

UDC 94(477):323.281“1920”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.27.281523

Tatyana GUMENYUK

PhD hab. (Philosophy), Full Professor, Vice-Rector for Scientific and Methodical Work, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, 30 Ye. Konovelets Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01133 (t_gumenyuk@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0001-9210-6424

Boris DRAMARETSKYI

PhD (History), Associate Professor, Senior Research of M. S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukraine Archeography and Source Studies, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 4 Triochsviatytska Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01001; Associate Professor, National University of Culture and Arts, 30 Ye. Konovelets Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01133 (dddboris@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0001-9210-6424

Тетяна ГУМЕНЮК

докторка філософських наук, професорка, заслужена працівниця освіти України, проректорка з науково-методичної роботи Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв, вул. С. Коновальця, 36, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 01133 (t_gumenyuk@ukr.net)

Борис ДРАМАРЕЦЬКИЙ

кандидат історичних наук, доцент, старший науковий співробітник Інституту української археології та джерелознавства ім. М. С. Грушевського НАН України, вул. Трьохсвятительська, 4, Київ, Україна, індекс 01001; доцент Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв, вул. С. Коновальця, 36, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 01133 (dddboris@gmail.com)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Gumenyuk, T. & Dramaretskyi, B. (2023). Cultural Policy in the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic in the 1920s. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 27, 128–139. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.27.281523

CULTURAL POLICY IN THE UKRAINIAN SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLIC IN THE 1920s

Abstract. *The purpose of the study is to determine the consequences of the Bolshevik policy transformation to Ukraine in the field of culture in the 1920s. The research methodology is based on the application of the principles of historical knowledge (historical and genetic, historical and comparative, historical and systemic), authorial objectivity, general scientific methods of analysis and synthesis, which made it possible to use the technologies of science connections for a holistic understanding of the material, which allowed to determine the purpose of the Bolshevik cultural policy and methods of its implementation in Ukraine. The scientific novelty consists in the fact that for the first time the ideological manipulation of the officially announced policy in the field of education,*

publishing and literature has been highlighted, since the real actions of the Bolsheviks were a return to Russification through immigration policy, simultaneous identification of supporters of Ukrainization and independent Ukrainian leaders with the aim of controlling or physically destroying them. **The Conclusion.** It has been determined that in the field of culture the most important task of the Bolshevik policy was the formation of a new type of a human being – the Soviet one. This meant instilling ideology, raising intolerance, and declaring those who had a different position “enemies of the people”. For the same purpose, an extensive system of censorship and repressive bodies was created. Transformation also took place in the national and cultural sphere: from Russification to Ukrainization, and the policy of Ukrainization can be considered as a temporary phenomenon, which aimed at fulfilling only tactical tasks – to take root in national areas and carry out industrialization. However, flourishing of the national culture, spread of the national idea, and increase in centripetal attitudes forced the Bolsheviks to curtail Ukrainization and eliminate representatives of the Ukrainian cultural and political elite from the mid-1920s. At the same time, the totalitarian system demanded unquestioning loyalty to the party leaders, exact execution of all orders up to self-sacrifice. Such deformation caused deep social changes, the vestiges of which can be observed even today among population of the post-Soviet countries.

Key words: cultural policy, the Ukrainian SSR, the Bolshevik party, Ukrainization, national revival, Russification.

КУЛЬТУРНА ПОЛІТИКА УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ СРР У 1920-х рр.

Анотація. Мета дослідження полягає у визначенні наслідків для України трансформації більшовицької політики у сфері культури у 1920-х рр. **Методологія дослідження** спирається на застосування принципів історичного пізнання (історико-генетичного, історико-порівняльного та історико-системного), авторської об'єктивності, загальнонаукових методів аналізу та синтезу, що дало змогу використати технології зв'язків науки для цілісного осмислення матеріалу, які уможливили визначення мети більшовицької культурної політики та методів її реалізації в Україні. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше висвітлено ідеологічну маніпуляцію офіційно проголошеної політики у сфері освіти, видавництва та літератури, оскільки реальними діями більшовиків стало повернення до русифікації шляхом переселенської політики, одночасного виявлення прихильників українізації та самостійних українських керівників з метою їх контролю або фізичного знищення. **Висновки.** Визначено, що найважливіше завдання більшовицької політики у сфері культури полягало у формуванні людини нового типу – радянської. Це означало насадження ідеології, виховання нетерпимості та оголошення тих, хто мав іншу позицію, “ворогами народу”. З цією ж метою створювалася розгалужена система цензури та репресивних органів. У національно-культурній сфері також відбулася трансформація: від русифікації – до українізації, а політику українізації можемо розглядати як явище тимчасове, що мало на меті виконання лише тактичних завдань – укорінитися у національних районах та провести індустріалізацію. Однак розквіт національної культури, поширення національної ідеї та збільшення відцентрових настроїв змусив більшовиків уже з середини 1920-х рр. згортати українізацію та усунути представників української культурної і політичної еліти. Водночас тоталітарна система вимагала беззаперечної відданості партійним вождям, точного виконання усіх наказів аж до самопожертви. Така деформація спричинила глибокі суспільні зміни, рудименти яких і сьогодні можемо спостерігати у населення пострадянських країн.

Ключові слова: культурна політика, УСРР, більшовицька партія, українізація, національне відродження, русифікація.

The Problem Statement. In the 1920s the development of Ukrainian culture became a peculiar phenomenon not only of breaking a previous worldview and completely replacing a traditional culture with a new one, artificially created by the political party of the Bolsheviks, but also of its rooting in the mass consciousness by administrative and forceful methods. Of course, during the periods of weakening of pressure – NEP, and later – thaw, sixties, perestroika, certain elements of freedom were allowed and Ukrainian society returned to national culture to one degree or another. However, violent imposition of the Soviet worldview

over the course of seventy years was evident. It was so strongly rooted in consciousness that, to a certain extent, it remains to this day. This violent imposition had a particularly noticeable effect on the modern Russian population, among whom Stalin is perceived as a brilliant manager, his period is identified with stability, order, a firm hand, and the bloody Bolshevik leaders are still shrouded in glory. Instead, Ukrainian national heroes are called enemies, pelted with mud and hated. “It is not only a manifestation of social psychology, according to which positive characteristics prevail in the assessment of the past, but also evidence that the policy of systematic influence on the mass consciousness, carried out in the 1930s, largely achieved its goal” (Rodionova, 2003, p. 3) – the Russian researchers admit. Therefore, determining the origins of the Soviet mentality formation on the example of culture formation is an extremely important task for modern Ukrainian researchers.

Nowadays, there is a need to acquire a high status of national culture in accordance with the needs of a sovereign state. Understanding the historical process known as the “cultural revolution” as the next stage that followed the political and social upheaval will allow us to find approaches to solving modern challenges facing Ukrainian society.

The Analysis of Recent Research Papers and Publications. The formation of Bolshevik cultural policy in the 1920s is one of the important topics of modern scientific research. It was during this period that the foundations of the Soviet worldview were laid, while the national and cultural issue was defeated. In the studies of K. Nikitenko, O. Kuts, the analysis of cultural processes under the conditions of the formation of a totalitarian society was carried out, both positive and negative processes of the Ukrainization policy implementation were highlighted (Nikitenko, 2016, pp. 12–26; Kuts, 2006, pp. 224–232). Development of publishing in the UkrSSR under the influence of the policy of Ukrainization, nationalization of publishing houses, printers, libraries and establishment of private publishing houses during the NEP period were studied by M. Andriichuk and O. Fetisova (Andriichuk, 2015, pp. 103–115; Fetisova, 2021). The spread of anti-Ukrainian sentiments in the urbanized cities of Ukraine, their influence on Ukrainization, which eventually manifested itself in the “theory of two cultures” and reflected on the entire culture-creating process, was studied by N. Idris and M. Parakhina (Idris, 2010, pp. 36–39; Parakhina, 2012, pp. 303–316). An important study was the publication of the book “Political Terror and Terrorism in Ukraine. The 19th – 20th centuries” by Ukrainian historians in which, on the basis of archival documents, it is proven that “the Soviet state immediately planned to change the living conditions and lifestyle of the majority of citizens radically. It was decided to deprive everyone who did not meet certain criteria of the very right to life” (Politychnyi teror, 2002, p. 4). Analyzing the culture of Ukraine during the period of Stalinist totalitarianism, M. Popovych emphasizes that “...to the festive carnival of the “country of victorious socialism” the stench of the “zone”, “low life” came (Popovych, 1998, p. 622). However, studies of the main provisions of Ukrainization in education, publishing, and culture, both at the declared level, and the simultaneous identification of objections and the formation of a totalitarian society are not enough.

The purpose of the study is to determine the consequences of the Bolshevik policy transformation for Ukraine in the field of culture during the 1920s.

The Results of the Research. At the beginning of the 1920s the conquest of the majority of Ukrainian territories by the Russian Bolsheviks and establishment of the Soviet power changed the conditions for the development of culture radically. The communist construction of a new socio-political reality according to Marxist-Leninist ideology, creation of the Soviet statehood and absolute control of the party-state leadership not only over the state and

political, but also a private life of population, led to “displacement of cultural phenomena and processes to the margins of a public life”, because “the more the state interferes with natural laws of a human development, the more brutal the regulation of a cultural policy, the more its forms are distorted” (Nikitenko, 2016, p. 12).

It should be emphasized that during the 1920s cultural policy went through certain stages: Russification-Ukrainization-Russification. Thus, the Communist Party returned to what it started with – to planting Russification, and Ukrainization was only a tactical retreat and pursued certain goals, which were far from the concepts of humanity and humanism, on the contrary, “proletarian” culture was encouraged in every way, “in which the main emphasis was on showing the suffering of the poor under the oppression of the bourgeoisie and landlords” (Kadeniuk, 2021, p. 100).

Immediately after the seizure of power, the Bolsheviks continued the previous policy of Russification, adhering to the old imperial cultural and national policy. It was forbidden to use the Ukrainian language in administration, to introduce it in cultural and educational institutions. This policy was understandable, because the majority of the leadership had imperial views, and cities, as centres of culture, were Russified. In the largest trade and industrial centres – Kharkiv and Kyiv, port cities, primarily Odesa, as well as in the cities of Eastern Ukraine, there lived about 3/4 of the Russian nationality (Vsesoiuznaia perepys, 1929; Zhiromskaya, 1988, p. 8). We mean not only the Russians, but the Russified Jews, the Ukrainians, etc., who were even more chauvinists, constantly proving their affiliation with the velykorosy.

At the same time, the occupation and establishment of control over the territory of Ukraine turned out to be a quite difficult task for the Bolsheviks. The powerful national liberation movement of 1917 – 1921 forced them to recognize the existence of Ukrainian statehood nominally in order to attract as many supporters as possible to their side, albeit on condition of recognition of their political system. In order to appease the hostile population, the Communist Party announced a new economic policy (NEP) in 1921, and in 1923, korenization (Ukrainization). It is obvious that the Bolsheviks were not going to give up either forcible introduction of non-economic methods in the economy, or Russification. Their policy turned out to be another lie and manipulation.

The declaratory refusal to carry out distribution of food and planting of communes and state farms did not at all mean the end of looting of the population. Proclamation of the National People's Republic of Ukraine was only a formal way to appease the peasantry, but in reality, during the period of 1921 – 1923, in Ukraine they created the first artificial famine, which took the lives of about 2 million people (Hladun, Rudnytskyi & Kulyk, 2019, pp. 22, 25). At the same time, several tasks were solved. The economic component was the pumping of resources to Russia and abroad, the political component was suppression of armed struggle.

At the same time, a resettlement policy was implemented, especially in the south-eastern region of Ukraine. Thus, the Census of 1923 recorded an increase in the urban population despite huge mortality of hunger. The population of cities increased from 500 thousand to 1.3 million (3.8 – 4.7 against 5 million people according to the Censuses of 1920 and 1923) (Sbornik statisticheskikh svedeni, 1924, p. 24; Tarapon, 2012, p. 126). This situation can be explained by the forced revival of heavy and mining industry. Peasants lost their property and escaped from starvation moving to cities, which, in turn, needed workers. Immigrants from remote regions of Russia were also sent there. In particular, during the period of 1921 – 1923, at least 855,060 evacuees from the Volga region arrived in Ukraine, including 267,000 children (Hod borbi s holodom, 1923, p. 31) the vast majority of whom also settled

in cities. There should be also mentioned the army of 1,200,000 that was located in Ukraine, a large part of the army consisted of urban population (Novitnia istoriya, 2002, p. 65). These groups, deprived of their roots, could exist only at the expense of work offered by state. However, the authorities modernized the country by restricting consumption. “Faced with the desire of people to work and receive monetary rewards for it, the party functionaries called it “consumer psychology”, “violence”, and began to fight against workers, applying punitive ways” (Nikolaiuk & Stoian, 2022, p. 99). Similar methods were used concerning peasantry. A core component of artificial creation of social tension among the members of this population group was the desire to diminish a significant influence of the wealthy, and the leading Bolshevik propaganda was the call that “the wealthy is a kurkul, an exploiter of the poor” (Lazurenko & Ocheretianyi, 2022, p. 116). At the same time, for propaganda reasons, in official publications there were mentioned wealthy peasant budgets. However, the reality was quite different. Thus, in the report note of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U for 1924, it was noted that the poor economy made every effort to make ends meet, compensating for the deficit with malnutrition and additional earnings (Svyaschnko & Terpan, 2022, p. 87).

After all, from the second half of the 1920s, when a system of complete control over the life of population was established, the need for further continuation of the NEP disappeared. Moreover, during the NEP period, the government constantly increased governing bodies of Ukrainian cooperation by people from the party-Soviet environment for whom work in cooperative movement was not the priority, they served the state-party machine of Bolshevism primarily (Fareniy, 2022, pp. 222–223, 230–231).

The policy of indigenization (Ukrainization) adopted in 1923 was also directed to appease the population of Ukraine outraged by frank manifestations of Ukrainophobia. Its goal was not only to take root in the national regions, gain trust there, and thereby increase support for its regime at the national level, but also to identify all those who stood for the Ukrainian cultural revival among the remnants of the national elite. Ukrainization meant overcoming Russification and expanding the sphere of use of the Ukrainian language, in the state institutions primarily. The Ukrainians were involved in the political and state apparatus, a network of educational institutions was established, the Ukrainian language was predominant in publishing houses.

In the education system, there was an increase in the Ukrainian language instruction. If in 1922 50.5% of schools (the so-called labour or social education schools) were Ukrainian, then in 1925 – 70.9%, respectively, in 1927 – 82% of schools, where 76% of students studied. In the same year (1927), 94% of students – the Ukrainians by nationality – studied in their native language, in 1929 – already 97.2%. In 1929, at vocational school, only 66%, in which two thirds of the students studied, were Ukrainian-speaking. Even among higher educational institutions, where implementation of Ukrainization was complicated by the lack of Ukrainian professors and teaching staff, the rate of Ukrainization reached 40% in the 1929/30 academic year (Kuts, 2006, p. 225).

In publishing, Ukrainianization meant increasing the number of the Ukrainian-language books, magazines, and newspapers. However, this did not apply to editions, but only to the names of publications, since products from the RSFSR continued to be sent to UkrSSR, and the number of the Russian-language publications published in Ukraine was huge. In particular, in 1923/1924, 385 Ukrainian-language and 927 Russian-language publications were published; in 1924/1925 – 1813 Ukrainian-language publications and 2535 Russian-language publications; in 1925/1926 – 2162 Ukrainian-language publications and 2365 Russian-language publications. Only in 1931, by titles the Ukrainian-language book

production began to prevail over the Russian-language books – 6,218 titles of Ukrainian publications and 2,014 Russian-language titles (Andriichuk, 2015, p. 105). Literary, technical, and agricultural literature was mainly published in Ukrainian, while books on Medicine, Mathematics, Chemistry, and Physics were published in insufficient quantities (Fetisova, 2021). This gap was provided by the Russian-language literature. It is not surprising, because specialists in the above-mentioned fields could be sent to work in the field of industrialization and creation of new types of weapons to prepare for the upcoming war. For example, the Society of Friends of the Chemical Industry (Dobrokhim), founded in Moscow, engaged in propaganda and training in defense against chemical attacks, and specialists in these fields of knowledge was required to be registered in order to mobilize in case of need quickly.

In the society, in the sphere of ideology, the most important thing was the idea formation of the need for self-sacrifice in the name of illusory “bright” ideals, “communist paradise”. The Bolsheviks instilled in population a positive image of themselves, their ideology, economy, culture, and hatred and intolerance towards those they considered enemies. This category included all those who did not support the actions of the party, and those who dared to declare a different position openly were destroyed physically. Dissidents were harshly branded in newspapers, it was not not written about their views. All this was accompanied by mass hysteria with the demand to punish the people's enemies. The party indicated friends or enemies not only within the country, but also at the foreign policy level. At the same time, with the change in the position of leadership, the attitude of population should also change. A vivid example of this change is transformation of the USSR's relations with the countries of the fascist and Nazi regimes. The entire population “in a single rush” had to have a positive or negative attitude towards one or another country, for example, Hitler's Germany.

It should be emphasized that, while implementing the policy of Ukrainization, the Bolsheviks envisioned the forced construction of enterprises of heavy industry, military and industrial complex. L. Kaganovych considered the main achievement of Ukrainization and the proof of a true national policy to be the deployment of new industrial construction in Ukraine (Nikolaiets, 2012, p. 92). However, in addition to the main goal of Ukrainization, it also had a “side effect”.

Such an effect was a rapid flowering of national culture, which went down in history under the name “Ukrainian renaissance”. The Unions of writers and literary associations were founded: “Hart”, “Pluh”, “Lanka”, VAPLITE – the Free Academy of Proletarian Literature. Theatrical activity developed: in Kyiv – the State Drama Theatre, State People's Theatre, “Young Theatre”, in Dniprovsk – the First State Drama Theatre, in Katerynoslav – T. Shevchenko State Theatre, in Vinnytsia – Ivan Franko New Ukrainian Drama Theatre. In 1922, “The Berezil” Theatre was established, which in 1926 moved to Kharkiv, as a new capital of the UkrSSR. Choir chapel “Dumka” and bandurist chapel performed there. Since 1923, the State Philharmonic had operated in Kyiv, which also moved to Kharkiv in 1927. The All-Ukrainian Photocinema Administration (VUFKU), established in 1922, subordinated all film studios on the basis of which there were established film producing factories – in Kyiv, Odesa, Yalta. In 1922, the K. Kostandi Society of Artists was founded in Odesa, in 1923 in Kharkiv – the Association of Artists of Red Ukraine, in 1925 in Kyiv – the Association of Revolutionary Art of Ukraine. Even outside the borders of the USSR – in Kuban, the North Caucasus, and the Far East, where more than 25% of the Ukrainians lived, the Ukrainian schools were established, the Ukrainian newspapers were published, and the Ukrainian radio broadcasting operated (Kuts, 2006, p. 225).

Another consequence of Ukrainization was the spread of the national idea and increase of centrifugal attitudes. In 1923 Pavlo Tychyna reveals the topic of a totalitarian society in the poem “Prometheus”. In 1924, Mykola Kulish wrote the play “97”, in which there was described the life of Ukrainian village during the famine of 1921 – 1923 in Kherson region (the first version of the play was called “Holod”). The play “97” became the highlight of the 1924/1925 theatre season in Ukraine, in 1925 it was staged in New York and other US cities, and “two years later, on tour in Moscow, the performance caused a standing ovation, and the then People's Commissar of Education of the USSR Anatoly Lunacharsky called the play “97” “the one about which the whole of Ukraine thundered, because it is the first powerful play about a peasant life” (Rudiachenko, 2021).

In 1925, Mykola Khvylioviy put forward the slogan “Away from Moscow” in which he called to focus on the experience of the leading countries of the world instead of copying Moscow's templates. Pamphlets of M. Khvylioviy: “Where are you Coming from?” (1925), “Thoughts against the Current” (1926), “Apologists for Scribalism” (1926) advocated Ukraine's movement towards Europe and called for getting rid of psychological dependence on Moscow as a guarantee of the revival of Ukrainian statehood. In 1926, he wrote a journalistic pamphlet “Ukraine or Malorosiya?” (published only in 1990). F. Schiller's lines were chosen as the epigraph: “Slavery is a shameful thing, but slave psychology in freedom is worthy of contempt” (Ablitsov, 2013). In 1926, Ostap Vyshnia published the collection “Let's Ukrainize” in an attempt to awaken national consciousness and reveal national self-identity, calling to preserve the native language and develop culture at the European level. In 1927, Ivan Bahrianyi published the poem “Ave Maria” without any official permission, in which he clearly outlined his attitude to the existing situation: “... today poets are a category of criminals to which I did not belong and do not want to belong. Don't call me a poet. Because the word *p o e t* has come to be abbreviated to define – a chameleon, a prostitute, a speculator, an adventurer, a slacker...” (Bahrianyi, 1927). In 1930, Volodymyr Sosiura wrote the poem “Two Masters” in which he talks about the internal split between a nationalist and a communist, the impossibility of combining a national duty with revolutionary devotion.

The national revival caused by Ukrainization affected not only Ukrainian literature, but also cinematography. In cinematography, Ukrainian directors shoot films at the world level. For example, O. Dovzhenko's films “Zvenyhora” (1928) and “Zemlia” (1929) became the world sensation that went around the screens of European and American countries. In fact, “Zemlia” had been shown in the USSR for 10 days – from April 8 to 17, 1930, when it was taken off the air. Instead, in Europe, the film was huge success, entering the 12 best films of world cinema.

In economics, one of the researchers of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Mykhailo Volobuiev from Kharkiv publishes the article “On the Issues of the Ukrainian Economy” in the magazine “The Bolshevik of Ukraine” in which he proved the “coloniality” of the Ukrainian economy during the time of the Russian Empire. The same policy, in his opinion, was continued by the central institutions of the USSR, using the economic and natural resources of Ukraine to export profits beyond its borders. This approach, M. Volobuiev admitted, was wrong because: “1) a historically incorrect approach to the issue of unity of the pre-revolutionary Russian economy and misunderstanding of the relationship nature between the Russian (velykoruska) and Ukrainian pre-revolutionary economies; 2) the ambiguity of the question about the nature of the relationship between these economies after October” (Volobuiev, 1928, (2), p. 46). Therefore, in the opinion of the author, it is necessary to “eliminate the “provincial status” of our

language, our literature, and our culture in general as a consequence of providing Ukraine with the unrestrained development of productive forces, providing it with the status of a formalized and completed national economic organism, final refusal to consider it as a simple sum of districts of a single indivisible economy” (Volobuiev, 1928, (3), p. 63).

At the same time, Ukrainization caused fierce resistance from both Russian-speaking and Russified population of Ukraine, as well as from the majority of leaders. His attitude towards the Ukrainian culture was clearly manifested in the speech of the second secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U D. Lebed, who on March 17, 1923 published the article “Some Issues of the Party Congress” in the newspaper “The Communist”. It ran: “Theoretically we know that the struggle of two cultures is inevitable. In Ukraine, due to historical circumstances, culture of a town is Russian culture, and culture of a village is Ukrainian. No communist and a true Marxist can say that “I stand on the point of view of Ukrainian culture victory” if only this culture holds back our progressive development” (Parakhina, 2012, p. 307).

Manifestations of great-power chauvinism occurred at all levels. “Socially, this is a contemptuous, intolerant attitude towards everything Ukrainian, especially the language, and even denial of the right of the Ukrainians to exist as a separate ethnic group. On the psychological and stereotypic side, it is the use of offensive ethnonyms (Malorosy, Khokhly), attribution of certain negative traits to the entire people. On the ideological and political level, this is “substantiation” of the thesis about the victory of the higher Russian culture of the proletariat and the dying out of the Ukrainian peasant culture, purposeful incitement of hatred towards the Ukrainians as a means of achieving political goals, aggressive and imperial ambitions, etc.” (Idris, 2010, p. 37). It became increasingly obvious that the policy of Ukrainization is a temporary phenomenon, and the consequences will be cruel. Back in 1928, in the play “Mina Mazaylo” M. Kulish wrote: “Their Ukrainization is a way to identify all of us, the Ukrainians, and then kill them so that there is no spirit of the Ukrainians”. I warn you!”. And then, even without believing himself: “Provocation. Who will kill twenty million Ukrainian peasants, who?” (Kulish M.H., 1928). Unfortunately, his words turned out to be prophetic. Subsequently, the purposeful destruction of Ukrainian leaders of the liberation struggle period of 1917 – 1921 began, then the figures of culture, education and science, and then the direct genocide of the Ukrainian people in 1932 – 1933.

Let us emphasize that as long as there was a fierce struggle for power in the ranks of the Bolshevik Party, they did not pay much attention to Ukrainization and “supported” the activities of the great Russian chauvinists. In fact, from December of 1922, when the top leaders of the Bolshevik group realized that Volodymyr Lenin (Volodymyr Ulianov) was physically unable to lead the party and would soon die, the struggle for power began that lasted until 1928. In 1924, after the death of V. Lenin, it gained momentum. Four immediately claimed the role of a new leader: Lev Trotsky (Leiba Bronshtein), Joseph Stalin (Josyp Dzhugashvili), Hryhoriy Zynoviev (Ovsii-Gershen Aaronovych Radomyslsky) and Lev Kamieniev (Lev Rosenfeld). Joseph Stalin was the most insidious and cruel in the intra-party struggle. He aspired to unlimited power, occupying the position of general secretary of the Communist Party(b) and people's commissar for nationalities affairs, and having established himself as a one-man leader, he began to curtail Ukrainization at a rapid pace.

First of all, the new leader got rid of those who could interfere with his power in the future – supporters of independent Ukraine and too “independent” heads of the UkrSSR. Thus, on January 9, 1926, the Comintern resolution on the expediency of political murders

was adopted (Politychnyi teror, 2002, p. 323), and the first of whom was Symon Petliura. Then the matter reached the Soviet leaders of the UkrSSR, who were accused of national evasion or, as J. Stalin called them in 1930, “creeping evasions” – local nationalism and great-power chauvinism (Yefimenko, 2010). Those murdered were all Communist Party members whose views differed from those of the leader. This case, for example, happened to O. Shumsky, a member of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U, the People's Commissar for Education, who actively promoted Ukrainianization and in 1925 raised the issue of the removal of Yo. Stalin's protégé Lazar Kaganovych from the position of General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U. At first, O. Shumsky was forced to repent, in 1927 he was transferred to Moscow under supervision for secondary work in the trade union, and then he was arrested. O. Shumsky tried to commit suicide and died in 1946. In general, in the 1930s, only 8.2% of the Communists who had joined the party before 1920 remained (Politychnyi teror, 2002, p. 441).

Mass physical destruction of objectionable figures of culture, education, and science began at the end of the 1920s. Stakhanov methods were used to falsify cases and hold show trials. For the same purpose, hysteria was ignited with the demand to destroy class enemies. “Love for one's Motherland, history, language, etc., had to be masked as much as possible from now on. After all, this person added another “crime” to himself – the accusation of nationalism” (Nikitenko, 2016, p. 20). A system was created that required unquestionable faith, based on the acceptance of any ideas or doctrines as absolute, without any evidence, and the rules and norms of behaviour often did not meet the elementary needs of a person. The leader's orders had to be carried out precisely and quickly, and one's own opinion that did not correspond to the “general line of the party” was not allowed. All public manifestations of every person's life were under state control, every actual or imagined deviation from the norms was mercilessly punished by terrorist means. The possibility of the slightest hint of opposition to the government, the independence of public organizations and associations from the party leadership was eliminated, control over all spheres of life, including culture, was established by means of mass terror” (Popovych, 1998, p. 621). The society began to live in fear, and denunciations became the norm. At the same time, psychology also changed, since the vast majority of people whose lives did not end in execution recorded it in their memory as a “lucky accident” or a “manifest of the Soviet justice”, which contributed to the formation of a symbolic tradition, according to which the violation of fundamental rights (under the conditions of preservation of life) was not considered as repression or suffering (Vronska & Stiazhkina, 2020, p. 90).

The Conclusion and Prospects of Research. Thus, we can consider the retreat from the Bolshevik policy of Russification in Ukraine in the form of Ukrainization as a temporary phenomenon that was adopted under the pressure of the Ukrainian population and was intended to fulfill only tactical tasks. At the beginning of the 1920s, it was no longer possible to adhere to the old cultural and national policy of the Russian Empire – the Ukrainian national liberation movement was too powerful. This factor forced the Bolshevik leaders to change their tactics, the goal of which was to gain support of population, to take root in the national areas and to carry out rapid industrialization.

In the field of culture, the most important thing was to form a new type of person – the Soviet type. This meant planting the Bolshevik ideology in the mass consciousness and cultivating intolerance towards those who had a different position, accompanying harassment of “enemies of the people” with hysteria and demand to punish them. In order for there

to be no deviations from the “one and true Marxist-Leninist path”, an extensive system of censorship and repressive bodies was created. At the same time, personnel from Russian regions were sent to Ukraine, thereby increasing Russification of cities and the south-eastern region of the UkrSSR. It was there that Ukrainianophobia manifested itself the most actively.

However, the consequences of Ukrainization turned out to be somewhat unexpected – a rapid flowering of national culture, spread of the national idea and increase of centrifugal attitudes. While there was a struggle for power among the Bolshevik leaders, they did not pay much attention to it. However, when J. Stalin established himself as a sole leader, Ukrainization began to be curtailed. This meant falsification of cases and holding of show trials against disagreeable figures of culture, education and science. In fact, on a physical level, the Ukrainian elite was exterminated, and those who remained alive lived in fear under constant supervision of punitive authorities. The new system destroyed all the principles of humanism, any freedom not only at physical, but also a spiritual level. Fear and denunciations of loved ones, friends, and colleagues prevailed in the society. At the same time, the totalitarian system demanded unquestioning loyalty to the party leaders, complete execution of all their orders, up to self-sacrifice. Such deformation caused deep social changes, vestiges of which can be observed even today among population of the post-Soviet countries.

Acknowledgement. We express our sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for the advice provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

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

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ablitsov, V. H. (2013). Khvylovyi Mykola Hryhorovych [Khvylovy Mykola Hryhorovych]. *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy [Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine]*. (Vol. 10: T-Ia) / Redkol.: V. A. Smolii (holova) ta in. NAN Ukrainy. Instytut istorii Ukrainy. Kyiv: V-vo “Naukova dumka”. URL: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Khvylovyj_M [in Ukrainian]

Andriichuk, M. (2015). Vydavnycha sprava u pidradianskii Ukraini v mizhvoiennyi period [Publishing in sub-Soviet Ukraine in the interwar period]. *Tekhnolohiia i tekhnika drukarstva*, 1(47), 103–115. [in Ukrainian]

Bahrianyi, I. (1927). *Ave Maria. Biblioteka ukrainskoi literatury* [Ave Maria. Library of Ukrainian literature]. URL: <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printit.php?tid=10875> [in Ukrainian]

Farenii, I. (2022). “Kooperativna intelhentsiia” USRR: protses formuvannia sotsialnoi samodostatnosti (1920-ti – persha polovyna 1930-kh rr.) [“Cooperative intelligentsia” of the Ukrainian SSR]. *Eminak*, 4 (40), 218–235. Doi: 10.33782/emina2022.4(40).616 [in Ukrainian].

Fetisova, O. (2021). Rozvytok ukrainskoi vydavnychoi spravy 20–30-kh rokiv XX stolittia [Development of Ukrainian publishing in the 1920s and 1930s]. *Knyhoznavcha mozaika*. URL: <https://museum.lib.kherson.ua/rozvitok-ukrainskoi-vidavnychoi-spravy-20-30-h-rokiv-hh-stolittya.htm> [in Ukrainian]

Hladun, O. M., Rudnytskyi, O. P. & Kulyk, N. V. (2019). Demohrafichni vtraty Ukrainy pid chas pershoho radianskoho holodu 1921 – 1923 rr. [Demographic losses of Ukraine during the first Soviet famine of 1921 – 1923]. *Demohrafiia ta sotsialna ekonomika*, 4 (38), 48–57. [in Ukrainian]

Hod borbi s holodom 1921 – 1922. (1923). Hod borbi s holodom 1921 – 1922: Cherez delehatov VII Vseukrainskoho s'ezda Sovetov vsem trudiashchymisia [Year of Fight against Hunger 1921 – 1922: Through the delegates of 7th All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets to all workers]. *Otchet Tsentralnoi komysii po borbe s posledstviamy holoda pri VUTsIKE*. Kharkov. [in Russian]

Idris, N. (2010). Antyukrainski nastroi u mistakh USRR za doby “ukrainizatsii” u 20 – na pochatku 30-kh rr. XX st. [Anti-Ukrainian sentiment in the cities of the USSR during the era of “Ukrainization” in the 20's – early 30's of the twentieth century]. *Mandrivets: Vseukrainskyi naukovyi zhurnal*, 5, 36–39. [in Ukrainian]

Kadeniuk, O. (2021). Diialnist hromadskykh yevreiskykh tovarystv na Podilli u 1920-h – 30-kh rokakh [Activities of Jewish communities in Podillia]. *Eminak*, 4 (36), 97–108. Doi: 10.33782/eminak2021.4(36).559 [in Ukrainian]

Kulish, M. H. (1928). Myna Mazaילו. Tretia diia [Myna Mazailo. The third act]. *Biblioteka ukrainskoi literatury*. URL: <https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printit.php?tid=1087> [in Ukrainian]

Kuts, O. (2006). Ukrainizatsiia yak katalizator dukhovnoho zhyttia ukrainskoho suspilstva 20–30-kh rokiv [Ukrainization as a catalyst for the spiritual life of Ukrainian society in the 20s and 30s]. *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy*, 32, 224–232. [in Ukrainian]

Lazurenko, V. & Ocheretianyi, V. (2022). Selianske zernovyrobnytstvo v USRR u druhii polovyni 1920-kh rr.: problema derzhavnogo dyktatu [Peasant grain production in the Ukrainian SSR in the second half of the 1920s: the problem of state dictation]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 5, 112–120. Doi: 10.15407/uhj2022.05.112 [in Ukrainian]

Nikitenko, K. (2016). Kultura i suspilstva: konflikt mizh totalitarnym i osobystym (na prykladi doby stalinizmu) [Culture and society: the conflict between totalitarian and personal (on the example of the Stalinist era)]. *Visnyk LNAM. Serii: Kulturolohiya*, 29, 12–26. [in Ukrainian]

Nikolaets, Yu. O. (2012). *Poselenska struktura naseleennia Donbasu: (etnopolitychnyi aspekt dynamiky)* [Settlement structure of the population of Donbass: (ethnopolitical aspect of dynamics)]. Monohrafiya. Kyiv: IPIEND im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

Nikolaiuk, T. & Stoian, T. (2022). Karalni zakhody yak metod pidvyshchennia produktyvnosti pratsi robitnykiv u radianskii Ukraini 1929 – 1938 rr. [Punitive measures as a method of increasing labor productivity...]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 3, 96–109. Doi: 10.15407/uhj2022.03.096 [in Ukrainian]

Parakhina, M. (2012). Teoriia “borotby dvokh kultur” – u poshukakh rosiisko-ukrainskoho istoriografichnoho konsensusu (mynule i suchasne odniiei kontseptsii) [The theory of “struggle of two cultures” – in search of Russian-Ukrainian historiographical consensus (past and present of one concept)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zbirnyk*, 15, 303–316. [in Ukrainian]

Politychnyi teror i teroryzm v Ukraini. (2002). *Politychnyi teror i teroryzm v Ukraini. XIX–XX st. Istorychni narysy* [Political terror and terrorism in Ukraine. The 19th – 20th centuries. Historical essays] / D. V. Arkhiereyskyi, O. H. Bazhan, T. V. Bykova ta in.; vidpov. red. V.A. Smolii. Kyiv: Nauk. Dumka. [in Ukrainian]

Popovych, M. V. (1998). *Narys istorii kultury Ukrainy* [Essay on the history of culture of Ukraine]. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]

Rodionova, I. V. (2003). *Sovetskaya ideologiya v 30-e gody XX veka* [Soviet ideology in the 30s of the twentieth century]: Metodicheskie rekomendatsii po kursu “Otechestvennaya istoriya”. Moskva. [in Russian]

Rudiachenko, O. (2021) Mykola Kulish. Khvora mriia potoplenoho liudstva [Mykola Kulish. Sick dream of sunken humanity]. *Ukrinform*. URL: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-culture/2831076-mikola-kulis-1-hvora-mria-potomlenogo-ludstva.html>. [in Ukrainian]

Sbornik statisticheskikh svedeniy. (1924). *Sbornik statisticheskikh svedeniy po Soyuzu SSR 1918 – 1923* [Collection of statistical information on the USSR 1918 – 1923] / Za pyat let raboty TsSU. Moskva. [in Russian]

Sliusarenko, A. H., Husiev, V. I. & Lytvyn, V. M., etc. (2002). *Novitnia istoriya Ukrainy (1900 – 2000)* [Recent History of Ukraine (1900 – 2000)]. 2-e vyd., pererob. i dopov. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]

Svyaschnko, Z. & Terpan, I. (2022). Nutrition in the expenditure part of the budgets of the peasant farms of Ukraine during the NEP period (1921 – 1929). *Skhidnoievopeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 22, 82–90. Doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.22.253743 [in English]

Tarapon, O. (2012). Demografichni, natsionalnyi ta sotsialnyi sklad naseleennia USRR-URSR 1920 – 1930-kh rr. u rozrizi povsiakdennoho zhyttia. [Demographic, national and social composition of the population of the UkrSSR 1920 – 1930's in the context of everyday life]. *Naukovi zapysky z ukrainskoi istorii. Zbirnyk naukovykh statei. Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskyi*, 32, 126–137. [in Ukrainian]

Trukhmanova, S. (2001). Dynamika kilkosti ta skladu naselennia Podillia za rodом zaniat u 20-kh – pochatku 30-kh rokiv XX stolittia [Dynamics of the number and composition of the population of Podillya by occupation in the 20s – early 30s of the XXth century]. *Etnichna istoriia narodiv Yevrop*, 8, 65–70. [in Ukrainian]

Volobuiev, M. (1928). Do problemy ukrainskoi ekonomiky. [To the problem of the Ukrainian economy]. *Bilshovyk Ukrainy*, (2), 46–72; (3), 42–63. [in Ukrainian]

Vronska, T. & Stiazhkina, O. (2020). Minusnyky u prostori radianskoho teroru [Minusnyky in the space of the Soviet terror]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1, 89–111. Doi: 10.15407/uhj2022.01.089 [in Ukrainian]

Vsesoiuznaia perepys naselenyia 1926 h. (1929). Vsesoiuznaia perepys naselenyia 1926 h. [All-Union Population Census in 1926]. *USSR. Itohy po respublyke. Polesskyi podraion. Otdel perepysy: Narodnost. Rodnoi yazik. Hramotnost. T. 11 / Trudy TsSU SSSR*. Moskva: Izd. TsSU SSSR. [in Russian]

Yefimenko, H. H. (2010). Natsional-ukhylnytstvo [National evasion]. *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy [Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine]*. (Vol. 7: Mi-O) / Redkol.: V. A. Smolii (holova) ta in. NAN Ukrainy. Instytut istorii Ukrainy. Kyiv: V-vo “Naukova dumka”. URL: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Natsional_ukhylnytstvo [in Ukrainian]

Zhiromskaya, V. B. (1988). *Sovetskiy gorod v 1921 – 1925 gg. Problemy sotsialnoy struktury* [Soviet city in 1921 – 1925. Social structure problems]. Moskva: Nauka. [in Russian]

*The article was received September 01, 2022.
Article recommended for publishing 14/06/2023.*