

UDC 94(477):323.1(092):323.281(47+57)“1971/1972”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.35.332683

### **Bohdan PASKA**

PhD (History), Associate Professor of the Department of History of Ukraine and Methods of Teaching History, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57 T. Shevchenko Street, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine, postal code 76000 (bohdan.paska@pnu.edu.ua)

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-5452-5254

**ResearcherID:** AAR-6870-2020

**Scopus ID:** 58690014200

### **Богдан ПАСКА**

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України і методики викладання історії, Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника, вул. Т. Шевченка, 57, м. Івано-Франківськ, Україна, індекс 76000 (bohdan.paska@pnu.edu.ua)

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Paska, B. (2025). The KGB reprisal towards Zenoviia Franko in the context of the case “Block” (1971 – 1972). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 35, 164–176. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.35.332683

## **THE KGB REPRISAL TOWARDS ZENOVIIA FRANKO IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CASE “BLOCK” (1971 – 1972)**

**Abstract.** *The purpose* of the research is a comprehensive study of the reprisal towards the philologist Zenoviia Franko by the State Security Committee (KGB) in the context of the “general pogrom” of the Ukrainian dissident movement. **Methodology of the Research.** The methodological basis of the article is the principles of objectivity, comprehensiveness, continuity, and historicism. In the study the methods of analysis and synthesis, problem-chronological, retrospective, typology have been used, as well as and comparison of information from various sources. **The scientific novelty** consists in the introduction into scientific circulation of a set of little-known documents from the State Archives of the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU), which enable us to reveal the prerequisites, course and results of the Soviet regime’s reprisal towards Z. Franko. For the first time, in the article there has been carried out a comprehensive analysis of the KGB’s measures against the linguist in 1971 – 1972. **Conclusions.** Thus, at the turn of the 1960s and 1970s, a linguist Z. Franko was one of the socially active participants in Kyiv dissident community. She was engaged in the distribution of samvydav publications, collecting funds for the public treasury, and making contacts with the Ukrainian diaspora. In July of 1971, after the dissident was included in the group development case “Block”, the KGB officers significantly intensified operational work against her using an agent network and a wiretapping system. In January of 1972, during the wave of arrests, it was decided to use preventive measures to achieve Z. Franko’s cooperation with the KGB, to obtain the necessary evidence against like-minded people from her, and completely compromise the dissident. The KGB’s special operation to discredit Z. Franko and isolate her from the resistance movement was complete success. Z. Franko’s penitential statement and subsequent appearance on television and radio were among the serious achievements of the special services at the initial stage of the “Block” case. The philologist’s testimony was actively used against the arrested dissidents, and her “renunciation” was a painful blow to the morale of the dissident community. In the following years, the linguist, temporarily deprived of her authority, withdrew from dissident activity and was forced to maintain close contacts with the KGB. Z. Franko was able to return to active participation in the national movement only during Gorbachev’s perestroika in the late 1980s.

**Key words:** Zenoviia Franko, Ukrainian dissident movement, Committee for State Security (KGB), Soviet regime, repressions, “Block” case.

## **РОЗПРАВА КДБ НАД ЗЕНОВІЄЮ ФРАНКО В КОНТЕКСТІ РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ СПРАВИ “БЛОК” (1971 – 1972)**

**Метою статті** є об’єктивне і комплексне вивчення процесу розправи Комітету державної безпеки (КДБ) над філологинею Зеновією Франко в контексті “генерального погрому” українського дисидентського руху. **Методологія.** Методологічною основою статті є принципи об’єктивності, всебічності, наступності, історизму. У роботі використано методи аналізу та синтезу, проблемно-хронологічний, ретроспективний, метод типології, метод порівняння і зіставлення інформації з різних джерел. **Наукова новизна** зумовлена введенням до наукового обігу комплексу маловідомих документів Галузевого державного архіву Служби безпеки України (ГДА СБУ), які дозволяють розкрити передумови, хід та результати розправи радянського режиму над З. Франко. У статті вперше здійснено всебічний аналіз заходів КДБ проти мовознавці у 1971 – 1972 рр.

**Висновки.** На рубежі 1960-х – 1970-х рр. З. Франко була однією з найбільш активних учасниць київського дисидентського середовища. Вона займалась поширенням самвидаву, збиранням коштів до громадської каси взаємодопомоги, а також налагодженням контактів з українською діаспорою. Після включення дисидентки до числа об’єктів справи групової розробки “Блок” у липні 1971 р. працівники КДБ значно посилили оперативну роботу проти неї з використанням агентурної мережі та системи прослуховування. Під час проведення хвилі арештів у січні 1972 р. було вирішено шляхом приватної профілактики домогтися співпраці З. Франко з органами КДБ, отримати від неї потрібні покази на односторонній і повністю скомпрометувати дисидентку. Спецоперація КДБ щодо дискредитації З. Франко, її відриву від середовища руху опору досягла цілкового успіху. Покаяльна заява та подальший виступ на телебаченні й радіо З. Франко стали одними з найбільш вагомих досягнень спецслужби на початковому етапі реалізації справи “Блок”. Покази філологині активно використовувалися проти заарештованих дисидентів, а її “зречення” стало болючим ударом по моральному духу дисидентського середовища. У наступні роки позбавлена будь-якого авторитету мовознавиця відійшла від дисидентської активності та змушена була підтримувати тісні відносини з КДБ. Повернутися до активної участі в руслі національного руху змогла тільки в часи горбачовської перебудови наприкінці 1980-х рр.

**Ключові слова:** Зеновія Франко, український дисидентський рух, Комітет державної безпеки (КДБ), радянський режим, репресії, справа “Блок”.

**Problem Statement.** At the beginning of the 1970s, the Soviet regime increased pressure on the representatives of the Ukrainian dissidents. At the instigation of the leadership of the republican Committee for State Security (KGB), the case of the group development “Block” was initiated, directed against participants in the Ukrainian national movement. As part of this case, a large-scale repressive special operation took place in early 1972, as a result of which the key leaders of the movement ended up behind bars. However, the KGB’s actions were not limited to arrests and trials; the special service officers simultaneously carried out a significant amount of operational and preventive work aimed at splitting the dissident environment and discrediting it. One of the first dissidents whom the KGB managed to persuade to cooperate and publicly repent through preventive measures was Zenoviia Franko, Kyiv linguist.

**Review of Recent Research and Publications.** Zenoviia Franko’s participation in the Ukrainian dissident movement is one of the little-studied pages of modern Ukrainian historiography. Obviously, some interest in this figure was significantly undermined by her “repentant statement” in 1972 and her rather complimentary behaviour towards the Soviet regime during the period after the wave of arrests in 1972. The information about the dissident’s public activity in the national movement in the 1960s and early 1970s can be found

in the studies of the historians Heorhiy Kasianov (Kasianov, 2019), Anatoliy Rusnachenko (Rusnachenko, 1998), Yuriy Danyliuk and Oleh Bazhan (Danyliuk, Bazhan, 2000), in the articles written by Yuriy Shapoval (Shapoval, 2023) and Vasyl Derevynskyi (Derevynskyi, 2023). An encyclopedic reference about Z. Franko is provided in the publication “Resistance Movement in Ukraine: in 1960 – 1990”, which was published under the editorship of Osyp Zinkevych (Zinkevych, 2012).

As for the methods actually used by the KGB against Z. Franko during the wave of arrests in 1972, among Ukrainian researchers of the dissident movement the opinion became predominant that in January of this year the linguist was arrested and spent behind bars several days or several weeks (Kasianov, 2019, p. 152; Rusnachenko, 1998, p. 190; Zaitsev, 2011, pp. 290–291). This thesis is not confirmed by any archival documents. According to the materials from the State Archives of the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU), the dissident was not arrested during the “general pogrom”, but instead a set of preventive measures was taken against her. Neither Z. Franko nor her husband Pavlo Yurachivskyi mention anything about the alleged arrest in their memoirs (Krushelnyska, 2003).

Z. Franko’s “penitential statement” published in the Soviet media and the public’s reaction to it were analysed by H. Kasianov on the basis of the party documents (Kasianov, 2019, pp. 158–159). In the context of studying the “general pogrom” of the Ukrainian dissidents, Anatoliy Rusnachenko (Rusnachenko, 1998, p. 192), Borys Zakharov (Zakharov, 2003, p. 107) and Oleh Bazhan (Bazhan, 2013, p. 34) mention the massacre of Z. Franko. The beginning of the wave of arrests of the Ukrainian intelligentsia in 1972 from the perspective of the confrontation between the special services of the foreign centres of the OUN and the KGB was characterized by Yaroslav Antoniuk and Volodymyr Trofymovych (Antoniuk, Trofymovych, 2021). The use of prevention methods, agent networks, operational and technical measures against the Ukrainian dissident environment in the 1970s are researched in Bohdan Paska’s studies (Paska, 2022a; Paska, 2022b; Paska, 2023). Nevertheless, the problem of the Soviet regime’s massacre of Z. Franko in the context of the implementation of the case of the KGB’s group operational development “Block” in 1971 – 1972 has not yet become the subject of a full-fledged study.

The basis of the source base of the article is previously classified materials of the KGB report notes from the State Archives of the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU), as well as the documentary publication dedicated to the philologist “Zenoviia Franko (1925 – 1991): Articles. Memories. Materials” (Krushelnyska, 2003).

**The purpose** of the research is a comprehensive study of the process of the KGB massacre of Zenoviia Franko in the context of the “general pogrom” of the Ukrainian dissident movement.

**Research Results.** Zenoviia Tarasivna Franko (1925 – 1991) – a granddaughter of the Great Kameniar, a famous linguist and literary critic, who in the 1950s and 1960s worked as a research fellow at the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences (AS) of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) in Kyiv, researched the history of the Ukrainian language, the stylistics of the works of Ukrainian literature classics, the history of language relations, etc. (Zinkevych, 2012, p. 771). From the mid-1960s, Z. Franko became close to the Kyiv dissident community. On September 4, 1965, she witnessed the open speech of Ivan Dziuba, Viacheslav Chornovil, and Vasyl Stus against the wave of repressions of the Ukrainian intelligentsia at “The Ukraina” cinema at the premiere of the film “Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors”. At the end of 1965 – the beginning of 1966, she helped I. Dziuba with

the publishing and distribution of his newly written study “Internationalism or Russification?”, and translated it into Russian (Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine, f. 16, c. 1042, p. 258; Shapoval, 2023, pp. 219–220). In January of 1966, according to the encyclopedic reference book “Resistance Movement in Ukraine: 1960 – 1990”, at the author’s request, it was Z. Franko who took the text “Internationalism or Russification?” to the Central Committee (CC) of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) with the aim to make it known among the top party and state leadership of the Ukrainian SSR with it (Zinkevych, 2012, p. 771).

The linguist supported the writing of protest statements against repressions actively. In particular, in February of 1966, she was one of 78 people to sign a letter protesting the closed nature of the trials of victims of the wave of arrests of 1965 (Kasianov, 2019, p. 73). In April of 1968, Zenoviia Tarasivna signed an appeal written by 139 representatives of the Ukrainian intelligentsia to the leaders of the USSR Leonid Brezhnev, Olexiy Kosyhin and Mykola Pidhirnyi, which was full of concern about the non-compliance with the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), the curtailment of liberalization and partial democratization of the ruling regime (Kasianov, 2019, p. 95–96). Finally, in 1966, during the KGB’s preventive measures against dissident intelligentsia, the regime began to exert political pressure on Z. Franko, and her public activism was sharply criticized (Kasianov, 2019, p. 78). In early 1969, the scholar was fired at the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR and expelled from the party (Krushelnitska, 2003, p. 198).

Nevertheless, such steps of the regime pushed Z. Franko to more intensive contacts with the dissident environment. It was in 1969 – 1971 that the peak of the linguist’s opposition activity occurred. During this period, she joined the distribution of samvydav literature, participated in the transfer of the magazine “The Ukrainian Herald” to Kyiv and its distribution. In 1970, the scholar joined a large-scale campaign to defend the arrested dissident Valentyn Moroz, signing one of the protest statements (Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine in Ivano-Frankivsk region, c. 10956-p, p. 370; Kasianov, 2019, p. 109; Moroz, 1975, p. 190). Z. Franko’s role in establishing contacts with the Ukrainian diaspora was quite important: she regularly met with tourists-Ukrainians from Western countries, provided them with information about the situation of the dissident movement, as well as literature (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1028, pp. 356–357). At the turn of the 1960s and 1970s, it was Z. Franko, together with I. Svitlychny, who headed the public mutual aid fund, where funds were collected to support the Ukrainian political prisoners and their families (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1042, p. 114). Given her special status among the Ukrainian intelligentsia as the granddaughter of Ivan Franko, Z. Franko could act more or less freely until a certain period, without fear of possible repression by the regime.

Ultimately, the rise and activation of the Ukrainian dissident movement in the early 1970s and, especially, the emergence and spread of the illegal magazine “Ukrainian Herald” led to an increased reaction from the Soviet regime. In July of 1971, at the initiative of the head of the KGB under the Council of Ministers (RM) of the Ukrainian SSR, Vitaliy Fedorchuk, a group development case was created under the code name “Block” against 24 active representatives of the dissident community. The KGB members included the names of Kyiv dissidents Ivan Svitlychny, Yevhen Sverstiuk, Ivan Dziuba, Vasyl Stus, Mykola Plakhotniuk, Zinovi Antoniuk, etc., and Lviv dissidents Viacheslav Chornovil, Iryna Kalynets, Stefania Shabatura, Ivan Hel, etc. in the list of objects of this case (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1020, pp. 116–127). In the last, 24th place, the name Z. Franko was placed with the following description: “She

is anti-Soviet, actively distributes hostile and ideologically harmful documents, including the illegal magazine "The Ukrainian Herald", and is involved in transmitting defamatory information about the situation in Ukraine abroad. To this end, she systematically meets with foreigners-Ukrainians coming to Kyiv, some of whom are suspected of having ties to nationalist centres" (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1020, pp. 126–127). Obviously, in the context of Z. Franko's public activities, the KGB officers saw a considerable threat to the regime in her distribution of samvydav literature, as well as contacts with couriers of the Ukrainian diaspora organizations.

In the following months, within the framework of the "Block" case, the KGB intensified its operational work against the Ukrainian dissidents, aimed at obtaining as much detailed information as possible about their public activity. To monitor Z. Franko, an agent network was used, in particular, the agents "Leonid", "Karpenko", the agent "Boiko", as well as eavesdropping equipment (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1028, pp. 354, 367). In 1971 the agency's control over the dissident was quite effective compared to other dissidents. It was determined that the linguist was the closest and most active assistant to the leader of the Kyiv dissident community, I. Svitlychny, who provided moral and material support to political prisoners, participated in organizing celebrations on the occasion of the release of repressed dissidents, etc. (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1028, pp. 356–357).

Through the work of agents in the KGB, it became known about Z. Franko's participation in the distribution of Issue 5 of "The Ukrainian Herald" magazine. In September of 1971, V. Chornovil brought this issue of the magazine from Lviv to Kyiv and handed it over to Z. Franko at a previously agreed place; later, the dissident introduced these materials to three close acquaintances at once, who turned out to be the KGB agents. In a confidential conversation with the agent "Boiko", the linguist reported that by November of 1971 she would be able to receive Issue 6 of the magazine. Z. Franko also participated in the distribution of other documents – V. Stus's work "Phenomenon of the Age", the letters written by V. Chornovil, I. Dziuba and Borys Antonenko-Davydovych in defense of the political prisoner V. Moroz, etc. (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1028, pp. 367–379).

The KGB kept a watchful eye on Z. Franko's very active ties with the Ukrainian diaspora. A report dated November 30, 1971 noted that over the past 4 months, about 20 foreigners of the Ukrainian origin had visited the scholar's apartment. The KGB officers determined that during a conversation with a Canadian citizen A. Horokhovych, Z. Franko spoke about the Russification of the Ukrainian people in the USSR, the distribution of "The Ukrainian Herald" magazine, the situation among the scientific and literary intelligentsia. The linguist asked the Koltuniuk couple from Canada to organize an active campaign in the West in defense of the political prisoner V. Moroz. The scholar showed the citizens of Czechoslovakia A. Kurymsky and Shyshkova Issue 5 of "The Ukrainian Herald" magazine (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1028, pp. 369–372). In November of 1971, Taras Franko, Zenoviia's father, fell seriously ill (and soon died), and his sister, Hanna Kliuchko-Franko, arrived from Canada to visit him. Through Z. Franko's mediation, she met with I. Svitlychny, and tried to obtain information about Yuri Shukhevych's situation and V. Moroz's health. On Zenoviia's recommendation, H. Kliuchko-Franko gave I. Svitlychny a fairly large sum of money to support the Ukrainian national movement (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1028, p. 375).

During her dissident activities, Z. Franko often tried to use methods of conspiracy. She sought to reveal that she was being monitored; in order to confuse the KGB agents' tracks, she sometimes deliberately got off the tram at a wrong stop. During a conversation with



A. Horokhovych, which took place in the apartment of one of the KGB agents, the dissident tried to detect listening devices, for this she dismantled the cornices and an electric fan (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1028, p. 378). Nevertheless, a significant amount of detailed information received by the KGB officers about the linguist's opposition activities indicates that the special service managed to establish reliable intelligence and operational surveillance over her.

Given the information obtained, in the KGB's view, Z. Franko's role and status among the Ukrainian dissidents had significantly increased by November of 1971. In the aforementioned report, her name was in the 6th place in the list of Kyiv objects of the "Block" case, after I. Svitlychny, I. Dziuba, Ye. Sverstiuk, V. Stus and Hryhoriy Kochur (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1028, p. 347). In this document, there is an interesting assumption by the KGB that I. Svitlychny and other dissidents could allegedly use Z. Franko because of her famous surname and assumed that she would not be subjected to repressions "for political reasons" as the granddaughter of a famous Ukrainian writer (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1028, p. 357). It is likely that similar arguments were used by the KGB later during the interrogations of the philologist with the aim of separating her from the dissident environment.

The reason for the start of the KGB's open repressive action against the Ukrainian dissident community was the visit to the Ukrainian SSR by the Belgian citizen of the Ukrainian origin, Yaroslav Dobosh, who was a courier for the Foreign Units of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (ZCh OUN). According to the researcher Ya. Antoniuk, the secret mission of Ya. Dobosh was organized by Omelian Koval, the head of the regional branch of the Foreign Units of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists in Belgium and the "Central Educational Council" of the Ukrainian Youth Association; it was personally blessed by the Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) Yosyp Slipyi (Antoniuk, 2019, p. 22). Yaroslav Dobosh arrived in Kyiv by the Prague-Moscow train on December 29, 1971. According to the KGB, the main task he received from O. Koval was to obtain the text of Issue 6 of "The Ukrainian Herald" magazine and take it abroad (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1032, p. 122). Given Z. Franko's active international contacts, it is not surprising that Ya. Dobosh knew her phone number and met with the dissident on the first day of his visit. She informed the courier that the next issue of "The Ukrainian Herald" magazine had not been ready yet, but gave him I. Svitlychny's contact details and recommended that he should also meet with him (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1032, pp. 52–53). During the conversation with a foreign guest, Z. Franko mentioned her recent meeting with another representative of the emigration, Khrystyna Holod; she suggested meeting with her in Lviv and for this purpose gave the phone number of Stefania Hulyk, a local dissident (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1034, p. 82). In the following days, Ya. Dobosh had several more meetings with Kyiv and Lviv dissidents, but while leaving the Ukrainian SSR he was detained by the KGB officers at Chop railway station on January 4, 1972 (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1032, pp. 52–56).

The KGB reports indicate that Ya. Dobosh came into the special services focus while trying to contact I. Svitlychny, whose phone number was given to the courier by Z. Franko. Given the tight agent control and constant surveillance of the philologist, it can be assumed that the KGB officers found out about Ya. Dobosh at the stage of meeting with her on December 29, 1971. During the first interrogations, the diaspora member agreed to cooperate with the investigation and gave evidence about his contacts with the Ukrainian dissidents. Preparing a wave of arrests, the KGB officers assigned a special place in their plans to Z. Franko. The report dated January 11, 1972 stated the following: "Considering the fact that Z. Franko... mentioned by Dobosh during the interrogations, was aware of the specific facts of the hostile

activities of Chornovil, Svitlychny and a number of other objects of the “Block” case, and was involved in the distribution of “The Ukrainian Herald” magazine, it is planned to organize work with her to obtain her testimony against her like-minded people”. “If this case develops positively, the materials obtained will be used to compromise Z. Franko in the nationalist environment and neutralize her hostile activities” (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1032, p. 115).

The above quote indicates that Z. Franko had no “business ties” with the Soviet secret services at least until January of 1972. The KGB officers were not confident in the positive outcome of the measures planned against the linguist. The KGB had no intention of arresting the dissident and carrying out a judicial crackdown on her. Instead, it was decided to act preventively. The plan was to “break” her through intimidation, threats, and psychological pressure, “extract” as many incriminating evidence as possible against her like-minded people, and then compromise and destroy her authority in the dissident community. Owing to skillfully conducted preliminary operational work and constant surveillance, the KGB officers apparently had a fairly accurate idea of Z. Franko’s psychological portrait, her “weak points” that could be pressed at the appropriate moment. In the following weeks and months, the massacre of the dissident unfolded in accordance with the scenario outlined in early January. The question of what was the key factor that influenced the fact that the linguist was not arrested along with other dissidents: her famous origin or character traits favourable for “re-education” – remains open.

The next day, January 12, 1972, the “general pogrom” of the Ukrainian dissident movement began: within several days, the leaders of the Kyiv cell I. Svitlychny, V. Stus, Oleksandr Serhiyenko, Z. Antoniuk, Leonid Pliushch, Ye. Sverstiuk, and Lviv residents V. Chornovil, I. Hel, M. Osadchy, S. Shabatura, Iryna Kalynets, and the others were detained. Instead, Z. Franko was secretly invited to the KGB for questioning that day, and during the first interrogations, the dissident began to give the investigators the evidence they needed about her own public activity and the activities of her like-minded people, and showed her willingness to give the KGB the samvydav materials she had (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1032, pp. 138–142). As Z. Franko recalled later, in order to persuade her to cooperate with the investigation, the KGB agents used five volumes of previously collected intelligence reports and materials from wiretapping the dissident’s private conversations (Krushelnyska, 2003, p. 83). Her husband Pavlo Yurachivskyi, in his memoirs, noted the dominance of a moral and psychological pressure on Z. Franko by the KGB investigators (Krushelnyska, 2003, p. 232). According to M. Kotsiubynska’s recollections, the key role in breaking the linguist’s character was played by the investigator Mykola Kolchyk, who in 1965–1966 was distinguished by his “successful” work according to the KGB standards in “re-education” of a dissident Dmytro Ivashchenko, and in the following year, 1973, he obtained a confession statement by I. Dziuba (Ovsienko, 2021).

During the first interrogations, the KGB investigators were primarily interested in Z. Franko’s participation in the distribution of samvydav literature, sources of funding for the dissident community, and contacts with foreigners. During the first week of the investigation, by January 19, the linguist had given evidence about her meetings with the arrested V. Chornovil, M. Plakhotniuk, and Z. Antoniuk to exchange samvydav literature. She also mentioned the surnames of representatives of the Ukrainian intelligentsia who provided her with funds for the dissident public mutual aid fund (the historians Mykhailo Braichevsky, Olena Apanovych, the linguists Oleksandr Ponomariv, V. Tsybmal, the writers Andriy Malyshko, Oles Honchar, Mykhailo Stelmakh, Volodymyr P’ianov, a teacher Valentyna

Drabata, an artist Tetiana Tsymbal) (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1032, pp. 258–259). She provided investigators with fairly detailed information about her meetings with the representatives of the diaspora in 1969 – 1971, and named more than 30 people who, during the conversations, asked about the internal political situation in the Ukrainian SSR, repressions against the intelligentsia, and the fate of political prisoners. Z. Franko also mentioned that dissidents I. Svitlychny, Ye. Sverstiuk, Leonid Seleznenko, Mykhailyna Kotsiubynska, and the others had regular meetings with foreigners (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1032, p. 298). On January 24, the head of the KGB of the Ukrainian SSR, V. Fedorchuk, reported to the party leadership that the evidence received from Z. Franko on like-minded people “will be used to expose the arrested” (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1032, p. 348).

At the end of January and during February of 1972, the KGB’s measures to further use Z. Franko against other members of the dissident community were intensified. During the interrogations, the linguist told investigators about her conversations with diaspora representatives Yuriy Kosach and Roman Serbyn. The dissident, in particular, informed Yuriy Kosach about the existence of the national opposition in the Ukrainian SSR, which, although not organized, was aimed at achieving specific democratic transformations. According to Z. Franko, the opposition’s goals were to ensure in the Ukrainian SSR all the attributes of state sovereignty – an autonomous budget, a separate economy, and the presence of diplomatic missions abroad (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1034, pp. 90–91). The dissident also told the KGB investigators about the provision of material assistance by representatives of the Ukrainian emigration to convicted participants in the resistance movement in Ukraine (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1034, p. 112). The linguist’s testimony was very beneficial to the investigation into the “Block” case, as it gave the KGB reason to consider the dissident environment a full-fledged opposition movement that had a significant support from abroad. And this, in turn, made it easier to prove the “guilt” of the arrested dissidents under specific articles of the Criminal Code.

In early February of 1972, the KGB officers arranged for Z. Franko face-to-face meetings with the arrested dissidents Z. Antoniuk (on February 2) and M. Plakhotniuk (on February 3), against whom she had previously given testimony. As a result, Z. Antoniuk, under pressure, was forced to admit that he had received several copies of the magazine “The Ukrainian Herald” and other self-published materials from Z. Franko. Within a week after the face-to-face meeting, Z. Antoniuk actually “split” and began to give the KGB the necessary evidence. During the face-to-face meeting with M. Plakhotniuk, Z. Franko confirmed that the dissident had given her four issues of “The Ukrainian Herald” magazine in 1970 – 1971. In response, M. Plakhotniuk contradicted his interlocutor sharply and refused to sign the minutes of the face-to-face meeting. The prisoner rightly condemned the linguist’s behaviour, and later told one of his cellmates that “this woman betrayed him, she may betray dozens of other people” (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1034, pp. 145, 198–199).

After appropriate processing by the KGB officers, Z. Franko became an informant for the special service at least since February of 1972, providing operatives with information about the content of her conversations with like-minded people and relatives. In particular, as evidenced by the report dated February 25 of this year, the linguist informed the KGB about her conversation with I. Dziuba, which concerned the possible organization of protests against the wave of arrests (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, pp. 97–98).

In the end, the influence of the KGB officers on Z. Franko turned out to be so strong that, in fact, under their dictation, she wrote a “penitential statement” – the “Open Letter” to the



editorial office of the newspaper “Soviet Ukraine”, which was published in the pages of this newspaper on March 2, 1972 (Franko, 1972). The linguist explained her agreement to such a step to herself by the fact that in 1968, after being expelled from the party, she had already written the statement of a similar content to the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine for Ideology, F. Ovcharenko. Nevertheless, the philologist was able to ensure that the text of the “Open Letter” did not include the name of any other Ukrainian dissident. (Krushelnytska, 2003, p. 83). Zenoviia Franko admitted her “guilt before her Motherland”, which consisted in “distributing slanderous and anti-Soviet materials” and “transferring information to disguised representatives of foreign hostile nationalist centres,” and asked the society for forgiveness. The author of the “Open Letter” was also grateful to the employees of the Soviet authorities for “stopping her in time” and appealed to other dissidents not to be “in the shameful position of an internal emigrant” (Franko, 1972).

This publication was significant success to the KGB in compromising the Ukrainian dissident environment among the Ukrainian public. The KGB leadership and the top party leadership of the Republic focused on collecting information about the reaction of the population of the Republic to the publication of Z. Franko’s “Open Letter”. On March 3–16, 1972, V. Fedorchuk sent nine special messages on this subject to the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Petro Shelest, which were full of information about the condemnation and categorical rejection of Z. Franko’s dissident activities by various Soviet citizens. In particular, Yurchenko, an employee of the Ukrknyha Association, stated in the presence of his colleagues: “Zinaida Franko’s place is in prison, not on the pages of the Soviet press... She slandered the Soviet reality until she was caught red-handed, and now she asks for forgiveness for what she did in the interests of our enemies...” (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, p. 198). The station operator of Koziatyn station in Vinnytsia region, Pylypenko, said the following among other railway workers: “People like Z. Franko should not only be imprisoned, but shot, because this repentance was written not out of good will, but after exposure” (SSA SSU, f. 6, c. 1036, p. 199). An employee of the Kyiv State Bank, Korsun, stated: “It is clear that Franko wrote an open letter not out of good will, but only when she was caught red-handed. She cannot be forgiven, she must be punished with imprisonment” (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, p. 221). Uzhhorod worker Rosul, a former member of the OUN, commenting on Z. Franko’s letter, said: “They should have all been imprisoned a long time ago so as not to muddy the waters and mislead honest people. At one time, many innocent people were put behind bars because of people like Dobosh and Z. Franko” (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, p. 258). In total, more than 50 similar statements were recorded in the KGB documentation.

Half as many (about 25) KGB informants noted more or less complimentary responses to Z. Franko’s “Open Letter”. Some citizens noted the obvious benefit of this statement in the context of the Soviet authorities’ further struggle against the Ukrainian national movement and émigré organizations. In particular, an employee of the Odesa Regional Department of Culture, Cherkasky, stated the following: “Z. Franko’s letter cannot but cause indignation at the actions of foreign nationalists – traitors, and some of our homegrown renegades... Z. Franko did a great thing by making such a necessary statement” (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, p. 199). Shanovsky, the head of the Philosophy department of the Vinnytsia branch of Kyiv Polytechnic University, saw political expediency in publishing the linguist’s penitential statement, as it would “stop attempts abroad to speculate on the name of the great writer and compare his struggle with the alleged “struggle” of his granddaughter” (SSA SSU,

f. 16, c. 1036, p. 256). Vlasyk, the manager of the construction department No. 13 in Lviv, expressed hope that Z. Franko's letter "will open the eyes of a number of people who fell under the influence of people like Chornovil and helped them in their hostile activities" (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, p. 221).

The special KGB reports recorded only isolated interpretations of Z. Franko's "Open Letter" as having been written under the KGB pressure. In particular, the dissident I. Dziuba stated at a meeting of the Presidium of the Writers' Association of Ukraine (SPU) on March 2, 1972, that the linguist's words looked "uncertain and ridiculous", because she could not have changed her views so suddenly, "it was written under dictation, under pressure, and such writings have never been of any use" (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, p. 199). A student at Ivano-Frankivsk Pedagogical Institute, Kandiuk, said in his circle: "When they put a prison shirt on you, you will write anything like that. Z. Franko was forced to write an open letter" (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1038, p. 37). Rozhko, a research fellow at the Lutsk Regional Museum of Local Lore, did not believe that the dissident wrote the letter of repentance herself, unless under very great pressure (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1038, p. 38). For some sympathizers of the Ukrainian national movement, the publication of Z. Franko's letter was evidence of the continuation of the struggle against the Soviet regime, at least abroad. A former OUN member named Syniuk, an accountant for one of the rural consumer societies in Rivne region, said: "Abroad, our guys are awake, doing their job, not like we are in the Soviet Union... But it doesn't depend on us. We've created such an atmosphere, we've squeezed them so much that it's impossible to say even a word" (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1038, p. 38).

The KGB officers quickly spread information about Z. Franko's letter of repentance among prisoners during the January wave of arrests of dissidents. The majority of political prisoners – I. Svitlychnyi, Ye. Sverstiuk, M. Plakhotniuk, V. Stus, O. Serhiienko, I. Hel, S. Shabatura, and the others – generally took this news quite negatively, condemning the linguist's act sharply (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, pp. 290–296). Arrested in February of 1972, Yu. Shukhevych interpreted the publication of Z. Franko's statement as a tactical move by the dissident in order to remain free and avoid repression (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, p. 292). Arrested at the end of 1971, Odesa dissident Nina Strokata treated the linguist's statement with distrust, expressing the opinion that the "Open Letter" was the result of the use of medical measures against Z. Franko for the purpose of a psychotropic influence (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, p. 293). Viacheslav Chornovil reacted to Z. Franko's statement with understanding, refusing to condemn it (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, p. 294). A positive feedback was made by Z. Antoniuk, who, on the second day after reading the "Open Letter," told the investigator that he was also ready to publish a similar article in the press (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, p. 291). In general, Z. Franko's publication caused considerable confusion and misunderstanding among political prisoners, and brought confusion into their environment.

The reaction of those representatives of the dissident community who were at large was similar. By mid-March of 1972, the KGB operatives had already determined that Z. Franko's publication was widely discussed among dissidents, most of whom expressed dissatisfaction and hostility towards the linguist, calling her a traitor. The philologist was called a "dangerous person" by Atena Volytska and Oksana Osadcha. Liubomyra Popadiuk sharply condemned Z. Franko's capitulation to the regime sharply. A poet Ihor Kalynets reacted to the publication in "Soviet Ukraine" quite ironically: "I will be "pleasant" to be imprisoned under the testimony of Z. Franko. I will know that the granddaughter of great Ivan Franko testified against me" (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1036, pp. 294–295). On March 13, during a personal meeting with the

linguist, a writer Oles Berdnyk, who was close to the dissident community, directly told her the following: “Everyone regards your letter as your defeat... Boys, your friends are in prison now, but you are not. If you had a choice – either prison or freedom, you should have chosen prison” (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1038, pp. 198–199). The KGB’s efforts to destroy Z. Franko’s authority among like-minded dissidents were crowned with complete success; she became an undesirable person for the majority of participants in the resistance movement.

The moral and psychological state of Z. Franko after her public abdication was very difficult – in fact, she was in severe depression and on the verge of suicide (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1038, p. 199). Therefore, on March 24, 1972, V. Fedorchuk proposed to the top party leadership to isolate the linguist from contacts with the dissident environment, as well as “to consolidate her in positions favourable to us”. For this purpose, it was planned to re-employ Z. Franko at the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, as well as to speed up the process of providing her with a separate apartment in Kyiv. Petro Shelest ordered to resolve the issue of Z. Franko’s employment as soon as possible, and as a result, she did indeed receive the position of a laboratory assistant at the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1038, pp. 243–244).

The Ukrainian diaspora did not immediately believe in the authenticity of Z. Franko’s “Open Letter”. Therefore, in early April of 1972, the KGB leadership expressed the idea of making a speech by the dissident on television and radio, broadcast both in Ukraine and abroad. The script for the TV show was developed by the KGB, including the lines of the announcer and Z. Franko, who agreed to take part in it almost immediately (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1040, pp. 11–14). Finally, on April 25, an interview with Z. Franko was broadcast on Ukrainian television, during which she read the main theses of her “Open Letter” and repeated the necessary ritual phrases “live” (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1042, p. 185).

Many viewers noticed a certain artificiality and insincerity in Z. Franko’s speech (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1042, pp. 185–187, 239–243), which, on the one hand, was caused by the consequences of increased psychological pressure by the KGB officers, and on the other hand, by the possible internal resistance of a broken dissident. An arrested artist S. Shabatura even saw certain advantages in the linguist’s television appearance, as the latter did not name any of her like-minded people, using general phrases instead (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1042, p. 242). However, the absolute majority of dissidents who were at large, in particular, Ivan Rusyn, Mykhailyna Kotsiubynska, Ihor Kalynets, Mykhailo Kosiv, and Afanas Zalyvakha, subjected Z. Franko to collective condemnation and ostracism after the speech (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1042, pp. 366–368). During a personal meeting with the linguist, Oksana Meshko expressed the general position of the dissident community: “I came not on my own behalf, but on behalf of all my friends, to condemn your act. This act deserves only a curse, neither the people nor history will ever forgive your speech in the newspaper and on television. The name Franko has become shameful for me. Everyone held on tightly, only you betrayed. Your place is in prison...” (SSA SSU, f. 16, c. 1042, pp. 187–188).

In the following months and years, in order to consolidate Z. Franko’s position as an exile in the circle of dissidents, the KGB’s compromising measures were continued. According to the recollections of P. Yurachivsky and a philologist Lidiia Kots-Hryhorchuk, she was specially taken to face-to-face meetings with unfamiliar people and to trials as a witness to create a negative image among the Ukrainian public (Krushelnytska, 2003, p. 199, 232). Zenoviia Franko was regularly forced to write articles against “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism” and the Ukrainian diaspora; she was constantly under the surveillance of the KGB. The linguist’s

testimony was used in the preparation of indictments in the criminal cases of many dissidents arrested in 1972, in particular, I. Svitlychny (SSA SSU, f. 6, c. 68805-fp, pp. 159, 175, 186), Ye. Sverstiuk (SSA SSU, f. 6, c. 67643-fp, p. 153), V. Chornovil (SSA SSU, f. 6, c. 72644-fp, pp. 292, 297).

**Conclusions.** Thus, at the turn of the 1960s and 1970s, a linguist Z. Franko was one of the socially active participants in Kyiv dissident community. She was engaged in the distribution of samvydav publications, collecting funds for the public treasury, and making contacts with the Ukrainian diaspora. In July of 1971, after the dissident was included in the group development case “Block”, the KGB officers significantly intensified operational work against her using an agent network and a wiretapping system. In January of 1972, during the wave of arrests, it was decided to use preventive measures to achieve Z. Franko’s cooperation with the KGB, to obtain the necessary evidence against like-minded people from her, and completely compromise the dissident.

The KGB’s special operation to discredit Z. Franko and isolate her from the resistance movement was complete success. Z. Franko’s penitential statement and subsequent appearance on television and radio were among the serious achievements of the special services at the initial stage of the “Block” case. The philologist’s testimony was actively used against the arrested dissidents, and her “renunciation” was a painful blow to the morale of the dissident community. In the following years, the linguist, temporarily deprived of her authority, withdrew from dissident activity and was forced to maintain close contacts with the KGB. Z. Franko was able to return to active participation in the national movement only during Gorbachev’s perestroika in the late 1980s.

Promising directions for further research include the analysis of subsequent KGB discrediting measures against Z. Franko in the 1970s, as well as the study of other special operations by the special service to prevent and compromise representatives of the dissident community during the “general pogrom” (in particular, the poets Mykola Kholodny, Hryhoriy Chubai, a literary critic Ivan Dziuba, etc.).

**Acknowledgement.** The author expresses his gratitude to the employees of the State Administration of the Security Service of Ukraine in Kyiv for the opportunity to use archival materials, as well as to the Armed Forces of Ukraine for protection against Russian aggression.

**Funding.** The author did not receive any financial support for the publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Antoniuk, Ya., & Trofymovych, V.** (2021). Protyborstvo spetssluzhzb zakordonnykh tsentriv OUN iz KDB (1960-ti – pochatok 1990-kh rr.) [The struggle of the special services of the foreign centers of the OUN against the KGB (the 1960s – the beginning of the 1990s)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 3, 114–125. DOI: 10.15407/uhj2021.03.114. [in Ukrainian].

**Antoniuk, Ya.** (2019). “Dobosh Case”: the biggest failure of ZCh OUN security services in resistance to KGB apparatus. *Sumy Historical and Archival Journal*, 32, 20–26. DOI: 10.21272/shaj.2019.i32.p.20. [in English].

**Bazhan, O.** (2013). Spetsoperatsiia KDB URSR “Blok”: rozrobka, khid, naslidky [Special operation of the KGB of the Ukrainian SSR “Block”: development, progress, consequences]. *Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA. Istorychni nauky – Scientific notes of NaUKMA. Historical sciences*, 143, 30–36. [in Ukrainian].

**Danyiuk, Yu., & Bazhan, O.** (2000). *Opozytsiia v Ukraini (druha polovyna 50-kh – 80-ti rr. XX st.)* [Opposition in Ukraine (Second Half of the 50s – 80s of the 20th Century)]. Kyiv: Ridnyi kraj. [in Ukrainian].

**Derevynskyi, V.** (2023). “The Ukrainian Herald” – a Journal of the Ukrainian Resistance (1970 –

1972). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 29, 173–183. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.29.292929 [in English].

**Franko, Z.** (1972). Vidkrytyi lyst [Open Letter]. *Radianska Ukraina – Soviet Ukraine*, March 2. [in Ukrainian].

*Haluzevyi derzhavnyi arkhiv Sluzhby bezpeky Ukrainy [Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine – SSA SSU].*

*Haluzevyi derzhavnyi arkhiv Sluzhby bezpeky Ukrainy v Ivano-Frankivskii oblasti [Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine in Ivano-Frankivsk region – SSA SSU in Iv.-Fr. region].*

**Kasianov, H.** (2019). *Nezhodni: ukrainska intelihtentsiia v rusi oporu 1960 – 1980-kh rokiv* [Dissent Voices: Ukrainian Intelligentsia in the Resistance Movement of the 1960s and 1980s]. Kyiv: Klio. [in Ukrainian].

**Krushelnyska, L.** (Ed.). (2003). *Zenoviiia Franko (1925 – 1991) : Stati. Spohady. Materialy* [Zenoviiia Franko (1925 – 1991) : Articles. Memoirs. Materials]. Lviv. [in Ukrainian].

**Moroz, V.** (1975). *Esei, lysty y dokumenty* [Essays, letters and documents]. Munich: Suchasnist. [in Ukrainian].

**Ovsiienko, V.** (2021). *Slidchy Kolchuk* [Investigator Kolchuk]. URL: <https://museum.khpg.org/1628664311> (accessed 23.04.2024). [in Ukrainian].

**Paska, B.** (2022a). Pryvatna profilaktyka yak metod borotby KDB proty ukrainskykh dysydyntiv u 1970-kh rr. [Private prevention as a method of the KGB's struggle against Ukrainian dissidents in the 1970s.]. *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk – Humanities science current issues*, 58(2), 20–26. DOI: 10.24919/2308-4863/58-2-3. [in Ukrainian].

**Paska, B.** (2022b). The KGB measures against the editorial board of the restored self-published magazine “Ukrainskyi Visnyk” under the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers (the mid – second half of the 1970s). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 25, 200–212. DOI: 10.24919/2519-058X.25.269579. [in English].

**Paska, B.** (2023). Zakhody KDB pry Radi Ministriv URSR shchodo prypynennia protestnoi aktyvnosti ukrainskykh dysydyntiv-politvianziv u 1970-kh rr. [Measures of the KGB under the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR to stop the protest activity of Ukrainian dissident political prisoners in the 1970s]. *Storinky istorii – History pages*, 55, 224–239. DOI: 10.20535/2307-5244.55.2022.269758. [in Ukrainian].

**Rusnachenko, A.** (1998). *Natsionalno-vyzvolnyi rukh v Ukraini: seredyna 1950–kh – pochatok 1990-kh rokiv* [National Liberation Movement in Ukraine: the Mid – 1950s – Early 1990s]. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo imeni Oleny Telihiy. [in Ukrainian].

**Shapoval, Yu.** (2023). Sprava Ivana Dziuby z vidstani piv stolittia [The case of Ivan Dziuba from a distance of half a century]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 5, 208–241. DOI: 10.15407/uhj2023.05.208. [in Ukrainian].

**Zaitsev, Yu.** (2011). “Chorna nich brezhnievskoi reaktsii” (1965 – 1973) [“The Black Night of the Brezhnev Reaction” (1965 – 1973)]. *Ukrainskyi vyvolnyi rukh – Ukrainian liberation movement*, 15, 263–293. [in Ukrainian].

**Zakharov, B.** (2003). *Narys istorii dysydyntskoho rukhu v Ukraini (1956 – 1987)* [An Essay on the History of the Dissident Movement in Ukraine (1956 – 1987)]. Kharkiv: Folio. [in Ukrainian].

**Zinkevych, O.** (Ed.). (2012). *Rukh oporu v Ukraini: 1960 – 1990. Entsyklopedychnyi dovidnyk* [The resistance movement in Ukraine: 1960 – 1990. Encyclopedic guide]. Kyiv: Smoloskyp. [in Ukrainian].

*The article was received September 11, 2024.  
Article recommended for publishing 30/05/2025.*