, is trying to gain an understanding of the situation that arose in Ukraine during the Second World War. According to him, collaboration takes place when the vast majority of the conquered population crosses the borderline "of passive execution of German orders." In Western Europe, the only enemy for the people of the invaded states was Nazis, and cooperation with the Germans was considered a form of betrayal. There were regimes in Ukraine which were not at all interested in the existence of an independent Ukrainian state, such as a totalitarian Stalinism, and Hitler's regime lasting from 1941 to 1944. Not surprising is the fact that, under conditions of war, part of the Ukrainians were able to save their lives, thanks to cooperation. Orest Subtelny is one more scientist, who acknowledges that collaborationism in Ukraine existed on an individual level, and had various motives (*Subtelny, 1991: 408-409*).

The points of view, regarding the national problems of the twentieth century, of the world-famous French philosopher and sociologist, Raymond Aron are expressed in his fundamental work "Peace and War between Nations". They are certain to be of paramount interest and cannot help mentioning. You can take it or leave it. His conclusions and analysis of the events help to understand the peculiarities of world diplomacy on the eve of the Second World War. Raymond Aron, analyzing the "diplomacy - strategy" of the Third Reich, and comparing it with the "diplomacy - strategy" of the Soviet Union concluded that it was "ideological and imperial, and, in fact, not national one". The author give reasons end evidence, explaining that in the period from 1939 to 1945, the Nations lost their unity so inherent in the period of the First World from 1914 to 1918. He does not mention such a phenomenon as collaborationism, but writes about "ideological traitors" who made a negative contribution to the split of their Nations. In his opinion, the number of these "ideological traitors" during the Second World War proved that "the Nation was no longer apprehended by all people as the highest value and the only principle of political organization" (*Aron, 2000: 283*). To the author's mind, the Germans, Russians and French showed it particularly brightly: "The number of ideological traitors, such as the Germans who preferred the defeat of their homeland to Hitler's victory, the Russians who fought against the regime they considered to be oppressive, even the number of those Frenchmen who wished Germany's victory being in favor of fascist ideas or having aversion to civil wars in Europe, "- show that the Nation was not really perceived as the highest value by the people in this period. Therefore, Raymond Aron raises another controversial issue in his work, namely, he asserts protection of the population from the civil wars in Europe to be one of the reasons of the emergence of collaborationism. In addition, he emphasizes, that if the Nation is split in the question of its own statehood, it "loses the ability to speak on the world stage", "the unity of the nation elite and masses is one of the determinants of its power" (*Aron, 2000: 283, 295*). That is, the power of the Nation is in the unity of the Nation. All the wars of the twentieth century, according to Raymond Aron, are of national character, because the constitutive principle of political entities is a national one. Europe ruined itself by national wars, and nations are responsible for the common ruining. "It would be useless to hope that the peoples will

simultaneously come to civilization, and to military glory. If, in the absence of a better term, we determine the historical viability as a set of qualities giving the nations a preponderance of power, no one will say that the most resourceful nations are also the most moral ones; on the contrary, there is every reason to ask, to what extent the collective viability is compatible with respect for people and to their freedoms" (Aron, 2000: 280-281, 296), - writes the researcher. But these statements, in our opinion, do not at all deny the national liberation movement, which results either in the peoples being successful or not being able to gain freedom. All the peoples have the right to establish their own state "since the day when collective consciousness begins to recognize the right of people to choose their political community, the wars become national, regardless of whether the two states claim the same province or a Nation, divided between the two traditional political entities, wants to create its own state» (Aron, 2000: 161).

Nevertheless, the success or failure of a subversive, rebel activity aimed at liberating people from the influence of both administrative and moral official authority, and integrating it into other political or military structures depends on what "spontaneous relationships are formed between the active fighting minority, and the masses of population" (Aron, 2000: 171). Sometimes this struggle is influenced negatively by patriotism and love to nation because they are the result of the transition of natural attachment to native land or native people to a political form. According to Raymond Aron's statement, such patriotism is endowed with more affective power than the "vague idea of Hellenic or European civilization" (Aron, 2000: 281).

The war between nations during the existence of mankind determined the ways in which you can change the hostile or neutral behavior of people in your favor. The French researcher determines three ways of manipulation such as intimidation, persuasion, subversion (Aron, 2000: 171). During the Second World War, they were successfully used by Nazi occupiers, the Red Army, and the Ukrainian national liberation movement in their struggle for the influence on the Ukrainian population.

As already mentioned, numerous facts are known in the history of mankind, which can be characterized as collaboration, including mass and individual cooperation with the oppressors. For example, in 491 B.C. Darius sent the ambassadors to Greece, demanding obedience from the Greek. While part of the Greek provinces recognized the power of the Persians, the Spartans and the Athenians refused and killed the Persian ambassadors. In 406 BC During the war of Sparta against Athens, the Spartans appealed for help to the Persians, enemies of the Greeks. The Persians helped the Spartans to defeat the Athenians, thus Sparta betrayed the interests of the entire Greek people for the sake of their governing. Alexander of Macedon created his huge state, conquered the peoples of Minor Asia, Egypt, India. His state was functioning due to the fact that he had given the local government the commanding authority in occupied territories. Innumerable examples of mass collaboration in the history of mankind can be set (Veche: *One Hundred Great Battles*, 1999: 10, 24-25, 32-36, 222-226).

Bright manifestations of individual collaboration can be called the behavior of the famous Greek diviner Hegesistratus from Elean who came to the Persians because of unbearable hatred to Sparta, as well as for a great reward. In 67 BC the commander of the Jewish army, Yosef ben Matityahu (Josephus Flavius) voluntarily gave himself up to the Romans, and then helped them subdue Judah; he described all these events in his book "The Jewish War", which is a valuable historical source. In 1380, the Ryazan prince Oleg went over to the Mongols only because his principdom was on the way of the conquerors, and in the autumn of 1378 his lands were already devastated by the Mongols. The princes of other

Russian lands got a clear idea of it, thus, Prince Dmitry of Moscow, who decided to go to meet the Mamay troops so that they could bypass the Ryazan principality and not provoke Prince Oleg to a armed protest against Moscow. Moreover, Prince Dmitry gave orders to the warriors, forbidding everybody even to touch any Ryazan settler (*Veche: One Hundred Great Battles, 1999: 20, 41, 83-84, 143-149*).

An analysis of the haunches of collaboration in the history of mankind makes it possible to draw some conclusions:

1. There are many examples of collaboration in the history of different peoples, when the power of enemies is recognized by the defeated in order to lessen the suffering of the population, in order not to destroy the cities, not burn down the countryside and accumulate forces for further fight.

2. There are various motives for going over to the enemy voluntarily, such as desire for a large monetary or property reward; hatred to the state in whose territory the collaborator lived; wish to save own life; hopelessness of further struggle; threat of savage reprisal or punishment of the regime for various misdeeds and misconduct.

3. There were numerous situations when a large part of the people went over to the invaders, believing in the promises of the enemy. Later turncoats faced brutal measures taken by the conquerors against the population and the collaboration was over.

4. There were frequent cases in the history of mankind when enemies turned to help in the process of internecine struggle for power in their state. We can find a lot of such examples in the history of Kievan Rus, even according to "Primary Chronicle."

5. There are examples, when the defeated, having no strength for further struggle, accepted the proposals of the winners. Occupants sometimes offered peace and friendship to stop the bloodshed. We can even observe some elements of humane attitude towards the conquered people.

6. Going over to the invaders in order to use their military force for further struggle for independence, creation of their state.

In addition, the collaborative behavior of a part of the population at different times of human existence can be explained by servility and time-serving, which "had been cultivated", from various causes, for a long time and was gradually transformed into one of the characteristic features of the mentality of a part of the people. And do not be afraid to talk about such negative features. They are inherent to one or another part of any nation, whether we want it or not. For example, as for the Ukrainians, Taras Shevchenko wrote about it. He clearly described two types of the Ukrainians, giving them vivid characteristics: one type having with state of mind taken after the Cossacks, Khmelnytsky, Mazepa, Haidamaks. And the others with the psychology of "a swine-herd" were ready to betray their mother "for a piece of rotten sausage" and could be easily intimidated and turned into slavery. T. G. Shevchenko, analyzing the history of Ukraine, came to the conclusion that the heroic state of mind is a traditional people's "philosophy of life". The problem of betrayal, apostasy, "patriotic betrayal" was of great interest for historians and writers in the nineteenth century. Thus, A. Shtur concluded after the revolutionary events of 1848 that when people lose their independence they lose their self-esteem, thus "the gate opens to every mean action". While analyzing Ukrainian history, P. Kulish also emphasizes the apostasy of the educated classes as a paradigm of Ukrainian history. He accuses the cultural strata of Ukrainian society of not having relied on rich ethnic background, gorgeous Ukrainian culture, both material and spiritual, ignoring folk traditions, not having given education to their people, and constant turning to someone else's culture, either Polish or Russian or Austrian and others. Thus, the

Ukrainian cultural leadership has deprived its people of the "national highland". Ivan Franco regarded "patriotic betrayal" as treason-treachery, betrayal-deception, false apostasy in order to win the enemy's confidence. He believed that "patriotic betrayal" is a poisonous definition for the Ukrainian people, because it undermines the nation, does not lead to qualitative regeneration at all, and, on the contrary, reduces the nation to nothing. Moreover, I. Franko identifies "patriotic betrayal" not as a means of getting partial independence, but as "national betrayal", that is, apostasy (*Rymarenko, 1995: 78-79*).

Let us try to define the concepts of "treason", "traitor" from the standpoint of the present, basing on the documents of the prewar and wartime, because collaborationism, as we have already seen, is identified with treason, apostasy. It is common knowledge that a "traitor" is a person who betrayed someone or gave something away to someone. Basing on the Criminal Code of the RSFSR (*The Criminal Code of the RSFSR, 1952: 1-128*) which acted on the eve, during the Second World War and in postwar times in the whole former USSR, we can determine what exactly was classified as treason of the Motherland. Counterrevolutionary crimes made a special part of the Criminal Code. The counterrevolutionary actions were determined as actions aimed at undermining, weakening, liquidating the power of the "workers and peasants" councils, undermining or weakening the foreign security of the USSR, as well as the main economic, political and national conquests of the proletarian revolution. In addition, these actions were recognized as counterrevolutionary if they were directed against other representatives of the working class, which are not part of the USSR, but these measures were required to observe international solidarity of the interests of workers (June 6, 1927 (Art. No. 49, p. 330)).

Motherland Betrayal, which is actions committed by citizens of the USSR to damage the military force of the USSR, its state independence or its territorial integrity, including espionage, revealing of military or state secrets, the going over to the enemy camp, escape or highjack to fly abroad is punishable by capital punishment, through shooting with confiscation of all property, or under mitigating circumstances, by deprivation of liberty, that is 10 years imprisonment with the confiscation of all property (July 20, 1934 (Art. No.30, p.173)).

The same crimes committed by military men are punishable by capital punishment through shooting with the confiscation of all property (July 20, 1934 (Art. No. 30, p.173)).

The second section of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR, adopted by the 2nd session of the Central Executive Committee on November 22, 1926, from January 1, 1927 (Art. No. 80, p. 60) is applied to the fact that citizens of the Soviet republics are liable under the laws of the RSFSR for their crimes committed on the territory of the RSFSR, as well as outside the USSR. Citizens of the Soviet Union republics were liable for the crime committed on the territory of the USSR under the criminal law.

The highest degree of punishment deterred those who could commit terrorist acts against representatives of the Soviet government or the leaders of revolutionary "workers and peasants" organizations. A term of imprisonment not shorter than 6 months was established for propaganda or agitation against the Soviet authorities, for the distribution, production, keeping of such literature. The same actions in the war time were punishable with capital punishment or imprisonment for a term of not less than three years, if there were mitigating circumstances. Therefore, we can see that those who were involved in propaganda or agitation, terrorist acts directed against the Soviet authorities, were prosecuted for the wish to divide their republic from the USSR and punished by law not only during the war, but also in peacetime, and their actions were classified as treason of the homeland.

Historical literature often confuses the concept of "state" with "fatherland". It is incompetent to identify the state, which acts as a form of organization of society as a whole with a special system of bodies and institutions, a system of rules, law, etc., with the place of birth of a person. Moreover, you cannot betray the state, if it does not exist, and in general, how can you betray your birthplace? A person could have been born in another city for various reasons, even far from the land of his people. Consequently, it is suggested that not all people fall into the category of collaborators, even if, for various reasons, they collaborated with the occupants.

In the literature, the term "collaborators" is very often referred not only to those who collaborated with the occupants on various motives, but also to those who helped them, that is, they gave hand. Moreover, two phenomena are identified such as collaboration and aiding and abetting. But the Criminal Code of the RSFSR also explains who is considered an accomplice. In accordance with it accomplices are people who contributed to the execution of the crime by their advice, instructions, provision of means and removal of barriers or concealing the perpetrator or traces of his crime.

During the war, and after the end of the Nazi occupation, a large part of the population the collaborators fell into the category of collaborationists and were sentenced by the legal bodies.

What influenced the behavior of part of population who, for various reasons, cooperated or supported the Nazi invaders during the Second World War? How do psychologists explain human behavior in general? Psychologists argue that the main components of human behavior are defined by premeditated goal which depends on the person's ability to choose freely and make decisions on his own. The person's outlook is also of fundamental importance, because it determines the direction and social value of human behavior. In a collective life, the behavior of a person depends on the nature of his interactions with the members of the groups. At the same time, a group acts as a special subject of behavior with its on purpose and motives. In group behavior, imitation, empathy, leadership, subordination of individual behavior according to group norms, emotional "infection", etc., are observed.

It is not difficult to explain the reasons for the behavior of the part of the Ukrainian population who, having suffered from Stalin terror, constant fear for their life and the lives of their close relatives, happily met the Nazi invaders as their liberators, and some part began to work with them immediately. Thus, we can see that individual behavior in extreme situations can outperform the group's rules of behavior, ignore them, and enter into contradictions with the group. Under extraordinary circumstances, when it depends on a person, what life he/she chooses, their world outlook is on the forefront and it dictates the nature of person's behavior.

Worldview is not only content, but also a means of realizing reality, the principles of life, which determine the nature of activity. There are three main types of worldview: philosophical, religious, and vital. Worldview on the living standard originates directly from living conditions. This level of world outlook, which seems to be the most widespread, because it exists in the form of a traditional notions of the world, not systematized, spontaneous, grounded on common sense, is most closely related to people engaged in physical labor, close to the earth farming. So, it is the world outlook which in extreme conditions of life tells the person the most optimal ways of further life behavior, not excluding the adaptation or even treason for the sake of saving life, which is apparently the most valuable thing that humans have.

Conclusions

Thus, we can conclude that collaborationism is a socio-economic, military-political, moral and ethical phenomenon that arises between the opposing parties both in peaceful times and during the war. It is demonstrated in collaboration with the enemy to achieve tactical, often opposing goals (*Shaikan, 2005: 403-409*). Collaborationism exists in two forms: in the form of passive cooperation, when the population voluntarily performs all orders of the occupiers; as well as in active form, when they are already actively cooperating with the occupants, taking part in the implementation of their political, economic, military activities of the enemy. The reasons for this phenomenon may be of political nature, when the collaborationists try to achieve their tactical goals in this way, and what is more, the goals of the collaborators, such as socio-economic ones: finding a job, supporting family, not starving to death; psychological ones: the desire to save life for yourself and your family often do not coincide with those of the invaders, creating the disagreement with the existing form of organization and power. As for the price to reach the aim, it depends on what general values are at the forefront of an individual what is his world outlook.

References

- Kosik, V. (1993). Ukraine and Germany in the Second World War. Paris - New York - Lviv. [in Ukrainian].*
- Raymond, A. (2000). Peace and War between Nations: Trans. from French. Kyiv: Universe. [in Ukrainian].*
- Rymarenko, Yu. I. (1995). National Development of Ukraine. Kyiv: Yurinkom. [in Ukrainian].*
- Shaikan, V. O. (2005). Collaboration on the Territory of the Reich commissariat "Ukraine" and the Military Zone during the Second World War. Kryvy Rih: AGN "Mineral". [in Ukrainian].*
- Subtelny, O. (1991). Ukraine: History. Kyiv: Ly`bid`. [in Ukrainian].*
- The Criminal Code of the RSFSR. (1952). Official text as amended on January 1, 1952. Moscow: Gosizdat "Legal Literature". [in Russian].*
- Veche. (1999). One Hundred Great Battles. Moscow: Veche. [in Russian].*