

UDC 94(477.63):329.15“1930/1940”
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.14.197183

Viktor BURENKOV

Research Assistant of the education and research Laboratory of Modern History of Ukraine and Innovative Educational Technologies, Zaporizhzhya National University, 66 Zhukovskogo Street, Zaporizhzhya, Ukraine, postal code 69600 (viktorburenkov@gmail.com)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9632-3781>

ResearcherID: AAF-7971-2019 (<http://www.researcherid.com/rid/AAF-7971-2019>)

Yurii KAHANOV

PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor, Vice-Rector for Scientific and Academic Affairs at Zaporizhzhya National University, 66 Zhukovskogo Street, Zaporizhzhya, Ukraine, postal code 69600 (znuhist@gmail.com)

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6889-7377>

ResearcherID: <http://www.researcherid.com/rid/V-3050-2017>

Віктор БУРЕНКОВ

молодший науковий співробітник навчально-наукової лабораторії модерної історії України та інноваційних освітніх технологій, Запорізький національний університет, вул. Жуковського, 66, м. Запоріжжя, Україна, індекс 69600 (viktorburenkov@ukr.net)

Юрій КАГАНОВ

доктор історичних наук, доцент, проректор з науково-педагогічної роботи Запорізького національного університету, вул. Жуковського, 66, м. Запоріжжя, Україна, 69600 (znuhist@gmail.com)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Burenkov, V. & Kahanov, Yu. (2020). The formation of non-formal groups of nomenclature in the USSR during the 1930-ies (on the example of the Soviet party leadership in Dnipropetrovsk region). *Skhidnoevropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 14, 108–116. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.14.197183

**THE FORMATION OF NON-FORMAL GROUPS OF NOMENCLATURE
IN THE USSR DURING THE 1930-IES (ON THE EXAMPLE
OF THE SOVIET PARTY LEADERSHIP IN DNIPROPETROVSK REGION)**

Abstract. The Purpose of the Research. The main purpose of the research is to cover principles of the existence and functioning of the Soviet party leadership in Dnipropetrovsk during the 1930-ies – at the beginning of the 1940-ies. **The Methodological Basis.** The research is based on the principle of systematicity, anthropologist and interdisciplinary. **The scientific novelty** lies in the fact that it was the first time in the Ukrainian historiography that on the background of the memoirs and archival documents analysis the attempts to clarify the reasons of the Dnipropetrovsk nomenclature formation during the end of the 1930-ies – the beginning 1940-ies as well as to demonstrate the consequences of the “nomenclature revolutions” in Dnipropetrovsk region were made. **The Conclusions.** It was clarified that during the 1930-ies in the environment of Dnipropetrovsk party nomenclature occurred a short-term consolidation around the top figure in the region – Mendel Khataievych. The

local version of a “leader cult” formed in the region. That process was interrupted by political repressions in 1937 – 1938. During the “Great Terror” almost all Soviet party nomenclature of the region was killed. The so-called “staff revolution” launched “political mobility” that opened wide opportunities to promote alive lower levels leaders. After that “cleaning”, the highest management of Dnipropetrovsk region was reached by Leonid Brezhnev, Kostiantyn Hrushevii and etc. There were names who would the so-called “Dnipropetrovsk clan” be associated with since the 1950-ies up to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the representatives of the clan held the highest party and government posts used to give tone to the political system of the USSR. Renovation of the party system in Dnipropetrovsk region connected with Mykyta Khrushchov and his appointees Demian Korotchenko and Semen Zadionchenko.

Key words: Dnipropetrovsk, nomenclature, regional elite, “Great Terror”, “staff revolution”, КР(б)У, “cultism”, patron-clientelism.

ФОРМУВАННЯ НЕФОРМАЛЬНИХ ГРУП НОМЕНКЛАТУРИ В СРСР 1930-Х РОКІВ (НА ПРИКЛАДІ ПАРТІЙНО-РАДЯНСЬКОГО КЕРІВНИЦТВА ДНІПРОПЕТРОВЩИНИ)

Анотація. Мета дослідження. Основною метою статті є висвітлення принципів існування та функціонування партійно-радянського керівництва Дніпропетровщини у 1930 – на початку 1940-х рр. **Методологічна база дослідження.** Робота ґрунтується на принципі системності, історизму, антропологізму, міждисциплінарності. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше в українській історіографії, на основі аналізу мемуарної літератури та архівних документів було здійснено спробу з’ясувати, яким чином відбувалося формування дніпропетровської номенклатури кінця 1930 – початку 1940-х рр. та показати наслідки “номенклатурної революції” на Дніпропетровщині. **Висновки.** Нами було встановлено, що протягом 1930-х рр. у середовищі дніпропетровської партійної номенклатури відбувається короткострокова консолідація довкола першої особи в регіоні – Менделя Хатаєвича. Тут формується локальна версія “культу вождя”. Цей процес був перерваний політичними репресіями 1937 – 1938 рр. Під час “Великого терору” була вибита майже вся партійно-радянська номенклатура регіону. Ця так звана “кадрова революція” запустила “політичні ліфти” – відкрила ціллим керівникам нижчих рівнів широкі можливості для просування вгору. Після цієї “чистки” до вищого керівництва Дніпропетровщини потрапили Леонід Брежнев, Костянтин Грушевий та ін. Саме з іменами цих діячів буде асоціюватися так званий “дніпропетровський клан”, представники якого клану, з кінця 1950-х рр. і аж до розпаду Радянського Союзу займали найвищі партійно-державні посади, “задавали тон” політичній системі СРСР. Відновлення партійного апарату на Дніпропетровщині пов’язано з Микитою Хрущовим та його висуванцями – Дем’яном Коротченком і Семеном Задіонченком.

Ключові слова: Дніпропетровськ, номенклатура, регіональна еліта, “Великий терор”, “кадрова революція”, КР(б)У, “культизм”, “патрон-клієнтелізм”.

The Statement of the Problem. One of the most urgent problems of the modern Ukrainian state is political corruption. Partially, the people of Ukraine inherited it from the Soviet Union along with a modernized planned economy, absence of civic institutions as well as bureaucratized political system which is riddled with the non-formal connections. Till 1991, these non-formal mechanisms of state power and exchange supported more or less the sustainable social, economic and political situation in the USSR. After the collapse of “the Red Empire”, the situations radically changed. There was a break with the United Centre which had been coordinating almost all spheres of the state life. In the consequence of this break-away, the collapse inside the regional elite, which had their patrons in Moscow, occurred. These most influential clients entered into a struggle against their patrons regarding resources and leading roles in the independent country, Ukraine. Along with its political practice, the

Soviet elites transit slows down the democratic progress of Ukraine. Successful freedom from such a Soviet legacy requires a thorough knowledge of a political elite that Ukraine has inherited from the Soviet Union. Taking this fact into consideration, the research of the regional elite of Dnipropetrovsk region of the 1930-ies is essential regarding its future establishment as the Dnipropetrovsk clan.

The Analysis of the Research. A huge number of scientific works is dedicated to the research of political nomenclature of the Ukrainian SSR of the 1930-ies. Particularly, the research of Zaporizhzhian scientist Mykola Frolov should be mentioned (Frolov, 2011). According to the research, most attention paid to the formation problem and functioning of the Soviet Ukrainian political system during 1920 – 1930-ies, the sources and mechanism of the nomenclature formation of the Ukrainian SSR elite are shown as well. An essential contribution concerning the research of party nomenclature was made by Mykola Doroshko. In his key research “Nomenclature: the ruling elite of Soviet Ukraine (1917 – 1938)”, the history of the origin and feature of the Communist-Soviet nomenclature of the Ukrainian SSR during 1917 – 1938, as well as motives of the party officials’ elimination by Stalin’s regime in 1937 – 1938 reveals (Doroshko, 2008). In the investigations of Valerii Vasiliev, the conflict between the senior leaders of the Ukrainian SSR and USSR which resulted in the destruction of personnel of the sub-centre power during “the Great Terror” are disclosed (Vasyliiev, 2014).

Viktor Mokhov, a Russian scientist, pays particular attention to a theoretical rethinking of practices that are typical for the Soviet regional elites (Mokhov, 2000; Mokhov, 2003). In the important work of Oleg Khlevniuk “Master of the House: Stalin and His Inner Circle” the author “illuminates the secret inner mechanisms of power in the Soviet Union during the years when Stalin established notorious dictatorship” and gives the detail analysis of “how and why the party and government purges and large-scale repressions of 1937 – 1938 carried out” (Khlevniuk, 2008). Among recent works published in the series “The History of Stalinism”, the researches of Archibald Getty (Getti, 2016), Gerald Easter (Ister, 2010), Evan Mawdsley and Steven White (Modkli & Uayt, 2011) should be mentioned. Through three investigations with some variations, the problem of non-formal practice in the framework of party elite of the Soviet Union is described. At the same time, gained experience regarding studying non-formal groups and practices of nomenclatures requires precise revision/verification on the particular examples. Taking all mentioned-above into account, the great relevance and interest in studying Dnepropetrovsk party clan should be stated.

The Purpose of the Research. Dnipropetrovsk nomenclature of the 1920-ies – the beginning of the 1930-ies particularly had been formed with “Varangians” (Burenkov, 2018, pp. 281–287). The purpose is to identify whether the principle of local leadership nomenclature selection had changed during the 1930-ies.

The Statement of the Basic Material. From February 1933 to March 1937, the senior secretary of Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee was a “barbarian” Mendel Khataievych, who was transferred to Dnipropetrovsk region from the position of the secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U (Russian State Archive of Socio-political History, f. 17, d. 3, c. 914, p. 13). Khataievych as a representative of the higher Soviet party elite in Ukraine used to support collectivisation and was one of the Holodomor 1932 – 1933 organisers. In that period, there was a formation of the so-called “Khataievych cult” in Dnipropetrovsk. Such regional “cultism” was reflected in the names of enterprises, collective farms, streets and parks. The name of Khataievych was given to the newly built palace of pioneers and “Central park of culture and leisure” (currently Lasar Globa Park) in Dnipropetrovsk city

(Brezhnev, 2019; Kavun, 2019). Such “cultism” was extended to all levels of leadership elite of the USSR (Getti, 2016, p. 78).

On March 17, 1937, Khataievych was dismissed from the position of the senior secretary of Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee and appointed as the second secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U. However, he did not stay on the new post for a long time, so on 9 July 1937 he was arrested for a fabricated case as a participant the so-called “Centre of Rightists and Trotskyites”. On 29 October 1937, the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR sentenced him to death for “the participation in a counter-revolutionary and terrorist organisation” – execution (Martirolog zhertv, 2019).

The withdrawal of Khataievych from the cohort of the regional party elite and later from the political field of the Soviet Union as well was caused by another campaign regarding a fight against the internal party enemies and Stalin personally. In many types of the research, some scientists try to prove that Khataievych was repressed due to the fact that he at one of the plenum sessions of the Regional Committee, in August 1936, claimed: “Practically, our leadership have elements of authoritarianism. Obviously, our organisation is not an exception as the elements of authoritarianism have not met liquidation in other organisations too. Against such declaration, grovelling in front of an individual, the manifestation of autocracy, I personally... always opposed the agitated ascension and any other rituals that were introduced and implemented in many places uselessly” (Ivanenko, 2019). To our mind, there is no need justifying physical destruction of Mendel Khataievych only for his critical declaration on one of the plenums. The main reason was the general direction to the total elimination of the nomenclature “old guards” as an influential and relatively independent from Stalin political elite of the USSR.

Khataievych belonged to the cohort of leaders, who thought “they deserved the status of an elite member due to their former “merits for the party”, tried to create conditions for their unprecedented participation in the state managing through regional sub-centres (Ister, 2010, p. 27). Stalin made considerable efforts in the fight against interparty groups. Speaking on the plenum of the Central Committee which was held in February and March 1937, he sacrificed the practice of personnel resources based on the principle of a personal commitment to the patron: “... sometimes people are selected by political and business principles, but with the point of view of personal acquaintance, devotion, friendly relationships, generally on account of the conventional character, features which should not be in our practice... What does it mean to carry a whole group of friends...? It means that you have received a kind of independence from local organisations and, if you want, some independence from the Central Committee. It has its own group, I have mine, they are devoted to me personally. This method of people selection is not good. This method is not a Bolshevik-like, I must say, anti-party-like method of people selection. Comrades must get this method over while it is not too late” (Zakliuchitelnoe slovo, 2019). Therefore, the motives to remove M. Khataievych were obvious.

Around the whole territory of the USSR in 1937 – 1938, there was a wave of the “Great Terror”. That murderous policy of “cleanings”, which was launched with the initiative and direct participation of Stalin, touched all population groups and did not pass any regional party elites. According to different estimates, in the result of cleaning from 50 to 70% of the Soviet nomenclature representatives were killed. Consequences for the political system of the USSR in 1937 – 1938 are often evaluated as the “staff revolution”.

Two waves of political repression in Dnipropetrovsk region should be singled out. The first wave of repression is relatively limited to the period from May to July in 1937,

the second one occurred in October 1937 – January 1938. The result of the cleaning campaign was a particular elimination of a local political elite, which used to belong to the teams of first secretaries of the Dnipropetrovsk the Oblast Committee of M. Khataievych and N. Marholin.

The first wave “washed away” region the party leaders of Dnipropetrovsk region along with the First Secretary of the Oblast Committee of CP(b)U M. Khataievych from the political map of the whole region. There was a long list of repressed members of the Regional Committee such as S. Oleksandrov (Head of the Propaganda Department), P. Vetrov (the Second Secretary of the Dnipropetrovsk City Committee), H. Oleksiienko (the Deputy Head of the Dnipropetrovsk Regional Executive Committee), I. Rumiantsev (the Head of the Dnipropetrovsk Regional Court), S. Dayn, V. Yablonskii, S. Taran, A. Nosach, as well as Yu. Makieiev, N. Tanyhin and M. Matveiev (thereafter secretaries of Dniprodzherzhynsk, Kryvyi Rih and Zaporizhzhia City Committees). During the first wave of repressions, 13 secretaries of the regionals CP(b)U committees became victims. An important source that helps to find out the motives of the elimination of those Dnipropetrovsk leaders is a letter of the communist Kuliakin to the Central Committee of All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) (AUCP(b)) concerning M. Khataievych: “1. The Comrade Khataievych, as an “observant communist” claimed, brought the Red one and turned out to be the public enemy; 2. Brought Leyser and turned out to be the public enemy; 3. Brought Levitin and turned out to be the public enemy; 4. Lehkyi, head of the regional department of the local industry – the public enemy; 5. The Head of the Regional Executive Committee Havrylov – the public enemy; 6. The Deputy Head of the Regional Executive Committee Broun – the public enemy; 7. The Secretary of the Regional Executive Committee Vronskiy – the public enemy; 8. Lehkyi, Head of the Local Industry department – the public enemy; 9. Aleksieienko, the Head of the Regional Planning – the public enemy; 10. The Deputy Goltenberg – the public enemy; 11. Sabsai, the Head of Trade – the public enemy; 12. Filippov, an employee of the Regional Committee – the public enemy; 13. Mykhailov – the public enemy; 14. Leibenson, a Secretary of the City Committee – the public enemy; 15. Komarovskiy, an employee of the City Committee – the public enemy; 16. Yahnetynska, an employee of the City Committee – the public enemy; 17. Holubenko, the Head of the City Council – the public enemy; 18. Akhmatov, the Regional Prosecutor – the public enemy; 19. Hetman, a bank director – the public enemy; 20. Hyurin, Budkevych...” (Archive of the President of the Russian Federation, f. 3, d. 24, c. 316, pp. 113–116).

During the second wave of the arrests, the newly appointed personnel of the Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee bureau headed by the First Secretary Natan Marholin and Mykola Nikitchenko, the heads of departments, secretaries of the cities and regional committees of the party, secretaries of party committees of large enterprises, as well as the heads of executive committees were sentenced to the prisons of the NKVD (Tereshchenko, 2002, p. 139). In addition, O. Viktorov, the first Secretary of Dnipropetrovsk LCSYU (Lenin’s Communist Society of Youth of Ukraine) and his follower Ye. Heiro, as well as I. Yanutan, the secretary of the Nikopol City Committee, were arrested and executed (Tereshchenko, 2002, p. 140). I. Fediaiev and his followers were shot away (Ivanenko, 2001, p. 23).

Generally, during the whole period of repressions, 59 out of 87 members of the Regional Committee, which put together 67 % of the overall members, were shot away (Ivanenko, 2001, p. 23). That “cleaning” of regional elites and Dnipropetrovsk one, in particular, launched “political mobility” that opened wide opportunities to promote alive personnel of management. There was a necessity to fill the «office gap» which occurred in the result of those cleanings.

After the “Great Terror”, Mykyta Khrushchov, who on 27 January 1938 was appointed as the First Vice Secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U, was assigned to renovate regular work of the CP(b)U. The situation in Ukraine impressed Khrushchov very much (RSASPH, f. 17, d. 163, c. 1181, p. 115). In his memoirs, Mr Khrushchov described the situation he had seen accordingly: “It seems that Mamai has passed Ukraine. As he told, there were neither secretaries of the regional committees in the republic, nor heads of the regional executive committees” (Khrushchev, 1997, p. 35). On a personal commission from Stalin, Khrushchov had travelled all over the republic and controlled selection process of new appointees on the positions of repressed predecessors. Stalin paid particular attention to Dnipropetrovsk. Why? Khrushchov answered that question with his own suggestion: “Maybe, he was worried about the situation in Dnipropetrovsk as he was afraid of being an industrial collapse” (Khrushchev, 1997, p. 37).

Before the arrival to Dnipropetrovsk region, Mykyta Khrushchov had a personal conversation with Stalin, who proposed him to appoint Demian Korotchenko the First Secretary of Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee (Khrushchev, 1997, p. 37). So that happened. Post of repressed Natan Marholin was taken by his old acquaintance Korotchenko who used to work in Bauman district in Moscow during the 1930-ies. Meanwhile, Marholin was a secretary of a district committee, D. Korotchenko was a Head of the district executive committee (Zverev, 1973, p. 131). It should be noticed that M. Khrushchov used to work in the same district committee. In our opinion, it was he, who had lobbied Korotchenko to be appointed as the First Secretary of Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee.

During his travel all over Dnipropetrovsk region, Khrushchov visited other big industrial cities of the region which were Zaporizhzhia and Dniprodzerzhynsk. In Dniprodzerzhynsk, the head of the republic first met Leonid Brezhnev and Leonid Korniets (Khrushchev, 1997, p. 37). In his memoirs, Khrushchov recalled that acquaintances poor enough, without any details: “we began to nominate the latter for party work, form party management. Then, Korniets was promoted. He was a secretary of a district committee in one of the Dnipropetrovsk villages. Except for Brezhnev, one more appointee from Dniprodzerzhynsk was nominated to the Propaganda Secretary of the party regional committee” (Khrushchev, 1997, c. 37). D. Korotchenko, a newly appointed head of the Ukrainian SSR government, recommended Khrushchov to promote L. Korniets. In the summary of 21 February 1938, prepared by the department of CP(b)U Central Committee executives, it was mentioned next: “Comrade L. R. Korniets has reasonable experience in party management, is knowledgeable in agriculture, Soviet work. Currently, he is working as the First Secretary of a large CP(b)U District Committee in Melitopol. Comrade Korotchenko characterizes him as a responsible and proactive worker. He might be promoted as a Second Secretary of the Dnipropetrovsk CP(b)U Regional Committee” (Kerivnyky uriadiv, 2019). In fact, Korniets worked on that position from February to August in 1938. After short-term work on the position of the Second Vice Secretary of the Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee, Khrushchov pushed him to the position of a Head of Presidium in Verkhovna Rada of the Ukrainian SSR (Lozyskyi, 2005, p. 203). In July 1939, a position of the Third Secretary of the CP(b)U Central Committee was established which was held by Dmytro Korotchenko, and Leonid Korniets started to serve as a Head of the Council of People’s Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR (Lozyskyi, 2005, p. 74). Therefore, Khrushchov used to actively help his nominees to held high posts on the ruling Olympus of the republic.

Taken the post of the Vice First Secretary of the Regional Committee, D. Korotchenko did not serve there for a long time. No sooner than two months, he had been promoted with

the help of Khrushchov. On 19 February, on the session of the Politbureau of the CP(b)U, the decision was made: “to approve comrade D. S. Korotchenko as a Head of the Council of People’s Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR dismissing him from the duties of the First Vice Secretary of the Dnipropetrovsk CP(b)U Regional Committee” (Kerivnyky uriadiv, 2019).

In February 1938, the First Secretary of Dnipropetrovsk CP(b)U Regional Committee was appointed Semen Zadionchenko, who took the position till July of 1941. He was a “barbarian” in the local nomenclature, was in friendly relationships with two of his processors N. Marholin and D. Korotchenko. All three used to do a party work at the same time in Bauman district in Moscow (Zverev, 1973, p. 131).

The election of S. Zadionchenko was the beginning of local party organization renovation after the “cleanings” 1937 – 1938. The formation of a new elite in the region started.

The Soviet party government bodies began a centre of local nomenclature consolidation. The most influential government body in the region was a Regional Committee bureau, which consisted of 9 members and 2 candidates to members (State Archives of Dnipropetrovsk Region, f. 19, d. 3, c. 324, pp. 17–18). In 1941, on the First Plenum of the Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee new members of the bureau were elected regarding Semen Zadionchenko as the First Secretary, Second and Third were Kostiantyn Hrushevii and Pavlo Naidenov; Leonid Brezhnev as an agitation and propaganda secretary; Mykhailo Kuchmii as a human resources secretary; Kostiantyn Karaiev as a head of the Regional Executive Committee; Mykola Menziuk as the Second Secretary of the Dnipropetrovsk City Committee; Kostiantyn Dobrosedov commander of the Workers’ and Peasants’ Red Army (Red Army) Corps stationed in the region, as well as Leonid Lukych as a Head of the Industrial Department. H. Shevchenko (Head of the Agricultural Department) and H. Belchenko (Secretary of the LCSYU Regional Committee) were chosen as candidates to members of the Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee Bureau.

All mentioned-above members and candidates to the members of Dnipropetrovsk CP(b)U Regional Committee were the representatives of the so-called new generation of the region leaders, who substituted the previously eliminated elite.

The Conclusions. Summarising, during the 1930-ies inside the environment of Dnipropetrovsk party nomenclature occurred a short-term consolidation around the top figure in the region – Mendel Khataievych. The local version of a “leader cult” was formed in the region. That process was interrupted by political repressions in 1937 – 1938. In our view, the specificities of forming and functioning of a regional “cultism” in the USSR require a separate and more detailed study.

During the “Great Terror” almost all Soviet party nomenclature of the region was killed. “Personnel Revolution” of 1937 – 1938 provided significant opportunities for career advancement of the survived leaders of the lowest levels. The so-called “staff revolution” launched “a political mobility” that opened wide opportunities to promote alive lower levels managers. The renovation of the party system in Dnipropetrovsk region was tightly connected with Mykyta Khrushchov and his nominees Demian Korotchenko and Semen Zadionchenko. Except the above-mentioned leaders, Leonid Brezhnev became the most influential and Dnipropetrovsk clan was formed around him.

In the following researches, it is important to observe the further fortune of the «local» representatives of Dnipropetrovsk Soviet party nomenclature and identify their influence on the republican and all-Union levels. After studying these questions, we would have an opportunity to explain features of formation and functioning of the so-called Dnipropetrovsk clan.

Acknowledgements. We are sincere grateful to the Shevchenko Scientific Society (the USA) for the support. The author expresses a sincere gratitude to the Candidate of Science in History, associate professor Olexyi Fedorovych Shteinle for his support and valuable advice during carrying out the research. In addition, there is a necessity to express gratitude to the personnel of Dnipropetrovsk State Regional Archive for their assistance in finding the necessary archival documents.

Funding. The author received no financial support for the publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arkhiv Prezidenta Rossijskoi Federatsii* [Archive of the President of the Russian Federation – *APRF*]
- Brezhnev, M. A.** (2019). *Ministr Shchelokov* [Minister Shchelokov]. URL: <https://www.rulit.me/books/ministr-shchelokov-read-439437-20.html>. [in Russian]
- Burenkov, V. M.** (2018). Formuvannia komunistychnoi elity Dnipropetrovshchyny u 1920-kh – na pochatku 1930-kh rokiv [Formation of communist elite in Dnipropetrovsk region during the 1920s – early 1930s]. *Naukovi pratsi istorychnoho fakultetu Zaporizkoho natsionalnoho universytetu – Scholarly Works of the Faculty of History, Zaporizhzhia National University*, 50, 281–287. doi: 10.26661/swfh-2018-50-030 [in Ukrainian]
- Derzhavnyi arkhiv Dnipropetrovskoi oblasti* [State Archives of Dnipropetrovsk Region – *SADR*]
- Doroshko, M. S.** (2008). *Nomenklatura: kerivna verkhivka Radianskoi Ukrainy (1917 – 1938 rr.): monohrafiia* [Nomenclature: The ruling Top of the Soviet Ukraine (1917 – 1938)]. Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr, 365 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Frolov, M. O.** (2011). Politychna systema ta nomenklatura elita radianskoi Ukrainy 1920-kh – 1930-kh rr.: osoblyvosti ta mekhanizm formuvannia i funktsionuvannia [The political System and Nomenclatural Elite of the Soviet Ukraine of 1920 – 1930s: the specific and mechanisms of formation and functionalizing]. Zaporizhzhia: KPU, 826 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Getti, Arch** (2016). *Praktika stalinizma: Bolsheviki, boyare i neumirayushchaya traditsiya* [Practicing Stalinism: Bolsheviks, Boyars, and the Persistence of Tradition]. Moskva: ROSSPEN, 374 p. [in Russian]
- Ister Dzh. M.** (2010). *Sovetskoe gosudarstvennoe stroitelstvo. Sistema lichnykh svyazey i samoidentifikatsiya elity v Sovetskoy Rossii* [Reconstructing The State. Personal Networks and Elite Identity in Soviet Russia]. Moskva: Rossiyskaya politicheskaya entsiklopediya (ROSSPEN); Fond “Prezidentskiy tsentr B. N. Yeltsina”, 255 p. [in Russian]
- Ivanenko, V. V.** (2019). *M. M. Khataievych: dolia revoliutsionera-bilshovyka* [M. M. Khataevich: the fate of the Bolshevik revolutionary]. URL: <http://ru.museum.dp.ua/article0035.html>. [in Ukrainian]
- Ivanenko, V. V. (Ed.)** (2001). *Svidchennia z mynulyshchyny : movoiu dokumentiv. Dnipropetrovska oblast* [Past testimony: language of the documents. Dnipropetrovsk region]. (Vol. 2). Dnipropetrovsk: Monolit, 319 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Kavun, M.** (2019). “Kadry reshaiut vse!” [“The staff solve everything!”]. URL: http://gorod.dp.ua/history/article_ru.php?article=198. [in Russian]
- Kerivnyky uriadiv.** (2019). *Kerivnyky uriadiv Ukrainskoi Radianskoi Sotsialistychnoi Respubliky* [Heads of Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic]. URL: http://www.kmu.gov.ua/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=1261415&cat_id=66125. [in Ukrainian]
- Khlevniuk, O. V.** (2008). *Master of the House. Stalin and His Inner Circle*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 344 p. doi:10.12987/yale/9780300110661.001.0001
- Khrushchev, N. S.** (2007). *Vospominaniya: izbrannye fragmenty* [Memories: Selected Fragments]. Moskva: Vagrius, 509 p. [in Russian]
- Lozyskyi, V. S.** (2005). *Politbiuro TsK Kompartii Ukrainy: istoriia, osoby, stosunki (1918 – 1991)* [Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine: history, personalities, relations (1918 – 1991)]. Kyiv: Heneza, 368 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Martirolog zhertv.** (2019). *Martirolog zhertv politicheskikh repressyi, rasstrelivnykh y zakhoronennykh v Moskve i Moskovskoi oblasti v 1918 – 1953 gg. Khataevich Mendel Markovich*

[Martyrologist of victims of political repression, shot and buried in Moscow and Moscow region in 1918 – 1953. Khataevich Mendel Markovich]. URL: <http://www.sakharov-center.ru/asfcd/martiolog/?t=page&id=14900>. [in Russian]

Modli E., & Uayt S. (2011). *Sovetskaya elita ot Lenina do Gorbacheva. Tsentralnyy Komitet i ego chleny, 1917 – 1991 gg.* [The Soviet Elite from Lenin to Gorbachev. The Central Committee and its Members, 1917 – 1991]. Moskva: Rossiyskaya politicheskaya entsiklopediya (ROSSPEN); Fond “Prezidentskiy tsentr B. N. Yeltsina”, 431 p. [in Russian]

Mokhov, V. P. (2000). *Elitizm i istoriya. Problemy izucheniya sovetskikh regionalnykh elit* [Elitism and History: the Problem of Study of the Soviet Regional Elites]. Perm: Permskoe kn. izd-vo, 195 p. [in Russian]

Mokhov, V. P. (2003). *Regionalnaya politicheskaya elita Rossii (1945 – 1991 gg.)* [The Regional Political Elite of Russia (1945 – 1991)]. Perm: Permskoe knizhnoe izd-vo, 238 p. [in Russian]

Rossiyskiy derzhavnyi arkhiv sotsialno-politychnoi istorii [Russian State Archive of Socio-political History – **RSASPH**]

Tereshchenko, R. K. (2002). *Mynule z hirky m prysmakom : represii v istorychnii retrospektyvi radianskoho suspilstva* [Past with a bitter aftertaste: repression in the historical retrospective of the Soviet society] (Vol. 3). Dnipropetrovsk: Reabilitovani istoriieiu: Monolit, 240 p. [in Ukrainian]

Vasyliiev, V. Yu. (2014). *Politychne kerivnytstvo URSS i SRSR: dynamika vidnosyn tsentr-subtsentr vlady (1917 – 1938)* [The Political Establishment of the USSR and UkrSSR: Dynamics of the Relations “Center-Subcenter” (1917 – 1938)]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy, 376 p. [in Ukrainian]

Yakovlev, A. N. (Ed.). (2004). *Lubyanka. Stalin i Glavnoe upravlenie gosbezopasnosti NKVD. Arkhiv Stalina. Dokumenty vysshikh organov partiynoy i gosudarstvennoy vlasti. 1937 – 1938* [Lubyanka. Stalin and NKVD Chief Directorate of State Security 1937 – 1938]. Moskva: MFD, 736 p. [in Russian]

Zakliuchitelnoe slovo. (2019). *Zakliuchitelnoe slovo na Plenum TsK VKP(b) 5 marta 1937 hoda (stenograficheskiy variant) Y. V. Stalin* [Closing remarks at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) March 5, 1937 (shorthand version) Y. V. Stalin]. URL: https://www.marxists.org/russkij/stalin/t14/t14_44.htm. [in Russian]

Zverev, A. G. (1973). *Zapiski ministra* [Minister’s notes]. Moskva: Politizdat, 270 p. [in Russian]

The article was received on May 12, 2019.
Article recommended for publishing 26/02/2020.