This year has so far been incredibly exhilarating for Carpatho-Rusyns. The present issue of the *Carpatho-Rusyn American* describes some of the people and events, both in the religious and secular worlds, which have attracted international attention to Rusyns. Two such instances merit special note. The canonization of Archpriest Alexis G. Toth by the Orthodox Church in America (OCA) and the establishment of the Andy Warhol Museum in Pittsburgh. The affirmation of Toth’s sainthood provided the opportunity for the OCA to acknowledge its largely Rusyn, rather than Russian, ethnic foundations—and it has done so. The numerous local and national publications covering the opening of the Pittsburgh museum have by and large succeeded in “canonizing” for the larger American public Warhol’s Carpatho-Rusyn roots and their influence on his revolutionary creativity. And while Toth and Warhol themselves may seem worlds apart, there are significant parallels worth exploring.

Once Toth and Warhol determined the paths they were to take, they threw themselves into their tasks. These paths led them away from their original homelands. Toth left Europe for the unknown reaches of the New World and to Minnesota, in particular, and Warhol left his hometown Pittsburgh for the heady and competitive world of New York City. They moved yet further from their places of origin. Toth left the Greek Catholic Church, the denomination in which he had grown up and in which he had built a fine reputation and career. As an artist, Warhol also chose to strike out on a new path and became the leading figure in the development of American Pop Art, an art which speaks to the pains and promises of this century.

Both Toth and Warhol were leaders whose life and work has had an influence on hundreds of thousands of people. Moving along their chosen paths, they became figures of veneration. Toth spoke to the hearts of many and brought them, as he felt, closer to the proper expression of their spirit as Rusyns in the Christian faith. Warhol already had an enormous worldwide following in his lifetime, and through his art—exhibited especially in the Warhol Museum of Modern Art in Medzilaborce, Slovakia and in the new Andy Warhol Museum in Pittsburgh—he will continue to speak to many, offering us an opportunity to feel more acutely the pulse of our fast-paced modern age.

Toth and Warhol could not have achieved what they did without hard work. For Toth, this meant hours of study, difficult negotiations, exhausting travel, writing, interacting with parishioners, celebrating lengthy divine services. As for Warhol, the notion that he led a profligate life in New York has now been shown to be a false myth. He worked diligently perfecting his art, experimenting with new methods and media, producing prodigiously. He was neither a sex-driven hedonist nor a drug user. He was a steady worker (and observer of all forms of life), he attended church regularly, and he brought his aging mother to live with him in New York City where for twenty years he cared for her as a traditional Rusyn son ought to do. His well-known flamboyance and seeming love of show were divorced from his true personality and were simply a part of his professional career as a creator and propagator of modern art.

In their own ways, Toth and Warhol were influenced by their Rusyn ethnic heritage. Toth grew up in the European homeland, steeped in Rusyn culture, versed in Carpathian plainchant, icons, ecclesiastical traditions and customs. He was a genuine father to his Rusyn people. Warhol grew up in a Rusyn immigrant atmosphere, and at the same time he was a young American boy. His Rusyn legacy penetrated his life in different ways. It is known, for instance, that he found his mother’s *pysanky* artistically fascinating, beautiful, and judged them to be extraordinarily valuable.

Even more to the point, though, is the assessment that biographers and art critics make of some of Warhol’s most famous work—those images of celebrities such as Marilyn Monroe and of other phenomena inextricably linked with American popular culture, such as Campbell Soup cans. These are “icons of popular culture,” they say, remarkably reminiscent of those “supercharged holy images, passive and stylized” which Warhol contemplated on the icon screen whenever he attended services at his home parish throughout his youth, St. John Chrysostom Byzantine Catholic Church in Pittsburgh’s Rusyn Valley. Warhol’s “icons” of twentieth-century celebrities are also infused with a high power. Is this enormously popular segment of his work a kind of twentieth-century Pop Art translation of an ancient and venerated Eastern Christian tradition?

Finally, in considering the points of contact between the figures of Alexis Toth and Andy Warhol, we might again turn to them as men who have drawn the attention of the world to Rusyns. One need only consult recent publications on the Toth canonization and the establishment of Pittsburgh’s Warhol museum to see how accurately and informatively the subject of Carpatho-Rusyns is discussed. An article in the journal of the Orthodox Church in America’s Diocese of Eastern Pennsylvania, *Alive in Christ*, refers to Toth’s Carpatho-Rusyns as a people without a nation, a small Slavic people, almost “anonymous . . . against the wide tapestry of this land,” struggling to define their identity. In the same journal, the Reverend Sergei Glagolev stands in awe of Toth and his Rusyn people: “You may be non-Slavonic or purely an ‘American’ even as I am historically ‘Great Russian.’” But let me make this perfectly clear: neither the ‘Americans’ nor the ‘Great Russians’ have brought us into our present-day promise. Rather, it was this remarkable ‘little’ man of no report who led these remarkable ‘little’ peoples into a return to Orthodoxy that is the basis of our mission and ministry in the Americas into the next century. ‘Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.’”

The opening of Pittsburgh’s Warhol Museum was also accompanied by numerous articles on Warhol, again, remarkably accurate in their rendering of his ethnic background. The longest piece was in the *Washington Post* (May 15, 1994). It describes Warhol’s Rusyn origins, his life in Pittsburgh’s Rusyn Valley, and stresses that he was Rusyn, not Russian, adding that Rusyns come from the Carpathian foothills and speak their own Slavic language. Writing in the *Washington Post*, Bob Colacello, friend and author of one of the most comprehensive biographies of the artist, notes that Warhol’s people were “Ruthenians, Carpatho-Rusyns, Eastern Rite Catholics. They weren’t even ‘Hunkies’ or ‘Polacks’,” Colacello insists. “Andy,” he says, “was an outsider among outsiders.”

Like Alexis Toth, a courageous priest ministering to his immigrant Rusyns in a land in which they were the proverbial outsiders, or “little” people, so too Andy Warhol, a son of Rusyn immigrants, spoke to the needs and creative imagination of his parents’ adopted land. They represent two poles, the sacred and the secular, but they are also linked in subtle ways through roots that are deep in the fertile legacy of their people.

**OUR FRONT COVER**

St. Aleksander Nevskij Orthodox cathedral church in Prešov, 1949
MARIA GULOVICH LIU

On May 26, 1946, by special order of United States President Harry Truman, Maria Gulovich Liu became the first woman in American history to be honored for heroism by a Corp of Cadets in full dress parade at West Point Academy. Present to pin the Bronze Star medal on her shoulder was General William Donovan, Director of the Office of Strategic Services. Also there to commend her was General Maxwell Taylor and other dignitaries. A week later, Maria was the honored guest at the home of Eleanor Roosevelt, former First Lady of the United States.

Maria Gulovich was born in 1921 in Litmanova, a small Carpatho-Rusyn village in northeastern Slovakia. At the age of four, her family moved to Jakubiany where her father Edmund Gulovich, a Greek Catholic priest, was transferred. Like Litmanova, Jakubiany was typical of many Rusyn villages in that area of farming, wood cutting, and with no paved roads or electricity. The Reverend Gulovich was born in the old Austro-Hungarian Empire and educated in the Greek Catholic secondary school (gymnasium) and theological seminary in Prešov as well as at the University of Budapest. After World War I, when Hungary was ruled briefly in 1919 by a Communist regime that persecuted the church, Gulovich tried to go to Austria. Denied entry to that country, he returned to Prešov which by then was part of the new state of Czechoslovakia. One year later he married Anastasia Zima and was assigned to the parish in Litmanová.

Anastasia Zima was the daughter of a Greek Catholic priest and, like her husband, was born in the Rusyn homeland of the pre-World War I Austro-Hungarian Empire. Anastasia was well educated, graduating from the Teacher’s College in Užhorod in 1919. She never used her teaching skills, however, because of her early marriage and the subsequent birth of six daughters, of whom Maria was the eldest. Both Maria’s parents were erudite. Her father knew ancient Greek and Latin, while her mother excelled in French and German. They encouraged Maria’s natural talent for languages, and other than her native Rusyn the young girl eventually mastered six languages: Slovak, Czech, Hungarian, German, Russian, and English.

Maria was educated in elementary schools in Stara L’ubovňa and Jakubiany before enrolling in the Greek Catholic convent school for girls in Prešov. She also spent a year with an aunt in Vienna perfecting her German. Later, at the Rusyn Greek Catholic Teachers College in Prešov she studied Slovak, Russian, and German as second languages but favored history and creative arts. Despite this varied linguistic and cultural background, Rusyn was always the language spoken in the home, and the Gulovich family never acknowledged being other than Carpatho-Rusyns. After graduation from Teacher’s College in 1940, she taught in an elementary school in the Rusyn village of Jarabina before being transferred to a school near Zvolen in western Slovakia.

From her father, Maria acquired a love of freedom and justice. It was a commitment to such values that led her to join the underground during the anti-Nazi Slovak Uprising of 1944. While still a teacher, she was recruited to be a courier for the Slovak underground and later by an American intelligence mission operating in Slovakia. At the time, Slovakia was an ally of Hitler’s Germany. Maria saved the lives of four of the men and helped rescue Allied airmen downed in enemy territory. It was for those acts that she was honored after the war at West Point Academy with the Bronze Star.

But those honors do not in themselves tell us about the intense suffering Maria and her family endured because of their courageous stance against political oppressors. She was wanted by both the German Gestapo and the Soviet secret police at the time she fled her homeland in 1945. Eluding both, and with the help of Allen Dulles, then head of the European branch of the Office of Strategic Services (the forerunner of the CIA), she was expatriated to the United States. Maria was not to see her family again until 1970.

During that quarter century of separation, her father, the supervisor of fourteen parishes besides his own, was imprisoned by the postwar Communist rulers of Czechoslovakia for refusing to permit his priests and parishes to be used as political tools and convert to Orthodoxy. He was sentenced to two years in a hard labor camp, and then exiled to Bohemia where he worked as a stoker in a furnace. Meanwhile, in the United States, Maria graduated from Vassar College in 1947 and went on to a career in advertising and educational films.

In 1951, she left her career to marry Eugene Peck, an attorney and war veteran. Three years later, the couple moved to California in an effort to alleviate by living in a warmer climate the severe after-effects of frostbite that Maria had suffered during her work with the wartime OSS mission. They had two children: Edmund, who operates his own satellite high-tech firm in Massachusetts; and Lynn, a veterinarian doing research in Florida. Five years after her divorce from Peck in 1976, Maria married Hans Liu.

Today Maria Gulovich Liu is employed as realtor and, as an avocation, works with an organization collecting books to be sent to Czechoslovakia. Sonya Jason, an American writer of Carpatho-Rusyn background, has just completed a book about Maria Gulovich’s life. Entitled The Crimson Rose: Heroine of the Dawes Mission, the book is expected to be published next year.

Sonya Jason
Woodland Hills, California
POVERTY, DIVERSITY, AND CONFLICT: SOME REMARKS ON SUBCARPATHIAN JEWRY

The Hasidic Mukachevo Rabbi Chaim Eleazar Spira was clearly wearing his heart upon his sleeve when he called his Zionist opponent Chaim Kugel, the head of the Hebrew gymnasium of that city, "a rebellious son who forsakes the way of the Torah," and vilified him later as a "traitor to one's country." For Rabbi Spira, Zionists were "heretics." For their part, the Zionists called Spira power-hungry, corrupt, and incompetent. After World War I, the Jewish community of Subcarpathian Rus' was more divided than ever before. The changes in the geographical, political, economic, cultural, and spiritual situation during the interwar years strained relations most especially between different communities within Subcarpathian Jewry, and to a lesser degree between Jews and Rusyns.

Jewish settlement in Subcarpathian Rus' dates back to the fifteenth century, although it was during the eighteenth century that large numbers of Jews crossed the Carpathian mountains and settled in the northeastern part of the Kingdom of Hungary, including Subcarpathian Rus'. Most of them originated from Galicia, where over-population, political unrest, and military conflicts made living conditions difficult. Civil war and revolts also caused material and human losses in Subcarpathian Rus' until 1711, after which the region was able to absorb larger numbers of newcomers. According to the 1787 census 6,311 Jews inhabited the Hungarian counties of Ung, Bereg, Ugocsa, and Maramaros. In the first half of the nineteenth century immigration from Galicia took place on a massive scale. This was the result of the loss of traditional Jewish autonomy and extreme poverty. Continuing immigration and high birthrates led to an enormous population growth: in 1910 the Jewish communities of the above-mentioned four Hungarian counties contained 128,791 people.

The Jewish immigrants soon got used to their new surroundings—not in the least because the region was also populated by Rusyns, whose way of living was familiar to the Jews, since Rusyns also inhabited the southern parts of Galicia. Following the Austrian-Hungarian Ausgleich of 1867, Jews were afforded equal legal status to their Christian neighbors. Although this formal emancipation in the Habsburg monarchy eased the life of the Jews, they were denied the corporate status as a nationality. Instead, they were recognized by its windows, which are larger than those of non-Jews. They are mostly made from wood, containing a front room (or entrance-hall) and a living room. The living room serves at the same time as a kitchen, bedroom, dining room, etc. A Jewish house in a village can be recognized by its windows, which are larger than those of other houses. In addition, Jewish houses are adjacent to each other. Characteristically, the center of every village is inhabited by Jews, while non-Jews live on the edge of the village. It is rare to find a solitary Jewish settlement. A Jewish family counts an average of 7 or 8 souls, but families with 10 to 12 members are not uncommon.

Although the majority of Jews lived in rural areas, the most important cities of Subcarpathian Rus' also counted large Jewish communities (up to 48 percent). The 1921 census, which is elaborately discussed in Selbstwehr, also offers data concerning the professional structure of the Subcarpathian Jews:
Agriculture, forestry and fishery 26.9%
Artisan and manufacturing industry 23.6%
Business and finance 26.4%
Transport 3.9%
Public service and free professions 5.2%
Army 0.2%
Housekeeping, no (mention of) profession 13.7%

The census further differentiated social groups within Subcarpathian Jewry. About 70,000 were self-employed and about 18,000 were laborers. Looked at another way, 75 percent of all Subcarpathian Jews were dependent on the work of the remaining 25 percent.

Since about 26 percent of Jews lived from agriculture. Subcarpathian Rus' had the largest percentage of Jewish peasantry in all of Europe. In the 1920s, a small group of Jewish large landowners profited from Czechoslovakia's agricultural reforms, although the economic dislocations of the interwar period caused widespread hunger, especially in the mountainous areas. Conditions were a little better in the Subcarpathian cities and provincial towns. In Mukachevo and Slatina, the new rich could be found. Nonetheless, a great part of the self-employed Jewish artisans were unable to share in the opportunities offered by the improvements in municipal infrastructure. Small workshops were not in a position to compete with the mass-produced industrial products from the more developed Czech provinces of Bohemia and Moravia. Jews also had new economic rivals in a rising Rusyn middle class of shopkeepers and merchants, who were encouraged by the Czechoslovak authorities to form cooperatives. Another factor aggravated the situation: the improvement of the Subcarpathian school system created a new layer of educated Rusyns, who competed with the Jews for government and civil service positions. As a result of these developments, relations between Rusyns and Jews became more strained in the 1920s.

The world economic depression only worsened conditions, especially in the agricultural sphere. In 1932, Selbstwehr stated that "this winter tens of thousands of Jews in Ruthenia suffer from hunger," and although the masses of Rusyns shared their fate, a familiar scapegoat entered the scene. In 1935, a Jewish member of the Czechoslovak parliament from Subcarpathian Rus', Chaim Kugel, protested "against any attempt to blame the poverty of the Subcarpathian peasantry on the Jews."

Illustrative of the change of climate was an accusation in 1930 against two Jews, who were accused of wounding and bleeding Rusyn children for ritual purposes. The affair was widely covered in Czechoslovak press organs. It was not until January 1932, however, when the economic crisis was at its height, that the Zionist weekly, Selbstwehr, reported the rise of a real state of pogrom in the region of Velkyj Berezyj, where the Jews, according to the 1921 census, comprised only about 7 percent of the population. The existing social tension was in part related to rumors that Jews were trying to bribe the judges to cover up the affair. Nonetheless, the Selbstwehr did not report any lootings or physical attacks. In the end, the accused Jews were acquitted because of lack of evidence. Although other kinds of anti-Jewish denunciations were reported in the 1920s and 1930s, such as a widely reported blood-libel affair in 1924 and accusations of Jews exploiting Rusyn peasants by selling them alcohol at exorbitant prices, the conditions for Jews in Subcarpathian Rus' were in no way as difficult as in neighboring countries of eastern Europe like Hungary, where state-supported anti-Semitism seemed to be the norm.

In interwar Czechoslovakia, the rights of ethnic minorities were recognized by the state and each person could express openly his or her national affiliation. It soon became clear that Jewish national consciousness among the Orthodox and Hasidic Jews of Subcarpathian Rus' had firmly struck root. In the 1921 and 1930 censuses, 87 and 93 percent respectively of all Subcarpathian Jews considered themselves to be Jews by nationality. It was, therefore, the least assimilated, Yiddish-speaking group which formed the nucleus of nationally-conscious Jews within Czechoslovakia. The political party which propagated Jewish nationalism was, however, to become the source of bitter conflict in Czechoslovakia's most eastern province. These were the Zionists.

After World War I, Zionism formed a new challenge for Subcarpathian Jewry. Czechoslovakia's Jewish Party, founded in 1919 by Zionists from Prague, was the only party that not only propagated the Jewish right of self-determination in Palestine, but also tried to represent the interests of all Jews throughout the new country. Initially, the party functioned more or less as an umbrella organization for all kinds of Jewish groups. By the end of the 1920s the party came to be identified exclusively with Zionism. This process culminated in 1931, when the Jewish Party of Czechoslovakia (Židovska strana Československa) was officially established. In January 1932, the party's first district convention took place in Subcarpathian Rus'. The party was most adamantly opposed, however, by the Hasidic Rabbi of Mukachevo, Chaim Eleazar Spira. He abhorred any kind of secular influence on Subcarpathia's Jewry, in part because of religious conviction, and in part because it undermined his own position of authority in the region. In his resistance against the Jewish party, Rabbi Spira cooperated with the Czechoslovak Agrarian party and urged the Jews to vote for it. His efforts were in general not successful.

In the 1924 elections in Subcarpathian Rus', the Jews were unable to unite, and instead two parties competed with each other: the Zionist Jewish People's party and the Orthodox Jewish Democratic party headed by magyarized Jews. The Zionist party garnered more votes, but neither received enough for a seat in parliament. Even though the Jewish party succeeded in uniting all Jewish political forces in the country during the 1925 elections, it was not until 1929 that it finally obtained two seats in parliament. This achievement was repeated in 1935, when in combination with other parties, the Jews of Subcarpathian Rus' got two deputies elected to the Czechoslovak parliament, one of whom was Chaim Kugel.

It seems paradoxical that a Zionist Jewish party was able to gather so many votes in an otherwise Orthodox and Hasidic setting, as was Subcarpathian Rus'. According to Ezra Mendelsohn, the explanation in part was that many Orthodox Jews who were not "too friendly to secular Jewish nationalism, voted for the Jewish Party because they believed in the need for a strong Jewish political organization devoted to protecting general Jewish interests in the new state." In that sense, the Subcarpathian Jews supported something of a dual leadership: a secular-national leadership that represented them in parliament and a traditional religious leadership that dominated the local religious community. Nevertheless, Zionism did gain ground in Subcarpathian Rus', especially among the youth, and this was something Rabbi Spira found hard to bear.

With the recognition of the Jews as a national minority in Czechoslovakia, they were entitled to all kinds of state-
sponsored cultural facilities in regions where they formed more than 20 percent of the population. This was the case in several of Subcarpathia’s cities. The Czechoslovak authorities did not always fulfill their constitutional obligations, a phenomenon all too familiar to the Rusyns, who were denied the autonomy promised to the province. Despite discontent with Czechoslovak rule among both Jews and Rusyns, this did not lead them into political cooperation. On the contrary, whereas the Rusyns distanced themselves more and more from the central authorities in Prague, the Jews tried to improve their situation by demonstrating even greater loyalty to the state. This divergence in political attitudes was deepened by educational developments.

The incorporation of Subcarpathian Rus’ into the Czechoslovak Republic led to enormous improvements in the educational system. New public as well as Christian and Jewish parochial primary schools were set up which were freely accessable to every child. There were separate schools or classes in the Rusyn, Hungarian, and Czech languages. Children from magarized Jewish families attended Hungarian schools. As for the majority of Subcarpathia’s Jews, many at first sent their children to the Rusyn schools, especially because they were familiar with Rusyn language, customs, and habits. Before long, however, the central authorities in Prague tried to change this situation. The Czechoslovak government, dominated during the interwar years by the Agrarian party, set up many Czech schools in Subcarpathian Rus’ not only for the children of Czech officials sent to the province, but also as a means to attract local Jews to support the state and the party. From the point of view of the state, this policy proved successful. By the 1930s, a large proportion of the increased number of Czech schools was attended by Jewish pupils. This development was not particularly appreciated by the Rusyn majority, nor for that matter by Subcarpathia’s Zionists.

In the view of the Zionists, Subcarpathia’s primary schools were characterized by too much Orthodoxy and too little modernism. In response, the Zionists set up their own Hebrew primary and secondary school system, which was recognized but not financed by the state and thus dependent on private donations. Among the more famous institutions was the Hebrew gymnasium in Mukachevo, under the direction of Chaim Kugel and, not surprisingly, famed by Rabbi Spira. Nevertheless, Subcarpathian Rus’ was the only region in Czechoslovakia where Hebrew schools could be found, and therefore the province became the most important breeding-ground for Zionism in Czechoslovakia. Thus, on the eve of World War II, the Jewish community of Subcarpathian Rus’ was more heterogeneous than ever before, with divergent and convergent interests and loyalties resulting in a tangle of conflicts. However strong these conflicts were, they took place within a democratic political context.

The situation changed drastically after the international political crisis set in motion by the Munich Pact of September 1938. Less than two months later, on November 2, 1938, Subcarpathian Rus’, which in the meantime was renamed Carpatho-Ukraine, lost 12 percent of its territory to Hungary. This included about 25,000 mostly urban magarized Jews. Complete annexation of the remainder of the province came in March 1939. In Hungary, Subcarpathian Rus’ was called simply Carpathia (Kárpátalja). Within this new political configuration, a number of anti-Jewish laws were passed that endangered the Subcarpathian Jewish community. Those laws were only the first stages of the Holocaust, carried out later by the Hungarian authorities.

After the German occupation of Hungary in March 1944, the Final Solution was implemented. As a result, about 80 percent of Subcarpathian Jewry perished. The remaining 20 percent who survived the camps did not return to what after the war became the Transcarpathian oblast of the Soviet Ukraine. Instead, they tried to start a new life elsewhere, most especially in the United States and Israel, taking their memories with them.

Harm Ramkema
Utrecht, The Netherlands

HISTORICAL SOCIETY
ESTABLISHING RUSYN DISPLAY

The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania is looking to the region’s Carpatho-Rusyn community to help it develop a display on Carpatho-Rusyn American life in the early twentieth century. Working in conjunction with the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, the Historical Society is trying to amass information and items about Carpatho-Rusyn life in western Pennsylvania before World War I.

The Historical Society is in the process of renovating its newly acquired Pittsburgh Regional History Center in Pittsburgh’s Strip District, traditionally a rich ethnic cultural and economic area. The Center will feature a core display outlining the history of western Pennsylvania and will open to the public in 1996. A part of that core display will be an immigrant courtyard patterned after the distinctive rowhouses of Homestead, Pennsylvania, in 1910. One of the features of the immigrant courtyard will be the setting for the funeral of a young Carpatho-Rusyn immigrant, held at that time in the home.

"The display is three-dimensional and experiential," said Anizia Karmazyn, the Historical Society’s curator working on the development of the display. "We want to help people understand what life, and even the experience of death, was like for the immigrant community at that time."

To create the display, a wide variety of items is needed. Among those items the Historical Society is seeking are authentic icons, other religious artifacts, and everyday items Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants would have brought from Europe and placed in their homes. By providing such materials as furniture, candle holders, prayer books (especially Father Aleksander Duchnový’s Chilb Dusy), and other items used by Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants, families can help add insight into the detail of turn-of-the-century immigrant life, particularly the preservation of ethnic culture in the new setting. "This is a unique opportunity for a family to share its past and ensure that its legacy will enrich the lives of future generations," said Karmazyn.

In addition, the Society is seeking to locate any old photographs of Carpatho-Rusyn funerals from around 1910 and any poems or letters Rusyn immigrants would have written about their experience in America. "It is important to note that if individuals have such items but don’t want to give them up, we can borrow them to make duplicates or copies and return the originals to the owners," Karmazyn explained.
Finally, members of the Historical Society staff would like to conduct oral history interviews with Carpatho-Rusyn immigrants or their children who lived in Homestead in 1910 or thereafter, particularly those who lived in Homestead’s Ward Two between McClure Street and City Farm Lane near the Carnegie Steel Company.

“We are pleased to assist the Historical Society in developing this display,” said John Righetti, communications officer for the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center. “The display will help to demonstrate the significant role Carpatho-Rusyns played in the history of western Pennsylvania and in the building of America. We hope the Carpatho-Rusyn community will come forward and support this effort by donating or loaning items and sharing their experiences.”

If you have an item to donate or loan, or would be willing to share an oral history, particularly if your family came from the Zemplyn or Sarys counties of former Austria-Hungary, or if you grew up in Homestead, please contact Anizia Karmazyn at the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania at (412) 281-2465 or John Righetti, Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center Communications Office, at (412) 625-9149.

CARPATHO-RUSYN CULTURAL SOCIETY FOUNDED

Overcoming religious differences which have long divided them, Carpatho-Rusyn Americans have founded a new cultural organization in Pittsburgh to serve the greater tri-state area and beyond. The Carpatho-Rusyn Society is a non-profit organization with the purpose of preserving and celebrating Carpatho-Rusyn culture. Its first meeting was held on Sunday, April 17, at the University of Pittsburgh and was attended by more than 85 people. Guest speaker for the event was Paul Robert Magocsi, president of the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center and executive director of the Multicultural History Society of Ontario, Canada. Magocsi spoke about the state of Carpatho-Rusyn culture in Europe and America. Visiting dignitaries and cultural activists on hand for the initial meeting included Olena Duc-Fajfer, Lemko Rusyn poet and representative of the Lemko Rusyn cultural organization of Poland (Stovarysynja Lemkiv) and Lawrence Goga, president of the Rusin Association of Minnesota.

As stated by the chair of the society’s planning group, John Righetti, the goal of the Carpatho-Rusyn Society (C-RS) is to create an organization that unites Carpatho-Rusyns culturally. “At the turn of the century almost one half of the entire Carpatho-Rusyn population immigrated to the United States for economic opportunity,” Righetti notes. “The largest settlement is western Pennsylvania/eastern Ohio, where more than 100,000 people are of Carpatho-Rusyn heritage. More than 700,000 Americans are of Carpatho-Rusyn background. We have seen a growing interest on the part of Carpatho-Rusyn Americans in this area to pull resources together to manifest effectively our culture. All are welcome to join and participate with us in the celebration of our heritage. In fact, membership in the C-RS is not limited to those of Carpatho-Rusyn background, but is open to anyone who recognizes Carpatho-Rusyns as a distinct ethnic group and wishes to explore and enjoy the culture.”

The society’s planning group, comprised of young Carpatho-Rusyn Americans of varying religious and professional backgrounds, has been planning the organization for more than a year. In October 1993, an initial meeting was held among Carpatho-Rusyn cultural enthusiasts at the University of Pittsburgh to ascertain community interest. More than 40 people attended with an additional 20 expressing an interest in involvement. Individuals came from as far as Pennsylvania cities Butler, Windber, and Johnstown, as well as Cleveland, Ohio and Fairmont, West Virginia. Since the initial meeting, members have joined from Johnson City, New York, eastern Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., and the Carolinas.

The creation of the society was motivated by many Carpatho-Rusyns in this region who have made recent trips to the Carpathian Region of Eastern Europe since the fall of Communism. “Many of us who have travelled to the homeland have marvelled at the fact that Carpatho-Rusyn organizations such as this one have developed all over Eastern Europe. Today active Carpatho-Rusyn cultural organizations with thousands of members exist in Slovakia, Transcarpathia, Poland, Hungary, and the former Yugoslavia,” another founder observed. “Many of these groups now sponsor their own theater groups, performing ensembles, publications, and schools. This is a fantastic achievement, considering that the Carpatho-Rusyns do not have a politically independent state of their own. We have been inspired by their example and now we hope to become the Rusyn community organization devoted to fostering Rusyn cultural life at the grassroots level in America.”

Meetings will be held every other month and a newsletter will be issued. The group will also participate in various cultural projects to assure the manifestation of Rusyn culture in America. The society already co-sponsored the Rusyn cultural display at the Pittsburgh Folk Festival on Memorial Day weekend this year. Along with the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, the Carpatho-Rusyn Society will take part in the establishment of a permanent Carpatho-Rusyn cultural display organized by the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania. (See HISTORICAL SOCIETY on page 6 in this issue.) The society is also studying the possibility of holding informational sessions on genealogy, offering classes to learn the Rusyn language, and organizing Rusyn educational and cultural trips to the European homeland.

For more information on the Carpatho-Rusyn Society or to secure a membership form, contact Richard Custer at (412) 682-2869 or John Righetti at (412) 625-9149. Or write to the Carpatho-Rusyn Society, 125 Westland Road, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15217.

A Forum on Carpatho-Rusyn Heritage

THE CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN
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CARPATHO-RUSYN AMERICAN
SAINT CANONIZED

The following reports on the canonization of St. Alexis were submitted by two correspondents for the C-RA. The first is by Nicholas Ressetar, who describes the ceremony itself, and the second is by Richard Custer, who helped set up and staff an educational and cultural display on Carpatho-Rusyns at the pilgrimage to the monastery where the canonization took place. — Editor

A native son of the Prešov Region, the Reverend Alexis G. Toth (1853-1909), was canonized a saint by the Orthodox Church in America in ceremonies held on May 27-30, 1994, at the Orthodox Monastery of St. Tikhon of Zadonsk in South Canaan, Pennsylvania. On a glorious sunny and breezy Sunday afternoon, the outdoor vigil service commenced in front of the monastery bell tower following the procession in which the wooden casket carrying the remains of the new saint was borne. Metropolitan Theodosius of the Orthodox Church in America opened the service by reading the official proclamation of sainthood in which Father Toth's accomplishments were recited.

Among the bishops participating were Archbishop Nicholas of Prešov, Slovakia, who brought a newly written icon of St. Alexis, and Bishop Nicholas of the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese of Johnstown, Pennsylvania. The congregation of approximately 1500 included Carpatho-Rusyn American parishioners from the saint's two American parishes, St. Mary's in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Holy Resurrection in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. The new saint will be known formally as St. Alexis of Wilkes-Barre, Confessor and Defender of Orthodoxy in America.

For nearly three hours, hymns, songs, and verses honoring Father Toth were both sung and chanted by the male choir. There is no special canonization service in the Orthodox Church. Instead, a festive vigil and a Divine Liturgy are celebrated in which the new saint's troparion and kondakion (special hymns relating to the saint or the feastday) and other songs are used for the first time. This public confession recognizing an individual's sainthood is, in itself, the canonization or glorification.

The liturgical highlight of the vigil was the procession around the monastery church with Father Toth's body, borne by his fellow priests on their shoulders, followed by the faithful. At each of the church's four corners, special prayers were read. After being returned to the bell tower, the casket was opened and a small wooden reliquary, handcarved and decorated in traditional Carpatho-Rusyn style, was removed. The assembly venerated St. Alexis' relics and was anointed with blessed oil.

Early the next morning, Memorial Day, some 10,000 pilgrims gathered for the annual monastery pilgrimage. Father Alexis' coffin was carried out of the main church by the ten bishops participating and was accompanied by over forty priests. Singing the Paschal troparion, the procession wound its way through the monastery grounds to the pavilion where the Divine Liturgy was celebrated. A sixty-voice mixed choir and a twenty-voice male choir led the congregation in singing the responses and hymns, several sung according to the melodies of Carpathian chant. The casket was placed in the midst of the church surrounded by the clergy and people.

At the Small Entrance—the point during which the Gospels are carried into the altar through the Royal Doors to the accompaniment of the Beatiudes—verses in St. Alexis'

Icon of the newly canonized St. Alexis

honor were sung. At the same time, his wooden coffin was once more lifted up and carried into the altar, around the holy table, and placed before the icon screen where it remained, open, for the duration of the service. Metropolitan Theodosius' sermon pointed to Father Alexis' life as a supreme example of Christian devotion. The congregation together then sang the troparion for St. Alexis in Carpathian plainchant, Tone 4:

O righteous Father Alexis,
Our heavenly intercessor and teacher,
Divine adornment of the Church of Christ!
Entreat the Master of All
To strengthen the Orthodox Faith in America,
To grant peace to the world
And to our souls great mercy.

Nicholas Ressetar
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

During the weekend of May 27-30, 1994, the Orthodox Church in America continued to commemorate the bicentennial of Orthodoxy in America as it celebrated the sainthood of the Archpriest Alexis Toth. The canonization took place during the 90th Annual Pilgrimage to the Orthodox Monastery of St. Tikhon in South Canaan, Pennsylvania. The accent on the Carpatho-Rusyn heritage of St. Alexis was enhanced by the presence of representatives of the Carpatho-Rusyn Society based in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, who sponsored an educational display about the Carpatho-Rusyn cultural and spiritual heritage of St. Alexis and the Carpatho-Rusyn people.

That so many faithful in the Orthodox Church in America still consider themselves Russian, albeit "Low Russian," may be beginning to change. Dozens of pilgrims at the
monastery were attracted by the images that our display presented—the Lemko-style churches, brightly colored pysanky, photographs of traditional Rusyn folk weddings. They acknowledge that these, rather than Russian items, are the elements of their own ethnic culture. The photo of one particular Lemko wedding play celebrated years ago by parishioners of St. Michael’s Church in Old Forge, Pennsylvania, which had all the participants’ names listed at the bottom, attracted special attention. So many people, either from Old Forge or with roots there, viewed this photo and recognized parents and other family members. And it was not the senior citizens, but the middle-aged and younger generations who came flocking to the display to view the photos and for information on Father Alexis’ ethnic identity.

Many converts to Orthodoxy who had never heard of Carpatho-Rusyns were quite surprised to know that a majority of the pilgrims present at the monastery were of Carpatho-Rusyn heritage. Others asked clarification on the differences between Russians and Carpatho-Rusyns, and appreciated the map provided which showed the location of the Rusyn homeland today. Yet others knew they were of Rusyn background and were thrilled to find out about the new Carpatho-Rusyn Society. Our display table stayed constantly busy with excited conversations throughout the pilgrimage as people came by to explore and discover their ethnic identity. How fitting this was! Father Alexis was proud of his Carpatho-Rusyn heritage and we hope he would have been proud of us as well.

Richard Custer
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

ANDY WARHOL MUSEUM OPENS IN PITTSBURGH

The weekend of May 13-15, 1994, witnessed the grand opening of the new Andy Warhol Museum in Pittsburgh. The events began with a $300-a-plate black-tie dinner and reception on May 13, followed by a $125-a-plate informal reception and buffet on May 14. On Sunday, May 15, the museum held a family street fair celebrating Warhol’s Pittsburgh roots and Carpatho-Rusyn heritage. The Slavjane Rusyn Folk Ensemble of McKees Rocks, Pennsylvania, performed Rusyn dances at the event, and tours were conducted of important locations in Warhol’s life, including the Rusyn Valley section of Pittsburgh and its St. John Chrysostom Byzantine Catholic Church where Warhol was baptized.

Pittsburgh organizations and media gave due recognition to Warhol’s Carpatho-Rusyn heritage during the events. Both Pittsburgh Sunday papers, the Post Gazette and Tribune Review, as well as national and international publications, ran articles about Warhol which identified him as a Carpatho-Rusyn American and addressed the role his heritage played in his art. Slippery Rock University in Butler County, Pennsylvania, placed full page ads in Pittsburgh’s city magazine and daily business paper talking about Warhol’s Rusyn heritage and the Warhol family’s support of arts exchange programs with students from Slovakia. Even Pittsburgh’s leading television station, KDCA-TV, covered the family street fair and declared that the Slavjane Carpatho-Rusyn Ensemble was there in celebration of Warhol’s ethnic background. An impressive plaque in the museum’s entrance also clearly describes Warhol’s Rusyn roots and discusses his Eastern Christian and Carpatho-Rusyn heritage as having an influence on his art.

The museum building, which consists of seven floors of art and artifacts from Warhol’s vast collection, is a renovated and expanded industrial structure reminiscent of Warhol’s own famous Manhattan art studio, the Factory. The collection includes about 900 paintings, 77 sculptures and collaborative works, 1500 drawings, more than 500 published and unique prints, over 400 black-and-white photographs, and Warhol’s own photographs. All the material has been contributed to the museum by The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc., and the Dia Center for the Arts.

Each floor presents a particular theme or period in Warhol’s life and work. The entire third floor of the museum for instance, is devoted to a display of his pre-New York life. Materials here include memorabilia of all sorts, among which are his baptismal certificate and photographs of his Rusyn relatives in Europe. All of this is part of an Archives Study Center on Warhol’s life, background, and art. Included in the archival center are Warhol’s working and source materials—photographs, newspapers, and magazines; 608 “time capsules” which are dated collections of materials from Warhol’s daily life; the complete issues of Warhol’s Interview magazine; videotapes, audiotapes, diaries, and correspondence. The museum also houses a film theater and a studio where art classes are offered to young people.

The Andy Warhol Museum is located at 117 Sandusky Street on the North Side of Pittsburgh, a short walk across the 7th Street Bridge from downtown Pittsburgh. For information call (412) 237-8300.
AN INTERVIEW WITH ARCHBISHOP NICHOLAS OF PREŞOV

Archbishop Nicholas Kocur of the Prešov Orthodox Diocese in Slovakia recently was in the United States for the canonization of the Reverend Alexis Toth, a native son of the Prešov Region. He travelled with the Reverend Imrich Belejkanic, a member of the faculty at the Orthodox Theological Seminary in Prešov. Both Archbishop Nicholas and Father Belejkanic were thrilled about being in America and having the opportunity to witness the canonization of Toth, who made possible not only the return to Orthodoxy and having the opportunity to witness the canonization of the Reverend Alexis Toth, a native son of the Prešov Region.

As for the situation of the Orthodox and Greek Catholic churches in Slovakia, according to both men, there are still serious issues to be resolved. "We have basically given the church buildings to the Greek Catholics where they have been requested," explained the archbishop. "But not all have been returned. In those villages where 98% or more of the population is Orthodox, the churches have remained Orthodox. This accounts for 18 parishes." The government, however, has a "98% rule." In some villages where there is a small Greek Catholic population, perhaps 5-10%, the Orthodox church building must still be given over to the Greek Catholic population, even though 90% or more of the population is Orthodox, according to the archbishop.

"In some villages," he notes, "we have been told to turn the church over, and we ask 'over to whom?' The Greek Catholic population is so small there. In other villages the churches have been closed entirely because there were too few Greek Catholics to use them. We have spoken to the Greek Catholic hierarchy and asked if we could buy these churches from them so that our people still have somewhere to worship and meet, but we have been told that that would be impossible. We were instructed that we should speak with the Roman Catholic Church authorities concerning this and so we took up the issue with a cardinal visiting Prešov, but he also indicated that this would be out of the question."

Recently, the Greek Catholic Church has asked that the Orthodox now turn over 23 rectories as well. Archbishop Nicholas explained that the Orthodox Church will do this as long as housing for the Orthodox priest is found within the same village so that his parish's needs can still be met.

The Orthodox Church is responding to the situation, according to Father Belejkanic, by building new churches in the Rusyn villages where they are needed. Last year 11 new churches were constructed and another 42 are under construction currently. The Church also plans to build its own rectories in the future. "This is a difficult process for our people," Father Belejkanic added. "There is very little money, so the people build the churches themselves."

In some areas, however, other tensions still exist. There are some villages where the majority Greek Catholic population protests the building of an Orthodox church for the minority Orthodox faithful. Sometimes, Father Belejkanic notes, "the protests receive local government support. In the village of Telgart for three years we have sought but cannot get permission to build a new church. The local officials said to us that before the 1950s all Orthodox were Greek Catholics, and that we should just all go back to the Greek Catholic Church." This attitude has been the subject of talks between Archbishop Nicholas and Greek Catholic Bishop Jan Hirka. Archbishop Nicholas says that he has asked Bishop Hirka to explain the full religious history of the Rusyn people to his followers, including the Rusyns' religious roots in the Orthodox faith before the seventeenth century. "But," adds the archbishop, "Bishop Hirka told me that he cannot go against his faithful."

Although the Czech Republic and Slovakia have split into two nations, the Orthodox Church in both has remained united. Two eparchies exist in the Czech Republic, with 30,000 faithful. The other two eparchies are in eastern Slovakia—Prešov and Michalovce. Together these last two have 89 parishes, mainly in the Rusyn villages of northeastern Slovakia. "The Orthodox Church is actually growing there," said the archbishop, "thanks to an increasing immigration of people from Rusyn Transcarpathia and the Chernobyl region in Ukraine—people coming to Slovakia for better economic opportunities and a better life." Because of this immigration and previous ones, the membership of the Orthodox Church in Slovakia comes from a variety of ethnic groups—Rusyns, Ukrainians, Slovaks, Bulgarians, Romanians, and Russians. Father Belejkanic pointed out, however, that the majority of Orthodox in Slovakia are definitely Rusyns.

The Orthodox Church faces numerous challenges due largely to the economics of the newly independent yet unstable Slovakia. "We already have our third government since independence," said Father Belejkanic. "The shift to a free market economy has caused many of our people to lose their jobs. This is a bigger problem in Slovakia than in the Czech Republic since our economy under the Communist regime was based on the manufacture of military goods and equipment." Because the people have little, it is even more difficult for the Church to progress in pursuing its life and work. "We need to teach our people more about the faith, but first we must have places in which to teach them. Therefore, we must build our churches." In addition, the Orthodox Church is trying to build an orphanage for children in Medzilaborce.

One of the bright spots for the Orthodox church in Slovakia is its Theological Seminary in Prešov. The seminary is now part of Šafárik University. This allows for some government support of it as an educational institution. It also means that anyone can attend its lectures and classes, including non-Orthodox students. "We presently have four Greek Catholic students," explained Father Belejkanic. "They have come to learn for themselves. They do not believe that Orthodoxy is a 'Communist' church."

The seminary currently has 130 students, some in the four-year program to become religious education teachers, others in the five-year program for the priesthood. "We sponsor noted scholars from outside to teach our students," explained Father Belejkanic. "We have had the dean of the seminary in Thessalonika, Greece, and during this trip to America, the archbishop has invited the Reverend Thomas Hopko of St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary in Crestwood, New York, to come and lecture."

The hope of the Orthodox Church's future work is found in its ever increasing role in the newly independent society. It is a role which Slovakia is asking all of its churches to assume. "The government wants the churches to restore society after years of Communism," said Archbishop Nicholas. "We have told the state that we want to do this, but they must help us financially so that we can do the work." And while the work is great, perhaps while visiting America Archbishop Nicholas and his group noted that a great deal can be done with little. The newly canonized Alexis Toth, after all, was just one man.

John J. Righetti
Mars, Pennsylvania
SINCE THE REVOLUTION OF 1989

Užhorod, Ukraine. On February 7, 1994, following instructions from Ukraine’s General Prosecutor in Kiev, the prosecutor’s office in Transcarpathia has forbidden the further activity of the Society of Carpatho-Rusyns. The reason given is that the society is not a legally registered organization. Although it was registered in 1990, the Ukrainian authorities recently required all organizations on its territory to re-register. The society’s request for re-registration was rejected, according to the Transcarpathian prosecutor’s office, because “Rusyn is not a separate nationality.” and therefore it is “not possible to register a Rusyn national-cultural organization.”

Such action seems to be in direct violation of two principles adopted in 1990 by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), of which Ukraine is a signatory: (1) that “to belong to a nationality is a matter of a person’s individual choice and no disadvantage may arise from the exercise of such a choice”; and (2) that “persons belonging to national minorities can exercise and enjoy their rights individually as well as in community with other members of their group.”

As a result of the Ukrainian government’s decision, the Society of Carpatho-Rusyns’ newspaper, Podkarpats’ka Rus’, was suspended in late February. It resumed publication one month later under the same name, although under registration of an individual and with a new masthead statement that reads simply: “a newspaper for Rusyns.”

Mukáčevo, Ukraine. On March 24, 1994, the Aleksander Duchnový Society (Obščество im. Aleksandra Duchnovýa) was re-established in Transcarpathia. It had first come into being in 1924, but was abolished by the Soviet authorities when they took over Subcarpathian Rus in 1944-1945. The Duchnový Society was in the past, and is to be again in the future, concerned primarily with cultural activity. At the March 24 founding meeting were representatives from branches in Svaljava, Mukáčevo, and Užhorod, and it is expected there will be—as during the interwar period—several other new branches throughout Transcarpathia. The writer Vasyľ Sočka-Boržavn spoke to the meeting about the historical record of the original society from 1924 to 1944.

Budapest, Hungary. On April 28, 1994, a new Rusyn-language publication, Rusynský život (Rusyn Life), made its debut. This is the first time since 1918 that a Rusyn newspaper or journal has appeared within the borders of present-day Hungary.

Rusynský život hopes to appear once or twice monthly, is published by the Organization of Rusyns in Hungary, and is edited by its chairperson, the poet Gabriel Hattinger. The first issue includes articles in Rusyn and Hungarian.

RECENT EVENTS

L’viv, Ukraine. On December 6-7, 1993, the Prosvita (Enlightenment) Society held an international conference in commemoration of its 100th anniversary. The society was active in promoting the Ukrainian national orientation in Galicia, Subcarpathian Rus, and the Lemko Region until its dissolution by Soviet authorities after World War II. Several speakers discussed the work of the Prosvita Society in the Lemko Region, including Ivan Krasov’s’kyj (L’viv), Hanna Horyn’ (L’viv), and Marija Vavryčyn (L’viv). Mykola Mušynka (Presov) and Pavlo Fedaka (Užhorod) described the Prosvita Society in interwar Subcarpathian Rus, and Mykola Cap (Novi Sad) addressed its relations with the Rusyns of Yugoslavia.

Osaka, Japan. The Japanese journal, Jidaijin, published in its February 17, 1994 issue (No. 37) an interview with Bohdan Horbal and Susyn Yvonne Mihalasky on the Rusyn minority question in Europe. Horbal, a master’s degree candidate at the University of Wroclaw in Poland, is presently doing research in New York City on the Rusyn-American press; Mihalasky is completing her doctoral thesis on the post-World War II deportation of Lemkos in Poland at the University of Toronto.

In recent years, various circles in Japan have shown an interest in Carpatho-Rusyns. The Sapporo Peace Foundation in Tokyo is presently funding the New York-based Institute of East West Studies Euro-Carpathian Region Project; and in 1988 a Japanese translation of Petr Bogatyrev’s 1929 study of Rusyn folklore and beliefs was published in Tokyo.

New York, New York. On February 24, 1994, the Slavic and Baltic Division of the New York Public Library presented a staff seminar on the collections of the Heritage Institute of the Byzantine Catholic Diocese of Passaic. Speakers included the Very Reverend Raymond Misulich (Diocese of Passaic), Professor Richard Renoff (Nassau County Community College), Bohdan Horbal, and Edward Kasinec (New York Public Library). The seminar acknowledged, in particular, the ongoing work of the Byzantine Catholic Diocese of Passaic, which since 1980 has helped to preserve on microfilm for public use rare and current Rusyn-American newspapers and other printed materials.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. On April 6, 1994, Professor Paul Robert Magosci (University of Toronto) delivered a lecture at the University of Pittsburgh Center for Russian and East European Studies entitled, “The Birth of a New Nation or the Return of an Old Problem: The Rusyns of East Central Europe,” and a second lecture at the Byzantine Ruthenian Catholic Seminary of SS Cyril and Methodius on the topic, “Religion and Identity in the Carpathians.”

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. On April 7, 1994, the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, Inc. held the annual meeting of its Advisory Board at the Cathedral of Learning, University of Pittsburgh. Participants reviewed the work of the center during the past three years, in particular the increase in the number of its publications and its contacts with all parts of the Rusyn homeland in Europe. Among the observers at Advisory Board were: Peter Bajcura (Butler, Pennsylvania), Richard Custer (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania), Olena Duc-Fajfer (Cracow, Poland), Bogdan Horbal (New York City), Robert Karlowicz (Pratt Institute), Susyn Mihalasky (Clifton, New Jersey), and John Ryzyk (Yonkers, New York).