

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ  
ДРОГОБИЦЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ ПЕДАГОГІЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ  
ІМЕНІ ІВАНА ФРАНКА  
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE  
DROHOBYCH IVAN FRANKO STATE PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY

ISSN 2519-058X (Print)  
ISSN 2664-2735 (Online)

# **СХІДНОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ВІСНИК**

## **EAST EUROPEAN HISTORICAL BULLETIN**

**ВИПУСК 18  
ISSUE 18**

**Дрогобич, 2021  
Drohobych, 2021**

*Рекомендовано до друку Вченою радою  
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка  
(протокол від 30 листопада 2020 року № 17)*

Наказом Міністерства освіти і науки України збірник включено до КАТЕГОРІЇ «А»  
Переліку наукових фахових видань України, в яких можуть публікуватися результати  
дисертаційних робіт на здобуття наукових ступенів доктора і  
кандидата наук у галузі «ІСТОРИЧНІ НАУКИ»  
(Наказ МОН України № 358 від 15.03.2019 р., додаток 9).

**Східноєвропейський історичний вісник** / [головний редактор В. Ільницький]. – Дрогобич:  
Видавничий дім «Гельветика», 2021. – Випуск 18. – 270 с.

Збірник розрахований на науковців, викладачів історії, аспірантів, докторантів, студентів  
й усіх, хто цікавиться історичним минулим.

Редакційна колегія не обов'язково поділяє позицію, висловлену авторами у статтях,  
та не несе відповідальності за достовірність наведених даних і посилань.

**Головний редактор:** Ільницький В. І. – д.іст.н., проф.

**Відповідальний редактор:** Галів М. Д. – д.пед.н., доц.

**Редакційна колегія:**

**Манвідас Віткунас** – д.іст.н., доц. (Литва); **Вацлав Вєжбєнец** – д.габ. з історії (Болгарія); **Дюра Гарді** – д.філос. з історії, професор (Сербія); **Дарко Даровец** – д. філос. з історії, проф. (Італія); **Дегтярьов С. І.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Пол Джозефсон** – д. філос. з історії, проф. (США); **Сергій Єкельчик** – д. філос. з історії, доц. (Канада); **Сергій Жук** – д.іст.н., проф. (США); **Саня Златановіч** – д.філос. з етнології та антропології, ст. наук. спів. (Сербія); **Мехмед Інбаши** – д.іст.н., проф. (Туреччина); **Корсак Р. В.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Андрій Кравчук** – д.філос., проф. (Канада); **Олександр Кухіанідзе** – д.філос., проф. (Грузія); **Литвин М. Р.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Тимур Магсумов** – к.іст.н., доц. (Велика Британія); **Юрай Марусяк** – д. філос. з історії (Словацька Республіка); **Морозов А. Г.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Роман Новацький** – д.габ. з історії, проф. (Польща); **Падалка С. С.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Патриляк І.К.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Петречко О. М.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Потєхїна І. Д.** – к.іст.н., доц. (Україна); **Рассамакін Ю. Я.** – к.іст.н., ст. наук. спів. (Україна); **Сергійчук В. І.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Ситник О. М.** – д.іст.н., доц. (Україна); **Стародубець Г. М.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Анджей Стемплік** – д.габ. з іст., проф. (Польща); **Степанчук В. М.** – д.іст.н., ст. наук. спів. (Україна); **Тельвак В. В.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Данієла Ля Фореста** – проф. (Італія); **Футала В. П.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Олександр Черкасов** – д.іст.н., проф. (США); **Сильвестер Чопек** – д.габ. з історії, проф. (Польща); **Чучко М. К.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Шаравара Т. О.** – д.іст.н., проф. (Україна); **Міхал Шмігель** – д.іст.н., доц. (Словацька Республіка).

**Збірник індексується в міжнародних базах даних:**  
**Web of Science (Emerging Sources Citation Index), "Index Copernicus"**  
**(ICV 2016-50.70; 2017-71.75; 2018-86,66; 2019-88,82)**

Статті збірника прирівнюються до публікацій у виданнях України, які включені до міжнародних науково-метричних баз відповідно до вимог наказу МОН України від 17 жовтня 2012 р. № 1112 (зі змінами, внесеними наказом МОН України від 03.12.2012 р. № 1380).

*Свідцтво про державну реєстрацію друкованого засобу масової інформації  
«Східноєвропейський історичний вісник» Серія КВ № 22449-12349Р від 28.12.2016 р.*

Усі електронні версії статей збірника оприлюднюються на офіційній сторінці видання  
<http://echb.dspu.edu.ua>

Засновник і видавець – Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка.  
Адреса редакції: Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет  
імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, обл. Львівська, 82100.  
тел.: (0324) 41-04-74, факс: (03244) 3-38-77, e-mail: [halivm@yahoo.com](mailto:halivm@yahoo.com)

© Дрогобицький державний педагогічний  
університет імені Івана Франка, 2021  
© Автори статей, 2021

**Recommended for publication**  
**by Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University Academic Council**  
**(protocol dd. 30.11.2020 No. 17)**

Under the Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, the collection is included in CATEGORY "A" of the List of electronic professional publications of Ukraine authorized to publish theses of applicants for the degree of doctor and candidate of sciences in the field "HISTORICAL SCIENCES" (Order of the MES of Ukraine № 358 on 15.03.2019, Appendix 9)

**East European Historical Bulletin** / [chief editor Vasyl Ilnytskyi]. – Drohobych: Publishing House "Helvetica", 2021. – Issue 18. – 270 p.

This collection is meant for scholars, history lecturers, postgraduates, doctorants, students and all the readership interested in historical past.

Editorial board do not necessarily reflect the position expressed by the authors of articles, and are not responsible for the accuracy of the data and references.

**Chief editor: Vasyl Ilnytskyi** – PhD hab. (History), Professor

**Executive editor: Mykola Haliv** – PhD hab. (Education), Assist. Professor

**Editorial Board:**

**Alexandr Cherkasov** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (USA); **Mykhailo Chuchko** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Sylwester Czopek** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Darko Darovec** – PhD (History), Professor (Italy); **Paul Josephson** – PhD (History), Professor (USA); **Serhii Degtyarev** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Daniela La Foresta** – Professor (Italy); **Vasyl Futala** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Đura Hardi** – PhD (History), Professor (Serbia); **Mehmet İnbasi** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Turkey); **Roman Korsak** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Andrii Krawchuk** – PhD (History), Professor (Canada); **Alexandre Kukhianidze** – PhD (Philosophy), Professor (Georgia); **Mykola Lytvyn** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Timur Magsumov** – PhD (History), Associate Professor (United Kingdom); **Juraj Marušiak** – Mgr., PhD (History), (Slovak Republic); **Anatoliy Morozow** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Roman Nowacki** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Serhiy Padalka** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Ivan Patryliak** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Oleh Petrechko** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Inna Potiekhina** – PhD (History), Associate Professor (Ukraine); **Yuriy Rassamakin** – PhD (History), Senior Research Fellow (Ukraine); **Volodymyr Serhiychuk** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Tamara Sharavara** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Michal Smigel** – PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor (Slovak Republic); **Galyna Starodubets** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Andrzej Stępnik** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Vasyl' Stepanchuk** – PhD hab. (History), Senior Research Fellow (Ukraine); **Olexander Sytnyk** – PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor (Ukraine); **Vitaliy Tel'vak** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Ukraine); **Manvydas Vitkūnas** – PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor (Lithuania); **Dochka Vladimirova-Aladzhova** – PhD (History) (Bulgaria); **Waclaw Wierzbieniec** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Serhy Yekelchyk** – PhD (History), Associate Professor (Canada); **Sergei Zhuk** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (USA); **Sanja Zlatanović** – PhD (Ethnology and Anthropology), Senior Researcher Associate (Serbia).

**The collection is indexed in the international databases:**  
**Web of Science (Emerging Sources Citation Index), "Index Copernicus"**  
**(ICV 2016-50,70; 2017-71,75; 2018-86,66; 2019-88,82)**

*The articles are equaled to publications in Ukrainian journals entered in international scientometric databases in accordance with the MES of Ukraine order dd. 17 november 2012 p. No. 1112 (amended by the MES of Ukraine order dd. 03.12.2012 No. 1380).*

*Print media registration certifi cate «East European Historical Bulletin» series KV No. 22449-12349P dd. 28.12.2016*

All electronic versions of articles in the collection are available on the official website edition  
<http://eehb.dspu.edu.ua>

Founder and Publisher: Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University.  
Office address: Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Ivan Franko Str., 24, Drohobych, Lviv Region, 82100. tel.: (0324) 41-04-74, fax: (03244) 3-38-77, e-mail: [halivm@yahoo.com](mailto:halivm@yahoo.com)

© Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 2021  
© Copyright by the contributors, 2021

## ЗМІСТ

<b>Ігор СМУТОК, Валерій ДОНЕНКО</b> ВИЩІ СУДОВІ ІНСТАНЦІЇ ДАВНЬОЇ РЕЧІ ПОСПОЛИТОЇ У СИСТЕМІ ПРАВОСУДДЯ КОРОЛІВСЬКИХ СТОЛОВИХ МАСТКІВ (НА ПРИКЛАДІ САМБІРСЬКОЇ ЕКОНОМІЇ XVI – XVIII ст.) .....	8
<b>Оксана КАРЛІНА, Анна КИРИЛЮК</b> ДЖЕРЕЛОЗНАВЧИЙ ПОТЕНЦІАЛ ІНВЕНТАРІВ БІБЛІОТЕК РИМО-КАТОЛИЦЬКИХ МОНАСТИРІВ ЛУЦЬКО-ЖИТОМИРСЬКОЇ ДІСЦЕЗІЇ КІНЦЯ XVIII – ПОЧАТКУ XIX ст. ....	16
<b>Андрій ХРІДОЧКІН, Петро МАКУШЕВ</b> ВАСИЛЬ НАЗАРОВИЧ КАРАЗІН: ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ПОРТРЕТ НА ТЛІ ЕПОХИ.....	30
<b>Ігор ЛИМАН, Вікторія КОНСТАНТИНОВА</b> РОЗБУДОВА МЕРЕЖІ ПРУССЬКИХ КОНСУЛЬСЬКИХ ПРЕДСТАВНИЦТВ НА УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ЗЕМЛЯХ У XIX СТОЛІТТІ НА ПРИКЛАДІ МІСТА КЕРЧ.....	45
<b>Віталій ТАЦІЄНКО, Наталія ТАЦІЄНКО</b> РОЛЬ ПРАВОСЛАВНОГО ПАРАФІЯЛЬНОГО ДУХОВЕНСТВА У ПРОВЕДЕННІ СЕЛЯНСЬКОЇ РЕФОРМИ 1861 р. (НА МАТЕРІАЛАХ КИЇВСЬКОЇ ГУБЕРНІЇ) .....	55
<b>Міхал ШМІГЕЛЬ, Павол ТИШЛЯР</b> “КОЛИ ЧОЛОВІКИ РОЗІЙШЛИСЯ ПО ВСЬОМУ СВІТУ ЗА ШМАТКОМ ХЛІБА...” ЕМІГРАЦІЯ РУСИНІВ-УКРАЇНЦІВ ІЗ ПІВНІЧНО-СХІДНОЇ СЛОВАЧЧИНИ В 1870 – 1940 рр. ....	64
<b>Андрій ЩЕГЛОВ, Олександра МЕЛЬНИК</b> СТАНОВИЩЕ ЄВРЕЙСЬКОЇ МЕНШИНИ ПІД ЧАС РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ОКУПАЦІЇ СХІДНОЇ ГАЛИЧИНИ В 1914 – 1915 рр.....	88
<b>Тетяна КОВАЛЕНКО</b> ВІЙНА ЗА МЕЖАМИ ФРОНТУ: БІЖЕНЦІ У ВНУТРІШНІХ ГУБЕРНІЯХ РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ІМПЕРІЇ В РОКИ ПЕРШОЇ СВІТОВОЇ ВІЙНИ .....	98
<b>Олександр КОМАРНІЦЬКИЙ, Людмила КОМАРНІЦЬКА</b> УКРАЇНСЬКО-ЄВРЕЙСЬКІ ВІДНОСИНИ У ДОБУ ДИРЕКТОРІЇ УНР: НА МАТЕРІАЛАХ МІСТЕЧОК ПРАВОБЕРЕЖНОЇ УКРАЇНИ.....	107
<b>Петро ІВАНИШИН, Ірина ДМИТРІВ, Ян ГЖЕСЯК</b> КОНЦЕПЦІЯ КУЛЬТУРНОГО НАЦІОНАЛІЗМУ У ТВОРЧОСТІ ДМИТРА ДОНЦОВА: ОСНОВНІ АСПЕКТИ .....	118
<b>Ігор ЯКУБОВСЬКИЙ</b> НАМІР ГЕНОЦИДУ В СВІТЛІ НОВИХ ДОКУМЕНТІВ ПРО ГОЛОДОМОР 1932 – 1933 рр. В УКРАЇНІ.....	127
<b>Олеся СТАСЮК</b> ДО ПИТАННЯ ПРО УКЛАДАННЯ СПИСКУ ВИКОНАВЦІВ ГОЛОДОМОРУ- ГЕНОЦИДУ УКРАЇНЦІВ: ПАРТІЙНО-ДЕРЖАВНА НОМЕНКЛАТУРА ТА ПРАЦІВНИКИ РЕПРЕСИВНО-КАРАЛЬНИХ ОРГАНІВ.....	135
<b>Тетяна КУЗНЕЦЬ, Ольга СКУС</b> АРХІВНО-СЛІДЧА СПРАВА НА ГРИГОРІЯ ТИМОФІЇВА ЯК ДЖЕРЕЛО З ІСТОРІЇ РЕПРЕСІЙ 1930-х РОКІВ .....	148
<b>Василь ГУЛАЙ, Віра МАКСИМЕЦЬ</b>	

РАДЯНСЬКИЙ ЧИННИК У ЗБРОЙНІЙ БОРОТБІ НА ТЕРИТОРІЇ ДИСТРИКТУ “ТАЛИЧИНА” ГЕНЕРАЛЬНОГО ГУБЕРНАТОРСТВА (1941 – 1944).....	156
<b>Олексій ГОНЧАРЕНКО, Олександр ПОТИЛЬЧАК</b> НОРМАТИВНО-ПРАВОВЕ ВРЕГУЛЮВАННЯ ПОВЕДІНКИ МІСЦЕВОГО НАСЕЛЕННЯ У ЗОНАХ ВІДПОВІДАЛЬНОСТІ ТИМЧАСОВОЇ ВІЙСЬКОВОЇ АДМІНІСТРАЦІЇ ТА РАЙХСКОМІСАРІАТУ “УКРАЇНА” (ЛІТО 1941 – ЗИМА 1942)...	167
<b>Галина СТАРОДУБЕЦЬ, Ірина СУШИК</b> ЗМІСТ ТА НАПРЯМКИ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ ЖІНОЧИХ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙ ВОЛИНИ (друга половина 1940-х – початок 1950-х років) .....	176
<b>Інна ДЕМУЗ, Дмитро ОСТРОВИК</b> ПРОБЛЕМИ СОЦІАЛІЗАЦІЇ ВОЇНІВ-“АФГАНЦІВ” В УКРАЇНІ У ВИСВІТЛЕННІ ОРГАНУ ЦК ЛКСМ УКРАЇНИ – ГАЗЕТИ “КОМСОМОЛЬСКОЕ ЗНАМЯ” .....	187
<b>Вікторія АБАКУМОВА</b> ОНОВЛЕННЯ РЕПЕРТУАРУ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ КІНОСТУДІЙ В УМОВАХ ПРОЦЕСУ ПЕРЕБУДОВИ.....	199
<b>Олексій ПОКОТИЛО, Олександр НАШИВОЧНИКОВ</b> ВИТОКИ РОСІЙСЬКО-УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ЗБРОЙНОГО КОНФЛІКТУ .....	210
<b>Людмила СТРІЛЬЧУК, Олександр ДОБРЖАНСЬКИЙ</b> ТРАДИЦІЇ ТА НОВАЦІЇ У ЗОВНІШНЬОПОЛІТИЧНИХ КОНЦЕПЦІЯХ ПОЛЬЩІ ЩОДО УКРАЇНИ (XX – початок XXI ст.).....	219
<b>Юрій СТЕПАНЧУК, Тетяна МЕЛЬНИЧУК</b> ЕВОЛЮЦІЯ ПОНЯТТЯ “УКРАЇНА” В РАННЬОМОДЕРНІ ЧАСИ У ВИСВІТЛЕННІ СУЧАСНОЇ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ІСТОРИОГРАФІЇ.....	229
<b>Андрій БОЛЯНОВСЬКИЙ</b> ІСТОРИОГРАФІЯ ПРОТИСТОЯННЯ СИЛ ПОЛЬСЬКОГО ТА УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ПІДПІЛЛЯ У РОКИ НІМЕЦЬКО-РАДЯНСЬКОЇ ВІЙНИ: ГОЛОВНІ ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ ТРАКТУВАННЯ ПОДІЙ У ПОЛЬЩІ .....	239
<b>РЕЦЕНЗІЇ</b>	
<b>Світлана ГІРНЯК, Юлія ТАЛАЛАЙ</b> ІВАН БОБЕРСЬКИЙ – ПЕДАГОГ, СПОРТОВЕЦЬ, ГРОМАДСЬКО-ПОЛІТИЧНИЙ ДІЯЧ (рецензія на монографію: Сова А. Іван Боберський: суспільно-культурна, військово-політична та освітньо-виховна діяльність. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 2019. 512 с.).....	252
<b>Наталія НЕЧАСВА-ЮРІЙЧУК, Сергій ТРОЯН</b> МОЛОДІЖНА ПОЛІТИКА НСДАП: РЕТРОСПЕКТИВНИЙ АНАЛІЗ (рецензія на монографію.: Давлетов О. Р. Підготовка “покоління вовків”: вишкіл майбутніх виконавців Голокосту (Нариси молодіжної політики НСДАП у 1922 – 1939 рр.). 2-е вид. доп. Дніпро: Український інститут вивчення Голокосту “Ткума”, 2019. 316 с.).....	260
<b>Василь ІЛЬНИЦЬКИЙ, Катерина ГОЛОВКО</b> ІСТОРІЯ ПОВСЯКДЕННОГО ЖИТТЯ ЗАХІДНОУКРАЇНСЬКОГО СЕЛЯНСТВА (рецензія на монографію: Старка В. В. Повсякденне життя західноукраїнського селянства в умовах суспільних трансформацій 1939 – 1953 рр. Тернопіль: Осадца Ю.В., 2019. 550 с.).....	265

---

**CONTENTS**

<b>Ihor SMUTOK, Valerii DONENKO</b> THE ANCIENT RZECZPOSPOLITA HIGHEST JUDICIAL BODIES IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM OF THE ROYAL ESTATES (ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE SAMBIR ECONOMY OF THE XVIth – XVIIIth CENTURIES).....	8
<b>Oksana Karlina, Anna KYRYLIUK</b> THE ROMAN CATHOLIC MONASTERIES LIBRARIES INVENTORIES' SOURCE POTENTIAL OF LUTSK-ZHYTOMYR DIOCESE AT THE END OF THE XVIIIth – BEGINNING OF THE XIXth CENTURY.....	16
<b>Andrii KHRIDOKHIN, Petro MAKUSHEV</b> VASYL NAZAROVYCH KARAZIN: HISTORIC PORTRAIT AGAINST A BACKDROP OF THE EPOCH.....	30
<b>Ihor LYMAN, Victoria KONSTANTINOVA</b> NETWORK FORMATION OF THE PRUSSIAN CONSULAR OFFICES IN UKRAINIAN LANDS IN THE 19th CENTURY: CASE STUDY OF THE PORT CITY OF KERCH.....	45
<b>Vitaliy TATSIYENKO, Natalia TATSIYENKO</b> THE ORTHODOX PARISH CLERGY'S ROLE IN THE PEASANT REFORM IMPLEMENTATION IN 1861 (BASED ON KYIV HUBERNIYA MATERIALS).....	55
<b>Michal ŠMIGEL, Pavol TIŠLIAR</b> “WHEN MEN MOVED ACROSS THE WORLD FOR A PIECE OF BREAD...” EMIGRATION OF RUSYNS-UKRAINIANS FROM THE NORTHEASTERN SLOVAKIA IN THE YEARS 1870 – 1940 .....	64
<b>Andrii SHCHEHLOV, Oleksandra MELNYK</b> THE SITUATION OF THE JEWISH MINORITY DURING THE RUSSIAN OCCUPATION OF EASTERN GALICIA IN 1914 – 1915.....	88
<b>Tetiana KOVALENKO</b> WAR BEYOND THE FRONTLINE: REFUGEES IN INTERNAL GOVERNORATES OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR.....	98
<b>Oleksandr KOMARNITSKYI, Liudmyla KOMARNITSKA</b> UKRAINIAN-JEWISH RELATIONS DURING THE PERIOD OF THE UNR DIRECTORY: BASED ON THE INFORMATION ON THE TOWNS OF RIGHT-BANK UKRAINE.....	107
<b>Petro IVANYSHYN, Iryna DMYTRIV, Jan GRZESIAK</b> THE CONCEPT OF CULTURAL NATIONALISM IN THE WORKS OF DMYTRO DONTSOV: MAIN ASPECTS .....	118
<b>Ihor YAKUBOVSKYI</b> THE GENOCIDE INTENTION IN THE LIGHT OF NEW DOCUMENTS ON THE HOLODOMOR OF 1932 – 1933 IN UKRAINE.....	127
<b>Olesia STASIUK</b> ON THE PERPETRATORS LIST COMPILATION OF THE HOLODOMOR-GENOCIDE OF THE UKRAINIANS: PARTY-STATE NOMENCLATURE AND EMPLOYEES OF REPRESSIVE PUNITIVE BODIES .....	135
<b>Tetiana KUZNETS, Olha SKUS</b> AN ARCHIVAL AND INVESTIGATIVE CASE ON HRYHORIY TYMOFIYIV AS A SOURCE ON THE HISTORY OF REPRESSION DURING THE 1930s .....	148

<b>Vasyl HULAY, Vira MAKSYMETS</b> THE SOVIET FACTOR IN THE ARMED STRUGGLE AT THE TERRITORY OF “HALYCHYNA” DISTRICT OF THE GENERAL GOVERNORATE (1941 – 1944) .....	156
<b>Oleksiy HONCHARENKO, Oleksandr POTYL’CHAK</b> LEGAL REGULATION OF LOCAL POPULATION BEHAVIOUR IN THE RESPONSIBILITY AREA OF THE PROVISIONAL MILITARY ADMINISTRATION AND REICH COMMISSARIAT “UKRAINE” (THE SUMMER OF 1941 – WINTER OF 1942) .....	167
<b>Halyna STARODUBETS, Iryna SUSHYK</b> CONTENT AND DIRECTIONS OF WOMEN ORGANIZATIONS ACTIVITIES IN VOLYN (the second half of the 1940s – beginning of the 1950s) .....	176
<b>Inna DEMUZ, Dmytro OSTROVYK</b> SOCIALIZATION PROBLEMS OF “AFGHAN” SOLDIERS IN UKRAINE IN THE COVERAGE OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE BODY OF THE LKSM OF UKRAINE – THE NEWSPAPER “KOM SOMOLSKOYE ZNAMIA” .....	187
<b>Viktorija ABAKUMOVA</b> UPDATING THE REPERTOIRE OF THE UKRAINIAN FILM STUDIOS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PERESTROIKA PROCESS .....	199
<b>Oleksiy POKOTYLO, Oleksandr NASHYVOCHNIKOV</b> SOURCES OF THE RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN ARMED CONFLICT .....	210
<b>Lyudmyla STRILCHUK, Oleksandr DOBRZHANSKYI</b> POLAND’S FOREIGN POLICY CONCEPTS TRADITIONS AND INNOVATIONS REGARDING UKRAINE (the XXth – the beginning of the XXIst century) .....	219
<b>Yuriy STEPANCHUK, Tetiana MELNYCHUK</b> THE CONCEPT OF “UKRAINE” EVOLUTION IN EARLY MODERN TIMES IN MODERN UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY COVERAGE .....	229
<b>Andrii BOLIANOVSKYI</b> HISTORIOGRAPHY OF CONFRONTATION BETWEEN POLISH AND UKRAINIAN UNDERGROUND FORCES DURING THE YEARS OF THE GERMAN-SOVIET WAR: MAIN TENDENCIES OF INTERPRETATION OF THE EVENTS IN POLAND .....	239
<b>REVIEW</b>	
<b>Svitlana HIRNIAK, Yuliya TALALAY</b> IVAN BOBERSKYI – TEACHER, ATHLETE, PUBLIC AND POLITICAL ACTIVIST (review of the monograph: Sova A. Ivan Boberskyi: socio-cultural, military-political and educational activities. Lviv: Institute of Ukrainian Studies of Ukraine, 2019. 512 p.).....	252
<b>Nataliia NECHAIEVA-YURIICHUK, Serhiy TROYAN</b> NSDAP YOUTH POLICY: RETROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS (Review of the monograph.: Davletov O. R. Preparation of the “generation of wolves”: training of future perpetrators of the Holocaust (Essays on the youth policy of the NSDAP in 1922 – 1939). 2nd ed., 2019. 316 p.) .....	260
<b>Vasyl ILNYTSKYI, Kateryna HOLOVKO</b> HISTORY OF AN EVERYDAY LIFE OF THE WESTERN UKRAINIAN PEASANTRY (review of the monograph: Starka V. V. Everyday Life of the Western Ukrainian Peasantry under the Conditions of Social Transformations in 1939 – 1953. Ternopil: Osadtsa Yu.V., 2019. 550 p.).....	265

UDC 340.15(477.83)“15/17”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226544

**Ihor SMUTOK**

*PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor of Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (smutokigor@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-5430-163X

**Valerii DONENKO**

*PhD hab. (Law), Associate Professor, Professor at the Department of Administrative and Customs Law of the University of Customs and Finance, 8 Krutohirny descent, Dnipro, Ukraine, postal code 49000 (don1964dnipro@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-5817-1406

**Ігор СМУТОК**

*доктор історичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет ім. Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (smutokigor@gmail.com)*

**Валерій ДОНЕНКО**

*доктор юридичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри адміністративного та митного права Університету митної справи та фінансів, узвіз Крутогірний, 8, м. Дніпро, Україна, індекс 49000 (don1964dnipro@ukr.net)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Smutok, I. & Donenko, V. (2021). The Ancient Rzeczpospolita highest judicial bodies in the justice system of the royal estates (on the example of the Sambir economy of the XVIth – XVIIIth centuries). *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 8–15. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226544

**THE ANCIENT RZECZPOSPOLITA HIGHEST JUDICIAL BODIES  
IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM OF THE ROYAL ESTATES (ON THE EXAMPLE  
OF THE SAMBIR ECONOMY OF THE XVIth – XVIIIth CENTURIES)**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research is to characterize the justice model's functioning at the highest levels of the judicial bodies in the Ancient Rzeczpospolita in the context of everyday legal practice in the royal estates (in particular, Sambir economy). The methodology of the research is based on the principles of historicism, scientificity, verification, as well as the use of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization) and special historical (historical-typological, historical-systemic) methods. The scientific novelty is that for the first time the Ancient Rzeczpospolita highest judicial bodies activity was revealed through the prism of everyday practices in the field of a separate administrative and economic object's justice system, in this case – Sambir economy, part of the royal estates of the Ancient Rzeczpospolita. The Conclusions.* *The royal estates' population and administration (in particular, the Sambir economy) used the courts of higher instance actively, appealing to them directly, or appealing against the decisions*

of the local courts. The most popular was the Crown Court of Referendum, less often people turned to the Crown Court of Assessors. Some issues could be considered by the field commissions set up by the King's order in order to consider certain issues. Finally, the 'Grodzki' courts (Sąd Grodzki) of Przemysł Land, Lublin Crown Tribunal, and Radom Tribunal were involved in resolving the controversial cases. disputes. The practice of appeals to these courts was created at the turn of the XVIth – XVIIth centuries, but for a long time it remained disordered and uncoordinated. The Crown Treasury Commission was established in the XVIIIth century and took control over appeals to various courts.

**Key words:** justice, court system, the Referendum Court, the Assessors Court, the Crown Treasury Commission, Sambir economy.

## **ВИЩІ СУДОВІ ІНСТАНЦІЇ ДАВНЬОЇ РЕЧІ ПОСПОЛИТОЇ У СИСТЕМІ ПРАВОСУДДЯ КОРОЛІВСЬКИХ СТОЛОВИХ МАЄТКІВ (НА ПРИКЛАДІ САМБІРСЬКОЇ ЕКОНОМІЇ XVI – XVIII ст.)**

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* – охарактеризувати модель функціонування правосуддя на вищих щаблях судочинства Давньої Речі Посполитої в контексті повсякденної правової практики у королівських столових маєтках (зокрема, Самбірської економії). **Методологія дослідження** базується на принципах історизму, науковості, верифікації, а також на використанні загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, узагальнення) та спеціально-історичних (історико-типологічний, історико-системний) методів. **Наукова новизна:** уперше розкрито діяльність вищих судових органів Давньої Речі Посполитої через призму повсякденних практик у сфері судочинства окремо взятого адміністративно-господарського об'єкту, у даному випадку – Самбірської економії, складової частини королівських маєтків Давньої Речі Посполитої. **Висновки.** Населення та адміністрація королівських столових маєтків (зокрема, Самбірської економії) активно послуговувалися судами вищої інстанції, звертаючись до них безпосередньо, або апелюючи на рішення місцевих судів. Найбільшою популярністю користувався королівський референдарський суд, рідше – королівський асесорський суд. Окремі питання могли розглядатися виїздними комісіями, створеними з наказу короля для розгляду певних питань. Нарешті, до вирішення спірних питань залучалися гродзькі суди Перемиської землі, Люблінський Коронний Трибунал, Радомський Трибунал. Практика звернень до перерахованих судових інстанцій витворилася ще на межі XVI – XVII ст., але тривалий час вона залишалася непорядкованою і нескоординованою. У XVIII ст. була створена Королівська скарбова комісія. Саме вона почала здійснювати контроль за зверненнями до різних судових інстанцій.

**Ключові слова:** Правосуддя, судочинство, Референдарський суд, Асесорський суд, Королівська скарбова комісія, Самбірська економія.

**The Problem Statement.** The system of higher judicial institutions of the Ancient Rzeczpospolita (Commonwealth) was quite complex. It was formed for a long time during the XVth – XVIIth centuries and was characterized by a lack of a clear coherent structure and a clear division of competences between different instances. Hence, starting from the XIXth century, the legal historians were forced to address this problem constantly in order to try to characterize the functioning of the judicial institutions of the Ancient Rzeczpospolita (Commonwealth) comprehensively and reconstruct the mechanisms of their activities. In most cases, such attempts are limited to theoretical considerations, which are reduced to the competencies' delineation of each of the instances. In our opinion, the disclosure of the above-mentioned issue would be more fruitful if we use somewhat different methodological approaches – through the prism of studying the legal relations of individually selected objects, which were subject to the jurisdiction of these courts. In particular, such an object may be Sambir economy – an administrative, judicial and economic complex of estates owned by the King. The economy's administration, as well as its population, were constantly in contact with the higher courts and used them as the appellate instances. Therefore, the court system's study will help us to acknowledge how the Ancient

Rzeczpospolita higher judicial institutions system functioned, and most importantly, to answer the question of how effective it was and allowed to provide justice.

**The purpose of the article is** to characterize the justice model's functioning at the highest levels of the court system in the Ancient Rzeczpospolita in the context of everyday legal practice in the royal estates (in particular, Sambir economy).

**The Analysis of Recent Researches.** The Ancient Rzeczpospolita court system has a history of almost one and a half centuries of study. In general, the organization of their creation and operation, competence and efficiency of work became the subject of the scientific research for many times. Nowadays, there are both individual achievements and even whole areas, which are dedicated to the court system, hence, information is considered in detail. For example, Ignatius Thaddeus Baranowski (Baranowski, 1909), Jan Rafacz (Rafacz, 1948) wrote about the Referendum Court, and the court materials for the XVIIIth century were published in several volumes by A. Keckowa, V. Pałucki (Keckowa & Pałucki, 1955) and M. Woźniakowa (Woźniakowa, 1969, 1970). A separate monograph on the Assessor Court was published by M. Woźniakowa (Woźniakowa, 1990). The Crown Tribunal, whose activities were investigated by V. Bednaruk (Bednaruk, 2008), also received a separate paper. Obviously, this list of the researchers, who worked on the issue isn't completed. However, today there is a lack of work that would consider the activities of these institutions comprehensively through the prism of everyday practices of certain social groups and individual regions or settlements.

**The Basic Material Statement.** The system of higher judicial bodies in the Ancient Rzeczpospolita consisted of several components. One of them was formed of courts headed by the King or delegated Royal Commissioners in the person of the Chancellor, the Referent, and so on. These were the so-called 'Zadvirni' Courts, which by the end of the XVIth century split into the Referential, the Assessor, the Relational Courts. The Sejm Court can also be included in this category with certain reservations. Furthermore, 'Grodsi' and 'Zemsky' Courts formed up a separate structure, which were headed by the Crown Tribunal. In addition, there were separate courts to deal with disputes in individual areas or for specific categories of the population. Radom Tribunal is the vivid example of such courts, which dealt with the army financing disputes, or the courts under the Crown Hetman, to whom the military was subject, and so on. All these courts to some extent served the population of the crown lands, including Sambir economy in the legal field (Rafacz, 1925, p. 3–5).

The leading role among the Crown Courts was given to the Referendum Court. It considered the peasants' and other underprivileged groups' cases at first in their conflicts with the rulers of the kingdoms, in our case with Sambir administration. Later on, in the XVIIIth century, the Referendum Court dealt with the cases on the land boundaries, the legality of possession of one or another economic object, such as 'viitivstvo', milling, 'soltysivstvo', etc. Usually, among the parties to the conflict we came across the peasant communities, as well as privileged groups: 'viitiv', 'soltys', freemen, innkeepers, millers. The citizens and the communities, who came from the suburbs of Sambir, Staryi Sambir and Stara Sil also appealed to the court. Among the defendants were people, who lived in Sambir economy (from the government officials to the peasants); also among them could be found people outside that environment (the gentry from neighboring villages, church institutions, peasant communities of private and church property, burghers, etc.) (Woźniakowa, 1969, pp. 69, 110, 114, 119–124, 141, 144–155, 164–166, 175, 179, 179–182, 211–221, 223, 225, 227–228, 234, 235, 238–240, 252; Keckowa & Pałucki, 1955, p. 122). The latter usually acted as the defendants. The peasant communities, as a rule, were represented by the government officials of economy (key-holders statesmen,

vice-administrators, administrators, clerks) or specially designated representatives (captive-patrons (Woźniakowa, 1969, p. 274; Woźniakowa, 1970, pp. 295, 307, 335; CAHR, Crown Metrica, sygn. 3, p. 30). The Referendum Court could serve as the first instance to which the plaintiffs could apply directly, bypassing Sambir Castle Court and other Sambir Economy's courts. At the same time, the Referendum Court acted as an appellate court in relation to the decisions made by Sambir Castle Court (CAHR, f. "Metryka Koronna", c. KR 3, pp. 159–160; c. KR 9, pp. 91–92.; c. Kr 18, pp. 59–60, 107, 148–149). A specifically convened commission for this purpose was responsible for the execution of the sentence of this court. In addition, its composition was determined by the court. If the economy's administration was not a party to the process, the Commission included the Castle officials. In some cases, the responsibility was shifted and entrusted to the economy's administrator, vice-administrator or the nearest city court ('Grodzki' Court), which was located in Przemyśl, Lviv, Zhydachiv (Woźniakowa, 1969, pp. 122, 146, 148, 219, 235).

Individual cases were referred to the Assessor's Court, usually cases concerning disputed ownership of the real estate in economy, as both parties had the appropriate privileges for it. For example, it was in the process between the owners Fedchuk and Pasevich of the voivodship in Yablinka Dubova, on the one hand, and Henryk Janson – on the other (Woźniakowa, 1970, p. 261), the Assessor's Court was entrusted with the interpretation and commentary of dispositive documents, which, of course, included royal privileges. Unlike the Referendum Court, the Assessor Court acted exclusively as an appellate institution. The Assessor Court dealt with the cases from both Sambir Castle Court and the Referendum Court (Woźniakowa, 1969, p. 119; Horn, 1976, pp. 113–116). In addition, the Assessor's Court also served as an appellate institution for the urban population of Sambir economy.

The economy's nobility, and not only them but also other nobility, who sued the economy's administration or its population, preferred the City Courts and Lublin Tribunal, it became clear in the XVIIth – XVIIIth centuries. At the turn of the XVIth – XVIIth centuries there was a gradual distinction between the owners of 'viitivstva', liberties, 'popivstva' by origin. As a result, 'viyty', freemen and priests or 'popovichi' of noble origin put emphasis on their status affiliation in every possible way, as they sought to resolve the legal issues in the local City Court and 'Zemski' (County) Courts (Smutok & Smutok, 2019). An appeal against local City Court and 'Zemski' (County) Courts' decisions was accordingly lodged with the Crown Tribunal. Sambir economy's administration did not object to this when it came to conflicts over beatings, raids, material damage, theft of property and livestock, and so on. However, Sambir economy's administration kept a close eye on land ownership and everything that affected savings in one way or another. In the case of economy's debts, abuse and violation of taxation and duties, seizure of non-privileged lands belonging to the community, etc., the economy's administration and the Crown Treasury pointed to inconsistencies between the jurisdiction of City Courts and 'Zemski' (County) Courts and Lublin Crown Tribunal concerning Sambir economy's population. For example, during a lawsuit between Medenychi communities area and Adam Humnytskyi, the owner of the neighboring village of Rudnyky, in 1720 – 1724 for disputed forests. The attempt, which was made in order to transfer the case to Lublin Crown Tribunal, bypassing the Referendum Court, led to the recovery of Humnytskyi fine of 500 hryven (Woźniakowa, 1969, pp. 173, 179). Such an attempt to use the services of the Tribunal in a case between Letnia village community and the owner of the Litnyanskoho 'viitivstva' Dominik Bekersky for disputed lands and damage in 1729 ended in a categorical ban on such actions (Woźniakowa, 1969, p. 238).

For Sambir, Saryi Sambir and Stara Sil City Courts the highest appellate instances were the Magistrate of Lviv and the highest court of Magdeburg law in Kraków Castle or Commissioners from six cities. The existence of such higher appellate institutions was recorded in Groitsky's work "Porządek sądów i spraw mieyskich". M. Hrushevskiy translated the above-mentioned fragment into Ukrainian the following: "In Rus' from cities and towns appeal to Lviv Councilors, because Lviv is the first and most important city from the whole Rus' land; this is true, because the most important and prominent city in the province should serve as the head of other towns and villages (the author refers to the German city law); from the Councilors of Lviv they appeal to the Supreme Court (prawa) of Magdebus at the Krakow Castle, and from there to the Royal Majesty or Commissioners of six cities". However, the scientist was wary of determining "how big the appellate district of the Lviv Council really was at different times" (Hrushevskiy, 1994, p. 354).

Novyi Sambir was in the "appellate district of the Lviv council". The above-mentioned information was indicated by the copying by Novyi Sambir of the organization of management in Lviv, duplication of Lviv guild statutes by Sambir shops and permanent appeals to Lviv Magistrate with a request to interpret certain legal norms. For example, in 1584 the people of Sambir asked for an explanation concerning the division of the hereditary estates (Dörflerówna, 1936, p. 82). In the end, Novyi Sambir's residents' appeals to Lviv Magistrate reached our time. (CSHAUL, f. 43, d. 1, c. 156, pp. 322–324). At the same time, the cities, which belonged to economy appealed to the Supreme Court of German law at Krakow Castle. For example, in the 1590-ies the case of the inheritance between Sambir burgher Peter Rakhvalik and the city clerk Joseph Bachelor, after the City Courts' verdicts on the spot, the case was transferred to Lviv, and from there – to Krakow Castle (CSHAUL, f. 13, d. 1, c. 311, pp. 444–445).

However, the above-mentioned system of appeals, which developed in the late Middle Ages, was dumbing down and was being superseded by Crown Courts. Due to the ordinance on the Crown Tribunal establishment in 1578, there was the decline of the Court of six cities. Among other things, it outlined the competences of the Crown Courts. Thus, it turned out that the 'Nadvirni' Courts coped with all the cases concerning the Crown revenues and took over the jurisdiction of the settlements of the Magdeburg Law and the Helminth Law. The advantages of 'Nadvirni' Courts and the Assessor Court were obvious: in contrast to the Magdeburg Court of six cities in Kraków Castle, which covered only Małopolska territory, the Assessor Court operated throughout the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. On the other hand, it was usually a matter of crown cities and towns, not private, so the appeal to the court did not cause remarks from most lawyers at the time (Woźniakowa, 1990, p. 39). The Crown Courts already heard cases between the burghers in the middle of the XVIth century. For example, the 'Zadvirnyi' Court passed a final verdict concerning Sambir's case with the Orthodox Bishop Antony Radilovskiy on the ownership of certain real estate in the city (Dörflerówna, 1936, p. 74). Owing to the Assessor Decrees Register for 69 cities from the territories of Ruskoho and Lubelskie voivodships, which are stored in the Czartoryski Library in Krakow, we could state that the number of cases, which were heard by the Assessor's Court was steadily growing in the XVIIth century. As a result, 34 records out of 800 relate to Novyi Sambir. They are divided chronologically as follows: one record is dedicated to 1578 – 1583, 30 records are devoted to 1603 – 1696, 3 records – 1729 – 1746 (NMK, c. 135, pp. 1–187; Woźniakowa, 1990, p. 111).

There was a separate Radom Tribunal, to which the possessors of 'soltisiv'-elected economy and other persons appealed in the ownership's legality of this category of land,

the definition of the economic and legal controversial issues related to the status of 'soltis' (elected). The legitimacy of such appeals was sometimes questioned in a Referendum Court (Stańczak, 1973, pp. 34–35; Inkin, 1963, p. 350).

Furthermore, the existence of several higher courts with vaguely defined competencies created red tape and various kinds of legal conflicts constantly. For example, a conflict arose between the Soltys community and village Litynya community, Dublyanskyi area over the public lands' seizure by the Soltis and the refusal to pay taxes to Sambir Castle. The case failed to be resolved at the level of the Vice-Administrative Court and the Royal Treasury Commission, and the villagers appealed to a Referendum Court, which ruled in their favor. In response, the Soltys community challenged the verdict at Radom Tribunal and also won the case. There was a precedent – which of the sentences was more important? The problem was resolved administratively: the Royal Treasury Commission ordered the economy's administration to abide by the Referendum Court's decision, which was favorable to the Litynya community and the Crown Treasury, and to ignore the Tribunal's verdict. Even the complaint made by Tarl, the leader of the elected infantry, did not help, who claimed that the Soltis community was part of his regiment and paid 'lanowe' (state land tax) (Stańczak, 1973, pp. 189–191; Woźniakowa, 1970, pp. 15, 19–21, 102, 161). In most cases, the preference was given to the party that had the real opportunity to enforce in practice the court's decision in its favor.

In addition, from the beginning of the Royal Treasury Commission establishment, the economy received the right to file their complaints against the decrees of the economic courts to the Royal Treasury in the name of the King. The Commission itself was not endowed with the judicial functions and did not consider appeals submitted directly to it, but transferred them to one of the economy's courts – either the Vice-Administrative or any other, which considered the same case previously, and obliged them to review the sentence (SLLNU–SMHPDRB, c. 565/III, pp. 12, 16, 47, 49, 53, 89, 167; c. 569/III, pp. 34, 45, 49, 51, 64, 67, 158, 159). In general, the Commission reserved for the savings population the right to file complaints against the actions of the Castle Administration (it was noted in one of the contract's clauses concluded between the Administrator and the Treasury (SLLNU–SMHPDRB, c. 569/III, p. 167) and if the case was decided in court, the Commission not only acted as a party to the proceedings but could also set up special field delegations in order to resolve the case on the spot (SLLNU–SMHPDRB, c. 569/III, pp. 233, 265). It happened that the re-examination was not successful, and then one of the parties could demand the case consideration in one of the above-mentioned courts: the Referendum Court, the Assessor Court, etc. To do this, it was necessary to obtain a mandate in the Treasury Commission. It should be noted that the Treasury Commission, given the importance of the dispute, the need to appeal to higher authorities, decided whether or not to grant the permission to continue the process (SLLNU–SMHPDRB, c. 564/III, pp. 23, 45, 47, 189).

In addition, the Commission's role, as a body that coordinated the economy's administration activities in the legal sphere, was quite noticeable throughout the XVIIIth century. Taking into consideration that the Commission monitored the progress of all more or less important lawsuits concerning the integrity of savings, profits from it, etc., in higher courts, and due to the Commission, the economy received all the necessary information and documentation, which was sent to the Crown Treasury's lawyers, who represented the Commission's interests in court. In fact, it was the Crown Treasury Commission, or rather its representatives, who acted as either the summoned or the claimant, taking a direct part in the process, while the administration was given the role of the "assistant": send relevant documents, etc. (CAHR, f. „Archiwum

Kameralny”, c. II/29, pp. 120–121; c. II/32, pp. 77–79; c. II/67, pp. 192–193, 194, 259–265, 292, 324–329, 335–338; c. 72, pp. 24, 49–51, 130–132, 154–155, 175, 215–219).

In order to carry out its policy in the field of justice, the Crown Treasury Commission resorted to the services of so-called “plenipotentiaries” or “patrons”. The origins of this phenomenon date back to the second half of the XVIIth century. Thus, in 1660 – 80-ies these functions were performed by Pavlo Patslavskiyi (“Plenipotent ekonomiczna w grodzie przemys. Od kilkunastu lat pracuiący”) (CSHAUL, f. 13, d.1, c. 435, pp. 176–180;). In 1698–1706, Jan Gasparski and Andriy Tymanovych held the position of plenipotentiary (SLLNU–SMHPDRB, c. 537/III, pp. 130–131, 397). Consequently, such individuals were given the necessary authority to represent and defend the interests of either the economy’s resident, a group of individuals, or the rural and urban community, the area, the country, and even the entire economy temporarily, mostly for the duration of a single case. At first, the population refused to use their services. However, in the 1720-ies and 1930-ies the situation changed, thanks to the Royal Treasury Commission’s active support, which disapproved various persons delegated from the population of the economy without the Castle authorities consent to appeal to the higher courts. All economy cases, which were transferred to higher courts passed through the plenipotentiaries, and the population reserved the right to choose temporary plenipotentiaries in private cases. The plenipotentiary cartridges began to be considered in this period as one of the key figures in the legal sphere, in the economy’s relationship with the rest of Rzeczpospolita’s judicial bodies. They were appointed by the Crown Commission and receive remuneration for their work first from the Crown Treasury, and from 1739 – from the economy’s treasury (SLLNU–SMHPDRB, c. 521/III, pp. 450–451; c. 564/III, pp. 23–24, 61–62, 312; Stańczak, 1973, pp. 197–198, 200–205).

**The Conclusions.** The royal estates’ population and administration (in particular, the Sambir economy) used the courts of higher instance actively, appealing to them directly, or appealing against the decisions of the local court (Starostynskiyi / Administrative, Pidstarostynskiyi / Vice-Administrator, ‘Vyitovsko-Lavnychyi’, etc.). The most popular was the Crown Court of Referendum, less often people turned to the Crown Court of Assessors. Some issues could be considered by the field commissions set up by the King’s order in order to consider certain issues. The practice of appeals to these courts degenerated at the turn of the XVIth – XVIIth centuries, but for a long time it remained disordered and uncoordinated. It was only in the XVIIIth century, after the Crown Treasury Commission establishment that appeals to various judicial institutions outside the economy were settled and supervised by the Crown officials from Warsaw.

**Acknowledgement.** The authors of the article are sincerely grateful to all members of the editorial board for the advice provided during doing the research and writing the article.

**Financing.** The authors did not receive any financial support for doing the research and writing the article.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych [CAHR – The Central Archives of Historical Records]*  
**Baranowski, I. T.** (1909). *Sądy Referendarsie [Referendary court]. Przegląd Historyczny, 9(1), 82–96.* [in Polish]  
**Bednaruk, W.** (2008). *Trybunał Koronny: szlachecki sąd najwyższy w latach 1578 – 1794. [Crown Tribunal: the highest nobility court in the years 1578 – 1794].* Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 330 p. [in Polish]

**Dörflerówna, A.** (comps.) (1936). *Materiały do Historji miasta Sambora 1390 – 1795*. [Materials for the history of the city of Sambir 1390 – 1795]. Lwów: Wyd-wo Towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie, 238 p. [in Polish and Latin]

**Horn, M.** (1976). *Walka chłopów czerwonoruskich z wyzyskiem feudalnym w latach 1600 – 1648*. [The roller Red Ruthenian peasants with feudal exploitation in the years 1600 – 1648]. T. 2. Opole: WSP, 1976. 203 p. [in Polish]

**Hrushevskiy, M.** (1994). *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy [History of Ukraine-Rus']* (in 11 vol., Vol. 5). Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 687 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Inkin, V.F.** (1963). Особенности социальной борьбы королевских крестьян в Галичине XVIII в. [features of the social struggle of the royal peasants in Galicia in the 18<sup>th</sup> century]. *Ежегодник по аграрной истории Восточной Европы. 1961 г. – Yearbook on agrarian history of Eastern Europe. 1961*. Рига: Издательство АН Латвийской ССР, 345–356. [in Russian]

**Keckowa, A. & Palucki W.** (Comps.) (1955). *Księgi Referendarji Koronnej z drugiej połowy XVIII wieku* [Crown referendary books from the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century]. Vol. 1, Warszawa, 663 p. [in Polish]

*Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie [NMK – National museum in Krakow]*

*Naukova biblioteka Lvivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Viddil rukopysnykh, starodrukovanykh ta ridkisykh knyh im. F. P. Maksymenka [SLLNU–SMHPDRB – Scientific Library of the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. The F. P. Maximenko Sector of Manuscript, Hand Press Druck and Rare Books]*

**Rafacz, J.** (1925). *Dawny proces polski [Former Polish lawsuit]*. Warszawa: Nakł. Tow-wa nauk. Warszaw, 131 p. [in Polish]

**Rafacz, J.** (1948). *Sąd referendarski Koronny. Z dziejów obrony prawnej chłopów w Dawnej Polsce*. [Referendary court. From the history of the legal defense of peasants in former Poland]. Poznań: Nakładem Poznańskiego Towarzystwa przyjaciół nauk, 124 p. [in Polish]

**Smutok, I. & Kolomoiets, T.** (2019). The Judicial system in King board manors of Rus Voyevodstvo in the XVI<sup>th</sup> – XVIII<sup>th</sup> centuries. *Skhidnoieuropejskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 11, 29–38. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.11.170698 [in English]

Smutok, I. & Smutok, L. (2019). Dokumenty do istorii Sambirskoi ekonomii u peremyslshlyk hrodskykh i zemskykh aktakh [Documents on the history of Sambor's economy in the Peremyshl administrative and nonilitsy elective courts] *Drohobyt'skyi kraieznavchyyi zbirnyk*, XXI, 441–448. [in Ukrainian]

**Stańczak, Ed.** (1973). *Kamera saska za czasów Augusta III [Saxon treasury for the reign of August III]*. Warszawa: PWN, 221 p. [in Polish]

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi archiv Ukrainy, m. Lviv. [CSHAUL – Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine, Lviv]*

**Woźniakowa, M.** (Comps.) (1969). *Księgi Referendarji Koronnej z czasów saskich, Sumariusz*. [Crown referendary books from the Saxon times, Sumary]. Vol. 1. Warszawa. 279 p. [in Polish]

**Woźniakowa, M.** (comps.) (1970). *Księgi Referendarji Koronnej z czasów saskich, Sumariusz*. [Crown referendary books from the Saxon times, Sumary]. Vol. 2. Warszawa. 479 p. [in Polish]

**Woźniakowa, M.** (1990). *Sąd asesorski koronny 1537 – 1795. Jego organizacja, funkcjonowanie i rola w dziejach prawa chełmińskiego i magdeburckiego*. [Crown assessor court 1537 – 1795. Its organization, functioning and role in the history od Chelm and Magdeburg law]. Warszawa, 432 p. [in Polish]

*The article was received on February 28, 2020.*

*Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC: 027.6:272-523.6(477)“17/18”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226512

**Oksana KARLINA**

*PhD (History), Associate Professor of Department of World History, Faculty of History, Political Science and National Security Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, 24 Chopin Street, Lutsk, Ukraine, postal code 43025 (oksana.karlina@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-8706-942X

**ResearcherID:** 3173402/oksana-karlina/

**Anna KYRYLIUK**

*Postgraduate student (history and archeology) of Department of World History, Faculty of History, Political Science and National Security Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University, 24 Chopin Street, Lutsk, Ukraine, postal code 43025 (annakyrlyuk@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-0235-2304

**ResearcherID:** 3171872/anna-kyryliuk/

**Оксана КАРЛІНА**

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри всесвітньої історії, факультету історії, політології та національної безпеки Волинського національного університету імені Лесі Українки, вул. Шопена 24, Луцьк, Україна, індекс 43025 (oksana.karlina@gmail.com)*

**Анна КИРИЛЮК**

*аспірантка кафедри всесвітньої історії, факультету історії, політології та національної безпеки Волинського національного університету імені Лесі Українки, вул. Шопена 24, Луцьк, Україна, індекс 43025 (annakyrlyuk@gmail.com)*

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Karlina, O. & Kyrlyuk, A. (2021). The Roman Catholic monasteries libraries inventories' source potential of Lutsk-Zhytomyr Diocese at the end of the XVIIIth – beginning of the XIXth century. *Skhidnoievropejskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 16–29. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226512

**THE ROMAN CATHOLIC MONASTERIES LIBRARIES INVENTORIES' SOURCE POTENTIAL OF LUTSK-ZHYTOMYR DIOCESE AT THE END OF THE XVIIIth – BEGINNING OF THE XIXth CENTURY**

**Abstract.** *The inventories of the libraries of the Roman Catholic monasteries of Lutsk-Zhytomyr Diocese are important historical sources, which are helpful in the research of monks' intellectual life, monastic culture, and material base of monastic schools. The inventories of monastic libraries do not constitute a distinct historical source but are the part of the monastic visitation - a universal document that includes a description of the whole monastery.*

*Persons, who led the visitations, did not have any specific requirements for compiling the library inventories. Therefore, the inventories that we have in our disposal differ in their appearance and structure. Some of them are very detailed. They include the author and book title, place, and date of publishing. Sometimes inventories' authors recorded only the name of a book and the number of its*

copies in the library. There were also such booklists which included lists of thematic sections of the library and lists of books that belonged to them.

We dispose of the libraries' inventories of eleven monasteries of Lutsk-Zhytomyr Roman Catholic Diocese which are stored in the funds of the State Archive of Zhytomyr oblast.

One of the largest libraries belonged to Lutsk Trinitarian monastery. We have in the disposition the visitations of this monastery of 1799, 1816, and 1819. Only the inventory of 1799 is very detailed and placed on 45 sheets of general visitation of the monastery. It recorded the title of a book, year and place of its publishing. The rest of the inventories show how the number of books in the monastic library changed. In 1799 there were 2177 books, in 1816 – 2578, and in 1819 – 2368. The decrease in the number of books in 1819 could be caused by the fact that books were transferred to another monastery of the Order or some educational institution.

The Trinitarian monastery in Shumbar, county of Kremenets, in 1799 had only a small library with 19 books. The reason was that the rest of the books were transferred to the Trinitarian monastery in Berestechko, where a school operated. As of 1816, the monastery in Berestechko already had 1515 books, but the inventory of the library is not detailed, so we have no other information besides the genre repertoire of the library. It is interesting that we know the identity of the librarian. He was Norbert Podvisotsky.

We dispose of the inventory of two Franciscan monasteries. The first one was in Mezhyrych Ostrozky, which had 323 books in 1819. The second one was in Kremenets. His library numbered 330 books. There was a small number of books in the libraries of Franciscan monasteries because the Franciscans were not engaged in active educational activities.

Another small book collection belonged to the Carmelite Monastery in Dorostany of Dubno County – 162 books in Polish and Latin. Two Augustinian monasteries in Zaturtsi and Radzkehiv had 138 and 214 books in their libraries, respectively. More books belonged to Bernardines from the village of Yalovychi – 829. Unfortunately, the inventory of the library is not detailed and contains only a list of thematic sections and information on the number of books.

A large library of 1009 books was in the monastery of the Order of Reformation from the village of Dederkaly near Kremenets. Its inventory is detailed, so in addition to the topics of the books, we also analyzed the places of publication of the literature. Most of the books were published in Venice, Lviv, Warsaw, and Krakow.

The monastery of the Order of Piarists in Dubrovytsia held one of the largest educational institutions in Volyn. The visitation of the monastery contains the inventory of the libraries of its church, monastery, school, and library of the Dubrovytsia Collegium. The last one arouses considerable interest. We have a detailed inventory. The library numbered 2087 books in 1818. They were published between the 16th and early 19th centuries, most of them – in the 18th century.

Thus, the inventories of monastery libraries are an important historical source. With their help, we can explore the amount of literature, its genres, time, and place of publication of the books. The literature of the monasteries gives an idea of the level of cultural and intellectual life in the monasteries. Also, a study of monastery inventory is important, as most of the old printed books are not preserved to this day.

**Key words:** inventory, monastery library, visitation, old-fashioned print, Roman Catholic monasteries, Lutsk-Zhytomyr diocese, Volyn province.

## **ДЖЕРЕЛОЗНАВЧИЙ ПОТЕНЦІАЛ ІНВЕНТАРІВ БІБЛІОТЕК РИМО-КАТОЛИЦЬКИХ МОНАСТІРІВ ЛУЦЬКО-ЖИТОМИРСЬКОЇ ДІЄЦЕЗІЇ КІНЦЯ ХVІІІ – ПОЧАТКУ ХІХ СТ.**

**Анотація.** Інвентарі бібліотек римо-католицьких монастирів Луцько-Житомирської дієцезії є важливим історичним джерелом з історії інтелектуального життя ченців, монастирської культури, а також шкіль, які діяли при монастирях. Вони є складовою частиною монастирської візитації – універсального документу, що містить опис всього монастирського комплексу та його майна. **Мета статті** – дослідити джерелознавчий потенціал бібліотечних інвентарів римо-католицьких монастирів Луцько-Житомирської дієцезії кінця ХVІІІ – початку ХІХ ст. **Методологія** підпорядкована принципам науковості та історизму. Вона ґрунтується на методах джерелознавчого аналізу та синтезу. Акцент зроблено на методі критичного аналізу документального матеріалу. **Наукова новизна.** Вперше проаналізовано джерелознавчий потенціал

інвентарів бібліотек одинадцяти монастирів Луцько-Житомирської римо-католицької дієцезії, що є складовою частиною візитацій, датованих кінцем XVIII – початком XIX ст. та збережених у фондах Державного архіву Житомирської області. Особи, які проводили візитацію, не керувалися визначеними вимогами щодо складання інвентаря бібліотеки. Віднайдені нами в архівних фондах інвентарі мають різну інформаційну наповненість. Деякі з них містять детальні відомості про наявні в бібліотеці монастиря книжки: автор/автори, назва книжки (повна чи скорочена), місце та рік друку, кількість наявних томів і примірників. Часто укладачі інвентарів записували лише назву книжки, її розмір, фізичний стан, кількість примірників. Зрідка зазначалися лише тематичні розділи книжкового фонду та кількість книжок у кожному з них.

Одна з найбільших бібліотек належала Луцькому монастирю тринітаріїв, про що свідчать візитації цього монастиря за 1799 р., 1816 р. та 1819 р. Однак лише інвентар бібліотеки за 1799 р. є детальним (займає 45 аркушів). У ньому було записано назву книжки, рік та місце виходу. Вивчення усіх трьох інвентарів дає змогу прослідкувати динаміку книжкового фонду бібліотеки: у 1799 р. він налічував 2177 книг, у 1816 р. – 2578, а у 1819 р. – 2368. Зменшення кількості книг у 1819 р. могло бути пов'язане з передачею початкової літератури для потреб парафіяльної школи, яка діяла при монастирі.

У 1799 р. монастир тринітаріїв у містечку Шумбар Кременецького повіту мав всього 19 книг, а основний бібліотечний фонд був перевезений до монастиря в Берестечку, де місцеві отці-тринітарії утримували школу. Станом на 1816 р. в їхньому розпорядженні було близько півтори тисячі книг, але інвентарний опис цієї книгозбірні дає можливість лише визначити її жанровий репертуар та вказати особу бібліотекаря. Ним був отець Норберт Підвисоцький.

Велику бібліотеку (близько тисячі книжок) згромадили реформати у селі Дедеркали біля Кременця. Наявність детального інвентаря дає змогу визначити її тематичну наповненість, час і місце друку творів. Найбільше з книг походило з друкарень Венеції, Львова, Варшави та Кракова.

У візитації монастиря піарів у Дубровиці Рівненського повіту 1818 р. книгозбірня поділялась на костельну, монастирську, парафіяльної школи та колеґіуму (повітової школи), які функціонували при монастирі. Найбільше книжок налічувала бібліотека колеґіуму: у розпорядженні учнів та учителів закладу було 2087 творів, виданих у XVI – на початку XIX століття.

Візитації двох францисканських монастирів (у Межиріччі Острозькому і Кременці) за 1819 р., в яких вміщені невеликі інвентарні описи книгозбірень, засвідчують, що францисканці зібрали порівняно небагато книжок (близько трьохсот), головним чином, твори, необхідні для проповідницької діяльності.

**Висновки.** Проаналізовані інвентарі монастирських бібліотек подібні між собою кількома рисами: поділом на тематичні розділи (хоча інколи по-різному названі), чисельною перевагою латиномовних книжок, домінуванням серед творів польською мовою проповідницької і навчальної літератури, відсутністю інкунабул, збереженістю книг, виданих переважно у XVIII столітті.

**Ключові слова:** інвентар бібліотеки, монастирська бібліотека, церковна візитація, стародруки, римо-католицькі монастирі, Луцько-Житомирська дієцезія, Волинська губернія.

**The Problem Statement.** It is vital to pay attention to the monastic culture development, in which libraries played an important role, in order to study the Roman Catholic monastic communities' history in Volyn comprehensively. The book collections' existence is associated with the rich intellectual life of the monastic fraternity and is not limited to its educational activities. The monasteries were involved in the process of spreading the primary secular education actively, only after Volyn lands accession to the Russian Empire. Taking into consideration the thematic focus of monastic libraries, it seems obvious that the clergy were in need of available books primarily.

The Roman Catholic monasteries libraries' inventories allow to reconstruct the libraries' quantitative content, thematic and genre diversity of books, where and when they were printed, how they were stored.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches.** The monastic libraries' inventories' source study potential of Lutsk-Zhytomyr diocese is covered in domestic and foreign scientific literature

poorly. The works, written by Iryna Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, who studies old prints from Volyn monastic libraries, which are stored in the funds of Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, stand out in the Ukrainian bibliographic work (Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, 2008; Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, 2010; Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, 2012; Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, 2013; Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, 2016;). One of the researcher's articles is devoted to the analysis of the Roman Catholic monastic libraries' sources history (Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, 2018). Natalia Sinkevych analyzed the Dominican monasteries libraries' in the context of studying the monastic centers' intellectual life (Sinkevych, 2009). The scientist, Nazariy Loshtyn devoted his work to the Roman Catholic monastic libraries' issue in Galicia (Loshtyn, 2018, p. 392). Ivan Almes dealt with the Orthodox and Greek Catholic monasteries' book collections (Almes, 2017, p. 115).

**The purpose of the article** is to determine the source potential, based on the Roman Catholic monasteries libraries' inventories analysis of Lutsk-Zhytomyr diocese at the end of the XVIIIth – the beginning of the XIXth centuries.

**The Basic Material Statement.** Volyn monastic libraries' inventories do not constitute a distinct historical source but are the part of the monastic visitation – a universal historical source that includes the detailed description of the library, which always complied a separate section.

The visitors were guided by the instructions according to which the acts of visitation were drawn up. There weren't found any specific requirements for the form and content of the library inventory in them. The only known instruction, issued to the Order of Reforms visitor from 1804, stated that information concerning the library should be one of the first points of visitation (Institute of Manuscripts of the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, f. 314, c. 27, p. 140).

It should be mentioned that the part of the visitation in which the library was described was called "The Library Inventory". The books in inventories were divided into thematic sections. Since the library registers were compiled in an arbitrary form, their information potential was different. Hence, in some visitations we could only come across the libraries' inventory, where the title of the book was recorded (mostly incomplete), sometimes the author, place and year of publication. It happened that the description of the book gave only its title, as well as the number of copies of this work in the library. In some inventories the size of the book was fixed. It can be assumed that the books were recorded in the inventory according to the location on the shelves.

Sometimes the visitation indicated only how many books and what topics were kept in the monastery. As a result, it is quite difficult to call such a list of the book collection's thematic sections the inventory. Occasionally, visitations include a separate inventory of books of the church, monastery, as well as the school that operated at the monastery. It could also happen that there was no information about the libraries' availability in the visitations.

The several monasteries libraries' inventories of Lutsk-Zhytomyr Roman Catholic diocese source potential should be analyzed, which belonged to different orders at the end of the XVIIIth – beginning of the XIXth centuries.

**The Order of the Trinitarians. Lutsk.** The Trinitarian monastery was built in 1718 on the site of the Union Church of Michael the Archangel with the permission of the Greek-Union Metropolitan of Kyiv, Halych and all Rus Lev Kyshka and the Bishop of Lutsk Józef Wygowski (State Archive of Zhytomyr Region, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 1). The novitiate operated at the monastery in the first half of the XIXth century. Until 1842 it was the residence of the provincial of the Order of Trinitarians of the Rus' province in the Russian Empire

(Gach, 1999, p. 57). The monastery was closed in 1850. As a result, part of the monastery's library got into Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine funds'.

The monastery library is an example of a large collection of books: its inventory is set out on 45 sheets of the monastery's general visitation of 1799, which describes 2,177 books (1,246 works), mainly in Latin and Polish. They are divided into 24 thematic sections (*Table 1*).

The visitation describes the books storage conditions. The compiler did not mention the room where the library was located, but noted that all books were stored in the carpentry cabinets, which were locked. There were six such cabinets (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 56). In addition, it is known that the library was located on the second floor of the monastery building, where there were an archive, an oratory and a school hall. The library wooden lacquered cabinets were made in the Ionic order architectural style, in particular, decorated with floral ornaments' carvings. Two of them were 13.5 cubits long and 6.5 cubits wide and were divided into five upper and five lower cabinets. The other four cabinets were 8 cubits long and 5 cubits wide and were divided into three upper and three lower cabinets (Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, 2010, p. 148).

Table 1

**Lutsk Trinitarian Monastery's Book Collection of 1799, 1816, 1819 (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 11-56; f. 90, d. 1, c. 293, p.8; f. 90, d. 1, c. 412, p. without pagination)**

№	Thematic section	Number of works		
		1799	1816	1819
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
1	The Holy Scripture	10	28	16
2	The Commentaries on the Holy Scriptures	4	35	33
3	The Holy Fathers' Works	26	71	79
4	Scholastic Theology	28	58	64
5	Dogmatic Theology	56	197	210
6	Moral Theology	156	129	142
7	Church Law	43	81	77
8	Civil Law	24	57	57
9	Church History	58	165	169
10	Secular History	153	133	138
11	Works on mathematics	12	21	21
12	Works on medicine	31	48	46
13	Primary Schools Books	20	-	-
14	Worship Books	39	-	57
15	Books in different languages	252	190	-
16	"Political" Books	94	171	153
17	Rhetoric	104	35	125
18	Poetry	36	-	54
19	"Military" Books	5	7	5
20	Economics Books	3	7	7
21	Books authored by members of the order	65	118	59
22	Prohibited Books	12	15	14
23	Choir Books	12	-	-
24	Architecture Books	4	7	7

Continuation Table 1

1	2	3	4	5
25	Sermons in Polish	-	189	185
26	Sermons in Latin	-	98	98
27	Ascetic Works	-	286	307
28	Philosophy	-	189	184
29	Geography	-	20	-
30	"Rubricistarum"	-	16	8
31	Doctrinal Books	-	33	30
32	"Devotinis"	-	74	-
33	Manuscripts	-	100	-
34	Historical Geography	-	-	23
	<b>Total</b>	1247	2578	2368

The list of books begins with the Holy Scriptures section, which includes various editions of the Bible and the Gospels mostly. The oldest book in this chapter is the "Psalterium Graece et Latinae", which was published in 1611, but the publication's place was not determined. The section "The Holy Fathers' Works" united the works, written by Francis of Assisi (Padua, 1739), Ignatius Loyola (Antwerp, 1662), Basil the Great (Cologne, 1617) (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 11) and other renowned theologians.

Lutsk Trinitarians Library enumerated 239 works on Dogmatic, Scholastic and Moral Theology. Among them we came across the works, written by Jan Alois Kulesha (1660 – 1706) "Wiara Prawosławna pismem świętym, soborami, Oycami SS. mianowicie greckimi y historią kościelną" (Vilnius in 1704), by Martin Rybczynski (1707 – 1794) "Ofiara Sprawiedliwości, albo Traktat o Czyscu", which was published in Berdychiv Carmelite Monastery publishing house in 1763; its author at that time headed the Rus' province of the Order of the Carmelites (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 16, 21).

Furthermore, the legal literature available in the monastery was divided into "Church Law" (43 works) and "Civil Law" (24 works). The oldest book on ecclesiastical law was Cracow edition of 1630 the "Concilium Provinciale Regni Polonia" (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 227, p. 24) authored by Bernard Maciejowski, Cardinal, Lutsk (1587 – 1600) and Cracow Bishop (1600 – 1605), known (among other things) for marrying Marina Mnishek and Tsar of Muscovy False Dmitry I. The Books on Civil Law were represented by the Sejm Constitutions Rzeczpospolita mainly, which were published in different years (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 16).

There were 65 works in the library, mainly about the lives of saints, sermons and prayers, authored by the Trinitarian monks. For example, "Życie B. Szymona de Roxas ord. Trinitat", (Berdychiv, 1796), "Życie i Nabożeństwo do B. Szymona i Michała Trynitarów" (Vilnius, 1776), "Modlitwy do NP. Maryi w kościele Tomaszowskim XX Trynitarzów", printed in Lviv (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 35).

In addition, the book "Sparta Polska [...]", published in 1703 in Zamość, in the section "Church History" deserves special attention. It described the miracles associated with the icon of the Virgin of Lutsk Dominican Monastery (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 227, p. 25), whose coronation took place in 1749. The icon of the Virgin of Lutsk Dominicans was a copy of the Roman icons from the Basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore in Italy. The miraculous image original burned down during a fire in Lutsk Cathedral in 1926, and only the engravings and a copy from 1640 survived (Sinkevych, 2005, p. 227).

The section “Secular History” included 153 works, mostly on the Commonwealth history. Consequently, we came across among them the “Chronicle of Poland”, written by Martin Cromer, which depicted the history of Poland from ancient times to 1505. The inventory’s compiler stated that the above-mentioned book no longer had a title page. It can be assumed that it was published in 1611 in Krakow. The renowned work “Żywoty Świętych”, written by Petro Skarha, which came out of one of the Krakow printing houses in 1760, could also be found in this section (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 25).

Furthermore, the library kept a lot of research and educational literature on Arithmetic, Algebra and Geometry (for example, “Elementa” by Christian von Wolf (1679-1754) (Genoa, 1734), “Geometrya Czyli nauka o ziemiomiernictwie [...]” by Patricia Skaradke (Warsaw, 1774), “Taumaturgus Mathby ematicus” Caspar Ensi (Cologne, 1636), and several works on Geography, including the popular Basilian Hilarion Karpinsky’s “Lexykon geographiczny” (Vilnius, 1766). The section “Woks on Medicine” contained several renowned medical treatises: published in 1551 by the Greek physician of the Roman Empire Areteus of Cappadocia (the turn of the I – II centuries AD), Professor of Medicine at the University of Wittenberg Daniel Zennert (1572 – 1637), Italian and physician of the XVIth century, Professor of the University of Padua Mark Antony Zimar (1460 – 1532), the physiologist, who worked at the Academy of Sedan (in the north of France), Leiden and Basel universities, Francis Sylvania (1614 – 1672), and the treatises of Hippocrates (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 35).

It should be mentioned that the section “Forbidden Books” was interesting, as it enumerated 12 works, which were included in various indexes of forbidden books by the Roman Catholic Church. For instance, we came across the work, written by Nicollo Machiavelli “Disputationum de republica, quas discursus nuncupavit, libri III”, published in 1599 in Venice; Ioannis Marin’s “Oconenfis Theologia Speculativa & Moralis” (Venice, 1720), which was included in the Catholic Church Forbidden Books Index in 1681, Frankfurt edition of 1595 the ancient Greek historian and politician works, Xenophon (approx. 430 BC – approx. 355 BC), as well as the works of Protestant authors, for example, “Devotiones et Cantica Luteranorum” (Dresden, 1745). One more work entitled as “De Secretis Mulinerum” (Amsterdam, 1669) and attributed mistakenly to the Dominican Father, mentor of Thomas Aquinas, the Saint of the Roman Catholic Church Albert the Great, was included in the above-mentioned section. Hence, the medical and philosophical treatise contained a variety of medical information, the magical acts’ descriptions and folklore sketches (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 56).

Due to the inventory compiling method, we managed to determine that most books were printed in the following European book printing centers: Venice, Cologne, Augsburg, Antwerp, Rome and Vienna. Several books were published in London, as well as in Lviv and Berdychiv.

The oldest book in the library was the tome “Vita S. Benedicti”, dated 1507, but the place of publication was not indicated (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 227, p. 26). The basis of Lutsk Trinitarians Monastery library comprised the XVIIIth century’s editions: 839 works (81.4%), there were only 35 books published in the XVIth century, and 148 books published in the XVIIth century (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 227, p. 11–56). Hence, Lutsk Trinitarians book fund was formed in the XVIIIth century.

Taking everything into account, Lutsk Trinitarian Monastery’s visitations in 1816 and 1819 do not contain any informative library inventory. As we only found a list of thematic sections and the number of copies in each of them. Apparently, the library was subject to detailed description only during general visits. In 1816 there were 2,461 books in the monastery’s book collection (Table 1). There were as many as 29 sections, among which

there were several new ones compared to 1799 (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 293, p. 8). The library's inventory compiler in the visitation for 1819 indicated the number of books of a certain size (in folio, in 4 °, in 8 °, in 12 °) in each of the 27 thematic sections.

**Shumbar, Kremenets povit (district).** In 1750, Michał Blendowski, a swordsman from Nowogródek, allocated funds and a plot of land to the Trinitarian fathers for the monastery construction in this town. In 1791 the monks from Kremenets, who had only a residence without a church in the city, joined Shumbar Trinitarians. The monastery in Shumbar was closed, like most monasteries in Volyn, in 1832 (Sobczyńska-Szczepańska, 2017, p. 107).

According to Shumbar Monastery's visitation of 1799, it is known that there were few books in it. The inventory contains a list of only 19 books (the title of the work, the author, although not always, the year of publication, the physical condition of the book). It was recorded that the availability of such a small number of books was due to the fact that the rest were handed over to the Trinitarians in Berestechko, where they maintained the school. In addition, the monastery did not have a place to store the library (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 225, p. 2).

The monastery had only one copy of the Bible. The visitation's compiler stated that the title page vanished and therefore the time and place of printing could not be established. The collection also included several books on Theology, Canon Law, collections of sermons, such as Samuel Wysotsky (Warsaw, 1740), Dominican Tomasz Bogdanowicz (Czestochowa, 1716) and the Trinitarian Onufriy (Vilnius, 1730) (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 225, p. 2).

**Berestechko, Dubno povit (district).** The monastery in this town was founded in 1689 by the Galician Castellan Tomasz Karczewski, who owned the town of Berestechko (Sobczyńska-Szczepańska, 2017, p. 157). Given the fact that the Berestechko Monastery was constantly a novitiate, as well as philosophical and theological studies, the last mention of which dates back to 1828, this center is attributed to the large monasteries (Gach, 1999, p. 157). It was closed in 1832.

According to the library's list of books, placed before the visitation in 1816, it contained 1515 works (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 286, p. 6–7), but only 18 thematic sections with the number of books were recorded in each. Most were historical works (256) and works on Moral Theology (185). It should be mentioned that 7 books were classified as forbidden (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 286, p. 6–7). Norbert of St. Joseph Pidvysotskyi acted as the Trinitarian Monastery librarian in Berestechko. He was not a clergyman but served in a monastery since 1798, where he was transferred from another monastery (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 286, p. 6–7).

**The Order of Franciscans. Mezhyrich, Ostroh povit (district).** The church and monastery in this town were founded by Prince Janusz Ostrożki, a Krakow Castellan, in 1612. The monastery ensemble is still a unique monument, as it is one of the few Roman Catholic complexes that performed a defensive function. The monastery's project author is considered to be the famous Polish architect Paweł Grozdicki (?– 1645), the architect of the Royal Arsenal in Warsaw and Lviv, the designer of Lviv Cathedral. The Holy Trinity Mezhyrityski Monastery was the largest center of the Franciscan Order in Volyn. The monastery functioned until the mid-50-ies of the XIXth century (Malenkov, 2006).

The library's inventory, placed in the visitation of 1804, consisted of two parts: the "Latin Library" and the "Polish Library". It was presented in the form of a table: in the first column the title of the book was entered, and in the next four columns – the book size: in folio, in 4 °, in 8 °, in 12 °; the number of copies of each work was also indicated. The inventory's compiler indicated the year of publication, when he was enumerating the Latin books, but never recorded the place of printing (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 240, p. Without pagination).

Furthermore, the inventory showed that the library had more literature in Latin – 271 books out of 390. In addition, the repertoire of books in Latin and Polish differed. There was no thematic division. Among the books in Latin we came across works on history: “Historia Redni Polonia”, written by Martin Cromer, “Orbis Polonus”, written by Polish chronicler, member of the Dominican Order Shimon Okolsky, “Historia Hungarica”, written by Antonio Bonfini, Italian humanist, poet and historian under the Hungarian kings SAZR, pp. 90, pp. 1, pp. 240, pp. Without pagination). There were numerous works on Philosophy. In particular, there were books by Anthony Ferrari, Bartholomew Masley, Andrea Semeri and others. There were also works written by ancient authors, including “Orationis” and “Epistola” by Marcus Tullius Cicero, works by Aristotle, which were recorded under the common name “Opus Aristotelis”. There were mostly theological works and sermons by various authors among the Polish-language literature (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 240, p. Without pagination).

The library’s inventory was compiled differently in Mezhyrich Franciscan Monastery’s visitation in 1819: the compiler provided only a list of 10 thematic sections (Holy Scripture, Theological Books, Church Books, etc.) and the number of the Latin-language books in them. It was also noted that the monastery had books in Polish (114 copies), but they were not thematically divided; the total number of the library fund was 323 books. The book collection also contained the church’s and the monastery’s archives and various documentation: the worship’s registers, the monastery books of income and expenditure, the act materials (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 396, p. 2).

**Kremenets.** In 1608, owing to Martin Shyshkovsky’s, Lutsk Bishop foundation a monastery of the Franciscan Order was established in Kremenets. After the National Liberation War, under Bohdan Khmelnytskyi’s leadership, the monastery complex was repaired at the expense of Count Stanislav Potocki. The monastery was abolished in 1832, and its buildings were transferred to the Orthodox Church (Sobchuk, 2008, p. 568).

According to the library’s inventory for 1816, there were four thematic sections, in which 231 books were listed, including as many as 41 books, which were classified as forbidden books (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 288, pp. 13–17). It is known that in 1818 the monastery’s library already had 400 volumes of books (Gizycki, 1920, p. 69). In addition, the theological literature and sermons dominance in the library was quite noticeable. The list of books in the inventory contained only the book title, sometimes very abbreviated (one or two words), and the number of volumes. There was no information about the time and place concerning the books’ publication (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 288, p. 13–19).

The books in the “History” section covered works on various topics. Consequently, there were works on the Sejm Constitutions of Rzeczpospolita, various legal documents, including, for example, the coronation procedure descriptions. The historical works embodiment was the “Kroniki Bernarda Wapowskiego z Radochoniec” (or Kronik Bernarda Lanigu). Bernard Wapowski was a renowned Polish Geographer and Chronicler. It is known that the chronicle told the story of the Slavs origin, and preserved only the part in which the account of events began in 1377, i.e., from the year of death of Grand Duke Olgerd of Lithuania, and ended in 1535. The author focused on the military political and diplomatic history of the Lithuanian-Polish state (Mytsyk, 2003, p. 688). Ancient literature was represented by the works written by Titus Livius “Orationes” and “Conciones annotations”. The section also included textbooks on Grammar, German, Geography, Geometry, and diverse dictionaries (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 288, p. 16).

**The Order of the Carmelites of Ancient Observance. Dorohostai, Dubno povit.** The founder of the monastery was Constance Sapieha, who by the will of her husband

Jan-Frederik Sapięha in 1666 applied to the Apostolic See for permission to build a monastery (Giżycki, 1918, p. 107). It is known that the monks took care of the parish and maintained the school. Hence, in 1808 the school had 18 students, in 1809 23 students were enrolled, in 1811 there were 15 students (Giżycki, 1918, p. 129). The monastery was closed in 1832.

The monastery's visitation included the library's inventory in 1817. There were multifarious books on the church and the monastery, written in Latin and Polish. In total, the library had 117 works in 162 volumes. The title of the books was given succinctly (the first two or three words), sometimes only the subject matter of the works and their number were indicated (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 298, p. Without pagination). Due to the available information, we can state that the Carmelite library contained a lot of preaching and biographical literature, as well as some well-known historical works, such as Jan Długosz's "Historia".

**The Order of Augustinians. Zaturtsi, Volodymyr-Volynskiy povit.** The Augustinian center was founded by Jan Lidokhovskiy, a Volyn Castellan, in 1620 (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 301, p. 1). This small monastery functioned until 1832. (CSHAUK, f. 442, d. 64, c. 166, p. 148).

Although the monastery's library in 1817 had 138 books on Scholastic and Moral Theology, Homiletics, History. In the inventory, they were divided into appropriate sections without specifying the place and time of their printing (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 301, p. 12–15).

**Radekhiv, Volodymyr-Volynskiy povit.** The Augustinian monastery in this village was founded by Adam Sylvester of Orange in 1753, but there was a mention that the monastery's foundation was established earlier at the expense of Wojciech Rostkowski in 1696. (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 309, p. 1). The monastery was closed in 1832.

According to the library's inventory, placed in the visitation of 1817, it is possible to state that in this small monastery the library numbered 190 works (214 volumes). The first part of the list, which had no title, contained mostly historical literature (18 works, 22 volumes). In addition, the following thematic sections were highlighted: Theology, Sermons and Rhetoric, Philosophy and Law, Ascetic Literature. The inventory did not indicate the place and year of the publication of the book. One of its distinguishing features from other inventories was the new arrivals' fixation, in particular, it was noted that 22 books were received after the general visitation in 1804, and another 8 books were purchased after the visitation in 1814. At the end of the visitation's text, the names of 8 more books were added (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 309, p. 8–9).

**The Order of the Bernardines. Yanivka, Kovel povit.** In this town in 1630 the monastery was founded by Michael and Christina Malinski. In 1740 a brick church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary was built (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 236, p. 1).

The monastery's visitation in 1807 contained a short inventory of the library, which did not contain a complete list of books, but only thematic sections and the number of books in each of them, a total of about 800 volumes; "Speeches, appeals and manifestos" in Latin and Polish (164 works) predominated, no historical and educational literature was singled out. In addition, the library kept 34 manuscripts (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 236, p. 2).

**The Order of Reforms. Dederkaly, Kremenets povit.** The monastery was built in 1748 at the expense of Michael Horace Price. It functioned until 1891 and was one of the few Catholic monastic centers that were not closed in the 1930-ies and 1950-ies in Lutsk-Zhytomyr diocese.

The monastery library was considerable, but we have no source evidence of the existence of the reforms of the educational institution (IMVNLU, f. 332, p. 19, p. 2). The library's inventory of 1818 was recorded in the form of a table: in the first column the year of publication of the book was recorded, in the second column the place of printing, in the next – the name

of the book, the last column indicated the number of copies in the library. First, the books were listed in Latin, then in Polish. The numbering of books was not continuous but began in each chapter.

The library's repertoire was typical. The compiler identified 12 thematic sections: Scripture (17 books), Commentaries on Scripture (122), Theological works (193), Philosophy, Geometry and Arithmetic (61), Historical Literature (118), Church History (76), Ascetic and Spiritual Literature (117), Forbidden Books (18) and others; in total – 1,009 books (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 222, p. 21).

Historical literature occupied a prominent place in the library of the Reformed Brethren. Works on the history of the Church and works on Secular history were listed separately. Furthermore, we came across the work written by Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the history of ancient Rome, one of the volumes of the History of Herodotus (London, 1715), the History of Germany by Struvius (Genoa, 1730), a study on the history of Byzantium, published in Venice in 1789 (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 222, p. 24). In the section the "Forbidden Books", there were works by Protestant theologians. All books were kept in cupboards, "and the forbidden ones are stored in the same library in a separate closed cupboard, nobody reads them because they don't have permission to do so" (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 222, p. 35).

The library kept works brought from Amsterdam, Leipzig, Paris, Antwerp, Cologne, Frankfurt am Main, London, Salzburg and other cities in Western Europe. Many books came from the printing houses of Krakow, Warsaw, Poznan and Lublin. There were 15 works published by the printing house at the monastery of the Order of Barefoot Carmelites in Berdychiv. The largest number of books in the monastery's collection was published in Venice (70 works) and Lviv (69 works) (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 222, pp. 21–35). It should be emphasized that in Lviv during the second half of the XVIIth – XVIIIth centuries there were several printing houses, including two monasteries: the Jesuit Monastery and the Franciscan Monastery (Loshtyn, 2018, p. 186).

Moreover, the books, which were kept in the church were recorded as a separate point of the visitation. These included liturgical books and materials from the current archive (the metric books, the cord books of income and expenses, books for recording the church donations, etc.) (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 222, p. 20).

The monastery's visitation in 1829 stated only that the library had 2166 books, there was no information about their subject. So, in ten years, the number of books doubled. However, the analyzed sources do not allow us to determine the reasons for such a significant increase in the book fund, although we can assume that the monastery purchased the necessary literature actively and the list of books included archival manuscripts stored in the church (IMVNLU, f. 332, c. 19, p. 2).

**The Order of PR. Dubrovysia, Rivne povit.** The monastery in this town was founded in 1684 on the foundation of Jan Karol Dolski (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 320, p. Without pagination), and ceased to operate in 1831.

According to the visitation of 1818 the following church's books were highlighted (there were 15 of them), 5 metric books, the books of the monastery, which include the chronicle of the monastery for 1733 – 1799, the book of income and expenses and other monastic documents (a total of 11 volumes) were singled out. 13 books are called «school». These included a "golden book" for enrolling students, a book with assignments for student exams, a general visit book, and other school records (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, c. 320, without pagination).

The library's inventory itself had the form of a table divided into 24 thematic sections. In the first column of the table the title of the book was written, in the second – the number

of copies of the work, in the third – the year of publication, and in the fourth – the place of publication. In this inventory we came across for the first time the atlases and maps separation, despite the fact that there were as many as 178. Among them was the famous atlas of the Scottish cartographer Pinkerman, which was considered at that time the best work on Cartography, noted for its detail; they are still used today. In total, the book collection numbered 2,087 books (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 320, p. Without pagination), of which 492 (61%) were published in the XVIIIth century and only 46 (7%) came from the printing houses of the XVIth century. It is vital to add that the library of PR in Dubrovysia was replenished actively with publications of the early XIXth century, mainly educational literature (103 books), which could be explained by the povit (county) school presence in the monastery. The monastery's visitation stated that PLN 400 were spent on the needs of the library in 1818 (SAZR, f. 90, d. 1, p. 320, p. Without pagination).

**The Conclusions and Prospects for Further Exploration of this Issue.** Taking everything into account, the inventory is an integral part of the visitations to the Roman Catholic monasteries of Lutsk-Zhytomyr diocese. There were no fixed requirements for compiling the inventories, but in most of them, the literature was divided into thematic sections. In general, large libraries belonged to the monasteries where the schools operated. Sometimes the visitation's compiler recorded the liturgical books of the church, the monastery and the school library in separate lists. It happened that manuscripts of the current archive of the monastery were included in the description of the library.

The analyzed inventories of monastic libraries are similar in several features: division into thematic sections (although sometimes differently named), the numerical predominance of Latin books, the dominance of the Polish-language preaching and educational literature, the absence of incunabula, the largest number of books published in the XVIIIth century, which gives grounds to argue about the monastic libraries book fund's formation mainly during the Enlightenment period. In the new political conditions that prevailed in Volyn after the partition of the Rzeczpospolita, monasteries continued to replenish their libraries with new revenues, allocating certain funds from their revenues for the purchase of books.

Due to the inventories, we could determine the quantitative and thematic content of book collections, genre repertoire, time and place of printing books. The presence of large libraries in monasteries was reduced not only to the practice of schooling, but also to a high level of monastic culture and intellectual life.

The inventory did not reflect the features of the books' decoration, ways, and time of receipt in the library. However, some of the old prints from Lutsk-Zhytomyr diocese libraries of the Roman Catholic monasteries are preserved in the archives and in the relevant departments of scientific libraries, and working with them allowed to solve the research problems.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors are grateful to the reading room staff of the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv for their help in forming the source base of this study.

**Financing.** The authors received no financial support for the research and publication of this article.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almes, I. (2017). Lectio orthodoxorum: knyzhkovi zibrania pravoslavnykh monastyriv lvivskoi yeparkhii naprykintsi XVI – u XVII stolitti (Lectio Orthodoxorum: Libraries of the Orthodox Monasteries of the Lviv Eparchy in the Late 16th – 17th Centuries). *Kyivska akademiia*, 14, 115–149. doi: 10.18523/1995-025x2017130145 [in Ukrainian]

- Derzhavnyi arkhiv Zhytomyrskoi oblasti [State Archive of Zhytomyr Region – SAZR]*
- Gach, P. P.** (1999). *Struktury i działalność duszpasterska zakonów męskich na ziemiach dawnej Rzeczypospolitej i Śląska w latach 1773–1914 [Structures and pastoral activity of male orders in the territories of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Silesia in 1773 – 1914]*. Lublin: KUL. [in Polish]
- Giżycki, J.** (1918). *Z przeszłości karmelitów na Litwie i Rusi [From the past of Carmelites in Lithuania and Ruthenia]*. Kraków: Druk W.L. Anczyca, 521 p. [in Polish]
- Giżycki, J.** (1920). *Krzemieniec i krzemienieckiego dekanatu kościoły [Krzemieniec and Krzemieniec deanery churches]*. 69. [in Polish].
- Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteki Ukrainy imeni V. I. Vernadskoho [Institute of Manuscripts of the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine – IMVNLU]*
- Loshtyn, N.** (2018). *Rusińska-Giertych, Halina. Kultura książki polskiej we Lwowie w okresie oświecenia (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2018), 392 S. (Rusińska-Giertych, Halina. Polish book culture in Lviv during the Enlightenment (Wrocław: University of Wrocław Press, 2018), 392 P.)*. *Kyivska akademiia*, 15, 181–190. doi: 10.18523/1995-025x2018155037. [in Ukrainian]
- Malenkov, R.** (2006). *Mezhyrich [Mezhirich]. Ukraina inkohnita*. URL: <http://ukrainaincognita.com/nasha-spadshchyna/zamky-ta-fortetsi/mezhyrich> [in Ukrainian]
- Mytsyk, Y.** (2003). *Vapovskiy Bernard ta yoho khronika. Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy, 1*, 688. URL: <http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Vapovskiy> [in Ukrainian]
- Sinkevych, N.** (2009). *Laudare, benedicere, praedicare. Dominikanskiy orden na Volyni v kintsii XVI – na pochatku XIX st. [To praise, to speak well of, to proclaim. Dominican Order in Volyn at the end of XVI – beginning of XIX century]*. Kyiv: Kairos, 408 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Sinkevych, N. O.** (2005). *Ikona Bohorodytsi lutskeho dominikanskoho monastyria: istoriia ta osoblyvosti poshyrennia kultu [The Icon of the Virgin of Lutsk Dominican Monastery: History and Peculiarities of Cultivation]*. *Drohobyskyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk*, 9, 225–233. [in Ukrainian]
- Sobchuk, V.** (2008). *Kremenetskyi frantsyskanskiy monastyr [Kremenets Franciscan Monastery]. Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy, 5*, 568. URL: [http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Kremenetskii\\_Frantsyskanskiy\\_Monastir](http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Kremenetskii_Frantsyskanskiy_Monastir) [in Ukrainian]
- Sobczyńska-Szczepańska, M.** (2017). *Architektura trynitarzyna na ziemiach dawnej Rzeczypospolitej, [Architecture of Trinitarians in the lands of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth]*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego. [in Polish].
- Tsentrалnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy m. Kyiv [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv – CSHAUK]*
- Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, I. O.** (2008). *Biblioteka Ostrozkeho yezuitskoho kolehiumu: istoriia ta suchasnyi stan fondu [The Library of the Ostroh Jesuit College: History and Current State of the Foundation]*. *Naukovi zapysky [Natsionalnoho universytetu. Ostrozka akademiia] Istorychni nauky*, 13, 378–392. [in Ukrainian]
- Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, I. O.** (2010). *Biblioteka Berestetskoho monastyria Ordu trynitarii: istorychna dolia ta stan doslidzhenosti fondu [Library of the Berestetsky Monastery of the Order of Trinitarians: the historical fate and state of the fund’s research]*. *Rukopysna ta knyzhkova spadshchyna Ukrainy, 14*, 103–114. [in Ukrainian]
- Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, I. O.** (2010). *Biblioteka Lutskeho monastyria Ordu trynitarii: istorychna dolia ta shliakhy nadkhozhdzhennia do Natsionalnoi biblioteki Ukrainy imeni V. I. Vernadskoho [The Library of Lutsk Monastery of the Order of Trinitarians: Historical Fate and Ways of Getting to the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine]*. *Staryi Lutsk. Naukovo-informatsiinyi zbirnyk*, 6, 146–154. [in Ukrainian]
- Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, I. O.** (2012). *Vydovy ta dzhereloznavchyi analiz dokumentiv z istorii knyhy ta istorii bibliotek v Ukraini XVI – pershoi chverti XIX st. [Specific and source-based analysis of documents on the history of books and history of libraries in Ukraine in the XVIth – the first quarter of the XIXth century]*. *Naukovi pratsi Natsionalnoi biblioteki Ukrainy im. V. I. Vernadskoho*, 34, 259–279. [in Ukrainian]
- Tsiborovska-Rymarovych, I. O.** (2013). *Starodruky z knyhozbirni Kremenetskeho monastyria ottziv reformativ yak dzherelo do istorii monastyrskoi biblioteki [Ancient Books from the Book*

Collection of the Kremenets Monastery of the Reformed Fathers as a Source for the History of the Monastery Library]. *Naukovi pratsi Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy im. V. I. Vernadskoho*, 37, 319–332. [in Ukrainian]

**Tsiborovska-Rymarovich, I. O.** (2016). Dzherela dlia doslidzhennia istorii formuvannia fondu knyhozbirni Berdychivskoho monastyria bosykh karmelitiv [Sources for the History of Formation of the Book Collection Fund of the Berdychiv Monastery of the Bare Carmelites]. *Naukovi pratsi Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V. I. Vernadskoho*, 44, S. 329–343. [in Ukrainian]

**Tsiborovska-Rymarovich, I. O.** (2018). Dzherelna baza doslidzhennia rymo-katolytskykh monastyrsykh knyhozbiren Lutsko-Zhytomyrskoi diietsezii XVIII – pershoi polovyny XIX st. [The Source Database for the Study of the Roman Catholic Monastery Book Collections of the Lutsk-Zhytomyr Diocese of the 18th – the First Half of the 19th Century]. *Zapysky tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, CCLXXI, 136–152. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on February 02, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94(477)(092)“18”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226563

**Andrii KHRIDOKHIN**

PhD (History), PhD hab. (Law), Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Law of Dniprovskiy University of the Humanities, 35 Yermolaieva Street, Dnipro, Ukraine, postal code 49033 (khridochkina@ukr.net)

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9387-8864>

**Petro MAKUSHEV**

PhD hab. (Law), Professor, Professor at the Department of Theory and History of State and Law of University of Customs and Finance, 2/4 Volodymyr Vernadskiy Street, Dnipro, Ukraine, postal code 49000 (mpv12@i.ua)

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8693-1428>

**Андрій ХРІДОЧКІН**

кандидат історичних наук, доктор юридичних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри права Дніпровського гуманітарного університету, вул. Єрмолаєвої, 35, м. Дніпро, Україна, індекс 49033 (khridochkina@ukr.net)

**Петро МАКУШЕВ**

доктор юридичних наук, професор, професор кафедри теорії та історії держави і права Університету митної справи та фінансів, вул. Володимира Вернадського, 2/4, м. Дніпро, Україна, індекс 49000 (mpv12@i.ua)

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Khridochkin, A. & Makushev, P. (2021). Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin: historic portrait against a backdrop of the epoch. *Skhidnoieuropeiskiy Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 30–44. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226563

**VASYL NAZAROVYCH KARAZIN:  
HISTORIC PORTRAIT AGAINST A BACKDROP OF THE EPOCH**

**Abstract. The Topicality of the Research.** The topicality of the issue under study is driven by the need to carry out a smooth coverage of Karazin's biography, which presents poorly researched pages of his life. When characterizing the socio-political views of Karazin, a range of studied aspects of his worldview has been extensively extended. **The Purpose of the Research.** The purpose of the article is to throw light on a life journey of the prominent political and public figure, a scientist of the early XIX<sup>th</sup> century Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin, to investigate the facts and fill gaps in his biography, to outline landmarks in his life and creative activity, to analyze his fundamental scientific achievements and their importance for descendants. **The Methodology of the Research.** The main methods, which have been used to study the matter at issue, are as follows: chronological, historical genetic, comparative historical, historical typological, synchronous, biographic, and prosopography approaches. **The Research Results.** In the article there has been elucidated Karazin's biography, which provides insight into the milestones of the formation of his worldview. The authors have specified features of the social and political views of Karazin, which shaped his unique interpretation of topical political matters

concerning the form of government, role of the state authority in the development of political and ideological areas. It has determined the scope and motivation for activity of Karazin as a landowner and the founder of many non-governmental organizations of that time. **The Practical Significance.** The research findings can be used while investigating sources of the formation of the ideology of conservatism of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, a degree of its assimilation of the provisions of innovative public opinion and pattern of the use of West European socio-political theories, a role of conservative nobility in the social movement, sequence of their ideas and policy of the ruling elite.

**Key words:** administrative activity, inventive activity, public activity, Karazin, reformatory endeavors, peasant matter, socio-political views, Kharkiv University.

## ВАСИЛЬ НАЗАРОВИЧ КАРАЗИН: ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ПОРТРЕТ НА ТЛІ ЕПОХИ

**Анотація. Актуальність дослідження.** Актуальність досліджуваної проблеми зумовлена потребою у здійсненні рівномірного висвітлення біографії Каразіна, в якій відображені раніше недостатньо вивчені сторінки його життя. При характеристиці суспільно-політичних поглядів Каразіна значно розширено коло досліджуваних аспектів його світогляду. **Мета дослідження.** Мета статті полягає у висвітленні життєвого шляху відомого політичного і громадського діяча, вченого першої половини XIX ст. Василя Назаровича Каразіна, дослідженні фактів і висвітленні прогалин в його біографії, окресленні основних віх життя і творчості, аналізі його основних наукових досягнень та їх значення для нащадків. **Методи дослідження.** Головними методами дослідження даної проблеми є хронологічний, історико-генетичний, порівняльно-історичний, історико-типологічний, синхронний, біографічний та просопографічний підходи. **Результати дослідження.** У статті висвітлено біографію Каразіна, яка відображає основні етапи формування його світогляду. Розкрито особливості соціальних і економічних поглядів Каразіна, що зумовили своєрідність трактування ним важливих політичних питань щодо державного устрою, ролі державної влади в розвитку економічної, політичної і ідеологічної галузей. Розкриті зміст і мотивація діяльності Каразіна як поміщика і засновника ряду громадських організацій того часу. **Практична значимість.** Одержані у статті результати можуть бути використані при дослідженні джерел формування ідеології консерватизму XIX ст., ступеню засвоєння нею положень прогресивної суспільної думки та характеру використання західноєвропейських суспільно-політичних теорій, ролі консервативно налаштованих дворян в суспільному русі, послідовності їх ідей і політики правлячих кіл.

**Ключові слова:** адміністративна діяльність, винахідницька діяльність, громадська діяльність, Каразін, реформаторські проекти, селянське питання, суспільно-політичні погляди, Харківський університет.

**The Problem Statement.** For a long time, Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin has not belonged to the category of those figures of national history, who are called “undeservedly forgotten” since Karazin’s contribution to the development of natural sciences is well-known and widely considered, and Kharkiv University established due to his great efforts has been named after him. The time when the name of Vasyl Nazarovych was mentioned exclusively in the context of the activities of famous historical figures was irrevocably up. Nowadays, there is no doubt that he is one of those famous people, who worked for the good of homeland and were active and outstanding citizens, who were always respected by contemporaries and remain respected by their descendants. Being endowed with a talent and organizational skills, they made and have kept making their unique contribution to the advancement of society, which in turn needs their talent and diligence. Thus, a genuine interest in individual representatives of that group of unique, and most often, extraordinary persons with distinct characters, different destinies but united by a shared aspiration – to improve the welfare of the people, rectify the social life of their country and mark a place for them in the history books – is unlimited. VasylNazarovychKarazin was one of such historical figures.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications.** The death of V. N. Karazin in 1842 remained an event which was not particularly noticed either by academic communities or the general public. The above is primarily explained by the reputation of the very Karazin – his “political unreliability”. Therefore, it was hardly accidental that the first publication dedicated to Vasyl Nazarovych appeared in 1860. It belonged to G. Danylevskiy, who published a biographic essay about his childhood and teenage years in five issues of the newspaper “Northern Bee” (*Severnaya pchela*) (Danylevskiy, 1860). Selective attitude towards the elucidation of Karazin’s life journey is justified by the unwillingness to break the prevailing tradition of that time – “to be out” of the post-Petersburg period of his life activities. However, the publication lifted the so-called taboo to refer to the personality of Vasyl Nazarovych and his epistolary heritage, the part of which began to be introduced through the pages of individual manuscripts during the 1860s.

In the research papers, the address to the Karazin subject commenced at the end of the 1880s and was associated with the presentation of the article by V. Loshchenkov and a two-volume contribution by V. Semevskiy (devoted to the peasant matter in the XVIIIth – the beginning of the XIXth century). By contrast with V. Loshchenkov (he considered Karazin as an advocate of the abolition of serfdom (Loshchenkov, 1887)), V. Semevskiy didn’t find grounds to regard his worldview as “anti-serfdom” (Semevskiy, 1887). Moreover, the standpoint of V. Semevskiy became predominant in the literature. Subsequently, this aspect of Karazin’s worldview was either discussed or mentioned taking into account Semevskiy’s view.

As a result, at the beginning of the XXth century the historical literature contained a well-formed stereotype of Karazin as a man, who defended the conservative principles that made his socio-political stance “not attractive” to the Soviet historical science.

The situation changed at the end of the 1940s. That occurred due to the kickoff of the study of his experiments in natural sciences. Hence, some publications, which mainly appeared in periodicals, reached the same conclusion: Karazin is a scientist, who was in advance of his times. However, that sort of statement in Marxist theory wasn’t in line with his reputation of a follower of the monarchical power and serfdom. The solution was found in focusing on those episodes of his biography and public activity, which gave a unilateral vision of the personality of Karazin. Papers of A. Sliusarskiy, V. Kozlovskiy (Kozlovskiy, 1963), generalizing works on the history of social, sociological, philosophical thought and social movement in Russia and Ukraine kept “glorifying” Karazin.

The publication of Yu. Lavrynenko’s book, which made ill-founded conclusion about Vasyl Nazarovych as the main “encourager and driver” of the liberal reforms in Russia and “nationally minded Ukrainian patriot” in the modern sense of the term, was notable in the foreign historiography of that time (Lavrynenko, 1975). I. Lysiak-Rudnytskiy, who assigned Karazin the title of the “forerunner”, “pioneer” of the Ukrainian revival remaining the state patriot of Russia and a regional patriot of Sloboda Ukraine, responded to the book (Lysiak-Rudnytskiy, 1993).

Nevertheless, the Ukrainian historiography denied the reference to Karazin as a representative of the Ukrainian national revival. He was introduced as a figure, who had been subjected to political repression of the Russian government (Losiiievskiy, 1993). Ya. Abramov’s idea of the involvement of Karazin in the rebellion of the Semyonovsky regiment in 1820 was revived (Venhlovskiy, 1990). The focus was on those pages of his biography, which allowed presenting the socio-political views of Karazin to be similar to the principles of representatives of consistent democratic ideology of the time. Thus, the anniversary edition gathered such statements about him to accomplish the before mentioned

goal, and the opening piece of M. Bieliaiev even emphasized a desire of “Kruchik landowner” “to root” into bourgeois relations (Bieliaiev, 1998).

**The Methodology of the Research.** In order to solve the research tasks, the authors have used a set of universal and special methodological principles. First of all, it has been applied the objectivity principle, which provides for directing the study on a comprehensive analysis of the worldview of V. N. Karazin and the reconstruction of his biography. The observance of the historical method has made it possible to characterize the socio-political views of V. N. Karazin, taking into account the specifics of the historical time, which differed by the varying stages of development of socio-political thought in various European countries. The compliance with the principle of multifactority, which involves studying a full range of objective and subjective factors influencing historical processes, has determined a need to analyze the ambiguous impact of different socio-political trends on the worldview of V. N. Karazin. Due to the use of the problem-chronological method of enunciating material, V. N. Karazin’s convictions have been investigated through formulating the scientific problems: socio-political views and peasant matter. When writing the article, the authors also used the principle of pluralism (it considers the acceptability of several perspectives to the problem under study), a bibliographical approach (the subject matter of which is the life journey of V. N. Karazin, the formation of his personality, development of his values, worldview, character and skills) as well as prosopography approach (it has allowed reconstructing multifaceted aspects of life of the Karazins keeping in mind all factors, which affected the personality of Vasyl Nazarovych).

**The Purpose of the Research.** The purpose of the article is to throw light on a life journey of the prominent political and public figure, a scientist of the early XIX<sup>th</sup> century Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin, to investigate the facts and fill gaps in his biography, to outline landmarks in his life and creative activity, to analyze his fundamental scientific achievements and their importance for descendants.

#### **The Basic Material Statement.**

**Formation of V. N. Karazin’s Worldview.** The progenitor of the Karazin line is considered to be Vasyl Nazarovych’s great-grandfather – Hrihorii Karadžić, who was the archbishop of the Bulgarian city Sofia for a long time (Khridochkin, 2001). Grandfather of Karazin – Oleksandr Hryhorovych was a native of Serbia – changed not only the place of residence of the family but also the type of his professional activity – he became a serviceman. It was then that the name of Oleksandr Karadžić was recorded in the documents as Karazin (Karazin, 1910). It is known that Oleksandr Karazin died in 1753 in Rublivka village in Kharkiv region. Father of Vasyl Nazarovych, Nazar Oleksandrovych, was of Greek origin on his mother’s side. He was fluent in Greek and Turkish and inherited the profession from his father – he also became a serviceman. Nazar had to take part both in the Seven Years’ War and the Russo-Turkish War (1768 – 1774). Nazar resigned his commission in 1770 having the rank of a colonel. On November 19, 1770, he granted the right of perpetual use of two Ukrainian villages in Kharkiv region: Kruchik (47 farmsteads) and Osnovyntsi (35 farmsteads) of the Krasnokutsk Commissariat. There he married Varvara Yakivna, a representative of one of the ancient Cossack families, the daughter of sotnik (a lieutenant of the Cossack troops) of Kharkiv regiment Yakov Ivanovych Kovalevskyi, future mother of Vasyl Nazarovych. On January 30, 1773, Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin was born in a farm house in Kruchik village (since a parents’ house had not been finished yet) (Bolebrukh, Kudelko, Khridochkin, 2005).

Vasyl spent his childhood in the bosom of his family. The conditions of upbringing of Karazin and his environment as well as friends of his family could influence the choice of

several options for his future or professional career. He saw the life of an ordinary Ukrainian estate, grew up surrounded by peasant children and communicated with serfs. At the same time, he witnessed a conflict between his father and a neighbor landlord due to a land plot they both wanted to own. In other words, Vasyl was brought up from a young age as the owner of the estate, which he would inherit from his father (Abramov, 1891). Moreover, he constantly listened to his father's stories about the wars he directly participated in, the lives of his Serb ancestors, who had been regularly fighting with Turkey for their national liberation. Under the conditions of the respected authority of Nazar Oleksandrovykh, his son had a natural desire to become a soldier.

After the death of Nazar, the family found itself in a financial squeeze, as the widow had to survive with two sons Vasyl and Ivan, who was only four years old at that time. Varvara Yakivna had to reach out to Count Ivan Mykhailovych (his name, unfortunately, wasn't identified) – the patron of the Karazins to whom Nazar Oleksandrovykh had addressed with various requests. It's most likely that due to his support, as well as under the auspices of people, who knew Vasyl Nazarovych's father well, the boy was enrolled in private boarding schools for noble children: the former – named after H. Fielding in Kremenchuk, and the latter – named after J. Schultz in Kharkiv. Unfortunately, a record of Vasyl Karazin's stay in those education institutions has not been kept (Sliusarskyi, 1955). However, there is no doubt he didn't betray his childhood dream – to be a military man – and shortly seized a chance.

During a trip of the Little Russia Governor-General Count P. Rumyantsev-Zadunaisky through Kharkiv, V. N. Karazin turned to him with “a request” to study military science. At his time, the count had served in the army with Vasyl's father (Stanchev, 2005), therefore, he helpfully enlisted the young man in the Cuirassier Regiment, which he headed. Within a short period of time, through Rumyantsev-Zadunaisky's help once again, the surname of Karazin was included in the list of the Semyonovsky Lifeguard Regiment, where he was never seen for five years. It is known that the “Manifesto on the Liberty of the Nobility of 1762” of Peter III freed representatives of the Russian nobility from its obligatory service to the state. However, according to the tradition established since Peter's times, many young people, who were deeply concerned with the idea of serving their country, wore military uniforms or embarked upon official careers in various government agencies.

Karazin was one of those young men and, thus, on January 22, 1791, he arrived in St. Petersburg and joined the Semyonovsky Regiment, an elite unit of the Russian army, having the rank of a sergeant. During the reign of Catherine II, guards were not burdened with military concerns and had enough free time, which they used at their discretion. Karazin spare no efforts for education and self-education. He regularly attended lectures at St. Petersburg Mining Corps, one of the best education institutions in Russia at that time. There he studied not only Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry but also foreign languages, Poetry, Political Economy and other sciences. He gained profound knowledge in natural sciences and humanities and mastered Latin, German, and French, which later came in handy to him.

The training at the Mining Corps was a period of V. Karazin's acquaintance and communication with different extraordinary people, for instance, with V. Kapnist, M. Karamz in and the others, including foreign scientific literature. In general, the years in Petersburg can be considered as an important stage of the formation of Karazin as a personality. It was the time of big changes in his worldview (Berkovych, Hurevych, Stashevskyi, 1953). After, he wasn't interested in the military career. On the one hand, it was caused by Vasyl Nazarovych's insight into various sciences and common disenchantment with that kind of

military service, which drastically contrasted with his childish vision of it. On the other hand, Karazin found himself in the entirely different environment.

The society became engaged in socio-political issues in the light of the familiarity of educated citizens of the country with the works of Western European thinkers. Thus, the interest in public affairs predominated. He was primarily concerned about the issues of serving the country. Therefore, he traveled through Russia and Ukraine for three years (from 1792 to 1795) trying to understand the state of society and public affairs. It is possible that after the trip, Karazin decided to come to grips with the problems of the peasantry. When he returned home, he thought about how to realize his intention. In particular, to improve relations with peasants, Karazin established the Village Council, a body controlling estate affairs with the direct participation of farmers. He made up his mind to establish a foothold in Kruchik (Posokhov, 2015). Apparently, the decision was quite conscious because, contrary to plans of his relatives, he married Domna Ivanivna, a serf, an apprentice of his mother. Such an unexpected step of Vasyl Nazarovych frayed relations with his family.

Despite quite long absence of Vasyl Nazarovych in St. Petersburg, his name still was in the list of guardsmen of the Semyonov Regiment he got paid an officer's salary for all that time. It is known that one of the first orders of the young Emperor Paul I required the arrival of all the nobles at the duty area they belonged to. Karazin most likely did not want to come to St. Petersburg, and thus, he was deprived of both the rank of an officer and an additional source of income. It is obvious that after, he did not feel comfortable enough in his homeland; hence he decided to leave the country for a while. On June 23, 1798, he sent a letter to the emperor, whereby he asked for an exit permit referring to health condition.

However, the issuance of foreign passports was suspended at that time, and Karazin concluded to flee (Uzbek, 2002). Vasyl Nazarovych and his pregnant wife, who gave in a long trip and died while giving birth, reached the border through Pskov, Riga, and Mitau. Near the border, Karazin hired four guides to help him cross the border. All his endeavors went down the drain: on the night of August 13, 1798, he was arrested. All attempts to bribe border guards failed, and a dispatch about the detained escapee was sent to St. Petersburg. In the existing situation, Karazin definitely would be subject to imprisonment in the Shlisselburg Fortress but he didn't lose his head and sent a letter to Paul I, trying to be ahead of the report.

His Highness was surprised by two things in that letter: firstly, why did not Karazin mention his illness, which required the stay at the seaside?; secondly, why did he "scare" the emperor that in case of "a tough sentence", the requester, who implored quarter, would fully realize the justification of hostility to the imperial power? Anyway, in Karazin's position, such negligence was understandable. However, nobody can tell, perhaps it was "extravagant" carelessness that attracted the attention of the emperor and the unpredictable Paul I turned anger into mercy.

It is apparent the message reached the recipient. Indeed, it is difficult to say what Karazin hoped for and whether he assumed that further events would develop in that way, but he visited the emperor; after a long conversation Vasyl Nazarovych got tenure in the state treasury. Moreover, based on the decision of the Senate as of February 3, 1800, V. N. Karazin was appointed to a post of translator at "the office of the state quaestor" and a chief director of baron Vasyliiev". A year later (on January 22, 1801) he obtained the rank of collegiate assessor for collecting materials on the history of medicine and finance.

The literature ambiguously states the grounds of Karazin's escape abroad. It seems possible to say that the "cruelty" of the reign of Paul I was hardly observed in remote Kruchik (Kudelko, Vovk, 2013). An explanation of some of the real reasons for those unsuccessful

travels can be found in the document “Personal information” as of October 1, 1798, written under the enrolment in the civil service.

Thus, the childhood habit of solitude, office silence with favorite books, reflections on a man and the world during walks in the grove, philosophism, as well as poor health, led to the fact that his dream of military service dimmed; the stay in St. Petersburg, relations with progressive youth adjusted Karazin’s views to the West, to his perfectly organized society, education, beauty of nature. Consequently, there Karazin hoped to find a niche for himself and his abilities and scientific aptitudes (Trefylev, 1910). These two reasons were heavily strengthened by love peculiar to 25-years-old young man. He loved his Domna very much, who wasn’t welcomed by his relatives, and their painful “reproaches” eventually forced Karazin to take a decisive step: to sell the estate on extremely disadvantageous terms and, as it is said, to follow with his love their noses.

The treatment on the coast was one of the motives for the foreign “tour” that is why Karazin did not dare, as the authors believe, to talk about it as his primary goal in a sincere request to the emperor dated August 30, 1798 – the others could be revealed... The official application for an international passport was quite another matter.

Hence, at the age of twenty-eight, Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin managed to achieve such a status in St. Petersburg high society that a representative of a provincial noble family could not even think of. His childhood dreams of a military career, which would most likely be realized due to father’s contacts, were driven out, primarily, by the desire to receive a decent education abroad and then, by the opportunity to become an equal member of the capital’s nobility, which jealously kept watch over the rapid career progression of the countryman. New perspectives, which opened up to V. N. Karazin, literally, captured him completely, and the only thing he worried about at the time was the position at the royal court.

**Activities of V. N. Karazin in administrative and public positions.** There is no doubt Vasyl Nazarovych was well-informed about the capital ambience as evidenced by the fact that he smoothly faced another change of the Russian emperor. Paul I was assassinated on the night of March 12, 1801, due to a conspiracy carried out by a small group of people, and one of his sons – Alexander – succeeded to the throne. Karazin, probably, heard something about the conspiracy, so he was ready for the inevitable in his way. On March 12, Vasyl Nazarovych had a prepared letter addressed to the new autocrat. The addressee received the letter ten days later but the content of that anonymous, in the words of Karazin, “political catechism” (Karazin, 1910) was of great interest to the tsar, because the letter to the successor was very consistent with the first Manifesto of Alexander Pavlovych. In his message, Karazin touched upon the need to reform the monarchy, to establish “other laws” in the country, to regulate peasant duties, etc. The search for the letter’s author did not require high effort: natives of Ukraine D. Palen and I. Troshchynskyi were familiar with Vasyl Nazarovych’s handwriting well, so in early April Karazin was introduced to Alexander I. This meeting, apparently, did not disappoint the emperor and resulted in the permission of His Majesty for Vasyl Nazarovych to “talk to him similarly open and write “private and confidential”. Karazin was pleased to take advantage of the offer and sent two detailed notes and as many as ten letters to the emperor for three years. They brought forward his proposals relating to the issues of the state and local government, reorganization of the court system in the country, foreign trade, the causes of the devaluation of karbovanets, and the future of state peasants and much more (Vovk, 2016).

Karazin’s success story was going on. On April 21, 1801, by the personal order of the emperor, he was transferred to the department headed by D. Troshchynskyi, a compatriot

of Karazin, and awarded a ring “for collecting materials on the history of finance”. Vasyl Nazarovych kept making new friends: he got acquainted with Speranskyi M. and O. Radishchiev, became an active member of the literary circle of the latter at the meetings of which he presented his poems, studied the manuscripts of Oleksandr Mykolaiovych. Karazin’s position among the capital nobility turned to be more steady – people, who suffered during the reign of Paul I were rehabilitated at his request.

One of the manifestations of trust of Alexander I in V. N. Karazin was the instruction to investigate the abuses of Kaluga Governor Lopukhin, who distinguished by “an outrage upon justice”, bribery, and other “dishonest cases”. Karazin conducted an in-depth analysis of charges, most of which were confirmed, and conveyed inspection results in a reporting notice to the emperor.

Vasyl Nazarovych also found his job in the government sector, which was being developed, as the beginning of the reign of Alexander I was characterized by attempts of the young emperor to update the system of state bodies of Russia. According to one of his Manifestos issued on September 8, 1802, ministries were formed instead of collegia. Thus, Karazin was appointed to the position of a “chief” of the “Commission on Schools” established under the Ministry of Public Education. The commission he headed had a key role in carrying out the reform of enlightenment, which was aimed at strengthening the centralization of education management and ensuring the consistency of curriculums of institutions of different degrees (Honcharuk, 2012). “Preliminary rules of public education” were prepared with direct involvement of Vasyl Nazarovych, and he compiled “Gymnasium general concept”. Karazin’s merits did not go unnoticed: on September 22, 1802, he was awarded the Order of St. Vladimir “for particular efforts to draft new statutes” for educational institutions of the Russian Empire.

Activities of V. N. Karazin at the superior position at the “Commission on Schools” and in the field of reforming higher, primarily, university education were fruitful as well. In addition to the change of the status of universities (each of them was to become the principal institution of the created educational districts), at the beginning of the XIXth century their number increased – universities were opened in Dorpat, Vilno, and Kazan. Kharkiv University is an exception among them as it was not only the first established in the Ukrainian lands, which were part of the Russian Empire, but also the first educational institution opened not by government decision but thanks to the initiative of patriotic representatives of the Ukrainian community, whose interests were expressed by Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin.

During two years he was literally crazed about the idea of establishing the university at the territory of Sloboda Ukraine. Scrambling between St. Petersburg and Kharkiv, Karazin achieved the emperor’s signing of a decree to open the university, organized several fundraising to support the establishment of the educational institution, donated his funds due to underfunding to prepare facilities and buy necessary equipment, invited foreign experts to work at the university, etc. Unfortunately, Karazin never succeeded in accomplishing business commenced by him and organized for completion.

On August 24, 1804, Karazin resigned having a rank of a state councilor. The reason was blaming him in June of the same year for “wasteful expenditure of public funds”, which he had been allocated for the purchase of prints and “hiring craft specialists” (Vovk, Kudelko, 2015). The above led to “severe reproof” and deprivation of the right to intervene in affairs of the education establishment. This episode was very likely a formal cause to call time on his career as a civil servant. In the words of Karazin, from the end of 1802 he felt another attitude

to himself both on the part of the entourage of the Emperor Alexander I and St. Petersburg nobles. The emperor refused to have personal meetings with Vasyl Nazarovych and forbade entering into any correspondence with him. One can assume that he had a good look through Karazin's political views and quitted considering them to be attractive. The imperial entourage changed its attitude towards Karazin by limiting the number of documents of the Ministry of Public Education he was authorized to work with; there were "misunderstandings" with the Minister P. Zavadovsky. The nobles resorted to insults and "false rumors".

It is difficult to say what Karazin expected when he submitted his resignation "for health reasons" on August 11. Probably, he was under the influence of an emotional impulse, although he had no other way. The order states: "to dismiss Karazin, the head of the central office of schools from the post of collegiate councilor, awarding him the rank of state councilor".

Karazin attempted to remain in the civil service, proposing himself as Russian emissary on Balkan affairs, who was to help the Serbian rebellion, which had broken out in Serbia and was directed against dependence on Turkey. At the same time, in the letter to the Foreign Minister, Prince A. Czartoryski, he wrote about the need for immediate negotiations between the Russian state and the Turkish government on granting the Serbian population autonomy. He was confident that the content of his message would become known to the emperor, so he turned to his feelings.

However, it seems he generated that sort of plan during personal communication with many public figures of Serbia, including Todor Filipovic, the future author of the draft of the state system of Serbia whom Karazin invited to work at Kharkiv University. Moreover, the striking similarity between Karazin's idea of the "Kingdom of Slovenes" and the project of establishment of "Slavic-Serbian Kingdom" by Stratimirovic and the demands of the leaders of the Serbian uprising catches the attention (Denysenko, 2007). The most interesting is that the message of Karazin to A. Czartoryski coincided with the arrival of deputies from the insurgents in St. Petersburg in the autumn of 1804.

Thus, the "hard-fought" idea of Vasyl Nazarovych turned no more than a year and a half in November 1804. Therefore, there is every reason to believe that Karazin, insisting on immediate assistance to the Serbs and knowing that the Serbian ambassadors asked the Russian government to send them a "Russian parliamentarian" to negotiate with Turkey, nominated himself for this role.

The resignation from the Ministry of Public Education was very painful for Karazin. He did not notice a point when excessive activity and self-confidence led to the dissatisfaction among the Minister of Education and his inner circle, and friendly relations with the emperor – among the stately nobility. Consequently, severed ties with Alexander I, resignation from the Ministry of Public Education, a ban on interfering in the affairs of his offspring – Kharkiv University – meant the collapse of all the life plans for Karazin, the loss of the opportunity to be useful to the Fatherland. These sentiments were expressed in a letter to A. Czartoryski dated November 21, 1804. Running for the liberation of the Serbs from the Turkish yoke, Karazin wrote that his father had repeatedly risked his life in the war for this very reason.

When the last-chance effort to remain in the civil service failed, Karazin had no choice but to return to Sloboda Ukraine. Having come to Kruchik, over a time necessary to get used to a completely different ambience and, perhaps, serious reflection, Karazin decided not only to regulate his financial standing but also to solve the complex agrarian-peasant problem, which troubled the society of that time. Thus, Kruchik village in Sloboda Ukraine turned into a kind of experimental site.

**V. N. Karazin – a landowner of Kruchik village.** Having faced the village reality, Karazin found out that it was far from great. Vasyl Nazarovych came to grips with reorganizing the management of his estate. He recommended the operation of the Village Council, which he had established before his departure to St. Petersburg. In his idea, its functioning had to cultivate the peasants' faith in the "just" power of a landowner. Karazin maintained that kind of faith in the minds of the peasants through introducing elements of peasant self-government with the obligatory control of the landowner.

After the return of V. N. Karazin to Kharkiv region, his life evolved a period of extremely fruitful research activities in various fields of science and, especially, in those which closely related to agriculture. The presentation of his invented device "for wine distilling", which was assessed as an "advance in distillation", in the Council of Moscow University at the beginning of 1806 can be considered as his baptism under fire (Pyrih, 2014). And two years later, he demonstrated a "light" version of his invention in the Society of Naturalists. After another two years, he introduced an effective means of producing nitrate. In 1810 Karazin established a meteorological station in Kruchik, which became the first in Ukraine. However, this happened after the release of Vasyl Nazarovych from the second arrest in his life.

The fact is that Karazin, even in Kharkiv village, kept monitoring foreign and domestic policy developments attentively. Although the news reached Kruchik late, Vasyl Nazarovych was well up in the major European events, knew about the state of affairs and the public sentiments in the country, and the failures of the Russian army in the fight against Napoleon (Khridochkin, 2001). He diligently recorded his observations and considerations in a diary and continued to share some of them with the emperor from time to time. In one of such letters he offered the Russian government a kind of interpretation of the international neutrality policy. From his perspective, Russia had to break diplomatic relations with all states without exception, return the armed forces from abroad and focus on the development of industry, agriculture, and public administration reform.

As a rule, the monarch ignored his numerous messages, but he did not delay to respond to this one and the reaction of Alexander I was very sharp. He ordered "to detain" Karazin at "Kharkiv City Military Prison" for eight days and have his written undertaking not to disturb His Majesty with "bold papers".

The arrest and another ban on sending letters to Alexander I influenced Karazin, and until 1820 he did not dare to violate the emperor's order. However, he did not give up attacking government officials with his projects and proposals. He got under V. Kochubey's, the Minister of Internal Affairs, skin the active "correspondence" with whom V. N. Karazin began with the announcement he had founded the Philotechnical Society in Kharkiv in 1811. Under the framework of the established organization, he not only performed managerial functions in good faith but also conducted intense research activities. Even a short list of problems Karazin bothered with demonstrates the scope of his interests and tireless practical activity. He was engaged in breeding new varieties of cereals traditional for Ukraine, sought to grow rice, maintained extending potato-growing area (Tykhoi, 1905). On his experimental area, he managed, according to him, to grow a poppy stalk, which had fifty branches and a millet bush with thirty branches. Karazin produced chemical fertilizers, and presented a threshing unit, which made it possible to squeeze nut and hemp-seed oils, for consideration of members of the society. He built a chemical laboratory equipping it with an autonomous heating system. His saltpeter and distillation plants in Kruchik manufactured dyes and cement, and a means of drying wood using steam was developed. Karazin's embalming experiments were successful enough.

Fruitful activity of Vasyl Nazarovych as an organizer and a scientist did not go unnoticed by the government: on April 13, 1815, he got a certificate of acknowledgement, and on August 20 – another one. The last recognition of Karazin’s merits as the head of the Philotechnical Society was an invitation to St. Petersburg to make a report and get one more honorary mention.

That said, Vasyl Nazarovych reckoned on a different outcome. By sending reports on the activities of the Philotechnical Society to the Minister of Internal Affairs systematically, he had high hopes, first, on state financial support and, second, granting his organization the nationwide significance (Khridochkin, 2001). These dreams never came true.

Due to the endeavors, Karazin managed to get into the government’s graces: he was again appointed to the Ministry of Public Education, moved to St. Petersburg where he found himself in a tumultuous political life as before and, trying to take the most active part in it, responded to major, in his perspective, political events. In particular, V. N. Karazin had never had doubts about the practicality of his idea of “improvement” of serfdom but, in those days, he began to think about extending his Kharkiv and Moscow-area experience to the entire state. Therefore, in April of 1820 he attempted to organize the “Society of Good Landlords, or Friends of the Fatherland”, as reported by the Minister of the Interior, by submitting a relevant draft to him.

Vasyl Nazarovych got in on the act in the political events of the Russian capital. He was already a well-known person in St. Petersburg circles. Thus, Karazin joined the Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature in the latter half of 1818 and on December 29 he was elected the vice-president of the organization. His activities became more intense and contributed a lot to the organization’s division into two ideological wings. On March 1, 1820, he gave a report at the meeting, promoting an idea of the need to create original domestic culture and criticizing some contemporary poets for the imitation of foreign authors. Moreover, pondering on the development of literature trends, he associated this process with the political matters emphasizing the relevance of censorship (Nikolaienko, 2004).

That kind of statement was enough to put many progressive figures of the “academic republic” against him. Besides, the speech of Vasyl Nazarovych caused fierce and protracted discussions, and the difference between views was so crucial that Karazin and his soulmates left the meeting room on March 15, 1820.

It is unlikely that such visceral opposition emerged due to Karazin’s thesis about the need to advance original national literature. It is possible the controversy was sparked by the piece of his speech which touched upon not the literature issues but political problems (Abashnyk, 2012). Unfortunately, it is challenging to conclude about what Karazin said during the war of words, but there was another reason for Karazin’s break with the society. As evidenced by the minutes of the meeting dated March 15, Vasyl Nazarovych provided the head of a particular office of the Ministry of Interior with texts of his speeches, as well as testimonies very unfortunate for the members of the Free Society. In addition, during the period from March to June, Karazin systematically sent several letters to the Minister of the Interior informing him of the state of affairs in the Society of Lovers of Literature.

Consequently, both Karazin’s “divisive” activities at the Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature and his relations with the government dangerous for the members of the organization made the affiliation of Vasyl Nazarovych to the society unwelcome. In the minds of many public figures, he was an ordinary informer after all.

On the other hand, in the letters addressed to the Minister of the Interior Vasyl Nazarovych was also concerned about the necessity to wrap up the “misfortune of the people” and eliminate military settlements in the country, pointed to the perniciousness of excessive admiration for

all foreign trends, called on the autocracy to “guide” the nobility to seek ways to “improve the fate of the peasants” in a nuanced way and advised to reform the financial and judicial systems; it allows one to speak about him not as an ordinary informer but as a man who was primarily anxious about the fortune of his country and who followed the desire to be useful to it.

In fact, Karazin’s striving to be in the thick of political life, his sometimes excessive initiative led to the third arrest in his life, which happened in early 1821. This time Vasyl Nazarovych was mistakenly arrested on suspicion of authorship of a leaflet seen in the barracks of the Semyonovsky Regiment, which arose in October 1820. The search carried out by the very police head found out a large number of papers. The conclusion reached can be formulated as follows: Karazin had nothing that would indicate his direct participation in the Semyonovsky events or the authorship of the proclamation; at the same time, among the papers of Vasyl Nazarovych there were detected several records in which he covered the October events of 1820. Kochubey didn’t dare to come to stand up for him (however, he knew for sure that Vasyl Nazarovych had not written that leaflet), and Alexander I decided to seize the occasion to penalize Karazin, who had violated the flat ban once again and sent a letter to the emperor in April 1820.

Vasyl Nazarovych was not a person inclined to report. Although, being under investigation, during interview he tried to justify himself against the charges and listed the names of people who, in his opinion, “deserved” the right to be in his shoes much more than he did. He called names, apparently, “for getting that even the mention of a particular person during a conversation with the police chief could turn into denunciation regardless of the desire of the speaker. Then fate did not just mock – it treated him with a high hand, and Karazin became a victim of unfavorable circumstances. His remission was indirect confirmation of the application of “disciplinary measures” to Vasyl Nazarovych. On May 21, 1821, Karazin was going to be sent from Shlisselburg to his Kharkiv estate and placed under the supervision of Bohodukhiv Zemstvo Governor (Bolebrukh 1987). Although, the accusation of authorship of Semyonovsky proclamation was not officially dropped; it was 1839, three years before his death, when Karazin was allowed to live in any city except St. Petersburg and Moscow, which he was forbidden to visit forever.

Deprived of the opportunity to participate in the socio-political life, Vasyl Nazarovych had to seek consolidation in science. His research work was multifaceted, and his contribution to science was strong. One can only wonder how many scientific advances and discoveries this undoubtedly talented scientist would have made if he had given his mind whole to exploratory activity (Bereziuk, 2003). The exceptional practicality of his experiments and research, which definitely could have – upon condition of their refinement and manufacturing application – a tangible economic effect, is noteworthy.

The beginning of the 1830s was marked by failed harvest in the villages, and thus, peasants were forced to turn to the wildlife fruits, including acorns, to not starve to death. Karazin studied their composition and found the way to extract the essential nutrient in order to bake “delicious and healthy bread”. Vasyl Nazarovych worked at improving the methods of planting potatoes and watermelons and maintained increasing the crops of such vegetables like turnips, carrots, beets, and the others. At his estate, he conducted sericulture research, made drugs and extracts of medicinal herbs which allowed treating nervous disorders. Despite his advanced age and poor health, Karazin explored the Orel coast looking for healing springs.

The lifting of the ban on his free movement gave a new impulse to the scientific activities of Vasyl Nazarovych. In 1839 Karazin began searching for ways to update horticulture and viticulture in the Crimea (Maistruk, 2014). Vasyl Nazarovych also delved into humanities,

in particular, history. Thus, he demonstrated his vision of history of Sloboda Ukraine by consistently interpreting its events from the nobleman's point of view. Confirming his role of an advocate of education, Vasyl Nazarovych routinely conducted classes at Kruchik School, which he had founded once upon a time.

Extremely intense research activity of Karazin gave him a certain authority in the world of science. He was an honoured and corresponding member of seven scientific societies of the Russian state. At different period of time he was elected a member of the academic boards of Moscow and Kharkiv universities, Moscow Society of Naturalists, the Society of Russian History and Antiquities, the Free Economic Society, and the Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature. Vasyl Nazarovych was deeply involved in science until his death, which befell him during a scientific inquiry in the field of improving distillation in the south of Ukraine where he visited with one of his sons – Philadelphus, who served under command of the Commander-in-Chief of the Black Sea Fleet Admiral Lazarev in Mykolaiv. In October 1842, Karazin travelled by relay to Kharkiv region, to Kruchik. On the way home he got wet during the foul weather, caught a cold, fell ill and returned to Mykolaiv where he died on November 4, 1842, in his son's house. Vasyl Nazarovych was buried in Mykolaiv cemetery in a place of a new family burial of the Karazins. Thus, at the age of sixty-nine, Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin breathed his last.

**The Conclusions.** The thread of life of Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin was active enough. He is remembered by contemporaries and descendants as a brain box man, an outstanding inventor, public figure, advocate for the improvement and development of the education system, a very energetic and enterprising person. Having received a good education, Vasyl Nazarovych worked at the Ministry of Public Education, headed one of its committees, was the founder of Kharkiv University, which has been named after him, and taught at Kruchik school established on his initiative.

Karazin is known as a public figure; moreover, he was distinguished by a compulsive drive to be always in the thick of events of the socio-political life. For this very reason, he took an active part in the activities of various non-governmental organizations and frequently commenced the formation of new associations. Karazin always sought to respond to significant, in his view, events of public and political life by sending letters and his numerous projects to the emperor and influential government leaders. In his letters, he drew attention to the arbitrariness of ministerial officials, indifference, bureaucracy, bribery, which prevailed in the state apparatus, landlords' lawlessness in relation to serfs.

Many people criticized Vasyl Nazarovych both during lifetime and after his death. This is explained by his negative personality traits – snobbery, overconfidence, arrogance, sometimes disregard of others – which were noted by people who dealt with him. These traits were especially evident during Karazin's service in the ministry when he tried to enter the emperor's office without an invitation in plain view of the nobility surprised by the provincial's impudence, or when he aspired to join literary evenings in the imperial palace the entrance to which was only for a narrow circle of "the elite". However, there is no doubt that until his death, Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin was bounded up in the interests of society despite the strokes of bad luck.

**Acknowledgement.** The authors of the article are sincerely grateful to all members of the editorial board for the advice provided during doing the research and writing the article.

**Financing.** The authors did not receive any financial support for doing the research and writing the article.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abashnik, V. A.** (2012). Filosofsko-pravovye vzgliady V. N. Karazina (1773–1842) [Philosophical and legal views of V. N. Karazina (1773–1842)]. *Hrani*, 6 (86), 21–24. [in Russian]
- Abramov, Ya. V.** (1891). *V. N. Karazin. Ego zhizn i obshchestvennaia deiatel'nost' [V. N. Karazin. Self-life and social activity]*. St. Petersburg, 96 p. [in Russian]
- Bereziuk, N. M.** (2003). Slid dobryi i vichnyi na zemli Slobozhanskii: (Ivan Nazarovych Karazin ta yoho nashchadky) [A good and eternal trace on the Slobozhanska land (Ivan Nazarovych Karazin and his descendants)]. *Universytety – Universitates*, 2, 26–33. [in Ukrainian]
- Berkovych, Z. S., Hurevych L.Y. & Stashevskiy, V. L.** (Comps.) (1953). *V. N. Karazin 1773 – 1842: Biobibliohrafiia [V. N. Karazin 1773 – 1842: Biobibliography]*. Kharkov, 76–77. [in Russian]
- Bieliaiev, M.** (1998). V. N. Karazin: storinky zhyttia ta diialnosti [V.N. Karazin: pages of life and work]. *Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin v otsinkakh suchasnykiv i nashchadkiv*. Kharkiv, 11. [in Ukrainian]
- Bolebrukh, A. H.** (1987). Do kharakterystyky svitohliadu V. N. Karazina [To characterize the V. N. Karazin's worldview]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 8, 85–95. [in Ukrainian]
- Bolebrukh, A. H., Kudelko, S. M. & Khridochkin, A. V.** (2005). *Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin (1773 – 1842): monohrafiia [Vasyl Nazarovych Karazin (1773 – 1842): monograph]*. Kharkiv: Vydavnytstvo “Avto-Enerhiia”, 348 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Danylevskiy, H. P.** (1860). Vasylyi Nazarovych Karazyn: materyaly dlia biohrafii [Vasily Nazarovych Karazin: materials for a biography]. *Severnaia pchela*, 24–26, 29, 30. [in Russian]
- Denysenko, A.** (2007). Zlety ta padinnia Vasylia Karazina [The Vasily Karazin's rise and fall]. *Pamiat stolit, 4–5*, 195–213. [in Ukrainian]
- Honcharuk, T. H.** (2012) V.N. Karazin (1773 – 1842 rr.) ta Odesa: do istorii zviazkiv zasnovnyka Kharkivskoho universytetu ta “Novoi Palmiry” [V. N. Karazin (1773 – 1842) and Odesa: to the history of relations between the founder of Kharkiv University and “Novaya Palmyra”]. *Intelihentsiia i vlada. Seriia: Istoriiia*, 26, 148–158. [in Ukrainian]
- Karazin, V. N.** (1910). *Sochineniia, pisma i bumagi V. N. Karazina: sobrannye i redaktirovannye prof. D. Bagaliem [Essays, letters and papers of V.N. Karazin: collected and edited by prof. D. Bagaliy]*. Kharkov: Tip. Zylberberh i synovia, 947 p. [in Russian]
- Khridochkin, A. V.** (2001). Istoriko-politicheskie predstavleniia V. N. Karazyna [Historical and political views of V. N. Karazin]. *Hrani*, 4 (18), 54–58. [in Russian]
- Khridochkin, A. V.** (2001a). Zhyttia ta diialnist V. N. Karazina [Life and work of V.N. Karazin]. *Humanitarnyi zhurnal*, 7, 110–115. [in Ukrainian]
- Khridochkin, A. V.** (2001b) Krestianskii vopros v traktovke V. N. Karazina [The Peasant Question in V.N. Karazin's interpretation]. *Hrani*, 5–6 (19–20), 73–77. [in Russian]
- Kozlovskiy, V. I.** (1963). Pytannia rozvytku vitchyznianoï promyslovosti v pohliadakh V. N. Karazina [Issues of domestic industry in the V.N. Karazin's views]. *Pytannia sotsialistychnoi ekonomiky i yii narodnoho hospodarstva*, 242–260. [in Ukrainian]
- Kudelko, S. M. & Vovk, O. I.** (2013). Vasyl Karazin bilia vytokiv formuvannia ukrainskoi naukovo-tekhnichnoi intelihentsii [Vasyl Karazin at the origins of the formation of the Ukrainian scientific and technical intelligentsia]. *Ukrainoznavchyi almanakh*, 14, 190–193. [in Ukrainian]
- Lavrinenko, Yu.** (1975). *Vasyl Karazin. Arkhitektura vidrodzhennia: Materialy i dumky do 200-littia z dnia narodzhennia. 1773 – 1973 [Vasily Karazin. Revival Architecture: Materials and Thoughts for the 200th Anniversary of His Birth. 1773 – 1973]*. Miunkhen, 192 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Loshchenkov, V.** (1887) V.N. Karazin kak pomeschchik sela Kruchik [V. N. Karazin as landowner of the village Kruchik]. *Kharkovskiy sbornik*, 53–64. [in Russian]
- Losyevskiy, Y.** (1993). *Russkaia lira Ukrainy: Russkie pisateli Ukrainy pervoi chetverti XIX v. [Russian literature of Ukraine: Russian writers of Ukraine in the first quarter of the XIX century]*. Kharkov, 200 p. [in Russian]
- Lysiak-Rudnytskni, I.** (1993). Karazin i pochatky ukrainskoho vidrodzhennia [Karazin and the beginnings of the Ukrainian revival]. *Istorychni ese*. In 2 vol. Kyiv, Vol. 1, 530 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Maistruk, O. N.** (2014). Soderzhanie i osnovnye napravleniia nauchno-prosvetitel'skoi i upravlencheskoi deiatel'nosti V. N. Karazyna (1773 – 1842) [The content and main directions of

scientific-educational and managerial activities of V. N. Karazin (1773 – 1842)]. *Zhurnal nauchnykh publikatsyi aspyrantov i doktorantov*, 6 (96), 135–138. [in Russian]

**Nikolaienko, N. O.** (2004). Derzhavnyi kontseptsii V. N. Karazina [The V. N. Karazin's state concepts]. *Suchasna ukrainska polityka: Polityky i politolohy pro nei*. Kyiv-Mykolaiv, 100–104. [in Ukrainian]

**Posokhov, S. Y.** (2015). “Neponiatnyi” vs “neponiaty” V. N. Karazin: kommentarii, remarki, apologia [“Incomprehensible” vs “incomprehensible” V.N. Karazin: comments, remarks, apology]. *Dialog so vremenem: almanakh intellektualnoi istorii*, 51, 64–93. [in Russian]

**Pyrih, P. V.** (2014). Velykyi uchenyi i reformator Vasyl Karazin (do 240-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia) [The great scientist and reformer Vasyl Karazin (to the 240th anniversary of his birth)]. *Siverianskyi litopys, 1–3 (115–117)*, 184–187. [in Ukrainian]

**Semevskiy, V. Y.** (1888). *Krestianskyi vopros v Rossii v XVIII – v I polovine XIX vv. [The peasant question in Russia in the eighteenth – in the first half of the nineteenth centuries]*: in 2 vol. S.-Peterburg, Vol. 1, 517 p. [in Russian]

**Stiusarskiy, A. H.** (1955). *V.N. Karazin. Ego zhizn i obshchestvennaia deiatelnost [V. N. Karazin. His life and social activity]*. Kharkov, 159 p. [in Russian]

**Stanchev, M. H.** (2005). Proiskhozhdenie V. N. Karazina: problem istoriografii i istochnikovedeniia [The origin of V. N. Karazin: problems of historiography and source studies]. *Bulgarian Historical Review: Research Quarterly. Organ of the Inst. Of History at the Bulg. Acad. Of Sciences*, 3–4, 203–215. [in Russian]

**Trefilev, E. P.** (1910). *Vssylke: k biohrafii Vasiliia Nazarovicha Karazina [In exile: To the biography of Vasily Nazarovich Karazin]*. Kharkov, 85 p. [in Russian]

**Tykhoi, N.** (1905). *Politicheskie vozzreniia V. N. Karazina [The V. N. Karazin's political views]*. Kharkov, 186 p. [in Russian]

**Uzbek, O. A.** (2002). *Vasyl Karazin z rodu Karadzhi [Vasyl Karazin from the Karaji family]*. Kharkiv: Maidan, 132 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Venhlovskiy, S.** (1990). Try areshy Karazina [Three arrests of Karazin]. *Nauka i kultura. Shchorichnyk*, 24, 86. [in Ukrainian]

**Vovk, O. I.** (2016). *Postat Vasylia Karazina v istoriografii [The figure of Vasily Karazin in historiography]*. Kharkiv : KhNU imeni V. N. Karazina, 328 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Vovk, O.I. & Kudelko, S. M.** (2015). *V. N. Karazin. Dialohy u chasi y prostori (doslidzhennia i materialy) [V. N. Karazin. Dialogues in time and space (research and materials)]*. Kharkiv: KhNU imeni V. N. Karazina, 272 p. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on February 27, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94(477.25):341.81(431)“18”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226514

**Ihor LYMAN**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the Department of History and Philosophy, Coordinator of International Relations of Berdyansk State Pedagogical University, 4 Shmidt Street, Berdyansk, Ukraine, postal code 71100 (Lyman@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-9349-8500

**ResearcherID:** E-2865-2019

**Victoria KONSTANTINOVA**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor, Director of the Research Institute of Urban History, Professor of Berdyansk State Pedagogical University, 4, Shmidt str., Berdyansk, Ukraine, postal code 71100 (VNKonst@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-1557-5213

**ResearcherID:** E-5402-2019

**Ігор ЛИМАН**

*доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри історії та філософії, координатор міжнародної діяльності Бердянського державного педагогічного університету, вул. Шмідта, 4, Бердянськ, Україна, індекс 71100 (Lyman@ukr.net)*

**Вікторія КОНСТАНТИНОВА**

*доктор історичних наук, професор, директор Науково-дослідного інституту історичної урбаністики, професор Бердянського державного педагогічного університету, вул. Шмідта, 4, Бердянськ, Україна, індекс 71100 (VNKonst@ukr.net)*

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Lyman, I. & Konstantinova, V. (2020). Network Formation of the Prussian Consular Offices in Ukrainian Lands in the 19th Century: Case Study of the Port City of Kerch. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 45–54. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226514

**NETWORK FORMATION OF THE PRUSSIAN CONSULAR OFFICES  
IN UKRAINIAN LANDS IN THE 19th CENTURY:  
CASE STUDY OF THE PORT CITY OF KERCH**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research is to study the history of the Prussian consular office and the Prussian consular representatives in the port city of Kerch, mainly, on the basis of the documents of Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz (Berlin). The research methodology is based on the search and comprehensive study of representative complexes of primarily sources. The scientific novelty: filling in the gap in the historiography regarding Kerch in the context of studying the network of foreign consular offices in the Ukrainian lands. The Conclusions.* *The Prussian consulate in Kerch was founded in 1845 on the initiative of an Englishman Edward Cattle. While the protection of the Prussian interests at the “Russian” territories of the Northern coast of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov region was previously the responsibility of the Prussian consul in Odesa, with the establishment of a consulate in Kerch, the latter began to take care of relevant issues in the lands adjacent to the Sea*

of Azov. However, this did not last for a long period of time. Cattley's departure from the region caused functioning closure of the consular office in Kerch until 1852, when Georg Nicolich was appointed a consular agent under the Prussian consul in Odesa. His activities in the city were interrupted because of the occupation of Kerch by Allied troops in 1855. At the beginning of 1857 Nicolich appealed to Berlin to dismiss him, which was due to the undermining of his financial situation as a result of the Crimean War, and the change in the quarantine rules in Kerch, which significantly reduced the income of the Prussian consular agent. Georg Nicolich soon died. His death marked the end of a short history of the Prussian consulate in Kerch. Official Berlin again drew attention to Kerch as the city where its consular office was to function, only 10 years later, and a vice-consul was soon appointed there. But he was a vice-consul of the North German Confederation, not Prussia.

**Key words:** consular office, consul, Kerch, Prussia, the Russian Empire.

## РОЗБУДОВА МЕРЕЖІ ПРУССЬКИХ КОНСУЛЬСЬКИХ ПРЕДСТАВНИЦТВ НА УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ЗЕМЛЯХ У XIX СТОЛІТТІ НА ПРИКЛАДІ МІСТА КЕРЧ

**Анотація.** Метою роботи є вивчення історії пруських консульського представництва і консульських представників у Керчі, спираючись в першу чергу на документи Секретного архіву Фундації пруської культурної спадщини (Берлін). **Методологія дослідження** базується на пошуку та всебічному вивченні репрезентативних комплексів періоджерсел. **Наукова новизна** полягає у заповненні наявної в історіографії лакуни щодо Керчі в контексті вивчення мережі іноземних консульських представництв на українських землях. **Висновки.** Прусське консульство в Керчі було засноване у 1845 р. за ініціативою англійця Едварда Кеттлі. Тоді як раніше захист пруських інтересів на підросійських територіях Північного Причорномор'я та Приазов'я знаходився в компетенції консула Пруссії в Одесі, із влаштуванням консульства в Керчі останнє стало опікуватись відповідними питаннями на землях, прилеглих до акваторії Азовського моря. Втім, це тривало не довго. З від'їздом Кеттлі з регіону діяльність консульського представництва в Керчі перервалась до 1852 р., коли на посаду консульського агента, підпорядкованого пруському консулу в Одесі, був призначений Георг Ніколич. Виконання ним обов'язків у місті перервалось в наслідок зайняття Керчі у 1855 р. союзницькими військами, а вже на початку 1857 р. Ніколич звернувся до Берліна з проханням про звільнення його з посади, що обумовлювалось як підривом його матеріального стану в наслідок Кримської війни, так і зміною карантинних правил у Керчі, які суттєво зменшували прибутки пруського консульського агента. Невдовзі Георг Ніколич помер, чим і завершилась вельми коротка історія існування консульського представництва Пруссії у Керчі. Офіційний Берлін знов звернув увагу на Керч як на місто, де мало діяти його консульське представництво, тільки через 10 років, і невдовзі туди був призначений віце-консул, але тепер вже не Пруссії, а Північнонімецького союзу.

**Ключові слова:** консульське представництво, консул, Керч, Пруссія, Російська імперія.

**The Problem Statement.** An important page in the history of the Ukrainian-German relations is the history of the consular missions of the German states, including the most powerful of them – Prussia, in the Ukrainian lands when they belonged to the Russian Empire. The formation of the Prussian consular network in the region began with the establishment of the consulate in Odesa in 1818, shortly after the city was granted a porto-franco. The next step in expanding this network was taken more than a quarter of a century later, when the issue of founding the Prussian consular office in Kerch was raised. Who was the initiator of such an expansion and how was it justified? When and in what status did the Prussian consular office in Kerch function and who represented the interests of Prussia there? What were the details of the biographies of these people? **The purpose** of this research is to answer these and a number of other questions, based, primarily, on the recently discovered and analyzed documents of the Secret Archives of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation (Berlin).

**The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications.** Since the publishing of the publication “The Black Sea Germans in the Life and Work of Odesa and the Region. 1803 – 2003; Bibliographic Index” (Samodurova, etc., 2003) the historiography of the issues analysis has significantly expanded. However, there was no breakthrough in the study of the history of the consular missions of the German states in general, nor in the history of the consuls of Prussia. Moreover, there is no study on the Prussian consulates or representation in Kerch. At the same time, during recent years there were published the monographs on consular missions of other states in the Ukrainian port cities during the period of the Russian Empire (Adadurov; Lyman, 2017 b, 2018 a, 2018 b, 2019, 2020). Liudmyla Vovchuk wrote the dissertation on “Activities of Foreign Consuls in the Black Sea-Azov Ports of the Russian Empire (the end of the XVIIIth – the beginning of the XXth century)” (in which, however, the Prussian consular office in Kerch was not mentioned) (Vovchuk, 2019). Therefore, there is a need to continue the study of the network of foreign consular missions in the Ukrainian lands and to fill in the gap in historiography regarding Kerch.

**The Basic Material Statement.** The issue of establishing the Prussian consular office in Kerch was raised at the end of 1844. It was initiated by Edward Cattley, who offered his candidacy for the post and soon came to office.

Born in St. Petersburg on April 17, 1816 (Descendants of Stevan Catlay) Edward Cattley belonged to the family, which gave the world a number of consuls and many more respectable merchants. It is significant that, representing the interests of Prussia and thus being associated with this Kingdom, Edward Cattley was a great exception in his family. After all, chronologically the first Prussian consul in Kerch was British.

Edward Catlay’s oldest direct ancestors are the great-great-great-great-great-grandfather Stephen Catlay (Stevan Catlay), who was born approximately in 1580, and his great-great-great-great-great-grandmother Elizabeth Jube (Elizabeth Jube, 1581 – 1657), who married in 1609 in Normanton (nowadays, a town in West Yorkshire in England).

The father of the Prussian consul Robert Cattley was born in York in 1787 (Descendants of Stevan Catlay) and moved to the Russian Empire at the beginning of the XIXth century, as a merchant and having some shares in the company “Catlay & Co.”. It is significant that Robert Cattley appeared on the first sheet of the Prussian consulate case in Kerch – on the sheet, which concerned the appointment procedure of Edward Cattley (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 1).

As a merchant, Edward Cattley served for some time in the city of his birth – the capital of the Russian Empire. In the German-language edition of 1835, his name appeared as a British citizen and valet (Illustrirter Kalender, p. 421). On April 20, 1843 in St. Petersburg, Edward Cartley married Clemence Elise Camp (Clemence Elise Camp). Clemence Elise was the same age as her husband – she was born on July 1, 1816. On October 2, 1844, Edward and Clemence Elise Cattley’s son, Edward Abbs Cattley, was born in the Crimea (Edward Abbs Cattley) (Descendants of Stevan Catlay)<sup>1</sup>.

On December 10, 1844, Edward Cattley himself sent a letter in French from Kerch addressed to August von Liebermann, the Royal Prussian Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Russian court. In the letter E. Cattley wrote that during his stay in Kerch a number of Prussian captains, who came to this port, expressed a strong desire to establish a vice-consulate of their country. Therefore, Edward Cattley was honoured to nominate his

---

<sup>1</sup> Later on, Edward Abbs, who was known in the Russian Empire as Dmitriy Dmitrievich, also became a merchant engaged in the grain and timber trade. The wife of Edward Abbs Cattley and, accordingly, the daughter-in-law of the Prussian consul in Kerch was the American – Louisa Harriett Ropes, the daughter of William Hooper Ropes, a merchant and head of the firm Ropes & Co, founded by his father, who became American ambassador to St. Petersburg in 1850.

candidacy for the post, justifying by other arguments the need to establish the Prussian vice-consulate in the city (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 2).

Edward Cattley's letter was received in St. Petersburg on December 18, and on December 28, 1844, Cattley's colleague, the Prussian Vice-Consul in St. Petersburg, Johann Bernhard Kempe, joined the case procedure. Johann Bernhard Kempe was also acquainted with Robert Cattley, Edward's father (J.V. Kempe), was also acquainted with Robert Cattley, Edward's father (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 2).

At that time there was only one Prussian consular office in the region – the consulate in Odesa, and its head was Johann Albrecht Bock, who had been in office since December 25, 1840. (GStA PK, Nr. 430, p. 47). Johann Albrecht Bock was also involved into establishing the consulate in Kerch and appointing a consular representative there (GStA PK, Nr. 456, pp. 8, 9, 11, 13). At a certain stage of the bureaucratic procedure, there was the idea of establishing a consulate in Kerch, not a vice-consulate. Finally, on July 12, 1845, the merchant Cattley was appointed a consular (GStA PK, Nr. 456, pp. 15, 16).

It was Edward Cattley in the status of the Prussian consul in Kerch, who appeared on the first sheet of the case “Consulate in Taganrog. Volume 2. 1845 – 1868” of Secret Archives of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation. In this French-language document, written in Kerch on December 10, 1845, there was described the specifics of navigation in the Sea of Azov and the Kerch Strait, related to the shallowness of this sea (GStA PK, Nr. 451). The correspondence with the Consul in Kerch, Edward Cattley, was mentioned in the document of the same case, written on February 14, 1848.

In the case “Consulate in Kerch, the Crimea, and Berdyansk” there were preserved the letters, written by Edward Cattley to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Prussia, dated of 1845 (GStA PK, Nr. 456, pp. 25–26) and of 1847 (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 30). The letters, like the above-mentioned letter of December 10, 1844, were written in French. In his correspondence to Berlin, E. Cattley wrote not only about Kerch but also about the ports of the Sea of Azov, caring for the Prussian trade interests not only in the city of his stay, but in Azov in general. In parallel with his position as the Prussian Consul in Kerch, Edward Cattley served as Swedish-Norwegian Vice Consul in the same city (Erik-Amburger-Datenbank).

After several years in Kerch, E. Cattley decided to move to another seaside town. On November 4, 1848, still putting signature as the Prussian consul in Kerch, in Berdyansk Edward Cattley wrote a French-language letter to Charles Trebbin, the Prussian consul in Odesa. In the letter Cattley, confirming receiving of Trebbin's letter of October 8, assured that, moving from Kerch to Berdyansk, he had no intention of “suspending his services to the Prussian government”. On the contrary, Cattley expressed the hope that after the change of residence, the benefits would only increase. It was about expanding the network of consular representatives in the region, including a vice-consul or consular agent. E. Cattley mentioned, that he had already written about this to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Ambassador of Prussia in St. Petersburg. E. Cattley hoped that the Prussian consul in Odesa would support such initiative (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 49).

In the middle of March of 1849, while staying still in Berdyansk, E. Cattley continued signing letters as the Prussian consul in Kerch (GStA PK, Nr. 456, pp. 53–54). As a Prussian consular representative in Kerch, his name and surname (Edward Cattley) were recorded in the lists of consular representatives of the German states abroad. The lists of consular representatives were published in Weimar in 1848 (Genealogisch-historisch-statistischer Almanach, S. 128) and in Leipzig in 1849 (Illustrierter Kalender, 1849, p. 110).

It is very interesting that in the database of Professor Eric Amburger (one of the descendants of Edward Cattley's relatives) "Foreigners in Pre-revolutionary Russia" ("Erik-Amburger-Datenbank. Ausländer im vorrevolutionären Russland") there is information that after holding the post of the Prussian consul in Kerch (which allegedly ended in 1848) Edward moved to Berdyansk, where he was a vice-consul of Great Britain in 1849 (Erik-Amburger-Datenbank). However, in the course of our research on the history of the British consuls in Berdyansk (Lyman, 2016a, 2016b, 2017a, 2017b, 2019) no evidence of this fact was found.

Edward did not stay for a long period of time in Berdyansk. In 1850, his 15-year-old cousin Stephen Thomas wrote in his diary that he had visited a country house, which was located at the distance of about 15 miles from St. Petersburg, a halfway to Peterhof. Stephen Thomas mentioned that "Mr. and Mrs. Edward Cattley had their country residence there (Uncle Robert's son). He is a consul and sometimes princes dine with him at his table" (Mahnke-Devlin, 2005, p. 96). The fact that at that time the former Prussian consul was no longer in office in Azov, but in the Baltic, is recorded in the Swedish history of the city of Vyborg (Ruuth, 1906, p. 820).

When Edward Cattley left the consular post in Kerch, his younger brother Charles Robert continued to work in the city, who was also the consular representative in Kerch, not Prussian, but British. Charles Cattley suspended his vice-consular service in Kerch due to the events of the Crimean War, because the Russian and British Empires were on different sides of the "barricades". The Russian authorities ordered Cattley to leave not only Kerch but also the territory of the Russian Empire. However, he returned to the Crimea in a few months as a soldier of the British-French troops. In September of 1854, Cattley came to office as a head of the British Department of Secret Intelligence ("Secret Intelligence Department") in the Crimea. It is logical that a long period of a consular service in Kerch provided excellent opportunities to Cattley to get the information on intelligence and plan operations in the eastern coast of the Crimea and Kerch itself. However, on July 10, 1855, Charles Cattley died of cholera. Queen Victoria was informed of Cattley's death. On July 30, 1855 Queen Victoria wrote that the commander in chief of the British troops in the Crimea, James Simpson, after the death of the head of military intelligence, must be in a state of great helplessness, having no sources for gathering information and not being able to maintain secret correspondence with the Tatars. 20 days before the Queen's letter, James Simpson himself wrote that the loss of "Mr. Calvert" (i.e., Charles Cattley) was irreparable and he had neither the chance nor the hope of finding a worthy successor of Cattley (Harris, 1993, pp. 94–129).

As for the former Prussian consul Edward Cattley, he took a very important place in the British community of the capital of the Russian Empire, becoming an agent of the London Russian Company in St. Petersburg and treasurer of the "British Factory" (Karttunen, P. 266). Namely, the treasurer, who was elected annually by members of the "British Factory", was considered the most important "official" person of the British community in St. Petersburg (Karttunen, 2004, p. 63).

In 1881, after about 16 years of work, Edward gave up working for the Russian company (Mahnke-Devlin, 2005, p. 104). He retired and left the Russian Empire, moved to England (Mahnke-Devlin, 2005, p. 96). The former Prussian consul in Kerch, Edward Cattley, ended his life not in the Prussian lands, but in Bournemouth, England. On March 15, 1895 Edward Cattley died there (Descendants of Stevan Catlay; Lyman, *Forecoming*).

Cattley's successor as a consul in Kerch was Georg Nicolich. In the papers of the Prussian consulate in Kerch, Georg Nicolich is first mentioned on March 25 (April 7), 1848, in the letter to Berlin from Odesa, written by the Prussian vice-consul in that city, Charles Trebbin (GStA PK, Nr. 456, pp. 34–35). He was also mentioned in Trebbin's letter to Berlin dated on October 1 (13) of the same year (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 38).

Nicolich's name (Nicolich, Nikolich) was mentioned later in the correspondence on Edward Cattley's intention to change his place of residence and the initiative to change the network of the Prussian consular representatives in the region. In various documents, Nicolich's name was mentioned as Johann or Georg. At some stage it was specified that the candidacy of the merchant Nicolich was being considered for the position of the Prussian consular agent in Kerch (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 56).

On May 20 (June 1), 1852, two documents were written in Odesa, in which the surname Nicolich was mentioned. The original of one of these documents, written in French, was sent to Georg Nicolich in Kerch, a copy of which was enclosed into the consulate's file. The document was a message from the recently appointed Prussian consul in Odesa, John Menger, stating that in accordance with the instructions of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Berlin, the Prussian consul in Odesa offered Georg Nicolich the position of a consular agent in Kerch, and he accepted this offer. John Menger informed the Prussian Embassy in St. Petersburg about such offer and consent. The Prussian Embassy in St. Petersburg was to inform the local authorities about the appointment. In addition, in the same letter, John Menger wrote to Nicolich that he would receive a seal to be used in performing his functions, as well as the documents, which he should be guided by in his activities, namely: Consular Regulations of September 18, 1796; Tariff of consular fees, determined by § XII of the Consular Regulations of 1796 (as amended); Decrees of January 30, 1815, August 23, 1816, June 15, 1830, April 24, 1834, April 25, 1834, January 6, 1837, 5 February 1839, March 9, 1839, November 6, 1840, June 8, 1841, August 16, 1844, September 23, 1844, April 16, 1845; Appendix to legislation directly related to the duties of a consular agent. John Menger instructed Nicolich on the specifics of the rules for collecting consular fees and performing other functions entrusted to the consular agent in Kerch (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 84).

In the case of "The Consulate in Kerch, in the Crimea, and in Berdyansk" of the Secret Archives of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation, the next sheet after the documents on Nicolich's appointment is dated of August 17, 1855 (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 96) i.e., it was written almost 3 years after the previous one, during the climax of the Crimean War, when Kerch had been occupied by Allied troops for several months.

John Menger's letter of August 17, 1855, was a reaction to a written address received from the Prussian consular agent in Kerch, Georg Nicolich, which he had written in French on July 16 (28), 1855, in Kharkiv. This was the place where Nicolich temporarily moved because of the war. In his letter, Georg Nicolich first of all apologized for not informing John Menger about his move as a refugee to Kharkiv, nor about the events that took place in Kerch during the occupation. Nicolich wrote that after the departure of the Russian state institutions from Kerch, the city did not resist, and the British acted "like pirates or flibusters, not as a civilized and respected nation". Nicolich described the misery of the city's residents and the sad fate of Kerch real estate, noting that Kerch was in ruins. As for himself, Nicolich said that he and his family had to leave the city, but managed to take the archives of the Prussian consular agency entrusted to him (GStA PK, Nr. 456, pp. 97–98).

John Menger informed the leadership in Berlin about this letter, and already in the document written on September 5, 1855, there was the issue of Nicolich's status not as the consular agent, but the vice-consul of Prussia (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 102). In this status his surname appeared in the documents of official Berlin on November 11 and 20 of the same year (GStA PK, Nr. 456, pp. 104, 105).

The next document in the case "Consulate in Kerch, the Crimea, and Berdyansk" dates back to February 6 (18), 1857 (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 106). In this letter from John Menger to

Berlin, Nicolich was again mentioned as a Prussian consular agent in Kerch. And this time, as well as in 1855, the appearance of a letter from the Prussian consul in Odesa after a long break was caused by a previous appeal to him by Georg Nicolich.

In his, again, the French-language letter to John Menger, written in Kerch on January 29 (February 10), 1857, Nicolich wrote about the circumstances, which left no doubt that after returning home from Kharkiv he was already well acquainted with the situation in Kerch after the withdrawal of the Allied troops. Georg Nicolich noted that this time the captains of ships going from abroad to the ports of the Sea of Azov did not have to call on the port city of Kerch directly, and could certify their documents obtained at the consulate of the Russian Empire in Constantinople, in quarantine. The situation was different from the one when Nicolich became a consular agent in Kerch and when the Prussian navigation could offer him benefits that compensated the work he did.

Nicolich wrote that his personal circumstances had also changed significantly since he had agreed to take up the post of the Prussian consular agent. Nicolich's financial situation was severely undermined by the war, which had just ended. Therefore, he wrote that, unfortunately, he no longer found the opportunity to continue serving as a consular agent (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 107).

However, the circumstances changed not only in Nicolich's affairs. The end of the Crimean War opened a new page in the history of consulates throughout the Azov-Black Sea region, including the history of the Prussian consular networks. On March 12 and 28, 1857, the documents were made in Berlin concerning possible changes not only in Kerch, but also in Berdyansk, where a Prussian consular agent could also be appointed (GStA PK, Nr. 456, pp. 108, 109).

Shortly afterwards, on April 7, 1858, the Governor-General of Novorossiysk and Bessarabia, on the basis of a note from the Austrian Consul General in Odesa, informed the Kerch-Yenikalsky Mayor that in connection with the death of Georg Nicolich, the duties of the Austrian Vice-Consul in Kerch were entrusted to the Belgian Consul in Kerch, Tito Nazzolini (Ot mestnogo nachalstva, 1858, p. 61).

The confusion with the surname of Nicolich, which is mentioned in the documents of the case "Consulate in Kerch, Crimea and Berdyansk", is explained by the fact that in Kerch the consular representatives of several countries were two brothers, Georg and Johann. After the death of Georg Nicolich in the consular building in Kerch in 1859, Johann (Ivan Mykolayovych) Nicolich remained, who had the status of Neapolitan vice-consul.

It is intriguing that as a consular agent of Prussia in Kerch, Georg Nicolich (Georges Nikolitch) is mentioned in the publication "Diplomatic Handbook of the Russian Empire" during 1861 – 1868. However, in a very significant way, in contrast to the edition compiled in St. Petersburg, Berlin editions of this period do not mention either Georg Nicolich or the existence of the Prussian consular office in Kerch, in general. For instance, they are not in the "Lists of the Prussian consular officers employed abroad", published in the "Preussisches Handelsarchiv" in 1861 – 1867. After 1861 there was recorded only the presence of the Consulate General of Prussia in Odesa and its subordinate consulate in Berdyansk and vice-consulate in Taganrog. We have reason to believe that St. Petersburg edition provided incorrect information, and in reality the Prussian consular representative in Kerch during the 1860s was absent. This statement is evidenced by the fact that on March 11 (23) 1861, Consul Ernst Mass sent the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Prussia a description of the archives of the Prussian Consulate in Odesa, which included the documents (magazines, protocols, etc.) of the Prussian consular agent in Kerch during 1852 – 1856 (GStA PK, Nr. 431).

On (13) June 1867, Kerch negotiator, Woldemar Roya, wrote the French-language letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Prussia, Bismark. In the letter he wrote that living for several years in Kerch, he occasionally saw the Prussian subjects additionally suffered from the fact that, not having their consul in Kerch, not knowing either the language or the laws of the country, they did not find protection from their government. Roya noted that due to the nature of his activities, he communicated daily with the captains of different countries, having to protect them as best he could. For this reason, Roya wrote that he requested the Prussian Ministry of Foreign Affairs to grant him consular powers in Kerch. Roya further noted that if the Minister wished to verify his reputation, such information could be provided by the consulates of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and the United Kingdom in Kerch (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 190).

On the same day, Woldemar Roya wrote the French-language letter to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Prussia requesting his appointment as a consul and assuring him that his position allowed him to defend the Prussian interests in the best possible way (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 191).

In Berlin, both letters were registered on July 8. Already on July 11, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Prussia addressed this issue to Consul General in Odesa, Ernst Mass (GStA PK, Nr. 456, S. 192). The response of the Consulate General in Odesa was on 14 (26) August (GStA PK, Nr. 456, p. 193). However, no document on the continuation of Woldemar Roy's petition in the case of the Consulate in Kerch, the Crimea and Berdyansk of the Secret Archives of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation had been found. Other sources give grounds to claim that Roya did not take the desired position of the Prussian consul in Kerch (Lyman, *Forecoming*). Soon the Prussian consular offices disappeared in other cities, giving way to the newly created North German Union.

**The Conclusions and Prospects of Further Researches.** Thus, the Prussian consulate in Kerch was founded in 1845 on the initiative of the Englishman, Edward Cattley, born in the Russian Empire, whose merchant family occupied important positions in St. Petersburg, and at that time his brother was the Vice-Consul of Great Britain in Kerch. Whereas the protection of the Prussian interests in the sub-Russian territories of the Northern Black Sea and the Azov Sea was previously the responsibility of the Prussian Consul in Odesa, with the establishment of a consulate in Kerch, the latter began to take care of relevant issues in the lands adjacent to the waters of the Sea of Azov. However, this did not last for a long period of time. At the end of 1848, Consul Edward Cattley, continuing to be the Prussian consul in Kerch, moved to Berdyansk. In 1850 he left the region. The functioning of the consular mission in Kerch was interrupted in 1852, when he became a consular agent subordinate to the Prussian consul in Odesa, Georg Nicolich, a representative of a respectable Kerch merchant family, was appointed. His service duty performing was interrupted as a result of the occupation of Kerch in 1855 by the Allied troops. At the beginning of 1857, Nicolich appealed to Berlin to dismiss him from office, which was due to the undermining of his financial situation as a result of the Crimean War, and by changing the quarantine rules in Kerch, which significantly reduced the income of the Prussian consular agent. Soon Georg Nicolich died, which ended a very short history of the existence of the Prussian consular office in Kerch. Official Berlin drew attention to Kerch again as the city where its consular office was to function, only 10 years later. There was appointed a vice-consul, but no longer Prussian, but the representative of the North German Union. Further prospect of studying this issue is to create a generalized analysis on the history of the Prussian consuls and consuls of the North German Union in southern Ukraine. We work on this issue currently.

We express our sincere gratitude to the staff of the Secret Archives of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation, who contributed to the search of the materials for writing this article.

Funding for this research was provided by the Foundation's Scholarship Programme, while no financial support was provided to the authors to write and publish the article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Adadurov, V., Chuma, B., Zhaloba, I. & Syrota, R.** (2017). *Arkhivy konsul'skykh ustanov inozemnykh derzhav yak dzhereło do vyvchennia ukraïnskoi istorii XIX – pochatku XX stolit [Archives of foreign consular offices as a source for the study of Ukrainian history during the 19th – early 20th centuries]*. Lviv: UCU Publishing House, 152 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Descendants of Stevan Catlay and Elizabeth Jube.** URL: <http://freepages.rootsweb.com/~hills/genealogy/cattley/d1.html#i250>. [in English]

**Erik-Amburger-Datenbank.** *Ausländer im vorrevolutionären Russland.* URL: <https://www.amburger.ios-regensburg.de/index.php?id=82498&mode=1>. [in German]

Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz (**GStA PK**), III. HA Mda, II Nr. 430: Konsulat in Odessa, Bd. 2. Jan. 1832 – Dez. 1850.

**Genealogisch-historisch-statistischer Almanach für das Jahr 1848** (1848). Weimar: Landes-Industrie-Comptoirs, 845 s. [in German]

**GStA PK**, III, HA Mda II Nr. 451: Konsulat in Taganrog, Bd. 2. 1845 – 1868.

**GStA PK**, III, HA Mda II Nr. 456: Konsulate in Kertsch auf der Krim und in Berdjansk. 1845 – 1868.

**GStA PK**, III, HA Mda, II Nr. 431: Konsulat in Odessa, Bd. 3. Dez. 1850 – Juni 1868.

**Harris, S. M.** (1993). *British Military Intelligence in the Crimean War, 1854 – 1856*. A thesis submitted to the faculty of graduate studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts. Department of History. The University of Calgary, 214 p. [in English]

**Illustrierter Kalender für 1849: Jahrbuch der Ereignisse, Bestrebungen und Fortschritte im Völkerleben und im Gebiete der Wissenschaften, Künste und Gewerbe** (1849). Leipzig: J.J. Weber, 254 s. [in German]

**Intelligenzblatt № 120 der St. Petersburgische Zeitung.** 31.05.1835, S. 421. [in German]

**Karttunen, M.-L.** (2004). *Making a Communal World. English Merchants in Imperial St. Petersburg*. Academic dissertation to be publicly discussed, by due permission of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Helsinki. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 314 p. [in English]

**Lyman, I. & Konstantinova, V.** (2016a). British Vice-Consul in Berdyansk John Edward Greaves. *Scriptorium nostrum*, 2 (5), 86–108. [in English]

**Lyman, I. & Konstantinova, V.** (2016b). William George Wagstaff – British Consul, Responsible for Ekaterinoslav Province and Ports of the Sea of Azov. *Історія і культура Придніпров'я: Невідомі та маловідомі сторінки*, 12, 57–62. [in English]

**Lyman, I. & Konstantinova, V.** (2017a). British Consul in Berdyansk Cumberbatch, Great-Grandfather of Modern Sherlock Holmes. *Scriptorium nostrum*, 2 (8), 195–207. [in English]

**Lyman, I. & Konstantinova, V.** (2018a). *Nimetski konsuly v Pivnichnomu Pryazov'ї [German Consuls in the Northern Azov Region]*. Dnipro: LIRA, 500 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Lyman, I. & Konstantinova, V.** (2018b). *Ukrainskyi Pivden ochyma konsuliv Brytanskoï imperii 19 – pochatku 20 st. Tom 1: Brytanski konsuly v portovomu misti Berdiansku [The Ukrainian South as viewed by consuls of the British Empire (19th – early 20th centuries). Volume 1: British consuls in the port city of Berdyansk]*. Kyiv, 630 p. [in Ukrainian and English]

**Lyman, I. & Konstantinova, V.** (2019). British Consulates in Port Cities of the Northern Black Sea and Azov Region of the Second Half of the 19th - Early 20th Centuries, *East European Historical Bulletin*, 12, 44–53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.12.178904> [in English]

**Lyman, I. & Konstantinova, V.** (2020). *Hretska hromada ta konsuly Hretsii u Berdiansku XIX – pochatku XX stolittia [The Greek Community and Consuls of Greece in Berdyansk of the Nineteenth – early Twentieth Centuries]*. Melitopol, 494 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Lyman, I. & Konstantinova, V.** (Forecoming). Prussian Consuls on the Southern Ukrainian Frontier. *The Journal of South-East European Studies*.

**Lyman, I. Konstantinova, V. & Danchenko, E.** (2017b). *Brytanskyi konsul i promyslovets Dzhon Hriievz [British consul and industrialist John Edward Greaves]*. Berdyansk: Tkachuk O.V, 200 p. [in Ukrainian and English]

**Mahnke-Devlin, J.** (2005). *Britische Migration nach Russland im 19. Jahrhundert: Integration-Kultur-Alltagsleben*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 297 s. DOI: [http://doi.org/10.15457/vom\\_69](http://doi.org/10.15457/vom_69) [in German]

**Ot mestnogo nachalstva.** (1858). Ot mestnogo nachalstva [From the local authorities]. *Obyavleniya Kerch-Enikolskogo gradonachalstva [Announcements of the Kerch-Yenikol city administration]*, 20.04.1858 (16), 61. [in Russian]

**Ruuth, J. W.** (1906). *Viborgs stads historia*. Andra bandet. Helsingfors, 1028 s.

**Samodurova, V., Ajsfeld, A. & Shevchuk N.** (Comps.) (2003). *Prichernomorskie nemcy v zhizni i deyatelnosti g. Odessy i regiona. 1803 – 2003; Bibliograficheskij ukazatel [Black Sea Germans in the life and work of Odessa and the region. 1803 – 2003; Bibliographic index]*. Odessa: Astroprint, 312 p. [in Russian]

**Vovchuk, L. A.** (2013). *Dialnist konsuliv inozemnykh derzhav u chornomorsko-azovs'kykh portakh Rossijskoi imperii (kinets 18 – pochatok 20 st.) [Activities of consuls of foreign states in the Black Sea and Azov ports of the Russian Empire (the end of the 18th – early 20th centuries)] (Candidate's thesis)*. Mykolayiv, 200 p. [in Ukrainian]The article was received on February 27, 2020.

*The article was received on February 27, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94(477.4)“1861”:271.2-722  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226554

**Vitaliy TATSIYENKO**

*PhD (History), Assistant Professor of History of Ukraine Chair, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, 28 Sadova Street, Uman, Ukraine, postal code 20300 (tatsiyenko1990@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-3372-9765

**Researcher ID:** D-7640-2019

**Natalia TATSIYENKO**

*PhD (History), Assistant Professor of History of Ukraine Chair, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, 28 Sadova Street, Uman, Ukraine, postal code 20300 (tatsiyenko\_natalia@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-7872-9008

**Researcher ID:** D-7639-2019

**Віталій ТАЦІЄНКО**

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини, вул. Садова, 28, м. Умань, Україна, індекс 20300, (tatsiyenko1990@ukr.net)*

**Наталія ТАЦІЄНКО**

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини, вул. Садова, 28, м. Умань, Україна, індекс 20300 (tatsiyenko\_natalia@ukr.net)*

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Tatsiyenko, V. & Tatsiyenko, N. (2021). The Orthodox parish clergy's role in the peasant reform implementation in 1861 (based on Kyiv huberniya materials). *Shkhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 55–63. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226554

**THE ORTHODOX PARISH CLERGY'S ROLE IN THE PEASANT REFORM IMPLEMENTATION IN 1861 (BASED ON KYIV HUBERNIYA MATERIALS)**

**Abstract. The purpose of the research is** – to clarify the Orthodox parish clergy's role in the peasant reform implementation in 1861, based on Kyiv huberniya (province) materials **The methodology of the research** includes the main principles of systematization, scientificity, historicism, as well as the use of general scientific methods of analysis, synthesis, generalization, comparison. **The scientific novelty** is that the authors, having used published and previously unused archival sources, materials of periodicals, showed the Orthodox parish clergy importance in the peasant reform of 1861 on the example of Kyiv huberniya (province). **The Conclusions.** During the peasant reform implementation, the authorities used the nationalized Orthodox Church for the ideological support actively, as its influence on the population was significant. The parish clergy's activities were regulated by the central church and diocesan administrations' instructions, which, threatened the “strict responsibility”, demanded that an arbitrary, and even more incorrect, explanation of the manifesto should be avoided. In the church

periodicals (“Kyiv Diocesan Gazette”, “The Guide for the Rural Pastors”) which were published for the clergy, the samples of sermons on this purely secular event could be found. The Orthodox clergy were obliged to form a positive assessment of the agrarian transformation, to promote the “correct” understanding of the peasant reform, to perform duties in favor of the landlords, to present it as the Emperor’s care. A particularly important task that the parish priests undertook to perform was to fight the protests among the peasantry, who were dissatisfied with the agrarian transformations’ predatory nature in 1861. The Orthodox Church, as part of the state apparatus, performed the demanded task successfully, in particular, approved and blessed the peasant reform.

**Key words:** peasant reform of 1861, the Orthodox clergy, landowner, Kyiv huberniya.

## РОЛЬ ПРАВОСЛАВНОГО ПАРАФІЯЛЬНОГО ДУХОВЕНСТВА У ПРОВЕДЕННІ СЕЛЯНСЬКОЇ РЕФОРМИ 1861 р. (НА МАТЕРІАЛАХ КИЇВСЬКОЇ ГУБЕРНІЇ)

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* – з’ясування на матеріалах Київської губернії ролі православного парафіяльного духовенства у впровадженні селянської реформи 1861 р. **Методологія дослідження** включає головні принципи системності, науковості, історизму, а також використання загальнонаукових методів аналізу, синтезу, узагальнення, порівняння. **Наукова новизна** роботи полягає у тому, що автори, використовуючи опубліковані та раніше неживдані архівні джерела, матеріали періодичних видань, на прикладі Київської губернії показали значення православного парафіяльного духовенства у проведенні селянської реформи 1861 р. **Висновки.** В ході реалізації селянської реформи влада активно використовувала одержавлену Православну церкву для ідеологічної підтримки, адже її вплив на населення був значним. Діяльність парафіяльних священно- і церковнослужителів регламентувалась інструкціями центральної церковної та єпархіальної адміністрації, які погрожуючи “суворою відповідальністю”, вимагали уникати довільного, а тим більше невірного пояснення маніфесту. В церковній періодиці (“Киевских епархиальных ведомостях”, “Руководстве для сельских пастырей”) для священнослужителів публікувалися зразки проповідей, присвячених цій суто світській події. Православному духовенству ставилось у обов’язок формувати позитивну оцінку аграрним перетворенням, сприяти “правильному” розумінню селянством реформи, виконанню повинностей на користь поміщиків, подавати її як турботу імператора. Особливо важливим завданням, яке зобов’язувало виконувати парафіяльні священнослужителі, була боротьба з протестними настроями серед селянства, яке виявляло незадоволення грабіжницьким характером аграрних перетворень 1861 р. Православна церква, будучи частиною державного апарату, досить успішно виконувала завдання, що полягали у схваленні та благословінні селянської реформи, чого від неї так вимагала влада.

**Ключові слова:** селянська реформа 1861 р., православне духовенство, поміщик, Київська губернія.

**The Problem Statement.** Taking into consideration the nature and scale of change, the period of the 60-ies – 70-ies of the XIXth century went down in history as “major reforms” that gave a powerful impetus to modernization processes in Ukraine. The peasant reform was one of the many innovations introduced by the government of Alexander II, and it became one of the main modernization’s drivers. The authorities used the Orthodox Church to ensure reform actively. The Orthodox Church was obliged to form a positive assessment of the agrarian transformation, to fight the protest mood among the peasantry.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications.** The peasant reform’s subject has significant historiography, which is one of the most powerful in historical science. However, some issue aspects still need to be reconsidered and further studied, in particular, the Orthodox parish clergy’s role in the peasant reform implementation in 1861. The researcher, D. Poyda covered the relationship question between the peasantry and the clergy, the church ministers’

importance in the reform's implementation (Poyda, 1962, pp. 113–127; Poyda, 1983, pp. 130–135). One more researcher, T. Kuznets considered the agrarian transformations' peculiarities in Kyiv huberniya (province) and the Orthodox clergy's position on its approval (Kuznets, 2008, pp. 15–21). The secular's and spiritual's power interaction in the reform's preparation and implementation, the help of the church to state structures during the mass peasant unrest were studied by Ye. Mokshina (Mokshina, 2011, pp. 170–173) and Ye. Matveeva (Matveeva, 2013, pp. 1–9). V. Pererva (Pererva, 2012, pp. 152–160) analyzed the agrarian transformations' impact on the church life of the Right Bank of Ukraine, in particular the introduction into the church calendar of special services dedicated to purely secular events, new holidays, changes in the titles of churches in the region. O. Korotkova (Korotkova, 2019, pp. 27–33), analyzed the causes and consequences of the growth of the Ukrainian peasantry antagonistic attitudes towards the clergy in the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth centuries, noted that the agrarian reform caused a decline in the church's authority. Yu. Khytrovska (Khytrovska, 2017, pp. 19–28) analyzed the public attitude to the Orthodox Church and the clergy's influence on the population of the Right Bank of Ukraine.

**The purpose of the article** is to cover the Orthodox parish clergy's role in the peasant reform implementation in 1861, based on Kyiv huberniya (province) materials.

**The Basic Material Statement.** Due to the ecclesiastical reform, brought in by Peter I, ecclesiastical authority became secular, and the Holy Synod became a ministry of religious affairs essentially. The Orthodox Church was clamped by the state. The clergy entrusted a significant number of government assignments to the clergy, especially the range of extracurricular responsibilities expanded in the XIXth century. The clerics were used by the authorities as an ideological tool, a tool in achieving social peace. In particular, in 1800 Kyiv eparchy's parishioners undertook to make every effort to appease the parishioners in case of their "disobedience to the owners" (Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv – CSHAK, f. 127, d. 354, c. 162, pp. 2–10). The government, with a peace keeping mission, involved the parish clergy actively during the inventory and peasant reforms, Kyiv Cossacks, and mass peasant riots at the beginning of the XXth century, etc. The evidence concerning the scale of the non-religious responsibilities that the authorities imposed on the clergy was the performance by them of even seemingly uncharacteristic police functions. The authorities even encroached on such an intimate thing as a confession. Ever since Peter's time, the law required breaking the secrecy of confession, although it contradicted the canons, and reporting evil intentions, criminal actions against the state and especially the Emperor. Even the word with which the priest addressed the faithful was controlled. The church preached the church as one of the means to maintain the existing order, social peace and used it to form a "correct" public opinion.

Hence, it is not surprising that during the period of the peasant reform, the authorities used the nationalized church for ideological support actively, as its influence on the population was significant. It was the parish priests, who played an extremely important role in the reform's implementation.

Anticipating the possibility of discontent and unrest among the peasantry, the authorities were aware of the benefits of the church to appease them. On the eve of the reform, special instruction for the parish clergy was sent to each diocese throughout the empire. The circular of the Holy Synod entrusted the clergy with a "sacred duty" to promote a correct understanding of the reform by the peasantry. It was stated that "it is always the duty of the priest to teach the parishioners that they should be faithful to the emperor and obey his superiors, that they should perform lawful duties steadily and conscientiously and pay

certain taxes and dues imposed or established” (CSHAK, f. 127, d. 699, c. 170, pp. 1–2). The priests were obliged to carry out the ideological work from the church pulpit and in home conversations unobtrusively. And in the church periodicals (“Diocesan Gazette”, “The Guide for the Rural Pastors”) for the clergy published samples of sermons on this purely secular event (Pererva, 2012, p. 153). It was required to explain to the peasants that the reform was “the fruit of the Emperor’s paternal care” and to form “gratitude and a zealous desire to justify the Emperor’s care and hope” (CSHAK, f. 127, d. 699, c. 170, pp. 1–2).

The church administration entrusted the function of peacekeepers during the reform only to the priests. The priests were required to warn the clergy, so that, first, hearing the peasants’ reflections on the manifesto on the 19<sup>th</sup> of February, they would not support them, given the lack of awareness in this matter, so as not to provoke unrest; secondly, if they witnessed the parishioners’ conversations, who posed a threat to the general peace, they had to “immediately and faithfully” inform the priest (CSHAK, f. 127, d. 699, c. 170, p. 2).

It should be noted that the circular emphasized specifically that priests should not show that they were performing this peacekeeping function especially by the government’s order.

In addition, similar appeals to the parish clergy could also be found in the church periodicals. In particular, the pages of “Kyiv Diocesan Gazette” stated that the priests should form beliefs among the believers that their release does not take place immediately, but gradually over a period of two years specified in the manifesto. Until its end, the peasants had to be “in the same order and perfect obedience to the landlords”. The pastors were also required to contain excessive expectations that could lead to violations of the landowners’ rights (Yeparkhialnaya khronika, 1861, pp. 96–97).

Furthermore, the clergy mediation issue between the landlords and the peasants in order to establish “peaceful relations” was also discussed in the columns of “The Guide for the Rural Pastors”. It was emphasized that the priests should “protect the idea of freedom from exaggeration, point out the line where the riot and the arbitrariness begin <...> especially in the hearts of the liberated gratitude to our most merciful monarch, inspire obedience to the authorities, inspire confidence and love for the landlords and reassure that the government cares for the good of all, that the wisdom of the authorities, at a certain time, will successfully bring to the desired end the cause of the peasants’ liberation” (Neskolko slov, 1861, pp. 385–386).

As the government was in anticipation of the mass protests, the following measures to minimize them and mobilize all forces were taken. In addition, the day of the manifesto’s signing was a well-kept secret. Even the Orthodox Church was on the qui vive and the troops were put on alert.

The government’s prudent predictions about the peasantry’s dissatisfaction with the reform, which they feared so much, came true. Numerous protests happened, for example, in nine Ukrainian huberniya (provinces) during 1855 101 peasant demonstrations took place, in 1856 – 82, in 1857 – 191, in 1858 – 190, in 1859 – 63 and in 1860 – 81 demonstrations. Moreover, 622 performances took place in Ukraine during January – May 1861 (Reient, 2011, p. 38). It is no coincidence that the legislation was planned to be promulgated not during the stormy week of oil, which ended on the 5<sup>th</sup> of March, but during Lent, when the church called on the people to humbling. In particular, the Minister of Internal Affairs S. Lanskyi warned all governors about it on the 12<sup>th</sup> of February (Reient, 2011, p. 39). Eventually, the “great gift” of the autocrat arrived in Kyiv on the 10 of March “on Friday of the first week of Lent”. At the end of the liturgy, the manifesto was read in all city churches. On the same day, it was sent to Kyiv huberniya (province) povit (counties) (Yeparkhialnaya khronika, 1861, p. 95).

The manifesto's promulgation took place solemnly in the churches in the presence of the local officials, landowners and the clergy. After getting acquainted with the manifesto, prayers for the king were held. In many places processions were held with the transfer of especially revered icons, the peasants collected funds for the construction of churches, chapels in memory of the liberation, the purchase of icons and royal portraits (Mokshina, 2011, p. 172).

In the church periodicals, there were mass reports that the peasants perceived the manifesto provisions with "joy", "deeply felt Tsar's love and mercy". For example, there were local diocesan records, which described the serfdom abolition's perception by the residents of the villages of Selezenivka and Tsanivka in Skvyra povit (county). After reading the manifesto on the 21st of March by a senior member of Skvyra Povit (county) Police, the villagers expressed a desire to purchase a portrait of Alexander II, asking permission to place it in the church, "so that they and their children will forever remember the generous mercy of the Emperor and pray for His Majesty" (*Blagodarnoe chuvstvo krestyan Kievskoy gubernii, po obyavlenii im manifesta 19 fevralya, 1861 goda, 1861, p. 387*). Informed about it the governor-general I. Vasylychikov sent a portrait, with the recommendation to place it in church school. As a result, after receiving a "precious gift" on the 5<sup>th</sup> of April, the faithful asked the local priest O. Vasylevskyi to offer three prayers with an akathist for the Emperor's health in three days. And on the 10<sup>th</sup> of June in 1861, the portrait was decorated with a gold frame.

In a way, the residents of the village Puhachivka, Vasylykiv povit (district) expressed their gratitude for their freedom. On the 15<sup>th</sup> of June in 1861, the peasants addressed the priest with the following request: "Pray to God, Father, for our good and merciful Tsar; we now see that things are better for us; we now see that our Tsar has mercy on us". In turn, the priest suggested that the community establish the image of St. Alexander Nevsky in the church, to which the faithful agreed. At the same time, the priest remarked to the villagers on the need to "holly" fulfill the obligations to the landowner and reminded of his "generous promise to give manor land to those of his peasants who will remain obedient to him until their final liberation" (*Blagodarnoe chuvstvo, 1861, pp. 388–389*). The peasants replied the following: "Let others do whatever they want, and we will do everything as God commanded and as the Tsar wants" (*Blagodarnoe chuvstvo, 1861, p. 389*).

Consequently, such articles pursued a propaganda goal, forming public opinion on the assessment of the ongoing peasant reform (Kuznets, 2008, p. 20).

The main motive declared in the manifesto, which prompted the authorities to eliminate serfdom, was "love and care for all our loyal subjects". The peasantry, on the other hand, was to accept with gratitude the rights granted, to be imbued with a feeling of love and devotion to the autocrat, and to "deeply feel the Tsar's care and mercy". In fact, the peasantry met the liberation from serfdom with disappointment. They were outraged by the predatory nature of the reform, so there were mass cases when the peasantry refused to believe what the local priests were reading. They believed that this was not a real royal manifesto, but fabricated by the landowners, who hid the real will. Often this indignation was directed at the parish clergy, who the peasants believed were "reading lies". The priests disobeyed the landlords massively, refused to perform their duties. The peasantry openly opposed the main provisions of the reform as they did not receive the paramount thing –land and freedom. This is not surprising, because the reform implementation was in the hands of those people, who were its opponents, so all the socio-economic issues facing the peasantry were not resolved. Even the manifesto's author, Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna Philaret (Drozdov), who at that time was one of the most authoritative church figures in the Russian Empire, did not approve

the reform. The reform was carried out at the expense of the peasantry, hence, its predatory nature cultivated among the peasantry protest sentiments.

After the manifesto's promulgation, diverse complaints were made concerning its misinterpretation, including by the clergy, which led to the refusal to perform duties in favor of the landlords. Both the secular and ecclesiastical authorities responded immediately. The diocesan administration threatened the "strict responsibility", demanded to avoid arbitrary, let alone incorrect, manifesto explanation and to follow the relevant instructions.

Despite the categorical church administration's prohibition to explain the provisions of the manifesto to the villagers, such cases did occur. According to the report, issued on the 8<sup>th</sup> of May in 1861, the district police officer L. Lund addressed to Kyiv governor P. Hesse concerning the fact that Deacon M. Orlovskiy from the village of Kashperivka, Tarashchanskyi district, visiting the faithful during the light week (April 23–29), during the feast announced that "it is not necessary to work more than women" (Baran, 1988, p. 281). As a result, L. Lund ordered to send a clergyman to the prison in Tarascha town until Kyiv governor made a decision. A similar situation occurred in the villages of Svytynets and Sosnivka in Berdychiv district, where the peasants refused to work for landlords "because the deacon Fotiy Shpotakovskiy read to us that way". It forced the authorities to bring a company of the Alexopol Regiment to these villages and severely punish five residents of the village Svytynets, who showed the most disobedience (Baran, 1988, p. 306).

Sometimes the manifesto's misinterpretation by the priests themselves led to the peasants' refusal to perform serfdom. Yes, in the village of Pedynivka of Zvenyhorod district, a peasant F. Shcherbak announced to the community that "whoever starts working for servitude will be cursed three times" (Baran, 1988, p. 296). In addition, the local priest V. Kremenskyi, who was accused of drinking, in a state of intoxication told the peasants, who turned to him after handing them a provision that had a decree and now "men should work only on condition with the landlord, and women there is no servitude" (Baran, 1988, p. 297). Consequently, the peasants began to evade duties. Therefore, the senior official of special assignments of Kyiv, Podilsk and Volyn governors-general Matushevych proposed Kyiv governor P. Hesse to appoint another priest instead of V. Kremenskyi (Baran, 1988, p. 300).

Often the reason for the peasants refusal to perform their duties in favor of the landlord was incorrect explanations of non-natives, as happened, for example, in Berdychiv district. After reading the regulations by retired non-commissioned officer F. Sobolevskiy, farmers in several villages were convinced that it was necessary to work only on foot for men one day a week. The dissemination of this information and similar rumors resulted in non-performance of duties in several dozen villages of the povit (county). The authorities were forced to deploy military units and punish the most active severely. Accordingly, when the priests, explaining the provisions of the manifesto, stressed the need to continue to blame the serfdom – it turned into conflict situations, because the peasants did not accept such an interpretation. Thus, in the villages of Nova Hreblya and Leonardivka in Berdychiv district, the priest L. Trembovskiy, who explained to the faithful the need to continue to perform their duties until two years after the publication of the manifesto, the villagers did not believe and shouted that the priest "reads a lie" (Baran, 1988, p. 304).

It should be noted that the clergy's authority was negatively affected by the duties' preservation in favor of the stories introduced by the regulations of 1842, after the serfdom abolition (allocation of 33 acres of land, cultivation of priestly allotments, providing the clergy with housing, farm buildings). By a separate order, issued on 1861, Kyiv governor

emphasized the obligation to continue to perform duties for the benefit of the parish clergy. Maintaining the obligation to cultivate church lands after the abolition of serfdom became increasingly dangerous for the Orthodox Church. The local secular and the church administrations were well aware of this (CSHAK, f. 442, d. 815, c. 118, pp. 10–11). In particular, reporting on the diocese state in 1865, Metropolitan Arseniy (Moskvin) noted that in some places the “good old relationship” between the parishioners and the pastors, while performing the obligatory cultivation of priestly plots, turned into conflict situations, and the duty “seems a continuation of the hated serfdom from which they were recently liberated” (CSHAK, f. 127, d. 1023, c. 180, p. 2). And only on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January in 1868, the obligation to work for the church was abolished.

In 1862, a new wave of mass peasant movement arose, caused by the conclusion of charters, which recorded the transition of serfs to the status of temporary conscripts. Therefore, the government again turned for support to the clergy, especially to the parish priests. They were given a special role in the further reform implementation. In each parish, the appearance of the charter became not only a public but also a church holiday. On this day, the clergy and from neighboring parishes were involved in the liturgy, conducting a solemn service, which usually took place during the temple feast. After the liturgy, as a rule, the clergy served a prayer service, which proclaimed Tsar-Liberator Alexander II longevity. In addition, the clergy on the occasion of such an event delivered not so much religious as political sermons (Pererva, 2012, p. 154).

In accordance with Metropolitan Arseniy's (Moskvin) order, issued on the 17<sup>th</sup> of May in 1862, “Kyiv Diocesan Gazette” published “A word to temporarily obliged peasants”, which the parish priests of the diocese were supposed to read and accompany with the pastoral conversations “in the same spirit”, especially in those areas where the charters were not concluded yet or where the peasants were worried. Referring to God's Commandments, the clergy put emphasis on the sinfulness not only of encroaching on the landed estates, but also of the very idea of obtaining them, as it contradicted the Eighth Commandment “Thou shalt not steal!” and the Tenth Commandment “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods”. The emphasis was put on the judgments' injustice that the land of the landlords, which they officially owned (acquired or inherited), should belong to the peasants “without any remuneration and without agreement with them, the rightful owners”. The pastors' duty was to form the parishioners' beliefs: “do not wish to take possession of something else illegally, but believe in God, try to acquire what you need with the labor of your hands and peaceful conditions with the owners” (Slovo k vremenno-obyazannym krestyanam, 1862, pp. 400–402). And in general, the reform implementation was presented as great mercy: “Think what is not only the truth, but also the mercy that you are offered to acquire in the permanent ownership of land known to you, to acquire legally, or for your work in for the benefit of the owner or for a reasonable price, at the payment of which the government itself is ready to help you. It is true mercy” (Slovo k vremenno-obyazannym krestyanam, 1862, p. 402). It should be noted that particular attention in the “A word...” was paid to the peasantry persuasion concerning the adoption of the charter, because “all this is for their benefit”. The priests also had to emphasize to the congregation not to heed all sorts of rumors and “not to listen to people not from the government” (Slovo k vremenno-obyazannym krestyanam, 1862, pp. 403–404).

Sent by Kyiv Governor-General to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, “A word to the temporarily obliged peasants” made a positive impression on P. Valuyev. Hence, numerous copies were sent to all governors, as the Minister considered it “useful to spread this

“A word...” among the peasants” and offered to publish it in the provincial information, because according to P. Valuyev it was “remarkable in terms of fidelity to the subject and clarity of the statement” (Poyda, 1960, p. 81).

According to D. Poyda, “A word to the temporarily obliged peasants” was a convincing argument in favor of the thesis of close cooperation between the government and the Orthodox Church during the main principles of the peasant reform implementation in 1861 (Poyda, 1983, pp. 130–135).

But despite the central and eparchial administrations’ instructions, some clergy tried to act in the peasantry interests. The priest in the village was always consulted, as he had education and was perceived as a kind of “expert”. For example, the repeated appeals of parishioners, who lived in the village Dovhenke, Uman district to the local priest Marakhovskiy, he advised “do not put crosses” under the charter, as there was no reliable information, and ask the peasants from other villages and provinces (CSHAK, f. 442, d. 300, c. 142, p. 198).

**The Conclusions.** Taking everything into consideration, the Orthodox Church, had at that time great influence on the public opinion formation, especially the peasantry. Hence, the Orthodox Church was involved actively by the authorities in order to support ideologically during the reform. The clergy’s peacekeeping activities in the context of a “correct” understanding of agrarian transformation were clearly regulated by the instructions of the central church and eparchial administrations. The clergy were obliged to form in the faithful the idea of the Tsar’s decisive role in the reform’s preparation and implementation, to present it as the Emperor’s care and mercy, to call for tolerance and anticipation of change for the better, to influence the peasants to fulfill their obligations loyal sentiments. And, of course, to fight the protest mood, because the clergy had to make every effort to avoid peasant unrest. The Orthodox Church, as part of the state apparatus, was quite successful in carrying out the tasks of approving and blessing the peasant reform, which the authorities so demanded of it.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors are grateful to the staff of the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv for their help in forming the source base of this study.

**Financing.** The authors received no financial support for the research and publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Baran, V. P., Boriak, H. V., Butych, M. I., Humeniuk, Ye. M., Demchenko, L. Ya., Naidenko, P. P. etc.** (Comps.). (1988). *Selianskiy rukh na Ukraini 1850 – 1861 rr.: zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv [Peasant movement in Ukraine in 1850 – 1861: collection of documents and materials]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 448 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Blagodarnoe chuvstvo.** (1861). Blagodarnoe chuvstvo krestyan Kievskoy gubernii, po obyavlenii im manifesta 19 fevralya, 1861 goda. [Grateful feeling of the peasants of the Kyiv province after the announcement of the manifesto to them on the 19<sup>th</sup> of February in 1861]. *Kievskie eparkhialnye vedomosti – Kiev diocesan news*, 12, 386–389. [in Russian]

**Khytrovska, Yu. V.** (2017). Hromadska dumka shchodo stanovyscha RPTs ta vplyviv pravoslavnoho dukhoventsva na naselennia Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy naprykintsi XIX – na pochatku XX st. (kriz pryzmu publikatsii pravoslavnoi presy) [Public Opinion About Russian Orthodox Church and Its Clergy’s Influence on Population in the Right-Bank Ukraine During Late 19<sup>th</sup> – Early 20<sup>th</sup> Cent. (Through the Prism of the Orthodox Press)]. *Storinky istorii: zbirnyk naukovykh prats – History pages: collection of scientific works*, 45, 19–28. doi: 10.20535/2307-5244.45.2017.117189 [in Ukrainian]

**Korotkova, O.** (2019). Antagonist tendencies in the relationship between the Clergy and the Ukrainian peasants in the XIX – beginning of the XX century. *Skhidnoevropeiskiy istorychniy visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 10, 27–33. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.10.159176 [in English]

**Kuznets, T. V.** (2008). Vidmina kriposnoho prava i pozytsiia pravoslavnoi tserkvy na prykladi Umanskoho povitu Kyivskoi hubernii [Abolition of serfdom and the Orthodox Church attitude presented on the example of Uman district, Kyiv province]. *Hileia (naukovyi visnyk) – Hileya (scientific bulletin)*, 12, 15–21. [in Ukrainian].

**Matveeva, Ye. S.** (2013). Osobennosti vzaimodeystviya svetskoy i dukhovnoy vlasti v period provedeniya krestyanskoj reformy v Rossii (na materialakh Orlovskoy gubernii) [The peculiarities of secular and church authorities' interaction during the peasant reform in Russia (based on the materials from Oryol province)]. *Kontsept – Concept*, 7, 1–9. URL: <https://e-koncept.ru/2013/13143.htm> [in Russian]

**Mokshina, Ye. N.** (2011). Rol Russkoj pravoslavnoj tserkvy v podgotovke i provedenii krestyanskoj reformy 1861 g. v Rossii [The role of Russian Orthodox Church in the preparation and implementation of the peasant reform of 1861 in Russia]. *Sotsialno-politicheskie nauki – Socio-political sciences*, 1, 170–173. [in Russian]

**Neskolko slov.** (1861). Neskolko slov po povodu obnarodovaniya vysochayshego manifesta ob osvobozhdenii krestyan ot krepostnoj zavisimosti [A few words on the promulgation of the emperor's manifesto on the emancipation of peasants from serfdom]. *Rukovodstvo dlya selskikh pastyrey – Rural Shepherds Guide*, 15, 383–386. [in Russian]

**Pererva, V. S.** (2008). Reforma 19 liutoho 1861 r. ta tserkovne zhyttia pravoberezhnykh yeparkhii Ukrainy [The reform of the 19<sup>th</sup> of February, 1861 and church life of Right-bank Ukraine's dioceses]. *Visnyk Kam'ianets-Podilskoho universytetu imeni Ivana Ohiiienka. Istorychni nauky – Bulletin of Ivan Ohiiienko University of Kamianets-Podilskyyi. Historical sciences*, 5, 152–160. [in Ukrainian].

**Poyda, D. P.** (1960). *Krestyanskoe dvizhenie na Pravoberezhnoj Ukraine v poreformennyj period (1866 – 1900 gg.)* [Peasant movement in Right-bank Ukraine during the post-reform period (1866 – 1900)]. Dnepropetrovsk: Dnepropetrovskoe obl. izd-vo, 488 p. [in Russian]

**Poyda, D. P.** (1962). Borba krestyan Pravoberezhnoj Ukrainy protiv dukhovenstva v poreformennyj period (1861 – 1900 gg.) [The struggle of Right-bank Ukraine's peasants against the clergy during the post-reform period (1861 – 1900)]. *Voprosy istorii religii i ateizma – Questions of the history of religion and atheism*, 10, 113–127. [in Russian]

**Poyda, D. P.** (1983). Dokument ob antinarodnoj roli dukhovenstva v period provedeniya reformy 1861 goda [The document on the clergy's antinational role during the reform implementation in 1861]. *Istoriograficheskie i istochnikovedcheskie problemy otechestvennoj istorii. Istochniki po sotsialno-ekonomicheskoy istorii Rossii i Ukrainy XVII – XIX vekov – Historiographical and source problems of national history. Sources on socio-economic history of Russia and Ukraine of the XVII – XIX centuries* (pp. 130–135). Dnepropetrovsk. [in Russian]

**Reient, O. P.** (2011). Do problemy skasuvannia kriposnoho prava v 1861 r. [Concerning the abolition of serfdom in 1861]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian historical journal*, 1, 34–51. [in Ukrainian]

**Slovo k vremenno-obyazannym krestyanam.** (1862). Slovo k vremenno-obyazannym krestyanam [A word to temporarily obligated peasants]. *Kievskie eparkhialnye vedomosti – Kiev diocesan news*, 12, 399–404. [in Russian]

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Kyiv [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv – CSHAK]*

**Yeparkhialnaya khronika.** (1861). Yeparkhialnaya khronika [Diocesan chronicle]. *Kievskie eparkhialnye vedomosti – Kiev diocesan news*, 3, 95–100. [in Russian]

*The article was received on February 13, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94(100=161.2)“1870/1940”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226564

**Michal ŠMIGEL**

*PhD (History), Associate Professor of Department of History, Faculty of Arts, Matej Bel University, 40 Tajovského Street, Banská Bystrica, Slovakia, postal code 974 01 (michal.smigel@umb.sk)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-2255-3135

**ResearcherID:** F-9451-2019

**Scopus ID:** 56598616800

**Web of Science ResearcherID:** F-9451-2019

**Pavol TIŠLIAR**

*PhD (History), Professor of Department of Archaeology and Museology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk university, 1 Arna Novaka Street, Brno, Czech Republic, postal code 620 00 & Professor of Department of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius, 2 J. Herdu Street, Trnava, Slovakia, postal code 917 01 (tisliar@phil.muni.cz)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-0886-7499

**ResearcherID:** C-1383-2017

**Scopus ID:** 55225944700

**Web of Science ResearcherID:** C-1383-2017

**Міхал ШМІГЕЛЬ**

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії філософського факультету Університету ім. Матєя Бєла, вул. Тайовського 40, м. Банська Бистриця, Словаччина, індекс 974 01 (michal.smigel@umb.sk)*

**Павол ТИШЛЯР**

*кандидат історичних наук, професор кафедри археології та музеєзнавства філософського факультету Університету Масарика, вул. Арна Новака 1, м. Брно, Чехія, індекс 620 00 та професор кафедри історії філософського факультету Університету Св. Кирила та Мефодія, вул. Й. Герду 2, м.Трнава, Словаччина, індекс 917 01 (tisliar@phil.muni.cz)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Šmigel, M. & Tiškiar, P. (2020). “When men moved across the world for a piece of bread...” Emigration of Rusyns-Ukrainians from the northeastern Slovakia in the years 1870 – 1940. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 64–87. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226564

**“WHEN MEN MOVED ACROSS THE WORLD FOR A PIECE OF BREAD...”  
EMIGRATION OF RUSYNS-UKRAINIANS  
FROM THE NORTHEASTERN SLOVAKIA IN THE YEARS 1870 – 1940**

*Abstract. The aim of the research is to define causes and impulses of Rusyns-Ukrainians migration flows from the territory of (today's) Slovakia in 1870 – 1940 and review the dimensions of*

their emigration in relation to population development. It also depicts the formation of the population climate in the overall context of emigration waves from Slovakia and Transcarpathia, as well as government migration and population policy. **The research methodology** is based on the principles of historicism, scientific verification, the author's objectivity, moderated narrative constructivism and use of the specially-historical (statistical, historical-typological, historical-systemic, etc.) and general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization) methods. **The scientific novelty.** The issue of migration flows of the population of Slovakia, mainly the issue of migration of Rusyns and Ukrainians since the 1870s and in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, is a relatively broad and still open topic. While many historical works are dedicated to the emigration of Slovaks, it does not go for the issue of emigration of Rusyns and Ukrainians from Slovakia. **Conclusions.** The emigration (permanent or temporary) of Rusyns-Ukrainians from Slovakia had divided families and reduced the settlement area of the minority in many cases and Rusyns-Ukrainians in Slovakia still feel its consequences. Moving of thousands of economically active people for work abroad from the economically backward region in the last third of the 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> century and during the interwar years 1920s – 1930s meant that the population of Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia stagnated due to migration. At the end of the 1930s, it even had statistically declining character because of political tension.

**Key words:** Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia, migration, population development, population climate, demographic processes, population of Slovakia, emigration from Slovakia.

**“КОЛИ ЧОЛОВІКИ РОЗІЙШЛИСЯ ПО ВСЬОМУ СВІТУ  
ЗА ШМАТКОМ ХЛІБА...”  
ЕМІГРАЦІЯ РУСИНІВ-УКРАЇНЦІВ ІЗ ПІВНІЧНО-СХІДНОЇ  
СЛОВАЧЧИНИ В 1870 – 1940 РР.**

**Анотація.** Мета дослідження полягає в розкритті причин та імпульсів міграційних рухів русинів-українців з території (сьогоднішньої) Словаччини в період 1870–1940 рр. та в аналізі розмірів їх еміграції відносно популяційного розвитку меншини, а також формування популяційного клімату в загальному контексті еміграційних хвиль зі Словаччини та Підкарпатської Русі. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах історизму, науковості, авторської об'єктивності, поміркованого нарративного конструктивізму та використання спеціально-історичних (статистичних, історико-типологічних, історико-системових тощо) і загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез тощо) методів. **Наукова новизна:** Питання міграційних рухів населення Словаччини і, зокрема, питання міграції русинів-українців в період з 1870-х рр. – у першій половині ХХ ст. є відносно широкою та досі відкритою темою. Хоча велика кількість історичних праць була присвячена еміграції словаків, не можна це сказати про проблему еміграції русинів-українців зі Словаччини. **Висновки.** Еміграція (постійна чи тимчасова) русинів-українців зі Словаччини у багатьох випадках розділяла сім'ї та розріджувала територіальне розселення меншини. Її наслідки це й досі відчуває русино-українське населення у Словаччині. Міграція тисяч економічно активних людей за роботою за кордон з економічно відсталого та аграрно переповненого регіону в останній третині ХІХ – на початку ХХ ст. та в міжвоєнні 1920 – 1930 рр. означав, що популяція русинів та українців у Словаччині під впливом міграції тривалий час стагнувала, а під впливом політичної напруженості наприкінці 1930-х рр. набула статистично занепадаючий характер.

**Ключові слова:** русини та українці в Словаччині, міграція, популяційний розвиток, популяційний клімат, демографічні процеси, населення Словаччини, еміграція зі Словаччини.

**The Problem Statement.** Migration, together with population growth, forms the basis of total population growth or decline. It affects not only the population itself, but also all characteristics and demographic processes in the life of the population. It has an influence on economic, social and demographic structures and is an important component of urbanization, territorial concentration of the population, etc., as well. Migration is thus one of the most important factors in population development not only at the national, but also at the regional level (Šprocha & Majo, 2016, p. 144).

Undoubtedly, the population of Slovakia in the last decades of the 19th century and during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, its number, characteristics and particularly population development, were to a large extent conditioned by migration flows. These had been influenced by various factors, but mainly by economic motivation. This surely goes for the case of Rusyn-Ukrainian population living in the northeast of Slovakia, who participated in the various stages of emigration (temporary or permanent) from the country since the last third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Foreign migration represents one of the main phenomenon of population development in Slovak history and in the history of the Rusyns in this period.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications.** Many historical works in Slovak (Czechoslovak) historiography have so far been dedicated to migration flows in Slovakia, i.e. flows of Slovaks (emigration or labor migration) in the given period. Czechoslovak demographers, historians, sociologists – pioneers of the issue such as A. Boháč, J. Svetoň, F. Bielik, E. Rákoš, J. Sirácky, E. Jakešová, A. Štefánek, J. Botík, M. Botíková, etc., as well as current researchers (M. Kmeť, P. Tišliar, B. Šprocha, I. Harušíák) had done a remarkable “piece of work” in this topic. There are several specialized proceedings (e.g. Slovaks abroad) and journals, as well as older and newer monographic works and the research continues. However, this cannot be said about the issue of emigration of Rusyns and Ukrainians from Slovakia in the years 1870–1950. Although this field includes mainly older works by F. Bielik, I. Vanat, L. Tajták and several newer works in the form of scientific studies, i.e. more comprehensive works, there is only a partial representation of the issue from M. Belej, M. Gajdoš – S. Konečný, M. Šmigel’ and others. Rusynian emigration has long been in the shadow of migration of Slovaks.

**The Purpose of Publication.** The aim of our paper is to “open” the issue of Rusyn-Ukrainian emigration from the territory of (today’s) Slovakia from the last third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the end of the 1930s. Following older and newer research, we specify the causes and impulses of migration flows of members of this minority and review the dimensions of emigration in relation to population development. The paper also focuses on the formation of population climate in the overall context of emigration waves from Slovakia and Transcarpathia (during Hungarian and Czechoslovak period), regarding government migration and population policy, too.

**The Basic Material Statement.** The marginal geographical location of the Rusynian settlement area at the foothills of northeastern Kingdom of Hungary, as well as the low social and educational level, probably had protected them from assimilation for a long time (Magoczi, 2016, p. 180). Although this had been happening for several centuries, it had fast pace in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The national revival of the Rusyns in the Kingdom of Hungary – as S. Konečný stated – began to develop very promising after the revolution in 1848 – 1849, but obviously, it had stagnated after the change in political conditions and the social atmosphere during the period of dualism. However, the main cause of the national movement crisis even among the Hungarian Rusyns had been demographic development, complex socio-economic conditions and emigration, not new political circumstances (Konečný, 2015, p. 119).

---

<sup>1</sup> We are of the opinion that this is one minority (Ukrainian ethnographic group) within a part of its members had identified (identifies) themselves as Rusyns and the other part as Ukrainians. Therefore, we choose a neutral name from our point of view – Rusyns-Ukrainians, although they had been most often marked as Rusyns in the given period.

Table 1

**Number of Rusyns in the Kingdom of Hungary (1840 – 1910)**

(Magoczi, 2016, p. 181, tab. 10.1)

Years	Total number of Rusyns	Number of Rusyns in Transcarpathia	Number of Rusyns in Slovakia
1840	442, 900	180, 100	203, 300
1851	447, 400	216, 100	113, 100
1869	455, 000	257, 200	183, 500
1880	353, 200	244, 700	88, 000
1890	379, 800	276, 600	96, 300
1900	424, 800	314, 500	84, 900
1910	464, 300	331, 600	97, 100

Note: Data rounded to the nearest hundred

In the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the population of the Kingdom of Hungary grew by 46%, while the number of Hungarians grew by 81.4%. However, non-Hungarian ethnic groups only grew by 25.8% (Slovak population grew by 16%). We can even notice a decline of Rusynian population (Konečný, 2015, p.119). To be more precise, there had been a differentiated development in the case of Carpathian Rusyns – while the number of Transcarpathian Rusyns between 1851 – 1900 increased (but their share in the total population declined), the number of Rusyns from northeastern Slovakia began to decline strongly in the same period (see Table 1).

According to the census of October 31, 1857, there were 230,000 Rusyns living in four Transcarpathian counties, i.e. 69.7% of the county’s total population (about 330,000 people). In 1900, there already were 405,994 Rusyns, i.e. 47.8% of the counties’ total population (848, 000 people). Thus, in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the population of the region actually grew by 157%, but the number of Rusyns by only 76.5%. Most Rusyns had lived in the Marmarosh county – 171,000 (47.7%) and in the Bereg county – 117,000 (49.4% of the county’s population). There had been 70,000 Rusyns in the Uzh county (43.3%) and 48,000 in the Ugoch county (52% of the county’s population) (Konečný, 2015, p.119).

In the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, there were about 113,000 people living in the east Slovak regions according to Hungarian statistics. In 1900, number of Rusyns declined to 85,000 (Magoczi, 2016, p. 181, tab. 10.1). At that time, the Rusyns lived mainly in three counties and represented a minority population. Thirty-five thousand Rusyns lived in the Zemplin county (10.6%), 34,000 in the Sharish county (19.4%) and 14,000 Rusyns in the Spish county (8.3% of the county’s population). Although Hungarian statistics from this period should not be taken too seriously – “*Sharish and Spish county authorities allegedly did not like to record Russian nationality and they often registered Rusyns as Slovaks*“, the main reason of this phenomenon had included: escalating emigration, Magyarization of Rusyns and Slovakization of Rusynian localities in the regions of Slovakia. According to data, there were 37 magyarized and 176 slovakized Rusynian villages in Slovakia in 1850 – 1900 (Konečný, 2015, p. 120).

The abolition of serfdom in the Austrian Empire in 1848 meant for the peasants not only liberation from their landowners, but also bigger freedom. However, it had not improved their economic conditions. These even had gotten worse in certain periods and regions, requiring new agricultural mobility. It had been the beginning of massive emigration processes for Hungarian Rusyns living at the southern hillsides of the Carpathians (i.e. from the northeastern

Slovakia and Transcarpathia), as well as for Rusyns from the Western Galicia (Lemkovyna) (see Tišliar & Šprocha, 2018, pp. 1010–1017).

First of all, since the beginning, i.e. during the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, some of the Rusyns moved every year during the harvest for seasonal work (6 – 8 weeks) in the fertile plains of the Kingdom of Hungary. While seasonal migration had only been a way for Rusynian families to make some extra money and improve the economic situation, there had also been those who had begun to consider moving to the fertile plains of the Kingdom of Hungary permanently. Others had been attracted by even more distant “fertile plains”. Basically, it had not been innovative in any way – this is how they just followed the large colonization programme of internal resettlements to the Great Hungarian Plain – so-called Lowland area (Kmeť, 2010, p. 134) happening since the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. During the 18<sup>th</sup> century, one fifth of the then Upper-Hungarian (Slovak) population, including Rusyns, emigrated there (Kmeť, 2012, pp. 20–21; Janto, 2016, p. 96). Rusynian families had settled in the village of Komlóška in the region of the Hungarian town of Sárospatak and together with the Slovaks had gone to the area of Békés, Csanád and Arad county. Since the half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, they went to Vojvodina – historical Bacska, i.e. Bács-Bodrog county (to be more precise, Bácskeresztúr /later renamed as Ruski Kerestur/ and Kucury) and in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, they went even more far to the south, the easternmost area of Slavonia – Srem (Magoczi, 2016, pp. 126–127, 191; Botík, 2007, p. 119). According to some data, in years 1850 – 1860, about 5,000 Rusyns from eastern Slovak counties moved to other regions of the Habsburg monarchy. In the years 1870 – 1875, there were about 100 – 200 Rusynian families moving from Transcarpathian counties every year (Kabuzan, 2006, p. 237).

At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Austria-Hungary was characterized by great contrasts in all spheres of social life, which was the result of unfinished capitalist changes in its individual countries and regions. Central industrialized areas “strongly” contrasted with border backward regions, which had just been entering the early stage of industrialization. Although Upper Hungary (basically mainly the territory of Slovakia) had been one of the most industrial areas in the Kingdom of Hungary, contrasts had manifested themselves in this Carpathian country as well. It had been the Slovak as well as the Transcarpathian settlement area of Rusyns-Ukrainians that belonged to the economically most backward regions of the Kingdom of Hungary. Moreover, social status of this population had been the worst of all groups of other nations in this country.

The demographic revolution had begun to affect the population of Upper Hungary much later than in western countries. At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this population was one of the youngest in Europe, with a high fertility rate (it began to gradually decline only after the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic) (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2018, p. 96 a f.). Due to its combination with the traditional way of life in the Slovak countryside and the characteristics of the economy, in which agriculture predominated as a primary source of living, it all resulted into *an agrarian overcrowding and an increase in unemployment* (Jakešová, 1987, p. 381). However – if we talk about the backwardness of economic sphere in eastern Slovakia – we must not omit that this had manifested itself both in industry and agriculture. Local development had been hindered by a lack of domestic capital (Jewish capital spread there in the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Czech capital expanded later – after the establishment of Czechoslovakia) and poor infrastructure in the indented mountain terrain (particularly in relation to distance to rail transport). Underdeveloped agriculture and the low agrotechnical level of peasantry had been conditioned by the overall economic and cultural backwardness of this region, the lack of arable land and its low yield. Moreover, the law

of inheritance had caused the land had constantly been dividing and became economically insecure for the maintenance of families. The only solution would be the restructuring of the then economy which, however, had not been possible due to the possibilities offered by the weak, insufficiently built Hungarian industry. This fact had inevitably driven Rusyns to look for extra income outside the region and later a main income that could support a large family. To some extent, this goes for foreign migration for work which, however, in many cases had taken the character of permanent emigration (Tišliar, 2014b, p. 56).

Within the industrialization of the dualistic monarchy in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, its accompanying processes and the effects on the mechanical movement of the population, more and more Rusynian families looked for work in the arising industrial centers of the country. Some of the Rusyns (under the influence of an extensive advertising campaign) had begun to adopt the bold idea of moving to the industrializing United States of North America (after 1865). However, it had not yet been a mass migration of Rusyns (Magoczi, 2016, p. 193). The turning point came after the beginning of economic crisis in 1873. This crisis caused by overproduction (1873 – 1879), lasting in the Kingdom of Hungary until the mid-1990s and also by the barren year 1879 are considered to be the main impulses of massive emigration flows from the country, mainly to the New World.

Table 2

**Population of Slovakia in 1880 – 1950**  
(Šprocha & Tišliar & Šmigel', 2014, p. 22, 35)

Year*	Population	Native language / nationality				
		Slovak (Czechoslovak)	Hungarian	German	Rusynian and Ukrainian**	other
1880	2, 455, 928	1, 498, 808	549, 059	225, 059	78, 941	104,061
1890	2, 587, 485	1, 600, 676	642, 484	232, 788	87, 787	26, 750
1900	2, 792, 569	1, 700, 842	759, 173	214, 302	84, 906	33, 346
1910	2, 926, 833	1, 685, 653	896, 338	196, 948	97, 014	50, 880
1919	2, 923, 214	1, 954, 446	689, 565	143, 466	81, 332	54, 405
1921	2, 955, 998	2, 013, 675	634, 827	139, 880	85, 628	81, 987
1930	3, 254, 189	2, 345, 909	571, 988	147, 501	91, 079	97,712
1938	2, 656, 426	2, 338, 382	57, 897	128, 347	69, 106	62, 694
1940	2, 591, 368	2, 244, 264	45, 880	130, 192	61, 270	109,762
1950	3, 442, 317	2, 982, 524	354, 532	5,179	48, 231	51, 851

\* Data from years 1880 – 1919 for present population, in 1921 – 1940 for only Czechoslovak (Slovak) nationals, in 1950 for present population again;

Data from 1938 and 1940 only for the then territory of Slovakia. In 1938, 77,488 Czechs were counted, but in 1940 there were only 3,253 of them in Slovakia. These persons were counted as of Slovak (Czechoslovak) nationality.

\*\* In 1919 – Rusynian nationality, in 1921 – Great-Russian, Ukrainian and Carpatho-Russian, in 1930 – Russian and Little-Russian, in 1938 – Rusynian, in 1940 – Ukrainian (Rusynian); in 1950 – Russian and Ukrainian nationality.

**Pre-war emigration (1880 – 1914).** Emigration abroad/overseas from the counties of Upper Hungary had not been a mass phenomenon until the 1880s. The turning point came in the 1880s and 1890s, when *the mass emigration of the population* from this area became a

part of a massive emigration flow from almost all European countries. During this period, the former initial areas of emigration (so-called old immigration to America – *old immigration*) consisting of the regions of Western, Central and Northern Europe, had gradually been replacing the Southern, Eastern, i.e. South-Eastern Europe and partly Central Europe (so-called *new immigration*). This mass labor migration included emigrants from Italy, the Balkan, the Russian Empire and from the Austro-Hungarian monarchy as well (Harušťák, 2013, p. 215).

The causes of mass emigration from Europe to overseas destinations in the last third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century – early 20<sup>th</sup> century (particularly to the USA, less to Canada and South America) did not differ in principle in individual states (or regions). They were mainly the result of demographic and economic “pressure” arising from the imbalance between population growth and its living opportunities (Bade, 2005, p. 152). Starting factors had clearly included *the economic situation*– the already mentioned economic crisis since 1873, lack of job opportunities, lack of land and *massive population growth* (Bade, 2005, p. 153). The population in the region of Central and Eastern Europe grew by an average of 75% in 1860 – 1910. This *demographic boom*, together with the stagnating and declining economic situation and the ongoing process of land division had provoked emigration process of hundreds of thousands of people (Harušťák, 2013, pp. 215, 221–222). Emigration had also been caused due to political or confessional reasons (e.g. massive emigration of Jews from Central and Eastern Europe to overseas, particularly the USA) (Joseph, 1914, p. 164).

On the other hand, the appeal of the New World, spreading through returnees from overseas, correspondence, legally or illegally active agents of the so-called steam navigation companies and pictures in the periodical press had also played a role here. “*Technological progress in transport and communication, lower travel fares and the construction of transnational networks and structures between immigrants in the new society and their country of origin had enabled mobility of these dimensions, which had led to the so-called chain migrations*” (Harušťák, 2013, pp. 215–216).

In the last decade before the outbreak of World War I, this mass transfer of the population had still been continuing. According to statistics, emigration in the years 1900–1915 is the most powerful flow of European emigration since 1846 (Bade, 2005, p. 132). In general, about 20 million people left Europe in the years 1870–1914. Most emigrants from Central, Eastern and Southern Europe (7.5 million) had belonged to minority “ethnic groups” of the Habsburgmonarchy (Poles, Slovaks, Czechs, Rusyns-Ukrainians, Jews, Slovenes), the German Empire (mainly Poles) and Russian Empire (especially Jews), living in economically marginal regions (Harušťák, 2013, p. 216, note. 74). Regarding the number of emigrants to the USA, Austria-Hungary took the third place in the years 1890–1900 (15.5% of all immigrants). In the years 1901–1910, the monarchy took with the number of resettled persons from Europe the first place (23.8%), while Italy (Fatula, 2018) took the second place. In the years 1861–1870, there were 7,800 people moving from Austria-Hungary to the USA. In the years 1871–1880, it had already been 73,000 people, in 1881 – 1890 – 353,700; in the years 1891 – 1900 – there were 597,000 people, during years 1901 – 1910 – 1,125,200 people and in 1911 – 1920 – 1,046,200 people. Total number of resettled people reached 3.2 million (in 1861 – 1920) (Kabuzan, 2006, p. 231).

Speaking of emigration from the Kingdom of Hungary<sup>2</sup> – in 1901, the authorities recorded more than 70,000 emigrants from the country to the USA, in 1903 there were already 120,000

<sup>2</sup> The first consistent statistics on migration flows from the Kingdom of Hungary was published in 1893 and included an annual balance of emigrants since 1881 at the level of counties and some towns. However, the data are approximately the same every year until 1897, so it is assumed that this happens due to interpolation and data had not been systematically collected each year. More comprehensive data on emigration from the Kingdom of Hungary are dated back to years 1899 – 1913 (Šprocha & Majo, 2016, p. 145).

of them and in 1905 the number of emigrants even reached 180,000 (1/4 of the Hungarian emigration consisted of Slovaks and Carpathian Rusyns). Around 1907, emigration from the Kingdom of Hungary (and thus also from Slovakia) culminated and exceeded number of 200,000 official migrants to the United States. However, efforts to emigrate declined – for example, in 1913, there were 119,159 Hungarian inhabitants emigrating to the USA, including 27,234 Slovaks (Harušťák, 2013, p. 216) and later, just before the war, the numbers reached slightly over 100,000 inhabitants per year (Syrný, 2016, pp. 14–15). To sum up this period, there were about 1.5 million emigrants in total, mostly members of non-Hungarian ethnic groups who had left the Kingdom of Hungary (emigrated especially to the USA) (Štefánek, 1944, p. 253). According to *Hungarian official statistics*, about 27% of Hungarians, 5% of Germans, 24% of Slovaks and 43% of Carpathian Rusyns out of the total number of all emigrants in the last decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> century emigrated (Vanat, 1990, p. 23).

However, current research indicates that at least half of all emigrants from the Kingdom of Hungary had come from the Upper Hungarian counties – Uzh, Zemplin, Sharish, Spish, Orava, Liptov and Turchan counties. Mass emigration of the population from the Upper Hungarian counties had been first noticed in Sharish county, followed by emigration from Zemplin, Spish and other counties (Harušťák, 2013, p. 221). Regarding the extent of emigration from the territory of (today's) Slovakia – current demographers estimate that there were 590,000 of emigrants in the years 1870 – 1910 (Šprocha & Majo, 2016, p. 147). According to J. Svetoň, the total number of emigrants in 1871 – 1914 is 650,000 (Svetoň, 1970, p. 191). Hungarian official statistics in 1899 – 1913 recorded 394,713 emigrants from Slovak counties, and data from US ports documented 451,457 Slovak immigrants to the United States (Svetoň, 1958, p. 152; see Tab. 3). The Ministry of Social Welfare of the Czechoslovak Republic (Czechoslovakia) assumed for the years 1899–1914 more than 477,000 emigrants that would purely statistically mean resettlement of approximately 30,000 people a year from Slovakia (Deset let..., 1924, p. 94). Based on Hungarian statistics, L. Tajták calculated that in the years 1900 – 1913, there were 361,074 people who emigrated from the territory of 15 Slovak counties (25,791 people per year). Speaking about mentioned counties, 212,930 persons had emigrated from the territory of four eastern Slovak counties (Zemplin, Sharish, Spish and Abov-Turnian), while from the remaining eleven Slovak counties it had been 148,144 persons. This represented a mutual ratio of 58.9% – 41.1% in favor of emigration from eastern Slovakia, although the mutual ratio of the population represented 27.5% – 72.5% to the east Slovak counties disadvantage (Tajták, 1980, p. 504; see also Tajták, 1975, p. 383).

Based on the data above, it can be seen there are significant differences between the published statistics about emigration from Slovak counties (depending on who and how collected and recalculated these data). A similar situation goes for the emigration of Carpathian (Hungarian) Rusyns during this period.

Part of the Carpathian Rusyns continued in their resettlement to Lowland in the last decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Some Lemko-Rusynian families moved to Slavonia and Northern Bosnia as well (since 1878 under the administration of Austria-Hungary). Rusyns from Spish county, Marmarosh county and other Transcarpathian counties had moved to the eastern Banat and the foothills of the southern (Transylvanian) Carpathians in the 1890s and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In 1910, the number of Banat Rusyns reached 2,500 and Bacs-Srem Rusyns in Vojvodina reached 15,000 (Magoczi, 2016, pp. 189–191)

Table 3

**Emigration from Slovakia in 1899 – 1913**

(Svetoň, 1958, p. 152)

Year	Data from Hungarian statistics from 15 Slovak counties		Data from American ports about Slovaks	
	Emigrants	Returnees	Immigrants to USA	Emigrants from USA
1899	18, 214	2, 873	15, 838	*
1900	19, 085	3, 853	29, 243	*
1901	25, 886	4, 170	29, 343	*
1902	25, 285	5, 824	36, 934	*
1903	23, 205	9, 857	34, 427	*
1904	24, 404	7, 289	27, 940	*
1905	49, 284	5, 600	52, 368	*
1906	42, 476	9, 968	38, 221	*
1907	42, 586	15, 070	42, 041	*
1908	12, 794	17, 765	16, 170	23, 573
1909	30, 597	4, 954	22, 586	8, 894
1910	23, 175	6,799	32, 416	9, 259
1911	15, 844	8, 844	21, 415	15, 561
1912	22, 508	6, 734	25, 281	12, 526
1913	19, 370	6, 499	27, 234	9, 854
1899– 1913	394, 713	116, 099	451, 457	79, 667

\* Datis missing

However, a much larger number of Hungarian Rusyns had gone overseas during this period, mainly to the USA. Some authors state that in the last decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, more than 150,000 Rusyns from Northeastern Slovakia and Transcarpathia emigrated to the USA, Canada, Argentina and other countries (Pop, 2011, p. 57). According to other data – approximately 130 – 155,000 persons moved from the territory of Hungarian Russia to the USA until 1914, i.e. almost 1/3 of its population (Švorc, 2007, p. 25). P. R. Magocsi declares (his information are based on US migration statistics) that the number of Hungarian Rusyns who emigrated to the USA during 1880–1914 was not less than 225,000 people (Onufrak, 2019, p. 143 – referring to Magocsi, 2005). The numbers of Carpathian Rusyns who had temporarily or permanently moved from the Kingdom of Hungary abroad / overseas in 1870 – 1914/1920 are estimated to 300 – 400,000 in total (Vanat, 1990, p. 23, note 35; Marunchak, 1991, p. 21). They were mainly from Uzh, Bereg, Zemplin and Sharish county. To conclude, about 500 – 550,000 Rusynians and Ukrainians emigrated from Austria-Hungary in this period (including 360,000 people from Austrian Galicia and Bukovina) (Makar, 2007, p. 12; Kabuzan, 2006, p. 252).

Undoubtedly, the emigration of Rusyns from Northeastern Slovakia began in the late 60s – early 70s and gained mass character in the late 70s – 80s of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In the 1880s, about 20,000 people emigrated from Sharish and almost 25,000 persons from Zemplin – they were mostly Rusyns living in the northern districts of these counties (Konečný, 2015, p. 124). Obviously, a similar extent of emigration continued in the 1890s as well. The end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and particularly the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century represented crucial

periods of foreign emigration from Slovakia. Since more accurate statistics are missing until 1900, the only way is to estimate the numbers – in the last third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it was at least 50,000 Rusyns who emigrated from the eastern Slovak counties (in 1880–1900, about 2,300 people a year; including repeated migrations). About 100,000 people had emigrated from the Transcarpathian counties (Konečný, 2015, p. 124), including about 70 – 75,000 Rusyns. To sum up, there had been 125,000 Carpathian Rusyns in total – 80,000 emigrated to the USA, 25,000 to Canada and 18,500 to the Latin America (Kabuzan, 2006, p. 238).

In 1899 – 1913, about 82,500 people emigrated from Zemplin county, 50,000 from Sharish and 46,000 from Spish county – i.e. 178,500 people in total, including 128,900 Slovaks (Sáposová, 2004, pp. 11–12, tab. 1 – referring to Szarka, 1995, pp. 246–247). About 17,000 – (Konečný, 2015, p. 124) 20,000 Rusyns had emigrated from these three counties (at first places in ranking of emigration from Slovak counties) in the mentioned period, i.e. 10–11% from the number of emigrants of these counties (*an average of 1,250 people per year*). From 1900 to the World War I, over 200,000 people emigrated from the four Transcarpathian counties, including about 60 – 70,000 Rusyns (Fatula, 2018, referring to Ílko, 1973; Kabuzan, 2006, p. 252). Of course, some emigrants had returned home after some time (but some had been emigrating repeatedly, even several times), so the absolute decline in population had been much lower. However – as S. Konečný emphasized – it does not change the fact that in the years 1899–1914, an average of 3,500 Rusyns per year emigrated abroad (according to Hungarian incomplete statistics). There had been Rusynian villages from where up to a quarter of the population had emigrated (Konečný, 2015, p. 124). *“In some places in Zemplin County, only women, children and the elderly remained, because men moved across the world for a piece of bread,”* – contemporaries state (Vanat, 1990, p. 23).

In 1870–1914, about 70,000 Rusyns from northeastern Slovakia and 130 – 145,000 Transcarpathian Rusyns migrated to various parts of the world (temporarily or permanently). Although moving abroad/overseas had meant to be only a temporary solution in many cases, it is estimated that up to 2/3 of all emigrants had stayed in the new country and 1/3 returned home (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2018, p. 250). If we regard this aspect and deal with the number of 300 – 400,000 Hungarian Rusyns-emigrants, this construct is being fulfilled. According to data, more than 200,000 Rusynian emigrants from Hungary lived in the United States during the World War I. (Konečný, 2015, p. 128), while the number of people from Slovakia reached 620,000 (Pútnik..., 1928, p. 98). However, these figures include the natural increase of settled emigrant families as well (at the beginning, the habit of starting traditional large families had been obvious here).

An important aspect of foreign emigration from Slovakia until the World War I. had been significant prevalence of men. This only confirms the originally prevailing intention of temporary labour migration. In 1899 – 1913, only 544 women per 1,000 men on average emigrated. Regarding their age, emigrants had been of younger age (approximately 1/3 of emigrants were 20-29-year-old, the second most numerous group were persons under 20). The low educational structure of emigrants had also been a specific feature of emigration (Šprocha & Majo, 2016, p. 146)

According to Harušťák, the social structure of Upper Hungary emigrants had logically been dominated by agricultural workers (up to 80%), who at first only looked for temporary work in order to earn money to improve living conditions or pay off debts. Some of them had settled in the New World permanently and others had made several other journeys (Harušťák, 2013, pp. 216–217). Labour migration had meant an improvement in socio-economic situation of emigrants from other European countries, while most Hungarian Rusyns had considered it a way of maintaining a bare existence which is indicated by its mass character (Vanat, 1990, p. 22).

For many emigrants, emigration was a form of *silent social protest* against unsatisfactory living conditions in their native land, which emigration could easily get them rid of (Harušťák, 2013, p. 217).

However, the causes had varied within the Upper Hungary region depending on the economic, cultural, demographic and natural specifics of the particular counties as well (Janto, 2017, p. 52). In addition to the main factors, i.e. the economic situation and population growth, other factors such as migration social networks, chain migration and individual decision-making process had an impact on emigration, too. Further factors include the so-called emigrant fever, evasion of military service, the activities of emigrant agents, preserving positive image of America (Harušťák, 2013, p. 222) and Magyarization.

The intensity and extent of emigration from the Upper Hungarian counties had not only been influenced by the desire for a better (or any) financial reward and a better life. It had been determined by emigration policy of the Kingdom of Hungary and immigration policy of the United States as well (in fact, until the beginning of the World War I., immigration to the United States was almost unrestricted). The Hungarian government had not prohibited emigration from the country *de jure* (which would be contrary to the Hungarian constitution), but only regulated the activities of emigration agents and agencies with activities in the territory of the kingdom of Hungary (Harušťák, 2013, pp. 217–218).

Mass emigration from the entire region of Central and Eastern Europe had left permanent traces in the population structure of the affected regions. Since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the number of men had decreased in some areas which affected not only the natural increase of the population, but also the labor market, supply and demand for men's labor (Harušťák, 2013, p. 219).

In the case of Rusyns-Ukrainians from northeastern Slovakia, migration for work abroad/overseas had a *direct population effect* – in contrast to seasonal labor migration appearing indirectly in the form of longer partners separation (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2018, p. 103) – and it is possible to speak of a *significant population stagnation* (see Table 4). Actually, for 40 years – in 1880 (78,941 people) – 1921 (85,629 people), the number of Rusyns grew only by 6,687 people in total, i.e. by 8.4% (to compare – in 1880 – 1921 the number of Rusyns increased from 244,700 to 376,200 in Transcarpathia, i.e. by 131,500 people – which is almost 54%). Of course, regarding the numbers of “Slovak” Rusyns, it is necessary to see the results of the process of Magyarization/Slovakization, as well as the demographic crisis of the war years 1915 – 1918 and the increase in mortality. However, the total population of Slovakia had statistically grown by 500,000 people – almost 20.4% in the same period. The cause of such a difference between the whole Slovak and Rusynian population growth is undoubtedly emigration factors.

Table 4

**Number of Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia and their share  
in the total number of population in the years 1880 – 1921**

Year	Number of inhabitants in Slovakia	Number of Rusyns and Ukrainians	Share of Rusyns and Ukrainians (%)
1880	2, 455, 928	78, 941	3.2
1890	2, 587, 485	87, 787	3.4
1900	2, 792, 569	84, 906	3.0
1910	2, 926, 833	97, 014	3.3
1919	2, 923, 214	81, 332	2.8
1921	2, 955, 998	85, 628	2.9

Note.: Tables 4, 6 and 7 are based on data from table 2.

### **Interwar migration of Rusyns-Ukrainians**

**Migration in the 1920s.** In the years 1914 – 1915, the Eastern Carpathians became the scene of World War I and front-line operations of the Austro-Hungarian and Russian army. The war had left great material damage here and the suffering of inhabitants had been enormous. Many villages of the Bardejov, Svidnik, Stropkov, Medzilaborce and Sninadistricts (including a major part of the Rusynian population) had been destroyed. Both armies had confiscated cattle and horses. Roads and bridges had also been destroyed, limiting access to particular villages quite far from railway connections. After moving the front back to the Carpathians, the Hungarian government had confirmed relief activities to provide emergency shelter to the war-affected population. However, this assistance was insufficient. The allocation of discarded military horses and young cattle had represented only a partial help for revive long-term backward agriculture in the region (Vanat, 1976, pp. 52–53).

With this legacy, Rusyn-Ukrainian society had entered the created Czechoslovak state (according to Czechoslovak statistics from 1921 – there were 461,849 Rusyns in total, including 85,628 living in Slovakia) (Tóth & Novotný & Stehlík, 2012, p. 625; Československá statistika, sv. 9, 1924, p. 60\*). It had consisted of two different economic units: the Czech lands belonging to the most economically developed areas of Austria and the relatively backward parts of the Upper Hungary – Slovakia and Subcarpathian Rus' (Shnitser, 2019, p. 99). In the settlement area of Rusyns-Ukrainians in Slovakia, i.e. in the northern parts of Zemplin, Sharish and Spish counties, socio-economic problems had still persisted.

The population of the northeastern areas of Slovakia had expected improving its position from the newly created Czechoslovak state. However, their living conditions had not improved. On the contrary – due to the loss of the Hungarian lowland, where some poor farmers from mountainous areas went for seasonal agricultural work until the war – they had worsened. Even employment in industry in eastern Slovakia did not increase in 1920 when compared to the western and central part of the country. Moreover, it fell below the level of the year 1900. Poor supply situation, shortage of daily consumer goods (flour, sugar, footwear, clothing, kerosene) and flourishing smuggling (export of rations and scarce goods to Poland which had led – after government intervention – to the declaration of martial law in border districts and guarding borders by selected military units) had exacerbated the situation (Vanat, 1976, pp. 53–54). It is understandable that under such socio-economic conditions there could be no improvement in the social position of the population. Especially languishing of agriculture in this region had required several immediate measures which the new Czechoslovak administration had not really been able to implement in a short time.

After the end of the World War I., the emigrant fever had returned to Slovakia (and Subcarpathian Rus'). If we could specify it more, it had happened after expulsion of Hungarian Bolsheviks and integration of the eastern Slovakia and Transcarpathia into integral Czechoslovak republic superiority in August, 1919 (Šmigel' & Syrný, 2019, p. 63). Particularly in the USA, the first post-war years had brought considerable prosperity for immigrants and home returning re-emigrants (for example, in 1922 up to 5,220 people (Štefánek, 1944, p. 247)) aroused the interest of others which was used by several migration agencies and ocean shipping companies. In the imagination of Rusynian peasants, emigration thus had become the only option how to earn money for living as soon as possible, i.e. acquire capital to build a house, enhance own farm or buying land. In the post-war years, the region had been flooded with expatriate agents and crowds had been waiting daily in front of the authorities for a passport to be issued.

Emigration agitation and illicit emigration in Eastern Slovakia had taken on such extension that the Chamber of Deputies (at the suggestion of deputies Sopka, Hodža, Stodola etc.) passed a resolution on December 20, 1920, demanding the Czechoslovak government to prevent mass emigration from this region. According to US statistics, in the fiscal year 1920/21, 40,884 emigrants from the Czechoslovak Republic moved to the USA, including migrants from Slovakia and Subcarpathian Rus' as the major group (Vanat, 1976, p. 56; Bielik, 1964, p. 301).

The Czechoslovak state had failed to take such economic and social measures that would provide employment and support for living for this population. Thus, the state had not restricted economic migration at all – it had tried to give it an organized character by helping people with leaving a country (Tišliar, 2014a, pp. 43–62). Foreign migration had been seen as a kind of “necessary release” removing the possible causes of the various economic and social conflicts that had thus been prevented to some extent (Tišliar, 2014b, pp. 59–60). However, the measures came from the other side – in May 1921, the US government passed the so-called *Emergency Quota Act* restricting the number of immigrants annually to 3% of the number of residents from that same country. The quota for the Czechoslovak Republic had been initially set at 14,282 persons per year and in 1924 it was reduced to 3,073 persons. As a result of measures of the US government, the number of emigrants from the Czechoslovak Republic declined after 1922 when compared to the pre-war years and the direction of migration changed as well (Vanat, 1976, pp. 56–57). Mainly Slovaks and Rusyns-Ukrainians from Czechoslovakia had continued to move to countries such as Canada, Argentina, Brazil and Western Europe, but also to Uruguay, Chile, Venezuela, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand etc. For example, demand for emigrant passports to Central American countries in the years 1920 – 1925 had been gradually increasing every year by 200–300 people (Fordinálová, 1983, p. 33).

According to I. Vanat, the number of people who were issued an emigration passport in the years 1922 – 1927 is 195,183, including 107,222 who went overseas. According to Czechoslovak statistics in the years 1922 – 1929, there were 6,262 Rusyns-Ukrainians who emigrated from the northeastern Slovakia (Vanat, p. 1976: 57) – i.e. an average of 783 people per year, but these figures are clearly questionable and the number of emigrants had been much higher. Statistics of foreign migration from Czechoslovakia (keeping since 1922) had been incomplete, as many left without emigrant passports with the help of emigrant agents (therefore numbers stated above should be perceived as *the lowest*). Emigrants from Eastern Slovakia (and also from Subcarpathian Rus') had continued to look for their place in “overseas” and – unlike Slovaks – only a small percentage had stayed in European countries (Kmeť, 2014, p. 73).

Seasonal migration of the population had still belonged to common (and since Hungarian times also traditional) forms of earnings, especially for population of the northern regions of Slovakia (Slovaks and Rusyns). It displayed as internal migration within Slovakia, for example, seasonal migrants had found work more often in southwestern Slovakia and since the early 1920s in Bohemia and Moravia as well, but also abroad – especially migration to neighbouring countries (Hungary, Austria, but also Germany, French, etc.) (Tišliar, 2014b, p. 58). In the period from the 1920s to the 1930s, more than 220,000 people in total seasonally migrated abroad in this way. persons (on average more than 11,000 persons per year). In the first half of the 1920s, more than 40,000 people per year participated in internal migration (within the territory of the Czechoslovak Republic. These numbers had not fallen significantly until the 1930s due to the global economic crisis (Svetoň, 1958, pp. 176–178), when particular states closed their economies off to immigrants. In comparison to these

figures, it is evident that official statistics of Rusyns migrating for labour in the 1920s (i.e. the above-mentioned 6,262 people – an average of 783 people per year) are unlikely and the real number probably reached at least 900 – 1000 people per year.

Although the interwar emigration of Rusyns and Ukrainians from Slovakia had not been as massive as in the previous period, the possibilities of emigration had not been comparable to the natural increase in population and the chances of free labor employment in the industrial sectors of the region. The issue of reviving agriculture by its gradual intensification had become very urgent after the war. The improvement of the social status of the population had depended on the solution of this problem, requiring several immediate measures: compensation for war damage, expansion of agricultural land – including forest land (expansion of pasture lands), land consolidation, increasing qualification of farmers and their temporary exemption from taxes, provision of state support for the purchase of high-quality seeds, seedlings, breeding cattle and agricultural inventory, accelerated construction of infrastructure. Although some steps had been taken, several of them had not been completed and thus had only a partial effect. Similarly, land reform in Northeastern Slovakia lasting practically throughout the whole interwar period, had not helped to expand the land fund of Rusynian-Ukrainian agriculture (unlike other regions of Bohemia, Moravia, Slovakia and even Transcarpathia), suffering from shortages of land (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2012, p. 220). As a result, the social status of Rusyns-Ukrainians in Slovakia, where a small agrarian element had predominated, had been the worst of all nationalities in the republic (Vanat, 1976, pp. 58–59, 62–63, 72).

**Migration in 1930s.** The global economic crisis of the 1930s, result of which the whole world had felt, had been another “blow” during the interwar period. It had led the masses of peasants of the interwar Czechoslovakia national peripheries to a total collapse, including Subcarpathian Rus’ and northern districts of the eastern Slovakia. The economic crisis had paralyzed the most sensitive area of the economy of these regions – forestry and woodworking industry, glass industry and tinkers. This had led to massive unemployment and in some cases to the hopeless situation of the mountain regions population in the Eastern Slovakia as well. During the crisis, the agrarian overpopulation of the region had appeared again (the number of inhabitants in the northern districts of eastern Slovakia grew by an average of 12% in 1921–1930) (Vanat, 1990, p. 199). For impoverished farmers, the only solution of the difficult situation had been migration for earnings again.

According to Czechoslovak official statistics of the year 1930, the largest number of people willing to emigrate from the Czechoslovak Republic were Rusyns-Ukrainians among all ethnic groups of the republic. In 1929, there were 2,606 Rusynian inhabitants (762 from Slovakia and 1,944 from Transcarpathia), 1,668 Hungarian, 1,641 German, 252 Polish and 346 Jewish inhabitants who applied for a passport. Speaking in whole-state figures, while in the 1920s the share of resettlers from Slovakia represented 55% and 61.3% from Subcarpathian Rus’, in 1929 the number of resettlers from the eastern part of the republic (i.e. Slovakia and Subcarpathian Rus’ together) reached 75.6%, t. j. 2/3 of all Czechoslovak emigrants. Natives of Subcarpathian Rus’ and Slovakia had represented 86.4% of the total number of emigrant farmers (Vanat, 1990, p. 200).

Emigration to European and transoceanic countries from the eastern parts of the Czechoslovak Republic reached its imaginary peak in 1930 when passports were issued to 16,682 inhabitants from Slovakia and 2,706 from Transcarpathia. In the following years, the number of issued passports (according to official statistics) had decreased significantly (Vanat, 1990, p. 200–201, tab. 21), however, it had not corresponded to the actual number of the resettlers.

Table 5

**Number of emigration passports issued to persons from Slovakia (1920 – 1938)  
and Subcarpathian Rus' (1920 – 1936)**

(Bielik, 1964, p. 301; Šprocha & Tišliar, 2009, p. 194, tab. 64)

Year	Number of issued emigration passports:					
	Slovakia			Subcarpathian Rus'		
	Total	To(from the total amount):		Total	To(from the total amount):	
Europe		overseas	Europe		overseas	
1920	13, 683	2, 410	11, 273	1,766	*	*
1921	15, 061	2, 949	12, 112	2,147	*	*
1922	16, 737	14, 188	2, 549	1,803	86	1, 712
1923	16, 596	9, 919	6, 677	313	35	278
1924	35, 202	25, 772	9, 430	2,493	173	2, 318
1925	8, 715	2, 885	5, 830	475	339	136
1926	14, 409	10, 945	3, 464	1,561	753	808
1927	12, 053	10, 854	1, 199	2,411	85	2, 326
1928	13, 544	10, 475	3, 069	2, 286	433	1, 853
1929	19, 401	11, 948	7, 453	3, 822	2, 309	1, 513
1930	16, 682	5, 709	10, 973	2, 706	1, 921	785
1931	4, 527	1, 603	2, 924	358	129	229
1932	2, 222	858	1, 364	123	24	99
1933	3, 009	987	2, 022	241	89	152
1934	3, 016	1, 520	1, 496	343	67	276
1935	3, 707	1, 868	1, 839	445	14	431
1936	4, 831	2, 267	2, 564	471	129	342
1937	8, 595	4, 069	4, 526	*	*	*
1938	6, 557	3, 752	2, 805	*	*	*
1920–1938	218, 547	124, 978	93, 569	23, 764	6, 586	13, 258

\* Data is missing.

A total of 218,547 emigration passports were issued in Slovakia in 1920 – 1938 (see Table 5). In the years 1920 – 1930 there were 182,083 passports (on average of 16,553 per year) and in the years 1931–1938 there were 36,464 passports (on average of 4,558 per year). Just to remind – in the years 1900 – 1913, there were 361,074 people moving out, i. e. an average of 25,791 people per year when compared to the previous period (according to Tajták's calculations). In 1920 – 1936, there were issued 23,764 emigration passports in total in Subcarpathian Rus' (see Tab. 5), including 21,783 passports (on average of 1,980 per year) in the years 1920–1930 and 1,981 passports (on average 330 per year) in the years 1931 – 1936.

However, according to the calculations of Milan Belej, in the years 1922 – 1937 there were issued 183,246 passports in Slovakia (in the years 1922 – 1930 it was 153,339 and in the years 1931 – 1937 only 29,907 passports). These include 56,834 passports (31%) in the eastern Slovakia, in 1922 – 1930 there were 49,267 issued passports and in 1931 – 1937 only 7,567 of them (Belej, 2007, pp. 210–211). Thus, it is evident that the dynamics of emigration flows in Slovakia and eastern Slovakia had quite declining tendency, similar to Subcarpathian Rus'.

From the point of view of the ethnic structure of emigrants during 1922 – 1937 and the total number of 183,246 passports issued in Slovakia, 153,289 persons of them were of Slovak nationality (83.7%), 13,581 people of Hungarian nationality (7.4%); 8,202 – Rusynian nationality (4, 5%); 6,597 – German nationality (3.6%); 807 – Jewish inhabitants (0.4%), 21 – people of Polish nationality and 749 persons (0.4%) of other nationalities. In the case of figures entirely for Eastern Slovakia – 56,834 passports had been issued to applicants from the region, including 8,046 for Rusyns (14.2%) at the second place after Slovaks – they had applied for 39,855 passports (70.1%) (Belej, 2007, p. 211). Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that the number of issued passports is not equal to the actual number of emigrants. Rather, it was the number of people who thus had expressed a willingness to migrate.

The above-mentioned Belej's data thus indicate that in the years 1922 – 1937 there were 503 Rusyns-Ukrainians from Eastern Slovakia on average per year, who were ready to emigrate (when compared to Slovaks from Eastern Slovakia, where it was an average of 2,491 persons per year). If we reconsider data from Vanat for the years 1922 – 1929 (about the emigration of 6,262 Rusyns – an average of 783 people per year) and deduct them from the data from Belej (for 20 – 30 years together), we can find out that in 1930 – 1937 there were at least 1,940 Rusyns willing to emigrate, i.e. 243 people per year. Although these are obviously incomplete data from official statistics, they suggest the fact that the emigration of Rusyns in the 1930s, under the influence of external factors, decreased and was around 1/3 of the number compared to the emigration in the 1920s. Although these data from official statistics are obviously incomplete, they suggest the fact that the emigration of Rusyns in the 1930s, under the influence of external factors, declined and represented 1/3 of the number when compared to the figures of emigration in the 1920s.

When comparing all-European statistics, it is evident that emigrants from Slovakia in the 1930s belonged to the largest group of social migrants. While in 1924 there were 1,174 emigrants per 100,000 inhabitants in Slovakia, the most in the whole Europe (!), in 1931 (similarly as in the following years) Slovakia with the number of its migrants (322) followed Ireland (826), Portugal (476) and Italy (335) (Jakešová, 1971, pp. 117–118). The fact is that more people had travelled overseas from the east Slovak regions within Slovakia, while from other areas they had gone to the Western Europe countries, usually for just seasonal work. However, it should be remarked that in the years of the economic crisis (1929 – 1933) a significant number of emigrants returned to Slovakia.

As a result of the economic crisis and the loss of extra income in local industry and abroad/overseas, tens of thousands of small landowners in northeastern Slovakia (as well as in Subcarpathian Rus') had found themselves in critical conditions. Many of them had been starving for several years (see also Verbytska & Kuzmin, 2019, p. 25) which had been the result of the barren year 1932 and partly 1934 as well. Low immunity due to malnutrition had led to the spread of epidemics and the increase of mortality of this population. According to Czechoslovak statistics from 1931, an average of 14.3 people out of 1,000 died (15.08 men and 13.68 women). It should be noted that the mortality of Rusyns had represented around 20 people, Poles – 18.7, Hungarians – 17.4, Czechs with Slovaks – 13.4, Jews – 12.9 and other nationalities – 12.5 people. Infant mortality had been particularly high, especially for children up to the first year of their life (e.g. in the Snina district, it had reached 15%) (Vanat, 1990, p. 204). Statistically speaking of 1,000 children born to Rusynian women in the early 1930s, up to 190 out of them did not survive the first year (it was 160 children on average in Slovakia; in some countries of northern and western Europe only 50) (Šprocha & Tišliar & Šmigel', 2017, p. 219).

On the other hand, Rusyns-Ukrainians had the highest birth rate among all ethnic groups in interwar Slovakia. The birth rate in Slovakia had begun to gradually decline from an average gross rate of 35‰ in the years 1919 – 1923 and in the years 1934 – 1937 to 24‰ (Tišliar, 2014c, pp. 47–48) (in 1920 – 4.25 children per woman on average, in 1930 – 3.49 and in 1937 – 2.77 children (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2008, p. 36)). However, the birth rate of Rusynian women had remained stable at 37–39 ‰ until the end of the 1920s. Despite the fact that it had begun to decline gradually in the 1930s, it had been still higher than 30 ‰ in the second half of the 1930s (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2016, p. 230; Šprocha & Tišliar & Šmigel, 2017, pp. 220–221). Although Rusynian women in the whole interwar period had been characterized by the lowest extramarital fertility (the share of illegitimate children was 4–7%), it is interesting that in the early 1930s, Rusynian women also had the highest index of extramarital fertility when compared to women from other ethnic groups in Slovakia (Šprocha & Tišliar & Šmigel, 2017, p. 220, tab. 4).

In 1921 – 1930 (see Table 6), the total number of Rusyns-Ukrainians in Slovakia had grown by 5,451 persons (6%), while the number of population (affected by emigration) of Slovakia grew by almost 300,000 (10%) in total in the same period. Even in this case as well, it is possible to speak of the Rusyns *population stagnation* in the 1920s where *migration factors played a significant role* (at least 6,262 migrating Rusyns had been mentioned). And since the year 1930 when the census (!) happened was one of the last prime years of interwar emigration, it had been obviously reflected in the statistics of the number of Rusyns.

Table 6

**Number of Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia and their share  
on total number of population in 1921 – 1940**

Year	Number of inhabitants in Slovakia	Number of Rusyns and Ukrainians	Share of Rusyns and Ukrainians(%)
1921	2, 955 998	85, 628	2.9
1930	3, 254 189	91, 079	2.8
1938	2, 656 426	69, 106	2.6
1940	2, 591 368	61, 270	2.4

However, it is much more difficult to analyze the number of Rusyns-Ukrainians in Slovakia between 1930 – 1940. The thing is that data about number of population in Slovakia from census in 1938 and 1940 are not comparable to previous interwar records. The reason is mainly *extensive territorial losses* that Slovakia went through in the years 1938 – 1939 after the Munich Agreement, the Vienna Arbitration, so-called Little war and as a result of “Polish territorial demands”. This was closely connected with the loss of the country’s population, including Rusyns.

However, the number of Rusyns would be expected to increase and by 1940 it would approach 100,000 people due to the trends in the population development of Rusyns-Ukrainians from the previous period, consideration data on the mortality and natality of the Rusynian population, as well as the declining trend of Rusynian emigration in the 1930s (only around 243 persons per year). Despite these factors, results of official censuses had shown that by the end of 1930s, overall number of Rusyns *had significantly and unnaturally declined* – from 91,079 people in 1930 to 69, 106 persons in 1938. In 1940, it was 61, 270 people, i.e. in ten years it statistically lost 29,809 persons – 32.7% (see Table 6). The reason for this “difference” from the actual numbers must be seen in the context of the time and especially in the special circumstances in which the 1938 and 1940’s censuses happened.

The so-called regional census of December 31, 1938 happened in the reduced territory of the (already autonomous) Slovakia, i. e. after the secession of large areas of Slovakia by Germany, Hungary and Poland following the Munich Agreement (September 29, 1938) and the Vienna Arbitration (November 2, 1938). It was a provisional, simple and inaccurate census, politically motivated in connection with territorial changes (*however, these had not yet affected the Rusynian settlement area*). Minorities had criticized the secret preparation for the census pointing out that some groups of the population had not been recorded with nationalities to which they had referred (Šprocha & Tišliar, 2012, pp. 18–21). Speaking about Rusyns – the decline in their number in 1938 (statistically by 24%; from the expected number – by 30%) when compared to 1930 meant an unnatural decline which was obviously of a non-migration nature.

Undoubtedly, members of the Rusyn-Ukrainian ethnic group in Slovakia in 1938 reflected several facts: escalating of the situation in the country – especially relations in Eastern Slovakia due to the national orientation of Rusyns and the determination of the Slovak-Rusynian land border in this period; Russophobic and Hungarophobic prejudices supported by the state propaganda; measures limiting the political life of the minority; attacks against the Greek Catholic Church because of its Rusynian character; alarm reports on the Hungarian-Polish division of Subcarpathian Rus', the annexation of area from the eastern Slovakia to Prešov, etc. (Konečný, 2005, p. 284). During the census in 1938, there were around 22 – 27,000 Rusyn-Ukrainians who did not refer to their own nationality under the influence of complex political and social situation both in the country and the region (of course, the “pressure of the Slovak environment” or the influence of natural assimilation is obvious there).

Another, for this time a proper census of December 15, 1940 and an additional census of January, 1941 had never been comprehensively compiled and published (Tišliar, 2011). What is the most important (from the point of view of the number of “Slovak” Rusyns), both censuses took place on the territory of the then Slovak Republic, which in March, 1939 was “impoverished” by a part of territory, *this time from the Rusynian settlement area*. The fact is that due to the so-called Little War (Slovak-Hungarian armed conflict at the end of March, 1939), Hungary which had previously annexed Subcarpathian Rus', expanded its territory to the exclusion of Eastern Slovakia – from the borders of Transcarpathia to Snina (part of territory from Stakchin in the north to Sobrance in the south). It had annexed 74 villages with about 40,000 population, 36 of them were Rusynian villages with about 20,000 inhabitants (Magocsi, 2016, p. 349; see *Územie a obyvateľstvo...*, 1939). This means that during census in 1940, there were about 80,000 Rusyns (i.e. without 20,000 of them, who actually lived in the territory of Hungary). However, about 20,000 of them still did not refer to their nationality (apparently because of combination of natural and purposeful assimilation).

This had happened due to the tense situation in the region, despite the fact that Greek Catholic Bishop Peter Pavol Gojdič had asked Greek Catholics (Rusyns, Russians, Ukrainians, “Rusnaks”) to state their nationality in the census as Rusynian (Konečný, 2005, p. 284; compare Vanat, 1985, p. 91). As the historian S. Konečný claims – the establishment of the Slovak Republic (March 14, 1939) and the Hungarian occupation of Subcarpathian Rus' and parts of eastern Slovakia at the end of March 1939 meant a certain isolation of the local Rusyns and further weakening of their political and national ambitions. *“The official ideology of the Slovak state had considered the national principle to be the driving force of all state-building processes and the basis of political life in the country. This doctrine divided the population into three groups. Slovaks and Germans represented first-class citizens, while members of the Hungarian and Rusynian minorities were accepted only as*

“bearable” communities. Jews and Romanies who had been called as “saboteurs of the nation” and “enemies of the state”, were in fact deprived of their civil and later also human rights.” (Konečný, 2005, p. 283, 285). Obviously, some Rusyns did not want to be second-class citizens and therefore chose to change their nationality.

It is apparent that at the end of the 1930s, another factor had played its role. It had been reflected in the statistical number of Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia and it had not been an emigration factor. It is a phenomenon of *denationalization* of the Rusyn-Ukrainian ethnic group with significant manifestations known from the later (post-war) period. Precisely speaking – this phenomenon had been repeated during the census in 1950 (see Table 7), when the revision of census data in northeastern Slovakia showed that up to 20 – 23,000 Rusyns had already referred to their Slovak nationality (Gajdoš & Konečný, 2014, pp. 215–218, supplement. – doc. 11), i.e. after subtracting of minority post-war emigration manifestations (see Šmigel, 2004, pp. 31–66; Šmigel & Kruško, 2011).

Table 7

**Number of Rusyns in Slovakia and their share in the total number of inhabitants  
in the years 1930 – 1950**

Year	Number of inhabitants in Slovakia	Number of Rusyns and Ukrainians	Share of Rusyns and Ukrainians (%)
1930	3, 254, 189	91, 079	2.8
1938	2, 656, 426	69, 106	2.6
1940	2, 591, 368	61, 270	2.4
1950	3, 442, 317	48, 231	1.4

In the analysis of the post-war state of Rusyns-Ukrainians and the results of the census in 1950, Slovak historians M. Gajdoš and S. Konečný had pointed to the phenomenon of the so-called *purposeful statistical assimilation*, which had been observed since 1938. Mentioned authors stated that “*the unnatural decline of the number of Rusyns and Ukrainians in Slovakia in 1930 – 1950 is obviously the result of polydetermination, i.e. the effect of several causes or factors that had differentiated significance and impact in this context, with different political, socio-economic and particular, or rather immanent character*”. The above-mentioned authors had mainly included assimilation policy of the Slovak government and regional authorities, dated from the declaration of autonomy of Slovakia (1938) until the end of the First Slovak Republic (1945), in the category of political causes. According to their opinion: “*...therefore, the number of Rusyns in 1940 was lower by more than 40% when compared to the year 1930, although this figure distorts the fact that the borders of the territory were not identical during the censuses and the methodology used in recording had been different*” etc. (Gajdoš & Konečný, 2014, pp. 40–41).

**The Conclusions.** Economically motivated migration flows of the population of Slovakia from the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the end of the 1930s aiming to get a job and thus ensure the living of their family, had been mainly connected with people of both productive and reproductive age. These were mostly breadwinners – mostly married male part of the population which was directly reflected not only in the fertility rate, but also in the number and structural characteristics of the population. At the same time, Slovakia had been failing from an economic point of view due to moving of people of economically active age. In addition, after getting a permanent job abroad or overseas, other family members had often followed their father. Although the total number of migrants decreased in the interwar period (when

compared to pre-war emigration – until 1914), Slovakia and the Rusynian-Ukrainian settlement area had long been among the migration loss-making countries/regions. A very important factor that points to this statement is the total volume of the migration balance of Slovakia, which in the years 1919 – 1937 meant a migration decrease of more than 186,000 people. Because of migration, the population of Slovakia had practically been only losing until 1932 (Tišliar, 2014c, pp. 44–45) and Rusyns-Ukrainians figuring as a part of it, had been seriously involved in the whole process. As the calculations of this study show, during the Hungarian period in 1870 – 1914, about 70,000 Rusyns migrated from Slovakia – on average of 1,550 people per year (while by the year 1900, it was about 1,700 people a year and in the years 1900 – 1914 it was about 1,250 people per year) and in the Czechoslovak period in 1920 – 1937 the number reached 9 – 10,000 Rusyns – an average of about 500 people per year (while in the 1920s, it was 783 people a year; in the 1930s – 243 people a year).

Emigration of Rusyns-Ukrainians from Slovakia – moving for work from an economically backward, poor, overpopulated and climatically raw ethnic settlement area – had been an economic necessity. It had also become *an important psychological aspect of their behaviour* during critical periods (economic crises, famine years, post-war periods). In addition, it had influenced the population development of the ethnic group (as indicated by the censuses from the years 1900 – 1930). For many Rusynian emigrants, such migration had embodied a form of *silent social protest* against unfavorable living conditions in their native country. However, at the end of the 1930s – when it was no longer possible to emigrate (as a result of the escalating war conflict in Europe) and political-national relations had been intensified in Slovakia – they had been isolated (after the Hungarian occupation of Subcarpathian Rus’) and begun to denationalize. Thus, it was another form of *silent social protest* of Rusyns which began in the late 1930s (appeared in the censuses in 1938 and 1940) and repeated (in combination with emigration) in the years after World War II. (in census in 1950).

Undoubtedly, the population policy of the state had also played an important role in the migration flows of Rusyns. As it had already been mentioned, the Hungarian government had not prevented emigration from the country *de jure*, it had only regulated the activities of emigration agents and agencies acting in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary. Similarly, the Czechoslovak Republic had not restricted emigration, but rather directly helped it and facilitated the moving of people. The Immigration Act (Act No. 71/1922 Coll.), passed in 1922, did not restrict emigration itself, but tried to give it an organized character and prohibited the promotion of emigration through an implausible form (Sbíрка zákonů..., 1922, pp. 77–78).

Interwar Czechoslovakia obviously held opposite, i.e. seemingly contradictory attitudes from the population policy point of view. On the one hand, the population in Czechoslovakia had been perceived from the position of *populationism*, where a typical example is bigger effort to improve the position of families (especially mothers and children from lower social classes) and social and family policy in general. On the other hand, there had also been typical positions of neo-Malthusianism visible mainly in the field of foreign migration. This was considered a kind of *“necessary relief”* (as a regulatory mechanism of the population, eliminating the possible causes of various economic and social conflicts). Therefore this attitude must be perceived particularly as a solution to the issue of rural agrarian overcrowding and social tensions, as well as an active means of dealing with high unemployment and problematic living standards.

However, the position of the leading representatives of the Czechoslovak Republic in the migration policy sphere had not been completely unified. In a particular way, some politicians

had approved and positively received mass emigration, the other part perceived had been concerned as foreign migration mainly affected people of economically active age. The direction that finally dominated had been, to a certain extent, a compromise between the two political starting points. Such a “contradiction” between migration policy and pro-population measures had been the result of a long-absent conception of a wellthought-out population policy, but also of the inability to use the economic potential of the population to the benefit of the state.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Bade, K. J.** (2005). *Evropa v pohybu. Evropské migrace dvou staletí* [Europe on the move. European migration of two centuries]. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny. [in Czech]

**Belej, M.** (2007). Vystáhovalectvo z východného Slovenska v medzivojnovom období na základe analýzy štatistických údajov (1922 – 1937) [Emigration from Eastern Slovakia between the world wars based on the analysis of statistical facts (1922 – 1937)]. *Annales historici Presovienses*, 7, 175–219. [in Slovak]

**Bielik, F.** (1964). Vystáhovalectvo z východného Slovenska za prvej ČSR [Emigration from eastern Slovakia during the first Czechoslovakia]. In: *Príspevky k dejinám východného Slovenska* [Studies on the history of eastern Slovakia]. Bratislava: SAV. [in Slovak]

**Botík, J.** (2007). *Etnická história Slovenska* [Ethnic history of Slovakia]. Bratislava: LÚČ. [in Slovak]

**Československá statistika – svazek 9.** Sčítání lidu v republice Československé ze dne 15. února 1921 [Czechoslovak Statistics – Volume 9. Census in the Czechoslovak Republic of 15 February 1921]. Praha: [s.n.], 1924. [in Czech]

**Deset let Československé republiky III** [Ten years of the Czechoslovak Republic III]. Praha: [s.n.], 1928. [in Czech]

**Fatula, R.** (2018). Do pershoii svitovoii 150 tysiach zarobitchan iz Zakarpattia vyiiikhaly za okean [Before the First World War, 150,000 workers from Transcarpathia went oversea]. In: *Holos karpat* [Voice Carpathian], 10. 3. 2018. URL: <https://goloskarpat.info/society/5aa421c7455e1/> [in Ukrainian]

**Fordinálová, E.** (1983). Vystáhovalectvo zo západného Slovenska v medzivojnovom období [Emigration from western Slovakia in the interwar period]. In: *Slováci v zahraničí* [Slovaks abroad], 9. Martin: Matica slovenská, 31–43. [in Slovak]

**Gajdoš, M. & Konečný, S.** (2014). *Ukrajinská menšina na Slovensku ako objekt a subjekt politiky II. (1945 – 1953)* [Ukrainian minority in Slovakia as an object and subject of policy II. (1945 – 1953)]. Prešov: UNIVERSUM. [in Slovak]

**Harušťák, I.** (2013). Príspevok k diskurzu o dejinách slovenského vystáhovalectva. Migračné impulzy a vystáhovalectvo z hornouhorských žúp na americký kontinent v kontexte migračných pohybov v strednej a východnej Európe v poslednej štvrtine 19. storočia [Contribution to the discourse on the history of Slovak emigration. Migration impulses and emigration from the highlands to the American continent in the context of migratory movements in Central and Eastern Europe in the last quarter of the 19th century]. In: Kováč, D. et al. (2013). *Sondy do slovenských dejín v dlhom 19. storočí* [Probes into Slovak history in the long 19th century]. Bratislava: Historický ústav SAV, 214–226. [in Slovak]

**Ílko, V.** (1973). *Zakarpatske selo na pochatku XX st. (1900 – 1919 rr.)* [Transcarpathian village in the early XX century (1900 – 1919)]. Lviv, 1973. [in Ukrainian]

**Jakešová, E.** (1971). Slovenské kultúrne združenie v Kanade v období druhej svetovej vojny [Slovak Cultural Association in Canada during the Second World War]. In: *Slováci v zahraničí* [Slovaks abroad], 1. Martin: Matica slovenská. [in Slovak]

**Jakešová, E.** (1987). Sociálno-ekonomické aspekty migrácie obyvateľstva Slovenska v dvadsiatych rokoch 20. storočia [Socio-economic aspects of migration of the population of Slovakia in the twenties of the 20th century]. *Historicky casopis*, 3, 381–399. [in Slovak]

**Janto, J.** (2016). Salašný chov oviec v Detve a na Slovensku [Salaš-type sheep farms in Detva and in Slovakia]. *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo – Museology and Cultural Heritage*, 4 (2), 95–106. [in Slovak]

**Janto, J.** (2017). Slovenské bryndziarstvo a vagačovská výrobnia v Detve. K 230. výročiu vzniku prvej bryndziarne [Production of bryndza in Slovakia and the Vagač bryndza manufacture in Detva: On the 230<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the founding of the first industrial site for the production of bryndza]. *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo- Museology and Cultural Heritage*, 5 (2), 51–59. [in Slovak]

**Joseph, S.** (1914). *Jewish Immigration to the United States from 1881 to 1910*. New York: Columbia University. [in English]

Kabuzan, V. M. (2006). *Ukraintsy v mire: dinamika chislennosti i rasseleniya. 20-e gody XVIII veka – 1989 god* [Ukrainians in the world: dynamics of numbers and settlement. 20s of the XVIII century – 1989]. Moskva: Nauka. [in Russian]

**Kmeť, M.** (2010). *Na margo dvoch storočí* [On the margin of two centuries]. Békešská Čaba: Výskumný ústav Slovákov v Maďarsku. [in Slovak]

**Kmeť, M.** (2012). *Krátke dejiny dolnozemsých Slovákov I* [A Brief History of Lowland Slovaks I]. Nadlak: Vydavateľstvo Ivan Krasko. [in Slovak]

**Kmeť, M.** (2014). K problematike vyst'ahovalectva zo Slovenska v medzivojnovom období [On the issue of emigration from Slovakia in the interwar period]. In: Šmigel', M. – Tišliar, P. et al. (2014). *Migračné procesy Slovenska (1918 – 1948)* [Migration processes of Slovakia (1918 – 1948)]. Banská Bystrica: Belianum, 71–85. [in Slovak]

**Konečný, S.** (2005). Rusínska a ukrajinská menšina po vzniku prvej Slovenskej republiky [Rusynian and Ukrainian minorities after the establishment of the first Slovak Republic]. In: *Slovenská republika 1939 – 1945 očami mladých historikov IV* [Slovak Republic 1939 – 1945 through the eyes of young historians VI]. Eds.: M. Šmigel', P. Mičko. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici, 283–291. [in Slovak]

**Konečný, S.** (2015). *Náčrt dejín karpatských Rusínov* [Sketch of the history of the Carpatho-Rusyns]. Prešov: Prešovska univerzita v Prešove – Ustav rusinskeho jazyka a kultury. [in Slovak]

**Magocsi, P. R.** (2005). *Our people: Carpatho-Rusyns and their descendants in North America*. Wauconda (Il.): Bochazy-Carducii Publishers. [in English]

**Magoczi, P. R.** (2016). *Chrbtom k horám. Dejiny Karpatskej Rusi a karpatských Rusínov* [With Their Backs to the Mountains: A History of Carpathian Rus' and Carpatho-Rusyns]. Prešov: UNIVERSUM. [in Slovak]

**Makar, Yu.** (2007). Ukraiinska diaspora: pokhodzhennia, kharakter, suchasnyi stan [Ukrainian diaspora: origin, nature, current state]. In: *Наукoві записки Національного університету “Острозька академія”. Історичні науки* [Scientific notes /National University “Ostroh Academy”. Historical sciences], 9, 9–19. [in Ukrainian]

**Marunchak, M.** (1991). *The Ukrainian Canadians a History. Vol. 1*. Second Edition. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Academy of Arts & Science. [in Ukrainian]

**Onufrak, A.** (2019). Štátotvorné úvahy Uhro-Rusínov na konci 1. Svetovej vojny – príklon k Československej republike [State-Building Considerations of Uhro-Rusins at the End of World War I – Inclination towards the Czechoslovak Republic]. *Historická sociologie*, 2, 141–155. DOI:10.14712/23363525.2019.21 [in Slovak]

**Pop, I.** (2011). *Malé dejiny Rusínov* [Small history of the Rusyns]. Bratislava: Združenie inteligencie Rusínov Slovenska. [in Slovak]

**Pútnik svätovojtešský na rok 1928** [Pilgrim “svätovojtešský“ for 192]. Trnava: Spolok sv. Vojtecha, 1928. [in Slovak]

**Sáposová, Z.** (2004). Migračné procesy Stredného Zemplína v období dualizmu (1867 – 1918) II. [Migration Processes of Central Zemplin in the Period of “Dualism“ (1867 – 1918) II.]. *Človek a Spoločnosť* [Individual and Society], 7 (1), 11–18. [in Slovak]

**Sbírka zákonů a nařízení státu československého, č. 23/1922** [Collection of Laws and Regulations of the Czechoslovak State, No. 23/1922]. Praha: Statní tiskárna, 1922. [in Czech]

**Shnitser, I.** (2019). Museum Affairs at the Territory of Subcarpathian Rus' in the Years of the First Czechoslovak Republic (1919 – 1938). *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo- Museology and Cultural Heritage*, 7 (1), 99–110. [in English]

**Svetoň, J.** (1958). *Obyvateľstvo Slovenska za kapitalizmu [The population of Slovakia in capitalism]*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SVPL. [in Slovak]

**Svetoň, J.** (1970). Slovenské vyst'ahovalectvo v období uhorského kapitalizmu [Slovak emigration in the period of Hungarian capitalism]. In: *Vývoj obyvateľstva Slovenska: výber z diela k nedožitým 65. narodeninám J. Svetoňa [Development of the population of Slovakia: a selection from the work dedicated to the undead 65<sup>th</sup> birthday of J. Sveton]*. Bratislava: Nakladateľstvo EPOCHA, 181–206. [in Slovak]

**Syrný, M.** (2016). *Slovenské dejiny. 20. storočie. Diel I. (1900 – 1945) [Slovak history. 20<sup>th</sup> century. Part I (1900 – 1945)]*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum. [in Slovak]

**Szarka, L.** (1995). *Szlovák nemzeti fejlődés-magyar nemzetiségi politika 1867 – 1918 [Slovak National Development – Hungarian Nationality Policy 1867 – 1918]*. Pozsony: Kalligram Könyvkiadó. [in Hungarian]

**Šmigel, M. & Kruško, Š.** (2011). *Opcia a presídlenie Rusínov do ZSSR (1945 – 1947) [Option and resettlement of Rusyns to the USSR (1945 – 1947)]*. Bratislava: Goralinga. [in Slovak]

**Šmigel, M. & Syrny, M.** (2019). “Revoliutsiya v Karpatakh”: zusyillia uhorskoii ta cheskoii polityky shchodo vtrymannia Slovachchyny ta Pidkarpattia u 1918 – 1919 rr. [Revolution in Carpathia: Hungarian and Czech politics efforts to keep Slovakia and the Subcarpathian region in 1918 – 1919]. In: *Istorychna panorama: Naukovyi zbirnyk ChNU [Historical panorama: Scientific collectio ChNU]*, 28–29, 43–69. (In Ukrainian)

**Šmigel, M.** (2004). Historické otázky a súvislosti opcie a presídlenia občanov Československa do Sovietskeho zväzu v roku 1947 [Historical questions and links of option and resettlement of Czechoslovak citizens in the Soviet Union in 1947]. *Historicky casopis*, 52, 31–66. [in Slovak]

**Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P. & Šmigel, M.** (2014). Pohyb etník, etnické hranice, etnický priestor na Slovensku v 1. polovici 20. storočia [Ethnic movement, ethnic borders, ethnic space in Slovakia in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century]. In: Šmigel, M. – Tišliar, P. et al. (2014). *Migračné procesy Slovenska (1918 – 1948) [Migration processes of Slovakia (1918 – 1948)]*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum, 10–42. [in Slovak]

**Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P.** (2008). *Plodnosť obyvateľstva a celková reprodukcia na Slovensku v rokoch 1919 – 1937 [Fertility of the population and total reproduction in Slovakia in the years 1919 – 1937]*. Bratislava: Stimul. [in Slovak]

**Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P.** (2009). *Populačný vývoj Podkarpatskej Rusi I. Demografická reprodukcia [Population development of Subcarpathian Russia I. Demographic reproduction]*. Bratislava: Infostat. [in Slovak]

**Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P.** (2012). *Demografický obraz Slovenska v sčítaniach ľudu 1919 – 1940 [Demographic image of Slovakia in the 1919 – 1940 census]*. Brno: Tribun EU. [in Slovak]

**Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P.** (2016). *Transformácia plodnosti žien Slovenska v 20. a na začiatku 21. storočia [Transformation of female fertility in Slovakia in the 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> century]*. Bratislava: MKD. [in Slovak]

**Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P.** (2018). *100 rokov obyvateľstva Slovenska: od vzniku Československa po súčasnosť [100 years of the population of Slovakia: from the establishment of Czechoslovakia to the present]*. Bratislava: Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo, o.z., - Centrum pre historickú demografiu a populačný vývoj Slovenska, FF UK v Bratislave. [in Slovak]

**Šprocha, B. & Tišliar, P. & Šmigel, M.** (2017). Demographic development Ruthenians (Rusyns) in Slovakia in the interwar years (1920 – 1930). *Rusin*, 47 (1), 213–231. [in English]

**Šprocha, B. & Majo, J.** (2016). *Storočie populačného vývoja Slovenska I.: demografické procesy [Century of population development of Slovakia I.: Demographic processes]*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, INFOSAT – Výskumné demografické centrum, Centrum spoločenských a psychologických vied SAV. [in Slovak]

**Štefánek, A.** (1944). *Základy sociografie Slovenska. Slovenská vlastiveda III [Basics of sociography of Slovakia. Slovak Homeland Studies III]*. Bratislava: Slovenská akadémia vied a umení. [in Slovak]

**Švorc, P.** (2007). *Zakletá zem. Podkarpatská Rus 1918 – 1946 [Cursed Land. Subcarpathian Rus 1918 – 1946]*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny. [in Czech]

**Tajták, L.** (1975). Slovenské vysťahovalectvo a migrácia v rokoch 1900 – 1914 [Slovak emigration and migration in the years 1900–1914]. *Historicky casopis*, 3, 377–415. [in Slovak]

**Tajták, L.** (1980). Vývin, pohyb a štrukturálne zmeny obyvateľstva v predvojnovom období (1900 – 1914) [Development, movement, and structural-changes of the population of Slovakia in the pre-war period (1900 – 1914)]. *Historicky casopis*, 28 (4), 497–530. [in Slovak]

**Tišliar, P. & Šprocha, B.** (2018). Topography of the Ruthenian Population in Slovakia in the 18th century through the first half of the 20th century. *Bylye Gody*, 49, 1009–1018. [in English]

**Tišliar, P.** (2011). *Národnostný kataster Slovenska v roku 1940* [National Cadastre of Slovakia in 1940]. Bratislava: Slovenský národný archív. [in Slovak]

**Tišliar, P.** (2014a). Beginnings of Organisation of Emigration in the Czechoslovak Republic. In: Tišliar, P., Čéplö, S. (eds.) (2014). *Studies in the Population of Slovakia 2*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Słowaków w Polsce, 43–62. [in English]

**Tišliar, P.** (2014b). Formy organizovania vysťahovalectva zo Slovenska po vzniku Československej republiky [Forms of organizing emigration from Slovakia after the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic]. In: Šmigel', M. – Tišliar, P. et al. (2014). *Migračné procesy Slovenska (1918 – 1948)* [Migration processes of Slovakia (1918 – 1948)]. Banská Bystrica: Belianum, 56–71. [in Slovak]

**Tišliar, P.** (2014c). Migračná politika na Slovensku v kontexte populačnej politiky v medzivojnovom období [Migration policy in Slovakia in the context of population policy in the interwar period]. In: Šmigel', M. – Tišliar, P. et al. (2014). *Migračné procesy Slovenska (1918 – 1948)* [Migration processes of Slovakia (1918 – 1948)]. Banská Bystrica: Belianum, 44–56. [in Slovak]

**Tóth, A. & Novotný, L. & Stehlík, M.** (2012). Národnostní menšiny v Československu 1918 – 1938. Od státu národního ke státu národnostnímu? [National minorities in Czechoslovakia 1918 – 1938. From the national state to the ethnic state?]. Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta. [in Czech]

**Územie a obyvateľstvo Slovenskej republiky a prehľad obcí a okresov odstúpených Nemecku, Maďarsku a Poľsku** [Territory and population of the Slovak Republic and an overview of municipalities and districts ceded to Germany, Hungary and Poland]. Bratislava: Štátny štatistický úrad, 1939. [in Slovak]

**Vanat, I.** (1976). Sociálno-ekonomické postavenie Ukrajincov na východnom Slovensku v rokoch 1918 – 1929 [Socio-economic position of Ukrainians in eastern Slovakia in the years 1918 – 1929]. In: *Nove obzory*, 18. Košice: Výchoslovenské vydavateľstvo, 39–73. [in Slovak]

**Vanat, I.** (1990). *Narysy novitnoii istorii ukraintsiv skhidnoii Slovachchyny I (1918 – 1938)* [Essays on modern history of Ukrainians in eastern Slovakia I (1918 – 1938)]. Bratislava: Slovatske pedahohichne vydavnytstvo. [in Ukrainian]

**Vanat, I.** (1985). *Narysy novitnoii istorii ukraintsiv skhidnoii Slovachchyny II (1938 – 1948)* [Essays on modern history of Ukrainians in eastern Slovakia II (1938 – 1948)]. Bratislava, Priashiv: Slovatske pedahohichne vydavnytstvo. [in Ukrainian]

**Verbytska, P. & Kuzmin, R.** (2019). Between amnesia and the “war of memories”: politics of memory in the museum narratives of Ukraine. *Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo- Museology and Cultural Heritage*, 7 (2), 23–34. [in English]

*The article was received on June 08, 2020.*

*Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94(477.83/.86=411.16)“1914/1915”  
DOI10.24919/2519-058X.18.226532

**Andrii SHCHEHLOV**

PhD (History), Army Scientific Center Leading Researcher, Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi National Army Academy, 32 Heroiv Maidanu Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79012 (deep\_in\_faith@ukr.net)

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-6484-0864

**Oleksandra MELNYK**

PhD (Economics), Docent of the Department of Humanities, Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi National Army Academy, 32 Heroiv Maidanu Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79012 (lmm1viv@gmail.com)

**ORCID:** 000-0003-3497-4148

**Андрій ШЕГЛОВ**

кандидат історичних наук, провідний науковий співробітник Наукового центру Сухопутних військ, Національна академія Сухопутних військ імені гетьмана Петра Сагайдачного, вулиця Героїв Майдану, 32, Львів, Україна, індекс 79012 (deep\_in\_faith@ukr.net)

**Олександра МЕЛЬНИК**

кандидат економічних наук, доцент кафедри гуманітарних наук, Національна академія Сухопутних військ імені гетьмана Петра Сагайдачного, вулиця Героїв Майдану, 32, Львів, Україна, індекс 79012 (v.vuzdryk@gmail.com)

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Shchehlov, A. & Melnyk, O. (2021). The Situation of the Jewish Minority during the Russian Occupation of Eastern Galicia in 1914–1915. *Skhidnoieuropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 88–97. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226532

## THE SITUATION OF THE JEWISH MINORITY DURING THE RUSSIAN OCCUPATION OF EASTERN GALICIA IN 1914 – 1915

**Abstract.** *The purpose* of the article – to analyze the situation, the state of affairs of the Jewish population of Eastern Galicia during World War I from August of 1914 till June of 1915. **The methodology of the research:** adherence to the principles of objectivity and historicism contributed to the elucidation of the preconditions, essence and consequences of the Russian administration activities during the occupation period concerning the Jewish community of Eastern Galicia. **The scientific novelty** consists in a comprehensive problem coverage of the civilian administration and military command attitude to the local population and national minorities; in the analysis of socio-political and economic processes on the eve and during the years of the Russian occupation administration, which has not been the subject of a special historical study. The attempt has been made to recreate the picture of political changes in the structure of Galician multinational society, where a social category emerged – the refugees. New archival materials have been introduced into scientific circulation, which allowed to generalize the situation of the Jewish community of Galicia during World War I. **The Conclusions.** The occupation of the Galician region by the Russian troops was accompanied by a violent policy against the local population and

national minorities of the region. The government's inaction led to mass looting and military violence against the Jews. Russia's anti-Jewish policy on the South-Western Front had a negative effect on the country's international image, creating additional obstacles for the country to obtain foreign loans. The policy of persecution of the Jewish population by the state led to the confrontation in the society, the creation of stereotypes ingrained in the public consciousness, where the Jews acted as enemies, traitors, moneylenders, speculators, who were accused of all internal and military miscalculations of the Empire.

**Key words:** Jewish minority, occupation, Eastern Galicia, the Russian Empire, World War I.

## СТАНОВИЩЕ ЄВРЕЙСЬКОЇ МЕНШИНИ ПІД ЧАС РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ОКУПАЦІЇ СХІДНОЇ ГАЛИЧИНИ В 1914 – 1915 рр.

**Анотація. Мета роботи** – проаналізувати становище єврейського населення Східної Галичини в період Першої світової війни з серпня 1914 по червень 1915 рр. **Методологія дослідження:** дотримання принципів об'єктивності та історизму сприяло розкриттю передумов, сутності та наслідків діяльності російської адміністрації протягом усього окупаційного періоду щодо єврейської спільноти Східної Галичини. **Наукова новизна** полягає у комплексному висвітленні проблеми ставлення цивільної адміністрації та військового командування до місцевого населення та національних меншин аналізі суспільно-політичних та економічних процесів напередодні та в роки російської окупаційної адміністрації, що донині не було предметом спеціального історичного дослідження. Зроблено спробу відтворити картину політичних змін у структурі галицького багатонаціонального суспільства, де з'явилася соціальна категорія – біженці. Введено до наукового обігу нові архівні матеріали, що дозволили узагальнити становище єврейської спільноти Галичини у роки Першої світової війни. **Висновки.** Захоплення галицького краю російськими військами супроводжувалося насильницькою політикою до місцевого населення й національних меншин краю. Бездіяльність влади призводила до масових грабунків та проявів насильства з боку військових щодо євреїв. Антиєврейська політика Росії на Південно-Західному фронті негативно позначилася на міжнародному іміджі держави, що створювало додаткові перешкоди для отримання країною зовнішніх кредитів. Політика переслідування юдейського населення з боку держави призвела до конфронтації в суспільстві, породження стереотипів які закріпилися в суспільній свідомості, де євреї виступають як вороги, зрадники, лихварі, спекулянти, яких звинувачували у всіх внутрішньодержавних та військових прорахунках імперії.

**Ключові слова:** єврейська меншина, окупація, Східна Галичина, Російська імперія, Перша Світова війна.

**The Problem Statement.** The course of World War I led to changes in the social structure of the society in Central and Eastern Europe. The majority of modern historical research concerns socio-political processes, military operations, the issues related to the resettlement of the population of Galicia, the activities of charitable organizations, superficially concerning the issue of refugees and the deportation of the Jewish population.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications.** We try to analyze the occupation policy of tsarist Russia in Galicia towards the regional Jewish minority, considering its position and the role of military command and civilian administration in the deportation of the Jews to Left-Bank Ukraine and the central provinces of the Russian Empire. The chronology of the study covers the period of 1914 – 1915. The researches of the following Ukrainian historians attract attention: Ya. Dashkevych, (Dashkevych, 2010), W. Melamed (Melamed, 1994), O. Reient (Reient, 2007), L. Zhvanko (Zhvanko, 2008), L. Bilous (Bilous, 2011), O. Serdiuk (Serdiuk, 2002), H. Sehedra (Sehedra, 2005), who analyzed superficially the situation of the national minorities of Eastern Galicia during World War I, involuntary resettlement and refugee problems were mainly considered in the context of the activities of charitable organizations related to the evacuation of the population of Galicia, Bukovyna and Volyn. The majority of

the scientific researches is devoted to the study of military operations in Western Ukraine, the attitude of political parties and public organizations towards the Russian occupation of the region, coverage of socio-political and economic processes before and during the Great War. Of scientific interest is the collection of materials of the local press of that time and the memoirs of eyewitnesses of these events, the testimonies of prisoners, who were taken hostage, as well as the attitude of the Russian occupation administration to the local population and national minorities (Semeniv, 2018). In the field of modern Ukrainian historians, the coverage of the issue of deportation and refuge of the Jewish population of Galicia has not been analyzed properly. Among foreign scholars, the state and migration of Galician Jewry during the Great War were studied by: G. Ioffe (Ioffe, 2001), S. Nelipovich (Nelipovich, 2004, 2009), E. Lohr (Lohr, 2001), S. Goldin (Goldin, 2005), O. Prusin (Prusin, 2005) and the others.

Among modern Russian scientific research we can single out the monograph of O. Bakhturina (Bakhturina, 2000), in which the policy of the Russian Empire in Galicia in 1915–1917 was characterized, in particular, superficially, the problem of refugees, “exiles”, hostages. One of the latest is the monograph “The Jews and the Ukrainians: Millennium of Coexistence” (Magochii & Petrovskiy-Shtern, 2018). The authors set the objective of dispelling mutual stereotypes and prejudices common both among the part of the Ukrainian society and certain groups of the Jews outside Ukraine regarding international relations in the region.

**The purpose** of the study is to analyze the policy of the Russian Empire towards the Jewish population of Eastern Galicia during World War I from August of 1914 till June of 1915.

**The Basic Material Statement.** Galician lands became the main arena in the Eastern Theater of War. The confrontation between the warring sides led to the economic destruction and the sustainable way of life destruction of the region’s population. “This part of the region, as described by “The Dilo” newspaper, is now presented as if it were deserted; villages and whole forests have disappeared from the ground, and as far as the eye can see, only the black soil, plowed by trenches” (Dilo, (4), 1915). The policy of tsarist Russia towards the Ukrainian lands was determined by the principle of imperial centrism and the suppression of any manifestations of separatism.

After a final occupation of Galicia in September and Bukovyna in October 1914, the Russian authorities liquidated the Austrian authorities and began to form their own administrative system under the “Provisional Regulations on the Administration of the Regions of Austria-Hungary under the Law of War”. “The Provisional Military Governor-General of Galicia” was established (RSMHA, f. 2003, d. 1, c. 1, p. 54), headed by Count G. Bobrinsky, which included four provinces: Lviv, Ternopil, Przemyśl and Chernivtsi with the division into 56 counties. To control the attitude of the Galician population towards the Russian occupation authorities and to detect “the places of a hostile resistance”, the “Provisional Gendarmerie Department under the Governor-General” was established, which was divided into 9 districts (RSMHA, f. 2003, d. 2. c. 539. pp. 9, 6–17).

The Russian occupation authorities included into the list of their “enemies” not only the Ukrainians, the Germans, but also the Jews, who, although were recognized as a separate nation, but without rights. The “settlement zone” continued to be applied to the Jews (the territory of a compact residence of the Jews in the Russian Empire, defined by the imperial government in order to prevent their penetration into the Greater Russian provinces to protect the Russian entrepreneurship from the Jewish rivalry, abolished only in February 1917). In support of these words, we can cite a memorandum to the Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Russian troops from the Director of the Diplomatic Chancellery, M. Basili,

who emphasized the hostility of the Jews to the Russian army, which was manifested in concealing food or selling it at speculative prices. It was noted that the Jews owned 35% of landlordism (Международные отношения в эпоху империализма..., С. 335-336, 337).

In his letter, General M. Bonch-Bruievych informed the Chief of Staff of the Russian Army, M. Yanushevych, that the Russian Empire was full of hostile deported subjects, who needed accurate registration, so that this hostile element could be completely eliminated after the war (Lohr, 2003). This fact one more time confirms the idea that anti-Semitism and xenophobia prevailed among the military leadership, as well as, among other high-ranking government officials. At the end of the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth centuries the Jewish national minority in the Russian Empire reached 5 million people, representing 4.16% of the total population (Natans, 2007, p. 208). Whereas at the beginning of the XXth century, in the Galician lands there lived more than 700 thousand of the Jews, which was respectively – 12.3% of the total population (Wrobel, 1994, p. 139).

Historically, the Jews were the subject to various legal restrictions in their place of residence and occupation in the Russian Empire. This fact caused the idea formation of an enemy of “a nation at war” (Lohr, 2001, p. 405). It should be noted that the legal insecurity of the Jews and persons belonging to other national minorities led to wrongful actions on the part of both the state and the common people, which led to interethnic conflicts.

At the end of 1914, in 1915, the Russian military joined the forced eviction of “hostile” people from the front line, which “was one of the first cases of a large-scale resettlement at the initiative of the state” (Bilous, 2011, pp. 69–70). At the same time, the Cossack army units took part in the pogroms of the Jewish estates from the beginning of the hostilities in Galicia and Bukovyna.

On September 7, 1914, the head of Rohatyn County informed the Governor of Lviv: “Everywhere in the county there is a picture of the complete destruction of landlords and Jewish estates, the property in these estates, if not looted, then destroyed. Cultivation and sowing of fields, as well as, harvesting are hampered by the lack of horses, vehicles confiscated first by the Austrian and then by our troops” (SALR, f. 907, d. 1, c. 33, pp. 2–3). Many owners of farms in Ternopil district, Stanislavshchyna and Lvivshchyna left their estates and were forced to migrate to the central territories of the Austrian Empire. These farms were looted and destroyed by the Russian troops “a crowd of soldiers headed (led – ed.) by the Cossacks, rushed, primarily, to the Jewish shops and abandoned apartments and the Russian officers not only allowed the looting, but even encouraged and participated in them” (Pid rosiiskym naizdom, 1915, p. 2). Thus, in the village of Mershenivka, Borshchiv district, V. Hert’s filvarok was destroyed, the damage was at the price of 605 000 crowns (CSHAUL, f. 191, d. 3, c. 14, pp. 17–19). In the village of Kudryntsi in the same county, Leiba Bartfeld’s filvaroks were severely damaged. All residential buildings were burned to the ground and the damage was at the price of 103 000 crowns (CSHAUL, f. 191, d. 3, c. 15, pp. 8–10).

There are many cases when during the retreat of the Austro-Hungarian troops the peasants also resorted to looting and arson of the estates of landlords and tenants. Thus, in September 1914, the estate of the landlady, A. Zaeman, in the village of Skomorohy Novi, Berezhany district, was destroyed (Diadychenko, 1967, p. 523).

M. Hankevych, Galician public and political figure, mocked the Russian politicians, who believed that the tsar was an ally of “Western European democracy”, who headed a “liberation war” against “the German imperialism” to defend “culture and civilization”. “... proof of a highly cultural mission – pogroms of the Jews have already taken place in Lviv. Leaders

of tsarist troops allow peasants (Galician peasants), and even order, to plunder manors and Jewish shops and inns. Peasants, who do not want to follow the orders of the tsarist demagogues, are killed as friends of the Jews, as servants of the Austrian army” (Hankevych, 1915, p. 6). Thus, the army leadership had all the leverage to prevent and stop violence at the territory under its control, but did not do so.

The withdrawal of the Russian troops from Galicia in April 1915 led to the evacuation of the civilian population. The flow of refugees increased as the army moved further to the East. In order to streamline this process, the command of the South-Western Front authorized the governors of Podilsk and Volyn to deal with the problems of refugees, who were granted a loan of 100 000 rubles (CSHAUK, f. 361, d. 1, c. 546, p. 35). The situation with refugees became an acute state problem, so the Russian Duma, in September of 1915, passed the law “On Meeting the Needs of Refugees”. Refugees were those, who had left areas threatened by the enemy, or had already been occupied by the enemy, also evicted by order of military or civilian authorities from the area of the hostilities, natives of hostile to Russia states, with the exception of foreigners – the subjects of the German or Austro-Hungarian state, who were evicted from the war zone administratively under police supervision, who were not considered refugees (Zakony i rasporyazheniya o bezhencah, 1916, pp. 2, 3). In the Russian Empire, in addition to refugees, there was a separate category of deported Jews from Galicia, who were deported as “unreliable” (Holkvist, 1998, pp. 26–54).

According to the calculations of E. Volkov, a researcher, at the end of 1917 the number of refugees and immigrants from the western fronts of the Russian Empire was 7 421 000 people (Volkov, 1930, p. 72). Of this total, deported Jewish population was approximately from 500 000 to 1 million (Lohr, 2001, p. 64). According to the data of T. Lazanska, the Ukrainian researcher, the number of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Galicia to the Russian Empire was 350 thousand people (Lazanska, 2009, p. 211). The Jews were often accused of spying for the Austrian troops and hiding defectors from the ranks of the Russian army or prisoners. This was, primarily, due to the desire of the population to resist the violent actions of the occupying power, looting and arbitrariness of regular army units, especially when the population lived near the front line. The Russian officials and the military command, in fact, blamed the Jews for all their troubles and defeats at the front, considering them, perhaps, Russia’s greatest enemies (Yakhontov, 1926, p. 43).

Not only the occupation power but also the Russian intelligentsia was convinced of the treachery of Judaism. Illustrative in this respect is the opinion of the famous Russian lawyer, V. Maklakov, who was a defender of M. Beyliss at the trial of 1913, who emphasized the hostility of the Jews of Galicia towards the Russians (Ansky, 2002, p. 20).

Another legal restriction on Judaism was the ban on entry and free movement at the territory of Galicia, which was introduced in mid-February of 1915. Violators of Governor-General G. Bobrynsky’s order were fined or imprisoned (Petrovych, 1915, pp. 114–115).

Administrative evictions were used for most people, whose stay in the province was considered “harmful” by the occupying authorities. Thus, before the loss of Sniatyn, the Russian troops captured “more than 3 000 Jews, many of them women, children, the weak, and the elderly. It was a terrifying wave when a whole crowd of poor people, under a storm of whips and sabers, started to move to Zalishchyky. In Sniatyn there is still no news about their fate” (Ukrainske slovo, 1918, p. 3). The sporadic deportation of the Jewish population to the interior of Russia from the war zone began in January of 1915, and from May of 1915 the resettlement became widespread and lasted until September.

According to the commander of the 11th Army, D. Shcherbachev, the expulsion of the Jewish population to the Russian Empire was economically impractical and dangerous, because they “spread... a contagion of both political and infectious nature...”. Therefore, it was proposed to direct the flow of migrants to the border with Romania, but these proposals were not approved by the head of the Galicia-Bukovyna Governor-General G. Bobrynsky (CSHAUK, f. 361, d. 1, c. 674, pp. 78, 80).

Due to the aggravated situation on the South-Western Front in May of 1915, the deportation of the Jewish population also took place in the eastern Galician counties. Ternopil counties were overcrowded with the Jewish immigrants. They were under constant government surveillance. According to the report of Ternopil Governor I. Czartoryski, there were 300 deported Jews in Zbarazh County and 700 deported Jews in Skalat County. A similar situation was observed in Buchach, Chortkiv and other counties. In the newspaper “Dilo” it was written: “The Jews are terribly depressed...” (Rosyiane v Buchachy, 1915, p. 3)

The epidemiological situation was terrible in the region. The migration of large masses of the population, living in unsanitary conditions led to the spread of diseases such as typhus, dysentery, smallpox. Typhus spread “... in the communities of Hryniv, Polianka, Yablonytsa, Perekhresne, Stebne, Fereskulia of Kosiv district. There was lack of doctors and sanitary care” (Shcho diiet sia na Ukraini, 1915, p. 4).

It should be noted that the spread of tuberculosis, which affected up to a quarter of the Jewish population of Eastern Galicia, became threatening (Pohrebynska, 1997, p. 31).

It was common practice for well-known Jews to take a written undertaking not to leave, forcing them to be loyal to the authorities, otherwise they and their families were in danger of being imprisoned or executed, and their property could be confiscated by the end of the war (Lohr, 2001, p. 413). On September 3, the Russian troops entered Lviv. According to the occupation conditions of the city, 16 hostages had to be taken (four representatives: each from the Ukrainians, the Old Rusyns, the Poles and the Jews) and giving back weapons and ammunition by the population. The hostages were settled in separate rooms at the George Hotel. They were responsible for any anti-Russian actions (Organizatsyia ladu v misti Lvovi, 1914, pp. 1–3; V okupovanii terytorii, 1914. pp. 1–2).

Denunciations on the Jews for a reward, loyalty of the authorities and getting rid of rivalry were widespread.

Galician magazines of 1915 – 1916 published the lists of people deported by the Russians. Thus, in October 1915, the newspaper “Dilo” reported that the hostages, who had been taken to Kyiv from Lviv, appealed to the Supreme Command to return to their hometown, since the purpose for which they were taken was not topical, “because there are no more Russian troops in Lviv, there is no need to guarantee the loyal behaviour of the local population”. Among the list of hostages we find the surnames of not only the Ukrainians and the Poles, but also famous and wealthy Jews: the rector of Lviv University, professor of physiology, Dr. Adolf Beck, a member of the Lawyer Association, the head of the Jewish community, Dr. Jacob Diamand, the chief physician of the eye clinic, the secretary of the Galician Chamber Maurice Oberlander, the printer Arthur Goldman, the merchants Isaac Shore, Samuel Pordes, Leo Goldman, Simon Feller, Bernard Brightman and Jacob Schreiber, manufacturers Solomon Goldfrucht, Moses Seckler, a landowner Michel Berl (Lvivski zakladnymy v Kyievi, 1915, p. 2). In Kyiv, the Jewish hostages lived in private houses and every morning they had to come to the police commissariats of the districts, in which they lived (Vyvezeni halychany, 1916, p. 3).

In the lists of the Jews replaced from Stanislaviv, we find the surnames of the lawyer, Solomon Gelekhrtret; the owner of the printing house and bookstore, Eisig Weiderfeld; the railway conductor, Moses Imbermann; the students Adolf Rosenstrach, Leopold Pistreich and 27 merchants and intermediaries (Kurjer Lwowski, 1915, p. 5).

By Order of General M. Ivanov, Commander-in-Chief of the South-Western Front, at the beginning of 1915 the Jews were resettled to Left-Bank Ukraine in Poltava and Chernihiv provinces, partly in Kyiv, Kherson and Tavriya provinces, except the Crimea (Galperin, 2008). In addition, according to statistics, the percentage of the Jewish population from the occupied territories, in Russia the “settlement zone” was the following: 17% – Central Russia, 14% – Volga region, 7% – the Urals and Siberia (Gatrell, 1999, p. 146).

As the situation at the front became more complicated, tsarist Russia’s policy of the Jews resettlement to the East changed, allowing them to return home and stay out of the “settlement zone” if a ransom was paid for them, except for the territories, where regular military units were located according to the circular “Collection of Laws and Orders of the Government”, which was published on August 21, 1915. It should be noted that very often local officials executed such orders at their own discretion (CSHAUK, f. 1010, d.1, c. 59, pp. 207, 249, 281–283).

In the autumn of 1915, by Order of the Commander-in-Chief of the South-Western Front, a commission was organized, headed by General A. von Knorring, to deal with the cases of displaced persons and hostages. The commission clarified the state of detention, the place, verification of documents of residents displaced from Galicia, as well as the release of people, who had been resettled from the front line.

The occupation of Lviv by the Russian army, especially at the initial stage of the establishment of the administrative administration of Galicia and Bukovyna, gave impact to the Jewish pogroms. Violence was accompanied by looting and murder, and in the middle of September of 1914, 49 people were subjected to physical torture, the majority of them was the Jews, in addition, there was property confiscation, eviction and destruction of the Jewish houses. Such manifestations of violence by the Russian army took place in many cities and towns of the region (Petrovych, 1915, p. 115).

Moses Tanenbaum, the city secretary of Bukovyna town of Kitzman, wrote about the abuse of the Russian soldiers during the escort of the Jewish hostages to Galicia, “... the old men were beaten to blood by the Cossacks. They used to stab with spears when the Jews did not go quickly. Even children were not spared. [...] Some of the unfortunate fell from hunger and fatigue. [...] Cholera spread in Ulashkivtsi, Ozeriany, Tovste and Chortkiv, where the Jews resettled from Zalishchyky lived in huts and stables. [...] about 1000 died. [...] The Jews were taken to work forcibly, i.e., digging ditches along the banks of the Seret. [...] those people worked from 6 a. m. till 8 p.m. The Cossacks beat them incessantly. They were not allowed to eat. They were promised only 50 kopicks per day and even that sum was not paid. Violence was on the agenda. 30 women and girls were raped in Ulashkivtsi one day” (Ukrainske slovo, 1916, pp. 2–3). Marauders, looting of shops, smashing of windows and beating of the Jews were a mass phenomenon.

With the beginning of the hostilities in August of 1914 in Husiatyn County, the estate of the Jewish rabbi David Friedban was ruined completely, the Synagogue was severely damaged. There was no Jewish population, who remained in the town (Vanchura, etc., 2003, p. 81). The Cossack army was involved into almost all Jewish pogroms. The place, where the Cossacks appeared on the horizon, the local population expected violence there.

The attitude of the Russian military administration towards the Jewish population at the occupied territories of Galicia and Bukovyna raised a wave of discontent in the international arena. The United States criticized Russia's policy, which affected the receiving of loans, interstate trade.

The Russian intelligentsia, such as M. Gorky, F. Sologub and other prominent figures, who founded the Society for the Study of the Jewish life, also opposed this Russian policy. The society aimed at acquainting the public with the life of the Jews and counteracting the anti-Semitic manifestations among the Russian society (Kel'ner, 2004, pp. 11–40).

Tsarist Russia's policy concerning the local population and national minorities on the South-West Front not only affected the front's military command negatively, but also weakened discipline among the Russian army, resulting in violence against the people of Eastern Galicia and failure on the front lines.

**The Conclusions.** The situation of the Jewish population is considered through the prism of the activities of the Russian military and civilian administrations in the occupied territories of Eastern Galicia. The war caused the displacement of the civilian population, which caused tension in the society and deterioration in relations among various national groups living in the area. The deportation of the Jews caused food crisis in some provinces (Chernihiv, Katerynoslav and Poltava), which led to the confrontation with the locals because the Jews were willing to work for lower wages. There was rivalry at the labour market. A social category emerged among the Jews – refugees, who were forced to leave their homes because of the hostilities.

The prospects for further research require a broad study of the Jewish issue in the context of the anti-Semitic policies of the Russian autocracy during World War I.

**Acknowledgments.** We express a sincere gratitude to all the members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for publishing. Special thanks to Rector of Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi National Army Academy for the support.

**Funding.** The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Ansky, S.** (2002). *The Enemy at His Pleasure: A Journey through the Jewish Pale of Settlement during World War I*. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 327 p. [in English]

**Bakhturina, A.Yu.** (2000). *Politika Rossiyskoy imperii v Vostochnoy Galitsii v gody Pervoy mirovoy voyny [The policy of the Russian Empire in Eastern Galicia during World War I]*. Moskva: AIRO-XX, 263 p. [in Russian]

**Bilous, L.** (2011) Deportatsiia yevreiskoho naseleennia na terytorii Rosiiskoi imperii pid chas Pershoi svitovoi viiny [Deportation of the Jewish population at the territory Russian Empire during World War I]. *Ukrains'kyj istorychnyj zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, (2), 65–79. [in Ukrainian]

**Dashkevych, Ya.** (1990) Vzaiemovidnosyny mizh ukrainskym ta yevreiskym naseleнням u Skhidnii Halychyni (kin. XIX – poch. XX st.) [Relations between the Ukrainian and Jewish Population in Eastern Galicia (the end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th centuries)]. *Ukrains'kyj istorychnyj zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 10, 63–73 [in Ukrainian].

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Lvivskoi oblasti [State Archives of Lviv Region – SALR].*

**Diadychenko, V. A.** (Ed.) (1967) *Istoriia selianstva Ukrainiskoi RSR. Vid naidavnishykh chasiv do Velykoi zhovtnevoi sotsialistychnoi revoliutsii* (Vol. 1). Kyiv: NVP “Vydavnytstvo “Naukova dumka” NAN Ukrainy”, 561 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Dilo.** (1915). *Dilo*, 30.01, 4. [in Ukrainian]

**Galperin, B. D.** (2008). *Osobyje zhurnaly Soveta ministrov Rossiyskoy imperii. 1909 – 1917 gg. 1915 god [Special journals of the Russian Empire Council of Ministers. 1909 – 1917. 1915]*. Moskva: ROSSPEN, 715 p. [in Russian]

**Gatrell, P.** (1999). *A Whole Empire Walking. Refugees in Russia during World War I*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 318 p. [in English]

**Goldin, S.** (2005) Deportatsii russkoy armiyey evreev iz Kovenskoy i Kurlyandskoy guberniy (aprel – may 1915) [The Jews Deportation from the Kurland and Koven provinces by the Russian army (April-May 1915)]. *Abstracts of Papers '05: Yevrei v menyayushchemsya mire*. (pp. 260-265). Riga. [in Russian]

**Hankevych, M.** (1915) Pid teperishniu khvyliu [Under the present wave]. *Visnyk Soiuzu vyzvolennia Ukrainy – Bulletin of the Union of Liberation of Ukraine*. Vienna, 21–22, 6. [in Ukrainian]

**Holkvist, P.** (1998) Russian catastrophe (1914 – 1921) in European context. Total mobilization and “population policy”. *Rossiia XXI, 11/12*, 26–54. [in Russian]

**Ioffe, G.Z.** (2001) Vyselenie evreev iz prifrontovoy polosy v 1915 godu [The eviction of the Jews from the frontline in 1915]. *Voprosy istorii – Questions of history*, 9, 85–97. [in Russian]

**Kel'ner, V.** (2004) The Jewish Question and Russian Social Life During World War I. *Russian Studies in History*, 43, 11–40. [in English]

**Kurjer Lwowski.** (1915). *Kurjer Lwowski [Lviv courier]*, 25.09, 5. [in Polish]

**Lazanska, T. I.** (2009). Stanovyshche bizhentsiv Ukrainy v roky Pershoi svitovoi viiny [The situation of refugees of Ukraine during World War I]. *Problemy istorii Ukrainy XIX – XX st. – Problems of the History of Ukraine in the 19th and 20th centuries*, XVI, 196–240. [in Ukrainian]

**Lohr, E.** (2003). *Nationalizing the Russian Empire: The Campaign Against Enemy Aliens during World War I*. Harvard: Harvard University Press. 237 p. [in English]

**Lvivski zakladnymy v Kyievi.** (1915). Lvivski zakladnymy v Kyievi [Lviv people like hostages in Kiev]. *Dilo*, 29.10, 2. [in Ukrainian]

**Magochii, P.-R. & Petrovskiy-Shtern, Y.** (2018) *Yevrei ta ukraintsi : tysiacholittia spivismuvannia [The Jews and the Ukrainians: millennia of coexistence]*. Uzhhorod: Vydavnytstvo Valeriia Padiaka, 338 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Melamed, V.** (1994) *Yevrei vo Lvove (XIII – pervaya polovina XX veka): sobytiya, obshchestvo, lyudi [The Jews in Lviv (XIII – first half of XX century): events, society, people.]*. Lvov: TEKOP, 263 p. [in Russian]

**Naselenie imperii.** (1897). *Naselenie imperii po perepisi 28-go yanvarya 1897 goda po uezdnam [The population of the empire according to the census of January 28, 1897 by counties]*. St. Petersburg, 30 p. [in Russian]

**Natans, B.** (2007). *Za chertoy. Yevrei vstrechayutsya s pozdneimperskoy Rossiey [Behind the line. The Jews meet with late imperial Russia]*. Moskva: ROSSPEN, 436 p. [in Russian]

**Nelipovich, S. G.** (2005) Nemtsy Varshavy v Pervoy mirovoy voyne 1914 – 1918 gg. [The Germans of Warsaw in the First World War 1914 – 1918]. *Abstracts of Papers '05: Rossiyskie nemtsy v inonatsionalnom okruzhenii: problemy adaptatsii, vzaimovlianiya, tolerantnosti*. (pp. 261–279). Moskva. [in Russian]

**Nelipovich, S. G.** (2009). Voennoe vedomstvo i mennonity Rossii v Pervoy mirovoy voyne (1914 – 1918 gg.) [The War Department and Mennonites of Russia during the First World War (1914 – 1918)]. *Abstracts of Papers '09: Etnicheskie nemtsy Rossii: Istoricheskiy fenomen “naroda v puti”*. (pp. 85–103). Moskva. [in Russian]

**Organizatsiya ladu v misti Lvovi.** (1914). Organizatsiya ladu v misti Lvovi [Organization of order in Lviv]. *Dilo*, 2.09. 1–3. [in Ukrainian]

**Petrovych, I.** (1915) *Halychyna pid chas rosiiskoi okupatsii: serpen 1914 – cherven 1915 [Galicia during the Russian occupation: August of 1914 – June 1915]*. Viden': “Politychna biblioteka”, 116 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Pid rosiiskym naizdom.** (1915). Pid rosiiskym naizdom [Under Russian occupation]. *Dilo*. 25.12, 2. [in Ukrainian]

**Pohrebynska, I. M. & Hon, M. M.** (1997). *Yevrei v Zakhidnoukrainskii Narodnii Respublitsi (do problemy ukrainsko-ievreiskykh vzaiemyn) [Jews in the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (to the Problem of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations)]*. Kyiv: NAN Ukrainy, Instytut natsionalnykh vidnosyn i politolohii, 86 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Reient, O.** (2007). Ukraina v Pershii svitovii viini: suchasni naukovo-metodolohichni aktsenty. *Problemy istorii Ukrainy: fakty, sudzhennia, poshuky – Problems of Ukrainian history: facts, judgments, searches*, 16, 88–103. [in Ukrainian]

*Rosiiskyi derzhavnyi viiskovo-istorychnyi arkhiv [Russian State Military History Archive – RSMHA].*

**Rosyiane v Buchachy.** (1915). Rosyiane v Buchachy [The Russians in Buchach]. *Dilo*, 20.02, 3. [in Ukrainian]

**Shcheda, H.V.** (2005). Ohliad dzherel ta literatury z problemy bizhentsiv v Ukraini u period Pershoi svitovoi viiny [Sources and literature on refugee problems in Ukraine during the First World War review]. *Problemy istorii Ukrainy XIX – pochatku XX st. – History of Ukraine problems of the 19th – beginning of the 20th centuries*, 9, 136–146. [in Ukrainian]

**Semeniv, V.** (Comps.) (2018). *Moskovska okupatsiia Halychyny v 1914 – 1917 rr. v svidchenniakh suchasnykiv [Moscow's occupation of Galicia in 1914 – 1917 in the testimony of contemporaries]*. Lviv: Apriori, 256 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Serdiuk, O.V.** (2002). Bizhenstvo v Ukraini pid chas Pershoi svitovoi viiny [Refugees in Ukraine during World War I]. *Problemy istorii Ukrainy XIX – pochatku XX st. – History of Ukraine problems of the 19th – beginning of the 20th centuries*, 4, 111–132. [in Ukrainian]

**Shcho diiet sia na Vkraini.** (1915). Shcho diiet sia na Vkraini [What is happening in Ukraine]. *Dilo*, 5.06, 4. [in Ukrainian]

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy u m. Lvovi [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Lviv – CSHAUL]*

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, Kyiv [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv – CSHAUK]*

**Ukrainske slovo.** (1916). *Ukrainske slovo [Ukrainian word]*, 30.01, 2–3. [in Ukrainian]

**Ukrainske slovo.** (1918). *Ukrainske slovo [Ukrainian word]*, 08.08, 3. [in Ukrainian]

**V okupovanii terytorii.** (1914). V okupovanii terytorii [In the occupied territory]. *Dilo*, 5.09, 1–2. [in Ukrainian]

**Vanchura, U., Kytior P. & Melnychuk, Kh.** (2003). *Zemlia Ternopil'ska: turystychnyi putivnyk [Ternopil land: tourist guide]*. Ternopil: Dzhura, 368 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Volkov, Ye. Z.** (1930). *Dinamika narodonaseleniya SSSR za vosemdesyat let [The eighty years USSR population dynamics]*. Moskva-Leningrad, 271 p. [in Russian]

**Vyvezeni halychany.** (1916). Vyvezeni halychany [Exported Halicians]. *Dilo*, 25.01, 3. [in Ukrainian]

**Wrobel, P.** (1994). The Jews of Galicia under Austrian-Polish Rule, 1867 – 1918. *Austrian History Yearbook*, XXV, 977–139. URL: [http://www.jewishgen.org/galicia/html/jews\\_of\\_galicia.pdf](http://www.jewishgen.org/galicia/html/jews_of_galicia.pdf). [in English]

**Yakhontov, A. N.** (1926) Tyazhelye dni (Sekretnye zasedaniya Soveta ministrov 16 iyulya – 2 sentyabrya 1915 g.) [Hard days (Secret meetings of the Council of Ministers July 16 – September 2, 1915)]. *Arkhir russoy revolyutsii (XVIII)*. Berlin. [in Russian]

**Zakony i rasporyazheniya o bezhencah.** (1916). *Zakony i rasporyazheniya o bezhencah [Refugee laws and regulations]*. Vyp. 1. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo yuridicheskogo otdela Glavnogo komiteta Vserossijskogo soyuza gorodov. 2-e izd., dop., 103 p. [in Russian]

**Zhvanko, L. M.** (2008). Bizhenstvo Pershoi svitovoi viiny: istoriohrafia problemy chy problemy istorii? [World War I refugees: a historiography of a problem or a problem of history?]. *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini – Historiographic studies in Ukraine*, 18, 380–392. [in Ukrainian]

*Международные отношения в эпоху империализма: документы из архивов царского и Временного правительств 1878 – 1917 гг.: Серия 3: 1914 – 1917. Т.6: 5 августа 1914 г. – 13 января 1915 г. Часть 1 (1935), Москва, 483 с.*

*The article was received on February 06, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94(570+471)-054.73“1914/1918”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226510

**Tetiana KOVALENKO**

*PhD (History), Senior Lecturer of the Department of Social and Economic Disciplines of International Education Institute for Study and Research and the Department of Modern and Contemporary History of School of History of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 4 Svobody Square, Kharkiv, Ukraine, Ukraine, postal code 61022 (teti.kovalenko@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-8309-8071

**ResearcherID:** AAH-6318-2019

**Тетяна КОВАЛЕНКО**

*кандидат історичних наук, старший викладач кафедри соціально-економічних дисциплін Навчально-наукового інституту міжнародної освіти та кафедри нової та новітньої історії історичного факультету Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна, пл. Свободи 4, м. Харків, Україна, індекс 61022, (teti.kovalenko@gmail.com)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Kovalenko, T. (2021). War beyond the Frontline: Refugees in Internal Governorates of the Russian Empire during the First World War. *Skhidnoieuropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 98–106. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226510

**WAR BEYOND THE FRONTLINE: REFUGEES  
IN INTERNAL GOVERNORATES OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE  
DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research is to discover the causes and character of mass migration and refugees at the territory of the Russian Empire during World War I, as well as to analyze the state policy in the field of refugees' care and to define the role of community and national aid organizations in it. The research methodology is based on the principles of historicism, objectivity, system-formation, and the use of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, retrospective, perspective, generalization) and special historical (historical genetic, historical typological, historical systemic, historical comparative) methods. The scientific novelty of the article is that the number of refugees, the legislative regulation of the organization of help to these victims of war, the conditions and effectiveness of the work of the state, community and national committees in the field of refugee care, and some individual components of their daily lives were determined on the basis of previously unknown archival and printed documents. The Conclusions.* *The consequences of the mass and forced evacuation of the population from Western provinces of the Russian Empire were tragic. The authorities themselves initiated the local residents eviction, explaining it by the demands of the war, and then took responsibility to provide them with aid and financed it. The counting on their quick return home after several successful military operations turned out to be wrong, and millions of people turned into refugees remained helpless and in need of help for a long time. The situation required not only state institutions to be involved in the work, because the state alone could not cope with the problem. Refugee care was held by the Russian community organisations and national committees of aid to the victims of the war (Ukrainian, Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian, etc.). Despite the work undertaken by the Russian authorities in the field of providing comprehensive social support to refugees, cooperation between the authorities and various aid organizations has been complicated, but not only by incomprehensible legislation. The cumbersome bureaucratic apparatus of the Russian Empire, the crisis of the authorities hampered promptness, while the refugees demanded immediate assistance.*

**Key words:** *refugees, aid organizations, the Russian Empire, World War I, state, community and national committees.*

## ВІЙНА ЗА МЕЖАМИ ФРОНТУ: БІЖЕНЦІ У ВНУТРІШНІХ ГУБЕРНІЯХ РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ІМПЕРІЇ В РОКИ ПЕРШОЇ СВІТОВОЇ ВІЙНИ

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* – визначити причини та характер масового біженства на території Російської імперії за часів Першої світової війни, а також проаналізувати державну політику в галузі опіки над біженцями й визначити в ній роль громадських та національних організацій допомоги. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах історизму, об'єктивності та системності, а також на використанні загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, ретроспектива, перспектива, узагальнення) та спеціально-історичних (історико-генетичний, історико-типологічний, історико-системний, історико-порівняльний) методів. **Наукова новизна статті** полягає у тому, що на основі невідомих раніше архівних та друкованих документів з'ясовано кількість біженців, правову регламентацію організації допомоги цим жертвам війни, умови та ефективність роботи державних, громадських та національних комітетів у сфері опіки біженців, окремі складові їх повсякденного життя. **Висновки.** Наслідки масової примусової евакуації населення західних губерній Російської імперії та часто безпорадність російської влади, яка спочатку ініціювала та профінансувала виселення місцевих мешканців, пояснюючи його вимогами війни, а потім взяла на себе організацію їм допомоги, були катастрофічними. Розрахунок на їхнє швидке повернення додому після кількох вдалих воєнних операцій виявився хибним, а мільйони перетворених на біженців людей вимагали залучення до роботи не тільки державних установ. Опікою біженців займалися російські громадські організації та національні комітети допомоги жертвам війни (польські, литовські, латиські тощо). Незважаючи на роботу проведену російською владою в сфері забезпечення всебічної соціальної допомоги біженцям, співпраця між ланками влади та різними організаціями допомоги була ускладнена, але не тільки небездоганним законодавством. Громіздкий бюрократичний апарат Російської імперії, криза органів влади заважали оперативності, тоді як біженці вимагали негайної допомоги.

**Ключові слова:** біженці, організація допомоги, Російська імперія, Перша світова війна, державні, громадські, національні комітети.

**The Problem Statement.** One of the consequences of World War I was the civilian mass migration and refugees. The United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands took care of Belgian refugees. The problem also emerged in Germany, where the entry of the French army into Alsace on the Western Front and the Russians into Prussia on the Eastern Front led to the appearance of refugees. The Austro-Hungarian authorities expelled Eastern Galicia inhabitants of towns and villages that were the part of the battle area zone. However, it was in the Russian Empire where refugee received unprecedented numbers of resettled people and in most cases it was forced.

**The purpose of publication** is to discover the causes and character of mass refugees' migration at the territory of the Russian Empire during World War I, as well as to analyze the state policy in the field of support of refugees and to determine in it the role of community and national aid organizations.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches.** Refugee (the term used was “bezhenstv” or “refugeedom”) in the Russian Empire during World War I was studied in the Ukrainian historiography (Lykhachova, 2010; Serdiuk, 2002; Zhvanko, 2012, etc.), by the Belarusian (Samatyua, 2003), by the Polish (Korzeniowski, Mądzik, Tarasiuk, 2007), British (Gatrell, 1999, 2000, 2015), by the Russian (Kurtsev, 1999, Shcherov, 2000, Tsovyan, 2005, etc.) researchers. In their works, scholars cover a large number of people – both refugees and all those involved in helping them. There exists a trend toward regionalization of a study. However, the subject matter is extremely multifaceted, that is why so many aspects are still covered by scholars insufficiently. It has a diverse source base, which is widely represented by the Ukrainian, Belarusian, Polish, Lithuanian, Russian archives, periodicals, memoirs, legal acts waiting for researchers.

**The Basic Material Statement.** Since the beginning of the military conflict, the inhabitants of Western provinces of the Russian Empire, frightened by the deepening of the front line, hastily fled their homes. People, mostly peasants, were hiding in woods or in neighboring villages outside the enemy's fire. They did not want to stay far from home (State Archive of the Russian Federation, f. 651, d. 1, c. 39, p. 17). Among the inhabitants of Western provinces of the Russian Empire there was only a small number of people, who moved to the interior regions of the country (on their own initiative and at their own expense). In most cases, they were housed with relatives or rented temporary accommodation. Few of them, who were suffering from need, were helped by local people and charitable organizations (e.g., Komitet Eye Imperatorskogo Vysochestva Velikoy Knyazhny Tatiany Nikolayevny po okazaniyu vremennoy pomoshchi postradavshim ot voyennykh deystviy (the Committee of Her Imperial Highness the Grand Duchess Tatiana Nikolaevna for the Temporary Relief of Victims of War, hereinafter referred to as the Tatiana Committee) that was founded on September 14, 1914). Thus, with the exception of the eviction of people of Russia belligerent states and the Jews because of spying charges by the summer of 1915, a spontaneous shortage of refugees prevailed among the population of the frontline zone, which was caused by the voluntary desire of people to stay away from military actions.

However, in the summer of 1915, refugee resettlement took a completely different character. The fact is that under the conditions of war, extraordinary powers were given to the Russian High Command by law, and therefore the right to control fully all spheres of life at the theater of military action. Consequently, after the beginning of the Russian army retreat after its defeat from the Austro-Hungarian and German troops in the spring and summer of 1915, it became possible for Stavka (the High Command of the armed forces in the Russian Empire) to make a decision to evacuate the population of the frontier provinces. The fact is that the Russian High Command believed that the enemy, who got to the devastated area, was experiencing difficulties in food, troop housing, etc.

“What cannot be taken away is to be destroyed,” – stated in the military order (Russian State Military Historical Archive – RSMHA, f. 2005, d. 1, c. 42, p. 9). Particular emphasis was placed on men of conscription age, who were considered to be potential soldiers (those who could be mobilized into the enemy's army). The order of the house-to-house and forced eviction of residents of the frontier provinces led to the fact that the refugee had acquired a scale to which the state was not ready. Finally, on June 26, 1915 the Supreme Commander ordered to cancel total forced eviction and the destruction of the property of the frontline residents immediately. However, exceptions were provided for situations where combat conditions and military objectives required it (RSMHA, f. 2005, d. 1, c. 42, p. 7). Therefore, there was room for arbitrariness of individual ranks.

The decision of the military immediately provoked ambiguous reaction in the Russian political circles. Negative effects of forced refugee were emphasized at the meetings of the Council of Ministers. The Minister of Internal Affairs Nikolay Shcherbatov fairly noted: “Women and children will leave their houses together with men. Millions will come to us to starve,” – at the same time, cynically adding: “May better die under the German's heel” (Galperina, 1999, p. 260).

Evacuating the population of the frontline provinces, the authorities counted on their rapid return home. “Everyone is convinced that the territories captured by the enemy will soon return to us,” – said the head of the Tatiana Committee in late September of 1915 Aleksey Neydhardt (SARF, f. P-3333, d. 2, c. 1, p. 29). In general, armed forces High Command of the belligerent

states was confident of a short duration of the military actions. Generals of both sides supposed that the future conflict will take several weeks. The illusions about the quick re-evacuation of refugees were gradually dispelled. Already in November of 1915, there was no doubt that refugees could not be considered “short-term guests” (*Iz deyatelnosti*, 1915, p. 63). Already in the spring of 1916 refugees had one inexpugnable desire: to get home as soon as possible.

The Law on Ensuring the Needs of Refugees was adopted on August 30, 1915, from that time until November of 1917 the document defined the state care policy for refugees. A separate section of the document was The Regulations on Ensuring the Needs of Refugees, which regulated the basics of public policy in this field. Article 1 of the Regulation provided the definition of the term “*refugee*” by stating that he or she is “a person who has left the areas threatened or already occupied by the enemy or this person is evicted by military or civil authorities from the area of military action”. Refugee status also got “citizens from Russia’s belligerent states”, except for the people evicted from the area of military actions under the police surveillance (*Zakony*, 1916, p. 3).

The granting of refugee status to “citizens from Russia’s belligerent states” concerned the subjects of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires – Armenian refugees from Turkey and residents of Eastern Galicia. The first started arriving in the Caucasus from the end of 1914 (because of the Turks violence). In 1915 the evacuation continued. Eastern Galicia became a part of Russia at the beginning of the war as a result of military operations that were successful for the Russian army. After the accession on the territory of the region General Government of Galicia and Bukovyna was formed (headed by Georgiy Bobrinsky). National and spiritual kinship with the Galician-Ruthenian people was declared in the society of the Russian Empire, while Russian nationalists claimed that Galicia was “primordial Russian land”, inhabited by the “Russian” people (Haid, 2017, p. 207). Anyway, all those who came from there formally remained citizens of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Turkish Empire, the states with which the Russian Empire was at war. Giving the Galicians and the Turkish Armenians status of refugees, the Russian government has committed to provide them with everything they needed (about Russian government policy in relation to citizens of hostile states and the Russian citizens recognized unreliable because of their nationality or ethnic origin, see Lohr, 2003).

The inconsistency of that time and contemporary interpretation of the term “refugee” draws attention. Nowadays, the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (1951) and amendments to the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees (1967), developed on the initiative of the United Nations Organization, became generally accepted in international law. According to these documents, a refugee is a person “owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it” (Convention, n. d., p. 3). The latest the Global Compact for Migration was formally endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in 2018, and in particular, it relies on the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees of 1951 (Zhvanko, 2019, pp. 93–95).

The Ukrainians, the Belarusians, the Poles, the Russians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians were the subjects of the Russian Empire. They did not cross the state border (they were mostly displaced by military orders) and were not prosecuted on the grounds listed in the

Convention and the Protocol. But during World War I, there were no legal regulations to define and protect this category of population. The novelty of refugee status often blindsided politicians, professionals, and ordinary citizens – all those, who sought to determine their place in the country's traditional social structure. While their number required the rapid creation of a legal framework to provide refugees with their crucial needs, the regulation of the transition from charitable support to a comprehensive and multifaceted state aid system.

Somewhat different experience in terms of legislative regulation was gained by the Austro-Hungarian authorities, who were also evicting Eastern Galicia residents of cities and villages that were the part of the combat actions (especially in the spring of 1916 due to the so-called Brusilov Offensive). The term “vyselentsi” or “displaced people” was used in relation to the victims. The aid was provided at the expense of the Austro-Hungarian treasury (Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Lviv, f. 397, d. 1, c. 6, pp. 1–3). Generally, up to 2 million civilians were internally displaced between 1914 and 1918 in the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Thorpe, 2011, p. 103), which began the war on two fronts in 1914 – against Serbia in the Balkans and against Russia in the east. Already in May of 1915 with the entry of Italy into the war, the third front added.

Determining the number of refugees who settled in the Russian Empire interior provinces, we should pay attention to the fact that the official data are mainly related only to those, who needed help. In other words, all those, who could take care of themselves (though it was a minority) were out of registration. Refugees, especially children and the elderly, who died while moving because of illnesses (typhus, diphtheria), cold, severe conditions of movement, remain unaccounted. Therefore, it is almost impossible to determine the exact number of these people.

The mass arrival of refugees to the Russian Empire interior provinces began in July – August of 1915, reached its peak in September – October and almost ended in December of that year. An example is the number of refugee moving cards issued in Kharkiv province. In October of 1915 it was 4 500, in December of 1915 – 1 400, in January of 1916 – 1 600, in February of 1916 – 500, in May of 1916 – 381, September of 1916 – 60, in October of 1916 – 52, in November of 1916 – in total 19 (Kharkiv Region State Archive, f. 18, d. 21, c. 225, p. 5.). During 1916 – 1917, only a small number of refugees were moved with family reunion purpose. But the movement took place only with the permission of the governor of the destination territory, and such refugees were not deprived of financial aid only if the total number of those, who had already received it did not exceed 50% (according to the Ministry of Interior Affairs circular on June 24, 1916). The rule remained in force after the February Revolution (KRSA, f. 18, d. 21, s. 153, p. 74; KRSA, f. 18, d. 21, c. 225, p. 16; Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv, f. 917, d. 1, c. 15, p. 172).

The number of refugees was periodically calculated during 1915 – 1918 by special organizations, representatives of the Russian authorities, the Provisional Government, and later the Bolshevik leadership. However, the set data were never the same. According to the estimates of the Tatiana Committee, which was considered to be an official body for registration of refugees, on December 20, 1915, at the territory of the Russian Empire without the Transcaucasia 2 706 309 refugees were registered, which represented 1,83% of the indigenous population of these territories. Out of them, 2 496 640 people settled in the European Russia provinces (2,06% of the local population), while the others settled in Siberia, the Caucasus and Central Asian regions (Lubny-Gertsyk, 1926, p. 23).

On May 1, 1916, the Tatiana Committee recorded 3 095 604 refugees, 564 832 of which lived in provincial cities (KRSA, f. 18, d. 21, c. 142, p. 5). The Otdel po Ustroystvu Bezhentsev (the Department for the Provision of Refugees) of the Vserossiyskiy Zemskiy

Soyuz Pomoshchi Bolnym i Ranenym Voinam (the All-Russian Zemstvo Union of Aid to Sick and Wounded Warriors (hereinafter referred to as the Zemstvo Union)) and the Vserossiyskiy Soyuz Gorodov (the All-Russian Union of Towns (hereinafter referred to as the Union of Towns)) recorded 3,2 million refugees (RSMHA, f. 2005, d. 1, c. 42, p. 537). Analyzing the number of people, who fell into the category of refugees, the scholar Peter Gatrell says they accounted for 5% of the total population of the Russian Empire (Gatrell, 2000, p. 38).

The most populated province according to the amount of refugees was the Katerynoslav province (9,23% of the total number of refugees in the Russian Empire). It is worth noting that statisticians of that time considered not only the Russians, but also the Ukrainians and the Belarusians to be the “Russian refugees” and this group of refugees was the largest in terms of numbers. The Poles ranked second, i.e., 17–20% of the total number of refugees of all nationalities (more statistics in Lykhachova, 2010, pp. 67–72).

Aid to refugees was implemented under the general guidance of the Osoboe Soveshchanie po Ustroystvu Bezhentsev (the Special Council for the Provision of Refugees), which was subordinated to the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The state took charge of all the costs of meeting the refugee needs. The Minister of Internal Affairs as the head of the Special Council for the Provision of Refugees managed all state credits (Zakony, 1916, pp. 3–4). The institution included: members of the State Council and the State Duma; representatives of ministries (military, foreign affairs, interior affairs, finance, education, lines of communications, commerce and industry) as well as other government committees. In addition, a representative from the Tatiana Committee and the Russian Committee of the Red Cross, the Zemstvo Union and the Union of Towns, as well as leading national committees of refugees’ support took part in the work of the Special Council for the Provision of Refugees. In practice, such numbers only hindered prompt decision-making, while life required immediate solving of many issues.

Locally, rural and urban councils of the Russian community organizations, i.e., the Zemstvo Union and the Union of Towns, were in charge of refugees, with the right to involve both community leaders and refugees at their own discretion. Heads of the provincial committees were appointed by the Minister of Internal Affairs. Country, city and district inspectors were elected by the provincial committees (Zakony, 1916, p. 7). At the same time, the issue of interaction between central and local authorities remained without attention. In the future, this delayed the aid to refugees and sometimes even negated the efforts of local committees. Due to the inflexibility of the Russian Empire bureaucracy, funds were not provided in time, and the resolutions of the Special Council for the Provision of Refugees could be kept for months at various instances.

Another important issue left unattended by lawmakers was the definition of the role of the Zemstvo Union and the Union of Towns in the refugee social protection process. De jure government ensured committees’ work in the Special Council for the Provision of Refugees, but de facto it was impossible to influence its decisions (the state institution included only one representative from these organizations). So while Zemstvo Union and the Union of Towns were in charge of refugees, they accurately implemented instructions and circulars of to the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The reason was that the government saw a political opponent in the All-Russian Zemstvo Union and the Union of Towns during all the time of their existence, but the situation required to transfer some powers to them. The Russian state could not cope with the aid to the millions of refugees alone.

Of great importance was the fact that the state contributed to the work of national committees of refugees support (Ukrainian, Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian, Armenian, etc.).

They were an acceptable alternative to the Russian community organizations, which were considered to be a political opponent (the Zemstvo Union and the Union of Towns). And it was not the last thing that made the authorities encourage their work. Moreover, national committees had virtually free rein to claim the refugee as an emblematic figure of national victimhood, who might yet be saved on the nation's behalf (Gatrell, 2015, p. 700).

Some of them appeared at the beginning of World War I on the initiative of the local intelligentsia. In particular, this is how the Towarzystwo Pomocy Biednym Rodzinom Polakow Uczestniczących w Wojnie oraz Zubozalej przez Wojne Ludnosci Polskiej (Polskie Towarzystwo Pomocy Ofiarom Wojny, the Community for Aid to Poor Families of Poles Participating in the War and the Polish Population Impoverished by the War, the Polish Society for Assistance to War Victims) was founded in Petrograd in September of 1914 on the initiative of the Poles, who lived there before the war. The Committee was headed by a manufacturer Vladyslav Zhukovsky. Henryk Swiecicki – the State Duma deputy – became one of the Vice-Presidents (CSHAUK, f. 917, d. 1, c. 48, p. 1). Other national committees such as the Centralny Komitet Obywatelski Krolestwa Polskiego w Rosji (Central Citizens' Committee of the Kingdom of Poland in Russia) were evacuated in the summer of 1915 along with a major wave of refugees' movement. That one began its work in September of 1914 in Warsaw under the leadership of the Warsaw Governor-General Dmitry Lyubimov to help civilians in the Kingdom of Poland provinces affected by war (CSHAUK, f. 707, d. 165, c. 111, p. 3; see also Korzeniowski, Mądzik, Tarasiuk, 2007, pp. 51–109).

The Tatiana Committee played an important role in the number of refugee aid organizations. It was a semipublic organization under the patronage of the Russian Emperor's daughter Grand Duchess Tatiana Nikolaevna. Her protection provided the committee with financial support from the government and at the same time made it possible to unite public and private initiative under "high name". An important element in the committee's activities was the provision of funds for the work of other refugee organizations, including national committees (Lykhachova, 2010, pp. 104–117).

It is important to add that the policy of the state determined the attitude to the moved population and in the society. As a result, refugees got aid not only from the treasury, but also from individuals' donations. Periodicals and other printed materials, which were saturated with desperate stories about the hard refugee fate, inhuman suffering, poverty, hopelessness, also shaped attitude to them in the Russian society. Refugee – "the misfortune that fell on the part of the empire's population as a result of the enemy invasion", was often associated with natural disasters (Deyatel'nost, 1916, p. 10). As a result, an image of a suffering person deprived of civil rights, the object of various demonstrations of public activity and humanitarian aid emerged. And such information policy was effective, because during 1915 – 1916 there was a charity upsurge. However, since the second half of 1916, the state policy had shown a tendency to reduce the cost of keeping refugees as much as possible. There were objective reasons for this: lack of political stability, financial and economic, food crisis, and exhaustion of a protracted war. The attitude of the local population towards refugees since the second half of 1916 became cold and negative, and they began to be considered a burden.

**The Conclusions.** Thus, the consequences of the forced mass evacuation of the population of the Russian Empire Western provinces were grave. The authorities themselves initiated the local residents eviction, explaining it by the demands of the war, and then took responsibility to provide them with aid. However, counting on their quick return home after several successful military operations turned out to be wrong, and millions of refugees remained

helpless and in need of help for a long time. This process was distinctive for all frontier provinces of the Russian Empire, i.e., parts of the territories of modern Poland, Belarus, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine. Refugees of different nationalities were registered in all interior regions of the Russian Empire.

The situation required not only state institutions to be involved in the work, because the state alone could not cope with the problem. Incorporating in refugee organizations such community organizations as the Zemstvo Union and the Union of Towns was not typical of the Russian reality. At the same time, the Russian authorities empowered national committees to help the victims of the war, which were opposed to unions. All of them carried out a similar range of tasks: were in charge of refugee housing, financial help, clothing, and footwear, creation of shelters, dormitories, canteens, and educational institutions. The chairmanship of refugee case of the Ministry of Internal Affairs reported about the state's interest in maintaining control.

Despite the work undertaken by the Russian authorities providing comprehensive social aid to refugees, cooperation between the authorities, charities, public and national organizations was complicated, but not only by incomplete legislation. Unmanageable bureaucratic apparatus of the Russian Empire, the crisis of the authorities hindered the promptness, while refugees were in need of immediate help.

**Acknowledgments.** We are grateful to the members of the editorial board and reviewers for the advice, given during the preparation of the article for publishing.

**Funding.** The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Convention.** (n. d.). *Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees*. URL: <http://www.unhcr.org/protection/basic/3b66c2aa10/convention-protocol-relating-status-refugees.html> [in English]

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Kharkivskoi oblasti [Kharkiv Region State Archive – KRSA]*

**Deyatelnost.** (1916). *Deyatelnost Komiteta Ee Imperatorskogo Vysochestva Velikoy Knyazhny Tatiany Nikolayevny [Activities of the Committee of Her Imperial Highness the Grand Duchess Tatiana Nikolaevna for the Temporary Relief of Victims of War]. Izvestiya Komiteta Ee Imperatorskogo Vysochestva Velikoy Knyazhny Tatiany Nikolayevny po okazaniyu vremennoy pomoshchi postradavshim ot voyennykh deystviy – News of the Committee of Her Imperial Highness the Grand Duchess Tatiana Nikolaevna for the Temporary Relief of Victims of War*, 2, 10–12. [in Russian]

**Galperina, B. D.** (Ed.). (1999). *Sovet ministrov Rossiyskoy imperii v gody Pervoy mirovoy voyny. Bumagi A. N. Yakhontova (zapiski zasedaniy i perepiska) [The Council of Ministers of the Russian Empire during the First World War. Papers by A. N. Yakhontov (notes of meetings and correspondence)]*. S.-Peterburg: Dmitriy Bulanin, 558 p. [in Russian]

**Gatrell, P.** (1999). *A Whole Empire Walking: Refugees in Russia During World War I*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 318 p. [in English]

**Gatrell, P.** (2000). Domestic and international dimensions of population displacement in Russia, 1914 – 1918. In S. Pons, & A. Romano (Eds.), *Russia in the Age of Wars 1914 – 1945* (pp. 37–52). Milano: Feltrinelli. [in English]

**Gatrell, P.** (2015). Tsarist Russia at War: the View from Above, 1914 – February 1917. *The Journal of Modern History*, 87 (3), 668–700. doi: 10.1086/682414 [in English]

*Gosudarstvennyy arkhiv Rossiyskoy Federatsii [State Archive of the Russian Federation – SARF]*

**Haid, E.** (2017). Galicia: A Bulwark against Russia? Propaganda and Violence in a Border Region during the First World War. *The Journal of Modern History*, 24 (2), 200–213. doi: 10.1080/13507486.2016.1257574 [in English]

**Iz deyatelnosti.** (1915). *Iz deyatelnosti otdela po ustroystvu bezhentsev zemskogo i gorodskogo soyuzov [From the Activities of the Department for the Provision of Refugees of the Zemstvo Union*

and Union of Towns]. *Izvestiya Glavnogo komiteta Vserossiyskogo zemskogo soyuza pomoshchi bolnym i ranenym voynam – News of the Main Committee of the All-Russian Zemstvo Union of Aid to Sick and Wounded Warriors*, 27, 60–88. [in Russian]

**Korzeniowski, M., Mądzik, M. & Tarasiuk, D.** (2007). *Tulaczy los. Uchodźcy polscy w Imperium Rosyjskim w latach Pierwszej wojny światowej [Wandering Fate. Polish Refugees in the Russian Empire during the First World War]*. Lublin: UMCS, 238 p. [in Polish]

**Kurtsev, A. N.** (1999). Bezhentsy Pervoy mirovoy voyny v Rossii (1914 – 1917) [Refugees of World War I in Russia (1914 – 1917)]. *Voprosy istorii – Questions of History*, 8, 98–114 [in Russian]

**Lohr, E.** (2003). *Nationalizing the Russian Empire: the campaign against enemy aliens during World War I*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 256 p. [in English]

**Lubny-Gertsyk, L. I.** (1926). *Dvizheniye naseleniya na territorii SSSR za vremya mirovoy voyny i revolyutsii [Movement of the Population on the Territory of the USSR during the World War and Revolution]*. Moscow: Planovoye khozyaystvo, 124 p. [in Russian]

**Lykachova, T. M.** (2010). *Polski bizhentsi v Rosii (serpen 1914 r. – lystopad 1917 r.) [Polish Refugees in Russia (August 1914 – November 1917)] (Candidate's thesis)*. Kharkiv. [in Ukrainian]

*Rossiyskiy gosudarstvennyy voyenno-istoricheskiy arkhiv [Russian State Military Historical Archive – RSMHA]*

**Samatyya, V. R.** (2003). Problema bezhentsev v Belarusi v gody Pervoy mirovoy voyny [The Problem of Refugees in Belarus during the First World War]. *Belorusskiy zhurnal mezhdunarodnogo prava i mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy – Belarusian Journal of International Law and International Relations*, 2, 71–74. [in Russian]

**Serdiuk, O. V.** (2002). Bizhenstvo v Ukraini pid chas Pershoi svitovoi viiny [Refugees in Ukraine during the First World War] (O. P. Reient, Ed.). *Problemy istorii Ukraini XIX – počatku XX st. – Problems of the History of Ukraine of XIX – beginning XX cc., (4)*, 111–132. [in Ukrainian]

**Shcherov, I. P.** (2000). *Migratsionnaya politika v Rossii. 1914 – 1922 gg. [Migration policy in Russia. 1914 – 1922]*. Smolensk: Smolensk State Pedagogical Institute, 314 p. [in Russian].

**Thorpe, J.** (2011). Displacing Empire. Refugee Welfare, National Activism and State Legitimacy in Austria-Hungary in the First World War. *Refugees and the End of Empire. Imperial Collapse and Forced Migration in the Twentieth Century*, 102–126. London: Palgrave Macmillan doi: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230305700> [in English]

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Kyiv. [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv – CSHAUK]*

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Lviv. [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Lviv – CSHAUL]*

**Tsovyan, D. G.** (2005). *Deyatelnost gosudarstvennykh organov i obshchestvennykh organizatsiy po okazaniyu pomoshchi bezhentsam v gody Pervoy mirovoy voyny. 1914 – 1917 gg. [The Activity of State Bodies and Community Organizations to Assist Refugees during the First World War. 1914 – 1917] (Candidate's thesis)*. Moscow. [in Russian]

**Zakony** (1916). *Zakony i rasporyazheniya o bezhentsakh [Refugee laws and regulations]*. (Vol. 1). Moscow: Mysl, 63 p. [in Russian].

**Zhvanko, L.** (2019). Mizhnarodno-pravovi instrumenty OON v konteksti vyrishennia hlobalnoi problemy bizhentsiv ta mihrantiv [UN International Legal Instruments in the Context of Addressing the Global Refugee and Migrant Problem]. *European Historical Studies*, 14, 83–100. doi: <http://doi.org/10.17721/2524-048X.2019.14.83-100> [in Ukrainian]

**Zhvanko, L. M.** (2012). *Bizhentsi Pershoi svitovoi viiny: ukrainskyi vymir (1914 – 1918 roky) [Refugees of the First World War: the Ukrainian Reality]*. – Kharkiv: Virovets A. P. “Apostrof”, 568 p. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on January 05, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94(477.4=411.16)"1918/1921"  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226511

**Oleksandr KOMARNITSKYI**

*NANVO Academician of Ukraine, PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of History of Ukraine, Kamianets-Podilskiy National Ivan Ohienko University, 61 Ohienko Street, Kamianets-Podilskiy, Ukraine, postal code 32300 (kob-1974@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-3021-6550

**ResearcherID:** ABC-6699-2020

**Liudmyla KOMARNITSKA**

*PhD (Philology), Lecturer of the Department of Social Work and Psychology Podilskiy Special Educational-Rehabilitation Socio-Economic College, 13 Hodovantsia St., Kamianets-Podilskiy, Ukraine, postal code 32300 (kob-1974@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-6742-8314

**Researcher ID:** ABG-3996-2020

**Олександр КОМАРНИЦЬКИЙ**

*академік НАНВО України, доктор історичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри історії України Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка, вул. Огієнка, 61, м. Кам'янець-Подільський, Україна, індекс 32300 (kob-1974@ukr.net)*

**Людмила КОМАРНИЦЬКА**

*кандидат філологічних наук, викладач кафедри соціальної роботи та психології Подільського спеціального навчально-реабілітаційного соціально-економічного коледжу, вул. Годованця, 13, м. Кам'янець-Подільський, Україна, індекс 32300 (kob-1974@ukr.net)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Komarnitskyi, O. & Komarnitska, L. (2021). Ukrainian-Jewish relations during the period of the UNR Directory: based on the information on the towns of Right-Bank Ukraine. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 107–117. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226511

**UKRAINIAN-JEWISH RELATIONS DURING THE PERIOD  
OF THE UNR DIRECTORY: BASED ON THE INFORMATION  
ON THE TOWNS OF RIGHT-BANK UKRAINE**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research – to elucidate the positive and negative aspects of the relationship between the Ukrainian and Jewish communities of the towns of Right-Bank Ukraine during the period of the Ukrainian People's Republic Directory. The elucidation of this issue is based on the works of historians-predecessors and the available source base. The methodology of the research is based on the principles of a definite concrete historical approach or historicism, objectivity, comprehensiveness and integrity, systematicity, as well as the use of the following methods: analysis and synthesis, historical genetic, historical comparative, historical typological, problem chronological. The scientific novelty consists in the fact that for the first time in historiography, on the one hand, vivid examples of cooperation between the Ukrainians and the Jews in the Right-Bank towns have*

been elucidated, on the other hand, – there have been elucidated the anti-Jewish excesses, associated with the pogroms of the Jewish communities in 1919 – 1920; there have been highlighted the causes of the pogrom actions by the Ukrainian army, insurgents and peasants. **The Conclusions.** The era of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic is marked by both positive and negative events in the life of the Ukrainian and Jewish communities in the Right-Bank towns. On the one hand, the Jews welcomed the restoration of the UPR, and the Ukrainians helped them prepare for Jewish national holidays. Together, these ethnic groups conducted activities of their educational societies. Some Jews helped the Ukrainian people in the struggle for the state independence. The Jews materially supported the Army of the Ukrainian People's Republic, and fought in the Ukrainian army. On the other hand, the period under study is marked by anti-Jewish excesses, which, to a large extent, were provoked by the commitment of the Jews to the Bolsheviks, the Jews ignored the mobilization measures of the Ukrainian government. The result of this inconsistency of the Jewish minority was the pogroms with human casualties committed by certain units of the UPR Army, as well as the insurgent atamans. There were at least 131 such pogroms. The urban peasants-Ukrainians were also “noted” for the pogroms, for whom the Jews, with whom they coexisted within one settlement were, first of all, exploiters, speculators, and only then the Bolsheviks. Such cases of pogroms were recorded in 26 towns. A number of sources indicate that the Ukrainian authorities tried to provide all possible material and legal assistance to the Jews, who suffered from the pogroms.

**Key words:** town, the Jews, community, army, pogroms.

## УКРАЇНСЬКО-ЄВРЕЙСЬКІ ВІДНОСИНИ У ДОБУ ДИРЕКТОРІЇ УНР: НА МАТЕРІАЛАХ МІСТЕЧОК ПРАВОБЕРЕЖНОЇ УКРАЇНИ

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* – спираючись на доробок попередників, наявну джерельну базу показати позитивні і негативні сторони взаємин української та єврейської громад містечок Правобережної України у добу Директорії УНР. **Методологія дослідження** спирається на принципи конкретно-історичного підходу або історизму, об'єктивності, всебічності і цілісності, системності, а також на використання методів – аналізу та синтезу, історико-генетичного, історико-порівняльного, історико-типологічного, проблемно-хронологічного. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше в історіографії показано, з одного боку, яскраві приклади співпраці українців та євреїв у правобережних містечках українців, з іншого боку, протиеврейські ексцеси, пов'язані з погромами єврейських громад у 1919 – 1920 рр., висвітлено причини погромницьких дій української армії, повстанців і селян. **Висновки.** Доба Директорії УНР позначена як позитивними, так і негативними подіями у житті української та єврейської громад правобережних містечок. З одного боку, євреї вітали відновлення УНР, а українці допомагали їм у підготовці національних свят. Спільно ці етнічні групи вирішували питання діяльності своїх просвітянських товариств. Частина євреїв допомагала українському народу у боротьбі за державну незалежність, матеріально підтримувала Армію УНР, воювали у складі українського війська. З іншого боку, досліджуваний нами період позначений і протиеврейськими ексцесами, які, значною мірою, були спровоковані прихильністю євреїв до більшовиків, ігноруванням ними мобілізаційних заходів української влади. Наслідком такої непослідовності єврейської меншини стали погроми із людськими жертвами, які здійснили окремі частини Армії УНР, а також повстанські отамани. Таких погромів відбулося не менше 131. Погромницькими діями “відзначилися” і містечкові селяни-українці, для яких євреї, з якими вони співіснували в межах одного населеного пункту, були, насамперед, експлуататорами, спекулянтами, а вже потім більшовиками. Такі випадки зафіксовано у 26 містечках. Низка джерел свідчить, що українська влада намагалася надавати посильну матеріальну та юридичну допомогу містечковим євреям, які потерпіли від погромів.

**Ключові слова:** містечко, євреї, громада, армія, погроми.

**The Problem Statement.** The problem of the Ukrainian-Jewish relations remains topical, despite a number of works by both domestic and foreign scholars, who “saw the light” during the 1990s of the previous century – at the beginning of this century. This is due

to the fact that for centuries the relationship between the Jews and the Ukrainians had not been easy. They lived in the same area for a long time, but at the same time, being different in mentality, religion, culture, language, customs, which left the mark on the relations of these peoples. There were both positive and negative moments in the relations of the Jews and the Ukrainians. There were the facts of hostility, which led to the stereotypes formation of Ukrainophobia and Judaophobia. In this respect, the Ukrainian-Jewish relations in the Ukrainian town during the first decades of the XXth century were quite significant, and a quantitative parity between these two ethnic groups was mostly preserved. This was the most visible on the Right Bank, which was the part of the “Jewish settlement zone”, which, in its turn, caused the compactness of the Jewish population living there.

**The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches.** Our research is mainly based on the archival sources from the Central State Archive of the highest authorities and administration of Ukraine (8 funds), the Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine (2 funds), the State Archives of Vinnytsia (1 fund) and Khmelnytsky regions (4 funds). A significant factual material contains the periodicals of that time, as well as the works of contemporaries of the events, which are described by the author of this article. Numerous scientific literature has been analyzed, which is directly or indirectly related to the Ukrainian-Jewish relations during the first decades of the XXth century, in particular, during the period of the Ukrainian People’s Republic Directory. Thorough researches on this issue are the works of emigration historians: O. Bryk (Bryk, 1961), T. Hunchak (Hunchak, 1993), S. Yekelchuk (Yekelchuk, 1995). We also single out the works of modern Ukrainian scientists E. Bevziuk and M. Doroshko (Bevziuk, Doroshko, 2019), M. Haliv (Haliv, 2018), V. Horak (Horak, 1998), O. Dudnyk (Dudnyk, 2018), A. Kryskov (Kryskov, 2000), F. Levitas (Levitas, 2011), V. Lozovyi (Lozovyi, 1997, 1998), S. Oliinyk (Oliinyk, 1995), A. Pyzhyk (Pyzhyk, 1998), V. Serhiichuk (Serhiichuk, 1998, 1999). Together with Professor O. Zavalniuk (Zavalniuk, Komarnitskyi, 2005), as well as one author (Komarnitskyi, 2009) we published the monographic studies that trace some aspects of the chosen issue. Despite the powerful array of scientific literature, the problem identified in the topic of the article has not been comprehensively studied.

**The purpose of the article** is to show the positive and negative aspects of the relations between the Ukrainian and Jewish communities of the towns of Right-Bank Ukraine during the period of the Ukrainian People’s Republic Directory. The study is based on the work of predecessors and the available source base.

**The Basic Material Statement.** At the end of the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth century the towns of Right-Bank of Ukraine were characterized by dynamic ethno-national changes. Taking into consideration the materials of the First All-Russian Census of 1897, in which there was recorded the confessional affiliation of the inhabitants (Localities of the Russian Empire, 1905, p. 17–29, 78–89, 158–170 (підр. нами), and also based on the fact that in the Right Bank 98,6% of the Jews professed Judaism (Pasmannik, 1917, p. 110), and according to the Census of 1920 in the towns of Kyiv province, the Ukrainians comprised 92,4% of the Orthodox burghers (and according to the Census of 1923 in Podilsk province, this figure was 81%, in Volyn – 95,3%) (The population of the Kyiv province, 1922, pp. 24–25; Population in the cities of Ukraine, 1925, pp. 106–107, 124–125), and we found out that in the towns of Kyiv region there were approximately 54,9% of the Ukrainians, 36,0% of the Jews, 4,5% of the Russians, and 4,6% of other nationalities; in Podillya – 38,5% of the Ukrainians, 43,7% of the Jews; 9% of the Russians, 8,8% of other nationalities; in Volyn – 43,2% of the Ukrainians, 47,9% of the Jews, 2,1% of the Russians, 6,8% of other

nationalities. In total, in the towns of Right-Bank Ukraine, there were 46,1% representatives of the titular nation, the Jews – 41,9%, the Russians – 5,4%, other nationalities – 6,6%. The Jewish population constituted more than 50% in the urban settlements in 11 of 36 districts of Right Bank Ukraine. A significant Jewish presence in the towns gave rise to some researchers (M. Kipper (Kipper, 1930), a modern Ukrainian researcher I. Ivanova (Ivanova, 2003), the Russian scientists V. Lukyn, A. Sokolova, B. Haymovich (Lukyn, Khaimovych, 1997; Lukyn, Sokolova, Haymovich, 2000)) in our opinion, to consider them Jewish wrongly. Podilsk local historian Yu. Sitsinsky interpreted the concept of «town» quite original, understanding it as a “city”. Describing the town of Smotrych (calling it a “city”), he noted that “the settlement is divided mainly into two groups: the Ukrainian village and the Jewish town” (The State Archives of Khmelnytskyi Region, f. s. 3333, d. 1, c. 28, p. 1b.).

Taking into consideration the above mentioned, it should be noted that in the national plan town settlements differed significantly from other categories of settlements, in particular, from villages where the Ukrainians predominated and the cities where the percentage of the Russians was higher than in towns (at the same time, the percentage of the Jews was higher in towns than in cities). In fact, this circumstance explains why the Ukrainian-Jewish relations were so acute in the towns. In addition, the Ukrainian community saw in the Jewish masses, first of all, an isolated closed part of the population, which seized all trades, owned large capitals, did not produce anything, but only exploited the others.

During the dramatic 1919 – 1920s the Ukrainian-Jewish relations were ambiguous. A number of archival documents and materials of that time periodicals illustrate vivid examples of cooperation between the Ukrainians and the Jews. Thus, in Zhvanets, the Jews, imitating the Ukrainians, welcomed the restoration of the Ukrainian People’s Republic (Holiday – a manifestation, p. 4). The Bund Committee of the town of Makariv praised the elimination of Hetman from power (Central State Archives of Public Unions of Ukraine (CSAPU of Ukraine), f. 41, d. 1, c. 19, p. 5).

We managed to find facts about how the Ukrainians helped the Jews prepare for their national holidays. In particular, on May 25, 1920, in Dunaiivtsi the celebrations were held on the occasion of the recognition of Palestine as the national and political center of the world Jewry (Local life, c. 2; From the province, p. 2). Local Jews participated in the meetings of the Society “Prosvita”. Lectures on the relations of the Ukrainians with national minorities were popular (Pyzhyk, 1998, p. 31). For instance, in Polonne, the audience listened to the lecture “The Jews and the Ukrainians” conducted by M. Nyrchuk, an employee of the provincial department. At the same time, the Jewish community of Zinkiv, positively assessing the role of “Prosvita”, donated 25 thousand rubles for the needs of the Ukrainian educators (Central State Archives of Supreme Authorities and Governments of Ukraine – CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1092, d. 2, c. 71, p. 1; f. 3301, d. 2, c. 67, p. 9; A gift for the army, p. 2; Chronicle, p. 2). At the same time, Ladyzhyn’s Ukrainian educators provided their premises to the Jewish educators, who, in particular, staged plays (From the life of “Prosvita”, pp. 23–24). A similar situation was observed in Mynkivtsi and Smotrych (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 2060, d. 1, c. 24, pp. 12, 17).

Such facts laid the basis for strengthening friendly relations between the Ukrainian and Jewish communities. On August 19, 1919, in Liubar, at a meeting attended by at least 400 local Jews, a representative of the Buzhda Chyzhda called to unite with the Ukrainian people, to help them in the struggle for the state independence, to support the UPR Army financially (In Volyn, p. 4). The part of the Jewish community responded to such appeals and helped the Ukrainian authorities and army. This support was openly stated at one of the

meetings with the Jewish delegation by S. Petliura, the Chief Ataman of the UPR troops (“the Jews always supported Ukraine’s independence”) (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 2060, d. 1, c. 18a, p. 5b.). The Jews of at least 4 towns welcomed “their liberator from the Bolshevik yoke” hospitably (Chief Ataman Petliura, p. 2; Posts, p. 2; From the life, p. 2; My enemies, p. 4; Serhiichuk, 1999, p. 124). A. Margolin, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian People’s Republic (a Jew by nationality) said that “the Jews helped sick and wounded Ukrainian soldiers, set up hospitals near the front line, the Jewish children washed the blood from the bodies of the Ukrainian soldiers in these hospitals” (Margolin, 1921, p. 274). One of such hospitals worked in Mykolaiv (In Podillya, p. 4). Mykolayiv resident, a Ukrainian, stated with optimism that “now ... the Ukrainian and Jewish peoples are convinced that the path of a national liberation and self-determination converge ... and we all will build jointly the free life of all nations living at the territory of the Ukrainian People’s Republic” (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 3301, d. 2, c. 113, pp. 1–1b.). There were cases when the Jewish population met the Cossacks with bread and salt, in particular, in Frampol (Jews help, p. 8; Lozovyi, 1998, p. 87) and Dunaiivtsi (War, p. 4). The Jewish community of Dunaiivtsi bought underwear and presented it to the Ukrainian soldiers (Kryskov, 2000, p. 273). The Jews of Zinkiv donated 61 790 krb for the needs of the UPR Army (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 3301, d. 1, c. 10, p. 1; d. 2, c. 67, p. 9; Chronicle, p. 2). The Jews in at least 15 other towns supported or expressed their readiness to help the authorities and the Ukrainian army with food, fodder and uniforms (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 538, d. 1, c. 116, p. 7b.; c. 171, p. 45–45b.; f. 1092, d. 2, c. 73, p. 41, 43; c. 185, p. 7b.; f. 2060, d. 1, c. 27, p. 8; c. 31, p. 3; f. 3301, d. 2, c. 83, p. 3; c. 85, p. 5, 7; The State Archives of Vinnytsia Region, f. p. 255, d. 1, c. 144, p. 37; Across Ukraine, p. 2; Hurtovyi, 2003, p. 39; Oliinyk, 1995, p. 245; Lukyn, Sokolova, Haymovich, 2000, p. 522). Some local Jews served in the UPR Army (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1092, d. 2, c. 11, p. 163; Kremenets, p. 1; Lukyn, Haymovich, 1997, p. 203).

The Jewish communities of the towns provided all possible assistance to the Ukrainian Galician Army, often being ahead of the Ukrainians even. The newspaper “Trudova Hromada” reported that during the battle with the Red Army units in July 1919, the Jews brought water and sour milk to the Galicians outside the town of Smotrych, and expressed regret over the temporary withdrawal of the Ukrainian troops. The local pharmacist and paramedics provided the first aid to the wounded (Help of the Jewish population, p. 3). The same newspaper soon published a letter in which Captain Greenberg addressed to the Jewish community of the town with the words of gratitude: “On behalf of our government, I sincerely thank the Jews of Smotrych for their sympathy and desire always to help me and maintain order ... I hope that with such an attitude of the Jews, the differences and antagonism that still prevailed between the nations of Greater Ukraine will soon disappear” (From Jewish life. Captain Greenberg, p. 7).

The Galician army consisted of the Jewish unit led by S. Lianberg. The unit managed to liberate the town of Mykhalpil from the Bolsheviks (D., M., p. 257). On August 25, 1919, owing to the Galicians, the pogrom in Fastiv was stopped (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 3299, d. 1, c. 45, p. 41), and the very next day the Jews of the town welcomed the Galicians with bread and salt, assuring them that “they would do their best to help build the Independent Republic, so that there would be peace” (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1092, d. 2, c. 73, p. 6).

The Ukrainians and the Jews also found a mutual understanding in functioning of their educational institutions. Thus, the Jewish community of Medvedivka provided a material support to the local school (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 3304, d. 1, c. 17, p. 15). They gave their helping hand when the primary school in Orynin, where the Jews made up 1/3 of all

pupils, was in a difficult situation. The financial burden of the school maintenance was on the Ukrainian community. When the issue arose of increasing the number of pupils, the Jews gave their support (The State Archives of Khmelnytskyi Region, f. s. 260, d. 1, c. 54, p. 16). In Haisyn region, the Ukrainian authorities already provided 150 thousand krb. for the maintenance of the Jewish educational institutions in 11 towns (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 538, d. 1, c. 27, p. 277b.; c. 29, p. 140). A number of former private educational institutions were included into the network of public schools, such as Murovano-Kurylovetska “Talmud-Tora” (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 538, d. 1, c. 32, p. 11b), Katerynopil Jewish public school (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 2060, d. 1, c. 41, p. 20b), Ladyzhyn Jewish folk school (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 538, d. 1, c. 27, pp. 253–253b).

There were a number of other examples of cooperation between the Ukrainian and the Jewish urban communities. At the same time, the era of the Ukrainian People’s Republic Directory is marked by the anti-Jewish excesses. In one of his works Professor V. Lozovy notes that Judaophobia in Ukraine did not have any ideological colour and was not the state policy. We share his point of view. Anti-semitism in the Ukrainian society at that time was explained, primarily, by the commitment of the Jewish minority to the Bolsheviks (Lozovy, 1997, p. 109). I. Cherykover, the Jewish historian argued that “the cities and towns of Ukraine became the main support of the Bolsheviks” (Bryk, p. 168). The archival documents shed light on the fact that the Jews, especially, young people, responded to the calls to join the Red Army willingly (The State Archives of Khmelnytskyi Region, f. s. 3251, d. 1, c. 6, p. 18, 31), and therefore supported the mobilization measures of the Ukrainian authorities reluctantly. For instance, there are the lists of those, who ignored these appeals in the towns of Kupel, Krasyliv, Teofipol (The State Archives of Khmelnytskyi Region, f. s. 296, d. 4, c. 5, p. 1, 3, 5, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 28, 48, 138, 146, 155, 159) and these lists were rich in the Jewish surnames. The Jews of Shatava falsified the documents and it turned out that they were all sick, so they had to be dismissed (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1092, d. 2, c. 71, p. 69b). The above-mentioned I. Cherykover wrote: “Having given a certain number of volunteers to the Red Guard, the Jewish workers did not give a single volunteer to the Ukrainians” (Bryk, p. 170). There were cases when the Jews shot at the rear of the Ukrainian army, particularly, in Horodok (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 538, d. 1, c. 89, p. 44; c. 177, p. 21b), Pohrebyshe (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1092, d. 2, c. 71, p. 104), Orynyn (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1065, d. 1, c. 14, p. 162). Provocations by the Jews against the Ukrainian authorities were recorded in 5 towns (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1092, d. 2, c. 71, p. 328b; f. 3299, d. 1, c. 40, p. 9; c. 67, p. 2; f. 3301, d. 2, c. 35, p. 1).

We should admit that some Ukrainians resorted to shameful pogroms against the Jewish population. In particular, pogroms with human casualties were committed by the UPR Army. According to our data, such actions took place in Kyiv region (in 2 towns), 15 in Podilsk region (in 15 towns), in Volyn region (in 3 towns). During the pogroms houses, shops were robbed, contributions were imposed (Zavalniuk, Komarnitskyi, 2005, pp. 299–305; Komarnitskyi, 2009, pp. 289–294). Such pogroms were committed by hungry, demoralized soldiers mainly. Thus, when the Jewish delegation of Kytaihorod town came to the commandant complaining about the looting by the Galician Cossacks, he stated: “The Cossacks are hungry and nothing can be done with it” (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 538, d. 1, c. 55, p. 42). At the same time, we do not agree to the opinion of the historians R. Koval and K. Zavalniuk, who stated that “the requisitions were expedient and justified: there was the war for the right of the Ukrainian nation to live on its land and the time for ceremonies did not come yet” (Koval & Zavalniuk, 2002, p. 49).

A number of archival documents contain the calls by the Ukrainian authorities for the mass extermination of the Jews. For instance, in the town of Rozhysche, the deputy head of the commandant's company stated: "We stand for Ukraine, beat all the Jews and the Liakhs". The county commissioner wanted to interfere in and protect the Jews, but he was arrested (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1092, d. 2, c. 21, p. 22b). At the village meeting the commandant of Kytaihorod made the speech and shouted that "the cursed Jews should be killed, cut to the last one and no one would be punished for that" (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1401, d. 1, c. 22, p. 10). The commandant and the chief of the local police, imposed contributions on Lianskorun and Hannopil Jewish communities to be collected by military units (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1092, d. 2, c. 13, p. 62; c. 57, p. 23b). In Hoshcha, the Cossacks terrorized the local Jews, promising to destroy the whole town if they did not make contributions (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1092, d. 2, c. 54, p. 69).

Most of the pogroms were carried out by insurgent atamans, who headed detachments, which had "their own policies, their own plans, their own methods of war», and were well trained ....., did not recognize anyone superior, had no programmes for the future" (Liutyi-Liutenko, 1986, p. 20). They often ignored and disobeyed orders from the central Ukrainian authorities, and exercised arbitrariness at the territories under their control. Taking into account this fact, the Ukrainian government could not be responsible for the pogrom activities of the insurgent atamans. We have found out that insurgents had committed more than 65 pogroms in the towns (Zavalniuk, Komarnitskyi, 2005, pp. 299–304; Komarnitskyi, 2009, pp. 289–293).

Among the pogrom makers there were insurgent groups, who killed the Jews deliberately because they were convinced of the Jews' hostility to the Ukrainian national movement. Among them there was Ataman Samosenko. In the town of Felshtyn from 485 to 600 people were killed by the Cossacks, headed by Ataman Samosenko (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 538, d. 1, c. 76, p. 1; Gusev-Orenburzkiy, b.h., p. 16; Ostrovskyi, 1926, p. 32). The pogroms, headed by Ataman Grygoriev, were brutal. The Cossaks headed by Grygoriev sold certificates to men for the right to live. The certificates were bought at the price of honour of young women and girls (Гопак, 1998, p. 151). 183 Jews were killed in Smila (Horak, 1998, pp. 150–151; Ostrovskyi, 1926, p. 36; Serhiichuk, 1998, p. 447; Skorobohatov, 1976, p. 29), in Kodyma – 115 (Serhiichuk, 1998, p. 453), in Bilozerya – 78, in Medvedivtsi – 62 (Horak, 1998, pp. 150–151), in Tahancha – 16 (CDAGO of Ukraine, f. 1, d. 20, c. 126, p. 69) and etc.

Series of pogroms were committed by the Ukrainian urban peasants who, before the events we described, coexisted peacefully with the Jews. The peasants, taking advantage of the general anarchy and chaos, tried to revenge, because the Jews were exploiters and entrepreneurs in the mentality of peasants. In addition, the Jews began to be associated with communism. On May 28, 1919 I. Kulyk, the Soviet activist, visiting Uman County, reported with anxiety: No work in the village is possible in our country now, because no worker will risk going to the village after the Ukrainian and Russian comrades were shot dead as "Jewish hires" by the insurgents (CSAPU of Ukraine, f. 1, d. 20, c. 20, p. 20). In June 1919, Cherviakov, the People's Commissar for Internal Affairs noted that «peasants and as well as insurgents (from Kremenets) with the Red Army soldiers say that we are fighting, and the Jews in the rear, in the party and the institutions go to the front, then get sick (CSAPU of Ukraine, f. 1, d. 20, c. 48, pp. 24–24b.). In addition, the Ukrainian peasants were extremely dissatisfied with the Jewish speculation on the consumer goods of the basic necessity (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 538, d. 1, c. 90, pp. 3, 151b). That is why, the peasants began to use the method of combating the Jewish abuse – a boycott. Thus, from the town of Bohuslav it

was reported that “the peasants of the surrounding villages ... refuse to take food to the town at all. The Jews are afraid to go to the village ...” (CSAPU of Ukraine, f. 41, d. 1, c. 35, p. 15).

According to our calculations, peasants took an active part in the pogroms in 9 towns of Kyiv, 16 towns in Podil, 1 town in Volyn provinces (Zavalniuk, Komarnitskyi, 2005, pp. 301–305; Komarnitskyi, 2009, pp. 290–294).

The Jewish town communities also defeated the Red Army units, Denikin and Polish legionnaires. This fact is mentioned in our monographs (Zavalniuk, Komarnitskyi, 2005, p. 167–168, 299–305; Komarnitskyi, 2009, pp. 154–160, 289–294).

We managed to find a number of facts when the peasants of the towns, risking their lives, saved the Jews from pogroms (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 3299, d. 1, c. 50, p. 22; Pogroms in Fastiv, pp. 1–2; Vynnychenko, 1992, p. 119; Lukyn, Sokolova, Haymovich, 2000, p. 511; Shafarenko, 2003, p. 97). In some period of time, the peasants began to realize that “the Jewish poor should not have been so insulted and humiliated” (O., S., p. 2), and if the Jews are guilty, “they should be dealt with the governmental law, not by people in a military uniform, which is unknown for anyone” (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 1401, d. 1, c. 22, p. 8).

In order to defend themselves, the Jews organized self-defense units. In the town of Khabno, the detachment was headed by a feldfebel (commander), to whom commanders, a clerk, a military training instructor and an accountant were subordinated. The staff of the self-defense units was divided into “real” (40-50 people) and “reserve” (100-150 people) fighters (Kipper, 1926, p. 42). In some towns, the Ukrainians were the members of self-defense units. Thus, in Horodyshche the self-defense detachment consisted of 50 Jews and 20 Ukrainians (Shtyf, 1922, p. 43), in Sataniv – 25 Jews and 5 Ukrainians (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 3301, d. 2, c. 88, p. 5). On July 28, 1919, Shyshko, a peasant from the town of Teofipol organized a self-defense detachment consisting of 200 Ukrainian peasants and 100 Jews. The detachment became famous for fighting with the Bolsheviks near the village of Katorzhyntsi (CSASAG of Ukraine, f. 3301, d. 2, c. 31, pp. 1–1b.; Z yevreiskoho zhyttia. Borotba, p. 4). Kupel self-defense detachment provided effective assistance to the Ukrainian army during the liberation of its hometown from the Bolsheviks (In Starokostiantyniv, p. 2). Zinkiv potters-Christians appealed to the local Jews to give them protection provided by the Jewish self-defense (Lukyn, Haymovich, 1997, p. 106).

The Ukrainian government tried to provide material and legal assistance to the Jewish population, i.e., the pogroms casualties. (See in detail in the monographs: Zavalniuk, Komarnitskyi, 2005, pp. 170–172; Komarnitskyi, 2009, pp. 162–163).

**The Conclusions.** Thus, the period of the Ukrainian People’s Republic Directory is marked by both positive and negative events in the life of the Ukrainian and Jewish communities in the Right-Bank towns. On the one hand, the Jews welcomed the restoration of the UPR, and Ukrainians helped them prepare for national holidays. Together, these ethnic groups conducted the activities of their educational societies. Some Jews helped the Ukrainian people in the struggle for the state independence, the Jews supported the Army of the Ukrainian People’s Republic financially, and fought in the Ukrainian Army. On the other hand, the period under study is also marked by the anti-Jewish excesses, which were largely provoked by the Jews’ commitment to the Bolsheviks and their disregard for the mobilization measures of the Ukrainian government. The result of this inconsistency of the Jewish minority was the pogroms with human casualties committed by certain units of the UPR Army, as well as the insurgent atamans. There were at least 131 such pogroms. The Ukrainian peasants also committed the pogroms, for whom the Jews, coexisting in the same settlement were,

first of all, exploiters, speculators, and only then the Bolsheviks. We recorded such cases in 26 towns. A number of sources indicate that the Ukrainian authorities tried to provide all possible material and legal assistance to the town's casualties of the pogroms.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Bevziuk, Ye., & Doroshko, M.** (2019). Probudzhennia netytulnykh natsii yak chynnyk rozpadu imperii (na prykladi monarkhii Habsburhiv) [Awakening of non-titular nations as a factor in the collapse of empires (on the example of the Habsburg monarchy)]. *Skhidnoevropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 13, 104–113. doi: 10.24919/2519-058kh.13.188673. [in Ukrainian]

**Bryk, O. S.** (1961). *Ukrainsko-yevreyski vzaiemovidnosyny [Ukrainian-Jewish relations]*. Vinnipeg, 383 p. [in Ukrainian]

**D., M.** (1958). *Zhydivskyi kurin. Ukrainska Halytska Armiia [The Jewish hut. The Ukrainian Galician Army]: U 40-richchia yii uchasti u vyzvolnykh zmahanniakh* (vol. 1, pp. 257–258.). Vinnipeg. [in Ukrainian].

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Khmelnytskoi oblasti [The State Archives of Khmelnytskyi Region – SAKhR]*

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Vinnytskoi oblasti [The State Archives of Vinnytsia Region – SAVR]*

Dopysy. Pryyzd p. Holovnoho Otamana do m. Dunaievets [Posts. Arrival of Mr. Chief Ataman to Dunaievetsi]. (1920). *Slovo*, 8 (7 zhovtnia), 2. [in Ukrainian]

**Dudnyk, O. V.** (2018). Yevreyski pohromy na Umanshchyni (1919 r.) [The Jewish pogroms in Uman region (1919)]. *Vcheni zapysky Tavriiskoho natsionalnoho universytetu im. V. I. Vernadskoho: ist. Nauky*, vol. 29 (68), 3, 13–17. [in Ukrainian]

**Gusev-Orenburzkiy, S.** (b.g.). *Kniga o yevreyskikh pogromakh na Ukraine v 1919 g. [Book about the Jewish pogroms in Ukraine in 1919]*. Petrograd: izd-vo Z. I. Grjebina, 160 p. [in Russian]

**Haliv, M.** (2018). Natsionalna polityka Rosiiskoi ta Avstro-Uhorskoi imperii na Volyni i v Halychyni (pochatok XX st.): porivnialnyi analiz [National policy of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires in Volhynia and Galicia (the beginning of the XX-th century): a comparative analysis]. *Skhidnoevropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 7, 65–74. doi: 10.24919/2519-058kh.7.131212. [in Ukrainian].

Holovnyi otaman Petliura v Solobkivtsiakh [Chief Ataman Petliura in Solobkivtsi]. (1919). *Vyzvolennia*, 24 (19 lypnia), 2. [in Ukrainian]

**Horak, V.** (1998). *Povstantsi otamana Hryhorieva (serpen 1918 – serpen 1919 rr.) [Rebels of Ataman Grigoriev (August 1918 – August 1919)]: istorychne doslidzhennia*. Fastiv: Polifast, 224 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Hunchak, T.** (1993). *Symon Petliura ta yevrei [Simon Petliura and the Jews]*. Kyiv: Lybid, 48 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Hurtovyi, H.** (2003). *Yevrei mistechka Torchyn [The Jews of the town of Torchyn]*. Kyiv: RYF: TOV “Iuh”, 94 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Ivanova, I. A.** (2003). Yevreiske mistechko Ukrainy v seredyni XIX – pershii polovyni XX st. [The Jewish town of Ukraine in the middle of the XIXth – the first half of the XXth century.] *Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnoho universytetu im. Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho*, (VI), 22–26. [in Ukrainian]

Khronika [Chronicle]. (1919). *Vistnyk Ukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliky*, 16 (15 lypnia), 2. [in Ukrainian]

**Kipper, M.** (1930). *Evreyskoe mestechko na Ukraine [The Jewish town in Ukraine]*. Harkov: Proletariy, 107 s. [in Russian]

**Komarnitskyi, O. B.** (2009). *Mistechka Volyni ta Kyivshchyny v dobu Ukrainskoi revoliutsii 1917 – 1920 rr.: monohrafiia [Towns of Volyn and Kyiv region during the Ukrainian revolution of 1917 – 1920]*. Kamianets-Podilskyi: Aksioma, 312 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Koval, R. M. & Zavalniuk, K. V.** (2002). *Trahediia otamana Volyntsia [The tragedy of Ataman Volynets]*. Kyiv: Diokor, 283 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kremenets. Pryiom novobrantsiv [Kremenets. Reception of recruits]. (1919). *Novyny*, 20 (27 liutoho), 1. [in Ukrainian]

**Kryskov, A. A.** (2000). Uriad UNR na zakhysti yevreiv [The UNR government defends the Jews]. *Materialy Kh Podilskoi istoriko-kraieznavchoi konferentsii* (pp. 271–275). Kamianets-Podilskyi. [in Ukrainian]

**Levitas, F.** (2011). Ukrainsko-yevreiskyi vidnosyny 1919 – 1920 rr.: podolannia stereotypiv natsionalnoi pamiaty [The Ukrainian-Jewish relations 1919 – 1920: overcoming stereotypes of national memory]. *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy*, (55), 382–393. [in Ukrainian]

**Liutyi-Liutenko, I.** (1986). *Vohon z Kholodnoho Yaru [Fire from the Kholodnui Yar]*: Spohady. Detroit, 151 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Lozovyi, V.** (1997). Natsionalna polityka Dyrektorii UNR [National policy of the Directory of the UNR]. *Tsentralna Rada i ukraïnskyi derzhavotvorchyi protses: mater. nauk. konf. (ch. 2, pp. 106–115)*. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]

**Lozovyi, V. S.** (1998). Yevreisko-ukraïnski stosunky v Kamianetsku dobu Dyrektorii UNR [The Jewish-Ukrainian relations in the Kamyianets era of the Directory of the UNR]. *Natsionalni menshyny Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy: istoriia i suchasnist: nauk. zb. "Velyka Volyn"* (18), 85–89. [in Ukrainian]

**Lukin, V., Haymovich, B.** (sost.). (1997). *100 evreyskikh mestecek Ukrainyi [100 Jewish townships of Ukraine]*: istorich. putevod. (1). Ierusalim, Sankt-Peterburg: Ezro: Podoliya, 256 p. [in Russian]

**Lukin, V., Sokolova, A., Haymovich, B.** (2000). *100 evreyskikh mestecek Ukrainyi [100 Jewish towns of Ukraine]*: istorich. putevod. (2). Sankt-Peterburg: izd. A. Gersht, 704 p. [in Russian]

**Margolin, A.** (1921). *Ukraina i politika Antantyi [Ukraine and the policy of the Atlanta]*: zapiski evreya i grajdanim. Berlin: izd-vo S. Efroni, 396 s. [in Russian]

Mestnaya jizn. Prazdnovanie priznaniya Palestyny v m. Dunaevtsah 26 maya [Local life. Celebration of the recognition of Palestine in Dunaiivtsi borough on May 26]. (1920). *Podolskiy kray*, 537 (29 maya), 2. [in Russian]

Moi vrazhinnia [My enemies]. (1920). *Kozatska dumka*, 14 (20 zhovtnia), 4. [in Ukrainian]

Na Podilliu. Dopomoha yevreiv kozakam. [In Podillya. The Jewish help to the Cossacks] (1919). *Novyi shliakh*, 11 (22 chervnia), 4. [in Ukrainian]

Na Volyni [In Volyn]. (1919). *Trudova hromada*, 64 (18 veresnia), 4. [in Ukrainian].

*Naselenie Kievskoy gubernii po dannym perepisi 1920 goda [The population of the Kyiv province during the year of 1920]*: Svodnyie dannyye po guberniyam i uezdnam (1922). (Ser. 1. Demografiya, t. 1, vyp. 1). Harkov, 60 s. [in Russian]

*Naseleniia v mistakh Ukrainy za danymy Vsesoiuznogo miskoho perepysu 15 bereznia 1923 r. [Population in the cities of Ukraine according to the All-Union City Census of March 15, 1923]* (1925). (Ser. I. Demografiia, t. 2, vyp. 3). Kharkiv. [in Ukrainian]

*Naseleniye mesta Rossiyskoy imperii v 500 i bolee jiteley s ukazaniem vsego nalichnogo v nih naseleniya i chisla jiteley preobladayuschih vero ispovedaniy po dannym Pervoy Vseobschey perepisi naseleniya 1897 g. [Localities of the Russian Empire of 500 or more inhabitants, indicating the total population in them and the number of inhabitants of the prevailing religions according to the First General Census of 1897.]* (1905). Sankt-Peterburg, 170 p.

**O., S.** Vrazhinnia z mist [Enemies from places.]. (1919). *Ukraïnskyi kozak*, 51 (19 veresnia), 1–2.

**Oliinyk, S. V.** (1995). Ukrainska Halytska Armiia i naselennia Podillia (lypen 1919 – kviten 1920 rr.) [Ukrainian Galician Army and the population of Podillya (July 1919 – April 1920)]. *Naukovi pratsi istorychnoho fakultetu (Kamianets-Podilskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnogo instytutu)*, (1), 244–247. [in Ukrainian]

**Ostrovskiy, Z. S.** (1926). *Evreiskye pohromy. 1918 – 1921 [The Jewish pogroms. 1918 – 1921]*. Moskva, 136 p. [in Russian]

**Pasmannik, D.** (1917). *Sudby evreyskogo naroda: Problemy evreyskoy obschestvennosti [The Fates of the Jewish People: Problems of the Jewish Community]*. Moskva: Sarodut, 237 s. [in Russian]

Po Ukraini. Kolonisty i nashe viisko. Vapniarka. 23.8. [Across Ukraine. The colonists and our army. Vapniarka. 23.8] (1919). *Ukraïnskyi kozak*, 40 (27 serpnia), 2. [in Pogromy v Fastove i Motovilovke [Pogroms in Fastiv and Motovilivka]. (1919). *Vinnitskaya jizn*, 7 (4 oktyabrya), 1–2. [in Russian]

Podarunok dlia armii. 17.07. [A gift to the army. 17.07.] (1919). *Vyzvolennia*, 24 (19 lypnia), 2. [in Ukrainian]

**Pyzhyk, A. M.** (1998). *Kulturno-prosvitnia diialnist uriadu UNR v period Dyrektorii [Cultural and educational activities of the UNR government during the Directory]*: broshura. Kyiv: Chetverta khvyliia, 35 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Serhiichuk, V.** (1998). *Pohromy v Ukraini: 1914 – 1920: vid shuchmykh stereotypiv do hirkoi pravdy, prykhovuvanoi v radianskykh arkhivakh [Pogroms in Ukraine: 1914 – 1920: from artificial stereotypes to the bitter truth hidden in Soviet archives]*. Kyiv: vyd-vo Oleny Telihy, 542 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Serhiichuk, V.** (1999). *Symon Petliura i yevreistvo [Simon Petliura and Judaism]*. Dnipro, 5–6, 105–140. [in Ukrainian]

**Shafarenko, A. M.** (2003). *Hermanivka vid naidavnishykh chasiv do sohodennia [Hermanivka from ancient times to the present]*. Hermanivka, 509 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Shtyf, N.** (1922). *Pogromy na Ukraine. Period Dobrovolcheskoj armii [Pogroms in Ukraine. Volunteer Army period]*. Berlin: Vostok, 96 s. [in Russian]

**Skorobohatov, V. P.** (1976). *Smila [Smila]: ist.-kraiezn. narys*. Dnipropetrovsk: Tiasmyn, 80 p. [in Ukrainian]

Sviato – manifestatsiia [Holiday – a manifestation]. (1919). *Nova Rada*, 2 (2 sichnia), 4. [in Ukrainian]

**Tan-Bogoraz, V. G.** (red.). (1926). *Evreyskoe mestechko v revolyutsii [Jewish town during the revolution]*. Moskva, Leningrad: GIZ, 219 s. [in Russian]

Telehramy. Pomich yevreiskoho naselennia [Help of the Jewish population]. (1919). *Trudova hromada*, 24 (24 lypnia), 3. [in Ukrainian]

**Troynitskiy, N. A.** (red.). (1905). *Naselennyye mesta Rossiyskoy imperii v 500 i bolee jiteley s ukazaniem vsego nalichnogo v nih naseleniya i chisla jiteley preobladayuschih veroispovedaniy po dannym Pervoy Vseobschey perepisi naseleniya 1897 g [Populated areas of the Russian Empire of 500 or more inhabitants, indicating the total population in them and the number of inhabitants of prevailing religions according to the First General Census of 1897]*. Sankt-Peterburg, 170 s. [in Russian]

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromadskykh obiednan Ukrainy [Central State Archives of Public Unions of Ukraine – CSAPUU]*

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchykh orhaniv vlady i upravlinnia Ukrainy [Central State Archives of Supreme Authorities and Governments of Ukraine – CSASUGU]*

V Starokostiantynivskomu poviti [In Starokostiantyniv district] (1919). *Vyzvolennia*, 6 (29 chervnia), 2. [in Ukrainian]

Viina. Interviu zi shtabom zahonu [War. Interview with the detachment headquarters]. (1919). *Novyi shliakh*, 2 (12 chervnia), 4. [in Ukrainian]

**Vynnychenko, V.** (1992). *Yevreiske pytannia na Ukraini [The Jewish issue in Ukraine]*. *Suchasnist*, 8, 116–125. [in Ukrainian]

**Yekelchik, S.** (1995). *Trahichna storinka Ukrainskoi revoliutsii: Symon Petliura ta yevreiski pohromy v Ukraini (1917 – 1920) [The Tragic Page of the Ukrainian Revolution: Simon Petliura and the Jewish Pogroms in Ukraine (1917-1920)]*. *Symon Petliura ta ukrainska natsionalna revoliutsiia: zb. nauk. pr.* (pp. 165–217). Kyiv: Rada. [in Ukrainian]

Z provintsii. Dunaievtsi [From the province. Dunaevtsi]. (1920). *Nash shliakh*, 104 (29 travnia), 2. [in Ukrainian]

Z yevreiskoho zhyttia. Borotba z bolshovykamy [From Jewish life. The struggle against the Bolsheviks]. (1919). *Ukraina*, 24 (7 veresnia), 4. [in Ukrainian]

Z yevreiskoho zhyttia. Sotnyk Hrinberh. Do yevreiskoi hromady m. Smotrycha [From Jewish life. Captain Greenberg. To the Jewish community of Smotrych]. (1919). *Trudova hromada*, 51 (2 veresnia), 7. [in Ukrainian]

Z zhyttia “Prosvit” na Podilliu: Bodnarenko A. m. Ladyzhyn, Haisynskoho povitu [From the life of «Prosvita» in Podillya: Bodnarenko A., Ladyzhyn, Haisyn district]. (1919). *Selo*, 2 (21 sichnia), 23–24. [in Ukrainian]

Z zhyttia Holovnoho Otamana [From the life of the Chief Ataman]. (1920). *Ukraina*, 119 (2 lypnia), 2. [in Ukrainian]

**Zavalniuk, O. M. & Komarnitskyi, O. B.** (2005). *Podilski mistechka v dobu Ukrainskoi revoliutsii 1917 – 1920 rr. [Podilsk towns during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 – 1920]*. Kamianets-Podilskyi: Abetka-NOVA, 320 p. [in Ukrainian]

Zhydy pomahaiut ukrainskomu viiskovi [The Jews help the Ukrainian military]. (1919). *Selianska hromada*, 8 (10 serpnia), 8. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on February 25, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94(477)(092)“19”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226509

**Petro IVANYSHYN**

*PhD hab. (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of Ukrainian Literature and Theory of Literature, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (pivanyshyn@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-9624-0994

**Iryna DMYTRIV**

*PhD hab. (Philology), Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Ukrainian Literature and Theory of Literature, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (ira.myrna@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-0937-1070

**Jan GRZESIAK**

*Dr hab. (Pedagogy), Professor, Department of Social Sciences, State Higher Vocational School in Konin, 1a Przyjaźni Str., Konin, Poland, postal code 62-510 (jan.grzesiak@konin.edu.pl)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-2898-4075

**Петро ІВАНИШИН**

*доктор філологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри української літератури та теорії літератури Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (pivanyshyn@gmail.com)*

**Ірина ДМИТРІВ**

*кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри української літератури та теорії літератури Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (ira.myrna@gmail.com)*

**Ян ГЖЕСЯК**

*доктор габілітований (педагогіка), професор кафедри соціальних наук Державної вищої професійної школи в Коніні, вул. Пзіязні 1а, Конін, Польща, індекс 62-510 (jan.grzesiak@konin.edu.pl)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Ivanyshyn, P., Dmytriv, I. & Grzesiak, J. (2021). The concept of cultural nationalism in the works of Dmytro Dontsov: main aspects. *Skhidnoieuropejskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 118–126. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226509

## THE CONCEPT OF CULTURAL NATIONALISM IN THE WORKS OF DMYTRO DONTSOV: MAIN ASPECTS

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research is to consider some important propaedeutic aspects of the interpretation of the Vistnyk cultural-nationalist concept, appealing to the experience of the founder of the Vistnyk tradition – the famous philosopher, publicist and editor Dmytro Dontsov. **The Methodology***

**of the Research.** Taking the purpose and tasks of the study into account, the methodological basis is clearly interdisciplinary. The epistemological potential of national philosophy as a philosophy of national existence, national science as a theory of nation, hermeneutics as a theory and practice of interpretation and post-colonialism as the interpretation of cultural phenomena from the standpoint of anti- and post-imperial consciousness is used in the work. **The scientific novelty** is that on the basis of the national-hermeneutic generalization and working definition of the concept of cultural nationalism, a propedeutic outlining of this phenomenon in the discourse of the founder of the Vistnyk tradition of Dmytro Dontsov is proposed. **The Conclusions.** The study covers the concept of cultural nationalism in general and outlines the most important elements of the concept of cultural nationalism within the ideology of D. Dontsov's willed nationalism. It is about the cultural dimension of the concepts of nationalism and national idea, national identity and national imperative. Other elements of the conception of the thinker also need more clarification: aesthetics, traditions, historiography, the national way of interpretation, religion, the system of values, the national Church, the religiosity of nationalism, the civilizational choice of Ukrainian, the national ideal, etc. The Dontsov's concept has an exceptional historical and genetic importance, as it has in a decisive way influenced the emergence of the ideological basis of such unique cultural and historical phenomena in the interwar period, such as *vistnykivstvo* and organized nationalism.

**Key words:** Dmytro Dontsov, nation, culture, nationalism, imperialism, international cooperation, multicultural education.

## КОНЦЕПЦІЯ КУЛЬТУРНОГО НАЦІОНАЛІЗМУ У ТВОРЧОСТІ ДМИТРА ДОНЦОВА: ОСНОВНІ АСПЕКТИ

**Анотація.** **Мета дослідження** – розглянути окремі важливі пропедевтичні аспекти тлумачення вісниківської культурно-націоналістичної концепції, звертаючись до досвіду основоположника вісниківської традиції – відомого філософа, публіциста, редактора Дмитра Донцова. **Методологія дослідження.** З огляду на мету і завдання дослідження, методологічна база виразно інтердисциплінарна. У роботі використовується гносеологічний потенціал націософії як філософії національного буття, націології як теорії нації, герменевтики як теорії та практики інтерпретації та постколоніалізму як інтерпретації культурних явищ з позиції анти- і постімперської свідомості. **Наукова новизна** полягає в тому, що на основі націософсько-герменевтичного узагальнення та робочого дефініціювання поняття культурного націоналізму запропоновано пропедевтичне окреслення цього феномена в дискурсі основоположника вісниківської традиції Дмитра Донцова. **Висновки.** У студії висвітлено поняття культурного націоналізму взагалі та окреслено найважливіші елементи концепції культурного націоналізму в межах ідеології вольового націоналізму Д. Донцова. Йшлося про культурні виміри понять націоналізму та національної ідеї, національної ідентичності та національного імперативу. Докладнішого висвітлення потребують також інші елементи концепції мислителя: естетики, традиції, історіософії, національного способу інтерпретації, релігії, системи вартостей, національної Церкви, релігійності націоналізму, цивілізаційного вибору українства, національного ідеалу та ін. Донцовська концепція має виняткове історико-генетичне значення, оскільки визначальним чином вплинула на постання ідейного базису таких унікальних культурно-історичних феноменів в межах доби між світовими війнами, як вісниківство та організований націоналізм.

**Ключові слова:** Дмитро Донцов, нація, культура, націоналізм, імперіалізм, міжнародна співпраця, полікультурна освіта.

**The Problem Statement.** In the context of the contemporary situation of development of native humanities studies, there is sometimes a lack of historical retrospective – a meaningful view at the previous interpretive tradition. This is clearly noticeably in the light of the interdisciplinary methodology of recent postcolonial criticism, which does not always realize the importance of anticolonial national-centric intentions of previous cultural and historical experiences: romanticism, Ukrainophilism, early modernism, *visnykivstvo* etc. for

its own hermeneutic basis. Actually, the latter, in our opinion, seems especially significant and conceptual, from the view of its heuristic potential.

**The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches.** Despite the presence of a large number of studies of *vistnykivstvo* as a cultural, historical and ideological-aesthetic phenomenon (O. Bahan, Ya. Dashkevych, M. Ilnytskyi, S. Kvit, V. Kachkan, H. Klochek, Yu. Kovaliv, V. Kolkutina, M. Krupach, V. Prosalova, R. Rahmannyi, T. Salyha, H. Svarnyk, etc.), however, in our opinion, in the post-imperial period there is a lack of interpretations of its philosophical-hermeneutic and methodological-conceptual component. (At the same time, it is necessary to avoid “the distorted notions about the nationalist (traditionalist) philosophy and aesthetics” (Bahan, 2009, p. 673) and doubtful interpretations of *vistnykivstvo* from the standpoint, according to S. Kvit, of the “Ukrainophobic academic international” (Kvit, 2013, p. 15)). It is, specifically, about the concept of cultural nationalism as a fundamental attribute of thinking and a way of interpreting reality within the consciousness of any creator-intellectual – ideologist, philosopher, artist, scholar, publicist, teacher, etc. – of the national-centric type. It is no by chance that modern national science emphasizes that “at the broadest level, nationalism should be considered as a form of historical culture and civic education” (Smit, 1994, p. 99).

The ideas and views expressed in the scientific works of Dmytro Dontsov are the subject of further scientific research in terms of nationalism (Grott, 2002; 2004; 2008).

**The Purpose of the Article.** Taking into account the brief size of this reflection, we’ll try to consider only some of the important propaedeutic aspects of the interpretation of the *Vistnyk* cultural-nationalist conception, appealing to the experience of the founder of the *Vistnyk* tradition – the famous philosopher, publicist and editor Dmytro Dontsov. Herewith we’ll use the methodological potential of national philosophy, national science, hermeneutics and post-colonialism.

**The Basic Material Statement.** Based on the congenial to the *vistnykivstvo*’s thinking methodological experience of national philosophical (national-existential) hermeneutics, we briefly outline the understanding of nationalism in the context of the theory of basic social worldviews or fundamental ideologies. Moreover, the understanding of nationalism as precisely the worldview of “the self-powerful of the nation” (elucidated in detail in the treatise “Nationalism” (1926)) is also dominant to the Dontsov’s philosophy.

In general, this is about the distinguishing between three fundamental ideological concepts: imperialism, cosmopolitanism and nationalism according to the nation and freedom as invariable values in the collective being. Imperialism (colonialism) and its hidden variant – cosmopolitanism – should be regarded as one of the two basic types of social worldview – the ideology of national non-freedom, the enslavement of one nation by another. Nationalism, on the other hand, is another major type of public worldview – the ideology of national freedom, that is, the strategy and practice of developing a free national existence. Imperialism (obviously) and cosmopolitanism (more covertly) affirm a predatory, nihilistic, devastating type of being, where calculative, shopkeeper, anti-existent thinking is dominated, where one becomes a slave of his pride, his selfishness and, at the same time, the master of the being and the slave of the other masters. Nationalism forms a caring, existentially-protective type of existence, where the existential-historical thinking is affirmed, where a person is a caring, free shepherd of being (in more details this theory has been interpreted in previous works: “National-existential Interpretation (Basic Theoretical and Pragmatic Aspects)”, “Freedom of the Nation”, “Ideological Foundations of Ukrainian Statehood”, “Concept of National

Revolution in Stepan Bandera's Political Philosophy", "National Revolution in Neo-Colonial Situation", "Ideological Sources of Geopolitics: National philosophy aspects", etc.).

In political theory and national science of the recent period, the famous American political scientist and geopolitist Samuel Huntington in his work "Who are we? Challenges to American National Identity"(2004) (Huntington, 2004) the most clearly differentiated three antagonistic worldview systems of imperialism, cosmopolitanism and nationalism. He described them as the three main ideological ways of state-building in the United States, but it is obviously that these strategies are not of local but universal theoretical significance, as they concern to any state. The first strategy is imperial (to transform the world into America, dissolve it in itself), the second strategy is cosmopolitan (to transform America into a world, dissolve into it), the third – nationalist (America must remain America, preserving its national originality, identity and sovereignty).

If in political theory is about three basic, that are difficult to combine, concepts of power and state-building strategies (imperialistic, cosmocratic and natocratic), then in the sphere of national existence as a structured spiritual system, these three concepts concern to cultural, economic, educational, scientific, religious, artistic, linguistic and other levels. Accordingly, cultural imperialism is distinguished as a world-view instruction of imposing to other peoples their own cultural (or pseudocultural) products with the purpose of eroding spiritual tradition, denationalization and enslavement. Cultural cosmopolitanism means the hidden (or unconscious) imperial strategy, the ideological instruction of cultural inferiority, denationalization, which foresees the destruction of own national originality and statehood, the subordination of one's spiritual values to the values of a "higher" metropolitan (as universal, global) tradition. Herewith cultural cosmopolitanism is often masked under altruistic or democratic slogans – as if it was "an effort of creating a world culture that is based based on the ideas of equality and freedom" (Gibernau). However, the consequences of cosmopolitan ideas are clearly imperial. For example, concerning Russia's contemporary aggressive policy it is about the creation in the dependent countries by the means of culture the imperial "Russian peace", while the "soft power" of the modern West, through "hybrid cosmopolitan culture", confirms a globalist "new imperialism." (Smit, 2006, pp. 33, 38). Instead, cultural nationalism emerges as a worldview position focused on preserving and developing its own cultural identity as a "sacred foundation" of the nation (Smit, 2009, p. 66), as the foundation of national freedom and statehood, as well as the basis of parity international dialogue.

Much about the complex relationship between imperialism, cosmopolitanism, and nationalism is discussed in contemporary national science and literary studies (particularly in post-colonial criticism). For example, Edward Said examined Orientalism as a cultural (often academic) way of the West to rule over the East, but "not a truthful discourse about the East". There fore, Orientalist "general ideas" are "throughout imbued with the doctrines of European highness, all kinds of racism, imperialism, and so on." (Said, 2001, pp. 17, 19). Here with, an American researcher of Palestinian origin also pointed out to the active use of the cosmopolitan method of enslavement of the peoples of the East on the example of Lord Cromer's instructions in reference to the colonized by the British Indians, Egyptians, Zulus, etc.: "although we will never be able to awaken in these people a sense of patriotism, akin to one based on the proximity of race or commonness of language, we may be able to foster original cosmopolitan devotion based on a sense of respect, which naturally appears towards people, endowed with higher talents and inclined to unselfish behavior, and on a sense of gratitude for the good that has already been done, and for what they hope." (Said, 2001, p. 54).

A well-known Ukrainian nation-scientist and literary scientist Stephanie Andrusiv is one of the first, whose detail was written about cosmopolitanism as the newest imperial method of denationalization on the example of liberalist strategy of mondialism: “It is imperialism without empire, that is, without its external attributes, which also seeks to subordinate peoples and territories through internal demoralization, transforming people into mass without ethnic and national consciousness, without traditions and roots – in the so-called non-national society, which is easy to exploit economically. Cosmopolitanism is the most effective and the most tried and tested means of its affirming and spreading in the world, and outwardly attractive rhetoric about the superiority of human rights over the rights of nations (as if a person is possible outside the community or there are no individual rights that can be realized only in a collective – ethnic group), about the superiority of the universal (“international”) over the national, ethnic, and in Ukraine – the importunate persuasion of the Ukrainians, who make up more than seventy percent of the population, in that as if “the national idea has not worked” in the present state building, so it is necessary to form not “an ethnic”, but “a political nation” (as if an ethnic nation cannot be a political one). In fact, it is about that in Ukraine there were not exactly a Ukrainian nation, because as though progressive “political” instead of backward, regressive “ethnic” in the Ukrainian context means “non-Ukrainian” (read “Russian”, exactly “Russian-speaking cosmopolitan”) against compromised, marginalized “Ukrainian” (“ethnic”) (Andrusiv, 2000, p. 20).

Cultural nationalism or nationalism in culture is the most effective answer to imperial-cosmopolitan strategies and practices in the cultural field, as nationalism and post-colonialism affirm. At the same time, it is considered not only as a national consciousness and sense, not only as “an ideological movement for the achievement and affirmation of independence, unity and identity of the nation”, but also as “a form of culture” – “the cultural doctrine of the nation and the will of the nation” (Smit, 1994, p. 80). It is no by chance that Australian literary scholar Simon During considered nationalism primarily as “cultural nationalism” because, “What protects against cultural, economic and military invasion of imperialism as not a culture?” (During, 1996, p. 566). In this sense, cultural nationalism emerges as a worldview position of the creators of national culture, which cultivates and affirms national identity (more broadly, the national idea), gives reasons for its true interpretation and artistic expression, and only through this foresees opposition to imperialism or cosmopolitanism (Ivanyshyn, 2005, p. 77).

One of the most eloquent examples of cultural-nationalist discourse can be found in the Ukrainian anti-colonial national philosophical tradition, specifically in the creative work of *vistnykivtsi*. The hermeneutic and publicist experience of D. Dontsov as the founder of the *vistnykivska* tradition in this case is very eloquent.

First of all, it is important to realize that, on the base of previous national-centric tradition, D. Dontsov works out his own variant of nationalism – “volitional” (or “valid”), which will mostly form the basis of the ideology of the OUN. For him, as a thinker, nationalism (“the self-powerful of the nation”) emerges as a “national ideology”, that is, a *social worldview* of the development of sovereign “peoples-nations”, opposed to the Provencal as “the worldview of the decline” of “peoples-provinces” (Dontsov, 2014, pp. 24–25). In the preface to the third edition of the treatise “Nationalism” (1966), the author emphasizes on a number of basic ideas of his work: confrontation with Drahomanov’s Little Russian’s conception, affirmation of the need for state independence, negation of socialism. The treatise answers three basic questions of any national liberation movement: 1) “what?” (“independence and complete separatism”

from Russia), 2) “how?” (“struggle”, “national revolution against the Muscovy”), 3) “who?” (“a man of a new spirit”). Herewith, the spiritual sphere played an important role, since the thinker is talking about a strategy of “complete gap with all Russia, and culturally – complete opposing to the whole spiritual complex of the Muscovy” (Dontsov, 2014, pp. 20–21).

Even the formulation of the pivot for the national-centric consciousness of the *national idea* is directly based on the tradition of artistic culture, because follows from the poetry of Taras Shevchenko. The philosopher formulates it as “the idea of state independence” and substantiates it as follows: “It has become an axiom of our thinking, the first demand of politics, the regular task of the day. This idea was nothing but a paraphrase of Shevchenko’s “own power in the own home.” For the nation to be sovereign, for it to have the authority on our land, for no one, no stranger to have power on that land.” (Dontsov, 2015, p. 87). Except the political and economic, the other elements of the Ukrainian idea formulated by D. Dontsov have a cultural character: “sovereignty” in politics, “Church that is free from the state” in religion, “Occidentalism” in culture, “free initiative and growth” in economic life (Dontsov, 2014, p. 177).

Only the *new political elite* (the “aristocracy”) is able to incarnate the national idea of Ukrainians into life. For D. Dontsov – they are idealistic, heroic, Cossack, chivalrous people, people of “warlike and lordship spirit”, the *vistnykivskyi* type of individual. The elitist type of national man lives by “high ideas that make the soul noble.” The type of ordinary man, sometimes just a servile, “unprincipled, weak-willed, unscrupulous man with the slogan “it’s no business of mine” or the desire to adapt to all “circumstances” and to any power that has fallen down on him” is opposed to it (Dontsov, 2015, pp. 92–96). Here it is important for the thinker to give an understanding of the destructiveness of the imperial ideology of the invaders. Because it was important for them not just to overcome Ukraine militarily, but to “kill her proud and independent spirit in her sons” (Dontsov, 2015, p. 83). It is exactly about cultural imperialism.

The cultural cosmopolitanism of the Little Russians and Provencals from the number of Socialists and Liberals is another important danger in the sphere of spiritual values. Their unprincipledness and unscrupulousness, skepticism and cynicism, according to the essayist, in its essence conceal a slave mentality, a willingness to worship “alien gods”, alien enslaving doctrines: “Man and community establish their own laws, axioms of life or fall down as a sacrifice of stranger pharaoh who brings his own laws that are foreign to that community” (Dontsov, 2015, pp. 85–86). It is not by chance that before the First World War, the thinker states above all the spiritual, cultural and outlook decline of the Ukrainian elite, her ailment with national “hermaphroditism”, her marginality: “Every even superficial observer of the Ukrainian movement in Russia must be struck by a strange fact: on the one hand, the doubtless progress of this movement, the capture by it every time the wider layers of society, on the other hand, the threatening decline of political thought in the circles of ideological leaders of bourgeois Ukrainians. The level of political maturity of modern Ukrainians is not only lower than that on which Ukrainians was in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but it cannot be compared even with the ideas of Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood” (Dontsov, 1911, p. 5).

A national imperative is the fundamental idea for a nationalist worldview. D. Dontsov introduces this term into the Ukrainian metadiscourse in the treatise “Nationalism” (1926). It is an idea as a categorical order that takes shape nationally and Christian-oriented thinking, permeates in the creative work of the thinker and serves as the basic reason for knowing and evaluating any reality, especially cultural ones. We see the corresponding formulations

throughout all the creative work of the political philosopher. For example, in the essay 1922 "To the old gods!" the author indicates that "only then a nation can keep its balance when will derive the rules of its life not from the sectarian commandments, but from the concepts and ideas that have arisen in the continuous struggle of generations for the preservation of ancestral land and family" (Dontsov, 2012, p. 63). In "Nationalism" it is about that the decadent, cosmopolitan, Provencal nationalism "did not know national postulates as something that was not discussed, was not a thing of faith, dogma. The imperatives of the nation were not categorical, only hypothetical imperatives..." (Dontsov, 2014, p. 65).

At the same time, the essayist clearly expresses the cultural component of the Provencal (*drahomanivstvo*) and true, valid nationalism through the following fundamental oppositions of the leading maxims: "The principles of valid nationalism, which everywhere emphasizes the moment of will, power and aggression, are an objection before-present foundations of "the mind", "spontaneity" and "mutual understanding", which are a complete contradiction of *drahomanivstvo*. The foundation of the latter were "rationalism in culture, federalism in the state, democracy in the community". The valid nationalism says: organic and faith is in culture, ownership is in the state, leadership, hierarchy are in the community. There the "happiness of the mass" was the essence of life, the class struggle was the life form, the infidelity was the life spirit. In valid nationalism, the essence of life is the activity and mighty of the nation, the life form is a national struggle, and the spirit of life is "romance", faith. There, patriotism was a "heavy yoke", not a "sentiment", here it should become a "sentiment", an own impulse, a passion outside of which there is neither happiness nor luxury". (Dontsov, 2014, pp. 176–177).

In such important spheres of national-existential hermeneutics and culture as art and literature, in the creative work of D. Dontsov national imperative forms a number of important and well-thought-out systems: national philosophical aesthetics (as the theory of the beautiful), national-existential hermeneutics (as the theory and practice of interpretation), national-centric theory of literature and literary criticism, which, despite of the available researches (S. Kvit, O. Bahan, V. Kolkutin, etc.), needs more detailed interpreting in the light of its concept of cultural nationalism. Here we allow ourselves to pay attention to the clear combination of national and Christian aspects of national order in the literary sphere. Distinguishing between the art (and, accordingly, the writing) of materialism, nihilism, decadence and great, noble, heroic art, D. Dontsov emphasizes on its Divine character: "There is also a second literature that, with a knife, reproaches evil and filth, forming everything high, pure and noble, all the virtues of our Divine Self, not for idyll or pleasure, only for the struggle for high aims, higher than our physical self ... This is a literature that forms the character, worldview, thought, soul and spirit of man and society, which we want it to be a Christian society not only from the name, but in essence". (Dontsov, 1949, p. 12).

On the other hand, he constantly emphasizes on the national-spiritual role of literature, its national-forming character. This is what is said in the preface to the post-war edition of collection of the essays "Two Literatures of Our Age" (1958). Since national existence is directly dependent on the quality of the national elite, on its outlook ("ideas of truth, good and beauty"), it must be admitted the key role of the great, human-forming and national-forming literature, which exactly forms this guiding world outlook, that is, to admit "the great role of literature in the spiritual and political forming of man and nation." (Dontsov, 1958, p. 5).

**Conclusions.** In this study, we tried to cover the concept of cultural nationalism in general and dotted outline only some the most important elements of the concept of cultural nationalism within the ideology of D. Dontsov's willed nationalism. It was about the cultural dimension of the concepts of nationalism and national idea, national identity and national imperative.

Other elements of this conception also need with enlisting broader analytical contexts more clarification: aesthetics, traditions, historiosophy, the national way of interpretation, religion, the system of values, the national Church, the religiosity of nationalism, the civilizational choice of Ukrainian, the national ideal, etc. Herewith we should realize that this Dontsov's concept has an exceptional historical and genetic importance, as it has in a decisive way influenced the emergence of the ideological basis of such unique cultural and historical phenomena in the interwar period, such as *vistnykivstvo* and organized nationalism. Without taking into account the system of cultural nationalism of D. Dontsov it seems hardly possible to grasp objectively the originality and versatility of *visnykivstvo*, the spiritual-historical meaning of nationalist ideology.

The processes of globalization and systemic transformations, especially in the system of functioning of the European Union, pose challenges to the contemporary information society, and even more recently, in the recent period of escalating national conflicts in many countries of the world. With the creation of the autonomous state of Ukraine at the end of the 20th century, after the Second World War and a series of transformations in the structures of the USSR, new conditions were created for the strengthening of scientific and cultural cooperation between the nations of Poland and Ukraine.

The efforts of D. Dontsov to mutual recognition of national identity in multidimensional international cooperation deserve to be emphasized. In this context, in recent decades there has been a lot of evidence of cooperation between nations in Polish-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Polish relations, covering a wide range of scientists, socio-cultural activists and business. One of the examples of such cooperation are the cooperation agreements between the Universities in Drohobych and Uzhhorod, and the State Higher Vocational School in Konin (Grzesiak, 2019; Wensierski, Zymomyra, 2006).

Interpersonal contacts between science and culture workers make it possible to enrich the achievements of science, for example about education or culture, both in Poland and in Ukraine through dialogues and discourses (including publications). Representatives of both nations, in the spirit of friendship and respect for the right of each nation to autonomous self-determination, contribute to the multiplication of the achievements through scientific and multicultural research that is not subject to politicization and does not undermine the value of truths. This is an extraordinary benefit to the areas of civic and patriotic education on the scale of each nation and state, and more broadly on an international scale.

The team of authors of this article proves the importance of combining the historical heritage as a tradition with current challenges and stands for care and actions aimed at an ever wider implementation of good – truth – peace for every person and every nation.

**Acknowledgments.** We express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing.

**Funding.** The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## REFERENCES

- Andrusiv, S. M.** (2000). *Modus natsionalnoi identychnosti: Lvivskiy tekst 30-kh rokiv XX st. Monohrafiia [Modus of national identity: Lviv text of the 1930s: Monograph]*. Lviv: Lvivskiy natsionalnyi universytet imeni Ivana Franka, Ternopil: Dzhura, 340 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Bahan, O.** (2009). Dmytro Dontsov, *vistnykivstvo*, nationalism: pytannia spadshchyny I spadkovosty [Dmytro Dontsov, *vistnykivstvo*, nationalism: issues of inheritance and heredity]. *Dontsov D. Literaturna eseistyka*. Drohobych: VF "Vidrodzhennia", 667–685. [in Ukrainian].

- Diuring, S.** (1996). Literatura – dviinyk natsionalizmu? [Is literature the double of nationalism?]. *Antolohiia svitovoiliteraturno-krytychnoi dumky XX st. Zared. M.Zubrytskoi*. Lviv: Litopys, 565–566. [in Ukrainian]
- Dontsov, D.** (1911). Natsionalni hermafrodyty. [National hermaphrodites]. *Nash holos*, 7, 4–17. [in Ukrainian]
- Dontsov, D.** (1949). *Yakoiu maie buty literatura?* [What should literature be like?]. Toronto. 12 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Dontsov, D.** (1958). Peredmovna do 2-hovydannia. [Preface to the 2nd edition]. *Dontsov, D. Dvi literaturny nashoi doby*. Toronto: Homin Ukrainy, 5–7. [in Ukrainian]
- Dontsov, D.** (2012). Dostaryhbohiv! [To the old gods!]. *Dontsov, D. Vybranivtory: u 10 t. Redkol.: O.Bahan (vidp. red.) i in.; lit. red. Ya. Radevych-Vynnytskyi. T. 3: Ideolohichna eseistyka (1922 – 1932 rr.). Uporiad., peredm., koment. O. Bahan*. Drohobych: VF “Vidrodzhennia”, 60–67. [in Ukrainian]
- Dontsov, D.** (2014). Natsionalizm [Nationalism]. *Dontsov, D. Vybranivtory: u 10 t. Redkol.: O. Bahan (vidp. red.) i in.; lit. red. Ya. Radevych-Vynnytskyi. T.7: Ideolohichna taistoriosofskaeseistyka (1923 – 1939 rr.). Uporiad., peredm., koment. O. Bahan*. Drohobych: VF “Vidrodzhennia”. S. 19–179. [in Ukrainian]
- Dontsov, D.** (2015). Demaskuvannishasheliv. [Unmasking thosewhodestroysomething, torturingsomeone, raisedoubts]. *Dontsov, D. Vybranivtory: u 10 t. Redkol.: O. Bahan (vidp. red.) i in.; lit. red. Ya. Radevych-Vynnytskyi. T.9: Ideolohichna i kulturolohichnaeseistyka (1948 – 1957 rr.). Uporiad., peredm., koment. O. Bahan*. Drohobych: VF “Vidrodzhennia”, 81–101. [in Ukrainian]
- Gibernau, M.** *Natsionalna identychnist vs kosmopolitychna identychnist [National identity vs cosmopolitan identity]*. URL: [http://www.ji-magazine.lviv.ua/2016/Gibernau\\_Nacionalna\\_identychnist.htm](http://www.ji-magazine.lviv.ua/2016/Gibernau_Nacionalna_identychnist.htm). [in Ukrainian]
- Grott, B.** (ed.) (2002). *Polacy i Ukraïncy dawniej i dziś*. [Poles and Ukrainians in the past and today]. Kraków. 221 s. [in Polish]
- Grott, B.** (ed.) (2004). *Stosunki polsko ukraińskie w latach 1939 – 2004*. [Polish-Ukrainian relations in 1939 – 2004]. Warszawa, 350 p. [in Polish]
- Grott, B.** (ed.). (2008). *Doncow Dmytro, Nacjonalizm [Dontcov Dmytro, Nationalism]*. Kraków, 281 p. [in Polish]
- Grzesiak, J.** (2019). Scientific and methodological aspects of improving the quality of humanistic education in the era of transformation. *Pedagogical science in the XXI century: state and development trends. Collective monograph*. Lviv-Toruń: Liha-Pres, 1–25. [in English]
- Hantington, S.** (2004). *Khto my?: Vyzovy amerykanskoi natsyonalnoi identychnosti. Per. sanhl. A. Bashkirova. [Who are we?: The Challenges of American National Identity]*. Moskva: OOO “Izdatelstvo AST”: OOO “Tranzitkniga”. 635 p. [in Russian]
- Ivanyshyn, P.V.** (2005). *Natsionalno-ekzystentsialna interpretatsiia (osnovni teoretychni ta prahmatychni aspekty). Monohrafiia. [National-existential interpretation (basic theoretical and pragmatic aspects): Monograph]*. Drohobych: VF “Vidrodzhennia”. 308 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Kvit, S.** (2013). *Dmytro Dontsov: ideolohichniy portret. Vydannia druhe, vypravlene i dopovnene. [Dmytro Dontsov: an ideological portrait. Second edition, corrected and supplemented]*. Lviv: Halytska vydavnycha spilka, 192 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Said, E. V.** (2001). *Orientalizm. Per. z anhl. V. Shovkun [Orientalism]*. K.: Osnovy. 511 s. [in Ukrainian]
- Smit, E.** (2006). *Natsiitanatsionalizmu hlobalnu epohu. Per. z anhl. M. Klymchuk i T. Tsybala. [Nations and nationalism in the global era]*. Kyiv: Nika-Tsent, 320 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Smit, E.** (2009). *Kulturni osnovy natsii. Iierarhiia, zapovit i respublika. Per. z anhl. P. Tarashchuk. [The cultural foundations of nations. Hierarchy, will and republic]*. Kyiv: Tempora. 312 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Smit, E. D.** (1994). *Natsionalna identychnist. Per. z anhl. Petro Tarashchuk. [National identity]*. Kyiv: Osnovy, 224 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Wensierski, P. & Zymomyra, M.** (ed.) (2006). *Ukraina – Polska: nowe wyzwanie epoki [Ukraine – Poland: the new challenges of the era]*. Koszalin-Gdańsk-Drohobycz-Kirowohrad, Vol. 6, 458 p. [in Polish]

The article was received on May 07, 2020.

Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.

UDC 94:341.485(477)“1932/1933”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226565

**Ihor YAKUBOVSKIY**

PhD (Architecture), Deputy Director of the Holodomor Research Institute, a branch of the National Museum of the Holodomor Genocide, 9 Lavrskiy Ave., Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01010 (igya78@gmail.com)

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-9986-6469

**ResearcherID:** 3423346/ihor-yakubovskyy/

**Ігор ЯКУБОВСЬКИЙ**

кандидат архітектури, заступник директора Інституту дослідження Голодомору філії Національного музею Голодомору-геноциду, пр. Лаврський, 9, Київ, Україна, індекс 01010 (igya78@gmail.com)

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Yakubovskiy, I. (2021). The Genocide Intention in the Light of New Documents on the Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 in Ukraine. *Skhidnoievropeiskiy Istorychniy Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 127–134. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226565

**THE GENOCIDE INTENTION IN THE LIGHT OF NEW DOCUMENTS  
ON THE HOLODOMOR OF 1932 – 1933 IN UKRAINE**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research is to identify and analyze additional archival documents that allow proving more thoroughly the USSR leadership's special intention existence to commit the Genocide against the Ukrainians, organizing the Holodomor in the USSR, the North Caucasus and Kuban in 1932 – 1933. The methodology of the research involves the use of the source methods, the analysis with the help of previously unknown documents, aimed at accumulating new evidence concerning the Genocide intention. The scientific novelty consists, primarily, in the fact that new archival sources have been introduced into the scientific circulation, which expanded the possibilities for the Holodomor legal qualification in 1932 – 1933 as the Genocide crime. For the first time, the documents have been found and analyzed showing that at least in the first half of 1933 the regional authorities required the villages, towns and districts authorities to send comprehensive information on the mortality rate dynamics in different age groups in the Holodomor every ten days, but the regional authorities did not take any measures in order to stop the mass murder by starvation, although they received reports regularly. The Conclusions.* The revealed documents concerning the Moldavian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic testified that the Holodomor organizers and executors of 1932 – 1933 created a special vertically integrated system aimed at constant monitoring of the mortality rate in the Ukrainian countryside, which provided for updating the information every five days at the district level and every ten days at the regional levels. The statistics and reports on Baltic region for the first half of 1933, which were regularly provided to the Moldavian Regional Committee of the CP (b) U, reflected a steady increase in the mortality rate in various villages and age groups. However, the information did not help, any decisive actions were not taken in order to help those people, who were starving, which only emphasized the government's intention to starve the planned amount of population to death.

**Key words:** the Holodomor, the Genocide, the Genocide intention, Ukraine, the Holodomor victims.

## НАМІР ГЕНОЦИДУ В СВІТЛІ НОВИХ ДОКУМЕНТІВ ПРО ГОЛОДОМОР 1932 – 1933 рр. В УКРАЇНІ

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* полягає у виявленні та аналізі додаткових архівних документів, які дозволяють ґрунтовніше довести наявність у керівництва СРСР спеціального наміру вчинити злочин геноцид щодо українців, організувавши на території УСРР, Північного Кавказу та Кубані Голодомор 1932 – 1933 рр. **Методологія дослідження** передбачає застосування джерелознавчих методів, аналіз за їхньою допомогою невідомих раніше документів, спрямований на формування нових доказів наміру геноциду. **Наукова новизна** дослідження полягає насамперед у тому, що до наукового обігу вводяться нові архівні джерела, які розширюють можливості для правової кваліфікації Голодомору 1932 – 1933 рр. як злочину геноциду. Вперше виявлено та проаналізовано документи, які свідчать про те, що владні структури обласного рівня як мінімум в першій половині 1933 р. вимагали від влад сіл, міст і районів надслати щодесять днів всебічну інформацію про динаміку смертності населення в різних його вікових групах на території Голодомору й регулярно отримували її від них, але не вживали заходів, спрямованих на припинення масового вбивства голодом. **Висновки.** Виявлені документи, які стосуються Молдавської АСРР, свідчать про те, що організатори і виконавці Голодомору 1932 – 1933 рр. створили спеціальну вертикально інтегровану систему постійного моніторингу рівня смертності в українському селі, яка передбачала оновлення інформації щоп'ять днів на рівні районів і щодесять днів на рівні області. Статистичні дані та доповідні по Балтському району за першу половину 1933 року, які регулярно надавалася Молдавському обкому КП(б)У, відображають постійне зростання смертності в різних селах та вікових групах. Проте ця інформація не стала сигналом для рішучих заходів з надання допомоги тим, хто голодував, що лише відтінює намір влади вбити голодом заплановану кількість населення.

**Ключові слова:** Голодомор, геноцид, намір геноциду, Україна, жертви Голодомору.

**The Problem Statement.** The Holodomor issue concerning the legal qualification and political and legal assessment of 1932 – 1933 is paramount in the bloodiest crime study against the Ukrainians in the XXth century. Since 1953, when Raphael Lemkin, the author of the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, published in 1948, defined the Holodomor as the “Soviet Genocide” (Lemkin, 2009, p. 31, 33), but the scientific and political discussions concerning the issue are of high topicality all around the world till nowadays. Even Kyiv Court of Appeal’s Resolution, issued on the 13th of January in 2010, which, summarized the criminal case № 475, stated that “the Ukrainian Holodomor parameters meet the requirements of the 1948 Convention” because they provided the part of the Ukrainian (and not any other) national group’s destruction”, couldn’t stop the heated discussions (Gerasymenko and Udovychenko, 2014, c. 441–442). At the heart of the issue is proving that the authorities at the time intended to organize a murder by starvation. According to researcher V. Vasylenko, “Decisive and critical for the legal assessment of a behavior as the Genocide crime is a special intention emergence to destroy a certain group and prove that this intention concerned this national, ethnic racial, religious group as such, and not finding an answer to the question why, for what reasons and motives where and when the crime was committed, or about the so-called quantitative Threshold, namely the number of the crime victims” (Vasylenko, 2016, p. 18). But there are no relevant legislative or administrative documents nowadays. And one can hardly hope that they will be found in the future because the Russian occupation Communist government preferred not to leave direct evidence on paper. The Communist government’s fervent desire to hide from the world the very fact of the Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 in Ukraine, could be considered perhaps as the most convincing evidence. Therefore, it remains only to operate with indirect historical and legal arguments, the

combination of which will give grounds to speak about the Genocide intention existence. The scientific basis of the Holodomor legal assessment of 1932 – 1933 became the main direction of elaboration the search for such evidence. Their diversification and accumulation deepen the idea of the essence of the latter, emphasizing the various components of the Genocide crime.

**The Analysis of Resent Researches.** Recently, the study concerning the Genocide intention was thriving. The Genocide intention issue was developed by both historians and lawyers actively, both the Genocide concept supporters and those who deny the genocidal nature of the Holodomor. There were the following modern legal scholars: M. Antonovych, V. Vasylenko, K. Bondar, D. Marcus, B. Futey, who kept to the concept, according to which in legal terms the above-mentioned UN Convention of 1948 did not require the presence of authentically recorded in the document/intention documents, and the set of historical arguments used by the Holodomor history researchers allows us to draw a reasoned conclusion about the Genocide intention, formed in the ruling elite of the USSR (Antonovych, 2016, pp. 84–92; Bondar, 2016, pp. 102–116; Marcus, 2003, pp. 246, 255; Futey, 2016, pp. 183–186; Vasylenko, 2016, pp. 20–62). Furthermore, the Genocide intention existence was noted by all historians directly or implicitly, who recognize the Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 as the Genocide, for example, A. Besançon, A. Graziosi, D. Koch, S. Kulchytskyi, V. Marochko, J. Mace, N. Neymark, N. Romanets, A. Serhiychuk, R. Serbyn, H. Fein and the others. The Genocide intention could be derived from the logic of decisions and the set of actions taken by the Holodomor organizers and high-ranking executors. The following execrable actions were considered to be self-sufficient proof of the Kremlin’s intention to commit the Genocide, in particular, the unbearable grain procurement plan, harsh repressive measures with the “blackboards” and the Law of Five Spikelets at the top of the pyramid, all food supplies confiscation, the Holodomor territory blockade.

At the same time, the thesis about the alleged legal nullity the Holodomor qualification of 1932 – 1933 as the Genocide carries on evolving in the intellectual circulation, as there weren’t found any direct instructions from J. Stalin and his associates concerning the Ukrainians extermination’s organization. In addition, the Russian historians who, denying the Genocide, continue to develop the idea of the “All Soviet Union famine” (Kondrashyn, 2011, c. 13; Zelenin, p. 45–46).

Hence, under such circumstances, the strategy of evidence base strengthening of the Holodomor Genocide requires to be covered with an explanatory model of the largest possible range of actions of the power vertical in Ukraine, showing conscious intent to commit famine, the fact that these weapons were aimed at the Ukrainians’ destruction, and the representatives of other national groups, who lived along with the Ukrainians fell under the general rink.

**The purpose of the article** is to investigate the identified documentary materials that expand the evidence base in order to prove the USSR leadership’s special intention existence to commit the Genocide against the Ukrainians, organised Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 in the USSR, the North Caucasus and Kuban.

**The Basic Material Statement.** The researchers, in order to determine whether or not there was a specific intent to commit the Genocide crime, focused on elucidating a well-thought-out and ever-improving repressive component of a policy aimed at the starvation of a part of the “Ukrainian national group”, which was camouflaged under the struggle for the the grain procurement plan implementation and against the Soviet government enemies and the saboteurs. The Holodomor organizers’ and perpetrators’ awareness issue, namely the consequences of their chosen course is much less developed. However, for the qualification

of the Holodomor as the Genocide, a detailed clarification of the latter aspect is of the utmost importance, as M. Antonovych emphasized rightly when analyzing the source of the law “Elements of Crimes” of the International Criminal Court (ICC), which has jurisdiction over the Genocide crimes (Antonovych, 2019, c. 20). According to the ICC, there is a close link between the crime itself and the intention presence and the knowledge of the consequences to be expected once the intention is implemented. (Elements, 2011, p. 1). To what extent did the Holodomor organizers and performers and at what level did they understand what results their actions would lead or could potentially lead to? Did they realize that they would cause the Holodomor territory formation, mass deaths from famine, as well as the accompanying manifestations of the crime, which in 1948 will be defined as the Genocide? Due to the recently found documents in Baltic District Committee party funds, there is a chance to expand the scientific ideas about these issues significantly.

First of all, it was about the Genocide crime organizers and the vertical of perpetrators awareness degree regarding the level and the mortality rate dynamics in the first half of 1933, when the Holodomor was thriving. In addition, during the Holodomor of 1932 – 1933, the Soviet statistical system failed miserably and could no longer be a source of complete information for the authorities (Boriak, 2008, pp. 199–215). It should be mentioned that the parallel mechanisms of information support of the power vertical weren’t reconstructed in their entirety. The array of sources, which was introduced into the scientific circulation, gave only a selective idea concerning the messages flow through different channels. Thus, the issue directly related to the Genocide intention issue remains unclear, namely, how fully and reliably was the government informed about the situation on the ground and the consequences of its actions, and most importantly, whether it really sought to have as accurate information as possible to assess and adjust their actions.

Owing to the Baltic District Committee party funds, it was just possible to come across the documents that shed light on the mechanism of informing the Communist Party bodies concerning the mortality rate through the grassroots party organization – the District Committee – the Moldovan Regional Committee of the CP (b) U. It was revealed that there were the interconnected documents, performed by I. Sirko’s directives the Moldovan Regional Committee of CP (b) U First Secretary, Kaptsevych the Baltic District Committee of CP (b) U secretary and Varhaftin, responsible employee of the same District Committee. In the force field of these documents were Kaptsevych’s information letters sent to the Regional Committee, as well as, and most importantly, the information about mortality rate in different periods from the 1<sup>st</sup> of January to the 10<sup>th</sup> of July in 1933. Most of the information was intended for Tyraspol data on the Baltic region. However, the documents on Baltic and Bondariv Village Councils for July 1–10, 1933 were also preserved.

I. Sirko’s directive addressed to Kaptsevych on the 28<sup>th</sup> of March in 1933 with the following requirement: “to inform the Regional Committee in writing about the the hunger strike facts and about the measures taken by you on this issue”, is considered to be of utmost importance (State Archive of Odesa Region – SAOR, f. P-869, d. 2, c. 44, p. 87). Furthermore, the document mentioned the previous directives (“a number of directives and instructions”), which were sent several times, but the Baltic District Committee had some problems with the implementation. In addition, the Baltic District Committee Secretary’s name was handwritten in the text of the directive printed on the regional committee form, which testified its distribution on other areas. Thus, the Moldovan Regional Committee of the CP (b) U demanded constant information concerning the Holodomor consequences.

It should be clarified for what kind of information they were waiting for as the requirement was disguised in the formula the “starvation facts”. The answer was on the surface, due to Kaptsevych’s and Varhaftin’s directives content, which were sent to the party centers’ secretaries, information letters to the regional committee, and even better specially formed information, which was sent to Tyraspol.

Thus, Varhaftin stressed the following on the 4<sup>th</sup> of June: “Despite repeated warnings about the timely and accurate information supply on the number of those in dire need of the food aid and the mortality, some party centers’ secretaries (Shlyakhova, Lyakhove, Passaty, Horbyne) still treat the most important cases irresponsibly, the data is incorrect and send untimely”. It was further ordered to submit the information for May 25-June 1 and the whole of May by the 6<sup>th</sup> of July, and there was also the warning that “the party centers’ secretaries are responsible for timely notification and accuracy of information personally, and those guilty of the non-compliance will be prosecuted” (SAOR, f. P-869, d. 2, c. 44, p. 98). In unison, Kaptsevych demanded the reports concerning “the number of deaths” on the 11<sup>th</sup> of June, and noted that “information for the last five days from the 25<sup>th</sup> of May to the 1<sup>st</sup> of June has not been provided yet”. First of all, the information was collected from places every five days, and second of all, that the process itself was launched much earlier than in May – June. Both Kaptsevych and Varhaftin put emphasis on the fact that they had to remind repeatedly about the information, which should be sent on time, and demanded to explain the reasons for the delay (SAOR, f. P-869, d. 2, c. 44, pp. 87, 98).

Hence, both the regional and district authorities were really talking about the mortality rate determination, and not just about the “starvation facts”, as the Moldovan Regional Committee of the CP (B) U First Secretary was trying to cover the issue. The Moldovan Regional Committee of the Central Committee (b) First Secretary’s directive, in particular, the verbal formula “the hunger strike facts and the measures you take on this issue” had a completely different meaning. In addition, both the district and the region authorities needed the accurate information on time. For non-compliance with the requirement, secretaries of grassroots party cells were threatened with severe punishment. At the same time, on the 31<sup>st</sup> of May, in a report to the Regional Committee, Kaptsevych complained that the “data on mortality from exhaustion, malnutrition by PKK commissioners and party secretaries were significantly belittled, because the old age – over 50 years, who actually died of malnutrition and exhaustion, their cause of death was related because the “old age”” (SAOR, f. P-869, d. 2, c. 44, p. 63).

Finally, all doubts about what kind of data the regional authorities really needed were removed by the developed form of information tables, which were sent to Tyraspol (as well as from other districts of the region). The same documents, reflecting the mortality rate dynamics from January to the 10<sup>th</sup> of July in 1933, shed light on how the authorities disposed of the information, how they responded to the violent increase in mortality. Taking into account the analyzed directives, we can make a conclusion about whether or not there was the intention to commit the Genocide crime.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the document, which was entitled “The Information on the number of those in dire need of food aid, sick and dead due to food difficulties in the Baltic region”. Eight of those documents submit generalized data separately for each village in the following chronological intervals: the 1<sup>st</sup> of January– the 28<sup>th</sup> of April, the 29<sup>th</sup> of April – the 14<sup>th</sup> of May, the 14<sup>th</sup> of May – the 25<sup>th</sup> of May, the 25<sup>th</sup> of May – the 1<sup>st</sup> of June, the 1<sup>st</sup> of June – the 10<sup>th</sup> of June, the 10<sup>th</sup> of June – the 20<sup>th</sup> of June, the 20<sup>th</sup> of June – the 1<sup>st</sup> of July, the 1<sup>st</sup> of July – the 10<sup>th</sup> of July (SAOR, f. P-869, d 2, folder 44, p. 75, 82–83,

84–86, 93–94, 104–112). In addition, there were two summary documents, which summarize the general results without a breakdown into villages. The first document was concluded on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of June and contained indicators for the 1<sup>st</sup> of January – the 28<sup>th</sup> of April, the 28<sup>th</sup> of April – the 14<sup>th</sup> of May, the 14<sup>th</sup> of May – the 25<sup>th</sup> of May (SAOR, f. P-869, d. 2, c. 44, p. 101). In the second document to the preliminary information the data for were added the 25<sup>th</sup> of May – the 1<sup>st</sup> of June, the 1<sup>st</sup> of June – the 10<sup>th</sup> of June, the 10<sup>th</sup> of June – the 20<sup>th</sup> of June (SAOR, f. P-869, d. 2, c. 44, p. 81).

The form of information with the generalization on each village provides the following components: the period for which the statement was made; the name of the settlement; the number of deaths by sex, by age groups (up to 10 years, 10–18 years, 18 – 50 years, over 50 years), by sectors (collective farmers or individuals); causes of death (rubrics “typhus and infectious diseases”, “old age”, “exhaustion and malnutrition”, “heart failure”, “other diseases”); the number of those in dire need of food aid, again divided into collective farmers and individuals, and within these groups into children and adults (SAOR, f. P-869, d. 2, c. 44, pp. 75, 80–82, 84, 93, 101). The information received from village councils had a similar form.

Against the background of the information form, as well as the above directives, the resolution of the Central Committee of the CP (b) U “On cases of starvation in villages and small towns of the republic” of the 8<sup>th</sup> of February in 1933 looked indicative internal resources to remedy the situation, it was planned to allocate centralized assistance. At the same time attention! – it was ordered: “While carrying out this work, to prohibit the sending of any official commissions and to keep official records regarding collective farms, districts and cities” (Pyrig, 2007, p. 668). In other words, the resolution demanded that documented traces of the Holodomor not be allowed to appear. All information had to be hidden from the outside eye and circulated in the power vertical exclusively. The documents found in the fund of the Baltic District Committee of the CP (b) U reflect this mechanism.

The figures contained in the data require a separate careful analysis. For the same article, the actual mortality rate dynamics were important. And it is impressive, even taking into account the high probability of underestimation of data, as Kaptsevych himself wrote. Despite the fact that the Baltic District Committee of the CP (b) U and the Moldovan Regional Committee of the CP (b) U constantly had information on the affairs’ state on the ground and demanded accurate data under threat of severe punishment, mortality rate only increased. If from the 1<sup>st</sup> January to the 28<sup>th</sup> of April in the area 2432 persons died, only in 15 days from the 29<sup>th</sup> of April to the 14<sup>th</sup> May – already 910 (without data on 8 Village Councils) (SAOR, f. P-869, d. 2, c. 44, pp. 81, 93, 101). Then the lever continued to gain momentum, so they began to receive information every ten days, and that every five days. Hence, from the 15<sup>th</sup> to the 25<sup>th</sup> of May, 907 people died, in five days from the 25<sup>th</sup> of May to the 1<sup>st</sup> of June – 683, from the 1<sup>st</sup> of June to the 10<sup>th</sup> of June – 1245, from the 10<sup>th</sup> of June to the 20<sup>th</sup> of June – 1158, from the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 10<sup>th</sup> of July – 693, but without data on 13 village councils (SAOR, f. P-869, d. 2, c. 44, pp. 75, 80–82, 84). Hence, the verbal indicators of mortality take on a particularly sinister coloring when viewed against the background of the fact that the authorities kept their hands firmly on the pulse of events.

**The Conclusions.** The study clearly shows that the power vertical was not just aware of the dynamics of mortality. It aimed to operate with constantly updated and accurate information on this issue. A special information mechanism was created, which provided for the regular receipt of relevant information from village councils to the region, as well as a notification form was developed, which contained comprehensive information on mortality

in different settlements and age groups. Ultimately, the authorities were well aware of the dire situation, took steps to keep it detailed, but did not take action to correct it, and the mortality rate curve only pulled up. Under conditions of strict centralization, such behavior could not be the initiative of the Communist Party leadership of the Moldavian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. So this algorithm was programmed by the center. The so-called “food aid”, but in fact a cynical loan, was designed, as in other regions of Ukraine, only to hide the real plan. All the above-mentioned information indicate only one thing – a deliberate course of starvation. Thus, there were additional arguments in favor of the conclusion that the authorities intended to commit the Genocide crime.

**Acknowledgements.** The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the journal’s editorial board members for the given advice during the preparation of the article for publishing.

**Funding.** The author did not receive financial assistance for research, preparation and publication of the article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Antonovych, M.** (2016). The 1932 – 1933 Holodomor in Ukraine within the Context of the Soviet Genocide against the Ukrainian Nation. In V. Vasylenko and M. Antonovych (Eds.), *The Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 in Ukraine as a Crime of Genocide under International Law* (pp. 74–95). Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “Kyievo-Mohylanska Akademiia”. [in Ukrainian]

**Antonovych, M.** (2019). Women and Children as Victims of Genocidal Acts in the Holodomor of the Ukrainian Nation. In Victoria A. Malko (Ed.), *Women and the Holodomor-Genocide: Victims, Survivors, Perpetrators* (pp. 17–33). Fresno: The Press at California State University. [in Ukrainian]

**Bondar, K.** (2016). Legal Definition of Genocide: Examining the 1932 – 1933 Holodomor in Ukraine under the Genocide Convention. In V. Vasylenko and M. Antonovych (Eds.), *The Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 in Ukraine as a Crime of Genocide under International Law* (pp. 95–119). Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “Kyievo-Mohylanska Akademiia”. [in Ukrainian]

**Boriak, H.** (2008). Population Losses in the Holodomor and Destruction of Related Archives, New Archival Evidence. In *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 30(1–2), 199–215. [in English]

**Derzhavnyi Arkhiv Odeskoi oblasti [The State Archive of Odesa Region – SAOR] Elements.** (2011). Elements of Crime. International Criminal Court, 2011. URL: <https://www.icc-cpi.int/NR/rdonryles/336923D8-A6AD-40EC-AD7B-45BF9DE73D56/0/ElementsOFCrimesEng.pdf>. [in English]

**Futey, B. A.** (2016). International Legal Responsibility for Genocide: Justice in the Courts. In V. Vasylenko and M. Antonovych (Eds.), *The Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 in Ukraine as a Crime of Genocide under International Law* (pp. 173–187). Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “Kyievo-Mohylanska Akademiia”. [in Ukrainian]

**Gerasymenko, M. and Udovychenko, V. (Eds.).** (2014). *Genocyd v Ukraini 1932 – 1933 rr. za materialamy kryminalnoi sprawy # 475* [Genocide in Ukraine under the Criminal Case # 475]. Kyiv: IUAD, 560 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Kondrashyn, V. V.** (2011). Predposylki i nachalo stalinskogo goloda (1929 – 1932) [The Causes and the Beginning of Stalin’s Famine (1929 – 1932)]. In Kondrashyn, V. V. (Ed.). *Golod v SSSR 1929–1934. Tom pervyi. Kn. 1. 1929 – iul 1932. Dokymenty* (pp. 11–52). Moskva: MFD. [in Russian]

**Lemkin, R.** (2009). *Soviet Genocide in Ukraine. Article in 28 Languages*. Kyiv: “Maisternia Knyhy”, 208 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Marcus, D.** (2003). Famine Crimes in International Law. *The American Journal of International Law*, 2, 245–281. [in English]

**Pyryg, R. (Ed.).** (2007). *Holodomor 1932–1933 v Ukraini. Dokumenty i materialy* [The Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 in Ukraine: Documents and Materials]. Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “Kyievo-Mohylanska Akademiia”, 1128 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Serhiychuk, V.** (2018). *Holodomor 1932 – 1933 rokiv iak genocid ukrainstva* [Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 as a Genocide of the Ukrainians]. Kyiv: PP Serhiychuk M. I., 432 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Vasylenko, V.** (2016). A Methodology for Legal Analysis of the 1932 – 1933 Holodomor in Ukraine as a Crime of Genocide. In V. Vasylenko and M. Antonovych (Eds.), *The Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 in Ukraine as a Crime of Genocide under International Law* (pp. 13–73). Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim “Kyievo-Mohylanska Akademiia”. [in Ukrainian]

**Zelenin, I. E.** (2003). Organizovannyi golod (1932 – 1933). *Krasnodsarskii pravozashchitnyi katalog – daidzhest, (1)*, 44–73. [in Russian]

*The article was received on February 27, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94:341.485(477)“1932/1933”+323.282(477)(092)  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226549

**Olesia STASIUK**

PhD (History), Director General of National Museum of the Holodomor-Genocide, Honored Worker of Culture of Ukraine, 3 Lavrska Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01015 (olesia.stasiuk@gmail.com)

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-9527-982X

**Олеся СТАСЮК**

кандидат історичних наук, генеральний директор Національного музею Голодомору-геноциду, заслужений працівник культури України, вул. Лаврська 3, Київ, Україна, індекс 01015 (olesia.stasiuk@gmail.com)

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Stasiuk, O. (2021). On the perpetrators list compilation of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians: party-state nomenclature and employees of repressive punitive bodies. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 135–147. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226549

**ON THE PERPETRATORS LIST COMPILATION  
OF THE HOLODOMOR-GENOCIDE OF THE UKRAINIANS: PARTY-STATE  
NOMENCLATURE AND EMPLOYEES OF REPRESSIVE PUNITIVE BODIES**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research is to publish the names of individual figures of the party-state nomenclature and employees of repressive and punitive bodies belonging to the cohort of perpetrators of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians, as well as to analyze their role in committing this crime. The research methodology is based on the principles of historicism, systematization, scientificity, verification, an authorial objectivity, the use of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization) and special historical (historical genetic, historical typological, historical systemic) methods. The scientific novelty is that for the first time the material on the compilation of future lists of perpetrators of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians in 1932 – 1933 has been analyzed, which is an important aspect of domestic famine studies at the present stage. The Conclusions.* Studying and compiling the lists of perpetrators of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians is an important and promising area of research, because it deals with the institution of commissioners, which arose as a result of a deliberate criminal intent by the top party leadership of the USSR to subdue the Ukrainians by making them starve. In this crime case, it is a collective subject of the crime – from the organizers among the top Soviet leadership to the party-state nomenclature and representatives of the repressive and punitive bodies of the USSR, which should be the subject of a comprehensive and full-fledged research, with a view to compiling and publishing as complete and authentic list as possible of all perpetrators of this crime. This case requires the need to broaden the view on the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians and to move to another level of the research – to generalized, synthetic studies, which led to the models modernization of historical knowledge and brought the Ukrainian famine to a higher, generalizing level of understanding.

**Key words:** Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians, lists of perpetrators, party-state nomenclature, repressive and punitive bodies of the USSR.

**ДО ПИТАННЯ ПРО УКЛАДАННЯ СПИСКУ ВИКОНАВЦІВ  
ГОЛОДОМОРУ-ГЕНОЦИДУ УКРАЇНЦІВ:  
ПАРТІЙНО-ДЕРЖАВНА НОМЕНКЛАТУРА ТА ПРАЦІВНИКИ  
РЕПРЕСИВНО-КАРАЛЬНИХ ОРГАНІВ**

***Анотація.** Мета дослідження – оприлюднити імена окремих діячів партійно-державної номенклатури та працівників репресивно-каральних органів, що належать до когорти виконавців Голодомору-геноциду українців, а також проаналізувати їхню роль у вчиненні даного злочину. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах історизму, системності, науковості, верифікації, авторської об'єктивності, на використанні загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, узагальнення) та спеціально-історичних (історико-генетичний, історико-типологічний, історико-системний) методів. **Наукова новизна** полягає в тому, що вперше проаналізовано матеріал на предмет укладання майбутніх списків виконавців Голодомору-геноциду українців 1932 – 1933 рр., що є вагомим аспектом вітчизняних голодоморознавчих студій на сучасному етапі. **Висновки.** Вивчення та укладання списків виконавців Голодомору-геноциду українців є важливим і перспективним напрямком дослідження, адже йдеться про інститут уповноважених, що виник в результаті цілеспрямованого злочинного наміру з боку вищого партійного керівництва СРСР приборкати українців шляхом їх примусового виголодження. У випадку з цим злочиним йдеться про колективного суб'єкта злочину – від організаторів серед вищого радянського керівництва до партійно-державної номенклатури та представників репресивно-каральних органів УРСС, який має стати об'єктом комплексного та повноцінного дослідження, маючи на меті укладання та оприлюднення якомога повнішого й автентичного списку усіх виконавців цього злочину. Це тягне за собою потребу розширення погляду на тему Голодомору-геноциду українців та переходу на інший рівень досліджень – до узагальнюючих, синтетичних опрацювань, що зумовлювало модернізацію існуючих моделей історичного пізнання та виводило українське голодоморознавство на вищий, узагальнюючий рівень осягнення проблем.*

***Ключові слова:** Голодомор-геноцид українців, списки виконавців, партійно-державна номенклатура, репресивно-каральні органи УРСС.*

**The Problem Statement.** Historical events, such as victories or crimes, can be unlikely considered predetermined according to some general outlined plan. Behind each of these events there are specific figures of different levels, who generate and implement these events, there are their creators at the level of political forces, individual groups and their leaders.

The situation is similar to the organization of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians in 1932 – 1933, which is undoubtedly a global crime with its own planning engineers, organizers and executors. The vast majority of famine historians for some reason ignore the personal aspect of the problem, paying more attention to the ideological preconditions, demographic data or, for instance, consequences. But as long as the question of the role of the commissioners and perpetrators institution of the Genocide of the Ukrainians remains unanswered, we will not be able to get a complete and detailed picture of this crime, we will not be able to understand its significance for modern Ukrainian society. It is not only about the organizers, who held the leading positions in the Ukrainian Bolshevik Party, about S. Kosior, P. Postyshev and V. Chubar, but it is also about other employees of the party apparatus, repressive and punitive bodies, whose names and lists must be made public, because it is a well-organized criminal vertical from an institutional point of view, which purposefully and consistently exterminated the Ukrainians, depriving them of their livelihoods and starving them to death at their ethnic territory.

**The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches.** Nowadays, the participation issue of commissioners and perpetrators institution in the Holodomor-Genocide of 1932 – 1933 in Ukraine is almost not raised among the Holodomor historians. Close to this topic are the

researches, which focus on analyzing the moral and political climate and social sentiments, formed under conditions of confrontation of rural activists and performers with peasant farmers, of the Genocide of the Ukrainians. (Bem, 2003; Bem, 2007), Stalin's "revolution from the above" as an important factor in the politicization of the Ukrainian community and the formation of rural "activists" and the institution of performers (Hrynevych, 2003), the socio-psychological portrait of a rural "activist" within the cultural and anthropological paradigm of historiographical researches (Drovoziuk, 2003), formation of social groups, typology of behaviour and methods of work of rural "activists" and performers (Lysenko, 2011; Lysenko, 2012), their activity as one of the factors in the emergence of peasant uprisings (Lysenko, 2013).

**The purpose of the article** – the publication of the names of individual figures of the party-state nomenclature and employees of repressive and punitive bodies, who belong to the cohort of perpetrators of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians, as well as the analysis of their role in committing this crime.

**The Basic Material Statement.** One of the important aspects of researching the topic of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians in 1932 – 1933 is the formation and analysis of the list of commissioners and executors, who helped the communist government to carry out the system of criminal acts, "aimed at the physical extermination of a group of people" in different regions of Ukraine, i.e., the Genocide, called by Nuremberg International Military Tribunal (Mokhonchuk, 2011, pp. 356–357). According to a resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly on 11 December 1946, Genocide was declared a crime according to the international law. The principal perpetrators and accomplices must be punished, no matter whether they are public officials or private individuals. The formation of the perpetrators list of the Genocide of the Ukrainians is one of the priorities of modern Holodomor historians. Without the list of perpetrators the Holodomor crime will still be questioned and challenged by various states, institutions and expert groups.

Let's try to single out and analyze some materials that are important for compiling the perpetrators list of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians in the future, we are talking about the information on the members of the party-state nomenclature, repressive and punitive bodies, who carried out criminal orders of the top party leadership at the territory of Ukraine.

### ***Performers of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians among the Party-State Nomenclature***

*Akulov Ivan Oleksiyovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide – a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. and the Organization Bureau of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (October of 1932 – November of 1933), the First Secretary of Donetsk Regional Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (September 20, 1932 – September 18, 1933) and the Secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. for Donbass (from October 12, 1932 till November 22, 1933). As the first deputy chairman of the OGPU, he headed the commission for the elaboration of the Instruction "On the Application of the Resolution of the CEC and RNC of the USSR of August 7, 1932 on the Protection of State Enterprises, Collective Farms and Cooperation and Strengthening Public (Socialist) Property" (the so-called "Law of 5 Spikelets"), the text of which, signed by him on September 16, 1932, by the Chairman of the Supreme Court of the USSR, A. Vynokurov, and the Prosecutor of the Supreme Court of the USSR, P. Krasikov, is the procedural basis for the Genocide of the Ukrainian nation.

On September 15, 1932, he signed a circular of the OGPU "On Measures to Ensure the Government Resolution on the Prohibition of Bread Selling", which implemented the

---

resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b), “On Fight against the Law Violations of Bread Selling at Market Places”, which forbade the sale and purchase of bread, flour and cereals at market places.

As the head of Donetsk regional committee of the CP(b)Ukr, he followed carefully the directives of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b), the personal instructions of J. Stalin and his emissaries: V. Molotov and L. Kaganovych, which led to the starvation of hundreds of thousands of Donetsk region residents.

*Alekseyev Mykyta Oleksiyovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide – the candidate for the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (January of 1932 – June of 1933), the First Secretary of Vinnytsia Regional Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (February – September of 1932), the Chairman of the Executive Committee of Dnipropetrovsk Regional Council (October of 1932 – May of 1933), the First Secretary of Kharkiv City Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (June of 1933 – June of 1934), the First Secretary of Kyiv City Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (June of 1934 – July of 1935).

*Asatkin Olexander Mykolayovych.* At the beginning of 1933 he was sent to Ukraine by the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) to the post of the head of the MTS political sector of the People’s Commissariat of Land of the USSR. He ensured the ideological and organizational committing the genocide crime by the MTS political departments in Ukraine. He received the information on starvation, mass deaths, cannibalism and corpse eating caused by forced prolonged starvation, as it was evidenced by a review note of the MTS political sector of Kyiv region dated June 14, 1933 (Central State Archive of Public Organizations of Ukraine, f. 1, d. 20, c. 6276, pp. 55–60). At the beginning of 1935, after the liquidation of the political departments of the MTS, he was appointed the head of the UNGO of the State Plan of the UkrSSR (the governing body of statistics), which falsified the current census of Ukraine, concealing the scale of the Genocide.

At the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b)Ukr. on June 8, 1933, he reported on the successful experience of the MTS political departments, the consequences of the “cleansing” among MTS employees, complaining about the absence of communists in 122 collective farms and 11 MTSs in Dnipropetrovsk region, which were left without “the party’s eye, without the party leadership with all the proper consequences” (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 1, c. 282, p. 14). *d* At the Plenum he was included into the membership of the Central Committee of the CP (b)Ukr.

On August 2, 1933, he reported at the meeting of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr. on the labour books of collective farmers, where the number of working days was recorded, but during the Holodomor bread was not given out.

On September 11, 1933 on the recommendation of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. he was included into the commission for the organization of resettlement of people in the steppe areas “at the expense of areas with a surplus population” (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 6, c. 285, p. 27). The resettlement did not take place due to the lack of contingents for it in the UkrSSR. Instead, resettlers from the RSFSSR were brought to the deserted villages. On December 17, 1933 he signed a joint resolution of the People’s Commissariat of the UkrSSR and the political sector of the MTS on the distribution of profits of collective farms under the categorical condition of a preliminary full implementation of the state planned tasks (Hanzha, 1971, p. 94).

In his speech at the XIIth Congress of the CP(b)Ukr. (held on January 18–23, 1934) he spoke about the “clutter” in MTS political departments with “counter-revolutionary

elements”, about the expediency of “cleaning” the boards of collective farms and rural party centers (the XIIth Congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine, 1934, pp. 517–522). On July 22, 1934, he made a report at the meeting of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr. on the political situation in the countryside, for which he was responsible as Moscow emissary to the People’s Land Commissariat.

*Weger Yevhen Ilich.* During the Holodomor-Genocide – the First Secretary of the Odesa Regional Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (since January of 1933). In February of 1933 – July of 1937 – a member of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr, a candidate for membership in the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr.

*Demchenko Mykola Nesterovych.* An active participant in collectivization. In January of 1930 – January of 1932 – People’s Commissar of Agriculture of the Ukrainian SSR, a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr. (March of 1931 – January of 1937). During the Holodomor-Genocide, he was the first secretary of Kyiv Regional Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (February of 1932 – June of 1934).

*Zatonsky Volodymyr Petrovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide, he was a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr (1933 – 1938), the People’s Commissar of the RSI of the UkrSSR, the chairman of the CC of the CP(b)Ukr, the People’s Commissar of Education of the UkrSSR (since February of 1933). Commissioner of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. in the regions and districts of the UkrSSR for grain procurement, a supporter of repressive methods. On January 5, 1932, he personally led the “dissolution” of the bureau of the Novomoskovsk district party committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (Dnipropetrovsk region) at the plenum of the district party committee for non-compliance with the Politburo of the CP(b)Ukr Central Committee in the case of grain procurement and the “election” of a new bureau.

In March of 1932, in the south of Ukraine, as an authorized politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr., he was engaged in taking away grain from peasants for the sowing campaign in collective farms. Knowing that the collective farmers of Sartan district were not given bread for working days, he personally forbade them to receive rations, instead “he offered to take grain from the more prosperous Mangus district”. On October 30, 1932, he was engaged in the organization of grain procurement in the districts of Kyiv region, demanded the application of a fine to collective farmers and farmers-individuals in the amount of the market price of grain without exemption from the yard plan.

In November of 1932 he took an active part in the special operation of the GPU of the UkrSSR “to eliminate Petliur’s nests and kurkul groups” in Kyiv region, and after a successful completion of the task to overcome the resistance of the Ukrainian peasantry in Kyiv region, he was “transferred” to Dnipropetrovsk region. (He organized a four-member commission headed by the first secretary of the CP(b)Ukr regional committee “for the day-to-day management of the use of judicial repression ... and the organization in this connection of mass party work both: by means of the press and directly in the collective farms, villages and districts”).

In January of 1933, in pursuance of a resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) of January 1, 1933, he conducted yard searches for grain in the pits and took away food in the villages of Odesa region. He proposed the “method of a concentrated offensive, or influence” – a combination of actions of all the commissioners (the party, the Soviet and GPU) to find the bread hidden by the peasants, as well as to use intimidation by repressions – “to break the resistance in 2 – 3 collective farms in the district and in this way – the process can take place easier further (to expand the breakthrough of the front”).

On January 20, he demanded that the leaders of Voznesensky and Arbuzivsky districts shoot those who, for fear of being accused of “stealing” bread, preferred to throw it into a well or river and thus, avoid repression. He supervised personally the search for pits with bread in the villages of Pischanyi Brid and Tatarivka.

*Liubchenko Panas Petrovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide – the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr (November 29, 1927 – June 14, 1934), the First Deputy Chairman of the People’s Commissar of the Ukrainian SSR (February 25, 1933 – April 28, 1934). He was a public prosecutor at the SVU trial (April of 1930). The member of the orgbureau of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (November of 1927 – August of 1937), the candidate for members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr (April of 1929 – April of 1934). At the beginning of the 1930s he became one of the active leaders of Moscow policy, played a leading role in implementing its policy of collectivization in Ukraine and confiscation of grain from the peasants, which led to the Holodomor-Genocide in 1932 – 1933 in Ukraine. In March of 1932 he was sent to the steppe regions of Ukraine as an authorized politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belarus to take away the grain from the peasants for the sowing campaign in collective farms. At the end of October of 1932 he was appointed responsible for the implementation of grain procurement in Vinnytsia region.

*Mayorov Mykhailo Musiyovych (Biberman Meyer Moiseyovych).* During the Holodomor-Genocide – People’s Commissar of Supply of the UkrSSR (1930 – 1932), the First Secretary of the Odesa Regional Committee of the CP(b)Ukr (until January of 1933), the candidate member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr (1932 – 1933), the member of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee and the Central Election Commission of the USSR.

*Markitan Pavlo Pylypovych.* During the Holodomor, he was the first secretary of the organizing bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine in Chernihiv region (October of 1932 – January of 1934). Prior to that, he was the second secretary of Kyiv (January-July of 1932) and Odesa (July-October of 1932) regional committees of the CP(b)Ukr.

*Petrovskyi Hryhoriy Ivanovych.* One of the organizers of the VChK. During the Holodomor-Genocide, he was a chairman of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee (1919 – 1938), a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belarus (1920 – 1938). From October of 1932 – responsible for the implementation of grain procurement in Donetsk region. Undoubtedly supporting as a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr all the orders of the organizers of the Genocide of the Ukrainian nation, headed by J. Stalin, he was well aware of the disastrous consequences of their execution from letters, statements, complaints and other documents that came to him from all over Ukraine since the beginning of 1932. In particular, some of them: a letter from a worker-loader S. Torgal to H. Petrovsky about starvation in Odesa region. January 10, 1932 (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 8, c. 117, p. 353); the report of K. Korenev to the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee about the arbitrariness of local leaders during grain procurement in the village of Lidyne, Ulyanovsk district, nowadays Sumy region. January 14, 1932 (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 8, c. 117, p. 184); the letter of a resident of Cherkaski Tyshky village of Lypetsk district, Kharkiv region, H. Veremiya to H. Petrovsky with a request to help remove the additional grain procurement plan. January 23, 1932 (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 8, c. 109, p. 58); a complaint of H. Tuza, a sugar factory worker, concerning the destruction (rozkurkulennia) of his farm and the starvation of his family in Tetiiv district of 18 February 1932: “I have written to you several times...” (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 8, c. 111, pp. 112–113).

He participated directly in the organization of the robbery of the Ukrainians: the decision of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. on March 6, 1932, like other members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr, was sent to the countryside to increase the rate of seed funds. He was sent to Donetsk region “to take all measures on the spot together with the regional committees” to ensure the implementation of the established final plan of grain procurement (CSAPOU, f. 1, inv. 6, c. 237, pp. 140–144).

On December 20, 1932, he signed the minutes of the meeting of the Presidium of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee on deprivation of the title of members of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee for non-fulfillment of grain procurement by the heads of district executive committees S. Khoreshko and M. Palamarchuk, later repressed (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 8, c. 3, pp. 233–234).

*Sarkisov Sarkis Artemovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide – the head of the All-Union office “Zagotzerno” at the USSR RNK in Moscow (February – September of 1932), the Secretary of Donetsk Regional Committee of the CP(b)Ukr for Bread Procurement (September of 1932 – September of 1933), the First Secretary of Donetsk Regional Committee of the CP(b)Ukr (September of 1933 – May of 1937), the member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr (1933 – 1937).

*Skrypnyk Mykola Oleksiyovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide, he was a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr. (1925 – 1933). He was personally involved into the implementation of the Genocide of the Ukrainian people. Prior to that, as Prosecutor General of the UkrSSR, he led campaigns to harass the writer M. Khvylovy, People’s Commissar for Education O. Shumsky for Ukrainization, accusing him of “national evasion”, as well as the economist M. Volobuyev, labeling him “Volobuyevshchyna”. From 1927 till February 28, 1933 – People’s Commissar of Education of the UkrSSR, continued Ukrainization, including outside Ukraine, what angered J. Stalin.

On March 6, 1932, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr. sent him to the steppe regions of Ukraine to take away grain from peasants for the sowing campaign in collective farms. Being aware of the catastrophic state of supply of rural teachers, the starvation of students and teachers, he did not initiate the provision of assistance and reduction of the grain procurement plan from the harvest of 1932. From the end of October 1932, he organized grain procurement in Dnipropetrovsk region as the head of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr. In January of 1933 he was engaged in the requisition of found bread in the villages of Vinnytsia and Kyiv regions.

*Strohanov Vasyl Andriyovych.* The Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr (July of 1930 – February of 1933), the second secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr (from December 13, 1930 till October 12, 1932). During the Holodomor-Genocide, he was the first secretary of Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee of the CP(b)Ukr (from October of 1932 till January of 1933). In March of 1932 he was sent to the southern regions of the UkrSSR to “strengthen the rate of seed fund”. On November 24, 1932, together with V. Molotov and V. Chubar, he signed the telegramme to J. Stalin with a proposal to grant a special commission of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr the right to sentences with the highest penalty – death penalty. On December 14, 1932, he reported to Moscow on the readiness of Dnipropetrovsk region to fulfill the annual grain procurement plan by the end of January of 1933. He signed the letter of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr on the mandatory export of “existing collective farm funds, including seeds” at the expense of grain supplies. On January 12, 1932, he reported to the Central Committee of

the Communist Party(b)Ukr. on the successful export of seeds and unsatisfactory work in the field of various grain procurement organizations.

*Sukhomlyn Kyrylo Vasylovych.* The Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b)Ukr. (June of 1930 – July of 1937). During the Holodomor-Genocide – Deputy Chairman of the Council of People’s Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR (from February 5 till July of 1932), Chairman of the All-Ukrainian Council of the Trade Unions (from July 25, 1932 till February of 1933), Chairman of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr – People’s Commissar of the RSI UkrSSR and at the same time – Deputy Chairman of the SNK UkrSSR (February 27 (28) of 1933 – 1934). At the end of October of 1932 he was appointed responsible for the procurement of grain in Vinnytsia region.

*Terekhov Roman Yakovych.* The Member of the Politburo and OrgBureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr. (1930 – 1933). During the Holodomor-Genocide – the First Secretary of Kharkiv Regional Committee of the CP (b)Ukr (July of 1932 – January of 1933). In February – September of 1933 – the Second Secretary of Donetsk Regional Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. In the spring of 1932 he was a member of the commission (S. Kosior, S. Redens and R. Terekhov) for suppressing the resistance of the peasants. In the autumn of 1932 he personally went to the districts of the region to procure bread. He demanded the intensification of repressive measures, application of natural fines to individuals, deprivation of their homestead land, eviction from a house. He signed the decision of the regional committee bureau to resuscitate chaff and re-thresh straw, which reduced the chances of the region’s peasants to survive.

*Chuvyrin Mykhailo Yevdokymovych.* The Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr. (1929 – 1936). During the Holodomor-Genocide – the First Secretary of Donetsk Regional Committee of the CP(b)Ukr (from July 20 till September 19, 1932), Chairman of the Executive Committee of Donetsk Regional Council of Workers, Peasants and the Red Army Deputies (from September 19, 1932 till March of 1933). From May of 1933 till April of 1934, he was a chairman of Vinnytsia Regional Commission for the Purification of the Party. On December 28, 1932, he personally signed the resolution of Donetsk Regional Executive Committee on the blacklisting of three collective farms in Rubizhansky and Rykovsky districts and five state farms.

*Yakir Yona Emmanuyilovych.* The Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. (June of 1930 – May of 1937), a commander of the Ukrainian (November of 1925 – May of 1935), Kyiv (May of 1935 – May of 1937) military districts.

### ***The Performers of the Holodomor – Genocide of the Ukrainians in the Ranks of Repressive and Punitive Bodies of the UkrSSR***

*Balytsky Vsevolod Apollonovych.* As deputy chairman of the OGPU of the USSR, he was a special commissioner of the OGPU in Ukraine (since November 24, 1932), subordinating to him the entire apparatus of the GPU of the UkrSSR and the obligation to send a report to the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) every decade. Plenipotentiary Representative of the OGPU for the USSR and Chairman of the GPU of the UkrSSR (February 21, 1933 – July 10, 1934). Member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party(b)Ukr. (1930 – 1937).

The Resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) “On the Passport System and the Unloading of Cities from Unnecessary Elements” of November 15, 1932, which introduced the only passport system in the USSR, provided for the establishment

of a commission headed by V. Balytsky, the Deputy Chairman of the OGPU, “to work out specific measures legislative, as well as of organizational and practical nature”, which would allow unloading cities from the “extra population”, first of all from “kulak, criminal and other anti-social elements, who hide in cities”.

On November 23, 1932, V. Balytsky sent J. Stalin draft resolutions of the CEC and SNC of the USSR “On the Introduction of a Single Passport System in the Cities of the USSR”, “On the System of Registration of the Population in the USSR”, “Instructions of the SNC of the USSR “On Registration of the Population, Regulation of Departure and Entry to the cities of Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkiv” (Popov, 1997, pp. 104, 105). These projects formed the basis of a joint resolution of the CEC and the SNC of the USSR of December 27, 1932 “On the Establishment of a Single Passport System for the USSR and the Mandatory Registration of Passports”. Peasants were excluded from the category of USSR citizens, who were issued passports. Thus, the control over internal migration was established, and the vast majority of USSR citizens were deprived of their right to freedom of movement.

As a special commissioner of the OGPU in Ukraine, he found unsatisfactory the course of the special operation of the GPU of the UkrSSR, carried out in pursuance of the resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP b)Ukr. “On the Elimination of Counter-revolutionary Nests and the Defeat of Kulak Groups”. According to the report of the GPU of the UkrSSR of November 27, 1932, during the first 5 days of the special operation, 1 843 people were arrested, including those, who resisted the bread export (Borysenko, 2008, p. 345).

He issued:

Operational Order №1 on the GPU of the UkrSSR of December 5, 1932, which stated that the reason for non-compliance with the control figures of the grain procurement plan is “the unconditional existence in Ukraine of an organized counter-revolutionary insurgent underground connected with foreign countries and foreign intelligence, mainly the Polish General Staff”. He set “the main task – the immediate breakthrough, exposure and defeat of the counter-revolutionary insurgent underground and a decisive blow to all kulak-Petliurist elements, who oppose and disrupt actively the main measures of the Soviet power and the party in the villages” (State Archives of Kharkiv Region, f. 6452, d. 4, c. 1987–1990.). With this aim, the Strike Task Group was established, owing to which there was “exposed” the underground in 200 districts of Ukraine.

– Operational Order №2 on the GPU of the UkrSSR of February 13, 1933 on the next tasks of intelligence and operational work of the GPU of the UkrSSR, issued by V. Balytsky, identified the main task for the near future mobilization of the district apparatus of the GPU to ensure spring sowing: detection by the agency of grain hidden in pits, “black barns”, waste and other hiding places, and its delivery to the state seed fund; ensuring its preservation; identification and arrest of all organizers of sabotage, members of counter-revolutionary insurgent organizations and active peasants-individuals; a decisive struggle against the initiators, organizers of mass departures from villages, etc. (Borysenko, 2008, pp. 513–514).

By a decision of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) of March 10, 1933, the three judges of the GPU of the UkrSSR, among whom there was V. Balytsky, were granted the right to consider cases of insurgency and “counter-revolution” in Ukraine. One of the first there was the case of 74 peasants of Kharkiv region, who, fleeing from starvation, fled to a new building in Kuryazh (Kharkiv suburban area). On April 3 – 4, 1933, the three, headed by V. Balytsky, imprisoned 27 people in concentration camps for three to

ten years, and at the second meeting on April 29, 1933, there were considered the materials of another 46 people, 19 of whom were sentenced to death penalty. The sentence was carried out on May 22, 1933. During 1933, according to the decision of the “three” at the Board of the GPU of the USSR, 805 people were shot, including 615 people according to the territorial bodies of the GPU, 52 people – transport bodies, 138 people – police bodies (Borysenko, 2008, p. 538).

V. Balytsky was directly involved into concealing the truth about the Holodomor-Genocide in Ukraine. With his participation, the resolution of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr. of March 13, 1933 was adopted, which, in particular, provided: “Instruct Comrade Balytsky to take measures to block information spread abroad about the famine in the village of Staroshvedske” (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 16, c. 9, p. 190).

On March 22, 1933, he reported: “I suggested that the heads of regional departments on these issues (“food complications”) should inform only the first secretaries of regional committees and orally only, after a careful verification of the information transmitted, so that our notes do not “wander”, in turn, do not become the source of various rumors. I suggested also not making special reports for the GPU of Ukraine on these issues, but to inform only me by personal letters...” (Berelovich, 2005, pp. 351–352).

Here are a few more names of employees of the repressive and punitive bodies of the Ukrainian SSR, who took a direct part in the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians.

*Karlson Karl Martynovych (Eduard Ivanovych)*. Deputy Chairman of the GPU of the UkrSSR (May of 1924 – May of 1934). As a member of the commission “for the development of measures for the kulaks” chaired by V. Molotov, he participated in the development of a secret resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) “On Measures to Eliminate Kulak Farms in Areas of Continuous Collectivization” from January 30, 1930. The member of the three (V. Balytsky, K. Carlson, I. Leplevsky), who by a resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) of March 20, 1933 was given the right to consider cases of insurrection and counterrevolution in Ukraine with the application of capital punishment.

*Leplevskyy Izrayil' Moysyevych*. During the Holodomor Genocide – Deputy Chairman of the GPU of the USSR (from February 20, 1933 – January 5, 1934). Member of the three (V. Balytsky, K. Carlson, I. Leplevsky), who by the resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) of March 20, 1933 was given the right to consider cases of insurrection and counter-revolution in Ukraine with the application of capital punishment.

*Bron Mykhaylo Isakovych*. Prosecutor of Kharkiv region in February 1932 – October of 1937. Member of the bureau of Kharkiv regional committee of the CP(b) Ukr.

*Hrossman Myron Borysovych*. Member of the Central Control Commission of the CPSU(b) (from July 13, 1930 to January 26, 1934). During the Holodomor, he was sent to Ukraine to the head of Donetsk regional department of the GPU (from October 7, 1932 till March 3, 1933).

*Dvynyanynov Vasyl' Andriyovych*. During the Holodomor-Genocide – the head of Chernihiv regional department of the GPU (from September 1932 till August 17, 1933). He was awarded the badge “Honorary Worker of the Cheka – GPU” and weapons from the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee (December of 1932).

*Zheleznohorsky (Ayzenberh) Hryhoriy Abramovych*. During the Holodomor-Genocide, he was the prosecutor in special cases of the GPU in the Prosecutor’s Office of the USSR (1932 – May of 1934).

*Ivanov Vasyl Tymofiyovych*. During the Holodomor – Head of Donetsk Regional Department of the GPU / NKVD (from March 3, 1933 till July 10, 1934) Awarded the badge “Honorary Worker of the Cheka – GPU” (December of 1932).

*Katznelson Zinovy Borisovich (Simel Borukhovych).* During the Holodomor-Genocide – the head of Kharkiv regional department of the GPU of the USSR (from March 3, 1933 till January 10, 1934). He organized and supervised the conduct of yard searches with taking away all food from peasant families, the eviction of Ukrainian owners outside Ukraine.

*Kyseliiov Arkadiy Leontiyovych (Kesler Aron Lazarovych).* Narkom of Justice and Prosecutor General of the UkrSSR from December 17, 1935 till September 5, 1936. Before that – Secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr., People's Commissar for Supply.

*Krayniy Lev Oleksandrovych (Karpylovskyy Leyb Azykovych).* Senior Assistant Attorney General and Head of Special Affairs. He was involved into political repression during the Holodomor.

*Krauklis Yan Krishyanovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide – head of Dnepropetrovsk regional department of the GPU of the UkrSSR (July 27, 1932 – August 17, 1933), the head of Chernihiv regional department of the GPU of the UkrSSR (from August 17, 1933 till January 10, 1934). He was awarded the Order of the Red Banner of Labour (December of 1932).

*Kumpykevych Volodymyr Oleksandrovych.* Prosecutor of Dnipropetrovsk region in February 1932 – January of 1934.

*Leoniuk Khoma Akymovych.* Deputy Chairman of the GPU of the UkrSSR (from September 18, 1932 till March 22, 1933), the head of the Odessa regional department of the GPU of the UkrSSR (March 22, 1933 – July 10, 1934).

*Mazo Solomon Samiylovych.* He directed operations for dekulakization and deportation of peasants of Ukraine. During the Holodomor-Genocide, he was the head of the economic department of the GPU of the UkrSSR and a member of the board of the GPU of the UkrSSR. Under his leadership, the Ukrainian intelligentsia in agriculture was destroyed in falsified cases against agronomists, zootechnicians, veterinarians, and the others. He organized the struggle against the resistance of Ukrainians to collectivization, grain procurement, dekulakization, etc. He was awarded the badge “Honorary Worker of the Cheka – GPU” in 1933.

*Minitskyy Yuzef Yanovych.* Not earlier than March and until November of 1933 – Deputy Prosecutor of Chernihiv region.

*Mironov Serhiy Naumovych (King Myron Yosyfovych).* During the Holodomor-Genocide – from September 28, 1933 till July 10, 1934, head of Dnipropetrovsk regional department of the GPU.

*Mykhaylyk Mykhaylo Vasyliovych* – Narkom of Justice and the Prosecutor General of the UkrSSR from June 14, 1933 till December 17, 1935.

*Muliavko Prokopiyy Semenovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide – the head of Kharkiv regional department of the GPU (from February 27, 1932 till November 3, 1932). Kharkiv regional department of the GPU of the UkrSSR held the first place in the number of convicts in the case of grain procurement. In August-November, 4 873 people were convicted in these cases.

*Pertsov Yuriy Moyseyovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide, from February 27, 1932 till January of 1933, the head of Odesa regional department of the GPU of the UkrSSR.

*Poliakov Vasyly Vasyliovych* – Prosecutor General of the UkrSSR from September of 1930 till June of 1933.

*Redens Stanislav Frantsovych* – Chairman of the GPU of the UkrSSR, Authorized Representative of the OGPU for the USSR (July 25, 1931 – February 20, 1933). A member of the three consisting of S. Kosior, S. Redens, and A. Kiseliiov, established by a resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU(b) of November 22, 1932, with the right to impose death sentences in cases of repression during grain procurement.

*Rozanov Oleksandr Borysovych (Rozenbrat Abram Borysovych).* During the Holodomor-Genocide – the head of Kyiv regional department of the GPU / NKVD of the UkrSSR (from February 27, 1932 till July 10, 1934).

*Rud Petro Havrylovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide – the head of Dnipropetrovsk regional department of the GPU (August 17, 1933 – September of 1933).

*Smoliynskyi Volodymyr Ivanovych.* Prosecutor of Kyiv region. In 1934 he was removed from office by a resolution of the bureau of the regional committee of the CP(b)Ukr.

*Sokolynskiyi Davyd Moiseyovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide – the head of Vinnytsia regional department of the GPU / NKVD of the UkrSSR (from November 19, 1932 till July 10, 1934).

*Tymofieyev Mykhailo Mykhailovych.* During the Holodomor-Genocide – the head of Donetsk regional department (from July 1, 1932 till October 7, 1932) and Kharkiv regional department of the GPU of the USSR (from November 3, 1932 till March of 1933).

It is clear that this is by no means a complete list of names of perpetrators of the Genocide as the crime against the Ukrainians, which needs a further analysis, involvement of new materials, clarification and integration into the issues of domestic famine studies.

**The Conclusions.** To sum up, it should be noted that the compilation of the list of perpetrators of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians in 1932 – 1933, is an important and promising area of the research, because it is about the institution of commissioners, which appeared as a result of a deliberate criminal intention on the part of the top party leadership of the USSR to subdue the Ukrainians by a forcible starvation. Every crime has the subject or subjects of its commission, and if they are not exposed and convicted during their life time or after death, then those, who committed the crime will be unpunished. In the case of the crime of the Holodomor-Genocide of the Ukrainians, it is a collective subject of the crime – from the organizers among the top Soviet party apparatus to the perpetrators at a local area. It is the institution of commissioners and performers-perpetrators during the Genocide of the Ukrainians, which included the party-state nomenclature and representatives of the repressive and punitive bodies of the USSR, should be the subject of a comprehensive research with a view to compiling and publishing as complete and authentic list as possible of all performers-perpetrators. The young generation of the Ukrainians must know the executioners, who during the tragic years of 1932 – 1933 contributed to the extermination of their grandfathers and great-grandfathers.

**The Funding.** The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## REFERENCES

**Bem, N.** (2003). Moralno-politychnyy stan ukrayinskoho selyanstva v umovakh holodomoru. [Moral and political state of the Ukrainian peasantry during the Holodomor]. *Problemi istorii Ukraini: fakti, sudženniâ, pošuki*, (10), 250–284. [in Ukrainian]

**Bem, N.** (2007). Vidobrazhennya suspil'nykh nastroyiv u vzayemnykh ukrayyns'koho selyanstva ta intelihentsiyi (1928 – 1930 rr.). [Reflection of public sentiments in the relations between the Ukrainian peasantry and the intelligentsia (1928 – 1930)]. *Problemi istorii Ukraini: fakti, sudženniâ, pošuki*, (16), 307–315. [in Ukrainian]

**Berelovich, A. & Danilov, V.** (eds.). (2005). *Sovetskaya derevnya glazami OGPU–NKVD [The Soviet village through the eyes of the OGPU–NKVD]*. Vol. 3. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 840 p. [in Russian]

**Borysenko, V., Danylenko, V., Kokin, S. et al.** (Comps.). (2008). *Rozsekrechena pamiat: Holodomor 1932 – 1933 rokiv v Ukrayini v dokumentakh GPU – NKVD. [Declassified memory: The Holodomor of 1932 – 1933 in Ukraine in the documents of the GPU–NKVD]*. Kyiv: Vyd. dim “Kyievo-Mohylianska akademii”, 668 p. [in Ukrainian]

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Kharkivskoi oblasti [State Archives of Kharkiv Region – SAKhR].*

**Drovoziuk, S.** (2003). Sotsialno-psykhologichniy portret silskoho “aktyvysta” 20–30-kh rr. v ukrayinskii istoriohrafii. [Socio-psychological portrait of a rural “activist” of the 20’s and 30’s in

Ukrainian historiography]. *Problemy istoriyi Ukrayiny: fakty, sudzhennya, poshuky*, (9), 360–372. [in Ukrainian]

**Hanzha, I.** (Ed.) (1971). *Istoriya kolektyvizatsiyi silskoho hospodarstva Ukrayinskoyi RSR: Zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv [History of collectivization of agriculture of the Ukrainian SSR: Collection of documents and materials]*. (Vol. 3). Kyiv: Vyd-vo AN URSR, 786 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Hrynevych, L.** (2003). Stalinska “revolyutsiya zhory” ta holod 1933 r. yak faktory polityzatsiyi ukrayinskoi spilnoty. [Stalin’s “revolution from above” and the famine of 1933 as factors in the politicization of the Ukrainian community]. *Ukrains'kij istorichnij zhurnal*, 5, 50–64. [in Ukrainian]

**Lysenko, O.** (2011). Dialnist silskykh aktyvistiv yak odyn z faktoriv vynyknennia selwanskykh povstan vesnoi 1930 r. [The activity of village activists as one of the factors in the emergence of peasant uprisings in the spring of 1930]. *Istoriya Ukrainy. Malovidomi imena, podii, fakty: Zbirnyk statei*, (37), 166–179. [in Ukrainian]

**Lysenko, O.** (2012). Silski aktyvisty: formuvannya sotsialnoi hrupy, typy povedinky ta metody roboty. [Rural activists: formation of a social group, types of behavior and methods of work]. In Kovalenko, O., Podkur, R., Vasyliiev, V. & Lysenko, O. (Eds.). *Nastroyi ta povedinka naseleennyia Chernihivshchyny v umovakh stalins'koyi revolyutsiyi “zhory”. 1928 – 1938. Zbirnyk dokumentiv ta materialiv* (pp. 40–62). Kyiv: Vydavets Lozovyi V. M. [in Ukrainian]

**Lysenko, O.** (2013). Silski aktyvisty Chernihivshchyny (kinets 1920 – 1930-ti rr.): typolohiia povedinky. [Village Activists of Chernihiv region (at the End 1920<sup>th</sup> – 1930<sup>th</sup>): Behavior Typology]. *Z arhiviv VUCHK-GPU-NKVD-KHB, (1–2)*, 255–284. [in Ukrainian]

**Mokhonchuk, S.** (2011). Zlochyn henotsydu: istorychne vyznachenna ta konventsiyne zakriplennia u mizhnarodnomu kryminalnomu pravi. [Definition Crime of Genocide: the Historical and the Conventional Assignment at the International Criminal Law]. *University scientific notes*, 3 (39), 356–361. [in Ukrainian]

**Popov, V.** (1997). Izmeneniye pasportnoy sistemy nosit printsipialno vazhnyy kharakter. Kak sozdavalas i razvalas pasportnaya sistema v strane. [Changing the passport system is fundamentally important. How the passport system in the country was created and developed]. *Istochnik*, 6, 101–121. [in Russian]

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromadskykh obiednan Ukrainy [Central State Archive of Public Organizations of Ukraine – CSAPOU]*

**XII Zizd Komunistychnoi partii (bilshovykiv) Ukrainy. Stenohrafichnyi zvit.** (1934). *XII Zizd Komunistychnoi partii (bilshovykiv) Ukrainy: Stenohrafichnyi zvit. (12<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine: Verbatim report)* (pp. 517–522). Kharkiv: Vyd-vo TsK KP(b)U. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on February 11, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94:343.301(477)(092)“1930”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226513

**Tetiana KUZNETS**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of History of Ukraine Chair, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, 28 Sadova Street, Uman, Ukraine, postal code 20301 (tetiana.kuznets@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-9282-110X

**Researcher ID:** G-5657-2019

**Olha SKUS**

*PhD (History), Associate Professor of History of Ukraine Chair, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, 28 Sadova Street, Uman, Ukraine, postal code 20301 (solhav2018@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-5063-451X

**Researcher ID:** D-7651-2019

**Тетяна КУЗНЕЦЬ**

*доктор історичних наук, професор, завкафедри історії України Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини, вул. Садова, 28, м. Умань, Україна, індекс 20301 (tetiana.kuznets@gmail.com)*

**Ольга СКУС**

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини, вул. Садова, 28, м. Умань, Черкаська область, Україна, індекс 20301 (solhav2018@gmail.com)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Kuznets, T., Skus, O., (2021). An Archival and Investigative Case on Hryhoriy Tymofiyiv as a Source on the History of Repressions during the 1930s. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 148–155. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226513

**AN ARCHIVAL AND INVESTIGATIVE CASE ON HRYHORIY TYMOFIYIV AS A SOURCE ON THE HISTORY OF REPRESSION DURING THE 1930s**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research is to cover the repressive policy of the Soviet government towards the Ukrainian intelligentsia during the 1930s on the example of the archival and investigative case analysis on H. S. Tymofiyiv, the director of Babanska secondary school. The research methodology is based on scientific principles of objectivity, historical reliability and information value of the found documents. There have been used special historical methods, general scientific, interdisciplinary, personalized analysis, etc. The source base of the study is based on previously unavailable archival materials of the regional branch of the Sectoral Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU) at the State Archives of Cherkasy region. The scientific novelty of the research is to establish historical justice concerning the past of the Ukrainian people, rethinking social transformations in the retrospect against the background of modern conditions of the Ukrainian independence defending. The Conclusions. Based on historical and scientific analysis, it has been proven that during the 1930s the Soviet*

government established unconstitutional extrajudicial bodies with unlimited rights. In accordance with their resolutions and orders, a simplified litigation procedure was applied in the case on Hryhoriy Stepanovych Tymofiyiv, an educator from Uman region. According to the criminal case fabricated by Babansky district department of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NKVD) of the Ukrainian SSR, which is full of falsified testimonies of witnesses and reports with a lack of the crime evidence and denial of the guilt in "the counterrevolutionary nationalist activity" by the accused, H. S. Tymofiyiv was convicted twice (in 1937 – imprisonment, in 1950 – eviction). Only in 1956, owing to the work of prosecutorial supervision, the complaints of H. S. Tymofiyiv and his wife, the case was reviewed and closed by the Military Board of the Supreme Court of the USSR. H. S. Tymofiyiv was rehabilitated.

**Key words:** Hryhoriy Stepanovych Tymofiyiv, repressive and punitive system, archival and investigative case, accusation, Babanska secondary school.

## АРХІВНО-СЛІДЧА СПРАВА НА ГРИГОРІЯ ТИМОФІІВА ЯК ДЖЕРЕЛО З ІСТОРІЇ РЕПРЕСІЙ 1930-х РОКІВ

**Анотація.** Мета дослідження передбачає висвітлення репресивної політики радянської влади щодо української інтелігенції у 1930-х роках на прикладі аналізу архівно-слідчої справи директора Бабанської середньої школи Г.С. Тимофіїва. **Методологія дослідження** має за основу наукові принципи об'єктивності, історичної достовірності та інформаційної цінності віднайдених документів. Використано спеціальні історичні методи, загальнонаукові, міждисциплінарні, персоніфікованого аналізу та ін. Основу джерельної бази дослідження становлять раніше недоступні архівні матеріали регіонального відділення Галузевого архіву Служби Безпеки України (СБУ) при Державному архіві Черкаської області. **Наукова новизна** праці полягає у встановленні історичної справедливості щодо минулого українського народу, переосмисленні суспільних трансформацій у ретроспективному просторі на тлі сучасних умов відстоювання української незалежності. **Висновки.** На основі історико-наукового аналізу доведено, що у 1930-х роках радянською владою створювалися неконституційні позасудові органи з широкими правами. Відповідно до їхніх постанов і наказів було застосовано спрощене судочинство у справі освітянина Уманщини – Григорія Степановича Тимофіїва. За сфабрикованою Бабанським районним відділом Народного комісаріату внутрішніх справ (НКВС) УРСР карною справою, яка переповнена сфальсифікованими показаннями свідків і протоколами очних ставок з побіжною відсутністю доказів злочину та запереченням своєї вини обвинуваченого в "контрреволюційній націоналістичній діяльності", Г.С. Тимофіїва було засуджено двічі (1937 – ув'язнення, 1950 – виселення). Лише у 1956 р. завдяки роботі прокурорського нагляду, скарг Г.С. Тимофіїва та його дружини, справу було переглянуто і закрито Військовою колегією Верховного суду СРСР. Г.С. Тимофіїва реабілітовано.

**Ключові слова:** Григорій Степанович Тимофіїв, репресивно-каральна система, архівно-слідча справа, обвинувачення, Бабанська середня школа.

**The Problem Statement.** Political repressions during the Soviet times are a broad and specific issue, which is studied in various discourses, primarily, political science, history, sociology and the others (Nikolayev I., 2019; Ruban M. Yu., Tatory'nov S.J., 2018). However, to a large extent, the issue still remains poorly studied or insufficiently rethought to learn certain lessons taking into consideration the current political situation not only in Ukraine but also around the world. After all, the consequences of the Soviet repressive and punitive system functioning during the last century were the physical extermination of the political, scientific and creative elite. There was deformation or destruction of values, traditions, longevity of generations. All those factors led to depressed public sentiment and, moreover, to the denationalization of the Ukrainian people.

Extended access to the information field, materials of the Sectoral Archives of the Security Service of Ukraine (the SBU) and its regional branches provides an opportunity

for a comprehensive elaboration and introduction into the scientific circulation of both complex generalizing works and individual personalized publications. As they say, the death of one person is a tragedy, and the death of millions of people – statistics. The spread of new scientific, historical and journalistic works of a regional nature will contribute to the life of a common historical space, taking into account the characteristics of certain social groups from different parts of Ukraine. Therefore, our task is to elucidate the criminal falsifications by the NKVD against teachers in Uman region during the 1930s, in particular, the falsified criminal case against H. S. Tymofiiiv, the director of Babanska secondary school.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications.** Scientific interest in the study of all aspects of the political terror during the interwar period remains stable due to the separation of the conceptual approaches diversity in the researches on the one hand, and the need to form the society values – on the other hand. There are many generalizing works of domestic and foreign researchers among the massive complex of works on the issue of the repressive and punitive system functioning in the republics of the former USSR and Ukraine, in particular. The following surnames of the historians and their works should be mentioned: V. Marochko, G. Hillig “Repressed Teachers of Ukraine: Victims of Political Terror (1929 – 1941)” (Marochko & Hillig, 2003), Enn Epplbom “History of the Gulag” (Epplbom, 2006) translated by A. Ishchenko, Yu. Shapoval and the others “Ukraine during the Period of the Great Terror: 1936 – 1938” (Ishchenko & Shapoval, 2009).

**The purpose** of the article is to reveal the features of the repression mechanism carried out during the 1930s by the Soviet totalitarian regime in Ukraine through the personalization of historical authenticity, in particular, the analysis and coverage of the archival investigative case on Hryhoriy Stepanovych Tymofiyiv, a teacher, Uman resident.

**The Basic Material Statement.** The repressive and punitive system of the totalitarian regime was formed in stages, beginning on November 8, 1917. The turning point in the large-scale centralization of the Soviet punitive bodies was the year of 1934, when the All-Union NKVD with branches in the republics and the extrajudicial body “Special Meeting” were established. In addition, the basis for the introduction of the simplification practice of judicial procedures by repressive bodies was the Resolution of the CEC and SNC of the USSR of December 1, 1934. It was the issue of making changes in the existing criminal procedure codes of the Soviet Union Republics on investigation and consideration cases on “terrorist organizations and terrorist acts against employees of the Soviet power”, in particular: “1. The investigation in these cases must be completed within a period not exceeding ten days. 2. To hand over the indictment to the accused one day before the trial in court. 3. Case hearings must be held without the participation of the court proceedings parties. 4. Cassation appeals against verdicts, as well as the filing of petitions for pardon, must not be allowed. 5. The death penalty must be carried out immediately after the sentence has been announced” (Postanovlenye, 1934). Thus, such changes gave the right to adopt and execute death sentences in falsified political cases in an expedited manner, while maintaining a certain procedural form. This later became a trend that led to the emergence of extrajudicial bodies (NKVD troikas) and the infamous operational order of the NKVD of the USSR No. 00447 “On the Repression of Former Kulaks, Criminals and other Anti-Soviet Elements” of July 30, 1937 (Operatyvnyi nakaz, 1937).

The repressive and punitive system functioned according to its own laws. Victims of mass repressions were people of different nationalities, professions, age categories... (Kuznets & Skus, 2020). The Ukrainian intelligentsia, teachers, in particular, suffered significant

devastating losses. The study of archival and investigative cases stored in the State Archives of Cherkasy region (DACHO) and the archives of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region makes it possible to trace the mechanism of repressions in Uman region, to establish and disclose the names of perpetrators, witnesses, victims ... The archival and investigative case on Hryhoriy Stepanovych Tymofiyiv reflects a criminal falsification of events, impunity, corruption of a certain stratum of the society, etc. (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5 (R), d. 1, c. 250p, 133 p.).

Hryhoriy Stepanovych Tymofiyiv was born in 1905 in the village of Vyshchetarasivka, Tomakivskyi district, Dnipropetrovsk region. He grew up in a large peasant family. He, the one among the children, received primary education (1917) and incomplete secondary education (1921). After graduating from Zaporizhzhya pedagogical college (1925) he was sent to work as a teacher in Babansky district of Uman region (nowadays – Uman district of Cherkasy region). During 1934 – 1937 he was a part-time student at Odesa pedagogical institute. For some time he held the position of a head of the district department of education, and later – the director of Babanska secondary school. He taught history. He joined the Komsomol organization in 1922, became a candidate of the CPSU (b) in 1929. From 1932 he was a member of the Babansky District Executive Committee and its presidium. The family composition before the arrest: a wife – Polina Andriyivna, born in 1907, the sons – a seven-year-old Volodymyr and a nine-month-old Julius.

Resolution of October 1, 1937 on the arrest of H. S. Tymofiyiv was issued by the head of the Babansky district department of the NKVD of the UkrSSR, a junior lieutenant of the state security, M. I. Belov, based on a consideration of the charges. The latter contained the information on crimes under Art. 54. paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, which consisted in the fact that “he was a member of a counter-revolutionary nationalist organization and carried out counter-revolutionary nationalist activities”, “he was a socially dangerous element and leaving him at large would hinder a successful investigation” (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, p. 1). According to this decision, Kulyk, Uman District Prosecutor, authorized the arrest of H. S. Tymofiyiv.

The analysis of the interrogation record of October 2, 1937 testifies to the categorical non-admission of guilt by the arrested and the denial of his participation in the “nationalist counter-revolutionary organization” (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 7–8). The accusations of close ties with the teachers of Babanska school, arrested in 1936 for counter-revolutionary activities, O. H. Orativsky and M. I. Brovchenko, probably, point at their testimony against H. S. Tymofiyiv. In addition, as evidenced by the additional protocol of interrogation on October 18, 1937, at the face-to-face of “participants in the counter-revolutionary nationalist organization” H. O. Melnik and M. D. Rudenko also confirmed the participation of H. S. Tymofiyiv (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 10–11). The expected information is contained in “Extract from the Interrogation Report of the Accused Melnyk Herasym Oleksandrovyich”, in particular, it is about known for him members of the nationalist insurgent organization, among whom – “Tymofiyiv Hrihoriy Stepanovych, was expelled from the party in 1937 for counter-revolutionary activities and connection with members of the counter-revolutionary organization, now – the director of Babanska secondary school”. Here we find the following evidence of H. O. Melnyk: “After the arrests in 1932–33, the organizational connection among the remaining members of the counter-revolutionary organization was not lost. Thus, in the district department of the public education the head was a member of the counter-revolutionary organization – Tymofiyiv

H. S. and an inspector-methodologist, I – Melnyk H. O. Later, apart from the fact that the heads of departments changed, the cases were transferred to the successors. During that time, starting from 1933 and until now, the instigators of the counter-revolutionary organization are: Rusanovsky M. Ya. – the director of Oksanynska secondary school, Tymofiyiv H. S. – the director of Babanska secondary school and I – a methodologist of regional education, Melnyk H. O.” (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, p. 10). In addition, at the face of H. O. Melnyk confirmed that he “was aware of the preparation of an armed uprising planned in 1932 – 1933 and the participation of H. S. Tymofiyiv”, which the latter denied the participation (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 52–55). He expressed the refusal and objection firmly at face-to-face meeting with M. D. Rudenko, who stated about the participation of H. S. Tymofiyiv “... for a long time in the Ukrainian nationalist counter-revolutionary organization” (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 47–49).

M. L. Parfeniuk was the witness in the case, who worked as a teacher of Mathematics at Babanska secondary school since 1935. In his testimony, in addition to counter-revolutionary activities, he mentioned about the “fascist methods” of bringing up children at school and the persecution of young teachers by H. S. Tymofiyiv. M. L. Parfeniuk said that “only old teachers had authority” – Rusanovsky, Dudnyk, Oliynyk, and the others (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 19–21). Another witness, G. L. Langer, a teacher of Babanska secondary school, testified about disrespect for the party leaders and government leaders at school, anti-Semitism, and mentioned “there are many similar examples in other schools in the district”. In addition, he testified the following: “I know a group of teachers in the district, headed by P. P. Bozhok and G. O. Miller. They carried out counter-revolutionary nationalist work at schools of the district. The group included the teachers: M. Ya. Rusanovsky (a director of Oksanynska secondary school), H. S. Tymofiyiv (a director of Babanska secondary school), Dudnyk (a teacher of Oksanynska secondary school), F. H. Kravets (a teacher of Babanska secondary school), M. K. Martyniuk (a teacher of Dubovska secondary school)” (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 25–27). All were arrested by the NKVD, except of Martyniuk.

In the case there is also the testimony of a witness – F. S. Puchkova, a teacher of Babanska secondary school, who stated that she had known H. S. Tymofiyiv since 1931 at work at school and she had known him as a “counter-revolutionary element”. In particular, it was about the lack of reaction from H. S. Tymofiyiv, at that time the inspector of public education, on “enemy attacks of the teacher Yarova”. Instead, he treated F. S. Puchkova with contempt, who “detected counter-revolutionary activities at school” (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 41–44).

The indictment in case No. 3347 was prepared by Smolny, the head of the 3rd Department of Department IV of the State Security Department (UDB) of Kyiv Regional Department of the NKVD, junior lieutenant of the State Security Service and approved by Sokolov, the head of Department IV of the UDB KOU NKVD, senior lieutenant. It is a typical report on the work done by the NKVD: “The UDB of the NKVD Regional Office identified and liquidated the anti-Soviet Ukrainian nationalist terrorist organization, which set itself the task of overthrowing the Soviet power in Ukraine by force and establishing the fascist system. One of the members of the organization was Hryhoriy Stepanovych Tymofiyiv, arrested on October 2, 1937 and the arrested in this case. Tymofiyiv H. S. rejected being guilty to the charges against him. The investigation – the testimony of members of the anti-Soviet

nationalist organization Melnyk H. O. and Rudenko M. D., their face-to-face meetings with the accused Tymofiyiv H. S. found out that he had been a member of the anti-Soviet Ukrainian nationalist terrorist organization since 1930, to which he had been recruited by Mykyta Filimonovych Teliatnyk. This organization prepared for the violent overthrow of the Soviet power in Ukraine and the establishment of the fascist system. Tymofiyiv H. S. carried out the anti-Soviet nationalist work at school, aimed at disrupting the curriculum. As a result, Tymofiyiv H. S. was the subject to the court of the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR in accordance with the law of December 1, 1934” (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 58–61).

According to the protocol of the preparatory meeting of October 24, 1937, the Military Board of the Supreme Court of the USSR determined that it agreed with the indictment approved by Raginsky, the assistant prosecutor of the USSR: Tymofiyiv H. S. must be sued according to Art. 20, 54-8 and 54-11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, to hear the case in closed court without the participation of the prosecution, defense and witnesses in accordance with the resolution of the CEC of the USSR from 01.12.34” (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, p. 63). According to the decision of the closed trial H. S. Tymofiyiv was sentenced to ten years imprisonment with confiscation of property and deprivation of political rights for 5 years (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 65–68).

Initially, H. S. Tymofiyiv was in prison in Tyumen, and in 1939 he was transferred to Norilsk labour camp (VTT) of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. From January of 1946, for exemplary work, his sentence was reduced, i.e., 2 years less with the attachment to Norilsk metallurgical plant. Until his release, he remained in the camp till the end of the hostilities, and later worked on the construction of the plant as a senior foreman.

On July 7, 1955, the Chief Military Prosecutor’s Office sent H. S. Tymofiyiv’s archival and investigative case to the head of the KGB Department under the RM of the Ukrainian SSR of Kyiv Region for inspection, as well as his appeal and his wife’s – Tymofiyiva P. A. In connection with the search for the case assistant there should have been no delay, taking into account that it requires oversight of the Party Control Committee (CPC) of the CPSU Central Committee. In the appeal we find the note on the consideration of the case without delay, taking into consideration that it came under the control of the Party Control Committee (CPC) of the Central Committee of the CPSU. The instruction “to carry out investigative actions necessary to establish the validity or unfoundedness of the conviction of H. S. Tymofiyiv” was argued by the following: “Both during the preliminary investigation and in court, Tymofiyiv H. S. pleaded not guilty, and categorically denied the testimony of Brovchenko, Melnyk, Rudenko, and witnesses Puchkova, Parfenyuk, and Langer in his case, stating that they had slandered him. Article 200 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Ukrainian SSR in the case on Tymofiyiv was not complied with” (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 70–72). In addition, in 1950 on Tymofiyiv H. S. the case was filed, on the basis of which by a resolution of the Special Meeting of the USSR State Security Committee of December 16, 1950, for the same crimes, he was exiled to a settlement in Krasnoyarsk territory under the supervision of the Ministry of State Security. The accused was not interrogated in this case.

In his appeal sent to the RM of the USSR addressed to the Chairman of the RM of the USSR H. M. Malenkov, H. S. Tymofiyiv denied his guilt categorically and claimed the use of coercive actions by the investigator M. I. Belov. In addition, from the explanations of H. S. Tymofiyiv finally becomes clear the reason for opening a political case against Hryhoriy Stepanovych, and

in particular it is about his refusal to testify against the headmaster of Babanska secondary school O. H. Orativsky, arrested in 1936, as a member of the “counter-revolutionary organization” (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, p. 73).

During the inspection of the archival and investigative case on H. S. Tymofiyiv in 1955, new witnesses were interviewed (Leleka P. Ya., Kondratiuk K. O., Tkachuk B. M., Desiatnyk M. M., Kersh L. Yu., Krotenko T. I.), and also M. F. Telitnyk, who “recruited H. S. Tymofiyiv to the counter-revolutionary organization”. All of them testified that they were not aware of any terrorist activities of H. S. Tymofiyiv.

At the beginning of January of 1956, the Military Prosecutor of the Department of the Chief Military Prosecutor’s Office, Bazykin, a lieutenant colonel of justice, issued an opinion to the Military Board of the Supreme Court of the USSR regarding the investigation into the case on H. S. Tymofiyiv (Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region, f. 5625, d. 1, c. 10871, pp. 122–125). According to the conclusion, the verdict and resolution of the Special Meeting of the USSR State Security Committee of December 16, 1950 were cancelled and the case was closed. Also, as a result of an additional investigation, it was found out that H. S. Tymofiyiv was convicted in 1937 without any reason. During the inspection of the archival and investigative cases on H. O. Melnyk and M. D. Rudenko it was found out that they were sentenced to death by the troika of the UNKVD of Kyiv region on October 25, 1937. The grounds for their arrest were the testimony of M. I. Brovchenko, who at the court hearing of Kyiv Regional Court withdrew his testimony, in particular, regarding H. O. Melnyk and M. D. Rudenko. M. I. Brovchenko was convicted under Art. 54-10 and 54-1 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR up to 8 years of labour camps. In this regard, H. S. Tymofiyiv’s sentence of the Military Board of the Supreme Court of October 25, 1937 was cancelled and the case was closed “for lack of corpus delicti in his actions”.

**The Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research.** The results of the analysis of the materials of the archival investigative case of Uman resident, a teacher Hryhoriy Stepanovych Tymofiyiv show the mechanism of falsification of criminal cases of the UDB of the NKVD during the 1930s. Being accused because of fabricated testimony under pressure from investigators and convicted under the rules of a simplified procedure in 1937, H. S. Tymofiyiv was convicted for the second time and exiled to a settlement “for the same crimes in 1950”. In 1956, according to the results of an additional investigation H. S. Tymofiyiv was rehabilitated. Thus, the peculiarities of repression against the Ukrainian intelligentsia can be identified as follows: the opening of a criminal case for refusing to give false testimony against colleagues; giving forced testimony by witnesses; a slander; non-admission of guilt by the repressed; lack of direct evidence; reopening of cases after the end of the term of imprisonment. In order to humiliate the repressed and level the person, unconstitutional extrajudicial bodies functioned during the 1930s, whose rights only expanded over time and reached their apogee in 1938. Establishment of historical justice, finding and honoring the names of the repressed require a further archival research on each region of the Ukrainian state, including Uman. Innocent victims of the Soviet repressive and punitive system are waiting for my martyrology – doctors, teachers, scientists, engineers, civil servants, military ...

**Acknowledgement.** We are sincerely grateful to the Director of the State Archives of Cherkasy Region, Klymenko Tetyana Anatoliivna and the Chief Specialist of the Archives of the SBU Office in Cherkasy Region, Pohorila Olena Petrivna for assistance in finding relevant documents for this study.

**Financing.** The authors did not receive any financial support for the research, authorship and / or publication of this article.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Arkhiv Upravlinnia SBU v Cherkaskii oblasti [Archive of the SBU Office in Cherkasy region]*

**Epplbom, Enn.** (2006). *Istoriia HULAHu [Gulag: History]* / per. z anhl. A. Ishchenka. Kyiv: Vyd. dim "Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia", 511 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Kuznets, T. & Skus, O.** (2020). Politychni represii proty polskoho intelektualnoho klasu na Umanshchyni v 20 – 30-ti roky. XX st. [Political repressions against polish intellectual class in the Uman region in the 1920s – 1930s of the 20th century]. *Eminak: naukovyi shchokvartalnyk [Eminak: The Science Quarterly]*, 2(30), 146–154. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2020.2\(30\)415](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2020.2(30)415). [in Ukrainian]

**Marochko, V. & Khillih, H.** (2003). *Represovani pedahohy Ukrainy: zhertyv politychnoho teroru (1929 – 1941) [Repressed Educators of Ukraine: Victims of Political Terror (1929 – 1941)]*. Kyiv, 302 p. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2019.2\(26\).293](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2019.2(26).293). [in Ukrainian]

**Nikolayev, I.** (2019). Zakonodavcha reglamentaciya ta mexanizmy kontrolyu bil'shovy'cz'koyi vlady za diyal'nisty gromads'ky'x ob'yednan' Ukrayiny' u pershij polovy'ni 1920-x rokiv [Legislation and control mechanisms of the Bolshevik authorities in the activities of public associations of Ukraine in the first half of the 1920s.]. *Eminak: naukovyj shchokvartal'nyk [Eminak: The Science Quarterly]*, 2 (26), 76–82. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2019.2\(26\).293](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2019.2(26).293). [in Ukrainian]

**Operatyvnyi nakaz.** (1937). Operatyvnyi nakaz NKVS SRSR № 00447 "Pro represuvannia kolyshnykh kurkuliv, karnykh zlochyntsviv ta inshykh antyradianskykh elementiv" vid 30 lypnia 1937 r. [Operational Order of the NKVD of the USSR № 00447 "On the repression of former kulaks, criminals and other anti-Soviet elements" of July 30, 1937]. *Trud [Work]*, 4 lypnia. [in Russian]

**Postanovlenye.** (1934). *Postanovlenye TsYK y SNK SSSR 1 dekabria 1934 h. "O vnesenii izmeneniy v deistvuiushchie Ugolovno-protsessualnye kodeksy soiuznykh respublik"* [Resolution of the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR on December 1, 1934 "On Amendments to the existing Criminal Procedure Codes of the Union Republics"]. URL : <http://stalin.memo.ru/images/1934.htm>. [in Russian]

**Ruban, M. Yu. & Tatory'nov S. J.** (2018). Represovani pravoslavni iyerarxy' ta svyashhennosluzhy'teli Baxmut's'kogo krayu [Repressed Orthodox hierarchs and clergymen of Bakhmut region]. *Ukrayins'kyj selyanyn [Ukrainian peasant]*, 19, 122–126. DOI: 10.31651/2413-8142-2018-19-122-127. [in Ukrainian]

**Shapoval, Yu.** (Comp.). (2009). *Ukraina v dobu "Velykoho teroru": 1936 – 1938 roky [Ukraine during the Great Terror era: 1936 – 1938 years]*. Kyiv : Lybid. 544 s. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on February 02, 2020.*

*Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94(477.83/86)-341.324“1941/1944”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226507

**Vasyl HULAY**

*PhD (History), PhD hab. (Politology), Professor, Head of international information department, Lviv Polytechnic National University, 13/4 Luitneva Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79022 (gulayvasyl@gmail.com)*

**ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7609-7967>

**Vira MAKSYMETS**

*PhD (Politology) Associate Professor, Department of International Information, Lviv Polytechnic National University, 158 Zelena Street, Stare Selo, Lviv region, Pustomyty district, Ukraine postal code 81154 (maksymetsvira@ukr.net)*

**ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9003-7055>

**Василь ГУЛАЙ**

*доктор політичних наук, кандидат історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри міжнародної інформації Національного університету “Львівська політехніка”, вул. Лютнева 13/4, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79022, (Vasyl.V.Hulai@lpnu.ua)*

**Vira МАКСИМЕЦЬ**

*кандидат політичних наук., доцент кафедри міжнародної інформації Національного університету “Львівська політехніка”, вул. Зелена 158, с. Старе Село, Пустомитівський р-н, Львівська обл., Україна, індекс 81154, (Vira.Y.Maksymets@lpnu.ua)*

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Hulay, V. & Maksymets, V. (2021). The Soviet factor in the armed struggle at the territory of “Halychyna” District of the General Governorate (1941 – 1944). *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 17, 156–166. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226507

**THE SOVIET FACTOR IN THE ARMED STRUGGLE  
AT THE TERRITORY OF “HALYCHYNA”  
DISTRICT OF THE GENERAL GOVERNORATE (1941 – 1944)**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the study is the analysis of the provocative role and sabotage-intelligence nature of the actions of the Soviet underground and partisans against the Nazi regime and the Ukrainian nationalist underground at the territory of “Halychyna” District. The study methodology is based on the application of a complex of historical (problem-historical, chronological, retrospective, synchronic), political (comparative, structural functional, systematic analysis, normative) and general scientific (analytical and synthetic, inductive and deductive) methods. The scientific novelty of the article is that for the first time in modern Ukrainian historiography an attempt has been made to do a comprehensive comparative analysis of the sabotage-intelligence activities of the Soviet security and military intelligence groups at the territory of “Halychyna” District of the General Governorate. The Conclusions.* *Therefore, based on the historical study, we can conclude that the characterization of the hostilities at the territory of Galicia, especially since the summer of 1943, should not neglect the existence and influence of intelligence-sabotage groups and individual agents of the state security*

agencies of the USSR and the UkrSSR and Intelligence Directorate General of the Red Army General Staff, the Soviet organized underground and partisan formations. The revealed archival documents together with other critically treated historiography make it possible to confirm a significant external factor in the organizational design of the pro-Soviet underground and partisan movement. At the same time, despite frequent effective actions against the Nazi occupation administration and the Wehrmacht, the struggle of the Soviet underground and partisans did not receive the support of the local, especially dominant Ukrainian population.

**Key words:** “Halychyna” district, armed struggle, the Soviet factor, intelligence and sabotage groups.

## **РАДЯНСЬКИЙ ЧИННИК У ЗБРОЙНІЙ БОРОТЬБІ НА ТЕРИТОРІЇ ДИСТРИКТУ “ГАЛИЧИНА” ГЕНЕРАЛЬНОГО ГУБЕРНАТОРСТВА (1941 – 1944)**

**Анотація. Мета дослідження** – аналіз провокативної ролі та диверсійно-розвідувального характеру дії радянських підпільників та партизан проти нацистського режиму та українського націоналістичного підпілля на території дистрикту “Галичина” Генерального Губернаторства. **Методологія дослідження** спирається на застосуванні комплексу історичних (проблемно-історичний, хронологічний, ретроспективний, синхроністичний), політологічних (порівняльний, структурно-функціональний, системного аналізу, нормативний), та загальнонаукових (аналітичний і синтетичний, індуктивний і дедуктивний) методів. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше в новітній українській історіографії зроблена спроба комплексного порівняльного аналізу розвідувально-дисерсійної діяльності груп радянських органів безпеки та військової розвідки на території дистрикту “Галичина” Генерального Губернаторства. **Висновки.** Отже, на підставі проведеного історичного дослідження можемо дійти до низки висновків, що при характеристиці воєнних дій на території Галичини, особливо від літа 1943 р., не варто залишати поза увагою існування та впливу розвідувально-диверсійних груп та окремих агентів органів державної безпеки СРСР і УРСР та Розвідувального управління Генерального штабу Червоної армії, радянського організованого підпілля та партизанських формувань. Виявлені архівні документи в сукупності з іншими критично опрацьованою історіографією дозволяють твердити про вагомий зовнішній чинник в організаційному оформленні прорадянського підпільницького та партизанського руху. При цьому, попри непоодинокі ефективні акції проти нацистської окупаційної адміністрації та Вермахту боротьба радянських підпільників та партизан не отримувала підтримки місцевого, передовсім домінуючого українського населення.

**Ключові слова:** дистрикт “Галичина”, збройна боротьба, радянський чинник, розвідувально-диверсійні групи.

**The Problem Statement.** The proposed research topic is relevant both in the scientific and theoretical aspect, allowing for the first time in modern Ukrainian historiography to analyze comprehensively the intelligence and sabotage activities of the Soviet security and military intelligence groups in “Halychyna” District of the General Governorate. In the applied dimension, to use the factual material and conclusions to cover the outlined topics in a public discourse, in particular, in order to counteract effectively the negative informational and psychological impact of modern Russian propaganda around the neo-imperial concept of the “Great Victory” and the important role of heroic Soviet underground and partisans in the struggle against the so-called Nazis and their allies.

**The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches.** An introductory description of the historiographical base of the proposed historical research is given in a previous publication by one of the authors (Hulai V. V.), which should be supplemented by a critical analysis of ideological memoirs of the Soviet underground members and partisan movement, mostly in

various literary publications, including Varyahina V. Vakulenko G. (Variahina, Vakulenko, 1979), Makivka S. (Makivka, 1959), Medvedev D (Medvedev, 1990).

In view of the considerable historiographic array of the Soviet period, which was conditioned by the need to satisfy the ideological demands of the Communist Party, some sporadic mentions the latest Ukrainian historiography about local pro-Soviet underground groups, intelligence and partisan groups, who came to Galicia from Volyn occupied by the Nazis, and later more and more from the neighboring Lublin district of the General Governorate, and the need for the involvement into historian discourse the latest works by Russian and Polish researchers, it may be promising to prepare a historiographic publication. It is appropriate to draw attention to the publications of O. Hogun (Hogun, 2012), A. Sukhykh (Sukhykh, 2016), M. Slobodianiuk (Slobodianiuk, 2010) and the others.

In particular, we would like to draw attention to the unpublished documents, which were critically interpreted and first introduced into scientific circulation, found by the authors in the Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine and the State Archives of Lviv Region.

**The Purpose of the Article.** The purpose of the proposed article is the analysis of the historical lessons of the provocative role, the sabotage and intelligence nature of the actions of the Soviet underground and partisans against the Nazi regime and the Ukrainian nationalist underground at the territory of the Halychyna District of the General Governorate.

**The Statement of the Basic Material.** It is common knowledge, the General District of Volyn-Podillya (the center – Lutsk), which covered the territory of Rivne, Volyn, Kamenets-Podilsky (now Khmelnytsky) regions, as well as the southern districts, directly bounded the Halychyna District of the General Governorate as well as Brest and Pinsk regions of Belarus, from where to the lands of Galicia came (except for a small number of saboteurs arriving by air bridge from the Soviet historiography “Big Earth”), reconnaissance groups and partisan formations.

Attempts by the Soviet authorities to organize a partisan movement in the rear of the enemy under the conditions of a catastrophic beginning of war, chaos, disorder were unsuccessful, in particular, because of serious organizational difficulties. Off-front and sabotage activities at the territory of Ukraine during the war were engaged in three structures – the People’s Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD), the Communist Party (Bolshevik) of Ukraine (CP(b)U) and the Workers and Peasants Red Army (WPRA). During the first period of the war, an intense interagency struggle for control over the leadership of the partisan movement was waged between the party, the army and the state security agencies. On May 30, 1942, the Central Headquarters of the Partisan Movement was established, and on June 20, 1942, the Ukrainian Headquarters of the Partisan Movement (UHGM) (Herasymenko & Pyliavets, 2009, p. 77).

During the fall of 1942 – the spring of 1943, 29 organizational groups (355 persons) directed the deployment of the partisan movement, most of them did not reach their destination, including Lviv region (Klokov, 1994, p. 44).

In the autumn of 1941 the Soviet underground groups emerged in different settlements of Lviv region: in the village of Krasne Buzky district (the organizer – a former member of the CPSU, I. Dubas), the village of Uhry of Horodotsky district (S. Hregil), the village of Luky of the same district (D. Rybak), the village of Vyriv Kamyanka-Buzky district (M. Protsyk), the village of Sasiv of Zolochiv district (P. Kundius), Stryi town (V. Hrytsiak), Zhovkva town, Stebnyk town and the others (Zamlynskyj, 1976, p. 51).

Let us dwell more on the information of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U on the organization of underground party organizations and partisan units at the territory of the USSR on October 10, 1941. In particular, 2 partisan detachments of 24 persons were exiled to

Ternopil region and 23 communists were underground. In addition, an underground regional party committee of 3 persons was created. In Lviv region, 12 partisan detachments were sent to 140 people, 36 communists and 3 people underground. In Stanislaviv region there were 7 partisan units with a total of 113 people, 27 communists in underground work under the direction of an underground corps (3 persons). In neighboring Drohobych region there were 4 partisan units of 116 people and 48 underground communists (Smolii, Lozytskyi, 2001, pp. 50–51). In our opinion, the above figures are more than modest, based on the personnel of the Soviet security organs and arrived in the region during the previous year and a half (1939 – 1941) of the party asset. Special attention should be paid to the effectiveness of a contingent from the East, alien to the Galician cities and villages of the Soviet underground and partisan, or rather sabotage, intelligence.

Resolution of the USSR State Defense Committee No. 2403 of October 11, 1942 envisaged for the winter of 1942 – 1943, among other things, to direct in each of the former Soviet regions of the USSR, which now belonged to the region to the district “Halychyna” (Lviv, Drohobych, Stanislavska and Ternopil) one reconnaissance and subversive group and a regional task force of 3-5 people to coordinate the guerrilla movement (Kovalenko, etc., 2011, pp. 139–141). The virtually insignificant number of agents planned to be deployed to Galicia are given, the question arises of their ability to resist the Nazis. Once again, we have to deal with the desire to demonstrate, in small quantities, the Soviet presence in Galicia as a whole and its individual industrial areas and transport hubs.

Beginning in the spring of 1942, several communist and socialist groups emerged in Lviv, meeting to discuss the political situation in Western Ukraine and preparing to organize an underground partisan war against Hitler’s invaders. Among their members are former members of the CPTU and members of the CPSU(b) V. Hrushin, J. Wiesenberg, K. Kyryliuk, M. Berezin, D. Tvardovsky and the others. At the same time, the same groups emerged in a number of other cities and villages of modern Lviv region. For example, in the villages of Zhydovychi and Polyukhiv Velykyi of Hlyniiany district – V. Dorozhko group, in Sambir of Drohobych region – I. Serakovsky group and the others (Variahina & Vakulenko, 1979, p. 28).

In the spring of 1942, a group of Polish communists led by A. Khmelevsky and Z. Cholianek sent from the USSR landed successfully in Lviv region, which helped to intensify the activity of the Polish anti-fascist underground of the pro-Soviet orientation (Brechak, 1974, p. 81).

Authors found in the State Archives of Lviv Region documents drawn up by party workers immediately after the liberation of the Nazi occupation allow one to speak of the important role in the organizational strengthening of the Soviet underground of Lviv, one of the leaders of the Polish Workers’ Party (Polish: Polska Partia Robotnicza, PPR), who came from Moscow to Warsaw and from which the leaders of the Avengers’ National Guard (later referred to as an organization in the Soviet historiography and propaganda as the People’s Guard of the Western Regions of Ukraine or the People’s Guard S. Franko – Authors) received instruction books and financial assistance for (State Archives of Lviv Region – SALR, f. 3, d. 1, c. 78, p. 159). To strengthen the National Guard of the Avengers, on the instruction of the said “Franek”, on February 23, 1943, Ivan Kurylovych (“Richard”) was sent to Lviv, who became the head of this organization. By the end of June 1943, the Avengers’ National Guard numbered up to 500 people, taking over the group in Drohobych, Brody, Helm, Stryi, Stanislaviv, and Ternopil (SALR, f. 3, d. 1, c. 78, p. 160).

As for the national composition of the members of the People’s Guard, an indirect idea of this can be obtained from the elaboration of biographies of participants in journalistic apologetics, co-authored by one of the members of the organization, a Russian – V. Variahina.

Thus, of the 93 listed members of the “National Guard”, 56 were the Ukrainians, 15 – the Poles, 9 – the Russians, and 3 – the Jews. 1941. Thus, even the non-Soviet authors could not hide in their biographies the fact that a large part of the Ukrainians and all Russians came to the region with the beginning of the so-called “Sovietization”, but among the Poles (natives of Lviv and other cities, which during the interwar period belonged to Poland) the vast majority were former activists of the Communist Party of Western Ukraine and the Polish left parties (Variahina & Vakulenko, 1979, pp. 172–227).

In the summer of 1942, a former member of the Communist Party Y. Wiesenberg travelled from Lviv to Warsaw to establish relations with the PPR, who easily managed to renew the connection with the Communists, who became the members of the PPR, and to obtain the underground publications of the newspaper “The Tribune of Liberty” – the PPR body and “The Guardian” – the body of the Guard of Lyudova (Variahina, Vakulenko, 1979, p. 29).

S. Zay, J. Slivka, J. Bier, O. Leshchynsky, A. Smolensky, T. Gayevsky, A. Polubiak belonged to the Polish organizers and leaders of the underground in Lviv. In the fall of 1942, they came under the leadership of the PPR Central Committee and the General Staff of the Army of Lyudova and formed the centers of these organizations (Kondriatiuk, 2011, p. 115).

Due to the extension of the actions of the People’s Guard to the districts of Drohobych, Stanislavsk and Ternopil regions, which were the part of Halychyna district, the council of the organization focused on propaganda work increasingly, which is discussed in detail by the author in his previous work.

In August of 1943 the name “People’s Guard of the Avengers” was replaced by “Partisan Council of the Western Regions of Ukraine”. However, the former abbreviated name of the People’s Guard continued to be used in advocacy.

In the second half of 1943, the Soviet underground was transformed into an organization of the partisan movement of the western regions of Ukraine. The CPR Central Committee transmitted it to the CC of CP(b)U and the Ukrainian Partisan Movement Headquarters (Kondriatiuk, 2011, p. 115).

For instance, in the decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (b) In “On the state and further development of the partisan movement in Ukraine” in July 1943 it was noted: “In the winter of 1942 – 1943 and in the spring of 1943 the partisan movement expanded significantly and organizationally. ... The masses of the Soviet population rose to active struggle against the German invaders”. At the territory of Lviv, Drohobych, Stanislav and Ternopil, the People’s Guard of the Western Regions of Ukraine functioned, renamed at the end of 1943 as the Partisan Movement of the Western Regions of Ukraine (up to 600 people). In Hlynianskyi district of Lviv region the organization “Homeland Liberation” was active. However, the underground committees of the CP(b)U in Drohobych, Stanislavsk, Chernivtsi, Izmail, Odesa, Mykolaiv and Lviv regions were not restored (Slobodianiuk, 2010, p. 56).

After a radical break in the battles on the Eastern Front and the rapid approach of the Red Army to the terrain of Lviv region, partisan groups and detachments became more active: in the regions: Brody partisan group, Krasnyansky sabotage partisan group, Rava-Ruska sabotage partisan group named after Ivan Franko and the others (Fedchenko, 1960, p. 114).

During the period 1943 – 1944 the partisan group “Patriots of the Slavs” under the command of V. Popov, numbering up to 22 people, operated at the territory of Buzkyi and Kamyanka-Buzkyi districts of Lviv region (SALR, f. 3, d. 1, c. 78, p. 155).

Thus, writing about the activity of P. Kundius’ detachment (also called the Zolochiv partisan detachment – Authors), K. Kondratyuk points at its main purpose –to protect the

population of several predominantly Polish villages from the UPA detachments (Kondriatiuk, 2011, p. 115). Summarizing the data of the Soviet historians and modern Ukrainian researchers, the publicist D. Chobit points out that in 1944 P. Kundius's detachment numbered up to 600 people, 90% of whom were the Poles (Chobit, 2020, pp. 214–215). The party archival documents drawn up immediately after the liberation of Lviv region state explicitly that P. Kundius took command of the Polish partisan unit and led it to liberate the Red Army of Zolochiv, Olesko and Krasnyansky districts of Lviv (SALR, f. 3, d. 1, c. 78, p. 157).

Similar activity in the district of Dorogobych was carried out by the “Orlik” detachment of the Army Lyudova Army under the leadership of Y. Vazhynsky. In June of 1944 near the village of Sianky, together with the Soviet airborne group, the “Orlik” detachment attacked the German detachment of 200 people. About 80 enemy soldiers were killed and wounded (Kondriatiuk, 2011, p. 115).

I. Iiushyn rightly notes that during the years of the German occupation of the western Ukrainian lands, the Soviet partisans cooperated not only with local Polish sympathizers of the Communists, but also with representatives of “Pro-London” military groups. However, in his opinion, the importance of such cooperation should not be exaggerated, as there are also many examples of the Polish-Soviet partisan warfare. For instance, on July 25, 1944, one of the organizers and leaders of Ivan Franko National Guard, M. Berezin, was killed by the Polish “narodovtsi” (Iiushyn, 2009, p. 349).

Y. Kyrychuk draws attention to the fact that the campaign in the second half of 1943 by the partisan union of S. Kovpak from southern Belarus to strike at the Boryslav-Drohobych oil basin was, among other things, to become a political demonstration of the Soviet presence in Galician lands where there was the Ukrainian national consciousness strong traditionally (Kyrychuk, 2000, p. 66).

According to O. Hogun, the military success of the Carpathian raid of Sumy Union of S. Kovpak in the summer of 1943 was insignificant, but its political importance is highly appreciated: the operation showed the weakness of the occupation administration (Hogun, 2012, p. 110). In practice, they did not refer to the activation of other small partisan detachments and underground groups in Galicia, despite the bold promises made by Commander Kovpak and Commissar Rudnev in the letter of June 9, 1943, in the name of the leader of Soviet Ukraine, M. Khrushchov: Stanislavskyyi, Lviv and Chernivtsi regions of the USSR and to prepare the population of these areas for an armed uprising.

O. Hogun emphasizes quite rightly the paradoxical consequence when the underground of AK and Bandera were activated in Galicia due to the Carpathian raid (Hogun, 2012, p. 111).

Responding to the claims of the chief of the Ukrainian staff of the partisan movement T. Strochach, the failure of the winter campaign of the commander of the 1st Ukrainian partisan division named after Kovpak (formed on the basis of the former Sumy Union of S. Kovpak) P. Vershigor stated on March 4, 1944 that “the Soviet partisans in Galicia ... feel as if they were in Germany and in Poland not worse than in real Soviet areas” (Hogun, 2012, p. 117).

In Ternopil region, the former head of Mykolaiv district executive committee Ya. Kravchenko created an underground organization “VUYKO” with a population of about 30 people, mostly based in the villages of Nastasiv and Veselivka in Mykulynetskyi district, where in 1940 the Ukrainian settlers from Lemkivschyna were resettled and one of the first collective farms was organized in the region. On March 18, 1943 in the village of Nastasiv Kravchenko and his closest assistant were killed (Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine – CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 22, c. 571, pp. 2–7).

It is undeniable that the local Poles cooperated actively with or even fought in the Soviet partisan and army subversive units, which increasingly directed into Galicia in the winter and spring of 1944. Only in the forests around the villages of Sasiv and Pobich to the north of Zolochiv there was active the group of 150 Soviet paratroopers and 30 Poles (Bohunov, 2005, p. 1088).

In October of 1942, a partisan group, "Liberation of the Fatherland", was formed in Hlyniansky District, under the leadership of the communists V. Dorozhko and I. Holovchenko, who had been active since October 7, 1942, until the day of the Red Army's arrival – July 23, 1944. The partisans had their own programme which required: 1) to carry out constant agitation and propaganda work among the population, 2) to unite in the organization of supporters of Soviet Ukraine to fight against the Nazis and bourgeois nationalists of all stripes; 3) to form combat and sabotage partisan units and to join workers of different nationalities; 4) to save the workers from the brutal fascist massacre; 5) to conduct a systematic reconnaissance of the forces and actions of the enemy in order to combat the occupiers effectively; 6) to conduct public awareness work on exposing hostile lies against the Soviet Union and the Soviet Army; 7) to prevent enemies from exporting material from Ukraine; 8) to study honest people from the intelligentsia, involving them into the ranks of active fighters with fascism. The partisans had a steering committee and six grassroots groups. The Liberation of the Fatherland group maintained a close contact with the Polish self-defense group of the village of Hanacheva, Hlyniany district, Lviv region (Fedchenko, 1960, pp. 119–120).

Such may be the previous historical and political characterization of the evolution of the organizational structure and communicative mechanisms and scope of the propaganda activities of the Soviet underground and partisans in Lviv region during the Nazi occupation of the region.

The mass influence from the winter of 1943 – 1944 on external influence to intensify reconnaissance and sabotage activities in the interests of the Red Army, which was approaching the territory of Halychyna district, should be emphasized separately. Thus, in the winter of 1944, as a result of successful offensive operations (Korsun-Shevchenkivska, Rivne-Lutsk, Nikopol-Kryvyi Rih), a large number of partisan formations, some of which also interacted with the Red Army troops actively, found themselves in the Soviet rear. In connection with this, a number of connections were reorganized – by the resolutions of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (b). In February 9, 1944, 10 detachments of Zhytomyr partisan division named after M. A. Shchors under the command of S. F. Malikov headed for independent action in Lviv and Ternopil region; 7 units of Rivne Union № 1 under the command of V. A. Begma, 3 detachments of Rivne Union named after M. A. Shchors under the command of M. V. Taratuty and 8 detachments of Rivne Union № 2 "For Motherland" under the command of I. P. Fedorov – to Lviv region; 7 detachments of Kamyanets-Podilsky compound named after G. K. Zhukov under the command of I. E. Skubko and 3 detachments of Ternopil Union named after M. Khrushchov under the command of I. I. Shtova – to Ternopil region. The team members of the connections were called to the disposal of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U to organize the collection and summarization of all materials and documents on the activities of their subordinate formations (Vlasenko, 2015, p. 71).

Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b) B of March 24, 1944, the Chernihiv-Volyn partisan unit under the command of A. F. Fedorov, which numbered 11 detachments with a number of 3100 people, was disbanded, and two units of 500 units were formed on its base (under the command of G. V. Balytsky and D. I. Rvanov), who were to operate at the territory of Drohobych (now the part of Lviv) and Stanislavsky (now Ivano-Frankivsk) regions (Vlasenko, 2015, p. 71).

The fact that the activities of the Soviet partisan-sabotage formations were primarily provocative in nature, leading, in the first place, to "retaliatory" actions of the Nazi regime against the civilian population of the region, can be traced through the lines of party reports, such as, for example, that on April 9, 1943, detachment of A. Odukh, taking away food and equipment, leaving the territory of Shumsky district, but as a result of Hitler's terror, about a thousand civilians were killed and several villages burned (Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine (CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 22, c. 571, pp. 8–9).

Sometimes in the party reports we also find the information about the counter-intelligence successes of the Nazis in the fight against mostly arrived, not local, the Soviet underground and partisans led by Moscow. Thus, among the others, the activities of the former Soviet prisoner of war Yakushev, who was recruited by the Nazis and pretending to be a commander of Zhytomyr partisan detachment, neutralized in Husiatyn, Kopichesk and Borshchiv districts of Ternopil region, an employee of the Vinnytsia UNKVD, I. Hryshchenko, a former deputy head of the military department the CC of the CP(b)U Dovoda and the others (CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 22, c. 571, pp. 8–9).

Another striking example of the individual terror of Moscow-based "national avengers" when, on June 1, 1943, the members of the Soviet underground organization of the former first secretary of Zabolotsk RK of the LKSMU of the Stanislav region of I. Golubtsov, killed a priest of the village Ilintsy, M. Volanski, for appealing to local residents to go to work in Germany and join Halychyna Division (CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 22, c. 538, p. 18).

The hostility of some of the local population was repeatedly pointed out by the commanders of the Soviet partisan formations, who were increasingly directed to the region as the Red Army approached. On March 17, 1944, commander of one of the Soviet partisan detachments Starinov reported on a hostile, even worse than towards the Germans, attitude of the local population of Ternopil region: "I have fought the fourth war, but have never encountered such hostility as in the liberated regions" (CSAPAU, f. 62, d. 1, c. 289, p. 14).

In continuation of the chosen strategy implementation by the Resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (b) of April 8, 1944 the formations and units operating at the territory of Rivne, Volyn, Kamenets-Podilsky (now Khmelnytsky) regions were reformed and reduced, and in their place there were created 14 independent maneuver units, numbering 350-500 people each, who were supposed to be fighting in the occupied areas of Lviv and Drohobych regions (Vlasenko, 2015, p. 72).

The most massive transfer, from the occupied Red Army in the winter and spring of 1944 to Volhynia and Podillya, reconnaissance and sabotage detachments intensified significantly the pro-Soviet partisan movement at the territory of Halychyna district.

The Soviet special services, controlled by most underground groups and partisan units throughout Ukraine, sought to use toponymy for propaganda purposes, especially, in the areas under the Nazi occupation, in particular, in Halychyna district. For instance, Ternopil partisan unit named after Khrushchov (this is what it was called from mid-October of 1943) under the command of the ethnic Russian I. Shytov never acted in Ternopil, but balanced on the border of modern Rivne and Zhytomyr regions (Sukhykh, 2016, p. 103).

One of the largest Soviet partisan formations that was targeted in the winter and spring of 1944 on the Galician land there was a unit named after J. V. Stalin. From January 6 till March 22, 1944, the unit attempted to break through to the south, encountering large forces retreating to the west of the German troops. In the areas adjacent to Ternopil and Kamianets-Podilsky, the partisans conducted 18 battles against the Nazis and 15 against the UPA.

Unable to reach the area of Pervomaisky, the unit went to the west to the territory of Lviv region. From March 25 till March 30, 1944, the partisans attempted to cross the railway and Ternopil-Zolochiv road route, guarded by considerable enemy forces. Only the detachment named after Nevsky and 30 subversive groups were able to carry out this task. The rest of the detachment of 1 156 troops on April 5, 1944 met with the Red Army and left the rear temporarily (Smolii & Lozytskyi, 2001, pp. 106–108).

On April 23, 1944, according to the decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (b) U to exit in the district of Boryslav-Drohobych, a unit of almost 900 people crossed the front line again and plunged into the rear of the enemy. The route ran through the northern slopes of the Carpathians in the Chernivtsi, Stanislav and Drohobych regions. Moving through difficult mountainous terrain, bypassing settlements, the unit reached the designated operational area on May 22, 1944 and was located between Skole and Turka. Until July 9, 1944, while in the districts of Boryslav – Drohobych – Stryi and Skole – Volovets and Turka – Sambir – Sanok, the partisans conducted 9 battles with the Nazis and 2 with the UPA, organized 16 ambushes along the roads, detonated 21 enemy echelons, 6 railway and road bridges. 22 fuel tanks, oil refineries and 3 sawmills were destroyed. Due to the approach of the front line, on July 9, 1944, the partisans crossed the territory of Poland and, on August 25, 1944, crossed the border with Slovakia (Kovalenko, etc., 2011, pp. 445–446).

April 26, 1944 employees of the radio unit of the partisan unit named after V. Lenin (Commander L. Ivanov) O. Khablo and M. Vovchyk-Blykitna reported to the Ukrainian partisan movement headquarters: “During your existence, Ivanov’s union failed to fulfill any of your orders, because the command postpones the time until their execution. It will become impossible and the unit continues to be inactive”. It was further stated that, having received the USHRR order to enter the territory of Lviv region, the command of the unit instead of its execution began to search the bases and depots of nationalists and lost the opportunity to break into the specified operational area (Kentii, Lozytskyi, 2011, p. 535).

**The Conclusions.** Based on the historical research, we can conclude that the characterization of the hostilities at the territory of Galicia, especially since the summer of 1943, should not neglect the existence and influence of intelligence-sabotage groups and individual agents of the state security agencies of the USSR and UkrSSR and Intelligence General Staff of the Red Army, the Soviet organized underground and partisan formations. The revealed archival documents together with other critically treated historiography make it possible to confirm a significant external factor in the organization of the pro-Soviet underground and partisan movement. At the same time, despite frequent effective actions against the Nazi occupation administration and the Wehrmacht, the struggle of the Soviet underground and partisans did not receive the support of the local, especially dominant Ukrainian population. In this context, it is necessary to analyze separately the national composition of the mentioned structures of the Soviet Movement of Resistance at the territory of Galicia, close links with the Polish anti-Hitler underground of the pro-Soviet left orientation and the desire to assume the role of the defender of the Polish population in the context of the escalation of the Ukrainian-Polish conflict in Galicia in 1944, which could be a promising field for further historical studies.

**Acknowledgments.** We express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

**Funding.** The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Bohunov, S. (ed.).** (2005). *Polshcha ta Ukraina u trydtsiatykh–sorokovykh rokakh KhKh stolittia: Nevidomi dokumenty z arkhiviv spetsialnykh sluzhb. T. 4: Poliaky i ukraintsi mizh dvoma totalitarnymy systemamy 1942 – 1945. Chastyna persha. [Poland and Ukraine in the Thirties and Forties of the Twentieth Century: Unknown Documents from the Special Services Archives. Vol 4: Poles and Ukrainians between the two totalitarian systems 1942 – 1945. Part One].* Varshava–Kyiv: Derzhavnyi arkhiv Sluzhby bezpeky Ukrainy, Arkhiv Ministerstva vnutrishnikh sprav i administratsii Respubliky Polshchi, Instytut natsionalnoi pam'iaty, Komisia z peresliduvannya zlochyniv proty polskoho narodu, Instytut politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen Natsionalnoi akademii nauk Ukrainy, 1512 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Brechak, I.** (1974). *Bojovi pobratymy (Z istorii uchasti polskykh antyfasystiv u radankomu partyzanskomu rusi na Ukraini v roky Velykoi Vitchyznanoi vijny) [Fighting Brothers (From the history of the participation of Polish anti-fascists in the Soviet guerrilla movement in Ukraine during the Great Patriotic War)].* Lviv: Vydavnytstvo “Kamenar”, 192 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Brytskyi, P. P.** (1995). *Ukraina u Druhii svitovii vijni (1939 – 1945 rr.) [Ukraine in the Second World War (1939 – 1945)].* Chernivtsi: Chernivetskyi derzhavnyi universytet im. Yu. Fedkovycha, 114 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Chobit, D.** (2020). *Zahybel Huty Peniatskoi 28 liutoho 1944 roku. Knyha persha. Trahediiia [The death of Guta Penyatska on February 28, 1944. Book one. Tragedy].* Peredmovva V. Serhiichuka. Kyiv: VD “Ukrainska kultura”, 612 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Denysenko, P. I., Lukin, V. P. & Moskalenko M. I. (Comp.)** (1969). *Lystivky partijnogho pidpillja i partyzanskykh zaghoniv Ukrainy u roky Velykji Vitchyznanoi vijny [Leaflets of the Party underground and guerrilla units of Ukraine during the Great Patriotic War].* Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo politychnoi literatury Ukrainy, 340 p. [in Ukrainian]

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Lvivskoi oblasti [State Archives of Lviv Region – SALR].*

**Fedchenko P.** (1960). *Partyzanskyj rukh na Lvivshhyni v roky Velykoi vitchyznanoi vijny. U borotbi za radansku vladu i socializm: Zbirnyk naukovykh statej [Partisan movement in Lviv region during the Great Patriotic War. In the Struggle for Soviet Power and Socialism: A Collection of Scientific Articles].* (pp. 112–124). Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Lvivskogo universytetu. [in Ukrainian]

**Herasymenko, L. & Pyliavets, R.** (Uporadn.) (2009). *Ukraina i ukraintskyj narod u Druhij svitovij vijni: Dyskusii [Ukraine and the Ukrainian people in World War II: Discussions].* Vyp. 2. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo imeni Oleny Telighy, 84 p. [in Ukrainian].

**Hogun, A.** (2012). *Stalinskie kommandos. Ukrainskie partizanskie formirovaniya, 1941 – 1944 [Stalin Commandos. Ukrainian guerrilla formations, 1941 – 1944].* (2-e izd., ispr. i dop.). Moskva: Rossiyskaya politicheskaya entsiklopediya (ROSSPEN), 527 p. [in Russian]

**Hulai, V. V.** (2011). *Mizhetnichna komunikaciya v Zakhidniy Ukraini u roky Drughoi svitovoi vijny: monohrafiya [Interethnic communication in Western Ukraine during the Second World War: a monograph].* Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Lvivskoi politekhniki, 460 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Hulai, V. V.** (2012). Rolj “tretjoi syly” v eskalatsii ukraintsko-polskogo konfliktu v Zakhidniy Ukrainy (zyma-lito 1944 r.): polityko-militarni aspekty [The role of the “third force” in the escalation of the Ukrainian-Polish conflict in Western Ukraine (winter-summer 1944): political and military aspects]. *Panorama politolohichnykh studij: naukovyj visnyk Rivnenskoho derzhavnogho ghumanitarnogho universytetu*, 8, 45–52. [in Ukrainian]

**Hulai, V. V.** (2014). Komunikatyvni mekhanizmy ta masshtaby propagandystskogho vplyvu radanskykh partyzan ta pidpilnykiv na naseledda Lvivshhyni v roky nacytskoi okupatsii [Communicative mechanisms and extent of propaganda influence of Soviet guerrillas and underground on the population of Lviv region during the Nazi occupation]. *Vyskovo-naukoviy visnyk*, 21, 104–119. [in Ukrainian].

**Iliushyn, I.** (2009). *Ukrainska povstanska armiiia i Armiiia Kraiova. Protystoianniia v Zakhidniy Ukraini (1939 – 1945 rr.). [Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the National Army. Confrontation in Western Ukraine (1939 – 1945)].* Kyiv: Vyd. dim “Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia”, 399 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Kentii, A. & Lozyskyi, V.** (2011). Borotba v tylu nacytskykh okupantiv v Ukraini: radanski okupanty u 1941 – 1944 rr. [The struggle in the style of Nazi occupiers in Ukraine: a happy occupation in 1941 – 1944].

*Ukraina v Drughiy svitoviy vini: poghlad z XXI st. [Ukraine in a different svitivi viyni: a glance from the XXI century].* Istorychni narysy. Knyha persha (pp. 512–541). Kyiv: Naukova dumka. [in Ukrainian]

**Klokov, V. I.** (1994). O strategii i taktike sovetskih partizan v bor'be protiv fashistskih okkupantov na Ukraine (1941 – 1944) [On the strategy and tactics of Soviet partisans in the fight against fascist invaders in Ukraine (1941 – 1944)]. *Istoricheskie tetradi Instituta istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy*. Kiev, 75 p. [in Russian]

**Kondriatiuk, K.** (2011). *Galychyna i Volyn u roky Drugoi svitovoi vijny (1939 – 1945): Navchalny posibnyk [Halychyna and Volhynia during the Second World War (1939 – 1945): Textbook]*. Lviv: LNU im. Ivana Franka, 160 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Kovalenko, O. B., Lysenko, O. V., Tsybmalenko, I. M., Afanasieva, T. A., Donchenko, T. V., Sydorenko, O. M. & Chaus, I. K.** (Comp.) (2011). *Partyzanska slava. Chernighivska oblast: dovidkovi materialy [Partisan glory. Chernihiv region: reference materials]*. Chernigiv: Desna Polighraf, 498 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Kyrychuk, Ju.** (2000). *Narys z istorii ukrainskoho nacionalno-vyzvolnoho rukhu 40-50-kh rokiv XX stolittya [An essay on the history of the Ukrainian national liberation movement of the 40-50s of the XX century]*. Lviv, 304 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Makivka, S.** (1959). *Narodna hvardiia imeni Ivana Franka. Iz spohadiv pidpilnyka [The Ivan Franko People's Guard. From the memories of the underground]*. Lviv: Knyzhkovo-zhurnalne vydavnytstvo, 126 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Medvedev, D. N.** (1990). *Sylnye dukhom: Roman [Strong in spirit: A novel]*. Donetsk: Donbas, 423 p. [in Russian]

**Slobodianiuk, M. A.** (2010). Radianski pidpilnyky u borotbi z natsytskymy okupantamy na terytorii Ukrainy [Soviet underground in the fight against Nazi occupiers in Ukraine]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 3, 46–63. [in Ukrainian]

**Smolii, V. A. & Lozytskyi, V. S.** (Comp.) (2001). *Ukraina partyzanska. 1941 – 1945. Partyzanski formuvannia ta orhany kerivnytstva nymy: naukovo-dovidkove vydannia / Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromadskykh obiednan Ukrainy [Ukraine is partisan. 1941 – 1945. Guerrilla Formations and Authorities: Scientific Reference / Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine]*. Kyiv: Parlamentske vydavnytstvo, 319 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Sukhykh, A.** (2016). Komandyr Ternopilskoho partyzanskoho z'iednannia im. M. Khrushchova I. I. Shytov: moralno-psykholohichniy portret [Commander of Ternopil guerrilla union them. M. Khrushchev II Shytov: moral and psychological portrait]. *Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu "Ostrozka akademiia" Seriia "Istorychni nauky"*, 25, 105–113. [in Ukrainian]

**Terliuk, I. Ya.** (2008). Okupatsiinyi rezhym v Ukraini 1941–1944 rr. i problemy tvorennia ukrainskoi natsionalnoi derzhavnosti: istoriia derzhavy i prava [The Occupation Regime in Ukraine from 1941 to 1944 and the Problems of Creating the Ukrainian National Statehood: History of the State and Law]. Lviv: Kameniar, 128 p. [in Ukrainian]

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromadskykh obiednan Ukrainy [Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine – CSAPAU].*

**Variahina, V. D. & Vakulenko, H. S.** (1979). *Narodna hvardiia imeni Ivana Franka: storinky heroichnoi borotby pidpilno-partyzanskoi orhanizatsii zakhidnykh oblastei Ukrainy. 1942 – 1944 roky [Ivan Franko People's Guard: pages of the heroic struggle of the underground partisan organization of the western regions of Ukraine. 1942 – 1944]*. Lviv: Kameniar, 229 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Vlasenko, S. I.** (2015). Radianskyi partyzanskyi rukh oporu v period zvilnennia Ukrainy ta krain Tsentralnoi i Pivdenno-Skhidnoi Yevropy (1943 – 1945 rr.) [Soviet guerrilla resistance movement during the liberation of Ukraine and the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe (1943 – 1945)]. *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, 3, 69–79. [in Ukrainian]

**Zamlynskyi, V. O.** (1976). *Z viroiu u Peremohu. Komunistychna partiia na choli partyzanskoi borotby proty nimetsko-fashysts'kykh zaharbnykiv u zakhidnykh oblastiakh Ukrainy 1941 – 1944 [With faith in Victory. Communist Party led by guerrilla fight against Nazi invaders in western regions of Ukraine 1941 – 1944]*. Kyiv: Vydavnyche obiednannia "Vyshcha shkola", 199 p. [in Ukrainian].

*The article was received on February 20, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 94(477)“1941/1942”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226506

**Oleksiy HONCHARENKO**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor of the Department of History and Culture of Ukraine, SHEI “Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi Hryhoriy Skovoroda State Pedagogical University”, 30, Sukchomlynsky Street, Pereyaslav, Kyiv region, Ukraine, postal code 08401 (oleksijghoncharenko@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8882-6397>

**ResearcherID:** AAC-1919-2020 (<http://www.researcherid.com/rid/AAC-1919-2020>)

**Oleksandr POTYL’CHAK**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of Department of Original and Special Historical Sciences of the National Pedagogical Drahomanov University, 6, Osvity Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 03037 (pot1965@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3518-9280>

**ResearcherID:** AAC-1919-2020 (<http://www.researcherid.com/rid/ABF-2675-2020>)

**Олексій ГОНЧАРЕНКО**

*доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри історії та культури України ДВНЗ “Переяслав-Хмельницький державний педагогічний університет імені Григорія Сковороди”, вул. Сухомлинського 30, м. Переяслав, Київська обл., Україна, індекс 08401 (oleksijghoncharenko@gmail.com)*

**Олександр ПОТИЛЬЧАК**

*доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедрою кафедри джерелознавства та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова, вул. Освіти, 6, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 03037 (pot1965@ukr.net)*

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Honcharenko, O. & Potyl’chak, O. (2021). Legal regulation of local population behaviour in the responsibility area of the Provisional Military Administration and Reich Commissariat “Ukraine” (the summer of 1941 – winter of 1942). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 167–175. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226506

**LEGAL REGULATION OF LOCAL POPULATION BEHAVIOUR  
IN THE RESPONSIBILITY AREA OF THE PROVISIONAL MILITARY  
ADMINISTRATION AND REICH COMMISSARIAT “UKRAINE”  
(THE SUMMER OF 1941 – WINTER OF 1942)**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research – to analyze the normative and legal influence of the Provisional Military Administration (hereinafter – the PMA) and the leadership of the Reich Commissariat “Ukraine” (hereinafter – the RCU), which was aimed at the observance of a lawful behaviour by the local population of occupied Ukraine. The methodology of the research is based on the application of the principles of systematicity, scientificity and historicism, as well as such methods*

of scientific knowledge as analysis, synthesis and comparison. **The scientific novelty** consists in the analysis of the normative measures of the occupation administrations to ensure the lawful behaviour of the local population. **The Conclusions.** After the successful occupation of the part of the Ukrainian lands by the German troops in 1941, the occupation administration faced the problem of regulating the observance of a lawful behaviour by the local population. Therefore, an important element of the work of the occupation administrations of the RCU and PMA was the creation of a full-fledged legal framework on the basis of which the influence on the lawful behaviour of the occupied society was exerted. During the first period of the occupation, before the emergence of a stable regulatory framework, the German administration applied the principle of combining and sometimes “imposing” two legal systems – the Soviet and Hitler’s. Exceptions were the laws, which denied the occupation, as well as the cases, in which the German regulations directly repealed certain Soviet legal norms. Almost similar appeals were repeated by the administration of the RCU, which took the place of the PMA. In fact, the normative acts of the PMA and the RCU abolished the Soviet legislation in terms of the state system, political regime and electoral system, but certain provisions of substantive law continued to be applied. Faced with the problems of lack of legal framework for the regulation of legal relations at the occupied territory, the administrators of the PMA and the RCU started applying the part of the regulatory framework, which functioned in the Third Reich. In the middle of 1942, the RCU administration created a separate normative act that regulated the criminal penalties of those members of the local population, who committed petty crimes and offenses. At the same time, the order was issued in the RCU regulating family and partly civil legal relations of the local population. In the PMA area, these transformations were never carried out. The heads of each of the field military commandant’s offices issued their own regulations, without codifying or reconciling them.

**Keywords:** occupation regime, Reich Commissariat “Ukraine”, provisional military administration, local population, lawful behaviour.

## **НОРМАТИВНО-ПРАВОВЕ ВРЕГУЛЮВАННЯ ПОВЕДІНКИ МІСЦЕВОГО НАСЕЛЕННЯ У ЗОНАХ ВІДПОВІДАЛЬНОСТІ ТИМЧАСОВОЇ ВІЙСЬКОВОЇ АДМІНІСТРАЦІЇ ТА РАЙХСКОМІСАРІАТУ “УКРАЇНА” (ЛІТО 1941 – ЗИМА 1942)**

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* – проаналізувати нормативно-правовий вплив тимчасової військової адміністрації (далі – ТВА) та керівництва Райхскомісаріату “Україна” (далі – РКУ), який спрямовувався на дотримання місцевим населенням окупованої України правомірної поведінки. **Методологія дослідження** опирається на застосування принципів системності, науковості та історизму, а також таких методів наукового пізнання як аналіз, синтез та порівняння. **Наукова новизна** полягає у проведеному аналізі нормативних заходів окупаційних адміністрацій у забезпеченні місцевим населенням правомірної поведінки. **Висновки.** Після успішної окупації частини українських земель, здійсненої військами Німеччини в 1941 р. перед окупаційною адміністрацією постала проблема нормативного забезпечення дотриманням місцевим населенням правомірної поведінки. Тому, важливим елементом роботи окупаційних адміністрацій РКУ і ТВА стало створення повноцінної нормативно-правової бази на основі застосування якої і здійснювався вплив на правомірну поведінку окупованого суспільства. У перший період окупації, до появи сталого нормативної бази німецька адміністрація застосовувала принцип поєднання, а подекуди й “накладання” двох правових систем – радянської та гітлерівської. Винятком становили закони, які заперечували факт окупації, а також випадки у яких німецькі нормативні приписи безпосередньо відмінювали певні радянські правові норми. Майже аналогічні звернення повторила і адміністрація РКУ, яка прийшла на місце ТВА. Фактично нормативними актами ТВА та РКУ відмінювалось радянське законодавство у частині державного устрою, політичного режиму, виборчої системи, але продовжували діяти окремі приписи галузей матеріального права. Зустрівшись із проблемами нестачі нормативно-правової бази з врегулювання правовідносин всередині окупованого соціуму управління ТВА та РКУ пішли шляхом застосування частини нормативної бази, яка діяла в Третньому Райху. У середині 1942 р. адміністрацією РКУ було створено окремий нормативний акт, який врегульовував кримінальні покарання тих представників місцевого населення, які вчинили дрібні злочини

*та правопорушення. У цей же період в РКУ з'явилось розпорядження, яким врегулювалися сімейні та частково цивільні правовідносини місцевого населення. У зоні ж ТВА ці перетворення так і не були проведені. Керівники кожної із польових військових комендатур видавали власні нормативно-правові акти, жодним чином їх не кодифікуючи та не узгоджуючи між собою.*

**Ключові слова:** *окупаційний режим, Райхскомісаріат "Україна", тимчасова військова адміністрація, місцеве населення, правомірна поведінка.*

**The Problem Statement.** Hitler's occupational regime established at the territory of our country became one of the greatest challenges for the Ukrainian society, because the very fact of the Ukrainian society existence was endangered. In case of Germany's victory, Ukraine was to become a "living space" for the so-called "Aryan people". The occupation regime itself, established on the occupied Ukrainian lands, was characterized by a ruthless cruelty, the use of unjustified mass repressive and punitive measures.

As a result of the established occupation regime, there were four occupation zones in Ukraine: the MZO, the RCU, "Halychyna" District as part of the Governor-General and the Transnistria Governorate, which was administered by Romania (Honcharenko, 2011, p. 6).

At the same time, after the successful occupation of part of the Ukrainian lands by the German troops in 1941, the Nazis faced the problem of the local population's observance of a lawful behaviour. The local population's observance of a lawful behaviour was to ensure not only a certain organization of a public life, but also aimed at solving important practical issues, goals and objectives of the established occupation regime by the military and civilian administrations of the RCU. The observance of a lawful behaviour by the local population presupposed the availability of information to the people about their responsibilities to Hitler regime and specific ideas about the methods of their implementation, the relationship with the occupiers and the administrative bodies. Without these conditions, it was impossible to organize the occupation administration of the local society.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications.** Some aspects of the issue under analysis were covered in the works of K. Berkhof (Berkhof, 2011), T. Snyder (Snyder, 2011), P. Rekotov (Rekotov, 1997), W. Shaikan (Shaikan, 2005), Yu. Levchenko (Levchenko, 2011) and the monographs of the authors of this article (Potyl'chak, 1997; Kucher & Potyl'chak, 2011; Honcharenko, 2011; Honcharenko, Kunytskyi & Lysenko, 2014). The social and legal status of the local population of the RCU is considered in the monograph of M. Kunytsky (Kunytskyi, 2014). A. Ivanenko focused her attention on the civil rule-making of local governments, in particular, Kyiv City Council in the autumn of 1941. In the researcher's publication it is noted that the German administration did not accept the completely rational plans of the local government under those conditions, and therefore they remained unfeasible (Ivanenko, 2018). A. Ivanenko also considered the peculiarities of the creation of a civil procedural law to regulate the relevant procedure in the RCU (Ivanenko, 2019).

Thus, as we see, the initial stage of studying the problem opened only some pages of the occupation reality, in particular, the practical application of a civil, criminal, family and administrative law in the Nazi-occupied Ukraine, including the sphere of justice. In fact, the researchers do not pay attention to the issues of a normative support of the PMA and the RCU occupation administrations influence on the lawful behaviour of the local population of Ukraine during the initial period of Hitler's "new order" formation – in the summer of 1941 and winter of 1942.

**The purpose of the article** is to analyze the measures of the provisional military administrations (hereinafter – PMA) and the RCU in the regulatory influence on the behaviour of the local population at the initial stage of the established occupation regime.

**The Basic Material Statement.** After the occupation of the territory of Ukraine, the first command and control bodies were the military commandant's offices of the Wehrmacht, which had to deal with the establishment of law and order. In this case, we distinguish them from the administration of the MZO and the rear (frontline) areas of the Wehrmacht. The use of the term PMA is explained by the fact that in the autumn of 1941, under the directives of the German leadership, the part of the occupied areas was transferred to "Halychyna" district administration and the RCU. In the middle of 1942, another part of the Ukrainian lands changed its departmental subordination and started to be subordinate to the RCU. Until then, the occupied territories of Ukraine were under the temporary control of the military and commandant's offices. But north-eastern Ukraine, along with some areas of the Crimea, remained under the permanent management of the military administration. Thus, we have every reason to believe that the part of the Ukrainian lands were subordinate to the PMA before being transferred to the RCU.

An important element of the work of the occupation administrations of the RCU and the PMA was the creation of a full-fledged legal framework on the basis of which the influence on the lawful behaviour of the occupied society was exerted. The German regulations, on the basis of which both future military action against the USSR and the occupation policy were prepared, determined the relevant goals and objectives of the strategic order. As it was mentioned above, in the future, Ukraine was to become a "living space" for the "Aryan people". But it was impossible to achieve this strategic goal "at once and immediately". The existence of the local society in the coordinate system of the Nazi occupation regime at the beginning of the war had not yet been framed in the legal plane. The regulation of the behaviour of the local population required clear and understandable rules.

The leadership of the Third Reich could not fully apply in occupied Ukraine the system of legal acts, which were in force in Germany. Since the law regulates objective social relations, it is almost impossible to apply the legal framework of countries with different historical traditions, current political systems, mentality, and even more so to introduce it in a "ready" form for the relations regulations in the occupied society. Therefore, the leadership of the Third Reich faced the problem of creating a legal system precisely for those countries, which were occupied by it. It was impossible to accomplish this objective during a short period of time. The settlement of various social relations, including the field of management, had to be carried out immediately and constantly, because the government could not allow the emergence of uncontrolled social processes. To leave the Soviet law unchanged while destroying the state and political system also did little, because it did not meet the goal of the Nazis.

The way out of the situation was found fairly quickly. At the occupied territories, the Germans applied the principle of combining and sometimes "overlapping" two legal systems – the Soviet and Hitler's. Already in the first regulations adopted by the PMA, the local population was informed about the continuation of the Soviet laws. Exceptions were the laws denying the fact of occupation, as well as the cases, in which the German regulations directly repealed certain Soviet legal norms (State Archives of Kirovohrad Region – SAKirR, f. r-2679, d. 1, c. 1, p. 9).

Almost similar appeals were made by representatives of the civil administration of the RCU, which replaced the PMA. However, for the RCU it was even more difficult, as the PMA regulations continued to function at this territory. Therefore, taking over power from the military, representatives of the RCU administration, in their first official appeals to the population, noted that "the laws of the Soviet Union, which existed before the occupation

of this territory, continue to function. Exceptions are the laws, which were introduced or amended by military and civilian authorities, as well as the laws that deny the de facto takeover of power by the Reich Commissioner” (State Archives of Pivne Region – SARR, f. r-22, d. 1, c. 3, p. 2v.).

Thus, in fact, the normative acts of the PMA and the RCU abolished the Soviet legislation in terms of the state system, political regime, electoral system, but purely formally there continued to function other spheres of the Soviet law system – criminal, civil, labour and administrative law. Of course, the provisions of these spheres of law did not function in their entirety. The provisions were not supported by procedural law. Therefore, in reality, little remained of the principle of the Soviet law application proclaimed by the occupation administrations. In practice, only certain Soviet provisions of labour, civil, criminal and administrative law were applied. However, the occupation administrators of the PMA and the RCU could not avoid problems in this sphere, because not only the texts of pre-war laws were missing in the local areas, but there was also a lack of specialists acquainted with the system of the Soviet law. In this situation the most difficult thing was the work of local government employees (city and district administrations), who in their official appeals to the German leadership, asked to send regulations with specific instructions (State Archives of Kherson Region – SAKhR, f. r-1501, d. 6, c. 6, pp. 45–56).

German rulemaking was of a low level concerning a prior training. For instance, in the labour law of the RCU, the instructions of which regulated the procedure and amount of payment of wages to certain categories of workers, including seasonal workers, tractor drivers, combine harvesters and MTS specialists, it was proposed to use the Soviet standards, which were valid from April 10, 1935. Employees of the legal department of the RCU, who prepared this normative document, did not explain to clerks the procedure for making the relevant payments. The Reich Commissioner made only a general indication that all previous regulations, which contradicted him, were no longer valid. However, there was no indication on what kind of specific legal provisions or documents was invalid (Central State Archive of the highest authorities and administration of Ukraine – CSAHAAU, f. 2077, d. 1, c. 10, pp. 57–58).

The occupation legal mechanism of making regulatory documents had a procedure according to which with the publishing of new regulations by the PMA and RCU managers, a mandatory provision on the termination of the Soviet legal regulations was introduced in the preamble of new regulations. Only after this preamble new legal norms were introduced into the text (State Archives of Poltava Region – SAPR, f. r-3049, d. 1, c. 3, pp. 91–94).

Of course, it was not easy for direct executors to use such regulatory documents. The German local authorities, in particular, the Gebit commissioners, were in a similar position and did not understand the previous Soviet legal system at all. Legally, there were not enough knowledgeable personnel members in the local government bodies. Therefore, the position of a legal adviser was usually introduced into the structure of local government bodies, who was to monitor the correct application of regulations adopted by the German authorities of the PMA and the RCU, to correlate their requirements with the provisions of the Soviet law. But even in this case, the professional qualifications of legal advisers of city and district administrations were not always appropriate to the official status they received.

Another complex management step of the local administration was the establishment of such a structural unit as legal departments at city and district administrations. It was the employees of legal departments, who could understand the specificity of the Soviet and German regulations, the prescriptions of which were applied simultaneously in occupied

Ukraine. However, many administrations did not have these departments. In some period of time, the functioning of these departments was stopped, and the employees were transferred to other management positions.

During the period when the territory of Ukraine was under the jurisdiction of the PMA and during the first months of the RCU's establishment, the local government tried to develop its own legal basis to regulate the most important relations among the members of the local community. Of course, the heads of the administrations understood the need for further coordination of this issue with the German administration. Thus, in the autumn of 1941 a special group of specialists familiar with jurisprudence was created in Kyiv City Council to develop temporary rules in the main branches of law – criminal, civil and administrative, as well as the rules of criminal and civil proceedings (State Archives of Kyiv Region – SAKR, f. r-2412, d. 2, c. 5, p. 44).

According to the original documentation of Kyiv City Council, this project was implemented and the group of experts formulated temporary rules on the basis of which the issues of substantive and procedural law should have been regulated (Іваненко, 2018). The analysis of the content of these draft documents shows that the members of the commission used the Soviet normative documents in the field of substantive and procedural law. At the same time, the Soviet legal heritage was significantly reduced and maximally adapted to the occupation realities. It seemed that the work of creating a new legal basis for the regulation of legal relations of the local population was completed. However, the German side, in this case the General Commissariat “Kyiv” of the RCU, to which the PMA had already delegated its powers, did not consider this issue, neither approving nor cancelling the results of the work of Kyiv City Council commission.

In fact, without even considering the results of the work of the commission of Kyiv City Council, the Commissariat General administration of the RCU also opposed publishing normative documents collection by this local government body (SAKR, f. r-2412, d. 2, c. 5, p. 12). The German authorities were not interested in the fact that this approach allowed to make a full use of the legal basis in everyday management practice, to systematize different provisions. Let alone the fact that much of this base was aimed at regulating the lawful behaviour of the local population. However, publishing of this normative documents collection was prohibited (SAKR, f. r-2362, d. 1, c. 1, p. 150).

A chaotic search for the way out of “a legal vacuum” situation was carried out in other regions of occupied Ukraine, in particular, in the General Commissariat of “Zhytomyr”. However, unlike Kyiv specialists, local law administrators decided to apply the pre-revolutionary legal system of the Russian Empire, both civil and criminal. It was on the basis of this approach that an algorithm for regulatory and legal support for the implementation of civil and criminal proceedings was developed, as well as the work of lawyer institutions (State Archives of Zhytomyr Region – SAZR, f. r-1152, d. 1, c. 3, p. 3, 4).

The German side was not interested in the initiative of the leadership of local governments in the legal sphere, albeit in some ways expedient and justified under the conditions in occupied Ukraine. However, if the Soviet law system could still be applied in some way in 1941, no one could explain how Zhytomyr specialists planned to put the legal heritage of the Russian Empire into practice.

To govern at the occupied territories of Ukraine, the central departments of Germany developed an appropriate procedure for sending regulations to the places, on the basis of which the heads of the PMA and the RCU created by-laws acts.

In the RCU, this kind of work was more orderly and centralized. Thus, the RCU administration received direct instructions of the Reich Minister of the Eastern occupied territories. On the basis of this normative base, the Reich Commissar issued his own resolutions and orders, publishing them in special collections of documents. From the autumn of 1941 until May 1942, the Reich Commissar published the collections of resolutions and orders entitled “Official Messages” (CSAHAAU, f. 2077, d. 1, c. 27, pp. 4–6) and “Bulletin of Reich Commissioner’s Resolutions” (State Archives of Dnipropetrovsk Region – SADR, f. 2283, d. 1, c. 15, pp. 24–28).

The Heads of the Commissariats-General also published collections of their own by-laws acts, entitled “Service Bulletins”, which were sent for practical use by the Gebit Commissioners (CSAHAAU, f. 3206, d. 6, c. 3, pp. 43–45; State Archives of Vinnytsia Region – SAVR, f. r-1312, d. 1, c. 1333, pp. 134–147). Some of these publications were translated into Ukrainian and Russian and were meant for practical use by local government officials.

It should be noted that there were certain phenomena of a destructive order in this plane of occupation administration. Personal animosity between A. Rosenberg and E. Koch did harm to the entire administrative apparatus of the RCU. In fact, there was the “war of laws” between the two German departments, and the Reich Commissioner, at his own discretion, interpreted the regulations received from the department of A. Rosenberg. Some of the commissioners-general followed A. Rosenberg’s instructions, which were quite rational under those conditions, and the others were guided by E. Koch’s directives. There were also commissioners-general, who only followed the instructions of the leadership formally, in fact, pursuing their own line in the purely tactical issues of the occupation policy (Honcharenko, 2011, p. 550; Kynytskyi, 2014, pp. 130, 131).

Faced with the problems of a legal framework lack for the regulation of legal relations among the occupied population, the managers of the PMA and the RCU went by applying the part of the regulatory framework, which functioned in the Third Reich. This primarily concerned criminal law. Thus, in the autumn of 1941, the German Criminal Code of 1871 was applied at the occupied territory of Ukraine. This normative act was applied in the edition of October 1, 1941 (SAPR, f. r-8676, d. 2, c. 4, pp. 1–109). But the Criminal Code outlined a limited number of subjects to whom it was applied. Those were people of the German nationality, citizens of the Third Reich and foreigners. Separate criminal penalties were imposed on the local population of Ukraine (CSAHAAU, f. 2077, d. 1, c. 10, p. 42).

Only in the middle of 1942 did the administration of the RCU, on the basis of removing certain provisions from the German Criminal Code, create a separate normative act that regulated the criminal penalties of those members of the local population, who committed petty crimes and offenses. Previously, the regulations were introduced in this area, where there were people of the German origin and previously were applied to citizens of the Third Reich. The regulations concerned the protection of the German interests and imposed severe penalties (CSAHAAU, f. 2077, d. 1, c. 20, p. 42).

From the summer of 1941 until the spring of 1942, the administrators of the PMA and the CCU created separate regulations to regulate civil, family, administrative and tax law. Only in the middle of 1942 did the RCU issue the order regulating the family and civil relations of the local population. At the PMA area level, these transformations were not carried out at the system.

**The Conclusions.** Thus, after the successful occupation of the part of the Ukrainian lands by the German troops in 1941, the Nazis faced the problem of a lawful behaviour observance by the local population. Therefore, an important element of the work of the occupation

administrations of the RCU and PMA was the creation of a full-fledged legal framework on the basis of which the influence on the lawful behaviour of the occupied population was made.

During the first period of the occupation, before the emergence of a stable regulatory framework, the German administration applied the principle of combining and sometimes “overlapping” two legal systems – the Soviet and Hitler’s. The laws, which denied the occupation, were the exceptions, as well as the cases in which the German regulations directly repealed certain Soviet legal norms. Almost similar appeals were made by representatives of the civil administration of the RCU, who replaced the PMA.

In fact, the regulations of the PMA and the RCU abolished the Soviet legislation in terms of the state system, political regime, electoral system, but some provisions of substantive law continued to be applied. Faced with the problems of a legal framework lack for the legal relations regulation at the occupied territory, the administrators of the PMA and the RCU used the part of the regulatory framework, which functioned during the period of the Third Reich. In the middle of 1942, the administration of the RCU created a separate normative act that regulated the criminal penalties of those members of the local population, who committed petty crimes and offenses. At that period of time, the RCU issued the order regulating family and partly civil relations of the local population. In the PMA area, these transformations were never performed. The heads of each military commandant’s office issued their own regulations without codifying or coordinating them.

**Acknowledgement.** The authors of the article are sincerely grateful to all members of the editorial board for the advice provided during doing the research and writing the article.

**Financing.** The authors did not receive any financial support for doing the research and writing the article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berkhoff, K.** (2011). *Zhnyva rozpachu. Zhyttia i smert v Ukraini pid natsystskoiu vladoiu* [Harvest of Despair: Life and Death in Ukraine under the Nazi Rule]. Kyiv: Krytyka, 455 p. [in Ukrainian]  
*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Dnipropetrovskoi oblasti* [State Archives of Dnipropetrovsk Region – **SADR**]  
*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Khersonskoi oblasti* [State Archives of Kherson Region – **SAKhR**]  
*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Kirovohradskoi oblasti* [State Archives of Kirovohrad Region – **SAKirR**]  
*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Kyivskoi oblasti* [State Archives of Kyiv Region – **SAKR**]  
*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Poltavskoi oblasti* [State Archives of Poltava Region – **SAPR**]  
*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Rivnenskoj oblasti* [State Archives of Rivne Region – **SARR**]  
*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Vinnytskoi oblasti* [State Archives of Vinnytsia Region – **SAVR**]  
*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Zhytomyrskoi oblasti* [State Archives of Zhytomyr Region].
- Honcharenko, O. M.** (2011). *Funktsionuvannia okupatsiinoi administratsii Raikhskomisariatu “Ukraina”: upravlinsko-rozporiadchi ta orhanizatsiino-pravovi aspekty (1941 – 1944 rr.)* [Functioning of the occupational administration of the Reichs Commissariat “Ukraine”: administrative and organizational legal aspects (1941 – 1944)]. Kyiv: NPU imeni M.P.Drahomanova, 600 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Honcharenko, O. M., Kunytskyi, M. P. & Lysenko, O. Ye.** (2014). *Systema orhaniv mistsevoho upravlinnia na terytorii raikhskomisariatu «Ukraina» ta «viiskovoi zony». 1941 – 1944 rr.* [The system of local government bodies at the territory of Reich Commissariat “Ukraine” and “military zone” 1941 – 1944 rr.]. Kyiv: NAN Ukrainy. Instytut istorii Ukrainy, 151 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Ivanenko, A.** (2018). Attempts to create civil and procedural norms in Ukraine during the period of the Nazi occupation (autumn of 1941). *Pereiaslavskiy litopys – Pereiaslav chronicle*, 14, 28–35. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.2267812. [in Ukrainian].
- Ivanenko, A.** (2019). Peculiarities in the creation of Civil Procedures Law during the period of the Nazi occupation of Ukraine (1941 – 1944). *Skhidnoevropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 11, 159–168. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.11.170710. [in Ukrainian].

**Kucher, V. & Potyl'chak O.** (2011). *Ukraina 1941 – 1944: trahediia narodu za fasadom Sviashchenoi viiny [Ukraine during 1941 – 1944: the tragedy of the people behind the facade of Holy War]*. Kyiv, Bila Tserkva: TOV «Bilotserkivdruk», 368 p. [in Ukrainian].

**Kunytskyi, M. P.** (2014). *Sotsialno-pravovyi status mistsevoho naseleння Raikhskomisariatu «Ukraina» (1941 – 1944 rr.) [Socio-legal status of the local population of the Reich Commissariat of Ukraine (1941 – 1944)]*. Kyiv: PP “NVTs “Profi”, 564 p. [in Ukrainian].

**Levchenko, Yu.** (2011). The judicial apparatus of the German administrative territorial units of Ukraine during the years of occupation 1941 – 1944. *Visnyk akademii pratsi i sotsialnykh vidnosyn federatsii profspilok Ukrainy – Journal of Academy of Labour, Social Relations Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine*, 4 (60), 115–120. [in Ukrainian]

**Potyl'chak, O.** (1997). *Ekonomichniy kolaboratsionizm v Ukraini v roky natsyystskoi okupatsii (1941 – 1944): prychny i proiavy [Economic collaboration in Ukraine during the Nazi occupation (1941 – 1944): causes and manifestations]*. Kyiv: Ukrainskyi derzhavnyi pedahohichnyi universytet imeni M.P.Drahomanova, 29 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Rekotov, P. V.** (1997) Governing bodies in the occupied territory of Ukraine (1941–1944). *Ukrains'kyj istorychnyj zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 3, 90–101. [in Ukrainian]

**Shaikan, V. O.** (2005). *Kolaboratsionizm na terytorii Reikhskomisariatu “Ukraina” ta viiskovoi zony v period Druhoi svitovoi viiny [Collaboration at the territory of the Reichs Commissariat “Ukraine” and the military zone during World War II]*. Kryvyi Rih: Mineral, 564 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Snyder, T.** (2011). *Kryvavi zemli: Yevropa pomizh Hitlerom ta Stalinyim [Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin]*. Kyiv: Hrani-T, 448 p. [in Ukrainian]

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchyykh orhaniv vlady i upravlinnia Ukrainy [Central State Archive of the highest authorities and administration of Ukraine – CSAHAAU]*

*The article was received on February 05, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDK 94(477.82):061.2-055.2“1940/1950”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226545

**Halyna STARODUBETS**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the Department of World History, Ivan Franko Zhytomyr State University, 40 Velyka Berdychivska Street, Zhytomyr, Ukraine, postal code 10008 (starodubec@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-2005-771X

**ResearcherID:** M-9514-2015

**Iryna SUSHYK**

*PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor of the Department of Socio-Humanitarian Technologies, Lutsk National Technical University, 75 Lvivska Street, Lutsk, Ukraine, postal code 43018 (sushykiryna@lutsk-ntu.com.ua)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-4620-5453

**Галина СТАРОДУБЕЦЬ**

*доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри всесвітньої історії Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка, м. Житомир, вул. Велика Бердичівська, 40, Україна, індекс 10008 (starodubec@gmail.com)*

**Ірина СУШИК**

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри соціогуманітарних технологій Луцького національного технічного університету, вул. Львівська, 75, м. Луцьк, Україна, індекс 43018 (sushykiryna@lutsk-ntu.com.ua)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Starodubets, H. & Sushyk, I. (2021). Content and directions of women organizations activities in Volyn (the second half of the 1940s – beginning of the 1950s). *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 176–186. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226545

**CONTENT AND DIRECTIONS OF WOMEN ORGANIZATIONS ACTIVITIES IN VOLYN  
(the second half of the 1940s – beginning of the 1950s)**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research is to reveal the specifics of women's organizations formation in the form of “women departments”, “women delegate meetings”, “women councils” in Volyn region during the first postwar years; to elucidate the content of their activities through the prism of political and propaganda work and participation in the process of the collective farm system formation in the region. The methodological basis of the research is the principles of historicism, scientificity, a combination of systemic and regional approaches, an authorial objectivity, a moderate narrative constructivism, as well as the use of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization) and special historical (historical genetic, historical typological, historical systemic) methods. The scientific novelty consists in the fact for the first time in the historiography of the Ukrainian women movement on the basis of previously unknown archival documents there has been elucidated the topic of women's participation in the Sovietization of the western regions of Ukraine during the first postwar decade, in particular, in Volyn; there has been highlighted the policy of the Bolshevik government's use of women as an effective*

tool for forming the collective farm system in the region; the dynamics of the quantitative growth of members of women's organizations has been elucidated. The construction of the image of a woman activist by Stalinist propaganda has been illustrated; controllability of the process of women activation by the party structures; the scale of work of "women departments" and "women councils" through the organization of women forums, meetings; rhetoric of speeches of women delegates. **The Conclusions.** After the liberation of Volyn region from the German occupiers, the campaign was launched there to restore the institutions of the Soviet power. In 1945, women department was established in the structure of the CP(b)Ukr regional committee, and women organizers were appointed in the district committees. These bodies coordinated and supervised the work of women's organizations, which were necessarily created en masse in institutions, organizations, villages, and later – in the collective farms of the region. Their main task was to mobilize women's resources for the process of economic life reconstruction and development in the region. In addition, they partially took care of the social problems of the region – the elimination of illiteracy and poor literacy of women, guardianship of orphans, the disabled, mothers with many children, the improvement and landscaping of villages and towns, and etc.

**Key words:** women, women departments, women councils, Volyn, Sovietization.

## ЗМІСТ ТА НАПРЯМКИ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ ЖІНОЧИХ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙ ВОЛИНИ (друга половина 1940-х – початок 1950-х років)

**Анотація. Мета дослідження** – розкрити специфіку формування жіночих організацій у формі "жінвідділів", "жіночих делегатських зборів", "жінрад" у Волинській області в перші повоєнні роки, показати зміст їх діяльності крізь призму політико-пропагандистської роботи та участі в процесі становлення в регіоні колгоспної системи. **Методологічною основою** дослідження є принципи історизму, науковості, поєднання системного та регіонального підходів, авторської об'єктивності, поміркованого нарративного конструктивізму, а також використання загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, узагальнення) та спеціально-історичних (історико-генетичний, історико-типологічний, історико-системний) методів. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше в історіографії українського жіночого руху на основі невідомих раніше архівних документів з'ясовано тему участі жінок в процесах радянізації західних областей України у перше повоєнне десятиліття, зокрема на Волині, розкрито політику використання більшовицькою владою жінок як дієвого інструменту насадження в регіоні колгоспної системи, динаміку кількісного росту учасників жіночих організацій. Показано конструювання сталінською пропагандою образу жінки-активістки; керованість процесу активізації жінок з боку партійних структур; масштаб роботи "жінвідділів" та "жінрад" через організацію жіночих форумів, зборів; риторіку виступів жінделегаток. **Висновки.** Після звільнення Волинської області від німецьких окупантів тут було розгорнуто кампанію з відновлення інститутів радянської влади. У 1945 р. в структурі обкому КП(б)У було створено жінвідділ, а в райкомах – призначені жіночі організатори. Ці органи координували та курували роботу жіночих організацій, які в обов'язковому порядку масово створювалися в установах, організаціях, селах, а згодом – і в колгоспах області. Основне їх завдання полягало в мобілізації жіночого ресурсу на процес відбудови та розбудови господарського життя області. Крім того, вони частково опікувалися соціальними проблемами регіону – ліквідація без- та малограмотності жінок, шефство над сиротами, інвалідами, багатодітними матерями, благоустрій сіл і містечок тощо.

**Ключові слова:** жінки, жіночі відділи, жіночі ради, Волинь, радянізація.

**The Problem Statement.** For a long time, gender history, in particular, the problems of the place and role of women in the state formation processes, have remained beyond the attention of historians. However, the study of women's experiences, practices of their lives and activities in the environment dominated by a male masculinity, is an essential condition for building the society based on gender tolerance. **The topicality** of the issue under analysis is also enhanced in connection with broadening the opportunities for modern women to

realize themselves as a politician, public figure, specialist in economics, science, law and, etc. Rethinking the role of women in the processes of Sovietization of the Western Ukrainian region, through the study of their activities in women organizations, will contribute to the destruction of the established gender stereotypes.

**The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches.** The historiography of the “women’s issue” during the period of Stalinism is quite representative. During the last decade, the problem of the emancipation of the Soviet women, which began during the 1920s, when a course was taken to solve the “women issue”, the creation of the Bolshevik Party women’s departments and women’s sectors within the committees is debated on the pages of the Ukrainian and foreign scientific publications. However, there is still beyond researchers’ attention the topic of women’s participation in the processes of Sovietization of the western regions of Ukraine during the first postwar decade.

Gender strategies of the Bolshevik government under the conditions of Sovietization of the western regions of Ukraine and Belarus in 1944 – 1946, women’s experience of participation in the process of Sovietization of the western regions of Ukraine under conditions of the Stalinist regime are considered in a number of articles by Professor Halyna Starodubets (Starodubets, 2020). The researcher expresses the opinion that “by initiating the creation of women’s organizations under the full control of the CP(b)Ukr, in this way the Bolsheviks gave the women movement structure, which simplified its management system” (Starodubets, 2018, pp. 73–79). The specifics of women organizations functioning under the Stalinist regime gave grounds for a domestic researcher, Natalia Oliynyk, to single out “a specific type of “the Soviet patriarchy”, when the main mechanism of women discrimination was not men, but a totalitarian state built on the principles of force and aggression, disregard for the interests of the individual” (Olijnyk, 2015, p. 149).

Myroslava Smolnitska analyzes indirectly the topic under research (Smoljnicjka, 2012, pp. 85–94). Comparing the state-sponsored image of the Soviet woman of the USSR during the first postwar decades with the realities of women’s everyday life, the author concludes that the Soviet woman was a powerful labour force mobilized by the state to perform various tasks. For the effective realization of all its possibilities, in the public consciousness the emphasis was made on the image formation: the Soviet woman – an active and equal “builder of the socialist society” (Smoljnicjka, 2011, p. 172).

The topic of women’s departments functioning in the western Ukrainian region is also raised in the regional context. Ruslana Popp, a researcher from Drohobych, states that “the policy of the Soviet system towards the women of Drohobych during the first postwar years was aimed at involving women into the reconstruction, production and socio-political processes in the region. A whole system of an ideological treatment and repressive measures has been developed to control and influence the women’s environment” (Popp, 2017, p. 332). Halyna Chornij interprets the creation of a wide network of women associations in Lviv region during the postwar period – delegate meetings and women councils with different sections as one of the ideological and practical means of the Bolshevik influence on the local population (Chornij, 2017, p. 202). She also thinks that “the policy of the Soviet government towards women in the process of collectivization of the western Ukrainian village was exploitative. Women were the main labour force used by the totalitarian system in rebuilding all pre-war agricultural sphere capacities” (Chornij, 2017, pp. 89–99).

Thus, the historiographical analysis of the issue under analysis gives grounds to conclude that the topic of women’s organizations functioning in the western regions of Ukraine during

the postwar period has not yet become the subject of a comprehensive scientific research. The topic of the Stalinist regime's implementation of the Bolsheviks gender policy in Volyn region remained beyond the research interests of modern scholars.

**The Purpose of the Article.** To investigate the specifics of the women's organizations formation in the form of "women departments", "women delegate meetings", "women councils" in Volyn region during the first postwar years; to elucidate the content of their activities through the prism of a political advocacy and participation in the collective farm system formation.

**The Basic Material Statement.** The liberation of the western regions of the USSR from German occupation was accompanied by the process of formation / restoring the Soviet political system there. As the Bolshevik government did not have any widespread social support in the region, it was forced to search for allies among various categories of the population. Based on the experience of Sovietization of Ukraine during the 1920s, the ruling Communist Party decided to revive women's organizations, the so-called "women's departments" that functioned in Soviet Ukraine until the beginning of the 1930s.

The Bolshevik government policy of using women as "as catalysts for a political and social change" (Codie, 2016, p. 26) was effective in the process of building the foundations of the Soviet state during the first decades after the October coup. On the one hand, the mobilization of women's resources allowed the Communists to rebuild Ukraine's war-torn economy more quickly and efficiently. On the other hand, the achievements in the Soviet women emancipation were actively used by Bolshevik propaganda both inside the country and abroad. As Sarah Ashwin rightly noted, "women played an important role in the Soviet symbolic system" (Ashwin, 2000, p. 3).

The resolution "On Work among Women in the Western Regions of Ukraine" of the Central Committee of the CP(b)Ukr became a kind of starting point for intensifying the work of the Western Ukrainian party-Soviet authorities in the direction of organizing the centers of women movement. The resolution was adopted on April 5, 1945. The main purpose of creating women's departments was very pragmatic: "to organize women to rebuild the economy" (Starodubets, 2019, p. 179). In no case it was possible for these bodies to have the character of public organizations and to be full-fledged subjects of the socio-political life of the state and to determine the purpose, strategy, forms and methods of their activity independently. Under the Stalinist regime, this was a priori impossible.

The process of forming departments dealing with work among women was organized and managed. During April-May of 1945, women's departments were formed at all Western Ukrainian regional committees of the CP (b) Ukr, and women organizers were appointed in district committees. At each women council, appropriate sections were established, the list of which was determined by the needs of economic and socio-political life of the region. Thus, in 1945, among the most important sections there were school, club (cultural and educational), cooperative, sanitary. Considerable attention was paid to the work with young people and activities aimed at eliminating poor literacy and illiteracy" (Starodubets, 2019, p. 179). Four years later, in 1949, the priorities of the communist government changed somewhat and, accordingly, this was reflected in the change of key vectors of women bodies. It was decided "it is expedient to create such sections – manufacturing, cultural and educational, household, school, sanitary and cooperative" (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 74, c. 6, p. 220).

The department of Volyn regional committee of the CP(b)Ukr for work among women began to function in May of 1945 (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 74, c. 5, p. 126). Due to the staff shortage

in the system of party-Soviet authorities during the first postwar years, the formation of its staff, and, accordingly, district and city departments took a long time. As of January-March 1946, the department of the regional party committee had one vacancy – instead of three instructors there were two, one of whom did not meet the requirements at all and for the first time was involved into the party work. The responsibilities of the officials were divided as follows: each instructor supervised 14 districts and one city, the head of the department supervised two districts and one city. In addition, the deputy head had to be in all areas when it was needed. The management of women departments was carried out by visiting instructors and the head of the department of places where practical assistance was provided to women bodies in their work (SAVR, f. R-1, d. 3, c. 917, p. 2). The regional leadership made considerable efforts to expand the network of women organizations. The so-called women delegate meetings and councils functioned in almost all district and city institutions and establishments, as well as in the villages of the region, and later on – in collective farms.

Table 1

**Dynamics of the Number of Women Organizations in Volyn Region in 1945 – 1949**  
(CSAPOU, f. R-1, d. 74, c. 5, p. 127; f. R-1, d. 74, c. 7, p. 34).

Year	Amount of Women Delegate Meetings		Amount of Members	
		in collective farms included		collective farmers included
1945	597		8690	
1946	910		13249	
1947	946		14367	
1948	1081	608	15900	8573
1949	1170	950	175000	14100

The statistic data in Table 1 illustrate the positive dynamics of the quantitative growth of members of women organizations during 1945 – 1949, which were directly managed by the relevant women departments. Thus, during the five post-war years, the number of local women organizations and their members almost doubled. However, we tend to assume that the quantitative indicators do not reflect the essence of the real state of the women movement in the region. Firstly, one should take into account the fact of writing more members than it was in the official reports of local officials. Secondly, the level of activity of the overwhelming majority of delegates was, to put it mildly, extremely low, as the party officials pointed out themselves. In particular, in one of the reports of the regional committee official on this issue it was noted that in a number of districts of the region “women councils in many villages formally exist and do not carry out any work” (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 74, c. 7, p. 75).

One of the most common forms of women work was the organization of meetings at various levels. The participants of these meetings were usually addressed by agitators or propaganda instructors of district committees or city committees of the CP(b)Ukr. Starting from June 14, 1945, when the regional meeting of women activists took place in Lutsk in the presence of 939 participants, such forums began to be summoned annually (SAVR, f. R-1, d. 3, c. 718, p. 1).

The women forum of this format was held for the first time and its organizers aimed at demonstrating the scale of the event to the present delegates and the persuasiveness of the Soviet government positive achievements in the field of gender policy. In the traditional style of the Bolshevik propaganda, the official speeches of the party-Soviet officials alternated with

speeches by “natives of the people”, “ordinary working women”. An eloquent illustration of a “successful woman”, who managed to reach career heights, was the participation in the meeting of Natalia Uzhviy, the native of Volyn, People’s Artist of the USSR (SAVR, f. R-1, d. 3, c. 718, pp. 57–59). Undoubtedly, the emotional performance of the famous woman made a proper impression on the women present in the hall.

It should be noted that the heroic image of the working woman, formed by Stalin’s propaganda during the 1930s, was exploited actively by party propagandists both in the press and in public speeches to audiences of various social groups. American researcher, Choi Chatterjee emphasizes that stories of the Soviet heroines during the 1930s “were constructed around the temporal antiphonies of a prerevolutionary oppression and postrevolutionary liberation” (Choi, 1999, p. 9). The same propaganda methods were used by party officials in the western regions of Ukraine. The year of 1939 became a kind of boundary that separated the “exploited woman of the past” from the “free Soviet worker-collective farmer”. The theme of liberating a peasant woman from the Polish yoke was constantly mentioned in numerous speeches by local activists at all levels, from republican meetings to village assemblies. Thus, at the regional meeting of the regional women’s active in 1946, Denisyuk Antonina from the village of Kusnyscha of the Holovnyansky district stated that “during the Polish rule I barely lived and was a laughing stock <...>. With the advent of the Soviet power, my children go to school, my husband worked as a chairman of the village council <...>. When I return home, I urge everyone present to take the most active part in the implementation of all types of government supplies and to join the collective farm” (CSAPOU, f. R-1, d. 74, c. 5, p. 131); the chairman of the women’s council of Ustyluh district, Petruk Varvara, addressing to colleagues from Torchyn district, emphasized that “only the collective farm gave us the opportunity to get out of need and grief” (CSAPOU, f. R-1, d. 74, c. 1, p. 29); Pats Anna from the village of Hushcha of Kivertsy district stated: “I came from Poland, where I always felt humiliated, I suffered from the abuse of the Polish landowners. Only here, in the Soviet Union, did I see the truth, equality, respect for the elders” (CSAPOU, f. R-1, d. 23, c. 1596, p. 25).

There are many of such examples. The heroization of the woman activist, the collective farmer, took place by contrasting her “poor past” with the “bright present” and contributed to the formation of markers for the image identification of the “Soviet woman”.

On July 2-3, 1946 in Lutsk, there took place the second regional meeting of women active of Volyn region with participation of 800 delegates (744 persons arrived) from 30 areas and three cities (SAVR, f. R-1, d. 2, c. 51, p. 5). The key issue on the agenda of the forum was the discussion of the problem of Volyn women tasks in the implementation of the 4th Stalin Five-Year Plan for reconstruction and development of the national economy.

The main topic of the speeches of women delegates and chairmen of women councils was a report on their work, which usually ended with an invitation to all those present at the meeting to join the social competition for the implementation of the 4th five-year plan. Thus, the head of the women council of the 10th quarter of Volodymyr-Volynskyi district, Lukashevych Vasylysa said that their women council held 25 meetings, organized various clubs, sewed and washed clothes for demobilized soldiers and orphans, women sewed 50 mattresses for the pioneer camp, and a team of women worked on repairing the school. “A lot of work was done by women of the 9th quarter of Volodymyr-Volynskyi district”, – reported the chairman of the women council, comrade Shchurova. “Women dug a telephone trench, the daily norm was fulfilled in 3 hours... A team of 18 women worked on repairing the school. In 1945, women activists sewed 250 sets of underwear for soldiers and planted

58 trees in the city park...”. Prymachuk Lukia, a collective farmer from women delegate, said that collective farmers were committed to harvesting and delivering grain on time. “I urge you comrades to work only in a collective”, – the woman said. One of the key moments of the meeting was the speech of the deputy of the Verkhovna Rada of the USSR, Vasiuta Paraska Varfolomiyivna, who told about her way from a simple peasant woman to a People’s Deputy. Paraska Varfolomiyivna called on women to join the social competition for the Stalinist Five-Year Plan and join the collective farm (SAVR, f. R-1, d. 2, c. 51, pp. 5–7).

Each of the speakers, first of all, focused on their own work achievements, or the achievements of their team members. The rhetoric of their speeches was imbued with pride that they were working for the benefit of the Soviet government. Participation in women organizations was seen as an opportunity to concentrate the energy of the women team and direct it to the Bolshevik Party objectives. As Olena Sapytska remarked rightly, “the Soviet government completely ruled out ‘femininity’ as a feature of the ‘Soviet woman’, considering rural women, first and foremost, as subjects of the economic goals of the state power” (Sapycjka, 2007, p. 170). Stalinist propaganda actively promoted a format of a gender order that modern researchers call ethocratic. In the format, a woman was first a public activist, a collective farmer / worker, and then a mother, wife, or just a person. In turn, women department policy was aimed at “the creation of a “new woman”, whose defining characteristics were independence and activism” (Barbara, 1992, p. 486).

In addition to conducting a political advocacy and mobilizing women’s resources to rebuild / develop the region’s economy, one of the priorities of women departments was to participate in the collectivization process. Women activists acted as agitators of the collective farm system, an influential force in the struggle against peasants individuals.

In Volyn, as in other western Ukrainian regions, the Soviet collective system was treated extremely negatively by the peasants. The authorities were forced to use various tools to influence the local population in order to impose the collective farm system on them. The powerful anti-Soviet armed resistance movement in the form of the UPA and OUN militants, which took place in the region during the first years after the liberation of the territory from German occupation, was a serious deterrent to the collectivization process in 1944 – 1946.

Taking into account the experience of collectivization of the Ukrainian countryside during the 1930s and the specifics of the western regions, the Stalinist regime relied on women who, by means of women departments, were to carry out appropriate propaganda work among the peasants. The result of purposeful work of women departments was “the organization on the initiative of women 150 collective farms in the region, in 1948” (CSAPOU, f. R-1, d. 74, c. 5, p. 142), and in “February of 1950 there were already 178” (SAVR, f. P-1, d 2, c. 185, p. 13). “There were 353 women councils in the collective farms, with more than one thousand sections organized, into which up to seven thousand women delegates and collective farm activists were involved” (SAVR, f. P-1, d 2, c. 114, p. 65). This year was marked in the history of Volyn region as “the year of continuous collectivization” (CSAPOU, f. R-1, d. 74, c. 5, p. 142).

The unification of small peasant individual farms was caused by extensive mass political, cultural, and educational work among women. In their speeches to fellow villagers, peasant-activists emphasized the advantages of the collective farm system over individual farming, and appealed to their patriotism and the conscious position of a citizen of a great state. Almost always the propaganda symbol of the “collective farm” was associated with a prosperous life as opposed to a poor life during the years of the Polish rule. “Women, comrades”, said Voznevskaya, the farmer of Voroshylov collective pig-farm – only after joining the collective farm path we

felt full, liberated, we learned about a happy life. Under the rule of Polish landowners we were not considered people, we were called cattle, and under the Soviet rule we are respected in the collective farm” (CSAPOU, f. R-1, d. 74, c. 7, p. 44). “Chairman of the women council of the village of Myskovets, Paraska, a resident of Olyk district, said that we, the peasants, need to unite in a collective farm, build a cultural and prosperous life. I am the first one to apply to the collective farm. Her example was repeated by Olha Vasylevska, a member of the women council, and in several other farms” (CSAPOU, f. R-1, d. 74, c. 5, p. 62).

In order to illustrate the advantages of collective farming over individual farming, it was practiced to conduct excursions of women-peasants to the leading collective farms of Volyn and other regions. Thus, from 18 to 23 November of 1948 there was organized excursion of collective farmers and individual peasants of Volyn to the collective farms of Kyiv region (Yaremchuk, 1980, p. 170). “In June of 1949, Kovel District Committee of the CP(b) Ukr organized an excursion for women-collective farmers of new and weak collective farms to the leading ones. The leading collective farm named after Stalin was visited by a group of women from the collective farm named after Kotovsky, the collective farm named after Kaganovych, the collective farm named after Khrushchov. Such events were propagandistic in nature and the participants of the tours were involved actively into propaganda work later.

As a rule, women council chairmen were the first ones to join collective farms. Thus, in 1949 speaking at a meeting of peasants-individuals, Rudyk Maria, Havryliuk Daria, Saladiuk Melania said: “Look, comrades, collective farms are organized all over Volyn, hundreds of thousands of peasants embarked on the only correct collective farm path, and we have not organized a collective farm so far. <...> Only collective farms can give us a happy, prosperous life, only in the collective farm we, women, will become truly equal” (SAVR, f. P-1, d. 2, c. 185, p. 13). They were supposed to be an example for their fellow villagers to follow.

At the beginning of 1950, 160 000 women worked in 1 075 collective farms in Volyn region, which was 60% of all workers there. At the collective farms, units were organized, which were mainly headed by women (out of 9 380 units, in 8 940 cases, they were headed by women). During this period 12 women of the region worked as heads of collective farms, 23 – leaders of a unit, 1450 women were elected members of the board of collective farms, 38 women – heads of village councils worked, 218 women – secretaries of village councils (SAVR, f. P-1, d. 2, c. 185, p. 17).

It should be noted that the authorities, represented by district committee officials, politicized all measures related to changes or adjustment of socio-economic, cultural, educational, etc., life of the local population as much as possible. An ordinary woman could not be the best worker in any sphere of life. She had to be a “conscious Soviet activist”, the head of a women department or women delegate meeting, or just a woman delegate. The emphasis was laid not so much on her personal human qualities as on political consciousness, loyalty to the ideas of Stalin and the Bolshevik Party. Often, women-activists, with the support of party curators, criticized and subjected women to a moral and psychological pressure who, in their opinion, did not work well in collective farm.

For instance, let’s analyze the conflict situation, which became the subject of discussion at the meeting of the collective farm named after Stalin, the village of Antonivka and the collective farm named after Khrushchov, the village of Kniahyninok, Lutsk district, on March 12, 1949 (CSAPOU, f. R-1, d. 70, c. 1747, p. 38). A farmer, a leader of a unit, comrade Skulynets expressed the opinion that Volyn lands were poor, low-harvesting, that is why, her unit planned lower rates of harvesting beets, corn and grain than the unit of comrade Zinenko.

Repet, the secretary of the Volyn regional committee of the CP(b)Ukr, based his speech on criticism of Skulynets' position, accusing her of "not breaking away from the views of the old, difficult life of Volyn peasants". <...> That she, without realizing it, set out to support the unconscious part of the collective farmers in focusing on the personal individual farm, not the collective farm" (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 70, c. 1747, pp. 38, 40). Under conditions, when the flywheel of Stalin's terror did not slow down in the western regions of Ukraine, such accusations could have extremely negative consequences for both: a leader of a unit and its members. Due to the circumstances, they were forced to accept the position of the opponent.

Stalin's propaganda constructed the image of the Soviet woman-activist, who has equal rights with her husband, can realize herself in all spheres of life and, most importantly, is grateful to the party and Stalin for her happy "present". In the mass media and public speeches, the representatives of women bodies declared loudly their support for Volynians' initiatives of the Bolshevik Party aimed at building the collective farm system. "And in this they rightly see a new vivid manifestation of Stalin's concern for the prosperity of the collective farms, for the good of the people" (CSAPOU, f. 1, d. 74, c. 7, p. 47).

The activity of women's bodies in Volyn during the post-war period was not limited to political propaganda work and organizational measures connected with establishing collective farms in the region. An integral part of their work was the protection of motherhood and childhood; conducting a children's health campaign (organization of pioneer camps, children's preschool and school playgrounds); singling out mothers with many children and single mothers; elimination of illiteracy and poor literacy; work on the education of delegates and women-activists, etc. Mandatory items in the annual reports were also: admission to the party and the Komsomol of women in the region; promotion of women to managerial and responsible positions; women's participation in the struggle against "Ukrainian-German nationalists".

**The Conclusions.** Thus, immediately after the liberation of Volyn region from the German occupiers, a campaign was launched there to restore the institutions of the Soviet power. Due to the fact that the Bolshevik Party did not have a stable social base in the region, its representatives, represented by the party-Soviet nomenklatura, made efforts to involve certain social groups into the process of Sovietization. Social groups – such as women, youth, the rural poor, local activists, etc.

In 1945, women department was established in the structure of the CP(b)Ukr regional committee, and women-organizers were appointed in the district committees. These bodies coordinated and supervised the work of women organizations, which were necessarily created en masse in institutions, organizations, villages, and later on – in the collective farms of the region. Their main task was to mobilize women's resources for the process of reconstruction and development of economic life in the region. In addition, they partially took care of the social problems of the region – the elimination of illiteracy and poor literacy of women, the care of orphans, the disabled, mothers with many children, the infrastructure improvement and landscaping of villages and towns, and etc.

Women departments cooperated with the agitation and propaganda departments actively, which were structural subdivisions of district committees, city committees and the regional committee of the CP(b)Ukr. Women-activists carried out extensive propaganda work to expand the social base of support for the Soviet government policies at the expense of local women. They took part in the formation process of the collective farm system in the region. Authorities used women not only as agitators and direct organizers of collective farms, but also as a propaganda tool. During the first

postwar years, Stalinist propagandists constructed the image of the emancipated Soviet woman as one of the symbols of a new prosperous collective farm life.

The proposed research may be part of a new direction in gender studies of a social history. A regional aspect of the activity and functioning vision of women organizations in Volyn during the 40–50s of the XXth century will be the contribution to the initiation and in future – writing the social history of women during the postwar period; it will provide a deeper understanding of the role and place of women organizations in the western regions of Ukraine in the process of Sovietization of this region.

**Acknowledgments.** The authors are grateful to the staff of the Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine, the State Archives of Volyn region for the materials provided for writing the article.

**The Funding.** The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and / or publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Ashwin, S.** (2000). *Gender, State and Society in Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia*. London; New York: Routledge, 176 p. [in English]

**Barbara, E. C.** (1992). The Utopianism of the Zhenotdel. *Slavic Review*, 51 (3), 485–496. [in English]

*Centralnyj derzhavnyj arkhiv ghromadsjkykh ob'jednanj Ukrainy [CSAPOU – Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine].*

**Choi, Ch.** (1999). The Soviet Heroines and Public Identity, 1930 – 1939. *The Carl Beck Papers in Russian & East European Studies, University of Pittsburgh*, (1402), 32 p. doi: 10.5195/cbp.1999.112 [in English]

**Chornij, G.** (2017). Dijalnistj zhinochykh rad Ljvivshhyny v seredyni 1940-kh – pershij polovyni 1950-kh rokiv. [Activities of women's councils of Lviv region in the mid-1940s – first half of the 1950s.]. *Molodyj vchenyj*, (3), 199–203. [in Ukrainian]

**Chornij, G.** (2017). Polityka radjansjkoji vlady shhodo zhinok u procesi kolektyvizaciji zakhidnoukrajinsjckogho rehionu (seredyna 1940-kh – pochatok 1950-kh rr.). [The Soviet power policy towards women in the process of collectivization of the western Ukrainian region (mid-1940s – at the beginning of the 1950s)]. *Ukrajina–Jevropa–Svit*, (20), 89–99. [in Ukrainian].

Codie, B. (2016). Wife, Mother, Soldier, Worker: Depictions of Peasant Women in the Soviet Propaganda. *A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the concentration of art history at the University of Dallas*, 66 p. [in English]

*Derzhavnyj arkhiv Volynsjoji oblasti [SAVR – State Archive of Volyn Region]*

**Olijnyk, N. Ju.** (2015). Emansypacija zhinok po-radjansjky: osoblyvosti ta naslidky. [Emancipation of Women in the Soviet Way: Features and Consequences], *Ghrani*, (6), 144–151. [in Ukrainian]

**Popp, R.** (2017). Polityka radjansjkoji systemy shhodo zhinoctva Droghobychchyny u pershi povojenni roky (1944 – 1953) [The policy of the Soviet system towards the women of Droghobych during the first postwar years (1944 – 1953)], *Droghobyckyj krajeznavchyj zbirnyk, Special issue 3*, 28–36. [in Ukrainian]

**Sapycjka, O. S.** (2007). *Siljski zhinky Ukrainy v period pidghotovky ta provedennja suciljnoji kolektyvizaciji (1928 – seredyna 1933 rr.) [Rural women of Ukraine during the period of preparation and carrying out of continuous collectivization (1928 – the middle of 1933)] (Candidate's thesis)*. Lughansjk, 199 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Smolnjcika, M.** (2011). Zhinka v radjansjkomu suspiljstvi: oficijnyj obraz i realjna praktyka. [Woman in the Soviet society: official image and real practice]. *Ukrajina XX st.: kuljtura, ideologhija, polityka*. Kyjiv: Instytut istoriji Ukrainy, (16), 162–174. [in Ukrainian].

**Smolnjcika, M.** (2012). Genderna polityka v URSR: pravove zakriplennja ta naprjamy realizaciji (seredyna 1940-kh – persha polovyna 1960-kh rr.). [Gender policy in the USSR: the right to consolidate

and directions of implementation (mid-1940s – first half of the 1960s)]. *Ukrajina XX st.: kultura, ideologija, polityka*, (17), 85–94. [in Ukrainian]

**Starodubets, G.** (2018). Vykorystannja zhinok jak trudovogho resursu totalitarnoji vlady v procesi radjanizaciji zakhidnykh oblastej Ukrainy [The use of women as a labour resource of totalitarian power in the process of Sovietization of the western regions of Ukraine]. *Skhidnojevropejskijj istorychnyj visnyk*, (3), 73–79. [in Ukrainian]

**Starodubets, G.** (2019). Women's experience of participation in the process of the Sovietization in the Western regions of Ukraine under the conditions of Stalin's regime. *Skhidnoievropejskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk-East European Historical Bulletin*, (10), 171–180. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.10.159184> [in English]

**Starodubets, G. M.** (2020). Osnovni vektory gromadsjko-polityčnoji dijalnosti siljskogho zhinocstva Volyni naprykinci 1920 – na pochatku 30-kh rokiv. [The main vectors of socio-political activity of rural women in Volyn at the end of the 1920s and at the beginning of the 1930s.]. *Naukovi zapysky Vinnycjkogho derzhavnogho pedagoghichnogho universytetu imeni Mykhajla Kocjubynskogho*, (32), 9–17. doi: <https://doi.org/10.31652/2411-2143-2020-32-9-17> [in Ukrainian]

**Yaremchuk, D.** (ed.). (1980). *Sotsialistychni peretvorennia v zakhidnykh oblastiakh Ukrainskoi RSR. 1939 – 1979. Zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv [Socialist transformations in the western regions of the Ukrainian SSR. 1939 – 1979. Collection of documents and materials]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 545 p. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on March 07, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 316.614-058.65:070.15(477)“1986/1987”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226537

**Inna DEMUZ**

*Doctor of History, Associate Professor, Chief Researcher of the Department of scientific and methodical work and abstracting, National Scientific Agricultural Library of the National Academy of Agrarian Sciences of Ukraine, 10 Heroiv Oborony Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 03127 (demuz\_inna@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-5936-2386

**Dmytro OSTROVYK**

*Student of postgraduate department, Pereiaslav-KhmelnytskyiHryhoriiSkovoroda State Pedagogical University, 30, Sukhomlynsky Street, Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi, Kyiv region, Ukraine, postal code 08401(dima\_ostrovyyk@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-7435-7035

**Інна ДЕМУЗ**

*доктор історичних наук, доцент, головний науковий співробітник відділу науково-методичної роботи та реферування Національної наукової сільськогосподарської бібліотеки НААН, вул. Героїв Оборони, 10, Київ, Україна, індекс 03127 (demuz\_inna@ukr.net)*

**Дмитро ОСТРОВИК**

*аспірант кафедри історії та культури України Переяслав-Хмельницького державного педагогічного університету імені Григорія Сковороди, вул. Сухомлинського, 30, Переяслав-Хмельницький, Україна, індекс 08401 (dima\_ostrovyyk@ukr.net)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Demuz, I. & Ostrovyyk, D. (2021). Socialization problems of “Afghan” soldiers in Ukraine in the coverage of the Central Committee body of the LKSM of Ukraine – the newspaper “Komsomolskoye Znamia”. *Skhidnoievropeiskiyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 187–198. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226544

**SOCIALIZATION PROBLEMS OF “AFGHAN” SOLDIERS IN UKRAINE  
IN THE COVERAGE OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE BODY  
OF THE LKSM OF UKRAINE – THE NEWSPAPER “KOMSOМOLSKOYE ZNAMIA”**

**Abstract.** *The purpose* of the research consists in the attempt to differentiate the problems of socialization of “Afghan” soldiers in Ukraine during the 1980s chronologically and thematically. **The scientific novelty** – for the first time in the Ukrainian historiography the materials of the official publication have been analyzed in order to cover the problems of “Afghan” soldiers in Ukraine of the period under analysis. **The Conclusions.** *Some aspects of the problem of socialization of “Afghan” soldiers began to be analyzed in 1986 – 1987 against the background of the “opening” of war to the society of that time with a message to “open” the soldiers themselves, the organization of “Afghan” soldiers societies (clubs, sections of “soldiers-internationalists”) and their involvement into the education of the younger generation, the need to preserve the memory of their fallen comrades.*

The coverage of the socialization problems of “Afghan” soldiers at the national level took place in the second half of 1987. Despite the measures developed by the Secretariat for state support of “Afghans”, which were published by the newspaper “KZ”, there were still problems with the Komsomol organizations patronage over young veterans and families of fallen servicemen, there were problems with veterans’ societies, in particular, concerning financial and material support, which was covered by this newspaper. The role of the newspaper is important in publishing the letters of participants in the hostilities in Afghanistan on the problems of the state support of “Afghan” soldiers and families of fallen soldiers. Such official publications require further elucidation of comprehensive information on the “Afghan” movement in the USSR, the problems of re-socialization of veterans, implementation of the state policy towards them, reflections of “Afghan” soldiers on the state policy on these issues; intensification of the search of a source base for a comprehensive study of the socialization problems of “Afghan” soldiers in the USSR in 1980 – 1991.

**Key words:** “Afghan” soldiers, Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Ukraine, “Komsomolskoe Znamia”, socialization, adaptation, state support.

### ПРОБЛЕМИ СОЦІАЛІЗАЦІЇ ВОЇНІВ-“АФГАНЦІВ” В УКРАЇНІ У ВИСВІТЛЕННІ ОРГАНУ ЦК ЛКСМ УКРАЇНИ – ГАЗЕТИ “КОМСОМОЛЬСКОЕ ЗНАМЯ”

**Анотація.** Мета дослідження полягає у спробі диференціювати хронологічно та за тематичними складовими проблеми соціалізації воїнів-“афганців” в Україні впродовж 1980-х рр. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше в українській історіографії проаналізовано матеріали офіційного видання на предмет висвітлення у ньому проблем воїнів-“афганців” в Україні вказаного періоду. **Висновки.** Окремі аспекти проблеми соціалізації воїнів-“афганців” виданням почали підійматись у 1986 – 1987 рр. на фоні “відкриття” війни тогочасному суспільству із посилком до “відкриття” самих воїнів, організації “афганських” осередків (клубів, секцій “воїнів-інтернаціоналістів”) та залучення їх до виховання підростаючого покоління, необхідності увінчання пам’яті загиблих побратимів. Висвітлення проблем соціалізації воїнів-“афганців” на республіканському рівні відбулося у другій половині 1987 р. Незважаючи на розроблені Секретаріатом заходи щодо держпідтримки “афганців”, котрі були опубліковані виданням КЗ, наявними лишилися проблеми шефства комсомольських організацій над молодими ветеранами та сім’ями загиблих військовослужбовців, мали місце проблеми ветеранських осередків, зокрема щодо матеріально-технічного забезпечення, що висвітлювалось даним друкованим органом. Важливою є роль видання в опублікуванні листів учасників бойових дій в Афганістані з проблем реалізації державної підтримки воїнів-“афганців” та сімей загиблих військових.

Подібні офіційні видання потребують подальшого виявлення різнобічної інформації стосовно “афганського” руху в УРСР, проблем ре соціалізації ветеранів, реалізації державної політики щодо них на місцях, рефлексій “афганців” на державну політику щодо цих питань, активізують пошуки джерельної бази для комплексного дослідження проблем соціалізації воїнів-“афганців” в УРСР 1980 – 1991 рр.

**Ключові слова:** воїни-“афганці”, ЦК ЛКСМ України, “Комсомольское знамя”, соціалізація, адаптація, державна підтримка.

**The Problem Statement.** The topicality of the research is due to its scientific, theoretical and practical significance to a domestic historiography. After all, the materials of the press body of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Ukraine, which are an important component of the source base and historiography of the socialization problem of “Afghan” soldiers in Ukraine during the period under study, were not comprehensively analyzed. At the same time, they were the sources of information that testified to the state policy on “Afghan” soldiers in terms of positioning demobilized soldiers in the society, which influenced the relevant conditions of a social adaptation, the position of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Young Communist League in the USSR on problems of the

state support for “Afghans” and the families of fallen servicemen. The publication contains a valuable empirical material – reflections of the “Afghan” soldiers on the experience in Afghanistan, expectations after the return and the reality of that time, among which there was a feeling of needlessness in a “peaceful” life. The demobilized “Afghan” soldiers witnessed how and to what extent the Komsomol “youth” solved their problems.

We consider the practical significance of this issue in the need to study the experience of adaptation, which is close to the Ukrainian society, to a peaceful life of “Afghan” soldiers, in particular, in the matters of a social communication of young veterans in the Soviet society during the 1980s, solving the problems of a self-realization of veterans after returning from the war, which may be useful in developing decent conditions for re-socialization of participants in the hostilities in eastern Ukraine – defenders of the Ukrainian statehood.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches.** The socialization issue of “Afghan” soldiers in historiography is multifaceted. Let’s pay attention to the coverage of the topic in periodicals. The problems of returning demobilized Afghan soldiers to peaceful conditions have long been ignored by the media (hereinafter – the media) and researchers. Only under the conditions of perestroika publicity, as the “opening” of the war to the society and the involvement of “Afghan” soldiers into the socio-political life of the state, the development of the “Afghan” movement the party officials emphasized the importance of the role of the latter in the Soviet society.

At the same time, the Soviet periodicals began to discuss the problems of “Afghan” soldiers and the relatives of the fallen soldiers they faced in the society. Such article was published in the “Pravda” newspaper on August 5, 1987, and it received a title that became “a motto” – “I did not send you to Afghanistan...”. Topical “Afghan” issues concerned the ban cases on submitting an obituary on the death of an “Afghan” soldier to a local newspaper; a refusal to help arrange a grave for a buried soldier; prohibitions, when perpetuating the memory of the deceased, to indicate on the monuments the death in Afghanistan; bureaucratic problems of the state support implementation for “Afghan” soldiers (Ya vas v Afganistan...1987, p. 3). Problems of a formal bureaucratic attitude to the medals awarding to demobilized “Afghans” were raised in the central edition of the Ukrainian SSR “Pravda Ukrainy” (Medal v polgolosa, 1988, p. 4). There was elucidated the issue of the state support realization of “Afghan” soldiers and families of the fallen soldiers at the all-Union level (Afganskaya bol... 1989, p. 3).

The issue of the current image of the war in the Soviet society and the reflections of its participants on this issue, the attitude to young veterans, the disabled, the families of fallen soldiers and the problems of their social protection (employment of “Afghan” soldiers with disabilities, poor pensions, housing problems of “Afghan soldiers”), etc.) became the subject of discussions with “Afghan soldiers” (Nam bylo legche... 1990, pp. 28–34; Mynepyl...1990, pp. 41–45; I ona mne...1990, pp. 48–55).

An important issue of the “Afghan syndrome” was raised in the Soviet periodicals. In particular, at the pages of the “Literary Review” a specialist in social psychology, D. Olshansky, resorted to the comparison of “Afghan” and “Vietnamese” syndromes, the state policy of the United States and the Soviet Union, the reaction to it by the American and Soviet societies (Olshanskiy, 1990, pp. 15–18).

The official discourse on the “Afghan war” of 1979-1989, the changes in the narrative concerning the Soviet troops in Afghanistan in the columns of the newspapers “Pravda”, “Komsomolskaya Pravda”, “Pravda Severa”, “Ogoniek” were analyzed by N. Avdonina, the Russian researcher (Avdonina, 2015, pp. 189–206). The issue of the representation of the “Afghan” theme of the 1980s by the newspaper under analysis was raised in the domestic

historiography (Ostrovkyk, 2019, pp. 43– 65). However, the set of problems of “Afghan” soldiers socialization, which were retransmitted to the public during the 1980s, was omitted by researchers. The lack of analysis of this layer of information in domestic historiography determines its topicality.

**The purpose** of the article: based on a study of the publications of the newspaper “Komsomolskoe Znamia” to differentiate the problem of “Afghan” soldiers socialization in Ukraine during the 1980s chronologically and thematically.

**The Basic Material Statement.** The official press played an important role in the socio-political life of the Soviet Union, forming and promoting ideological and educational principles for the Soviet youth. This is what the activities of the Komsomol were aimed at. One of the official press publications of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League in Ukraine was the newspaper “Komsomolskoe Znamia” (during 1938 – 1956 it was published under the name “Stalinskoye Plemya”). Realizing the presence of an ideological component of the official publication, which should make researchers be careful with such materials, we will try to analyze them in accordance with the above given topic.

The interest of the printed bodies of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Ukraine, both the researched publication and the newspaper “Youth of Ukraine” in “Afghan” topics during the “perestroika” period took place under conditions, when the solution to the “Afghan Issue” became one of the main for the Soviet Union. At the same time, the appearance in the columns of materials devoted to “Afghan” soldiers was due to a revision of the state youth policy by the party leadership. The approaches to the activities of informal youth groups, among which “Afghan” soldiers had been for a long time, changed. Thus, the interaction of this category of youth with Komsomol structures, such as the involvement of yesterday’s fighters into the military patriotic education of a younger generation was a worthy example of a social activity of “Afghan” soldiers, which needed to be promoted in the society.

The socialization issues of “Afghan” soldiers in Ukraine by the editions of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Ukraine, in particular, “Komsomolskoe Znamia” (hereinafter – KZ), as mentioned above, began to be raised during the “perestroika” period.

One such publication is an extensive article by Captain V. Hrynychak, a participant in the war in Afghanistan, a Hero of the Soviet Union. In particular, the combat officer spoke about the military service of the Soviet soldiers in Afghanistan: “... I remember how in December of the eighty-third we accepted replenishment. Everything was unusual for the boys, from the strict routine of the army life to the landscape, the sparse air of the highlands. *Heavy marches through the mountains, when not one hour, not two – not one day exhausting ascents and descents. And the throat from thirst becomes like..., and the water, though running along the bottom of the gorge, but to go down to it – a few hours. And at every step it is possible to meet with the enemies...*” (Podolgusovesti...1986, p. 1). In addition, the officer’s article is important in terms of the “Afghan” soldiers socialization in a peaceful life. After all, in the context of the Afghan period of young people’s lives, talking about “normal outings to areas where enemy gangs operated”, about real, not “training” battles of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan, about the wounds and losses of comrades, V. Hrynychak, as an officer, who was wounded, emphasized the importance of support from the others for soldiers, who were wounded and returned to the Soviet society, the support for the families of the fallen “Afghan soldiers”, as well as soldiers and officers in the DRA – by letters (Podolgusovesti ..., 1986, p. 2).

Despite the “opening” of the war to the public, the thesis of “international duty” remained a “red line” in the coverage of “Afghan” materials in the columns of the “KZ”. At the same time, in the message to servicemen, who left Afghanistan with units and subdivisions in 1986, the message of the Central Committee of the CPSU of October 14, 1986, there were indicated the names of soldiers posthumously awarded the title of Hero of the USSR; for the first time at the pages of the publication it was announced about the tribute of memory and honour to the fallen soldiers of the Soviet society, about the duty of “every party, the trade union, the Komsomol organization, the Soviets of People’s Deputies” to show care and attention to their families, to “reduce” the pain and bitterness of loss of theirs (Voinam-internatsionalistam, vozvrashchayuschimsya..., 1986, p. 1).

It is obvious that the instruction given in one of the press bodies of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Ukraine is the position of the central leadership of the party and the Komsomol in Ukraine – in particular, on the issue of popularization of “Afghan” soldiers in the Soviet society, those who had fulfilled the “international duty”.

Thus, among the first issues of 1987 there is a message to open “yesterday’s warriors” to the society. In the “conversation”, the “Afghan” soldier, the Hero of the Soviet Union, V. Kapshuk, emphasized that it was not enough for the Komsomol committees to restrict their activity to compiling lists of soldiers and “gather” them for solemn meetings. *“They need to be entrusted with serious, great things. Consult with them more often. They are worth it”* (Pisma lichno tebe, 1987, p. 1).

We consider important the role of the newspaper in the publications of citizens’ correspondence on the discovery of young soldiers in the society. Among other things, the following lines were written in the letters: *“... But when I started talking about specific people, the children changed. They had no idea, for instance, that Volodymyr Plastun, a member of the bureau of the city Komsomol, had been awarded the Order of the Red Star for his international duty in Afghanistan. The classroom became quiet, the eyes “sparkled”, the faces “brightened”. And I thought about how often in educational work we pass by living, concrete examples. And they are the strongest argument”; “... I brought to the first meeting the guys, who served in Afghanistan. Many of them have military awards. Their classmates had no idea, who they were studying with. They were very reluctant to talk about themselves. Especially, Mykola Savchenko. He never told anyone that he had the Order of the Red Star, the medals. We need to “discover” these guys. And the Komsomol should be the first here”; “... I have been working with teenagers for twenty-eight years. Not at secondary school or vocational school. At the educational and labour colony... I look at them and think: what kind of people will they be after the release? We try to make them understand that life is not over, we need the courage to start from “zero”. When they leave us, they cannot be left alone, we must fight for everyone. They really need the word of those, who went through a real battle, who carried their comrades out from bullets, who knows the price of a human life... Soldiers, who returned from Afghanistan, can become tutors of “difficult” teenagers. They will follow them, believe them”; “I envy the lives of our guys in Afghanistan. I collect newspaper notes about them. I already have a whole folder. I’m rereading everything about Mykola Chepyk. I have an acquaintance, who served with him. He talked a lot about him. That is why, I offered to organize the Komsomol meeting, to tell about the guys, who served in Afghanistan, to invite the guy. But the leader of the Komsomol organization was getting married, and she was not up to the meeting. The deputy stated that there was no such “topic of conversation” in the schedule. So there is nothing to organize. So everything remained unchanged”*

(Pisma lichno tebe, 1987, p. 2). We should note the presence of interest in the demobilized “Afghan” soldiers socialization, because in the columns of the Komsomol publication we find the message about the need to “open” soldiers, who returned from the war, to the Soviet society, as well as their involvement into the education of the youth.

At the same time, for the first time in the materials of the “KZ” in 1987, they “talked” about the problems of “Afghan” soldiers, holding a “round table” discussion together with Donetsk regional committee of the Komsomol on the “platform”. Its participants were the Komsomol official – the second secretary of the regional committee, E. Anoprienko, demobilized “Afghan” soldiers, the students: D. Dorokhov and E. Yasinsky, a chairman of the council of soldiers-internationalists of the district Komsomol organization, S. Sopolev, schoolchildren (Otkrovenno o vajnom..., 1987, p. 2). The issues of preserving the memory about fallen soldiers, helping their families, “Afghan” soldiers, who were seriously wounded, meetings of “soldiers returning home”, opening corners of memory at school museums dedicated to graduates – “soldiers-internationalists”, functioning of reserve soldiers councils and clubs of “soldiers-internationalists” at the Komsomol committees, involvement of “Afghan” soldiers societies into the education of “problem” adolescents and the younger generation in general (Otkrovenno o vajnom ..., 1987, p. 2). It should be also noted that it was in this publication that “soldiers-internationalist” were first called “Afghan” soldiers for the first time. A characteristic symbolism could be seen in it. A. Hurbych, Head of the Propaganda and Agitation Department of Donetsk Regional Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, rightly pointed out the drawbacks in the work with “Afghan” soldiers, which turned out to be “unforgivably many” (Otkrovenno o vajnom ..., 1987, p. 2).

It is obvious that such openness on the part of the party functionary was possible owing to the “perestroika” publicity, which contributed to a certain openness in the columns of the official publications on “Afghan” soldiers problems and the families of fallen soldiers.

On August 11, 1987, the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the LKSMMU considered the issue “On strengthening the patronage of Komsomol organizations of the Republic over soldiers-internationalists and the families of the fallen”. It was decided to implement instructions and take measures to improve this work in Ukraine (Chervonopyskyi, 2008, p. 51; Ostrovyk, 2019, pp. 157–159). It is important that the Secretariat ordered to publish the statement of the developed guidelines in the republican “youth” newspapers (Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine, f. 7, d. 18, c. 1995, p. 7). On August 21, 1987, the “editorial board” of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Ukraine pointed at a “formal bureaucratic attitude” of certain Komsomol committees regarding the requests of soldiers-internationalists and the families of fallen soldiers; non-compliance of the requirements for the organization of patronage over demobilized soldiers and the families of fallen “Afghan” soldiers by a number of the Komsomol committees; a “superficial approach”, “heartlessness” and inefficiency of the Komsomol functionaries – secretaries of city and district committees of the Komsomol in resolving requests and appeals of soldiers-internationalists, failure at establishing “necessary contact” with military commissariats and social security bodies, failure at having information on retired soldiers, who arrived at their organizations (Voinam-internatsionalistam, semyam..., 1987, p. 1). The facts of formalism and bureaucracy regarding the “Afghan” soldiers and the families of the fallen soldiers were described as “political short-sightedness” and “heartlessness” of the first secretaries of city and district committees of the Komsomol (Voinam-internatsionalistam, semyam..., 1987, p. 1). Critical remarks were followed by measures to solve these issues.

Regional, district, city committees of the Komsomol, social security bodies and military registration and enlistment offices were instructed to analyze the state of patronage of hospitals, “soldiers-internationalists”, the families of the fallen soldiers and to take measures to facilitate this work; the departments of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Ukraine and their committees were ordered: to increase the demands to the Komsomol officials concerning a careful consideration of the written and oral appeals of “Afghan” soldiers, families of fallen soldiers, to hold meetings of bureau members, the Komsomol officials with soldiers in reserve; to establish records of soldiers-internationalists and to ensure their “active involvement into public work”, to demand “a specific party, Komsomol or public order”; “to nominate soldiers-internationalists actively, who have authority in the youth environment” for the Komsomol work, in the governing bodies of the Komsomol organizations, and recommend the “best” ones for joining the CPSU; in 1987 to complete the establishment of regional, city and district councils of soldiers in reserve, directing their activities to improve the military patriotic education of the youth, training young men for a military service, propaganda of different types of the Armed Forces, control over observance of government privileges provided for “invalids of the Soviet Army”, soldiers-internationalists, etc. (Voinam-internatsionalistam, semyam..., 1987, p. 1, Ostrovyk, 2019, pp. 157–159).

We state that the complex of problems of “soldiers-internationalists” in the USSR and measures to solve them in the materials of the Komsomol newspaper were first covered only in the second half of 1987.

In 1988, the “KZ” newspaper pointed out the typical problems of participants in the hostilities in Afghanistan. In particular, there was criticized the issue of “patronage” of city and district Komsomol organizations over demobilized soldiers, who, after leaving the TurkVO hospital, (Turkestan Military District – Author), returned home. The cases when city and district committees did not inform the hospital about “Afghan” soldiers took place in Kharkiv, Chernivtsi, Zhytomyr region (Delochesti, 1988, p. 2). The issue of organized appeal of “Afghan” soldiers of Bila Tserkva plant, members of the city club “Internationalist” to resolve the housing problem was raised. “Afghan” soldiers “encountered” the problem of “visiting offices”, the trade union, the director of the plant, the deputy chairman of the city executive committee, the secretary of the city party committee and formal “replies” and “excuses” (Delochesti, 1988, p. 2). Although, it was noted that caring for “Afghan” soldiers should be the matter of honour not only for the Komsomol organizations, but for all those, who surround “Afghan” soldiers (Delochesti, 1988, p. 2).

The inattentive treatment of “Afghan” soldiers was discussed at a rally of the Crimean veterans, where they discussed the lack of proper premises and sports equipment in the club for teenagers and “fake promises” by the city executive committee in resolving this issue, a lack of practical measures of executive committees of city and district councils in the implementation of the decision of the regional executive committee to improve the living conditions of “Afghan” soldiers’ families (Net drujby krepche..., 1988, p. 2).

It should also be noted that the leadership of the party and the Komsomol, in general, tried to use the experience of yesterday’s “Afghan” soldiers in the Soviet realities. After all, as it was written in the newspaper, the decision of the “final document” adopted during the All-Union meeting of young reserve soldiers (held in Ashgabat in November 1987), – “... in the work on military patriotic education of young people, their preparation for service in the army and navy, perestroika is extremely slow. This work remains “flagship”, “boring”,

“formalized” (Shkolamujestva, 1988, p. 2). At the beginning of 1988, V. Popko, a head of the sports and defense department of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Ukraine, wrote in the comments of the “KZ” that “Afghan” soldiers had a real authority among young people and were a “colossal reserve”, which the Komsomol did not use enough” (Net drujby krepche ..., 1988, p. 2).

In the context of this “youth-Komsomol” problem, the newspaper once again raises the issue of establishing creating “Afghan” soldiers centers and their involvement into the education of youth. For instance, there were covered the issues of improving a military patriotic education, preparation of young people for a military service, which were discussed during the rally of Kyiv reserve soldiers (there was the creation of a regional council of reserve soldiers. “Afghan” participants were positioned as the core of the union, as those, who did not want to “put up with inertia and drawbacks in the work of people responsible for a military patriotic education of the youth”); it was informed about organizing a district rally of reserve soldiers (also in Kyiv region), the creation of a veteran unit “Podvyh” (was engaged with the club of conscripts “Desantnyk” and the section “Memory” (specialized in caring for veterans’ graves, helping veterans and war invalids) (Slet voinov zapasa, 1988, p. 1; Soldat vseгда soldat, 1988, p. 4).

Secretary of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Ukraine, Yu. Sokolov, emphasized the importance of using the experience of “Afghan” soldiers as the example of determination and effectiveness in promoting a “military patriotism” among the Soviet youth. He also noted that this issue was the subject of discussion in the republican Komsomol organization at the end of 1987. The organization of the all-Ukrainian meeting of reserve soldiers in June of 1988, as it was mentioned, was aimed at “generalizing the best” in the direction of educating the younger generation, developing “prospects for working with the growing military generation” (Vnimanie, my nachinaem, 1988, p. 2). The head of the Ukrainian Komsomol pointed at the Komsomol committees formalism in solving the problems of “Afghan” soldiers, widows, families of fallen soldiers, which was also the subject of dialogue in developing the ways of improving this situation; learning from the experience of the Komsomol societies, which managed to help demobilized “Afghan” soldiers “find their place in life, obtain a profession” (Vnimanie, my nachinaem, 1988, p. 2). The drawbacks in the patronage of “Afghan” soldiers can be traced from the words of the Komsomol official: “... Personally, my opinion is that experience is accumulated there, where there is a high notion of humanity, where the one was to realize what a difficult burden fell on the fate of not yet grown up guys. Where the one solves the problems of yesterday’s soldiers from a human rather than a bureaucratic standpoint, they do patriotic work at the call of the heart, not because someone has instructed them to do so...” (Vnimanie, my nachinaem, 1988, p. 2).

On May 15, 1988, the withdrawal of the troops from Afghanistan began. In an official address to the “Afghan” soldiers returning home, the party leadership emphasized the need for their “energy” for “perestroika, the case of renewing socialism, defending its conquests” (Obraschenie TSK KPSS..., 1988,p. 1). However, as it was mentioned above, the issue of “Afghan” soldiers was far from being resolved. For instance, the newspaper published the letters of appeal from soldiers to the editors: “Hello, editors! I turn to you not only for help, but also for advice. A lot is being written, said and shown about soldiers-internationalists. In general, all this is a real “show”. I performed an international duty from December of 1983 till October of 1985. There took place many things. I served in the artillery. Started as a soldier, ended as a sergeant. I performed my military duties honestly. When going to the reserve, the unit commander, the zampolit said: “Guys, in a civilian life you are the hope and

support. Carry your honour high. You are soldiers-internationalists. Be proud of it”. And I, like everyone else, went home with this “load”. But here everything turned out not as we dreamed. There are so many of you in the Union. We won’t get everything for you” – that’s how my former boss at my previous job answered my question concerning housing problem ...” (Gorkiepisma, ih..., 1988, p. 2). The “Afghan” soldier continued: “... A small retreat: in March, the “Afghan” soldiers were gathered to meet with the city authorities, representatives of the trade department, social security, police, housing and communal services, the city Komsomol. It was a real “fake”, a show. Many questions were asked to these representatives. However, some specific answers were received. Everything else was “blurred”, “vague” (Gorkiepisma, ih..., 1988, p. 2). The family of an “Afghan” soldier from Odesa pointed out the problematic cases of the state support for the families of the military fallen in Afghanistan. In particular, the young veteran and his wife wrote to the editorial board about the refusal to provide a voucher for the rehabilitation of a diabetic and hypertensive patient, the mother of the soldier, who died in 1984; the problem of “including” the surname of the widow of an “Afghan” soldier into the shop list for war invalids; a promise to help repair an apartment, which was “delayed” for two years for the sick mother of another “Afghan” soldier. “... What benefits for “Afghan” soldiers can we talk about, even if the families of those killed in Afghanistan are not provided with benefits?”, the authors of the letter to the editorial office wrote (Gorkie pisma, ih..., 1988, p. 2). Thus, the cases show how in the Soviet reality of that time the “Afghan” soldiers lost their vital ideals of experience, when, returning from the war, they witnessed “ostentation”, “bloated” support for them by the authorities. At the same time, they testify to the fact that the families of soldiers, who died in Afghanistan, remained hostages of the state support implementation.

Terrible things were discussed with the “Afghan” soldiers of Poltava region: the correspondent learned that their fellows cut off his hand after “solving” his “housing problem”; “... And only after that the boy received a residence permit, a job and a disability document”. Apparently, again, there was a loss of a person’s life ideals, because, as presented in the material, the “Afghan” soldier, disappointed, “realized that everyone lives only for himself and tries to “grab” more” (this case was discussed at the meeting of the Central Committee Plenum of the Young Communist League of Ukraine, with reference to the publication in the “KZ”) (Pamyat v podvale, 1989, pp. 4–5; CSAPAU, f. 7, d. 18, c. 2096, p. 170). “Yesterday’s soldiers” talked about the problem of housing for “Afghans”, demanding the premises for the Konotop Club of soldiers-internationalists (they were given a basement), “searching for” building materials for repairs on their own, no hope in the Komsomol help, a two-year visit by a widow with two children in the issue of housing repair assistance (Pamyat v podvale, 1989, pp. 4–5).

As an example of inadequate support for “Afghans”, we should mention the situation with the transfer of housing by Kyiv City Committee, which was built for government officials (representatives of the Council of Ministers and the State Plan), to “Afghans”, families of victims, war veterans and invalids, large families. The housing turned out to be unfinished (Razjalovannyiy dom, 1990, p. 4). “Afghans” of Novomoskovsk (Dnipropetrovsk region) united in the center of Afghanistan veterans, who worked to help the families of the dead, the disabled, etc., needed premises and funds to increase production (“Espada” jdet pomoschi, 1990, p. 4). Chernihiv “Afghans” raised funds in a self-organized manner, deciding to hold a charity concert and transferring funds to the families of those killed in Afghanistan (I kakjemne..., 1990, p. 5).

Regarding the state support of “Afghan” families, the resolution of the Central Committee of the LKSMU was published, which indicated the payment of a pension to children, whose parents died in Afghanistan; the amount of payment was 40 rubles per month for each child under 18 years of age. However, as N. Serhienko, the head of the sports and defense-mass work department of the Central Committee of the LKSMU, pointed out, one million was not enough; the Komsomol hoped for support of “other organizations and people” (Nejal potratit..., 1990, p. 4).

Thus, the materials of the newspaper under analysis highlight the problems of “Afghan” soldiers socialization in the USSR, which can be differentiated according to a thematic focus.

The appearance of this issue at the pages of the press body of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League of Ukraine “Komsomolskoe Znamia” is traced with the onset of the “perestroika” period. At the end of 1986, in the government address, for the first time it was mentioned about commemoration of the victims and the obligation to support their families. A qualitatively new stage in the coverage of the “Afghan theme” by this newspaper began in 1987 with a message to various aspects of “Afghan” soldiers socialization in Ukraine: the need to “open” yesterday’s soldiers to the society, to which they returned after the war, to popularize their experience and to use it in the upbringing of the younger generation. At the same time, in August of 1987, there were highlighted systemic drawbacks in the implementation of the “patronage” of the Komsomol committees over “soldiers-internationalists” and the families of fallen soldiers in Ukraine, and organizational and practical measures were taken to facilitate this work. At the same time, there were raised the problems of a material support of “Afghan” societies, unsatisfactory patronage of the Komsomol organizations, problems of “Afghan” soldiers at the local level.

With the beginning of the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan, in the articles of the “Komsomolskoe Znamia” the problems of demobilized “Afghan” soldiers were pointed out by “Afghan” soldiers and representatives of families, whose members died in Afghanistan, appealing to the ostentation and “bloated” support of young veterans by the authorities and the problem of implementing the state support for the families of fallen soldiers. In general, the analysis of the newspaper publications showed that the conditions for the social adaptation of yesterday’s soldiers against the background of the war and the expectation of a decent reception were not in favour of young veterans in the Soviet society.

Acknowledgement. The authors of the article are sincerely grateful to all members of the editorial board for the advice provided during doing the research and writing the article.

Financing. The authors did not receive any financial support for doing the research and writing the article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**I ona mne.** (1990). “I ona mne, proklyataya, snitsya” [“And I saw it, damned, in my dreams”]. *Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil*, 9, 48–55. [in Russian]

**My ne pyl na vetru.** (1990). “My ne pyl na vetru...” [“We are not Dust in the Wind ...”]. *Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil*, 15, 41–45. [in Russian]

**Nam bylo legche na voine.** (1990). Nam bylo legche na voine [It was Easier for us in the War]. *Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil*, 2, 28–34. [in Russian]

**Avdonina, N.** (2015). Ispolnivshie internatsionalnyy dolg. Obraz “afgantsa” v sovetskikh sredstvakh massovoy informatsii [The one, who have Fulfilled the International Duty. The Image of the “Afghans” in the Soviet Mass Media]. *Svobodnaya mysl'*, (5), 189–206. [in Russian]

**Ostrovyyk, D.** (2019). Gazeta “Komsomolskoe znamya” yakkdzhereloreprezentatsiia fhanskoitematyky u 1980 – 1991 rr. [The Newspaper “Komsomolskoe Znamya” as a Source of

Representation of Afghan Issues in 1980-1991]. *Istoriianauky i bihrafistyka*, 4, 43–65. [in Ukrainian]. doi:10.31073/istnauka201904-03

**Ostrovyk, D.** (2019). Transformatsiia derzhavnoi polityky radians'koi vlady schodo voyniv-“afhantsiv” v Ukraini 1979 – 1991 rr. [Transformation of the State Policy of the Soviet Government towards Afghan Soldiers in Ukraine in 1979 – 1991]. *Vijs'kovo-istorychnyj merydian: elektronnyj naukovyj fakhovyy zhurnal*, 1 (23), 150–170. URL: [https://vim.gov.ua/pages/\\_journal\\_files/23.05.2019/pdf/VIM\\_23\\_2019-150-170.pdf](https://vim.gov.ua/pages/_journal_files/23.05.2019/pdf/VIM_23_2019-150-170.pdf) [in Ukrainian]

**Olshanskiy, D.** (1990). Afganskiy sindrom [Afghan Syndrome]. *Literaturnoe obozrenie – Literary Review*, 3, 9–18. [in Russian]

*Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromadskykh obiednan Ukrainy [Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine – CSAPAU]*

**Chervonopyskyi, S. V.** (2008). Politychni ta sotsialni naslidky dlia Ukrainy spetsoperatsii SRSR v Afhanistani 1979 – 1989 rokiviroi USVA v yikhpodolanni [Political and Social Implications for Ukraine of the USSR Special Operations in Afghanistan 1979 – 1989 and the Role of USM in Overcoming It.]. Kyiv: “Medinform”, 156 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Podolgu sovesti i chesti.** (1986, January 14). Podolgu sovesti i chesti [By Duty of Conscience and Honour]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 1–2. [in Russian]

**Voinam-internatsionalistam.** (1986, October 14). Voinam-internatsionalistam, vozvrashchayuschimsya iz Demokraticheskoy Respubliki Afganistan [Internationalist Warriors Returning from the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 1. [in Russian]

**Pisma lichno tebe.** (1987, January 4). Pisma lichno tebe [Letters to you personally]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 1 [in Russian]

**Otkrovenno o vajnom.** (1987, April 11). Otkrovenno o vajnom. Kruglyiy stol “KZ” [Frankly about the Important. Round Table “KZ”]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 2. [in Russian]

**Ya vas v Afganistan ne posilal.** (1987, August 5). “Ya vas v Afganistan ne posilal...” [“I did not send you to Afghanistan ...”]. *Pravda*, 3. [in Russian]

**Voinam-internatsionalistam.** (1987, August 21). Voinam-internatsionalistam, semyam pogibshih – komsomolskuyu zabotu [To soldiers-internationalists, families of the dead – Komsomol concern]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 1 [in Russian]

**Ne v prave zabyivat.** (1987, September 6). Ne v prave zabyivat [Have no Right to Forget]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 1. [in Russian]

**Delo chesti.** (1988, January 22). Delo chesti [A Matter of Honour]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 2. [in Russian]

**Shkola mujestva.** (1988, January 26). Shkola mujestva [School of Courage]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 2. [in Russian]

**Medal v polgolosa.** (1988, February 3). Medal v polgolosa [Medal in an under Tone]. *Pravda Ukrainy*, 4 [in Russian]

**Net drujby krepche.** (1988, February 3). Net drujby krepche boevoy [No friendship is stronger than fighting]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 2 [in Russian]

**Slet voynov zapasa.** (1988, April 29). Slet voynov zapasa [Warriors in Reserve Meeting]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 1. [in Russian]

**Soldat vseгда soldat.** (1988, May 3). Soldat vseгда soldat [A Soldier is always a Soldier]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 4. [in Russian]

**Obraschenie TSK KPSS.** (1988, May 15). Obraschenie TSK KPSS k sovetskim voynam-internatsionalistam, vozvrashchayuschimsya iz Respubliki Afganistan [Appeal of the CPSU Central Committee to the Soviet soldiers-internationalists returning from the Republic of Afghanistan]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 1. [in Russian]

**Gorkie pisma.** (1988, May 29). Gorkie pisma, ih pishut v redaktsiyu voyni-internatsionalisty [Bitter letters, they are written to the editor by internationalist warriors]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 2. [in Russian]

**Vnimanie, my nachinaem.** (1988, June 4). Vnimanie, my nachinaem [Attention, we Start]. *Komsomolskoe znanya*, 2. [in Russian]

**V dushe moey Afganistan.** (1988, June 8). V dushe moey Afganistan [Afghanistan in my Soul]. *Komsomolskoe znamya*, 1. [in Russian]

**Jivye misheni.** (1988, June 10). Jivye misheni [Living Targets]. *Komsomolskoe znamya*, 1. [in Russian]

**Pamyat v podvale.** (1989, March 31). Pamyat v podvale [Basement Memory]. *Komsomolskoe znamya*, 4–5. [in Russian]

**Afganskaya bol.** (1989, August 17). Afganskaya bol [Afghan Pain]. *Pravda*, 3. [in Russian]

**Razjalovannyiy dom.** (1990, April 8). Razjalovannyiy dom [Demoted House]. *Komsomolskoe znamya*, 4. [in Russian]

**“Espada” jdet pomoschi.** (1990, April 29). “Espada” jdet pomoschi [“Espada” is Waiting for Help]. *Komsomolskoe znamya*, 4. [in Russian]

**Ne jal potratit million.** (1990, May 6). Ne jal potratit million [No Regrets to Spend a Million]. *Komsomolskoe znamya*, 4. [in Russian]

**I kak je mne ne vspominat.** (1990, May 27). “I kak je mne ne vspominat...” [And how can I not Remember ...]. *Komsomolskoe znamya*, 5. [in Russian]

*The article was received on March 15, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 791.62(477)“1985/1991”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226504

**Viktorija ABAKUMOVA**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor, Professor of Department of Ukraine's History, Sumy State Pedagogical University named after AS Makarenko, 87 Romenska street, Sumy, Ukraine, postal code 40002 (espuma@yahoo.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-2574-1799  
**ResearcherID:** AAH-4201-2020

**Вікторія АБАКУМОВА**

*доктор історичних наук, професор, професор кафедри історії України, Сумський державний педагогічний університет імені А. С. Макаренка, вул. Роменська, 87, Суми, Україна, індекс 40002 (espuma@yahoo.com)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Abakumova, V. (2021). Updating the repertoire of the Ukrainian film studios in the context of the Perestroika process. *Skhidnoievropeiskiy Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 199–209. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226504

**UPDATING THE REPERTOIRE OF THE UKRAINIAN FILM STUDIOS  
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PERESTROIKA PROCESS**

**Abstract.** *The aim of the study* It was shown that the activity of the Ukrainian film studios during the period of the Perestroika process of 1985 – 1991 is an important page of the history of a cultural life and social and political process of Ukraine. The process of updating the repertoire of the Ukrainian film studios in the context of the realignment process has been analyzed. Important in this context was the study of the factors contributing to the thematic updating of the films. **The Research Methodology.** The methodology of the study was based on the principles of historicism, objectivity and scientific capacity. The article focuses on the analysis of the state of the scientific development of the problem in national historiography. The main conceptual approaches to the study of the problem have been identified. **The scientific novelty** is to reveal the thematic features of the repertoire of the Ukrainian films during the period of systematic changes from 1985 till 1991 basing on the archival materials. The presented scientific work has **the scientific novelty** in the context of the Ukrainian historiography. **The Conclusions.** The factors of updating the repertoire portfolio were clarified: first, new topics were identified by new thematic plans, the so-called. government procurement, which underwent fundamental changes as a result of the reform course of the government. Secondly, the release of censorship led to the evolution of the public view of the past, pushing artists to turn their own works into an instrument of the political opposition to popular opposition to the authorities. Anti-alcohol movies appeared for the sake of supporting the course of the authorities. Thematic plans of the state order envisaged creating films on the theme aimed at updating the Ukrainian national motives. Such work went hand in hand with encouraging artists to introduce the Ukrainian language into works of verbal arts. Due to this, the interest of the state-of-the-art motion picture studios to the Ukrainian literature and dramatic classics increased. It diversified the domestic achievements of the cinematic works of the historical genre. The theme of the historical past of the Ukrainian people took a leading place in the repertoire of the Ukrainian film studios. After the Chernobyl disaster the environmental theme was one of the first to get the independent artistic coverage. The themes that could not be fully realized in the pre-rebuilding period included religious films.

**Key words:** repertoire, film studio, film, script writer, director, Perestroika.

## ОНОВЛЕННЯ РЕПЕРТУАРУ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ КІНОСТУДІЙ В УМОВАХ ПРОЦЕСУ ПЕРЕБУДОВИ

**Анотація. Мета дослідження.** Показано, що діяльність українських кіностудій у період процесу Перебудови 1985 – 1991 рр. є важливою сторінкою історії культурного життя та суспільно-політичного процесу України. Аналізується процес оновлення репертуару українських кіностудій в умовах Перебудови. Важливим в цьому контексті стало дослідження чинників, що сприяли тематичному оновленню кінострічок. **Методологія дослідження.** В основі методології дослідження лежать принципи історизму, об'єктивності та наукової спроможності. У статті проаналізовано стан наукової розробленості проблеми у вітчизняній історіографії. Визначено основні концептуальні підходи до вивчення проблеми. **Наукова новизна** полягає у розкритті тематичних особливостей репертуару українських кінострічок в період системних змін 1985 – 1991 рр. за архівними матеріалами. Представлена наукова робота має наукову новизну в контексті української історіографії. **Висновки.** З'ясовано чинники оновлення репертуарного портфелю: по-перше, нова тематики була визначена новими тематичними планами т. зв. державного замовлення, які зазнали корінних змін в результаті реформаторського курсу влади. По-друге, вивільнення від цензури зумовлювало еволюцію суспільного погляду минулого; підштовхувало митців до перетворення власних творів на інструмент політичного протистояння народної опозиції владі. Заради підтримки курсу влади з'явилися кінотвори антиалкогольної тематики. Тематичними планами державного замовлення передбачалося створення фільмів на тему, що націлювала митців на актуалізацію українських національних мотивів. Ця робота йшла паралельна зі заохоченням митців до запровадження української мови до творів вербальних видів мистецтва. Завдяки цьому підвищився інтерес митців державних кіностудій ігрового кіно до української літератури й драматургічної класики. Це розмаїтило вітчизняний доробок кінематографічних творів історичного жанру. Тема історичного минулого українського народу посіла провідне місце в репертуарі українських кіностудій. Після чорнобильської аварії екологічна тема однією з перших отримала незаангажоване художнє висвітлення. До тем, що не могли повноцінно втілюватися в доперебудовний час, належали фільми з релігійної тематики.

**Ключові слова:** репертуар, кіностудія, кінострічка, фільм, автор сценарію, режисер, Перебудова.

**The Problem Statement.** During the studied chronological period the emergence and development of the systemic changes resulted from the economic and political reforms caused by the authorities (1985 – 1988) and the rapid democratization and radical changes that swept across the society during the period of downward movement of the restructuring forces (1988 – 1991). Freedom of expression in the arts came about by overcoming censorship, easing ideological pressure, and limiting bureaucratic interference with the creative process. The purpose of this article is to find out the thematic features of the repertoire of the Ukrainian film studios in the context of the realignment process.

**The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches.** The research documents for the study of the cultural policy of the state, the role and place of cultural figures in the process of its practical implementation are kept in the documents of the Central State Archive of the Public Associations of Ukraine (CSAPAU), Central State Archives of the Supreme Bodies of Power and Management of Ukraine (CSASBPMU), Central State Archives Museum of Literature and Art of Ukraine (CSAMLAU) and Departmental Archive of the Ministry culture of Ukraine. They formed the original base of the study. The political history of the Ukrainian cinema including the times of perestroika, was studied by L. Hoseiko (Ghosejko, 2005). In the section of the collective monograph “Ukrainian Cinema of the Times of the Perestroika: Changing the Fate” by I. Zubavina the consonant to us conclusion about the genre-thematic variety of multicolours difficult to rigorous typologising of the late 1980s – early 1990 scan

be found (Zubavina, 2006). A researcher H. Tsyba focused on the socio-political features of the period under study such as weakening censorship, publicity, and the crisis of self-identification of the Soviet individual. Instead, the repertoire features of the Ukrainian film studios (Cyba, 2014) remained out of her attention. We will try to fill in some factual gaps in the question, hoping that the presentation of a broad factual base will to some extent determine the scientific novelty of our research.

**The Purpose of the Article.** To analyze the process of updating the repertoire of the Ukrainian film studios in the context of the perestroika process. Important in this context is the study of the factors that contributed to the thematic updating the films.

**The Basic Material Statement.** At the beginning of perestroika, in 1985 the authorities expected creative work from the artists in the spirit of the socialist realism: glorifying the revolutionary struggle of the people and their leaders, the Soviet way of life, socialist construction and labor enthusiasm. The sources for creative inspiration included the current guidelines of the party and government, state anniversaries and holidays. Already at the end of the studied period, in 1991, i.e., is after 6 years the repertoire of the Ukrainian artist changed radically. After examining the circumstances of updating the repertoire the factors of influence can be enumerated. Firstly, the reform course of the government as the starting mechanism of the socio-political transformation processes led to a significant renewal of the nature of public procurement. The initiation in the national priorities programme of the national priorities aimed at activists of culture to introduce the Ukrainian motives into the artistic creativity, restore the status of the Ukrainian language as a language of art (Abakumova, 2013, p. 63). Secondly, the entry of the creative process into the realm of profanity returned not only the independence of choice to artists, but also freedom to the humanistic ideal. The artists' consciousness was no longer humiliated by fears and prohibitions. The content of creativity began to be determined by the freedom of choice. The desire to create new values led to the evolution of the public view of the past. Thirdly, during the years immediately preceding the independence, the main task of the education and culture was to update the key themes of the Ukrainian society: the language issue, the historical past, the Chernobyl tragedy. Through the efforts of cultural figures, these issues were turned into pain points in the minds of the Ukrainian community.

It should be noted that these factors were intertwined. It is difficult to trace the cause and effect. Therefore, we analyze the thematic changes in the repertoire of the Ukrainian film studios in the chronological order.

With initiating the reform course of the government the artists were required to update the social and resonant issues. First of all, it was an anti-alcohol campaign. It was emphasized that "the theatres, cinemas, television and radio programs, artistic works of motives that promoted drunkenness, feasting were not allowed to enter" (O merakh po preodolenyju pijanstva y alkogholyzma, 1985, p. 25). Therefore, during the period of 1986 – 1987 the film fund of the republic enriched the feature films "Blaming the Wedding" (directed by O. Ityhilov, 1986) and "The Lonely Woman Wants to Get Acquainted" (directed by V. Kryshstofovich, 1986) (both by O. Dovzhenko Film Studio), 7 chronically documentary, popular science, cartoon tapes that revealed the harmfulness of bad habits, promoted the positive practice of their preventing, a healthy life, the norms of the socialist morality. To supplement the film fund of the republic employees of the studio "Ukrkinochronika" duplicated the films "Even a Glass Harms", "Hangover", "The Black Border", "Degree of Fall", "Alcohol and the Accident", "Sorrow", "Alcohol and Teenager", "Alcohol and Woman". In total during this period cinema rental had at

the disposal a considerable fund – 21 feature and 125 chronically documentary, popular science films about the harmfulness of alcohol addiction (CSASBPMU, f. 2, d. 15, c. 417, p. 97).

Since 1986 the environmental theme was one of the top to be covered by the artistic coverage. Radiation disaster revived many people's sense of a civic responsibility for the protection of their homeland. Soon the Chornobyl theme became the subject of many works of art. Writers and documentaries were the first to master the topic of the environmental disaster.

Back in August of 1986, the premiere of the film made at "Ukrtelevfilm" studio "Chornobyl: Two Colours of Time" was broadcast on TV (script writers L. Muzhuk, H. Salhanin, director I. Kobrin). The film was official in the character and made in a heroic pathos. Meanwhile, the authors of the first Chornobyl films, which were made in the very epicenter of the catastrophe, were the subject to censorship. These included V. Shestopalova ("Memory of Courage and Brotherhood"), I. Holdstein ("Pain and Courage of Chornobyl") (1986), V. Shevchenko "Chornobyl: Chronicle of Hard Weeks" (1986). The latter film was the most censored. The State Office for Nuclear Power made 152 remarks about the film directed by Shevchenko. The film by director Serhiyenko "The Chime of Chornobyl" (1986) was included unofficially into the programme of the Berlin Film Festival in February 1987 without official sanctioning (Kolokol Chernobylia. Polnometrazhnyi film, 1987). Its showing gained considerable resonance both at home and abroad. Censorship could not be avoided by later films either. In particular, the tape by H. Shklyarev'sky, "Mi-cro-phon!" (1989), is about silencing the scale of a catastrophe. The new feature documentary by Serhiyenko "Threshold" (1988) was allowed to rent only due to a deputy's request at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (Porog. Polnometrazhnyi film, 1988). However, neither circulation nor film rental can be called wide enough.

Significantly, only after awarding the 1988 USSR State Prize to V. Shevchenko, the author of the film "Chornobyl: Chronicle of Hard Weeks" (posthumously), did the censorship in Ukraine relating the Chornobyl issue not so severe. Thus, freedom came from Moscow. As early as 1989 the documentary video-cinematography "Chornobyl – Two Colors of Time" received the State Prize of the Ukrainian SSR. T.H. Shevchenko. And director M. Belikov was given the state order to create a feature film about the Chornobyl tragedy "The Decay" (CSASBPMU, f. 2, d. 15, c. 1635, p. 96).

Loosening the creative thought was influenced by the restriction of Holovlit's authorities. The reorganization of the main censorship body in the USSR was carried out in accordance with the new "General Scheme for Managing the State Secrets in the Press". A similar process took place in cinematography. After the 5th Congress of the Union of Cinematographers of the USSR (1986), the practice of depriving officials of certain films of the right to screen was abolished. After 1987 films that had remained on the shelves for many years came to the viewers. In particular, the pictures of the Ukrainian directors: the first directorial work by Yu. Ilyenko "Well for the Thirsty" (1966), two films by K. Muratova – "Short Meetings" (1967) and "Long Farewells" (1971), a satirical musical by M. Rasheyev "The Hare Reserve" (1973) (Koroghodsjkyj, 1987, p.166). That is why the sensations of film criticism of the late 1980s were related to those films that had been subject to censorship for many years.

Another factor in renewing the repertoire of the Ukrainian film studios was the campaign to introduce the Ukrainian language to works of verbal arts. The first information about the attention of the Ministry of Culture of the USSR to this problem dates back to 1987 (See for example, CSASBPMU, f. 5116, d. 19, c. 2860, p. 71; c. 2959, p. 14; CSAMLAU, f. 616, d. 1, c. 1865, p. 20; CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 32, c. 2451, pp. 157–161). This work went hand in hand with

the introduction of a thematic piece of art that aimed at updating the Ukrainian national motifs. Until then, national motives in the work of the Ukrainian artists were strictly dosed. But with the release of the Ukrainian cinematography from the dictatorship of the USSR Goskino (the state cinema), the practice of forming creative programmes began to be rethought.

Thus, in 1988, the directorate of the O. Dovzhenko film studio together with the leading creative workers and writers of the republic developed a long-term programme for the revival of the national cinema. Large-scale cinema projects about the life and work of Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko, Lesya Ukrayinka, adaptation of the Ukrainian literary classics, creative rehabilitation of the Ukrainian writers, applications of young Ukrainian screenwriters and directors awaited the fastest realization (CSASBPMU, f. 5116, d. 19, c. 3069, p. 35).

The language of these cinematographic works was to be Ukrainian. In 1990, the tendency to expand the use of the Ukrainian language in cinema was fixed by the Republican National Film Release Program for 1990 – 1991 (CSASBPMU, f. 5116, d. 19, c. 3069, p. 39). The effective means of its introduction by the Ministry of Culture of the USSR was to consider the social and creative order for films that covered the most significant and active problems of the history of Ukraine and its present. In 1991, such a feature was acquired by the feature films “The Birthday Gift” (O. Dovzhenko Kyiv Film Studio, directed by L. Osyka, 1991), and “The Miracle in the Land of Oblivion” (Odesa Film Studio, directed by N. Motuzko, 1991), the film series “Essays on the History of Ukraine”<sup>1</sup> (“Ukrkinokhronika”), which was of a fundamental importance in the programme of the revival and development of the national cinema journalism, etc. In 1991, out of 32 films (feature films, science fiction chronicle-documentaries) initiated by the Social-Creative Order of the Ministry of Culture of the USSR, 29 were released in the Ukrainian language version (the majority were mass-screen films of the Kyivnaukfilm studio) (CSASBPMU, f. 5116, d. 19, c. 3069, pp. 36–39).

In 1989 the delegates of the extraordinary 6<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Cinematographers’ Union supported a promising plan for the development of the Ukrainian national cinema and discussed the ways to solve the economic and creative problems of creating the programme “The Ukrainian National Cinema” (CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 32, c. 2665, p. 38). The main place in the discussion of delegates was taken by the ways of reviving the language of the cinema. In the previous period of the Ukrainian feature films, interest in the national culture was almost lost.

The atmosphere of perestroika turned out to be fruitful. There was an increase in the interest of artists of the state-owned film studios in the Ukrainian literature and drama classics, which remained undeveloped by screen art. It diversified the domestic achievements of the cinema works of the historical genre (Abakumova, 2019, p. 13). Only during the period of 1988 – 1991 several films of the same name were screened on the basis of the Ukrainian writers: M. Kulish “The Zone” (directed by M. Mashchenko, S. Shakhbazyan, 1988), and M. Kotsyubyns’ky “Writing the Book of Life” (directed by O. Denysenko, 1988) and “The Birthday Gift” (directed by L. Osyka, 1991), H. Khotkevich, “The Fireplace of Souls” (directed by S. Klymenko, 1989), V. Shevchuk, “Chimeras of the Green Summer” (directed by V. Fesenko, 1989) and “The Miracle in the Land of Oblivion” (directed by N. Motuzko, 1991), V. Pidmohyl’l’ny, “Good God” (directed by O. Yershov, 1990) and “History of Mr. Yivha” (directed by M. Ivanov, 1990), by I. Kotlyarevs’ky “The Moscovite Magician” (directed by M. Zaseyev-Rudenko, 1991), M. Khvylyovy “Poodle” (directed by T. Cherkashyna, 1991), as well as H. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko “Konotop Witch” – the

---

<sup>1</sup>The educational-historical serial was released under the title “Unknown Ukraine”. The first word of the title *unknown* was stressed as for many generations of Ukrainians their own history was unknown or known partly and in brief.

film “Witch” (directed by H. Shychayeva, 1990), M. Khvylyovy “I (Romance)” is a movie “I am the one, who ...” (directed by O. Volodina, 1990). They embodied the themes of the Ukraine’s historical past, national life, and reflected the acute problems of the present.

The theme of the historical past of the Ukrainian people took the leading place in the updated repertoire of the Ukrainian film studios. At first, its coverage in the works of art took place under the programme of the state order. The government recognized the need for an unbiased study of the historical past of the Ukrainian people. At that period the theme became one of the debatable public issues of the time. This is evidenced by the Republican Programme for the Development of Historical Studies, Improving the Study and Propagating the History of the Ukrainian SSR, adopted in 1990 (CSASBPMU, f. 2, d. 15, c. 1635, p. 96). That is, the programme was adopted in response to a broad public campaign to educate the Ukrainian intelligent strata about the historical past of the Ukrainian people. Several films received state funding. In particular, within the state order socially relevant feature films were created: at the Odesa Film Studio - the film “Hu-Ha” (directed by V. Novak, 1989), about the fate of a battalion on one of the fronts of World War II, at the O. Dovzhenko Kyiv Film Studio – film “Breakup” (directed by M. Belikov, 1990), about the events of Chornobyl in April of 1986 (CSASBPMU, f. 2, d. 15, c. 1635, p. 96).

Soon the reflection of the past and the present of Ukraine, its heroic history, life and customs of the Ukrainian people was outlined by the Republican National Film Release Programme in 1990 – 1991 (CSASBPMU, f. 5116, d. 19, c. 3069, p. 39; f. 2, d. 15, c. 2052, p. 7). For example, a grand plan consisted in a government order to create a documentary on the history of Ukraine on a scientific basis. The production of the series documentary “History of Ukraine” (20-25 series) was planned to be realized within 7-8 years with the involvement of the best intellectual forces of the republic. Funding for the work was planned from the republican budget (estimated in 1990, approximately 2 million roubles) (CSASBPMU, f. 2, d. 15, c. 2052, p. 7; f. 5116, d. 19, c. 2962, p. 111; CSAPAU, f. 1, d. 32, c. 2665, p. 50; CSAMLAU, f. 1009, d. 1, c. 1638). But the main work on the series took place after 1991 in independent Ukraine.

Among the historical works created during 1989 – 1991 a considerable group consisted of scientific educational and chronically documentary cinematographic works. It should be noted that more dynamic national identification of the domestic cinema took place in non-feature films. In 1989 the creative team of the creative association “Krynitsa” of the Studio “Ukrkinokhronika” created a series of chronically documentary films in which the attention of the audience focused on the topical issues of the public and spiritual life of Ukraine, the promotion of its moral and cultural values: “Kobzo My” (S. Lysets’ky), “On Christmas” (directed by V. Storozhenko, O. Koval, A. Karas), as well as a series of film, awarded in 1991 with the T. Shevchenko State Prize of the Ukrainian SSR “Discover Yourself”, “Taras”, “In Front of the Icon” (the author’s team included R. Serhiyenko, V. Kostenko, M. Shudrya, O. Koval, V. Sperkach). Cinematography touched on the Holocaust: “Babyn Yar: The Truth About Tragedy” (V. Heorhiyenko, O. Shlaen, 1990) generalizing the testimonies of victims and participants in the tragic events, “Babyn Yar” (directed by I. Holdstein, 1989), “Babyn Yar” (directed by E. Yefymenko, 1991) – a reportage on the events, which took place near the monument in Babyn Yar. The authors of the movie “Mali Hulyaky” (directed by Yu. Tereshchenko, 1989) were among the first in the cinema to raise the topic of the Holodomor.

The theme of the artificially created famine of 1932 – 1933, the horrors of the famine were reflected in a number of films, including “The 1933, Memoirs of Eyewitnesses” (6 hrs., directed by M. Laktionov-Stezenko, 1989), “Oh, god, these are the guests to my

place” and “I am the people” (directed by P. Farenyuk, 1989 and 1990), “Under the sign of trouble” (directed by K. Krainiy, 1990), “Crying” (3 hrs, directed by O. Kryvarchuk, 1989), “Famine-1933” (adaptation of V. Barka’s novel *The Yellow Prince*, directed by O. Yanchuk, 1991), and the others.

During 1990 – 1991 the national themes became introduced in the work programmes of the Kyivnaukfilm studio. It should be noted that the films of this studio usually were produced in Russian, since the production of popular science films was made according to the special order and was allocated mainly from the Soviet Union central budget. However, in 1990 the number of short Ukrainian-language scientific educational films<sup>2</sup> increased twice (Departmental Archive of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine, f. 5116, d. 19, c. 3143, p. 102). The studio’s author team created scientific and journalistic explorations of acute problems of a public life in the republic: “The Truth Will Make You Free” (directed by L. Udovenko, 1990) about dictatorship and culture; “My Motherland Crimea” (directed by R. Plakhov-Modestov, 1990), on the fate of the Crimean Tatar people after their deportation; “High Above Trakhtemyrov” (directed by D. Bohdanov, 1990) – the Cossack history of Trakhtemyrov; “The Living Legend of the Ages” (directed by L. Anichkin, 1990) on the history of Khortytsya and the others. The following year, the audience saw about 30 full-length and short films in the Ukrainian language aimed at the revival and development of the national culture: “Kyiv Through the Ages” (directed by O. Kosynov, 1991), “Time of Choice” (directed by O. Levchenko, 1991). “Both by God and People” (directed by Yu. Tereshchenko, 1991) about the famine, “Field of our memory” (directed by A. Fedorov, 1991), about the struggle of the population of the western regions of Ukraine for creating the Ukrainian independent united state, “September of 1939” (directed by A. Fedorov, 1991), on a new look at the events of the reunification of Western Ukraine with the USSR and the others. These films were rather unusual with novelty and daring. Positively assessing the conditions for creativity during the period of perestroika, the director of “Ukrkinokhronika” Yury Tereshchenko mentioned: “the state gave us money, but we offered films that humiliated this state” (Tereshchenko, 2008).

Films aimed at exposing the crimes of the Soviet totalitarian system and its repressive mechanisms were made up of a separate array. In particular, the story about Bykivnya “Love It”, based on V. Sosyura’s poem “Love Ukraine” and “NKVD Battalions” (both directed by L. Bukin, 1989 and 1991), and the films “Camp Dust” (directed by H. Davydenko, 1990) on intellectuals thrown into concentration camps, “Stalin Syndrome” (directed by R. Shyrman, 1990), “Tango of the Death” (directed by O. Muratov, 1991). In memory of the victims of Stalin’s repression, the tragic fate of the Ukrainian intelligent strata was the theme of a number of films created by the Ukrainian documentaries: “Mykola Kulish” (directed by S. Suprunyuk, 1990), “Oleksandr Oles” (directed by S. Poleshko, 1991), “What I love, what I believe in, what I hope for” (directed by Yu. Ivanov, 1991) – about the work of Y. Fed’kovich, “From the Life of Ostap Vyshnya” (directed by Y. Lanchak, 1991), “Our Crime Is Singing” (directed by V. Shestopalova, 1991) about the tragic fate of Vasyl’ Stus; a series of films by director L. Anichkin about the fate of writers exiled to Solovky: “Dray Khmara. Last Pages” (1990), “My Address: Solovky. The Trap” (1991) about L. Kurbas; “My address: Solovky The Burden of Silence” (1991) about M. Kulish. The names of people who either went into hiding or just crossed out of the pages of history books were returned

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that these are science *educational* films, not science fiction ones. The replacement of words is not accidental. Kyivnaukfilm popular science film studio promoted objects and phenomena that are well-established in science and technology. As for the history of Ukraine, the term popularization is not accurate because it is a struggle for the Ukrainian history, for its objective and impartial knowledge and coverage.

to the history. This is a feature film of the Ukrtefilm Studio in 5 parts “And Our Voice Will Be Heard by the World” (directed by R. Syn’ko, 1989), about the tragic fate of the Ukrainian writers and poets, repressed in the 1930s.

An attempt to show the situation of the division of forces in the confrontation with the UPA – NKVD, the tragedy of the establishment of the Soviet power in Western Ukraine is made in the paintings “The Carpathian Gold” (directed by V. Zhyvolup, 1991), “We Did Not Hear the Chimes when we Were Dying” (directed by M. Fedyuk, 1991), “The Last Bunker” (directed by V. Ilyenko, 1991), “People with Numbers” (directed by Ya. Lupiy, 1991). The effects of the imperial expansion were evidenced by the film “Afghani soldier” (directed by V. Mazur, 1991).

These works testify to the artists’ own view of the history of Ukraine. In the works of the Ukrainian artists, an analysis of the tragic consequences of the anti-Ukrainian policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet authorities, including the spiritual losses of the totalitarianism times, took place. Indicative is the film “To the Memory of the Fallen Houses” (directed by O. Samolevs’ka, 1988) about the destruction of the cathedrals: St. Michael’s Golden-domed, Uspens’ky, Mother of God of Pyrohoshchi, and other material monuments of history. The film “Dew Point” (directed by S. Losev, 1989) testified to the decline of peasant culture due to the forced organizing collective farms and famine of 1933 – 1932 and 1947. The first part of the film “The Ukrainians. Faith. Hope. Love” (directed by V. Schmotolokha, 1991) depicted the problem of Christianity in Ukraine, in particular, the fight of the Ukrainian orthodox church for its independence from Moscow patriarchy. The story of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, for which revival the Ukrainian intellectuals led a relentless campaign<sup>3</sup>, was recounted by the film “Through the ancient times into the future”, in particular, by its second part, “The Light of the Kyiv Helicone” (directed by B. Boyko, 1991).

The processes of perestroika led to a new change in myth consciousness. In the search for a “national face” and cultural selfidentification, at the end of the 1980s, cinematographers began to create different “easterns” like westerns, but on the national material. Most of these tapes came out after 1991, but some of them were seen by the the audience during the period of the state independence. For example, “Cossacks are going” (directed by S. Omelchuk, 1991), “Hold on, Cossack” (directed by V. Semanov, 1991).

Thus, at the beginning of the 1980s and 1990s, periodicals, documentaries, and educational films were the most expeditious in overcoming lack of environmental awareness, ignorance of the Ukrainian population about their historical past. Their historical role in promoting the separatist idea depended on the number of recipients. For example, the films of the Lviv Art Association “Halychyna-Film”, which creation was based mainly on modern and historical materials of the western regions of Ukraine, for example, called the films “We Didn’t Hear Chimes when We Were Dying”, “The Last Bunker”, “People with Numbers” had only regional rental. The screening of the movie “Hunger-33” took place on the central television of Ukraine. It happened just before the All-Ukrainian referendum of 1991 and, according to viewers, influenced its results (Barka Vasylj).

Indirectly, the theme of history was present in films on ethnography and folklore, tapes on the development of folk crafts, customs and rituals, applied arts. Such pictures were still

<sup>3</sup> At the first Congress of the International Association of the Ukrainian Language Researchers (1990) a number of documents and appeals were adopted, in particular, to the Verkhovna Rada of the Ukrainian SSR on the revival of the national shrine of the Ukrainian people, the decoration of the world culture - the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (Vidrodyty nacionaljnu svjatynju: zvernennja do Verkhovnoji Rady URSR Pershoho Konghresu Miznarodnoji asociaciji ukrajinstiv, 1991, p.95). In January of 1991, Les’ Tanyuk and Ihor Yukhnovs’ky asked Mykhaylo Horbachov to open the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (CSASBPMU, f. 1, d. 22, c. 2069, pp. 1–3).

produced at the Kyivnaukfilm studio, and were enlarged on the eve of the declaration of independence: “Okshulag” (directed by A. Borsyuk, 1991) is about the national sculptor Maria Hlushko; “Kozak as the True Soul (directed by M. Dzen’kevych, 1991) – a cultural exploration of the origin of the image of Cossack Mamay; “Passions around Symbolism” (directed by V. Hnenny, 1991) is a genealogy of state symbolism in the monuments of the times of Kyiv Rus. Biographical films appeared in which the authors sought to cover the epoch through the lives and actions of the historical figures: “Bohdan Khmelnytsky” (directed by S. Suprunyuk, 1991); “Paradise Islands of Hetman Sahaidachny” (directed by M. Tkachuk, 1991).

The themes that could not be fully realized in the pre-rebuilding period included the religious films. Such pictures began to appear on the eve of the celebration of the 1000th anniversary of the baptism of Kyivan Rus: “Chimes” and “Spiritual Schools of the Russian Orthodox Church” (both directed by S. Losev, 1987). Instead of anti-religious ideology the cinematography returned an unbiased view of the believing person and contradictory events in the history of religion. The authors speculated on the belief that, at all times, they inspired architects and painters to work – the film “Art and Religion” (directed by L. Klyuyev, 1991); the tragic missionary path of Fr. Oleksandr Men’, a popularizer of the theological books in the country of total atheism - the film “The Cross of Father Oleksandr” (directed by M. Levenko, 1991); appealed to religious holidays – the film “A Sad and Bright Holiday of ours” (dir. K. Krainiy, 1991) about Christmas, Easter, Trinity in the village of Nezhandkoviychi in Halychyna; advocated the restoration of the rights of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church – “The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church” (dir. O. Ihnatusha, 1991), “The Ukrainians. Faith. Hope. Love”(directed by V. Schmotolokha, 1991).

The Ukrainian cartoon makers successfully mastered the folk traditions and literature, expanded the genre-thematic range of this type of plastic art. Appeal to folklore, lyric-epic genres showed that the distinct features of national origin began to manifest themselves in the Ukrainian animation. There were some achievements in this area. Adaptation of playful Ukrainian songs, such as “Oh, where are you going ...” (dir. I. Hurvych, 1988), the screen version of the literary classic – “Terrible revenge” (dir. M. Tytov, film artist N. Huz’, 1989) were included into the treasury of the Ukrainian animation. Significantly, all mass-produced animated films (13-18 titles per year) were produced during this period in the Ukrainian language (CSASBPMU, f. 5116, d. 19, c. 3069, p. 38).

**The Conclusions.** Thus, having analyzed the progress of updating the repertoire of the Ukrainian film studios in the context of the perestroika process, we can draw some conclusions.

Firstly, with the beginning of the reform course, the authorities demanded that the artists should update the social and resonant issues. That is why, cinema artists had a focus on anti-alcohol issues.

Secondly, radiation distress gave many citizens a sense of a civic responsibility related to the protection of their homeland. Therefore in 1986 the environmental theme was one of the tops to receive unbiased artistic coverage.

Thirdly, there was a borrowing of the Ukrainian national motives for formulating. Initially, this was a screen shot of the Ukrainian cinema classics with fairly neutral, politically speaking, storylines. Later, works of the rehabilitated writers of Ukraine were screened. Movies were created in which the attention of the audience was focused on the pressing issues of public and spiritual life of Ukraine, promoting its moral and cultural values.

Fourthly, the topic of the historical past of the Ukrainian people became one of the debatable social issues of the time. Thus, cinema works appeared that covered the most

significant and active problems of the Ukrainian history and its present. The cinema raised the subject of the Holocaust, the Holodomor (intended artificial famine), the fate of the Crimean Tatar people after their deportation, the struggle of the population of the western regions of Ukraine for the creating the Ukrainian independent united state. There was a film attempting to show the situation of the division of forces in opposition to the UPA (Ukrainian Resistance Army) – NKVD (Internal Affairs Ministry), the tragedy of establishing the Soviet power in Western Ukraine, a new look at the events of the reunification of Western Ukraine with the Ukrainian SSR. Movies aimed at exposing the crimes of the Soviet totalitarian system and its repressive mechanisms were made up of a separate array. The filmmakers raised the issue of Christianity in Ukraine, in particular, the theme of the struggle of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church for independence from the Moscow Patriarchate.

The further study of the state of the Ukrainian cinema in the era of perestroika explains our attention to the problem of how liberalization of the repertoire policy led to the contemporary problems in the field of film production.

**Acknowledgments.** The author of the publication expresses sincere gratitude to the employees of the Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine (TSDAHO Ukraine) and employees of the Central State Archive of higher authorities and management of Ukraine (TSDAVO Ukraine) for the support and assistance in searching the archival material.

**Funding.** The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Abakumova, V. I.** (2019). Dijaljnistj teatriv shhodo vtilennja na sceni tvoriv ukrajinsjkoji dramaturghiji v roky perebudovy. [Activities of theaters for implementation on scenes of Ukrainian dramaturgy during period of perestroika]. *Historical studies of social progress*, 7, 12–19. URL: [http://issp.gnpu.edu.ua/sites/default/files/doc/abakumova\\_1.pdf](http://issp.gnpu.edu.ua/sites/default/files/doc/abakumova_1.pdf). doi: 10.31376/2411-5177-2019-7-12-19 [in Ukrainian]

**Abakumova, V. I.** (2019). The question of the use of Ukrainian in cinema at the end of the 1980s. Abstracts of Papers '2019: *Problems and prospects of implementation of innovative research results*, Vol. 4. (pp. 62–64). Valletta, Republic of Malta. URL: <https://ojs.ukrlogos.in.ua/index.php/conferences/issue/view/2019.12.13/2019.12.13.v4>. doi: 10.36074/13.12.2019.v4.02 [in Ukrainian]

**Barka Vasylj.** [Barka Vasylj]. *Klub poeziji – Poetry Club*. URL: <http://www.poetryclub.com.ua/metsr.php?id=209&type=critiques> [in Ukrainian]

*Centralnyj derzhavnyj arkhiv-muzej literatury i mystectva Ukrajinny [Central State Archives Museum of Literature and Art of Ukraine – CSAMLAU]*

*Centralnyi Derzhavnyi Arhiv Hromadskykh Obyednan Ukrainy [Central State Archives of Public Associations of Ukraine – CSAPAU]*

*Centralnyi Derzhavnyi Arkhiv Vyshchychkh Orhaniv Vlady i Upravlinnia Ukrainy [Central State Archives of the Supreme Bodies of Power and Management of Ukraine – CSASBPMU]*

**Cyba, Gh.** (2014). Poshuky nacionaljnoji identychnosti ta istorychnoji pravdy v ukrajinsjkomu kino doby Perebudovy (1986 – 1991) [The search for national identity and historical truth in the Ukrainian cinema of the day of Perestroika (1986 – 1991)]. *MIST: Mystectvo, istorija, suchasnistj, teorija – MIST: Art, history, modernity, theory*, 10, 224–233. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Mist\\_2014\\_10\\_18](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Mist_2014_10_18) [in Ukrainian]

**Ghosejko, L.** (2005). *Istorija ukrajinsjkogho kinematoghrafa. 1896 – 1995 [History of Ukrainian cinema. 1986 – 1995]*. Kyiv: KINO-KOLO, 464 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Kolokol Chernobylia.** Polnometrazhnyi film, 1987 [Chernobyl Bell. Full-length movie, 1987]. URL: <https://csdfmuseum.ru/films/33-F> [in Russian]

**Koroghodsikyj, R.** (1987). Vazhka stezja perebudovy: rozmova iz kinorezhyserom M. Bjelikovym [The difficult path of perestroika: talking to a filmmaker M. Bjelikovym]. *Kyiv, I*, 163–166. [in Ukrainian]

**O merakh po preodolenyju pjjanstva y alkogholyzma.** (1985). O merakh po preodolenyju pjjanstva y alkogholyzma: Postanovlenye Centraljnogho Komyteta KPSS ot 7.05.1985 [On measures to overcome drunkenness and alcoholism: Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU of 05/07/1985]. *KPSS v rezoljucijakh i reshenijakh sez dov, konferencij i plenumov TcK (1898 – 1988) – CPSU in resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee (1898 – 1988)* (Vol.15, pp. 21–27). Moskva. [in Russian].

**Porog.** (1988). Porog. Polnometrazhnyi film, 1988 [Threshold. Full-length movie, 1988]. URL: <https://csdfmuseum.ru/films/34-%D0%BF%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%B3> [in Russian]

**Tereshhenko, Ju.** (2008). Koly ty ne bajduzhyj [When you care about]. *Kino-Teatr*, 3. URL: [https://ktm.ukma.edu.ua/show\\_content.php?id=781](https://ktm.ukma.edu.ua/show_content.php?id=781) [in Ukrainian]

*Vidomchij arkhiv Ministerstva kuljturny Ukrainy [Departmental Archive of the Ministry culture of Ukraine]*

**Vidrodyty nacionaljnu svjatynju: zvernennja do Verkhovnoji Rady URSR Pershogho Konghresu Mizhnarodnoji asociaciji ukrajinstiv** [Revive the national shrine: appeal to the Verkhovna Rada of the Ukrainian SSR of the First Congress of the International Ukrainian Association] (1991). *Slovo i čas – Word and Time*, 1, 95. [in Ukrainian]

**Zubavina, I. B.** (2006). Ukrajinjske kino chasiv “perebudovy”: zmina doli [Ukrainian cinema since perestroika: a change in fate]. *Narysy z istoriji kinomystectva Ukrainy – Essays on the history of cinema in Ukraine* (pp. 313–370). Kyiv: Intertekhnologhija. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received December 17, 2019.*

*Article recommended for publishing 26/02/2021.*

UDC 327.5(470:477)“20”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226536

**Oleksiy POKOTYLO**

*PhD (Hystory), Leader Researcher at the Research Department problems of history of wars and martial arts, National Defence University of Ukraine named after Ivan Cherniakhovskiy, 28 Povitroflotsky Avenue, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 03049 (voyen\_ist@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-1136-5123

**Oleksandr NASHYVOCHNIKOV**

*PhD (Hystory), Head of Research Department problems of history of wars and martial arts, National Defence University of Ukraine named after Ivan Cherniakhovskiy, 28 Povitroflotsky Avenue, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 03049 (dr.alexander@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-4197-6408

**Олексій ПОКОТИЛО**

*кандидат історичних наук, провідний науковий співробітник науково-дослідного відділу проблем історії війн і воєнного мистецтва науково-дослідного центру воєнної історії Національного університету оборони України імені Івана Черняхівського, проспект Повітрофлотський, 28, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 03049 (voyen\_ist@ukr.net)*

**Олександр НАШИВОЧНИКОВ**

*кандидат історичних наук, начальник науково-дослідного відділу проблем історії війн і воєнного мистецтва науково-дослідного центру воєнної історії Національного університету оборони України імені Івана Черняхівського, проспект Повітрофлотський, 28, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 03049 (dr.alexander@ukr.net)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Pokotylo, O. & Nashyvochnikov, O. (2021). Sources of the Russian-Ukrainian Armed Conflict. *Skhidnoievropeiskiy Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 210–218. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226536

## SOURCES OF THE RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN ARMED CONFLICT

**Abstract. The purpose of the research** – to reveal the origins of the Russian-Ukrainian armed conflict at the beginning of the XXIst century, its preconditions and circumstances. **The methodology of the research** is based on the principles of historicism, systematics, scientificity, authorial objectivity, as well as the use of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization) and special historical (historical genetic, historical typological, historical systemic) methods. **The scientific novelty** consists in the fact that for the first time in the history of the Russian-Ukrainian relations, based on previously unknown sources, it has been clarified how at the end of the XXth century the political leadership of the Russian Federation laid the foundations for the Russian-Ukrainian armed conflict in 2014. **The Conclusions.** Since 1991, the Russian leadership has effectively inflamed the conflict in some regions, including the Crimea, by “not allowing” Ukraine to be an independent state with the right to European development. At the same time, in order to damage the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Ukraine, the Black Sea Fleet was used as the main lever of influence. It should be noted that the impact on the population of the Crimean peninsula, through the prism of events around the Black Sea Fleet, was carried out in many spheres, primarily,

military, political, informational, linguistic, etc. In our opinion, in 1997 the resolution of the issue of the Black Sea Fleet division marked the fact that by this time the majority of the population of the territory of the Crimea had formed a negative attitude towards the Ukrainian authorities and, as a result, towards the Armed Forces of Ukraine. Therefore, the rapid occupation of the Crimean peninsula in 2014 and the events in Donbass were a natural consequence of the unfriendly policy of the Russian political leadership towards Ukraine, which the leadership has been pursuing since 1991.

**Key words:** Ukraine, the Russian Federation, the Navy, the Black Sea Fleet, the Crimea, armed conflict.

## ВИТОКИ РОСІЙСЬКО-УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ЗБРОЙНОГО КОНФЛІКТУ

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* – розкрити витoki російсько-українського збройного конфлікту на початку ХХІ століття, його передумови та обставини. **Методологія дослідження** спирається на принципах історизму, системності, науковості, авторської об'єктивності, а також на використання загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, узагальнення) та спеціально-історичних (історико-генетичний, історико-типологічний, історико-системний) методів. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше в історії російсько-українських відносин на основі невідомих раніше джерел з'ясовано яким чином політичне керівництво Російської Федерації наприкінці ХХ століття заклало підвалини для виникнення російсько-українського збройного конфлікту 2014 року. **Висновки:** починаючи з 1991 року російське керівництво ефективно розпалювало конфлікт в окремих регіонах, зокрема в Криму, “не дозволяючи” Україні бути незалежною державою з правом на європейській розвиток. При цьому, з метою завдання шкоди територіальній цілісності і суверенітету України як основний важіль впливу був використаний Чорноморський флот. Зазначимо, що вплив на населення Кримського півострову скрізь призму подій навколо Чорноморського флоту здійснювався у багатьох сферах, насамперед воєнній, політичній, інформаційній, мовній тощо. Вирішення питання навколо розподілу Чорноморського флоту в 1997 році, на наш погляд, ознаменувало те, що к цьому моменту у більшості населення території Криму було сформовано негативне ставлення до української влади та, як слід, до Збройних Сил України. Тому, швидка окупація Кримського півострова в 2014 році та події на Донбасі стали закономірним наслідком недружньої політики російського політичного керівництва по відношенню до України, яку воно здійснювало починаючи із 1991 року.

**Ключові слова:** Україна, Російська Федерація, Військово-Морські Сили, Чорноморський флот, Крим, збройний конфлікт

**The Problem Statement.** Nowadays, there is no doubt that the Russian-Ukrainian armed conflict is the result of a long hybrid war of the Russian Federation against Ukraine since August 1991. After the proclamation of Ukraine's independence, the Russian political leadership understood that the Ukrainian society did not want to return to the orbit of the Russian Federation, but sought to rebuild its state on a democratic basis (Tsviliuk & Kutuzova, 2009, p. 209). Of course, this was a challenge not only to the leaders of the imperial ambitions. Sovereign Ukraine questioned the existence of the entire political system of the Russian state (Seheda & Shevchuk, 2019, p. 1).

It was at that time, when the work began on the gradual destruction of Ukraine as an independent state, which led to an open Russian-Ukrainian conflict in 2014. Inflation of this conflict began to be carried out against the background of acute problems of division of the Black Sea Fleet in the Crimea (Fedorovykh, 2007).

**The objective** of the research is to elucidate the methods of a hybrid war conducting and to prevent further actions of the aggressor country aimed at destroying the sovereignty and independence of Ukraine.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications.** A significant number of scientific works, including the works of modern historians, in particular, O. Boyko, S. Kulchytsky,

M. Doroshko and the others, are devoted to the problem of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict in 2014. The intensification of the study of the causes of the Russian-Ukrainian armed conflict is, of course, connected with the attempt to find the ways to overcome the conflict. However, in our opinion, among the publications on the emergence of modern local wars and armed conflicts, very little attention is paid to the circumstances and preconditions for their occurrence. Even domestic authors sometimes ignore these issues.

**The purpose** of the article is elucidation and analysis of the causes and circumstances of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict in 2014 with a further identification of the ways to counter the aggressive intentions of the anti-Ukrainian forces.

**The Basic Material Statement.** Undeclared wars, such as the one begun by Russia against Ukraine in 2014, are usually described as hybrid by modern researchers and are qualified as a supposedly new phenomenon in the history of wars. However, in our opinion, the undeclared war for the destruction of the Ukrainian statehood began on August 24, 1991, when Ukraine's independence was declared (Postanova, 1991). According to the plan of the Russian political leadership after the collapse of the USSR and the proclamation of the Russian Federation as its successor, the Soviet republics, as supposedly sovereign states, were to unite in the Union of Independent States headed by Moscow leadership.

However, the desire of the population of Ukraine to get rid of Moscow control contradicted the plans of Boris Yeltsin and his team, which was later confirmed by the results of the All-Ukrainian referendum, when more than 90% of its participants supported the Declaration of Independence of Ukraine (Adamovych, 2009, p. 16).

Therefore, in order to prevent Ukraine's withdrawal from the orbit of the Russian political leadership influence, on August 26, 1991, P. Voshchanov, the press secretary of the President of the Russian Federation, issued an official statement containing an open threat to the neighbouring states, including Ukraine. It was stated, in particular, that in case of the republics termination of allied relations with Russia, the Russian Federation "reserves the right to raise the issue of border revision". P. Voshchanov explained that the statement mainly concerns the Crimea, Donbass and North Kazakhstan, where there are a significant number of the Russians. If these republics withdraw from the alliance with Russia, then "we must take care of the population living there, and we must not forget that these lands were developed by the Russians. Russia is unlikely to agree to give them away so easily" (Illarionov, 2011). Later, this verbal threat by P. Voshchanov was practically realized in 2014 in the Ukrainian Crimea and Donbass.

The next day, in the speech by the President of the Russian Federation Boris Yeltsin, the claims were made to own the Black Sea Fleet and territorial allegations against Ukraine were formulated. They soon grew into a persistent problem in the Ukrainian-Russian relations.

However, at night on 7 – 8 December of 1991, near Bilovezka Pushcha (the village of Viskuli, Bilorus) the heads of governments of the three allied republics: S. Shushkevich and V. Kebich, the representatives of the Republic Belarus, and B. Yeltsin and G. Burbulis from the Russian Federation, L. Kravchuk and V. Fokin from Ukraine announced the termination of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (hereinafter – the USSR) and signed the Agreement on the Commonwealth of Independent States (hereinafter – the CIS), which finally ceased the existence of the USSR (Smolii, 2016, p. 137).

The Agreement, which Ukraine ratified with reservations, came into force on December 10, 1991 (Central State Archive of the highest authorities and administration of Ukraine – CSAHAU, f. 1, d. 16, c. 4636, pp. 57–58). In the Agreement, in particular, it was determined that "*the member states of the Commonwealth will maintain under a joint*

*command the common military strategic space, including unified control of nuclear weapons, ... jointly guarantee the necessary conditions for the location, operation, material and social security of strategic armed forces*" (CSAHAAU, f. 1, d. 16, c. 4636, pp. 57–58). However, in this document the implementation mechanism was not set out, as the CIS political leadership did not have a common understanding of what should be considered under the term "strategic armed forces", as well as their status, conditions of deployment and provision at the territory of sovereign states. Of course, this made it possible to use the Provisions of the Agreement in one's own political interests (Fedorovykh, 2007).

On December 30, 1991, at the meeting of the CIS heads of the states in Minsk, there was confirmed the legal right of each member state to establish its own armed forces (Chernenko, 1992, p. 1). As a result, the objects of the Soviet Union subordination located at the territory of Ukraine became its state property. All members of the Commonwealth, without any exception, legally acknowledged that Ukraine would exercise this right without any conditions from January 3, 1992 (Chernenko, 1992, p. 1). All this was confirmed in Art. 2 of the Agreement of the Council of Heads of State of the Commonwealth of Independent States "On the Armed Forces and Border Troops" (Uhoda, 1991). It was agreed that the Joint Command of the Strategic Restraint Forces would include only those military formations that would be determined by each state on a special list specified in a separate protocol. Keeping to the Provisions of these agreements, during the negotiations on January 2–3, 1992 in Kyiv, Ukraine proposed a substantiated list of formations, units and establishments to be included into the strategic forces for the period until the export of nuclear weapons from Ukraine, i.e., by the end of 1994 (Savchenko, 1997, pp. 12–13).

Another result of this meeting was that on January 3, 1992, the troops stationed at the Ukrainian territory were to begin taking a voluntary oath of allegiance to the people of Ukraine (Danilov, 2000, p. 69). It should be emphasized that on November 22, 1991, the Minister of Defense of Ukraine, Colonel-General K. Morozov, in an article "Being with the People at a Crucial Period in its History" published in "The Narodna Armiya" newspaper, openly stated that the Ukrainian Navy would be formed on the basis of a part of the Black Sea Fleet of the former USSR, based on the territory of Ukraine. The Minister of Defense of Ukraine also explained in detail the mechanism of servicemen transfer to the Armed Forces of Ukraine (Pokotylo, 2011, pp. 733–735). At the same time, in the newspaper there were explained in detail the provisions of the adopted laws on guarantees of the rights and freedoms of servicemen. It should be noted that this article was also reprinted by the newspaper of the Black Sea Fleet "Flag of the Motherland" (Danilov, 2000, p. 65).

In this context, something needs to be clarified. The fact is that after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Ukraine inherited about 2 000 strategic and up to 4 200 tactical nuclear warheads, as well as 176 intercontinental ballistic missiles and 40 strategic bombers as nuclear weapons carriers (Shama, 2018). At the same time, a significant part of the bombers belonged to the aviation of the Black Sea Fleet, which made it a powerful lever of influence not so much militarily but politically.

Despite this, very little attention was paid to the issue of subordination of the Black Sea Fleet, primarily, because there was a struggle for power in Ukraine and Russia during this period. In fact, the leaders of both countries ignored the importance of resolving the naval issue. For instance, the Ukrainian leadership did not arrive in Sevastopol, hoping that the subordination of the Black Sea Fleet to the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine would take place by itself, even the commander of the Ukrainian fleet was not appointed (Danilov, 2000, pp. 69–70). At the same time, the Russian

authorities did not need the Black Sea Fleet at all. Thus, according to the commander of the Black Sea Fleet, Admiral I. Kasatonov "...*The situation really looked strange. Moscow was stubbornly silent, although both the Ministry of Defense and the General Staff were well aware of the pressure of the independent government on us (Ukraine – the author's note). Instead of a clear order, abstract words of support were received*" (Nordvik, 2015).

As the subsequent events showed, the extremely favourable moment for the establishment of the Ukrainian Navy was not used. As a result, the policy of the Black Sea Fleet Command changed to the opposite, as the superficial attitude to the naval problem and the delay in its solution by the leadership and the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine was recognized as their weakness. Russia began a political pressure on Ukraine to reach a favourable decision on the Black Sea Fleet as a ownership guarantor of the Crimean peninsula (Mamchak, 2007, p. 201).

However, despite the negative processes, on January 3, 1992, the troops stationed at the territory of Ukraine, in addition to the troops that were the part of the Strategic forces, began to take a voluntary oath of allegiance to the people of Ukraine. The corresponding cipher telegramme of the Minister of Defense of Ukraine with instructions on the beginning of taking the oath was sent on December 31, 1991 (Kuz'muk, 2001, p. 279). But if everything was clarified and fully predicted concerning taking the oath in the army units at the territory of Ukraine, for definite reasons the situation was quite uncertain in the Black Sea Fleet.

Thus, on January 4, 1992, the commander of the Black Sea Fleet, Admiral I. Kasatonov, without the consent of the Ukrainian leadership, voluntarily declared that the Black Sea Fleet was Russian and would be only subordinate to the USSR Minister of Defense Marshal E. Shaposhnikov and the Commander-in-Chief of the USSR Navy – Admiral V. Chernavin, Deputy Minister of Defense (Kasatonov, 2015). The next day, at the meeting of the Naval Military Council chaired by Admiral I. Kasatonov, it was decided not to take the oath until the agreement was reached between Ukraine and Russia on the ownership of the Black Sea Fleet (Savchenko, 1997, p. 19).

I. Kasatonov himself recalls the events of that time: "... *I made my own decision (concerning the Black Sea Fleet – the author's note)... and announced that the Black Sea Fleet is Russian and subordinates exclusively to the President of Russia and Marshal of Aviation Yevgeny Shaposhnikov, Commander-in-Chief of the Joint Forces of the CIS. At the same time, I forbade taking the Ukrainian military oath on ship boards and in naval units* (Kozak, 2019).

At the same time, the commander of the Black Sea Fleet began to organize personally taking the CIS oath and openly opposed the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine. All his activities were aimed at changing the public opinion in the locations of the fleet, the military units and the navy to make servicemen give up the desire to serve the Ukrainian people. For instance, for the publication in the naval newspaper "The Flag of the Motherland" (January 10, 1992) of L. Kravchuk's address, the President of Ukraine to the personnel of the navy on taking a military oath of allegiance to the people of Ukraine, Admiral I. Kasatonov fired the editor of the newspaper, Captain of Rank 1, Ya. Kniazev in reserve (Mamchak, 2007, pp. 203–204).

Admiral I. Kasatonov's anti-Ukrainian position determined the ideology of the Russian Federation's confrontation with Ukraine against the background of the Black Sea Fleet problems. The main idea was the following: since the Fleet was based in Georgia, Russia and Ukraine, it was strategic and should report to the command of the CIS Navy, i.e., the Navy of the Russian Federation. In this case, representatives of the non-strategic Ministry of Defense of Ukraine would be prohibited from visiting the strategic Black Sea Fleet. In addition, the laws of Ukraine and orders of the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine did not concern the Black Sea Fleet.

In Ukraine, meanwhile, priority steps were taken to build up the Ukrainian army. Thus, on January 9, 1992, at the first All-Ukrainian Conference on Military Construction, held in Kyiv, there were formulated the urgent tasks of reforming the Armed Forces of Ukraine. The meeting was chaired by L. Kravchuk, the President of Ukraine – Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Ukraine in the presence of I. Pliushch, the Chairman of the Verkhovna Rada and V. Fokin, the Prime Minister of Ukraine.

However, the Ministry of Defense did not take decisive action to establish the Ukrainian Navy. In addition, on January 11, 1992 in Kyiv during the negotiations of the Ukrainian and Russian state delegations on the military political issues, the Ukrainian side stated that it planned to form the future Ukrainian Navy only based on the part of the Black Sea Fleet. This decision was confirmed on January 16, 1992 during the meeting of the CIS heads of the states in Moscow (Kolotilova, 2001, pp. 41–42). Thus, the negotiations on the status of the Black Sea Fleet reached the interstate level: the issue of its division between Ukraine and Russia arose.

The resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Russia of May 21, 1992 strengthened significantly and turned the naval propaganda into an outspoken anti-Ukrainian political campaign in Sevastopol and the Crimea. “On the Legal Assessment of the Highest State Authorities of the RSFSR to Change the Status of the Crimea, Adopted in 1954” (CSAHAAU, f. 5233, d. 1, c. 13, p. 41).

The Black Sea Fleet Command also resorted to provocations. Thus, on January 28, 1992, under the legend of preparations for the 300th anniversary of the Russian Fleet, the cruiser “Moscow” and the patrol ship “Immaculate” were sent from Sevastopol to Novorossiysk. On board of the cruiser, the command and the Military Council of the Navy met with Boris Yeltsin, the Russian President and Marshal E. Shaposhnikov, the Commander-in-Chief of the United CIS Armed Forces. During the meeting, Boris Yeltsin stated that he opposed the idea of the division of the Fleet. Not only the legislative authority but the leaders of Russia openly supported the commander of the Black Sea Fleet, Admiral I. Kasatonov, who kept to the idea of the united Fleet (Mamchak, 2007, p. 205; Savchenko, 1997, pp. 25–26).

Subsequently, on February 6, 1992, the Verkhovna Rada of Russia adopted the resolution “On Continuing Work on Studying the Legal Validity of Decisions of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of February 19, 1954 and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of April 26, 1954 on Withdrawal of the Crimean Region from the RSFSR” (Postanovlenie, 1992) and the resolution “On the Unity of the Red Banner Black Sea Fleet”, which, in particular, stated: “*Having considered the situation around the Red Banner Black Sea Fleet as a result of unilateral actions of the leadership of the Ukrainian Republic, the Verkhovna Rada of the Russian Federation resolves: the Government of the Russian Federation take all necessary measures to preserve the Red Banner Black Sea Fleet, which protects the interests of all CIS member states in the Mediterranean in accordance with the Agreement on the establishment of the Commonwealth of Independent States of December 8, 1991* (Postanovlenie, 1992a).

Thus, military sailors were involved into the political struggle, and the political leadership of the Russian Federation with the help of the navy continued planning to control the entire Black Sea coast of the Ukrainian state from Odesa to Kerch. Of course, the goal of the Russian leadership was to return gradually the whole territory of Ukraine to its sphere of influence, even by force. This is indirectly confirmed by the memoirs of Admiral I. Kasatonov: “*Mere defense is not my tactic. I received the blessing of Patriarch Oleksiy II so that the fleet would continue to be Russian. I initiated the adoption of the Act of State Independence of the Republic of Crimea by the Crimean Parliament... If Moscow had put pressure a little, demonstrating political will, the Crimea could have belonged to Russia in 1992...*” (Kasatonov, 2015).

At that time, the separatist movement intensified in the Crimea and Sevastopol. Decrees of the President of Ukraine and Resolutions of the Verkhovna Rada were sabotaged. The Soviet flags hang over the official institutions of the Crimea. The pro-Russian paramilitary organizations of the “Cossacks” (repeatedly appealed to the officers of the 126th Motorized Rifle Horlivka Division for weapons) functioned openly. The “military patriotic clubs” functioned openly as well. There were cases of beatings of the local Ukrainian organizations activists by supporters of the “independence” of the Crimea. There was abuse of the state Ukrainian symbols, etc. (UNSO, 2018).

At that time, in the Crimea the most radical pro-Russian political parties and public organizations were: the Communist Party of Ukraine, led by L. Hrach; Sevastopol organization of the Russian Patriotic Assembly, which was later renamed into the Russian People’s Chamber of Sevastopol, headed by O. Kruglov and R. Telyatnikova; the Republican Movement of the Crimea, led by a lawyer Yu. Meshkov; the Russian Party, led by S. Shuvainikov and the Republican Party of the Crimea, led by V. Mezhak. As the result of their activity, in the information environment, a negative public opinion was spread about forced Ukrainization, about the Ukrainian statehood, as hostile to Russia, and etc. At the same time, the Ukrainian press was not sent to Sevastopol for almost six months. Strengthening of the information blockade and ideological campaign against Ukraine, which, with the silent observation by local authorities, began to take provocative forms: humiliating anti-Ukrainian inscriptions loomed everywhere; not only at rallies, but also in the press the calls to arm against the People’s Movement of Ukraine were published (Mamchak, 2007, p. 212).

In the spring of 1992, in particular, from March 24 till April 9, the relations between Ukraine and Russia deteriorated considerably because of the issue of the Black Sea Fleet and entered an active phase of confrontation at both political and military levels. Thus, on April 1, 1992, the Commander-in-Chief of the CIS Navy, Admiral V. Chernavin, arrived in Sevastopol. Under his leadership, the Black Sea Fleet’s actions continued against Ukraine’s course to create its own fleet. Under Admiral V. Chernavin leadership the activities in Sevastopol were held with the participation of O. Rutskey, the Russian Vice President. The representative of the President of Ukraine in Sevastopol I. Yermakov wasn’t reported on the participation of O. Rutskey in the activities in Sevastopol. The governmental parliamentary delegation of Ukraine headed by B. Sharikov, the Assistant to the President of Ukraine for Military Affairs, Lieutenant General, was simply ignored (Mamchak, 2007, p. 212).

As it turned out, the arrival of O. Rutskey in Sevastopol on April 3 of the same year and some excitement of the high command of the Black Sea Fleet around his arrival was necessary to gain public support of the Russian President Boris Yeltsin’s statement, which was made the same day: *“In case of any attempt to unilaterally change the status of the Black Sea Fleet, the Russian Federation will be forced to take the fleet under its jurisdiction”* (Mamchak, 2007, p. 213). O. Rutskey stated that the Black Sea Fleet *“was Russian, it will remain Russian”* (Mamchak, 2007, p. 89), *“the Act of transfer of the Crimea to Ukraine in 1954 is not a document” and further he sees the Crimea as the part of Russia* (CSAHAAU, f. 1, d. 16, c. 4742, p. 171).

On April 5, 1992, L. Krachuk, the President of Ukraine, being aware of the threat of subordination of the Black Sea Fleet to Russia, summoned an extraordinary meeting of the National Security Council of Ukraine. The result of the meeting was the historic Decree of the President of Ukraine № 209/92 “On Urgent Measures for the Formation of the Armed Forces of Ukraine”, the second paragraph of which clearly states: *“To form the Naval Forces of Ukraine on the basis of the Black Sea Fleet forces stationed at the territory of Ukraine. The Ministry of Defense of Ukraine to start forming the governing bodies of the Naval Forces*

of Ukraine, making agreement with the Commander-in-Chief of the United Forces of the Commonwealth on the list of ships and units of the Black Sea Fleet, which are temporarily transferred to the operational subordination to the command of the Strategic Forces of the Commonwealth” (CSAHAAU, f. 5233, d. 1, c. 42, pp. 175–176).

It should be added that the final issue regarding the division of the Black Sea Fleet of the former Soviet Union was determined on May 28, 1997 in the Agreement between Ukraine and the Russian Federation, according to which the Black Sea Fleet was distributed in the ratio of 81,7% to Russia and 18,3 % – to Ukraine. According to the official data, the division of the Black Sea Fleet was finally completed in the second half of 1997 (Pokotylo, 2011, p. 734). However, it can be stated that in 1997 the issue of the division of the Black Sea Fleet was completed, while the political issue of returning Ukraine to the sphere of influence of the Russian Federation, on the contrary, only began. Whereas during 1991 – 1997, with the assistance of the Russian political leadership, the majority of the population of the territory of the Crimea developed a negative attitude towards the Ukrainian authorities and, as it should be, towards the Armed Forces of Ukraine, at the same time, the Black Sea Fleet of the Russian Federation had respect and moral support among the population, even many years later. All these factors contributed to the rapid occupation of the Crimea in 2014.

**The Conclusions.** Having analyzed the documents of that period thoroughly, the authors came to the following conclusions:

firstly, since 1991, the political leadership of the Russian Federation has begun covert activities to return Ukraine to its sphere of influence;

secondly, in order to damage the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Ukraine, the Black Sea Fleet was used as the main lever of influence;

thirdly, the influence on the population of the Crimean peninsula through the prism of events concerning the Black Sea Fleet was carried out in many spheres, primarily, military, political, informational, linguistic, etc., which contributed to the occupation of the Crimea in 2014.

**Acknowledgement.** We express sincere gratitude to all the members of the editorial board for the advice they provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

**Financing.** The authors did not receive any financial support for the research, authorship and / or publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Adamovych, S. V.** (2009). Diialnist Narodnogo Rukhu Ukrainy v Donbasi v umovakh zdobuttia Ukrainoiu nezalezhnosti [Activities of the People’s Movement of Ukraine in Donbass in the conditions of Ukraine’s independence]. *Abstracts of Papers '09: Narodny Rukh Ukrainy mistse v istorii ta politytsi.* (pp. 12–16). Odesa. [in Ukrainian]

**Chernenko, P.** (1992). Soglasheniia podpisany, voprosy ostaiutsia [Agreements have been signed, questions remain]. *Krasnaia Zvezda, 1–2 (20688-20689), 1, 3.* [in Russian]

**Danilov, A. P.** (2000). *Ukrains'kij flot: bilia dzherel vidrodzhennia [Ukrainian fleet: near the sources of revival].* Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo imeni Oleny Telihy, 600 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Fedorovych, A.** (2007). *Razdel Chernomorskoho flota v tsifrah I faktakh [Distribution of the Black Sea Fleet in figures and facts].* URL: <http://fondiv.ru/articles/3/193/> [in Russian]

**Illarionov, A.** (2011). *Zaiavlenie Pavla Voschanova 26 avhusta 1991 h. [Pavel Voshchanov’s statement August 26, 1991].* URL: <https://aillarionov.livejournal.com/287920.html> [in Russian]

**Kasatonov, I.** (2015). *Oborona Sevastopolia ot Ukrainy [Defense of Sevastopol from Ukraine].* URL: <https://rg.ru/2015/09/29/rodina-sevastopol.html> [in Russian]

**Kolotilova, L. M.** (Comps.). (2001). *Uhoda pro stvorennia Spivdruzhnosti Nezalezhnykh Derzhav vid 8 hrudnia 1991 r. [Agreement on the Establishment of the Commonwealth of Independent States of December 8, 1991].* *Ukraina – Rossiia. 1990–2000 rr. Dokumenty ta materialy.* Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter, 776 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Kozak, Yu.** (2019). *Vernym farvaterom skvoz' vse shtorma* [The right fairway through all storms]. URL: <http://redstar.ru/vernym-farvaterom-skvoz-vse-shtorma/> [in Russian]

**Kuz'muk, O. I.** (Ed.) (2001). *Viys'kove budivnytstvo v Ukraini v XX stolitti: istorichnyj narys, podii, portrety* [Military construction in Ukraine in the XX century: historical essay, events, portraits]. Kyiv: Vydavnychj dim "In Yure", 448 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Mamchak, M. A.** (2007). *Ukraina: shliakh do moria. Istoriiia Ukrainskoho flotu*. [Ukraine: the way to the sea. History of the Ukrainian fleet]. Sniatyn: PrutPrynt, 404 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Nordvik, V.** (2015). *Tret'ia oborona Sevastopolia* [The third defense of Sevastopol]. URL: <https://rg.ru/2015/09/29/rodina-sevastopol.html> [in Russian]

**Pokotylo, O.** (2011). Z istorii stanovlennia Vijs'kovo-Mors'kykh Syl Ukrainy. [From the history of the formation of the Naval Forces of Ukraine]. *Abstracts of Papers 'II: Voenna istoriia Pivnichnoho Prychornomor'ia ta Tavrii*. (pp. 733–735). Sevastopol. [in Ukrainian]

**Postanova.** (1991). Postanova Verkhovnoj Rady Ukrain's'koj RSR №1427-XII vid 24.08.1991 "Pro proholoshennia nezalezhnosti Ukrainy" [Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of the Ukrainian SSR №1427-XII of 24.08.1991 "On the Proclamation of Independence of Ukraine"]. URL: <https://ips.ligazakon.net/document/view/t142700?an=2> [in Ukrainian]

**Postanovlenie.** (1992). Postanovlenie Verkhovnoho Soveta Rossijskoj Federatsii №2292-H ot 06.02.1992 "O prodolzhenii raboty po izucheniu pravovoj obosnovannosti reshenij Prezidiuma Verkhovnoho Soveta SSSR ot 19 fevralia 1954 h. i Verkhovnoho Soveta SSSR ot 26 apreliia 1954 h. o vyvedenii Krymskoj oblasti iz sostava RSFSR" [Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation № 2292-G of 06.02.1992 "On the continuation of work on the study of the legal validity of the decisions of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of 19 February 1954 and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of 26 April 1954 on the withdrawal of the Crimean region RSFSR"]. URL: <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/901606173> [in Russian]

**Postanovlenie.** (1992a). Postanovlenie Verkhovnoho Soveta Rossijskoj Federatsii № 2293-1 ot 06.02.1992 "O edinstve Krasnoznamennoho Chernomorskoho flota" [Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation №2293-1 of 06.02.1992 "On the unity of the Red Banner Black Sea Fleet"]. URL: <https://www.lawmix.ru/expertlaw/271380/> [in Russian]

**Savchenko, N. A.** (1997). *Anatomiia neob'javlennoj voiny* [Anatomy of undeclared war]. Kyiv: Ukrain's'ka perspektyva, 344 p. [in Russian]

**Sheda, S. P. & Shevchuk, V. P.** (2019). Hibrydna vijna Rosii proty Ukrainy: istorichnyj vymir [Russia's hybrid war against Ukraine: a historical dimension]. *Nauka i oborona*, 1, 31–35. doi: 10.33099/2618-1614-2019-6-1-31-35 [in Ukrainian]

**Shama, O.** (2018). Memorandum zamedlennoho dejstviiia [Delayed memorandum]. *Zhurnal NV – Journal NV*, 4. URL: <https://magazine.nv.ua/journal/2987-journal-no-4/memorandum-zamedlennoho-dejstvija.html> [in Russian]

**Smolii, V. A.** (Ed.). (2016). *25 rokov nezalezhnosti: narysy istorii tvorennia natsii ta derzhavy* [25 years of independence: essays on the history of the nation and state]. Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr, 726 p. [in Ukrainian].

*Tsentr'nyj derzhavnyj arkhiv vyschykh orhaniv vlady ta upravlinnia Ukrainy* [Central State Archive of the highest authorities and administration of Ukraine – CSAHAAU]

**Tsivliuk, S. A. & Kutuzova, N. H.** (2009). Intelektual'na elita i vidrodzhennia ukrains'koi derzhavnosti [Intellectual elite and the revival of Ukrainian statehood]. *Abstracts of Papers '09: Narodnyj Rukh Ukrainy mistse v istorii ta politytsi*. (pp. 204–209). Odesa. [in Ukrainian]

**Uhoda.** (1991). Uhoda Rady Hlav derzhav-uchasnyts' Spivdruzhnosti Nezalezhnykh Derzhav vid 30 hrudnia 1991 r. "Pro Zbrojni Syly I Prykordonni vijs'ka" [Agreement of the Council of Heads of State of the Commonwealth of Independent States of December 30, 1991 "On the Armed Forces and Border Troops"]. URL: [https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/997\\_115](https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/997_115) [in Ukrainian]

**UNSO.** (2018). UNSO: Pokhid na Krym 1992 r. [UNSO: Hike to the Crimea in 1992]. *Infotsentr UNSO*. URL: <http://unso.in.ua/uk/new/unso-pohid-na-krym-1992-r> [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on February 07, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 327(438:477)“19/20”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226553

***Lyudmyla STRILCHUK***

*PhD hab. (History), Professor of World History Department, Lesia Ukrainka East European National University, 24 Chopin Street, Lutsk, Ukraine, postal code 43000 (strilczuk@ua.fm)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-0700-6080

**ResearcherID:** G-8696-2019

***Oleksandr DOBRZHANSKYI***

*PhD hab. (History), Professor, Dean of Political Science History and International Relations Faculty, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, 2 M. Kotsyubynskoho Street, Chernivtsi, Ukraine, postal code 58000 (dobrzhanskiy@i.ua)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-3817-188X

**ResearcherID:** R-7899-2016

***Людмила СТРИЛЬЧУК***

*доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри всесвітньої історії Східноєвропейського національного університету імені Лесі Українки, вул. Шопена, 24, м. Луцьк, Україна, індекс 43000 (strilczuk@ua.fm)*

***Олександр ДОБРЖАНСЬКИЙ***

*доктор історичних наук, професор, декан факультету історії політології та міжнародних відносин Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича, вул. М. Коцюбинського, 2, м. Чернівці, Україна, індекс 58000 (dobrzhanskiy@i.ua)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Strilchuk, L. & Dobrzhanskiy, O. (2021). Poland's Foreign Policy Concepts Traditions and Innovations Regarding Ukraine (the XXth – the beginning of the XXIst century). *Skhidnoievropeyskiy Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 219–228. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226553

**POLAND'S FOREIGN POLICY CONCEPTS TRADITIONS  
AND INNOVATIONS REGARDING UKRAINE  
(the XXth – the beginning of the XXIst century)**

**Abstract.** *In the modern world, the state's foreign policy is one of the supporting foundations of statehood, and therefore the study of the foreign policy concepts formation and implementation experience is relevant and necessary for the development of the modern interstate and good neighborly relations between Ukraine and Poland. The Polish political elite, in different historical periods, distinguished visions about Ukraine clearly, its role and significance for Rzeczpospolita (Commonwealth), and these visions remained constant, actualized over time, or, conversely, acquired new shapes and coloring. The Piast and the Jagiellonian concepts have been the main Poland's foreign policy concepts since the beginning of the XXth century, and continue to be of utmost importance and that new or existing foreign policy doctrines have been created or developed based on them. The article depicts Poland's foreign policy concepts evolution regarding Ukraine, in particular, and the*

eastern vector of Polish politics in general. **The purpose of the research** is to analyze and compare Poland's foreign policy concepts evolution towards Ukraine and to study the factors that influenced the transformation of these concepts. **The methodology of the research** is based on the principles of historicism in the unity of all its components, systematization and scientificity. The interdisciplinary research is focused on the involvement of historical comparative and historical systemic methods, methods of microhistorical analysis. **The scientific novelty** is that there is the continuation of studies, which were initiated by domestic, Polish and other foreign researchers, in particular on Poland's foreign policy concepts formation and implementation in the eastern direction and on Ukraine in particular. **The Conclusions.** The historical traditions of Poland's eastern foreign policy vector are obvious, and although the Polish eastern policy forms may have changed, its content has balanced between two established concepts: the Jagiellonian and the Piast. The Republic of Poland having used the positive experience of the past and striving to have a reliable ally on its eastern border, builds a modern eastern policy vector in which Ukraine is given one of the leading roles in the best traditions of the Jagiellonian foreign policy doctrine.

**Key words:** Poland, Ukraine, foreign policy, Jagiellonian concept, Piast concept, Prometheanism, incorporation, eastern policy.

## ТРАДИЦІЇ ТА НОВАЦІЇ У ЗОВНІШНЬОПОЛІТИЧНИХ КОНЦЕПЦІЯХ ПОЛЬЩІ ЩОДО УКРАЇНИ (XX – початок XXI ст.)

**Анотація.** У сучасному світі зовнішня політика держави є однією із несучих підвалин державності, а тому вивчення досвіду формування та реалізації зовнішньополітичних концепцій є актуальним і необхідним для розбудови сучасних міждержавних і добросусідських відносин України та Республіки Польща. У польській політичній еліті, в різні історичні періоди, чітко вирізнялися бачення щодо України, її ролі та значення для Речі Посполитої, і ці бачення залишалися сталими, актуалізуючись у часі, чи ж навпаки, набували нових обрисів і забарвлення. З початку XX століття головними зовнішньополітичними концепціями Польщі були і продовжують залишатися п'ястівська та ягелонська теорії, і, саме на основі них створювалися нові чи розбудовувалися уже існуючі доктрини зовнішньої політики. Представлена стаття є спробою проілюструвати еволюцію зовнішньополітичних концепцій Польщі щодо України, зокрема, та східного вектору польської політики, загалом. **Мета статті** полягає в аналізі та порівнянні еволюції зовнішньополітичних концепцій Польщі щодо України та дослідженні чинників, котрі впливали на трансформацію цих концепцій. **Методологічну основу** становлять принципи історизму в єдності всіх його компонентів, системності та науковості. Міждисциплінарне дослідження орієнтоване на залучення історико-порівняльного й історико-системного методів, прийомів мікроісторичного аналізу. **Наукова новизна** полягає у продовженні студій, започаткованих вітчизняними, польськими та іншими зарубіжними дослідниками, зокрема щодо формування та реалізації зовнішньополітичних концепцій Польщі у східному напрямку і щодо України зокрема. **Висновки.** Історичні традиції східного зовнішньополітичного вектору Польщі очевидні, і, хоча, могли змінюватися форми польської східної політики, зміст її балансував поміж двома усталеними концепціями: ягелонською та п'ястівською. Використовуючи позитивний досвід минулого, прагнучи мати надійного союзника за своїм східним кордоном Республіка Польща, у кращих традиціях, ягелонської зовнішньополітичної доктрини вибудовує вектор сучасної східної політики у якій Україні відводиться одна із чільних ролей.

**Ключові слова:** Польща, Україна, зовнішня політика, ягелонська концепція, п'ястівська концепція, прометеїзм, інкорпорація, східна політика.

**The Problem Statement.** The centuries-old history of the Ukrainian-Polish neighborhood absorbed many examples of good neighborly and allied relations, along with numerous conflicts and confrontations. The historical neighborhood of the two peoples was not always the neighborhood of two states: often the Ukrainian and the Polish lands were part of the same states, such as the Austro-Hungarian Empire or the Russian Empire, were closely

linked by “friendship” in the Soviet era of the second half of the XXth century. One of the manifestations of the common historical heritage is the Ukrainian lands presence in the First and Second Rzeczpospolita, which, in fact, implies that the Poles deprived the Ukrainians of statehood twice. (It implies, for example, the Ukrainians loss in the Ukrainian-Polish War. In addition, the above-mentioned statement belongs to A. Michnik, a Polish public figure and journalist). However, despite the “swing of history” in the Polish political elite, in different historical periods, visions concerning Ukraine were distinguished clearly, and these visions remained stable, updated over time, or, conversely, acquired new shapes and coloring.

In the modern world, the state's foreign policy is one of the supporting foundations of statehood, and therefore the study of the foreign policy concepts formation and implementation experience is relevant and necessary for the development of modern interstate and good neighborly relations between Ukraine and Poland. Taking everything into consideration, we propose to study Poland's foreign policy concepts formation and evolution regarding Ukraine.

**The Analysis of Recent Researches.** Numerous Ukrainian historians studied Poland's foreign policy concepts formation and evolution issues towards Ukraine, for example, M. Lytvyn (Lytvyn, 2017), V. Komar (Komar, 2011), L. Strilchuk (Strilchuk, 2008), (Strilchuk, 2013) L. Zashkilnyak (Zashkilnyak, 2002). Furthermore, the Polish historians, publicists and politicians also covered Poland's eastern policy vision towards Ukraine in their works, for example, K. Fedorowicz (Fedorowicz, 2004), K. Skubiszewski (Skubiszewski, 1997) and the others.

**The purpose of the article** is to identify Poland's foreign policy concepts formation and evolution features towards Ukraine during the XXth – the beginning of the XXIst century, the implementation of their comparative analysis and study of factors that influenced the transformation of these concepts.

**The Basic Material Statement.** J. Giedroyc's thesis, the Polish publicist, that the modern Republic of Poland still lives by two ghosts – J. Pilsudski and R. Dmowski – is widely known today (Unger, 2002, p. 12). In fact, we agree with the thesis. To our mind, it should be noted that the modern foreign policy of the Republic of Poland, to a large extent, absorbed J. Pilsudski's and R. Dmowski's political concepts. In particular, the two main visions of the new Poland emerged and survived to this day: the Jagiellonian concept and the Piast concept due to the Polish state nationalism wave at the time. It is no secret that in the current Polish political debate on foreign policy in the East, there are many concepts that are quite difficult to understand. In general, the current discussions in Poland on Eastern policy can be called a conflict between the nationalists and Giedroyc's ideas supporters.

Hence, the Jagiellonian and the Piast concepts are the oldest Polish political doctrines, date back to the Polish state heyday, the times of greatness and power, which become role models and are projected by contemporaries on their own realities. The Piast's foreign policy concept is based on the so-called doctrine of “Sarmatism”, which substantiates the fact of the Polish nobility origin from the Sarmatians. According to this concept, it was the Piast dynasty that brought Poland into Western civilization, removed the veil of paganism and brought Christianity in 966. Within the framework of this concept, “theories of the platform and the foothills” stood out, according to which the state acted as a kind of Western civilization and Christianity outpost. At the heart of this approach was R. Dmowski's incorporative, the anti-German theory (Wapinski, 1989), which emphasized that there could be no room for a weak Poland between strong Russia and Germany, and that Poland should own the lands where the Poles prevailed (Roszkowski, 2009, p. 29).

The Jagiellonian concept is based on memories of the mighty Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, which emerged during the Jagiellonian era and was the result of a series of successful unions and alliances, which in turn led to the formation of a multinational state body. The Jagiellonian concept is characterized by an anti-Russian orientation (the Russian Empire emerged later and expanded, mainly due to the conquest policy) and differs from the Russian peaceful direction of political, economic, cultural and religious expansion to the east (Koniuszewski, 2012, p. 94).

The doctrines of the Intermarium (Between-Seas, Międzymorze) and Prometheanism (Prometeizm) stood out within the Jagiellonian concept. The Intermarium (Międzymorze) was a political project aimed at creating a huge federation of countries between the Baltic, Black and Adriatic Seas on the legacy of the First Polish Republic. The Prometheanism (Prometeizm) was a political project carried out in the period between the two world wars by J. Pilsudski. After all, it was the idea of peaceful state-building that inspired J. Pilsudski's federal concept, which aimed not only to revive Poland after World War I, but, above all, to create a federation of Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine and Belarus. In the predominant eastern direction of expansion, declared by the Polish leader, the dominant role was played by the Ukrainian issue in order to weaken Russia (Suelya, 2018, pp. 268–271). According to J. Pilsudski, an integral element of Prometheanism was the attempt to “rip Russia to the national seams” (Pilsudski, 1939, p. 63).

The Polish head of state defended the belief that the greatest threat to the Polish state and other countries in the region was the Imperial Russia. Therefore, for the Poles, the Ukrainians and the Lithuanians, the joint task against the Imperial Russian encroachments was a priority. In fact, the above-mentioned motivation was the basis of the Polish army's attack on Kyiv in 1920 (Dodonov, 2019, p. 127), the allied relations between S. Petliura and J. Pilsudski, (Krasivskyy, 2008, pp. 210–254), and the failed coup attempt in Kaunas in August 1919 by J. Pilsudski against the Lithuanian government and Prime Minister, M. Sleževičius (Komar, 2011, p. 79). The coup's aim was to create a pro-Polish government cabinet that would join the union of Lithuania and Poland.

J. Pilsudski tried to create a kind of barrier between Russia and the Polish state in the form of independent nation-states linked to Poland by federal ties. It would guarantee security for the Polish state on the part of Russia (Zashkilnyak, 2002, p. 451). Those states were supposed to be Ukraine, Belarus and Lithuania. The federal concept embodied by the Polish leader encountered the territories delimitation issue, the Polish population was a significant part of the population in all those territories, the Poles inhabited compactly such territories as Eastern Galicia, Grodno Governorate and Vilnius region, although the Ukrainians, the Belarusians and the Lithuanians predominated there (Lytvyn, 2017, pp. 230–244).

J. Pilsudski came from Vilnius region, like the vast majority of his contemporaries, the Poles, was unable to imagine a united Polish state without the so-called “Kress” and relied on their accession by force. The Endeks took a different position on Poland's eastern borders. The Endeks foreign policy position, known as the incorporation, was based on the unappealable inclusion in the Second Polish Republic of the vast majority of Ukraine (actually to the Dniπρο), as well as Lithuania and Belarus. Such claims were made with reference to Rzeczpospolita borders in 1772. As L. Zashkilnyak noted the following: “in support of such claims, the Endeks claimed that although the Poles make up 15–25 percent of the population in these areas, they represent the joint intellectual and economic force of the region” (Zashkilnyak, 2002, p. 451).

The Prometheanism concept formation specificity, as a system of views on foreign and domestic policy of the Polish state, was that it was created through J. Pilsudski's activities, individual members of the ruling camp – the Pilsudchyski, as well as the ideologists, politicians and scientists, who were the Prometheanism movement active participants. In addition, J. Pilsudski's views were the Prometheanism concept foreign policy priorities' worldviews development, who believed that the Soviet state became the successor to the Imperial Russia and was trying to expand its own spheres of influence in Asia and Europe. The Polish leader was convinced that the Bolshevik coup, although it caused significant political, socio-economic and cultural transformations, did not change the traditional Russian mentality to dominance in the region (Pilsudski, 1939, p. 66). The thesis concerning Poland's unfavorable geopolitical location, which felt a constant threat from both Bolshevik Russia and Germany, was the starting point in the Prometheanism concept.

The contradiction between the policies of J. Pilsudski and the Pilsudchyski concerning the Ukrainian issue was obvious at least in that they did not notice the organic unity of Galicia with Dnieper Ukraine, on the one hand supporting Ukraine's independence, which should become a barrier to the Russian expansion and most Poles, considered Galicia an integral part of the Second Polish Republic (Komar, 2011, p. 79). The prominent pilsudchyski L. Wasilewski wrote the following concerning the above-mentioned issue: "What will happen, if Poland defends enthusiastically in foreign policy an independent Ukraine up to the Caucasus, and in domestic will be guided by the invader's morality?" (Wasilewski, 1932, p. 4).

Another important political figure in post-war Poland was R. Dmowski, a Polish politician and publicist, the founder of the nationalist political group "The Greater Poland Camp" (Obóz Wielkiej Polski). In addition, R. Dmowski was a supporter of good neighborly relations with Russia and had a bit different opinion concerning the Polish state revival, as he considered Germany to be the main threat to Poland (Radomski, 2000). Therefore, his new interpretation of eastern Polish policy consisted in the fact that Russia, which was still large but weakened, should transfer its lands to the Second Polish Republic. Furthermore, Ukraine and Belarus should be divided between Poland and Russia on a national basis, the essence of which was that the territories inhabited by the Poles were supposed to be transferred to the Second Polish Republic, and the rest – to Russia (Wapinski, 1989, p.150).

It was believed that such scenario implementation would be a helping tool in the Polish element assimilation, and vice versa, its implementation would prevent the Poles' "denationalization". In fact, in the 1920-ies and 1930-ies, a synthesis of two foreign policy conceptions of Poland's eastern policy took place, the irony of which is that the Second Polish Republic was built as a unitary state within the framework proposed by R. Dmowski. As a result, the Second Polish Republic owned the territories that, according to the federal concept, would belong to Lithuania, Belarus and Ukraine.

A new Polish foreign policy concept emerged in the beginning of 1930-ies, known as the "equal distance policy" It was known that J. Beck was the policy's initiator, who took the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Second Polish Republic in November 1932 (Kryvonos, 2013, p. 198). In fact, the policy's main idea, proposed by J. Beck, was to strike the right balance between two super-powerful states – the USSR and Germany. In particular, the Polish-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact for a period of three years was signed on the 25th of July in 1932, became its manifestation. Later on, the Polish-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact was extended for another ten years in 1934, and in conclusion, the German-Polish Non-Aggression Pact was signed between Warsaw and Berlin for ten years in January 1934. Due to the treaties, the Second

Polish Republic strengthened the position in the international arena and became a vivid example of the Prometheanism policy continuation. It should be mentioned that the National Socialists came to power in Germany in early 1933, which led to a significant decline in German-Soviet relations, which official Warsaw tried to take advantage of in order to establish neutrality with both Germany and the USSR, as well as to avoid war on two fronts in case of its break out.

On the one hand, there was the international political situation aggravation in Europe in the second half of the 1930-ies, and on the other, J. Pilsudski died in May 1935, which deprived Poland's ruling political camp of universal authority, led to the Prometheanism's policy crisis. Therefore, the Polish foreign policy was based on the concept of balancing between Germany and the USSR with regard to France, but France at that time sought for rapprochement with the Soviet Union. Under such circumstances, the Polish diplomacy, led by J. Beck, succumbed to the German promises concerning peaceful coexistence (Zashkilnyak, 2002, p. 488), which, as the following events showed, was a great miscalculation.

The Polish foreign policy was subjected to meticulous revision after the end of World War II, in 1945. As a result, it was removed from the discussion's agenda on its content and forms, because all visions of official Warsaw (including foreign policy) were approved or, most often, dictated from Moscow. That is why, during the postwar period, it is impossible to talk about the existence of any Polish foreign policy concepts. Hence, the Polish People's Republic followed the USSR foreign policy and was forced to cooperate with the "socialist camp" states, limit contacts with the capitalist countries. The above-mentioned period could be characterized as Poland's forced orientation to the East.

The paradox was that the de facto ban on political discussions in the Polish People's Republic led to the birth of probably the most important concept of modern Polish Eastern policy, brought in by Polish emigrant figures J. Giedroyc and J. Mieroszewski. The renowned figures presented and substantiated the political program actually in the columns of the magazine "Kultura", which, in the opinion of the authors, was to form the basis for future independent Poland's foreign policy emergence with its neighbors. The political program became known as the "Giedroyc-Mieroszewski Doctrine". The Emigrant figures counted and ruminated on possible ways and options for Eastern Europe unification in order to counter the Soviet threat jointly, analyzed possible options for political transformation in the Polish People's Republic and the restoration of an independent Polish state (Myeroshevskyy, 2005a, pp. 149–156).

J. Mieroszewski was known as Poland's reconciliation supporter with neighboring peoples along the eastern border, hence another name for the "Giedroyc-Mieroszewski Doctrine" emerged – "ULB" (the abbreviation stands for the names of countries – Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus). Its essence was that it was necessary to recognize the irreversibility of postwar borders and territorial changes that occurred as a result of World War II. Consequently, J. Mieroszewski regarded Lviv and Vilnius acceptance loss by the Poles as the main guarantee for the mutual understanding with the Polish People's Republic neighbors in the east, and, in the future, the independence acquisition by Central and Eastern Europe states that fell within the USSR's influence sphere (Myeroshevskyy, 2005b, pp. 195–209). Taking into consideration that it was a bold point of view that was obviously a new look and contrasted sharply with the Polish emigration policy visions in Britain and the United States in the 1950-ies and 1960-ies of the XXth century. In fact, it was said that Poland had to agree to its post-war borders and abandon the ideas of revisionism.

J. Giedroyc and J. Meroszewski argued that Poland's security depends on the existence of independent states on its eastern border directly, which would exclude Poland from being

between the super-powerful states – Germany and the USSR, as it happened on the eve of World War II (Gedroyts, 2015). In fact, the above-mentioned doctrine combined the post-Stalinist political reality with the Polish national interests. Nowadays, that position is quite logical and understandable, but during the Polish People's Republic days, the vast majority of the Polish political emigrants did not accept the existing borders, they recognized only the Second Polish Republic borders.

During the 1970-ies of the XXth century, J. Giedroyc published the concept, which was called: "There can be no free Poland without free Ukraine" (Genyk, 2006 – 2007, p. 308). Of course, such statements were not possible in the Polish People's Republic or in the USSR territory. And the fact that J. Giedroyc and his associates developed foreign policy doctrines while in exile, not being limited by censorship, only contributed to the spread of the democratic (persecuted in the USSR and the Polish People's Republic) ideas about the future of Ukraine and Poland. It should also be emphasized that J. Giedroyc nurtured and heralded ideas about the Ukrainian-Polish reconciliation repeatedly, to which, by the way, he remained loyal for the rest of his life.

J. Giedroyc had discussions concerning the Ukrainian borders in the late 70-ies of the XXth century, together with like-minded people initiated the signing of the "Declaration on the Ukrainian case", published in the "Kultura" issue in 1977. The declaration raised questions about the urgent need to create an independent Ukrainian state for liberation from the totalitarian regime, along with other countries of the socialist camp. The declaration was signed by a whole cohort of the Polish, Czech, Russian and Hungarian emigrants, who pointed to their own suffering "not only from the Russian but also from the Polish imperialism" (Genyk, 2010 – 2011, p. 215). The next logical step was to move away from the Jagiellonian concept, which put emphasis on the so-called normality of the Belarusian, Lithuanian and Ukrainian lands belonging to the Polish Crown.

In addition, one more J. Giedroyc's Polish foreign policy conception concerning Ukraine should be analyzed, as it is more relevant today than ever and boils down to the fact that the main guarantee of a successful struggle for the independence and democratic transformation in Poland and Ukraine is and remains important the Ukrainian-Polish interethnic reconciliation and joint anti-totalitarian struggle. According to the thesis, the Poles and the Ukrainians rapprochement is the key to counteracting the Russian expansion in Central and Eastern Europe. In the context of Russia's current aggression in eastern Ukraine, this thesis acquires special significance and urgency.

Meanwhile, the Polish Solidarity confident victory in the June 1989 elections ushered in a new stage in the Polish history and raised questions about the forms and content of policy in the eastern direction. In fact, the new Eastern policy consisted in the policy of two vectors as it demonstrated that J. Giedroyc's and J. Meroszewski's painstaking work was not in vain, because the Polish Eastern policy postulates, formulated by them in previous decades became possible to implement.

The Polish foreign policy formation process since 1989 was quite complex and controversial, because from the very beginning it was necessary to develop a clear position on the changes that took place in the West, and more importantly – in the East. The crisis, and later on the USSR collapse, put on the agenda the Polish political elite's need to approach the Third Partition of Poland new foreign policy formation with special balance. Therefore, the main goal of the new Eastern policy was to respond to the changes taking place abroad (Strilchuk, 2008, p. 516). K. Fedorowicz, the Polish political scientist believes that, first of all, it was dictated by the state

security considerations, an attempt to prevent a situation in which the Polish eastern border could become a zone of tension (Fedorowicz, 2004, p. 226). On the one hand, the two vectors policy begun in 1990, was to support the USSR former republics, which aspired to independence, and, on the other hand, to preserve the old, stable relations with the Soviet authorities and not violate the Warsaw Pact. In fact, it was the Prometheanism policy implementation “with looking back on Moscow” (Fedorowicz, 2004, p. 227).

E. Nowakowski, the Polish researcher believes that Poland’s foreign policy in the eastern direction at the turn of the 80-90-ies of the XXth century “was based on three basic principles:

- the Soviet structures preservation and support for the reforms initiated by M. Gorbachev;
- the support for some republics of the USSR, especially Ukraine, as its closest eastern neighbor (so-called modern Prometheanism);
- maintaining permanent contacts with the Russian Federation as the Soviet Union successor” (Nowakowski, 1991, p. 87).

It should be noted that all these concepts developed in parallel, none of them was a priority, but at the same time Polish diplomacy took Ukraine in particular (given its importance in the region and importance for Poland) in shaping Eastern policy in the period 1989 – 1999. The Eastern policy evolution of the Republic of Poland was inextricably linked with the democratic processes in Poland and T. Mazowiecki’s first government of solidarity formation, as well as with the loss of relevance of the Polish-Soviet relations. It was a rather complex process that did not involve the rapid changes in relations with Poland’s eastern neighbors (Strilchuk, 2013, p. 142). According to K. Skubiszewski, who headed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland from 1989 to 1993, the content of the two-vector policy (also known as the “two-way” policy) was: “to maintain the necessary relations with the so-called center, Moscow”, and the parallel implementation of equal contacts with the USSR republics, mainly with Ukraine, Belarus and Russia, bypassing the center...” (Skubiszewski, 1997, p. 271).

The Polish Eastern policy sequence could be traced during the 1990-ies till the beginning of the XXIst century in numerous examples, such as the fact that Poland became one of the first countries in the world to recognize Ukraine’s independence on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of December in 1991; since 1997 RP and Ukraine – strategic partners; Poland’s support for Ukraine during the Orange Revolution; joint holding of the football championship “Euro – 2012” (Strilchuk, 2013, pp. 205–206).

After the Civic Platform came to power in the Republic of Poland, a new Polish concept of Eastern policy appeared, aimed at detente in relations with the Russian Federation and was created in the style of the idea of the German Foreign Minister – F.-W. Steinmeier. The Polish version of this policy was presented by Foreign Minister R. Sikorski, whose concept in fact created a paradoxical situation in which the Polish government implemented the concept of detente and Polish President L. Kaczynski, keeping to the Prometheanism position, tried to implement it.

In fact, the struggle between the two foreign policy concepts of Eastern policy came to an end due to the tragic death of President L. Kaczynski in April 2010. And already in 2013, R. Sikorski delivered a speech in which he called for a reorientation of Poland’s foreign policy in the western direction. It was J. Giedroyc’s original ideas that were rejected de facto in favor of the Piast concept, the Polish Foreign Minister saw the priority of relations with Brussels and Germany in order to strengthen the position of the Republic of Poland in the European arena. The analogy with the era of Piast Poland is clear because, in contrast to the Jagiellonian, who made history through their activities in Eastern Europe, the Piast opened Poland’s door to Western Carolingian civilization in the mid-Xth century by bringing

Christianity. The Piast's foreign policy was based on close contacts with the West. R. Sikorski, imitating the Piast dynasty representatives, tried to highlight the Western vector priority in the foreign policy of the Republic of Poland.

However, with Kaczynski's victory "Law and Justice" party in the elections to the Polish parliament, the Polish government was rejecting the Polish foreign policy orientation to the West increasingly, there was another turn to the Jagiellonian idea, which manifested itself through the so-called concept of the "Three Seas". The above-mentioned concept was reduced to intensifying contacts between EU member states between the Baltic, Adriatic and Black Seas with the parallel support of Ukraine, Belarus and Lithuania.

M. Zanevych, the Polish researcher calls the modern eastern policy of the Republic of Poland a "hybrid course" given that it was influenced actively by the representatives of the extreme right forces (neo-endeks) in the Polish parliament. It is well-known that the main neo-endeks rhetoric is reduced to the care of the Poles located on the eastern border of Poland, and as a rule, this rhetoric has a negative tone towards Ukraine and Lithuania. It concerns primarily common history issues, such as World War II and the Ukrainian-Polish confrontation in Volyn and Galicia, Volyn tragedy victims' memorialization, the common history interpretation (Strilchuk, 2018, pp. 158–159), etc. Therefore, we fully agree with M. Zanevych's opinion about modern Poland eastern policy hybridity, which carries out a kind of maneuvering between support for Kyiv and neo-endeks rhetoric, which in modern Ukrainian-Polish relations is manifested by the disputes over historical memory, the aggravation of the interstate relations through the acts of vandalism and the Polish national memory places (Strilchuk, 2018, p. 160), the attacks on Ukrainian workers in Poland, etc.

Taking everything into account, we can conclude that over time, the Jagiellonian and the Piast concepts, as foreign policy doctrines, did not lose their relevance in Poland, but with each state's historical stage of development were revised and adapted to new realities, continuing to remain relevant. The historical traditions of Poland's eastern foreign policy vector are obvious, and although the forms of Polish eastern policy may slightly changed, its content balanced between two well-established concepts. For the last three decades, Ukraine, represented by the Republic of Poland, had a reliable political ally, a lobbyist for the national interests in European institutions, and a powerful economic partner. Due to the joint efforts of the Ukrainian diplomacy and the Polish ruling political elites it became possible to implement the above-mentioned cooperation. The Republic of Poland having used the positive experience of the past and striving to have a reliable ally on its eastern border, builds a modern eastern policy vector in which Ukraine is given one of the leading roles in the best traditions of the Jagiellonian foreign policy doctrine.

Acknowledgement. The authors of the article are sincerely grateful to all members of the editorial board for the advice provided during doing the research and writing the article.

Financing. The authors did not receive any financial support for doing the research and writing the article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Dodonov, R.** (Ed.). (2019). *Skladni pytannya istorychnoyi pam'yati u paradyhmi dialohichnosti kul'tur: Kolektyvna monohrafiya [Complex issues of historical memory in the paradigm of dialogic cultures: A collective monograph]*. Bilostok: BV, 292 p.

**Fedorowicz, K.** (2004). *Ukraina w polskiej polityce wschodniej w latach 1989 – 1999 [Ukraine in Polish Eastern Policy in 1989 – 1999]*. Poznań. 248 p. [in Polish].

**Gedroyts, Y.** (2015). *Avtobiohrafiya u chotyry ruky [Autobiography in four hands]*. Kyiv. 408 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Genyk, M.** (2006 – 2007). Vzayemovidnosyny Yezhy Hyedroytsya i ukrayinskoyi emihratsiyi [Relations between Jerzy Giedroyc and Ukrainian emigration]. *Halychyna*, 12–13, 458–461. [in Ukrainian]

**Genyk, M.** (2010 – 2011). Rol “Deklaratsiyi v ukrayynskiyi spravi” 1977 roku v dosyahnenni polsko-ukrayynskoho prymyrennya [The role of the Declaration in Ukrainian Affairs in 1977 in achieving Polish-Ukrainian reconciliation]. *Ukrayina–Polsha: istorychna spadshchyna i suspilna svidomist*, 3–4, 213–221. [in Ukrainian]

**Komar, V.** (2011). *Kontseptsiya prometeyizmu v politytsi Polshchi (1921 – 1939)*. [The Concept of Prometheism in the Politics of Poland (1921 – 1939)]. Ivano-Frankivsk. 360 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Koniuszewski, A.** (2012). *Meandry geopolityki. Wplyw gry mocarstw na polozhenie Polski* [Geopolitics meanders. Impact of the superpowers’ game on Poland’s location]. Warszawa. 294 p. [in Polish]

**Krasivskyy, O.** (2008). *Ukrayynsko-polski vzayemyny v 1917 – 1923 rr.* [Ukrainian-Polish relations in 1917 – 1923]. Kyiv. 376 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Kryvonos, R.** (2013). Bek Yuzef [Beck Yousef]. *Ukrayynska dyplomatychna entsyklopediya*. In 5 vols. Kharkiv, Vol. 1, 245 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Lytvyn, M.** (Ed.). (2017). *Ukrayynsko-polski vidnosyny. Novitnya doba* [Ukrainian-Polish relations. The newest day]. Lviv, 732 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Myeroshevskyy, U.** (2005a). Lysty z ostrova [Letters from the island]. *Prostir svobody. Ukrayina na shpaltakh paryzkoyi “Kultury”*. Kyiv, 149–156. [in Ukrainian]

**Myeroshevskyy, U.** (2005b). Rosiyskyy “polskyy kompleks” i prostir ULB [The Russian “Polish Complex” and the Space of the UBL: Article]. *Prostir svobody. Ukrayina na shpaltakh paryzkoyi “Kultury”*. Kyiv, 195–209. [in Ukrainian]

**Nowakowski, J.** (1991). Polska polityka wschodnia w 1991 roku. [Polish eastern policy in 1991]. *Rocznik Polskiej Polityki Zagranicznej*, 77–88. [in Polish]

**Pilsudski, J.** (1939). *Pisma zbiorowe* [Collective letters]. Vol. V. Warszawa. 578 p. [in Polish]

**Radomski, G.** (2000). *Narodowa Demokracja wobec problematyki mniejszości narodowych w Drugiej Rzeczypospolitej w latach 1918 – 1926*. [National Democracy in the face of the issues of national minorities in the Second Polish Republic in 1918 – 1926]. Toruń. 170 p. [in Polish]

**Roszkowski, W.** (2009). *Najnowsza historia Polski (1914 – 1945)* [The latest history of Poland (1914 – 1945)]. Warszawa. 474 p. [in Polish]

**Skubiszewski, K.** (1997). *Polityka zagraniczna i odzyskanie niepodleglosci. Przemówienia, oświadczenia, wywiady 1989 – 1993* [Foreign policy and regaining independence. Speeches, statements, interviews 1989 – 1993]. Warszawa. 756 p. [in Polish]

**Strilchuk, L.** (2008). Ukrayina v polskiy skhidniy politytsi 1989 – 1999 rr. [Ukraine in Polish Eastern Policy 1989 – 1999]. *III Mizhnarodnyy naukovy konhres ukrayynskyykh istorykiv. «Ukrayynska istorychna nauka na shlyakhu tvorchoho postupu»*. Lutsk, 17 – 19 travnya 2006 r.: *Dopovidi ta povidomlennya*. V 3-kh tomakh. Lutsk, T.3. 515–519. [in Ukrainian]

**Strilchuk, L.** (2013). *Ukrayina – Polshcha: vid dobrosusids'kykh vidnosyn do stratehichnoho partnerstva (kinets XX – XXI stolittya)* [Ukraine – Poland: from good neighborly relations to strategic partnerships (end of XX – XXI century)]. Lutsk. 608 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Strilchuk, L.** (2018) The Ukrainian-Polish Confrontation in Volhynia in the Second World War: Historical Memory Transformations. *Codrul Cosminului*, XXIV (1), 145–165. [in English]

**Suelya, V.** (2018). *Yuzef Pilsudskyy* [Jozef Pilsudski]. Kyiv. 528 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Unger, L.** (2002). Europa, nie Azja [Europe, not Asia]. *Gazeta Wyborcza*. 4 lipca. 12. [in Polish]

**Wapinski, R.** (1989). *Roman Dmowski* [Roman Dmowski]. Lublin. 392 p. [in Polish]

**Wasilewski, L.** (1932). O drogi porozumienia [For a way of agreement]. *Biuletyn Polsko-Ukrainiski*, 2, 4–5. [in Polish]

**Zashkilnyak, L. O. & Krykun, M. H.** (2002). *Istoriya Polshchi: Vid naydavnishykh chasiv do nashykh dniv* [History of Poland: From ancient times to the present day]. Lviv. 752 p. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on February 03, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 930.1(477):94(477)  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226552

**Yuriy STEPANCHUK**

*PhD hab.(History), Docent, Associate Professor of the Department of History and Culture of Ukraine of Vinnytsia State Pedagogical University named after M. Kotsiubynskiy, 32 Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi’ Street, Vinnytsia, Ukraine, postal code 21001 (iiepp@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-6693-1463

**Tetiana MELNYCHUK**

*PhD (History), Docent of the Department of History and Culture of Ukraine of Vinnytsia State Pedagogical University named after M. Kotsiubynskiy, 32 Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi’ Street, Vinnytsia, Ukraine, postal code 21001 (tmelnuhyk@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-6814-142X

**Юрiй СТЕПАНЧУК**

*доктор iсторичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри iсторiї та культури України Винницького державного педагогiчного унiверситету iменi Михайла Коцюбинського, м. Винниця, вул. Костянтина Острозького, 32, Україна, iндекс 21001 (iiepp@ukr.net)*

**Тетяна МЕЛЬНИЧУК**

*кандидат iсторичних наук, доцент кафедри iсторiї та культури України Винницького державного педагогiчного унiверситету iменi Михайла Коцюбинського, м. Винниця, вул. Костянтина Острозького, 32, Україна, iндекс 21001 (tmelnuhyk@gmail.com)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Stepanchuk, Yu. & Melnychuk, T. (2021). The Concept of “Ukraine” Evolution in Early Modern times in Modern Ukrainian Historiography Coverage. *Skhidnoievropeiskiy Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 229–238. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226552

## THE CONCEPT OF “UKRAINE” EVOLUTION IN EARLY MODERN TIMES IN MODERN UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY COVERAGE

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research* isto identify the main tendencies of the modern scientific discourse concerning the issue of evolution interpretation in early modern times of the name “Ukraine”. **The methodology of the research** involves the comparative studies’ methods symbiosis usage, contextual analysis, convergence from the abstract to the concrete and vice versa. **The scientific novelty** is determined by the fact that the basic laws of modern scientific discourse in Ukraine, connected with the understanding of the name “Ukraine” functioning in early modern Ukraine and derived concepts: the “Ukrainian people”, the “Ukrainians”. The thematic and conceptual echo between modern interpretations has been traced, the scientific innovations which have appeared recently were allocated, perspective directions of the further researches were outlined. **The Conclusions.** In the first decades of the XXIst century there has been a renewed research focus on interpretations of the past functioning of the name “Ukraine”, but the emphasis shifted from the problems of the origin and original semantics of this concept to clarify the peculiarities of its use in early modern times. In particular, the concept’s circulation among the Ukrainian nobility and the Cossacks, the place of names

*“Ukraine”, the “Ukrainian people”, the “Ukrainians” in the practices of the Hetmanate’s elite until the end of the 70-ies of the XVIIIth century, the functioning of the concept of “Ukraine” in the Cossack narratives of the XVIIIth century was considered. Two important tendencies of scientific discourse were singled out: the evolution of the name “Ukraine” did not go beyond the geographical-territorial framework; the name “Ukraine” became a political name, and the terms the “Ukrainian people” and the “Ukrainians” became the Hetmanate’s elite marker of the identity.*

**Key words:** *Ukraine, the Ukrainians, the Ukrainian people, modern historiography, scientific discourse, concept, key tendencies.*

## **ЕВОЛЮЦІЯ ПОНЯТТЯ “УКРАЇНА” В РАНЬМОДЕРНІ ЧАСИ У ВИСВІТЛЕННІ СУЧАСНОЇ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ**

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* полягає у вияві основних тенденцій сучасного наукового дискурсу щодо інтерпретації проблеми еволюції в ранньомодерні часи самоназви “Україна”. **Методологія дослідження** передбачає використання симбіозу методів компаративістики, контекстуального аналізу, сходження від абстрактного до конкретного і навпаки. **Наукова новизна** визначається тим, що з’ясовано основні закономірності сучасного наукового дискурсу в Україні, пов’язаного з осмисленням функціонування в ранньомодерній Україні самоназви “Україна” та похідних понять – “український народ”, “українці”. Простежено тематичний і концептуальний перегук між сучасними інтерпретаціями, виділено наукові новації, які з’явилися останнім часом, окреслено перспективні напрямки подальших досліджень. **Висновки.** *У перші десятиліття XXI ст. спостережено поновлення дослідницької уваги до інтерпретації функціонування в минулому самоназви «Україна», проте акцент зміщено з проблем походження та первісної семантики цього поняття до з’ясування особливостей його вживання в ранньомодерні часи. Зокрема, простежено обіг поняття в середовищі української шляхти та козацтва, місце самоназв “Україна”, “український народ”, “українці” у практиках еліти Гетьманщини до кінця 70-х рр. XVII ст., розглянуто функціонування поняття “Україна” в козацьких нарративах XVIII ст. Виділено дві важливі тенденції наукового дискурсу: еволюція самоназви “Україна” не вийшла за географічно-територіальні рамки; назва “Україна” перетворилася на політонім, а поняття “український народ” та “українці” стали маркером ідентичності еліти Гетьманщини.*

**Ключові слова:** *Україна, українці, український народ, сучасна історіографія, науковий дискурс, концепція, ключові тенденції.*

**The Problem Statement.** The scientific discourse’s detailed analysis relevance in the study concerning the concept of “Ukraine” semantic content’s evolution in early modern times was primarily due to the fact that such a discourse was of paramount importance for the adequate scientific ideas’ formation about the identity’s specifics in early modern Ukraine. The belief in the existence of a name of one’s own territorial and political space was a very informative indicator in the worldview’s study of and the elite’s self-awareness. However, owing to the elites’ change in Ukraine after the Hetmanate’s formation left a special imprint, as a result, the competition between the names “Rus” and “Ukraine” intensified. Furthermore, the above-mentioned processes reflected the needs related to the Ukrainian state’s restoration under the Cossack flag of its international recognition, the Cossacks’ emergence on the horizon of a new Ukrainian’s elite formation with a simultaneous decline in nobility’s representative role.

Hence, the historiographical development analysis of the name of the Ukrainian world process is aimed at highlighting the modern research’s features and a set of problems’ conceptualization, which is related to the elites’ and Ukrainian statehood’s history. There is a drastic need to identify the Ukrainian discourse’s influence on the scientific ideas

concerning early modern Ukraine in the world, especially in the Hetmanate’s essence qualification.

**The Analysis of Resent Researches.** The functioning specifics’ analysis of the concept of “Ukraine” in early modern times did not serve as an object of in-depth historiographical attention. A few observations are available in the historiographical tradition up till nowadays. Most of them are expressed not in the special investigations on the historiography of the issue, but in the occasional reproduction of their own considerations on the issue. First of all, N. Yakovenko in 2012 limited herself to generalizing that modern historians (both in Ukraine and abroad) reached a certain consensus that “Ukraine” until the Cossack wars of the mid – the XVIIth century was called the south-eastern border of Rzeczpospolita – Kyiv and Bratslav voivodships” (Yakovenko, 2012, p. 32). N. Yakovenko also noted that the researchers managed to notice the gradual expansion concerning the concept’s of “Ukraine” territorial content in the sources. Second of, one more researcher, T. Chukhlib, sought to initiate a new discussion on the use of the terms “Ukraine”, the “Ukrainian people” and the “Ukrainians” in the early modern era, argued with his contemporaries, questioned the main thesis about the geographical and territorial dimension of Ukraine (Chukhlib, 2015, pp. 15–18). Finally, L. Zashkilniak and V. Adadurov accuse modern researchers of illegally using the name “Ukraine” for the early modern era in the ethnopolitical sense, calling for its use only as a geographical-territorial concept, i.e., in the natural, in their opinion, meaning for those times (Zashkilniak, 2008, pp. 77–78; Adadurov, 2013, p. 9).

**The Purpose of Publication** is to clarify the main tendencies in the interpretation concerning the semantic content of the early modern name “Ukraine” in modern Ukrainian historiography.

**The Basic Material Statement.** The research interest in the issue of the name “Ukraine” resumed in the mainland Ukrainian historiography at the beginning of 90-ies of the XXth century after a long break. Due to the humanities’ development conditions in Ukraine, which underwent radical changes, the above-mentioned boom occurred. Gaining independence led to the fall of the harsh Soviet ideological dictatorship and the “iron curtain”, to the introduction of institutional innovations in Ukrainian science, to unleash the tightness of the Soviet historiography, the leading Ukrainian historians’ fundamental works publication of the end of the XIXth and beginning of the XXth centuries, as well as the works, written by diaspora researchers. The Ukrainian historiography’s real integration process into the world context also started. Young people deprived of the personal legacy of Soviet totalitarianism joined the scientific discourse. As a result, it led to a sharp expansion of thematic and conceptual horizons of historical research. In particular, there was an interest in the elites’ and the Ukrainian statehood’s history, which paved the way for issues related to both historical names of the Ukrainian world – “Rus” and “Ukraine”. In the end, an additional factor was the general atmosphere filled with new intellectual challenges posed by an independent Ukrainian state’s restoration.

It should be noted that an important intellectual stimulus for the emergence in mainland Ukraine of new scientific versions of the functioning of the concept of “Ukraine” in early modern times was the development of the conceptual achievements of diasporic historiography, as in many other areas of historical knowledge. The works, written by S. Shelukhin, J. Rudnytskyi, Y. Shevelyov and the representatives of the younger generation (F. Sysyn, Z. Kohut) in this field inspired the directions of issue’s understanding, finally, determined the perspective of many conceptualizations.

Due to S. Makarchuk, who conducted a report at the regular Congress of the International Association of Ukrainian Studies, which was the signal for the revival of interest in the origin and evolution of the meaning of the name “Ukraine” already in 1993 (Makarchuk, 1994, pp. 206–211), and a year later, P. Tolochko’s article made an attempt to trace the semantic changes in the Ukrainian space of the concept of “Ukraine” in the XIIth – at beginning of the XVIIIth centuries. In the end, it was possible to formulate the provisions that initiated one of the main interpretative versions in modern Ukrainian historiography.

The researcher, P. Tolochko used the chronicle material of the XIIth – beginning of the XVIIIth centuries, as well as part of the documentary sources, which were introduced into scientific circulation, and as a result, at the basic level joined the already well-developed in historiography model, which includes the idea of evolving the name “Ukraine” from the “outskirts” sound to denote a specific geographical and territorial integrity in the XIIth – XVIIIth centuries. The starting positions of the researcher coincide with J. Rudnytskyi’s view, who opposed S. Shelukhin’s main thesis that the name Ukraine originally meant “land” as a whole. However, in the interpretation of the early modern semantics of the concept of “Ukraine” P. Tolochko’s and J. Rudnytskyi’s thoughts diverged. According to J. Rudnytskyi, the term in the XVIth – XVIIth centuries acquired the meaning of the “country, land, state” (Rudnytskyi, 1951, pp. 59, 88), for P. Tolochko, the term never went beyond geographical boundaries.

According to P. Tolochko, the “outskirts” pedigree of “Ukraine” had no alternative, as well as restrictions during the Hetmanate semantics of the concept of space. In addition, the author claimed that “The territorial and geographical nature of the name “Ukraine” was not in doubt among any of the serious researchers” (Tolochko, 1994, p. 3). The further main plotline was represented by the thesis that in the future the semantic content of the concept, although undergoing modifications, but it took place within the paradigm of “ukrain”. The multiplicity of the “Ukrainians” was explained by the fact that in scientific sources they “were called the peripheral (border) territories that were under the political protectorate (or entirely in administrative and political subordination) of Poland, Lithuania, Russia, Turkey” (Tolochko, 1994, p. 5). Due to the Hetmanate emergence’s influence in the middle of the XVIIth century, one of them began to acquire a broader meaning, but still, only geographical and territorial denoted only the space of the Cossack state. The researcher denied the possibility of the evolution of the concept towards ethnopolitonym, specifically emphasizing this; the upper limit of such evolution was the establishment in society for “Ukraine” of the status of a separate region: “... during the XVIIth – beginning of the XVIIIth centuries, it gradually acquired the meaning of a specific geographical concept equivalent to the name of Volyn, Podillya, Zaporizhya, Red Rus’, Siveria, Pokuttya” (Tolochko, 1994, p. 8).

Tolochko’s interpretation remains the starting point for conceptual approaches based on the idea of the “outskirts” origin of the concept of “Ukraine” till nowadays. The above-mentioned approaches were in abundance in the Ukrainian historiography. Numerous researchers, for example, V. Adadurov, L. Zashkilniak, G. Kasianov, V. Kravchenko, A. Motsya, and O. Tolochko supported the idea that in the early modern period the mentioned concept should be interpreted from the territorial-geographical point of view. For example, L. Zashkilniak put emphasis on the fact that the authors used constantly the term “Ukraine”, the “Ukrainians”, the “Ukrainian”, although for the Middle Ages and early modern times these terms had primarily geographical and territorial, not national content – we can speak about it only at the end of the XIXth century” (Zashkilniak, 2008, pp. 77–78). The researcher A. Motsia in a scientific article quoted P. Tolochko’s conclusion and commented extensively

on it (Motsia, 2007, p. 343). The notion of "Ukraine" as a separate territory along with Podillya, Volyn or Galicia was appealed to by appeals not to use this concept in the political sense and not to modernize ethnonyms, based on the fact that "each epoch must be described in its own terms" (Adadurov, 2013, p. 9; Kasianov, Tolochko, 2012, p. 20).

Furthermore, a version appeared that was fundamentally different from the position of the geographical-territorial interpretation of the semantic content of the name "Ukraine" for early modern times, closer to the XXth century. Hence, P. Sas joined the mainstream of diasporic historiography (from S. Shelukhin to J. Rudnytskyi and F. Sysyn) and outlined a completely different trajectory of the evolution of the concept. The image of "Ukraine" to the middle of the XVIIth century in the political-territorial categories was interpreted as the "Rus'heiress", in particular, the following information was mentioned: "At the end of the XVIth – in the first half of the XVIIth century the reductions of the term "Rus" in its political and geographical aspects to the political-territorial definition of "Ukraine" were traced" (Sas, 1998, p. 98). The above-mentioned approach made possible a new interpretation of the further fate of "Ukraine" in scientific discourse – its transformation into a political name in the restored Ukrainian state in the middle of the XVIIth century (Sas, 1998, p. 105). For the XVIth – the first half of the XVIIth century the researcher, following F. Sysyn (1982), distinguished two versions of the circulation of the concept in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: in a broad sense it covered all Ukrainian voivodships, in a narrow sense – "Ukraine" in the first half of the XVIIth century "acted as a political-territorial definition concerning Kyiv region and Eastern Podillya" (Sas, 1998, p. 104).

Typologically, N. Yakovenko's conceptual vision is in line with P. Sasa's work, but the researcher chronologically and thematically expanded the observation to the second half of the XVIIth century. First of all, the unambiguity of the statement about the "outskirts" origin of the term was devalued. N. Yakovenko spoke in support of the possibility of a different interpretation of the content of the first news concerning "Ukraine", noting that S. Shelukhin's concept of the origin of the name Ukraine from the Proto-Slavic "kraĭ" or "ukraj" had a right to exist (Yakovenko, 2012, pp. 31, 44). In addition, the researcher expressed solidarity with another S. Shelukhin's thesis, in particular, the name "Ukraine" arose as an oral name (Yakovenko, 2005, p. 23). Noting the semantic plurality with the use of the concept during the Middle Ages and early modern times, combined with the tendency to cover the term of the entire Ukrainian space, and competition with Rus' terminology, the researcher summed up the following: "...so, maybe this word really was the specific name of Ukraine-Rus' and, in fact, that's why, in the end, it won the name contest" (Yakovenko, 2012, p. 43).

Interpretation of the semantics of the name "Ukraine" in early modern times echoed in N. Yakovenko's concept with P. Sas's generalizations. The researcher, who always had a high culture of working with sources, could not miss the frequent mentions that were difficult to fit into the "Ukraine" paradigm – it was just a border with an uninhabited Wild Field. Hence, N. Yakovenko noted that in the scientific circulation the concept of "Ukraine" was in two main meanings – broad and narrow. In addition, the researcher stated the emergence of the terms "the Ukrainians", "the Ukrainian people", "the Ukrainian", which were used in sources in the territorial sense, without connection with the problem of identity (Yakovenko, 2012, pp. 35, 61, 83, 86).

In addition, it was first observed that before the Union of Lublin in 1569, the term "Ukraine" and its derivatives were not used in the Polish Crown in relation to the Ukrainian lands. The motivated assumption was also made that the tradition was introduced by the Rus' Chancellery' clerks (Yakovenko, 2012, pp. 33–34). Another important observation, which

enriched the concept of using the term “Ukraine” in a broad sense, concerned the introduction of the Rus’ and Podolsk voivodships (Yakovenko, 2012, p. 35).

The undoubted priority of the researcher was to develop the question of regional differences in the use of the term “Ukraine” among the Rus’ nobility. While analyzing the elite’s statements from different voivodships, N. Yakovenko came to the reasoned conclusion that Kyiv gentry denied others the right to identify their voivodship with “Ukraine”, reserving this name only for themselves. For the Galician land “Ukraine” began outside the Rus’ voivodeship, while Volyn until the middle of the XVIIth century disowned the “Ukrainian name”, but under the Hetmanate’s influence, which began to apply the latter name to itself in the 1660-ies and 1670-ies” (Yakovenko, 2012, pp. 84–89). Finally, without worrying specifically about the analysis of the use of the name “Ukraine” in the Hetmanate, N. Yakovenko noted that there were signs of the “identification – at least in terms of the Cossack elite – the name “Ukraine” with Rus’ space in general”, which opened new interpretative perspectives with the functioning of the concept in the restored Ukrainian state (Yakovenko, 2012, pp. 40–41).

Hence, such functioning was in the center of attention for a number of researchers and brought to the horizon the generalizations that were in the plane of recognizing the evolution of the term “Ukraine” in the direction of becoming a political name. The researchers, F. Sysyn and Z. Kohut focused on the analysis of the Hetmanate elite’s ideas emergence concerning “Ukraine” as a “homeland”, which automatically introduced this name into the circle of political concepts. F. Sysyn proved that in the time of Ivan Mazepa the Cossack Officer unequivocally considered the name “Ukraine” as a homeland, using other terms as well: “homeland Little Russia” and “our homeland Ukraine Little Russia” (Sysyn, 2006, pp. 13–17).

Another fundamental thesis of the researcher was the following: “It seems that the use of the term “Little Russia” could be an assertion of the unity of the Right Bank Ukraine and the Left Bank Ukraine when international treaties and competing governments and Hetmans divided this unity” (Sysyn, 2006, p. 13). This approach differed significantly from P. Tolochko’s position, according to which “Ukraine” in the Hetmanate times was only a geographical and orientation concept. Instead, Z. Kohut traced the origins of the speculations about the Cossack ideas’ erosion concerning the “Fatherland of the Commonwealth”, the emergence of the “Fatherland of Little Russia”, and then – “Ukraine, the dear homeland” (Kohut, 2008, pp. 228–239). Accordingly, “Ukraine” as an object of political loyalty and manifestation of the identity of the Hetmanate still appears in the state-political sense. In addition, F. Sysyn made inspiring judgments about the then semantics of the concept of the “Ukrainian people”, bringing it from the territorial concept to the level of a new name: “after 1648, the terms “the Cossack”, “the Rus’”, “the Ukrainian” became almost synonymous (Sysyn, 1995, p. 55). However, the researcher did not try to consider the above-mentioned connotations specifically.

At the same time, the research was launched in the Ukrainian historiography in order to clarify the place of the concept of “Ukraine” in the conscious choice and political concepts of the Hetmanate’s elite. V. Stepankov and V. Smolii emphasized that under the influence of the appearance in the middle of the XVIIth century, the name “Ukraine” acquired the function of a political name in the Ukrainian state (Smolii, Stepankov, 2014, p. 14). One more researcher, S. Bahro found that in both the broader and shorter editions of H. Hrabianka’s Chronicle the term “Ukraine” was used much more often than “Little Russia”, and in many cases – as “Fatherland” (Bahro, 2013, pp. 188–191). In addition, O. Dziuba traced the circulation and context of the concept of “Ukraine” in the Cossack Officers’ diaries of the XVIIIth century, the bottom line was that the concept of “Ukraine” prevailed in them over the term “Little

Russia", identifying both the Hetmanate as such and the homeland, ie, used as a political name (Dziuba, 2015, pp. 46,52). Consequently, V. Balushok, following F. Sysyn, put emphasis on the fact that after the Hetmanate's emergence, "the term "the Ukrainians" gradually spread as a name among the inhabitants of the Cossack Ukraine" (Balushok, 2014, p. 53). Due to the researcher, the basis for the terminological orientation of modern Ukrainian nation-building was created.

V. Brekhunenko and T. Chukhlib tried to generalize such observations in their entirety. In a conceptual work devoted to the Hetmanate's era, V. Brekhunenko traced the evolution of the name "Ukraine" in the Hetmanate specifically. Ideologically in the canvas, paved by F. Sysyn and Z. Kohut, the researcher not only stated the fact of turning the name "Ukraine" into a political name, but also closely linked it with the state's and the Cossack state's legitimation issue, noting the parallel use of concepts in the Hetmanate the terms "Ukraine" and "Mala Rus": "If the appeal of the new Ukrainian elite to the concept of "Mala Rus" was to demonstrate the continuity between 'knyaz' times and the Hetmanate, the spread of "Ukraine" to "Mala Rus" / Hetmanate symbolized the transformation of the Cossacks into a representative of the Ukrainian world". At the same time, from the fact that the foreman operated with the concept of "Ukraine" consistently, when it came to the optimal borders of the state – ethnic, it follows that in the territorial-political sense, the concept of "Ukraine" covered the entire territorial settlement of the Ukrainians (Brekhunenko, 2014, pp. 107–108). The reasons why the name "Ukraine" did not become the only name of the state should be sought in the the Officers' unwillingness to "break stereotypes and oust the nobility from the highest, as at that time, level – symbolic" (Brekhunenko, 2014, p. 109).

It should be noted that the researcher T. Chukhlib managed to trace the functioning of the ambiguous interpretation of the concept of "Ukraine" in the second half of the XVIIth century in a number of articles. The researcher calculated scrupulously all cases of using the term "Ukraine", "outskirts", "the Ukrainian" in the sources introduced into the scientific circulation, as well as in the documentary materials he found. Therefore, T. Chukhlib's conclusions were made on a wide source base. Dominant for the conceptualizations of the scientist was the separation of the actual Ukrainian practices of using the concepts of "Ukraine" from the neighbors, which structured the existing cases, overcoming the semantic chaos that allegedly existed. There were also two main meanings of the name in the Ukrainian texts: the historical territory of the Rus' / Ukrainian people, the state headed by the Hetman. It is important to note that B. Khmelnytskyi already tried to introduce the diplomatic name "Ukraine" into the diplomatic circulation, that it was included in the text of the March Articles of 1654, and in the Buchach Treaty of 1672 between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Ottoman Empire the term "the Ukrainian state" was used. According to T. Chukhlib, "From specific geographical-territorial" and "geographical-orientational concepts" (as they were at the end of the XVIth – in the first half of the XVIIth century), these terms became "political territorial" and "political national" definitions (Chukhlib, 2015, pp. 39–41).

In addition, the researcher traced the emergence in the discourse of the Hetmanate's elite of the concepts of "the Ukrainian people", "the Ukrainians" and their semantics. The researcher considered the 1660-ies to be the time of the final approval of these former territorial terms in the new semantic content as names and equivalents of "Rusyn" and "the Rus' people" (Chukhlib, 2017, pp. 7–39).

Recently, V. Brekhunenko added new arguments regarding T. Chukhlib's generalizations concerning "the Ukrainians" and "the Ukrainian people", for the first time involving the

Hetmanate's court documentation. The everyday use of the term "all the Ukrainian people" in the 1670-ies and its semantic echo with the "Little Russian people" allowed to strengthen the basis for the conceptual thesis that the term "the Ukrainian people" already meant the identity of the Hetmanate's elite (Brekhunenko, 2019, pp. 14–17; Brekhunenko, 2020, pp. 137–141).

At the same time, V. Brekhunenko also managed to expand the range of observations on the concept of "Ukraine" as a political name. While analyzing the Russian origin's documentary sources, the researcher came to the conclusion that the name "Ukraine" was established firmly in Moscovia Russia to denote the Hetmanate as a political entity and a subject of international relations. The apogee of the concept's usage by the Russian sources in the political-territorial sense dates back to 1708 – 1709.

**The Conclusions.** Finally, it should be noted that in the scientific discourse in general, and in modern Ukrainian historiography in particular, the issue of the evolution of the semantic content of the concept of "Ukraine" occupies a prominent place. The two conceptual lines are competing nowadays. According to the first, the change of content took place exclusively within the framework of geographical and territorial significance. Instead, the second line states the transformation (after the Hetmanate's emergence) of the name "Ukraine" into a political name, and the names "the Ukrainian people" and "the Ukrainians" (in the 1660-ies at the latest) – on the horizon of the new Ukrainian elite's identity. If the supporters of the first interpretation are limited to the XXIth century only by static remarks, within the second interpretation the researchers carry out numerous scientific researches, expand the nomenclature of aspects, specify positions and approaches, which makes it flexible and open for further improvements, and therefore much more promising.

**Acknowledgement.** The authors of the article are sincerely grateful to all members of the editorial board for the advice provided during doing the research and writing the article.

**Financing.** The authors did not receive any financial support for doing the research and writing the article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Adadurov, V.** (2013). Teoretychni zasady ta metodolohiia vpysuvannia ukrainskoi istorii v yevropeyskyi kontekst (pohliad istoryka-vsesvitnyka) [Theoretical Principles and Methodology of Incribing the Ukrainian History in the European Context (The View of a World Historian)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 2, 4–23. [in Ukrainian]

**Bahro, S.** (2013). Vitchyzna Hryhoriia Hrabianky: mirkuvannia pro poshyrennia poniattia kozatskoi vitchyzny v Hetmanshchyni u kintsi XVII — pershii polovyni XVIII st. [Hryhoriy Grabianka's Fatherland: Reflections on the Spread of the Concept of the Cossack Fatherland in the Hetmanate in the Late 17th – First Half of the 18th Century]. *Siversshchyna v istorii Ukrainy*, 6, 188–191. [in Ukrainian]

**Balushok, V.** (2014). Yak rusyny staly ukrainsiamy (transformatsiia ukrainskoi etnonimii v XIX – XX stolittiakh) [How Ruthenians Became Ukrainians (Transformation of the Ukrainian Ethnonymy in the 19th and 20th Centuries)]. *Materialy do ukrainskoi etnolohii*, Kyiv, 52–57. [in Ukrainian]

**Brehunenko, V.** (2019). *Arkhiv rannomodernoï Ukrainy skhizy. Dokumenty kolektsii Oleksandra Lazarevskoho (Seria: Dokumenty Heneralnoho viiskovoho sudu ta Heneralnoi viiskovoi kantseliarii)* [Archive of the Early Modern Ukrainian State. Documents of the Collection of Alexander Lazarevsky (Series: Documents of the General Military Court and the General Military Chancellery)]. Kyiv, 432 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Brekhunenko, V.** (2014). *Skhidna brama Yevropy. Kozatska Ukraina seredyny XVII – XVIII st.* [Eastern Gate of Europe. Cossack Ukraine in the Middle of the XVII – XVIII Centuries]. Kyiv, Tempora, 504 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Brekhunenko, V.** (2020). *Ukraina y ukrainsi. Imia yak pole bytvy* [Ukraine and Ukrainians. Name as a Battlefield]. Kyiv, 272 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Chukhlib, T.** (2015). Poniattia “Ukraina” ta “Ukrainnyi” v ofitsiinomu dyskursi Viiska Zaporozkoho (1649 – 1659 rr.) [The Concept of “Ukraine” and “Ukrainian” in the Official Discourse of the Zaporozhian Army (1649 – 1659)]. *Ukraina v Tsentralno-Skhidnii Yevropi*, 15, 13–41. [in Ukrainian]

**Chukhlib, T.** (2016). Poniattia “Ukraina”, “Ukrainskyi”, “Ukrainska derzhava” v ofitsiinomu dyskursi Viiska Zaporozkoho (1659 – 1665 rr.) [The Concept of “Ukraine”, “Ukrainian”, “Ukrainian State” in the Official Discourse of the Zaporozhian Army (1659 – 1665)]. *Ukraina v Tsentralno-Skhidnii Yevropi*, 16, 13–46. [in Ukrainian]

**Chukhlib, T.** (2017). “Usi zhyteli ukrainskoi porody...”: movna ta svidomisna evoliutsiia poniattia “narod” u Viisku Zaporozkomu (druha polovyna XVII st.) [“All the Inhabitants of the Ukrainian Breed...”: Linguistic and Conscious Evolution of the Concept of “People” in the Zaporozhian Army (Second Half of the XVII Century)]. *Chornomorska mynushyna, Odesa*, 12, 17–39. [in Ukrainian]

**Chukhlib, T.** (2017). Poniattia “Ukraina”, “ukraintsi”, “Otchyzna”, “narod” v ofitsiinomu dyskursi Viiska Zaporozkoho (1666 – 1672 rr.) [The concept of “Ukraine”, “Ukrainians”, “Moherland”, “People” in the Official Discourse of the Zaporozhian Army (1666 – 1672)]. *Ukraina v Tsentralno-Skhidnii Yevropi*, 17, 41–79. [in Ukrainian]

**Chukhlib, T.** (2019). Poshyrennia nazvy “Ukraina” v ofitsiinomu dyskursi Rechi Pospolytoi yak odyn iz naslidkiv Liublinskoi unii 1569 r. [Dissemination of the Name “Ukraine” in the Official Discourse of Rich Pospolyta as One of the Consequences of the Union of Lublin in 1569]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1, 4–24. [in Ukrainian]

**Dziuba, O.** (2015). “Ukraina” i “Malorosiiia”: slova i poniattia v ukrainskii memuaranii literaturi XVIII st. [“Ukraine” and “Malorosiiia”: Words and Concepts in the Ukrainian Memoir Literature of the XVIII Century]. *Ukraina v Tsentralno-Skhidnii Yevropi*, 15, 42–54. [in Ukrainian]

**Kasianov, H. & Tolochko, O.** (2012). Natsionalni istorii ta suchasna istoriografii. Vyklyky y nebezpeky pry napyssanni novoi istorii Ukrainy, [National Histories and Modern Historiography. Challenges and Dangers in Writing a New History of Ukraine]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 6, 4–24. [in Ukrainian]

**Kohut, Z.** (2008). Vid Hadiacha do Andrusova: osmyslennia “otchyzny” v ukrainskii politychnii kulturi [From Gadyach to Andrusov: Understanding the “Fatherland” in Ukrainian Political Culture]. *Hadiatska unia 1658 roku*. Kyiv, 352 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Kravchenko, V.** (2011). *Ukraina, imperiia, Rosiia. Vybrani staty z modernoi istorii ta istoriografii. [Ukraine, Empire, Russia. Selected Articles on Modern History and Historiography]*. Kyiv, Krytyka, 544 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Makarchuk, S.** (1994). Ukraina i ukraintsi: poiava, poshyrennia ta utverdzhennia nazv [Ukraine and Ukrainians: the Emergence, Spread and Adoption of Names]. *Druhyi mizhnarodnyi konhres ukrainistiv Lviv 22–28 serpnia 1993 r. Dopovidi i povidomlennia. Istoriografii ukrainoznavstva, etnoloiiia, kultura*. Lviv, 206–211. [in Ukrainian]

**Motsia, O.** (2007). Yak Rus stavala Ukrainoiu [How Russia Became Ukraine]. In V. A. Smolii (ed.). *Terra Cossacorum: Studii z davnoi i novoi istorii Ukrainy. Naukovyi zbirnyk na poshanu profesora Valerii Stepankova*, Kyiv, Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 339–345. [in Ukrainian]

**Nakonechnyi, Ye.** (2001). *Ukradene imia: chomu rusyny staly ukraintsiamy [Stolen Name: Why the Ruthenians Became Ukrainians]*. Lviv, 242 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Rudnytskyi, Ya.** (1951). *Slovo y nazva “Ukraina” [Word and Name “Ukraine”]*. Vinnipeh, 132 p. [in English]

**Sas, P.** (1998). *Politychna kultura ukrainskoho suspilstva (kinets XVI – persha polovyna XVII st.) [Political Culture of the Ukrainian Society (End of XVI – First Half of XVII century)]*. Kyiv, 296 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Sas, P.** (2001). Vid “Rusi” do “Ukrain” [From “Rus” to “Ukraine”]. *Istoriia ukrainskoi kultury u piaty tomakh, t. 2: Ukrainska kultura XIII – pershoi polovyny XVII stolit*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 795–800. [in Ukrainian]

**Shelukhin, S.** (1936). *Ukraina – nazva nashoi zemli z naidavnishykh chasiv [Ukraine is the Name of Our Land From Ancient Times]*. Praha, 248 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Smolii, V. & Stepankov, V.** (1997). *Ukrainska derzhavna ideia XVII – XVIII st.: problemy formuvannia, evoliutsiia, realizatsii [Ukrainian State Idea of the XVII – XVIII Centuries: Problems of Formation, Evolution, Realization]*. Kyiv: “Alternatyvy”, 367 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Smolii, V. & Stepankov, V.** (2014). *Ukrainskyi politychnyi proekt XVII st.: stanovlennia natsionalnoho instytutu vlady*. [Ukrainian Political Project of the XVII Century: the Formation of a National Institution of Power]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 194 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Sysyn, F.** (1982). Regionalism and Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ukraine: The Nobility's Grievances at the Diet of 1641. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 6, *chapt. 2*, 167–190. [in English]

**Sysyn, F.** (1995). Khmelnychyna ta yii rol v utvorenni modernoi ukrainskoi natsii [Khmelnitsky Region and Its Role in the Formation of the Modern Ukrainian Nation]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 4, 67–77. [in Ukrainian]

**Sysyn, F.** (2006). “Otchyzna” v politychnii kulturi Ukrainy pochatku XVIII st. [«Fatherland» in the Political Culture of Ukraine in the Early XVIII Century]. *Ukraina moderna*, 10, 7–18. [in Ukrainian]

**Tolochko, P.** (1994). Nazva Ukraina v pivdenno-ruskykh litopysakh i aktovykh dokumentakh [Name Ukraine in the South Russian Chronicles and Act Document]. *Kyivska starovyna*, 3, 2–9. [in Ukrainian]

**Yakovenko, N.** (1997). *Narys istorii serednovichnoi ta rannomodernoi istorii Ukrainy* [Essay on the History of Medieval and Early Modern History of Ukraine]. Vydannia druhe, pereroblene ta rozshyrene. Kyiv: Krytyka, 382 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Yakovenko, N.** (2012). *Dzerkala identychnosti. Doslidzhennia z istorii uiaвлен ta idei v Ukraini XVI – pochatku XVIII stolittia* [Mirrors of Identity. Research on the History of Ideas in Ukraine in the XVI – Early XVIII Centuries]. Kyiv, Krytyka, 472 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Zashkilniak, L.** (2008). Shkilna istoriia ochyma istorykiv-naukovtsiv [School History Through the Eyes of Historians-Scientists]. *Materialy Robochoi narady z monitorynhu shkilnykh pidruchnykiv istorii Ukrainy*, Kyiv, 77–78. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on March 29, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 930.1:94(477:438)“1939/1945”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226505

**Andrii BOLIANSKYI**

PhD hab. (History), Senior Research Fellow of the Centre for the studying Ukrainian-Polish relations at Ivan Krypiakevych Institute for Ukrainian Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kozelnytska Street 4, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79026 (andrii.bolianovskiyi@ukr.net);

Associate Professor at the Chair of History, Museum Studies and Cultural Heritage of the Institute of the Humanities and Social Sciences of “Lviv Politehnika” National University, Metropolitan Andrew Str. 5, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79026 (andrii.v.bolianovskiyi@lpnu.com)

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-7685-1854

**Андрій БОЛЯНОВСЬКИЙ**

доктор історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник відділу “Центр дослідження українсько-польських відносин” Інституту українознавства ім. І. Крип’якевича НАН України, вул. Козельницька 4, Львів, Україна, індекс 79026 (andrii.bolianovskiyi@ukr.net); доцент кафедри історії, музеєзнавства та культурної спадщини Інституту гуманітарних і соціальних наук Національного університету “Львівська політехніка”, вул. Митрополита Андрія 5, Львів, індекс 79026 (andrii.v.bolianovskiyi@lpnu.com)

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Bolianovskiy, A. (2021). Historiography of Confrontation between Polish and Ukrainian underground forces during the Years of the German-Soviet War: Main Tendencies of Interpretation of Events in Poland. *Skhidnoievropeiskiyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 239–251. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226505

**HISTORIOGRAPHY OF CONFRONTATION BETWEEN POLISH  
AND UKRAINIAN UNDERGROUND FORCES DURING THE YEARS  
OF THE GERMAN-SOVIET WAR: MAIN TENDENCIES  
OF INTERPRETATION OF THE EVENTS IN POLAND**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research* is to depict how different interpretations of the most actual questions of the theme are presented in the historiography of the studying subject in Poland. **The research methodology** is based on the methods of comparative and critical analysis as well as on the principle of scientific objectivity by the characteristics of main works that were published in Poland on the theme under analysis. **The scientific novelty** of the article is a critical analysis of interpretation of the reasons, course, and results of conflicts between the Polish and Ukrainian underground forces in Polish historiography during the last decades. **The Conclusions:** By the analyzing the works on the history of inter-ethnic wars the obvious tendency can be observed: inclination of some authors to impose reception of these conflicts exclusively from the point of view of their participants aiming at obtaining the empathy for “our own” victims with silence over “alien victims” of these confrontations. The studying the Polish-Ukrainian relations during the years of the German-Soviet War by many authors in Poland can be the typical example of wide-spreading of such tendencies. Despite many works on the subject that were published in this country, it is still topical the need of critical scholar studies of the reasons, forms, and results of the animosity between the Polish Home Army (Armia Krajowa, AK) on one side, and Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists headed by Stepan Bandera (OUN-B) as well as the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (Ukraïnska Povstancha Armiya, the UPA) on other

side in 1943 – 1944. More research is needed to develop new space for much deeper reception of this difficult for resolving historical problem that will help historians to understand real roots, forms and consequences of these hostilities. Main attention of studying problematic is devoted mainly to depicting the theme of losses of the Polish civilian population during this confrontation while many other important questions for understanding the reasons, character and development of this conflict still need further studying (clarifying the number of the Ukrainian victims of confrontation between AK and the UPA armed formations, the comparative analysis of forms and scales of crimes committed by their soldiers against the civil population, attempts to stop the confrontations by negotiations between representatives of the Ukrainian and Polish underground forces, the influence of the Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union on the worsening of the Ukrainian-Polish relations, etc.). The clarifying of reasons for conflict, political responsibility for its consequences, the number of deaths have a special significance for understanding the complex of confrontations between AK and the UPA in the future scholar works, which must be freed from one-sided national prejudices.

**Key words:** the Polish underground, the Ukrainian underground, confrontation, the German-Soviet War, historiography in Poland, reception.

## ІСТОРИОГРАФІЯ ПРОТИСТОЯННЯ СИЛ ПОЛЬСЬКОГО ТА УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ПІДПІЛЛЯ У РОКИ НІМЕЦЬКО-РАДЯНСЬКОЇ ВІЙНИ: ГОЛОВНІ ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ ТРАКТУВАННЯ ПОДІЙ У ПОЛЬЩІ

**Анотація.** *Мета дослідження* – висвітлити, як різні інтерпретації найактуальніших питань теми репрезентовані в історіографії предмета дослідження у Польщі. **Методологія дослідження** базується на застосуванні методів порівняльного і критичного аналізу, а також принципу наукової об'єктивності у процесі вивчення головних праць, опублікованих із вказаної теми. **Наукова новизна** статті – критичний аналіз причин, ходу і наслідків конфліктів між польськими і українськими підпільними силами в історіографії у Польщі в останні десятиліття. **Висновки.** У процесі аналізу праць з історії міжетнічних конфліктів можна прослідкувати виразну тенденцію: схильність нав'язати сприймання цих конфліктів виключно зі сприймання його учасниками з очевидною метою отримати емпатію до “своїх” жертв із замовчуванням “чужих жертв” цих конфронтацій. Типовим прикладом поширення таких тенденцій може бути стан вивчення дослідниками у Польщі проблеми протистоянь між польською Армією Крайовою (АК) з одного боку і Організацією Українських Націоналістів під проводом Степана Бандери (ОУН-Б) й Українською Повстанчою Армією (УПА) з другого у 1943 – 1944 роках. У цій країні актуальною залишається потреба критично-наукового дослідження причин, форм і наслідків цього протистояння. Головну увагу у дослідженні цієї проблематики у Польщі присвячено висвітленню втрат польського цивільного населення в ході протистояння. Водночас багато інших важливих питань для розуміння передумов, характеру й розвитку цього протистояння потребують подальшого вивчення (з'ясування кількості українських жертв протистояння збройних формувань АК і УПА, порівняльний аналіз форм та методів злочинів, скоєних їх вояками проти цивільного населення, спроби зупинити протистояння шляхом ведення переговорів між представниками українського та польського підпілля, вплив нацистської Німеччини та Радянського Союзу на погіршення українсько-польських відносин тощо). З'ясування причин конфліктів, політичної відповідальності за їх наслідки, втручання “третьох сил” та кількості загиблих має особливе значення для розуміння комплексу проблем конфронтації між АК і УПА у майбутніх наукових дослідженнях, що повинні бути вільними від однобічних національних упередженостей.

**Ключові слова:** польсько-українське протистояння, німецько-радянська війна, історіографія у Польщі, сприймання.

**The Problem Statement.** The rise of nationalist tendencies in the policies of the formation of historical memory in Poland, Hungary, Romania and other European countries as well as the Baltic states, Russia, Ukraine, Georgia, and other former Soviet republics, in particular, – have since reinforced the central importance of nationalism in the history of political processes in Europe. A special attention of historians in this context is devoted to

the studying the roots, development and consequences of international conflicts and impact of the dramatic changes that have taken place in the past on the contemporary development of international relations in Central Eastern Europe. Much of the effort went into the task of attempting to understand, compare, and interpret relations between OUN-B and AK during the years of the German-Soviet war. Advocates of the national perspective on this conflict hold that its different forms have deep historical, social, economical and religious foundations. Even the scholarly literature on the subject is sharply polarized (Kasianov, 2006, pp. 247–259; Copey, 2008, pp. 531–560).

**The Purpose of the Article.** The purpose of this article is to characterize the main tendencies of publications in Poland, which are important for understanding of reception of the Polish-Ukrainian relations during the German-Soviet War. The article deals with the conceptual propositions of the writing of history of this subject in Poland (from 1991 till the last years) in order to reveal the essence of this historiography in studying the problem. Because both the Polish and Ukrainian authors, as usual, have many in common in reception of studying the subject, making to some degree common hypotheses, statements, and conclusions. It seems necessary to use some generalized terms for destinations of some tendencies in “national versions of history”. In particular, by some generalizations the author uses general terms like adverbs and destinations “Polish” or relatively “Ukrainian” toward reception, versions, interpretations, and historiographies in Poland and Ukraine.

**The Basic Material Statement.** During the first decade after the end of World War II the topic of confrontation between the OUN-B and AK forces during the period of the German-Soviet War was a taboo both in Ukraine (at that time – the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Poland (at that time – the Polish People’s Republic or *Polska Republika Ludowa*, PRL) under the power and influence of the Soviet Union. The generation of the Poles being born after World War II was educated about the Polish-Ukrainian conflicts on the example of the Carpathian drama mainly as based on one book of Jan Gerhard “*Łuny w Bieszczadach* [Glowes in the Carpathians]” (Gerhard, 1959). From the beginning of the 1960s in the Polish People’s Republic some anti-nationalist articles were also published with the aim at discrediting the idea of a political alliance of the Ukrainian and Polish anti-Communist dissidents in the Polish society. The articles condemning the OUN-B and the UPA anti-Polish activities were published too (see, e.g.: Szota, 1963, pp. 163–218). Later Antoni Szcześniak and Wiesław Szota’s book as other “sanctioned work” was published. It devoted one section of a chapter to the OUN-B campaign of ethnic cleansing of Volhynia and Galicia from the Polish minority there (Szcześniak, Szota, 1973). However, the publication of this work had apparently been permitted; it was immediately withdrawn from bookstore all over Poland and forbidden for distribution. From critical point of view the anti-Polish activity of the Ukrainian nationalists during World War II was only mentioned briefly in the publications on the history of this country in some articles, monographs, etc. (see e.g.: Markiewicz, 1980). Any facts on the crimes of the Polish armed formations against the Ukrainian population at the same time were silenced.

Simultaneously from this time there were existed many myths on the topic of the Polish-Ukrainian relations in historiography of PRL. There were a lot of legends, that allegedly the Ukrainians killed the Polish intellectuals in Lviv on July of 1941, that allegedly the Ukrainian soldiers of 14th Waffen-SS Division “Galicia” participated in the Nazi uprising in Warsaw, about hyperbolized number of the Polish victims in Volhynia in 1943, etc. By the second part of the 1980s such legends were concentrated in the works by Edward Prus (Prus, 1985; 1988).

The topic of research was extremely politicized in Poland after the fall of the Communist system in Eastern Europe. In part, from the beginning of the 1990s the latent function of some Polish authors was to bind together with a band of a collective guilt the wavering adherents within the Ukrainians (Motyka, 2000, pp. 166–178).

The tendencies from the mid-1990th had been continued in the works of political publicists Edward Prus (see e.g.: Prus, 1994) and the author of the Ukrainian origin, Viktor Polishchuk, that were widely popularized in Poland. It is interesting to note that book of Polishchuk “Bitter Truth” was published once in Ukrainian and in English. All the rest his books were published in Polish that let us the reason to characterize his narratives as the part of the Polish historiography (Poliszczuk, 1995; 1999; 2000).

The study of a historical writing on the above-mentioned topic put things in such a way that the Polish underground and its adherents might not be to blame by the provoking of conflict between the Ukrainian and Polish underground forces. After the elimination of censorship in Poland during the 1990s, previously “repressed memories” flooded the myth on market-stories of “400,000 victims of the Ukrainian terror” and “genocide of the Poles” began to circulate (Terles, 1993, p. 22).

The leading role in perpetuating the negative stereotype of the Ukrainians had been played by organizations of the Poles, who were resettled from the Eastern borderlands, called *Kresy* by them in 1944-1946 (one of the most known of them was the Society for Memorialization of the victims of the Ukrainian nationalists in Poland, *Stowarzyszenie Upamiętnienia Ofiar Zbrodni Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów* in Polish). Under their influence the Polish authors, as a rule, do not consider the interwar policy of the Second Polish Republic as the main reason of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict but concentrate their attention on “forceless Polish victims of terrible Ukrainian crimes,” during the period of World War II (Motyka, 1995, pp. 219–226; Motyka, 2000, pp. 166–178; Karłowicz, Popek, 1998).

The books that have the tendencies to accuse the OUN members and the UPA soldiers as criminals have been published over the last two decades in Poland (Gross, 1999; Kuźmierz, 2006). They give us total exaggerations on the Polish victims as result of confrontation between the Polish and Ukrainian underground forces during the years of the German-Soviet War, making the silence over not only the crimes of the Polish armed formations but even the crimes committed by the Soviet Union against both the Poles and the Ukrainians (see e.g.: Karłowicz, Popek, 1998).

An implacable stand were taken by the Polish historians Władysław and Ewa Siemaszko in their book “Genocide of the Polish Population of Volhynia by the Ukrainian Nationalists in 1939 – 1945”, which was published in Warsaw in 2000. They included key ideas on the adoption of one-sided mythological narrative by writers, who were criticized OUN-B and UPA activity. Firstly, allegedly the Ukrainians and other national minorities lived in amity, peace and prosperity in the Second Polish Republic. Secondly, all the Poles of Volhynia were presented exclusively as “peaceful inhabitants” living in peace and harmony in the above-mentioned region. There was no mention of any essential discrimination or mass persecution of the Ukrainians. Thirdly, the Poles were treated in a hospitable fashion because they symbolized a peace and never aspired to the aim of expelling the indigenous Ukrainian population. Conversely, this implies that if the Ukrainian nationalists were ready to stop at the beginning their anti-Polish action, relations between the two groups could return to normal. However, the most important is that Siemaszkos’ book provides an example of transformation technologies implementation of a local individual, family and regional group

memory of many thousands of victims of the OUN-B and AK confrontation into a collective national memory of many millions citizens of contemporary Poland. It was made by using exaggerations of a number of the Polish victims of inter-ethnic confrontation on the basis of secondary sources (Siemaszko, Siemaszko, 2000, vol. 1–2).

In few years the same simplified picture of the events in Galicia was represented in three books by Henryk Komański and Szczepan Siekierka (including one book in cooperation with Edward Róžański) (Komański, Siekierka, 2004; Siekierka, Komański, Róžański, 2008; Siekierka, Komański, Róžański, 2008)). At the same time, similar martyrologies on the Polish victims of the Polish-Ukrainian confrontation on the eastern borderland of contemporary Poland were published by Zdzisław Konieczny (Konieczny, 2006), Stanisław Jastrzębski (Jastrzębski, 2007) and Sławomir Żurek (Żurek, 2007).

All above-mentioned books included some lists and registers of murdered Poles. Their authors like Siemaszkos focused their attention, primarily, upon individual memory of the Poles from Volhynia and Galicia totally ignoring the testimonies of their Ukrainian neighbours. However, their critical point toward the Ukrainians only – which he presents as an essential part of his overall argument – is almost certainly misguided; and their efforts to maintain it, despite non-conforming evidence, involve serious methodological lapses. Their statements are in fact erroneous by reason for ignoring the problem of the Ukrainian losses. Objective results can be obtained by taking into account the data on the Ukrainian victims of confrontation on the basis of the Ukrainian archival sources by the simultaneous critical analyzing memoirs of the Polish witnesses and other Polish sources. Such kind of one-sidedness and such approach to the problem of a collective memory prevails in Poland. Many Polish authors conceived of the Ukrainian nationalist movement mostly in purely negative terms and used the rhetoric of self-defence of forceless Polish population against the Ukrainian nationalists (see: e.g., Jastrzębski, 2001; Filar, 2007).

Most of the Polish historians divided conflicts between the Ukrainian and the Polish underground forces in 1943–1944 into two phases: the Ukrainian terror and the Polish defence. Prof. Władysław Filar was one of them. He relatively neglected and misunderstood the inter-war period, namely the years 1921 – 1939. Filar stated that mass killing of the Poles began long before there were any signs of intentions of the Nazis and the Bolsheviks in the Polish-Ukrainian relations. The ethnic cleansing, says Filar, was implemented mainly by the OUN-B, not by the Ukrainian peasantry, and the shift toward mass persecutions was experienced by these individuals as anything but radical, the final step being another increment at the end of a series of policies leading “logically” to that conclusion. Filar was interested ostensibly in the Ukrainians’ responsibility for ethnic conflict and its impact in many chapters dealing with the war between the Ukrainian and the Polish underground forces, treated by him as extermination of the Polish population in Volhynia (Filar, 2003).

Filar’s interpretation very much reflects Czesław Partacz’s and Krzysztof Lada’s own vision. Their book examines the attitude and policy of the Polish Government-in-exile in regard to the Ukrainian question of 1939 – 1945. Partacz and Lada in their common work devoted special attention to both the Polish and Ukrainian attempts of understanding during World War II. Making use of previously unavailable archival material it seeks to present a much fuller picture of the Polish policy that has until now been possible. On the other hand, although this book accused the Ukrainians in crimes against the Poles, this does not explain the real reasons for Volhynian conflict. Both Partacz and Lada make a substantial contribution to their field, but neither pays much attention to the real roots of the above-mentioned conflict.

Lada – as well as Partacz – sees the impact of integral nationalist ideas even among non-OUN-B members, who often reject them. Both of these authors stated that allegedly OUN-B and the UPA was motivated by a human-hate ideology and that was the main reason for their anti-Polish activities. According to their thesis, the Ukrainian integral nationalist ideology included idea of ethnic cleansing already by the end of the 1930s obviously the Volhynian tragedy was an example of implementation of these ideas (Partacz, Łada, 2004).

The above-mentioned books influenced the portrayal of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict of 1939 – 1945 in the Polish history textbooks. In one of them, which was specially issued for the Ukrainians it was even stated that allegedly “during the one-and-half-year, from time to time with great cruelty, over 100 thousand of children, women and men were murdered [by the UPA]” (*Pol'shcha. Narys istorii*, 2015, p. 281).

Main tendencies of historiography of the AK-OUN-B conflict by the Polish diaspora during the second half of the XXth century were represented by politically motivated narratives of Volhynia or Galicia natives (Dziemiańczuk, 1999; Korman, 1989; Terles, 1993), partially by adherents of the right-wing nationalist ideology, the so-called “national-democrats” (see e.g.: Giertych, 1980).

The majority of such works were written by these Poles, who personal or whose families survived after the OUN and the UPA anti-Polish action; this determined sharply biased tendencies of these authors toward the Ukrainians. Tadeusz Piotrowski, a former professor of sociology at the University of New Hampshire at Manchester, was one of them. In his monograph Piotrowski demonstrated one-sided approach, expounding the complex of political and military situation in 1943 – 1944 only in the manner it was conceived by the Polish right-wing politicians during World War II or treated by the Polish underground right-radical press of that time. Of slanderous nature are Piotrowski's assertions that the operations taken by the UPA during the summer of 1943 – the spring of 1944 in Western Ukraine were nothing but the genocide of the Polish population. Piotrowski's monograph is completely based on the contrived thesis that the Polish-Ukrainian conflict was almost exclusively a result of the Ukrainian animosity to the Poles. Piotrowski considered everything that was done by the UPA for cleansing its territory from the Polish military bases to be its “measures of genocide”. While particular aspects of many events were explained, some (e.g., anti-Ukrainian terror of the Polish armed formations) are not mentioned at all. Piotrowski's book shows a biased and distorted view of the Polish-Ukrainian relations. Piotrowski treated the Volhynian tragedy as an act committed by those terrible Ukrainian nationalists against the valiant and innocent Polish people, defending their homeland. Piotrowski prefers to talk about Volhynia without accent on the unacceptable Polish policy of a ruthless exploitation and discrimination against the Ukrainians of Western Ukraine (Piotrowski, 1995; Piotrowski, 2000).

The legend about one-sided “Ukrainian barbarity” in Volhynia was retold not only in Piotrowski's books but also in many books by other authors published in 1999 – 2005 (see e.g.: Pelensky, 2005, pp. 49–62). This part of the Polish historians is not striving to propose the balanced, historically true and complete picture of the Polish-Ukrainian relations. Being guided to a large extent by purely utilitarian considerations of the negative attitude against the OUN-B and the UPA from the German-Soviet War times, they almost completely ignored such notable tragic reasons of the Ukrainian nationalist animosity toward the Poles as murders of the Ukrainians by the Polish police in Volhynia as well as terror of Home Army (*Armia Krajowa*, AK) and other Polish formations in this region, Galicia and Kholm region during the years of 1943 – 1944. Of course, such attempts to keep silent about common responsibility of the Polish and Ukrainian politicians and organizations for tragic Polish-Ukrainian conflict

of the past does not promote a deepening of understanding between the two nations today as well as in the future. However, as long as research analysis of the Polish-Ukrainian relations during the years of World War II restricts its focus to crime aspect only, it remains limited and undeveloped thematically.

Only separate authors in Poland distanced themselves from the hagiographic commemoration, the accent on a overwhelmed data of the Polish victims that never was confirmed by common Polish-Ukrainian investigations and large-scale common archeologic research works, and memoirs of the Ukrainian eyewitnesses of these events. For instance, Tadeusz Olszanski cast a fresh glance on confrontation of the forces of the Polish and Ukrainian underground and its history (Olszański, 1991). Small part of the Polish historians represented relatively objective point of views, e. g. Zbigniew Kowalewski (Kowalewski, 1993).

Specific worth mentioning here is Professor Ryszard Torzecki, who wrote monograph on the Poles and the Ukrainians in 1939 – 1945, where he thoroughly studied the Ukrainian issue in the Polish policy at the same time. He was one of the first to demand an objective study of the acute problems in the Polish-Ukrainian relations during the above-mentioned period. His book, probably, the best and most objective Polish research of all that has ever been written about these relations during World War II. Torzecki do not have a passion for political speculation by this problem. One of the most comprehensive frameworks for conceptualizing the issues of the Polish-Ukrainian relations during World-War II can be found in this recent work. As Torzecki pointed out, the Poles were indeed adamant in viewing both Volhynia and Galicia as integral parts of the Polish state. The Polish government-in-exile would go only as far as offering civil rights to Volhynian and Galician Ukrainians equal to other citizens of Poland. This, however, was utterly not enough to the OUN-B. That was one of the main reasons why its leadership treated AK armed formations from the summer of 1943 like not only as possible ally, but also as a potential future occupant of their country and thus the one of the main enemies of the Ukrainian independence. In consequence, the mistakes of the Polish policy are well highlighted. The central aim of Torzecki's book was also to provide an general history using the noteworthy archival materials to present the Polish-Ukrainian relations in international situation, the role of "the third force" in regulating using ethnic conflict between the Poles and the Ukrainians, etc. Thus, the readers of his book will find the picture of events is far more balanced. (Torzecki, 1993, pp. 197–224).

The works on the history of the Polish Home Army and its confrontation with the UPA by their critical analysis are of extraordinary importance for understanding the situation in Volhynia during the years of World War II. Despite statements of their authors about small armament of local AK detachments, the content of these publications confirms that there were well-trained military formations that were organized by officers and non-commissioned-officers of pre-war Polish army, who received a good military training before September of 1939. These works also give historians enough facts and information to make conclusions that in many cases these formations were organized earlier and better than the UPA detachments. Main of these works are the monographs of Jozef Turowski (Turowski, 1990) and Waclaw Romanowski (Romanowski, 1993), well-informative article and books of Adam Peretiatkowicz (Peretiatkowicz, 1994, pp. 33–44; Peretiatkowicz, 1994; Peretiatkowicz, 1997) as well as the articles of Michal Klimecki (Klimecki, 1998, pp. 55–76) and Roman Striłka (Striłka, 1998, pp. 77–85). These authors described the activities of AK underground forces in Volhynia 1939/44 – proceders of Volhynian Infantry Division 27 of the AK, calling them as self-defence units.

The books of Jerzy Węgierski, a former AK officer, were devoted to the Polish Home Army and partially to its participation in the struggle against the OUN-B underground and the UPA detachments in Galicia. Most of them are described the activities of the Union of Armed Struggle (Związek Walki Zbrojnej or ZWZ in Polish abbreviation, renamed into AK in February 1942) in this region from the end of 1939 till the end of 1944 (see, e.g.: Węgierski, 1991; Węgierski, 1994; Węgierski, 1996).

One of the most known critics of the Ukrainian interpretations of confrontation between the OUN-B/UPA and AK forces during the years of the German-Soviet War was Grzegorz Motyka. Initially some time after Torzecki's book *Motyka* shifted to a positive evaluation in appraising relations between the UPA and the Polish underground resistance by the end and immediately after World War II. His book (in cooperation with Rafał Wnuk) "Masters and Slayers: Cooperation between the UPA and AK during the 1940s" was not only a new view, but a turning point in the Polish historiography, urging the public to concentrate on the factors that united, rather than disunited, the two nations (Motyka, Wnuk, 1997).

On the one hand, later Motyka, despite a critical review of Volodymyr Viatrovykh's book, in fact supported his concept on the Polish-Ukrainian war claiming that from 1943 "repeating the scenario of 1918" or "the outbreak of the Polish-Ukrainian war for Lviv" was typical of the situation in Western Ukraine. On other hand, he shifted from some positive estimations of the OUN-B in book "Masters and Slayers" to negativism in assessing the Ukrainian underground stated that the anti-Polish action of the Ukrainian nationalists were the acts of deliberate ethnic cleansing on the part of the OUN-B, which ideologically dominated the UPA and wanted to transform Volhynia into a homogeneous ethnically Ukrainian territory (Motyka, 2011, pp. 124, 242). He also shows that the Polish collaborationists, who are ignored by many Polish historians, had committed under the guidance of the Nazis the punitive operations not only on the occupied territory of Volhynia but at the territories of Polissia and Galicia as well (Motyka, 1998, pp. 128–131; Motyka, 1999, pp. 118–121). On the other hand, Motyka too briefly summarizes the anti-Ukrainian actions of AK and various other Polish armed formations, while the anti-Polish UPA actions are dealt with at great length in many his works.

In simplifying the history of the Polish-Ukrainian relations some historians in Poland see one of the means for disguising the Polish government-in-exile's pretensions on the Western Ukrainian lands during World War II. Some Polish authors also stated that many Ukrainians, who served the German occupation authorities, were involved into the Polish-Ukrainian conflicts too. Simultaneously some Polish authors portray the Poles, who also collaborated with the Nazis against the Ukrainians not as betrayers of their country, but, justifying them, they are represented as fighters against the Ukrainian terror, as supporters of the Polish underground movement (Siemaszko; Siemaszko, 2000, vol.2, pp. 1077–1078). However, even some historians in Poland unmask these false statements. Separate Ukrainian archival documents have been widely used lately by these authors as sources in the works devoted to the Ukrainian-Polish relations (e.g., by Władysław Filar, Grzegorz Motyka), who confirmed collaborationism of the Polish police in the Nazi service in Volhynia that was directed against the Ukrainians (Filar, 2003, pp. 181–201; Motyka, 2011, pp. 105–107).

The collection of articles "Anti-Polish Action of the OUN-UPA 1943-1944. Facts and Interpretations" was of great importance for understanding of the newest Polish interpretations of warfare between participants of the Polish and Ukrainian underground forces. The narratives and constructions of the Polish historians toward the nature of ethnic

confrontations (Kwaśniewski, 1994, pp. 39–54; Sokołowski, 1994, pp. 39–48; Szykiewicz, 1996, pp. 15–30), general sketches of the Polish-Ukrainian relations in a historical perspective, general strategies and tactics in their historical relations (Malikowski, 2003, pp. 189–214), military preparations and activities of the Polish armed formations (Klimecki, 1998, pp. 55–76; Krawczyk, 2008, pp. 102–132), an analysis of the human losses in conflicts (Hryciuk, 2005), etc. also are interesting for the understanding the reasons, processes and results of the Polish-Ukrainian conflicts during World War II.

By the last two decades in Poland was obvious a clear tendency of exaggerating “another part’s guilt” and relativization of guilt for “own crimes”. Quite often some authors only demonstrated an evident ignoring undesirable for them information rather than forgetting of it. Keeping on labelling Volhynian tragedy as the anti-Polish genocide, but when the whole Ukrainian villages across the so-called Curzon line (lands of the so-called *Zakerzonnia*) were whipped out in 1943 – 1944, many Polish authors didn’t see this as genocide. For instance, E. Siemaszko, and the others expressed the opinion that the Poles, who murdered the Ukrainian civilians in Sahryn in 1944, and in Pavlokoma in 1945, are free of any guilt since it was the guilt of the Ukrainians (Dytkowski, 2011; Isakowicz-Zaleski, 2011; Siemaszko, 2011; Kulińska, 2006; Konieczny, 2000).

**The Conclusions.** Analyzing the works of the Polish historians the conclusion can be done that the “Polono-centric perception” of the Polish-Ukrainian conflicts during the years of the German-Soviet War shapes a contemporary reception of this topic in Poland. Quite obvious is tendency to receive empathy to the Polish victims with simultaneous ignorance of the Ukrainian casualties of an international confrontation. “Political intervention” through myth-making on the history of these dramatical events by some authors in Poland, stopped constructive disputes of the tragical and even bloody pages of common Polish-Ukrainian history. Decisive influence on the historical treatment of the Ukrainian-Polish relations during the years of the German-Soviet War played a political interference in their studying by some historians in contemporary Poland. On the basis of their statements and conclusions the Polish mass-media generated emotional perceptions in ways that were particularly problematic and that stimulate further politicization of the past, which sometimes produced no less negative troubles into further Polish-Ukrainian relations than historical intervention of Russia into these relations from outside. However, only taking into account all the arguments and conceptual approaches of historians of Poland and Ukraine we can have enough field for generalizations on the studying problem and other difficult issues of the Polish-Ukrainian history.

**Funding.** The author received no financial support for the research, authorship and publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Antypolska akcja OUN-UPA 1943 – 1944: fakty i interpretacje** (2002). *Antypolska akcja OUN-UPA 1943 – 1944: fakty i interpretacje [OUN-UPA anti-Polish action 1943 – 1944: facts and interpretations]*. Ed. by G.Motyka and D.Libionka]. Warszawa: IPN – Komisja ścigania zbrodni przeciwno narodowi Polskiemu, 166 p. [in Polish]

**Copsey, N.** (2008). Remembrance of Things Past: the Lingering Impact of History on Contemporary Polish-Ukrainian Relations. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 60 (4), 531–560; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09668130801999847> [in English]

**Dytkowski, J.** (2011). Sahryń to nie Ostrówki. *Nasz Dziennik*, 144 (22–23 czerwca). URL: <http://www.naszdziennik.pl/index.php?dat=20110622&tvp=po&id=po05.txt> [in Polish]

**Dziemiańczuk, W.** (1999). *Polish Self Defence in Volhynia* [transl.: A. Getlich & H. Sokolska]. Toronto: Alliance of the Polish Eastern Provinces, 128 p. [in Polish]

**Filar, W.** (2003). *Wołyń 1939 – 1944: eksterminacja czy walki polsko-ukraińskie: studium historyczno-wojskowe zmagania na Wołyniu w obronie polskości, wiary i godności ludzkiej [Volhynia 1939 – 1944: extermination or the Polish-Ukrainian fights: study of historical military struggle in Volhynia in defence of Polishness, faith and human dignity]*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 467 p. [in Polish]

**Filar, W.** (2007). *Przebraże – bastion polskiej samoobrony na Wołyniu [Przebraże – a bastion of Polish self-defence in Volhynia]*. Warszawa: Światowy Związek Żołnierzy Armii Krajowej: Oficyna Wydawnicza Rytm, 121 p. [in Polish]

**Giertych, J.** (1980). O przeprowadzonej przez Ukraińców rzezi polskiej ludności [On throat-slitting of the Polish population by the Ukrainians]. *Komunikaty Towarzystwa im. R. Dmowskiego [Communicate of the Roman Dmowski's Society]*, 2 (1). [in Polish]

**Gross, E.** (1999). *Zbrodnie Ukraińskiej Powstańczej Armii [Crimes of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army]*. Głogów: nakł. autora, 452 p. [in Polish]

**Hryciuk, G.** (2005). *Przemiany narodowościowe i ludnościowe w Galicji Wschodniej i na Wołyniu w latach 1931 – 1948 [National and population transformations in Eastern Galicia and Volhynia in the years 1931 – 1948]*. Toruń, 424 p. [in Polish]

**Isakowicz-Zaleski, T.** (2011). Sahryn nie był ludobójstwem [Sahryn was not a genocide]. *Gazeta Polska*, 3 sierpnia. URL: <http://www.bibula.com/?p=41645> [in Polish]

**Jaszczyński, S.** (2007). *Ludobójstwo nacjonalistów ukraińskich na Polakach na Lubelszczyźnie w latach 1939 – 1947 [Genocide of the Poles by the Ukrainian nationalists during the years of 1939 – 1947]*. Wrocław: Nortom, 263 p. [in Polish]

**Jastrzębski, S.** (2001). *Kresy wschodnie we krwi: rzecz o polskiej samoobronie [Polish borderlands in blood: history of Polish self-defence]*. Wrocław, 176 p. [in Polish]

**Karłowicz, L. & Poppek, L.** (1998). *Okrutna przestroga [Terrible warning]*. Lublin: Polihymnia, 606 p. [in Polish]

**Kasianov, G.** (2006). The Ukrainian–Polish conflict of 1943/44 in contemporary public, academic and political debates in Ukraine and Poland. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 19 (3–4), 247–259. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09668130801999847> [in English]

**Klimecki, M.** (1998). *Geneza i organizacja polskiej samoobrony na Wołyniu i w Małopolsce Wschodniej podczas II wojny światowej (Genesis and organization of the Polish self-defence in Volhynia and in Eastern Small Poland during World War II). Polska-Ukraina. Trudne pytania [Poland-Ukraine: Difficult questions]*. Vol. 3 (pp. 55–76). Warszawa: Karta. [in Polish]

**Komański, H. & Siekierka, Sz.** (2004). *Ludobójstwo dokonane przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich na Polakach w województwie tarnopolskim 1939 – 1946 [Genocide against the Polish population in Voievodship of Tarnopol, that has been perpetrated by the Ukrainian nationalists in 1939 – 1946]*. Wrocław, 1182 p. [in Polish]

**Konieczny, Z.** (2005). *Był taki czas... U źródeł akcji odwetowej w Pawłokomie [By the sources of retaliation action]*. Przemyśl, 86 p. [in Polish]

**Konieczny, Z.** (2006). *Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie na ziemiach obecnej Polski w latach 1918 – 1947 [Polish-Ukrainian relations in the lands of present Poland, 1918 – 1947]*. Wrocław: [Na rubieży. Zakład Wydawniczy]: Stowarzyszenie Upamiętnienia Ofiar Zbrodni Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów, 536 p. [in Polish]

**Korman, A.** (1989). *Piąte przykazanie boskie: nie zabijaj! Nieukarane ludobójstwo dokonane przez ukraińskich szowinistów w latach 1939 – 1945 [Fifth God's Testament: don't kill! Unpunished genocide permitted by the Ukrainian chauvinists in the years of 1939 – 1945]*. Londyn, 46 p. [in Polish]

**Korman, A.** (2002). *Stosunek UPA do Polaków na ziemiach południowo-wschodnich II Rzeczypospolitej [UPA attitude toward the Poles in southern-eastern lands of Second Polish Republic]*. Wrocław: Nortom, 162 p. [in Polish]

**Kowalewski, Z.** (1993). *Kwestia polska w powojennej strategii Ukraińskiej Powstańczej Armii [Polish Question in post-war strategy of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army]. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Prace Historyczne [Scientific Journal of Jagellonian University. Historical Studies]*, 103, 189–224. [in Polish]

**Krawczyk, J.** (2008). Tworzenie się samoobrony ludności polskiej przez eksterminacyjną akcję OUN-UPA na terenie byłego woj. tarnopolskiego w latach 1943 – 1944 [Creation of self-defence of Polish population through an extermination action of the OUN-UPA on the territories of former Voivodship of Tarnopol in the years of 1943 – 1944]. *Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie. Wojna i współczesność / pod red. J. Marszałek-Kawy, Z. Karpusa* [Polish-Ukrainian relations. War and present. Ed. by J. Marszałek-Kawa, Z. Karpus] (pp.102–132). Toruń. [in Polish]

**Kulińska, L.** (2006). Pawłokoma. *Dziennik Polski* [Polish Daily], 103 (4 maja), 10. URL: <http://www.dziennik.krakow.pl/pl/aktualnosci/krai/236854-pawlokoma.html> [in Polish]

**Kuzmicz, Ł.** (2006). *Zbrodnie bez kary* [Crimes without punishment]. Rzeszów: Agencja Poligraficzno-Wydawnicza “Sandra”, 349 p. [in Polish]

**Kwaśniewski, K.** (1994). Konflikt etniczny [Ethnic conflict]. *Sprawy Narodowościowe* [National matters], 3 (1), 39–54. [in Polish]

**Łukaszów, J.** [Olszański, T.] (1989). Walki polsko-ukraińskie 1943 – 1947 [Polish-Ukrainian fights, 1943 – 1947]. *Zeszyty Historyczne* [Historical Journal]. Paryż, 90 (455), 159–199. [in Polish]

**Malikowski, M.** (2002). Strategie i taktyki stosowane w kontaktach polsko-ukraińskich w zakresie ujmowania historii wzajemnych stosunków [Strategies and tactics in Polish-Ukrainian contacts in the field of resolving of both-sided relations]. *Polacy i Ukraińcy wczoraj i dziś, red. B. Grott* [Poles and Ukrainians yesterday and today / Ed. by B. Grott] (pp.189–214). Kraków. [in Polish]

**Markiewicz, J.** (1980). *Partyzancki kraj* [Partisan land]. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie, 561 p. [in Polish]

**Motyka, G. & Wnuk, R.** (1997). “Pany” i “rezuny”. *Współpraca AK-WiN i UPA 1945 – 1947* [“Masters” and “throat-slitters”. Cooperation between the AK-WiN and the UPA, 1945 – 1947]. Warszawa: Volumen, 212 p. [in Polish]

**Motyka, G.** (1997). Konflikt polsko-ukraiński na Wołyniu w świetle polskiej historiografii [The Polish-Ukrainian Conflict in Volhynia in Light of Polish Historiography]. *Przegląd Wschodni. Warsaw*, 4 (1), 219–226. [in Polish]

**Motyka, G.** (1998). Polski policjant na Wołyniu [Polish policeman in Volhonia]. *Karta*, 24, 126–140. [in Polish]

**Motyka, G.** (1999). *Tak było w Bieszczadach. Walki polsko-ukraińskie 1943 – 1948* [It was happened in Bieszczady. Polish-Ukrainian struggle, 1943 – 1948]. Warsaw: Oficyna Wydawnicza Volumen, 552 p. [in Polish]

**Motyka, G.** (2000). *Problematyka stosunków polsko-ukraińskich w latach 1939 – 1948 w polskiej historiografii po roku 1989* [Problematic of Polish-Ukrainian relations in the years of 1939 – 1948 in Polish historiography after 1989]. *Historycy polscy i ukraińscy wobec problemów XX wieku / pod red. P. Kosiewskiego i G. Motyki* [Polish and Ukrainian historians toward problems of the XXth century / Ed. by P. Kosiewski and G. Motyka] (pp. 166–178). Kraków. [in Polish]

**Motyka, G.** (2011). *Od rzezi wołyńskiej do akcji “Wista”: konflikt polsko-ukraiński 1943 – 1947* [From Volhynian slaughter to ‘Vistula’ action: Polish-Ukrainian conflict 1943 – 1947]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo literackie, 521 p. [in Polish]

**Olszański T. A.** (1991). Konflikt polsko-ukraiński 1943 – 1947 [Polish-Ukrainian conflict, 1943 – 1947]. *Więź*, 11–12 (listopa–grudzień), 214–232. [in Polish]

**Partacz, Cz. & Łada, K.** (2004). *Polska wobec ukraińskich dążeń niepodległościowych w czasie II wojny światowej* [Poland in the face of Ukrainian independence aspirations during World War II]. Toruń: CEE [Centrum Edukacji Europejskiej], 412 p. [in Polish]

**Pelensky, A.** (2005). The Unknown Genocide in Volhynia and Galicia. *Undergraduate Journal of Slavic Studies. Spring*, 1 (1), 49–62. [in English]

**Peretiatkowicz, A.** (1994). Samoobrona ludności polskiej na Wołyniu w latach 1943 – 1944 [Self-defence of Polish population in Volhynia during the years of 1943 – 1944]. *Armia Krajowa na Wołyniu* [Home Army in Volhynia] (pp. 33–44). Warszawa. [in Polish]

**Peretiatkowicz, A.** (1995). *Polska samoobrona w okolicach Łucka* [Polish self-defence in the neighborhoods of Luck]. Katowice, 252 p. [in Polish]

**Peretiatkowicz, A.** (1997). *Wołyńska samoobrona w dorzeczu Horynia* [Volhynian self-defence in the Horyn basin]. Katowice: Biblioteka Wołyńska, 336 p. [in Polish]

**Piotrowski, T.** (1995). *Polish-Ukrainian Relations during World War II: Ethnic Cleansing in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia*. Toronto, 55 p. [in English]

**Piotrowski, T.** (2000). *Genocide and Rescue in Wołyń. Recollections of the Ukrainian Nationalist Ethnic Cleansing Campaign Against the Poles During World War II*. Jefferson, North Carolina; London, 319 p. [in English]

**Pol'shcha. Narys istorii** (2015). *Za redaktsiieiu Vlodzimiezha Mendzhets'koho ta Iezhy Bratsyseyevycha [Poland. Sketch of its history. Ed. by Włodzimierz Medrzecki and Jerzy Bracyszewicz]*. Varshava: Instytut Natsional'noi Pam'iaty; Komisiia pereslidyvannia zlochyniv proty pol's'koho narodu, 367 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Poliszczuk, W.** (1996). *Falszowanie historii najnowszej Ukrainy; Wołyń 1943 i jego znaczenie [Falsehood of the history of contemporary Ukraine: Volhynia 1943 and its importance]*. Toronto; Warszawa, 92 p. [in Polish]

**Poliszczuk, W.** (1999). *Bitter truth: the criminality of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA): (the testimony of a Ukrainian)* [from the Pol. trans. to Eng. by C.Eljasz and L. Korneluk]. Toronto, 403 p. [in English]

**Poliszczuk, W.** (2000). *Dowody zbrodni OUN i UPA. Integralny nacjonalizm ukraiński jako odmiana faszyzmu [Evidence of the OUN and the UPA crimes. Ukrainian integral nationalism as form of fascism]. Vol. 2. Działalność ukraińskich struktur nacjonalistycznych w latach 1920 – 1999 [Activiry of the Ukrainian nationalist structures during the years of 1920 – 1999]*. Toronto, 778 p. [in Polish]

**Prus E.** (1988). *Atamania UPA: tragedia kresów [The UPA atamans: thagedy of the borderlands]*. Warszawa, 368 p. [in Polish]

**Prus, E.** (1985). *Herosi spod znaku tryzuba: Konowalec, Bandera, Szuchewycz [Heroes under the sign of trident: Konovalec, Bandera, Shuchevych]*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Związków Zawodowych, 348 p. [in Polish]

**Prus, E.** (1994). *UPA – armia powstańcza czy kurenie rezunów? [The UPA: insurgent army or the battalions of throat-slitters?]*. Wrocław, 129 p. [in Polish]

**Romanowski, W.** (1993). *ZWZ-AK na Wołyniu 1939 – 1944 [ZWZ-AK in Volhynia, 1939 – 1944]*. Lublin, 407 p. [in Polish]

**Siekierka Sz., Komański H., Bulzacki K.** (2006). *Ludobójstwo dokonane przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich na Polakach w województwie Lwowskim 1939 – 1947 [Genocide against the Polish population in Voievodship of Lwow, that has been perpetrated by the Ukrainian nationalists in 1939 – 1947]*. Wrocław, 1269 p. [in Polish]

**Siekierka Sz., Komański H., Różański E.** (2008). *Ludobójstwo dokonane przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich na Polakach w województwie stanisławowskim 1939 – 1946 [Genocide against the Polish population in Voievodship of Stanislawow, that has been perpetrated by the Ukrainian nationalists in 1939 – 1947]*. Wrocław, 879 p. [in Polish]

**Siemaszko W., Siemaszko E.** (2000). *Ludobójstwo dokonane przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich na ludności polskiej Wołynia 1939 – 1945 [Genocide Against the Polish population of Volhynia, that has been perpetrated by the Ukrainian nationalists in 1939 – 1945]*, vol. I-II, Warszawa, 1440 p. [in Polish]

**Siemaszko, E.** (2011). *Wołyń i Sahryń. Rzeczpospolita (W3)*, 263, P10-P11. URL: <http://www.rp.pl/artvku/61991.750348.html> [in Polish]

**Sokołowski, T.** (1994). *Typologia nacjonalizmów i ich przejawy w konfliktach narodowościowych Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej [Typology of nationalisms and their manifestations in national conflicts of Eastern and Central Europe]*. *Nacjonalizm. Konflikty narodowościowe w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej / Red. S. Helnarski [Nationalism. National conflicts of Eastern and Central Europe. Ed. by S. Helnarski]* (pp. 39–48). Toruń. [in Polish]

**Strilka, R.** (1998). *Geneza polskiej samoobrony na Wołyniu i jej rola w obronie ludności polskiej [Genesis of the Polish self-defence in Volhynia and its role in defence of the Polish population]* *Polska-Ukraina: trudne pytania, Materiały seminarium w Łucku 20-22 maja 1998.*, t. 3 (pp. 77–85). Warszawa: Karta. [in Polish]

**Szczeńiak, A. & Szota, W.** (1973). *Droga do nikąd. Działalność Organizacji Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów i jej likwidacja w Polsce [The Path to Nowhere: The Activities of the Organization of*

*the Ukrainian Nationalists and its Stamping out in Poland*]. Warsaw: Ministerstwo Obrony Narodowej, 587 p. [in Polish]

**Szota, W.** (1963). Zarys rozwoju Organizacji Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów i Ukraińskiej Armii Powstańczej [Sketch of the history of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army]. *Wojskowy przegląd historyczny [Military historical review]*, 1, 163–218. [in Polish]

**Szynkiewicz, S.** (1996). *Konflikt tożsamości, tożsamość w konflikcie. Konflikty etniczne. Źródła–typy–sposoby rozstrzygnięcia [Conflict of identity, identity in conflict. Ethnic conflicts. Sources–types–means of resolving]*. Ed. by S. Woźniak / Red. S. Woźniak (pp.15–30). Warszawa: Instytut archeologii i etnologii PAN. [in Polish]

**Terles, M.** (1993) *Ethnic Cleansing of the Poles in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia, 1942 – 1946*. Toronto: Edited by ZZWRP, 79 p. [in English]

**Torzecki, R.** (1993). *Polacy i Ukraińcy: sprawa ukraińska w czasie II wojny światowej na terenie II Rzeczypospolitej [The Poles and the Ukrainians: Ukrainian case during World War II at the territories of Second Polish Republic]*. Warszawa: W-wo Naukowe PWN, 349 p. [in Polish].

**Turowski, J.** (1990). *Pożoga. Walki 27 Wołyńskiej Dywizji AK [Fire. Fights of AK 27th Volhynian Division]*. Warszawa: PWN, 552 p. [in Polish]

**Węgierski J.** (1991). *Lwów pod okupacją sowiecką, 1939 – 1941 [Lwow under the Soviet occupation, 1939 – 1941]*. Warszawa: Editions Spotkania, 432 p. [in Polish]

**Węgierski J.** (1994). *Lwowska konspiracja narodowa i katolicka, 1939 – 1947 [Lwow's national and catholic conspiracy 1939 – 1947]*. Kraków: Platan, 350 p. [in Polish]

**Węgierski, J.** (1996). *Armia Krajowa w okręgach Stanisławów i Tarnopol [Home Army in districts of Stanislawow and Tarnopol]*. Kraków: Platan, 387 p. [in Polish]

**Żurek S.** (2007). *UPA w Bieszczadach: straty ludności polskiej poniesione z rąk ukraińskich w Bieszczadach w latach 1939 – 1947 [The UPA in Bieshchady: losses of Polish population from the hands of Ukrainians in Bieshchady in the years of 1939 – 1947]*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo “Nortom”, 259 p. [in Polish]

*The article was received on February 26, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

## РЕЦЕНЗІЇ / REVIEWS

UDC 930.2(477):94(477)(092)  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226541

### **Svitlana HIRNIAK**

*PhD hab. (Philology), Associate Professor of the Department of Philological Sciences and Methods of Teaching in Elementary School, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (s.girnjak10@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-7264-0312

### **Yuliya TALALAY**

*PhD (Pedagogy), Associate Professor of the Department of Germanic Languages and Translation Studies, Institute of Foreign Languages, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (julietalalay@gmail.com; jutal@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-3134-2030

**Researcher ID:** AАН-8250-2021

### **Світлана ГІРНЯК**

*доктор філологічних наук, професор кафедри філологічних дисциплін та методики їх викладання у початковій школі Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (s.girnjak10@gmail.com)*

### **Юлія ТАЛАЛАЙ**

*кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри германських мов і перекладознавства, навчально-науковий інститут іноземних мов Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (julietalalay@gmail.com; jutal@ukr.net)*

### **IVAN BOBERSKYI – TEACHER, ATHLETE, PUBLIC AND POLITICAL ACTIVIST**

**(review of the monograph: Sova A. Ivan Boberskyi: socio-cultural, military political and educational activities. Lviv: Institute of Ukrainian Studies of Ukraine, 2019. 512 p.)**

### **ІВАН БОБЕРСЬКИЙ – ПЕДАГОГ, СПОРТОВЕЦЬ, ГРОМАДСЬКО-ПОЛІТИЧНИЙ ДІЯЧ**

**(рецензія на монографію: Сова А. Іван Боберський: суспільно-культурна, військово-політична та освітньо-виховна діяльність. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 2019. 512 с.)**

Ivan Boberskyi (1873 – 1947) was a teacher, a public, a military, a political and statesman, an organizer, the Ukrainian physical education founder, an athlete, a journalist, an editor, a

publisher, a translator, a philanthropist, a photographer, an archivist, an expert in several European languages among the prominent Ukrainian figures at the end of the XIXth – the first half of the XXth century. The very list of his statuses, interests and preferences testifies to the talent, versatility and uniqueness of the person. Ivan Boberskyi's diverse cultural, educational, socio-political activities are important for the Ukrainian humanities as a separate page of the Ukrainian history of the XXth century. Despite the emergence of many researches that directly or indirectly related to the life and work of this person, his figure was not studied by the scientists comprehensively. An exception was the monograph, published by Lviv historian Andriy Sova "Ivan Boberskyi: socio-cultural, military-political and educational activities" (Lviv, 2019, 512 p.).

It should be noted that it was not the first study by A. Sova, dedicated to Ivan Boberskyi. In 2017, A. Sova published a monograph with the co-author with Ya. Tymchak, which analyzed one of the primary aspects of Ivan Boberskyi's activity: the Ukrainian body-educational's and sport traditional's formation (Sova, Tymchak, 2017). The work received positive reviews from the Ukrainian historians (Kost', 2017; Romanyuk, 2017). Furthermore, after conducting additional research, A. Sova finally presented to the academic community a peer-reviewed monograph, which was marked by an unconditional scientific novelty, which was previously noted in his review by Professor A. Hrechylo (Hrechylo, 2020). In the monograph the author conceptually, comprehensively, holistically, thoroughly analyzed Ivan Boberskyi's socio-cultural, military-political and educational activities; introduced into the scientific circulation important, unknown documents of state, public, private archives, museum and library collections from around the world; traced I. Boberskyi's worldviews formation, highlighted his work in Ukraine (Galicia), the USA, Canada, Yugoslavia; collected and analyzed Ivan Boberskyi's creative heritage.

The monograph consisted of an introduction, five chapters, conclusions, a list of used sources and literature (a total of 1421 items), 43 appendices, nominal and geographical indexes. The first section analyzed the topic's level of scientific study and described the source base. The researcher divided the issue's historiography into three periods: 1) the 1900-ies – 1947; 2) 1947 – the 1980-ies; 3) the 1990-ies – 2020. According to A. Sova, the first period included the contemporaries' publications on I. Boberskyi, written during his lifetime. The second group of studies consisted of intelligence of Ukrainian scholars in the diaspora and works, which were published in the USSR in 1947 – the 1980-ies. In the third group, the researcher included works published after Ukrainian independence restoration (Sova, 2019, p. 11–43).

The author conditionally divided the processed sources into seven groups: 1) the documents of the Ukrainian military, political and state formations and institutions in which I. Boberskyi worked; 2) the documents of the public organizations of which he was a member and with which he cooperated directly during his life; 3) I. Boberskyi's creative heritage; 4) the epistolary sources; 5) the periodicals; 6) the memories, diaries, interviews; 7) the photos (Sova, 2019, p. 44).

Hence, A. Sova's scale of processed documents of archival origin from 17 archives and museums, as well as documents from 12 private archives is impressive. The author used materials from foreign institutions: Archive-Museum named after Dmytro Antonovych of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in the USA, archive of the Ukrainian Student Society "Sich" in Graz, the National Library in Warsaw, the Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Center in Winnipeg, the Ukrainian Museum-Archive in Cleveland, the Ukrainian National Museum in Chicago. The researcher especially elaborated the epistolary sources, more than three

dozen press periodicals of the first half of the XXth century, as well as the memoirs, written by S. Haiduchko, O. Hrytsai, I. Kedryn, G. Korenets, N. Leontovych-Bashuk, T. Lototskyi, S. Nagirna-Lev, O. Okhrymovych, P. Franko, S. Shah, M. Shkilnyk.

In the second chapter, the researcher revealed the formation of I. Boberskyi as a person and highlighted his pedagogical activities in Galicia and the diaspora. A. Sova described the environment in which I. Boberskyi grew up and was formed, he emphasized his pedigree, which dates back to the XVIth century. The scientist depicted I. Boberskyi's worldview formation in the family circle (a father Mykola – the Greek Catholic priest, a mother – Anna-Dominika – a teacher), described the educational trajectory of the studied personality: studying in the gymnasiums of New Sancho (1884 – 1887) and Sambir (1887 – 1891), the universities of Lviv (1891 – 1895) and Graz (1895 – 1899). The scientist dwelled in more detail on I. Boberskyi's life, in particular “Graz period”, during which the young student mastered advanced, innovative for his time competencies in the field of Physical Education and sports (1897) (Sova, 2019, pp. 58–72). Hence, the monograph outlined the first steps taken by I. Boberskyi's pedagogical work in the IV gymnasium of Lviv and the gymnasium in Drohobych, where he began to put into practice the knowledge acquired in Europe in the German language and the theory and methods of physical education. The author accumulated much more material on I. Boberskyi's pedagogical activity in the Academic Gymnasium in Lviv (1901 – 1918), where the teacher taught German, headed the German-language library for high school students, introduced gymnastics classes (physical education lessons), joined as a member-patron of the activities of the community “Ruslan”, founded the “Ukrainian Sports Club” (USC). In Gymnastics lessons I. Boberskyi combined the elements of European Gymnastics Systems with the Ukrainian traditional folk forms, introduced motor and sports terminology and prepared the first professional Ukrainian-language publications on Physical Education and sports. As an organizer, he managed to make the most of the opportunities that the Ukrainian community of Lviv had at that time to develop and popularize the “rykhanka” (physical exercises), in particular the material and technical base of the “Sokil-Bat'ko” society and the gymnasium. His educational and methodical works “Zabavy I Hry Rykhovi” (Fun and Physical Exercises' Games) (1904), “Zabavy I Hry Rykhovi part two” (1905), “Zabavy I Hry Rykhovi, part three. Kicking the Ball” (1906), “The Ordinary Exercises” (1909) were used in Gymnastics lessons and in the USC activities, and also gained popularity in the Ukrainian lands and in the diaspora (Sova, 2019, pp. 72–89).

It is known that during 1903 – 1914 I. Boberskyi worked in the Women's Seminary of the Ukrainian Pedagogical Society and Bazilian Sisters Servants Gymnasium in Lviv. A. Sova researched I. Boberskyi's contribution to the training of pedagogical staff, where Gymnastics classes were introduced and the “Girls' Sports Club” (GSC) was created. According to the researcher, this circle developed actively during 1910 – 1914, grew quantitatively and qualitatively, nurturing and spreading various sports among the Ukrainian women. Furthermore, while working in the Women's Gymnasium, I. Boberskyi also prepared educational and methodical works “Sytkivka” (1909), “Lavchyna and Shcheblivka” (1910), “Prorukh” (1912), which were used by other Gymnastics teachers and the GSC's members, as well as all interested in the Ukrainian lands and in the Ukrainian diaspora (Sova, 2019, pp. 90–104).

It should be mentioned that I. Boberskyi's educational activity study in the diaspora required greater difficulties from A. Sova. It is known that the teacher in 1920 – 1932 in Canada joined the activities of the “Ridna Shkola” (Native School), the Ukrainian Institute of Education, spoke at various events, celebrations, celebrations not only in Winnipeg, where

he lived, but also in various parts of Canada, was a participant in cultural, educational and scientific events of the Canadian Ukrainians. The author attached special importance to the “Organization of the Ukrainian Teachers” (OUU), and taught repeatedly various disciplines at teacher training courses, organized by this authoritative organization. During the 1920-ies and 1940-ies, he provided pieces of advice to many individuals and organizations, drafted statutes, wrote articles, notes, etc., in particular, assisted the “St. Raphael’s Ukrainian Immigrants’ Welfare Association” to establish large-scale publishing activities. A. Sova accumulated information recorded in the memoirs, photographs, documents about the life and way of life of the Ukrainians in Canada scrupulously. In the second half of the 1920-ies and 1930-ies, he traveled to Europe, where he spoke on topical issues of education, culture, history and politics. On the basis of a large collection of books collected by him during his stay in Canada, in Winnipeg was created “The Canadian Library. Ivan Boberskyi”. He also conducted scientific studies, the results of which were published in the pages of the Ukrainian General Encyclopedia (Lviv; Stanyslaviv; Kolomyia, 1935). In 1936, I. Boberskyi visited the IV Winter Olympic Games in Garmisch-Partenkirchen and the XIth Summer Olympic Games in Berlin, published a number of journalistic reports in the Ukrainian publications. It should be noted that A. Sova worked particularly carefully on I. Boberskyi’s reports from the Olympic Games (Sova, 2019, pp. 105–121).

The third section was devoted to I. Boberskyi’s work in the “Sokil” society organization during 1901 – 1939. First of all, A. Sova analyzed the teacher’s organizational activity within the framework of the Teachers’ Circle ‘rukhnanka’ at the “Sokil” organization in Lviv. The researcher noted that with I. Boberskyi’s active participation in the “Sokil” organization diverse significant events and activities took place, in particular, the first music and ‘rukhnanka’ evening of the Ukrainian society “Sokil” organization in Lviv on the 6<sup>th</sup> of April in 1902, the ‘rukhnanka’ evening in Lviv Philharmonic on the 5<sup>th</sup> of April in 1903, the opening of a new ‘rukhnanka’ (gymnastics hall) of the Ukrainian “Sokil” organization in Lviv on the 5<sup>th</sup> of November in 1906 (at 20 Ruska Street), the purchase of land and the arrangement of the ‘rukhnanka’-sports square “Sokil-Bat’ko” in Lviv (other names – “the Ukrainian Horod” (the Ukrainian City), “the Ukrainian Mecca”, the national fort) and the others. He took an active part in several commissions and sections of the society, in particular in “Praporova”, “Zabavova”, “Odnostroyeva”, “The Commission for the purchase of the Ukrainian Horod in Lviv”. Ivan Boberskyi introduced and popularized various sports. Thanks to his hard work, the “Sokil” society grew quantitatively and qualitatively. As of June 1914, there were 974 “Sokil” cells in Galicia with about 70,000 members. I. Boberskyi’s authority and merits were marked by the presentation in 1911 of a sergeant’s mace with the words: “Take us further!” (Sova, 2019, pp. 122–139).

At the same time, A. Sova analyzed I. Boberskyi’s editorial and publishing activities. As a result, “Sokil News” (1909) and “News from Zaporizhzhia” (1910 – 1914) the first official publications of the “Sokil-Batko” Society were published, which covered primarily the activities of Ukrainian firefighters, motorists, sports and riflemen societies in Galicia, published articles on the Physical Education and sports development, history of Ukraine, the life of the Ukrainians in different parts of the world, activity reports, information articles, appeals, orders, materials from speeches, evenings, photos, etc. In addition to magazines, during I. Boberskyi’s presidency, 44 different editions of “Sokil” literature were published. A. Sova quite rightly noted that I. Boberskyi together with the “Sokil-Batko” management managed to develop a corporate style of the organization and provide its members with the external attributes and symbols that indicated belonging to the Ukrainians (Sova, 2019, pp. 139–153).

One of the paragraphs of the peer-reviewed monograph was devoted to I. Boberskyi's activity in the context of the I and II "krayevukh zdvyhiv" (regional shifts) in Galicia. Consequently, after being at the head of "Sokil" organization (1908), he began to work in order to strengthen the society's organization, to improve communication between the central cell in Lviv and "Sokil's" "nests" (cells) in Galicia. Hence, in 1909, the "headquarters" of the "Sokil" society changed its name to "Sokil-Bat'ko" ("Falcon-Father"). It was decided to hold large-scale, universal national-cultural and 'rukhanka' "Sokil" events, which were called 'zdvyhy' in Galicia, following the Czech model and following the example of the "Sich" organizations. A significant contribution to the initiation and their successful implementation belongs to I. Boberskyi. The first Krayovyi Zdvyh (Regional Shift) held on the 9th – 10th of September in 1911, on the occasion of Taras Shevchenko's death 50th anniversary, and "Shevchenko Zdvyh" (Shift) on the 27th – 29th of June in 1914, on the occasion of Taras Shevchenko's birth 100th anniversary, became the Ukrainians' national consciousness high-level manifestation, dignity and cohesion. According to A. Sova, 'krayevi zdvyhu' (regional shifts) were an important factor in the Ukrainian Sokil Movement development and evidence of its entry into a new, qualitatively higher level of the organizational work involving the Ukrainians of the Dnieper region and various centers of the Ukrainian diaspora (Sova, 2019, pp. 153–169).

At the same time, A. Sova outlined I. Boberskyi's participation in the events held by the "Sokil" organizations of the Slavic peoples. Before World War I, the teacher attended many events of the Czech, Croatian and Slovenian organizations "Sokil". In particular, he was at the V All-Sokil Rally in Prague in 1907, the Congress of Slavic Sokils in Zagreb in 1911, and the others. The most significant event for the Ukrainian "Sokils" in Galicia before World War I was the participation in the VI All-Sokil Rally in Prague, which took place on the 28<sup>th</sup>–30<sup>th</sup> of June and on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July in 1912 and was dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the Czech Sokil (Falconry) Movement. Moreover, I. Boberskyi organized a trip to the rally and headed the Ukrainian delegation, which showed itself to the Czechs and delegations from different parts of Europe and America. During the interwar period, I. Boberskyi also took care of the Ukrainians participation in all-sokil rallies in Prague: VII – 1920, VIII – 1926, IX – 1932, X – 1938 (Sova, 2019, pp. 169–181).

The fourth chapter of the monograph reveals I. Boberskyi's participation in the social movement of Galicia and the Ukrainian diaspora. A. Sova managed to show the teacher's participation in the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the Teachers' Community and "Prosvita" most thoroughly. The researcher claims that I. Boberskyi was an active regular member of the NTSh during 1902 – 1903, and in the following years and until the early 1940-ies he collaborated with the NTSh in publishing his works, worked on the translation of "Essay on the History of the Ukrainian People". Hrushevskyi in German. During the interwar period and during World War II, NTSh donated part of its library, archives and items for exhibition on the history of Ukrainian Physical Education and sports. At the beginning of the XXth century I. Boberskyi, along with the other well-known figures of the time, in particular M. Hrushevskyi, was one of the founders of the "Teachers' Community". As an authoritative teacher, he represented the Ukrainian teachers in April 1912 at the Congress of the State Union of Secondary School Teachers in Vienna, the Teachers' Community at international forums, in particular, in August 1910 at the Third Congress on School Hygiene in Paris (Sova, 2019, pp. 182–201).

In the same section, A. Sova detailed information about I. Boberskyi's activities in the USC, as mentioned earlier, describing the pedagogical work of the researched personality in the Academic Gymnasium in Lviv. He described in detail the purpose, tasks, structure of the USC, the competition of this large-scale group with other sports organizations – the

Polish, the Czech, the Jewish. A. Sova believed that the USC activities became an example and encouragement for the establishment of sports clubs “Dnipro” (Lviv), “Syanova Chaika” (gymnasium in Przemyśl); “Podillya” (gymnasium in Ternopil); “Sich” (in Stryi, soon renamed the sports club “Skala”) (Sova, 2019, pp. 201–210).

It is known that I. Boberskyi cooperated actively with the societies “Ukraine” and “Plast” during 1911 – 1939. The author noted that I. Boberskyi’s efforts and his students – S. Haiduchko, H. Luchakivskyi, V. Paliyiv, M. Yavorskyi and the others, consequently, the sports society “Ukraine” was established in Lviv on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of September in 1911. Members of ST “Ukraine” created a number of sports sections (’leshchetova’, ’sanchatova’ (sled), ’sovhar’, ’myacheva’ (ball), ’sitkovka’, athletics and walking and entertainment). Before World War I, I. Boberskyi took care of the society’s affairs, took an active part in its life, and gave impetus to the First (October 15–16, 1911) and Second “Zaporizhzhya Competitions” (June 29, 1914) in Lviv. the next two decades took place in Galicia; assisted in the organization and participated as a judge in the competition for “the struggle for the art of Galician Ukraine” (the first competition – on the 23<sup>rd</sup> – 24<sup>th</sup> of March in 1912, the second – on the 15<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> of March in 1913) (Sova, 2019, pp. 211–219).

I. Boberskyi also stood at the origins of the Plast created in 1911 in Lviv (the name was proposed by him). After getting acquainted with the principles of English scouting, I. Boberskyi and his students – O. Tysovskyi, P. Franko and I. Chmola created a new educational organization, which gave the Ukrainian essence. The Plast took its first steps with the support, advice and financial assistance of I. Boberskyi. In particular, he provided great assistance to a student and colleague at the Academic Gymnasium O. Tysovskyi, who compiled the book “The Plast (scouting for boys) in Ukrainian schools”. According to A. Sova’s research, I. Boberskyi managed to involve young teachers in the Plast’s creation and the spread of its activity: D. Bilynska, S. Haiduchka, T. Polikha, S. Sidorovych, O. Stepanov, O. Tysovskyi, O. Fedov, M. Fedusevich, A., T. Franko and P. Franko, and the others (Sova, 2019, pp. 219–230).

Furthermore, extremely interesting, full of new historical facts was the section of the monograph on I. Boberskyi’s public work in Canada, Yugoslavia and European countries during the 1920-ies and 1940-ies. A. Sova put emphasis on the fact that I. Boberskyi proved himself as an organizer, authoritative and far-sighted public figure as being in the diaspora – first in Canada (1920 – 1932), and then in Yugoslavia (1932 – 1947). In addition, I. Boberskyi was a representative of Lviv “Society for the Guardianship of the Ukrainian Emigrants in Lviv”, with which the Society for the “St.Raphael’s UkrainianImmigrants’ WelfareAssociation in Canada” cooperated, which was aimed at helping the Ukrainians – the immigrants and those who wanted to go to Canada for permanent residence, in particular, in search of work for the newcomers. After moving from Canada to Yugoslavia on the 29<sup>th</sup> of May in 1932, I. Boberskyi became a lieutenant of the “St.Raphael’s UkrainianImmigrants’ WelfareAssociation in Canada” in Europe. He joined the founding of the Ukrainian Rifle Society (URS), the first branch of which was established on the 28<sup>th</sup> of January in 1928 in Winnipeg (helped to prepare the charter and establish the first URS branch). I. Boberskyi was elected as the Honorary Chairman of the “Ukrainian Sokil Union Abroad” on the 10<sup>th</sup> of December in 1933, among the main tasks of which was the Sokil Movement spread among the Ukrainians in the diaspora. At the same time, I. Boberskyi was an active member of the Ukrainian People’s Union (UNU), an all-Ukrainian association of the diaspora whose goal was to preserve the Ukrainian identity outside the Ukrainian ethnic lands. I. Boberskyi participated in the XVIIIth and the XXIst conventions (general meetings) of the ONS in

Pittsburgh (now Pennsylvania, USA), on the 15<sup>th</sup> of May in 1933 and the 25<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> of March in 1946, was a delegate to the 333rd Division (in May 1933 In total, 401 departments were represented, in March 1946 – 477) (Sova, 2019, pp. 230–247).

The fifth chapter of the monograph covered an equally interesting page in I. Boberskyi's biography, namely, his military-political and state-building activities. A. Sova claimed that during World War I the teacher was a member of the Main Ukrainian Council, the General Ukrainian Council, the Ukrainian Combat Command (since 1917 the Central Command) of the Legion of Ukrainian Sich Riflemen. A. Sova revealed I. Boberskyi's activities in the State Secretariat for the Military Affairs of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR) (1918 – 1919). At this time, the teacher proved himself as the head of the "Writing Department" in the State Secretariat for the Military Affairs of ZUNR, engaged in creating the Ukrainian military terminology, uniform for the Galician Army, topographic maps, edited the magazine "Bulletin of the State Secretariat for Military Affairs", collected photos and various materials concerning liberation struggle (Sova, 2019, pp. 248–275).

During his forced stay in the diaspora, I. Boberskyi, on behalf of ZUNR government in 1920 in the United States and in 1920 – 1924 in Canada, confirmed his reputation as an energetic and productive organizer, authoritative and far-sighted politician, diplomat, faithful son of the Ukrainian people, independence fighter of Ukraine. His selfless and sacrificial work helped to convey to the Ukrainians in the diaspora and the world community truthful information about the struggle of the Ukrainian people for their independence and statehood. Such a powerful campaign forced the US and Canadian governments to recognize the need to address the Ukrainian issue in various international institutions. Thanks to I. Boberskyi's activities, the Representations of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR) in the USA and Canada were able to collect and provide significant financial support to ZUNR government in exile (Sova, 2019, pp. 275–288).

Having characterized A. Sova's monograph as a significant work in the Ukrainian biography stream, at the same time we should highlight a number of gaps in his reception concerning I. Boberskyi's image. First of all, having revealed the multifaceted social activity of a teacher, the researcher paid insufficient attention to depicting I. Boberskyi as a "living person", with certain character traits, habits, peculiarities of communication with other people, first of all, members of his own family. The researcher only briefly revealed I. Boberskyi's relations with the clergy, as well as the last period of the teacher's life in Slovenia. In addition, the monograph is somewhat overloaded with citations.

Taking everything into consideration, we should note that the monograph, written A. Sova is a thorough scientific study, which is characterized by novelty, sufficient objectivity, processing a large number of documentary sources. Undoubtedly, this work is a significant contribution to the Ukrainian biography.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Hrechylo, A.** (2020). [Rev. on]: Sova A. Ivan Boberskyi: suspilno-kulturna, viiskovo-politychna ta osvithno-vykhovna diialnist: monohrafiia. Lviv, 2019. 512 p. [Sova A. Ivan Boberskyi: Socio-Cultural, Military Political and Educational Activities: monograph. Lviv, 2019. 512 p.]. *Visnyk NTSh. Informatsiine vydannia Svitovoi rady Naukovykh tovarystv im. Shevchenka*, 63, 118–119. [in Ukrainian]

**Kost, S.** (2017). [Rev. on]: Sova A., Tymchak Ya. Ivan Boberskyi – osnovopolozhnyk ukrainskoi tilovkhnovnoi i sportovoi tradytsii / Za nauk. red. Yevhena Prystupy. Lviv: LDUFK, Apriori, 2017. 232 p. [Sova A., Tymchak Ya. Ivan Boberskyi – the Ukrainian Physical Education and Sports Tradition Founder / For science. ed. Eugene Prystupy. Lviv: LDUFK, Apriori, 2017. 232 p.]. *Visnyk NTSh. Informatsiine vydannia Svitovoi rady Naukovykh tovarystv im. Shevchenka*, 58, 111–112. [in Ukrainian]

**Romaniuk, M.** (2018). [Rev. on]: Sova A., Tymchak Ya. Ivan Boberskyi – osnovopolozhnyk ukrainskoi tilovykhovnoi i sportovoi tradytsii / za nauk. red. Yevhena Prystupy. Lviv: LDUFK, Apriori, 2017. 232 p. [Sova A., Tymchak Ya. Ivan Boberskyi – the Ukrainian Physical Education and Sports Tradition Founder / for science. ed. Eugene Prystupy. Lviv: LDUFK, Apriori, 2017. 232 p.]. *Ukraina: kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist*, 31, 295–299. [in Ukrainian]

**Sova, A. & Tymchak, Ya.** (2017). *Ivan Boberskyi – osnovopolozhnyk ukrainskoi tilovykhovnoi i sportovoi tradytsii [Ivan Boberskyi – the Ukrainian Physical Education and Sports Tradition Founder]*. Lviv: LDUFK; Apriori, 232 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Sova, A.** (2019). *Ivan Boberskyi: suspilno-kulturna, viiskovo-politychna ta osvithno-vykhovna diialnist [Ivan Boberskyi: socio-cultural, militarypolitical and educational activities]*. Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy, 512 p. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on June 29, 2020.*

*Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 930.2(477):323.2-053.6(477)  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226558

**Nataliia NECHAIIEVA-YURIICHUK**

*PhD (History), Associate professor of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (Ukraine), Kotsyubyns'koho St, 2, Chernivtsi, Ukraine, postal code 58012 (nynataliya@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-5882-7121

**ResearcherID:** S-7151-2016

**Serhiy TROYAN**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor of the Department of International Relations, Information and Regional Studies of the National Aviation University (Ukraine), prospekt Kosmonavta Komarova, 1, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 02000 (kattis@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-3053-6530

**Наталія НЕЧАЄВА-ЮРІЙЧУК**

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри політології та державного управління Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича, вул. Коцюбинського, 2, м. Чернівці, Україна, індекс 58012 (nynataliya@ukr.net)*

**Сергій ТРОЯН**

*доктор історичних наук, професор, професор кафедри міжнародних відносин, інформації та регіональних студій Національного авіаційного університету, проспект Космонавта Комарова, 1, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 02000 (kattis@ukr.net)*

**NSDAP YOUTH POLICY: RETROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS**

**(Review of the monograph.: Davletov O. R. Preparation of the “generation of wolves”:  
training of future perpetrators of the Holocaust (Essays on the youth policy  
of the NSDAP in 1922 – 1939). 2nd ed., 2019. 316 p.)**

**МОЛОДІЖНА ПОЛІТИКА НСДАП: РЕТРОСПЕКТИВНИЙ АНАЛІЗ**

**(рецензія на монографію.: Давлетов О. Р. Підготовка “покоління вовків”:  
вишкіл майбутніх виконавців Голокосту (Нариси молодіжної політики НСДАП  
у 1922 – 1939 рр.). 2-е вид. доп. Дніпро: Український інститут вивчення  
Голокосту “Ткума”, 2019. 316 с.)**

Due to World War II 75th Anniversary, a number of new scientific publications on various aspects of the origins, causes, nature, manifestations and consequences of the global conflict of 1939 – 1945 emerged. Numerous historians, including the domestic ones, put emphasis on the importance of studying the phenomenon of totalitarianism and its negative manifestations, which led to mass tragedies, among which the Holocaust stands out.

The Nazi regime was the Holocaust creator and executor primarily, whose policy covered all spheres of the socio-economic and socio-political life. The Nazi dictatorship's

establishing process in Germany was completed during the 30th of January in 1933 when Adolf Hitler was appointed as the coalition government Chancellor of the National Socialist Workers' Party of Germany (Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (NSDAP)) and the German People's Party (Deutsche Volkspartei (NNP)), and the 2nd of August in 1934, after the death of President Paul von Hindenburg when The Reich Chancellor proclaimed himself as the Third Reich Führer (Leader). Mass repression became an inextricable feature of it, which was elevated to the rank of state policy.

Particular attention was paid to young people as a catalyst for future change in Germany and abroad. The importance of studying the NSDAP youth policy peculiarities is actualized in the global changes' conditions of the present. The events in Ukraine demonstrate the individual political players' fervent desire to assert their influence and impose their will on the entire world community. In our opinion, the current trends in geopolitical development indicate the threat of certain political regimes returns to the totalitarian practices of the past. The political propaganda's Renaissance, interference in the internal affairs of other states, territorial changes, now known as the annexation and in the interwar period as the Anschluss, made us ruminant on the need to learn historical lessons in order to develop a strategy, which could prevent world conflicts and preserve the global world system.

The first attempts to protect the world from the global conflicts' recurrence and their devastating consequences were made immediately after the end of World War I. However, the League of Nations creation in 1919 did not prevent the totalitarian regimes' emergence on the European continent, which unleashed World War II. The National Socialism formation in Germany took place in the Weimar Republic, whose democratic regime could not withstand the pressure of internal problems and external factors. The Revanchist sentiments in Germany were generated, on the one hand, by the defeat in the World War, and, on the other hand, by misunderstanding and unwillingness to accept democracy. In fact, the majority of society shifted the responsibility for making fateful decisions to the most radical political force, personified by the NSDAP.

After the National Socialists came to power, more than 200,000 opponents of the regime were killed or tortured under the law on the arrest of suspects in the "subversive activities", and 450,000 were sentenced to 1,500 years in prison or sent to the concentration camps for political, religious, and racial reasons. In total, more than 3 million people were repressed. If communists, social democrats, and the anti-Nazi organizations' representatives were exterminated for their political beliefs, another factor in the mass persecution was the national and ethnic affiliation.

Furthermore, the Jews, who made up less than 1% of Germany's population, were declared almost the dictatorship's main enemies. The above-mentioned or a similar practice was a characteristic feature of the totalitarian regimes when the unification of society around the ruling ideology was carried out by "appointing" a common enemy and fighting against it. The Nazis' paramount goal was to remove the "non-Aryans" (the Jews) from public life (the Nazi interpretation of the "non-Aryans" comprised people who had Jewish parents or grandparents). The Jews were forbidden to engage in public affairs, to teach in schools and universities, to practice doctoring, dentistry, and lawyering. There were even special marks in their passports and in every woman's passport the name of Sarah was added and Israel – to man's passports.

In April of 1933, the NSDAP called for a boycott of the Jewish shops and firms, but the action was only partially successful, as the population was unprepared for such blatant anti-Semitism. In general, more than 400 laws and decrees were passed against the Jews in the 1930-ies. In Germany, the process of the Jews ousting from the economic, political, and

cultural life took five years. The children were expelled from schools, and the students from universities, who wanted to emigrate were released without their property. On the night of the 9<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup> of November in 1938, the Nazis staged a massacre that went down in history as the “Crystal Night”. The Jewish shops, synagogues, and cemeteries were looted and destroyed throughout Germany. Hundreds of the Jews died, and about 30,000 Nazis were sent to the concentration camps. The Nazis blamed the Jews for the crime and forced them to pay 1 billion marks in “compensation”.

The NSDAP leaders were the Holocaust ideologues, led by Hitler, well understood that the anti-Semitic policies could succeed only as a result of their unconditional support by all social and age groups in German society. Hence, it is not a coincidence that a special role in its implementation was given to young people

The second edition of the monograph, written by Oleksandr Rasydovych Davlyetov, Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor of the Department of World History and International Relations at Zaporizhia National University, revealed the author’s vision concerning the genesis of the “wolf generation” – the future perpetrators of the Holocaust. In addition, O.R. Davlyetov from the standpoint of a researcher of the Weimar Republic history and the Third Reich studied and analyzed the basic preconditions, ideological and organizational factors, directions, forms and methods of the Nazi educational work with German youth in 1922–1939 comprehensively.

The structural and logical scheme of scientific work is the subject to the main goal – on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of sources and array of existing historiography of the problem to determine the main stages of the genesis of “Hitler Youth”, to highlight and reconstruct the activities of the Nazi youth movement at various stages of its existence. The NSDAP of the Weimar period (1922 – 1933) and during the development of the “Third Reich” (1933 – 1939), analyze the process of educating German youth through the prism of training future ordinary Holocaust perpetrators. In addition to the introduction, conclusions, and notes, the monograph consists of twelve essays, thirty appendices, a list of abbreviations, a list of sources and literature used, and a brief author’s reference. It is important to emphasize that the rich illustrative material from the archival, book and museum collections are a helping tool in better understanding the content of the work.

Furthermore, the author tried to conduct a systematic analysis of the fascism phenomenon in the first essay. In particular, he briefly described the its emergence preconditions, the main constituent elements, and also focused on the polyvariance of the definition.

The second essay is devoted to elucidating the National Socialist worldview system’s ideological and theoretical origins. The influence of social Darwinism, geopolitics, the theory of the Aryan race supremacy, various mythologists, ideas of occultism, mysticism, is traced on it.

Adolf Hitler’s views, the Nazi leader, concerning the education of German youth were the subject of consideration in the third essay. The Ukrainian historian analyzed them primarily on the basis of the Nazi movement program work – the book “My Struggle”.

The fourth essay focuses the reader’s attention on the Nazi youth movement emergence. Chronologically, the above-mentioned plot related to 1919 – 1922 and was associated with the NSDAP appearance and the Nazi party youth policy formation beginning.

The fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth essays are devoted to influence of the Nazi youth organizations formation and evolution and the individual Nazi ideologues and practitioners movement in general. In particular, the role of 18-year-old Gustav Adolf Lenk in the formation of a special youth “brain center” and the activities of the “Jungsturm Adolf Hitler”

in 1922 – 1925 was revealed. Moreover, “Hitler Youth” formation was covered in 1925 – 1931. Finally, O. R. Davlyetov focused on the peculiarities and nature of competition with the “Hitler Youth” of other youth units of the NSDAP, coming to power and the role of 21-year-old German student at the University of Munich Baltur Baldur unification of the youth movement in Germany on the Nazi model.

The ninth essay in the monograph highlights two important aspects of the subject matter. On the one hand, it is about the “Hitler Youth” as the only youth organization of the Third Reich, and, on the other hand, it revealed the leading vectors of the Nazi youth association in 1936 – 1939.

The anti-Semitic aspects of the upbringing of young people in Nazi Germany and the legal support of the NSDAP’s anti-Semitic policy in 1933 – 1939 are analyzed in the tenth and eleventh essays. The emphasis was put on the following: the “Nazi propaganda machine, led by the Reich Minister of Propaganda of the “Third Reich” Josef Goebbels, during this time intensified in German society a negative and “empirically” justified image of the Jews” (pp. 135–136).

In the last, twelfth essay, having found an original approach to the scientific historical research, O. R. Davlyetov made a concise but comprehensive analysis of the study of the National Socialism phenomenon in European historiography of the XXth century. The author focused on the change of the conceptual and paradigmatic component, including the angle of the “paradigm shift” and the need to further find an answer to the still relevant, including in the light of the modern neo-Nazi threat, the answer to the question: “Why did the civilization collapse in Germany?”” (p. 150).

It should be noted that the important characteristic of the monograph is its documentary nature. In fact, the author proceeds from the renowned position of the German historian and historian of the German Empire Leopold von Ranke that only a direct follow of the sources can help establish the truth, “as it really was” (“Wie es eigentlich gewesen”). Hence, not only the wide involvement of documents for the analysis of the studied historical events and facts, but also the inclusion as an important element of the structural and logical scheme of the monograph of thirty documentary appendices (pp. 170–87).

A significant amount of scientifically interesting illustrative material not only complements the sources cited by O. R. Davlyetov, facilitates the perception of the presented material, but also strengthens the scientific nature of the historical research.

The monographic work is made on the basis of the author’s elaboration and involvement of a wide range of sources and literature. It is based on both foreign, primarily German, and domestic publications of documents and various scientific investigations.

In our opinion, the subject and object of the study need to be clarified, as it does not refer to the Holocaust in any way, although this term is present in the title of the monograph (p. 7). But only one task among 5 concerns the Holocaust issue.

The author should have explained in the introduction or in the first essay the essence and conceptual approaches to the definition of the Holocaust, revealed the meaning of the term the “generation of wolves”, established causal links between the NSDAP youth policy and the Holocaust, actualizing this topic in the context of modern events. It seems appropriate to strengthen the critical aspect in the coverage of the above-mentioned topic, in particular not only by citing the main facts of various vectors of the NSDAP youth policy, but also explaining what role it played in the “wolf generation” formation and its consequences for today. In some cases, it seems that the text proposed by the author is a kind of source for further study and analysis of the NSDAP youth policy in the training of future Holocaust perpetrators.

We consider it appropriate to recommend starting the main part of the work with an essay on the ideological and theoretical origins of the National Socialist worldview, establishing a connection between it and fascism as an ideology and bringing the reader to the second essay – “Fascism: Conditions of Origin” (essay I in the monograph’s text).

The ninth essay lacks the author’s critical view of the Hitler Youth’s activities and the conclusions need to be substantiated.

The general conclusions are deprived of the established and empirically proven causal links between the NSDAP youth policy and the Holocaust policy, the author’s attitude to this problem.

In general, the peer-reviewed work is original, interesting, meaningful. The presented factual, illustrative material, source base of research deserves special attention. Valuable for researchers are the applications proposed by the author, which reveal unknown aspects of the problem. In general, O. R. Davlyetov’s monograph “The Preparation of the “generation of wolves”: training of future Holocaust perpetrators (Essays on the youth policy of the NSDAP in 1922 – 1939)” is of unconditional scientific interest and can be recommended for both professional historians and students, graduate students, all those who are interested in the problems of German history of the interwar period and various aspects of the Holocaust research.

*The article was received on February 11, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

UDC 930.2(477):304(477.8)“1939/1953”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226543

**Vasyl ILNYTSKYI**

*PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor, Head of the Department of History of Ukraine, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Str., Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100; Associate Professor, Department of Mobilization, Personnel and Human Resources Management and Defense Planning, Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi National Ground Forces Academy, 32 Heroyiv Maydana Str., Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79026 (vilnickiy@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-4969-052X  
**ResearcherID:** H-4431-2017  
**Scopus ID:** 57203399830

**Kateryna HOLOVKO**

*PhD hab. (Law), Head of the Department of Economic and Legal Research of the Black Sea Research Institute of Economy and Innovations, 6/1 Inhlezi str., Odesa, Ukraine, postal code 65101 (k.v.mozharovska@gmail.com)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-7414-6078

**Василь ІЛЬНИЦЬКИЙ**

*доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри історії України, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100; доцент кафедри мобілізаційної, організаційно-штатної, кадрової роботи та оборонного планування, Національна академія сухопутних військ імені гетьмана Петра Сагайдачного, вул. Героїв Майдану, 32, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79026 (vilnickiy@gmail.com)*

**Катерина ГОЛОВКО**

*доктор юридичних наук, завідувач відділу економіко-правових досліджень Причорноморського науково-дослідного інституту економіки та інновацій, вул. Інглезі, 6/1, м. Одеса, Україна, індекс 65101 (k.v.mozharovska@gmail.com)*

**HISTORY OF AN EVERYDAY LIFE  
OF THE WESTERN UKRAINIAN PEASANTRY**

**(review of the monograph: Starka V. V. Everyday Life of the Western Ukrainian Peasantry under the Conditions of Social Transformations in 1939 – 1953. Ternopil: Osadtsa Yu.V., 2019. 550 p.)**

**ІСТОРИЯ ПОВСЯКДЕННОГО ЖИТТЯ  
ЗАХІДНОУКРАЇНСЬКОГО СЕЛЯНСТВА**

**(рецензія на монографію: Старка В. В. Повсякденне життя західноукраїнського селянства в умовах суспільних трансформацій 1939 – 1953 рр. Тернопіль: Осадца Ю.В., 2019. 550 с.)**

Social transformations in modern Ukraine, which began after gaining the state independence, the rejection of totalitarian ideas of the political system, led to a qualitatively new situation in an everyday life. The events of the Ukrainian revolutions: “The Revolution

on Granite”, “The Orange Revolution” and “The Dignity Revolution” created a fundamentally new atmosphere, which helped increase the interest of a wide range of scholars and the public in the historical past.

An important role in preserving the national state traditions belongs to the Ukrainian peasantry. As V. Cook noted in his work “Collective Farm Slavery”: “To write about the fate of the Ukrainian peasantry throughout our history would mean writing the history of the Ukrainian people, because the Ukrainian peasantry, quite different from the peasants of many other nations, was the main core of the Ukrainian nation. The Ukrainian peasantry was the creator of the Ukrainian history”.

The history analysis of an everyday life, allowed the author not only to describe life, but also to reveal its structure and essence, to analyze an everyday life as an active component of the historical past.

The topicality of the reviewed monograph by V. Starka consists in the fact that despite the significant role of the peasantry in the socio-political life of Western Ukraine, researchers underestimated its role in the socio-historical processes.

The expediency of studying various aspects of the issue under analysis is dictated as the social significance of the research problem, which consists in making it possible to generalize the experience of the past, to deepen theoretical ideas, to offer practical recommendations that need to be implemented in the practice of the present, and the enrichment of scientific knowledge with significant factual material, the possibility of unbiased coverage of events, the reconstruction of processes and a clearer reflection of the objective laws of the research topic.

Despite the variability of historical destiny, the Western Ukrainian peasantry became a kind of indicator of the socio-political, socio-economic, cultural and religious situation in Ukraine, influencing the political events and processes directly or indirectly. In this regard, the peer-reviewed monograph is a topical scientific study, which is especially needed by modern Ukrainian historiography.

The structure of the peer-reviewed monograph is detailed, logical, consistent, balanced and concise, scientifically substantiated, as well as the presentation of the material in the chapters. In our opinion, it is quite successful and holistic, as it allows to reveal complex and contradictory processes in the western Ukrainian village.

The monograph consists of five chapters, namely: Chapter I deals with the characteristics of the source complex and historiography of the studied issues, a separate section is devoted to the theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of an everyday history; Chapter II focuses on the peculiarities of an organizational and legal support of the administrative leadership of the western Ukrainian village in 1939 – 1953; Chapter III deals with a thorough study of the socio-economic development of the western Ukrainian village in 1939 – 1953; Chapter IV focuses on the analysis of the socio-political life of the western Ukrainian peasantry in 1939 – 1953; Chapter V deals with coverage of the cultural and educational life of the western Ukrainian village.

There should be noted the fact of thorough and meticulous work of the researcher on the search and generalization of rich in content and capacious documentary material, which allowed him to introduce the novelty in the elaboration of this rather complex topic.

It should be emphasized that the peer-reviewed monograph is marked by the thoroughness of the source base, which gave the author the opportunity to express his own competent opinion on the most controversial aspects of the problem. V. Starka introduces into the scientific circulation not only new documents and materials, but he also generalizes the

historical facts, socio-political life and phenomena, reconstructs the events, connected with the daily life of peasants under the conditions of the social transformations of 1939 – 1953.

The majority of the sources on the outlined issues is stored in the Central State Archive of the highest authorities and administration of Ukraine, Kyiv, the Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine, Kyiv, the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Lviv, the State Archives of Ivano-Frankivsk, Lviv, Ternopil regions. A significant amount of materials was analyzed in V. Vernadsky National Scientific Library of Ukraine, the departments of Ukrainian studies and rare books of V. Stefanyk National Scientific Library of Lviv.

The author classified the analyzed sources into several groups, in accordance with the origin, place of storage, content and significance of information: the official documents of the authorities of the Soviet Union and the Nazi Germany, the archival documents and materials, the statistical collections, the published collections of documents and materials, the publication of periodicals of magazine and newspaper type, the materials of rural folklore, the documents of a personal origin – memories of direct participants and witnesses of the events under research. Additional sources were material and pictorial documents of that time: the photographs, posters, postcards, home clothes, household items.

An important factor that significantly affects the daily life of the population of the region is the public authorities activities. The well-being of the people, and thus the support of the government, depend on the organic interaction of citizens with the authorities. Taking into consideration the strategic importance of the western Ukrainian lands for the interests of the leadership of the Soviet Union, the region underwent an administrative reform during a relatively short period of time. The author tries to understand the difficulty in these relationships, the boundaries of which range from a full support to a rather rapid disappointment and resistance. It should be noted that V. Staraka, in addition to public authorities, studied the management model created in the western Ukrainian village by the structures of the Ukrainian national liberation movement. He describes a kind of competition between the structures of the Ukrainian national liberation movement and the official authorities of the Soviet and the Nazi totalitarian regimes for the commitment of the local population.

The events analyzed in the Chapters and the conclusions made by the author can serve as a guide for modern administrators during the implementation of administrative territorial reforms.

For the effective management of the western Ukrainian lands, the Soviet and the Nazi regimes retained a significant number of military forces and civil administration in these areas. The lion's share of a material support fell on the shoulders of the peasants, through the introduced system of taxes and duties, which are covered in Chapter III "Socio-Economic Development of the Western Ukrainian Village in 1939 – 1953". In the chapter, the author emphasizes two main aspects: government institutions tried to implement their economic plans at all costs, completely ignoring the interests of the peasants; instead the peasantry, in various ways adapted to new socio-economic realities, and following the orders of management, had its own interest. It was at that time that the Ukrainian peasantry developed the skills to survive under the most extreme conditions.

In Chapter IV "Socio-Political Life of the Western Ukrainian Peasantry in 1939 – 1953", the impact of migration processes on the established way of life, as well as the mentality and ancestral traditions are described. Under the pressure of external factors, not only the state-peasant relations were transformed, but also the established way of life, which could not cause the Resistance Movement. The participation of peasants in the struggle against the occupiers changed not only their daily lives, but also shook the faith of some traditional Christian laws and morals. Obviously,

when the peasants found themselves in the situation “between the hammer and the anvil”, when it is impossible to determine where “one’s own” and where “strange” were, according to the author, to assess the events of that time from the point of view of today is quite difficult, as well as to make a universal formula for covering the realities of that time. During that period of time everyone had his own truth, which had the right to exist.

At the same time, the author notes that “living under the rule of foreign governments, Galician peasants developed a unique way of an everyday life reality reception. Sustainability of a social behaviour created an original model of an active or passive socio-political behaviour. Galician peasants were very careful about something new, that is why, they did not particularly want to join the governing structures or to celebrate the state holidays unknown to them” (p. 343).

“Cultural and educational life of the western Ukrainian village” is analyzed in Chapter V. The author emphasizes that under the conditions of absence of television and radio, the main rural entertainment was religious festivities (carols, Christmas carols, hayivky, etc.), young people had fun during parties (vechornyts). There always functioned a choir and an amateur drama group in the village, which gave a concert at the local club from time to time. The exotic of the rural leisure of that time was cinema, which was brought from the “district” or “city” from time to time.

The spiritual life of peasants is covered in Chapter 5 separately. The researcher emphasizes the high piety of the Galician peasantry, which fought steadily for the preservation of their religious traditions. Special attention is paid to the role of the clergy, and especially Metropolitan A. Sheptytsky, in preserving a traditional rural spiritual life.

The conclusions made by the researcher are comprehensive and deeply reasoned, fully derived from interesting and scientifically important factual material. The main scientific provisions are formulated carefully and professionally, with knowledge of the researched problems. The conclusions are thoroughly substantiated and have indisputable value. The author is an expert on the material, the problems raised indicate a high scientific level of preparation of a monographic study.

The monographic study has a well-structured list of sources used. In addition, the monograph is supplemented by appendices. V. Starka showed a wide knowledge of the special literature on the problem under study and was able to analyze it professionally.

At the same time, it should be noted that the peer-reviewed monograph has some drawbacks. In this case, there attracts attention, first of all, the fact that the formulations of some chapters titles (or subsections) goes somewhat beyond the subject field of everyday history. For instance, the title of Chapter III “Socio-Economic Development of the Western Ukrainian Village in 1939 – 1953” may lead the reader to the conclusion that it is more about economic and social history in its classical sense. Also from the title of Chapter IV “Socio-Political Life of the Western Ukrainian Peasantry in 1939 – 1953” we can assume that it is about a typical political history. At the same time, the analysis of the content of these chapters of the monograph shows that the realities of an everyday life are properly represented in the author’s text. Hence, we believe that the nomenclature of the structural parts of the peer-reviewed monograph should be specified, focusing on the “everyday” aspects.

As an argumentative discussion, we would like to advise the author to enrich the peer-reviewed monograph with the methodological tools of imagology. It is the analysis of the subjective reception of certain social phenomena through the evaluation formula “their own – strange”. As we know, the Galician peasantry managed to visit several socio-political and socio-economic systems during the period under study. From this point, the answer to

the question of what elements of each of these political and social systems of the Galician peasantry were accepted as “their own” and which as “strange” or “hostile” would be of great value. The answer to this question will have not only purely theoretical significance; it will become a strong argument in topical socio-political discussions, in particular, on the question of whether the arrival of each of these systems was for the Galician peasantry “liberation” or “conquest”? It should be noted that the above mentioned drawback and suggestions do not undermine the scientific value of the peer-reviewed monograph.

V. Starka’s monograph fills a gap in the system of studies of an everyday life of the Western Ukrainian peasantry of the outlined period. The systematized and objectively presented material has not only worldview significance, but it will become an important and, most importantly, effective means of the national historiography.

*The article was received on May 20, 2020.  
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*

НАУКОВЕ ВИДАННЯ

**СХІДНОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ  
ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ВІСНИК**

**EAST EUROPEAN  
HISTORICAL BULLETIN**

**ВИПУСК 18  
ISSUE 18**

Головний редактор  
*Василь Ільницький*

Відповідальний редактор  
*Микола Галів*

Літературне редагування  
*Ірина Невмержицька*

Редагування англomовних текстів  
*Віра Слінецька, Юлія Талалай*

Технічний редактор  
*Лілія Гриник*

Макетування та верстка  
*Наталія Кузнєцова*

Дизайн обкладинки  
*Олег Лазебний*

**Здано до набору 11.12.2020 р. Підписано до друку 18.12.2020 р.**

Гарнітура Times. Формат 70x100 1/16.  
Друк офсетний. Папір офсетний.  
Ум. друк. арк. 31,39. Зам. № 0321/102  
Наклад 300 примірників

Друкарня – Видавничий дім «Гельветика»  
73034, м. Херсон, вул. Паровозна, 46-а  
Телефон +38 (0552) 39-95-80,  
+38 (095) 934 48 28, +38 (097) 723 06 08  
E-mail: mailbox@helvetica.com.ua  
Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи  
ДК № 6424 від 04.10.2018 р.