

ANASTASIA ULANOWICZ\*  
University of Florida (Gainesville, Florida, USA)

## “We are the People”: The Holodomor and North American-Ukrainian Diasporic Memory in Marsha Forchuk Skrypuch’s *Enough*

“We are the People”: The Holodomor and North American-Ukrainian Diasporic Memory in Marsha Forchuk Skrypuch’s *Enough*. Although the Holodomor — the Ukrainian famine of 1932–1933 — has played a major role in the cultural memory of Ukrainian diasporic communities in the United States and Canada, relatively few North American children’s books directly represent this traumatic historical event. One exception, however, is Marsha Forchuk Skrypuch’s and Michael Martchenko’s picture book, *Enough* (2000), which adapts a traditional Ukrainian folktale in order to introduce young readers to the historical and political circumstances in which this artificial famine occurred. By drawing on what scholar Jack Zipes has identified as the “subversive potential” of fairy tales, Skrypuch and Martchenko critique the ironies and injustices that undergirded Soviet forced collectivization and Stalinist famine policy. Additionally, they explicitly set a portion of their fairy tale adaptation in Canada in order to gesture to the role played by the Holodomor in structuring diasporic memory and identity, especially in relation to post-Independence era Ukraine.

**Keywords:** Holodomor, diaspora, fairytales, picture book, Stalin

«Мы — народ»: Голодомор и североамериканско-украинская диаспорная память в книге *Enough* Марши Форчук Скрыпуч. Несмотря на то, что Голодомор — голод в Украине 1932–1933 годов — сыграл важную роль в культурной памяти украинских диаспорных общин в Соединенных Штатах и Канаде, относительно мало североамериканских детских книг описывает это травматическое событие. Важное место в этом контексте является книга Марши Форчук Скрыпуч и Майкла Мартченко «Достаточно» (2000), которая адаптирует традиционную украинскую сказку для того, чтобы познакомить молодых читателей с историческими и политическими

---

\* **Address:** Turlington Hall 4412, Gainesville, FL 32611-7310, USA. **E-mail:** aulanow@ufl.edu.

обстоятельствами этого искусственного голода. Опираясь на то, что ученый Джек Зайпс назвал «подрывным потенциалом» сказок, Скрыпук и Мартченко критикуют иронию и несправедливость советской принудительной коллективизации и политики сталинского голода. Кроме того, они установили часть своей сказочной адаптации в Канаде, чтобы показать роль Голодомора в структурировании диаспорной памяти и самобытности, и связи последних с независимой Украиной.

**Ключевые слова:** Голодомор, диаспора, сказки, иллюстрированная книга, Сталин

On 7 November, 2015, thousands of Ukrainian Americans wearing traditional embroidered blouses congregated in downtown Washington, D.C. to observe the official unveiling of a monument to the victims of the Ukrainian famine of 1931–1933, otherwise known as the Holodomor.<sup>1</sup> The participants in this event — who made pilgrimages from such far-flung regions of the United States as Ohio, California, and Florida — first attended a rally in front of D.C.’s Union Station, where they listened to statements delivered by famine survivors, visiting Ukrainian dignitaries, and elected public officials<sup>2</sup> who each decried the Stalinist regime’s deliberate starvation of more than four million Ukrainian peasants.<sup>3</sup> At the conclusion of the rally, participants solemnly processed to the monument itself, where they lit candles

<sup>1</sup> The term Holodomor — literally, death or murder by hunger — is widely attributed to the Ukrainian author and political activist Ivan Drach. The sole attribution of this term to Drach, however (especially in the North American diaspora) is overdetermined, since it was coterminously used by Ukrainian authors such as Yevhen Malaniuk, Vasyl Barka, and Ulas Samchuk, and later deployed by author-dissidents such as Olexa Riznykiv. Indeed, the term “Holodomor” is the title of a novella by Yevhen Hutsalo, a member of the Ukrainian literary/political “Sixties” generation. Roma Franko’s translation of Hutsalo’s story is anthologized in Sonia Morris’ collection of Holodomor fiction, *A Hunger Most Cruel* (Winnipeg 2002, pp. 93–207).

<sup>2</sup> Ukrainian First Lady Maryna Poroshenko delivered a statement at the rally and in turn offered a prayer at the monument. Congressman Sander Levin, the head of a bipartisan commission that signed the memorial into law, also spoke; former President George W. Bush, who approved the memorial in 2006, sent an official statement that was read aloud at the congregation. Then-presidential candidates Jeb Bush, Hillary Clinton, Marco Rubio, and Bernie Sanders also sent official statements; notably, now-President (and then-candidate) Donald Trump apparently declined to do so.

<sup>3</sup> The exact number of victims is a continuing source of controversy amongst scholars, some of whom have maintained that the Ukrainian death toll exceeded seven million. The official number is difficult to ascertain in part because many Soviet census records during the period of the Famine were lost, destroyed, or forged to minimize the death toll; moreover, numbers vary depending on whether they are limited merely to the populace within the official borders of the Ukrainian-SSR or whether they include Ukrainians living outside these borders, for example, in the Kuban. For a precise account of the various criteria used to project Famine losses in Ukraine, see Oleh Wolowyna’s “The Famine-Genocide of 1932–33: Estimation of Losses and Demographic Impact.” Anthologized in Bohdan Klid’s and Alexander J. Motyl’s *The Holodomor Reader: A Sourcebook on the Famine of 1932–1933 in Ukraine*, Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 2012, pp. 59–64.

and offered hand-written notes before a bas-relief sculpture depicting a gradually receding field of wheat.<sup>4</sup>

In the same year, the Canada-Ukraine Foundation, in partnership with the Canadian government, sponsored a “Holodomor National Awareness Tour.” As part of this educational initiative, the foundation transformed a standard tour bus into a “mobile classroom” furnished with media technology used to display documentaries and digital presentations. Much like traveling lending-libraries popular in North America in the earlier century, this bus travelled to both cities and remote rural communities in an effort to bring nationwide attention to the artificial famine and its contemporary implications. According to a statement made by the Foundation in the 9 August 2015 issue of the diasporic newspaper, *The Ukrainian Weekly*, the ultimate purpose of the tour was to “promote understanding of the consequences of hatred and discrimination and highlight the values of freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.”<sup>5</sup>

These two memorial efforts place into relief the tremendous significance of the Holodomor in the cultural memory of North American Ukrainian diasporic communities; indeed, many of these communities are composed of famine survivors and their progeny. At the same time, however, these public interventions demonstrate how members of the North American diaspora have drawn on their collective memory of the Holodomor in order to participate actively in the civic life and democratic objectives of their national communities. To be sure, these events, and others like them<sup>6</sup> offer scholars of cultural memory rich opportunities to consider how diasporic communities negotiate their received memories of the past and their newly-founded citizenship within “host” nations.

And yet, such opportunities are equally available within the form of other (and perhaps lesser appreciated) cultural artifacts, including works of literature for young people. Indeed, the Canadian picture book, *Enough* (2000) — written by Marsha Forchuk Skrypuch and illustrated by Michael Martchenko — offers particular insight into the role of traumatic collective memory in diasporic communities. In the course of

---

<sup>4</sup> The monument was designed by the Ukrainian-American architect and sculptor Larysa Kurylas; its image of a gradually depleted field of wheat refers at once to increasingly punishing Soviet grain requisitions and to directly proportional deaths by starvation.

<sup>5</sup> “Holodomor Mobile Classroom Ready to Take the Road,” *The Ukrainian Weekly* 9 August 2015. 1, 15. According to this article, the tour bus was purchased at a significant discount from Fleetwood Transportation, a corporation that regularly employs Mennonites — a demographic that “suffered greatly” during the Holodomor.

<sup>6</sup> For example, the Ukrainian Canadian Research and Documentation Center (UCRDC) has recently created a Children of Holodomor Survivors Oral History Project, which not only archives the testimonies of children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren of Holodomor survivors, but also traces evidence of post-traumatic symptoms in successive generations. Likewise, such organizations as the Holodomor Research and Education Consortium of the Canadian Institute of the Ukrainian Studies have sponsored an annual Holodomor Lecture in Toronto: keynote speakers have included Yale historian Timothy Snyder and the internationally recognized journalist Anne Applebaum.

this narrative, which is told in the form of a fairy tale, a young girl saves her Ukrainian village from certain starvation by traveling to the Canadian prairie, where she secures only “enough” wheat her community needs to survive; her quest is contrasted by a similar journey undertaken by a Soviet soldier, whose greed leads to his literal downfall. On the one hand, the combination of Skrypuch’s nuanced prose and Martchenko’s strategically-colored illustrations offers a succinct commentary on how the Ukrainian peasantry was starved during the process of forced collectivization as well as the ways the Soviet state justified this artificial famine; ultimately, its use of the fairy tale serves as an ironic and pointed response to Stalin’s dismissal of reports of famine as mere “fairytales.” On the other hand, however, Skrypuch’s and Martchenko’s decision to set a significant portion of their fairy tale specifically in early twentieth-century Canada — rather than in a timeless and nameless magical land — places into relief particular anxieties and concerns that structure diasporic cultural memory of the Holodomor. Indeed, the author’s and illustrator’s depiction of a remote Canadian-Ukrainian farming community that bands together to aid its starving Eastern European “sister village” effectively allegorizes the process by which North Americans of Ukrainian origin drew on what sociologist Vic Satzewich has termed a “victim narrative” in order to articulate a “common cause” that at once united them, distinguished them from members of their North American “host societies,” and enhanced their affective and political relationship to their country of origin.<sup>7</sup>

In the following analysis, then, I focus closely on Skrypuch’s deployment of fairy tale conventions, as well as Martchenko’s use of visual rhetoric, in order to demonstrate how *Enough* offers a critical account of the Holodomor even as it subtly reflects on how its representation of this traumatic historical event is indicative of a particular diasporic investment in its continued commemoration. Specifically, I argue that the narrative’s use of a familiar fairy tale structure and symbolic economy not only renders a metaphoric representation of a traumatic historical event, but also implicitly proposes collective, rather than merely individual, strategies of working through such trauma.

## Context and Methodology

Certainly, the Holodomor is a topic with which even the youngest members of the North American Ukrainian diaspora are well acquainted: not only is it featured in the curricula of Ukrainian-language schools and “Saturday schools,” but it is also brought to children’s attention through museum visits, memorial performances and religious services, and community pilgrimages to historical monuments. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, that relatively few diasporic authors and illustrators have sought to depict this event within books that are expressly produced for,

---

<sup>7</sup> V. Satzewich, *The Ukrainian Diaspora*, New York 2002, p. 188.

and immediately accessible to, young children. One exception, however, might be Skrypuch’s and Martchenko’s picture book, *Enough*.<sup>8</sup> In the course of the story, set during the famine, a peasant girl named Marusia witnesses Soviet soldiers extracting all the grain from her village of Zhitya (the Ukrainian word for “life”). Their plunder is so total that only one seed remains; however, true to fairy tale form, it is a magical seed that invites the appearance of a kindly stork who promises Marusia that he can help her secure the grain she and her neighbors need to survive. Mounted on the back of the stork, Marusia flies over the recently plowed graveyards of Ukraine and across the ocean to a far-off land — implicitly coded as Canada — where she is greeted by “women and men dressed in the clothing of Ukraine” who generously offer her a portion of their abundant harvest. Since Marusia is, after all, a virtuous fairy tale heroine, she accepts only the amount she and her neighbors need; upon her return journey on the back of the stork, she and her fellow villagers hide the store in the local graveyard, where it might evade detection of surveilling soldiers. Of course, since every fairy tale hero is complemented by a morally bankrupt counterpart, one of the village’s occupying soldiers also encounters the stork and, like Marusia, rides on its back to a fabulous land of plenty. Unlike Marusia, however, the soldier is so intent upon securing more than a fair share of the stock that the weight of his bundles cause him to fall from the bird who struggles to carry him.

According to the book’s jacket introductory blurb, *Enough* is a “spirited Ukrainian folktale” — a characterization that is perhaps well-intended but nevertheless misleading. Certainly, Skrypuch’s story demonstrates the basic elements of a folktale<sup>9</sup>: for example, it features a young hero who departs from the comforts of (an often symbolically named) home in pursuit of a goal or reward; the appearance of a magical helper<sup>10</sup> who aids her on her journey as well as a villain who threatens it; and the repetition of tasks and attendant obstacles that establish structure and narrative tension. Indeed, the construction and thematic content of *Enough* closely resembles those of traditional Ukrainian folktales — for example, “The Greedy Old Woman and the Lime Tree” or “The Rich Miser”<sup>11</sup> — that reward altruism and modesty even as they punish selfishness and greed. In the final analysis, however, Skrypuch’s book

---

<sup>8</sup> M. Forchuk-Skrypuch and M. Martchenko, *Enough*, Ontario 2000. This book is not paginated. In what follows, then, I will offer detailed and contextualized accounts of its verbal and visual content that make clear its location within the greater narrative.

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, Vladimir Propp’s *Morphology of the Folktale*, originally published in 1928, which focuses on Russian (or, more generally, Slavic) folktales in order to identify 31 discrete elements or “functions” of the folktale including, for example, the hero’s initial embarkation on a journey, a struggle between the hero and the villain, and the hero’s eventual return.

<sup>10</sup> Here, it is not insignificant that the magical helper is a stork since storks regularly appear in Slavic folklore; additionally, the stork has been adopted as the national symbol of Ukraine.

<sup>11</sup> These tales are anthologized in *Ukrainian Folk Tales* (Kyiv 1981, pp. 345–347 and 351–352). Although *Enough*’s cover blurb suggests that it is originally a folktale, I have yet to discover a tale that corresponds specifically with its narrative; however, since I am not a folklorist by training, I can neither affirm nor deny its possible existence.

is ultimately not a folktale but rather a fairy tale. Whereas a folktale is, strictly speaking, an autochthonous narrative that has been orally transmitted over the course of centuries, a fairy tale is by definition a written and published narrative that, although it may adapt or embellish a pre-existing folktale or otherwise share certain morphological elements with orally-reproduced lore, nevertheless is mediated by the precise ideological and material circumstances of its production.

As the notable folklore scholar Jack Zipes argues, it is crucial that readers of fairy tales “break their magic spell” — or, in other words, resist the conventional assumption that they are timeless, universal, and therefore apolitical — in order to engage with their immanent, historically- and culturally-contingent concerns.<sup>12</sup> “Almost all critics who have studied the emergence of the literary fairy tale in Europe,” Zipes contends, “agree that educated writers purposely appropriated the oral folktale and converted it into a type of literary discourse about mores, values, and manners so that children and adults would become civilized according to the social code of that time”; in turn, he insists that originally written tales and adaptations ranging from those produced by Hans Christian Andersen to the Disney corporation, respectively, be subjected to rigorous historical and cultural analysis.<sup>13</sup> To be sure, the historicizing method that Zipes and other scholars such as Maria Tatar and Marina Warner have employed in their studies of European and Anglo-American fairy tales is particularly necessary to the analysis of a text such as *Enough*, whose author and illustrator not only explicitly allude to a specific historical event but who also implicitly draw on their subject positions as late-twentieth-century Canadians of Ukrainian heritage in order to interpret these relatively recent events and their moral and political implications through the received framework of the fairy tale.

It is equally important, moreover, to consider how the publication of Skrypuch’s and Martchenko’s fairy tale picture book generally coincided with a relatively recent and fairly voluminous production of books for young people that likewise adapt or otherwise critically repurpose fairy tales in order to address traumatic historical events — predominately, the Holocaust — that are ultimately ineffable to children and adults alike. Maurice Sendak’s picture book, *Dear Mili* (1988), for example, famously reinterprets a tale of loss and redemption originally composed by Wilhelm Grimm by inserting subtle visual allusions to Anne Frank and the children of Izieu sent to their deaths by Klaus Barbie; according to Hamida Bosmajian, Sendak’s book functions as a “palimpsest” that demonstrates his negotiation of beloved German literary and visual traditions with his second-generation memory of the Holocaust.<sup>14</sup> More recent texts such as Jane Yolen’s *Briar Rose* (1992) and

<sup>12</sup> This formulation is the thesis of Zipes’ *Breaking the Magic Spell: Radical Theories of Folk and Fairy Tales* (University of Kentucky, 1979) it also significantly informs his later studies, including *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion* (Routledge, 2006), cited below.

<sup>13</sup> Zipes, *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion*, New York 2006, p. 3.

<sup>14</sup> H. Bosmajian. “Memory and Desire in the Landscapes of Sendak’s *Dear Mili*.” *The Lion and the Unicorn* 19:2, p. 193.

Louise Murphy's *The True Story of Hansel and Gretel* (2003) simultaneously draw on and subvert fairy tale conventions in order to depict the complex historical and circumstances in which Holocaust victims, perpetrators, and bystanders were enmeshed: the former novel draws on elements of "Sleeping Beauty" to portray the resuscitation of a gassing victim of the Chelmno concentration camp, whereas the latter reimagines the Grimm Brothers' "Hansel and Gretel" from the posthumous perspective of an elderly Polish midwife who is sent to the ovens of Auschwitz for harboring a pair of Jewish orphans.

As Margarete J. Landwehr convincingly argues, fairy tale adaptations such as Yolen's and Murphy's serve as "particularly appropriate allegories" of historically traumatic events (here, specifically, the Holocaust) not only because they establish a familiar narrative structure through which young people might assimilate key elements of "historical knowledge" but also because their uses of metaphor and other forms of figurative language permit empathy and a greater "emotional understanding" of a traumatic event even as they make clear the ultimate breach between contemporary readers and historically-situated characters.<sup>15</sup> Certainly, the narrative strategies employed by *Enough* complement those used by Sendak, Yolen, Murphy, and other authors of Holocaust-themed fairy tale adaptations, not least because they attempt to resolve what Landwehr identifies as the "tension" between the historical knowledge and emotional understanding of an ultimately ineffable traumatic event. Significantly, moreover, *Enough* utilizes those strategies primarily used by children's books that represent the Holocaust in order to call to critical attention another, but lesser-known, early-twentieth-century European genocide: the Holodomor. Through its highly metaphorical treatment of what Ukrainian-Canadian famine survivor Miron Dolot has called the "hidden Holocaust,"<sup>16</sup> Skrypuch's and Martchenko's picture book in turn demonstrates how the historical knowledge and empathetic insight delivered through a fairy tale structure might inform not only the developing consciousness of individual readers but also the ethos of a larger diasporic community that lives in its wake.

<sup>15</sup> M. Landwehr, "The Fairy Tale as Allegory for the Holocaust: Representing the Unrepresentable in Yolen's *Briar Rose* and Murphy's *Hansel and Gretel*." *Fairy Tales Reimagined* 2009, p. 153.

<sup>16</sup> M. Dolot. *Execution by Hunger: The Hidden Holocaust* New York 1987. Dolot's subtitle is potentially problematic insofar as it implies a certain rivalry, as it were, between North American Ukrainian and Jewish diasporic communities regarding the degree to which the distinct historically traumatic events that continue to haunt them have been represented in popular discourse — an implicit conflict that Vic Satzewich addresses in his history of the Ukrainian diaspora, cited below. Arguably, however, Dolot's subtitle does not so much gesture toward a "competition" between representations of the Holocaust and the Ukrainian famine as it demonstrates the parallels between Nazi persecution of an ethnic/religious minority and Stalinist persecution of a class minority in such a way that places into relief the key components of twentieth-century European forms of totalitarianism.

## Subversive Uses of the Fairy Tale in Holodomor Representation

Much like Yolen's and Murphy's novels, *Enough* also judiciously inserts essential historical details into a fairytale framework in order to address the structures of injustice and cruel ironies that contributed to a specific instance of historical trauma. Indeed, the first pages of the narrative — which relate a soldier's sudden appearance on Marusia's family farm, his initial confiscation of their humble harvest, and his later return for the subsistence-level remainder — offer a brief but historically accurate account of the strategic process by which Soviet activists and state representatives targeted independent homesteads for increasingly punishing requisitions of grain, food-stuffs, and items of personal property. Moreover, the narrative intimates the reason for these progressive seizures: although Marusia and her father live in a mutually-sustaining village, they nevertheless operate an independent farm ("their farm") which, according to the decrees of "the Dictator," now belongs to "the People." Although the narrative resists using specific terminology, it should be clear to readers with even rudimentary knowledge of early Soviet history that Marusia's family have been branded as landowners ("kurkuls"/"kulaks") whose apparent resistance to join a collectivized Soviet farm ("kollhosp"/"kolkhoz")<sup>17</sup> has rendered them "enemies of the people" and thus targeted them for extreme, if not total, requisitions of food and property.

According to Robert Conquest's pioneering study of the Holodomor, *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine* (1986), the term "kurkul"/"kulak" was initially deployed in the revolutionary Leninist era to designate wealthy middle-class "counter-revolutionary" landowners who were accused of jealously guarding their private property and exploiting the wage-labor of farm-hands and seasonal workers; by 1929, Stalin decreed that the success of the on-going revolutionary project depended on "the liquidation of the kulaks as a class."<sup>18</sup> As Conquest maintains, however, the "use of the term 'kulak' had been a distortion of the truth right from the beginning of the regime"<sup>19</sup> since most individuals identified as such "were poor"<sup>20</sup>: in fact, only a "minority" of those identified as wealthy landowners possessed "three or four cows and two or three horses" and only "1% of farms employed more than one paid worker."<sup>21</sup> To this end, Skrypuch's narrative succinctly addresses the ironic and rather arbitrary designation of self-sustaining farmers as representatives of a "wealthy"

<sup>17</sup> Here, as elsewhere, I introduce the transliteration of Ukrainian terms followed by the transliteration of their Russian cognates. Although, admittedly, the latter are more recognizable to international audiences — not least because Russian was the official language of the Soviet Union — I believe it is crucial to foreground Ukrainian terms in relation to specifically Ukrainian historical contexts. Even so, I preserve Russian terms used in direct scholarly quotations.

<sup>18</sup> R. Conquest. *The Harvest of Sorrow*, New York 1986, p. 117.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118.

or otherwise “exploitative” class by stating that Marusia’s family farm is so “small” that “even in the best years they had barely enough food to survive.”

Of course, as Conquest demonstrates, the identification of certain small and moderately prosperous landowners was not entirely indiscriminate, since it preemptively eliminated “the natural leaders of the peasants against the Communist subjugation of the countryside.”<sup>22</sup> That is, it weakened, if not decapitated, localized resistance to state-imposed measures of collectivization by targeting even moderately successful peasants who defended their homesteads and in turn coercing their fellow villagers into join kolhosps. Moreover, and perhaps more crucially, the Soviet state’s designation of kurkuls as “anti-people” or “sub-human” effectively stripped small landholders of their civil rights, if not their claim to humanity, in such a way that legitimized the liquidation of their property and ultimately rationalized the seizure of their very lives.<sup>23</sup> By late 1932, such dehumanizing rhetoric was extended to the entire Ukrainian peasantry — including those farmers who had “voluntarily” joined kolhosps — as a means of targeting and literally starving off an entire ethnic population whose long-held investment in Ukrainian nationalism was suspected as a threat to the Soviet state and thus constituted it as “anti-people.”<sup>24</sup> Thus, according to historian David Marples, collectivization efforts in Ukraine were ultimately distinguished from those in other regions of the USSR, including the Don and Volga regions of Russia, insofar as they sought to “bring a republic to heel through the application of harsher punishments than were applied elsewhere.”<sup>25</sup> For this reason, the Holodomor has become widely recognized, by scholars and laypeople alike, as a genocide.<sup>26</sup>

Admittedly, claims to the Holodomor as a genocide have contributed to great scholarly and political controversy: not only have historians debated the unique status of the Ukrainian famine with respect to concurrent famines throughout the Soviet Union, but some Russians and (most recently) Russophilic Ukrainian separatists have claimed such charges as pro-Western, Russophobic propaganda.<sup>27</sup> Al-

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 119.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 120.

<sup>24</sup> D. Marples, *Holodomor: Causes of the 1932–1933 Famine in Ukraine*, Saskatoon 2009, pp. 44–45.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>26</sup> The first person to name the Holodomor a genocide was the Polish-Jewish scholar Raphael Lemkin, who in fact coined the term “genocide.” In an address given at the Ukrainian Famine commemoration in New York in 1953 — and later reprinted in the *Journal of International Criminal Justice* in 2009 and also anthologized in Bohdan Klid’s and Alexander J. Motyl’s *The Holodomor Reader* — Lemkin documented how the starvation of the peasantry was carried out alongside deportations and Ukrainian Communist Party purges in order to argue that the Famine was part of a “systematic destruction of the Ukrainian nation” intended toward “its progressive absorption within the new Soviet state” (p. 81).

<sup>27</sup> See, for example, Bohdan Klid’s and Alexander J. Motyl’s *The Holodomor Reader* (Toronto, 2012) which anthologizes and annotates the scholars’ debate. See also David Marples’ *Holodomor: Causes of the 1932–1933 Famine in Ukraine* (Saskatoon 2011) — the transcript of a 2010 Mohyla Lecture in which the historian reflects on the historians’ debate in order to demonstrate the unique characteristics of the

though *Enough*, for its part, refrains from mentioning the term “genocide” in either its textual material or its paratextual author’s note, it nevertheless insinuates that the extreme measures demanded by Stalinist-era efforts at collectivization contributed to the veritable decimation of the Ukrainian peasantry. For instance, in the passage in which Marusia’s counterpart, the greedy soldier, mounts the magical stork in search of more abundant fields of grain, Skrypuch’s verbal narrative proclaims that he “flew over empty fields and full graveyards”; Martchenko’s accompanying illustration features the uniformed soldier flying over recently dug grave mounds marked by three-pronged Orthodox crosses and decaying plants.<sup>28</sup>

If such indexical markers are not entirely sufficient in communicating the immense — and deliberately planned — death toll suffered by the Ukrainian peasantry under 1930’s-era Stalinism, a later passage in Skrypuch’s verbal narrative addresses it in more explicit terms. When, for example, Marusia arrives on her plan to hide her contraband wheat in a freshly dug grave plot where it might be least detected, she does so not only because “full graveyards” have overtaken once-abundant fields, but also because she realizes that it is the “Dictator’s wish that this land be filled with graves.” As it happens, Marusia’s plan is a success. Once the “Dictator” — who, as I will discuss in more detail below, is a clear allegorical stand-in for Stalin — visits “all that remains of Zhitya,” he is so pleased by the abundance of graves that mark the village’s “sacrifice” that he all but misses the veritable seeds of resistance that the starving peasants have stowed away in the cemetery. To this end, then, *Enough* allegorizes at once the Stalinist genocidal urge to “bury” the Ukrainian peasant minority as well as this demographic’s obstinate wish to re-emerge as the germinating “seeds” of a stronger Ukrainian cultural and national consciousness.<sup>29</sup>

Insofar as Skrypuch’s and Martchenko’s picture book gestures toward the designation of the Holodomor as a genocide, it also addresses — and arguably undermines — the Stalinist rhetoric that justified the famine’s instantiation. Its critique becomes abundantly clear in an early passage that features a succinct and pointed exchange between Marusia and the soldier who demands her family’s harvest: when

---

Famine post-1932. The political controversy the Holodomor’s designation as a genocide has become increasingly heated since President Yushchenko’s post-Orange Revolution official commemoration of the event and the rise of a pro-Russian separatist movement following Putin’s annexation of Crimea in 2014; in both instances, Ukrainian (and more generally, European) recognition of the Famine as a genocide have been decried as symptoms of pro-Western, Russophobic propaganda.

<sup>28</sup> According to historical record, most victims of the Holodomor were not granted the dignity of individual burial spots and official markers; rather, the death toll was so large in most Ukrainian villages that the dead (as well as the near-dead) were unceremoniously dumped in mass pits subsequently filled with lime. Even so, Martchenko’s illustration serves as an index of the lives lost during the artificial famine; indeed, it may even be read as an attempt to posthumously commemorate those victims whose deaths were not immediately recognized and consecrated.

<sup>29</sup> Whether or not its author and illustrator intended it as such, this concluding portion of *Enough* rhymes with the (possibly apocryphal) Meso-American proverb, “They tried to bury us: They didn’t know we were seeds.”

the soldier justifies the requisition by stating that "your wheat and your farm now belong to the People," the heroine cannily retorts, "We are the People." In both statements, the word "People" is capitalized, so as to designate not simply a generalized collective but rather a very specific and symbolic one: the People of the Soviet Union. In this way, Skrypuch's narrative exposes certain bitter ironies. According to Soviet discourse and the aesthetic works that promulgated it — for example, Oleksandr Dovzhenko's *Earth* [Земля] (1930) and Dzyga Vertov's *Three Songs About Lenin* [Три песни о Ленине] (1934) — the peasantry constituted the very heart, soul, and indeed muscle of the Soviet People.<sup>30</sup> However, as these aforementioned works also make very clear, peasants' membership within the body politic, or the proverbial People, was closely circumscribed: dependent as it was on memberships in collective farms or kolhosps, it necessarily excluded those independent farmers who had historically cultivated the proverbial "breadbasket of Europe."

Furthermore, even as the Stalinist administration made a concerted effort to retain the fertile and thus economically lucrative Ukrainian republic within the territory of a Soviet People's state, it nevertheless aimed to liquidate the very flesh-and-blood "people" who constituted this republic. Thus, Marusia's claim that she and her fellow Ukrainian villagers "are the People" dares her counterpart to expose the lie at the heart of Stalinist ideology. That is, if the soldier disagrees with Marusia's statement, then he disavows Soviet claims to the Ukrainian republic and all those who live within its territory. However, if he agrees, he tacitly acknowledges that the Soviet state's starvation measures have deliberately marginalized, if not legally excluded, an entire population with a claim to membership within the "People."

Although Skrypuch's verbal narrative absolves the soldier from responding to Marusia's riddle — perhaps because it may be better detected and solved by the reader herself — Martchenko's accompanying illustrations further intensify Skrypuch's play on the term "People" by clothing Marusia and her fellow villagers in shades of red. To be sure, the color red is characteristic of the embroidered blouses and scarves traditionally worn by rural Ukrainians: additionally, its association with blood renders it an archetypal symbol of both life and death.<sup>31</sup> And yet, when Martchenko's color palate is considered alongside Skrypuch's strategic use of "People," it takes on additional signifi-

<sup>30</sup> Dovzhenko was a Ukrainian Communist director whose film, *Earth* (Zemlya), is widely regarded as a Soviet cinematic masterpiece that rivals works produced by his rival, Sergei Eisenstein; his film celebrates the triumph of Soviet collectivized farming over village homesteads bound by cultural tradition and religion. Vertov's *Three Songs About Lenin*, for its part, extols the virtues of atheistic collectivized farming in the Caucasus even as it neglects to mention the state-sponsored coercion of traditionally nomadic and Muslim minorities.

<sup>31</sup> The front and end pages of Skrypuch's and Martchenko's picture book feature photorealistic illustrations of a florally-decorated red shawl reminiscent of those still worn by Ukrainian women at church services and other special occasions. Even as this allusion to Ukrainian folk art signifies the professed "authenticity" of the narrative contained between the front- and end-pages, its ultimate status as a facsimile calls attention to the story's mediation by a pair of early-twentieth-century artists who reflect upon Ukrainian history and culture from relatively distanced diasporic perspectives.

cance. That is, if the color red has, in the past two centuries, come to signify the ideals of communism — including the equal distribution of resources and property according to the needs of the collective — then Martchenko’s use of this iconic color suggests that the Ukrainian peasant communities who so resisted state-imposed collectivization were already adhering to an autochthonous and primitive form of communism that was ultimately disrupted by the intrusion of the state.

Indeed, one of Martchenko’s later illustrations, which depicts a group of sun-burnt villagers who band together to bury the contraband grain necessary for their future survival, implicitly challenges Soviet claims that Ukrainian peasants were solely invested in private profit and instead suggests that independent farms were connected within a larger and mutually-sustaining network that relied upon cooperation and collective action. By contrast, Martchenko’s depictions of Marusia’s nemesis, the soldier, tacitly argue that the state ideology that he represents is ultimately antithetical to communist ideals of equal distribution of material goods and the just rewards of labor. In one illustration, for example, in which the soldier first meets the magical stork, Martchenko poses the cringing and red-nosed<sup>32</sup> officer before a hut whose doors, windows, and roof are practically bursting with the golden grain he has just commandeered from Marusia’s neighbors. Although this image could certainly be dismissed as cartoonish exaggeration befitting of the hyperbolic character of the fairy tale, it may not be as removed from historical record as one might immediately suspect: in fact, Conquest maintains that “grain was piled up in the open and left to rot” at railroad junctures in such heavily-policed regions as the Poltava Province.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, a very minor visual detail in the background of this illustration — a fence encircled by barbed wire — obliquely refers to the measures that collectivization agents took to guard grain from the very laborers who harvested it; additionally, it might also be read as an allusion to quarantine measures imposed on Ukrainian villages in 1933, which simultaneously prohibited the escape of starving peasants and the delivery of life-sustaining nutritional supplies.<sup>34</sup> In any case, Martchenko’s use of visual rhetoric makes clear that, if the ideals of communism ensure that each individual is granted “enough” according to her or his needs, then such ideals were more fully realized by so-called “kurkuls” or “anti-people” than they ever were by the champions of Soviet forced collectivization.

Of course, it should be admitted that the Leninist interpretation of communism, later taken to its extreme limits by Stalin, had little regard for the primitive arrangements of collective life that structured the labor of Ukrainian peasants — or, for that matter, Russian peasants and the Kazakh nomads who were also subjected to forced collectivization, punishing grain requisitions, and consequent famine conditions. Indeed, the very purpose of Stalin’s first Five Year Plan, as implemented in 1929, was

<sup>32</sup> An allusion, perhaps, to how collectivization agents and Red Army soldiers were often paid with, and sustained by, supplies of vodka. Indeed, Martchenko subtly inserts three tiny bubbles around the soldier’s nose; according to conventional comics iconography, such marks suggest drunkenness.

<sup>33</sup> R. Conquest, *The Harvest of Sorrow*, New York 1986, p. 237.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

to transform rural enclaves into strictly regimented and technologically-advanced agricultural factories which, much like their urban industrial counterparts, might produce a yield to sustain both the Soviet domestic economy and its participation in international trade. And yet, as Skrypuch’s narrative and Martchenko’s illustrations both suggest, the measures imposed by the Soviet/Stalinist state might be considered more regressive, if not reactionary, than revolutionary. This becomes especially evident in the latter part of the narrative, when the soldier’s hero, the “Dictator,” deigns to visit Marusia’s humble village of Zhitya after learning that its peasants have “sacrifice[d] so much” that it has fulfilled his wish that “this land [Ukraine] be filled with graves.” Martchenko’s illustrations of the handle-bar-mustached “Dictator” make it very clear that this bombastic and self-assured villain is no less than Stalin himself.<sup>35</sup>

Curiously, however, Martchenko outfits the “Dictator” in the regalia of nineteenth-century Romanov tsars: he sports, for example, a military cap; a clean white coat laden with epaulettes, golden braids, and gaudy medals; a jewel-encrusted sword; and knee-high black leather boots bristling with sharp golden spurs. Initially, this image clashes with iconic images that feature Stalin within spartan gray-green military uniforms trimmed with modest but symbolic swathes of red — and certainly, it contradicts Stalin’s reputation as a Bolshevik revolutionary who contributed substantially to the overthrow of the Romanov dynasty. And yet, Martchenko’s illustrations cannily capture the ultimate evaluation of Stalin made by one of his most significant biographers, Simon Sebag-Montefiore, who argues that the autocrat “always measured himself against the Romanovs.”<sup>36</sup> Indeed, in the 1930’s — the very decade of the famine and the later purges — Stalin was said to have remarked that the “people need a tsar whom they can worship and for whom they can live and work”; to this end, he “carefully crafted his own image to create a new template of tsar, fatherly and mysterious, industrial and urban, the leader of an internationalist mission yet the monarch of the Russians.”<sup>37</sup> Certainly, this image of a “Red Tsar” is caricatured in Martchenko’s illustrations of the “Dictator,” and as such, it speaks to the suspicions of the Ukrainian peasantry: that is, that Soviet claims on Ukrainian territory were ultimately a continuation of an earlier imperial project, and that, in

<sup>35</sup> Here, Martchenko’s sly allusion to Stalin’s iconic handle-bar mustache corresponds with Maurice Sendak’s similarly mustachioed reference to Hitler in *Brundibar*, (New York 2003) the picture book he co-authored with playwright Tony Kushner in homage to the children’s opera composed by Hans Krása and subsequently performed by child inmates at the Terezin concentration camp. Significantly, both *Enough* and *Brundibar* not only repurpose popular Eastern European tales in order to critique genocidal imperial regimes, but also offer cartoonish depictions of their autocratic leaders.

<sup>36</sup> S. Sebag-Montefiore, *The Romanovs, 1613–1917*, New York, p. 653. Sebag-Montefiore is the author of *Stalin: The Court of the Red Tsar* (2004) and *Young Stalin* (2007). The above passages, however, are taken from the conclusion of his history of the Romanov dynasty, in which the author discusses the Romanov legacy with respect to the Soviet empire and, more recently, Putin’s autocratic turn.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 653.

turn, the Soviet venture of forced collectivization amounted to nothing less than the imposition of a second serfdom.<sup>38</sup>

Finally, Skrypuch's and Martchenko's caricature of Stalin is additionally subversive insofar as it deliberately casts the "Dictator" as a fairy tale villain. It is not insignificant, for example, that Stalin — the ultimate engineer of the artificial famine and the coterminous purges of both the Ukrainian intelligentsia and Communist Party — nevertheless breezily dismissed reports of mass starvation in Ukraine as mere "fairy tales." According to Conquest, when Roman Terekhov, the First Secretary of the Kharkiv Provincial Committee, "told Stalin that famine was raging, and asked for grain to be sent in,"<sup>39</sup> Stalin accused him of being a "romancer"<sup>40</sup> and proceeded to offer a blistering repartee:

We have been told that you, Comrade Terekhov, are a good speaker; it seems that you are a good storyteller, you've made up such a fable about famine, thinking to frighten us, but it won't work. Wouldn't it be better for you to leave the post of provincial committee secretary and the Ukrainian Central Committee and join the Writers' Union?

Then you can write your fables and fools will read them.<sup>41</sup>

If Stalin insisted, in bad faith, on dismissing reports of famine as "fables" — "fairy tales," according to the translation offered by the pioneering Holodomor scholar James Mace<sup>42</sup> — then Skrypuch and Martchenko ironically take him at his word by deliberately presenting their carefully-researched depiction of Famine history<sup>43</sup> within the form of a fairy tale. Thus, by precisely deploying a literary form that Stalin equated with the propagation of lies, it exposes his own penchant for dissembling and fabrication. Furthermore, by casting Stalin into the role of a pompous and utterly laughable fairy tale villain, Skrypuch and Martchenko mock him by inserting him into an unenviable position within the very narrative form he so scorned. To this end, then, *Enough* demonstrates what Zipes identifies as the subversive potential of folk and fairy tales, insofar as it imaginatively inverts conventionally accepted historical narratives and the relations of power they uphold and, in so doing, invites its audience to respond to them from a new and potentially radical perspective.

<sup>38</sup> V. Satzewich, op. cit., p. 180.

<sup>39</sup> R. Conquest, op. cit., p. 324.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 240.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., pp. 324–325.

<sup>42</sup> J.E. Mace, "The Man-Made Famine in Soviet Ukraine: What Happened and Why," *The Ukrainian Weekly* 16 January, 1983, <http://ukrweekly.com/uwwp/the-man-made-famine-of-1933-in-soviet-ukraine-what-happened-and-why/5/> (access: 6.10.2017).

<sup>43</sup> The frontispiece of *Enough* cites some of the author's and illustrator's credible sources — Conquest's *The Harvest of Sorrow*, Andrew Gregorovich's *Black Famine in Ukraine 1932–1933: A Struggle for Existence*, and the documentary film, *Harvest of Despair* — and encourages readers to access them in turn.

## Holodomor Memory in the Diasporic "New World"

Although *Enough* certainly demonstrates its producers' extensive research of, and critical engagement with, the history of the Holodomor, it is important to consider it in relation to the historical and socio-political context in which it was produced: after all, the book was published in early twenty-first century Canada, and both Skrypuch and Martchenko<sup>44</sup> are Canadians of Ukrainian origin. To be sure, the pair do not make any effort to obscure their Canadian identities. In fact, they incorporate the nation of their birth into the very fabric of their tale by transporting their heroine to a fecund place of salvation that uncannily resembles the Canadian prairie. When, in the course of Skrypuch's narrative adaptation, Marusia hops onto the back of the magical stork to search for grain abroad, she flies "over a great ocean and farther on to a new world" — a tacit reference to the trans-Atlantic "New World" of North America purportedly discovered by fifteenth-century European explorers. Lest this allusion to the northern continent be lost on readers, Skrypuch's subsequent lines succinctly capture the changing social geography of Canada from the "birds-eye view" of one flying westward from the seaboard provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to the populous and lake-pocked provinces of Quebec and Ontario and further to the prairies of Manitoba and Saskatchewan: Marusia marvels "as cities changed to forests and lakes" until she finally descends into an "endless prairie dotted with patches of dust and wheat." Thus, just as Skrypuch's narrative and Martchenko's accompanying illustrations establish the first scenes of the fairy tale specifically in famine-era eastern Ukraine, so too do they make clear that the later scenes occur within an easily-recognizable socio-geographic space: the midwestern Canadian provinces historically farmed by Ukrainian settlers. It is here, in the prairie country that uncannily resembles the eastern Ukrainian steppe, that Marusia is waved down by "women and men dressed in the clothing of Ukraine" who greet her as kin and profess their willingness to share their harvest.

Crucially, Martchenko's accompanying illustrations offer a rather accurate portrayal of the expansiveness of Canadian farmlands — whose immensity may still be grasped by contemporary airline passengers — even as they suggest a certain fairy tale-like fecundity. For instance, one particularly striking image contained within the narrative (and reproduced on the book's cover) features Marusia perched upon the massive winging stork as she gazes down upon diminutive Canadian farmers clad in a curious combination of Ukrainian embroidered blouses and American-style denim overalls; unlike their emaciated Eastern counterparts, these plump and smiling villagers merrily haul great heaps of wheat from golden and squarely-regimented fields that recede into the edges of the page. Thus, the illustration suggests that in

<sup>44</sup> Martchenko's contribution to *Enough* is doubly significant: not only is he a Canadian of Ukrainian origin, but he is also best known for his illustrations of Robert Munsch's *The Paper Bag Princess* (1980), a picture book that self-reflexively comments on fairy tale conventions and their ideological implications.

the “new world” of Canada — unlike the ostensibly “old world” of Soviet Ukraine — farmers not only have “enough” to sustain themselves, but also are so free from want or outside intimidation that they might gladly flag down and assist a hungry stranger.

Initially, this part of Skrypuch’s narrative, as well as Martchenko’s accompanying illustrations, may be read as an attempt to promulgate Western-style democratic capitalism as an alternative to the failed utopian ideals of Soviet-style communism. Moreover, and perhaps more crucially, it suggests that diasporic North American communities were fully prepared, and able, to assist their Eastern European brethren during the height of the Ukrainian famine. These interpretations, however, are not entirely convincing. First, although Ukrainian immigrants undoubtedly harvested the expansive Canadian prairies, and although they certainly did not starve for their efforts, they nevertheless failed to reap the benefits of capitalist utopian promises. Indeed, as Vic Satzewich demonstrates in his history of the North American Ukrainian diaspora, Ukrainian agricultural laborers in late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century Canada were not only regarded as racialized “others” by Anglo-Canadians and exploited as such by the landowners they served, but they were also subjected to disenfranchisement and legal detainment during the First World War and continued to suffer from ethnic discrimination in its aftermath.<sup>45</sup> Indeed, Skrypuch alludes to such injustices when one of Marusia’s Canadian hosts proclaims that “Times are hard, but we are happy to share.”

Moreover, although members of the North American diaspora were surely aware of the forced starvation of Ukrainian peasants, they were nevertheless fairly powerless in interceding on behalf of their European brethren, not least because strenuous denials of the famine issued by such celebrated journalists as the *New York Times* correspondent Walter Duranty ensured the official recognition of the Soviet Union by Western nations such as the U.S.<sup>46</sup> Thus, *Enough* might well be suspected in engaging in fairy-tale-like wish fulfillment, not only because it posits Ukrainian settlements as utopian communities but also because it imagines them as the saviors they were incapable of being, despite their best inclinations, during the Famine era.

Of course, *Enough* never pretends to be anything more than an exercise in wish-fulfillment: after all, it explicitly adapts fairy tale conventions and, as such, introduces the clearly fabulous story of a talking stork sprung from a magical grain of wheat who saves a single starving village. To this end, then, one might exert a certain degree of caution before extracting an overly literal or simplistic interpretation of the text. Surely, the picture book *does* represent members of the North American diaspora as friendly cousins, as it were, of native Ukrainians — and just as surely, it posits the diaspora as responsible to fellow Ukrainians suffering under a totalitarian regime.

<sup>45</sup> V. Satzewich, op. cit., p. 38.

<sup>46</sup> Walter Duranty was a *New York Times* reporter who not only strenuously denied the existence of famine in his Pulitzer Prize-winning correspondences from Soviet Ukraine, but who also played a significant role in the U.S.’s official recognition of the U.S.S.R. See S.J. Taylor, *Stalin’s Apologist: Walter Duranty: The New York Time’s Man in Moscow*, Oxford 1990.

However, its depiction of friendly Ukrainian-Canadian farmers who band together to assist Marusia and her village in her time of need might be read more broadly as an allegory of the ways in which Ukrainian communities in North America consolidated a cultural and political identity in response to the Holodomor. According to Satzewich, pre-World-War Ukrainian communities in the United States and Canada were substantially fractured by ethno-political conflicts; for example, they were separated by religious affiliation (Orthodox versus Ukrainian Catholic), political sympathies (nationalism versus socialism) and degrees of cultural and linguistic fluency.<sup>47</sup> In fact, as Satzewich demonstrates, many Ukrainian immigrants to North America did not even explicitly identify as Ukrainian, not least because Ukraine itself did not declare territorial statehood until 1918; thus, some Ukrainian Catholics (“Greek Catholics”) were misidentified as “Greeks,” while those who proclaimed themselves “Rusyn” (or descendants of the kingdom of Rus’) were misnamed “Russians.”<sup>48</sup> It was only at a moment of crisis, after diasporic Ukrainians of multiple backgrounds and affiliations began to receive news of a great famine that affected their variously-imagined but geographically-specific common homeland, that they began to forge a common identity. According to Satzewich, in “Durkheimian terms, the development of a sense of victimization is an important part of diaspora consciousness because it may help to solidify group boundaries. Victim narratives, along with ethnic leaders’ cultivation of a sense of unease within host societies, brings people together around a common cause and supplies some of the glue that sustains community identity and life.”<sup>49</sup>

Indeed, it is not insignificant that the English-language diasporic newspaper published expressly for youth readers, *The Ukrainian Weekly*, was founded in 1933 at the very height of the famine: according to the paper’s editors, the need for young people of Ukrainian descent to engage in informed activism on behalf of “occupied and oppressed” Ukrainians ultimately outweighed their responsibility to remain fluent in their elders’ native tongue.<sup>50</sup> To this end, news of the famine not only bonded together a previously scattered (or, to wit, a truly “diasporic”) community, but also inaugurated a successive set of generations committed to deploying the civic rights granted to them in their new North American homelands in order to redress the injustices suffered by their Eastern European brethren. In the decades following the Holodomor, for example, North Americans of Ukrainian descent played a major role in bringing Soviet crimes to global attention; sending aid to orphans and other victims of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster of 1986; lobbying for international recognition of the newly sovereign Ukrainian state in 1991; and, most recently, supporting their Ukrainian brethren during the Orange Revolution of 2004 and the Maidan protests of 2014.

---

<sup>47</sup> V. Satzewich, op. cit., p. 70.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., pp. 41–42.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 188.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. 119.

Notably, Skrypuch allegorizes the relationship between the North American diaspora and their Ukrainian “cousins” not only through her depiction of Marusia’s “new world” helpers, but also within her preceding author’s note. After briefly introducing the historical context in which her story is set, Skrypuch notes the significance of the wheat with which Marusia is gifted:

The wheat that Marusia gathered in Canada originated in Ukraine. David Fife, an Ontario farmer, obtained a handful of wheat from Scotland in 1842. This wheat had been taken from a ship unloading grain from Ukraine. When Fife planted it, he realized that it sprouted ten days earlier than others. This advantage transformed the Canadian Prairies from grasslands to wheat fields. This wheat was named “Red Fife” and has been called “the first Ukrainian immigrant to Canada.”

As Skrypuch intimates, her account of the “Red Fife” strain of wheat is a story of immigration and (literal) transplantation — and as such, it celebrates a mutually beneficial relationship between Ukrainians and Canadians. That is, it suggests that Ukrainians — here represented by the wheat that historically sustained steppe-dwellers — not only blossomed and thrived in their new North American home, but that they radically transformed the Canadian geographical (and by extension, socio-political) landscape. Moreover, Skrypuch implies that if they were able to do so, this was in part because the Canadian soil was especially conducive to their growth. Skrypuch further alludes to why Canada has so sustained Ukrainian “transplants” by accounting for the wheat’s transnational migration and importation via Scotland: its exchange by, and sustenance of, people of various national and cultural origins suggests Canada’s official commitment to fostering a multicultural “mosaic” in which diasporic communities might actively sustain their languages, religions, and cultural mores even as they mutually engage in the civic life of the larger secular nation-state.

Skrypuch’s foreword, however, is not simply a homage to Canada and its mutually sustaining relationship with its particularly vibrant Ukrainian communities. Rather, it is just as much an allegory of the relationship between the North American diaspora and contemporary Ukraine. It is not insignificant, for example, that Skrypuch’s statement begins by referring to Marusia’s transportation of wheat back to her country of origin — and, in fact, to the very steppes where this grain was originally cultivated and sown. In this way, the foreword insinuates that migration need not be unidirectional but rather multidirectional. Indeed, especially since Ukraine’s declaration of independence in 1991, North American diasporic communities have made a concerted effort to organize exchange programs, create sister academic programs and mutual business ventures, and sponsor émigrés moving both east and west. To be sure, the North Americans of Ukrainian descent who return to Ukraine, whether temporarily or permanently, are in many ways substantially different from their eastern “cousins”: like grain that has been cross-fertilized and sown in foreign soil, they are, in effect, a hybrid demographic.<sup>51</sup> And yet, as Skrypuch’s narrative suggests, such

<sup>51</sup> The concept of hybridity is, of course, central to post-colonial theory and diaspora studies; it was initially used by Homi K. Bhaba to address the new cultural identities and forms emerging from

new “strains” might be grafted with pre-existing ones in order to give further life — *zhitya* — to a long-threatened national and cultural community.

Furthermore, as Skrypuch’s narrative also insinuates, such life-giving and mutually-sustaining solidarity emerges within, and is constructed by, moments of historical crisis — whether it be the Holodomor and its lasting memory or by more recent post-colonial struggles for democracy and economic transparency. To be sure, the hope that *Enough* expresses is idealistic and, as such, overlooks the cultural and political complexities that characterize the on-going relationship between Ukrainians and the North American diaspora: indeed, it may well be charged with delivering fairy-tale-like wish-fulfilment. And yet, as Zipes reminds us, fairy tales, emerging as they do from very real material and ideological conditions, offer utopian visions of justice that might either be disregarded or actively pursued.

## Conclusion

Ultimately, then, an analysis of *Enough* places into relief the significant role played by children’s literature in offering complex and nuanced representations of traumatic historical events such as the Holodomor. Moreover, it serves as an intriguing case study of how the collective memory of such an event is substantially mediated by the particular historical and cultural moment in which it is given expression — here, specifically, the late-twentieth-century Canadian-Ukrainian diaspora. If *Enough* is especially effective in its address of the Holodomor and its diasporic memory, however, this is because it does so within the economy of the fairy tale. First, Skrypuch’s and Martchenko’s text makes possible the delicate balance between historical knowledge and emotional understanding that Landwehr identifies as so necessary to readers’ engagement with traumatic historical events. Its use of a familiar narrative structure that depends significantly on repetition, for instance, allows for the employment and reiteration of crucial historical facts such as grain seizures and acts of physical and psychological intimidation, if not terror. Likewise, its metaphorical language and juxtaposition of a sympathetic heroine and a greedy villain not only allegorizes the major conflict between Ukrainian peasants and the totalitarian Soviet state but also offers an affective investment in such a conflict. By featuring a heroine who, true to fairy tale form, is developed only broadly enough to demonstrate only a few familiar and culturally esteemed character traits and desires — here, a commitment to moderation and an investment in personal and collective survival — *Enough* invites readers from various backgrounds to identify with Marusia and thus to imagine the fear and anxiety experienced by the early twentieth-century Ukrainian peasantry she represents. And yet, precisely because the story so self-consciously employs such a minimally developed

---

imperial projects, (forced) migration, and globalization. See H. Bhaba, *The Location of Culture*, New York 1994.

and clearly fictional character whose allegorical referents may only be imagined, it reminds the contemporary reader of her/his critical distance from the Holodomor and thus forecloses her/his temptation to over-identify with or otherwise appropriate the experiences of actual famine victims and survivors.<sup>52</sup>

Insofar as *Enough* draws on the fairytale to communicate historical knowledge and permit an (albeit critically distanced) emotional investment in a historical trauma, it also demonstrates what scholars such as Zipes and María Jesús Martínez-Alfaro have identified as the “radical” and “subversive” potential of fairy tales. Reminding his readers that the term “radical” literally means “getting to the root of things,” Zipes argues that the recognition of the immanent material and socio-political conditions in which a fairy tale was composed in turn makes possible the specific ideological investments and interventions of a given tale.<sup>53</sup> Drawing on Zipes, Martínez-Alfaro in turn argues that contemporary texts that self-consciously repurpose fairytales in order to address moments of historical trauma productively “complicate the reader’s response to the text owing to the fluidity of movement between registers of history and fantasy”; such “complication,” she maintains, does not at all deny the “evil that shattered the lives of millions of innocents” but rather makes “more real what may seem less so at the remove of several decades.”<sup>54</sup>

Certainly, the cognitive dissonance achieved by *Enough*’s own “subversive” play with the “registers of history and fantasy” enhances its critique of Stalin’s contention that reports of widespread famine in Ukraine were mere “fairytales.” That is, by deliberately using the fairytale form to render “more real” — or otherwise more immediate — actual, lived experiences of the Holodomor, this book ironically challenges not only Stalin’s infamous denial but also its erroneous equivalence of fairytales and ahistorical wish-fulfillment. Sadly, its intervention is still a much-needed one, not least because Soviet apologists and neo-Russian-imperialists alike continue to deny the ultimate reality of the Holodomor: indeed, in a particular instance of historical irony, the much-lauded Soviet dissident Alexander Solzhenitsyn has recently echoed Stalin’s contention that testimonies to the Ukrainian famine amount to a mere “fairy tale.”<sup>55</sup>

<sup>52</sup> The tendency to over-identify with, or otherwise overlook a certain ethical distance from, trauma survivors and victims, is one that has been often addressed by Holocaust scholars such as Dori Laub and Dominick LaCapra. Indeed, Martínez-Alfaro (cited below) references both of these scholars when she contends that Yolen’s and Murphy’s fairy tale representations of the Holocaust are constructed in such a way that reminds contemporary readers of their historical and cultural distance from protagonists with whom they are positioned to sympathize.

<sup>53</sup> J. Zipes, *Breaking the Magic Spell*, p. x.

<sup>54</sup> M.J. Martínez, “Rewriting the Fairy Tale in Louise Murphy’s and Lisa Goldstein’s Holocaust Narratives” 2016, p. 66.

<sup>55</sup> In an opinion piece published by the Toronto *Globe and Mail* on 31 May, 2008, Solzhenitsyn does not deny that a famine plagued the entire Soviet Union during the early 1930’s, but nevertheless contends that interpretations of the famine in Ukraine as a genocide are the result of “spiteful, chauvinistic, anti-Russian minds.” Solzhenitsyn in turn addresses the “parliaments of the world” by stating

If Skrypuch's and Martchenko's use of the fairy tale form to depict the Holodomor is especially significant, however, this may be because it not only offers readers a complex and nuanced representation of historical trauma but also because it affords them the opportunity to work through such trauma. Since the publication of Bruno Bettelheim's *The Uses of Enchantment* in 1976, scholars of folklore and children's literature alike have observed the ways that fairytales uniquely address the psychological needs of trauma survivors and subsequent generations alike. Landwehr, for example, contends that fairytale plots repurposed within literary depictions of historical trauma feature themes of "self-transformation" and "redemption" in ways that "give meaning to suffering and hope to those in despair."<sup>56</sup> In her slightly more circumspect reading of historically-themed fairytale renditions, Martínez-Alfaro not only reiterates Zipes' contention that fairytales "conquer [...] concrete terrors through metaphors"<sup>57</sup> but also maintains that certain contemporary renditions strategically employ narrative gaps and ambiguities that prompt readers to wrestle with the unresolved — or ultimately insolvable — legacies of major twentieth-century historical events. Certainly, *Enough* serves as an effective case study of these claims, not least because it simultaneously addresses child readers and their adult guardians. On the one hand, its fortuitous conclusion allays or otherwise strategically manages the fears experienced by young people for whom this is the first exposure to a traumatic, if not genocidal, historical event. On the other hand, however, its allegorical representation of how the news, and later memory, of the Holodomor consolidated and mobilized a literally scattered (or "diasporic") community that is still nevertheless troubled by the event's contemporary reverberations beckons readers with a more sophisticated historical sensibility to consider their ethical and political relationship to the past.

Significantly, *Enough* invites not only individual but also *collective* negotiations of the "concrete terrors" produced by the still-echoing memory of the famine. Insofar as the latter half of the picture book features an entire Canadian farming village that comes to the aid of Marusia and her Ukrainian community — rather than, say, a single noble individual — it suggests that the most productive responses to traumatic events such as the Holodomor are those undertaken by organized collectives who recognize not only the imperative to preserve these events within eternal memory ("*vichnaya pamyat*") but also the necessity of addressing their contemporary legacies. To be sure, this was the impulse that made possible the assembly of thousands of diasporic Ukrainians at the consecration of the Holodomor Memorial in Washington, DC in 2015; as their many placards suggested, the participants in this gathering were invested not simply in memorializing the famine but also in calling the American public to extend further support to Ukrainians (including, notably, descendants of Holodomor victims) recently threatened by Russian neo-imperialism.

---

that this "vicious defamation is easy to insinuate into Western minds. They have never understood our history: You can sell them any old fairy tale, even one as mindless as this."

<sup>56</sup> M. Landwehr, op. cit., p. 166.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 66.

Likewise, the kind of collective “working through” of trauma implied by the metaphorical logic of Skrypuch’s and Martchenko’s fairy tale is demonstrated by the Canadian Holodomor Awareness bus-tour, which has been quite literally driven by diasporic Ukrainians’ belief that the memory of an early-twentieth century genocide might “promote understanding of the consequences of hatred and injustice” within an increasingly globalized world. If *Enough* is a particularly powerful text, then, it is because it beckons young North American readers — both within and beyond the Ukrainian diaspora — to respond collectively and critically to the memory and continued reverberations of the past with the alacrity of Marusia and her Canadian cousins. In this way, it reimagines “the People” as those organized collectives who draw on their memory of the past in order to redress the injustices of the present.

## Bibliography

- Bhaba, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Bosmajian, Hamida. “Memory and desire in the landscapes of Sendak’s *Dear Mili*.” *The Lion and the Unicorn* 19.2 (1995): 186–210.
- Conquest, Robert. 1986. *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dolot, Miron. 1987. *Execution by Hunger: The Hidden Holocaust*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Earth* [Земля]. Directed by Oleksandr Dovzhenko. Kharkiv, 1930.
- “Holodomor Mobile Classroom Ready to Take the Road.” *The Ukrainian Weekly* 9 Aug. 2015: 1, 15.
- Hunt, Peter. “Aftermath of a Famine.” *Washington Post* 27 April 2008, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/04/26/AR2008042602039.html>.
- Hutsalo, Yevhen. 2002. “Holodomor: Murder by starvation.” Trans. Roma Frako. In *A Hunger Most Cruel* Ed. Sonia Morris. Winnipeg: Language Lantern Publications: 93–207.
- Landwehr, Margerete J. “The fairy tale as allegory for the Holocaust: Representing the unrepresentable in Yolen’s *Briar Rose* and Murphy’s *Hansel and Gretel*.” In *Fairy Tales Reimagined*. Ed. Susan Redington Bobby. 2009. Jefferson: McFarland: 153–167.
- Lemkin, Raphael. 2012. “Soviet genocide in Ukraine.” In *The Holodomor Reader: A Sourcebook on the Famine of 1932–1933 in Ukraine*. Eds. Bohdan Klid and Motyl, Alexander J. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press: 79–81.
- Klid, Bohdan and Motyl, Alexander J. 2012. *The Holodomor Reader: A Sourcebook on the Famine of 1932–1933 in Ukraine*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Mace, James E. “The man-made famine in Soviet Ukraine: What happened and why.” *The Ukrainian Weekly* 16 January, 1983, <http://www.ukrweekly.com/uwwp/the-man-made-famine-of-1933-in-soviet-ukraine-what-happened-and-why/5/>.
- Marples, David. 2011. *Holodomor: Causes of the 1932–1933 Famine in Ukraine*. Saskatoon: Heritage Press.
- Martínez-Alfaro, María Jesús. 2016. “Rewriting the fairy tale in Louise Murphy’s and Lisa Goldstein’s Holocaust narratives.” *European Journal of English Studies* 201: 64–82.
- Motyl, Alexander J. 2013. *Sweet Snow*. Cervena Barba Press.
- Munsch, Robert. 1980. *The Paper Bag Princess*. Illus. Michael Martchenko. Toronto Annick Press.
- Murphy, Louise. 2003. *The True Story of Hansel and Gretel: A Novel of War and Survival*. New York: Penguin.
- Propp, Vladimir. 2015. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Eastford: Martino.

- Satzewich, Vic. 2012. *The Ukrainian Diaspora*. New York: Routledge.
- Sebag-Montefiore, Simon. 2004. *Stalin: The Court of the Red Tsar*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sebag-Montefiore, Simon. 2007. *Young Stalin*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sebag-Montefiore, Simon. 2016. *The Romanovs, 1613–1918*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sendak, Maurice and Tony Kushner. 2013. *Brundibar*. New York: Hyperion.
- Skrypuch, Marsha Forchuk. 2000. *Enough*. Illus. Michael Martchenko. Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry & Whiteside Limited.
- Solzhenitsyn, Alexander. “The Ukrainian famine was not a genocide.” *Toronto Globe and Mail* 31 May, 2008, <https://beta.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/the-ukrainian-famine-was-not-a-genocide/article720047/?ref=http://www.theglobeandmail.com&>.
- Taylor, S.J. 1990. *Stalin’s Apologist: Walter Duranty: The New York Times’ Man in Moscow*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Three Songs About Lenin* [Три песни о Ленине]. Directed by Dzyga Vertov (1934) Moscow, Mezhrabpomfilm.
- Ukrainian Folk Tales*. Ed. and Trans. Irina Zheleznova. Kyiv Dnipro Publishers, 1981.
- Wolowyna, Oleh. 2012. “The famine-genocide of 1932–1933: Estimation of losses and demographic impact.” In *The Holodomor Reader: A Sourcebook on the Famine of 1932–1933 in Ukraine*. Ed. Klid, Bohdan and Motyl, Alexander J. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies: 59–64.
- Yolen, Jane. 1992. *Briar Rose*. New York: Tor Books.
- Zipes, Jack. 2002. *Breaking the Magic Spell: Radical Theories of Folk & Fairy Tales*. Revised and expanded edition. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Zipes, Jack. 2006. *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion*. New York: Routledge.

Accepted for publication: 10.10.2017