

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

ISSN 2519-058X (Print)

СХІДНОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ВІСНИК

EAST EUROPEAN HISTORICAL BULLETIN

**ВИПУСК 7
ISSUE 7**

**Дрогобич, 2018
Drohobych, 2018**

*Рекомендовано до друку Вченою радою
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(протокол від 29 травня 2018 року № 8)*

Наказом МОН України збірник включено до Переліку наукових видань, в яких можуть публікуватися результати дисертаційних робіт на здобуття наукових ступенів доктора і кандидата наук з історичних наук (Наказ МОН України від 13.03.2017 р. № 374).

Східноєвропейський історичний вісник / [головний редактор В. Ільницький]. – Дрогобич: Видавничий дім «Гельветика», 2018. – Вип. 7. – 212 с.

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

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

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

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

Редакційна колегія:

Борщевич В. Т. – д.і.н.; **Вагнер Марек** – д.габ. з іст., проф. (Польща); **Вегеш М. М.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Вацлав Вєжбєнєц** – д.габ. з іст., проф. (Польща); **Гліва Анджей** – доктор історії (Польща); **Дегтярьов С.І.**; **Корсак Р. В.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Литвин М. Р.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Морозов А. Г.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Новацький Роман** – д. габ. з іст., проф. (Польща); **Падалка С. С.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Патриляк І. К.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Петречко О. М.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Сергійчук В. І.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Ситник О. М.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Стародубець Г. М.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Стемпнік Анджей** – д.габ. з іст., проф. (Польща); **Тельвак В. В.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Футала В. П.** – д.і.н., проф.; **Чопек Сильвестер** – д.габ. з іст., проф. (Польща).

Рецензенти:

Білий Дмитро Дмитрович – д.і.н., проф., професор кафедри хореографії та мистецтвознавства Львівського державного університету фізичної культури імені Івана Боберського;

Гуцуляк Віктор Володимирович – д.і.н., проф., професор кафедри археології та спеціальних галузей історичної науки Черкаського державного університету імені Богдана Хмельницького;

Деревінський Василь Федорович – д.і.н., проф., професор Київського національного університету будівництва і архітектури.

Збірник індексується в міжнародних базах даних: Cite Factor, Google Scholar, Directory of Research Journals Indexing, Journal Index, Polish Scholarly Bibliography, Research Bible, Scientific Indexing Services, Index Copernicus International

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

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

Усі електронні версії статей збірника оприлюднюються на офіційній сторінці видання

<http://http://ddpu.drohobych.net/ehbull/>

<http://http://ddpu.drohobych.net/ehbull/>

<http://ehb.ddpu.drohobych.net/>

Засновник і видавець – Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка.

Адреса редакції: Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, обл. Львівська, 82100.
тел.: (0324) 41-04-74, факс: (03244) 3-38-77, e-mail: vilnickiy@gmail.com

© Дрогобицький державний педагогічний
університет імені Івана Франка, 2018
© Автори статей 2018

Recommended for publication
by Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University Academic Council
(protocol dd. 29.05.2018 No. 8)

By a Decree of Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine this collection of articles is entered into the List of scientific editions in which results of dissertational researches in competition for scientific degrees of doctor and candidate of science in historical disciplines may be published.
(Decree of MES of Ukraine dd. 13.03.2017 No 374).

East European Historical Bulletin / [chief editor Vasyl Ilnytskyi]. – Drohobych: Publishing House “Helvetica”, 2018. – Issue 7. – 212 p.

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

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

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

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

Editorial Board:

Volodymyr Borshcheych – PhD hab. (History); **Marek Wagner** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Mykola Vehesh** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Waclaw Wierzbieniec** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Andrzej Gliwa** – PhD (History) (Poland); **Sergeyi Degtyarev**; **Roman Korsak** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Mykola Lytvyn** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Anatoliy Morozow** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Roman Nowacki** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Serhiy Padalka** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Ivan Patryliak** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Oleh Petrechko** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Volodymyr Serhiychuk** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Oleksander Sytnyk** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Galyna Starodubets** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Andrzej Stępnik** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland); **Vitaliy Tel'vak** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Vasyl Futala** – PhD hab. (History), Professor; **Sylwester Czopek** – PhD hab. (History), Professor (Poland).

Reviewers:

Dmytro Bilyi – PhD hab. (History), Professor of the Chair of Choreography and Art Studies, Lviv State Ivan Boberskyi Physical Culture University;

Victor Hutsuliak – PhD hab. (History), Professor of the Chair of Archeology and Special Branches of Historic Science, Cherkassy State Bohdan Khmelnytskyi University;

Vasyl Derevynskyi – PhD hab. (History), Professor of Kyiv National University of Construction and Architecture.

The edition has been entered into international scientometric databases: Cite Factor, Google Scholar, Directory of Research Journals Indexing, Journal Index, Polish Scholarly Bibliography, Research Bible, Scientific Indexing Services, Index Copernicus International

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

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

All electronic versions of articles in the collection are available on the official website edition

<http://http://ddpu.drohobych.net/ehbull/>

<http://http://ddpu.drohobych.net/ehbull/>

<http://eehb.ddpu.drohobych.net/>

Founder and Publisher: Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University.

Office address: Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Ivan Franko Str., 24, Drohobych, Lviv Region, 82100. tel.: (0324) 41-04-74, fax: (03244) 3-38-77, e-mail: vilnickiy@gmail.com

© Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 2018

© Copyright by the contributors, 2018

ЗМІСТ

Іван КУЦІЙ РЕЦЕПЦІЯ ЄВРОПИ/ЗАХОДУ У НАУКОВІЙ СПАДЩИНІ МИХАЙЛА МАКСИМОВИЧА	8
Василь МЕНЬКО ГЕНЕЗА ТА ПОХОДЖЕННЯ ПРАВОСЛАВНИХ ЦЕРКОВНИХ БРАТСТВ УКРАЇНИ І БІЛОРУСІЇ У ПРАЦЯХ ПРЕДСТАВНИКІВ РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ІСТОРИЧНОЇ НАУКИ (50-ті рр. ХІХ – поч. ХХ ст.).....	16
Лідія ЛАЗУРКО ЛЬВІВСЬКИЙ ЧАСОПИС «PRZEGLĄD ARCHEOLOGICZNY» ТА УКРАЇНСЬКА ТЕМАТИКА.....	22
Ольга ВЛАДИГА БІЛЯ ВИТОКІВ АРХЕОГРАФІЧНОЇ КОМІСІЇ НТШ: ДІЯЛЬНІСТЬ МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО В 1894 – 1895 рр.....	31
Тарас БАТЮК СПІВПРАЦЯ МИРОНА КОРДУБИ ІЗ ГАЗЕТОЮ «ДІЛО»	40
Віталій ТЕЛЬВАК, Вікторія ТЕЛЬВАК УКРАЇНСЬКА ІСТОРИОГРАФІЯ У ДЗЕРКАЛІ ПОЛЬСЬКОЇ ПУБЛІЦИСТИКИ (МИХАЙЛО ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ CONTRA ФРАНЦІШЕК РАВІТА-ГАВРОНСЬКИЙ).....	46
Віталій МАСНЕНКО ЮРІЙ НЕМИРИЧ ЯК ІДЕАЛЬНИЙ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАНТ ШЛЯХЕТСЬКОГО СТАНУ У ВІЗІЇ В'ЯЧЕСЛАВА ЛИПІНСЬКОГО	54
Микола ГАЛІВ НАЦІОНАЛЬНА ПОЛІТИКА РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ТА АВСТРО-УГОРСЬКОЇ ІМПЕРІЙ НА ВОЛИНІ І В ГАЛИЧИНІ (ПОЧАТОК ХХ ст.): ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ.....	65
Лариса СИНЯВСЬКА РАДЯНСЬКА ІСТОРИОГРАФІЯ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ ВАЖКОЇ ПРОМИСЛОВІСТІ СХІДНОГО РЕГІОНУ УКРАЇНИ В УМОВАХ ПЕРШОЇ СВІТОВОЇ ВІЙНИ	75
Вадим МАШТАЛІР ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ШЛЯХ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ДЕРЖАВНОГО ВІЙСЬКОВОГО МУЗЕЮ (1917 – 1920 рр.).....	88
Олександр КОЗІЙ, Оксана ГОРБАЧИК ГРОМАДСЬКО-ПОЛІТИЧНА ДІЯЛЬНІСТЬ М. СТАХІВА У ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯХ ПРЕДСТАВНИКІВ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ЗАРУБІЖЖЯ ТА СУЧАСНИХ ВІТЧИЗНЯНИХ ІСТОРИКІВ.....	97
Сергій КОРНОВЕНКО СЕЛЯНСЬКИЙ ФАКТОР ПЕРЕХОДУ ДО НОВОЇ ЕКОНОМІЧНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ (1921 р.).....	104

Діана ЯБЛОНСЬКА ФАКУЛЬТЕТИ ПРОФЕСІЙНОЇ ОСВІТИ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНОГО ВИХОВАННЯ КАМ'ЯНЕЦЬ-ПОДІЛЬСЬКОГО ІНСТИТУТУ НАРОДНОЇ ОСВІТИ (1921 – 1930).....	111
Василь ІЛЬНИЦЬКИЙ ВИЯВЛЕННЯ ТА ЛІКВІДАЦІЯ РАДЯНСЬКИМИ РЕПРЕСИВНО-КАРАЛЬНИМИ ОРГАНАМИ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ, ПОЛЬСЬКИХ ТА ЄВРЕЙСЬКИХ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙ У м. ДРОГОБИЧ (1940 р.).....	120
Олександра СТАСЮК ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ФОРМУВАННЯ ПРЕДСТАВНИЦЬКОЇ ГІЛКИ ВЛАДИ У ЗАХІДНОУКРАЇНСЬКИХ ОБЛАСТЯХ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ РСР ПОВОЄННОГО ПЕРІОДУ	151
Дмитро НЕФЬОДОВ ПОВОЄННЕ РОБІТНИЦТВО УРСР (1946 – 1965 рр.) В ОЦІНЦІ ЗАХІДНОЇ РАДЯНОЛОГІЇ	160
Василь ІЛЬНИЦЬКИЙ, Наталія КАНТОР РЕПРЕСІЇ РАДЯНСЬКОЇ АДМІНІСТРАЦІЇ ПРОТИ РОДИН ПОВСТАНЦІВ У КАРПАТСЬКОМУ КРАЇ ОУН (1945 – 1954).....	173
Яніна ФЕДОРЕНКО РОЗВИТОК АГРОХОЛДИНГОВИХ СТРУКТУР У СІЛЬСЬКІЙ МІСЦЕВОСТІ УКРАЇНИ (ТЕХНОЛОГІЧНІ ПЕРЕВАГИ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНІ ЗАГРОЗИ).....	181
Юрій СЛЮСАРЕНКО ПРАВОВЕ РЕГУЛЮВАННЯ ЕКОЛОГІЧНОЇ БЕЗПЕКИ ПІД ЧАС ВИДОБУТКУ НАФТИ ТА ГАЗУ В УКРАЇНІ.....	189
Ігор ГИРИЧ ЛЬВІВСЬКА ІСТОРИЧНА ШКОЛА МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО: НОВИЙ ІСТОРИОГРАФІЧНИЙ СИНТЕЗ. Рецензія на: Віталій Тельвак, Василь Педич. Львівська історична школа Михайла Грушевського. Львів: Світ, 2016. 440 с.	199
Микола ЛИТВИН ЛІТОПИС УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ВИЗВОЛЬНОГО РУХУ СЕРЕДИНИ XX СТОЛІТТЯ НА УКРАЇНСЬКО-ПОЛЬСЬКОМУ ПОГРАНИЧЧІ. Рецензія на: В. І. Ільницький. Карпатський край ОУН в українському визвольному русі (1945–1954): монографія / Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України; Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка. Дрогобич: Посвіт, 2016. 696 с.	209

CONTENTS

Ivan KUTSYI THE RECEPTION OF EUROPE/WEST IN THE SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE OF THE MYKHAILO MAKSYMOVYCH	8
Vasyl MEN'KO THE ORIGIN AND ONTOGENESIS OF ORTHODOX CHURCH BROTHERHOODS IN UKRAINE AND BELORUSSIA IN THE WORKS OF REPRESENTATIVES OF RUSSIAN HISTORICAL SCIENCE (the 1850s – beginning of the XX century)	16
Lidiya LAZURKO LVIV CHRONICLE «PRZEGLĄD ARCHEOLOGICZNY» AND THE UKRAINIAN ISSUE	22
Olha VLADYHA BY THE ESTUARY OF THE ARCHEOGRAFIC COMMISSION OF THE NTSH (TARAS SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY): MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI'S ACTIVITY IN 1894 – 1895	31
Taras BATIUK MYRON KORDUBA'S COOPERATION WITH THE NEWSPAPER «DILO».....	40
Vitalii TELVAK, Viktoria TELVAK UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE MIRROR OF POLISH JOURNALISM (MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI CONTRA FRANCISHEK RAVITA-GAVRONSKY).....	46
Vitaliy MASNENKO YURIY NEMYRYCH AS AN IDEAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SZLACHTA LAYER IN VYACHESLAV LYPYNSKY'S VISION	54
Mykola HALIV THE NATIONAL POLICIES OF THE RUSSIAN AND AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRES' IN VOLHYNIA AND GALICIA (at the beginning of the XX century): A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	65
Larisa SINYAVSKA SOVIET HISTORIOGRAPHY OF RESEARCHES OF THE HEAVY INDUSTRY OF EASTERN UKRAINE UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR	75
Vadym MASHTALIR A HISTORICAL WAY OF THE UKRAINIAN STATE MILITARY MUSEUM (1917 – 1920).....	88
Olexandr KOZIY, Oxana HORBACHYK M. STAKHIV'S POLITICAL ACTIVITY IN RESEARCHES BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF UKRAINIANS ABROAD AND COMTEMPORARY DOMESTIC HISTORIANS	97
Sergey KORNOVENKO A PEASANT COMPONENT IN THE TRANSITION TO THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY (1921)	104

Diana YABLONSKA DEPARTMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND SOCIAL TRAINING OF KAMYANETS-PODILSKYI INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION (1921 – 1930).....	111
Vasyl ILNYTSKYI SPOTTING AND LIQUIDATION OF UKRAINIAN, POLISH AND JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS IN DROHOBYCH BY SOVIET REPRESSIVE UNITS (1940).....	120
Olexandra STASIUK THE PECULIARITIES OF FORMATION OF THE REPRESENTATIVE BRANCH OF POWER IN THE WEST UKRAINIAN REGIONS OF THE UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD....	151
Dmytro NEFYODOV THE UKRAINIAN SSR POSTWAR WORKING CLASS (1946 – 1965) IN THE EVALUATION OF THE SOVIETOLOGY IN THE WEST.....	160
Vasyl ILNYTSKYI, Natalia KANTOR REPRISALS OF THE SOVIET ADMINISTRATION AGAINST FAMILIES OF INSURGENTS IN KARPATSKYI KRAI OF THE OUN (1945 – 1954)	173
Yanina FEDORENKO DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL HOLDING STRUCTURES IN UKRAINE’S COUNTRYSIDE (TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES AND SOCIAL THREATS).....	181
Yuriy SLUSARENKO LEGAL REGULATION OF ECOLOGICAL SAFETY DURING THE OIL AND GAS EXTRACTION IN UKRAINE.....	189
Ihor HYRYCH MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI LVIV HISTORICAL SCHOOL: A NEW HISTORIOGRAPHIC SYNTHESIS. Review of: Vitalii Telvak, Vasyl Pedych. Lvivska istorychna shkola Mykhaila Hrushevskoho. Lviv: Svit, 2016. 440 s.....	199
Mykola LYTVYN THE CHRONICLE OF THE UKRAINIAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT OF THE MIDDLE OF THE XX CENTURY ON THE UKRAINIAN-POLISH BORDER. Review of: V. I. Ilnytsky. The OUN Carpathian region in Ukrainian liberation movement (1945 – 1954): monograph / Ivan Krypiakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine; Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University. Drohobych: Posvit, 2016. 696 p.....	209

UDC 930.1(092)(477)
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.132753

Ivan KUTSYI,
orcid.org/0000-0002-3556-1962
Ph D hab. (History), Associate professor
of History of Ukraine Department
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University
(Ukraine, Ternopil) kutsyy@ukr.net

THE RECEPTION OF EUROPE/WEST IN THE SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE OF THE MYKHAILO MAKSYMOVYCH

In the articles Mykhailo Maksymovich 'civilization identity has been considered. The specificity of the scholars' civilization views has been analyzed through the twofold category «our: foreign», the basic civilization images on his mental map have been outlined, their content filling and axiologic loading has been examined. Also, the attention has been focused on the scientist's interpretations of a historical image of Europe/the West as a «foreign» civilisation to the Slavs. The role of M. M. Maksymovych in the process of Ukrainian civilization identification has been summed up.

Key words: M. Maksymovych, the West, Europe, civilisation, image, identity, Slavs, the Slavic land, Poland.

Іван КУЦІЙ,
доктор історичних наук,
доцент кафедри історії України
Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету
імені Володимира Гнатюка (Україна, Тернопіль) kutsyy@ukr.net

РЕЦЕПЦІЯ ЄВРОПИ/ЗАХОДУ У НАУКОВІЙ СПАДЩИНІ МИХАЙЛА МАКСИМОВИЧА

У статті розглянуто цивілізаційну ідентичність Михайла Максимовича. Проаналізовано специфіку цивілізаційних поглядів вченого крізь призму двоєдиної категорії «свій-чужий», окреслено основні цивілізаційні образи на його ментальній карті, простежено їхнє змістове наповнення та аксіологічне навантаження. Акцентовано увагу на інтерпретаціях вченим історичного образу Європи/Заходу як «чужої» слов'янам цивілізації. Узагальнено роль М. Максимовича у процесі генези української цивілізаційної ідентичності.

Ключові слова: М. Максимович, Захід, Європа, цивілізація, образ, ідентичність, слов'яни, Слов'янина, Польща.

The problem statement. In the contemporary intellectual space of Ukraine the categorical thesis-ideologeme about the purely European belonging of Ukraine's cultural-civilization values is widespread. By ascertaining this no views on civilization of the persons and even the whole intellectual trends of the Ukrainian past, who or which in due time stuck to the alternative to the Europe oriented doctrines are taken into account. It is to such persons that Mykhailo Maksymovych belongs.

Research analysis. Though the heritage of this scientist, who was a remarkable figure in the Ukrainian and Russian historiographic traditions of the XIX century, is one of the very well studied, the problem of his civilization orientations is not clarified in the Ukrainian

science. It suffice here to mention the following fact: among a significant number of the researches devoted to M. Maksymovych' multilateral activity, not a single one treated his view on the civilization belonging of Ukraine. The purpose of the article. Eventually, the outlining of the problems of the aforementioned Ukrainian scientist image of Europe makes up the purpose of this article.

Presenting main ideas. M. Maksymovych, as well as the majority of his contemporaries in the Ukrainian and Russian intellectual environment, identified himself with the Slavic world as a separate and autarkic cultural-civilization community. In his texts «his» civilisation is terminologically designated as the Slavic world, the Slavs, the Slavic tribe, Slavic circle, Slavic elements, and most frequently as Slovyianshchyna (the «Slavonic civilization»). Within the boundaries of the Slavic world, M. Maksymovych and his contemporaries singled out somewhat narrower cultural-civilization community, defining it as the Rus' world. To it the whole East Slavic orthodox space was included. The Slavic world in their consciousness appeared to be a civilization antagonistic to the West, Europe, or the so-called Germanic world. Thus, they thought of the history of the Slavic peoples as perpetual – since the times immemorial – opposition to aggressive and enemy pressure from the Germanic peoples.

M. M. Maksymovych' formation as a scientist took lace during an epoch, in which – according to Andrzej Valitsky – «the attitude to the values, symbolised by a word «the West», became the main criterion of ideological differences» (Валіцький, 1998: 69). After all, M. Maksymovych can be considered as one of the first representatives of the Ukrainian Slavofiles (pan-Slavists), for whom, in Mykola Riabchuk's words, «xenophobia or, at least, suspicion to all foreign, non-Slavic» was characteristic (Рябчук, 2000: 78). Already in his early studies he evidently outlined «his» civilization identity. He accurately and unequivocally inscribed the representatives of the «Rus' tribe» into a wider, super-ethnic context alias Slavic. Everything that was connected with the Slavic world he accepted as «his», whereas all that was beyond the defined space (that is, was «not Slavic»), was, certainly, considered as «not his», «foreign» to him, or even as «inimical». Although in M. Maksymovych' works no strict definition as to the content filling of civilization identification of the Slavic world, many indirect mentions of the basic grounds on which the author conducted his civilization identification policy.

Despite his prime attention to the image of «his» civilisation (that is, the Slavic world), M. Maksymovych paid much attention to the image of Europe/the West. His used a remarkable terminological variety in the description of the latter's vital space. Most frequently he designated it as the West. The toponym Europe he used mostly in geographic-spatial context. He used such notions as the foreign west, the Latin West, the German circle. Generally speaking, M. Maksymovych often identified all European with all German and Germanic. as a matter of fact, he wrote that in Mykhailo Lomonosov's outlook «ancient Slavic world, Latin world and Germanizm» had merged (Максимович, 2004d: 51). The Swedes, Norwegians, Englishmen, and Goths the scientist also readily called «the peoples of the Germanic tribe» (ibid.). The perception of Europe/ the West as «foreign vital space» is most distinct in his expressions like «in our East and the European West» (Максимович, 2004d: 61). M. M. Maksymovych' reception of the West as hostile to the Rus'/Slavic world can be felt in his many other references: «The Southern Rus' (Ruthenia), having suffered so much from the eastern enemies, also suffered much the western enemies» (Максимович, 1877a: 210).

The scientist regarded Napoleonic intrusion of 1812 into Russia as a concrete display of the western military aggression. In «The Bubniv company» he metaphorically wrote about

those events: «The Russian land was boiled and waving like the sea in an attempt to get rid of the grandiose idol of the west with his hordes» (Максимович, 1876а: 825). A testimony of the fact that the scientist perceived Napoleonic empire as an embodiment of all the West is obvious from the next quotation: «on the field by Borodino the force of the Rus' had fought with the force of the West» (Максимович, 1876а: 824).

A menacing danger to the integrity and autarky of the Slavic world M. Maksymovych saw not so much in the West's military-political expansion, as in its cultural influences. Therefore, he negatively estimated the European cultural-educational tendencies in the Ukrainian historical process. So, Feofan of Prokopovych's verses written in the Latin language the scientist ironically called «the academic games» (Максимович, 1877с: 47). In his works «About the Laura Mohyla school», in the XVII century into the ancient Rus'-Slavic tradition «the learning of that time European West was introduced, considerably decorated with paganism or heathenry of the classical Helleno-Latin antiquity. This learning was accepted as the external condition sine qua non for the development of our education». So, notwithstanding its external character, M. Maksymovych regarded the process of the West European cultural-educational influences as a menacing intrusion of the «foreign» within the sphere of the «his own». Later he would accentuate on a negative reaction of the Rus' culture to this western intrusion: «But the Rus' mind then already saw both the necessity and possibility of eliminating from it everything that belonged to it [the foreign culture] as an image of the mind which had not yet been clarified by the divine truth and to turn it into its own Christian enlightenment» (Максимович, 1877а: 213). As can hardly be doubted, the scientist saw a deviation from the bases of true Christianity in the European cultural tradition.

In his fundamental study «A history of the ancient Rus' literature» M. Maksymovych described a tendency of the «striving to ger on European lines» in cultural-educational development of the Russian empire from Peter I to Alexander I. in a rather veiled form. The author critically underlined that, even despite the domination of the West European education, still the «original elements of life did not stop being brightly manifested in this period» (Максимович, 1880а: 353). The scientist paid attention to the antagonistic character of the interaction of the European and pan-Slavic worlds in cultural-intellectual processes: «These two different domains united in the Rus' mind not peacefully» (Максимович, 1880а: 354). In an entirely approving tone he characterised the contemporary to him cultural tendency of Russia, which «in our enlightened time at last /.../ returned to its East Rus world». M. Maksymovych drew a periodical scheme of the historical development of the Rus culture. «The cultural-civilization influences on it at different historical stages became the main criterion of his periodization. The scientist confirmed as follows: «Thus, in comparison with the main influences on the enlightenment in the Rus' world, it is possible to call the ancient period as Greek-Eastern or, more exactly, Greek-Slavic, the middle period should be called Greek-Latin-Slavic, and the new one can me called New-European, whereas the contemporary period marks the beginning of an authentic Rus' (Rus') one» (Максимович, 1880а: 354). Here M. Maksymovych summarised, that «Russia had gradually and in due time bypassed all the sky of the enlightened Christian world, and now consciously entered this period the its great life, in which it should open all the depth and completeness of its spirit and express in full the quality of its Rus' populace». As is clear, the scientist here in a neutral-tolerant tone referred to the «foreign» (including those of the West) influences on the cultural development of Rus' world. Furthermore, he saw the main essence and positive final result of the historical development of the Rus'/Slavic world in turning from the «foreign» to the original «vernacular»

bases. It is necessary to notify that in the aforementioned work the author's veiled thoughts about the negative influence of the European West on the Russian empire can be discerned between his lines. Actually, their frank statement would have induced him to more critically estimate the activity of the Russian emperors-«Europeanizers», such as Peter I, Catherine II, and Alexander I. But such statements, certainly, would have caused suspicions in his political unreliability. At the same time, M. Maksymovych ascertained that «The south-eastern Slavs were subjected to more various influences of the foreign people, either Asian, or European» (Максимович, 1880а: 454).

Of great interest for the contemporary biographers are also M. Maksymovych' not public sentences about the West, which are void of self-censorship and scientifically-ethical factors. So, in a letter to O. Bodpanskyi he called the Latin language «barbarian Latin» (Максимович, 2004а: 40). Pronouncing in 1862 upon a preponderance of the «newly elected Germans-educators» in the intellectual life of the Russian empire, he emphatically summarised so: «Probably, even within the space of the Rus' world the Slavic tribe is doomed never to get liberated from from the German captivity» (Максимович, 2004а: 59). Hence, of the Ukrainian historians M. Maksymovych most consecutively adhered to the view of Europe/the West as the «foreign» and «hostile» for the Slavic peoples environment.

M. Maksymovych considered Catholicism as distinguished sign of «the West». In this phenomenon he implied a much broader sense, than just religious dogmas and the dominating in the West confession. The image of Catholicism the scientist perceived as a political and cultural community of the West European peoples, as a complete mega-structure. However, the scholar seldom took into consideration the internal differentiation, non-uniform ethnic-national, dynastic, and political construction of the Catholic space. The Catholic world arose in his image of civilization rather as structurally complete and homogeneous, contrary to a mosaic of the peoples, countries and monarchies competing and conflicting with one another. His perception of Catholicism as an attribute of the West M. Maksymovych expressed in references to it as a «western faith» (Максимович, 2004d: 67). Other his thoughts are self-expressive, like that «numerous encroachment of Rome which did not abandon its intentions to involve Russia under the papal power» (Максимович, 2004b: 153). According to the scientist, Feodosiy Pecherskyi «protected the Grand Prince Iziaslav from the temptations of the powerful ruler of the West», that is, from Pope George VII (Максимович, 1877b: 220). M. Maksymovych considered the later ages as «a heavy time for western Rus' over which the western confession-driving tempest eventually raged» (Максимович, 1877b: 235).

Separately it should be stressed, that within the limits of a collected image of Catholicism M. Maksymovych (as well as his contemporaries) accused the main originator of «the western threat» alias the Jesuit order. He wrote that «the spirit of animosity through the lips of Jesuits tirelessly whispered in the ears of the Poles of confessional persecutions and unreasonable arrogance» (Максимович, 2004e: 261). In his other work the scientist noticed that Jesuits restored Catholicism in Poland, «working not for the sake of the Christian faith, but purely for the papal power, thinking only about the Roman tiara and without a thought of the Polish crown» (Максимович, 2004f: 376). Most expressively M. Maksymovych estimated Jesuits as carriers of the western civilization' bases in his study «The Bubniv company»: «The reformatory new thinking /.../ opened Jesuits the road to catch in their nets the new generations of western Rus' princes who, admiring the cunning and fraudulent doctrine of these western wise men, /.../ abandoned the piety of their ancestors and distanced themselves from the Orthodox Rus' as dust from the earth, drifted on it by a whirlwind» (Максимович, 1876а:

750). So, the order of Jesuits M. Maksymovych represented as the main tool of introduction of the western cultural-religious values into Rus' and, on the whole, in the Slavic world.

If the image of Catholicism with all its compounds or derivative phenomena arose as a spiritually-religious component of Europe/ the West, the other, not less significant components of this civilization image were represented by separate «western» (first of all, Germanic) peoples. One of such peoples which name is invariably present at discussions about civilization identity, were annalistic Varangians. Actually, the discussions over the Varangian or Norman question were among the most significant problem for both Ukrainian, and Russian historical sciences in the XIX century.

Yet in his early work «From whence the Rus' land derives» M. Maksymovych interpreted the Scandinavian Varangians not just as a tribe «of strangers», but as the representatives of entirely different from the Slavs cultural-civilization environment: «the Varangians spoke a different language and were a folk different from the Slavs» (Максимович, 2004d: 81). He accurately pointed out the belonging of the Varangians to the «western» civilization: «In the middle of the XI century the word «Varangian» designated «western» «i. e., everything opposite to the Greek-Eastern and Slavic-Rus'» (Максимович, 2004d: 81). Further on in the text of the aforementioned work the author wrote this statement: «the Varangian faith is called the western or Latin faith, contrary to the Yrthodoxy of Rus'. The Varangian and Latin for him [Feodosiya Pecherskyi. – I. K.] is the same /.../. Yet before Nestoru Rus' men looked at a Varangian as at a western dissenter» (Максимович, 2004d: 82).

In «A history of the ancient Rus' literature» M. Maksymovych distinctly outlined the image of a Varangian as «a stranger» who embodied everything western: «The name Varangian was always associated the notion of an «offshore man», a stranger, a foreigner and, last but not least, a confessional dissenter: thus, in the XI and XII centuries the western or Latin confession was also called Varangian; a Latinist and and a Varangian were identical words». And further on the scientist specified a successive identity of the notions of the Varangians and the Germans in the designation of the quality «western»: «From the XIII the name «Scandinavians» began also to mean «Germans» which during the Middle Ages substituted the name of «Varangians»: the Latin faith was already called German, and with this name they began – quite indefinitely – designating not only all strange, all western, but also all foreign, all belonging to foreign languages» (Максимович, 1880a: 369). The scientist placed emphasis on the fact that an Ancient Rus' annalistic tradition accurately told the Varangians, the strangers to the East Slavic lands, and the Rus' men. While recognising in the former the Germans-Scandinavians, M. Maksymovych called the latter Pomoria-Baltic Slavs, that is, «fellow tribesmen». Although he traced many common features between these two tribes, he, all the same, allocated them into different – «foreign», «western» and «near ones», that is, «Slavic» civilization communities: «But in relation to their language and nationality, they were different: therefore, an influence of the Rus' on the East Slavs, in our understanding, was other, much closer and successful, than influences of foreign to them Varangians» (Максимович, 1880a: 371). The scientist noted also an assimilating influence of the Slavs on the Germans-Varangians: «The Varangians of Scandinavia, on order not to be strangers in our native land, had to accept its Slavic-Rus' nationality and lose their own German one, and still to a greater extent than the Normans lost theirs in western Europe» (Максимович, 1880a: 371). Hence, M. Maksymovych – to an extent – recognised the influence of western civilization («Varangian milieu») on the development of life in Ancient Rus'. Nevertheless, he did not give any definite value to this fact. As an original counterbalance to these influences he

singled out the Byzantine («Greek-Christian milieu») cultural-civilization influence. The scientist also paid attention, that the western/German influence on the Rus' world had a weighty importance for old Novgorod which « thanks to the relations with the Germans adopted from them more the western life, than the other areas of Rus'» (Максимович, 1880а: 383).

There are hardly reasons to assert that images of Europe/the West in M. Maksymovych' view had a completely negative colouring. The scientist did not go entirely beyond the borders of the established during the Enlightenment epoch o mental map on which «civilized» Europe was opposed to «barbarous» East. In his texts some indirect facts can be found which certify the author's views at Europe as the «enlightened», «cultural», and «civilized" world which positively contrasts against the «eastern barbarity».

Poland, which in his system of civilization images of «the Slavic East – the Germanic West" took a special place, also was in the focus of M. Maksymovych' scientific attention. In his historical texts the thought about «the western» recreancy of Poland was expressively enough displayed. Actually, the scientist was one of the first in the Ukrainian historiography who acquired the Slavofile thesis of the Slavic world and its transition to the side of the Catholic West. He characterized Poland as «the first «pro-Polish» representative in the «Slavic» milieu» (Максимович, 1876а: 750). In the historical concept of the scientist Poland was treated as an initially Slavic-Orthodox country and only in due course it became a leading representative of western Catholicism in the Slavic space: «At first it had accepted east Orthodoxy from the common to the Slavs teachers, but then the Catholicism took over in it» (Максимович, 1876а: 750). The situation, «when Poland so forcefully and ruthlessly tore off true children of the Orthodox church», the scientist interpreted as a display of the «western tempest of confessional reprisals». Thus, he considered Poland both the victim, and the tool of this «most western tempest». Poland, in his words, «drove western Rus' in that same net in which it itself had been caught by Jesuits» (Максимович, 1877b: 235). He valued King Sigismund III as « brought up by Jesuits and afflicted with their spirit» (Максимович, 1876а: 750). The hint on mastering by Poland of immoral values of the West is traced in the statement about the court «of the mercenary and immoral queen Вона» (Максимович, 1876b: 175). Here M. Maksymovych, not without irony, responded to the election for the Polish crown of a representative of the West European dynasty: «Free in the election of kings Rzecz Pospolita, after it had more than a year and a half worried about its king, elected itself the king who had been a of the Bartholomew night, the 22 year old Henry Valois who four months later fled from Krakow secretly as a night robber, having taken the Polish crown away with him to Paris /.../ At night chosen, he had arrived also at night and went away at night» (Максимович, 1876b: 177). Dwelling upon «Poland western choice», M. Maksymovych reminded about its Slavic root and initial language -cultural cognition with Rus'. He wrote about the Polish language that it «is of one-breed with that of Rus', having yet not lost then its young freshness under the difficult scholasticism of Jesuit Latin» (Максимович, 1876с: 208). M. Maksymovych very clearly expressed his thought on Poland as the tool of expansion of the West to the East is seen in this fragment» Poland, having taken hold of western Rus' and having given in to Jesuits, restored the Catholicism and depressed other Christian confessions. By these means it restored Catholicism among not only among its basic Polish people, having strongly undermined the Reformation in it, but also carried out an unhappy revolt also in the Rus' areas attached to it» (Максимович, 1876с: 208). M. Maksymovych regarded the cultural Rus' cultural tradition in the Polish and Latin language in the times of Rzecz Pospolita as «spoilt» by influences of western/Latin inspirituality.

Conclusions. Thus, M. M. Maksymovych's scientific-historical heritage should be considered as a powerful source of studying civilization identity of the representatives of Ukrainian intelligentsia of the XIX century. His historical views and beliefs most consistently displayed the world outlook bases of adherents of the Slavic identity and evidently outlined their relation to Europe/the West. Despite some inconsistent positions, M. Maksymovych actually outlined a paradigm of the further development of the Ukrainian civilization identity almost for whole XIX century. With his works, M. Maksymovych contributed both to a conceptual distinction civilization of a civilization image of the West and to its distribution among the readers' audience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Валіцький, 1998 – Валіцький А. В полоні консервативної утопії: Структура і видозміни російського слов'янофільства. К.: Основи, 1998. 710 с.
- Максимович, 1876a – Максимович М. Бубновская сотня // *Собрание сочинений М. А. Максимова*. Том I. Отдѣлъ историческій. К., 1876. С. 747–834.
- Максимович, 1880a – Максимович М. *Исторія древней русской словесности* // *Собрание сочинений М. А. Максимова*. Том III. Языкознание. История словесности. К., 1880. С. 346–479.
- Максимович, 1880b – Максимович М. Критико-историческое изслѣдованіе о русскомъ языкѣ // *Собрание сочинений М. А. Максимова*. Том III: Языкознание. История словесности. К., 1880. С. 3–24.
- Максимович, 2004a – Максимович М. *Листи / Упор. і вст. ст. В. Короткого*. К.: Либідь, 2004. 312 с.
- Максимович, 2004b – Максимович М. *Объ участіи и значеніи Кіева въ общей жизни Россіи* // Максимович М. *Вибрані твори з історії Київської Русі, Кіева і України*. К.: Вища школа, 2004. С. 144–158.
- Максимович, 1877a – Максимович М. *О лаврской могилинской школѣ* // *Собрание сочинений М. А. Максимова*. Том II: Отдѣлы: историко-топографическій, археологическій и этнографическій. К., 1877. С. 210–215.
- Максимович, 2004c – Максимович М. *О мнимомъ запустѣннн Украины въ нашествіе Батыево и населеніи ея новопришлымъ народомъ (Письмо М. П. Погодину)* // Максимович М. *Вибрані твори з історії Київської Русі, Кіева і України*. К.: Вища школа, 2004. С. 130–141.
- Максимович, 1877b – Максимович М. *О надгробияхъ в Печерскомъ монастырѣ* // *Собрание сочинений М. А. Максимова*. Том II: Отдѣлы: историко-топографическій, археологическій и этнографическій. К., 1877. С. 216–237.
- Максимович, 2004d – Максимович М. *Откуда идеть Русская земля, по сказанію Несторовой повѣсти и по другимъ стариннымъ писаніямъ русскимъ* // Максимович М. *Вибрані твори з історії Київської Русі, Кіева і України*. К.: Вища школа, 2004. С. 46–115.
- Максимович, 1876b – Максимович М. *Письма о князьяхъ Острожскихъ (Къ графинѣ А. Д. Блудовой)* // *Собрание сочинений М. А. Максимова*. Том I: Отдѣлъ историческій. К., 1876. С. 164–195.
- Максимович, 1876c – Максимович М. *Родословныя записки кіевлянина* // *Собрание сочинений М. А. Максимова*. Том I: Отдѣлъ историческій. К., 1876. С. 208–216.
- Максимович, 2004e – Максимович М. *Сказаніе о гетманѣ Петрѣ Сагайдачномъ* // Максимович М. *Вибрані твори з історії Київської Русі, Кіева і України*. К.: Вища школа, 2004. С. 255–280.
- Максимович, 2004f – Максимович М. *Сказаніе о Коліивщинѣ* // Максимович М. *Вибрані твори з історії Київської Русі, Кіева і України*. К.: Вища школа, 2004. С. 373–399.
- Максимович, 1877c – Максимович М. *Топографическія замѣтки кіевлянина* // *Собрание сочинений М. А. Максимова*. Том II: Отдѣлы: историко-топографическій, археологическій и этнографическій. К., 1877. С. 39–49.
- Рябчук, 2000 – Рябчук М. *Західники мимоволі: парадокси українського нативізму* // Рябчук М. *Від Малоросії до України: парадокси запізнлого націстворення*. К.: Критика, 2000. С. 66–102.

REFERENCES

- Valitskiy, 1998 – Valitskiy A. In the captivity of conservatory Utopia: the structure and modifications of the Russian Slavophile mood. K.: Osnovy, 1998. 710 s. [in Ukrainian]
- Maksimovich, 1876a – Maksimovichy M. Bubnovskaya sotnya [The Bubniv company] // *Sobranie sochineniy M. A. Maksimovicha*. Tom I. Otdel istoricheskoy. K., 1876. S. 747–834. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 1880a – Maksimovichy M. Istoriya drevney russkoy slovesnosti [A history of the ancient Rus' literature] // *Sobranie sochineniy M. A. Maksimovicha*. Tom III. Yazykoznanie. Istoriya slovesnosti. K., 1880. S. 346–479. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 1880b – Maksimovichy M. Kritiko-istoicheskoe izsledovanie o russkom yazyke [A critical-historical study of the Russian language] // *Sobranie sochineniy M. A. Maksimovicha*. Tom III: Yazykoznanie. Istoriya slovesnosti. K., 1880. S. 3–24. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 2004a – Maksimovich M. Listi / Upor. i vst. st. V. Korotkogo [Letters]. K.: Libid, 2004. 312 s. [in Ukrainian]
- Maksimovich, 2004b – Maksimovich M. Ob uchastii i znachenyi Kieva v obschey jizni Rossii [On Kiev's participation and significance in Russias common life] // Maksimovich M. *Vybrani tvory z istorii Kyivskoi Rusi, Kyieva i Ukrainy*. K.: Vischa shkola, 2004. S. 144–158. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 1877a – Maksimovichy M. O lavrskoy mogilinskoj shkole [On the Laura Mohyla academy] // *Sobranie sochineniy M. A. Maksimovicha*. Tomy II: Otdel: istoriko-topograficheskij, arheologicheskij i etnograficheskij. K., 1877. S. 210–215. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 2004c – Maksimovich M. O mnimom zapustenii Ukrainy v nashestvie Batyievo i naselenii eya novoprishlyim narodom (Pismo M. P. Pogodinu) [On a make-belief desertion of Ukraine in Baty's time and its inhabitation with the newly arrived people] // Maksimovich M. *Vybrani tvory z istorii Kyivskoi Rusi, Kyieva i Ukrainy*. K.: Vischa shkola, 2004. S. 130–141. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 1877b – Maksimovichy M. O nadgrobiyah v Pecherskom monastyire [On the graves in Pecherskyi monastery] // *Sobranie sochineniy M. A. Maksimovicha*. Tomy II: Otdel: istoriko-topograficheskij, arheologicheskij i etnograficheskij. K., 1877. S. 216–237. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 2004d – Maksimovich M. Otkuda idet Russkaya zemlya, po skazaniyu Nestorovoy povesti i po drugim starinnyim pisaniyam russkim [From whence the Rus' land derives] // Maksimovich M. *Vybrani tvory z istorii Kyivskoi Rusi, Kyieva i Ukrainy*. K.: Vischa shkola, 2004. S. 46–115. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 1876b – Maksimovichy M. Pisma o knyazyah Ostrojskih (K grafine A. D. Bludovoy) [The letters about the Ostrih princes] // *Sobranie sochineniy M. A. Maksimovicha*. Tom I: Otdel istoricheskoy. K., 1876. S. 164–195. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 1876c – Maksimovichy M. Rodoslovnyiia zapiski kievlyanina [The lineage records of a Kievan] // *Sobranie sochineniy M. A. Maksimovicha*. Tom I: Otdel istoricheskoy. K., 1876. S. 208–216. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 2004e – Maksimovich M. Skazanie o getmane Petre Sagaydachnom [The tale of Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi] // Maksimovich M. *Vybrani tvory z istorii Kyivskoi Rusi, Kyieva i Ukrainy*. K.: Vischa shkola, 2004. S. 255–280. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 2004f – Maksimovich M. Skazanie o Koliivshchine [The tale of the Koliyivshchyna] // Maksimovich M. *Vybrani tvory z istorii Kyivskoi Rusi, Kyieva i Ukrainy*. K.: Vischa shkola, 2004. S. 373–399. [in Russian]
- Maksimovich, 1877c – Maksimovichy M. Topograficheskaya zametki kievlyanina [The topographic records of a Kievan] // *Sobranie sochineniy M. A. Maksimovicha*. Tom II: Otdely: istoriko-topograficheskij, arheologicheskij i etnograficheskij. K., 1877. S. 39–49. [in Russian]
- Riabchuk, 2000 – Riabchuk M. Zakhidnyky mymovoli: paradoksy ukrainskoho natyvizmu [Pro-Westerners unwillingly: the paradoxes of Ukrainian nativism] // Riabchuk M. *Vid Malorosii do Ukrainy: paradoksy zapizniloho natsiietvorennia*. K.: Krytyka, 2000. S. 66–102. [in Ukrainian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 06.04.2018 р.

UDC 2-737(477+476):930(470+571)«18/19»
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131618

Vasyl MEN'KO,
orcid.org/0000-0002-9528-547X
Senior Lecturer, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
(Ukraine, Drohobych) vasulmenko@gmail.com

**THE ORIGIN AND ONTOGENESIS OF ORTHODOX CHURCH
BROTHERHOODS IN UKRAINE AND BELORUSSIA IN THE WORKS
OF REPRESENTATIVES OF RUSSIAN HISTORICAL SCIENCE
(the 1850s – beginning of the XX century)**

The article presents an analysis of scientific achievements of the historians of the Russian historical school of the second half of the XIX century and their contribution into the study of the problem of origin of the Orthodox church brotherhoods of Ukraine and Belarus.

Key words: brotherhood, metropolitan, church.

Василь МЕНЬКО,
старший викладач
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного
університету імені Івана Франка (Україна, Дрогобич)
vasulmenko@gmail.com

**ГЕНЕЗА ТА ПОХОДЖЕННЯ ПРАВОСЛАВНИХ ЦЕРКОВНИХ БРАТСТВ
УКРАЇНИ І БІЛОРУСІЇ У ПРАЦЯХ ПРЕДСТАВНИКІВ РОСІЙСЬКОЇ
ІСТОРИЧНОЇ НАУКИ (50-ті рр. XIX – поч. XX ст.)**

У статті проаналізовано науковий доробок та внесок істориків російської історичної школи другої половини XIX ст. у вивчення проблеми походження православних церковних братств України і Білорусії. Доведено, що російські історики православної історіографічної школи акцентували увагу переважно на релігійних формах функціонування братств і сферах діяльності, які сприяли зміцненню і захисту православ'я. Висвітлено особливості розвитку історіографії в контексті тогочасних умов розвитку, показано основні напрямки та досягнення.

Ключові слова: братства, митрополія, церква.

The statement of the problem. The phenomenon of church brotherhoods alias religious secular organisations of Ukraine and Belorussia of the early modern time (XVI – XVIII centuries) has always drawn the attention of researchers. Hence, in scientific literature the problems connected with the origin of brotherhoods, their typology, granting stauropregional (autonomous) rights, conflicts with hierarchy, and the reasons of a long and cruel struggle against the Unia were mostly discussed. Almost all historians of early modern church and culture paid much attention to these problems, and their works contained historiographic reviews of the problems.

The analysis of the researches. By today in a great mass of historical literature the original works enlightening the phenomenon of brotherhood movement on Ukraine's territory are not numerous. M. Kapral in his review of S. S. Lukashova's monograph justly remarks: «Since the publication in 1966 of the known Yaroslav Isaievych' book Brotherhoods and their role in the developments of Ukrainian culture in the XVI– XVIII centuries», separate

publications almost did not change the situation, and so, in the estimation of this phenomenon old values dominated (Kapral, 2007:133–144).

However, this does not mean that this question has not been investigated hitherto or that it has no historiography. The elaboration of separate political, historical-legal, social, and economical plots from the history of Orthodox church brotherhoods, and historiographic problems were treated in the work of many researchers. Among them the following deserve mentioning: B. Lorens (Lorens, 2005), O. Fefelova (Fefelova, 2001), S. Lukashova (Lukashova, 2006), and others.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the historiographic achievements devoted to theories on the origin of Orthodox brotherhoods, to find out the basic directions and tendencies of the development of the theme, to define little studied and non-studied questions of the problem under consideration.

The statement of the basic material. In the 1850s–1870s the problem of the origin of church brotherhoods of Ukraine and Belorussia became a research subject of major importance for Russian historical science representatives. It was raised by A. Popov's publication of his book «Feasts and Bratchyny» (Popov, 1854) in which the author considered a custom to arrange a general banquets on the temple holiday: «the Community gave banquets which were also known as bratchyny. The link of the banquets with holidays specifies their religious value, but the fact that games, dances, and songs which accompanied those banquets testify to their pagan origin» (Popov, 1854:21).

If at a banquet there was a fight or murder, the community acted as the public court (Popov, 1854:33). His theory of the genealogical unity of all East Slavic peoples has defined a new direction of historical researches.

Separate Russian historians, such as V. Kliuchevskiy (Kliuchkovskiy, 2004), V. Solovyov (Solovyov, 1856), and others, connected the origin of brotherhoods with the existence on the northeast lands of Rus' of old Rus' bratchyny. From that theory it followed that the Ukrainian brotherhoods became a direct continuation of the bratchyny of Rus' since the times immemorial, that is, they were not a historical and cultural phenomenon characteristic for Ukraine only.

That imperial Russian theory ignored the essential differences in living conditions between Northeast Rus' on the one hand, and Ukraine and Belorussia on the other hand, it did not also take into consideration the chronological factor (as is known, Old Rus' bratchyny were active mainly in the XII–XIII centuries and, consequently, that is why to speak about an unequivocal continuity between them and the Ukrainian brotherhoods which developed almost two hundred years later, is rather problematical). In the activity of brotherhoods the aforementioned historians singled out two periods, namely, one prior to the middle of the XVI century and a later one, but they did not determine a principle difference between bratchyny and church brotherhoods.

Metropolitan Philaret (Humyliyovskiy) also allocated two periods in the activity of brotherhoods. During the first one, the brotherhood were engaged mainly in the care of buildings and maintenance of the clergy and the poor (Philaret (Humyliyovskiy), 1847:25). Metropolitan Philaret's work contains a great number of factological errors.

Thus, he asserted that Lviv Stauropegion was founded «thanks to the promotion of Gedeon, a Lviv bishop and a well-known advocate of Orthodoxy» (Philaret (Humyliyovskiy), 1847:96): and that was said contrarily to the fact, that many documents testifying to a serious conflict between the brotherhood the bishop survived.

I. Flerov's monograph (Flerov, 1857) is dedicated to the history of church brotherhoods, essentially differs from the works of his contemporaries. He saw the source of the origin of

church brotherhoods in early Christian communities, considering, like Metropolitan Philaret, the cause of the appearance of brotherhoods (confraternitates) movement as the necessity of struggle against the Catholic propaganda. In the favour of in I. Flerov wrote the following: everywhere Church societies or brotherhoods started to be established, which members by oath promised to firmly stay in the belief of their fathers and by all efforts to oppose the stream of Roman-Catholic split. It was then that in all the provinces of southwest Russia the brotherhoods of Lviv, Vilnius, Kiev, Pinsk, Orshansk, Brest, Lutsk, Mohiliov, Belz, Minsk, as well as many others arose (Flerov, 1857:12).

Further on the researcher analyzes also other reasons of appearance of brotherhoods. He sheds some light on the problem of their form organization, from whom they could inherit the very idea of brotherhood formation, and in what primary kind it had existed. Another task that the historian assumes is how the Polish kings and, in general, the Polish government could have admitted the very existence of brotherhoods?

I. Flerov comes to a conclusion that «brotherhoods must have arisen from the structure of that time society, or, at least, should have found for themselves a support among the civil establishments of that time» (Flerov, 1857:14). The scientist assumed that craft guilds might have been a reason to cause the appearance of church brotherhoods, besides, on it the establishment of Magdeburg law had a direct influence.

The great number of the facts telling about the activity of church brotherhoods in Rzeczpospolita's cities which were guided on the basis of Magdeburg law, do not raise any doubts. Even the kings, whom hated the very existence of those brotherhoods, could not forbid them, because they represented the organisations which got under protection of the Magdeburg law.

Putting forward his hypothesis that the Orthodox inhabitants of southwest Rus' had borrowed the idea of formation of brotherhoods from the guilds, the author makes the following remark: «As is known, all handicraftsmen, no matter of religious distinctions, belonged to the guilds. But as an aftermath, about 1458, handicraftsmen of the Orthodox confession began to form societies within their milieu or brotherhoods» (Flerov, 1857:18).

Flerov's work became a major landmark in Russian historiography, having initiated the direct research of the role of Orthodox church brotherhoods in many vital spheres of the Ukrainian historical process.

Similarly to I. Flerov, M. O. Koyalovych in his book «Lithuanian church union» puts forward another of the origin of brotherhoods, considering that craft shops were the direct samples for the appearance brotherhoods (Koyalovych, 1859:65).

Still another version of the origin of brotherhoods in 1875 was put forward by the senior lecturer (later, professor) Mykola Afanasiyovych Skabalanovych (Skabalanovych, 1875:271–287). He asserted that the Orthodox brotherhoods copied the West European guilds and Catholic brotherhoods, but the arguments he used in his statement's support are rather inconsistent. Without making any particular dwelling on that subject, the author sticks to his hypothesis about the origin of both the Orthodox brotherhoods and European guilds from pagan sources.

The researcher asserted that, at first, the people who gathered for a feast, both in Rus' and in Germanic countries, had no particular obligations one to another. «In due course, such obligations appeared – to help maintain one another and the church in difficult circumstances, festive meetings turned to unions, guilds, corporations of people» (Skabalanovych, 1875:274).

However, this point of view did not receive a wide circulation within the historical science of the XIX – beginning of the XX century.

In the 1890s the church historian O. Papkov publishes a number of articles in the «Theological Herald» devoted to the history of the Ukrainian and Belorussian brotherhoods (Papkov, 1891:166–188). In 1900 A. Papkov's larger special work about brotherhoods was published (Papkov, 1900). Despite the broad chronological span (from the princely time to the end of the XVIII century), its problem statement should be considered as very careful. The historian suggested his periodization of the history of brotherhoods. The period between 1586 and 1600 he called an epoch of transformations, the period within 1600 and 1620 was called the period of powerful protection of Orthodoxy by brotherhoods. The author also formulated an important definition, namely, that «brotherhoods were large Christian unions with wide educational and charitable purposes» (Papkov, 1901:1083–1108).

A. Papkov also formulated the thought that the appearance of brotherhoods had introduced in Orthodox societies «the Church-social system», granted by patriarchs. In the author's opinion, several positions put forward and proved by the researcher are still of great value despite their conditionality.

Already in A. Papkov's works the problem of the role of laymen in the church, who, headed by prince K. Ostroz'kyi, lead the Kievan Metropoly out from a deep crisis. At the mentioned background, the role of brotherhoods as circular organisations was derived quite naturally (and, accordingly, in a very much simplified way) (Papkov, 1900:LV). The accentuation of secular forms in the activity of brotherhoods was very convenient for Russian historiography in respect of a more relief display of the struggle of the «Russian people» against the Catholicism and Unia. Considering that the education level was enough high in the last third of century, he connects it with the formation of brotherhoods as «educational-charitable» unions. The researcher also accentuated on the role of petty bourgeois in the activity of the Lviv brotherhood, underlining at, the same time, a considerable quantity of magnates and szlachta within the structure of the Vilnius brotherhood..

In the middle of the XI century, right after the publications of the first materials on the history of Lviv and other brotherhoods, in Russian historiography a polemic about the origin of these organisations developed. The beginning of the discussion was initiated by S. Solovyov who put forward the theory of the brotherhoods origin in the end of the XVI–XVII centuries from the Old Rus' «bratchyny», known from the XII century (Solovyov, 1856:108). At the same time, Solovyov considered that the further development of brotherhoods had been influenced by the guilds and city self-management according to the Magdeburg law.

An original theory of the origin of brotherhoods was suggested by O. Y. Yefymenko, according to whom all brotherhoods and similar organisations derive from from one «parental form» of clan brotherhood (Yefymenko, 1905:200–309). For the first time the Ukrainian and Belorussian brotherhoods were considered as a part of one all-European process. Investigating materials on histories of the clan unions of the Slavs, Germans and Scandinavians, Yefymenko came to a conclusion that the West European guild, the craft shop, the Old Rus' bratchyna, and the church brotherhood were the homogeneous phenomena and derive from patrimonial unions. Yefymenko not only connected the Ukrainian brotherhoods with the similar unions in other European countries, but also traced back their development and evolution up to the XI century.

Thus, the researcher has created a certain extra-historical abstraction from which all peculiar features of brotherhoods existing at various times which had absolutely different problems have been eliminated.

From the theoretical point of view L. Karsavin's works are very interesting, despite the fact that Ukrainian church brotherhoods were not the subject of his researches. He was the

first in Russian historiography to offer the characteristic of a medieval brotherhoods of Western Europe (Karsavin, 1992:143–149). According to the researcher, brotherhoods are the organisations of laymen which should be considered within the framework of the history of monks, as they represent a form of «weakened asceticism» and display the ideals of some or other sides of religious life of their epoch' (Karsavin, 1992:148).

As well as the representatives of the Ukrainian church historiography, Russian researchers of the Orthodox historiographic school have focused their attention mainly on religious forms of functioning of brotherhoods, whereas the historians of the so called university school have shown an interest in the problem of the origin of brotherhoods and their contribution into the development of public thought and culture.

The conclusion. Summing up the available stock of researches on the history and theory of the origin of the Orthodox brotherhoods, it is necessary to note that Russian historians of the Orthodox historiographic school focused their attention mainly on religious forms of brotherhoods' functioning and in such fields of activity which assisted in strengthening and protection of the Orthodoxy.

The works of Russian historians of the second half of the XIX c. became a major landmark in the history of Russian historiographic thought as these works initiated a comprehensive investigation of the theories of the origin of brotherhoods in Ukraine and Russia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ефименко, 1905 – Ефименко О. Я. Южно-русские братства // Южная Русь. СПб., 1905. Т. 1. 367 с.
- Капраль, 2007 – Капраль М. «У своєму соку» або чи є вартісним дослідження без архівних джерел. // Український гуманітарний огляд. Київ, 2007. Вип. 13. С. 133–144.
- Карсавин, 1992 – Карсавин Л.П. Монашество в средние века. Москва., 1992. 453 с.
- Ключковський, 2004 – Ключковський В.О. Боярская дума Древней Руси. М., 2004. 470 с.
- Коялович, 1859 – Коялович М.О. Литовская церковная уния. СПб., 1859. Т. 1. 275 с.
- Лукашова, 2006 – Лукашова С.С. Миряне и церковь: религиозные братства Киевской митрополии в конце XVI века. М., 2006. 321 с.
- Папков, 1891 – Папков А.А. Охранительная деятельность православных братств в последние годы царствования короля Сигизмунда III: 1620–1632 // Богословский вестник. 1891. № 5. С. 166–188.
- Папков, 1901 – Папков А.А. Братства // Православная богословская энциклопедия или Богословский энциклопедический словарь. Под ред. проф. А.П. Лопухина. Т. 2. Петроград, 1901. С. 1083–1108.
- Папков, 1900 – Папков А.А. Братства. (Очерк истории западнорусских православных братств). М., 1900. – 753 с.
- Попов, 1854 – Попов А. Пирь и братчины // Архив историко-юридических сведений относящихся до России. Изд. Н. Качаловым. М., 1854. Кн. 2. Пол. 2.
- Скабаланович, 1875 – Скабаланович Н. Западноевропейские гильдии и западно-русские братства // Христианские чтения. 1875. № 9–10. С. 271–287.
- Соловьев, 1856 – Соловьев С.М. Братчины // Русская беседа. 1856. № 4. С. 108–117.
- Успенське братство і його роль в українському національно-культурному відродженні. Доповіді та повідомлення науковій конференції 5 квітня 1996 р. Львів, 1996.
- Фефелова, 2001 – Фефелова О. А. Православные братства на восточнославянских территориях Речи Посполитой во второй половине XVI – первой половины XVII веков // Автореф. дис. канд. ист. наук. Томск, 2001. 20 с.
- Филарет (Гумилевский), 1847 – Филарет (Гумилевский), митр. История русской церкви. М., 1847. Т. 3. С. 25.
- Филарет (Гумилевский), 1847 – Филарет (Гумилевский), митр. История русской церкви. М., 1847. Т. 4. С. 96.
- Флеров, 1857 – Флеров И. О православных церковных братствах, противоборствовавших унии в восточно-западной России в XVI, XVII, XVIII столетиях. СПб., Изд. Книгопродавца Н. Г. Овсянникова. 1857. 200 с.

Lorens , 2005 – Lorens B. Bractva cerkiewne w eparchii przemyskiej w XVII – XVIII wieku. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego. Rzeszów, 2005. 336 s.

REFERENCES

- Efymenko, 1905 – Efymenko O.Ia. Yuzhno-russkiye bratstva [The brotherhoods of southern Rus'] // Southern Rus'. SPb., 1905. T. 1. 367 p. [in Russian]
- Kapral, 2007 – Kapral M. «U svoiemu soku» abo chy ye vartisnym doslidzhennia bez arkhivnykh dzherel. [«It one's own juice», or whether there search without archival sources is valid] // Ukrainian humanitarian review. Kyiv, 2007. Vyp. 13. Pp. 133–144. [in Russian]
- Karsavyn, 1992 – Karsavyn L.P. Monashestvo v srednye veka. [Monkhood in Middle Agea]. Moskva., 1992. 453 p. [in Russian]
- Kliuchkovskiy, 2004 – Kliuchkovskiy V.O. Boiarskaia дума Drevnei Rusy. [The Boyar Duma of Ancient Rus']. M., 2004, 470 p. [in Russian]
- Koialovych, 1859 – Koialovych M.O. Lytovskaia tserkovnaia unyia. [Lithuanian Church Union]. SPb., 1859. T.1. 275 p. [in Russian]
- Lukashova, 2006 – Lukashova S. S. Myriane y tserkov: relyhyoznye bratstva Kyevskoi mytropoly v kontse XVI veka. [Laymen and the Church: religious brotherhoods in Kiev metropolity in the end of XVI c.]. M., 2006. 321 p. [in Russian]
- Papkov, 1891 – Papkov A.A. Okhranytelnaia deiatelnost pravoslavnykh bratstv v poslednyy hody tsarstvovaniya korolia Syhyzmunda III: 1620 – 1632 [Protection activity of the Orthodox brotherhood in the last years of there ignof King Sigismund III: 1620 – 1632] // Theologian herald. 1891. № 5. Pp. 166–188. [in Russian]
- Papkov, 1901 – Papkov A. A. Bratstva // Pravoslavnaia bohoslovkaia entsyklopedyia yly Bohoslovskiy entsyklopedycheskiy slovar. [The Orthodox theologian encyclopedia or Theologian encyclopedia dictionary]. Pod red. prof. A. P. Lopukhyna. T. 2. Petrohrad, 1901. Pp. 1083–1108. [in Russian]
- Papkov, 1900 – Papkov A.A. Bratstva. (Ocherk ystoriy zapadnorusskykh pravoslavnykh bratstv). [Brotherhoods. (Asketchof the history of west Rus' Orthodox brotherhoods)]. M., 1900. 753 p. [in Russian]
- Popov, 1854 – Popov A. Pyry y bratchyny // Arkhyv ystoryko-yurydycheskykh svedeniy otosiyashchykh sia do Rossy. [Archive of historical-juridical information concerning Russia]. Yzd. N. Kachalovym. M., 1854. Kn. 2. Pol. 2. [in Russian]
- Skabalanovych, 1875 – Skabalanovych N. Zapadnoevropeiskye hyldyy y zapadno-russkiye bratstva [West European guilds and western Rus' brotherhoods] // Christian readings. 1875. № 9–10. Pp. 271–287. [in Russian]
- Soloviev, 1856 – Soloviev S.M. Bratchyny [Bratchiny] // Russian conversation. 1856. № 4. S. 108–117. [in Russian]
- Uspenske bratstvo i yoho rol v ukrainskomu natsionalno-kulturnomu vidrodzhenni. Dopovid i ta povidomlennia naukovy konferentsii 4–5 kvitnia [The Dormition Brotherhood and its role in Ukrainian national and cultural revival. Reports and speeches of the scientific conference of 4–5 April 1996]. 1996 r. Lviv, 1996. [in Ukrainian]
- Fefelova, 2001 – Fefelova O. A. Pravoslavnye bratstva na vostochnoslavianskykh terrytoryakh Rechy Pospolytoi vo vtoroi poloviny XVI – pervoi poloviny XVII vekov [Orthodox brotherhoods in the east Slavic lands of the Polish Republic in the second half of the XVI – first half of the XVII centuries] // Avtoref. dys.kand. yst.nauk. Tomsk, 2001. 20 p. [in Russian]
- Fylaret (Humylevskiy), 1847 – Fylaret (Humylevskiy), mytr. Ystoriya russkoi tserkvy. [History of Russian Church]. M., 1847. T. 3. P. 25. [in Russian]
- Fylaret (Humylevskiy), 1847 – Fylaret (Humylevskiy), mytr. Ystoriya russkoi tserkvy. [History of Russian Church]. M., 1847. T. 4. P. 96. [in Russian]
- Flerov, 1857 – Flerov Y. O pravoslavnykh tserkovnykh bratstvakh, protyvoborstvovavshykh unyy v fho-zapadnoi Rosyy v XVI, XVII, XVIII stoletiyakh. [On the Orthodox brotherhoods, which holloded the Unia in soeth-western Russia in the XVI, XVII, and XVIII centuries.] SPb., Yzd. Knyhoprodavtsa N.H. Ovsiannykova. 1857. 200 p. [in Russian]
- Lorens , 2005 – Lorens B. Bractva cerkiewne w eparchii przemyskiej w XVII – XVIII wieku. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego. [Church brotherhoods in Peremysl eparchies in the XVII – XVIII centuries]. Rzeszów, 2005. 336 p. [in Polish]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.04.2018 р.

UDC 070.448
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131214

Lidiya LAZURKO,
orcid 0000-0002-9748-9249
Ph D hab. (History), Associate Professor,
Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
(Drohobych, Ukraine, lazurkol@gmail.com)

LVIV CHRONICLE «PRZEGLĄD ARCHEOLOGICZNY» AND THE UKRAINIAN ISSUE

The article raises the issues of establishing and clarifying certain aspects of the first Lviv specifically historical journal «Przeгляд Archeologiczny» («Archeological Review»). Established in 1876 with educational purposes, the journal focused on informing about the latest developments in the field of archeology, and at the same time, researches in various special historical fields and art history. On the pages of «Przeгляд Archeologiczny» the first, to an extent amateur, explorations of Ukrainian sacral art and architecture as a distinct style that stirred sharp scientific debates and triggered the activation of the research in this area were published.

Key words: historiography, historical journal, «Przeгляд Archeologiczny», Ukrainian sacral art.

Лідія ЛАЗУРКО,
кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного
університету імені Івана Франка
(Дрогобич, Україна) lazurkol@gmail.com

ЛЬВІВСЬКИЙ ЧАСОПИС «PRZEGLĄD ARCHEOLOGICZNY» ТА УКРАЇНСЬКА ТЕМАТИКА

У статті піднімаються питання створення та з'ясування окремих аспектів діяльності першого львівського спеціально-історичного часопису «Przeгляд Archeologiczny». Створений у 1876 р. з просвітницькою метою, часопис робив акцент на інформуванні про найновіші здобутки у галузі археології, не цураючись, водночас, досліджень у різноманітних спеціально-історичних царинах та історії мистецтв. Саме на сторінках «Przeglądu Archeologicznego» були опубліковані перші, децю аматорські, розвідки про русинське сакральне мистецтво та архітектуру як окремий стиль, що сколихнуло гострі наукові дискусії та стало поштовхом до активізації досліджень у цьому напрямку.

Ключові слова: історіографія, історичний журнал, «Przeгляд Archeologiczny», українське сакральне мистецтво.

The statement of the problem. In the XIX century archeology, in connection with an increase of interest to olden time subjects, started declaring its existence as a science. However, still for a long time, it remained within the domain of history of cultural and collected round itself admirers of the past of very different interests. The fashion for the past, which was partially maintained by archeology, did not bypass Ukrainian Galicia of that time. Here, in 1848, in the Zbruch river near the village of Horodnytsia, a wooden idol was casually found, a statue, which represented the pagan god Sviatovyd, that had thitherto been unknown.

This find turned out an extremely strong stimulus which stipulated the appearance of a variety of scientific works of different character and marked the beginning of the search and studying of archeological finds in Galicia (Bulyk, 2005: 377). A wide coverage in press made the image of Sviatovyd for some time an original symbol of archaeological researches in East Galicia which turned out a powerful push for the further searches and realisation of organizational work. By the mid 1970s in Lviv a considerably large group of persons interested in archeology grew up, by which efforts on 31 December, 1875 the «Towarzystwo Archeologiczne Krajowe» («The Regional Archeological Society», further referred to as «RAS») with its own scientific-informational tribune, that is a specialised historical journal «Archeological Review» («Przegląd Archeologiczny», further referred to as «AR») (CSHAU – Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine – in Lviv, File 146, Opus 25, Case 48, Page 21).

The analysis of researches. The studying of the organizational-scientific activity of this organ's editorial board has not hitherto been a subject of separate researches. From the viewpoint of the context of Lviv press history, Ye. Yarovetskyi (Jarowiecki, 2008: 122) was the first to have referred to «AR» as a press organ, although, without specifying of the structure of that edition, which had been initially known as the aforementioned «RAS» (CSHAU in Lviv. F. 192. Op. 1. C. 6. Pp. 17–22), and later as «Towarzystwo Archeologiczne and c. k. Konserwatorium Pomników» («Archeological Society and the C[entral] C[omission] on the Conservation of Monuments»). Some more attention to «AR» as a special-historical journal was given by A. Tocek in his research devoted to Lviv scientific historical editions of the end of the XIX – beginning of the XX century. He presented an original historical reference of the journal's activity, having in brief concentrated on the illumination of features of its form and content (Toczek, 2005: 190–191). In the context of the formation of archeology as a sciences in Lviv H. Bulyk raised the issue of «AR», concentrating on questions of partiality of the «RAS» management in carrying out of the edition (Bulyk, 2008: 209–237). Also, R. Masyk investigated the question of functioning of the journal in the context of history of the Archaeological society's activity. In particular, he accentuated on the demonstration of evolution of thematic interests of contributors to the edition, which he saw as due to the subordination of Lviv organisation of archeologists in 1882 to zealous tsarist service and corresponding changes in its tasks (Masyk, 2008: 157–170).

At various times the history of the regional archeology in view with the question of activity of one oldest Polish archaeological societies in Galician land and its publishing body was studied by B. Janusz, Y. Kostrzewski, A. Nadolski, A. Abramowicz, A. Feloniuk, I. Chornovol (Janusz, 1919: 20–22; Kostrzewski, 1949: 20; Nadolski, 1966: 170; Abramowicz, 1967: 153–154; Feloniuk, 2003: 16; Chornovol, 2005: 212–230). Nevertheless all these operating time had fragmentary character and do not give complete representation about «PA».

The article's purpose. This article treats of the questions of creation and initial activity of a special-historical journal «AR» as a platforms for discussion of questions of Ukrainian sacral art. In particular, the historiographic analysis of the content of the journal's publications concerning Ukrainian matters is carried out, the evolution of the edition's structure is investigated, and its editorial board's activity is clarified. Besides, among other adjacent questions, one of the most interesting one is that which concerns the functioning of journal «AR» at the background of that time historical science in general and within the context of formation of a Lviv historiographic branch in particular. After all, as the views of contemporary researchers prove, in questions of development of archaeological studies Lviv went abreast with the spirit and style of the epoch, as other big cities of Europe (Sytnyk, 2012: 14).

The presentation of the basic ideas. The appearance of an archaeological society in East Galicia by the end of 1875 seems to be but a natural result of the increase of interest to prehistory, in which the contemporary European nations sought their ethnic roots. As a matter of fact, the situation on the territory under consideration had its specificity connected with the stratification of interests of the two peoples, Poles and Ukrainians, equally persistent in pretending to these lands (Sytnyk, 2012: 14). However, in the time of which the given article is about, it was yet the search for old artifacts for the sake of preservation and knowledge, and not opposition, that was the basic research directive.

S. Krzyżanivskyi (1841 – 1881), Krakow historian, archeologist, and heraldry expert, renowned admirer of fine art and old artifacts, became the ideological inspirer and creator of Lviv organisation of archeologists (The Chronicle of Regional Archeological Society / Kronika Towarzystwa archeologicznego krajowego, 1876: 29). Ye. Yanota, Professor of Lviv university, and K. Vidman became respectively the vice-president and the secretary of the Society, whereas J. Kolachkovsky became the deputy secretary.

The territorial specificity of the Society turned out to result in the fact, that – as N. Bulyk underlines – its structure by membership and language was Polish, but – as it existed within the environment of Lviv and East Galicia, it concentrated round itself Ukrainian researchers (Bulyk, 2008: 210). Thus, in the first list of the Society members one comes across the surname I. Sharanevych (CSHAU in Lviv. F. 192. Op. 1. Case 1. P. 4, 9–16). Later on A. Petrushevych joined in the active work in the Society and chronicle. To such – obviously – intended «super-national» orientation of the organisation S. Krzyżanivskyi's following words can readily testify: «... In our Society it is necessary to call scientists of all nationalities and tribes, and first of all – the cognate with us slavic tribes-brethren, to the common work on prehistoric archeology!» (Krzyżanivskyi, 1876: 5). It should be notified, that this appeal was displayed also in the organisation's symbolics, which by common election was represented by the Zbruch river idol. A roundish sign was framed by the full name of Towarzystwo Archeologiczne Krajowe (Regional Archeological Society), and in its middle the figure of a pagan deity of Sviatovyd was surrounded by the inscriptions of his name in the Polish and Ukrainian languages and the runic signs. This symbol decorated the titles of all journal «AR's» issues.

The purpose of the newly created Society was formulated in § 2 of its Statute as follows: «the protection of ancient finds, which is carried out by means of gathering, description (or photographing), and studying of various movable and immovable monuments concerning the past of Galicia and the Grand Princedom of Krakow» (CSHAU in Lviv. F. 192. Op. 1. Case 6. P. 17–22). Besides, the Society had to undertake the popularization of archeology by organizing of public discussions of its questions and publishing, – according to § 45 of its Statute, – of journal «Archeological Review» (CSHAU in Lviv. F. 192. Op. 1. Case 6. P. 17–22). The image of the aforementioned idol from the Zbruch river became a symbol of the newly formed organisation. The symbol's sketch had been discussed over and accepted at the organising committee session on 12 January, 1876, and in due later time it was confirmed at the General meeting ((The Chronicle of Regional Archeological Society / Kronika Towarzystwa archeologicznego krajowego, 1876: 30).

The special-historical journal «AR» was published from 1876 to 1890 with different periodicity and, even, long pauses. Actually, at present its precise number of edited issues is not known. In Lviv 8 separate writing-books have survived: three writing-books of the annual edition printed in 1876, the fourth that was published in 1877, and also three writing-books

of 1882 – 1883 and one of 1888 which in 1890 was reedited. A more captious study of the content of this journal's issues allowed the researchers to assert that the editions of 1876 – 1877, 1882 – 1883 and 1888 differed by their content filling.

The previous plan of the edition implied a quarterly edition of issues, but already the first yearly edition had a serious pause connected with the technical moment – the work on its edition in the summer simply stood still because of its creators participation in archeological excavations. Already after the publication of the first issue the editorial board made a statement about the impossibility of regular editing.

The «AR's» first editor-in-chief was Antony Schneider, Lviv amateur historian, specialist in the local lore, archeologist, ethnographer, member of the administrative board of the Society, and its librarian. The structure of the first issue of the journal met the typical requirements imposed on the scientific-historical editions of that time. The first issue of the journal, one hundred pages thick, was divided into four headings: articles, review of the scientific literature in archeology (compiled by J. Kolachkovsky, historian of art, vice-president of the Society who worked as an engineer-railwayman), various scientific information (miscellanea), and the chronicle of the Society's activity (conducted by K. Vidman, one of the founders of Lviv organisation of archeologists and, also, its secretary).

Along with archeology, which dominated on the pages of the journal, theme on journal pages, the other subjects also found place here, like genealogy reserches, cause and effect publications, particularly, in the field of diplomatics and study of art reviews. To tell the truth, these latter appeared in the the second period of the journal's existence when V. Dzieduszycki became the head of the Society. It was with his name that the appearance on the pages of «AR» of sensational and ambiguously apprehended in scientific circles reearches on Ukrainian art was connected (Rudenko, 2004: 165–172).

V. Dzieduszycki's article about the St Bartholomew Roman-Catholic cathedral and St George's church in Drohobych, which – according to the author – was one of the small towns of the Red Rus' most interesting for the archeologist, became the first publication in 1883 issue. V. Dzieduszycki, enough prophetically as by then, wrote that «Drohobych, that had became known in the beginning of the 1880s thanks to the neighbourhood to Boryslav, a town rich in oil, would shortly becomes one of the most outstanding towns in the region. But it would never becomes a typical modern faceless industrial town without the past and memoirs which are so many around the world» (Dzieduszycki, 1883: 6–15). In his research Dzieduszycki draw attention to the most ancient architectural complex of Drohobych, namely the cathedral and its defensive tower near it. The time of the construction of the latter author connected with the rule of Volodymyr Osmomysl in Peremyshl Principality. At the same time, he thought that the cathedlal, whose history was very closely intertwined with that of the city, had been constructed later on the place of an old, still pagan, sacred site. It is interesting, that Dzieduszycki's sketch in the journal was illustrated with the samples of drawings of Drohobych cathedral, its detailed plan, and pictures of its interior and reliefs.

As to the wooden St George's Church, Dzieduszycki concentrated on discussing of different hypotheses about its establishment. He did not consider the version, then much spread about, about queen Bona as its probable founder, and was inclined to support the opinion about someone from Jagiello kin still linked to the Ruthenian confession who could be the founder of it. For a plausible version he accepted also the legend that the church was exchanged for salt by the local merchants in the Right bank Ukraine and transported to Droho-

bych. The author also gave the detailed description of this historical-religious monument, in which architecture and design east motives can be traced.

Dzieduszycki's next research was on the Rus' sacral art by which a bright sample – Bohorodchany iconostasis – was sensationally found in 1880, the find not less resonant than the statue of Sviatovydy. According to the researcher, this relic as a whole, was not an isolated separate phenomenon as that time art critics wished to represent, but was a sample and display of an original work of art in the Ruthenian style which had no analogues throughout the Rus' space (Dzieduszycki, 1888: 91–130). In particular, V. Dzieduszycki in this research defended the idea of original Ruthenian art. About it he wrote: «It is not known, whether the Ruthenians had been the creators of the best images here produced, but the name «Ruthenian art» is not too brave at all. In the old Ruthenian voivodeships of Rzeczpospolita an art so original arouse that can have its own name as it is a separate Old Rus' school» (Dzieduszycki, 1888: 91–92). The researcher considered that the representatives of this art adhered to the Eastern Church canons, somewhat changed under the influence of the Western Church. However, the way in which the old masters represented traditional scenes was new: the biblical scenes were interpreted more freely, the represented figures were not static and often arose at a landscape background, and their clothes reflected the epoch of their creator.

According to Dzieduszycki's opinion, the works in which the Byzantian tradition was penetrated by the spirit of the West, appeared during the times of the Vasas, when the Old Rus' art had reached its period of blossoming. However, that blossoming lasted not long and shortly the Rus' art dissolved in the Italian baroque.

The aforementioned Bohorodchany iconostasis was the property of the monastery of the Maniava Hermitage in Pokutia. After its closing during the times of emperor Joseph, some Austrian official sold the iconostasis in Bohorodchany, in a modest wooden church, which was so close that some icons had to be cut off from the complex in order to install it. Among the other losses were some icons, drawn again by the unknown artists, and the compositions and elements damaged in the course of time. Dzieduszycki assumed that the painted images of the iconostasis derived from the XVI century, and the wooden inlaid elements came from the XVIII century. From the point of view of architectonics this iconostasis had something in common with the iconostasis of St Nicolas' Church in Buchach. As well as there, all the figures depicted in this iconostasis prayed in an eastern manners, but the Virgin and some angels had the hands folded up in a western manners. In fact, in this fragment the researcher saw the Bohorodchany master an average intermediary between the West and the East.

In the same issue of the journal a detailed report on an archaeological exhibition in Lviv was published in 1885, which accompanied such a special event as the first congress of Polish archeologists (A Report on the archeological exhibition / Sprawozdanie o wystawie archeologicznej, 1888: 207–218). The author of the report accented on the value of scientific congresses on the whole, illustrating the importance of professional meetings of those interested in archeology, and gave the statistical data containing the information about the German society of anthropologists and archeologists in 1884 organized already its fifteenth meeting, and that archeologists of Russia gathered already in the sixth time. At the same time, for Polish researchers that was only the first professional meeting.

The question of the purposes and problems of the particular Lviv congress was brought up. They were formulated in the meeting's program and concerned the actual problem of the region of research, namely, – the absence of arrangements between representatives of different nations living in one territory, necessity of preservation of historical and archaeological

monuments of each culture and of civilisation on the whole. The organizers of the congress considered that the proper attitude to the artefacts of the past, in particular, that had art value, could become extinct lest the level of national interest in and admiration of scientific researches would not be raised.

For the purpose of realisation of that discussion's declaration, the working languages of the meetings should be both Polish and Ukrainian, and the exhibition of monuments and excursions to Bohorodchany for the acquaintance with the famous iconostasis should be carried out by common efforts. B. Dzieduszycki himself showed an example by delivering a speech at the opening of the congress in the Polish and Ukrainian languages, and in a report on church painting in Rus' he characterised it from the point of view of architecture, painting, and carving.

To the most ancient Rus' painting monument the author enlisted frescos in the chapels of Vavel created during times of Kazimir Jagellonchyk. In them the Byzantian tradition was slightly mixed with the motives of West-European Renaissance. And the bloom of the Rus' painting proper, according to B. Dzieduszycki, took place during the time of Sigizmund III. To the most outstanding monuments of those times he enlisted Bohorodchany and Lviv (of St. Prakseda's Church) iconostases. And already after Cossack wars on Ruthenian lands it was baroque style that dominated there, which best was revealed in Buchach and Krasna Pushcha iconostases with their outstanding unbelievable plastic sculptures from wood.

It should be noticed, that not all shared that admiration with which Dzieduszycki represented Ruthenian painting. But the question, raised by him in his researches concerning the novelty and certain sensational nature for those who had never paid attention to the Ukrainian art and had not even suspected of its existence, caused interest.

Somewhat earlier, in 1880, at the first J. Długocz congress of Polish historians in Krakow, M. Sokolovsky, for the purpose of finding out of mobile demarcation lines of eastern and western civilisation, raised a question of Ruthenian art. M. Sokolovsky touched the questions which fell outside of the limits of a highly specialised research and were of debatable character, as the author, contrarily to widespread representations, recognised the possibility of existence of the Ruthenian school of painting and concentrated researchers' attention on the necessity of studying of the Polish influences in the process of its formation. This problem was fed also by other researchers of Galician olden time monuments, both of Polish and Ukrainian sides. And the exhibition of old artifacts became a culmination of these discussions, having sensibly divided the thoughts of disputants.

From the tribune of the first Polish professional historical journal «Kwartalnik Historyczny» («Historical Quarterly»), created in 1887 in Lviv, a sharp enough criticism sounded. Already in the first issue the reader came across a rather long article devoted to this theme. The exhibition of old artifacts, wrote the observer, which had been organised in Lviv together with the congress of archeologists, had gained neither scientific, nor political achievements. Demonstratively enough called Polish-Ukrainian, it should have been a uniform argument or a compliment in honour of a separate Ruthenian civilisation of the land, an attempt of originality on the area of archeology and art (Σ. Wystawa Archeologiczna / An Archeological Show, 1887: 24). The results of the exhibition were so inutile that if it were not for the introductory article by M. Sokolovsky on Ruthenian painting, there would have been no objects for criticism altogether. On the contrary, the small M. Sokolovsky's preface was admitted for a respectable one, written with method, taste, and erudition. However, according to the critic, what M. Sokolovsky accepted for a display of the separate Ruthenian art and its school,

was only a testimony to inter-penetration and interference of eastern and western arts (ibidem, 1887: 25).

In the same issue of the journal of 1887 a large polemic article by W. Lozynsky (Łoziński) was published, concerning the aforementioned Dzieduszycki's work in which the question of an iconostasis from a Basilian monastery in the Maniava Hermitage was considered, which after its liquidation had been transferred to Bohorodchany church and in the end of the XIX century became «the most recent document» in the matter of Ukrainian painting (Sygma (Łoziński W.), 1887: 150).

The basic dispute in that article was pivoting round the question of existence of the Ukrainian school of painting which, according to V. Dzieduszycki, had developed under the influence of the free western civilisation, under the open sky of the European art (Dzieduszycki, 1888: 91–130). In his turn, V. Lozynsky on the basis of own stylistic, compositional and coloristic analysis of the iconostasis' elements and the painting technique assumed, that this monument of sacral art could not be the product of a separate Ukrainian school and called into question the very existence of the latter (Sygma (Łoziński W.), 1887: 149–209).

The conclusions. In the mid 1870s in Lviv at the initiative of S. Krzyżanowski and with an active support of admirers of old artefacts, the first in East Galicia «Towarzystwo Archeologiczne Krajowe» («Regional Archeological Society») was organized, which official speaker was journal «Przegląd Archeologiczny» («Archeological Review»), one of the first special-historical editions of Lviv. From 1876 to 1890 the journal was published with various periodicity caused by many objective reasons, mainly, by the problems of financial character and of content filling. The editors of the journal, which was created with the educational purpose, placed emphasis on informing about the most recent achievements in the field of archeology, at the same time, avoiding no researches in various special-historical fields and history of arts. Trying to stick to the bases of scientific tolerance, the Society's managers and contributors to the journal suggested publications of researches of cultural inheritance without accounting for the national identity of the investigated artefacts. As a result, in «AR» the first, though somewhat amateur in character, researches about the Ukrainian sacral art and architecture as a separate style were published, which stirred up sharp scientific discussions and became a push to activation of researches in this direction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ЦДДА м. Львів – Центральний державний історичний архів України у Львові.

Булик, 2008 – Булик Н. Археологічні осередки Львова (1875 – 1914): Наукові пошуки та польові здобутки // Археологічні дослідження Львівського університету. Вип. 11. Львів, 2008. – С. 209–237.

Булик, 2008 – Булик Н. До питання про формування археологічної науки в Галичині у XIX столітті // Матеріали і дослідження з археології Прикарпаття і Волині. Вип. 9. Львів, 2005. С. 372–385.

Масик, 2008 – Масик Р. Крайове археологічне товариство у Львові (1875 – 1890) // Наукові зошити історичного факультету Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка. Вип. 9–10. Львів, 2008. С. 157–170.

Руденко, 2004 – Руденко О. Естетичні погляди на сакральне мистецтво В. Дідушицького // Вісник Львівського університету. Філософські науки. Вип. 6. Львів, 2004. С. 165–172.

Ситник, 2012 – Ситник О. Археологічна наука у Львові (перша половина XX ст.). Львів – Жешів, 2012. 365 с.

Фелонюк, 2003 – Фелонюк А. Крайове археологічне товариство у Львові // Літопис. № 10. Львів, 2003. С. 16–17.

- Чорновол, 2005 – Чорновол І. Володимир Антонович, граф Войцех Дідушицький і археологічний з'їзд у Львові 1885 р. // *Wielokulturowe środowisko historyczne Lwowa w XIX i XX w.*, t. III. – Rzeszów, 2005. – S. 212–230.
- Abramowicz, 1967 – Abramowicz A. Wiek archeologii. Problemy polskiej archeologii dziewiętnastowiecznej. Warszawa, 1967. 188 s.
- Dzieduszycki, 1883 – Dzieduszycki W. Fara łańciska i cerkiew św. Jura w Drohobyczu // *Przegląd Archeologiczny*. 1883. R. II. Z. 1. S. 6–15.
- Dzieduszycki, 1888 – Dzieduszycki W. Ikonostas Bohorodczański // *Przegląd Archeologiczny*. 1888. R. II. Z. IV. S. 91–130.
- Janusz, 1919 – Janusz B. Kultura przedhistoryczna Podola galicyjskiego. Lwów, 1919. 172 s.
- Jarowiecki, 2008 – Jarowiecki J. Dzieje prasy polskiej we Lwowie do 1945 r. Kraków – Wrocław, 2008. 502 s.
- Kostrzewski, 1949 – Kostrzewski J. Dzieje polskich badań prehistorycznych. Poznań, 1949. 219 s.
- Kronika Towarzystwa Archeologicznego, 1876 – Kronika Towarzystwa Archeologicznego Krajowego we Lwowie // *Przegląd Archeologiczny*. 1876. R. I. Z. 1. S. 29–30.
- Krzyżanowski, 1876 – Krzyżanowski S. Mowa miana dnia 20 lutego 1876 r. na pierwszym posiedzeniu wydziału // *Przegląd Archeologiczny*. 1876. R. I. Z. 1. S. 5.
- Nadolski, 1966 – Nadolski A. Dzieje archeologii polskiej w XIX i XX w. // *Studia i materiały z dziejów nauki polskiej*, 1966. Seria A. Z. 9. S. 161–176.
- Sprawozdanie o wystawie, 1888 – Sprawozdanie o wystawie archeologicznej we Lwowie w roku 1885 // *Przegląd Archeologiczny*. 1888. R. II. Z. IV. S. 207–218.
- Sygm (Łoziński W.), 1887 – Sygm (Łoziński W.) Malarstwo Cerkiewne na Rusi // *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1887. R. I. Z. 1. S. 149–209.
- Toczek, 2005 – Toczek A. Czasopiśmiennictwo historyczne we Lwowie // *Wielokulturowe środowisko historyczne Lwowa w XIX i XX w.*, t. III., red. J. Maternicki, L. Zaskilnjak. Rzeszów, 2005. S. 175–198.
- Σ. Wystawa Archeologiczna, 1887 – Σ. Wystawa Archeologiczna Polsko-Ruska we Lwowie. Tekst objaśniający napisał Ludwik Wierzbicki. O malarstwie Maryan Sokołowski (Выстава археологічна польско-руська. Львів 1885) // *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. 1887. R. I. Z. I. S. 24–31.

REFERENCES

- Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy u Lvovi [Central state historical archive of Ukraine in Lviv. Galician vicegerency].
- Bulyk, 2008 – Bulyk N. Arkheolohichni oseredky Lvova (1875 – 1914): Naukovi poshuky ta polovi zdobutky [Regional archeological society in Lviv (1875 – 1914)] // *Arkheolohichni doslidzhennia Lvivskoho universytetu*. Vyp. 11. Lviv, 2008. Pp. 209–237. [in Ukrainian]
- Bulyk, 2008 – Bulyk N. Do pyttannia pro formuvannia arkheolohichnoi nauky v Halychyni u XIX stolitti [On the formation of archeological science in Galicia in the XIX century] // *Materiały i doslidzhennia z arkheolohii Prykarpattia i Volyni*. Vyp. 9. Lviv, 2005. Pp. 372–385. [in Ukrainian]
- Masyk, 2008 – Masyk R. Kraiove arkheolohichne tovarystvo u Lvovi (1875 – 1890) [Regional Archaeological Society in Lviv (1875 - 1890)] // *Naukovi zoshyty istorychnoho fakultetu Lvivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka*. Vyp. 9–10. Lviv, 2008. Pp. 157–170. [in Ukrainian]
- Rudenko, 2004 – Rudenko O. Estetychni pohliady na sakralne mystetstvo V. Didushytskoho [The aesthetic views of sacred art of V. Didushytski] // *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Filozofski nauky*. Vyp. 6. Lviv, 2004. Pp. 165–172. [in Ukrainian]
- Sytnyk, 2012 – Sytnyk O. Arkheolohichna nauka u Lvovi (persha polovyna XX st.). [Archaeological science in Lviv (first half of XX century)] Lviv – Rzheshiv, 2012. 365 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Feloniuk, 2003 – Feloniuk A. Kraiove arkheolohichne tovarystvo u Lvovi [Regional Archaeological Society in Lviv] // *Litopys*. № 10. Lviv, 2003. Pp. 16–17. [in Ukrainian]
- Chornovol, 2005 – Chornovol I. Volodymyr Antonovych, hraf Voitsekh Didushytskyi i arkheolohichni zїzd u Lvovi 1885 r. [Volodymyr Antonovych, duke Woizech Dzieduszycki and archeological congress in Lviv in 1885] // *Wielokulturowe środowisko historyczne Lwowa w XIX i XX w.*, T. III. Rzeszów, 2005. Pp. 212–230. [in Ukrainian]

- Abramowicz, 1967 – Abramowicz A. Wiek archeologii. Problemy polskiej archeologii dziewiętnastowiecznej [Wiek archeologii. Problemy polskiej archeologii dziewiętnastowiecznej]. Warszawa, 1967. 188 p. [in Polish]
- Dzieduszycki, 1883 – Dzieduszycki W. Fara łacińska i cerkiew św. Jura w Drohobyczu [The Latin church and the church of Saint. Jura in Drohobych] // Przegląd Archeologiczny. 1883. R. II. Z. 1. Pp. 6–15. [in Polish]
- Dzieduszycki, 1888 – Dzieduszycki W. Ikonostas Bohorodczański [Bohorodchany iconostasis] // PA. 1888. R. II. Z. IV. Pp. 91–130. [in Polish]
- Janusz, 1919 – Janusz B. Kultura przedhistoryczna Podola galicyjskiego [The prehistoric culture of Galician]. Lwow, 1919. 172 p. [in Polish]
- Jarowiecki, 2008 – Jarowiecki J. Dzieje prasy polskiej we Lwowie do 1945 r. [The achievements of Polish press in Lviv by 1945] Kraków – Wrocław, 2008. 502 p. [in Polish]
- Kostrzewski, 1949 – Kostrzewski J. Dzieje polskich badań prehistorycznych [The achievements of Polish studies of prehistory]. Poznań, 1949. 219 p. [in Polish]
- Kronika Towarzystwa Archeologicznego, 1876 – Kronika Towarzystwa Archeologicznego Krajowego we Lwowie [The Chronicle of Regional archeological society in Lviv] // Przegląd Archeologiczny. 1876. R. I. Z. 1. Pp. 29–30. [in Polish]
- Krzyżanowski, 1876 – Krzyżanowski S. Mowa miana dnia 20 lutego 1876 r. na pierwszym posiedzeniu wydziału [The Speech delivered on the 20th of February 1876 at the first meeting of the society] // Przegląd Archeologiczny. 1876. R. I. Z. 1. P. 5. [in Polish]
- Nadolski, 1966 – Nadolski A. Dzieje archeologii polskiej w XIX i XX w. [The achievements of Polish archeology in the XIX and XX cc.] // Studia i materiały z dziejów nauki polskiej, 1966. Seria A. Z. 9. Pp. 161–176. [in Polish]
- Sprawozdanie o wystawie, 1888 – Sprawozdanie o wystawie archeologicznej we Lwowie w roku 1885 [Report of an archeological exhibition in Lviv in 1885] // Przegląd Archeologiczny. 1888. R. II. Z. IV. Pp. 207–218. [in Polish]
- Sygma (Łoziński W.), 1887 – Sygma (Łoziński W.) Malarstwo Cerkiewne na Rusi [Church painting in Rus'] // Kwartalnik Historyczny. 1887. R. I. Z. 1. Pp. 149–209. [in Polish]
- Toczek, 2005 – Toczek A. Czasopiśmiennictwo historyczne we Lwowie [Historical chronicles in Lviv] // Wielokulturowe środowisko historyczne Lwowa w XIX i XX w., t. III., red. J. Maternicki, L. Zaskilnajak. Rzeszów, 2005. Pp. 175–198. [in Polish]
- Σ. Wystawa Archeologiczna, 1887 – Σ. Wystawa Archeologiczna Polsko-Ruska we Lwowie [Polish-Ukrainian exhibition in Lviv] // Kwartalnik Historyczny. 1887. R. I. Z. I. Pp. 24–31. [in Polish]
- Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.04.2018 р.*

UDC 94 (477.83) (092):930.25
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131616

Olha VLADYHA,
orcid.org/0000-0001-5444-7164
Ph D hab. (History), Associate Professor of Lviv Professional College
of Computer Technologies and Building
(Ukraine, Lviv) *olhavladyha@gmail.com*

**BY THE ESTUARY OF THE ARCHEOGRAFIC COMMISSION
OF THE NTSH (TARAS SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY):
MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI'S ACTIVITY IN 1894 – 1895**

In the article an analysis of M. Hrushevskiy's archeographic activity in the 1894 – 1895s has been examined. The main directions of the scientist's research (elaboration of Warsaw and Moscow archives), organizational (discussions of source study and archeographic problems at the sessions of the Historic-Philosophical section of the NTSh), and publishing (the publication of the first volume of «The Sources of the History of Ukraine-Rus'») work have been revealed. The conclusion is drawn about the significant influence of that time archeographic activity of the scientist on modernisation of the Ukrainian historical science.

Key words: *M. Hrushevskiy, the Ukrainian historiography, archeography, Archeographic commission of the NTSh, «The Sources of the History of Ukraine-Rus'».*

Ольга ВЛАДИГА,
кандидат історичних наук, викладач історії
Львівського вищого професійного училища
комп'ютерних технологій та будівництва
(Україна, Львів) *olhavladyha@gmail.com*

**БІЛЯ ВИТОКІВ АРХЕОГРАФІЧНОЇ КОМІСІЇ НТШ:
ДІЯЛЬНІСТЬ МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО В 1894 – 1895 рр.**

У статті проаналізовано археографічну діяльність М. Грушевського протягом 1894 – 1895 рр. Виявлено головні напрямки пошукової (опрацювання архівів Варшави та Москви), організаційної (обговорення джерелознавчо-археографічних проблем на засіданнях Історико-філософської секції НТШ) та видавничої (публікація першого тому «Жерел до історії України-Руси») праці вченого. Зроблено висновок про вагомість впливу тогочасної археографічної діяльності вченого на модернізацію української історичної науки.

Ключові слова: *М. Грушевський, українська історіографія, археографія, Археографічна комісія НТШ, «Жерела до історії України-Руси».*

The statement of the problem. As is well-known, Mykhailo Hrushevskiy's archeographic activity in the years in Lviv was concentrated in the Archeographic commission of Taras Shevchenko Scientific Society (further on referred to as AC NTSh). Himself Volodmyr Antonovych' pupil, he had gained much experience when cooperating with the Kiev Archeographic Commission and, then, initiated the creations of such a Commission in Lviv within the frames of the Society's activity. However, before the Commission was formed in the beginning of 1896, the scientist throughout his first one and a half years after he had moved to Lviv, carried out his numerous archeographic plans in other forms. The contemporary historiography can hardly boast of knowing much of that.

The analysis of researches. The problem of M. Hrushevskyi's archeographic activity in TSSS was repeatedly addressed to by the researchers of his life and creativity (Hyrych, 1997; Telvak, Pedych, 2016: 70–76). However, the aforementioned researchers, as well as their predecessors, focus upon his activity as the AC NTSh' chairman in 1896 – 1914. Instead, the archeographic work of the Ukrainian professor in the first years of his staying in Lviv still remains almost unknown. This fact stipulates the topicality of the present research.

The article's purpose is to comprehensively reconstruct M. Hrushevskyi's archeographic activity during 1894 – 1895 on the basis of multifarious sources.

The statement of the basic material. The correspondence of the young professor with Mykola Biliashivskyi and Ivan Nechui-Levytskyi makes up the main source for the presented analysis, as well as the protocols of sessions of the Historic-Philosophical section of the NTSh, of which M. Hrushevskyi was elected director soon after his arrival in Lviv on November 16th, 1894. Actually, since then, at almost every session of the section at the initiatives of the newly elected director the problems source-study and archeographic character were discussed. Already at the aforementioned November session M. Hrushevskyi laid out a detailed enough project of expansion of the NTSh' archeographic line of activity, which fact testifies that the idea of the project had been cherished by him yet in the days of his studies in Kiev. In it, underlying the achievements of the Kiev documentary school, the scientist pronounced on by far insufficient development in detail of the Ukrainian historical science despite its an intensive advance during recent years. Such a condition, he fairly specified, appreciably depended on the lack of a compendium of the published sources. On account of that, M. Hrushevskyi accentuated that the historiographic gains of the predecessors require an attentive critical verification in that it should become a reliable base to proceed from and further to work over the existing eventual lacunas.

As an expert in the matter, M. Hrushevskyi pronounced upon the inexhaustibility of the potential of libraries and archives in what concerned the old period of Ukrainian history and, furthermore, is medieval and early modern periods. In fact, only the most popular themes, to a certain extent were then supplied with the published sources, whereas the majority of events in the Ukrainian past remained practically without any serious source support. M. Hrushevskyi exemplified his statements by such Ukrainian territories as the Belz region and Podilia, and also by the general questions of the class and economic history, formation of local administration, etc. So, the scientist underlined, it was necessary for the NTSh as the chief representative of the Ukrainian science to get down to archeographic work. By setting this task, the researcher repeats that the selection of sources should meet the requirements of «a broad understanding of the word «history» – as concerning monuments annalistic, legal, historical-literary, historical-statistical, ethnographic, of church history, educational, of everyday life, and the like» (Hrushevskyi, 1993: 151).

In M. Hrushevskyi's opinion, small collections of acts and literary monuments could be printed in the «Zapysky NTSh» («The Notes of the NTSh»). However, that obviously could not solve the problem. And the scientist initiated the foundation of a special source publishing house which he suggested to entitle as «Zherela do istorii Ukraïny-Rusi» («The Sources of the History of Ukraine-Rus'»). According to the author of the project, the edition's issues could be published regularly, twice a year, some 25 pages in size each. Appealing to the experience of Kiev Archeographic Commission, M. Hrushevskyi considered that each such issue should consist of an introductory survey up to 5 pages in size), texts of sources, and various indexes. In the content plane these issues should not be confined

only to Galician Rus', but provide yet unpublished sources for all periods and all Ukrainian regions.

The author of the project defined the following three blocks of source monuments: 1) a collection of surveys and inventories of the Ruthenian Voivodeship of the XVI century, which then were located in the Moscow archive of the Ministry of Justice and in Warsaw's Main archive and Archive of the State Chamber; 2) the similar collection for the Belz region from the same archives; 3) the most ancient acts of the Podilia land kept in the archives of Warsaw, Kiev, and Lviv; 4) acts of the Belz region in the archives of the Bernardines in Lviv, and in the archives of Warsaw, Vilnius, and Moscow; 5) the acts concerning Lviv's history of the XV–XVI centuries from the city and regional archives; 6) acts of the Lithuanian and Ruthenian records of civil acts for the history of the Kiev and Bratslav regions, Volhynia, and Left-bank Ukraine of the XV–XVI centuries from the Moscow archive of the Ministry of Justice; 7) acts for the history of Ukraine from the XVII–XVIII centuries from the archives of Moscow, which had to be the continuation of Mykola Kostomarov's archeographic publications; 8) inventories of the XVII–XVIII centuries for the history of peasantry; 9) «The General Investigation of Estates» of 1729–1730; 10) the Rus'-Lithuanian chronicles; 11) monuments of old Ukrainian writings of the XVI–XVII centuries, of both historical and barely literary character; 12) a collection of monuments of old Ukrainian writings, reprinted from inaccessible editions; 13) a collection of sources on the history of the Ukrainian law (Hrushevskyi, 1993: 151–153). That plan, in the scientist's consideration, outlined only the priority source requirements. Its realization was possible without considerable research efforts and financial expenses.

The realisation of such an ambitious project, as its author justly underlined, could not be the affair of separate enthusiasts. In that project M. Hrushevskyi for the first time pronounced for a necessity of establishing of a separate Archeographic Commission within the structure of the NTSh. This commission should dispose of a certain constant budget for the projects, so that the research and editorial work could be planned beforehand. Extremely interesting were the objectives that the scientific set forth for the activity of the Archeographic Commission: «... To join to the work both local and extraneous archeographic forces, to set forth archeographic tasks for elaboration [...], to take care that the works prepared for publication met the requirements concerning their content, scientific character, and language standards, to arrange archeographic excursion in order to find archeographic monuments for the history of Rus' both within and without the land, etc» (Hrushevskyi, 1993: 151–154).

His correspondence of that time testifies to the importance of this project for M. Hrushevskyi, in which the scientist informs his addressees of his archeographic plans and their coordination with the NTSh's chairmen O. Barvinskyi. So, in his letter to M. Biliashivskyi, by then the chief of archives of the former Finance administration of the Kingdom of Poland, he wrote the next: «Our local «scientific society» accepted my suggestion to start editing a collection of acts and monuments on the history of the Rus'» (Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's Correspondence, 2001: 24) The similar information can be found in his letter to I. Nechui-Levytskyi: «In the Shevchenko Society I put forward a suggestion to begin publishing the sources, which was gladly accepted» (Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's Correspondence, 1997: 45).

M. Hrushevskyi's project was optimistically apprehended by the Society's management and, as is obvious from the aforementioned letters, was confirmed in the autumn of 1894. To it the report of the chairman of the NTSh Olexandr Barvinskyi at a general meeting on January 21st, 1895 also testifies. Mentioning new projects which the Society started to realise,

O. Barvynskyi noticed that «the success in the consent among the sections decided that this year «Historical sources» should be edited, which program was developed by prof. M. Hrushevskyi» (*Z tovarystva / From the society*, 1895a: 2).

Thus, as is evident already from the short messages on the activity of the NTSh. M. Hrushevskyi energetically, as was inherent to him, took to the realisation of the project, which he had suggested. Soon the scientist addressed to the aforementioned M. Biliashivskyi with a request to inform him whether or not in the Archive of the Royal Treasury a survey of the Ruthenian Voivodeship of the XVI century is present. His consultations with M. Biliashivskyi and his own archeographic experience pushed M. Hrushevskyi to embark on archeographic travels to Moscow and Warsaw. So, in the second half of March, 1895, the scientist worked over the funds of a Moscow archive of the Ministry of Justice, the Moscow Main archive of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and the Manuscript Department of Rumiantsev museum. In May of the same year he spent short-term archival searches in Warsaw. About these circumstances of his archeographic travels one can learn from the scientist's letters to M. Biliashivskyi (*Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's Correspondence*, 2001: 23–37). The results of his searches M. Hrushevskyi reported at session of Historical-Philosophical sections on June 12th, 1895. Especially in detail he dwelled on his finds in Moscow Archive of internal affairs and Warsaw Archive of the Royal Treasury (*From the society*, 1895b: 1). The scientist contributed the substantial information on these finds into the «Zapysky NTSh» (*Hrushevskyi*, 1895a: 1).

The trips to Moscow and Warsaw allowed M. Hrushevskyi to restore to old and to impose new links in the milieu of archivists. Using these contacts, the scientist accomplished the copying of the manuscripts which he thought necessary, as well as their further publication in the NTSh' editions. For example, from one of the researcher's letter to M. Biliashivskyi it becomes evident that it was due to one of M. Hrushevskyi's Warsaw colleague the Ukrainian scientist found a professional copyist who made diligent copies of the manuscripts which he needed. Also, through M. Biliashivskyi, the Lviv professor asked to verify the indistinctly copied fragments of sources and their comparison with the originals (*Mykhailo Hrushevskyi's Correspondence*, 2001: 23–37).

A sufficiently great attention to archeographic problematics was paid by the scientist at the sessions of the the Historic-Philosophical section of the NTSh. For instance, protocol of 16 November 1894 testifies to the fact, that the newly elected chairman of the section presented for discussion the essay «The newly edited monuments of old Rus' writings of the XII XIII centuries», in which he dwelt on the analysis of «The legend of the death of the Rus' land» and «Metropolitan Klym's message» (CSHAU ([the] Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine). Fund (further on F.) 309. Description (D.) 1. Case (C.) 42. Sheet (Sh.) 141). At a February meeting in 1895 M. Hrushevskyi criticized V. Kotsovskyi's work «The historical-literary notes on the «Tale of Ihor's Campaign» (CSHAU in Lviv. F. 309. D.1. C. 42. Sh. 9). The protocol of 19 March 1895 notifies that the director of the section informed on the valuable manuscript, found in the Ossolinski library in Lviv under the name «Metrica samboriensis» (The Sambir record of civil acts). The scientist noticed that the found manuscript was a Sambir Roman Catholic record of civil acts of the XVI century that gives a lot of interesting material concerning Catholicism and Orthodoxy relations (*From the society*, 1895a: 5).

At sessions the director of the Historic-Philosophical section of the NTSh also put forward essentially source study themes for discussion. So, the protocol of a session on October 24th, 1895 informs, that M. Hrushevskyi read aloud an abstract on the most ancient Lithuanian-

Ruthenian chronicle (From the society, 1896: 1). To source study the scientist dedicated his report at the December session of the section where he presented for his colleagues' discretion his considerations concerning the text of the «Galician-Volhynian chronicle» (From the society, 1896: 1–2). This abstract later was published on the pages of the central edition of the Society. In it the scientist explained and specified a chain of fragments, which, to his mind, were not properly reflected in the edition of the chronicle (Hrushevskiy, 1895c: 1). Also, M. Hrushevskiy's small panegyric in honour of Vytovt, the grand prince of Lithuanian, mentioned in the Belorussia-Lithuanian chronicles, was purely of source study character (Hrushevskiy, 1895d).

His work on collecting of documents for the first volume of «The Sources of the History of Ukraine-Rus'» forced M. Hrushevskiy to restructure some theoretical problems of editorial archeography. So, in his letter to M. Biliashivskiy the scientist remarked: «I stick to the method of being precise in publishing the Polish acts in the original. In my opinion, to correct on modernize orthography is not good, because to such corrections, once you have stepped on this path, it is never possible to apply strong criteria» [M. Hrushevskiy's accentuation. – O. V.] (Mykhailo Hrushevskiy's Correspondence, 2001: 33). In his letters to Ivan Franko, discussing Franko's plans about editing apocryphal stories, Hrushevskiy noted this: «In our most recent conversation I forgot to agree with you upon the method of editing of apocryphal texts. Here I am of this opinion: either shortenings and titlos are to be left untouched, or all their open forms should be placed in brackets...» (Mykhailo Hrushevskiy's Correspondence, 1997: 78).

In accordance with these theoretical instructions, M. Hrushevskiy prepared for publication the first volume of «The Sources of the History of Ukraine-Rus'». In the introduction to that edition the scientist noted a constantly increasing actuality of archeographic studios in the context of modernisation of theoretical-methodological bases of European historiography in second half of the XIX century, which was connected with the reorientation of the subject of historical science from political-dynastic problems to a wide range of social, economic, and culturological problems. M. Hrushevskiy considered such a positioning of the problems particularly important for the Ukrainian humanitarian studies (Hrushevskiy, 2003: 38). With this consideration in view and referring to his project, M. Hrushevskiy announced that the NTSh decided to publish archeographic materials on Ukrainian history in two source series. The first was «The Sources of the History of Ukraine-Rus'», which would contain mainly act material. The second was «Monuments of the Ukrainian alias Ruthenian language and literature», appointed for literary works.

M. Hrushevskiy separately dwelled on an explanation of the selected by him archeographic approaches to the edition of sources which qualitatively differed from the ones used by such a authoritative archeographic establishment as the Kiev Provisional Commission for consideration of ancient acts, which pupil, to an extent, the Lviv professor could be certainly considered. He suggested to publish documents completely, taking in sources of one version, irrespective of their fund belonging. In the preface the fundamental bases of rendering of the sores text was explained. The main of them it is better to present by the words of the historian himself: «to print a letter after a letter, changing nothing, even incomprehensibilities, without any corrections» (Hrushevskiy, 2003: 43). The first issue of «The Sources of the History of Ukraine-Rus'» contained surveys of Ruthenian Voivodeship of 1565 – 1566. M. Hrushevskiy was convinced that they contained extremely informative material concerning social and economic development of the Ukrainian territories.

The archeographic level of Hrushevskiy's work as reflected in the first issue of «The Sources» found a favourable enough reception in the scientific criticism milieu

(Telvak, 2008: 47–48, 52–53). Not only Ukrainian, but also Polish and Russian observers distinguished a progressive archeographic technique of the publisher who defended an exact rendering of the contents of the originals. For example, M. Dovnar-Zapolskyi specified: «From the point of view of the choice of material, one can be fully satisfied: the book includes a whole series of documents which are of utmost importance for the history of Galicia's economic life in the XVI century» (Dovnar-Zapolskyi, 1895: 146). Of particular interest were the prefaces which generalised the contributed source materials. In scientific literature their independent scientific value constantly grew, their «diligence» and «exhaustiveness» of elaboration of sources were marked out (Shcherbyna, 1896).

In his first years in Lviv M. Hrushevskyi also debuted as an archeographer of the history of Ukrainian Cossacks. On the pages of «Zapysky NTSh» he published his article «The Kiev Castellan and the Cossacks», in which he included a decree of the Seym court of 1570 on the case of the Kiev castellan Pavlo Sapieha and the Armenian merchants, that had been found out in the funds of the Moscow Archive of the Ministry of Justice (Hrushevskyi, 1895e). Another his publication of that time the researcher was dedicated the Cossacks topic, treating the activity of the known organizer of the register Cossacks Jan Oryshevskyi (Hrushevskyi, 1895f).

During his first two years of stay in Lviv M. Hrushevskyi, along with «The Sources of the History of Ukraine-Rus'», realised one more solid archeographic project which had special didactic purposes. Reading a course of the ancient history of Ukraine at Lviv university, the scientist justly considered it necessary to give into the hands of his students the base sources collected in one book. With that end in view, in 1895, on the pages of Lviv biweekly «Teacher», he published his work under the title «Excerpts from the sources on the history of Rus'». Later, this work was edited as a separate book. Explaining to readers the necessity of a complex edition of basic sources on the beginnings of Ukrainian history, M. Hrushevskyi in his introduction remarked: «I have proceeded from the conviction, that only direct acquaintance with sources on which basis the conclusions of the historical literature could be drawn, gives the clear and strong knowledge, relieves from inevitable dependence on subjectivity of this or that historical work, and gives a chance to be guided in science irrespective of differences and changes of standpoints which take place in historiography» (Hrushevskyi, 2004: 3).

The scientist explained the necessity of such an edition also by the fact that a long time Ukrainian historiography was not recognized as an independent scientific discipline, after all, there were no such source collections which would elucidate the past of the Ukrainian people as a certain complete community. The presented sources in the editions, first of all – Russian and Polish, only partly could solve this problem, because they had mainly concentrated on the past of their own ethnoses and quite often incorporated Ukrainian past into their narrations (Hrushevskyi, 2004: 3). The Lviv professor considered the target audience of his collection to be not only studying youth, but also «all who inclines to a deeper and more independent study of the history of Rus' [-Ukraine]». Accounting for the unpreparedness of the readers' audience, the researcher took to branchy comments to the presented sources which was done with the purpose to lead the reader into the context of the source text origin and its information loading.

The conclusions. Thus, already in the first years of his stay in Lviv M. Hrushevskyi had already wide archeographic interests and developed the main bases of archeographic work. The Lviv professor as a successor of the traditions of Kiev Archeographic Commissions and the pupil of V. Antonovych' source study school, wonderfully understood requirements of the

development of documentary bases of Ukrainian historical science and had necessary professional knowledge for the realisation of creative plans. Taking advantages of the constitutional advantage of Austro-Hungary, which allowed free development of Ukrainian science in the native language, the scientist, immediately after arriving in Lviv, at once suggested the plan of a large-scale archeographic searches, that aimed to result in a collection of documentary material on the key periods of Ukrainian history. Among the far-reaching consequences of that his activity was a plan of the necessary compendium of source for the reconstruction of a complete picture of the Ukrainian past and the overcoming of a chronic retardation of the domestic development of the humanities. Having headed the Historic-Philosophical section of the NTSh and – in due course – also the whole Society, the scientist, with miraculous energy, under conditions of severe shortage of necessary means, undertook the realisation of his ambitious plan, inspiring his Galician colleagues with his own industriousness. Already the first results of that work proved the correctness of his views at the prime importance of source study and anticipated the successes of archeographic activities of the Society in the end of the XIX – beginning of the XX centuries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Гирич, 1997 – Гирич І. Б. Організація М. С. Грушевським археографічної роботи у львівський період життя й діяльності (1894 – 1914 рр.) // Український історичний журнал. 1997. № 1. С. 72–86.
- Грушевський, 1895a – Грушевський М. Архив скарбу коронного в Варшаві. Замітка археографічна // Записки НТШ. Львів, 1895. Т. VI. С. 1–4.
- Грушевський, 1895b – Грушевський М. Опись подільських замків 1491 р. // Записки НТШ. Львів, 1895. Т. VII. С. 1–18.
- Грушевський, 1895c – Грушевський М. Примітки до тексту Галицько-волинської літописи // Записки НТШ. Львів, 1895. Т. VIII. С. 1–5.
- Грушевський, 1895d – Грушевський М. Похвала в. кн. Витовту. Кілька уваг про склад Найдавнішої русько-литовської літописі // Записки НТШ. Львів, 1895. Т. VIII. С. 1–16.
- Грушевський, 1895e – Грушевський М. Київський каштелян і козаки // Записки НТШ. Львів, 1895. Т. VI. С. 7–9.
- Грушевський, 1895f – Грушевський М. Надання Оришевському Копистерна та Гайсина // Записки НТШ. Львів, 1895. Т. VIII. С. 5–8.
- Грушевський, 1993 – Грушевський М. Про видане джерел до історії українсько-руської. Записка до хв.. виділу Наукового Товариства ім. Шевченка // Едиційна археографія в Україні у XIX – XX ст. Плани, проекти, програми видань. Випуск 1. К., 1993. С. 151–154.
- Грушевський, 2003 – Грушевський М. Передмова до тому 1-го «Жерел до історії України-Руси» // Грушевський М. С. Твори: У 50 т. Львів: Світ, 2003. Т. 5: Серія «Історичні студії та розвідки (1888 – 1896)». С. 38–43.
- Грушевський, 2004 – Грушевський М. Віймки з жерел до історії України-Руси до половини XI віку // Грушевський М. С. Твори: У 50 т. Львів: Світ, 2004. Т. 6: Серія «Історичні студії та розвідки (1895 – 1900)». С. 3–143.
- Довнар-Запольский, 1895 – Довнар-Запольский М. К истории экономического быта Галиции в XVI веке (Жерела до історії України-Руси. Під ред. М. Грушевського. Т. 1) // Журнал Министерства народного просвещения. Седьмое десятилетие. Часть СССХV. 1895. Январь. С. 146–156.
- З товариства, 1895a – З товариства // Записки НТШ. Львів, 1895. Т. VI. С. 1–5.
- З товариства, 1895b – З товариства // Записки НТШ. Львів, 1895. Т. VII. С. 1–2.
- З товариства, 1896 – З товариства // Записки НТШ. Львів, 1896. Т. IX. С. 1–2.
- Листування Михайла Грушевського, 1997 – Листування Михайла Грушевського. Т. I. Київ – Нью-Йорк – Париж – Львів – Торонто, 1997. 398 с.
- Листування Михайла Грушевського, 2001 – Листування Михайла Грушевського. Т. II. К.; Нью-Йорк, Париж, Львів, Торонто, 2001. 412 с.

Тельвак, 2008 – Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття). Київ–Дрогобич, 2008. 494 с.

Тельвак, Педич, 2016 – Тельвак В., Педич В. Львівська історична школа Михайла Грушевського. Львів, 2016. 440 с.

ЦДІАУЛ – Центральний державний історичний архів України у м. Львів.

Щербина, 1896 – Щербина В.: Жерела до історії України-Руси. Під ред. М. Грушевського. Т. 1 // Киевская Старина. 1896. Т. XLIV. С. 37–41.

REFERENCES

Hyrych, 1997 – Hyrych I. B. Orhanizatsiia M.S.Hrushevskym arkhivom arkhivnoho roboty u Lvivskiy period zhyttia y diialnosti (1894-1914 rr.) [The organization of archeographic activity in Lviv by Mykhailo Hrushevskiy in his Lviv period of life and work (1894 1914)] // Ukraine historical magazine. 1997. № 1. Pp. 72–86. [in Ukrainian]

Hrushevskiy, 1895a – Hrushevskiy M. Arkhiv skarbu koronnoho v Varshavi. – Zamitka arkhivno-arhivna [The Archive of the Royal Treasury in Warsaw. – An archeographic report] // Zapysky NTSh. Lviv, 1895. V. VI. Pp. 1–4. [in Ukrainian]

Hrushevskiy, 1895b – Hrushevskiy M. Opy podilskykh zamkiv 1491 r. [Description of Podilia castles in 1491] // Zapysky NTSh. Lviv, 1895. V. VII. Pp. 1–18. [in Ukrainian]

Hrushevskiy, 1895c – Hrushevskiy M. Prymitky do tekstu Halytsko-volynskoi litopysy [Notes to the text of the Galician-Volhynian chronicle] // Zapysky NTSh. Lviv, 1895. V. VIII. Pp. 1–5. [in Ukrainian]

Hrushevskiy, 1895d – Hrushevskiy M. Pokhvala v. kn. Vytovtu. Kilka uvah pro sklad Naidavnishoi rusko-lytovskoi litopysi [A Praise to Vytovt. Some remarks on the structure of the oldest Rus'-Lithuanian chronicle] // Zapysky NTSh. Lviv, 1895. V. VIII. Pp. 1–16. [in Ukrainian]

Hrushevskiy, 1895e – Hrushevskiy M. Kyivskiy kashtelian i kozaky [The Kiev Castellan and the Cossacks] // Zapysky NTSh. Lviv, 1895. V. VI. Pp. 7–9. [in Ukrainian] [in Ukrainian]

Hrushevskiy, 1895f – Hrushevskiy M. Nadannia Oryshevskomu Kopysterna ta Haisyna [Granting Kopystern and Haisyn to Oryshevskiy] // Zapysky NTSh. Lviv, 1895. V. VIII. Pp. 5–8. [in Ukrainian]

Hrushevskiy, 1993 – Hrushevskiy M. Pro vydanie dzherel do istoriy ukrainsko-ruskoj. Zapyska do khv. vydilu Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka [On the edition of the Sources of the history of Ukraine-Rus'/ A note to an organizational department of the NTSh] // Edytsiina arkhivofrafiia v Ukraini u XIX-XX st. Plany, proekty, prohramy vydan [Edition archeography in Ukraine in the XIX-XX cc. Plans, projects, publication programs]. Issue 1. K., 1993. Pp. 151–154. [in Ukrainian]

Hrushevskiy, 2003 – Hrushevskiy M. Peredmova do tomu 1-ho «Zherel do istorii Ukrainy-Rusy» [Preface to Vol. I of the sources of the history of Ukraine-Rus'] // Hrushevskiy M. S. Works: In 50 vv. Lviv: Swit, 2003. V. 5. Pp. 38–43. [in Ukrainian]

Hrushevskiy, 2004 – Hrushevskiy M. Vyimky z zherel do istorii Ukrainy-Rusy do polovyny XI viku [Excerpts from the sources of the history of Ukraine-Rus' prior to the mid XI century] // Hrushevskiy M. S. Works: In 50 vv. Lviv: Swit, 2004. V. 6. Pp. 3–143. [in Ukrainian]

Dovnar-Zapolskiy, 1895 – Dovnar-Zapolskiy M. K istorii ekonomicheskoho byta Halytsiy v XVI veke (Zherela do istorii Ukrainy-Rusy. Pid red. M.Hrushevskoho. T.1) [On the history of economic daily life in Galicia in the XVI century (The Sources of the History of Ukraine-Rus'. Editor M. Hrushevskiy. V.1)] // Journal of Ministry of People's Education. The seventh decade. Part CCCXV. 1895. January. P. 146–156. [in Russian]

From the society, 1895a – Z tovarystva [From the society] // Zapysky NTSh. Lviv, 1895. V. VI. P. 1–5. [in Ukrainian]

From the society, 1895b – Z tovarystva [From the society] // Zapysky NTSh. Lviv, 1895. V. VII. P. 1–2. [in Ukrainian]

From the society, 1896 – Z tovarystva [From the society] // Zapysky NTSh. Lviv, 1896. V. IX. P. 1–2. [in Ukrainian]

Correspondence of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy, 1997 – Lystuvannia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Correspondence of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]. V. I. Kiev – New York – Paris– Lviv–Toronto, 1997. 398 p. [in Ukrainian]

Correspondence of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy, 2001 – Lystuvannia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Correspondence of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy]. V. II. Kiev – New York – Paris– Lviv– Toronto, 2001. 412 p. [in Ukrainian]

Telvak, 2008 – Telvak V. Tvorchy spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia) [Creative Heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi in judgements of his contemporaries (end XIX c. – 1930s)]. Kiev-Drohobych, 2008. 494 p. [in Ukrainian]

Telvak, Pedych, 2016 – Telvak V., Pedych V. Lvivska istorychna shkola Mykhaila Hrushevskoho [Lviv historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi]. Lviv, 2016. 440 p. [in Ukrainian]

CDIAUL – Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Lviv.

Shcherbyna, 1896 – Shcherbyna V.: Zherela do istorii Ukrainy-Rusy. Pid red. M. Hrushevskoho. T.1 [The Sources of the History of Ukraine-Rus'. Editor M. Hrushevskyi. V.1] // Kievskaiia Starina. 1896. V. XLIV. Pp. 37–41. [in Russian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 8.04.2018 р.

UDC 94 (477) (092)
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131615

Taras BATIUK,
orcid.org/0000-0003-4159-5226
*Ph D hab. (History), Associate Professor of Ukraine's History Department at
Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
(Ukraine, Drohobych) tbatyuk@gmail.com*

MYRON KORDUBA'S COOPERATION WITH THE NEWSPAPER «DILO»

The article treats the question of Myron Korduba's cooperation with the first Galician Ukrainian daily newspaper «Dilo». The available information, publicistic and critical articles of the scientist on the pages of the newspaper in view has been analyzed. The thematic palette of his publications has been reproduced. The features of the historian's cooperation with «Dilo» throughout the end of the XIX – first decade of the XX centuries and, also, in the interwar period have been marked out. The conclusion about the originality Korduba – the journalist's style has been made, as to him the principles in upholding of his position, tolerance in perception of arguments of the opponent, objectivity by interpretation of important social themes were adherent.

Key words: M. Korduba, «Dilo», journalism, publicism, fiction.

Тарас БАТЮК,
*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України Дрогобицького
державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Україна, Дрогобич) tbatyuk@gmail.com*

СПІВПРАЦЯ МИРОНА КОРДУБИ ІЗ ГАЗЕТОЮ «ДІЛО»

Стаття присвячена проблемі співпраці Мирона Кордуби з першою галицькою українською щоденною газетою «Діло». Проаналізовано інформаційні, публіцистичні та критичні статті вченого на сторінках видання. Відтворено тематичну палітру його публікацій. Відзначено особливості співробітництва історика з «Ділом» протягом кінця XIX – першого десятиліття XX ст., а також у міжвоєнний час. Зроблено висновок про своєрідність стилю Кордуби-журналіста, якому були притаманні принциповість у відстоюванні власної позиції, толерантність у сприйнятті аргументів опонента, об'єктивність при інтерпретації важливих соціальних тем.

Ключові слова: М. Кордуба, «Діло», журналістика, публіцистика, белетристика.

The statement of the problem. In the contemporary renaissance of bio-historiographic researches the Korduba studies is one of the most appreciable thematic plots. Thus, more and more often the question of the necessity of overcoming the historical-centrism in studying of the creative inheritance of the outstanding Ukrainian is raised. It goes about the necessity to draw attention not only to the scientific, but also to journalistic, belles-lettres, collection, and other directions of his creative potential's realisation. The author is of the opinion, that Myron Korduba's scientific creativity was densely connected with his journalistic career. After all, it was not infrequent that the periodical press columns contained popular judgements about the purely scientific problems in which the known historian was interested. At the same time, the demands of the national life, which the national periodical press was then pronouncing, made Korduba adjust his professional talent to the challenges of the day. Hence, the author of the article considers a most important problem of the contemporary Korduba studies to be an all-round elaboration of a journalistic com-

pound of the many-sided activity of that outstanding representative of the Lviv historical school. As the first step of its realisation, the author suggests an attempt a reconstruction of the features of M. Korduba's cooperation with most renowned Ukrainian newspaper «Dilo», in which many outstanding Ukrainian intellectuals of the end of the XIX – first third of the XX century received their journalistic training.

The analysis of the recent researches. The issue of M. Korduba's cooperation with periodicals, along with the aforementioned topicality, has not yet become a subject of at least in any way regular scientific consideration. Actually, by today probably are but two attempts to recreate the journalistic activity of the known Ukrainian study specialist. What is meant is Tet-yana Kul'chytska's attempts to find out the features of his cooperation with the Polish periodical editions (Kul'chytska, 2007: 112–136), as well as this article's author's study about M. Korduba as a contributor to the newspaper «Bukovyna» (Batiuk, 2013: 147–151).

The article's purpose is to recreate M. Korduba's many-sided cooperation with the newspaper «Dilo» throughout the first third of the XX century.

The statement of the basic material. The beginnings of M. Korduba's cooperation with the most popular among Galician Ukrainians daily newspaper «Dilo» date back to the end of the XIX century, when the young historian was a student of the Viennese university and informed the Lviv public about the political and cultural life of the imperial capital. His substantial reports, entitled as «The letters from Vienna», were always printed on the first page of the newspaper, which fact testifies both to the importance of the submitted information and their popularity among readers (Korduba, 1897).

M. Korduba's cooperation with «Dilo» went on after his moving in 1900 to the capital of the Bukovyna land, wherein he received a post o the gymnasium professor. Galician Ukrainians at that time were thirsty for the information on the national life of the brotherly population in other regions of Austro-Hungarian empire, so, in a short period of time the young historian becomes a most active Chernivtsi correspondent of the newspaper «Dilo». Thus, in his articles M. Korduba concentrates on the problems of the national struggle of the radical Ukrainian population with the owners of the land alias Romanians and Germans, remarking that «Bukovyna is but Austria in miniature» (Korduba, 1903a: 1).

However, also the internal life of the Ukrainian community of that land often becomes a point of captious attention of the young scientist. Thanks to the fact that M. Korduba mostly contributed his articles anonymously, he could frankly write about the negative sides of the local life of his compatriots (Korduba, 1903b: 1). Here the publicist's craving not only to diagnose the vices of the contemporary to him social life, but also to suggest his own recipes of public recovering are but evident.

Along with the novelties of the local Bukovynian life, the readers of «Dilo» were interested in M. Korduba's travel impressions from his scientific business trips. So, in 1907, on the instruction of the Archeographic Commission o the NTS, the young scientist throughout several months elaborated Moscow archival collections. Along with purely scientific work, on the instruction of the «Dilo's» editorial board M. Korduba studied the Ukrainian life in the second Russian capital. His observations were generalized in the publicistic sketch «A Letter from Moscow» which was being published throughout several issues of the Lviv newspaper.

First of all, the Chernivtsi historian writes about the difficulties in collecting of the necessary material: «If hitherto I did not write about the Ukrainian community in Moscow, the reason for that was a difficulty with collecting of the necessary data. The number of people, who are interested in the Ukrainian movement, here is very small, and the number of such who could

tell anything about that movement is even still less. Therefore, all the information I had to collect crumb by crumb and then to stick them together to form something like a picture» (Mykhailovych, 1907, 249: 2).

M. Korduba's observant eye noted the difference between Moscow's and Petersburg's Ukrainian communities which consisted in the absence of «the people at positions», because the centre of business life of the empire was in the northern capital. Those not numerous Ukrainians, the observer stated, who after the first news about liberalisation of the national life in 1905 had joined the Shevchenko Society, later in panic renounced any cultural work during the times of the post-revolutionary reactions.

At the same time, the scientist remarked that «a considerable circle» of Ukrainian youth who studied in Moscow educational institutions also felt a necessity in unification in order to satisfy at least the minimum of national needs. But M. Korduba specified, that from the viewpoint of national consciousness the Ukrainian milieu in Moscow was inexpressive enough. So, students-Ukrainians of the Moscow university, according to the Ukrainian observer, «except only their common territorial background, have nothing to do with the Ukrainian culture» (Mykhailovych, 1907, 249: 2). Among all Moscow higher education establishments, as M. Korduba specified, the Ukrainian youth community of the agricultural institute was the most conscious and active.

Its representatives invited M. Korduba to their session with the request to make a report about cultural and scientific life of their Galician brethren. Certainly, the Chernivtsi historian could not reject their request and spent the whole evening in a companionable circle of youth longing for the news from their brethren from abroad. «It was a beautiful evening and the conversation would go on far after the midnight, if it were not for the last train that departed to Moscow at half past 12», – so M. Korduba's shared his recollections with the readers of «Dilo» (Mykhailovych, 1907, 249: 3).

The Moscow fellow countrymen liked their guest from Bukovyna, so his meeting with the youth took place again. This time M. Korduba read the lecture «On the cultural and national development of the Ukrainians in Galicia». The glory of the debut speech of the guest from Ukraine had resulted in the fact that to his second lecture a rather large group of youth (over 60 persons) was attracted, as also of the representatives of the elder generation of Ukrainians among whom M. Korduba noticed Ahathangel Krymskyi. And this time again the lecture ended in an interesting discussion of the national progress of Galician Ukrainians which dragged on into the late evening. «In an elevated and pensive mood the guests returned to Moscow by the last train...», – informed M. Korduba his Lviv readers.

Along with the articles of information character, M. Korduba also acquainted that time Galician readers with the novelties of study of Ukraine literature. Suffice it to mention here his resonant critical estimation of the doctor's work of Ivan Dzhydzhora, his colleague by the Lviv historical school. Unlike many other Ukrainian critics (for example, M. Hrushevskyi and M. Vasylenko) who in general approvingly responded to I. Dzhydzhora's work «The economic policy of the Russian government against Ukraine in 1710 – 1730», M. Korduba submitted the work to a sharp criticism. The Chernivtsi scientist in a mocking manner called the aforementioned work of I. Dzhydzhora such which was fully deprived of scientific value. On the pages of «Dilo» he advised his colleague by the historical school «not to spoil paper with groundless guesses and combinations». Specifying on numerous «significant methodical misses», the reviewer rebuked the young author with a discrepancy between the introduction and the conclusions of his doctor's work. To the critic's mind, the suggested by I. Dzhydzhora hypothesis about a considerable de-

velopment of trade during the times of the Cossack Hetmanate came into a disagreement with the conclusion about the destructive consequences for the Ukrainian lands of a trading regulation during Peter the Great's reforms (Korduba, 1912: 1–3).

It is interesting, that the editorial board of «Dilo» appeared so solidary with their constant author's estimations, that it even refused I. Dzhydzhora in his right to publish a refutable answer. In it the young pupil of M. Hrushevskyi historical school by many examples proved that his senior colleague was extremely partial at criticizing of his doctor's work. The reproaches stated by M. Korduba the young author called «unfair», and the manner in which they had been made he called «inconsiderate». At the end of his respond, with a clear feeling of being offended by his Chernivtsi colleague, I. Dzhydzhora underlined the following: «But all the same, one thing can be expected from M[ister] Korduba: if not a good attitude towards the author so criticized by him, then, in any case, a diligence in the interpretation of the thoughts of the works by other authors with no account for whether they are pleasant for him or not» (Pryshliak, 2004: 542).

In a search for the reasons of such a bitter respond of M. Korduba to the scientific work of his younger colleague and mate by the Lviv scientific milieu, the other of this article shares the view of the contemporary scholar Volodymyr Pryshliak. The Lutsk researcher, pondering on the motivation of M. Korduba's super-critical approach, along with specially professional moments, specifies so: «In that situation, probably, M. Korduba's ambitions «oscillated» and also added to the critique, his elementary envy that, unlike Dzhydzhora, he had not stayed in Lviv, and had to edify pupils in the Chernivtsi gymnasium» (Pryshliak, 2008: 29). The stated observation, to some extent, is confirmed by the reaction to M. Korduba's critical remarks on behalf of the other representatives of the Lviv school. For example, expressing in a letter to I. Dzhydzhora his indignation at the incorrectness of their Chernivtsi colleague, Mykola Zalizniak put to doubt, as he said, the «sewn with too white threads» «suspicious and hardly convincing» criticism of the elder colleague (Pryshliak, 2004: 545).

M. Korduba's cooperation with the newspaper «Dilo» was intensive also in the interwar period. Along with short reports of chronic character, at that time on the pages of the edition he published larger articles concerning various problems. For example, a substantial sketch «The impressions of a trip to Kiev», which served as an original report to the Galician community after his visit to the capital of the Soviet Ukraine in 1928. This visit brought about the occasion to invite the Lviv scientist's teacher and the old friend, Mykhalo Hrushevskyi, the then president of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, to attend a solemn assembly of rendering honours of in commemoration of Volodymyr Antonovych.

With the observant eyes of a skilled journalist M. Korduba at once noticed striking changes in the life of the Dnieper Ukraine. First of all, he could well observe the results of the Ukrainization: the universal use of the Ukrainian language in offices, inscriptions in Ukrainian in Kiev streets, increase of Ukrainian speaking population in the city, and the like. Also, the Galician observer was pleased by many facts displaying the Ukrainization in the field of culture: refined theatrical repertoires, the Ukrainian dubbing-in of foreign films, a great variety of the Ukrainian language printed matter. At the same time, he could not help noticing the impoverishment of the Ukrainian intelligentsia which could not sustain an appropriate standard of life through the modest salary.

But his greatest shock for M. Korduba was total ideologization of all spheres of life of the Soviet society and much stronger intolerance towards dissenters, than it had been during the tsarism time. «And the political relations? – the Galician scientist rhetorically asks. – It may sound paradoxically, as from the point political point of view all there went upside down, one but has to state that in comparison with the pre-war time the political condition of citizens changes least of

all. The same police system of supervision and importunate, exasperating control of private life, the same insolence of office and government and the lack of protection against that insolence, still more sensible than during the previous regime intolerance to any criticism or, at least, to any different thought» (Korduba, 1928: 8).

Also, at that time M. Korduba acquainted the Ukrainian community of the land with his scientific searches. On the pages of «Dilo», as the most popular by then Ukrainian press tribune, he decided to draw public attention to already half-forgotten national anniversary, namely, the centennial anniversary of the birthday of Feofan Lebedyntsev. For the first time M. Korduba accentuated on the necessity of returning the figure of the founder of the «Kievskaiia starina» into the national pantheon on the pages of the newspaper «Dilo» in his study «Contributions to the biography of the forgotten scientist and editor». In that article the researcher made not only his colleagues-historians, but also a wider ranges of Ukrainian intelligentsia to pay attention to the annoying fact of forgetting the pioneer of the Ukrainian humanitarian periodical press; the person, who made public service a matter of all his life (Korduba, 1930: 3).

In the early thirties M. Korduba's cooperation with the newspaper «Dilo» gradually decreases. The appointment of the outstanding study of Ukraine specialist to the historical department of the Warsaw University, where he developed active scientific and pedagogical work that took almost all his free time, was the reason of it. Informing the Ukrainians of the Second Rzeczpospolita of that joyful news, the editorial board of «Dilo» newspaper, at the same time, remarked with grief that its longstanding contributor would be necessitated to considerably limit his cooperation with the Lviv periodical (Ukrainian professors, 1929: 1–2).

The conclusions. So, the analysis of M. Korduba's cooperation with the newspaper «Dilo» allows the author to speak about the outstanding scientist as a talented journalist who with his publicistic pen diagnosed the vices of the contemporary to him society and suggested his own recipes of public recovery. A versatile journalistic repertoire of the renowned representative of the Lviv historical school is too obvious: he arises not only as a journalist-reporter, but also as a talented publicist who skilfully raises important public questions. The multi-topicality of the scientists articles contributed to «Dilo» is impressive. In the focus of attention of Korduba-journalist versatile actual problems of the national existence – political, cultural, and educational, –can be found. The study of the problem topic enabled the author of the given article also to find out many features of M. Korduba's journalistic style. In the author's opinion, inherent to M. Korduba were his adherence to principles in arguing of his own standpoint, tolerance in perception of arguments of his opponent, objectivity at interpretation of important social themes, and – last bit not least – a perpetual work over the improvement of the style of his publicism. Eventually, further special references to M. Korduba's journalistic credo should remain in researchers' view as they will provide opportunities to more fully realize the originality of his creative nature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Батюк, 2013 – Батюк Т. Співпраця Мирона Кордуби з газетою «Буковина» // Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія», 2013. Вип. 20. С. 147–151.
- Кордуба, 1928 – Кордуба М. Вражіння з поїздки до Києва // Діло. – Львів, 1928. Ч. 84. С. 8.
- Кордуба, 1930 – Кордуба М. Причинки до життєпису призабутого ученого і редактора // Діло. 1930. Ч. 9. С. 3.
- Кордуба, 1912 – Кордуба М. З нашої наукової літератури. Іван Джиджора. Економічна політика російського правительства супроти України в 1710 до 1730 рр. Львів 1912. (Відбитка із Записок наук. тов. ім. Шевченка т. ХСVIII, CI, CII, CV) // Діло. 1912. Ч. 230. С. 1–3.
- Кульчицька, 2007 – Кульчицька Т. Мирон Кордуба у польських історичних та суспільно-політичних періодичних виданнях (1895 – 1939) // Записки Львівської наукової бібліотеки ім. В. Стефаника. Львів, 2007. Вип. 15. С. 112–136.

Михайлович, 1907 – Михайлович М. [Кордуба М.]. Лист з Москви // Діло. 1907. Ч. 249. С. 2–3; Ч. 250. С. 2; Ч. 258. С. 2; Ч. 268. С. 2.

Пришляк, 2004 – Пришляк В. Мирон Кордуба та Іван Джиджора: рецензент і автор // До джерел: Збірник наукових праць на пошану О.Купчинського з нагоди його 70-річчя. К.; Львів, 2004. С. 532–554.

Пришляк, 2008 – Пришляк В. Михайло Грушевський та Іван Джиджора: учитель і учень у світлі взаємного листування // Листування Михайла Грушевського. Т. 4: Листування Михайла Грушевського та Івана Джиджори. Київ, Нью-Йорк, Париж, Львів, Торонто: УІТ, ВД «Простір», 2008. – С. 11–47.

Українські професори, 1929 – Українські професори на польських університетах. Дві нові катедри у Варшаві // Діло. 1929. Ч. 53. С. 1–2.

Кордуба, 1897 – [XYZ][Кордуба М.]. Письмо з Ведня // Дело. 1897. Ч. 182. С. 1–2; Ч. 183. С. 1; Ч. 186. С. 1; Ч. 193. С. 1; Ч. 205. С. 1; Ч. 210. С. 1–2.

Кордуба, 1903a – [Кордуба М.]. Політичні відносини на Буковині // Діло. 1903. Ч. 25. С. 1.

Кордуба, 1903b – [Кордуба М.]. Нова політична акція на Буковині // Діло. 1903. Ч. 110. С. 1.

REFERENCES

Batiuk, 2013 – Batiuk T. Spivpratsia Myrona Kordubyzhazetoiu «Bukovyna» [Myron Korduba's cooperation with the newspaper «Bukovyna»] // Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu «Ostrozka akademiia», 2013. Vyp. 20. Pp. 147–151. [in Ukrainian]

Korduba, 1928 – Korduba M. Vrazhinnia z poizdky do Kyieva [The impressions of a trip to Kiev] // Dilo. – Lviv, 1928. Ch. 84. P. 8. [in Ukrainian]

Korduba, 1930 – Korduba M. Prychynky do zhyttiepysu pry zabutoho uchenoho i redaktora [Contributions to the biography of the forgotten scientist and editor] // Dilo. 1930. Ch. 9. P. 3. [in Ukrainian]

Korduba, 1912 – Korduba M. Z nashoi naukovoï literatury. Ivan Dzhydzhora. Ekonomichna polityka rosiiskoho pravytelstva suproty Ukrainy v 1710 do 1730 rr. Lviv 1912. [From our scientific literature. Ivan Dzhydzhora. The economic policy of the Russian government against Ukraine in 1710 – 1730] (Vidbytko iz Zapysok nauk. tov. im. Shevchenka t. XCVIII, CI, CIII, CV) // Dilo. 1912. Ch. 230. Pp. 1–3. [in Ukrainian]

Kulchytska, 2007 – Kulchytska T. Myron Korduba u polskykh istorychnykh ta suspilno-politychnykh periodychnykh vydanniakh (1895 – 1939) [Myron Korduba in the Polish historical and social-political periodicals] // Zapysky Lvivskoi naukovoï biblioteki im. V. Stefanyka. Lviv, 2007. Vyp. 15. Pp. 112–136. [in Ukrainian]

Mykhailovych, 1907 – Mykhailovych M. [Korduba M.]. Lyst z Moskvy [A Letter from Moscow] // Dilo. 1907. Ch. 249. S. 2–3; Ch. 250. S. 2; Ch. 258. S. 2; Ch. 268. S. 2. [in Ukrainian]

Pryshliak, 2004 – Pryshliak V. Myron Korduba ta Ivan Dzhydzhora: retsenzent i avtor [Myron Korduba and Ivan Dzhydzhora: the reviewer and the author] // Do dzherel: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats na poshanu O. Kupchynskoho z nahody yoho 70-richchia. K.; Lviv, 2004. Pp. 532–554. [in Ukrainian]

Pryshliak, 2008 – Pryshliak V. Mykhailo Hrushevskyyi ta Ivan Dzhydzhora: uchytel i uchen u svitli vziaimnoho lystuvannia [Mykhailo Hrushevskyyi and Ivan Dzhydzhora: the teacher and the pupil in the light of their correspondence] // Lystuvannia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho. T. 4: Lystuvannia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho ta Ivana Dzhydzhory. Kyiv, Niu-York, Paryzh, Lviv, Toronto: UIT, VD «Prostir», 2008. Pp. 11–47. [in Ukrainian]

Ukrainski profesory, 1929 – Ukrainski profesory na polskykh universytetakh. Dvi novi katedry u Varshavi [Ukrainian professors in Polish universities. Two new departments in Warsaw] // Dilo. 1929. Ch. 53. Pp. 1–2. [in Ukrainian]

Korduba, 1897 – [XYZ] [Korduba M.]. Pysmo z Vednia [A letter from Vienna] // Delo. 1897. Ch. 182. Pp. 1–2; Ch. 183. P. 1; Ch. 186. P. 1; Ch. 193. P. 1; Ch. 205. P. 1; Ch. 210. Pp. 1–2. [in Ukrainian]

Korduba, 1903a – [Korduba M.]. Politychni vidnosyny na Bukovyni [The political relations in Bukovyna] // Dilo. 1903. Ch. 25. P. 1. [in Ukrainian]

Korduba, 1903b – [Korduba M.]. Nova politychna aktsiia na Bukovyni [A new political action in Bukovyna] // Dilo. 1903. Ch. 110. P. 1. [in Ukrainian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 8.04.2018 р.

UDC 94 (477) (092)
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130671

Vitalii TELVAK,

orcid.org/0000-0002-2445-968X

*Ph D hab. (History), Professor at Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University (Drohobych, Ukraine)
telvak1@yahoo.com*

Viktoria TELVAK,

orcid.org/0000-0003-4671-743X

Ph D hab. (History), Assistant Professor, Department of World History and Special Historical Disciplines, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University (Drohobych, Ukraine) vitaliteltvak@gmail.com

UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE MIRROR OF POLISH JOURNALISM (MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI CONTRA FRANCISHEK RAVITA-GAVRONSKY)

This article is devoted to the analysis of the views of the Polish journalist F. Ravita-Havronsky on Hrushevskyi's socio-political and scientific activity. The peculiarities of the relationship of the Polish journalist with the historical ideology and historiographical practice of the Ukrainian scientist has been reconstructed. The conclusion about the influence of F. Ravita-Havronsky's interpretations among the Polish intelligentsia of the end of XIX th – the first third of the XX th century has been made.

Key words: *F. Ravita-Havronsky, Hrushevskyy studies, journalism, History of Ukraine-Rus.*

Віталій ТЕЛЬВАК,

доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету (Україна, Дрогобич) telvak1@yahoo.com

Вікторія ТЕЛЬВАК,

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету (Україна, Дрогобич) vitaliteltvak@gmail.com

УКРАЇНСЬКА ІСТОРІОГРАФІЯ У ДЗЕРКАЛІ ПОЛЬСЬКОЇ ПУБЛІЦИСТИКИ (МИХАЙЛО ГРУШЕВСЬКИЙ CONTRA ФРАНЦІШЕК РАВІТА-ГАВРОНСЬКИЙ)

Стаття присвячена аналізу поглядів польського публіциста Ф. Равіти-Гавронського на суспільно-політичну та наукову діяльність М. Грушевського. Відтворено особливості ставлення польського публіциста до історичної ідеології та історіографічної практики українського вченого. Зроблено висновок про впливовість інтерпретацій Ф. Равіти-Гавронського в середовищі польської інтелігенції кінця XIX – першої третини XX ст.

Ключові слова: *Ф. Равіта-Гавронський, грушевськiana, публіцистика, «Історія України-Руси».*

The problem statement. The Polish Hrushevskyy studies began at the end of the nineteenth century, when the youngest student of the Kiev documentary school Volodymyr Antonovych at that time published his first scientific research. During the subsequent decades,

until the death of the scientist in 1934, the assessment of the work of M. Hrushevskyyi by Polish colleagues depended both on the intensity of his scientific work and on the general state of interethnic relations in which the author of the «History of Ukraine-Rus» often played a prominent, and sometimes, a determining role. Noting the periods of intensification and weakening of Hrushevskyyi studies reflection in the intellectual culture of our neighbors, we emphasize that the attitude of Polish figures to the leader of Ukrainian historiography was always emotional, including not only understanding of the importance of his contribution to the scientific understanding of historical processes in the East European historiographical space, but also the public resonance and the influence of the proposed hypotheses.

In view of this, in the Polish Hrushevskyyi studies we can distinguish between two connected nuclei – historiographical and journalistic one. The representatives of the first emphasized on the science-education component of the broad-based academic activity of Ukrainian colleagues, arguing with them on numerous professional problems. Representatives of the other, the Polish political writers, accentuated the ideological component of the historical activity of M. Hrushevskyyi and the influence of his historiographical hypotheses on contemporary Ukrainian society. It should be noted that due to the peculiarities of communication with the reader (first and foremost through periodicals and popular science publications), their influence on the broad circles of Polish society was larger, and they themselves shaped the image of M. Hrushevskyyi in the mass consciousness.

One of the most striking Polish publicists and popularizers of historical knowledge in the second half of the nineteenth – first third of the twentieth century was an agronomist Franciszek Ravita-Gavrnskiy (1846 – 1930). Advocating the idea of the expediency of Poland's rebirth within the territorial limits of the First Commonwealth, he certainly encountered representatives of the growing Ukrainian intellectual movement, which emphasized the right of Ukrainians not only for cultural but also for political self-determination within their own ethnic lands. Hence, the historical ideas of the leader of the Ukrainian life, M. Hrushevskyyi, were fully in the focus of the critical attention of the Polish publicist. Despite the fact that the Ukrainian studies works of F. Ravita-Gavrnskiy have been repeatedly analyzed by modern researchers, his Hrushevskyyi studies works did not become the object of an independent analysis. Instead, as it will be demonstrated below, those are the key elements in the controversy with the author of «The History of Ukraine-Rus» which constructed the historical ideology of the part of Polish nation represented by F. Ravita-Gavrnskiy.

Research analysis. Hrushevskyyi studies elements of the historical writing by F. Ravita-Gavrnskiy were investigated in the monographic studios of E. Koko (Koko, 2006) as well as in works of V. Telvak (Тельвак, 2008: 82, 123–125). However, as an independent problem, the Hrushevskyyi studies elements in the works of F. Ravita-Gavrnskiy have not been studied yet. This fact determines the relevance of our research.

The purpose of the article is to clarify the specifics of the Hrushevskyyi studies discourse of F. Ravita-Gavrnskiy.

Presenting main ideas. The first investigations of the Polish historian works concerning the research of his younger Ukrainian colleague date back to the end of the nineteenth century, when M. Hrushevskyyi manifested himself as a supporter of the anti-Norman theory, which in the second half of the nineteenth century was actively developed by Naddniproshchyna intellectuals including his teacher V. Antonovich. Actually, F. Ravita-Gavrnskiy regards M. Hrushevskyyi as a follower and disciple of Kyiv school in his work «Essay on the state-social structure of Russia in the eleventh and twelfth centuries». Noting the Renaissance of the

anti-Norman theory, the Polish researcher on the pages of his book points out that the most persuasive arguments in favor of this theory were provided by V. Antonovych and M. Hrushevskiy. According to the critic, the latter, in his monograph on the Principality of Kyiv at inauguration lecture at the University of Lviv, argued that the Slavic state existed long before the invasion of the Vikings. Those were Vikings that changed the character of state to the military one. This point also became the object of emotional criticism of F. Ravita-Gavronsky, who blamed the Ukrainian colleague for being biased and willing to promote at all costs the thesis of the existence of the Principality of Kyiv before Vikings (Rawita-Gawrocski, 1896: 2–8).

F. Ravita-Gavronsky's critical reaction was not left without the answer of the Lviv professor. The mentioned book was marked on the pages of the department of scientific chronicles «Notes of SSS». Criticizing the Normanist sympathies of the Polish belletrist (as he was called by M. Hrushevskiy), the scholar noted the weakness of the author's professional competence, since in the criticized work there was not even a mentioning of the loud scientific discussions taking place in contemporary science around the problem of the influence of the Norman factor on socio-political processes in Eastern Europe. The reviewer also noted the methodological weakness of the work («methodological oscillation») and numerous factual misunderstandings, which were in abundance. In the end, refusing to admit even the elementary professionalism of the book, M. Hrushevskiy stated that «the work makes an impression of careless and pretentiously made amateurish work, a real» attack «on Rus historiography, which does not bring a special honor to either the author's name or Polish historiography, which somehow very seriously lacks a more solid acquaintance with the history of Rus» (Грушевський, 2004: 523).

Interestingly, the acute tone of M. Hrushevskiy's review was rather painfully perceived by F. Ravita-Gavronsky. In his memoirs, without mentioning the name of a Ukrainian scientist, he justified that scientific critique was too strict and did not understand the author's idea. After all, he wrote a book on socio-political relations in the Old Rus state only as «the introduction to a distant future», that is, the history of the Ukrainian Cossack (Rawita-Gawrocski, 2012: 54).

The intense violent scientific-organizational and socio-political activity deployed by M. Hrushevskiy at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, attracted attention of representatives of various circles of the Polish intelligentsia, who perceived him as a threat to their dominant position in Eastern Galicia. Since then, the acuteness of perception of all aspects of Lviv professor's activity has increased significantly. The author of the «History of Ukraine-Rus» received the greatest critic from Polish publicists. In this case, the most prominent role was played by F. Ravita-Gavronsky. In his reports on the pages of numerous Polish periodicals, he emphasized the danger of deployed by M. Hrushevskiy and his colleagues activity on the suburbs of the lands. The Polish publicist was especially concerned about the events of the Lviv professor in constructing Ukrainian modern historical memory, in which the century of being under Polish rule was interpreted as a precious time lost for the Ukrainian nation to advance. From the pages of his articles, he seemed to be threatened by the «fantastic Ukraine-Rus, fabricated history by Hrushevskiy» (Rawita-Gawrocski, 2012: 96).

In order to systematically contrast the historical ideology of the Ukrainian scientist with his own historiosophical views, F. Ravita-Gavronsky founded the magazine «Рухъ» in 1911, devoted, as noted in the subtitles, to «History and Culture of Ukraine, Podolia, Volhyn and Red Rus». The fact that the critical point of the new journal was directed against the expanding M. Hrushevskiy's modern Ukrainian historical ideology was mentioned by the Polish

writer himself in his memoirs. «The idea of the need to publish such a quarterly [«this» is the magazine «Рух» – aut.] has been designed in my dreams long ago» he points out: «The impetus for this was simply the need to defend our history from slander and falsehood, which was thrown by unbridled Rus historians stamped by Mykhailo Hrushevskiy, a professor at Lviv University» (Rawita-Gawroński, 2012: 130). The content of the five issues of the magazine published in print was aimed at combating the historical visions of the author of «History of Ukraine-Rus» and representatives of his scientific school.

At the beginning of the twentieth century M. Hrushevskiy began a comprehensive study of the history of the Ukrainian Cossacks, which became the favorite area of interests of F. Ravita-Gavronsky. Having devoted a lot of historical and journalistic works to the events of the Ukrainian Cossack Revolution, the Polish researcher, of course, could not stay silent towards the work of the most authoritative specialist. Especially at the Cossack studies of Ukrainian researcher F. Ravita-Gavronsky focused his attention in his extensive article «Professor Hrushevskiy and his «History of Ukraine-Rus». Although in this work the main focus of attention is concentrated on volumes devoted to the Cossack times, the author often refers to other parts of «History...» to confirm his conclusions (Rawita-Gawroński, 1911).

In an ironic tone peculiar of all his journalism, the researcher displays an interpretation of M. Hrushevskiy's ideas of origins and genesis of the Cossacks, as well as its role in the history of the Ukrainian nation. He ultimately admits the diligence and erudition of his Ukrainian colleague. Publicist also writes about a viable factual basis of work and a well-established chronology of events. This peculiar «backbone» of the work of the critic the author offers to leave, and all the rest, that is, the author's interpretation of the events, facts and phenomena of the history of the Cossacks, unequivocally discarded as things tendentious, unscientific, excessively subjective, caused by the «nationalist position of the author».

Disposing the past of the Cossack from the negative side and showing its exclusively devastating influence on the society of the Commonwealth (without distinction of nationality and religion), the reviewer argues that in the work of M. Hrushevskiy «the historical logic is obscured by today's political thought, the desire to turn ordinary robbers into national and ideological heroes of the twentieth century». As a result of such a bias, according to the critic, the history of the Cossack in the work of M. Hrushevskiy appears as «the only excuse to blame Poland»; and «packs of robbers» turn into «noble knights» who saw the purpose of their life in protecting the Ukrainian population. According to F. Ravita-Gavronsky, the reason for such a «distortion» of the historical past is the «pupil's» methodology of the author, consisting, on the one hand, in the bias against the arguments of the opponents, on the other – in the absence of a logical connection between the derivative facts and the proclaimed conclusion, an attempt to falsify the fact-finding under the pre-formulated thesis and the constructed structure. The reviewer was not satisfied by the linguistic side too, the reason: the «young» Ukrainian language, the inexorability of its conceptual apparatus, which made the style of «History» «excessively difficult to read».

F. Ravita-Gavronsky criticized the most the terminology of M. Hrushevskiy: he considers it absolutely unjustified to use the term «Ukraine-Rus». Especially inappropriate it seems in the context of East European history of the early Middle Ages. It is noteworthy that, when explaining the motivation of a Ukrainian scientist in constructing a new historical terminology, F. Ravita-Gavronsky emphasizes on his political «state» bias which led to logical «historical» and «territorial» claims to Russia, Austria-Hungary and Poland. Therefore, the

Polish researcher emphasizes on the artificiality of M. Hrushevskyi's reconstructed Ukrainian historical model in such a far-reaching retrospective and within such a widely-defined ethnographic territory.

The latter thesis F. Ravita-Gavrinsky was actively developed in his numerous journalistic writings, emphasizing the weakness and underdevelopment of the cultural and national life of Ukrainians (he called the latter Rusyns), who are not ready yet for active social and political life, since they do not fully realize their own needs. «Their misfortune is», he pointed out outwardly, «that the Rusyns want more than their mental, cultural and material strengths may cover, that their aspirations never correspond to reality and its boundaries, that the restlessness of their primitive nature – the ethnic character – brings them more harm than anything else taken and described by Hrushevskyi and his followers» (Rawita-Gawrocski, 1912: 575). As a result of this weakness, F. Ravita-Gavrinsky claims, Ukrainians uncritically perceive the political ideas of Ukrainian activists and, above all, of M. Hrushevskyi, «an ardent socialist».

In his writings, the Polish publicist does not spare space for harsh characteristics of the Ukrainian elite, depicting its representatives as immoral and selfish intriguers who are completely indifferent to the fate of their own people. At the same time, the researcher is not limited only by his time, but boldly reaches the depths of centuries. Thus, characterizing the activities of the Ukrainian hetmans after Khmelnytsky, he notes: «We have investigated only half a century, but how much it involves arbitrariness, betrayal, and murders. This was not done for the sake of the goodness of the people, not for the sake of state secrecy, not for the sake of lost rights, but only for the sake disturbances, with a blindness towards any other goal but their own» (Rawita-Gawrocski, 1912: 568). The political traditions of hetmans, as F. Ravita-Gavrinsky states, were continued by Ukrainian activists from the beginning of the twentieth century (Rawita-Gawrocski, 1909: 18, 21). This was especially dangerous on the eve of the inevitable conflict on the European arena, when Ukrainians led by such «adventurist» leaders will surely speak out, as he pointed out, against the hegemony of the Polish in Eastern Galicia. It should be noted that the negative evaluations that F. Ravita-Gavrinsky used to criticize M. Hrushevskyi's ideas were disseminated by Polish scholars to the whole group of Ukrainian intellectuals – in their work he saw a threat to the future of Poland.

The Polish researcher also wrote critical works to the Cossack studies heritage of M. Hrushevskyi. On their pages, which should be emphasized, he always paid tribute to the efforts of his Ukrainian colleague to enrich the Source study of this prominent period of the Ukrainian past. At the same time, F. Ravita-Gavrinsky, for the most part, repeated the above-mentioned criticism concerning «History of Ukraine-Rus» and the personality of its author. For example, in his work at the eve of the First World War, «The Territory, the Population and the Creation of the Cossacks», the publicist once again subjected to a crushing critique of the idealization of national movements by «historians from the school of Antonovich-Hrushevskyi» (Rawita-Gawrocski, 1914: 68).

However, in this case, M. Hrushevskyi did not stay silent, having criticized a collection of sources for the history of the Cossacks, prepared by a Polish researcher on the pages of the Kievan «Ukraine» edited by the historian. First of all, the columnist pointed out the informational value of the reprinted and for the first time introduced to the scientific circulation sources. Alongside this, the critic has demonstrated on numerous examples the Source study and archaeological incompetence of F. Ravita-Gavrinsky, who published his texts in a «sloppy manner», with an enormous amount of errors that significantly distort the actual content of historical documents (Грушевський, 2014).

At the eve of the First World War, the tensions in the Ukrainian and Polish societies increased markedly due to the approaching crisis of a pan-European scale. At this time, F. Ravita-Gavronsky significantly exacerbated his journalistic talent in relation to the Ukrainian problem and personally M. Hrushevskyi, often falling into a frank vulgarity of tone. Thus, in the extensive article «The Rus Question Regarding Austria and Russia», he introduced his opponent to the readers as «the son of a priest from Helm», although he was well acquainted with the biography of the Lviv professor (Rawita-Gawrocski, 1912: 569). This, apparently, was a reflection of Polish gentry towards people from the Orthodox clergy environment.

The First World War convinced F. Ravita-Gavronsky in the rightness of his fears. Brought up on the writings of M. Hrushevskyi, a new generation of Ukrainians with arms in hands took up the implementation of the slogans of state independence. The author of «The History of Ukraine-Rus», as it was once anticipated by his Polish opponent, was at the head of the first Ukrainian government. The sad experience of the Polish-Ukrainian confrontation has further exacerbated the critique of F. Ravita-Gavronsky in relation to Ukrainian political figures and their, as he repeatedly pointed out, precursors of the middle of the XVII century. Thus, in the book «Genesis and the development of the idea of the Cossacks and Cossackhood in the XVI century», the researcher with a new force was criticizing the interpretation of M. Hrushevskyi and his followers of key events in the history of Ukrainian during early modern times. Blaming the author of «The History of Ukraine-Russia» for an idealization and considerable subjectivity in assessments of historical phenomena, the Polish journalist emphasized that «representatives of the Kyiv school» transformed the history of the Cossacks into «the history of national martyrdom» (Rawita-Gawrocski, 1924: 150). At the same time, F. Ravita-Gavronsky continued to pay tribute to the Source study achievements of his Ukrainian colleague at the field of Cossack archaeography.

Alongside with the controversy around the events of the Ukrainian Cossack Revolution, F. Ravita-Gavronsky continued to criticize the underlying elements of M. Hrushevskyi's constructed national historical ideology. Like other Polish publicists, he further argued with the terminology of his Ukrainian counterpart, particularly strongly denouncing the unlawfulness of the use of the «Ukraine» toponym in the context of the Eastern European Middle Ages. In one of his later works, F. Ravita-Gavronsky once again emphasized on the artificiality and inappropriateness of using M. Hrushevskyi's toponym «Ukraine» instead of historically justified and reasoned, in his opinion, «Rus», explaining the historiographical motivation of his Ukrainian colleague exclusively by «chauvinistic persuasions»: «From his [M. Hrushevskyi] side it was», as the Polish scholar remarked, «a kind of licentia poetica against history, truth and logic, which had no support other than political views themselves» (Rawita-Gawrocski, 1922: 15). He once again lists the controversial M. Hrushevskyi's ideas, the most important of which is the vision of popular movements of the XVI – XVIII centuries, as a national liberation factor, and thus, the publicist conducts an emotional polemic with them.

Apart from this, F. Ravita-Gavronsky regards the public-political activity of M. Hrushevskyi as a field for the realization of his historiographical hypotheses. He sees it as an attempt of the researcher to create, with Berlin's support, an artificial (in its expression – «bookish») national community of the Ukrainian population of Russia and Austria-Hungary – the demonstration of an outright hostility towards the idea of restoration of Polish statehood within the ancient Commonwealth, the propaganda of Polish-Ukrainian hatred in Eastern Galicia (Rawita-Gawrocski, 1922: 17–19).

Estimating from the height of past years the diverse activities of M. Hrushevskyi in Lviv, F. Ravita-Gavronsky criticized the consequences quite strictly. Describing the Badeni-

Romanchuk agreement as an unfortunate political combination that did not bring the Polish nation the desired inter-ethnic appeasement in Eastern Galicia, the publicist listed among the other failures the appointment of M. Hrushevskiy at the post of the head of Department of History at Lviv University. By directly demonizing the influences of his long-time antagonist on contemporary Ukrainians, he categorically declared himself: «Peaceful before Galician society [M. Hrushevskiy] plunged into the path of hatred against the Polish people, following an example of Russian historians by fomenting historic agendas and making them a model for the present» (Koko, 2006: 138).

Conclusions. Summing up the Hrushevskiy studies of F. Ravita-Gavrönsky, we shall point out its features, which were typical of all Polish journalism concerning the Ukrainian question. First of all, it is irreconcilable in the perception of the modern Ukrainian historical ideology that was designed by M. Hrushevskiy and his associates through the «cutting off» Polish and Russian distortions of the Ukrainian historical narrative. As a consequence of this process, as it was predicted by the Polish researcher, there was the emergence of a new national outlook, the bearers of which questioned the domination of the Polish nation in the ethnic Ukrainian lands. Honestly seeing M. Hrushevskiy as an ideologue of Ukrainian national life rather than a cabinet scientist, F. Ravita-Gavrönsky regarded through this prism his academic works. However, this level of professionalism of an amateur Ukrainian studies scientist was obviously not enough, and we do not see an argumentative polemic with the historiographical hypotheses of the author of «The History of Ukraine-Rus», but rather an outright profanation. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Polish scientists themselves did not support the controversial zeal of F. Ravita-Gavrönsky, but appreciated much more the creative efforts of his opponent. The journalist himself witnessed the sad consequences of the tactics chosen by him and the majority of the Polish politician regarding the Ukrainian movement, to be more precise, the refusal to establish a dialogue and the lack of desire to understand the another side led to a bloody Polish-Ukrainian war and the further radicalization of interethnic relations in the interwar period. But even this did not push a talented publicist not only to try to reconsider, but at least to correct his attitude towards the nation, which he deliberately denied to call by its own name during his whole life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Грушевський, 2004 – Грушевський М. Нові розвідки з історії давньої Русі // Грушевський М.С. Твори: У 50 т. / Редкол.: П. Сохань, Я. Дашкевич, І. Гирич та ін.; Голов. ред. П. Сохань. Львів: Світ, 2004. Т. 6: Серія «Історичні студії та розвідки (1895 – 1900)». С. 512–533.

Грушевський, 2014 – Грушевський М.: Sprawy i rzeczy ukraińskie. Materiały do dziejów kozaczyzny i hajdamaczyzny, wydał Fr. Rawita-Gawroński. Lwów, 1914, ст. 14 // Україна. 1914. Кн. 3. С. 94–95.

Тельвак, 2008 – Тельвак В. Творча спадщина Михайла Грушевського в оцінках сучасників (кінець XIX – 30-ті роки XX століття). Київ–Дрогобич, 2008. 494 с.

Koko, 2006 – Koko E. Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846 – 1930) wobec Ukrainy i jej przeszłości. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 2006. 274 s.

Rawita-Gawroński, 1924 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Geneza i rozwój idei Kozactwa i Kozaczyzny w XVI wieku. Warszawa–Kraków, 1924. 150 s.

Rawita-Gawroński, 1922 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Kozaczyzna Ukrainna w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej do końca XVIII-go wieku. Zarys polityczno–historyczny. Warszawa–Kraków–Lublin–Łódź–Poznań–Wilno–Zakopane, 1922. 238 s.

Rawita-Gawroński, 1912 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Kwestya ruska wobec Austriy i Rosyi // Świat Słowiński. Kraków, 1912. Rocznik VIII. Sierpień–Wrzesień. S. 557–578.

Rawita-Gawroński, 2012 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Ludzie i czasy mego wieku. Wspomnienia, wypadki, zapiski (1892 – 1914). Gdańsk, 2012. 265 s.

Rawita-Gawroński, 1914 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Obszar, zaludnienie i tworzenie się Kozaczyzny. Kraków, 1914. 70 s.

Rawita-Gawroński, 1909 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Oderwanie Chełmszczyzny i Rusini. Lwów, 1909. 24 s.

Rawita-Gawroński, 1911 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Profesor Hruszewskij i jego Historia Ukrainy-Rusi // Świat Słowiański. Kraków, 1911. Rocznik VII. Maj. S. 337–356.

Rawita-Gawroński, 1896 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Ustrój państwowo-społeczny Rusi w XI i XII w. W zarysie. Lwów, 1896. 222 s.

REFERENCES

Hrushevskiy, 2004 – Hrushevskiy M. Novi rozvidky z istorii davnoi Rusy [New Research on the History of Ancient Rus] // Hrushevskiy M. S. Tvory: U 50 t. Lviv: Svit, 2004. T. 6: Seria «Istorychni studii ta rozvidky (1895 – 1900)» [Hrushevskiy M. S. Works: In 50 Vol. – Lviv: World, 2004. – Vol. 6: Series «Historical Studies and Investigations (1895 – 1900)»]. S. 512–533. [in Ukrainian]

Hrushevskiy, 2014 – Hrushevskiy M.: Sprawy i rzeczy ukraińskie. Materiały do dziejów kozaczyzny i hajdamaczyzny, wydał Fr. Rawita-Gawroński. Lwów, 1914, cr. 14 [Cases and Cossacks' History and Haidamachyna, published by Fr. Rawita-Gawroński. Lwów, 1914, p. 14] // Ukraine. 1914. Book 3. S. 94–95. [in Ukrainian]

Telvak, 2008 – Telvak V. Tvorchyna spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykiv (kinets XIX – 30-ti roky XX stolittia) [The creative heritage of Mykhailo Hrushevsky in the evaluation of contemporaries (the end of the 19th and the 30th years of the twentieth century)]. Kyiv–Drohobych, 2008. 494 s. [in Ukrainian]

Koko, 2006 – Koko E. Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846 – 1930) wobec Ukrainy i jej przeszłości [Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846 – 1930) about Ukraine and its past]. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 2006. 274 s. [in Polish]

Rawita-Gawroński, 1924 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Geneza i rozwój idei Kozactwa i Kozaczyzny w XVI wieku [Genesis and the development of the idea of the Cossacks and the Cossackhood in the XVI century]. Warszawa–Kraków, 1924. 150 s. [in Polish]

Rawita-Gawroński, 1922 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Kozaczyzna Ukrainna w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej do końca XVIII-go wieku. Zarys polityczno–historyczny [Ukrainka Cossack in the Polish Republic to the end of the XVIII-th century., Political-historical essay]. Warszawa–Kraków–Lublin–Łódź–Poznań–Wilno–Zakopane, 1922. 238 s. [in Polish]

Rawita-Gawroński, 1912 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Kwestya ruska wobec Austrii i Rosyi [Rusyn Question and Austria and Russia] // Slavic World. Kraków, 1912. Vol. VIII. Sierpień–Wrzesień. S. 557–578. [in Polish]

Rawita-Gawroński, 2012 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Ludzie i czasy mego wieku. Wspomnienia, wypadki, zapiski (1892 – 1914) [People and times of my age. Memoirs, events, notes (1892-1914)]. Gdańsk, 2012. 265 s. [in Polish]

Rawita-Gawroński, 1914 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Obszar, zaludnienie i tworzenie się Kozaczyzny [Territory, Population and Creation of the Cossackhood]. Kraków, 1914. 70 s. [in Polish]

Rawita-Gawroński, 1909 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Oderwanie Chełmszczyzny i Rusini [Deportation of the Kholmshchyna and Rusyns]. Lwów, 1909. 24 s. [in Polish]

Rawita-Gawroński, 1911 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Profesor Hruszewskij i jego Historia Ukrainy-Rusi [Professor Hrushevskiy and his History of Ukraine-Rus] // Slavic World. Kraków, 1911. Vol. VII. Maj. S. 337–356. [in Polish]

Rawita-Gawroński, 1896 – Rawita-Gawroński Fr. Ustrój państwowo-społeczny Rusi w XI i XII w. W zarysie. [Essay of the state-social system of Russia XI and XII centuries. In outline] Lwów, 1896. 222 s. [in Polish]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.04.2018 р.

UDC 930(092):94(477)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131216

Vitaliy MASNENKO,
*Ph D hab. (History), Professor, Head of Ukraine's History Department of Bohdan
Khmelnitsky National University at Cherkasy (Ukraine, Cherkasy)*
masnenko@ukr.net

YURIY NEMYRYCH AS AN IDEAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SZLACHTA LAYER IN VYACHESLAV LYPYNSKY'S VISION¹

The article reviews a historiographical image of Yuriy Nemyrych, – Ukrainian politician, military chief and diplomat, as reconstructed by Vyacheslav Lypynsky. It is clarified, that the researcher's main attention was drawn to the distinctive features of the aforementioned historical figure as a model representative of the Ukrainian nobility.

Key words: Vyacheslav Lipynsky, Yuri Nemyrych, historiographical image, Ruthenian szlachta, Cossack state, Arianism.

Віталій МАСНЕНКО,
*доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри історії України
Черкаського національного університету імені Богдана Хмельницького
(Україна, Черкаси) masnenko@ukr.net*

ЮРІЙ НЕМИРИЧ ЯК ІДЕАЛЬНИЙ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАНТ ШЛЯХЕТСЬКОГО СТАНУ У ВІЗІІ В'ЯЧЕСЛАВА ЛИПІНСЬКОГО

У статті розглядається історіографічний образ українського політика, воєначальника та дипломата Юрія Немирича, сконструйований В'ячеславом Липинським. З'ясовано, що основна увага дослідника зосереджувалась на визначальних рисах вказаного історичного діяча як взірцевого представника руської шляхти, яка долучилась до українського державотворення XVII ст. Початкова конфесійна належність Немирича до протестантизму (аріанства) розглядається як своєрідний інтелектуальний місток і дисидентський досвід, які приведуть його до козацьчини й активної участі в розбудові української державності. Також особливо наголошується на його європейській орієнтації. Доводиться, що історіографічний образ Немирича, створений Липинським, мав не лише суто наукове значення, а й неодноразово актуалізувався як зразковий соціальний тип для сучасної української політичної ситуації.

Ключові слова: В'ячеслав Липинський, Юрій Немирич, історіографічний образ, руська шляхта, козацька держава, аріанство.

The statement of the problem. Yuriy Stephanovych Nemyrych (1612 – 1659), nobleman, military leader, the outstanding Ukrainian politician, humanist, diplomat, inspirer of the project of the Treaty of Hadiache, and the author of several theological treatises, was one of the characters of the Ukrainian history most estimated by V. Lypynsky. Furthermore, this figure was interpreted by the aforementioned historian as an exemplary image of «the true son of the Ukrainian people», a representative of the local magnate layer whose destiny, however, was tragic.

¹ Publications are based on the research provided by the grant support of the State Fund For Fundamental Research (project № 77/42-2018)

The analysis of the researches. It is surprising, that some authors (e. g., M. Bryck) unjustly reproached Lypynsky for his as if improper illumination of the figure of Yuriy Nemyrych (Bryck, 1974: 13). At the same time, Yu. Tereshchenko – absolutely in his right manner – emphatically underlines the aforementioned researcher's particular attention to the personality of Yuriy Nemyrych, who was a bright representative of a fate-making phenomenon in the Ukrainian history alias the «turn of that time Ukrainian *szlachta* to the Ukrainian state life». Besides, it is possible to agree with Tereshchenko's thought on Lypynsky's view of the activity of Yuriy Nemyrych' «accord with his civic stand and the movement of the Dnieper's right-bank Ukrainian *szlachta* to the national identity, initiated in the middle of the XIX century» (Tereshchenko, 2013: 72–76). I. Hyrych also accentuates the fact of Yuriy Nemyrych becoming a real hero for Lypynsky, after all, «the biography of the latter in the best way confirmed Viacheslav Kazymyrovych's theoretical sociological constructions» (Hyrych, 2012: 201). It is important that the thinker expressively enough felt the parallelism between his own self-presentation and the destiny of his hero. In Nemyrych's vital instruction, his position in religious, political, and state-building questions become patent, and it is possible «to see also paraphrases of idea of the father of national conservatism in territorial patriotism – a basis of the political nation which builds national unity not on blood or belief principles, and on bases of patriotism of the earth» (Hyrych, 2012: 204).

The **article's purpose** consists in the revelation of the specificity of the reflexion of the image of Yuriy Nemyrych as an exemplary representative of the Ruthenian (alias Ukrainian) *szlachta*, who joined in the Ukrainian state building in the XVII century, in Viacheslav Lypynsky's scientific and publicistic inheritance.

The statement of the basic material.

Nemyrych is a representative of the szlachta layer.

The attention to this figure has been caused by several circumstances. First of all, by his aristocratic origin, after all, Lypynsky paid enough attention to those representatives of the aforementioned layer who were active figures in the case of Ukrainian state life. Obviously, all that went about a question of a certain ideal image which would be satisfactorily approached to his own self-identification. Therefore, no wonder that he publicly declared the following: «Never I renounced before and I do not renounce now that I belong to the Polish *szlachta* kin, since the time I have settled in Ukraine. And why should I renounce that at all? To Polish *szlachta* many Ukrainians belonged, for example, Konashevych-Sahaidachny, Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Stanislav Krychevsky, Ivan Bohun, Yuriy Nemyrych, Bohdan Stetkevych, Ivan Vyhovsky, Mazepa-Koliedynsky, Orlyk, Kalnishevsky... From the culture of Polish *szlachta* all the Dnieper's left-bank Ukraine's hetman foremen grew up, of which many were of Polish *szlachta* origin. I thank God that I have in me the blood of those who created the very idea, the very political concepts of our modern Ukraine. Happy I am that I was born from the blood of my ancestors, my instinctive inclination to the Ukrainian case is the struggle for the power over my own land» (Lypynsky, 1995a: XXVIII–XXIX). As can be seen, Nemyrych was seated at the foreground in the original «*szlachta* pantheon» of the Ukrainian case, which had been designed by the thinker. Therefore, it is no wonder that Nemyrych became a hero of its first Lypynsky's historical studies, namely «The General of artillery in the Ruthenian Principedom (from the archive of the Nemyrychi)» and «The Arian Diet in Kyselyna on Volhynia in May 1638 (on the history of Arianism in Ukraine)», published in «Notes of the SSC (Shevchenko Scientific Society)» of 1909 and 1910.

Furthermore, in the collection of «From The history of Ukraine» of 1912 the researcher examines the texts of judicial acts on the raid on Yuriy Nemyrych's estate and the information

about his other activities (*Z dziejow Ukrainy*, 1912). In more details, this case is analysed in later works in the context of intense struggle for free land ownership in the milieu of the direct producers (peasants, Cossacks, petty *szlachta* members) and magnates who captured new land possession. Lypynsky summarized as follows: «Yuriy Nemyrych, like the majority of that time prosperous *szlachta* and magnates from the northwest wood Ukrainian lands was besieged with a colonizational fever, that, with the desire to buy the land in the southern steppe Cossack land Ukraine where «milk and honey flew» (Lypynsky, 1991: 195).

Under such circumstances the Kyiv land barrister Yuriy Nemyrych got in 1643 the right to the disputable land possessions on the banks of the rivers Vorskla and Orelia. Furthermore, a considerable amount of other possession came into his ownership in different ways, so that he «could compete already with the other Ukrainian magnates». Moreover, Nemyrych could even take hold of the property which was given by the king to Stanislav Potocky. But the situation had changed in 1646 after Potocky received «commissar authority over registered Cossacks», and Nemyrych, fleeing from the pursuit of the Arians, had to go abroad. In the result of an armed raid Yuriy Nemyrych' estates passed into Stanislav Potocky's possession. It is noteworthy, that petty bourgeoisie took part in that raid (i. e., Cossacks, migrants who went into the Cossack service, etc.), of all the small towns, which earlier belonged to Nemyrych. Lypynsky pays a special attention to this very circumstance, remarking that it was that «element which hated masters and their state servants, which to a very great extent supports each enemy of the present «lord», no matter whether he was an enemy and the hated magnate» (Lypynsky, 1980: 259–261).

The researcher recognised that «Yuriy, as well as all his contemporaries, in everyday life was a person rather restless». In particular, Yuriy persistently is at war with his relative, cousin Joseph Charles (...) Nemyrych (of the Olevska line), an ardent Catholic of an orthodox sort; the harm that Yuriy had made to him and his father by his raids, Joseph counts in several thousands and mentions in this in his will» (Lypynsky, 2013b: 417).

V. Lypynsky also paid attention to a very characteristic, from his point of view, situation. After Yu. Nemyrych enters the service of the Zaporozhian Host, and arrives to the capital Chyhyryn, «the Hetman hospitably received that desirable visitor, that educated son of Ukraine, but, nevertheless, he did not give him his manors, which he possessed in the territory of the Sich lands near Kremenchuk and Perevolochna» (Lypynsky, 1991: 130). At the same time, as well as many other Zaporozhian Host *starshyna* (foremen), he awarded with a «treasure» for his service to the state (Lypynsky, 1991: 200).

Also, it is characteristic that the historian repeatedly placed his intended emphasis on the high social status of his hero. So, explaining circumstances of the cooperation of Yuriy Nemyrych and Radziwill, Lypynsky refutes M. Korduba's thought about an allegedly official subordinated character of these relations: «the Ukrainian magnate was equal to the Lithuanian magnate and the two were linked by their overall aims and common interests. Yuriy Nemyrych' later outstanding participation in the Ukrainian state and national life should not give any grounds to modern Ukrainian historians for thinking that Nemyrych could be only somebody's «servant» (Lypynsky, 1991: 262).

Nemyrych as freethinking Arian

Yuriy Nemyrych' Arianism, as well as his favour towards the Cossacks, according to V. Lypynsky's observation, were the main aspects of imperception of his figure by the majority of later *szlachta* milieu (including the descendants of Nemyrych kin who had converted into Catholicism). His hero's descendants who lived at the break of the XVII and XVIII centuries, the researcher represents already in negative context, as typical representatives

of the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) *szlachta* who had lost their state significance: «These newly-baked» Polish «masters», these Nemyrych' descendants (who by then began converting Catholics from their former Orthodoxy and Arianism)...., in order to prove their «Polishness» and «true *szlachta* status», become assiduous propagandists of Catholicism and Polishness» (Lypynsky, 2015a: 266).

As expected, the historian only partly concentrated upon the Protestant aspect of his hero's biography (he did that in the majority of his early works), and, mainly, elucidated his state activity. That, in part, can be explained by Lypynsky's general attitude to this religion (eventually, as well as to all confessions which were considered by it not only from the religious point of view, but – and primarily – from the state one). So, he considered that «the departure of Protestants from the Catholic church» had been «the last stage of the struggle of Germanic barbarians with the material culture, which had been won by them, and spiritual and moral culture of Ancient Rome, by which they had got conquered. Having appropriated this culture, the conquerors wished to free themselves from its authority, its spiritual power. As such a liberation movement, Protestantism played a great role in the matter of completing of the national individualization of the German, Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon nations» (Lypynsky, 1995b: 86). At the same time, he was convinced that liberal, freethinking, individualistic, and ideologically both unclear and dim attributes of Protestantism represent a significant public danger which can be counterbalanced by means of the «unity of the ruling class» or disciplining influence of the «hierarchical and dogmatic Catholic religious culture». This last, in his opinion, was what the «strongly infected with Protestant freethinking Poland» lacked (Lypynsky, 1995b: 87). The appearance of Arianism proper Lypynsky connects with the weakness and lack of authority of the traditional church: «In our history, for an example the so-called new faith can serve (primarily, Arianism), which had been very strong during the time of the decline of Orthodoxy and which perished completely in the time of its revival» (Lypynsky, 1995b: 68). At the same time, he pays attention to the social aspect of this dogma, that «Arianism in our lands was not exclusively «a belief of grandees», that at meetings people of «different conditions and standards» converged and faced each other, like it take place in democratic orthodox brotherhoods» (Lypynsky, 2013a: 440).

The way to the «new confession» of the Cherniakhivsky branch of the Nemyrych kin had been initiated by Yuriy's father, Stepan, who «was the first to have passed into the fashionable then Arianism». Lypynsky specially placed an emphasis on the heredity as an important moment for him at that time: «from his father Yuriy inherited freethinking views, boldness of thought, and also the adherence to European culture» (Lypynsky, 1991: 194).

Further on, the historian in details described his hero's high educational level which «Yuriy received, at first, in a well-known then in Poland Arian academy in Rakiv, after which he left to Europe to finish his study at the universities in Holland, then in Oxford and Cambridge, and – at last – in Paris» (Lypynsky, 1991: 194). Therefore, by his education level he exceeded his time Ukrainian *szlachta*. For Lypynsky its European character was very valuable: «Due to his «European» «Arian confession he was connected with the most Europeanized – so to speak in a modern way – «progressive» part of his stratum» (Lypynsky, 1991: 193).

Yuriy Nemyrych' activity as an adherer of Arianism, according to Lypynsky's statement, consisted in spreading of Arianism ideas and higher education in his own country, in maintenance of the Arian communities on the lands in his possession, particularly, in Cherniakhiv, financing of presbyters and preachers, initiating of debates with Jesuits, and supporting of publication of books. A letter to Krzysztof Radziwill, the Grand Hetman of Lithuania and Vilnius

Voivoda, from the participants of the Diet in Kyselyna (of 28 May, 1638) is a documentary acknowledgement of the weight of Yuriy Nemyrych as a defender of Arian confession. The document was found by V. Lypynsky in the archive of the Chartoryiski and entered by him into scientific circulation. The name of Yuriy Nemyrych begins the list of the signatories of that petition with the request to protect the «neglected» rights of the Arians.

Thus, Nemyrych was an influential enough secular protector of the «socian science», and it was thanks to him, that «the persecuted in the *szlachta* milieu of *Rzeczpospolita* Arianism eventually survived»: «They are headed by Yuriy Nemyrych, an ardent defender of his co-believers not only at Seyms, Diets, in courts and tribunals, and, generally, in the public-state life, but also in the hot that time religious polemics, the author of polemic leaflets, «certain writings», written «in contempt» for the dominating faith..., which circulate amidst the reading public of that time so fond of such literature» (Lypynsky, 2013a: 431). Lypynsky also mentioned some theological works written by Yu. Nemyrych.

The researcher also noticed that Nemyrych had come to the Diet in Kyselyna when returning from the Sejm in Warsaw, at which he had entered into the acts a protest against anti-Arian decisions of the Sejm. His numerous denunciations in «blasphemy» and judicial claims against him from Ultra-catholic *szlachta* were also mentioned. Eventually, under the pressure of such prosecutions Yuriy Nemyrych had to go abroad in 1646, but already in 1648 he took part in the Warsaw Sejm at which he had to defend himself from attacks on his belonging to Arians.

Afterwards, Nemyrych in a manifesto addressing all dissidents of *Rzeczpospolita* appeals to the union with «the Eastern, that is, Orthodox church. According to Lypynsky, here «his participation in Arian movement comes to an end, and, at the same time, begins a new phase of his direct struggle for the political and national rights of the Ukrainian people, conducted if not in the rows, then in the close consent with the greatest of that time defenders of these rights, namely, the Cossacks» (Lypynsky, 2013a: 432).

So, Yu. Yuriy Nemyrych' Arian belonging was indeed an intellectual bridge and a powerful dissident experience which led him at last to the Cossacks and to an active participation in development of the Ukrainian statehood. In other words, his choice in favour of his native people was not incidental (and, moreover, it did not follow from his adventurous character), but was conditioned by new spiritual impulses which were characteristic for the Protestant environment. Lypynsky very precisely detected this link, asserting that «it is necessary to take into consideration their better European political education which manifested itself in the inspired by Nemyrych Hadiache condition, all these Arian «novelties», i. e., humanitarian mottoes and democratic ideas, were inoculated to the believers by «the new belief» (Lypynsky, 2013a: 441).

Nemyrych' confessional alteration, his conversion into the «pious faith» (Orthodoxy), at Lypynsky's first sight, was of political character – «here the main role had played the motives purely... political (the cancellation and prosecution of Arianism by *Rzeczpospolita*)» (Lypynsky, 1980: 313). However, later, in his writing «Ukraine at the breakpoint», the historian supplied this act with a wider range of arguments, underlining the new, essentially state connotations: «The unity with the newly arisen Ukrainian state, – as usual, vigorous and thoroughly consequent in his deeds, Yuriy Nemyrych consolidates and manifests with his turn to the ancestral Orthodox faith» (Lypynsky, 1991: 200). In this sense, such Yuriy Nemyrych' step approximate him to the position of Mykhailo/Staniślav Krychevsky (which fact Lypynsky denied in his earlier works). It is interesting, that simultaneously with new char-

acteristics, Lypynsky also refers to the rumours spread by the enemies of Yuriy Nemyrych: for example, that by means of his conversion in Orthodoxy he wanted to marry Rozanda, a Moldavian *hospodarivna* and Tymish Khmelnytsky's widow (especially having specified in the notes the real marriage condition of his hero, – that he was married and was the husband of Elizabeth Slupetska).

In Lypynsky's positive judgments on Yuriy Nemyrych' change of confession modern researchers see a wider context, namely, its conformity to his conceptual instructions concerning the place of religion and church in the future Ukrainian state, in which the national-state issue would have a higher priority over the one of confession-church (Hyrych, 2012: 203–204). Furthermore, Yu. Tereshchenko assumes that gaining more social weight by such figures as Nemyrych, a person of wide European outlook, high culture, and erudition, which he put in the service of the Cossack state, testified to the restoration of an ancient Ukrainian tradition of religious tolerance in the confessional policy of B. Khmelnytsky in his last years of being hetman (Tereshchenko, 2013: 80). The aforementioned policy, obviously, went ahead of the time and was a bright acknowledgement of Europeanization of the Ukrainian leading social stratum.

The way to a service for the Ukrainian state

V. Lypynsky paid much attention to the basic landmarks of Yu. Nemyrych' life. Thus, the fact of his being a representative of the interests of a considerable part of his *szlachta* stratum, that its parts which searched for the most optimum variant of realisation of its state potential, was audibly accentuated.

So, yet before the explosion of Khmelnytsky's struggle, Nemyrych «as a loyal royal subjected takes part in the wars of Volodyslav IV with Moscow and Sweden, at the head of his own two military units, under the leadership of royal hetman S. Koniecpolsky» (Lypynsky, 1991: 195).

The Cossack revolt found Yuriy Nemyrych in Dnieper Ukraine, from where he, as well as others members of non-Cossack *szlachta*, had to escape in order to save his the life. At the same time, the Cossack revolt and Volodyslav's death activated the reformatory part of *szlachta* to actions. Lypynsky is convinced that at that time «Yuriy Nemyrych, as well as the majority Ukrainian *szlachta*, trusts in a possibility of reforms and order change in *Rzeczpospolita Polska*» (Lypynsky, 1991: 196–197). He was made to arrive to such conclusions by an extreme political activity of our hero concerning the election of the new king which best nominee he saw among the representatives of Semyhorod (Transylvania) princely family of Rakoczi, trying to agitate hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky to his plans. The failure of this action and the election of Jan Kazimir as king (he was the candidate of magnate-*szlachta* Catholic oligarchy, led to a big disappointment in the environment of dissident *szlachta*. In particular, they were amazed by the fact that such an extremely adverse royal election took place under the consent of the Cossacks. After the failure Yu. Nemyrych distanced himself from active political activities for a certain time.

Nevertheless, already in March 1649 the nobility Diet in Kyiv land elects Yuriy Nemyrych general leader of the local *szlachta* guard organised for the suppression of Cossack revolt. Together with a military unit of his voivodeship he took part in a Zboriv campaign against the Cossacks. After the Zboriv agreements he became a consecutive adherent of the policy of compromise which was defended and realized by Adam Kysil. In particular, in 1652 and 1654 he was a constant participant of negotiations with the Zaporozhian Host. His election in June, 1655 as the deputy to Kyiv voivodeship «for the pacification of Ukraine» in order to conclude treatises with Khmelnytsky became his last act of participation in the official political life of *Rzeczpospolita*».

But already in November of 1655 Yu. Nemyrych, together with a part of Ukrainian *szlachta* breaks off with Jan Kazimir and swears «for citizenship» to the Swedish king (Lypynsky, 1991: 179, 199). Lypynsky explains this step of his hero by his alleged expectations, «that, maybe, the Swedes could make so wishful rest and order in Ukraine». As these hopes appeared not completely justified, Nemyrych applied great efforts to activate the negotiations between Charles Gustav and Bohdan Khmelnytsky, in which he acted as a productive enough intermediary.

However, already in the beginning of 1657 Yu. Nemyrych arrived at the hetman court in Chyhyryn and began his service for the Ukrainian state. For Lypynsky it was an extremely important sign event as it was a testimony to the end of a difficult and long maturing of the Ukrainian Cossacks who «from the revolted against *Rzeczpospolita* military-plundering nationless caste has turned into a state-national stratum». In that way the obstacles which separated Ukrainian *szlachta* from the Cossack Ukraine were destroyed. So, «Yuriy Nemyrych' arrival in Chyhyryn at the beginning of 1657 was not an extraordinary event, but the normal phenomenon which marked the completion of a process of the formation of the State and organic connection of all parts of the Ukrainian nation» (Lypynsky, 1991: 200).

The historian specially underlined that except Yu. Nemyrych himself a considerable quantity of representatives of the *szlachta* environment, including his brother Stepan Nemyrych, Olexander Chaplych-Shpanovsky, Havryil Hulevych-Voityunsky, Remigijan Surin, and others entered the service for the hetman.

Eventually, Lypynsky names Yuriy Nemyrych among Bohdan Khmelnytsky's outstanding associates of noble origin, having included him into those belonging to the category of politicians and diplomats. In addition, though, he remarked that his hero only in due course had followed «the majority of the people, whereas thereto he «more that once together with Kysil negotiated with the insurgents in the name of *Rzeczpospolita*» (Lypynsky, 1980: 61).

The figure of Yuriy Nemyrych was of particular interest for Lypynsky just because he, having entered the service for the Ukrainian state, did not leave his *szlachta* stratum: «As this our outstanding statesman, who later became a creator of one of our state's acts of the greatest weight, namely, the Korsun' Swedish-Ukrainian Condition, and a codifier and inspirer of the Hadiatske Treaty, was neither an exclusively original idealist, nor a declassed politician-dreamer, and was recognised as a representative of the *szlachta* stratum who could join and did join in the construction of the Ukrainian State only then when this state was able to provide normal existence for the whole Ukrainian *szlachta* as a separate class of the nation» (Lypynsky, 1991: 193–194). The political choice of Yuriy Nemyrych was extremely valuable for Lypynsky as an argument on acknowledgement of his own position. As I. Hyrych properly underlined, the historian addressed such a choice also to modern Ukrainians of the Polish culture: «He considered that it was necessary to remain in their social status, but to work no more for the Polish, but for the Ukrainian state. Just so, as Yuriy Nemyrych had done in the middle of the XVII century. Although he remained a big land owner and master, but he transferred into side of the Cossacks. – the force which then created the Ukrainian state» (Hyrych, 2012: 203). Hence, it all went about a real question of a bilateral process of the establishment of the Ukrainian state as a mature political organism and the comprehension by the *szlachta* of its place in the process of this state building.

Lypynsky focuses attention that the Ukrainian *szlachta* gave the people in hard times «their knowledge, their mind». Yu. Nemyrych as one of the creators of the Hadiache union, the agreement which guaranteed to Ukraine the extensive rights of «the Great Princedom

of Ruthenians», and a «rich master, skilled in sciences, who got education in Holland, once a powerful Kyiv land barrister in the foreign for him *Rzeczpospolita*, may serve a most indicative example of such intellectual service. Then he became an ordinary Cossack colonel among his people» (Lypynsky, 2015b: 191).

After all, V. Lypynsky became interested in Yu. Nemyrych, first of all, as a natural statesman and one of the most active adherents of the Ukrainian state. He invariably sees him within a circle of those, «who with their entire soul trusted and still trust in the «violent thoughts» of hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky about the free, independent, great and strong Ukrainian State, one of those who struggled for such a state not «under compulsion», but from their will, not because of a momentary wave of propaganda, but by the work of their whole life...» (Lypynsky, 1995a: 41).

The tragedy of the destiny of all the «Nemyrychi».

For Lypynsky Yu. Nemyrych's tragical destruction became a constant nutritious ground for deep considerations and statements, in the majority entirely justified, but at times rather emotionally painted. The researcher was inclined to think that the murder of Yuriy Nemyrych by pro-Moscow minded Cossacks at the moment of his greatest rise as a Ukrainian statesman (during the conclusion the Hadiache union) was not only a casual confluence of adverse circumstances, but testified to intrinsic negative political and social processes of that time. First of all, the most part of the *szlachta* stratum lost its powerful thereto potential and was searching a self-realisation beyond the Ukrainian political space. Lypynsky expressively outlines this process of denationalisation of Ukrainian *szlachta*. Besides, this disintegration affected all the rest strata of the national organism. This opinion concerns it: «Yuriy Nemyrych paid with life a debt to Moloch of national disintegration» (Lypynsky, 2013b: 424).

It is symbolic, that V. Lypynsky dedicated his conceptual political treatise «Letters to the brothers-grain-growers» to «memory of those noble agricultural knights of the XVII century, who... had come to initiate the Cossack revolt of 1648 and tried to give its blind, anarchical and primitive elements the Ukrainian State Idea, but, unable by a republican method of the organisation to coup with the Ukrainian chaos and to become the base of the Ukrainian State, were lost together with it in the revolt...». In these lines Yu. Nemyrych's destiny also is expressively read. More to that, his tragical image was used by Lypynsky for the definition of the *szlachta* stratum's self-sacrifice for the sake of realisation of the idea of the Ukrainian statehood. He even put forward a certain «caution» before the Ukrainian statesmen, outlining thereby the danger and ingratitude of their future vocation: «Do you, oh miserable, know what waits for you? – the fate of Yuriys Nemyryches who had been tortured to death by the Cossack mob to enjoy Moscow and Warsaw...» (Lypynsky, 1995a: X). Summing up the defeat of the Ukrainian state creation during the revolution of 1917 – 1921, particularly, regarding the support by the «conscious Ukrainians» of that part of the old local ruling stratum which adhered to the Ukrainian political life, Lypynsky calls the latter «Yuriys Nemyryches (in the plural form), who were killed by those for whom they wanted to sacrifice their lives» (Lypynsky, 1926: 544).

In the end of his earthen way, burdened with the conflict with the majority of the hetman's environment, V. Lypynsky took to an emotional enough comparison of his own destiny with destiny of his heroes. In the letter of 10 February, 1930 to D. Doroshenko, one of the few by then his friends, he put some rhetorical questions and in the answers to which he hypocritically testified to his disappointment in the Ukrainian state affair: «Perhaps, the deaths of Krychevsky, Yuriy Nemyrych and others, abandoned or killed by Ukrainians and,

consequently, blackened by the foreigners as the «non-impartial» fighters for Ukraine, were necessary for reason that all the strong and creative turned off from this mean Ukraine and went to build the might of Russia or Poland, that might of the organisms, which genesis is founded on companionable love, unity, and courage. After Krychevsky and Nemyrych had played involuntarily on this land such a heavy and ungrateful role, the eternal rest would be granted for them, and to all Ukrainians, like to notorious Marko Proklyatiy (Cursed), who had betrayed and abandoned them, a mutual gnawing would be given in the forms of the Ukrainian issue until the end of time» (Lypynsky, 2003: 638). However, an attentive perusal of even such intentionally aggravated sarcastic maxims can testify to the fact that Lypynsky, actually, enlisted these specified historical figures into the circle of the best representatives of the Ukrainian aristocratic stratum and, accordingly, was assured that their destruction was not in vain. Thereby, his own activity, contrary to adverse circumstances of his destiny, he considered such that assisted the struggle for the Ukrainian statehood.

It is noteworthy, that the study of Yu. Nemyrych was continued by V. Lypynsky's pupils, in particular, Ihor Losky (Losky, 1928: 113–152). According to O. Zadorozhna, this researcher of problems of the Hetmanate in a rather apologetic manner has depicted Yuriy Nemyrych «as a national hero, a statesman and a true European» (Zadorozhna, 2010: 4). It is obvious, that in his researches Losky relied upon the conceptual approaches of his teacher.

The conclusions. Yuriy Nemyrych' figure was used by Lypynsky for outlining of a certain social trajectory of the historical destiny of Ruthenian *szlachta* in the course of its social transformation, which basic algorithm consisted in the loss of its leading state-building role in *Rzeczpospolita*. Nevertheless, even in such circumstances the social weight of this stratum was so powerful that its best representatives (no doubt, Yu. Nemyrych among them), found a really possible way-out for the use of their vital energy, namely, to join the Cossacks in the development of the Ukrainian state. That was assisted by the outstanding personal traits of Nemyrych, his erudition and European orientation. Therefore, the historiographic image of Nemyrych, created by Lypynsky, not only had an special scientific value, but also was fully actualized as an exemplary social type for the current Ukrainian political situation. With a great probability, it is possible even to assume that for Viacheslav Lypynsky Yuriy Nemyrych was his original *historical Alter ego*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Z dziejów Ukrainy, 1912 – Z dziejów Ukrainy: księga pamiątkowa ku czci Włodzimierza Antonowicza, Paulina Święcickiego i Tadeusza Ryłskiego / Wydana staraniem dra Józefa Jurkiewicza, Franciszki Wolskiej, Ludwika Siedleckiego i Wacława Lipińskiego; pod red. Wacława Lipińskiego. Kijów, 1912. 675 s.

Брик, 1974 – Брик М. Юрій Немирич на тлі історії України. Лоссер, 1974. 152 с.

Гирич, 2012 – Гирич І. Новий герой української історичної романістики, або Повернення до заповітів В'ячеслава Липинського [Післямова] // Корсак І. Немиричів ключ: роман. К.: Ярославів Вал, 2012. С. 200-206.

Задорожна, 2010 – Задорожна О. Ф. Рід Немиричів у шляхетській корпорації Київського воєводства: майновий статус і політична діяльність (XVI – середина XVII ст.): Авторефер. дис. к. і. н. К., 2010. 21 с.

Липинський, 2013а – Липинський В. Аріанський соймик в Киселині на Волині в маю 1638 р. (Причинок до історії аріанства на Україні) // В'ячеслав Липинський та його доба: Книга третя. Наукове видання / Упоряд. Т. Осташко, Ю. Терещенко. Союз гетьманців-державників; Центр соціогуманітарних досліджень імені В. Липинського; Українська вільна академія наук у США. К.: Темпора, 2013. С. 426–441.

Липинський, 2013b – Липинський В. Генерал артилерії в.кн. Руського (з архіву Немиричів) // В'ячеслав Липинський та його доба: Книга третя. Наукове видання / Упоряд. Т. Осташко, Ю. Терещенко. Союз гетьманців-державників; Центр соціогуманітарних досліджень імені В. Липинського; Українська вільна академія наук у США. К.: Темпора, 2013. С. 416–325.

Липинський, 2015a – Липинський В. Данило Братковський – суспільний діяч і письменник кінця XVII століття // Його ж. Суспільно-політичні твори (1908 – 1917) / Ред. Р. Пеленський, І. Гирич, О. Проценко. К.: Український письменник, 2015. Т. 1. С. 264–277.

Липинський, 1995a – Липинський В. Листи до братів-хліборобів. Про ідею і організацію українського монархізму // Його ж. Твори. Політологічна секція. К., Філадельфія: Ін-т Східноєвропейських досліджень НАН України; Східноєвропейський дослідний ін-т ім. В. К. Липинського, 1995. Т. 6. Кн. 1. 470 с.

Липинський, 2003 – Липинський В. Листи до Д. Дорошенка // Листування В. Липинського / Ред. Я. Пеленський, Р. Залуцький, Х. Пеленська та ін. К.: Смолоскип, 2003. Т. 1. С. 572–648.

Липинський, 1926 – Липинський В. Покликання «варягів», чи організація хліборобів? Кілька уваг з приводу статті С. Х. Чикаленка «Де вихід?» // Його ж. Листи до братів-хліборобів про організацію українського монархізму. Писані 1919 – 1926 рр. Відень, 1926. С. 471–580.

Липинський, 1995b – Липинський В. Релігія і Церква в історії України. – К.: Вид-во «Рада», 1995. 96 с.

Липинський, 1991 – Липинський В. Україна на переломі 1657 – 1659. Замітки до історії українського державного будівництва в XVII- ім столітті // Його ж. Твори. Історична секція. Філадельфія: Східноєвропейський дослідний ін-т ім. В.К. Липинського, 1991. Т. 3. 346 с.

Липинський, 1980 – Липинський В. Участь шляхти у великому українському повстанні під проводом гетьмана Богдана Хмельницького // Його ж. Твори. Історична секція. Філадельфія: Східноєвропейський дослідний ін-т ім. В.К. Липинського, 1980. Т. 2. 638 с.

Липинський, 2015b – Липинський В. Шляхта на Україні. Її роль в житті народу українського на тлі його історії // Його ж. Суспільно-політичні твори (1908 – 1917) / Ред. Р. Пеленський, І. Гирич, О. Проценко. К.: Український письменник, 2015. Т. 1. С. 129–233.

Лоський, 1928 – Лоський І. Юрій Немирич канцлер великого князства руського // Поступ. 1928. № 8. С. 113–252.

Терещенко, 2013 – Терещенко Ю. Проблема європеїзації козацької державності в «Україні на переломі» В'ячеслава Липинського // В'ячеслав Липинський та його доба: Книга третя. Наукове видання / Упоряд. Т. Осташко, Ю. Терещенко. Союз гетьманців-державників; Центр соціогуманітарних досліджень імені В. Липинського; Українська вільна академія наук у США. К.: Темпора, 2013. С. 20–87.

REFERENCES

Z dziejow Ukrainy, 1912 – Z dziejow Ukrainy: ksyonzhka pamyatkova k chsti Vlodzimierzha Antonovicha, Paulina Święcickiego i Tadeusza Rylskiego [From the history of Ukraine: a memorial book in honor of Volodymyr Antonovych, Paulin Święcicki and Tadei Rylskiy] / Wydana staraniem dra Jozefa Jurkiewicha, Franciszki Wolskiy, Ludwika Siedleckiego i V'iacheslava Lypynskoho; pod red. V'iacheslava Lypynskoho. Kyiv, 1912. 675 p. [in Polish]

Bryck, 1974 – Bryck M., Yuriy Nemyrych na tli istoriy Ukrainy [Yuriy Nemyrych at the background of Ukraine's history]. Loser, 1974. 152 p. [in Ukrainian]

Hurych, 2012 – Hurych I. Novyi heroi ukrainskoi istorichnoi romanistyky, abo Povnennia do zapovitiv V'iacheslava Lypynskoho; Pisliamova [A new hero of the Ukrainian historical novel creativity, or the return to Viacheslav Lypynsky's; instructions] // Korsak I. Nemyrychiv kliuch: roman. Kyiv: Yaroslaviv Val, 2012. Pp. 200–206. [in Ukrainian]

Zadorozhna, 2010 – Zadorozhna O. F. Rid Nemyrychiv u shliakhetskii korporatsii Kyivskoho voievodstva: mainovyi status i politychna diialnist (XVI – seredyna XVII st.) [The kin of the Nemyrychi in a szlachta corporations of Kyiv voivodeship: the property status and political activity (the XVI – mid XVII centuries)]: Avtorefer. dys. k. i. n. Kyiv, 2010. 21 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lypynsky, 2013a – Lypynsky V. Ariianskyi soimyky v Kyselyni na Volyni v maiu 1638 r. (Prychynok do istorii arianstva na Ukraini) [The Arian Diet at Kyselyna in Volhynia in May 1638 (A contribution

to the history of Arianism in Ukraine)] // V'icheslav Lypynsky ta yoho doba: Knyha tretia. Naukove vydannia / Uporiad. T. Ostashko, Yu. Tereshchenko. Coiuz hetmansiv-derzhavnykiv; Tsentrsotsiohumanitarnykh doslidzhen imeni V. Lypynskoho; Ukrainska vilna akademiia nauk u SShA. Kyiv: Tempora, 2013. Pp. 426–441. [in Ukrainian]

Lypynsky, 2013b – Lypynsky V. Heneral artylerii v.kn. Ruskoho (z arkhivu Nemyrychiv) [The General of artillery of the Grand Principality of Rus' (from the archive of the Nemyrychi)] // V'icheslav Lypynsky ta yoho doba: Knyha tretia. Naukove vydannia / Uporiad. T. Ostashko, Yu. Tereshchenko. Coiuz hetmansiv-derzhavnykiv; Tsentrsotsiohumanitarnykh doslidzhen imeni V. Lypynskoho; Ukrainska vilna akademiia nauk u SShA. Kyiv: Tempora, 2013. Pp. 416–325. [in Ukrainian]

Lypynsky, 2015a – Lypynsky V. Danylo Bratkovskiy – suspilnyi diiach i pysmennyk kintsia KhVII stolittia [Danylo Bratkovsky as a public figure and the writer of end of the XVII century] // Yoho zh. Suspilno-politychni tvory (1908 – 1917) [Social-political works (1908 – 1917)] / Red. R. Pelenskyi, I. Hyrych, O. Protsenko. Kyiv: Ukrainyskyi pysmennyk, 2015. T.1. Pp. 264–277. [in Ukrainian]

Lypynsky, 1995a – Lypynsky V. Lysty do brativ-khliborobiv. Pro ideiu i orhanizatsiiu ukrainskoho monarkhizmu [Letters to the brothers-grain-growers. On the idea and organisation of Ukrainian monarchism] // Yoho zh. Tvory. Politolohichna sektsiia [Works. The section of politology] Kyiv, Filadelfiia: In-t Skhidnoevropeyskykh doslidzhen NAN Ukrainy; Skhidnoevropeyskyi doslidnyi in-t im. V.K. Lypynskoho, 1995. T. 6. Kn. 1. 470 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lypynsky, 2003 – Lypynsky V. Lysty do D. Doroshenka [Letters to D. Doroshenko] // Lystuvannia V. Lypynskoho / Red. Ya. Pelenskyi, R. Zalutskyi, Kh. Pelenska ta in. Kyiv: Smoloskyp, 2003. T. 1. Pp. 572–648. [in Ukrainian]

Lypynsky, 1926 – Lypynsky V. Poklykannia «variahiv», chy orhanizatsiia khliborobiv? Kilka uvah z pryvodu statti Ye. Kh. Chykalenka «De vykhid?» [The calling of the Varangians, or the organisation of grain-growers? Some remarks on Ye. Kh. Chykalenko's article «Where is the way-out?») // Yoho zh. Lysty do brativ-khliborobiv pro orhanizatsiiu ukrainskoho monarkhizmu. [Letters to the brothers-grain-growers about the organisation of Ukrainian monarchism] Pysani 1919 – 1926 rr. Viden, 1926. Pp. 471–580. [in Ukrainian]

Lypynsky, 1995b – Lypynsky V. Relihiia i Tserkva v istorii Ukrainy [Religion and Church in the history of Ukraine]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo «Rada», 1995. 96 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lypynsky, 1991 – Lypynsky V. Ukraina na perelomi 1657 – 1659. Zamitky do istorii ukrainskoho derzhavnogo budivnytstva v XVII-im stolitti [Ukraine at the break of 1657 – 1659. Notes to the history of the Ukrainian state building in the XVII century] // Lypynsky V. Tvory. Istorychna sektsiia [Works. The section of History]. Filadelfiia: Skhidnoevropeyskyi doslidnyi in-t im. V.K. Lypynskoho, 1991. T. 3. 346 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lypynsky, 1980 – Lypynsky V. Uchast shliakhty u velykomu ukrainskomu povstanni pid provodom hetmana Bohdana Khmelnytskoho [The participation of szlachta in the great Ukrainian revolt under the leadership of hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky] // Lypynsky V. Tvory. Istorychna sektsiia. Filadelfiia: Skhidnoevropeyskyi doslidnyi in-t im. V.K. Lypynskoho, 1980. T. 2. 638 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lypynsky, 2015b – Lypynsky V. Shliakhta na Ukraini. Yii rol v zhytti narodu ukrainskoho na tli yoho istorii [Szlachta in Ukraine. Its role in the life of the people of Ukraine at the background of its history] // Yoho zh. Suspilno-politychni tvory (1908 – 1917) [Political works (1908 – 1917)] / Red. R. Pelenskyi, I. Hyrych, O. Protsenko. Kyiv: Ukrainyskyi pysmennyk, 2015. T. 1. Pp. 129–233. [in Ukrainian]

Losky, 1928 – Loskyi I. Yuryi Nemyrych kantsler velykoho kniazhestva ruskoho [Yuriy Nemyrych as the chancellor of the Grand Principality of Rus'] // Postup. 1928. №8. Pp. 113–252. [in Ukrainian]

Tereshchenko, 2013 – Tereshchenko Yu. Problema yevropeizatsii kozatskoi derzhavnosti v «Ukraini na perelomi» V'icheslava Lypynskoho [The problem of Europeanization of the Cossack statehood in «Ukraine at the break» by Viacheslav Lypynsky] // V'icheslav Lypynsky ta yoho doba: Knyha tretia. Naukove vydannia / Uporiad. T. Ostashko, Yu. Tereshchenko. Coiuz hetmansiv-derzhavnykiv; Tsentrsotsiohumanitarnykh doslidzhen imeni V. Lypynskoho; Ukrainska vilna akademiia nauk u SShA. Kyiv: Tempora, 2013. Pp. 20–87. [in Ukrainian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 8.04.2018 р.

UDC 94(477.4)«XIX»

DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131212

Mykola HALIV,

orcid 0000-0001-7068-3124

Ph D (Education), Associate Professor of Department
of History of Ukraine of Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
(Ukraine, Drohobych) halivm@yahoo.com

THE NATIONAL POLICIES OF THE RUSSIAN AND AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRES' IN VOLHYNIA AND GALICIA (at the beginning of the XX century): A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

In the article, by means of a comparative confrontation, the national policies of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires in Volhynia and Galicia at the beginning of the XX century are analyzed, in particular, what concerns the three greatest ethnic groups of these lands, namely, the Ukrainians, Poles, and Jews. The territorial borders of the research under view cover the Volhynian gubernia of the Russian empire and the eastern part of Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria (the eastern Galicia) of Austro-Hungarian empire.

A comparative analysis of the national policy of the two aforementioned empires in concern of the three most numerous ethnic groups of Volhynia and East Galicia testifies to the presence of considerable differences in the methods of actions of the Russian and Austrian governments. The Romanovs' monarchy craved to unify the national structure of the population of the Volhynia gubernia by the assimilation of the Ukrainians, Poles, and Jews, as well as by the restriction of their economic and cultural-educational interests. The majority of the Ukrainian population of the Volhynia gubernia were treated by the Russian officials as the "little Russians", that is, as the part of the uniform Russian people. The struggle was conducted against the Ukrainian intelligentsia which supported a national-cultural separateness of the Ukrainian people. The Poles and the Jews were unequivocally treated as «foreigners» towards whom the government carried out an overtly discriminating policy. At the same time, the Habsburg monarchy, having transferred in 1860th into the parliamentarism line, recognized the national-cultural rights of the Ukrainians, Poles and Jews of Galicia. However, in a politically-administrative plane, the Austrian power relied on the Polish minority in Galicia, especially on its political, social and economic elite. In these conditions, the Ukrainians and the Jew, showing loyalty to the Austrian authorities, were actively engaged in the development of their own political, party, public, economic, and cultural institutions. In spite of all obstacles, the national policy of the two empires has something in common, namely, the problem of self-preservation as the monarchic states and an ideology of the fidelity to the monarchical house.

Key words: Volhynian gubernia, East Galicia, the Russian empire, the Austro-Hungarian empire, national policy, Ukrainians, Poles, Jews.

Микола ГАЛІВ,

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри історії України
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Україна, Дрогобич) halivm@yahoo.com

НАЦІОНАЛЬНА ПОЛІТИКА РОСІЙСЬКОЇ ТА АВСТРО-УГОРСЬКОЇ ІМПЕРІЙ НА ВОЛИНІ І В ГАЛИЧИНІ (ПОЧАТОК ХХ ст.): ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ

У статті шляхом компаративного співставлення проаналізовано національну політику Російської та Австро-Угорської імперій на Волині і в Галичині на початку ХХ ст., зокрема щодо трьох найбільших етнічних груп цих земель: українців, поляків і євреїв. Територіальні рамки

¹ Публікація містить результати досліджень, проведених при грантовій підтримці Державного фонду фундаментальних досліджень за конкурсним проектом Ф77/80 – 2018 (договір від 29.03.2018)

дослідження охопили Волинську губернію Російської імперії та східну частину Королівства Галичини і Лодомерії (Східну Галичину) Австро-Угорської імперії

Порівняльний аналіз національної політики двох імперій щодо трьох найбільш чисельних етнічних груп Волині та Східної Галичини засвідчив наявність значних відмінностей у методах дій російського та австрійського урядів. Монархія Романових прагнула уніфікувати національний склад населення Волині шляхом асиміляції українців, поляків та євреїв, обмеження їх економічних та культурно-освітніх інтересів. Більшість українського населення Волинської губернії російськими чиновниками трактувалися як «малоросіяни», тобто частина єдиного російського народу. Боротьба велася проти української інтелігенції, яка виступала за національно-культурну окремішність українського народу. Поляки та євреї однозначно трактувалися як «іногородці», щодо яких уряд проводив відверто дискримінаційну національну політику. Натомість монархія Габсбургів, ставши у 1860-х рр. на шлях парламентаризму, визнавала національно-культурні права українців, поляків та євреїв Галичини. Однак в політично-адміністративній площині австрійські власті спиралися на галицьку польську меншину, точніше її політичну, соціальну та господарську еліту. В цих умовах українці і євреї, демонструючи лояльність до австрійських властей, активно займалися розбудовою власних політично-партійних, громадських, економічних і культурних інституцій. Попри все, національна політика двох імперій мала децю схоже – завдання самозбереження монархічних держав та ідеологію відданості монаршому дому.

Ключові слова: Волинська губернія, Східна Галичина, Російська імперія, Австро-Угорська імперія, національна політика, українці, поляки, євреї.

The statement of the problem. The study of the national policy of the imperial regimes in the West Ukrainian lands necessarily demands the use of a comparative-historical method. It gives a chance to find out the basic aspects and directions of the official policy of the Romanovs' and the Habsburg empires concerning national communities, to clarify the similar and different manifestations of the governmental-administrative influence of St Petersburg and Vienna on the motley – from ethnic viewpoint – population of the West Ukrainian lands. In particular, the use of this method is efficient in what concerns the expansion of the national movements of the Ukrainians, Poles and Jews in Volhynia and Galicia in the beginning of the XX century.

The analysis of latest researches. The national policy of the Russian empire concerning the population of Volhynia was studied by such researchers as A. Borodiy, O. Bilobrovets, O. Buravskiy, M. Barmak, M. Hauchman V. Zhelizniak, Z. Lukavskiy, V. Nadolska, I. Pohrebnynska, Yu. Polishchuk, A. Ratsilevych, N. Shcherbak and others. Likewise, the policy of the Austro-Hungarian empire in the national sphere was studied by such scholars as O. Arkusha, M. Hon, M. Lytvyn, I. Monolatiy, M. Mudryi, I. Pater, Y. Honigsman, Y. Shymov, S. Shröder, etc. Nevertheless, at present there are no such works which would clarify the national policy of the both empires in the West Ukrainian lands in a comparative manner.

The purpose of this article is to compare the national policy of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires in Volhynia and in Galicia (1900 – 1914), in particular, concerning the three greatest ethnic groups of these lands, namely, the Ukrainians, the Poles, and the Jews. It should be noticed, that the territorial framework of this research covers the Volhynian gubernia of the Russian empire and the eastern part of the Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria (Eastern Galicia) of the Austro-Hungarian empire.

The statement of the basic material. The analysis of national structure of the population of Volhynia and Galicia in the beginning of the XX century points to the similarity in quantity indicators of the Ukrainian, Polish and Jewish communities. According to the census of 1897, which, however, specified not so much the nationality, but the native language of the listed persons, in the Volhynian gubernia there were 2 095 579 Ukrainian speaking population which made up 70,1 % of the total gubernia's population. Then in the gubernia there

lived 394 774 Jewish speaking people that made up 13,2 % of the gubernia population. The Poles by the quantity of their population took the third place: at that time in Volhynia, accounting 184 161 Polish speakers that made 6,2 % the gubernia's total population (Pervaia vseobshchaia perepys', 1904: 3–10).

According to the census of 1900, in the whole East Galicia (excluding the Brzoziv district, which was mainly Polish by population) there lived 4 735 477 people. In East Galicia there were 3 005 916 (63,48 %) Greek-Catholics. The number of the Roman Catholics, whom the Polish scientists rank as Poles, was 1 074 753 (22,70 %), the inhabitants of the Judaic religion amounted to 613 764 persons (12,96 %) (Etnohrafiia Ukrainy, 2004: 99). As can be seen, a certain difference was observed in the number of Poles in Volhynia and East Galicia, whereas the indicators of the number of the other two ethnic groups were similar.

The idea of «official nationality» was elaborated by Count S. Uvarov, minister of education and president of the St Petersburg Academy of Sciences. «Uvarov's doctrine» was a general basis of the national policy of the Russian empire in the territory of Volhynia: Orthodoxy, autocracy, nationality. Here, as well as in other non-Russian regions, it was reduced to the ideological program of unification of the empire and cultural integration of the non-Russian peoples. The governmental activity in this region breaks up into three separate, but interconnected directions, which, however, coincided with «Uvarov's triad»: consolidation of the positions of the Orthodox church, strengthening of the state control by the full integration of the country's administrative and educational systems into one all-imperial, and an expansion of the influence of Russian education, directed into the creation a uniform Russian nationality (Haukhman, 2010: 33).

At the same time, a compromise search between the state interests in preservation of its integrity and political stability, and the aspirations of the national movements for independence in their own states, which called into question the future of Austro-Hungary, became the basic content of the political life of the Habsburg monarchy in the beginning of the XX century. E. Körber's government (1900 – 1904) somehow removed the international stress by suggesting to concentrate upon great economical projects. Since 1905 the government initiated a reform of the elective legislation, insisting, that the parliament should become more «democratic», than regional diets. International oppositions moved into the crown territories (including Galicia) where they – in multiple cases – became of considerable scope (Natsionalne pytannia, 2012: 77). The tradition of a formation of all-imperial patriotism and consciousnesses («Austrian loyalty») in the national regions of the Danube empire, to a certain extent, promoted the revival of national consciousness of the Ukrainians, Poles, and Jews. As I. Monolatiy remarked, the ethnic-national management of the ruling dynasty and local authorities in the West Ukrainian region was carried out on the bases of the state paternalism, and the ethnic communities here did not oppose it: after all, their leaders conducted the dialogue, which was different both by quality and political expediency. In such a way the «cooperation with Vienna» was being constructed, which gave the chance to defend their own national-political ideals (Monolatiy, 2008a: 164).

The policy of the aforementioned empires concerning the Ukrainians, Poles and Jews deserves considering in more details.

The Ukrainians. The official policy of the imperial government concerning vast masses of Ukrainians (then «Little Russians») was not discriminational. Officially, the Ukrainians were considered but Russians and were given possibilities to do any career provided that they knew the Russian language and confess Orthodoxy. The Russian officials put a special

accent on the schooling process. In the Russian empire the school policy intertwined with the national one which main task consisted in a gradual merge of the national outskirts into a uniform state by means of denationalization and the forceful policy of Russification. Notwithstanding that, in Volhynia the quantity of elementary schools was but very small and, no wonder, that illiteracy became a usual phenomenon among Ukrainians. But that prevented the realization of the Russification policy through school. What is interesting, is that the Volhynian governors did not care for the distribution of schooling as they did not see any threat from the Ukrainians whom they considered only as a component of the Russian people. In general, the anti-Ukrainian prohibitions of 1863 and 1876 were directed mainly not against the Ukrainian population as such, but against the Ukrainian intelligentsia, that is, against the Ukrainian national creation as most of the population of the Volhynia gubernia was illiterate, and the prohibitions concerned just writing (Zhelizniak, 2016: 28). It is by this fact that the struggle against the Ukrainian national movement after the Russian revolution of 1905 – 1907 can be well explained. As is known, during the revolution in Volhynia some cells of the Prosvita society were formed, however, until 1912, under the pressure of P. Stolypin's reactionary policy, all of them stopped their activity. Contrary to the Ukrainian political parties, which actively operated in Volhynia (in particular, the Revolutionary Ukrainian party), the imperial power supported the Russian chauvinistic organizations, including «the Union of the Russian people» (Ratsilevych, 2004: 70).

The policy of the Habsburg monarchy in Galicia concerning the Ukrainians considerably differed from the policy of the Romanovs' empire. The Austrian government recognized the singularity of the Ukrainian people and from the second half of the XIX century refused from its plans of Germanization. However, after 1867 the governmental policy concerning the Ukrainians in Galicia gained a specific character on account of the tolerability of the Polish political and cultural domination in the region. The Ukrainians were discharged of the power bodies in the lands where the key administrative places were occupied by the Poles. Under those conditions they initiated a struggle for national equality. It is necessary to take into consideration that in the beginning of the XX century there were already several Ukrainian political parties, among which the Ukrainian national-democratic party got the largest distribution.

The Austrian political regime gave possibilities to the Ukrainians to combat for the language issue. Contrary to the accurate instructions which made the official bodies to answer to the references in what language they were written, the local authorities often communicated with the Ukrainian parties in Polish either «by principle» or through an oversight or ignorance. The Ukrainians led the struggle for the real and not the nominal right to use their Ukrainian language in administration and courts. In the beginning of the XX century there was a movement of the Ukrainian rural communities for the change of the official language from Polish to Ukrainian. The action of Greek-Catholic priests who sent back the Polish language official requirements concerning registers of births in the record books gained a mass character. Particularly sharp was the struggle for school training. In almost all the elementary schools in cities and in the majority of secondary schools the working language was Polish (except for the Ukrainian academic gymnasium in Lviv, and the German gymnasiums in Lviv and Brody). At the break of the XIX – XX centuries the Ukrainians had a success with the opening of the Ukrainian state gymnasium in Peremyshl (1895), Kolomyia (1900), Ternopil (1901), and Stanislaviv (1905). Further on, as the openings of the Ukrainian state gymnasiums were blocked by the Polish majority in the Galician diet, therefore the Ukrainians took to the establishment of private gymnasiums (Natsionalne pytannia, 2012: 79–80).

A number of educational institutions, as the teacher training seminary and Lviv university, legally were bilingual. However, in teacher training seminaries only minor subjects were taught in the Ukrainian language. At Lviv university the overwhelming majority of chairs was in the hands of the Poles; the Polish language was used in the internal administration and office-work, contrary to the fact that the Ukrainian students were a weighty numerical group. In 1913/14 the Poles made up 44,6 % of the students of Lviv university, the Ukrainians made up 25,9 %, and the Jews accounted 28,1 %. At the university 80 Polish and 8 Ukrainian chairs operated. From the beginning of the XX century of the creation of a Ukrainian university in Lviv became a key requirements of the Ukrainians. It caused much opposition on behalf of the Polish politicians who were afraid that a Ukrainian university would serve as the tool of «Ukrainization» of Lviv. Nevertheless, in the end of 1912 the Austrian government did process over the project of the establishment of a Ukrainian university in Galicia not later than 1916, however, it was not realized (Natsionalne pytannia, 2012: 80).

The Poles. In Volhynia the Poles represented an overwhelming majority of szlachta, that is, the nobility of the country. After the Polish rebellion of 1831 – 1833 and 1863 the Russian power liquidated the achievements of the Polish cultural-educational activity in Volhynia. The process of liquidation of Polish school training begun, although it remained only at the private level. It was forbidden for Roman-Catholic clergy to open schools, to instruct and teach children of elementary education level in the Polish language. A supervision over those Poles who tried to teach children reading and writing in the Polish language was established. The printing, sale and use of the Polish books and newspapers on the whole territory was forbidden. The struggle against penetration into Ukraine of the products of the Polish press and the communication with the Polish emigrants was conducted. The imperial government tried to undermine also the economical potential of the Polish minority, first of all, that of szlachta. As early as in 1865 the decree about the prohibition for the Poles to buy new lands had been issued, which was valid till 1905 (Buravskyy, 2004: 38, 40; Polishchuk, 2012: 145–150, 208–217; Shcherbak, 2005: 239).

In the year of the Russian revolution a pressure upon the Poles nearly stopped. Poles had an opportunity to take part in elections into the State Duma. However, election campaigns had its special characteristic features in Volhynia. Here a complicated electoral system was introduced, which did not give chances to the Poles to make their way to the Russian parliament (Łukawski, 1967: 16). All in all, to the first State Duma only three persons were elected from Volhynia (Kwiatkowski, 1932: 153). However, in the following elections the Poles were actively counteracted by Russian chauvinists, in particular, by members of the “Pochaiv Union of the Russian people” (Bilobrovets, 2014: 19). In general, historians name the policy of the Russian empire concerning the Poles as «the policy of de-Polonization» (Nadolska, 2003: 48–55).

An entirely other policy concerning the Poles in Galicia was maintained by the Habsburg monarchy. After Galicia was granted an autonomy (1867), the Austrian government, in fact, agreed with the Polish domination in the region, having received instead a partnership of the Poles in formation of the majority in the Austrian parliament. «A special status» of the region was fixed by the creation in 1871 of the post of the so-called minister without a portfolio (the minister for the region) which played a role of the intermediary between the Austrian and the regional governments and, informally, also prevented the direct contacts between Vienna and the Ukrainian politicians. The posts of the minister, Galician viceregent, and marshal of the Galician diet were, as a rule, held by the Polish aristocrats (Natsionalne pytannia, 2012: 78–79).

The Poles of the Austrian Galicia were as if a semi-latent «dominating people», which, though deprived of their own independent state, preserved its traditional elite and domination zones. Under the condition of the Polish nobility's domination the autonomy of Galicia automatically meant the Polish autonomy. Thanks to their actual domination in the region the Polish officials restored their monopoly position in the bodies of the regional power and local government (Monolatii, 2008a: 161). By national structure the Galician officials were mostly either Polish or Polonized. For a Ukrainian to chose an official career almost inevitably meant his Polonization. The regional school council which consisted mainly of Poles, quickly enough carried out the Polonization of Galicia (Natsionalne pytannia, 2012: 79). Such a policy gave grounds to the Polish political leaders during the First World War to set the goal of restoration of the independent Polish state.

The Jews. The policy concerning the Jews in the Russian empire was of restrictive character and was directed for the prevention of their penetration into the Great Russian gubernias in order to concentrate them mainly in the western regions of the empire, which list included also the Volhynian gubernia. Still in 1791 Queen Catherine II by her decree established the territorial borders of the constant residing of the Jews, – «a strip of constant settlement». The strip was abolished only in 1917 after the February revolution by the law «On cancellation of confessional and national restrictions» (Barmak, 1999: 116, 121). In 1882 it was forbidden for the Jews to live in villages even within the borders of «strips of settlement» (Pohrebynska).

Except territorial restrictions, the Jews were under pressure in the economic, religious, and educational aspects. In 1864 the decrees were issued that forbade all the Jews without exception acquisitions of land from landowners and peasants by any way in nine western gubernias, that is, in the gubernias of «the strips of constant settlement». On July 23rd, 1865 the «Instruction on the order of sale of state lands in the western gubernias» was accepted. The Jews, as well as the Poles, were excluded from the list of subjects of the purchase of manors. According to the law, from December 8th, 1867 the Jews could become tenants or managing directors of mills, sugar, glass and other factories, the management of which required technical knowledge and some available capital (Borodii, 2014: 76). Within the borders of the «strip of settlement», as well as in certain other places where a constant stay was authorized for certain categories of the Jewish population, the Jews had the right to buy real estate. But this general rule was limited by numerous restrictions. Within the «strip of settlement», outside of cities and small towns, since 1882 the conclusion of saling, pawning, and lease agreements addressed to Jews was suspended. In the western gubernias the Jews were not authorized to be also shareholders of sugar factories. Eventually, in the fifty versts wide border land the Jews were not authorized to possess real estates (Pohrebynska).

In the XIX century in Russia a special system of the raised taxation of the Jews was valid. Since 1884, a «box tax» from the Jews was introduced. It existed in two forms, – general and auxiliary. The former was the tax on the consumption of meat by the Jews. It was collected from each animal killed for the kosher meal, from each killed bird, and from the sale of each pound of kosher meat. The auxiliary tax was the one on the inherited by the Jews property or their industrial enterprises, on the incomes from the tenancy of shops, barns, and housing premises, which belonged to them. Those taxes were also on the use of the Jewish clothes, both used by men and women. From 1844 the candle tax began to be collected on the kindling of candles during Jewish meetings on Saturdays. Only by this tax the Jews had to pay annually nearly 230 000 rubles. A special tax was imposed on the Jewish printing houses.

Since 1862 the Jews were permitted to print Jewish books, but there was an established payment for each printing press (Pohrebynska).

In the beginning of the XX century the Russian tsarism policy concerning the Jews was formulated frankly enough: either their assimilation and obedience to the nation-wide purposes of Russia, or emigration. The whole system of legislative regulation of life and activity of the Jews driven into the «stripe of settlement» was directed to forcing them to reject their national and religious traditions and, eventually, to make a heavy personal choice within the limits of the cruel internal alternative as formulated by the imperial politicians (Pohrebynska).

The policy of the Austro-Hungarian empire concerning the Jews was entirely different. It should be noticed, that the Jewish population of Galicia was congregated into 262 religious communities which had 250 synagogues and 376 schools. By the part of the Jewish population Galicia was ahead of all other gubernias of the Habsburg monarchy. In 1900 66,2 % of Jews of Austria lived in Galicia. In 1910 61,6 % of the Jewish population in Eastern Galicia lived in cities and small towns, making in some of them an overwhelming majority. The largest Jewish communities lived in Lviv, Kolomyia, Brody, Ternopil, Stanislaviv, Peremyshl, Drohobych, and Stryi. In a number of professional groups the percentage of the Jewish population was very high. So, by the data for 1900, the Jews made up almost 40 % of those occupied in industry, 74 % in trade, 27 % in public service, and 49,3 % of all the Galician intelligentsia. The concentration in the hands of the Jews of the landed property, rent of agricultural lands had a tendency to increasing (Natsionalne pytannia, 2012: 85). The Austrian government should have accounted for the influence of the Jews in social and economic life of the land.

In spite of all, the Austrian power wanted to stop the practice of the separation of the Jews from the rest of the society and to make usual subordinated citizens of them. Granting the Jewish communities the right to self-management, the Austrian government officials put them under the state control, having introduced, in particular, the post of «the regional rabbi», – the nominal head of all the Jewish communities (kagals). The constitutional reforms of 1867 and 1905 opened wide opportunities of political emancipation for the Jews: the leveling of civil rights put an end to the appreciable aspiration of the Christian communities in that period to limit the public activity of the Jews. The new legal field allowed the Jews an access, first of all, to the city and district councils. The gaining of equality initiated a difficult period of modernization of the Jewish community in the land, which had to learn to live «outside the Ghetto», in a wider political and cultural contacts with the external world. The modernization processes passed at the background of discussions in Jewish communities. In a rivalry of the orthodox with the reformers the advantage of the latter became clear, but, at the same time, their movement was accompanied by assimilating processes. Two assimilatory directions were formed, respectively, to the «high» German (its adherents asserted that the Jews owe their freedom and equality to the Habsburgs) and Polish (the Jews should be grateful to the Poles for their merits in history) cultures (Natsionalne pytannia, 2012: 85–86).

At the same time, being Austrian citizens equal in rights, the Jews were deprived of the rights of a national community. The Polish elite, which was stronger in the political-economic domain, used the union with the Jews as a tool of the national oppression of the Ukrainian population. The outstanding Jewish representative V. Zhabotynskyi in 1906 wrote the following on this issue: «In the whole Polish hegemony in Galicia the Jewish help played an outstanding role. The falsification of the census «enlisted» all the Jewry in the land to be of Polish nationality... And the loss of this «augment» will mean the end of the legend about

the Polish majority and the beginning of the end of a reactionary szlachta domination. Best of all the Poles themselves feel it, and it is from there that their rage comes with which they pursue the Jewish «separatism»» (Monolatiy, 2008b: 157). Also characteristic of the position of the Jews in Galicia was the active Zionist and Jewish social democratic movements, and the activity of some parties (in particular, the Jewish national party of Galicia, founded in 1893) and professional, youth and cultural-educational public organizations (Monolatiy, 2008b: 164–166). All that prepared the national Renaissance of the Jews of Galicia at the beginning of the XX century.

The conclusions. Thus, a comparative analysis of the national policy of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires concerning three most numeral ethnic groups of Volhynia and Eastern Galicia has certified the presence of considerable differences in the methods of government of the two states. The Romanovs' monarchy aspired to unify the national structure of the population of Volhynia by the assimilation of the Ukrainians, Poles and Jews, restriction of their economic and cultural-educational interests. The majority of the Ukrainian population of the Volhynian gubernia were treated by Russian officials as «Little Russians», that is, like a part of the uniform Russian people. The struggle was conducted against the Ukrainian intelligentsia who supported the national-cultural separateness of the Ukrainian people. The Poles and the Jews were unequivocally treated as foreigners concerning whom the government carried out a frankly discriminational national policy. On the contrary, the Habsburg monarchy, having become parliamentary in 1860, recognized the national-cultural rights of the Ukrainians, Poles and Jews of Galicia. However, in a politically-administrative aspect the Austrian authorities more relied on the Galician Polish minority, more precisely, on its political, social and economic elite. Under these conditions the Ukrainians and the Jew, showing loyalty to the Austrian authorities, were actively engaged in the development of their own political-party, public, economic and cultural establishments. Eventually, the national policy of the both empires had one in common, that was the problem of self-preservation of the monarchic states and the ideology of fidelity to the monarchical dynasty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Бармак, 1999 – Бармак М. Німецьке, чеське та єврейське населення Волинської губернії (1796 – 1914 рр.). Тернопіль: ТДПУ, 1999. 208 с.
- Білобровець, 2014 – Білобровець О.М. Вибори до Державної думи та Державної ради на Правобережжі: участь польського населення // Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Історія. 2014. Вип. 22. С. 17–20.
- Бородій, 2014 – Бородій А. Євреї в аграрних відносинах на території Правобережної України у 1861 – 1914 рр.: дис. ... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01. Кам'янець-Подільський, 2014. 258 с.
- Буравський, 2004 – Буравський О. А. Поляки Волині у другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст. Житомир: Вид-во ЖДУ, 2004. 168 с.
- Гаухман, 2010 – Гаухман М. Російська національна політика щодо польського питання на Правобережній Україні (1905 – 1914 рр.) // Волинські історичні записки: збірник наукових праць. 2010. Т. 5. С. 32–37.
- Етнографія України, 2004 – Етнографія України: Навч. посібник / За ред. С. Макарчука. Львів: Світ, 2004. 520 с.
- Желізняк, 2016 – Желізняк В. Національна політика Російської імперії на Волині: управлінський аспект // Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка. Серія: Історія. 2016. Вип. 2(1). С. 25–29.
- Монолатій, 2008а – Монолатій І. С. Австролялізм як «тактика очікування» етнонаціональних спільнот західноукраїнського регіону // Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України. 2008. Вип. 41. С. 156–166.

Монолатій, 2008b – Монолатій І. Євреї у Галичині в австрійський період (1772 – 1918 рр.) // Незалежний культурологічний часопис «І». 2008. № 51. С. 150–169.

Надольська, 2003 – Надольська В. В. Політика деполонізації в Російській імперії: витоки, шляхи реалізації, наслідки // Наукові записки національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія. Історичні науки. Острог, 2003. С. 48–55.

Національне питання, 2012 – Національне питання в Україні ХХ – на початку ХХІ ст.: історичні нариси / [авт. кол.: О. Г. Аркуша, В. Ф. Верстюк та ін.; відп. ред. В. А. Смолій]. Київ: Ніка-Центр, 2012. 590 с.

Первая всеобщая перепись, 1904 – Первая всеобщая перепись населения Российской империи 1897 г. Волынская губерния / ред. Н. А. Тройницкий. СПб.: Издание центрального статистического комитета Министерства внутренних дел, 1904. Т. VIII. 280 с.

Погребинська – Погребинська І. Законодавство Російської імперії щодо євреїв. У складі двох імперій (кінець ХVІІІ ст. – початок ХХ ст.) // Єврейська енциклопедія – Розділ II. URL – http://holocaust-ukraine.net/ru/razdel_ii.htm

Поліщук, 2012 – Поліщук Ю. М. Національні меншини Правобережжя України у контексті етнічної політики Російської імперії (кінець ХVІІІ – початок ХХ ст.). Київ: ІПіЕНД ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України, 2012. 432 с.

Рацілевич, 2004 – Рацілевич А. П. Особливості українського національного руху на Волині початку ХХ ст. // *Ucrainica Polonica*. Київ-Житомир, 2004. Т. 1. С. 67–76.

Щербак, 2005 – Щербак Н. О. Національне питання в політиці царизму у Правобережній Україні (кінець ХVІІІ – початок ХХ століття). Київ: Ризографіка, 2005. 616 с.

Łukawski, 1967 – Łukawski Z. Koło polskie w Rosyjskiej Dumie Państwowej w latach 1906 – 1909 [Polish faction in the Russian parliament in the years 1906 – 1909]. Wrocław, 1967. 229 s.

Kwiatkowski, 1932 – Kwiatkowski W. Walka o wolność i potęgę Polski [The fight for the freedom and power of Poland]. Lwów, 1932. Т. 1. 369 s.

REFERENCES

Barmak, 1999 – Barmak M. Nimetske, cheske ta yevreiske naselennia Volynskoi hubernii (1796 – 1914 rr.) [German, Czech and Jewish population of Volhynian gubernia (1796 – 1914)]. Ternopil: TDPU, 1999. 208 p. [in Ukrainian]

Bilobrovets, 2014 – Bilobrovets O. M. Vybory do Derzhavnoi dumy ta Derzhavnoi rady na Pravoberezhzhi: uchast polskoho naselennia [Elections to the State Duma and the State Council on the Right-Bank Ukraine: participation of the Polish population]. Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Serii: Istorii. 2014. Vyp. 22. Pp. 17–20. [in Ukrainian]

Borodii, 2014 – Borodii A. Yevrei v ahrarykh vidnosynakh na terytorii Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy u 1861 – 1914 rr. [Jews in agrarian relations in the territory of the Right-Bank Ukraine in 1861–1914]: dys. ...kand.ist.nauk: 07.00.01. Kamianets-Podilskiy, 2014. 258 p. [in Ukrainian]

Buravskiy, 2004 – Buravskiy O. A. Poliaky Volyni u druii polovyni ХІХ – na pochatku ХХ st. [Poles in Volhynia in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries]. Zhytomyr: Vyd-vo ZhDU, 2004. 168 p. [in Ukrainian]

Haukhman, 2010 – Haukhman M. Rosiiska natsionalna polityka shchodo polskoho pytannia na Pravoberezhnii Ukraini (1905 – 1914 rr.) [Russian national policy on the Polish question in the Right-Bank Ukraine (1905 – 1914)]. Volynski istorychni zapysky: zbirnyk naukovykh prats. 2010. Т. 5. Pp. 32–37. [in Ukrainian]

Etnohrafiia Ukrainy, 2004 – Etnohrafiia Ukrainy [Ethnography of Ukraine]: Navch. posibnyk / Za red. S. Makarchuka. Lviv: Svit, 2004. 520 p. [in Ukrainian]

Zhelizniak, 2016 – Zhelizniak V. Natsionalna polityka Rosiiskoi imperii na Volyni: upravlinskyi aspekt [The national policy of the Russian Empire in Volhynia: a managerial aspect]. Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka. Serii: Istorii. 2016. Vyp. 2(1). Pp. 25–29. [in Ukrainian]

Monolatiy, 2008a – Monolatiy I.S. Avstroloializm yak «takyka ochikuvannia» etnonatsionalnykh spilnot zakhidnoukrainskoho regionu [An Austrian loyalty as a «tactic of expectation» of ethnonational

communities of the Western Ukrainian region]. Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy. 2008. Vyp. 41. Pp. 156–166. [in Ukrainian]

Monolatiy, 2008b – Monolatiy I. Yevrei u Halychyni v avstriiskyi period (1772 – 1918 rr.) [Jews in Galicia during the Austrian period (1772 – 1918)]. Nezaleznyy kulturno-ohichnyi chasopys «I». 2008. № 51. Pp. 150–169. [in Ukrainian]

Nadolska, 2003 – Nadolska V. V. Polityka depolonizatsii v Rosiiskii imperii: vytoky, shliakhy realizatsii, naslidky [The policy of de-polonization in the Russian empire: origins, ways of realization, consequences]. Naukovi zapysky natsionalnoho universytetu «Ostrozka akademiia». Serii. Istorychni nauky. Ostroh, 2003. Pp. 48–55. [in Ukrainian]

Natsionalne pytannia, 2012 – Natsionalne pytannia v Ukraini XX – na pochatku XXI st.: istorychni narysy [The national question in Ukraine XX – early XXI century: historical essays]. Avt. kol.: O. H. Arkusha, V. F. Verstiuk ta in.; vidp. red. V. A. Smolii. Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr, 2012. 590 p. [in Ukrainian]

Pervaia vseobshchaia perepys', 1904 – Pervaia vseobshchaia perepys' naseleniia Rosyiskoy imperii 1897 h. Volynskaia huberniia [The first general census of the population of the Russian Empire in 1897. Volyn province]. Red. N. A. Troinitskiy. SPb.: Izdanie tsentralnoho statisticheskoho komiteta Ministerstva vnutrennikh del, 1904. T. VIII. 280 p. [in Russian]

Pohrebynska – Pohrebynska I. Zakonodavstvo Rosiiskoi imperii shchodo yevreiv. U skladi dvokh imperii. Yevreiska entsyklopediia – Rozdil II (kinets XVIII st. – pochatok XX st.) [The Russian Empire's legislation about Jews. In the composition of two empires (the end of the XVIII century – the beginning of XX century)]. Jewish Encyclopedia – Chapter II]. URL – http://holocaust-ukraine.net/ru/razdel_ii.htm [in Ukrainian]

Polishchuk, 2012 – Polishchuk Yu. M. Natsionalni menshyny Pravoberezhzhia Ukrainy u konteksti etnichnoi polityky Rosiiskoi imperii (kinets XVIII – pochatok XX st.) [National Minorities of the Right-Bank Ukraine in the context of the Russian Empire's ethnic policy (the end of the XVIII – the beginning of the XX century)]. Kyiv: IPIEND im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy, 2012. 432 p. [in Ukrainian]

Ratsilevych, 2004 – Ratsilevych A. P. Osoblyvosti ukrainskoho natsionalnoho rukhu na Volyni pochatku XX st. [The features of the Ukrainian national movement in Volyn at the beginning of the XX century]. Ucrainica Polonica. Kyiv–Zhytomyr, 2004. T. 1. Pp. 67–76. [in Ukrainian]

Shcherbak, 2005 – Shcherbak N. O. Natsionalne pytannia v politytsi tsaryzmu u Pravoberezhnii Ukraini (kinets XVIII – pochatok XX stolittia) [The national question in the Russian Empire's policy in the Right-Bank Ukraine (the end of the XVIII – the beginning of XX century)]. Kyiv: Ryzohrafika, 2005. 616 p. [in Ukrainian]

Łukawski, 1967 – Łukawski Z. Koło polskie w Rosyjskiej Dumie Państwowej w latach 1906 – 1909 [The Polish milieu in the Russian People's Duma in 1906 - 1909]. Wrocław, 1967. 229 p. [in Polish]

Kwiatkowski, 1932 – Kwiatkowski W. Walka o wolność i potęgę Polski [The struggle for Poland's liberation and power]. Lwów, 1932. T. 1. 369 p. [in Polish]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 19.04.2018 р.

UDC 94(477.5/7)«1914/1918»:62
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130667

Larisa SINYAVSKA,
orcid.org/0000-0001-5575-5775
Ph D hab. (History), Associate Professor,
Professor of Department of Ukrainian History
Bohdan Khmelnytskyi Cherkasy National University
(Ukraine, Cherkassy) lora-s@meta.ua

SOVIET HISTORIOGRAPHY OF RESEARCHES OF THE HEAVY INDUSTRY OF EASTERN UKRAINE UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The First World War led to significant changes in the geopolitical situation in the world. Its scale and duration led to the collapse of several empires, among which was the Russian Empire. The association of as many of the territories that were previously part of the Russian Empire, the aggressiveness of the foreign policy of the USSR, and the excessive analysis of all spheres of life required an appropriate economic foundation, the implementation of ideological work and ethno-national policy. This marked the isolation of the Soviet historiography of the newest period in the history of mankind, beginning with the Bolshevik revolution, which led to the perception and consideration of the history of the First World War as periods of 1914–1916 and 1917–1918. Thus, the fact of political life was a factor in the allocation of certain historical periods, which to a large extent contradicted the distinction of historical periods of human development on the basis of changes in industrial and economic relations. The Marxist periodization, modified by the Bolshevik leaders in accordance with its goals, became an important factor which influence on the coverage of the history of the First World War in the USSR.

The main aim of the article is to overview Soviet historiography on the state of heavy industry in the East of Ukraine during the First World War and to analyze the views of the authors on the economic phenomena and processes that took place at these enterprises in 1914–1918.

It is important to mention that the substantiation of the historical condition of the establishment of Soviet power during the 1920's after a long civil war, demanded a certain shift in the emphasis on the coverage of economic processes during the First World War. On the one hand, there was a need to prove the existence of a monopoly capitalism in the Russian Empire, whose destruction was declared an important milestone in the construction of a «socialist society», but on the other hand – economic transformations and successes in the USSR for a long time were evaluated in comparison with the achievements of the Russian Empire in 1913. This led to the gradual introduction of various stamps in the assessments of economic development both during the First World War and in the prewar period, which largely reflected by Soviet historiography.

Despite the existing Soviet historiography, in which the authors analyzed economic phenomena and processes during the First World War, changes in the heavy industry of the East of Ukraine, unfortunately, were investigated only fragmentarily: mostly in the context of processes that took place in the territory of the Russian Empire. However, in the presence of general tendencies in the field of finance and measures aimed at ensuring state regulation of economic development, there were a number of peculiarities in the field of heavy industry in Ukrainian lands which were not subject of scientific studies.

The main idea of the article is that in the second half of the XX century, in the Soviet historiography, coverage of the First World War gave way to the study of the events of the Second World War. The increase in interest in this event was followed in the writings of Russian scientists in the 90's of the XX century. As a result of content analysis and critical discourse analysis, this interest was partly due to the growing tendency to outline the links between the Russian Federation and the Russian Empire, criticizing the Soviet period in the history of the country. Imperial ambitions of the Russian Federation at the beginning of the XXI century became one of the factors of increasing attention to the events of the First World War.

Key words: First World War, economy, industry, East of Ukraine, Soviet historiography.

Лариса СИНЯВСЬКА,
доктор історичних наук, доцент,
професор кафедри історії України
Черкаського національного університету
імені Богдана Хмельницького (Україна, Черкаси) lora-s@meta.ua

РАДЯНСЬКА ІСТОРИОГРАФІЯ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ ВАЖКОЇ ПРОМИСЛОВОСТІ СХІДНОГО РЕГІОНУ УКРАЇНИ В УМОВАХ ПЕРШОЇ СВІТОВОЇ ВІЙНИ

Висвітлено радянську історіографію з аналізу стану важкої промисловості східного регіону України під час Першої світової війни та проаналізовано погляди авторів щодо економічних явищ і процесів, що відбувалися на цих підприємствах у 1914 – 1918 рр. Доведено, що попри наявну літературу, автори якої розглядали економічні явища та процеси у роки Першої світової війни, але зміни у важкій індустрії Сходу України досліджено лише фрагментарно: здебільшого у контексті перетворень, що відбувалися на теренах Російської імперії.

Ключові слова: Перша світова війна, економіка, промисловість, Схід України, радянська історіографія.

The statement of the problem. The First World War led to significant changes in the geopolitical situation in the world. Its scale and duration led to the collapse of several empires, including Russian. The association of as many of the territories that were previously part of the Russian Empire, the aggressiveness of the foreign policy of the USSR, and the excessive analysis of all spheres of life required an appropriate economic foundation, the implementation of ideological work and ethno-national policy. This left its mark on the isolation of the Soviet historiography of the newest period in the history of mankind, beginning with the Bolshevik coup, which led to the perception and consideration of the history of the First World War as periods of 1914 – 1916 and 1917 – 1918.

Thus, the fact of political life was a factor in the allocation of certain historical periods, which to a large extent contradicted the distinction of historical periods of human development on the basis of changes in industrial and economic relations. This was the basis for outlining, for example, the slave and feudal system. The Marxist periodization, modified by the Bolshevik leaders in accordance with its goals, became an important factor influencing the coverage of the history of the First World War in the USSR.

The purpose of the article is to review the Soviet historiography on the state of the heavy industry of the East of Ukraine during the First World War and to analyze the views of the authors on the economic phenomena and processes that took place at these enterprises in 1914 – 1918.

The main material. The substantiation of the historical condition for the establishment of Soviet power during the 1920's after a long civil war required a certain shift in the emphasis on the coverage of economic processes during the First World War. On the one hand, there was a need to prove the existence of monopoly capitalism in the Russian Empire whose destruction was declared an important milestone in the construction of a «socialist society», but on the other hand, economic transformations and successes in the USSR for a long time were evaluated in comparison with the achievements of the Russian Empire in 1913. This led to the gradual introduction of various kinds of stamps in estimates of economic development during the First World War and in the prewar period. At the same time, economic experi-

ments in the years of the NEP, the course on industrialization led to an increase in interest in illuminating the development of heavy industry, whose performance was declared a criterion for assessing the success of economic transformations. The presentation of industrialization as a means to get rid of foreign influence in the conditions of the USSR's «hostile environment» of capitalist countries demanded increased attention of researchers to the study of the influence of foreign capital on the economy of the Russian Empire. A gradual increase in the level of statism of Soviet society led to unrestrained criticism of the monopolies, as unions that opposed state structures, defending above all their mercenary interests. That is why the practice of Soviet scientists entered the critique of monopolistic associations with the conclusion that monopolies hampered the development of industry, and unwise government policy contributed to the growth of crisis phenomena in the economy (Последние дни, 1921), (Сидоров, 1927).

During the 1920's the main focus of Soviet historical and economic science was the process of monopolization of production, the relationship between the tsarist and monopolistic capital, the monopolization of profits, the activities of the «Prodamet» and «Produgol» associations (Гольман, 1927), (Грановский, 1929). Monopolistic associations gradually began to serve as one of the main obstacles to the nationalization of the economy, which was declared the most progressive phenomenon. Critics were subjected to entrepreneurial initiative and the process of concentration of production, which, according to many Soviet scientists, was conditioned only by selfish motives of industrialists. It is worth noting the study of P. Sharov, who described the dependence of military operations on the possibilities of the economy. The paper emphasizes that it was thanks to the modern production facilities of the Moscow economic region and the eastern region of Ukraine that the Russian Empire managed to provide for some time the needs of the armed forces (Шаров, 1928).

The studies also paid attention to the study of the impact of dependence on foreign capital on the stability of economic processes in Russia and the adoption of certain policies by the Russian government (Оль, 1922), (Оль, 1925), (Ронин, 1926). In connection with the determination of the Russian economy depends on foreign capital determined the role of German investors including those who lived in the Russian Empire in the formation of monopoly capitalism. The opposite views were expressed: some researchers believed that Russia was completely dependent on foreign capital, being a colony or semi-colony (Гольман, 1927), (Ванаг, 1930) and supporters of the so-called «national» direction have argued that this did not happen (Гиндин, 1927), (Сидоров, 1927), (Грановский, 1929). In addition, both statements were used by the Stalinist ideological machine to justify the expediency of forced industrialization: on the one hand, the country had to get rid of dependence on foreign capital and investments, and on the other, there were «objective opportunities» for economic transformations due to internal capabilities and reserves (appeared even the direction of publications, the authors of which argued that despite the massive introduction of certain scientific achievements abroad, in Russia, such discoveries were made earlier).

The analysis of the influence of foreign capital on Russian industry during the First World War, which was aimed primarily at proving the necessity of eliminating dependence on foreign entrepreneurs to ensure an adequate level of defense capabilities of the USSR, was mainly carried out with reference to unsuccessful examples of cooperation with foreign firms and organizations. The result was almost complete lack of reliable data on foreign, in particular, German, land tenure and capital in Russia, as in such materials nobody was essentially interested in the long-term. Among the first were the calculations of M. Halytsky (Галицкий, 1922). But they

were made mostly on the basis of untested newspaper reports and they were not accompanied by analytical material. In particular, methods of calculations were not covered.

Some authors used the data of P. Olya, which was grouped in 1917 by industry (Оль, 1922), (Оль, 1925). But they also have a characteristic lack of explanations for the initial data on the size of foreign capital in any joint-stock company. In this regard, it is necessary to recognize the fair judgment that the figures given by P. Olya «are more expert evaluations than precise statistics» (Дякин, 1971: 9). Despite this, some of Olya's findings are noteworthy as they are the result of significant analytical work.

In the writings of Soviet researchers, the analysis of the process of militarization of the economy of the Russian Empire in the years of the First World War became popular. Emphasized the importance of mobilizing the economy to meet the needs of the army. The role of state bodies in this process and in the organization of evacuation of industrial enterprises was determined (Сорокин, 1922). Separately were investigated, the attraction of various categories of workers to work in industrial enterprises within the militarization of the economy (Гессен, 1927), the implementation of financial policies (Каценеленбаум, 1924), (Гиндин, 1927) and the features of monopoly capitalism in the Russian Empire (Грановский, 1929).

During the 30's of the XX century intensified attention to the determination of the impact of foreign capital on the activities of industrial enterprises in the territory of the Russian Empire, criticizing the increasing dependence on foreign entrepreneurs (Ванаг, 1930). Outside the attention of the researchers, the analysis of the effectiveness of economic relations on the basis of private property and the determination of the appropriate limits of state interference in economic processes was gradually drawn. During this period Soviet historical and economic science was completely isolated from the influence of foreign scientific researches. Staying outside the world of research, Soviet scientists focused on «substantiating» the economic transformations of socialism and criticism of capitalist relations. It is important that the analysis of the ideas of J. Keynes and the basic postulates of «New course» of F. Roosevelt was ignored by Soviet researchers of the XX century. This led to the primitiveness of judgments about attempts to state regulation of economic processes carried out by the government of the Russian Empire during the First World War. Behind the thoughtless critique of the Provisional Government's actions, the accusations of the Ukrainian Central Rada of Hetman P. Skoropadsky and the Directory in «bourgeois nationalism» concealed reforms in the sphere of industrial production, attempts to preserve the industrial capacities of industrial enterprises and skilled personnel. The struggle for control over the industrial enterprises of the East of Ukraine between Russian and Ukrainian power structures also remained out of the attention of scientists against the backdrop of large-scale coverage of the «triumphal procession of Soviet power in Ukraine».

During the second half of the 50's – in the 60's of the XX century several attempts have been made to analyze the process of concentration of production in the Russian Empire and determine its impact on the defense of the country (Гэфтер, 1953), (Погребинский, 1954), (Шигалин, 1956), (Маевский, 1957а), (Бовыкин, Тарновский, 1957), (Волобуев, 1957), (Погребинский, 1958), (Тарновский, 1958), (Гиндин, 1964). Monopolistic associations have been accused of neglecting national interests in the construction of transport routes, the organization of coal mining and the organization of transportation of mineral fuel through the desire to obtain extra profits, which, according to scientists, led to an increase in the fuel and energy problem. Gradually, scientists began to become increasingly interested in the topic of the illumination of the strike struggle of workers for their rights and the participation of

the Bolsheviks in the organization of anti-government activities in the working environment with the definition of its impact on the work of industrial enterprises (Никифорова, 1953), (Рабочее движение, 1966), (Кириянов, 1971). At the same time, the spread of the labor movement was due primarily to the growth of the economic crisis in the conditions of war. The results sought to connect with the Bolshevik Revolution, avoiding talk about the economic losses that occurred as a result of strikes (Корелин, 1965).

Instead, the emphasis was on aggravating the financial crisis in the Russian Empire during the war years. Problems in financial policy were related to the problems in the system of governance and the general decline of autocracy, which, according to the scientists, was unable to ensure a well-balanced use of public finances and the proper mobilization of forces and means of warfare (Бовыкин, 1966), (Бовыкин, 1970), (Иванов, Тарновский, 1970). It was pointed out the dependence of the Russian Empire on foreign investment, which created the preconditions for the imbalance of the financial system during the war. However, Soviet researchers for the most part did not link the aggravation of financial problems with the implementation of Russia's financial obligations to the Entente allies for the supplied equipment and mechanisms, as was later done by Russian scientists.

On the example of the organization of production and financial activities of monopolistic associations, financing of economic activity by credit unions, Soviet researchers analyzed the peculiarities of the movement of financial flows during the war years, comparing this process with the prewar (Дозорцев, 1973), (Голиков, 1974), (Воронкова, 1975).

Comparison of the process of organizing production before the war and during the war years, with the emphasis on the role of the Bolshevik Party in the reconstruction of industry and agriculture, and the suppression of the destructive influence of revolutionary organizations on production activity became the subject of an analysis of a significant number of Soviet researchers.

It is worth highlighting the work of I. Maievsky (Маевский, 1957b), the author of which – the doctor of economic sciences – made an attempt to comprehensively explore the development of Russian economy during the First World War. His study includes an analysis of the nature of industrial restructuring to meet military needs, features of production and forms of distribution of metal and fuel, the process of concentration of production and the growth of profits of industrialists through the execution of military orders, the dynamics of labor productivity and the provision of enterprises with labor force. At the same time, in this work I. Maievsky widely represented the role of the Bolsheviks in the organization of strike movement with an emphasis on determining the factors that accelerated the decline of autocracy.

At the same time, it should be noted the work of V. Dyakin, who paid much attention to the analysis of the relationship between the Russian bourgeoisie and the tsarist during the First World War, as well as the coverage of the activities of joint stock companies, part of the capital of which were the finances of foreign entrepreneurs (Дякин, 1967), (Дякин, 1968), (Дякин, 1971).

In studies A. Sidorov stressed out that the main reasons for the growth of crisis phenomena in the economy of Russia was a low capacity of transport routes (and especially railways) and their relatively small network, as well as the location of production due to the features of the process of concentration of capital (Сидоров, 1957), (Сидоров, 1960). Being competent and acquainted with the content of the source base by the researcher, A. Sidorov considered the fact of the uneven development of various economic branches and the presence in these sectors of different rates of economic growth. But like most other researchers, he gives

preference to general phenomena in his opinion compared with secondary ones (Ланской, 2010: 196).

In the works of Soviet researchers mostly highlighted progress towards the concentration of capital in the Russian Empire. At the same time, attention was drawn to the enterprises located on the territory of the Donbas, since an absolute majority of them were built and equipped with modern machines and mechanisms by attracting foreign capital and concentration of production (Тарновский, 1958), (Шепелев, 1973), (Шепелев, 1987), (Кубицкая, 1989), (Кушнирук, 1989).

Considerable attention was paid to the study of the history of individual industrial enterprises. At the same time, the emphasis was placed on the study of the labor movement and the participation of workers in the «establishment of Soviet power in Ukraine», and much less attention was paid to the analysis of production processes, organization of labor. By pointing indicators that characterize output, retreated into the background managers and employees who have made great efforts for the organization of enterprises in market conditions and increased government regulation of economic processes during the First World War (Малюк и др., 1960), (Кнышев и др., 1962), (Каган, 1963), (Прохоров и др., 1964), (Зарево над заводом, 1965), (Коммунарцы, 1965), (Евселевский, Пустовит, 1967), (Варавва, Маленко, 1970).

Some aspects of the activity of industrial enterprises in the eastern region of Ukraine were considered within the framework of the studies devoted to the analysis of providing the army with the necessary equipment. In this regard, much attention was paid to the coverage of the so-called «shell hunger» and measures aimed at solving this problem. The importance of organizing large-scale production of shells of various calibres was emphasized, but at the same time it was pointed out that the loading of individual enterprises by comparatively simple manufacture of this type of ammunition complicated the simultaneous production of machines and mechanisms, the technology of which was much more complicated. Therefore, in some cases, enterprises that had equipment for the production of turbine engines for ships or metal-working machines, were engaged in the production of shells. It was pointed out that the problem was the organization of providing defense enterprises with skilled workers, fuel and raw materials (Астафьев, 1976).

The ideological principles that guided their research in most of the Soviet historians who studied the events of the First World War often contradicted not only historical facts but, in fact, one another. Thus, the justification for the existence of monopoly capitalism in Russia and, accordingly, the prerequisites for the socialist revolution required the advancement of success in the economic development before the war. At the same time, the justification for the need to overthrow autocracy required criticism of the government during the war years. Therefore, enough effort was made to cover the crisis phenomena in the economy of the Russian Empire during the First World War (Флоринский, 1988), (Аврех, 1989).

Guided by the relevant directions, the economic reasons were determined for the deployment of the campaign «Fighting German domination» in the Russian Empire during the First World War. It was pointed out that, in the opinion of the ruling circles, the slogan of the elimination of «German domination» was to draw on the side of the government the middle and petty bourgeoisie, which thus got an opportunity to get rid of competitors of German origin, to provide the authorities with support for the broad bourgeois parties that sought to strengthen the government's assistance to the «Russian industry» (Кризис, 1984: 182). It was emphasized that the struggle with «Germanism» created attractive prospects in the agrarian sphere, because by liquidating the land tenure of the Germans-colonists, the government was

given a chance to resolve the land issue without affecting the interests of Russian landlords (Флоринский, 1988: 93). It was emphasized that the struggle against «German domination» was supposed to contribute to the formation of chauvinistic sentiments in the population (Дякин, 1968: 227). However, in agreeing with the opinions of Soviet researchers, it should be pointed out that the coverage of their campaign against the German colonists aimed, first of all, to demonstrate the shortcomings of the work of Russian officials, their interest in preserving landlord land tenure and feudalism, which hampered economic development, and led to future revolutionary transformations in Russian society. However, the close cooperation between the leaders of the Bolshevik Party and the German intelligence and the receipt of large funds for the organization of the Bolshevik coup was concealed.

Conclusions. Thus, we can state that in the second half of the XX century in the Soviet historiography coverage of the First World War gave way to the study of the events of the Second World War. The increase of interest in this event was displayed in the writings of Russian scientists in the 90's of the XX century. According to the results of content analysis and critical discourse analysis, this interest was partly due to the growing tendency to outline the links between the Russian Federation and the Russian Empire criticizing the Soviet period of the history of the country. Imperial ambitions of the Russian Federation at the beginning of the XXI century became one of the factors of increasing attention to the events of the First World War.

At the same time, it should be pointed out that despite the literature, authors of which analyzed economic phenomena and processes during the First World War, unfortunately, changes in the heavy industry of the East of Ukraine were investigated only fragmentarily: mostly in the context of processes that took place in the territory of the Russian Empire. However, in the presence of general tendencies in the field of finance and measures which were aimed at ensuring state regulation of economic development, there were a number of peculiarities in the field of heavy industry in Ukrainian lands which were not the subject of scientific studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Аврех, 1989 – Аврех А. Я. Царизм накануне свержения. Москва: Наука, 1989. 256 с.
- Астафьев, 1976 – Астафьев И. И. По поводу записки Верховной следственной Комиссии о кризисе вооружения русской армии в период Первой мировой войны // Материалы по истории России в период капитализма. Москва, 1976. С. 96–128.
- Бовыкин, 1966 – Бовыкин В. И. Зарождение финансового капитала в России: автореф. дис. ... д-ра ист. наук. Москва, 1966. 30 с.
- Бовыкин, Тарновский, 1957 – Бовыкин В. И., Тарновский К. Н. Концентрация производства и развитие монополий в металлообрабатывающей промышленности России // Вопросы истории. 1957. № 2, февраль. С. 19–31.
- Бовыкин, 1970 – Бовыкин В. И. Индустриальное развитие России до 1917 г. // V Международный конгресс экономической истории, Ленинград, 10–14 августа 1970 г. Ленинград: [Б. и.], 1970. 13 с.
- Ванаг, 1930 – Ванаг Н. Н. Финансовый капитал России накануне мировой войны. Опыт историко-экономического исследования финансового капитала в России. Ленинград: Госиздат, 1930. 414 с.
- Варавва, Маленко, 1970 – Варавва В. М., Маленко Е. Е. Молодость столетнего завода. Очерк истории Конотопского паровозагоноремонтного завода. Харьков: Прапор, 1970. 176 с.
- Волобуев, 1957 – Волобуев П. В. Топливный кризис и монополии в России накануне первой мировой войны // Вопросы истории. 1957. № 1. январь. С. 33–46.
- Воронкова, 1975 – Воронкова С. В. Материалы Особого совещания по обороне государства. Источниковедческое исследование. Москва: Изд-во Московского университета, 1975. 190 с.

- Галицкий, 1922 – Галицкий М. Иностранные капиталы в русской промышленности перед войной // Народное хозяйство. 1922. № 3. С. 36–58.
- Гессен, 1927 – Гессен В. Ю. Труд детей и подростков в фабрично-заводской промышленности России от XVII века до Октябрьской революции. Москва; Ленинград: Гос. изд-во, 1927. Т. I. 267 с.
- Гефтер, 1953 – Гефтер М. Я. Царизм и монополистический капитал в металлургии Юга России до первой мировой войны (К вопросу о подчинении государственного аппарата царизма монополиям) // Исторические записки. 1953. Т. 43. С. 70–130.
- Гиндин, 1927 – Гиндин Е. Ф. Банки и промышленность в России до 1917 г. К вопросу о финансовом капитале в России. Москва: Промиздат, 1927. 208 с.
- Гиндин, 1964 – Гиндин И. Ф. Балансы акционерных предприятий как исторический источник // Малоисследованные источники по истории СССР XIX – XX вв. (Источниковедческий анализ). Москва, 1964. С. 74–147.
- Голиков, 1974 – Голиков А. Г. Материалы российских акционерно-паевых торгово-промышленных предприятий (источниковедческое исследование): автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук: 07.00.09. Москва, 1974. 26 с.
- Гольман, 1927 – Гольман М. Русский империализм. Очерк развития монополистического капитализма в России. Ленинград: Прибой, 1927. 455 с.
- Грановский, 1929 – Грановский Е. Л. Монополистический капитализм в России. Ленинград: Прибой, 1929. 168 с.
- Дозорцев, 1973 – Дозорцев С. С. Особенности развития монополистических предприятий в промышленности России. (По материалам Мальцевского и Брянского акционерных обществ): автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук: 07.00.02. Ленинград, 1973. 29 с.
- Дякин, 1967 – Дякин В. С. Русская буржуазия и царизм в годы первой мировой войны (1914 – 1917). Ленинград: Наука. Ленингр. отд-ние, 1967. 373 с.
- Дякин, 1968 – Дякин В. С. Первая мировая война и мероприятия по ликвидации так называемого немецкого засилья // Первая мировая война. 1914 – 1918: сб. статей. Москва, 1968. С. 227–238.
- Дякин, 1971 – Дякин В. С. Германские капиталы в России (электроиндустрия и электрический транспорт). Ленинград: Наука. Ленингр. отд-ние, 1971. 288 с.
- Евселевский, Пустовит, 1967 – Евселевский Л., Пустовит П. Крюковский вагоностроительный. Очерки истории завода. Харьков: Прапор, 1967. 210 с.
- Зарево над заводом, 1965 – Зарево над заводом. История Макеевского завода им. С. М. Кирова / [сост. С. С. Нарбут]. Донецк: Донбасс, 1965. 128 с. (История фабрик и заводов).
- Иванов, Тарновский, 1970 – Иванов Л., Тарновский К. Общественно-экономическая структура России. Проблема многоукладности // V Международный конгресс экономических наук, Ленинград, 10–14 августа 1970 г. Москва: Изд-во «Наука», 1970. 15 с.
- Каган, 1963 – Донецкий металлургический завод / ред.-сост. Т. Б. Каган. Донецк: Кн. изд-во, 1963. 28 с.
- Каценеленбаум, 1924 – Каценеленбаум З. С. Денежное обращение России 1914 – 1924. Москва; Ленинград: Изд-во «Экономическая жизнь», 1924. 192 с.
- Кирьянов, 1971 – Кирьянов Ю. И. Рабочие Юга России. 1914 – февраль 1917 г. Москва: Наука, 1971. 307 с.
- Кнышев и др., 1962 – Кнышев И. Н., Мазов В. Ф., Жигулин В. И. Лицом к огню. Краткий очерк истории Днепропетровского металлургического завода им. Г. И. Петровского. Днепропетровск: Кн. изд-во, 1962. 431 с.
- Коммунарцы, 1965 – Коммунарцы. История Коммунарского ордена Красного Знамени металлургического завода / [Е. А. Куксина, В. Г. Никитенко, Г. А. Плетенцов и др.]. Донецк: Донбасс, 1965. 128 с.
- Корелин, 1965 – Корелин А. П. Монополии в металлообрабатывающей промышленности России и их антирабочая политика в годы первой мировой войны: автореф. дис. ... канд. ист. наук. Москва, 1965. 19 с.
- Кризис, 1984 – Кризис самодержавия в России. 1895 – 1917 / Б. В. Ананьич [и др.]. Ленинград: Наука. Ленингр. отд-ние, 1984. 663 с.

Кубицкая, 1989 – Кубицкая О. А. Эволюция монополистической организации (на примере Совета представителей паровозостроительных заводов) // Монополистический капитализм в России: сб. науч. трудов. Москва, 1989. С. 86–103.

Кушнирук, 1989 – Кушнирук С. В. Анализ экономического положения фирм-контрагентов синдиката «Продуголь» // Монополистический капитализм в России: сб. науч. трудов. Москва, 1989. С. 46–57.

Ланской, 2010 – Ланской Г. Н. Отечественная историография экономической истории России начала XX века. Москва: Российский гос. гуманитарный ун-т, 2010. 507 с.

Маевский, 1957а – Маевский И. В. К вопросу о зависимости России в период первой мировой войны // Вопросы истории. 1957. № 1, январь. С. 69–77.

Маевский, 1957б – Маевский И. В. Экономика русской промышленности в условиях первой мировой войны. Москва: Политиздат, 1957. 391 с.

Малюк и др., 1960 – Молодость старого завода. Очерк истории Днепровского металлургического завода им. Дзержинского / В. Малюк [и др.]. Днепропетровск: Днепропетровское кн. изд-во, 1960. 233 с.

Никифорова, 1953 – Никифорова Л. Р. Горловская забастовка 1916 г. // Исторические записки. 1953. Т. 44. С. 77–93.

Оль, 1922 – Оль П. В. Иностранные капиталы в России. Петроград: 4-я Гос. тип., 1922. 304 с.

Оль, 1925 – Оль П. В. Иностранные капиталы в народном хозяйстве довоенной России. Ленинград: [Изд-во Всесоюзной Академии Наук], 1925. 35 с.

Погребинский, 1954 – Погребинский А. П. Очерки истории финансов дореволюционной России (XIX – XX вв.). Москва: Госфиниздат, 1954. 268 с.

Погребинский, 1958 – Погребинский А. П. Синдикат «Продамет» в годы первой мировой войны (1914 – 1917) // Вопросы истории. 1958. № 10, октябрь. С. 22–34.

Последние дни, 1921 – Последние дни императорской власти. По неизданным документам / сост. А. Блок. Петербург: АЛКОНОСТ, 1921. 168 с.

Прохоров и др., 1964 – Прохоров В. С., Деда Б. И., Горяной В. Д. Криворожский металл. Очерк истории завода / Криворожский ордена Трудового Красного Знамени металлургический завод им. В. И. Ленина. Днепропетровск: Промінь, 1964. 299 с.

Рабочее движение, 1966 – Рабочее движение на Украине в период Первой мировой империалистической войны. Июль 1914 г. – февраль 1917 г.: сб. документов и материалов. Киев: Наук. думка, 1966. 434 с.

Ронин, 1926 – Ронин С. Иностранный капитал и русские банки. К вопросу о финансовом капитале в России. Москва: Изд-во коммунистического ун-та им. Я. М. Свердлова, 1926. 144 с.

Сидоров, 1927 – Сидоров А. Л. Влияние империалистической войны на экономику России // Очерки по истории Октябрьской революции. Москва; Ленинград, 1927. Т. 1. С. 3–176.

Сидоров, 1957 – Сидоров А. Л. К истории топливного кризиса в России в годы первой мировой войны (1914 – 1917) // Исторические записки. 1957. Т. 59. С. 26–83.

Сидоров, 1960 – Сидоров А. Л. Финансовое положение России в годы первой мировой войны (1914 – 1917). Москва: Изд-во АН СССР, 1960. 579 с.

Сорокин, 1922 – Сорокин П. Война и милитаризация общества // Артельное дело. 1922. № 1–4, январь–февраль. С. 3–10.

Тарновский, 1958 – Тарновский К. Н. Формирование государственно-монополистического капитализма в России в годы первой мировой войны (на примере металлургической промышленности). Москва: Изд-во Московского ун-та, 1958. 263 с.

Флоринский, 1988 – Флоринский М. Ф. Кризис государственного управления в России в годы первой мировой войны (Совет министров в 1914 – 1917 гг.). Ленинград: Изд-во Ленинградского гос. ун-та, 1988. 207 с.

Шаров, 1928 – Шаров П. Влияние экономики на исход мировой войны 1914 – 1918. Москва; Ленинград: Гос. изд-во отдела военной лит., 1928. 174 с.

Шепелев, 1973 – Шепелев Л. Е. Акционерные компании в России. Ленинград: Наука. Ленингр. отд-ние, 1973. 347 с.

Шепелев, 1987 – Шепелев Л. Е. Царизм и буржуазия в 1904 – 1914 гг. Проблемы торгово-промышленной политики. Ленинград: Наука. Ленингр. отд-ние, 1987. 272 с.

Шигалин, 1956 – Шигалин Г. И. Военная экономика в первую мировую войну (1914 – 1918 гг.). Москва: Воениздат, 1956. 332 с.

REFERENCES

Avrekh, 1989 – Avrekh A. Ya. Tsarizm nakanune sverzheniya [Tsarism on the eve of the overthrow]. Moskva: Nauka, 1989. 256 p. [in Russian]

Astafev, 1976 – Astafev I. I. Po povodu zapiski Verkhovnoy sledstvennoy Komissii o krizise vooruzheniya russkoy armii v period Pervoy mirovoy voyny [Regarding the note of the Supreme Investigation Commission about the crisis of armament of the Russian army during the First World War] // Materialy po istorii Rossii v period kapitalizma. Moskva, 1976. Pp. 96–128. [in Russian]

Bovykin, 1966 – Bovykin V. I. Zarozhdenie finansovogo kapitala v Rossii [The birth of financial capital in Russia]: avtoref. dis. ... d-ra ist. nauk. Moskva, 1966. 30 p. [in Russian]

Bovykin, Tarnovskiy, 1957 – Bovykin V. I., Tarnovskiy K. N. Kotsentratsiya proizvodstva i razvitie monopolii v metalloobrabatvayushchey promyshlennosti Rossii [Concentration of production and development of monopolies in the metalworking industry in Russia] // Voprosy istorii. 1957. № 2, fevral. Pp. 19–31. [in Russian]

Bovykin, 1970 – Bovykin V. I. Industrialnoe razvitie Rossii do 1917 g. [Industrial development of Russia before 1917] // V Mezhdunarodnyy kongress ekonomicheskoy istorii, Leningrad, 10–14 avgusta 1970 g. Leningrad: [B. i.], 1970. 13 p. [in Russian]

Vanag, 1930 – Vanag N. N. Finansovyy kapital Rossii nakanune mirovoy voyny. Opyt istoriko-ekonomicheskogo issledovaniya finansovogo kapitala v Rossii [The financial capital of Russia on the eve of the world war. The experience of the historical and economic study of financial capital in Russia]. Leningrad: Gosizdat, 1930. 414 p. [in Russian]

Varavva, Malenko, 1970 – Varavva V. M., Malenko Ye. Ye. Molodost stoletnego zavoda. Ocherk istorii Konotopskogo parovozovagonoremontnogo zavoda [Early life of the centenary plant. An outline of the history of the Konotopsk steam engine-repair plant]. Kharkov: Prapor, 1970. 176 p. [in Russian]

Volobuev, 1957 – Volobuev P. V. Toplivnyy krizis i monopolii v Rossii nakanune pervoy mirovoy voyny [Fuel crisis and monopolies in Russia on the eve of the First World War] // Voprosy istorii. 1957. № 1, yanvar. Pp. 33–46. [in Russian].

Voronkova, 1975 – Voronkova S. V. Materialy Osobogo soveshchaniya po oborone gosudarstva. Istochnikovedcheskoe issledovanie [Materials of the Special Meeting on state defense. Source study]. Moskva: Izd-vo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1975. 190 p. [in Russian]

Galitskiy, 1922 – Galitskiy M. Inostrannyye kapitaly v russkoy promyshlennosti pered voynoy [Foreign capital in the Russian industry before the war] // Narodnoe khozyaystvo. 1922. № 3. Pp. 36–58. [in Russian]

Gessen, 1927 – Gessen V. Yu. Trud detey i podrostkov v fabrichno-zavodskoy promyshlennosti Rossii ot XVII veka do Oktyabrskoy revolyutsii [The work of children and adolescents in the factory industry of Russia from the XVII century to the October Revolution]. Moskva; Leningrad: Gos. izd-vo, 1927. T. I. 267 p. [in Russian]

Gefter, 1953 – Gefter M. Ya. Tsarizm i monopolisticheskiy kapital v metallurgii Yuga Rossii do pervoy mirovoy voyny (K voprosu o podchinenii gosudarstvennogo apparata tsarizma monopoliiyam) [Tsarism and monopoly capital in the metallurgy of the South of Russia before the First World War (On the question of the subordination of the state apparatus of tsarism to monopolies)] // Istoricheskie zapiski. 1953. T. 43. Pp. 70–130. [in Russian]

Gindin, 1927 – Gindin Ye. F. Banki i promyshlennost v Rossii do 1917 g. K voprosu o finansovom kapitale v Rossii [Banks and industry in Russia before 1917. On the issue of financial capital in Russia]. Moskva: Promizdat, 1927. 208 p. [in Russian]

Gindin, 1964 – Gindin I. F. Balansy aktsionernykh predpriyatiy kak istoricheskiy istochnik [Balances of joint-stock companies as a historical source] // Maloissledovannyye istochniki po istorii SSSR XIX – XX vv. (Istochnikovedcheskiy analiz). Moskva, 1964. Pp. 74–147. [in Russian]

Golikov, 1974 – Golikov A. G. Materialy rossiyskikh aktsionerno-paevykh torгово-promyshlennykh predpriyatiy (istochnikovovedcheskoe issledovanie) [Materials of Russian joint-stock-share trade and industrial enterprises (source study)]: avtoref. dis. ... kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.09. Moskva, 1974. 26 p. [in Russian].

Golman, 1927 – Golman M. Russkiy imperializm. Ocherk razvitiya monopolisticheskogo kapitalizma v Rossii [Russian imperialism. Essay on the development of monopoly capitalism in Russia]. Leningrad: Priboy, 1927. 455 s. [in Russian]

Granovskiy, 1929 – Granovskiy Ye. L. Monopolisticheskii kapitalizm v Rossii [Monopoly capitalism in Russia]. Leningrad: Priboy, 1929. 168 p. [in Russian]

Dozortsev, 1973 – Dozortsev S. S. Osobennosti razvitiya monopolisticheskikh predpriyatiy v promyshlennosti Rossii. (Po materialam Maltsevskogo i Bryanskogo aktsionerneykh obshchestv) [Features of the development of monopolistic enterprises in the industry of Russia. (Based on the materials of Maltsevsk and Bryansk joint-stock companies)]: avtoref. dis. ... kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.02. Leningrad, 1973. 29 p. [in Russian]

Dyakin, 1967 – Dyakin V. S. Russkaya burzhuaziya i tsarizm v gody pervoy mirovoy voyny (1914 – 1917) [The Russian bourgeoisie and tsarism during the First World War (1914 – 1917)]. Leningrad: Nauka. Leningr. otd-nie, 1967. 373 p. [in Russian].

Dyakin, 1968 – Dyakin V. S. Pervaya mirovaya voyna i meropriyatiya po likvidatsii tak nazyvaemogo nemetskogo zasilya [The First World War and measures to eliminate the so-called German dominance] // Pervaya mirovaya voyna. 1914 – 1918: sb. statey. Moskva, 1968. Pp. 227–238. [in Russian]

Dyakin, 1971 – Dyakin V. S. Germanskii kapitaly v Rossii (elektroindustriya i elektricheskiy transport) [German capitals in Russia (electrical industry and electric transport)]. Leningrad: Nauka. Leningr. otd-nie, 1971. 288 p. [in Russian]

Yevelevskiy, Pustovit, 1967 – Yevelevskiy L., Pustovit P. Kryukovskiy vagonostroitelnyy. Ocherki istorii zavoda [Kryukov railway car building. Essays on the history of the plant]. Kharkov: Prapor, 1967. 210 p. [in Russian]

Zarevo nad zavodom, 1965 – Zarevo nad zavodom. Istoriya Makeevskogo zavoda im. S. M. Kirova [Glow over the plant. History of Makeevsk plant named after S. M. Kirov] / [sost. S. S. Narbut]. Donetsk: Donbass, 1965. 128 p. (Istoriya fabrik i zavodov). [in Russian]

Ivanov, Tarnovskiy, 1970 – Ivanov L., Tarnovskiy K. Obshchestvenno-ekonomicheskaya struktura Rossii. Problema mnogoukladnosti [The socio-economic structure of Russia. The problem of multi-folding] // V Mezhdunarodnyy kongress ekonomicheskikh nauk, Leningrad, 10–14 avgusta 1970 g. Moskva: Izd-vo «Nauka», 1970. 15 p. [in Russian]

Kagan, 1963 – Donetskii metallurgicheskii zavod [Donetsk metallurgical plant] / red.-sost. T. B. Kagan. Donetsk: Kn. izd-vo, 1963. 28 p. [in Russian]

Katsenelenbaum, 1924 – Katsenelenbaum Z. S. Denezhnoe obrashchenie Rossii 1914 – 1924 [Monetary circulation of Russia 1914 – 1924]. Moskva; Leningrad: Izd-vo «Ekonomicheskaya zhizn», 1924. 192 p. [in Russian]

Kiryakov, 1971 – Kiryakov Yu. I. Rabochie Yuga Rossii. 1914 – fevral 1917 g. [Workers of the South of Russia. 1914 – february 1917]. Moskva: Nauka, 1971. 307 p. [in Russian]

Knyshev i dr., 1962 – Knyshev I. N., Mazov V. F., Zhigulin V. I. Litsom k ognyu. Kratkiy ocherk istorii Dnepropetrovskogo metallurgicheskogo zavoda im. G. I. Petrovskogo [Face to the fire. A Short History of the Dnepropetrovsk metallurgical plant named after G. I. Petrovsky]. Dnepropetrovsk: Kn. izd-vo, 1962. 431 p. [in Russian]

Kommunartsy, 1965 – Kommunartsy. Istoriya Kommunarskogo ordena Krasnogo Znameni metallurgicheskogo zavoda [The Communards. History of the Kommunar order of the red banner metallurgical plant] / [Ye. A. Kuksina, V. G. Nikitenko, G. A. Pletentsov i dr.]. Donetsk: Donbass, 1965. 128 p. [in Russian]

Korelin, 1965 – Korelin A. P. Monopolii v metalloobrabatyvayushchey promyshlennosti Rossii i ikh antirabochaya politika v gody pervoy mirovoy voyny [Monopolies in the metalworking industry in Russia and their anti-workers policy during the First World War]: avtoref. dis. ... kand. ist. nauk. Moskva, 1965. 19 p. [in Russian].

Krizis, 1984 – Krizis samodержaviya v Rossii. 1895 – 1917 [The crisis of autocracy in Russia. 1895 – 1917] / B. V. Ananich [i dr.]. Leningrad: Nauka. Leningr. otd-nie, 1984. 663 p. [in Russian]

- Kubitskaya, 1989 – Kubitskaya O. A. Evolyutsiya monopolisticheskoy organizatsii (na primere Soveta predstaviteley parovozostroitelnykh zavodov) [Evolution of a monopolistic organization (based on the example of the Council of representatives of Locomotive building plants)] // Monopolisticheskiy kapitalizm v Rossii: sb. nauch. trudov. Moskva, 1989. Pp. 86–103. [in Russian]
- Kushniruk, 1989 – Kushniruk S. V. Analiz ekonomicheskogo polozheniya firm-kontragentov sindikata «Produgol» [Analysis of the economic situation of the counterparty firms syndicate «Produgol»] // Monopolisticheskiy kapitalizm v Rossii: sb. nauch. trudov. Moskva, 1989. Pp. 46–57. [in Russian]
- Lanskoy, 2010 – Lanskoy G. N. Otechestvennaya istoriografiya ekonomicheskoy istorii Rossii nachala XX veka [Domestic historiography of the economic history of Russia at the beginning of the XX century]. Moskva: Rossiyskiy gos. gumanitarnyy un-t, 2010. 507 p. [in Russian]
- Maevskiy, 1957a – Maevskiy I. V. K voprosu o zavisimosti Rossii v period pervoy mirovoy voyny [On the Dependence of Russia in the First World War] // Voprosy istorii. 1957. № 1, yanvar. Pp. 69–77. [in Russian]
- Maevskiy, 1957b – Maevskiy I. V. Ekonomika russkoy promyshlennosti v usloviyakh pervoy mirovoy voyny [The economy of Russian industry in the First World War]. Moskva: Politizdat, 1957. 391 p. [in Russian]
- Malyuk i dr., 1960 – Molodost starogo zavoda. Ocherk istorii Dneprovskogo metallurgicheskogo zavoda im. Dzerzhinskogo [Early life of the old factory. An essay on the history of the Dneprovsk metallurgical plant named after Dzerzhinsky] / V. Malyuk [i dr.]. Dnepropetrovsk: Dnepropetrovskoe kn. izd-vo, 1960. 233 p. [in Russian]
- Nikiforova, 1953 – Nikiforova L. R. Gorlovskaya zabastovka 1916 g. [Gorlovsky strike 1916] // Istoricheskie zapiski. 1953. T. 44. Pp. 77–93. [in Russian]
- Ol, 1922 – Ol P. V. Inostrannye kapitally v Rossii [Foreign capitals in Russia]. Petrograd: 4-ya Gos. tip., 1922. 304 p. [in Russian]
- Ol, 1925 – Ol P. V. Inostrannye kapitally v narodnom khozyaystve dovoennoy Rossii [Foreign capital in the national economy of pre-war Russia]. Leningrad: [Izd-vo Vsesoyuznoy Akademii Nauk], 1925. 35 p. [in Russian]
- Pogrebinskiy, 1954 – Pogrebinskiy A. P. Ocherki istorii finansov dorevolyutsionnoy Rossii (XIX – XX vv.) [Essays on the history of finance in pre-revolutionary Russia (XIX–XX century)]. Moskva: Gosfinizdat, 1954. 268 p. [in Russian]
- Pogrebinskiy, 1958 – Pogrebinskiy A. P. Sindikat «Prodamet» v gody pervoy mirovoy voyny (1914 – 1917) [Syndicate «Prodamet» in the years of the First World War (1914 – 1917)] // Voprosy istorii. 1958. № 10, oktyabr. Pp. 22–34. [in Russian]
- Poslednie dni, 1921 – Poslednie dni imperatorskoy vlasti. Po neizdannym dokumentam [The last days of the imperial power. According to unpublished documents] / sost. A. Blok. Peterburg: ALKONOST, 1921. 168 p. [in Russian]
- Prokhorov i dr., 1964 – Prokhorov V. S., Deda B. I., Goryanov V. D. Krivorozhskiy metall. Ocherk istorii zavoda [Krivorozhsky metal. Essay on the history of the plant] / Krivorozhskiy ordena Trudovogo Krasnogo Znameni metallurgicheskiiy zavod im. V. I. Lenina. Dnepropetrovsk: Promin, 1964. 299 p. [in Russian]
- Rabochee dvizhenie, 1966 – Rabochee dvizhenie na Ukraine v period Pervoy mirovoy imperialisticheskoy voyny. Iyul 1914 g. – fevral 1917 g. [Workers' movement in Ukraine during the First World imperialist war. July 1914 – February 1917]: sb. dokumentov i materialov. Kiev: Nauk. dumka, 1966. 434 p. [in Russian]
- Ronin, 1926 – Ronin S. Inostrannyy kapital i russkie banki. K voprosu o finansovom kapitale v Rossii [Foreign capital and Russian banks. On the issue of financial capital in Russia]. Moskva: Izd-vo kommunisticheskogo un-ta im. Ya. M. Sverdlova, 1926. 144 p. [in Russian]
- Sidorov, 1927 – Sidorov A. L. Vliyanie imperialisticheskoy voyny na ekonomiku Rossii [Impact of the imperialist war on the Russian economy] // Ocherki po istorii Oktyabrskoy revolyutsii. Moskva; Leningrad, 1927. T. 1. Pp. 3–176. [in Russian]
- Sidorov, 1957 – Sidorov A. L. K istorii toplivnogo krizisa v Rossii v gody pervoy mirovoy voyny (1914 – 1917) [To the history of the fuel crisis in Russia during the First World War (1914 – 1917)] // Istoricheskie zapiski. 1957. T. 59. Pp. 26–83. [in Russian]

Sidorov, 1960 – Sidorov A. L. Finansovoe polozhenie Rossii v gody pervoy mirovoy voyny (1914 – 1917) [The financial situation of Russia during the First World War (1914 – 1917)]. Moskva: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1960. 579 p. [in Russian]

Sorokin, 1922 – Sorokin P. Voyna i militarizatsiya obshchestva [War and militarization of society] // Artelnoe delo. 1922. № 1–4, yanvar–fevral. Pp. 3–10. [in Russian]

Tarnovskiy, 1958 – Tarnovskiy K. N. Formirovanie gosudarstvenno-monopolisticheskogo kapitalizma v Rossii v gody pervoy mirovoy voyny (na primere metallurgicheskoy promyshlennosti) [Formation of state-monopoly capitalism in Russia during the First World War (on the example of the metallurgical industry)]. Moskva: Izd-vo Moskovskogo un-ta, 1958. 263 p. [in Russian]

Florinskiy, 1988 – Florinskiy M. F. Krizis gosudarstvennogo upravleniya v Rossii v gody pervoy mirovoy voyny (Sovet ministrov v 1914 – 1917 gg.) [The crisis of public administration in Russia during the First World War. (Council of Ministers in 1914 – 1917)]. Leningrad: Izd-vo Leningradskogo gos. un-ta, 1988. 207 p. [in Russian]

Sharov, 1928 – Sharov P. Vliyanie ekonomiki na iskhod mirovoy voyny 1914 – 1918 [The impact of the economy on the outcome of the world war 1914 – 1918]. Moskva; Leningrad: Gos. izd-vo otdela voennoy lit., 1928. 174 p. [in Russian]

Shepelev, 1973 – Shepelev L. Ye. Aktsionernye kompanii v Rossii [Joint-stock companies in Russia]. Leningrad: Nauka. Leningr. otd-nie, 1973. 347 p. [in Russian]

Shepelev, 1987 – Shepelev L. Ye. Tsarizm i burzhuaziya v 1904 – 1914 gg. Problemy torgovo-promyshlennoy politiki [Tsarism and the bourgeoisie in 1904 – 1914. Problems of commercial and industrial policy]. Leningrad: Nauka. Leningr. otd-nie, 1987. 272 p. [in Russian]

Shigalin, 1956 – Shigalin G. I. Voennaya ekonomika v pervuyu mirovuyu voynu (1914 – 1918 gg.) [Military economy in the First World War (1914 – 1918)]. Moskva: Voenizdat, 1956. 332 p. [in Russian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 18.04.2018 р.

UDC 069:355(477) «1910/1920»
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130660

Vadym MASHTALIR,
orcid.org/0000-0002-8132-217X
*Ph D hab. (History), Chief of Department – Deputy Head of Department of the Main
Department of Personnel of the General Staff
of the Armed Forces of Ukraine
(Ukraine, Kiev) vadim_mashtalir@ukr.net*

A HISTORICAL WAY OF THE UKRAINIAN STATE MILITARY MUSEUM (1917 – 1920)

The article is devoted to the analysis of the activities of the Ukrainian state military museum during 1917 – 1920. The author considers and highlights the prerequisites for the creation, functioning, achievements, and destiny of the specified museum in the specified chronological frames.

The activity of the museum, materials, and documents covering the work of the museum and its figures – A. D. Blahodir and M. Y. Obidnyi, have been analyzed, namely, the definition of the main ideas of these statesmen to improve the museum work of Ukrainian military historical institutions on the example of the state military museum. The activity of the military museum was investigated during the influence of state power in the period between the domination of the territory of Ukraine by the authorities of the Central Rada and Soviet Russia and the arrival of Bolshevik troops to Kiev.

The origins of the concept for the collection of historical material and scientific activity of the military historical museum are revealed. The author established that the period of the Ukrainian liberation movement became a time of the cultural revival of the Ukrainian people when certain advances in the museum sphere were achieved.

In a complex military-political situation, scientific and public memorial conservation organizations, together with state institutions established during the Ukrainian revolution, focused on protecting and preserving monuments of Ukraine's military history. But at the same time, the research of museum items and collections, the holding of exposition works did not have a planned character; they were conducted selectively because in the complex military and political conditions the main task of the Ukrainian state military museum was to preserve the monuments from destruction and robbery.

The author notifies, that the activity of the museum was to collect and protect the monuments of the revolution, much attention was paid to preserving the monuments of antiquity on the ground, saving archives, in particular the archive of the First world war, valuable documents and materials of the Kiev department of the Russian military historical society. In the era of the Hetmanate, the Ministry of Public Education and Arts provided financial assistance to the museum institution, and the left part of the Mariinsky Palace was allocated for the placement of the exhibition. In the summer of 1918, the museum suffered a tragic fate, when due to a misunderstanding between officials of different ranks over the museum collections an act of vandalism was committed.

According to the results of archival materials of the Central state archives of the supreme bodies of power and government in Ukraine (F. 3179, Op. 1, 16 cases), which occupies the period 1919 – 1922 and the personal fund in the archives of M. Y. Obidnyi (F. 3504, Op. 1, 12 cases) established that M. Obidnyi, after the termination of the Ukrainian military historical museum, in 1920 created a new museum education – the Main military historical museum-archive at the General Staff of the Ukrainian People's Republic.

Key words: exhibit, expedition, museum-archive, military-historical museum.

Вадим МАШТАЛІР,

кандидат історичних наук, начальник відділу – заступник начальника управління
Головного управління персоналу
Генерального штабу Збройних Сил України
(Україна, Київ) vadim_mashtalir@ukr.net

ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ШЛЯХ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ДЕРЖАВНОГО ВІЙСЬКОВОГО МУЗЕЮ (1917 – 1920 РОКИ)

Стаття присвячена аналізу діяльності Українського державного військового музею протягом 1917 – 1920 рр. У статті висвітлено передумови створення, функціонування, здобутки та долю зазначеного музею. Проаналізовано діяльність музею, матеріали і документи, що висвітлювали роботу музею та його діячів – О. Д. Благодіра та М. Ю. Обідного, а саме визначенню основних ідей цих державних діячів щодо поліпшення музейної роботи українських воєнно-історичних установ на прикладі державного військового музею. Досліджено діяльність музею під час впливу державної влади у період між пануванням на території України Центральної Ради та Радянської Росії і приходом, слідом за цим, більшовицьких військ до Києва. Розкрито зародження концепції зі збору історичного матеріалу та наукової діяльності військово-історичного музею.

Ключові слова: експонат, експедиція, музей-архів, військово-історичний музей.

Problem statement. The Ukrainian revolution of 1917 – 1921 gave a significant impetus to the state-forming processes in Ukraine. Inextricably linked with the tasks of state and cultural construction, the issues of protection and preservation of the national military historical heritage were resolved (Denysenko, 2014: 36–42).

Military museums are a multi-vector and unique historical source, both in its content and in the form of interpretations of information, a means of informing society, since they unite around themselves the true admirers of the military historical past.

The Ukrainian military history museum (or the Ukrainian State military museum) is a cultural institution that was established in 1917 on the basis of the military history museum of the Kiev branch of the Russian imperial military historical society. The post of director in this museum since May 1917 was occupied by the official Alexander Demyanovich Blagodir – a native of the Kiev province, former director of the historical archive in the city of Smolensk. Assistant to the director of the museum was a native of Poltava region – an official Mikhail Yuryevich Obidny (TSDAVO. F. 1075. Content 2. Case 37. Sheet. 201–204).

The functioning of this military museum occurred during the period of military seizure of state power in Ukraine, its short-term rule and another sharp change in the period between the rule of the Central Rada and Soviet Russia and the arrival after that in Kiev bolsheviks.

Analysis of research. The activities and results of the work of the Ukrainian state military museum found their first coverage in 1918 on the pages of the Military Scientific Bulletin of the General Staff (MHM, 1918: 70–71) and in 1919 on the pages of the Military Journal (MMJ, 1919: 54), as well as in the articles A. Blagodir «Ukrainian kleynods» (Blagodir, 1918: 58–65), «From the martyrology of Ukrainian antiquity» (Blagodir, 1919: 1–2) and M. Obidny «Military-Scientific Expeditions» (Obidny, 1919: 69).

The regional critic and art critic F. Ernst in 1918 described the tragic fate of the Ukrainian State Military Museum in an article entitled «Arts Treasures of Kiev that suffered in 1918» when an act of vandalism was committed as a result of a misunderstanding between officials of different ranks over museum collections (Ernst, 1918: 20).

In the Ukrainian scientific literature, scientist O. Denysenko in the article «Public Initiatives for the protection of monuments of history and culture in the Ukrainian State of 1918» (Denysenko, 2014: 36–42), considers the activity and historical path of the Ukrainian military historical museum in the context of research of initiatives of public institutions and state institutions on the analysis of shifts in the cultural life of the Ukrainian State of 1918.

The main body of sources on the history of the Ukrainian revolution is concentrated in the Central state archives of the highest bodies of power and government of Ukraine. Founded in 1921 as the Central archive of the revolution, it had a special purpose – to store documents on the history of the revolutionary movement and the central state institutions of the post-imperial period.

Given such thematic orientation, its foundations focus on authentic documents on the history of the creation and functioning of major state entities – the Ukrainian People's Republic of the time of the Central Rada, the Ukrainian State (Hetmanate), the Ukrainian People's Republic of the period of the Directory, the Western Ukrainian National Republic, the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic, their central and regional governments.

Thus, in the Central state archives of the supreme bodies of power and administration in Ukraine, there is a fund (F. 3179. Content 1. 16 cases), that covers the period 1919 – 1922 and the personal fund of M. Y. Obidny (F. 3504. Content 1. 12 cases). However, the Ukrainian historiography does not have a generalized complex scientific work on the activities of the above-mentioned military historical museum.

The purpose of the article is to highlight the preconditions for the creation, functioning, achievements, and destiny of the museum in the specified chronological frames, as well as a description of the museum's concept, which was first proposed by the Ukrainian State Military Museum for the collection of historical material and scientific activities.

Presentation of the main material. The Public Committee for the commemoration of the soldiers who perished during the First World War operated in Kyiv (Denysenko, 2014: 36–42). It consisted of state and public figures, members of the city дума, well-known artists. On November 15, 1915, it was decided to perpetuate the heroes who died on the fronts of the First World War and announced a competition for the creation of projects of temples, chapels, and monuments to establish them in the field of battles and military cemeteries.

In June 1916, after summarizing the results of the competition, the construction of a temple in Kiev began, which was to become the main object of the memorial complex of the military cemetery for officers and soldiers who died at the fronts and died from wounds in Kiev hospitals. Construction began in the area of the military cemetery (Zverinetska street), but it could not be completed. The Public committee that dealt with these issues through the revolutionary events ceased its activities (Isakova, 1991: 57).

It should be noted that a large role in the protection of monuments of military history was played by museums around which the accomplices of the memorial case were united, who made considerable efforts in Kyiv to organize the National archives museum of war and revolution.

In August 1917, with the initiative of its creation, the cultural-educational commission of the All-Ukrainian Council of Military Deputies made a statement that, through the press, appealed to the public to send exhibits to the future museum that would characterize the development of revolutionary events in Ukraine (Nova Rada, 1917).

This proposal was supported by the department of preservation of monuments of antiquity and art of the government. The plan for the creation of this museum was developed in September 1917. The work on the implementation of the developed plan for the creation of a new museum has begun.

In the spring of 1918, after the unification of the Museum of war and revolution 1914 – 1917, established in 1917, and the Military historical museum of the Kiev division of the Russian military historical society in Kyiv, the Ukrainian State military museum was created (Denysenko, 2014: 36–42).

Exhibits for the new archive-museum of war and revolution were selected at the Kiev artillery warehouse, as well as in other cities of Ukraine. By creating a museum of war and revolution, the All-Ukrainian Council of military deputies appealed to the chief of staff of the Kyiv military district to hand over to the museum some of the exhibits of the military historical museum. However, assistance from the military leadership was not received (Mashtalir, 2012: 194–211).

Obviously, with the onset of a war between the Central Rada and Soviet Russia and the arrival of the bolshevik troops in Kyiv, the activity of the museum was stopped. However, it is known that during the time of the bolshevik authorities in Kyiv, a «guard sheet» was issued to the museum's leadership and its collections remained intact (Ernst, 1918: 20).

Restoration of the work of the Ukrainian military historical museum in

Kiev was held in March 1918 – after the liberation of the city by parts of the Central Rada and German troops. On April 1, an order was issued by the Military Ministry of the Ukrainian people's Republic part 13 (for General Staff), which ordered: «All military units, institutions and institutions that are within Ukraine and subject to disbandment for demobilization, immediately send to the military science department of the General the headquarters of the Ukrainian People's Republic (11, Bankova street, Kyiv), descriptions and precise information on the status and location of flags, letters of commendation, icons and generally valuable historical documents and things: paintings and portraits, collections of weapons, signs of clothing and supplies, as well as libraries».

According to the order, all these things should be transferred to the State Ukrainian Military historical museum or the Library of the General Staff (MSB GSt, 1918: 53).

Detailed information on the activities of the Ukrainian state military museum in April–June 1918 was published on the pages of the «Military Scientific Bulletin of the General Staff», which was published in Kiev. In part 2 of this edition (released in late April), an article entitled «Military Historical Notes» was published, probably attributed to Blagodir (the material was published without a signature), in which the concept of a museum was actually presented (MSB GSt, 1918: 53).

During the Hetmanate time, the Ministry of education and the arts has provided the museum with financial assistance, and the left wing of the Mariinsky Palace in Kyiv has been allocated for the placement of the exhibition. The article states that the new institution of culture is created on the model of the Berlin military museum in the left wing of the Royal Palace.

It «will serve the purpose of raising the population's love and respect for the native army, protecting the native land and introducing the people, especially the school youth (excursions of the students from the explanation of the museum's director) with the latest news of military equipment. For this purpose, it is planned to publish catalogs with illustrative photographs for sale at the lowest price to all those who enter the museum and send them free of charge to schools, arrange an exhibition of military weapons, uniforms, and weapons, photographs, and drawings from the theater of military events, etc» (MHN, 1918: 44).

According to the plan of the founders of the museum, he was supposed to consist of the following departments: a) the era before the Mongol-Tatar invasion (Scythian-Sarmatian and Slavic era); b) the Polish-Lithuanian era; c) the time of the Hetmanate; d) the period from Hetman Mazepa to the reign of Paul I; e) «recent times» – until 1914; f) The First World War.

For the exposition, it was planned to order models of ships and airplanes of various designs of that time. A special commission was to be sent to the places of battles of the First world war and the armed struggle for the Ukrainian People's Republic (hereinafter – UPR) – to collect the exhibits. A special platform with samples of military equipment was to be built in front of the museum building: cannons, machine guns, bombs, mortars, various technical military equipment, and model trenches with wire obstacles.

The author listed the achievements of the museum as of April 1918:

1. The banner of the Bogdanovsky regiment (1917) with the inscription «The 1st Ukrainian Cossack named after Hetman Bogdan Khmelnytsky regiment» was received from the General Staff;

2. The regimental flag of the 160th infantry Abkhazian regiment of the Russian army;

3. Portrait of General judge of the Hetmanate times Gamalei brought from home Gamall in Konotop district;

4. Portrait of Hetman Ivan Mazepa, probably acquired from private individuals (MHN, 1918: 44).

The third issue of the Military Scientific Bulletin (MSB GSt, 1918: 53), which was published in the second half of May 1918, was published articles by the director of the museum A. Blagodir «State Military Historical Museum» and his deputy M. Obidny «Military-scientific expeditions». In the article A. Blagodir (it was signed only with the letter «B.»), it was a question of new acquisitions to the museum, these were (MHM, 1918: 70–71):

- a) thirteen regimental banners of the Russian regiments that were kept in the premises of the First Ukrainian Military School (before – the Kiev Grand Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich military school);

- b) six flags, two silver pipes and regimental folding of various parts of the Russian army, sent to the museum by organizations and individuals.

The article by M. Obidny is, in fact, a concept for collecting the unique material and scientific activity of the military historical museum. It was suggested:

1. Transfer all exhibits of a military nature from other museums, and if they are not transportable – take photos;

2. Publish «appeals» to citizens about free admission (or redemption for money) of exhibits;

3. To immortalize the places where the glorious military events took place, especially the location of the Zaporizhzhya Sich, the corresponding monuments, and to draw up short historical chronicles about them;

4. Restore the old graves and pour new ones – where the Cossack leaders were buried;

5. Take photos of iconic military buildings;

6. Create an album of drawings of Ukrainian military relics;

7. Make notes about all the historical military relics, which are on the territory of Ukraine and outside (M. Obidny, 1918: 69).

In the development of the concept outlined in M. Obidny's article «Military scientific expeditions», in the next issue of the «Military scientific bulletin», A. Blagodir's essay «Ukrainian Kleinody» (Blagodir, 1918: 58–65) was published. It briefly mentioned some Ukrainian military relics, especially the Zaporizhzhya Sich era, which were stored outside the homeland – in the museums of Petrograd and Moscow, and also in Ukraine, in particular, in the museums of Odessa (Blagodir, 1918: 58–65).

Thus, the activity of the museum was to collect and protect the monuments of the revolution, much attention was paid to preserving the monuments of antiquity on the ground, saving archives,

in particular, the archive of the First world war, valuable documents and materials of the Kiev department of the Russian military historical society (Denysenko, 2014: 40).

On the night of June 22 to June 23, 1918, the activities of the museum and its leadership were interrupted in the most unexpected way, and the museum suffered a tragic fate, when, due to a misunderstanding between officials of different ranks, an act of vandalism was committed over museum collections. After the director of the museum A. Blagodir refused to vacate the premises for the needs of the Military ministry, armed officers broke into the museum premises and began to throw valuable exhibits on the street where they fell under the rain.

The events that occurred were covered in detail in the book of the famous local historian Fyodor Ernst:

«Meanwhile, the palace is occupied by the Ministry of Internal Affairs; the huge building, probably, appears to be tight, and now the head of the Military historical museum receives an order to immediately clean the premises for the needs of the said ministry. In vain asked the head of the department to preliminarily withdraw another building, at least somewhat suitable for the needs of the museum. June 17 follows the categorical order of the military ministry to "take out the museum property on the square».

The headmaster was forced to report that «as an expert in the matter and the true son of Ukraine ... throwing an extremely valuable museum on the street with my own hands, I have no legal and moral right. And on June 22, at 11 o'clock in the morning, a detachment of soldiers led by the chief of the military science department of the General Staff, despite protests and resistance to the administration of the museum, began to take out the museum property to the square in front of the outbuilding. Some of the things were thrown into the windows. In the morning there was a huge downpour.

As a result, paintings and drawings were soaked, weapons, ancient chain mail, armor – rusted, regimental banners and banners were damaged, several busts were broken, many windows were destroyed, a lot of weapons were stolen. At present, the spoiled remains of a valuable museum are dumped in the dirty and damp basement of the General Staff building. The head of the museum, for failure to comply with the orders of the authorities, is deprived of a post» (Ernst, 1918: 20).

A. Blagodir was dismissed, and the remains of the exhibits were moved to a private house in Kiev at the address: St. Catherine, 12, which became the «house of the museum». In February 1919, after the arrival of the Red Army in Kiev, the military historical museum was preserved and, according to available information, remained under the control of the Soviet military department – the reconstructed headquarters of the Kiev military district. Approximately in March-April 1919 in the «house of the military historical museum» from the district headquarters on street Bankova moved to the editorial office of the Military-Military Journal, an organ of the Kiev's military district (MMJ, 1919: 50).

The actions of the military to liberate the premises of the left wing of the Mariinsky Palace, which occupied the museum, aroused indignation on the part of the broad scientific and cultural community. A sharp assessment was received about the circumstances of the destruction of the Military museum at a meeting of the Cultural Commission at the Ukrainian Peace Delegation. The adopted resolution noted that such acts not only harm national and cultural construction in Ukraine but also undermine its authority in the international arena (Ernst, 1918: 19–20).

The well-known public and cultural figure M. Bilyashivsky categorically evaluated the actions of the military department in a letter to Colonel Arkas, who, on behalf of the staff, investigated the incident (Denysenko, 2014: 40–41). The head of the department for the protection of monuments of art and art wrote in a letter of June 29, 1918: «At a time when there is a lot of

talk about protection and the acquisition of monuments, which we have kept very little, a ready museum, carefully collected, barbarously destroyed. It was impossible to assume that such a thing could have happened among even a non-cultural citizenship» (NAHM FIAS. F. 13. Content 5. Case 308. Sheet 3).

July 3, 1918, this terrible act was the subject of discussion at a meeting of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian State. And although for the performers who deliberately destroyed the monuments of Ukrainian history, everything ended almost without any consequences, this event became an occasion for solving pressing problems in the field of museum construction and protection of monuments of work in general. This concerned the provision of museum facilities with appropriate facilities, the training of personnel for museum institutions and, in general, the implementation of measures for the protection of monuments in the center and in the field. (Denysenko, 2014: 40–41).

The further fate of the exhibits of the Ukrainian military historical museum was as follows. In January 1919, before the retreat of the acting army of the Ukrainian People's Republic from Kiev, the flag of the 1st Ukrainian Cossack Regiment named Bohdan Khmelnytsky and some other regalia associated with the struggle with the bolsheviks. The rest of the exhibits remained in the city. In the autumn of 1919, when Kiev was under the authority of the Armed Forces of South Russia (the white guard troops of general A. Denikin), the vast majority of the regimental flags and other relics of the Russian Imperial Army was removed from the museum. Later (in the 1920s) these relics became the basis of the collection of Russian military flags that were exhibited at the Belgrade Church in Yugoslavia. After the entry into the territory of Yugoslavia of the Red Army, a collection of flags was transported to the museums of Leningrad and Moscow. As for the works of culture, art, furniture, historical things, etc., they mostly became the property of Soviet museums in Kyiv in the 1920's (Tinchenko, 2013: 48).

Due to constant military actions and instability of political power in 1920 – 1940, the work of military-historical institutions in the territory of Ukraine was destroyed. In early February 1919 troops of the Ukrainian People's Republic left Kyiv. Despite the fact that a considerable amount of museum exhibits has remained in the city, its management, as well as probably some valuable things and documents, left Kiev. The director of the museum was again A. Blagodir (TSDAVO. F. 3504. Content 1. Case 1. Sheet 1–150).

He was a staunch opponent of the power of Hetman P. Skoropadsky. After the troops of the Directory on December 14, 1918, occupied Kiev, Blagodir became the head of the commission for manning the Main Directorate of the General Staff of the Ukrainian People's Republic. On December 25, a meeting of this commission took place, at which it was decided to release 18 people – generals, chiefs, and officials, «so that they would not be accepted by any department of our Republic, as people, who are hostile to the cause of the Ukrainian People» (CDAWOW. F. 1508s / 3779, Content 1. Case 1. Sheet 52–71).

A large part of 1919, the Directorate of the Ukrainian military historical museum located in the city of Kamyanets-Podilsky. A. Blagodir and his unchanged deputy M. Obidny at that time were considered in the staff of the Main Directorate of the General Staff of the Ukrainian People's Republic (TSDAVO. F. 1075. Content 2. Case 37. Sheet 201–204).

In the autumn of 1919 with the participation of Blagodir A. D., the first and only issue of the magazine «Ukrainian antiquities» was published. It begins with the article of Alexander Demyanovich «From the martyrology of Ukrainian antiquities». The author described the history of the robbery of Ukrainian antiquities. He remembered that during the time of the Russian Empire,

the finds that were made on the Ukrainian lands were mass exported to the museums of St. Petersburg and Moscow.

During the First World War, Russian troops expropriated and exported to Russia the collections of L'viv Staupigiy. During the Bolshevik rule, a mass sale of antiquities began both from state museums and private collections. Many rarities were bought for almost nothing to cost by representatives of foreign missions. Blagodir has critically evaluated the activities of the Hetman's government: for the confiscating the premises of the military historical museum in Kiev and the maritime museum – in Mykolaiv (Blagodir, 1919: 1–2). Incidentally, the mention of confiscation of the premises of the maritime museum in Mykolaiv is still the only evidence of attempts to create a similar institution of culture.

Summarizing the above, it is possible to note that from November 1919 Kamyanets-Podilsky became the arena of the struggle between Ukrainian, White Guard, Polish, and later – the Red Army. The activities of the administration of the Ukrainian Military History Museum were finally discontinued. According to some information, A. Blagodir went to L'viv. His deputy, M. Obidny, in 1920 created the Main Military Historical Museum-Archive at the General Staff of the Ukrainian People's Republic. But this was already a new museum creation.

Conclusions. The period of the Ukrainian liberation movement can be characterized as a period of time relative to the cultural revival of the Ukrainian people when certain advances in the field of military museology were achieved. In a complex military and political situation, leading scientists of the time and public figures, together with the Ukrainian military historical museum, focused on the protection and preservation of monuments of military history.

It's a shame to admit that during the period under review the registration and accounting of the museum exhibits of the Ukrainian military historical museum were episodic and selective, and, basically, this was due to the unstable political situation in Ukraine, as well as, as evidenced by archival materials, insufficient funding. At the same time, according to the author of the article, the main value of the work and the high evaluation of the activity of the military historical museum in difficult military and political conditions is the preservation of authentic monuments of military history from destruction and robbery.

We will consider that this scientific investigation is only a basis for continuing research on the development of military museology, and its practical significance consists in the possibility of using the revealed factual material, its scientific interpretation, and conclusions regarding the formation and functioning of military historical museums on the territory of Ukraine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Благодір, 1918 – Благодір О. Українські клейноди / Військово-науковий вісник Генерального Штабу. 1918 р. Київ, ч. 4–5. С. 58–65.

Благодір, 1919 – Благодір О. З мартирології української старовини / Благодір // Українська старовина. Орган Комісії для охорони пам'яток старовини та мистецтва при Головнім управлінні мистецтв і національної культури. 1919. № 1. С. 1–2.

ВВЖ, 1919 – Военный-військовий журнал. Київ. 1919. №3. С. 50.

ВІЗ, 1918 – Військово-історичні замітки / Військово-науковий вісник Генерального штабу, 1918 р. Київ. Ч. 2. С. 44.

ВНВ ГШ, 1918 – Військово-науковий вісник Генерального штабу. 1918 р. Київ. Ч. 2. С. 53.

ДВІМ, 1918 – Б. Державний Військово-Історичний Музей / Військово-науковий вісник Генерального штабу. 1918 р. Київ. Ч. 3. С. 70–71.

Денисенко, 2014 – Денисенко О. А. Громадські ініціативи з охорони пам'яток історії та культури в Українській Державі 1918 р. // Наукові записки. Том 156. Історичні науки. 2014. С. 36–42.

- Исакова, 1991 – Исакова Е. В. Храмы-памятники русской воинской доблести. М., 1991. С. 57.
- Машталір, 2012 – Машталір В. В. Розвиток музейної справи в системі Міністерства оборони України // Збірник наукових праць «Праці Центру пам'яткознавства». Київ: Центр пам'яткознавства НАНУ і УТОПІК. 2012. Вип. № 22. С. 194–211.
- НАФРФ ІМФЕ (Національні архівні фонди рукописів та фонозаписів Інституту мистецтвознавства, фольклористики та етнології ім. М. Рильського НАН України).
- Нова Рада, 1917 – Нова Рада. 1917. 20 серпня.
- Обідний, 1918 – Обідний М. Військово-наукові експедиції // Військово-Науковий вісник Генерального Штабу. 1918 р. Київ. Ч. 3. С. 69.
- Тинченко, 2013 – Тинченко Я. Старый Цейхгауз // Русские полковые знамена в фондах Национального музея истории Украины. Москва. 2013. №1. С. 48.
- ЦДАВОУ – Центральний державний архів вищих органів влади та управління України.
- Эрнст, 1918 – Эрнст Ф. Художественные сокровища Киева, пострадавшие в 1918 году. Киев. 1918. 20 с.

REFERENCES

- Blahodir, 1918 – Blahodir O. Ukrainiski kleinody [Ukrainian jewelry] / Viiskovo-naukovy visnyk Heneralnoho Shtabu, 1918 r. Kyiv. Ch. 4–5. Pp. 58–65. [in Ukrainian]
- Blahodir, 1919 – Blahodir O. Z martyrolohii ukrainskoi starovyny [Martirológ Ukrainian antiquity] // Ukrainska starovyna. Orhan Komisii dlia okhorony pam'iatok starovyny ta mystetstva pry Holovnim upravlinni mystetstv i natsionalnoi kultury. 1919. № 1. Pp. 1–2. [in Ukrainian]
- VVZh, 1919 – Voennyi-viiskovy zhurnal, Kyiv. 1919. № 3. P. 50. [in Ukrainian]
- VIZ, 1918 – Viiskovo-istorychni zamitky / Viiskovo-naukovy visnyk Heneralnoho shtabu. 1918 r. Kyiv. Ch. 2. P. 44. [in Ukrainian]
- VNV HSh, 1918 – Viiskovo-naukovy visnyk Heneralnoho shtabu, 1918 r. Kyiv. Ch. 2. P. 53. [in Ukrainian]
- DVIM, 1918 – B. Derzhavnyi Viiskovo-Istorychni Muzei / Viiskovo-naukovy vistnyk Heneralnoho shtabu. 1918 r. Kyiv. Ch. 3. Pp. 70–71. [in Ukrainian]
- Denysenko, 2014 – Denysenko O. A. Hromadski initsiatyvy z okhorony pam'iatok istorii ta kultury v Ukrainskii Derzhavi 1918 r. [Public initiatives for the protection of historical and cultural monuments in the Ukrainian State 1918] // Naukovi zapysky. Tom 156. Istorychni nauky. 2014. Pp. 36–42. [in Ukrainian]
- Ysakova, 1991 – Ysakova E. V. Hramy-pamiatnyky russkoi voynskoi dobresty [Churches-monuments to Russian military valor]. M. 1991. P. 57. [in Russian]
- Mashtalir, 2012 – Mashtalir V. V. Rozvytok muzeinoi spravy v systemi Ministerstva oborony Ukrainy [Development of Museum business in the system of the Ministry of defense of Ukraine] // Zbirnyk naukovykh prats «Pratsi Tsentru pam'iatkoznavstva». Kyiv: Tsentru pam'iatkoznavstva NANU i UTOPIK. 2012. Vyp. № 22. Pp. 194–211. [in Ukrainian]
- NAFRF IMFE (Natsionalni arkhivni fondy rukopysiv ta fonozapysiv Instytutu mystetstvoznnavstva, folklorystyky ta etnologii im. M. Rylskoho NAN Ukrainy) [NAFRF IMF (National Archives of Manuscripts and Phonographies of the Institute of Art Studies, Folklore Studies and Ethnology named after M. Rylsky, NAS of Ukraine)]
- Nova Rada, 1917 – Nova Rada. 1917. 20 serpnia. [in Ukrainian]
- Obidny, 1918 – Obidny M. Viiskovo-naukovi ekspedytsii [Military-scientific expedition] // Viiskovo-Naukovyi visnyk Heneralnoho Shtabu, 1918 r. Kyiv. Ch. 3. P. 69. [in Ukrainian]
- Tynchenko, 2013 – Tynchenko Ya. Saryj Tseikhhaus [Old Zeughaus] // Russkie polkovye znamena v fondah Nacional'nogo muzeya istorii Ukrainy. Moskva. 2013. №1. P. 48. [in Ukrainian]
- TsDAVOU – Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchikh organiv vlady ta upravlinnya Ukrainy [Central State Archive of the Higher Authorities and Administration of Ukraine] EErnst, 1918 – EErnst F. Hudozhestvennye sokrovishcha Kiev, postpravshie v 1918 godu [Kyiv Artistic treasures, suffered in 1918], Kyev, 1918. 20 p. [in Russian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 18.04.2018 р.

UDC 94(477)«19»

DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131617

Olexandr KOZIY,

orcid.org/0000-0002-0494-3095

*Ph D hab. (History), Assistant Professor of Department of the World History and Special Historical Disciplines,
Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
(Ukraine, Drohobych) olkoziy@gmail.com*

Oxana HORBACHYK,

orcid.org/0000-0001-6671-2025

*Ph D hab. (History), Assistant Professor of Department of the World History and Special Historical Disciplines,
Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University
(Ukraine, Drohobych) oksa7803@gmail.com*

M. STAKHIV'S POLITICAL ACTIVITY IN RESEARCHES BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF UKRAINIANS ABROAD AND CONTEMPORARY DOMESTIC HISTORIANS

In the article the state of the contemporary domestic scientific research of the political activity of Matviy Stakhiv, one of the most active figures of the political processes in Western Ukraine in the interwar period of the XX century, is analyzed. As is stated by the authors, his political and scientific work is specifically interesting for scientists and public circles due to its expressive displays of the interlacing of social and national aspects of the Ukrainian [independent] movement during the outlined period.

The conclusion is made that it was only in the time of Ukraine's independence that a possibility of an unbiased attempt of a comprehensive investigation of the state-construction struggles in 1918 – 1923 became available to historians. The Ukrainian socialist movement in the interwar Poland and the scientific activity of the post-war Ukrainian emigration, however, did not lead to the appearance of any generalizing work dedicated to M. Stakhiv.

Key words: *M. Stakhiv, the USRP (the Ukrainian Socialist Radical Party), the Western Ukrainian National Republic (ZUNR), the Ukrainian Galician Army (UGA), public work, emigratory period.*

Олександр КОЗИЙ,

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри всесвітньої історії
та спеціальних історичних дисциплін*

*Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Україна, Дрогобич) olkoziy@gmail.com*

Оксана ГОРБАЧИК,

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри всесвітньої історії
та спеціальних історичних дисциплін*

*Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка
(Україна, Дрогобич) oksa7803@gmail.com*

ГРОМАДСЬКО-ПОЛІТИЧНА ДІЯЛЬНІСТЬ М. СТАХІВА У ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯХ ПРЕДСТАВНИКІВ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ЗАРУБІЖЖЯ ТА СУЧАСНИХ ВІТЧИЗНЯНИХ ІСТОРИКІВ

У статті проаналізовано стан сучасного вітчизняного наукового дослідження громадсько-політичної діяльності одного з найактивніших діячів суспільно-політичних процесів Західної України у міжвоєнний період XX ст. – Матвія Стахів. Авторами відзначено, що його

політична та наукова праця цікава для науковців і громадських кіл тим, що виразно відображає переплетіння соціальних та національних аспектів українського руху в окреслений період.

Зроблено висновок про те, що лише у період незалежності України перед істориками відкрилася можливість неупередженого всебічного дослідження державотворчих змагань 1918 – 1923 рр., українського соціалістичного руху міжвоєнної Польщі, наукової діяльності повоєнної української еміграції, що однак, не привело до появи узагальнюючої праці, присвяченої М. Стахіву.

Ключові слова: М. Стахів, УСРП (Українська соціалістично-радикальна партія), Західно-Українська Народна Республіка (ЗУНР), Українська Галицька Армія (УГА), громадська діяльність, еміграційний період.

The statement of the problem. In the contemporary Ukrainian historiography the political activity of a great number of Ukrainian public figures of the XIX – XX centuries presents topical directions for researches. M. Stakhiv political and scientific work (1895 – 1978) is interesting for scientists and public circles in that it expressively displays an interlacing of social and national aspects of the Ukrainian movement during the outlined period. However, it has not been properly elucidated in the Ukrainian domestic historiography.

The article's purpose is to analyze the studies by the representatives of the Ukrainians abroad and contemporary domestic historians in which M. Stakhiv political activity is the subject of investigation.

The statement of the basic material. The achievements of the representatives of the Ukrainian scholars abroad are difficult to estimate unequivocally. An Ivano-Frankivsk researcher V. Velykochyi noticed that «after the Second World War in the Ukrainian diaspora a new period of studying of the national-political movement of the beginning of the XX century was initiated. However, despite the caused by the war deviations in the peoples' outlook, it was marked by a rigid ideological polemic coherent with attempts to place defeats and miscalculations on the opponents' shoulders» (Velykochyi, 2011: 91). At the same time, the researcher singled out the scientific produce of that time professional historians, among whom M. Stakhiv took a remarkable place. V. Velykochyi is right to notice the next: «Under a burden of their own ideological sympathies and the works of their predecessors, they had difficulties in overcoming ideological banalities, but, notwithstanding that, their works reveal inherent diligence to transfer the solutions of contradictory problems of the historical past into a plane of scientific discussions» (Velykochyi, 2011: 92).

V. Prokhoda's article «Considerations about Dr. M. Stakhiv work «Ukraine in the time of the Directory» (Prokhoda, 1967)», in which the criticism of separate concepts and thoughts expressed on the subject was presented, can serve as a vivid example of the aforementioned discussions. M. Stakhiv's research activity laid grounds for the scholarly studies of many other emigratory scientists, including I. Kedryn (Kedryn, 1986) and K. Pan'kivskyi (Pan'kivskyi, 1963), who – on the bases of their memoirs tried to recreate a difficult picture of political life of the Ukrainian society in the West Ukrainian lands in the interwar period of the XX century. The majority of the aforementioned scholars, on the one hand, turn to M. Stakhiv's researches and, on the other hand, when characterizing the political position of the USRP, repeatedly mention his name among the other party leaders. During the period under view a number of thematically more specified studies appear, as well as thorough researches containing a considerable amount of memoirs by O. Horbach (Horbach, 1949), A. Krezub (Krezub, 1966), L. Shankovskyi (Shankovskyi, 1974), etc., which acquaint the reader with the features of the UGA's (Ukrainian Galician Army's) military campaigns during 1918 – 1919, in particular, tracing part by part the way of struggle of the group «Krukenychi», which commandant was

M. Stakhiv for a long time. The contemporary Ukrainian historiography, elucidating many particulars of M. Stakhiv's scientific and political activity, acquaints the general reader with its next four aspects: 1) his participation in operations of World War I and Ukrainian-Polish wars of 1918 – 1919; 2) his emigratory activity in Czechoslovakia; 3) his party-political work in the USRP; 4) his activity in the Ukrainian diaspora's public and scientific organizations.

The conducted analysis of the scientific works of the Ukrainian researches allow the authors to ascertain that, unfortunately, the outstanding politician's military way in the ranks of the Austro-Hungarian army and the UGA, as well as his activity in emigratory Ukrainian communities are investigated but sporadically. The major events of these issues are reconstructed on the basis of the newly revealed archival materials and memoirs of his contemporaries.

The scientific works of the first aspect partially acquaint the reader with one of the hardest periods in M. Stakhiv's life, that is, with his military fate in the front lines of the First World War and in the ranks of the UGA. Contrarily to the sufficient, as it seems, attention of the Ukrainian researchers to the problem of the Ukrainian-Polish war in 1918 – 1919, it is still hard enough to track the struggling way of separate military men of the UGA. No exception is M. Stakhiv, who – after his arrival from the Italian front in the end of 1918 – joined the ranks of the Sich Riflemen. Among the Ukrainian scientists, the Lviv historian M. Lytvyn thoroughly elucidated the military actions of the Ukrainian-Polish war 1918 – 1919 (Lytvyn, 1998). Having analyzed the process of formation of the Western Ukrainian National Republic (ZUNR) military groups, in particular, the group «Krukenychi» under the command of M. Stakhiv, the researcher ascertained that «in an overwhelming majority they were formed in an organized way, and the Administrative Command of the Ukrainian Galician Army (AK UGA) already on its early stages of existence established an connection with them and formed a control system...» (Lytvyn, 1998: 141).

The contemporary researches of the second aspect (M. Stakhiv's emigratory period in Czechoslovakia) acquaint their readers with the everyday life of the Ukrainian military emigration. After the intrusion of J. Gallier's army into the Polish-Ukrainian conflict, M. Stakhiv – together with the UGA's mountain units – got into the Czechoslovak camp German Yablonne. Separate pages of the life of that time interned persons among which a future leader of the USRP was, were characterized by I. Sribniak (Sribniak, 2006), V. Pryshliak (Pryshliak, 1992), M. Pavlenko (Pavlenko, 1999), and others. The latter, in particular, noticed that “the first military groups which in May, 1919 got in the territory of Czechoslovakia, were the «Mountain brigade» of ataman Cherskyi and the parts of groups «Staryi Sambir», «Hlyboka», and «Krukenychi»...» (Pavlenko, 1999: 185). Also, M. Pavlenko remarked that from the Ministry of national defence of Czechoslovakia the interned received dwelling places, provision, regimentals, and everything necessary for existence, including the salary, identical with that of Czechoslovak military men (Pavlenko, 1999: 187).

O. Dudnyk (Dudnyk, 2003) is one of few Ukrainian researchers who in details characterizes political tastes of the Ukrainian emigrant students. The scientist has singled out three factors which influenced the distribution of socialist ideas among the students of Czechoslovakia: 1) the activity of M. Drahomanov socialist circles (in the emigratory students' environment they frequently passed to communistic positions through an increase of the «communofile tendency» among the western Ukrainians); 2) in Czechoslovakia a significant amount of socialist parties existed, which were supported by the power and, personally, by president T. Masaryk who hoped that it were just socialists-democrats who would substitute

the Bolsheviks or, at least, would come to terms with them and, then, from objects of help they would become a subject of political value; 3) the student milieu in Czechoslovakia was under the influence of the Ukrainian scientific emigration, then standing mostly on socialist positions (Dudnyk, 2003: 243).

The Ukrainian party-political life in the West Ukrainian lands in the interwar period of the XX century (the third aspect of scientific studies which were published in the independent Ukraine) is one of the themes which is best studied by contemporary scholars. This historiographic gap became to be a constantly and dynamically filled up in the time of Ukrainian independence. Having analyzed the development of the historical science in the 1990s, along with its tendentiousness in concern of separate problems, Ivano-Frankivsk researcher V. Velykochoyi noticed that «such a situation was predetermined by a concentration of scientists' efforts on the «disclosure of falsifications» and elimination of the «blank spots» from the «actual» problems of history which «caused the greatest public resonance and interest» (Velykochoyi, 2010: 373–389).

With this factor in view, the figure of M. Stakhiv, as well as the figures of many other unjustly forgotten outstanding Ukrainian politicians, has de facto «dropped out» from the scientific interests of historians. As an exception, in 1992 in Ternopil M. Stakhiv's work «Ukraine against the Bolsheviks. Sketches in the history of the aggression of Soviet Russia» has been reedited (Stakhiv, 1992). In his preface, R. Mateiko underlined an extreme topicality of M. Stakhiv's written works. The researcher emphasized this: «Many participants of the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people who, having escaped from the totalitarian regime, were made to part with their native land, preserved and fixed [in writing] their rich recollections.... It is just with such an alloy of interesting and significant facts, truly free judgments, use of the literature inaccessible to us, and an unbiased analysis that the aforementioned doctor Matviy Stakhiv's work is valuable» (Stakhiv, 1992: 2).

In 1995 the Ukrainian public circles celebrated the 100th anniversary of M. Stakhiv's birthday, however, the date did not assist in filling up of the «blank spots» in his biography. Along the 1990s he was most frequently mentioned by scientists in the context of political processes in the interwar Poland (as shown by researches of M. Kuhutiak (Kuhutiak, 1993), S. Kulchytskyi (Kulchytskyi, 1999), Y. Hrytsak (Hrytsak, 1996), and others. This latter, as a matter of fact, considered an influence of the «young» radicals on political processes in Galicia in the beginning of the XX century and the strategy and tactics of the USRP in the Second Rzeczpospolita Polska, specified, that «the radicalization of the Ukrainian movement in the 1930s was the other side of an increasing withdrawal of the Polish regime from democracy, and an increase of judicial and police brutality» (Hrytsak, 1996: 199). Further on the number of researches of Ukrainian historians into the case of the socialists-radicals and their leaders has been constantly increasing.

On account of an insufficient level of elucidation of the lives of the well-known figures of socialist movement, M. Mishchuk's (Mishchuk, 2005) and O. Bodnar's (Bodnar, 2008) works are of a considerable interest, because they directly acquaint the readers with the peculiarities of the formation and development of this ideological trend in Western Ukraine. In particular, M. Mishchuk investigated M. Stakhiv's party-organizational work in the period of the crystallization of the USRP, his activity in the convocation of the county assemblies in Galicia and Volhynia in the late 1920s, his propaganda work during election campaigns in 1928 and 1930, and his scientific activity in the co-operative society «Self-education», etc.

O. Bodnar, considering the USRP's parliamentary activity and an extra-parliamentary work of the party members in 1928 – 1935, singled out the assemblies of which in the end of the 1920s – first half of the 1930s M. Stakhiv was one of organizers and active participants.

The researcher noticed that those assemblies, as a rule, unanimously adopted resolutions which «approved the position of the USRP in the matters of the creation of the Ukrainian elective block», and, also, sharply criticized the position of representatives of the UNDP (Bodnar, 2008: 432).

M. Stakhiv's bitter criticism of the Soviet regime in Dnieper Ukraine and fascist tendencies of the interwar Europe did not remain unnoticed, for example, by I. Soliar (Soliar, 2011). This Lviv researcher has noticed that one of the founders of the USRP during the 1920s – 1930s was the party's invariable ideologist and formed its so-called strategic and orientation line (Soliar, 2011: 268).

M. Shvahuliak has characterized the consolidation processes among the leaders of the major Ukrainian parties of Western Ukraine in the late 1930s, M. Stakhiv being one of them (Shvahuliak, 1994). The author has singled M. Stakhiv out among other figures of the Contact committee, which aspired to rally the Ukrainian political structures in face of the increasing threat of totalitarian tendencies in the Polish state. Also, M. Shvahuliak has noticed that M. Stakhiv accurately defined a strategic line of the newly formed inter-party organ: the Committee had «to show Polish political factors that the «normalization» had behind it but a small group without any significance in the Ukrainian society» (Shvahuliak, 1994: 235).

The fourth aspect of contemporary researches which concern M. Stakhiv's post-war period of life is relatively not numerous. Among the scientific studies concerning this thematic niche that of O. Shved, entitled «Stepan Vytvytskyi: his public-political activity», in which M. Stakhiv's activity in the Ukrainian National Rada is incidentally characterized, primarily deserves mentioning (Shved, 2010). The researcher has noticed that on the eve of the assembly of the Ukrainian Congress Committee in 1952 the former irreconcilable opponents, namely, M. Stakhiv and V. Mudryi, offered a resolution in which they asked the Rada to call a conference of representatives of all political groups under its initiative and supervision in order to solve the problem of participation of the Ukrainian representatives in the American Committee (Shved, 2010: 138).

The conclusions. Thus, this historiographic review certifies that the contemporary Ukrainian historiography lacks a complex scientific research which would clarify M. Stakhiv's political activity. Only in the time of Ukraine's independence, in connection with the changes of methodological paradigms and increase of the source base, the historians eventually have faced a possibility of an unbiased comprehensive investigation of the state building attempts of the 1918 – 1923, Ukrainian socialist movement in the interwar Poland, and the scientific activity of the post-war Ukrainian emigration, but, however, all that has not resulted in the appearance of the generalizing work, which would have been dedicated to the life and work of one of the USRP leaders M. Stakhiv.

The scientific and popular scientific researches by foreign scholars can be a perspective direction of a more detailed study of the theme under consideration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Боднар, 2008 – Боднар О. Українська соціалістично-радикальна партія: основи політичної платформи (1926 – 1939) // Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність. Ювілейний збірник на пошану Івана Патера. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 2008. Вип. 16. С. 430–436.

Великочий, 2010 – Великочий В. С. Австро-Угорська політика в Галичині періоду Першої світової війни: штрихи до аналізу української історіографії // Проблеми історії України XIX – початку XX ст. 2010. Вип. 17. С. 373–389.

Великочий, 2011 – Великочий В. Українська історіографія про партійно-політичну систему Галичини воєнно-революційної доби: загальна характеристика // Галичина. 2011. № 12. С. 91–96.

- Горбач, 1949 – Горбач О. ЗУНР (ЗОУНР) в 1918 – 1923 рр. // Енциклопедія українознавства. Т. 1. Мюнхен; Нью-Йорк: Молоде життя, 1949. С. 527–530.
- Грицак, 1996 – Я. Нарис історії України. Формування модерної нації XIX – XX століття. Київ: Генеза, 1996. 360 с.
- Дудник, 2003 – Дудник О. Суспільно-політичне життя та громадянська позиція українських студентів-емігрантів у Чехословаччині у міжвоєнний період // Проблеми слов'янознавства. 2003. Вип. 53. С. 243–247.
- Кедрин, 1986 – Кедрин І. У межах зацікавлення / Наукове товариство ім. Шевченка. Нью-Йорк; Париж; Сідней; Торонто: [Б. в.], 1986. 523 с.
- Крезуб, 1966 – Крезуб А. Нарис історії українсько-польської війни 1918 – 1919. Нью-Йорк: Око, 1966. 179 с.
- Кугутяк, 1993 – Кугутяк М. Галичина: сторінки історії. Нарис суспільно-політичного руху (XIX ст. – 1939 р.). Івано-Франківськ, 1993. 200 с.
- Кульчицький, 1999 – Кульчицький С. Україна між двома війнами (1921 – 1939 рр.). Київ, 1999. [Україна кризь віки]. Т. 11. 336 с.
- Литвин, 1998 – Литвин М. Українсько-польська війна. 1918 – 1919. Львів, 1998. 488 с.
- Міщук, 2005 – Міщук М. Національна ідея в політичних програмах та практичній діяльності Української радикальної партії (1918 – 1939 рр.) // Україна соборна: 36. наук. статей. Київ, 2005. Вип. 2. Ч. 1. С. 192–198.
- Павленко, 1999 – Павленко М. Ставлення Чехословацької влади до інтернованих частин Української Галицької армії // Проблеми слов'янознавства. 1999. Вип. 50. С. 185–192.
- Паньківський, 1963 – Паньківський К. У 15-ліття Української Нац. Ради // Листи до приятелів / [ред. Микола Шлемкевич]. Нью-Йорк: «Ключі», 1963. Рік XI. Ч. 125–126. Кн. 7–8. С. 44–46.
- Пришляк, 1992 – Пришляк В. Історико-просвітницька діяльність інтернованих стрільців УГА в Чехословаччині // Українська еміграція: історія і сучасність. Матеріали міжнародних наукових конференцій, присвячених 100-річчю еміграції українців до Канади. Львів, 1992. С. 301–308.
- Прохода, 1967 – Прохода В. Уваги до праці д-ра М. Стахів «Україна в добі Директорії» // Український історик. 1967. Ч. 1/2 (13/14). С. 90–102.
- Соляр, 2011 – Соляр І. Зовнішні орієнтації українських партій національно-державницького табору Західної України (1923–1939). Львів, 2011. 356 с.
- Срібняк, 2006 – Срібняк І. Преса інтернованих частин Української Галицької Армії у Чехословаччині (1919–1921 рр.) // Магістеріум (Національний університет «Києво-Могилянська Академія»). Серія «Журналістика». Київ, 2006. Вип. 22. С. 76–80.
- Стахів, 1992 – Стахів М. Україна проти большевиків. Нариси з історії агресії Советської Росії. Тернопіль, 1992. 172 с.
- Шанковський, 1974 – Шанковський Л. Українська Галицька Армія: Воєнно-історична студія. Вінніпег: Вид. Д. Микитюк, 1974. 396 с.
- Швагуляк, 1994 – Швагуляк М. Маловідома сторінка політичного життя Західної України передодня Другої світової війни (з історії Контактного Комітету. 1937 – 1939 роки) // Записки Наукового товариства імені Шевченка / [ред. Олег Купчинський]. Львів, 1994. Т. ССХХVІІІ. С. 207–248.
- Швед, 2010 – Швед О. Степан Витвицький: громадсько-політична діяльність. Львів: Астролябія, 2010. 180 с.

REFERENCES

- Bodnar, 2008 – Bodnar O. Ukrainka sotsialistychno-radykalna partiia: osnovy politychnoi platformy (1926 – 1939) [The Ukrainian socialist-republican party: the bases of a political platform (1926 – 1939)] // Ukraine: cultural heritage, national consciousness, statehood. Anniversary collection in honour Ivan Pater. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 2008. Iss. 16. Pp. 430–436. [in Ukrainian]
- Velykochyi, 2010 – Velykochyi V.S. Avstro-Uhorska polityka v Halychyni periodu Pershoi svitovoi viiny: shtrykhy do analizu ukrainskoi istoriohrafii [Austro-Hungarian politics in Galicia in the period of World War I: the information for the analysis of Ukrainian historiography] // Problems of the history of Ukraine of the XIX – beginning of the XX cc. Iss. 17. Pp. 373–389. [in Ukrainian]
- Velykochyi, 2011 – Velykochyi V. Ukrainka istoriohrafia pro partiino-politychnu systemu Halychyny voienno-revoliutsiinoi doby: zahalna kharakterystyka [Ukrainian historiography on Galician party-political system in the war-revolutionary time: a general characteristic] // Galicia 2011. № 12. Pp. 91–96. [in Ukrainian]
- Horbach, 1949 – Horbach O. ZUNR (ZOUNR) v 1918 – 23 rr. [ZUNR in 1918 – 23] // Entsyklopediia ukrainoznavstva. T. 1. Miunkhen; Niu-York: Molode zhyttia, 1949. Pp. 527–530. [in Ukrainian]

Hrytsak, 1996 – Hrytsak Ya. Narys istorii Ukrainy. Formuvannia modernoi natsii XIX–XX stolittia. [Sketch in Ukraine's history. The formation of a modern nation of the XIX – XX centuries] Kyiv: Heneza, 1996. 360 p. [in Ukrainian]

Dudnyk, 2003 – Dudnyk O. Suspilno-politychne zhyttia ta hromadianska pozytsiia ukrainskykh studentiv-emigrantiv u Chekhoslovachchyni u mizhvoiennyi period [The social-political life and civic position of Ukrainian students-emigres in Czechoslovakia in the interwar period] // *Problems of Slavic Studies*. 2003. Iss. 53. Pp. 243–247. [in Ukrainian]

Kedryn, 1986 – Kedryn I. U mezhakh zatsikavlennia [Within the borders of interest] / *Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka*. Niu-York; Paryzh; Sydnei; Toronto: [W. e.], 1986. 523 s. [in Ukrainian]

Krezub, 1966 – Krezub A. Narys istorii ukrainsko-polskoi viiny 1918 – 1919 [A sketch of the history of Ukrainian – Polish war of 1918 – 1919] Niu-York: Oko, 1966. 179 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kuhutiak, 1993 – Kuhutiak M. Halychyna: storinky istorii. Narys suspilno-politychnoho rukhu (XIX st. – 1939 r.). [Galicia: the pages of history. A sketch of a social-political movement (XIX c. – 1939)] Ivano-Frankivsk, 1993. 200 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kulchytskyi, 1999 – Kulchytskyi S. Ukraina mizh dvoma viinamy (1921 – 1939 rr.). [Ukraine between the two wars (1921 – 1939 pp.)] Kyiv, 1999. [Ukraina kriz viky]. T. 11. 336 p.

Lytvyn, 1998 – Lytvyn M. Ukrainsko-polska viina. 1918 – 1919. [Ukrainian-Polish war of 1918 – 1919] Lviv, 1998. 488 p. [in Ukrainian]

Mishchuk, 2005 – Mishchuk M. Natsionalna ideia v politychnykh prohramakh ta praktychnii diialnosti Ukrainskoi radykalnoi partii (1918 – 1939 rr.) [The national idea in political programmes and the practical activity of Ukrainian radical party (1918 – 1939)] // *Sovereign Ukraine: A collection of scientific articles*. Київ, 2005. Iss. 2. Part 1. Pp. 192–198. [in Ukrainian]

Pavlenko, 1999 – Pavlenko M. Stavlennia Chekhoslovatskoi vlady do internovanykh chastyn Ukrainskoi Halytskoi armii [The attitude of Czechoslovak government to the interned units of Ukrainian Galician Army] // *Problems of Slavic Studies*. 1999. Iss. 50. Pp. 185–192. [in Ukrainian]

Pankivskiy, 1963 – Pankivskiy K. U 15-littia Ukrainskoi Nats. Rady [To the 15th anniversary of Ukrainian National Rada] // *Ukrainian emigration: history and contemporaneity. Materials of international scientific conferences, dedicated to 100th anniversary of the emigration of Ukrainians to Canada*. Львів, 1992. Pp. 301–308. [in Ukrainian]

Pryshliak, 1992 – Pryshliak V. Istoryko-prosvitnytska diialnist internovanykh striltsiv UHA v Chekhoslovachchyni [The historical-educational activity of the interned riflemen of UHA in Czechoslovakia] // *Ukrainska emihratsiia: istoriia i suchasnist. Materialy mizhnarodnykh naukovykh konferentsii, prysviachenykh 100-richchiiu emihratsii ukrainsiv do Kanady*. Lviv, 1992. Pp. 301–308. [in Ukrainian]

Prokhoda, 1967 – Prokhoda V. Uvahy do pratsi d-ra M. Stakhiva «Ukraina v dobi Dyrektorii» [Remarks to Dr M. Stakhiv's work «Ukraine in the time of the Directory»] // *Ukrainian historian*. 1967. Part 1/2 (13/14). Pp. 90–102. [in Ukrainian]

Soliar, 2011 – Soliar I. Zovnishni oriientsatsii ukrainskykh partii natsionalno-derzhavnytskoho taboru Zakhidnoi Ukrainy (1923–1939). [External orientations of Ukrainian parties of the national-state orientation of Western Ukraine (1923 – 1939)] Lviv, 2011. 356 p. [in Ukrainian]

Sribniak, 2006 – Sribniak I. Presa internovanykh chastyn Ukrainskoi Halytskoi Armii u Chekhoslovachchyni (1919 – 1921 rr.) [The press of the interned units of Ukrainian Galician Army in Czechoslovakia (1919 – 1921)] // *Magisterium (the National University «Kiev Mohyla Academy»*. Series «Journalism». Kyiv, 2006. Vyp. 22. Pp. 76–80. [in Ukrainian]

Stakhiv, 1992 – Stakhiv M. Ukraina proty bolshevykiv. Narysy z istorii ahresii Sovietskoi Rosii. [Ukraine against the Bolsheviks. A sketch in the history of the aggression of Soviet Russia] Ternopil, 1992. 172 p. [in Ukrainian]

Shankovskiy, 1974 – Shankovskiy L. Ukrainska Halytska Armii: Voiенno-istorychna studiiia. [Ukrainian Galician Army: a military-historical study] Vinnipeh: Vyd. D. Mykytiuk, 1974. 396 p. [in Ukrainian]

Shvahuliak, 1994 – Shvahuliak M. Malovidoma storinka politychnoho zhyttia Zakhidnoi Ukrainy peredodnia Druhoi svitovoi viiny (Z istorii Kontaktynoho Komitetu. 1937 – 1939 roky) [A little-known page of the political life of Western Ukraine on the eve of World War II (From the history of the Contact Committee. 1937–1939)] // *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka* / [red. Oleh Kupchynskiy]. Lviv, 1994. T. CCXXVIII. Pp. 207–248. [in Ukrainian]

Shved, 2010 – Shved O. Stepan Vytvytskyi: hromadsko-politychna diialnist. [Stepan Vytvytskyi: his public-political activity] Lviv: Astrolabiia, 2010. 180 p. [in Ukrainian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 11.04.2018 р.

UDC 94(477)
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.132975

Sergey KORNOVENKO,
orcid 0000-0002-6268-2321
Ph D hab. (History), Professor, Prorector for Research Innovative and International Activities of Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University at Cherkasy (Ukraine, Cherkasy)
s-kornovenko@ukr.net

A PEASANT COMPONENT IN THE TRANSITION TO THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY (1921)

The contribution deals with the study of the New Economic Policy. The analysis of the declassified documentary data enables the author to expose a high level of socio-political activity of Ukrainian peasants in the early 20-ies of the XXth century. The paper explicates that the Ukrainian peasantry were dissatisfied with the policy of «war communism». Active anti-Soviet stand of peasantry forced the Bolsheviks to reconsider the doctrinal principles of Marxism, particularly its socio-economic component. The peasantry became a real threat to the Bolsheviks' rule, which caused the transition to the New Economic Policy.

Key words: the New Economic Policy, Ukrainian peasantry, socio-political activity of peasants, Ukraine.

Сергій КОРНОВЕНКО,
доктор історичних наук, професор, проректор з наукової, інноваційної та міжнародної діяльності Черкаського національного університету імені Богдана Хмельницького (Україна, Черкаси) s-kornovenko@ukr.net

СЕЛЯНСЬКИЙ ФАКТОР ПЕРЕХОДУ ДО НОВОЇ ЕКОНОМІЧНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ (1921 р.)

Статтю присвячено вивченню нової економічної політики. Автором на основі аналізу розсекречених матеріалів розкрито високий ступінь суспільно-політичної активності українського селянства на початку 20-х років XX століття. Висвітлено, що селянство України не було задоволено політикою «воєнного комунізму». Активна антирадянська позиція селянства зумовила перегляд більшовиками доктринальних засад марксизму, зокрема соціально-економічного складника. Перехід до нової економічної політики відбувся завдяки тому, що селянство створило реальну загрозу більшовикам із утримання ними влади.

Ключові слова: нова економічна політика, українське селянство, суспільно-політична активність селянства, Україна.

The statement of the problem. The New Economic Policy (hereafter – NEP) as a socio-cultural phenomenon of the post-revolutionary era has been in the focus of attention of several generations of researches in the context of studying the history of Ukraine of the 1920-ies. This is due to the fact that the NEP is a unique page of socio-political, socio-economic, spiritual, and cultural national history. Firstly, it was one of the first nationwide attempts to move away from rigid administration of economy and social life at the period of the War Communism. Secondly, the NEP period is the renaissance of the Ukrainian national culture started by the Ukrainian revolution. Thirdly, the NEP was the time of the alternative search.

The analysis of researches. For a long time the Soviet historiography interpreted the transition to NEP as an «accomplishment of Lenin's genius» and the «genius» of the Bolshevik Party (Trapeznikov, 1976: 453–455). Subsequently, this approach was criticized by new Ukrainian and Russian historians (Kulchytskyi, 1996; Morozov, 1993; Kalinichenko, 1997; Danilov, 2006: 26–32; Orlov, 2006: 33–54). However, we believe that modern domestic historiography did not pay much attention to the peasant component as a key one in the transition to NEP. The author of the article aims to investigate the impact of peasant components, including socio-political activity of the peasantry, on the Bolsheviks' decision to introduce the NEP.

In historiographical tradition and socio-political practice of the late XIX – early XX century there was established the unfounded, in our view, understanding of the peasantry as inert, pro-monarchy-minded and conservatively-thinking social groups that can not be self-sufficient and active subject of the historical process in the broad sense of the word. Obviously, such an understanding of the peasantry as being defective and inconsistent in socio-political and socio-economic life was caused by the government's protectionist policies against the peasantry in the late XIX – early XX century (Sviashchenko, 2012).

Later, the idea of the peasantry inferiority was adopted by the Bolsheviks (Lenin, 1968: 362–366; Lenin, 1976: 235, 313, 325–326). They developed the concept of the peasantry as an ally of the proletariat in the struggle for a brighter future. However, the proletariat who supposedly had nothing to lose but their own bonds was declared the leader (Safonov, 2012: 15–18). Instead the farmer was considered an entity with «dual psychology».

In any case in the late XIX – early XX century the peasants stayed obscure. This «Janus in bast shoes» for the majority of the then socium was the object and subject of cognition, as a «thing in itself», which they tried to comprehend while attributing it mostly unusual characteristics, trying to adapt it to the then-known models and schemes. Self-cognition of peasantry as it was and through inherent characteristics did not happen.

However, socio-political activity of the peasantry within the Ukrainian revolution of 1917 – 1921 dramatically disagreed with the impressions of the peasantry and understanding it which dominated in the intellectual space of that period. A thorough analysis of historical events of the early twentieth century clearly shows the politicization and radicalization of peasant consciousness; the phenomenon was reflected in the «Great peasant revolution» that started in 1902. We agree with the V. Danilov's project concerning the peasant revolution of 1902 – 1922. However, as for us, the upper chronological limit requires further discussion, at least in terms of the Ukrainian realities. There are no substantial objections to the idea that the peasant movement of the early twentieth century laid deep foundation to all revolutionary transformations that were experienced by Ukraine and Russia in the first decades of the twentieth century. It is against the background of the peasant revolution the other revolutions were unfolding – national-democratic, social, political ones, and so on. The Peasant Revolution in Ukraine and Russia was a protective reaction of the peasantry of Ukraine and Russia to the objective, inherent to all developed countries process of primitive accumulation of capital at the expense of the impoverishment of the peasantry, and as a result – its liquidation under the influence of industrial civilization. The main slogan and goal of the peasant revolution were: «the land and the right to freely farm on it» (Danilov, 1992: 310–321; Danilov, 1996: 4–23; Kondrashin, 2008: 70–74).

In places where the above mentioned peasant ideal contrasted with the position of a political regime peasant resistance movement flared up. For instance, within the first two decades

of July, 1919 in Ukraine there were 207 armed peasant uprisings against the Soviet rule. Of these, 111 occurred in the Kyiv region, 37 – in the Poltava region, 20 – in the Volyn region, 14 – in the Kherson region, and 12 – in Chernihiv and Podillya (Zinchenko, 2008: 137).

The anti-Soviet peasant armed resistance movement did not stop in 1920 – early 1921. The peasants of Ukraine did not accept the policy of the «war communism». During this period the wave of the anti-Soviet armed peasant uprisings swept across Ukraine. The documents which have been inaccessible for the researchers for a long period, objectively illustrate the then situation in the country which ensued with the end of large-scale hostilities.

For instance, making a brief review of the situation in Ukraine in June, 1920, a special department in the Southwestern Front reported: «Ukraine is experiencing another wave of uprisings. In the Kharkiv, Donetsk, and Chernihiv provinces the uprising are of a rolling nature, they spread there from the neighboring Kursk, Ekaterinoslav, and Kiev provinces, where the uprising have an organized. The Kiev and Ekaterinoslav provinces are the cradles of the uprisings. These outbreaks are caused by the erroneous actions of the members of the grain requisitioning squads» (Kratkij obzor, 1998: 259).

In its info summary of June 16–30, 1920, the secret department of the Cheka informed: «The Kharkiv province. In the Ahtyrsk district due to the decisive means for pumping bread the mood of the peasantry changed for the worse. The party is working imperfectly, and the peasants have little or no understanding of the problems of the Soviet power» (Iz informacionnoj svodki sekret'nogo otdela, 1998: 268).

V. Antonov-Ovseyenko reported: «As of the beginning of June the mood of the peasants of the Katerynoslav region are not in favor of the Soviet power. As of June from 226 districts (of 278 districts in the province), there were: engulfed in uprisings – 6 affected by ... gang violence – 64, hostile, but not active – 91, the kulak-loyal – 63, and pro-Soviet – 3. Joining the gangs by the poor people should be considered first, as a reflection of the natural process of the stratification of the country folk, and secondly, as an error which lies in it that we have not timely considered the moment and did not assemble the poor through an appropriate form of organization. As for the middle peasants, they can be an excellent material for use under the following conditions: 1) if we make them interested in robbing the kulaks; 2) will implement our policy of transferring the main burden on the kulaks» (Iz doklada, 1998: 277–278).

The Katerynoslav Cheka, reporting on its activities of July, 15 through August, 1, 1920, informed: «In connection with the use of the repressive means within implementing the grain requisition, the strengthening of the hostility to the Soviet power is being observed among the peasants. There are cases of disbanding the Soviets and replacing them by the village elders. As a result of a series of repressive operations the implementation of the requisition has advanced but the banditry still has considerable dimensions, including its impact on those strata of the peasantry who used to be passive» (Iz dvuhnedel'noj svodki Ekaterinoslavskoj gubcheka, 1998: 279).

The info summary of August, 15–20, 1920 reads: «The Kiev province. The mood of the population is good and cheerful. In the counties that were not occupied by the Polish-Petlyura troops, the mood of the peasants is pro-Petlyura and the kulaks are tuning the peasants against the Soviet power. The Poltava province. The attitude of the peasants to the Communist Party is hostile. The Kherson province. The mood of the population of the Olexandriya county is pro-Petlyura. The populace is hiding weapons, even guns. The rebellion is highly possible» (Iz informacionnoj svodki, 1998: 295).

From a two week info summary of the of the Cheka Secret department construction (September, 15–30, 1920): «The Katerynoslav province. The province is an unfavorable ground

for the Soviet construction. The mood of all the layers of the population is unsatisfactory. The peasants are hostile. The Podillya province. In the Vinnitsa district the Pikivtsi and Lyupynets townships the locals have completely rejected the grain requisition. The situation has turned so alarming that the requisitioners refused to work without the support group. The Donetsk province. The peasantry have absolutely no idea of the Soviet power and the Communist Party» (*Iz dvuhnedel'noj informacionnoj svodki*, 1998: 323).

The Cheka secret department, analyzing the situation in the areas of Ukraine subject to the Bolsheviks, testified: «Kherson, the Mykolayiv province. Soviet institutions are poisoned by anti-Semitism. The food distributing committees render completely inactive, even the working population and the workers of the provincial towns get nothing from what has been guaranteed by the rationing system. The free market price on bread is 300 rubles. The township and village Soviet institutions are manned with the outright counter-revolutionaries with no possibility of replacing them due to the deficit of specialists. The lack of discipline is characteristic of the Soviet institutions» (*Iz dvuhnedel'noj informacionnoj svodki*, 1998: 326).

The report of a secret department of the Cheka on the insurgency as of November, 1920, contains the following: «The last experience of vranghelivschyna (the general Vranghel's influence) proved that the Ukrainian kulaks and the peasantry in general seem to have remained loyal, but it does not mean that the well-to-do elements of the village have fully and readily joined the Soviet power. Rich peasants are afraid of the landlords' sticks, the whips of the policemen and of the heavy tribute to the governor, but they are also afraid of the proletarian consistency in building communism. The Ukrainian kulaks want to become «masters» in the countryside, individual and sole, and not to depend on the town and the workers. In short three years of revolution so many big and minor governments besieged the Ukrainian countryside that «anarchy» seems to a Ukrainian «farmer» to be kind of some «ideal» healing of all the evil possible» (*Doklad*, 1998: 365).

Gradually, by the spring of 1921, a negative attitude of the peasantry to the grain requisition had fully manifested itself. It couldn't stay unnoticeable. A. Tsyurupa reported: «Demoralisation, disorganization, and the destruction of our staff are everywhere. It is only on the front of the Ukrainian grain requisition that 1700 grain collectors were killed» (*Desyatyj s"ezd*, 1963: 422). Let us pay tribute to the Bolshevik leader and his ability to objectively assess the reality. V. Lenin said: «The peasantry are dissatisfied with that form of relationships that we have established, they do not want this form of relationship, and are unwilling to exist like this any more. Definitely. They have expressed it explicitly. This is the will of the public masses of the working population» (*Lenin*, 1974: 59).

March 1921 became the climax of the crisis. The country was shocked by the news of the uprising in the town of Kronstadt. It was raised by the sailors, most of whom were the peasants dissatisfied with the policy of «war communism». The Bolsheviks were facing the real threat of losing power. «The economics of spring 1921 turned to the policy of «Kronstadt» (*Lenin*, 1974: 387). Under the pressure from the anti-Bolshevik position of the peasantry and other socio-economic and socio-political factors, on February 4, 1921, in his speech at the Moscow conference of the metalworkers V. Lenin put forward a general problem to be solved: reconsidering the relationships of workers and peasants. In this regard, he wrote about the necessity to satisfy the desire of the peasantry and replace grain requisition (as extracting surplus) by grain taxation (*Lenin*, 1973: 306–309).

The conclusions. Thus, in the early 20-ies of the XXth century dissatisfaction Ukrainian peasants by the Soviet authorities, as evidenced by the mass character and the scale of

peasant uprisings in Ukraine during this period, in fact, forced the state and the party Soviet leaders to review the economic theory and practice of Marxism. Without the introduction of the NEP, the Bolsheviks would not have retained power in their hands. In this regard, being pressured by the peasants they opened the doors of commodity-money relations as economic incentives of the production, especially in agriculture. Refusal from the policy of «war communism» meant the revival of the market management mode, mainly for the peasants.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Данилов, 1992 – Данилов В. Аграрные реформы и аграрная революция в России // Великий незнакомец: крестьяне и фермеры в современном мире. Москва, 1992. С. 310–321.

Данилов, 1996 – Данилов В. Крестьянская революция в России, 1902 – 1922 гг. // Крестьяне и власть. Москва-Тамбов, 1996. С. 4–23. [Электронный ресурс] Режим доступа: http://www.patriotica.ru/history/danilov_rev.html

Данилов, 2006 – Данилов В. К вопросу о понимании нэпа // НЭП: экономические политические и социокультурные аспекты. Москва: РОССПЭН, 2006. С. 26–32.

Десятый съезд, 1963 – Десятый съезд РКП(б). Март 1921 год. Стенографический отчет. Москва, 1963. 915 с.

Доклад, 1998 – Доклад секретного отдела ВЧК о повстанческом движении по состоянию на ноябрь 1920 г. // Советская деревня ВЧК – ЩГПУ – НКВД. Документы и материалы. В 4-х т. / т. 1 1918 – 1922 гг. / Под ред. А. Береловича, В. Данилова. Москва: РОССПЭН, 1998. С. 363–379.

Зінченко, 2008 – Зінченко А. Нариси історії Подільського селянства: 1917 – 1930 рр. Вінниця, 2008. 344 с.

Из двухнедельной информационной сводки, 1998 – Из двухнедельной информационной сводки секретного отдела ВЧК за 15–30 сентября 1920 г. // Советская деревня ВЧК – ЩГПУ – НКВД. Документы и материалы. В 4-х т. / т. 1 1918 – 1922 гг. / Под ред. А. Береловича, В. Данилова. Москва: РОССПЭН, 1998. С. 322–328.

Из двухнедельной сводки Екатеринославской губчека, 1998 – Из двухнедельной сводки Екатеринославской губчека за время с 15 июля по 1 августа 1920 г. // Советская деревня ВЧК – ЩГПУ – НКВД. Документы и материалы. В 4-х т. / т. 1 1918 – 1922 гг. / Под ред. А. Береловича, В. Данилова. Москва: РОССПЭН, 1998. С. 279–281.

Из доклада, 1998 – Из доклада народного комиссара внутренних дел Украины Антонова в ВЧК о политическом положении Екатеринославской губернии по его личным наблюдениям // Советская деревня ВЧК – ЩГПУ – НКВД. Документы и материалы. В 4-х т. / т. 1 1918 – 1922 гг. / Под ред. А. Береловича, В. Данилова. Москва: РОССПЭН, 1998. С. 277–278.

Из информационной сводки, 1998 – Из информационной сводки за 1–15 августа 1920 г. // Советская деревня ВЧК – ЩГПУ – НКВД. Документы и материалы. В 4-х т. / т. 1 1918 – 1922 гг. / Под ред. А. Береловича, В. Данилова. Москва: РОССПЭН, 1998. С. 295–299.

Из информационной сводки секретного отдела, 1998 – Из информационной сводки секретного отдела ВЧК за 16 – 30 июня 1920 г. // Советская деревня ВЧК – ЩГПУ – НКВД. Документы и материалы. В 4-х т. / т. 1 1918 – 1922 гг. / Под ред. А. Береловича, В. Данилова. Москва: РОССПЭН, 1998. С. 267–276.

Калініченко, 1997 – Калініченко В. Селянське господарство в Україні в період НЕПу: Історико-економічне дослідження. Харків: Основа, 1997. 400 с.

Кондрашин, 2008 – Кондрашин В. «Крестьянская революция в России. 1902 – 1922 гг.»: научный проект и научная концепция (предварительные заметки) // Украинский селянин. 2008. Випуск 11. С. 70–74.

Краткий обзор, 1998 – Краткий обзор положения на Украине (по сведениям особого отдела Юго-Западного фронта на 15–30 апреля) // Советская деревня ВЧК – ЩГПУ – НКВД. Документы и материалы. В 4-х т. / т. 1 1918 – 1922 гг. / Под ред. А. Береловича, В. Данилова. Москва: РОССПЭН, 1998. С. 259–261.

Кульчицький, 1996 – Кульчицький С. Комунізм в Україні: перше десятиріччя (1919 – 1928 рр.). Київ: Основи, 1996. 396 с.

Ленін, 1973 – Ленін В. І. Повне зібрання творів: У 55 т. Київ: Видавництво політичної літератури, 1973. Т. 42. 608 с.

Ленін, 1974 – Ленін В. І. Повне зібрання творів: У 55 т. Київ: Видавництво політичної літератури, 1974. Т. 43. 527 с.

Ленин, 1968 – Ленин В. Объединительный съезд РСДРП. 10–25 апреля 1906 г. // Полное собрание сочинений. Москва, 1968. Т. 12. С. 362–366.

Ленин, 1976 – Ленин В. Аграрная программа социал-демократии в первой русской революции 1905 – 1907 годов // Полное собрание сочинений. Москва, 1976. Т. 16. С. 235, 313, 325–326.

Морозов, 1993 – Морозов А. Село і гроші. Українська кредитна кооперація в добу НЕПу. Черкаси, 1993. 274 с.

Орлов, 2006 – Орлов И. НЭП в региональном ракурсе: от усредненных оценок к многообразию // НЭП: экономические политические и социокультурные аспекты. Москва: РОССПЭН, 2006. С. 33–54.

Сафонов, 2012 – Сафонов Д. Крестьянство как объект и субъект процесса модернизации // Вісник Черкаського університету. Серія історичні наук № 35 (248). Черкаси, 2012. С. 15–18.

Священко, 2012 – Священко З. Проурядові аграрні ініціативи в Російській імперії на початку ХХ ст. Умань: ФОП Жовтий О. О., 2012. 343 с.

Трапезников, 1976 – Трапезников С. П. Ленинизм и аграрно-крестьянский вопрос: В 2 т. Т. 1. Москва: Мысль, 1976. 567 с.

REFERENCES

Danilov, 1992 – Danilov V. Agrarnye reformy i agrarnaya revolyuciya v Rossii [The agrarian reforms and the agrarian revolution in Russia] // Velikij neznakomec: krest'yane i fermery v sovremennom mire [A great stranger: peasants and farmers in the modern world]. Moskva, 1992. Pp. 310–321. [in Russian].

Danilov, 1996 – Danilov V. Krest'yanskaya revolyuciya v Rossii, 1902 – 1922 gg. [The peasant revolution in Russia, 1902 – 1922] // Krest'yane i vlast' [Peasants and power]. Moskva-Tambov, 1996. Pp. 4–23. Retrieved from http://www.patriotica.ru/history/danilov_rev.html [in Russian]

Danilov, 2006 – Danilov V. K voprosu o ponimanii nehpa [On the issue of understanding the NEP] // NEHP: ehkonomicheskie, politicheskie i sociokulturnye aspekty [NEP: Economic, political and socio-cultural aspects]. Moskva: ROSSPEHN, 2006. Pp. 26–32. [in Russian]

Desyatij s"ezd, 1963 – Desyatij s"ezd RKP(b). Mart 1921 god. Stenograficheskij otchet [The tenth congress of the Russian Communist Party (of the Bolsheviks). March, 1921. The Verbatim report]. Moskva, 1963. 915 p. [in Russian]

Doklad, 1998 – Doklad sekret'nogo otdela VCHK o povstancheskom dvizhenii po sostoyaniyu na noyabr' 1920 g. [The report of the Cheka secret department on the insurgencies as of November, 1920] // Sovetskaya derevnya VCHK – SHCHGPU – NKVD. Dokumenty i materialy [The Soviet village Cheka – SCHGPU – NKVD. Documents and materials]. V 4-h t. T. 1: 1918 – 1922 gg. / Pod red. A. Berelovicha, V. Danilova. Moskva: ROSSPEHN, 1998. Pp. 363–379. [in Russian]

Zinchenko, 2008 – Zinchenko A. Narysy istorii Podil'skoho selianstva: 1917 – 1930 rr. [The essays on the history of the Podolsk province peasants: 1917 – 1930]. Vinnytsia, 2008. 344 p. [in Ukrainian]

Iz dvuhnedel'noj informacionnoj svodki, 1998 – Iz dvuhnedel'noj informacionnoj svodki sekret'nogo otdela VCHK za 15–30 sentyabrya 1920 g. [From the two-week info summary of the secret department of the Cheka as of September 15–30, 1920] // Sovetskaya derevnya VCHK – SHCHGPU – NKVD. Dokumenty i materialy [The Soviet village Cheka – SCHGPU – NKVD. Documents and materials.]. V 4-h t. T. 1: 1918 – 1922 gg. / Pod red. A. Berelovicha, V. Danilova. Moskva: ROSSPEHN, 1998. Pp. 322–328. [in Russian]

Iz dvuhnedel'noj svodki Ekaterinoslavskoj gubcheka, 1998 – Iz dvuhnedel'noj svodki Ekaterinoslavskoj gubcheka za vremya s 15 iyulya po 1 avgusta 1920 g. [From the two-week info summary of the Ekaterinoslav province Cheka as of July, 15 through August, 1, 1920] // Sovetskaya derevnya VCHK – SHCHGPU – NKVD. Dokumenty i materialy [The Soviet village Cheka – SCHGPU – NKVD. Documents and materials.]. V 4-h t. T. 1: 1918 – 1922 gg. / Pod red. A. Berelovicha, V. Danilova. Moskva: ROSSPEHN, 1998. Pp. 279–281. [in Russian]

Iz doklada, 1998 – Iz doklada narodnogo komissara vnutrennih del Ukrainy Antonova v VCHK o politicheskom polozhenii Ekaterinoslavskoj gubernii po ego lichnym nablyudenyam [From the reports of the national Commissioner of Internal Affairs of Ukraine Antonov in the Cheka on the political situation in the Ekaterinoslav province by his personal observations] // Sovetskaya derevnya VCHK – SHCHGPU – NKVD. Dokumenty i materialy [The Soviet village Cheka – SCHGPU – NKVD. Documents and materials.]. V 4-h t. T. 1: 1918 – 1922 gg. / Pod red. A. Berelovicha, V. Danilova. Moskva: ROSSPEHN, 1998. Pp. 277–278. [in Russian]

Iz informacionnoj svodki, 1998 – Iz informacionnoj svodki za 1–15 avgusta 1920 g. [From the info summary as of August, 1–15, 1920] // Sovetskaya derevnya VCHK – SHCHGPU – NKVD. Dokumenty i materialy [The Soviet village Cheka – SCHGPU – NKVD. Documents and materials.]. V 4-h t. T. 1: 1918 – 1922 gg. / Pod red. A. Berelovicha, V. Danilova. Moskva: ROSSPEHN, 1998. Pp. 295–299. [in Russian]

Iz informacionnoj svodki sekret'nogo otdela, 1998 – Iz informacionnoj svodki sekret'nogo otdela VCHK za 16–30 iyunya 1920 g. [From the info summary of the secret department of the Cheka as of June, 16–30, 1920] // Sovetskaya derevnya VCHK – SHCHGPU – NKVD. Dokumenty i materialy [The Soviet village Cheka – SCHGPU – NKVD. Documents and materials]. V 4-h t. T. 1: 1918 – 1922 gg. / Pod red. A. Berelovicha, V. Danilova. Moskva: ROSSPEHN, 1998. Pp. 267–276. [in Russian]

Kalinichenko, 1997 – Kalinichenko V. Selianske hospodarstvo v Ukraini v period NEPu: Istoryko-ekonomichne doslidzhennia [Farming in Ukraine during the NEP: Historical and economic research]. Kharkiv: Osnova, 1997. 400 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kondrashin, 2008 – Kondrashin V. «Krest'yanskaya revolyuciya v Rossii. 1902 – 1922 gg.»: nauchnyj proekt i nauchnaya koncepciya (predvaritel'nye zametki) [«The peasant revolution in Russia. 1902 – 1922» the scientific project and the scientific concept (preliminary notes)] // Ukrainskyi selianyn [Ukrainian peasant]. Kyiv, 2008. Vypusk 11. Pp. 70–74. [in Russian]

Kratkij obzor, 1998 – Kratkij obzor polozheniya na Ukraine (po svedeniyam osobogo otdela YUgo-Zapadnogo fronta na 15–30 aprelya) [A Brief overview of the situation in Ukraine (on the information of the special department of the South-West Front as of April, 15–30)] // Sovetskaya derevnya VCHK – SHCHGPU – NKVD. Dokumenty i materialy [The Soviet village Cheka – SCHGPU – NKVD. Documents and materials]. V 4-h t. T. 1: 1918 – 1922 gg. / Pod red. A. Berelovicha, V. Danilova. Moskva: ROSSPEHN, 1998. Pp. 259–261. [in Russian]

Kulchytskyi, 1996 – Kulchytskyi S. Komunizm v Ukraini: pershe desiatyrichchia (1919 – 1928 rr.) [Communism in Ukraine: the first decade (1919 – 1928)]. Kyiv: Osnovy, 1996. 396 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lenin, 1973 – Lenin V. I. Povne zibrannia tvoriv: U 55 t. [The full collection of manuscripts: In 55 v.]. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo politychnoi literatury, 1973. T. 42. 608 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lenin, 1974 – Lenin V. I. Povne zibrannia tvoriv: U 55 t. [The full collection of manuscripts: In 55 v.]. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo politychnoi literatury, 1974. T. 43. 527 p. [in Ukrainian]

Lenin, 1968 – Lenin V. Ob'edinitel'nyj s'ezd RSDRP. 10–25 aprelya 1906 g. [The unifying congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party. April, 10–25, 1906] // Polnoe sobranie sochinenij [The Full collection of manuscripts]. Moskva, 1968. T. 12. Pp. 362–366. [in Russian]

Lenin, 1976 – Lenin V. Agrarnaya programma social-demokratii v pervoj russoj revolyucii 1905 – 1907 godov [The agrarian program of the social democracy in the first Russian revolution of 1905 – 1907] // Polnoe sobranie sochinenij [The Full collection of manuscripts]. Moskva, 1976. T. 16. Pp. 235, 313, 325–326. [in Russian]

Morozov, 1993 – Morozov A. Selo i hroshi. Ukrainska kredytna kooperatsiia v dobu NEPu [Village and money. Ukrainian credit co-operatives in the days of the NEP]. Cherkasy, 1993. 274 s. [in Ukrainian]

Orlov, 2006 – Orlov I. NEHP v regional'nom rakurse: ot usrednennykh ocenok k mnogoobraziyu [NEP in the regional perspective: from the average assessment to the variety] // NEHP: ehkonomicheskie, politicheskie i sociokul'turnye aspekty [NEP: Economic, Political, and Socio-cultural aspects]. Moskva: ROSSPEHN, 2006. Pp. 33–54. [in Russian]

Safonov, 2012 – Safonov D. Krest'yanstvo kak ob'ekt i sub'ekt processa modernizacii [Peasantry as an object and subject of the modernization process] // Visnyk Cherkaskoho universytetu. Seriya istorychni nauk № 35 (248) [Bulletin of the Cherkassy University. A series of historical sciences]. Cherkasy, 2012. Pp. 15–18. [in Russian]

Sviashchenko, 2012 – Sviashchenko Z. Prouriadovi aharni initsiatyvy v Rosiiskii imperii na pochatku KhKh st. [Pro-government agricultural initiatives in the Russian Empire in the early twentieth century]. Uman: FOP Zhovtyi O.O., 2012. 343 s. [in Ukrainian]

Trapeznikov, 1976 – Trapeznikov S. P. Leninizm i agrarno-krest'yanskij vopros [Leninism and the agraro-peasant issue]: V 2 t. T. 1. Moskva: Mysl', 1976. 567 p. [in Russian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.04.2018 р.

UDC 378.093.5(477.43-21)“1921/1930”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130674

Diana YABLONSKA,
orcid.org/0000-0002-9138-2766
Postgraduate Student of Ukrainians History Department,
Leading specialist of Department of
Scientific Work and International Relations,
Kamianets-Podilskyi National Ivan Ohiienko University
(Ukraine, Kamianets-Podilskyi)
dianayblonska@meta.ua

DEPARTMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND SOCIAL TRAINING OF KAMYANETS-PODILSKYI INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION (1921 – 1930)

The article deals with the process of establishing and functioning of the professional and social education departments of the Kamyanets-Podilskyi Institute of Public Education, their structure main tasks and basic problems which are further described. It has been established that the educational, scientific and educational work of these departments was subordinated to the qualitative training of specialists of pedagogical profile, whom the secondary schools of the Ukrainian USSR urgently needed.

Key words. Kamynets-Podilskyi Institute of Public Education, Department of Vocational Education, Department of Social Education, structure, training, lecturers, professors, students.

Діана ЯБЛОНСЬКА,
аспірант кафедри історії України,
провідний фахівець відділу наукової роботи і міжнародних зв'язків
Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка
(Україна, Кам'янець-Подільський)
dianayblonska@meta.ua

ФАКУЛЬТЕТИ ПРОФЕСІЙНОЇ ОСВІТИ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНОГО ВИХОВАННЯ КАМ'ЯНЕЦЬ-ПОДІЛЬСЬКОГО ІНСТИТУТУ НАРОДНОЇ ОСВІТИ (1921 – 1930)

У статті досліджується процес заснування і діяльності факультетів професійної освіти та соціального виховання Кам'янець-Подільського інституту народної освіти, з'ясовано їх структуру, основні завдання та головні проблеми, які вилилися у подальше закриття. Встановлено, що освітня, наукова та виховна робота цих підрозділів була підпорядкована якійсь підготовці фахівців педагогічного профілю, яких гостро потребувала загальноосвітня школа УСРР.

Ключові слова. Кам'янець-Подільський інститут народної освіти, факультет професійної освіти, факультет соціального виховання, структура, навчання, викладачі, професори, студенти.

The statement of the problem. Pedagogical institutions of higher education in Ukraine form specialists who will work with the same goal – to teach and develop the younger generation – the country's future. The same task had the departments of professional education and social education in Kamianets-Podilskyi IPE, which was realized in the conditions of formation and development of the Soviet model of higher education.

The analysis of sources and recent researches. Today there is a small number of works devoted to the activity of the departments of Kamianets-Podilskyi IPE. Significant con-

tribution to the study of this topic were made by O. Zavalnyuk, S. Kopylov, A. Filinyuk, L. Bazhenov, V. Prokopchuk, A. Komarnitsky, V. Nesterenko, etc. In their studies the general features of the historical development of the educational center in Podilia have been clarified.

The article's purpose. The purpose of the article is to study the educational, scientific, and cultural centers in Podilia, that is, the departments of vocational education and social upbringing of Kamyanets-Podilskyi IPE.

Statement of the basic material. In 1921, at the beginning of its work, the IPE had only two departments, namely, social-historical and physics-mathematical. At that time, the position of the rector was occupied by biologist S. D. Sidoryak. However, with the lack of respect from the scientific and pedagogical staff, due to his unprofessionalism in running the higher educational institution, he was replaced by P. G. Klepatsky, a researcher of the history of Ukraine (Kopylov, 1998: 209–210).

The first step of the new rector of the IPE was the change of the management of that higher educational establishment, the work of the collective economy, the staff of teachers and material and technical base, student life, the cultural and educational sphere of the life of the institute (Ritchka, 1991: 202).

The Department of Professional Studies was founded on May 18, 1921, by decree No. 67 of the Political Commissar S. Chaly on the basis of two departments of the Kamianets-Podilskyi University: Physics, Mathematics, and Social-Historical (or Social-Humanitarian) (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 5. Sh. 21). The department's structure had certain divisions. Thus, the physics and mathematics department consisted of two subdivisions: industrial and natural (Kamenets-Podilsky, 2003: 43). The department was located in the University street, 31 (now Ohienko's St., 61) (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 254. Sh. 5), 57 rooms were used, 10 of them were classrooms. On average, 25 % of state money was spent on staff payment; almost the same amount was given to the department of social studies, but the funds came with a delay (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 5. Sh. 22).

The teaching staff of the department of professional education had often changed, which was explained by the financial difficulties they were having total control from the Soviet Union. In 1923, the teaching staff at the department was (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 5. Sh. 20):

№	Teacher's Surname	Subjects	Position
1	Alenich O. A.	Astronomy	Astronomer-supervisor
2	Gamorak N.T.	Botany	Staff lecturer
3	Regula Ya. I.		Head of Department
4	Geryinovich V. O.	Geography	Staff lecturer
5	Martynyuk A. A.		Teacher
6	Lysenko O. O.	Geology	Freelance instructor
7	Nazarevich S. I.		Head of Department
8	Dlodezhevsky S. S.	General linguistics	Head of Department, Professor
9	Semenov M. M.		Staff lecturer
10	Buchinsky P. M.	Zoology	Head of Department, Professor
11	Kozhuhov O. M.		Staff lecturer
12	Sidoryak S. D.		Staff lecturer
13	Khitkov M. O.		Professor

14	Barvinsky B. O.	Material Culture History	Professor
15	Butakov V. I.		Staff lecturer
16	Lyubarsky I. A.		Staff lecturer
17	Sitsinsky Yu. I.		Staff lecturer
18	Stashevsky Ye. D.		Head of Department, Professor
19	Bzhosnyovsky O. A.	History of the national economy	Scholar
20	Dudolkevich B. K.		Staff lecturer
21	Zavadsky Ye. A.		Staff lecturer
22	Matviyevsky M. F.		Freelance instructor
23	Gaevsky S. R.	History of Russian literature	Staff lecturer
24	Klepatsky P. G.	History of Ukraine	Head of Department, Professor
25	Klymenko P. V.		Professor
26	Koperzhynskyi K. O.	History of Ukrainian Literature	Staff lecturer
27	Vasilkovsky M. M.	History of Philosophy and Logics	Staff lecturer
28	Neselovsky O. Z.		Head of Department, Professor
29	Hegemeester V. M.	History of art	Staff lecturer
30	Paul K. A.	Lecture of the German language	Head
31	Godilo-Godlevskaya O. O.	Lecture of the French language	Head
32	Derevyanko M. S.	Mathematics	Staff lecturer
33	Parkhomenko P. Yu.		Staff lecturer
34	Hvredov M. M.		Head of Department, Professor
35	Hvedorovich A.		Professor
36	Bezborodko M. I.	Mineralogy	Head of Department, Professor
37	Orlok O. M.		Staff lecturer
38	Grinchenko M. O.	Music	Head of Department
39	Zaklinsky R. R.	Basics of Marxism	Staff lecturer
40	Rusova S. F.	Pedagogics	Head of Department, Professor
41	Chalyi P. V.		Professor
42	Dray-Khmara M. O.	Slavic language	Staff lecturer
43	Kovalivska O. M.	Ukrainian language	Staff lecturer
44	Bernadsky V. K.	Physics	Head of Department
45	Malinovsky A. Ye.		Head of Department, Professor
46	Retanov O. M.		Staff lecturer
47	Boris A. G.	Physiology	Staff lecturer
48	Vikul M. P.	Chemistry	Professor
49	Krasnikov S. M.		Head of Department
50	Polonsky O. M.		Staff lecturer
51	Smirnov A. F.		Head of the laboratory

In order to enter the department of vocational education, it was necessary to pass an interview (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 254. Sh. 7). During the enrollment process, the preference was given to children of workers and peasants (applications of others were taken into consideration after them). All the entrants had to fill the following questionnaire (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 5. Sh. 23):

- place of birth;
- nationality and native language;
- sex;
- training;
- preparatory experience;
- social status;
- served military service / did not serve military service;
- financial condition;
- professional affiliation;
- party spirit;
- party (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 5. Sh. 23 reverse).

The first academic year began on November 1, 1921, after the end of the work in the field (Gerynovich, 1927: 17). The department's administration consisted of the dean's office (the dean – P. M. Buchinsky), meanwhile there was a faculty bureau, two secretaries, a clerk, an assistant clerk, two office workers. The economic division was united to the whole institute (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 5. Sh. 24–24). At the department there were students committee and course committee students whose function was to satisfy the various needs of the students group (course, trimester, department) (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 254. Sh. 13).

In one of the publications of the newspaper «Red Way» students of Kamianets-Podilskyi Institute, were called as «rotten». That happened because they couldn't answer the question «who are they?», «Why do they study?» And so on. There were cases in Kamianets-Podilskyi the IPE when only 1 student came to the classes, and sometimes nobody was present (Ritchka, 1991: 94).

The main task of the Faculty of Professional Education was the upbringing of the youth, training for future teachers for their work in schools and post-graduate students for teaching and research work. At the faculty, the majority of subjects were taught in the Ukrainian (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 254. Sh. 1 reverse). However, Professor E. D. Stashevsky and V. I. Butakov, The Head of the Department of Material Culture History, presented their lectures in Russian. All curricula for each trimester were approved by the NCE of the USSR (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 5. Sh. 28).

The department had 8 sections (mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, geology, geography, social-historical and philological sciences), students communities (Studcom), the IPE staff and 5 extra activity classes (geographical, biological, pedagogical, literary and communist for non-party students), which were united for the two faculties and which carried out scientific cooperation between professors and students (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 5. Sh. 32).

For students, such subjects as zoology, botany, philological seminars, pedagogics and psychology (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 4. Sh. 28) were the most interesting. The educational process was presented in the form of lectures, seminars, practical and laboratory classes (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 4. Sh. 4). A combine method of teaching was the most frequently used, which was the combination of theory and practice. Lectures were conducted in all subjects, seminars were in philology, history, art, pedagogics and geography

(DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 4. Sh. 32); Laboratory classes were in physics, chemistry, biology (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 4. Sh. 30); the rest of the disciplines had practical lessons (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 5. Sh. 25).

For students special political courses were obligatory in order to provide political education: the foundation of Marxism, the history of revolutionary movements in Ukraine, a historical review of socio-political literature (lecture) and the foundations of Marxism (practical lessons) (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 4. Sh. 33).

The main subject was considered to be mathematics, which had the biggest amount of academic hours (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 395. Sh. 95–95 reverse). At the other department, the focus was on social upbringing (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 4. Sh. 29). All subjects of both departments were united by a general plan and approved by the NCE of the USSR (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 4. Sh. 4 reverse).

Since 1921, the government had begun a new policy of regulation the number of the students, which was called «socio-economic verification» (Komarnitsky, 2017: 97). Students were given special questionnaires about social affiliation, attitude towards education, and so on. In May 1922, the re-registration in the Kamenets-Podilskythe IPE was conducted. As a result, almost 500 people were expelled (Komarnitsky, 2017: 98). Such social cleansing led to the fact that in the spring of 1922 approximately only 252 students (out of a total of 887) were left in the IPE (DAKhO. S. 302, D. 1. C. 5. Sh. 194). Such check-ups at the department of Professional Education happened from time to time throughout the period of its existence.

The material base of the Faculty of Professional Education consisted of a variety of laboratories (chemical, physics with a mechanical office) and study rooms (art, statistics, astronomical and astronomical observatory, zoological, zootechnical, mineralogical and geological, botanical) (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 395. Sh. 116). The mechanical office was responsible for repairing the entire equipment (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 3. C. 5. Sh. 23). The main attention should be paid to the library, which was general (for the whole institute), for students, for each office and laboratory and for the teaching staff (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 395. Sh. 53). The last was used only by the teachers of the university, and in general at the Faculty of Professional Studies there were 10 of them. The general library was used by the two departments and consisted mainly of books that were donated to the University for its opening (1918). However, in both libraries had one problem, the lack of a complete scientific and educational material. Everybody was taught by the lectures, the texts of which the teachers copied on typewriters, but sometimes they donated books from their own funds for the university library (Kamenets-Podilsky, 2003: 45).

In the spring of 1921, the Revolutionary Committee, after the request from the governance of the Institute, grant 300 acres of land, 2 mills and gardens for the Institute (Gerynovich, 1927: 18). The main aim for that was to improve the economic status of IPE. The combining of the educational process with physical work took place during the whole existence of the institute, and not only students, but also the teaching staff of the IPE came out for the field work. Later V. O. Gerinovich called this period the time of stubborn work for the sake of a piece of bread, when during the day the whole the IPE team worked in the field, garden and in the evening they were engaged in classrooms, extra lessons, offices, laboratories, etc. (Kamyanets-Podilskyi, 2003: 45).

At the end of 1922, the reformation of the Kamianets-Podilskythe IPE happened. According to the decision of the Presidium of the NCE of the USSR, the higher educational

institution was transformed into a school of social education with two branches: pre-school and school (on the basis of mathematical natural sciences and socio-economic sciences with the introduction of specialization in II-III year of study). Its task was to prepare educators for kindergartens, orphanages and teachers of seven-year schools, which country desperately needed (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 395. Sh. 117).

On September 30, 1922, at the elections of the head of the Institute P. G. Klepatsky did not have enough votes, so P. M. Buchinsky became the new rector. (Ritchka, 1991: 203). He was working at this post only one year, and then, because of health problems, applied for dismissal from an administrative position. On October 23, 1923, 40-year-old professor V. O. Gerynovich became the rector of the IPE (Melnyk, Filinyuk, 1998: 32).

During his work the structural and organizational changes of the IPE were over. In 1923, the department of Professional Education was liquidated, and the departments of training educators for kindergartens, orphanages and teachers for seven years schools were founded (Zavalnyuk, 2004: 190). The high school combines pedagogical courses named after M. P. Drahomanov and Vinnitsathe IPE (which led to its increase and transformation), the only higher educational institution in Podillya (Kamianets-Podilskyi, 2003: 49).

The Department of Social Education was established on November 1, 1921. Its discovery was supported by the teachers of the Institute and future students (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 47).

As for the main goals and tasks of the given educational unit, according to the decision of the National Commissariat of Education and all the instructions of the Politkommissar S. Chaly, they were to combine a boarding school for practitioners and orphanages, the education in which would be an example for educational work of similar institutions of higher education (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 47). That was the whole essence of the department of social education, which initially was interpreted as a pedagogical laboratory.

During the opening of the Department, some measures for opening the 100-personthe IPE boarding school for students were taken. However, because of the absence of a suitable dwelling, these plans were transferred for the next year (DAKhO. F S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 47 reverse). According to the financial record from 17.11.1921, Professor M. M. Khvednorov created the budget of the Department of Social Education in 1922, according to which 283 100 000 rubles were provided for the maintenance of the building for the orphanage, 250 10000 rubles for the children's home, 66 000 rubles for the clubhouse and workshops and other department's costs – 696 033 700 rubles. (DAKhO. F S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 50).

After the opening of the Department of Social Studies, the number of students who wanted to study were recruited and the amount was about 89 people. Reading lectures began on December 1, 1921, and they were held every day in front of 30–40 students (DAKhO. F S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 47). During the first trimester, three faculty meetings (01.11.1921, 03.11.1921 and 03.12.1921) and four meetings of the commission of specialists were held (05.11.1921, 14.11.1921, 19.11.1921, 21.11.1921). The commission consisted of: the chairman of the commission – political commissar S. Chaly, deputy chairman – rectorthe IPE S. D. Sidoryak, secretary – I. Kovalska, members of the commission – lecturers S. F. Rusova and M. V. Vasylkivsky. All teachers of the Faculty of Social Education under the chairmanship of the Dean were present at the meeting (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 48).

For the first year of study V. I. Butakova, M. V. Vasylkivsky, N. T. Gamorak, V. M. Gagnameister, V. O. Gerinovich, I. Kovalsky, S. F. Rusov, M. M. Semeniyeu, S. D. Sidoryak, M. M. Khvedyorov and S. Chaly were involved for the teaching process. Teaching was con-

ducted in accordance with the curricula that came from Kharkiv. However, due to the lack of lecturers on some scientific subjects, some changes were added. For example, due to illness, Professor V. I. Butakov wasn't present at classes in chemistry, and therefore the discipline «The History of Pedagogical Theory and Practice» was taught, which was taught by political commissar S. Chaly (this same discipline replaced all subjects which weren't taught at the department for various reasons) During their free time, they organized lessons of teaching Ukrainian or Writing (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 48).

Occasionally, classes were conducted in very cold conditions, in unheated rooms, at low temperatures, and sometimes without electricity, with candles or kerosene lamps. Despite these unfavorable conditions, students who were in poor conditions, regularly attended lectures, following their curriculum.

The winter break (holidays) of 1922/1923 had a negative impact on educational process. Because of the cold and snowstorms, and the lack of proper direct rail connection, many students were not able to return to the IPE in time. There were occasions when they, after a long road to Kamianets-Podilskyi, became sick. For these reasons, studying at the Department of Social Education could not begin their studies in time. They were able to come back to the lessons only on February 21, 1923, meanwhile there were only 5–14 people in different courses (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 52).

At the end of the first trimester, the students passed exams, and the next trimester had only 20 students out of 26. However, the department commission was allowed to study six more students who due to various circumstances, were unable to pass exams at the end of the first trimester (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 50, Sh. 48 reverse).

From November, 1921 I. Y. Kulik was elected for the dean's position of the department of social education (from 1922 – V. O. Gerinovich), which was approved by the commission of specialists from November 19, 1921. At that time, new department members included O. Retanov, V. Nikityuk and K. Koperzhinsky. The last was elected to the commission of specialists to replace S. F. Rusova at the end of 1922 (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 51 reverse).

The work of the department had many problems according to the lack of a sufficient number of specialists-teachers. Global attention was paid to theoretical disciplines and the course of the first and second years of study, which usually did not promote the interest for students in the pedagogical work. For example, there was no cooperation between the Department of Social Education and the orphanage, which, due to its difficult financial situation, never became a pedagogical laboratory for observations (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 49).

Since 1923 Professor Vissetsky had been invited to the post of teacher and practitioner. During one of the meetings of the commission of specialists he made an offer to open a psychological and pedagogical department at the department, but it should have been accepted by the NCE of the USSR. At the end of November 1923, a permission from Kharkiv was received to open such department, which purpose was to improve in theoretical and practical way the teaching of social psychology, pedagogics, experimental pedagogics and psychology. In addition, the aim of his work was to establish cooperation with students of the orphanage and boarding school. Particular attention was paid to children with special needs, and it was planned to create a special school for them at the IPE (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 49).

On October 23, 1923, 40-year-old professor Volodymyr Gerinovich became the rector of the IPE (Komarnitsky, 2017: 32). During his running, the structural and organizational changes of the IPE were completed: the department of Professional education was

eliminated, new units were opened, the task of which was to prepare educators for kindergartens, orphanages and teachers for seven-year schools (Zavalnyuk, 2004: 190).

During its whole existence, the department of social education had cooperated with the department of professional education. An example of this was the joint classes on such disciplines as «Machine Study» under the direction of Professor M. Khvedyrov, «History of Culture» – Professor V. I. Butakova and others (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 1. C. 50. Sh. 49 reverse).

Since 1925, students had been studying according to the four-year plan. The first three years of study included: propaedeutic, pedagogical training, teaching of pedagogical and socio-political disciplines. During the last year, the studying was over with 4 courses of science: socio-economic, biological, physical-mathematical and preschool. All students had to prepare course paper, and graduates had to do candidate work to determine their readiness for independent work in the chosen specialization (Zavalnyuk, Komarnitsky, 2006: 18).

On January 1, 1928, V. O. Geriinovich was fired from the post of rector (DAKhO. S. 302. D. 2. C. 43c. Sh. 39) and with him more than 10 the IPE teachers. Performing the duties of the rector of the Kamianets-Podilskyi the IPE (since January 1928) was appointed by F. A. Kondratsky, and from December 1928 he became the rector. Becoming a leader, he faced different kinds of difficulties in restructuring the system of higher education, which was dictated by higher authorities (Bystra, 2017: 139), for example, they were forced to comply with the orders of the National Commissariat of Defense, in particular, regarding the social elimination of students and teaching staff as «unworkable elements» of the institute (Melnik, Filinuk, 1998: 35–36).

On September 1, 1930, the Kamianets-Podilskyi the IPE was reorganized into the Institute of Social Education (here and later – the ISE) with a three-year educational plan and the department named after its director Franz Andriyovych Kondracky (until April 26, 1931) (Kamenets-Podilsky, 2003: 58).

Conclusions. Throughout the whole period of department's existence the teaching staff managed to implement educational plans, meanwhile attracting to the student contingent those who had previously studied at the State Ukrainian University. They were supposed to ensure the ideological nature of the educational process trying to find the most appropriate material and technical base. Both educational units were preparing the staff generally less qualified than during the pre-Soviet time, but they were ready to serve the new authorities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Бистра, 2017 – Бистра М. Образ радянського вчителя у періодичних виданнях України кінця 1930-х рр. на прикладі газети «Більшовицька правда» // Східноєвропейський історичний вісник. Дрогобич, Посвіт, 2017. Вип. 5. С. 138–145.

Геринович, 1927 – Геринович В.О. До історії Кам'янець-Подільського інституту народної освіти // Записки Кам'янець-Подільського інституту народної освіти. Кам'янець-Подільський, 1927. Т. 2. С. 1–24.

ДАХМО – Державний архів Хмельницької області.

Завальнюк, Комарницький, 2006 – Завальнюк О. М., Комарницький О. Б. Кам'янець-Подільський державний університет (1918 – 2006 рр.): історичний нарис. Кам'янець-Подільський, Абетка-НОВА, 2006. 196 с.

Завальнюк, 2004 – Завальнюк О. М. В. О. Геринович – приват-доцент Кам'янець-Подільського державного українського університету (1919 – 1921) // Історія України: маловідомі імена, події, факти: збірник наукових статей. Київ, Інститут історії України НАН України, 2004. Вип. 25. С. 183–193.

Кам'янець-Подільський, 2003 – Кам'янець-Подільський державний університет: минуле і сьогодення. Кам'янець-Подільський, Оіюм, 2003. 408 с.

Комарніцький, 2017 – Комарніцький О. Б. Студенти-педагоги у модернізації вищої освіти радянської України у 1920 – 1930-х рр.: монографія. Кам'янець-Подільський, ТОВ «Друкарня «Рута», 2017. 984 с.

Копилов, 1998 – Копилов С. А. П. Клепатський: Кам'янецький період діяльності (1919 – 1921 рр.) // Освіта, наука та культура на Поділлі: збірник наукових праць. Кам'янець-Подільський, Оіум, 1998. Т. 1. С. 209–214.

Мельник, Філінюк, 1998 – Мельник Е. М., Філінюк А. Г. Кам'янець-Подільський інститут народної освіти: розвиток, досягнення та втрати (1921 – 1930 рр.) // Освіта, наука та культура на Поділлі: збірник наукових праць. Кам'янець-Подільський, Оіум, 1998. Т. 1. С. 28–40.

Ричка, 1991 – Ричка В. М. Загублене життя (П. Г. Клепатський) // Репресоване краєзнавство (20 – 30-ті роки). Київ, Рідний край, 1991. С. 202–204.

REFERENCES

Bystra, 2017 – Bystra M. Obraz radianskoho vchytelia u periodychnykh vydanniakh Ukrainy kintsia 1930-kh rr. na prykladі hazety «Bilshovytska pravda» [The image of the soviet teacher in periodical publications of Ukraine in the last 1930s. on the example of the newspaper «Bilshovitska pravda»] // East European Historical Bulletin. Drohobych, Posvit, 2017. V. 5. Pp. 138–145. [in Ukrainian]

Gerinovich, 1927 – Herynovych V. O. Do istorii Kamianets-Podilskoho instytutu narodnoi osvity [In the history of the Kamyanets-Podilsky Institute of Public Education] // Zapysky Kamianets-Podilskoho instytutu narodnoi osvity. Kamianets-Podilskyi, 1927. T. 2. Pp. 1–24. [in Ukrainian]

DAKhO – Derzhavnyi arkhiv Khmelnytskoi oblasti [State Archive of Khmelnytsky Region].

Zavalnyuk, Komarnitsky, 2006 – Zavalnyuk O.M. Komarnitsky O.B. Kamianets-Podilskyi derzhavnyi universytet (1918 – 2006 rr.): istorychnyi narys [Kamyanets-Podilsky State University (1918 – 2006): historical essay]. Kamyanets-Podilsky, Abetka-NOVA, 2006. 196 p. [in Ukrainian]

Zavalnyuk, 2004 – Zavalnyuk O. M. V. O. Herynovych – pryvat-dotsent Kamianets-Podilskoho derzhavnogo ukrainskoho universytetu (1919 – 1921) [V. O. Gerinovich is a private associate professor of the Kamyanets-Podilsky State Ukrainian University (1919 – 1921)] // Istoriiia Ukrainy: malovidomi imena, podii, fakty: zbirnyk naukovykh statei. Kyiv, Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2004. V. 25. Pp. 183–193. [in Ukrainian]

Kamenets-Podilskyi, 2003 – Kamianets-Podilskyi derzhavnyi universytet: mynule i sohodennia [Kamenets-Podilskyi State University: Past and Present]. Kamianets-Podilskyi: Oium, 2003. 408 p. [in Ukrainian]

Komarnitsky, 2017 – Komarnitsky O. B. Studenty-pedahohy u modernizatsii vyshchoi osvity radianskoi Ukrainy u 1920 – 1930-kh rr.: monohrafiia [Students-teachers in the modernization of higher education of Soviet Ukraine in the 1920 – 1930's: monograph]. Kamianets-Podilskyi: TOV «Drukarnia «Ruta», 2017. 984 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kopylov, 1998 – Kopylov S. A. P. Klepatskyi: Kamianetskyi period diialnosti (1919 – 1921 rr.) [P. Klepatsky: Kamianetsky period of activity (1919 – 1921 gg.)] // Osvita, nauka ta kultura na Podilli: zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Kam'ianets-Podilskyi, Oium, 1998. T. 1. Pp. 209–214. [in Ukrainian]

Melnik, Filiniuk, 1998 – Melnyk E. M., Filiniuk A. H. Kam'ianets-Podilskyi instytut narodnoi osvity: rozvytok, dosiahnennia ta utraty (1921 – 1930 rr.) [Kamyanets-Podilsky Institute of Public Education: Development, Achievements and Losses (1921 – 1930s)] // Osvita, nauka ta kultura na Podilli: zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Kam'ianets-Podilskyi, Oium, 1998. T. 1. Pp. 28–40. [in Ukrainian]

Ritchka, 1991 – Rychka V. M. Zahublene zhyttia (P. H. Klepatskyi) [Lost Life (PG Klepatsky)] // Represovane kraieznnavstvo (20 – 30-ti roky). Kyiv, Ridnyi kraj, 1991. Pp. 202–204. [in Ukrainian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 15.04.2018 р.

UDC 94(477.83)«1940»
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130646

Vasyl ILNYTSKYI,
Ph D hab. (History), Associate Professor, Head of Department of Ukraine's History of Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University (Ukraine, Drohobych) vilnickiy@gmail.com

SPOTTING AND LIQUIDATION OF UKRAINIAN, POLISH AND JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS IN DROHOBYCH BY SOVIET REPRESSIVE UNITS (1940)¹

In the articles an excerpt from an intelligence-operative agency case of the struggle of Soviet repressive-punitive administration against Ukrainian, Polish, and Jewish both illegal and legal organisations has been analysed. The published document provides the chance to disclose the features of establishment of the Soviet administration in Drohobych and to trace the extent of the local repressive policy towards the political, public, cultural, and religious organisations. The document is kept in the Security service of Ukraine's branch state archive, more particularly, in Fund 71 (The Acts of transfer of archival documentary materials of UCSS (Ukrainian Committee of State Security) in Lviv region into archive (1939 – 1991).

Key words: Drohobych, an intelligence-operative agency case, Ukrainian, Polish, and Jewish legal and illegal organizations, repressive-punitive bodies.

Василь ІЛЬНИЦЬКИЙ,
orcid.org/0000-0002-4969-052X
доктор історичних наук, доцент
завідувач кафедри історії України
Дрогобицького державного педагогічного
університету імені Івана Франка (Україна, Дрогобич)
vilnickiy@gmail.com

ВИЯВЛЕННЯ ТА ЛІКВІДАЦІЯ РАДЯНСЬКИМИ РЕПРЕСИВНО-КАРАЛЬНИМИ ОРГАНАМИ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ, ПОЛЬСЬКИХ ТА ЄВРЕЙСЬКИХ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙ У м. ДРОГОБИЧ (1940 р.)

У статті проаналізовано витяг із агентурно-оперативної справи про боротьбу радянської репресивно-каральної адміністрації із українськими, польськими, єврейськими нелегальними і легальними організаціями. Публікований документ дає змогу розкрити особливості становлення радянської адміністрації у м. Дрогобич, простежуються масштаби репресивної політики щодо політичних, громадських, культурних, релігійних організацій. Документ зберігається у Галузевому державному архіві Служби безпеки України, зокрема у фонді 71 (Акти передачі архівних документальних матеріалів УКДБ у Львівській області в архів (1939 – 1991 рр.).

Ключові слова: Дрогобич, агентурно-оперативна справа, українські, польські, єврейські легальні та нелегальні організації, репресивно-каральні органи.

¹ Публікація містить результати досліджень, проведених у рамках виконання наукового проекту «Українсько-польсько-єврейські взаємини у Східній Галичині (перша половина ХХ ст.): історичний досвід, уроки для сучасності», що фінансується за рахунок коштів загального фонду державного бюджету. ID:95861 29.08.2017 (176-1)

Problem statement. The problem of formation and establishment of Soviet administration in the West Ukrainian lands belongs to actual scientific problems, which have drawn and will draw the attention of researchers. During dozens of years this problem have been elucidated one-sidedly, its documentary base has been under the signature stamp «top secret». The acquisition of independence by Ukraine has opened possibilities for an objective and complex illumination of this question. In particular, this process has become more active with opening of access and declassification of archive funds.

An active struggle against all political, public, educational, and cultural organizations (whether Ukrainian, Polish, or Jewish) became an important compound of the activity of the Soviet administration in West Ukrainian lands. For that, the repressive-punitive system used a complex of forms and methods which had been approved in East Ukraine. The illumination of this question will show not only the process of struggle, its scale and means thus used, but will also help to study the history, structure, personal strength and basic lines of activity of Ukrainian, Polish and Jewish organizations of the West Ukrainian region.

The analysis of sources and recent researches. Separate aspects of the problem of formation and establishment of the Soviet administration have been considered, first of all, in the generalizing works of Ivan Bilas, Yuriy Kyrychuk, Anatoliy Rusnachenko, and Ivan Patryliak (Bilas, 1994; Kyrychuk, 2003; Rusnachenko, 2002; Patryliak, 2012). The collective, summarizing monograph of the working group on the research of the activity of OUN and UPA, which contains sections about the Sovietization of the West Ukrainian areas, is also important for the illumination of this problem (OUN and UPA, 2005). More in details the issue of the opposition of the Soviet repressive-punitive system against the Ukrainian and Polish underground is considered in the works of Volodymyr Serhiychuk, Yuriy Shapoval, Stepan Makarchuk (Makarchuk, 2004; Serhiychuk, 2005; Shapoval, 2001). The issue of functioning of the Polish underground, its relation with the Ukrainian liberation movement, and its opposition to the repressive-punitive system was most fully studied by Ihor Iliushyn (Iliushyn, 2003; Iliushyn, 2001; Iliushyn, 2009). Separate aspects of the policy of Sovietization of Western Ukraine were studied by M. Lytvyn, O. Lutsky, K. Naumenko, K. Kondratyuk, S. Kondratyuk, B. Yarosh, V. Nikolskyi (Lytvyn, Lutsky, Naumenko, 1999; Lutsky, 2001; Kondratyuk, 2000; Yarosh, 1999; Nikolskyi, 2003). However, the declassification of a chain of archival funds allows the researches to essentially replenish the available information on the scale, form and methods of Sovietization of the western region of Ukraine (1939 – 1941).

The article's purpose is to add available information on the struggle of Soviet repressive-punitive organs against the Ukrainian, Polish, and Jewish organizations in Drohobych (1940).

Statement of the basic material. The published document includes an excerpt of a rather voluminous (178 pages.) case of the intelligence-operative agency development of all legal (though, after the arrival of the Soviet administration, all organisations were forbidden and became illegal) and illegal Ukrainian, Polish, and Jewish organizations of Drohobych region. Most probably, the case was opened in 1940. The case № 9 is kept in Fund 71 (The Acts of transfer of archival documentary materials of UCSS in Lviv region into archive (1939 – 1991) of the Security Service of Ukraine's branch state archive. The workers of the UNCIA (Ukrainian National Committee of Internal Affairs) of Drohobych region are the authors and compilers of these documents. In the whole collection very detailed biographical data concerning nearly two thousand persons, who were accused in accordance with the two hundred forty secret-service cases, are presented. In this article only a part of that case is published, including the information on almost 400 persons, who were participants in nearly 50 legal and illegal organizations.

In general, the presented in the document information can be divided in three parts: number and name of the secret-service case, the list of persons who pass on it, and a short description of the purpose and the objective of an organisation.

The result of the collected, during a short time, information on all illegal and legal organizations are really amazing. The specificity and completeness of the received data deserves a separate notification. From the document the researchers learn about the widely branched out and structured networks of the legal and illegal organizations of the Ukrainians, Poles, and Jews. What can be assuredly asserted, is that in the result of the use of a whole complex of actions in 1940 the Soviet power bodies possessed a huge scope of agency-operative information, which they actively realised by means of arresting and repressing everyone, who made or, potentially, could make a resistance to the establishment of the Soviet administration in the West Ukrainian lands. A special efficiency and work productivity of the secret service agency should be accentuated hereby.

Conclusions. What should be primarily mentioned, is the fact that the published document is an important source for a complex study of the question of the formation and establishment of the Soviet administration in Drohobych. It is quite certain, that this material can essentially help the further scientific, because it provides the valuable information, like the surnames and names of the organisations' members, without which any search in the archive of the Ukraine's State Service Administration in Lviv region is impossible.

The document is for the first time entered into the scientific circulation in the source language. In the publication the lexicon, author's and editorial features of the text of the source is as much as possible preserved. The personal and geographical names are presented without any changes. Only the most evident grammatical flaws have been subjected to corresponding corrections. The document is accompanied with the legend constituting the document's place of preservation (the archive's name, the number of the fund, description, case, pages).

The document

СПО УНКВД:

231 АГДЕЛО № 135 «Радисты».

1730. СЛАТВИНСКИЙ Тадей Владиславович, 1901 г. рожд., урож. и жив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п, работал слесарем мастерской Облуправления связи, при польских властях работал нач. электросети г. Дрогобыч, имел связи с членами партии «эндеков».

1731. ПАШНЕВ Василий Ильич, 1912 г. рожд., урож. с. Хохлова, Сажневского р-на, Курской обл., русский, из кулаков, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, военнотрудовой, мл. воентехник, имел родственников на территории Германии, поддерживал связь с женами быв. офицеров польской армии, эмигрировавших в Германию.

Разрабатывались как резко настроенные лица против соввласти.

СОВЕРШЕНО СЕКРЕТНО

СПИСОК

Лиц, разрабатываемых по действующим агентурным делам

УНКВД Дрогобычской области

ПО СПО:

Агдело № 107 «Недобитые»

1. ТАНЕНБАУМ Леопольд Якубович, 1924 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, еврей, сын бывш. офицера польской армии, учащийся техникума.

2. КУРЕК Эдуард Брониславович, 1918 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, учащийся техникума.

3. РЕГАВТ Адольф Осипович, 1922 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, еврей, учащийся техникума.

4. ВЖАСКА Марьян Губертович, 1924 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, поляк, учащийся техникума.

5. ЗИНГЕР Антон Соломонович, 1923 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, учащийся техникума.

Разрабатывались как контрреволюционная группа, стремящаяся бежать за границу, где принять участие с иностранными войсками в борьбе против соввласти.

Агдело № 51 «Радисты»

6. ЧАСКОВСКИЙ Ян-Казимир Брониславович, 1906 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Столярская, поляк, б/п, работал пом. машиниста на заводе «Нафта».

7. Энгель Здислав Станиславович, 1919 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, поляк б/п, работал бойцом горпожкоманды. по подозрению.

Разрабатывались в проведении вражеской деятельности, направленной против соввласти, поддерживали связь из зарубежом, посредством нелегальной радиостанции.

Агдело № 153 «Воинственные скворцы»

8. ПАШУЛЬКА Адам Юльянович, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Листопада № 71, поляк, б/п.

9. ФАЛЯНДЫС Бронислав Петрович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Войтовская гора № 148-б, поляк, б/п.

10. СКШИПЕЦ Казимир Францевич, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Поперечная № 1 кв. 2, поляк, б/п.

11. СТУПНИЦКИЙ Збигнев Мечиславович, 1917 г. рожд., урож. г. Романов, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Листопада № 27, поляк, б/п, являлся членом организации «гарцежи».

Разрабатывались как контрреволюционная молодежная организация «ПОВ», проводящая антисоветскую деятельность. Эта организация имела оружие и намеривалась использовать ее против соввласти.

Агдело № 28 «Надежда»

12. БОГАЧ Юльян Данилович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, Дрогобычская ул. № 33-б, поляк, б/п, без опр. занятий.

13. ОНАЦИШИН Ян Маркусович, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, ул. Дрогобычская № 33-б, поляк, б/п, без опр. занятий.

14. СКИБОВА Владислава Хоронимна, 1908 г., рожд., урож. г. Дрогобыч, прожив. г. Борислав, Дрогобычская ул. № 33-б, полька, б/п, домохозяйка, являлась комендантом организации «стрелец».

15. ЛОБОЗА Янина Яновна, – Ивановна, 1914 г. рожд., урож. с. Сельково, прожив. г. Борислав, ул. Щепановского № 23, полька, б/п, без опр. занятий.

Разрабатывались в проведении к-р повстанческой деятельности.

Агдело № 45 – «Бандиты»

16. ОСИНСКИЙ Юзеф, 1905 г. рожд., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская 40, поляк, б/п, без опр. занятий, б. офицер польармии.

17. ПЕТРИН Казимир, 1913 г. рожд., поляк, б/п, без опр. занятий, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Болонная.

18. МОЛОТОК /МУЛОТЕК/, 1902 г. рожд., поляк, б/п, без опр. занятий, бывш. майор польской армии.

Разрабатывались как участники подпольной польской к-р повстанческой организации, ставившей своей целью свержение соввласти в Западных областях Украины.

Агдело № 281 – «Недовольные»

19. СТОЩАК-ФИШЕР Гелена Антоновна, 1907 г. рожд., урож. и жит. гор. Дрогобыч ул. Пушкина № 92, полька, б/п, домохозяйка.

20. ФИШЕР Янина Антоновна, 1911 г., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, полька, б/п, без опр. занятий.

21. ЭМЕРЛЕ-ФИШЕР Стефания Антоновна, 1914 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч ул. Пушкина № 92, полька, б/п, домохозяйка.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении антисоветской деятельности, поддерживали тесную связь с сестрой, высланной вглубь СССР.

Агдело № 97 – «Легионеры»

22. МЛЫНАЖ Клименс-Болеслав Йосифович, 1889 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч ул. Блонная № 14, поляк, работал педагогом в школе, бывш. активный участник «ПОВ», являлся заместителем председ. уездного комитета «ПОВ».

В связи с прекращением агдела подлежал переводу на д.ф.

23. ЛОРЕНЦ Станислав Лойзевич, 1893 г. рожд., урож. г. Станислав, прожив. г. Дрогобыч ул. Горького № 42, поляк, в прошлом являлся активным участником и членом уездного комитета «ПОВ», имел свою кустарную электромастерскую.

В связи с прекращением агдела подлежал переводу на д.ф.

24. УРБАНОВИЧ Иван Бартоломеевич, 1891 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч поляк, бывш. активный участник и член уездного комитета организации «ПОВ», работал на заводе «Салина».

В связи с прекращением агдела подлежал переводу на д.ф.

25. РИБНЕР Казимир Иванович, 1903 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, Горького № 42, поляк, бывш. активный участник и член уездного комитета организации «ПОВ», работал бухгалтером Облздравотдела.

В связи с прекращением агдела подлежал переводу на д.ф.

26. ВЖАСЕК Эмель Петрович, 1901 г. рожд., урож. г. Самбор, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Снежная № 6, поляк, бывш. судья польского суда, до прихода Красной Армии являлся председателем уездного комитета по организации «ПОВ».

Нелегально бежал за кордон.

27. КАПУСТЯК Антон Михайлович 1892 г. рожд., урож. г. Львов, прожив. в г. Дрогобыч, ул. Юра № 39, бывш. активный участник и член уездного комитета организации «ПОВ», поляк, нелегально бежал за кордон.

28. БОБРАЙ Томаш Йосифович 1896 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Малая № 5, поляк, бывш. активный участник и член уездного комитета организации «ПОВ», нелегально бежал за кордон.

29. КОБРИН Зигмунд-Виктор Иванович-Янович, 1893 г. рожд., урож. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, бывш. активный участник организации «ПОВ».

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении организованной контрреволюционной нац. деятельности против соввласти.

Агдело № 119 «Заговорщики»

30. КОБРИН Дзюнек-Владислав Янович, 1905 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Шевека № 6, поляк, б/п, кустарь сапожник, бывш. офицер польской армии.

31. ДОМБРОВСКИЙ Андрей Севастьянович, 1904 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Франко № 9, поляк, б/п, без опр. занятий.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении антисоветской деятельности.

Агдело № 93 – «Легионисты»

32. ВАЖНЫЙ Тадеуш Карлович, 1912 г. рожд., урож. г. Самбор, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская № 233, поляк, б/п.

33. КЕЦОНЬ Владислав Степанович, 1921 г. рожд., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Фабричная № 1, поляк, б/п.

34. КОТОВИЧ Валерьян Юзефович, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Польна № 57, поляк, б/п, без опр. занятий.

35. ЯБЛОНСКИЙ Владислав-Иосиф Мартынович, 1901 г. рожд., урож. г. Добромиль, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Собесского 4, поляк, б/п.

36. ГУДЕЧЕК Францишек Иванович, 1876 г. рожд., урож. г. Львов, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п.

37. ГУДЕЧЕК Стефания Григорьевна, 1900 г. рожд., урож. м. Рогатин, Станиславской обл., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Блонна № 9.

38. ГЛУШКО Зигмунд, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская № 249, поляк, б/п.

Разрабатывались, как польские националисты, в 1940 г. являлись организаторами по вербовке в Венгрию польских офицеров и националистов, для вступления там в польские легионы, для нападения на СССР.

Агдело № 54 – «Мыслители»

39. ВОЙТОВИЧ Эмиль Юзефович, 1894 г. рождения, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Грунвальдская № 60.

40. ЦЫБУЛЬСКИЙ Игнат Антонович, 1894 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Церковная № 2, работал на заводе бывш. «Польми».

41. БАЛЕЦКИЙ Адам Варфоломеевич, 1897 г. рождения, поляк, прожив. г. Дрогобыч.

42. ТОПОЛЬ Томаш Войцехович, 1894 г. рожд., поляк, работал на заводе «Польми», прожив. г. Дрогобыч.

В связи с прекращением агдела подлежал переводу на д.ф.

43. ДОЧЬ Тадеуш Антонович, 1893 г. рожд., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк,

В связи с прекращением агдела, подлежал переводу на д.ф.

44. АДАМСКИЙ Эдмунд Юзефович, 1901 г. рожд., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк.

В связи с прекращением агдела подлежал переводу на д.ф.

45. ЮШАВЕЦКИЙ Михаил Николаевич, 1895 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Горишня Брама № 8, поляк, б/п, работал слесарем в транспортной конторе «Укрнефтедобыча», в прошлом член фашистской организации «333» и др. нац. организаций. В начале 1940 г. нелегально пришел из Германии на совсторону.

В связи с прекращением агдела подлежал переводу на д.ф.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении антисоветской деятельности – распространению провокационных слухов против СССР.

Агдело № 203 – «Гнездо»

46. КАВЕЦКИЙ Кароль Шимонович, 1896 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Садовая № 12, поляк, б/п, работал на дому сапожником.

47. САРВАТКО Станислав Севастьянович, 1880 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Горишня Брама № 55, поляк, б/п, кустарь.

48. ВЗОРЕК Станислав Михайлович, 1885г. рожд., урож. г. Львов, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Беднарского № 7, поляк, б/п, работал в артели «Металлист».

49. ВАЛЕК Иосиф Францевич, 1905 г. рожд., урож. г. Лабенць Пинчовского р-на, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Садовая № 6-а, поляк, парикмахер.

50. ЯНУШЕВИЧ Кароль Казимирович, 1892 г. рожд., урож. г. Дрогобыч, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Шевченко № 9, б/п, сторож школы.

51. ЯНУШЕВИЧ Франц Каролевиц, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Шевченко № 9, поляк, б/п.

52. КЛЕРМАН Пинкус Маркусович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Снежная № 1, еврей, б/п, учащийся.

53. ЛОБАСЬ Владимир Михайлович, 1894 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Бориславская № 50, поляк, б/п.

Разрабатывались, как участники польской нац. организации, проводили к-р деятельность.

Агдело № 352 – «Настойчивые»

54. ГНАТИК Станислав Иванович, 1908 г. рожд., урож. г. Львов, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, Бичная Горького № 36, поляк, б/п, работал монтером АТС, состоял членом организации «стрельцов».

55. СЕНИВ Фроил Николаевна, 1909 г. рожд., урож. г. Тернополь, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, Стрийская № 78, полька, б/п, работала секретарем АТС.

56. СЕРЕМАК Войцех Иванович, 1897 г. рожд., урож. с. Бохня Краковского воеводства, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Комсомольская № 17, поляк, б/п, работал монтером АТС, в прошлом состоял в польском легионе, принимал участие в боях против Красной Армии в 1920 г.

57. ЖИГУЛЕВСКИЙ Адольф Якубович, 1909 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п, работал монтером АТС, состоял членом спортивного военного общества «Юнак» и организации стрельцов.

Разрабатывались как контрреволюционная группа, состоящая из бывших членов антисов. организаций стрельцов и «герцежа», враждебно настроенных против соввласти.

13. Агдело № 56 «Мечтатели»

58. ЖИГУЛЕВСКИЙ Иосиф Тимофеевич, 1908 г. рожд., урож. Пидбуж, прож. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, бывш. капрал польской армии, состоял членом ППС и участником по организации стрельцов, работал в горпожкоманде.

59. ГЛЕНЬ Антон Михайлович, 1899 г. рожд., урож. м. Санок, Германия, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, работал шофером пожкоманды, поляк, быв. активный член ППС.

60. АПОЛИНСКИЙ Бронислав Иванович, 1899 г. рожд., урож. с. Губичи, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, работал в пожкоманде, добровольно служил в петлюровской армии.

61. ФУРЗИН Михаил Владиславович, 1909 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, работал шофером пожаркоманды, бывш. капрал польской армии.

62. КИСИЛЬ Кастер Михайлович, 1907 г. рожд., урож. с. Дубляны, Самборского р-на, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, работал шофером пожаркоманды, бывш. капрал польской армии.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении антисоветской деятельности и распространении антисоветских слухов.

14. Агдело № 50 – «Коршуны»

63. ГОСТИЛЬ Хилярий Мартвянович, прожив. г. Борислав, работал педагогом коммерческой школы, поляк, б/п, бывш. капитан польской армии.

64. МОТЫКИВИЧНА Анна Валентиновна, 1900 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, полька, б/п, без опр. занятий.

65. ДМИТРЕНКО Евгений Григорьевич, 1915 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, поляк, б/п, бывш. польский офицер. польармии.

66. МИХАЛЬСКИЙ Степан Владимирович, 1905 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, поляк, б/п, бывш. руководитель организации скаутов.

67. МАРУСЯК Франц Иванович, 1899 г. рожд., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п.

68. НОЙСЕРЕК Бронислав Якубович, 1886 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, поляк, б/п, бывший активный пеовяк.

69. РАЧКОВСКИЙ Станислав Янович, 1898 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, поляк, б/п, бывш. член ППС.

70. РАЧКОВСКИЙ Тадеуш Станиславович, 1920 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, поляк, б/п.

71. ТВАРДЫЙ Збигнев Станиславович, 1920 г. рожд., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п.

72. СУРОВЯК Александр Янович, 1907 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, поляк, б/п, член ППС.

73. ТАЙНОБРАМСКАЯ Анна, 1920 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, полька, б/п.

74. ЯРОШЕВСКИЙ Георгий Казимирович, 1923 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, поляк, б/п.

75. ШОППА Адольф Францишкович, 1907 г. рожд., прожив. г. Борислав, бывш. член союза резервистов.

76. ЩАНЕК Стефан Евгеньевич, 1911 г. рожд., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п.

77. ЧЕХОРОВСКИЙ Эрвин Станиславович, 1897 г. рожд., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п, б. подофицер-резервист, состоял в организации «Млада польска».

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении организованной польской нац. антисоветской деятельности, подготавливали вооруженное восстание против сов. власти.

[...]5. Агдело № 229 «Ходаки»

78. ЯНИЦКАЯ Мария Степановна, 1882 г. рожд., уроженка и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Жупна № 32, полька, б/п, иждивенка.

79. ЯНИЦКИЙ Болеслав Стефанович, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Франко № 122, поляк, б/п, работал завхозом Ушосдора НКВД.

80. ЯНИЦКИЙ Збышек Стефанович, урож. г. Дрогобыч, бежал в Венгрию.

81. ЯНИЦКИЙ Бобось Стефанович, бежал в Венгрию, поляк, б/п.

Разрабатывались, как подозрительные по шпионажу в пользу одного из иностранных государств.

16. Агдело № 239 – «Жолтоблакитные»

82. БАРАНИК Григорий Николаевич, 1894 г. рожд., урож. г. Угнев, Рава-Русского р-на, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская № 17, украинец, б/п, работал товароведом в облпотресоюзе, ранее проживал в Италии.

В связи с прекращением агдела подлежал переводу на списочный учет с заведением на него учетного дела.

83. БАРАНЕЦКАЯ Ярослава Николаевна, 1916 г. рожд., урож. и жит.ница Воля-Якубова, украинка, б/п, работала в музыкальном институте учительницей в г. Дрогобыче, дочь попа.

В связи с прекращением агдела, подлежал переводу на списочный учет с заведением на него учетного дела.

84. ФРУДЗЕН Иван Григорьевич, 1875 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Гоголя №19, украинец, б/п, до 1939 г. работал в Дрогобычском магистрате в качестве официала.

В связи с прекращением агдела подлежал переводу на списочный учет с заведением на него учетного дела.

Разрабатывались как связанные с польской диверсионной группой, скрывающейся в Карпатах на территории Венгрии, а также по подозрению в переправе лиц за кордон.

[...]7. Агдело № 315 – «Паразиты»

85. МАНЖОС Александр Андрианович, 1910 г. рожд., урож. м. Вороновцы, Винницкой обл., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Польная №14, укр., член ВЛКСМ, работал директором конторы «Главкинопрокат».

86. ХЦЮК Филиция Ивановна, 1914 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Фабричная, № I-а, укр., б/п, без опр. занят, жена быв. офицера.

87. КОВАЛЫК Янина Францишковна, 1910 г. рожд., урож. Живец, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Фабричная, № I-а, полька, б/п, без опр. занятий, муж бывш. офицер во время польско-германской войны бежал в Венгрию.

88. ВИННИЧУК Адам Иванович, 1919 г. рожд., крож. г. Городок, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Фабричная, № I-а, б/п, работал в охране завода № 2, бывш. Галиция.

Разрабатывались как участники шпионской группы лиц, приходящих из Венгрии и передачи последним материалов шпионского характера.

18. Агдело № 26 «Мстители»

89. БАРАННИК Северин Никитович, 1889 г. рожд., урож. с. Угнев, Рава-Русского р-на, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, игумен украинской церкви, состоял членом УНДО и «Просвіти».

90. СИНКРИВСКИЙ Иван Семенович, 1896 г. рождения, ур. г. Тернополь, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, украинец, б/п, священник укр. церкви, из кулаков, в прошлом член УНДО и «Просвіти».

91. КРИНИЦКИЙ Роман Емельянович, 1881 г. рожд., урож. с. Плангино, Германия, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, украинец, б/п, работал священником украинской церкви, сын служителя религиозного культа, бывш. член УНДО и «Просвіти».

92. МОДРИЦКИЙ Иосиф Стефанович, 1865 г. рожд., урож. и жит. Дрогобыч, украинец, б/п, священник украинской церкви, ранее примыкал к партии УНДО, состоял членом «Просвіти».

93. ТЕСОВСКИЙ Иван Степанович, 1866 г. рожд., урож. с. Рудаковцы, бывш. Мостицкого района, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, украинец, б/п, священник украинской церкви, примыкал к организации «УНДО, являлся членом «Просвіти», поддерживал связь с братом, находящимся в Чехословакии.

94. ЖУПАНСКИЙ Павел Павлович, 1885 г. рожд., урож. с. Пилипин, бывш. Коломинского повита, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, священник украинской церкви, являлся членом организации «Просвіта».

95. ГВОЗДИВСКИЙ Петр Васильевич, 1912 г. рожд., урож. с. Арташев, бывш. Жовковского повита, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., без опр. занятий, служит. религиозного культа, из кулаков, ранее примыкал к партии УНДО.

96. ГРУБЫЙ Михаил Александрович, 1896 г. рожд., урож. с. Агитна, бывш. Жовковского повита, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, служит. религиозного культа, сын священника, состоял в организации «Просвіта».

97. БАГУН Василий Емельянович, 1903 г. рожд., урож. с. Цеблево, бывш. Сокальского повита, укр., б/п, служит. религиозного культа, из кулаков, ранее примыкал к партии УНДО, бывш. Член «Просвіти».

98. НИЩИЙ Эдуард Петрович, 1879 г. рожд., урож. с. Борщавицы, Львовской обл., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, священник украинской церкви, из середняков, бывш. член УНДО и «Просвіти».

99. СЛОНСКИЙ Юлиан, 1889 г. рожд., прожив. с. Модричи, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, симпатизировал партии УНДО.

100. ЖУК Виктор, 1888 г. рождения, прожив. с. Михайлевичи, Дрогобычск. р-на, укр., б/п, принадлежал к партии УНДО.

101. МАТЫНОВИЧ Омеля, 1875 г. рожд., прожив. с. Тустановичи, Дрогобычск. р-на, укр., б/п, ранее принадлежал к партии УНДО.

102. ИВАНУСИВ Николай, 1873 г. рожд., прожив. с. Вацевичи, Дрогобычск. р-на, укр., б/п, священник украинской церкви, в прошлом член УНДО.

103. ПЛЕШКЕВИЧ Юлиан, 1895 г. рожд., прожив. г. Самбор, в прошлом член партии УНДО.

104. КОНЦИЛОВСКИЙ Йосафат, 1876 г. рожд., прожив. г. Перемышль, укр., б/п, епископ г. Перемышль.

105. КРУЦЬКО Андрей, 1887 г. рожд., прожив. с. Добровляны, Меденицкого р-на, укр., б/п, примыкал к парти УНДО.

106. ЯЦЕВ Нестор, 1895 г. рожд., ур. б/п, священник гор. Борислав, бывш. член УНДО.

Разрабатывались как церковная группа бывш. членов УНДО, проводившая контрреволюционную работу под руководством игумена Баранника против мероприятий соввласти.

19. Агдело № 402 «Саранча»

107. ШЕВЧУК Владимир Семенович, 1886 г., рожд., урож. с. Березка, Дрогобычск. обл., прожив. г. Стрый, ул. Ланы № 19, укр., б/п.

108. ГОЛОВКЕВИЧ Василий Михайлович, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Болеховцы, Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве.

109. КОБИЛЬНИК Степан Михайлович, 1909 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, работал на заводе № 1, бывш. активный член организации «ОУН».

110. ГУБИЦКИЙ Илья Васильевич, 1900 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Болеховцы, Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, занимался сельским хозяйством.

Подозревались в причастности к антисоветской оуновской организации, в прошлом активные украинские националисты.

20. Агдело № 369 – «Коновальцы»

111. ПОРЦИНА Дмитрий Андреевич, 1913 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Монастырец, Журавновского р-на, укр., б/п, работал в сельском хозяйстве.

112. КНЬШ Юрий, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Монастырец, Журавновского р-на, укр., б/п, работа в сельском хозяйстве.

113. МАРЧУК Семен, урож. и жит. с. Монастырец, Журавновского р-на, укр., б/п, работал нач. участка, райконторы связи, польским судом был осужден за активное участие в организации «ОУН».

114. КОСТЕЛЬНЫЙ Николай, 1917 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Монастырец, Журавновского р-на, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве.

115. ШЕВЧУК Данил, 1913 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Буянов Журавновского р-на, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве.

116. ЗУБ Иван Васильевич, урож. и жит. с. Корчевка, Журавновского р-на, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, сын кулака.

Разрабатывались, как активная группа, организации украинских националистов «ОУН», ставящей себе целью свержение существующего строя.

21. Агдело №84 – «Римляне»

117. БАНАС Станислав Шимонович, 1888 г. рожд., урож. сел. Сельница, Перемышльского р-на, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п, игумен римо-католического костела.

118. СОПАЛЬСКИЙ Францишек Францишкевич, 1877 г. рожд., урож. с. Кольчицы, быв. Краковского воеводства, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, Войтова Гора, №46, поляк, б/п, ксендз римо-католического костела.

119. ПЕЛЬЧАР Михаил Казимирович, 1890 г. рожд. с. Кростинко-Вижня, прожив. в г. Дрогобыч, ул. Польна № 12, поляк, б/п, ксендз римо-католического костела.

120. БАРИЦ Иосиф Войцехович, 1912 г. рожд., урож. с. Забара, Тешевского повита, прожив. г. Дрогобыч-Польна Т-20, поляк, б/, ксендз римо-католического костела.

121. ТОЧЕК Валентин Матвеевич, 1871 г. рожд., урож. с. Ноздзец, Бжешевского повита, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Жупна № 7-а, поляк, б/п, ксендз римо-католического костела.

122. ГЛАЗАР Иосиф Иванович, 1984 г. рожд., урож. с. Кростинко-Вижня, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п, ксендз римо-католического костела.

123. ГАЗДА Казимир-Иван Войтехович, 1915 г. рожд., урож. с. Соколов, б. Кольбушевского повита, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Вольна № 20, поляк, б/п, ксендз римо-католического костела, сын фабриканта.

124. КИТКО Степан Матвеевич, 1904 г. рожд., уроженец с. Нова-Гора, Кшановского повита, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Польна № 20, поляк, б/п, монах римо-католического костела.

125. ТОМИЦЕК Августин Каролевич, 1914 г. рожд., урож. с. Гашовичи, б. Рудницкого повита, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Польна № 20, поляк, б/п, монах, органист польского костела.

Группа духовенства римо-католического костела проводила активно к-р работу, распространяла антисоветские провокационные слухи.

22. Агдело № 359 – «Гранадеры»

126. НИМИЛОВИЧ Мария Теодоровна, 1918 г. рожд., урож. с. Медики, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Чкалова № 48, украинка, б/п, без опр. занятий, дочь священника.

127. НИМИЛОВИЧ Дмитрий Николаевич, 1885 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская 137, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве.

128. НИМИЛОВИЧ Емельян Теофилович, 1908 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская № 61, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, брат его арестован как видный украинский националист.

129. НИМИЛОВИЧ Ульян Теофилович, 1890 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская 61, укр., б/п., работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, брат его арестован как активный член «ОУН».

130. НИМИЛОВИЧ Юльян Нестерович, 1911 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская № 75, укр., б/п, работал слесарем на заводе № 1.

131. КОГУТ Григорий Михайлович, 1898 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская № 37-б, укр., б/п, работал бухгалтером Облпотребсоюза, в прошлом активный украинский националист, член ораганизации «ОУН», за что арестовывался польской полицией.

132. ЛЕВИТАН Игнатий Абрамович, 1909 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, б/п, зубной техник поликлиники,

133. КРАНН Филипп Самойлович, 1900 г. рожд., урож. г. Львов, прожив. гор. Дрогобыч, ул. Ленина № 21, еврея, б/п, работал зубным техником поликлиники.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в участии в украинской антисоветской оуновской организации.

23. Агдело № 351 «Неугомонные»

134. ГРИНАДА Юзефа Войцеховна, 1910 г. рожд., урож. г. Пидгайцы, Тернопольской обл., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Войтовская Гора, № 34, полька, б/п, являлась связисткой и переправщицей людей за границу,

135. ЦЫМБРИКЕВИЧ Юлия Ивановна, 1904 г. рожд., урож. и жит.ница г. Дрогобыч, ул. Войтовская Гора, № 16, полька, б/п, являлась переправщицей людей на сторону Венгрии.

136. БЛАЖЕВА Агнета Ивановна, 1901 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Войтовская Гора № 16, полька, б/п, являлась переправщицей людей на сторону Венгрии.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в переправе людей на территорию Венгрии.

24. Агдело № 109, «Специалисты»

137. ОБЕРЛЕНДЕР Густав Давыдович, 1905 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, еврей, б/п, работал техником в Облмелтресте, в прошлом имел собственный магазин.

138. КАМЕРМАН Генрих Михайлович, 1905 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, еврей, б/п, работал инженером Облмилтреста, бывш. владелец нефтеразработки.

139. КЛЯРЕВ Александр Аронович, 1910 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, член партии сионистов, работал экономистом Облмелтресте, бывш. адвокат.

140. КУПФЕРБЕРГ Эдвард Моисеевич, 1914 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Мицкевича № 31, еврей, б/п, работал техником в Облмелтресте, бывш. владелец мебельного магазина, состоял в организации «звязку».

141. РАПП Самуил Якубович, 1910 г. рожд. урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, б/п, работал инженером в Облмелтресте, бывш. владелец магазина.

Разрабатывались как группа антисоветски настроенных лиц, занимавшихся систематической антисоветской агитацией.

25. Агдело № 77, «Гашомерцы»

142. БРЕНЕР Натан Якубович, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Яна № 25, еврей, студент технической школы являлся активным участником еврейско-фашистской организации сионистов-ревизионистов.

143. ШТИФЕЛЬ Шарлота Ароновна, 1920 г. рожд., урож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Польная № 59, еврейка, студентка технической школы, являлась активной сионистской и руководителем молодежной организации «Гашомер-Гацоир».

144. ОРЕНШТАЙН Отыля Гершовна, 1923 г. рож., урож. г. Дрогобыч, еврейка, студентка технической школы, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Собесского № 24, состояла членом бундовской молодежной организации «Цукунфат», антисоветски настроена.

145. КИТАЙГОРОДСКАЯ Етка Рафаиловна, 1920 г. рожд., урож. г. Дрогобыч, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Райха № 22, еврейка, студентка технической школы, состояла в сионистской организации «Гашомер» и бундовской молодежной организации «Цукунфат».

Разрабатывались по окраске «сионисты» как антисоветская группа, а/с настроенных лиц.

26. Агдело № 235 – «Изменники»

146. РАУХ Соломон Абрамович, 1906 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Франко № 3, еврей, б/п, работал в художественной мастерской, быв. член КПЗУ, исключен за троцкизм.

147. РАУХ Мендель Абрамович, 1910 г. рожд. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Франко № 3, еврей, работал зав. комбинатом индпошива, в 1939 г. приехал из Парижа, быв. чл. КПЗУ.

148. ГЛИК Абрам Айзикович, 1908 г. рожд. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, б/п, работал бухгалтером типографии «Большевицка правда».

149. ГЛИК-ГРИНВАЛЬД Елена Лейзеровна, 1907 г. рожд. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Горького № 27, еврейка, б/п, работала в школе по обучению малограмотных.

150. ГРИНВАЛЬД Рахиль Лазаревич, 1910 г. рожд. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Мицкевича № 40, еврей, б/п, работал портным на дому.

151. ШРАЕР Файвель Пинкасович, 1909 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Беднарская ул. № 11б, еврей, б/п, работал главным инженером жилуправления.

Разрабатывались по окраске «троцкисты», группировавшиеся и проводившие антисоветскую деятельность.

27. Агдело № 90 – «Клерикалы»

152. АВИГДОР Яков Абрамович, 1895 г. рожд., урож. м. Тира-Вавольска, Плесковского р-на, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, сын торговца, руководитель религиозной организаций «Агуда» и «Магзика-Годат», является окружным раввином.

153. ЛАНДЕМАН Абрам Хаскалевич, 1863г. рожд., урож. м. Буск, б. Каменского повята, Львовской обл., еврей, б. торговец, равин, имеет свой молильный дом.

154. НУСЕМБУН Вольф Давидович, 1877 г. рожд., урож. г. Стрий, прожив.

г. Дрогобыч, еврей, быв. торговец, чл. «Кагала» и руководитель религиозной организации «Агуда», равин гор. Дрогобыч.

155. АЛЬСТЕР Герш Мойшевич, 1891 г. рожд., урож. г. Львов, прож. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, б. торговец, руководитель организации «Агуда», являлся служителем религиозного культа в молильном доме.

156. ПАНЦЕР Лейб Йосифович, урож. и жит. гор. Дрогобыч, еврей, в прошлом крупный торговец и владелец кирпичного завода и фабрики свечей, руководитель религиозной организации «Агуда», являлся служителем религиозного культа.

157. ЛЯБЕН Шулен Сендерович, 1892 г. рожд., урож. г. Борислав, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, бывш. торговец, последнее время являлся подравинном.

158. БИЛЯК Берль Шмелькович, 1890 г. рожд., урож. Шежец, того же повита, Германия, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, в прошлом крупный торговец, руководитель религиозной организации «Магзика годат», являлся служителем религиозного культа.

159. ЛИБЕР Копель Озиашевич, 1883 г. рожд., урож. с. Лимна, б. Турковского повита, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, в прошлом торговец, активный религиозник и руководитель организации «Агуда».

160. ФЕНСТЕР Сруль, урож. г. Стрий, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, чл. «Кагала», руководитель религиозной организации «Макзикагодас», являлся равинном.

Группа еврейского клерикального духовенства, разрабатывалась как проводившая активную контрреволюционную деятельность.

28. Агдело №68 «Галерчики»

161. ТОРГОВСКИЙ Тадеуш Иванович, 1886 г. рожд., урож. г. Самбор, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Грунвальская, № 24, поляк, работал врачом на дому, являлся активным членом «Союза галерчиков».

162. СВИДОРСКИЙ Йосиф Войцехович, 1890 г. рожд., ур. с. Зборецький, Старый Константинов, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Тихая, № 5, поляк, работал шорником на заводе №1 б. Польми, являлся членом «Союза галерчиков».

163. БРУСИК Петр Янович, 1900 г. рожд., ур. г. Развадов, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Грунвальская, № 75, поляк, являлся активным членом «Союза галерчиков», в последнее время находился на нелегальном положении.

164. ПЕНЦАК Йосиф Янович, 1893 г. рожд., урож. г. Львов, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская, № 121, поляк, чернорабочий завода № 1, являлся активным членом «Союза галерчиков», последнее время находился на нелегальном положении.

Разрабатывались по окраске «польская к-р», как члены военно-фашистского союза галерчиков, созданного генералом Галлером.

29. Агдело №382 «Обреченные»

165. ХОМЧИНСКИЙ Ярослав Иванович, 1912 г. рожд., урож. с. Ступница, Самборского р-на, ул. Снежная, № 3, укр, б/п, студент пединститута.

166. БАРАНЯК Йосиф Михайлович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. с. Подбуж, Дорогобычской обл., прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Снежная, № 43, укр., б/п, студент пединститута.

167. ФРАНКО Иван Григорьевич, 1919 г. рожд., урож. с. Нагуевичи, Подбужского р-на, прож. г. Днепропетровск, военная часть № 340, укр., б/п, служил в Красной Армии.

168. Чайковский Мирослав Владимирович, 1920 г. рожд., урож. с. Микакло, Самборского р-на, ул. Снежная, № 43, укр. б/п, студент пединститута.

169. РЫМЕЦ Владимир Михайлович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. с. Тершив, Стрелковского р-на, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Снежная, № 43, укр., б/п, студент пединститута.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении к-р нац. деятельности. Этой группой студентов руководил до ухода в армию ФРАНКО Иван.

30. Агдело №127 «Гимназисты»

170. БАТОГ Марьян Теофилович, 1921 г. рождения, урож. г. Борислав, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, Стрийская 103, поляк, учащийся польской гимназии, сын урядника, состоял членом организации «ПОВ».

171. ШИМЛЛЕР Мечеслав-Осип Мнович, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Юра № 49, поляк, учащийся польской гимназии, состоял членом организации «ПОВ».

172. КОЛЕНДОВСКИЙ Юрик /Ежик/ Марьянович, 1923 г. рожд. урож. г. Борислав, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Бартоломея № 21, поляк, учащийся польской гимназии, сын урядника, являлся членом организации «ПОВ».

173. КОПАЧИНСКИЙ Здислав Влацлавович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Крашевского № 2, поляк, сын учителя, состоял членом организации «ПОВ».

174. ВАЙКРЕБ Йосиф, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Гарцарского № 18, еврей, учащийся польской гимназии, сын рабочего, состоял членом организации «ПОВ».

175. РОЛЛЕВИЧ Збигнев Янович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Вийтовская гора № 94, поляк, учащийся польской гимназии, сын урядника, состоял членом организации «ПОВ».

176. ЖУЛЬКЕВИЧ Лешек Станиславович, 1920 г. рожд., урож. г. Краковец, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Польма, № 17, поляк, учащийся польской гимназии, состоял членом организации «ПОВ».

177. ГЕКСЕЛЬ Ян-Николай Юзефович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Собесского № 26, поляк, учащийся польской гимназии, сын купца, отец арестован НКВД, являлся участником организации «ПОВ», последнее время находился на нелегальном положении.

178. ЛИНДЕР Тадеуш-Здислав Генрихович, 1924 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, учащийся польской гимназии, являлся участником организации «ПОВ».

179. СВАРОВСКАЯ Ванда Юзефановы, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Жупна № 42, полька, учащаяся польской гимназии, являлась участником организации «ПОВ».

180. СВАРОВСКАЯ Гелена Казимировы, 1922 г. рожд., урож. с. Нове Мисто, под Древендою, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Жупна № 42, учащаяся польской гимназии, являлась участником организации «ПОВ».

181. КОБРИН Янина Зигмундовы, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Завалля № 2, полька, учащаяся польской гимназии, являлась участником организации «ПОВ».

182. ВЗОРЕК Эдуард Станиславович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Беднарского № 7, поляк, учащийся польской гимназии, являлся участником организации «ПОВ».

183. ТЕВЛЕНКА Варвара-Ирина Владимировна, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Листопада № 15, полька, б/п, учащаяся школы № 12.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении антисоветской, польской нац. деятельности, направленной против мероприятий соввласти.

32. Агдело № 126 «Медики»

184. ЧИЖЕВСКИЙ Казимир Брониславович, 1898 г. рожд., урож. г. Львов, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Грунвальская № 67, поляк, б/п, врач-хирург, бывш. капитан резерва польской армии, в прошлом член партии «ОЗН».

185. МИХАЛЬЧИК Владислав Константинович, 1911 г. рожд., урож. г. Борислав, прож. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п, работал врачом больницы №1.

186. ДУБИЦКИЙ Изидор Васильевич, 1905 г. рожд., урож. г. Тернополь, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, работал врачом больницы №1.

187. ЧИЖЕВСКАЯ Ивона Осиповна, 1900 г. рожд., урож. г. Львов, прожив. Грунвальская ул., № 67, г. Дрогобыч, полька, б/п, работала врачом больницы № 1.

Группа антисоветских настроенных лиц, под руководством активного члена «ОЗН» ЧИЖЕВСКОГО проводит антисоветскую работу.

32. Агдело № 264 «Курсисты»

188. КОЛОМЕЕЦ Лев, 1915 г. рожд., урож. г. Перемышля, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, студент пединститута.

189. КОМАРОВСКИЙ Святослав, 1921 г. рожд., урож. с. Нижанковичи, Перемышльского р-на, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, студент пединститута.

190. ЛЕЩИШИН Василий, 1920 г. рожд., ур. с. Поляны, Дрогобычского р-на, студент пединститута.

191. ХИМЯК Иван, 1920 г. рожд., урож. с. Новосилькидит, прож. г. Дрогобыч, студент пединститута.

192. КУПИЧ Виктор Николаевич, 1919 г. рожд., ур. г. Самбор, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Грунвальдская № 12, студент пединститута.

193. ВЕЛИТЯК Павел, 1920 г. рожд., урож. с. Грушатичи, Перемышльского р-на, прож. г. Дрогобыч, студент пединститута.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении активной антисоветской деятельности, распространяя а/с агитацию

33. Агдело №129 «Дружинники»

194. ЯКУБОВСКАЯ Любовь Михайловна, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Снежная № 33, укр., б/п, ученица школы им. Франко.

195. НЕМИЛОВИЧ Мирон Теодорович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. с. Тинев, прож. с. Унятычи, Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, учащийся школы.

195. ЗУЛЯК Владимир Александрович, 1920 г. рожд., урож. с. Ставок, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Бориславская № 1, укр., б/п, учащийся школы.

196. НЕМИЛОВИЧ Елена Теодоровна, 1924 г. рожд., урож. г. Самбор, прожив. с. Унятычи, Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, учащийся школы, дочь священника.

197. СТЕЦКОВ Степан Иванович, 1925 г. рожд., урож. с. Грушев, Медыничского р-на, прожив. там же, укр., б/п, учащийся школы.

198. КАЛЕНСОВСКИЙ Лев Эпполитович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, учащийся школы.

Разрабатывались как члены «Марийской дружины», проводящие антисоветскую работу.

34. Агдело № – «Семейка»

199. СВАРОВСКАЯ Геленада Йосифовна, 1901 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Жупна №42, полька, б/п, домохозяйка, родственники проживают в Германии.

200. ЦЫБУЛЬСКАЯ Пелагея Ванцентовна, 1862 г. рожд., урож. Нью-Йорк, США, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Жупна № 42, зять арестован, дочь выслана, два сына находятся в Германии.

201. СВАРОВСКИЙ Казимир Йосифович, 1885 г. рожд. урож. села Яворив, Львовской обл., прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Жупна № 42, поляк, б/п, работал в Стройотделе, в прошлом работал секретарем польского суда.

202. СВАРОВСКАЯ Олена Казимировна, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Жупна № 42, полька, б/п, занималась в заочном институте.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении антисоветской деятельности, поддерживали письменную связь с лицами, высланными вглубь СССР.

35. Агдело №321 «Саламандра»

203. ДУБИЦКАЯ Мария Брониславовна, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Мицкевича № 42, полька, б/п, без определенных занятий, являлась членом костельной организации.

204. ДЮГ Янина Мациновна, 1922 г. рожд., урож. г. Дрогобыч, прож. с. Ставище, Дрогобычского р-на, полька, б/п, без определенных занятий, быв. член костельной организации.

205. ЗГУТ Максимильян Станиславович, 1917 г. рожд., урож. г. Дрогобыч, прож. с. Болеховцы, Дрогобычского р-на, поляк, б/п, без определенных занятий.

206. КАВЕЦКАЯ Чеслава Брониславовна, 1921 г. рожд., урож. г. Дрогобыч, прож. там же, ул. Жупна № 24, быв. член костельной организации.

207. КУХАРСКАЯ Янина Ивановна, 1992 г. рожд., урож. м. Черхава, Самборского р-на, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Слиппа, № 2, полька, б/п, без определенных занятий, быв. член костельной организации, отец арестован органами НКВД.

208. СТРИЧЕК Михалина Михайловна, 1919 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Мицкевича, № 20, полька, б/п, работала на медбазе.

209. СТРИЧЕК Ядвига Михайловна, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Мицкевича, №20, полька, б/п, без определенных занятий, быв. член костельной организации.

210. ФУРОВИЧ Гелена Эдвардовна, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и г. Дрогобыч, ул. Камелярская № 3, полька, б/п, без определенных занятий, быв. член костельной организации.

211. МОНГОЛЬД Мария Франковна, 1914 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Поперечная, № 3, полька, б/п, без определенных занятий, быв. член костельной организации.

212. МОНГОЛЬД Здислава Михайловна, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Горького, № 18, полька, б/п, без определенных занятий, быв. член костельной организации.

Разрабатывались как группа тайной организации польского Красного креста, организованная членом «ПОВ», проводила а/с работу.

36. Агдело № 162 «Радиолюбители»

213. БАРАНОВСКИЙ Тадей Болеславович, 1884 г. рожд., урож. с. Больша, Херсонской губ, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Бартоломея, № 14, поляк, б/п, работал врачом поликлиники, в прошлом активный член партии «ЭНД», быв. капитан резерва.

214. НОВАКОВСКИЙ Владислав Иванович, 1892 г. рожд., урож. г. Ярослав, Германия, прож. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п, врач поликлиники.

215. ВИТЕР Бронислав Владиславович, 1904 г. рожд., урож. г. Тернополь, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Горького, № 12, б/п, врач поликлиники, быв. член партии, «ЭНД.».

Разрабатывалась как группа антисоветки настроенных, проводящая к-р разговоры.

37. Агдело № 287 «Черные орлы»

216. ДЕРЕНГОВСКИЙ Антоний Казимирович, 1925 г. рожд., урож. села Збойска, (Германия), прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Революции, № 7, поляк, б/п, учащийся школы, отец арестован.

217. МАТИСЯКЕВИЧ Леонард Станиславович, 1924 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская № 159, поляк, б/п, учащийся школы.

218. СТОНЧАК Станислав Вильгельмович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Вокзальная № 3, поляк, б/п, работал на ж.д.

Молодежная к-р повстанческая организация, разрабатывалась по подозрению в проведении а/с работы.

38. Агдело № 247 «Интуристы»

219. СТОРХ Симха, 1892 г. рожд. урож. с. Гнилье, Сколевского р-на, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, б/п, кустарь-портной, занимался переправой беженцев в Чехию.

220. СТОРХ Моисей Симхович, 1915 г. рожд., урож. с. Гнилье, Сколевского р-на, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Чацкого № 15, еврей, б/п, без опр. занятий.

221. СТОРХ Шлейм Симхович, 1914 г. рожд., урож. с. Гнилье, Сколевского р-на, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Чацкого № 15, еврей, б/п, без опр. занятий.

222. ДАВЕРМАН Ицек, 1907 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, еврей, б/п, без опр. занятий, польским судом был осужден за воровство к тюремному заключению.

223. ШТАЙФ Идаль, 1917 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Крыжа, еврей, б/п, без опр. занятий.

Разрабатывались, как группа, занимавшаяся переправой лиц за кордон и контрабандной деятельностью.

39. Агдело № 243 «Связисты»

224. ВИЛИНСКИЙ Карл Карлович, 1906 г. рожд., урож. г. Бережаны, Тернопольской обл., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Листопада, поляк, б/п, не работал, бывш. чл. «ОЗН», сын кадрового капитана польской армии.

225. ЛИНДЕРОВА Матильда Францевна, 1902 г. рожд., урож. г. Львов, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Чкалова № 18, полька, б/п, не работала, состояла членом организации «ОЗН».

226. БУЛЬФАН Альбин Владимирович, 1895 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Листопада № 6, поляк, б/п, работал начальником почтового отделения ж.д. почты, в прошлом член организации «ПОВ» и «ОЗН», польский националист.

227. БУЛЬФАН Владимир Владимирович, 1897 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Листопада № 14, поляк, б/п, работал на центральном телеграфе, в прошлом являлся членом организации «ПОВ» и «ОЗН», бывш. жандарм.

228. БЕЛЯВСКАЯ Ядвига Иосифовна, 1914 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская № 37, полька, б/п, работала старшей телефонисткой междугородней телефонной станции, состояла членом женской военной организации «Герцеж».

229. ЛАБИНДКОВСКИЙ Мечислав Иосифович, 1905 г. рожд., урож. г. Броды, Львовской обл., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Снежна № 2, поляк, б/п, работал на центральном телеграфе, поляк, б/п.

Разрабатывались как группа враждебно настроенная против соввласти, проводящая антисоветскую агитацию.

40. Агдело № 82 «Дикообразы»

230. БРАСИЛИТЕН Ушер-Селич Хаимович, 1907 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Подваля № 9, еврей, б/п, работал переплетчиком типографии, состоял членом сионистской организации.

231. БРАСИЛИТЕН Файвель, 1912 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Токарская № 4, еврей, член сионистской партии «Нос», работал переплетчиком типографии.

232. БРИНЕ Мойхеш Зайвелевич, 1907 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Мицкевича № 21, еврей, б/п, работал наборщиком типографии, являлся членом сионистской организации.

233. БАКЕНРОБ Максимильян Изакович, 1912 г. рожд., урож. с. Болеховцы, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Горького № 2, еврей, б/п, студент пединститута.

234. ГОТЕСМАН Абрагам, 1913 г. рождения, урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Подваля № 10-а, еврей, б/п, работал бухгалтером Облтопотдела.

235. БЕКЕНДОРФ-ГЕРЦМАН Изаак Моисеевич, 29 лет, урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Герцена № 28, еврей, б/п, без опр. занятий, сын мелкого торговца.

236. РУДЕНФЕР Борух, еврей, б/п, работал на заводе в б. Галиции.

Разрабатывались как участники сионистской к-р организации, проводившие активную борьбу против соввласти, компартии.

41. Агдело № 94 «Фалангисты»

237. КИШКО Михаил Григорьевич, 1919 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

238. ЯНЕВ Левко Семенович, 1921 г. рождения, урож. и жит. с. Колпец, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

239. ФАРИН Николай Петрович, 1911 г. рожд., укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, урож. и жит. с. Колпец, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

240. СИНУТА Игнат Петрович, 1915 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

241. СИНУТА Иосиф Петрович, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

242. КУЛИК Михаил Михайлович, 1915 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

243. КУЛИК Василий Михайлович, 1907 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

244. КУЛИК Михаил Иванович, 1908 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

245. КЛИМКО Михаил Васильевич, 1915 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйств., бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

246. АНДРИЕВСКИЙ Василий Иосифович, 1910 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

247. ПОЛОМАР Иосиф Васильевич, 1910 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

248. КИШКО Богдан Михайлович, 1919 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

249. ЯЛОХА Михаил, 1914 г. рожд., урож. с. Колпец, прожив. с. Стебник, Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

250. ВАКЛЮК Стефан Максимович, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

251. КУЛИК Михаил Юрьевич, 1914 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Колпец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, бывш. участник организации «ОУН».

Разрабатывались по окраске «укр. к-р», лица, проводящие антисоветскую националистическую деятельность.

42. Агдело № 326 «Посредники»

253. ЧЕРНЫЙ-ГОРОХОВСКИЙ Иван Борисович, 1914 г. рожд. урож. с. Дубрава, Стрийского р-на, прож. в г. Сколе, укр., б/п, работал мастером в пекарне, из рабочих, в прошлом осужден польским судом за украинскую нац. деятельность.

254. ЧОБЫЧ Михалина, 22 лет, урож. и жит.ница с. Любинцы, Сколевского р-на Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, работала в сельском хозяйстве отца, состояла членом украинской к-р нац. организации.

255. ПЕТРИКАН Михаил, 30 лет, урож. и жит. с. Стыново-Нижняя, Сколевского р-на, укр., б/п, работал учителем начальной школы, в 1940 г. арестовывался НКВД за переправу оуновцев за кордон.

256. ЦУМАК, 30 лет, урож. с. Стыново, Сколевского р-на, скрывался укр. б/п, без. опр. занятий, являлся членом укр. к-р нац. организации.

Разрабатывались как участники украинской к-р нац. организации и проводящие свою вражескую деятельность, а также занимавшиеся переправой националистов за кордон.

43. Агдело №150 «Мечтатели»

257. ГРЕЧИН Янина Собестьяновна, 1909 г. рожд. полька, работала на заводе № 1, быв. «Галиция» слесарем, член завкома и депутат Горсовета, бывш. проститутка.

258. СВЕНТАНЬ Здислав Густавович, 1920 г. рожд., поляк, работал парикмахером в коммунальной парикмахерской, два брата за рубежом.

Во время пребывания немцев были связаны с офицерами, СВЕНТОНЬ поддерживал связь с агентом «гестапо». Разрабатывались по подозрению в шпионаже.

44. Агдело № 95 «Зақордонники»

259. СЛОНСКИЙ Мирон Максимович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, Дрогобычской обл., ул. Стебницкая №2, укр., б/п, из кулаков, пытался перейти границу в сторону Германии.

260. РЕЗНЯК Славко Александрович, 1920 г. рожд., урож. с. Трускавец, Дрогобычской обл., ул. Жарельня №10, укр., б/п, являлся соучастником организации «ОУН», пытался бежать в Германию.

261. БИСЯК Николай Антонович, 1916 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, ул. Холодна №7, поляк, работал парикмахером на курорте, являлся участником укр. нац. организации, пытался бежать в Германию, с целью вступления в украинский легион.

262. БЕЛАС Роман Андреевич, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, укр., работал парикмахером на курорте, являлся членом организации «ОУН», пытался бежать в Германию для вступления в украинский национальный легион.

263. БЕЛАС Михайл Андреевич, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, укр., б/п, являлся участником «ОУН» пытался перейти границу в сторону Германии, для вступления в укр. нац. легион.

264. РЕЗНЯК Роман Александрович, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, ул. Жарельня № 10, укр., б/п, из кулаков, являлся членом укр. к-р нац. организации «ОУН», пытался бежать в Германию, для вступления в укр. нац. легион.

265. ПАВЛЮКОВИЧ Иван Дмитриевич, 1915 г. рожд., укр., б/п, работал парикмахером на курорте в Трускавец, сын крупного богача, активный член организации «ОУН», пытался бежать в Германию для вступления в укр. нац. легион.

266. ПРИСТАЙ Василий Дмитриевич, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, укр., б/п, учащийся технической школы, в прошлом член организации «ОУН», пытался перейти границу в сторону Германии для вступления в украинский легион.

267. ВЕРЕТКО Николай Илькович, 1909 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, ул. Яроша № 4, укр., б/п, работал агентом по торговле на курортах, в прошлом активный член «ОУН», пытался бежать в Германию для вступления в легион.

268. ПАВЛЮКОВИЧ Василий Дмитриевич, 1912 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, укр., б/п, сын крупного богача, пытался перейти границу в сторону Германии для вступления в украинский легион.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении активной антисоветской нац. деятельности, направленной на отторжение Украины от Советского Союза.

45. Агдело № 302 «Беглецы»

269. ЛАВРОВ-ЛАВРИВ Роман Иванович, 1912 г. рожд. урож. с. Тустановичи, Бориславского р-на, прож. г. Борислав, укр., б/п, без опр. занятий, в прошлом судим за активную оуновскую деятельность.

270. ЛАВРОВ Иван Иванович, 1915 г. рожд., урож. с. Тустановичи, Бориславського р-на, прож. г. Борислав, укр., б/п, работал секретарем завкома 2-го нефтепромысла.

271. ВЕЛЬГУШ Агафья Васильевна, 1913 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Горишня Брама № 66, укр., б/п, без опр. занятий, бывш. член организации «Сокол».

272. ШЕВЧУК Любовь Ивановна, 1919 г. рожд., урож. с. Болаховцы, Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, без опр. занятий, активная националистка, в последнее время выполняла роль связиста краевой экзекутивы «ОУН» г. Львов.

273. СЕЛЕЦКАЯ Мария Степановна, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Самбор, укр., б/п, без опр. занятий, член организации «ОУН», выполняла роль повитового курьера, два брата, активные оуновцы, бежали за кордон.

274. СТЕБЕЛЬСКАЯ Ирена-Анна Ильинична, 1913 г. рожд., урож. с. Голин, Калушского р-на, Станиславской обл., прожив. г. Самбор, укр., б/п, работала инструктором рай. ОНО, украинская националистка.

275. АНДРИАНОВИЧ Ярослава Юлиановна, 1914 г. рожд., урож. с. Тустановичи, Бориславского р-на, прожив. г. Борислав, укр., б/п, без опр. занятий, дочь попа, брат ее укр. националист, бежал за кордон.

276. ЦМОЦ Константин Григорьевич, 1914 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Вижня, Сколевского р-на, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, активный украинский националист, один из руководителей «ОУН».

277. ИЛЬКИВ Николай Михайлович, 1910 г. рожд., урож. с. Тустановичи, Бориславского р-на, Дрогобычской обл., судившийся в 1933 г. за активную оуновскую деятельность.

278. ГНАТОВ Матвей Петрович, 1906 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, член «ОУН», в 1932 г. арестовывался за оуновскую деятельность.

279. ИВАНЧУК Иван Степанович, 1905 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, член «ОУН», з 1932 г. арестовывался за оуновскую деятельность.

280. БАЧИНСКИЙ Ярослав Васильевич, 1914 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, укр., б/п, являлся членом «ОУН», за что арестовывался польскими властями.

Разрабатывались как участники украинской нац. к-р организации «ОУН», проводившие активную повстанческую работу, направленную против Советского Союза.

46. Агдело № 100 «Семейка»

281. СТАЦКАЯ Ядвига Антоновна, 1914 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Островского № 14, укр., б/п, работала секретарем Облсобеза, родители – быв. владельцы нефтяных вышек.

282. СТАЦКАЯ Стефания Антоновна, 1919 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Островского № 14, укр., б/п, родители – быв. владельцы нефтяных вышек.

283. СТАЦКАЯ Теодозия Семеновна, 1896 г. рожд., урож. г. Борислав, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Островского № 14, укр., б/п, домохозяйка, быв. владелица нефтяных вышек.

284. ТАРАТУЦКИЙ Владимир Якубович, 1912 г. рожд., урож. г. Борислав, прож. г. Стрий, беспартийный, работал инженером на бумажной фабрике.

285. ТАРАТУЦКАЯ Евстафия Антоновна, 1914 г. рожд., урож. г. Дрогобыч, прож. с. Кохавино, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, родители бывш. владельцы нефтяных вышек.

286. ЧЕРЕВКО Владимир Теодорович, 1913 г. рожд., прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Клебанская № 8, укр., б/п, работал экономистом «Укрнефтепереработка», бывш. адвокат.

Разрабатывались как активные украинские националисты, распространявшие провокационные слухи против СССР, группировавшие вокруг себя антисоветский элемент .

47. Агдело № 122 «Мечтатели»

287. КРУГЛЫЙ Теофил Николаевич, 35 лет, урож. г. Дрогобыч, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Млынки, рабочий завода «Польмин», член украинской «Просвиты».

288. ПАСИНОВИЧ Филько Дмитриевич, 1908 г. рожд., украинец, урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Раневицкая, укр., б/п, работал на заводе быв. «Польмин», укр. националист.

289. ПАСИНОВИЧ Григорий Дмитриевич, 1907 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Рановецкого, укр., б/п, работал на заводе быв. «Польмин», укр. националист.

290. ДЕРЕЖИЦКИЙ Василий Григорьевич, 1905 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Млинарского № 9, укр. б/п, работал на заводе «Польмин», укр. националист.

291. ШИМКО Михаил Григорьевич, 1900 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Плебанская-Нижняя, укр. б/п, работал на заводе б. «Польмин», укр. националист.

292. ГЕВКО Йосиф Иванович, 52 лет, урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, работал на ж.д. транспорте, являлся руководителем «Просвита».

293. БРОВАРСКИЙ Рудольф Петрович, 1907 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Раневицка № 6, укр., б/п, работал охранником на заводе бывш. «Польмин», украинский националист.

Разрабатывались, как бывш. члены украинской организации «Просвита», организовано связанные между собой и с границей, а также занимавшиеся антисоветской деятельностью.

48. Агдело № 67 «Мелюзга»

294. РАЙНГАРТЕН Герц Изаконович, 1913 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Райха № 19, еврей, б/п, не работал, из купцов, являлся активным членом фашисткой организации «сионистов-ревизионистов».

295. ТНЕКЕНДОРФ Матес Гаршович, 1912 г. рожд., урож. г. Самбор, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Юра №16, еврей, б/п, бухгалтер Облторготдела, из торговцев, являлся руководителем фашисткой молодежной организации «сионистов-ревизионистов».

296. ФРИДМАН-РАЙХ Жико Озяшевич, 1917 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Слоный ставок №10, еврей, б/п, работал инструктором «Динамо», из крупных купцов, являлся активным членом организации «сионистов-ревизионистов».

297. БРОХЕР Макс, 1913 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская № 102, еврей, б/п, не работал, из торговцев, являлся активным членом организации «сионистов-ревизионистов».

Разрабатывались по окраске «сионисты» как активные члены еврейской фашисткой организации фашистов-ревизионистов, занимавшиеся антисоветской деятельностью.

49. Агдело № 151 «Беглецы»

298. МОСКАЛ Анатолий Станиславович, 39 лет, урож. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, бывш. конфидент польской полиции, бежавший вместе с белополяками за границу, в последнее время находился на нелегальном положении.

299. НЕДОВИЧ Мария Станиславовна, 1913 г. рожд., урож. г. Стравы, Львовской обл., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, родные проживают на территории Германии, полька, работала маникюршей в парикмахерской.

300. НЕДОВИЧ Михаил Янович, 1910 г. рожд., урож. г. Добромыль, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, работал на почте.

301. КУШНИР Теофил Теодорович, 1907 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, поляк, б/п, работал почтальоном на почте.

Фигурант дела МОСКАЛ Антоний переброшен гестапо для шпионской работы на территории СССР, о чем осведомлены остальные фигуранты. Разрабатывается как подозревавшие в шпионаже в пользу Германии.

50. Агдело № 110 «Недовольные»

302. КОБРИН Юзеф Коралевич, 1902 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Словацкого, поляк, быв. член ППС, бывш. конфидент польской полиции, работал на заводе № 1.

303. ГАЛУШКО Мечеслав Антонович, 1912 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Словацкого, поляк, без опр. занятий.

304. САВЧЕНКО Григорий Григорьевич, 1917 г. рожд., урож. г. Фрунзе, ур. чл. ВЛКСМ, красноармеец, шофер военной прокуратуры 8 корпуса, в Красной Армии состоит с 1938 г.

Разрабатывались по подозрению в проведении шпионской деятельности.

51. Агдело № 217 «Блок»

305. КАШУБА Нестор Михайлович, 1906 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Охронек № 3, укр., б/п, работал в Горплане Горсовета.

КАШУБА Роман Михайлович, 1915 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Бична Охронек № 32, укр., б/п, работал в домоуправлении, при польвlastях был секретарем тюрьмы.

Разрабатывались как украинские националисты, проводившие нелегальные сборища, и группировали вокруг себя антисоветский элемент.

54. Агдело № 413 «Округ»

307. ГАБШИЙ Роман Михайлович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, учащийся 8 класса средней школы, являлся участником к-р организации украинских националистов «ОУН».

308. ЛИСОВИЧ Наталья Ивановна, 1924 г. рожд., урож. с. Далява, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрыйская № 187, укр., б/п, учащаяся школы, являлась участницей антисоветской оуновской организации.

309. ПЕТРИК Анна Степановна, 1925 г. рожд., урож. и прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Верхня-Колиева № 10, укр., б/п, учащаяся 8 класса средней школы, член организации «ОУН».

310. ЛЕМЕХ Ирина Ильковна, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Зализна № 47, укр., б/п, учащаяся 9 класса средней школы, являлась участницей оуновской организации.

311. КУЛИНИЧ Степан Тимофеевич, 1923 г. урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Газова № 2, укр., б/п, студент пединститута, являлся участником организации «ОУН».

312. ПЕТРИВ Славко Иосифович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. с. Трускавец, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, учащийся школы.

313. РИЗНЯК Мирослав Алексеевич, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, укр., б/п, студент пединститута, являлся участником а/с организации «ОУН».

314. АНТОНИВ Ярослав Михайлович, 1922 г. рожд., урож., с. Стебник, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, студент пединститута, является членом оуновской организации.

315. ТАТАРСКИЙ Евгений Иосифович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Ивана Франко № 44, укр., б/п, студент пединститута, являлся участником оуновской организации.

316. КУЙДИЧ Иван Юрьевич, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Листопада № 53, укр., б/п, учащийся школы, являлся участником оуновской организации.

317. ЛОБОДА Ольга Васильевна, 1921 г. рожд., урож. с. Модричи, Дрогобычской обл., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр. б/п, учащаяся школы, являлась участником оуновской организации,

318. ПРИМАК Ольга Григорьевна, урож. с. Модричи, Дрогобычской обл., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, учащаяся школы.

319. ИВАСИКИВ Ольга Ивановна, 1924 г. рожд., урож. и жит.ница г. Дрогобыч, ул. Ивана Франка № 52, укр., б/п, учащаяся школы, являлась участницей организации «ОУН».

320. СПАНЧАК Иван Онуфриевич, 1923 г. рожд., прожив. г. Дрогобыч укр., б/п, учащийся 9 класса средней школы, являлся участником антисоветской оуновской организации.

321. БОЖИК Николай Михайлович, 1922 г. рождения, жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. 17 вересня № 67, укр., б/п, учащийся 10 школы, являлся участником оуновской организации.

322. КРИШТАЛЬ Теодор Иванович, 1923 г. рождения, урож. с. Гаи Ныжни, Дрогобычской обл., проживал г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, учащийся 8 класса средней школы, являлся участником организации «ОУН».

323. ФАРИМАН Мирослав Олексович, 1924 г. рожд., урож. с. Доброгостыв, Стебник, прожив. с. Доброгостыв, укр. б/п, учащийся школы, являлся участником оуновской организации,

324. ТАТАРСКИЙ Осип Васильевич, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Стрийская № 103, укр., б/п, студент пединститута, являлся участником оуновской организации,

325. КРАВЕЦ Иван Васильевич, 1924 г. рожд., урож. с. Гаи Ныжни Дрогобычской обл., прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, учащийся 9 класса средней школы, являлся участником оуновской организации.

326. ДЕЛЕНКО Богдан Витович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. с. Довге Добривляны, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Пушкина № 24, укр., б/п, учащийся школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

327. ВИШКО Юлий Петрович, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, укр., б/п, учащийся школы, являлся участником ОУН-онвской организации.

328. ЖГУТ Андрей Степанович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. с. Воля Якубова, прожив. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, учащийся 9 класса средней школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

329. СКРИПУХ Иван Илькович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Снежна № 33, укр., б/п, учащийся 10 класса средней школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

330. ФЕДУШ Владимир Иванович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. с. Ластивка, прожив г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, учащийся 8 класса средней школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

331. КУНЦИВ Владимир Степанович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Попели Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, учащийся 8 класса средней школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

332. МОТЫКА Иванна Васильевна, 1924 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, ул. Холодная № 12, укр., б/п, учащаяся, являлась участницей ОУН-овской организации.

333. ЯВОРСКИЙ Василий Михайлович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, ул. Ситники № 3, укр., б/п, иждивенец, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

334. ПИЛИПЧАК Михаил Владимирович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Борислав, ул. Коцюбинского № 46, укр., б/п, работал на нефтепромысле чернорабочим, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации,

335. БАЧИНСКИЙ Петр Сеневиц, 1918 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Тустановичи, Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, работал на нефтепромысле, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

336. ПИЛЬКО Роман Теодорович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Тустановичи, Дрогобычского р-на, укр, б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

337. ЗАРИЦКИЙ Дмитрий Васильевич, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. села Тустановичи, Дрогобычского р-на, ул. Франко № 9, укр., б/п, без опр. занятий, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

338. ГУТОВИЧ Богдан Антонович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, укр., б/п, учащийся школы № 1, являлся участником ОУНовской организации,

339. БРАТУСЬ Василий Михайлович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Унятычи Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, учащийся, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

340. БЕРЕЖНИЦКАЯ Мария Алексеевна, 1921 г. рожд., урож. с. Черехавка, Самборского р-на, проживала в г. Самбор, ул. Замейская № 34, укр., б/п, учащаяся средней школы, являлась участницей ОУН-овской организации.

341. ВОЛОШИН Василий Дмитриевич, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Вишня, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, учащийся школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

342. ГРАБОВСКАЯ Татьяна Марковна, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. Самбор, ул. Замейская № 21, укр., б/п, учащаяся средней школы, являлась участницей ОУН-овской организации.

343. ГОРНИЦКИЙ Ростислав Зенонович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Самбор, ул. Коперника № 21, укр. б/п, учащийся средней школы,

344. ФЛЮНТ Тарас Зенонович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Самбор, ул. Змиевская № 17, укр., б/п, учащийся в средней школе, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

345. ФИЛЦ Роман Михайлович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Самбор, ул. Церковная № 4, укр., б/п, учащийся школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

346. ПЛОШКЕВИЧ Ирина Юлиановна, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Самбора, укр., б/п, учащаяся школы, являлась участницей ОУН-овской организации.

347. КУЦАН Богдан Иванович, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Самбор, ул. Замейская № 67, укр., б/п, учащийся 10 класса средней школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

348. ХОМЯК Илько Григорьевич, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Унятычи, Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

349. ХОМЯК Кароль Мариевич, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Унятычи, Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

350. ТОРСКИЙ Андрей Илькович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Унятычи, Дрогобычского р-на, укр., б/п, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

351. ЗАХОРЯК Василий Николаевич, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Лишня, Дрогобычской обл., украинец, б/п, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

352. ДИДУХ Николай Васильевич, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. села Лишня, украинец, б/п, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
353. КОВАЛЬ Петр Степанович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Медвежа, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
354. ТЕРЛЕЦКИЙ Иван Николаевич, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Медвежа, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
355. ЛЫСИК Владимир Михайлович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Попели, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
356. ВЫСЕК Владимир Антонович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. с. Попели, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
357. СТЕЛЬМАХ Ярослав Илькович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Попели, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
358. КРАМАРЬ Дорка Йосифовна, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, укр., б/п, uczашаяся неполной средней школы, являлась участницей ОУН-овской организации.
359. ЧАЙКОВСКИЙ Николай Васильевич, 1922 г. рожд., урож. с. Луки, Дублянского р-на, прожив. г. Самбор, ул. Замейская № 9, украинец, б/п, учащийся школы, являлась участником а/с организации.
360. БАРАНИК Микола Васильевич, 1924 г. рожд., урож. с. Лютовиска, Старо-Самборского р-на, прожив. в г. Самбор, Церковная площ. № 8, украинец, б/п, учащийся школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
361. ХАНАС Антип Васильевич, 1924 г. рождения, урож. с. Берестины, Старо-Самборского р-на, прожив. г. Самбор, ул. Цегольна 9 кв., украинец, б/п, учащийся школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
362. ФЕДИК Владимир Михайлович, 1923 г. рождения, урож. м. Озымина, Дубинского р-на, прожив. г. Самбор, ул. Замейская № 28, украинец, б/п, учащийся школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
363. ДАНИЛИШИН Андрей Николаевич, 1919 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
364. КОЦЮБА Роман Федорович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Плебания № 8, укр., б/п, работал контролером ЦОК, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
365. СПРИС Орест Александрович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Тустановичи, ул. И. Франко № 21, укр., б/п, учащийся Бориславской школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
366. ОМРОЗИЙ Яким Дмитриевич, 1911 г. рожд., урож. с. Чуква, Самборского р-на, находился на нелегальном положении, укр., б/п, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
367. ОПРИШКО Корнеля Васильевна, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Тустановичи, укр., б/п, учащаяся Бориславской школы, являлась участницей ОУН-овской организации.
368. КИСИЛИЧНИК Михаил Николаевич, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, укр., б/п, работал в своем сельском хозяйстве, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.
369. ВИТВИЦКИЙ Ярослав Васильевич, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Тустановичи, укр., б/п, учащийся Бориславской школы, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

370. БОЖИК Роман Прокофьевич, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, укр., б/п, занимался сельским хозяйством, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

371. МОРОЗ Дмитрий Дмитриевич, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Стебник, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, занимался сельским хозяйством, подозревался в причастности к организации «ОУН».

372. МОРОЗ Михаил Юркович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Стебник, укр., б/п, находился на иждивении родителей, подозревался в причастности к организации «ОУН».

373. БИЛАС Николай Константинович, 1919 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Модричи, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, занимался сельским хозяйством, подозревался в причастности к ОУН-овской организации.

374. МАГУР Николай Михайлович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Модричи, укр., б/п, занимался сельским хозяйством, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

375. ХЕВПА Николай Михайлович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Модричи, укр., б/п, занимался сельским хозяйством, подозревался в причастности к организации «ОУН».

376. КОВЦУН Богдан, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Модричи, укр., б/п, занимался сельским хозяйством, подозревался в причастности к организации «ОУН».

377. ЖИГОЛЯК Михаил Юркович, 1921 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Станеля, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, занимался сельским хозяйством, подозревался в причастности к ОУН-овской организации.

378. СТЕЦКЕВИЧ Ярослав Михайлович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. села Колпец, Дрогобычской обл., укр. б/п, работал в вагонном депо ст. Дрогобыч, являлся участником ОУН-овской организации.

379. ГОДОВАНЕЦ Михаил, 1919 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Модричи, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, занимался сельским хозяйством, подозревался в причастности к ОУН-овской организации,

380. КУЛЬЧИЦКИЙ Игорь Теодорович, 1920 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Кульчицы, Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, учащийся, подозревался в причастности к организации «ОУН».

381. ЛУЖЕЦКИЙ Осип Якубович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Ступница, Дрогобычской обл., Дублянского р-на, укр., б/п, находился на иждивении родителей, подозревался в причастности к ОУН-овской организации.

382. НОВОСЕЛЬСКИЙ Зиновий Петрович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. Кружики, Дублянского р-на Дрогобычской обл., укр., б/п, находился на иждивении родителей, подозревался в причастности к ОУН-овской организации.

383. ОПРИШКО Евгения Катериновна, 1923 г. рожд., урож. г. Перемышль, прож. г. Дрогобыч, ул. Франко № 40, укр., б/п, студентка педкурсов, подозревалась в причастности к ОУН-овской организации.

384. ПРИСТАЙ Мирослав Андреевич, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, ул. Суховолья № 53, укр., б/п, работал слесарем в техникуме, подозревался в причастности к организации «ОУН».

385. ПРИСТАЙ Василий Андреевич, 1922 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Трускавец, ул. Суховолья № 53, укр., б/п, студент техникума, подозревался в причастности к организации «ОУН».

386. ТЕРЛЕЦКИЙ Зенон Григорьевич, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Тустановичи, Бориславского р-на, ул. Коцюбинского № 66, укр., б/п, учащийся школы, подозревался в причастности к ОУН-овской организации.

387. АДРЯНОВИЧ Орест Ільянович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. и жит. с. Тустановичи, ул. Франко № 1, укр., б/п, учасний школи, підозревался в причастности к організації «ОУН».

388. ПАПИШ Ярослав Михайлович, 1922 г. рожд., урож. с. Рудки, Рудковского р-на, прожив. г. Самбор, укр., б/п, учасний школи, являлся участником ОУН-овской організації.

389. КУЛЬЧИЦКИЙ Марьян Дмитрович, 1923 г. рожд., урож. с. Береги, Самборского р-на, прожив. с. Тустановичи, Бориславского р-на, ул. Коцюбинского № 27, укр., б/п, учасний школи, підозревался в причастности к ОУН-овской організації.

Разрабатывались, как участники контрреволюционной організації українских националистов, проводившие активную антисоветскую деятельность, подготавливая вооруженное восстание.

Джерело:

Галузевий державний архів Служби безпеки України. Ф. 71. Оп. 6. Спр. 9. Арк. 1–37.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Білас, 1994 – Білас І. Репресивно-каральна система в Україні 1917 – 1953. Суспільно-політичний та історико-правовий аналіз. У двох книгах. К.: Либідь; Військо України, 1994. Кн. 1. 432 с.

Льюшин, 2003 – Льюшин І. Польське підпілля на території Західної України в роки Другої світової війни. Незалежний культурологічний часопис «Ї» [гол. ред. Т. Возняк]. Львів, 2003. С. 152–171.

Льюшин, 2001 – Льюшин І. Протистояння УПА і АК (Армії Крайової) в роки Другої світової війни на тлі діяльності польського підпілля в Західній Україні. К.: Інститут історії України НАН України, 2001. 289 с.

Льюшин, 2009 – Льюшин І. Українська повстанська армія і Армія Крайова. Протистояння в Західній Україні (1939 – 1945 рр.). К.: Вид-дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2009. 399 с.

Кентій, 1999 – Кентій А. Нарис боротьби ОУН–УПА в Україні (1946 – 1956 рр.). К.: Інститут історії України НАН України, 1999. 111 с.

Киричук, 2003 – Киричук Ю. Український національний рух 40 – 50-х років ХХ століття: ідеологія та практика. Львів: Добра справа, 2003. 464 с.

Кондратюк, Кондратюк 2000 – Кондратюк К., Кондратюк С. Репресії органів НКВС проти населення західних областей України (1939 – 1941) // Наукові зошити історичного факультету. Львів, 2000. Вип. 3. С. 146–149.

Кондратюк, Кондратюк 2001 – Кондратюк К., Кондратюк С. Становлення і характер радянської влади в Західній Україні (вересень 1939 – червень 1941 рр.) // Галичина. 2001. № 5–6. С. 347–353.

Литвин, Луцький, Науменко, 1999 – Литвин М. Р., Луцький О. І., Науменко К. С. 1939: Західні землі України. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, 1999. 152 с.

Луцький, 1996 – Луцький О. «Радянізація» Львов: вересень 1939 – червень 1941 // Львів. Історичні нариси. Львів, 1996. С. 448–450.

Макарчук, 2004 – Макарчук С. Радянські методи боротьби з ОУН і УПА. 1944 – 1945 рр. // Українська Повстанська Армія у боротьбі проти тоталітарних режимів. Львів, 2004. С. 210 – 223.

Нікольський, 2003 – Нікольський В. М. Репресивна діяльність органів державної безпеки СРСР в Україні (кінець 1920 – 1950 рр.): Історико-статистичне дослідження. Донецьк, 2003. 623 с.

ОУН і УПА, 2005 – Організація Українських Націоналістів і Українська Повстанська Армія. Історичні нариси / [за ред. С. Кульчицького]. К.: Інститут історії України НАН України, 2005. 496 с.

Патриляк, 2012 – Патриляк І. «Встань і борись! Слухай і вір...»: українське націоналістичне підпілля та повстанський рух (1939 – 1960 рр.): монографія Іван Патриляк. Львів: Часопис, 2012. 592 с.

Русначенко, 2002 – Русначенко А. Народ збурений: Національно-визвольний рух в Україні й національні рухи опору в Білорусії, Литві, Латвії, Естонії у 1940 – 50-х роках. К.: Університетське видавництво «Пульсари», 2002. 519 с.

Сергійчук, 2005 – Сергійчук В. Український здвиг: Прикарпаття. 1939 – 1955 рр. К.: Українська Видавнича Спілка, 2005. 840 с.

Шаповал, 2001 – Шаповал Ю. Війна після війни // Літопис УПА. Нова серія. Т. 3. Боротьба проти УПА і націоналістичного підпілля: директивні документи ЦК Компартії України. 1943 – 1959. Київ; Торонто, 2001. 670 с.

Ярош, 1999 – Ярош Б. О. Сторінки політичної історії західноукраїнських земель (30 – 50-ті рр. XX ст.). Луцьк, 1999. 181 с.

REFERENCES

Bilas, 1994 – Bilas I. Represywno-karalna systema v Ukraini 1917 – 1953 [The repressive system in Ukraine in 1917 – 1953]. Suspilno-politychnyi ta istoryko-pravovyi analiz. U dvokh knykh. K.: Lybid; Viisko Ukrainy, 1994. Kn. 1. 432 pp. [in Ukrainian]

Iiushyn, 2003 – Iiushyn I. Polske pidpillia na terytorii Zakhidnoi Ukrainy v roky Druhoi svitovoi viiny [The Polish underground in the territory of Western Ukraine during the Second World War]. Nezaleznyi kulturolohichni chasopys «I» [hol. red. T. Vozniak]. Lviv, 2003. Pp. 152–171. [in Ukrainian]

Iiushyn, 2001 – Iiushyn I. Protystoiannia UPA i AK (Armii Kraiovoi) v roky Druhoi svitovoi viiny na tli diialnosti polskoho pidpillia v Zakhidnii Ukraini [The opposition of the UPA and AK (Armija Krajowa) during the Second World War against the background of the Polish underground's activity in Western Ukraine]. K.: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2001. 289 p. [in Ukrainian]

Iiushyn, 2009 – Iiushyn I. Ukrainska povstanska armiiia i Armija Kraiova. Protystoiannia v Zakhidnii Ukraini (1939 – 1945 rr.) [The Ukrainian insurgent army and Armija Krajowa. The opposition in Western Ukraine (1939 – 1945)]. K.: Vyd.dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia», 2009. 399 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kentii, 1999 – Kentii A. Narys borotby OUN–UPA v Ukraini (1946–1956 rr.) [On functioning of UPA departments in Chernivtsi land; An outline of the struggle of OUN-UPA in Ukraine (1946 – 1956)]. Kyiv, Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 1999. 111 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kyrychuk, 2003 – Kyrychuk Yu. Ukrainskyi natsionalnyi rukh 40–50-kh rokiv XX stolittia: ideolohiia ta praktyka [Ukrainian Nationalist Movement of 1940s–1950s: Ideology and Practice]. Lviv, Dobra sprava, 2003. 464 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kondratiuk, Kondratiuk 2000 – Kondratiuk K., Kondratiuk S. Represii orhaniv NKVS proty naselennia zakhidnykh oblastei Ukrainy (1939 – 1941) [The NKVD Organs' Repressions of the Population of the Western Areas of Ukraine (1939 – 1941)] // Naukovi zoshyty istorychnoho fakultetu. Lviv, 2000. Vyp. 3. Pp. 146–149. [in Ukrainian]

Kondratiuk, Kondratiuk 2001 – Kondratiuk K., Kondratiuk S. Stanovlennia i kharakter radianskoï vlady v Zakhidnii Ukraini (veresen 1939 – cherven 1941 rr.) [The Establishment and Character of the Soviet Power in Western Ukraine (September, 1939 – June, 1941)] // Halychyna. 2001. № 5–6. Pp. 347–353. [in Ukrainian]

Lytvyn, Lutskyi, Naumenko, 1999 – Lytvyn M. R., Lutskyi O. I., Naumenko K. Ye. 1939: Zakhidni zemli Ukrainy [1939: Ukraine's Western Lands]. Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy, 1999. 152 c. [in Ukrainian]

Lutskyi, 1996 – Lutskyi O. «Radianizatsiia» Lvova: veresen 1939 – cherven 1941 [«The Sovietization» of Lviv: September, 1939 – June, 1941] // Lviv. Istorychni narysy. Lviv, 1996. Pp. 448–450. [in Ukrainian]

Makarchuk, 2004 – Makarchuk S. Radianski metody borotby z OUN i UPA. 1944 – 1945 rr. [Soviet methods of struggle against OUN and UPA. 1944 – 1945] // Ukrainska Povstanska Armiiia u borotbi proty totalitarnykh rezhymiv. Lviv, 2004. Pp. 210–223. [in Ukrainian]

Nikolskyi, 2003 – Nikolskyi V. M. Represywna diialnist orhaniv derzhavnoi bezpeky SRSR v Ukraini (kinets 1920 – 1950 rr.): Istoryko-statystyчне doslidzhennia [The Repressive Activity of the USSR's State Security Agencies in Ukraine (the end of the 1920s – 1950s)]. Donetsk, 2003. 623 p. [in Ukrainian]

OUN i UPA, 2005 – Orhanizatsiia Ukrainykykh Natsionalistiv i Ukrainska Povstanska Armia. Istorychni narysy [The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army] / [za red. S. Kulchytskoho]. – K.: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2005. 496 p. [in Ukrainian]

Patryliak, 2012 – Patryliak I. «Vstan i borys! Slukhai i vir...»: ukrainske natsionalistychne pidpillia ta povstanskyi rukh (1939 – 1960 rr.) [“Stand up and fight! Listen and believe...”: the Ukrainian nationalist underground and insurgent movement (1939 – 1960)]. Lviv: Chasopys, 2012. 592 p. [in Ukrainian]

Rusnachenko, 2002 – Rusnachenko A. Narod zburenyi: Natsionalno-vyzvolnyi rukh v Ukraini y natsionalni rukhy oporu v Bilorusii, Lytvi, Latvii, Estonii u 1940 – 50-kh rokakh [The Revolted People: National liberation movement in Ukraine and national resistance movements in Belarus', Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the 1940s – 1950s]. Kyiv, Universytetske vydavnytstvo «Pulsary», 2002. – 519 p. [in Ukrainian]

Serhiichuk, 2005 – Serhiichuk V. Ukrainykyi zdvyh: Prykarpattia [the Ukrainian revolt: Sub-Carpathia]. 1939 – 1955 rr. – K.: Ukrainska Vydavnycha Spilka, 2005. 840 p. [in Ukrainian]

Shapoval, 2001 – Shapoval Yu. Viina pislia viiny [A War after the war] // Litopys UPA. Nova seriia. T. 3. Borotba proty UPA i natsionalistychnoho pidpillia: dyrektyvni dokumenty TsK Kompartii Ukrainy. 1943 – 1959. Kyiv; Toronto, 2001. 670 p. [in Ukrainian]

Yarosh, 1999 – Yarosh B. O. Storinky politychnoi istorii zakhidnoukrainskykh zemel (30 – 50-ti rr. XX st.) [Pages of Political History of the West Ukrainian Lands (1930s – 1950s)]. Lutsk, 1999. 181 p. [in Ukrainian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 19.04.2018 р.

UDC [94:328.1](477.8)«1944/1951»
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.132752

Olexandra STASIUK,

orcid.org/0000-0002-2957-0432

*Ph D hab. (History), Senior Researcher of Department of Modern History,
I. Krypiakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies of the NAS of Ukraine
(Ukraine, Lviv) ol_stasuk@ukr.net*

THE PECULIARITIES OF FORMATION OF THE REPRESENTATIVE BRANCH OF POWER IN THE WEST UKRAINIAN REGIONS OF THE UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD

The article treats of the features of formation of the representative branch of power in the West Ukrainian regions (oblasts) of the post-war period in relation to other regions of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The losses of the deputy corps of the Ukr. SSR of the first convocation during the war and their causes are disclosed, the statistical data is cited. The intrusion of the regime into the process of restoration of local Soviets (soviets, radas) in 1944–1945 is shown. The accent is made on a full submission of the process to the control of the party authorities. The qualitative structures of deputy representatives of different levels of the second and third convocations from the West Ukrainian regions in the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and Ukr. SSR, as well as the local soviets, are characterised. The political, social, national, and gender differences of the deputy representatives of the West Ukrainian oblasts in relations to the diplomatic corps of the Ukr. SSR and the structure of the «people's» electees of the East Ukrainian regions are specified. The conclusion is made about the artificial nature of the process of formation of the deputy corps in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic with the aim to demonstrate the participation of all social classes in the state government and to prove the democratic character of the regime.

Key words: West Ukrainian regions of the USSR, post-war period, representative branch of power, deputy corps.

Олександра СТАСЮК,

*кандидат історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник відділу новітньої
історії Інституту українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України
(Україна, Львів) ol_stasuk@ukr.net*

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ФОРМУВАННЯ ПРЕДСТАВНИЦЬКОЇ ГІЛКИ ВЛАДИ У ЗАХІДНОУКРАЇНСЬКИХ ОБЛАСТЯХ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ РСР ПОВОЄННОГО ПЕРІОДУ

У статті висвітлено особливості формування представницької гілки влади в західноукраїнських областях повоєнного періоду у стосунку до інших регіонів Української РСР. Виявлено втрати депутатського корпусу УРСР першого скликання за час війни та їх причини, наведено статистичні дані. Показано втручання режиму у процес відновлення місцевих рад у 1944 – 1945 роках. Наголошено на повній підконтрольності процесу партійним органам влади. Охарактеризовано якісний склад депутатського представництва різних рівнів другого та третього скликань від західноукраїнського регіону у ВР СРСР та УРСР, а також місцевих рад. Вказано на політичні, соціальні, національні, та гендерні відмінності депутатського представництва від західноукраїнських областей у стосунку до дикторпусу УРСР та складу «народних обранців» східноукраїнського регіону. Зроблено висновок про штучність процесу формування депутатського корпусу в Українській РСР з метою продемонструвати участь всіх верств суспільства в управлінні державою та довести демократичність режиму.

Ключові слова: західноукраїнські області УРСР, повоєнний період, представницька гілка влади, депутатський корпус.

Problem statement. The formation and development of democratic institutions of the independent Ukraine are in the centre of attention of domestic and foreign scholars. The study of these problems, in particular, from the point of view of a historical retrospective, is important for the search of optimum ways of reforms and timely reaction to political crises and present day challenges. In view of that, the West Ukrainian regions are most attractive to scholars and have a powerful potential for the solution of many national and state-building problems.

The analysis of researches. In the historiography the changes in cadres in the West Ukrainian regions after their joining to the Ukr. SSR many works are dedicated. This problem many the Soviet scholars usually treated with a marked underlining of the progressive role of the party cadres and experts in different areas from the East Ukrainian regions in the Sovietization of Western Ukraine (Vlaskin, 1966), (Trofymiak, 1970), (Kirsanova, 1981). However, they ignored negative sides of the process. The works of modern domestic scholars are marked with new approaches to studying of the specified problem which are based on conceptual statements about a violent character of the change of political elite of the West Ukrainian regions, the regime's mistrust in the local intelligentsia, a low educational level of the part-Soviet activists sent by the Central Committee (CC) for the Sovietization of the regions, an aggravation on this basis of social and national contradictions, etc. (Voslenskyi, 1991), (Kondratiyk, Leskiv, 2005), (Dokash, 2013). However, the specified researches mainly concern the personnel structure of party and executive structures, heads of leading establishments and enterprises, but, at the same time, the quantitative and qualitative structure of the representative branch of power of different levels is not sufficiently analysed. In addition, the researchers do not single out the West Ukrainian representatives from the total number of deputies of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and, accordingly, do not pay attention to the regional characteristics of the diplomatic corps.

The purpose of the article is to elucidate the features of formation of the representative branch of the bodies of power of different levels in the West Ukrainian regions in the post-war period in their relation to the other regions of Ukr. SSR on the basis of archival sources. Besides, the purpose of this article includes finding out regional features of quantitative and qualitative structure of the deputy representation in the Supreme Soviets (SS) of the USSR, Ukr. SSR, and local authorities.

The statement of the basic material. Despite the fact, that the term of functioning of the Supreme Soviets of the USSR, its republics and local authorities of the first cadence had expired yet in 1941–1942, the representatives of the regime during the post-war period did not hasten to restore the representative institutions, primarily adjusting the work of the executive branch of power, party and power structures. For that there were several reasons. First, the work of the representative branch of power in the Soviet Union was of secondary value in the control system of the state and, also, was ineffective. Actually, Soviets but duplicated the party's power's vertical, creating a visibility of democracy. Secondly, the war and connected with it material and human losses led to an excessive radicalization of public mood, so that Moscow was afraid that the system of operated democracy could get out of the party control. Many additional problems were connected with the financial difficulties, shortage of the human resource, insufficient probation of the new elective legislation, and so on. After all, the basic reason for postponing the election campaign was the necessity to oppose the national-liberation movements in the occupied after the Second World War regions (the Baltic republics, Western Ukraine, Western Belorussia, Bukovyna, and Transcarpathia).

The movement of the Ukrainian nationalists under the leadership of OUN and UPA in West Ukrainian regions was particularly dangerous for the power, as it actively counteracted the establishment of the Soviet regime and threatened to extend the activity to the whole republic's territory. Underestimating the strength of the Ukrainian insurgents, the representatives of the regime expected to cope with them during crossing of the fronts, but, nevertheless, the struggle went on for years, so in the West Ukrainian regions the power was compelled to conduct the first elections of the representative branch of power at the background of a sharp military-political conflict which at the break of 1945–1946 reached its peak of development. It created definite hardships for the power in the course of preparation and organization of the elections, but did not influence in any way the formation of structure of the deputy corps which was defined in the party offices long before the voting process.

During the war the numerical structure of the deputy corps of the USSR and Ukr. SSR were sharply reduced. From the total of deputies who balloted from the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of the first convocation, 28 were subjected to repression and 22 perished (the List of deputies of the SS of the USSR of the first convocation). 22 persons from among the deputies of the SS of the Ukr. SSR left the structure of the deputy corps for various reason (were killed at the front, subjected to repression, shot by the Germans, liquidated by the Banderites, sent to Germany, taken prisoner, etc.). By the beginning of 1946 the representatives of the power had no uniform information about 13 people's electees of the SS of the Ukr. SSR of the first convocation (CSAHAB of Ukraine. Fund 1. Description 31. Case 2. Pages 1–82). As a result at the sixth session of SS of the Ukr. SSR in March, 1944, which considered problems of post-war restoration of the country, only 2/3 deputies were present. By May 1st, 1945 289 persons or 72 % out of 400 deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR of the first convocation were within the republic. By the beginning of 1946 it became possible to restore over 80 % of the pre-war deputy structure of the SS of the Ukr. SSR, but almost 20 % were lost for ever (The history of the state service in Ukraine: 342–345).

In particular, large losses were observed at the local level. For example, of the corresponding quantity of deputies of country Soviets of the Ukr. SSR of the first convocation by the beginning of 1945 only 50 % remained, of city Soviets' deputies only 33 % remained, of regional Soviets' deputies only 29 % remained, and of rural only 40 % remained (Dokash: 11–16). In the West Ukrainian regions those losses were still larger: of 76 deputies of Lviv region Soviet, elected in 1940, by January 1st, 1945 only 32 men (42 %), of 73 deputies of Drohobych region Soviet only 23 persons (31 %), and of 29 deputies of Rivne region only 13 persons (44 %) were documentally fixed (The quantitative and qualitative structure of deputies of regional Soviets of deputies of workers). That is, on average, the regional Soviet of the West Ukrainian regions by the beginning of 1945 was filled only for 35–40 %. The district Soviets here were presented only by a few electees, and in many village Soviets remained no electees at all. In particular, in Lviv region in Peremysliany district Soviet of 51 deputies, elected in 1940, only 3 remained, in Bibrka district Soviet of 40 deputies 8 remained. (SALR. Fund 221. Description 2. Case 1766. Pages 61, 65.).

In their response to the inquiry of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR which demanded in February, 1945 to be informed on the available structure of deputies of the first convocation, the local power bodies complained that to find the whereabouts of the majority of the former deputies was impossible through the loss of that time records and fluidity of the population. Moreover, Mr Dmytrysh, the secretary of Rivne region Soviet's

executive committee, on April, 10th, 1945 informed that in 6 districts of the region it was impossible to establish the exact data about the structure of their Soviets as the archives did not keep out and there remained no people who could give the information (CSAHAB of Ukraine.Fund 1. Description 20. Case 4. Page 112).

The reduction of the number of deputies in the West Ukrainian regions, except all-Union factors, had a number of additional circumstances. E. g., many of “people's electees” of the village and district Soviets perished from the hands of the Banderites, many other emigrated to the West or— for various reason were —hid from the Soviet power, living in illegal position. The flow of deputies also took place because of specification of the western border after the end of the Second World War. D. Roman, the secretary of Drohobych regional Soviet of deputies of workers' Executive committee, informed the Presidium of the SS of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in his reference of February 9, 1945 that the reduction of the quantity of deputies was connected with the withdrawal of a part of Drohobych region's territory to Poland (CSAHAB of Ukraine.Fund 1. Description 20. Case 4. Page 52). And in Sokal land, which was attached to the Ukr. SSR during the post-war period (in exchange for oil deposits in Dobromyl territory), the deputies to the Soviet representative bodies of power were not elected at all.

Proceeding from it, the Central Committee (CC) in its act of April 1st, 1944 “On administrative bodies of the local Soviets of workers' deputief” decided to restore the Soviets and their executive committees at the expense of the local party and Soviet's activists. That is, the structure of local Soviets began to be filled «manually» with the necessary people, and with neglect of democracy principles. In view of this, by January, 1st, 1947 throughout the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in regional Soviets 37,7 % of the persons had no deputy mandates. In district Soviets this figure was 23,8 %, and in village Soviets it was 32,3 % (CSAHAB of Ukraine.Fund 1 were deputies only. Description 30. Case 589. Page 7).

The election campaigns carried out in 1946–1947 brought about the next structure of deputy corps of the SS of the USSR, and republics and local Soviets, which was renewed almost in 80 %. Not even the cardinal renewal of the structure of the representative branch of power did not make its activity more efficient and did not reduce their dependence on the party structures. Supervising the elections at each stage, the representatives of the regime took care, that exclusively loyal to the power citizens got into the representative bodies. In particular, all care was taken in order no persons who co-operated with the Nazis or participants of the national-liberation movement, or were in a captivity were elected there. That is, Stalin and his supporters once again generated pocket representations with a very extremely limited right of vote at different levels of the Soviet branch of power.

The qualitative structure of deputy corps of the Ukr. SR of the second convocation in the core kept the tendencies planned during 1938–1941 election campaigns, although separate indicators showed variability. E. g., joining of the West Ukrainian territories to the Ukr. SSR made deputy structure of the SS of the Ukr. SSR more Ukrainian. If in the SS of the Ukr. SSR of the first convocation elected in 1938 the Ukrainians made up 45– 50 % on average, the deputy corps of the second convocation had already 296 Ukrainians (71 %), and the third had 309 (73 %). As a part of the representation to SS of the Ukr. SSR from the West Ukrainian regions of the second convocation there were still more Ukrainians, namely, 83 representatives (86 %), and of the third they were 86 (90 %). The quantity increase of the representatives of the Ukrainian nationality in the diplomatic corps was linked with the party instructions to more actively promote the representatives of the local population in the West

Ukrainian regions on to administrative posts, and a relative liberalisation of the national policy of the regime during the post-war period in general. However, in 1960s – 1980s the quantity of Ukrainians among deputies constantly decreased, and, at the same time, the quantity of Russians and representatives of other nationalities increased. In addition, a considerable part of deputies-Ukrainians belonged to the Russified persons who did not know the Ukrainian language and culture, and who imagined themselves inferior elements.

To the second – by the quantity – national group in the SS of the Ukr. SSR the Russians belonged, who in the parliament of the second convocation made up 110 members. (27 %), and in that of the third convocation they were 102 (24 %). Taking into consideration, that the number of Russians in the population of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in 1930s – 1940s was approximately 10 %, their representation in the SS of the Ukr. SSR was evidently overestimated. Especially, it was inconsistently large among the deputies from the West Ukrainian regions where Russians as a national minority made up no more than 2 percent of the local population. So, to the SS of the Ukr. SSR of the second and of the third convocations from the West Ukrainian regions 13 (14 %) and 10 (10 %) Russians respectively were elected. To the representative branch of power of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, besides the Ukrainians and Russians, persons of other nationalities (Georgians, Jews, Armenians, Byelorussians, and others) were elected, whose quantity, however, did not exceed 1,5 % (CSAHAB of Ukraine traditionally got. Fund 1. Description 20. Case 119. Page 3).

In particular, the national palette of local Soviets was motley. E. g., on December 21, 1947 to the local Soviets in Ukr. SSR the following members were elected: Jews – 3.748 (1,22 %), Poles – 1.817 (0,6 %), Bulgarians – 1.367 (0,4 %), Byelorussians - 1.154 (0,38 %), Greeks - 684 (0,22 %), Romanians – 604 (0,2 %), Czechs – 90 (0,03 %), Tatars – 92 (0,03 %), Latvians – 37 (0,01 %), Mordvinians – 39, Georgian – 33, Albanians – 30, Chuvashs – 27, Lithuanians-23, Ossetins – 21, Uzbeks – 11 (CSAHAB of Ukraine. Fund 1. Description 18. Case 50. Page 13). However, in the West Ukrainian regions to local Soviets mainly Ukrainians, Russians, Poles, and Jews were elected. For example, to Lviv regional Soviet of the second convocation in December 1947 70 Ukrainians and only 10 Russians were elected (State Archive of Lviv Oblast. Fund 231. Description 2. Case 244. Page 1).

The characteristics of deputy structure by political signs, certainly, were not marked by a great variety. There were regional and village Soviets in which structure there were only Ukrainians. Among deputies, the members and candidates in members of the All-Union Communist party (of the Bolsheviks) and the Communist party (of the Bolsheviks) of Ukraine, as also Komsomol members prevailed. The rest were such who did not belong to the party, privately depended on the party colleagues, and had no possibility to represent separate thoughts. The quantity of the party members constantly increased. Thus, to the Ukr. SSR's regional Soviets in December, 1947 17.048 or 62 % of the general structure of deputies of regional Soviets elected were party members, and during a similar elections of 1950 their quantity already made up 17.963 (64,8 %).

Comparatively less persons with party membership cards were in the representative branch of power of different levels in the West Ukrainian regions. Thus, in the SS of the Ukr. SSR of the second convocation there were 79,76 % of members and candidates for membership, whereas their representation in the West Ukrainian regions was 73,96 %. In particular low quantity of party members was observable in the environment of delegations of local Soviets of the West Ukrainian regions, because the promoted workers from among the locals mainly were not party members. For an example: on December 21, 1947 19 party members

were elected to Vinnytsia regional Soviet, 23 were elected to Stalin regional Soviet, 18 were elected to Poltavaregional Soviet, 22 were elected to Kharkiv regional Soviet, 9 were elected to Volhynian regional Soviet, 7 were elected to Drohobych regional Soviet, 10 were elected to Lvivregional Soviet, 8 were elected to Rivne regional Soviet, and 6 were elected to Stanislaviv regional Soviet (CSAHAB of Ukraine. Fund R-1. Description 18. Case 44. Page 43). 140 party members were elected to district Soviets in Voroshylovhrad region, 199 were elected to those in Zhytomyr region, 159 were elected to those in Poltava region, 62 were elected to those in Volhynian region, 51 were elected to those in Drohobych region, 58 were elected in Lviv region, 39 were elected in Stanislaviv region, and 26 were elected to those in Ternopil region (CSAHAB of Ukraine. Fund R-1. Description 18. Case 44. Page 109).

The proportion of deputies who balloted from the West Ukrainian regions, the number of the natives of other regions of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and even of the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic was ever high. Those were the proteges of the party sent to Western Ukraine to make the Soviet transformations. As a rule, they were the first to get to the structure of representative delegations, acquiring the right to represent the thought of the region's population in the SS of the USSR and Ukr. SSR. Whereas the inhabitants of the East Ukrainian regions elected the representatives mainly from the local cadres. Thus, of 15 candidates in the deputies to the SS of the Ukr. SSR of the second convocation in Ternopil region there were only 5 locals (BSA of the SSU. Fund 13. Case 376. Vol. 38. P. 85), while in Voroshylovhrad region this ratio was 18 and 13 (BSA of the SSU. Fund 13. Case 376. V. 38. Page 70).

The administrative and professional posts of candidates in deputies were not marked by a freart variety. The state and party figures of republican, regional and regional levels, leaders of the NKVS (Ministry of Internal Affairs) and NKDB (MGB, Ministry of State Security), heads of large enterprises, high military ranks, chairmen of the village Soviets and collective farms, and the like superiors became promoters of the case of workers and peasants. This all-union practice without changes was applied in the western regions. Particularly, among candidates in the deputies to the SS of the Ukr. SSR from the West Ukrainian regions of the second convocation were such: the well-known Soviet and party figure D.Z. Manuil'skyi, the Heroes of the Soviet Union K.M. Halytskyi and M.I. Naumov, major-general O.V. Chapayev, – the son of the known guerrilla leader Vasily Chapayev, one of leading figures of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the KGB of the RSFR A.O. Nikiforov, and others. At the same time, from among the local population they elected mainly the members of the CPWU and physical laborer (successive collective farmers and workers), who for the lack of education often could not carry out not only legislative, but also representative functions. The power had it that the well checked up people and those devoted to the party should be dominant in the higher echelons of power, therefore, the aforementioned tendency remained for long time. In particular, to the Council of Nationalities of the SS of the USSR on March, 12, 1950 from the West Ukrainian regions 6 representatives were elected, of them 2 secretaries of regional party organizations, 3 chairmen of executive committee, and one chairman of a collective farm, – all members and candidates in members of CP of Ukraine. (CSAHAB. Fund 1. Description 20. Case 233. Page 1). In the rest regions of the Ukr. SSR which population already had well acquired the rules of the Soviet electoral games, the power could operate in a more democratic manner. Here they proposed much more workers and peasants to be electees. So, from the Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhiaregions to the Council of Nationalities of the SS of the USSR in 1950 from among the nomenclature workers only two secretaries of executive

committees of regional Soviets were elected, of Voroshylovhrad region just one secretary of the city CP organization was elected, of Kiev region also one minister was elected, and in the rest were regions workers and employees, including poets Rylskyi and Tychyna (CSAHAB of Ukraine.Fund1. Description 20. Case 233. Pages 6-8).

In general, the percentage of workers and peasants as deputies of SS of the USSR and Ukr. SSR in the studied period was insignificant and constantly decreasing. Within to prove that the SS of the Ukr. SSR really has national representation, at conclusion of statistical data chairmen of collective farms, heads of MTS, pedagogues, doctors, etc. were treated as workers and peasants. At the same time, intelligentsia in the Soviet parliament was traditionally represented by just few persons, despite the fact that this social layer made the most qualitative element of the deputy corps.

Educational level of the basic quantity of deputies was not high, however, to the SS of the USSR and Ukr. SSR many people with the higher and incomplete higher education were elected. Especially, in the SS of the Ukr. SSR of their second convocation such made up 158 (38,6 %) and 27 (6,5 %) respectively. All the same, people with secondary and elementary education prevailed (27 (6,5 %) with secondary special, 57 (13,7) with the secondary general, 146 (34,7 %) with primary (CSAHAB of Ukraine.Fund1. Description 20. Case 119. Page 4). At local levels an equal quantity of representatives with higher education was, in general, scanty, though an accurate tendency to increase of the general educational level of promoted workers was observed.

At the The quantity of women in representative structures was defined by a quota and made approximately third of all promoted workers. To local Soviets of females selected *большой*, in particular on equal regional, city and *поселковых* Soviets. In particular to SS of the Ukr. SSR of the second convocation 112 women (26,99 %) (CSAHAB of Ukraine have been selected approximately.Fund1. Description 18. Case 50. Page 10), and to local Soviets in chest 1947 – 99.770 (32,46 %) women (CSAHAB of Ukraine.Fund1. Description 18. Case 50. Page 10зв.-11). During the third and fourth cadences the proof tendency to increase in quantity of women in representative structures of the power is observed. In particular, to the local Soviets of the third cadence on December, 17, 1950 106.828 (33,1 %) women were elected (CSAHAB of Ukraine.Fund1. Description 20. Case 214. Pages 1–7): 6.282 (38,1 %) were elected to city Soviets of regional and republican subordination, 3.830 (38,12 %) to district Soviets of cities, 5.177 (35,11 %) were elected to town Soviets (CSAHAB of Ukraine.Fund1. Description 20. Case 214. Pages 1–7).

From the West Ukrainian regions to the SS of the Ukr. SSR only 23 % of women (out of 115 deputies 27 were women) on February, 9, 1947 were put forward, but it was considerably more, than the number elected to the SS of the Ukr. SSR of the first convocation, wherein women made up only one fifth, and even one sixth (15–20 %) of the general structure of deputies (CSAHAB of Ukraine.Fund1. Description 20. Case 4. Page 11). Such a state of things was explained by a traditional role of the woman in the West Ukrainian society, her dependence on the financial position of the man and her lacking corresponding skills and appropriate education. For example, to the SS of the Ukr. SSR on February, 9, 1947 in Kiev region 8 women, in Kharkiv region 7, in Chernihiv region 6, and in Volhynian region 3, in Drohobych region 4, in Transcarpathian region 2 women were put forward (CSAHAB of Ukraine. Fund1. Description 18. Case 50. Page 10).

The age of the majority of deputies of the investigated period embraced 30-40 years, but already then the tendency to parliament ageing was observed. During 2 to 10 convocations

of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR the quantity of deputies of 30–39 years old shortened from 29,8 % to 15,5 %, or by 14,3 %, of 40–49 years old shortened from 46,9 % to 30,9 %, or by 16 %. At the same time, from the 2nd to the 10th convocations the number of deputies aged 50 grew from 13,5 % to 38,3 %, or by 24,8 % (Kravchenko, Tytarenko, 1998: 17–19).

Some part of deputies were elected simultaneously to several representations, because the Soviet elective legislation did not contain any cautions about it. Thus, to the SS of the USSR and Ukr. SSR of the second convocation D. Z. Manuiliyskiy, P.N. Reshetniak, M.S. Hrechuha, I.I. Turianytsia, and others were simultaneously elected. Many deputies were «old residents» put forward for 3 to 5 cadences successively which resisted the process of renewal of the representative branch of power. However, such phenomenon as family relationship, so expressively present in the parliament of contemporary Ukraine, was not observed.

Conclusions. So, a restoration of the structure of the deputy corps of different levels in the Ukr. SSR during the post-war period took place with infringement of terms and legislative norms, which was connected with difficult political circumstances, and wishes of officials to keep the influence on the functioning of the representative branch of power. Qualitative characteristics of deputy representation from the West Ukrainian regions of the investigated period considerably differed from the structure of people's electees of the rest of the Ukr. SSR's regions by political, social, national, and gender features, which could be explained by the different historical-political development of the specified territories. Power representatives tried to unify the qualitative structure of representation from the West Ukrainian regions, to make it identical in relation to the other regions of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, what, however, was achieved only in the 1960s years. The structure of the representative branch of power in the West Ukrainian regions and the Ukr. SSR on the whole did not display political and social stratification of the society, and was a result of the artificial quotas established by the power on purpose to show the democratic character of the regime.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Власкін, 1966 – Власкін П.О. До питання про роботу партійних організацій України з кадрів місцевих Рад (1959–1964) // Український історичний журнал. К., 1966. С. 56–64.

Восленский, 1991 – Восленский М. Номенклатура. М.: Советская Россия, МП Октябрь, 1991. 624 с.

Докаш, 2013 – Докаш О.Ю. Політика відновлення органів влади та управління західних областей УРСР на завершальному етапі Другої світової війни: структурно-кадровий зріз // Наука і сучасність: виклики глобалізації. (Міжнародна конференція, м. Київ, 25 травня 2013 р.). Част. II (юрідичні науки, педагогічні науки, політичні науки). К.: Центр наукових публікацій, 2013. С. 131–135.

Історія державної служби, 2009 – Історія державної служби в Україні. У 5-ти томах. Головне управління державної служби України Інститут історії України Національної академії наук України / Відп. Ред. Т. В. Мотренко, В. А. Смолій. К.: Ніка-Центр, 2009. Т. 2. 536 с.

Кірсанова, 1981 – Кірсанова О. Я. Розвиток суспільно-політичної активності трудящих західних областей УРСР у процесі будівництва основ соціалізму. К.: Наукова думка, 1981. 224 с.

Кондратюк, 2005 – Кондратюк К., Леськів М. Формування репресивного апарату тоталітарного режиму в західних областях України (1944 – 1953) // Наукові зошити історичного факультету Львівського національного університету ім. І. Франка: зб. наук. праць. Львів, ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2005. Вип. 7. С. 339–346.

Кравченко, 1998; Титаренко, 1998 – Кравченко В. Титаренко Ю. Державотворення в Україні. Історія та сучасність. Донецьк, 1998. С. 17–19.

Трофим'як, 1970 – Трофим'як Ю.М. Добір і виховання керівних кадрів з активу жінок: (На матеріалах західних областей УРСР, 1946–1955 рр.) // Наукові праці з історії КПРС. К., 1970. Вип. 37. С. 123–130.

Список депутатів – Список депутатів ВР СРСР першого скликання // URL: <https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki>

ГДА СБУ – Галузевий державний архів Служби Безпеки України, м.Київ

ДАЛО – Державний архів Львівської області.

ЦДАВО України – Центральний державний архів вищих органів влади України.

REFERENCES

Vlaskin, 1966 – Vlaskin P.O. Do pytannia pro robotu partiinykh orhanizatsii Ukrainy z kadramy mistsevykh Rad (1959–1964) [On the work of the party organizations of Ukraine with the cadres of the local Soviets in 1959–1964] // *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*. K., 1966. Pp. 56–64. [in Ukrainian]

Voslenskiy, 1991 – Voslenskiy M. Nomenklatura [Nomenclature]. M.: Sovetskaia Rossyia, MP Oktiabr, 1991. 624 p. [in Russian]

Dokash, 2013 – Dokash O. Yu. Polityka vidnovlennia orhaniv vlady ta upravlinnia zakhidnykh oblastei URSS na zavershalnomu etapi Druhoi svitovoi viiny: strukturno-kadrovyyi zriz [The policy of renovation of organs of power and administration of the western regions of Ukraine at the final stage of WWII: a structural section of cadres] // *Nauka i suchasnist: vyklyky hlobalizatsii*. (Mizhnarodna konferentsiia, m. Kyiv, 25 travnia 2013 r.). Chast. II (iurydychni nauky, pedahohichni nauky, politychni nauky). – K.: Tsentr naukovykh publikatsii, 2013. P. 131–135. [in Ukrainian]

Istoriia derzhavnoi sluzhby, 2009 – Istoriia derzhavnoi sluzhby v Ukraini. U 5-ty tomakh. [The history of the state service in Ukraine. In 5 volumes] Holovne upravlinnia derzhavnoi sluzhby Ukrainy Instytut istorii Ukrainy Natsionalnoi akademii nauk Ukrainy. / Vidp. Red. T. V. Motrenko, V. A. Smolii. K.: Nika-Tsentr, 2009. T. 2. 536 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kirsanova, 1981 – Kirsanova O. Ya. Rozvytok suspilno-politychnoi aktyvnosti trudiashchykh zakhidnykh oblastei URSS u protsesi budivnytstva osnov sotsializmu [The development of social-political activity of workers of the western regions of Ukraine in the process of building of the bases of socialism in Ukraine] / O. Ya. Kirsanova. K.: Naukova dumka, 1981. – 224 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kondratiuk, Leskiv, 2005 – Kondratiuk K., Leskiv M. Formuvannia represyvnogo aparatu totalitarnoho rezhymu v zakhidnykh oblastiakh Ukrainy (1944 – 1953) [The formation of the totalitarian apparatus in the western regions of Ukraine (1944 – 1953)] // *Naukovi zoshyty istorychnoho fakultetu Lvivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu im. I. Franka: zb. nauk, prats*. Lviv, LNU imeni Ivana Franka, 2005. Vyp. 7. P. 339–346. [in Ukrainian]

Kravchenko, Tytarenko, 1998 – Kravchenko V. Tytarenko Yu. Derzhavotvorennia v Ukraini. Istoriia ta suchasnist [The state creation in Ukraine. Its history and contemporaneity]. Donetsk, 1998. Pp. 17–19. [in Ukrainian]

Trofym'iak, 1970 – Trofym'iak Yu.M. Dobir i vykhovannia kerivnykh kadrov z aktyvu zhinok: (Na materialakh zakhidnykh oblastei URSS, 1946–1955 rr. [Selection and upbringing of managing cadres from women-activists (On the materials of the western regions of Ukraine 1946–1955)]) // *Naukovi pratsi z istorii KPRS*. K., 1970. Vyp. 37. Pp. 123–130. [in Ukrainian]

Spysok deputativ – Spysok deputativ VR SRSR pershoho sklykannia [The list of deputies of the SS of the USSR of the first convocation] // URL: <https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki> [in Ukrainian]

HDA SBU – Haluzevyi derzhavnyi arkhiv Sluzhby Bezpeky Ukrainy [The branch state archive of the Security Service of Ukraine], m. Kyiv.

DALO – Derzhavnyi arkhiv Lvivskoi oblasti [The state archive of Lviv oblast].

TsDAVO Ukrainy – Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchykh orhaniv vlady Ukrainy [The central state archive of the higher bodies of power of Ukraine].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.04.2018 р.

UDC 930.1:94(477)-058.243«1946–1965»
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130665

Dmytro NEFYODOV,

orcid.org/0000-0003-1992-7271

Ph D hab. (History), Postdoctoral student of Department of History of Mykolaiv V. O. Sukhomlynsky National University (Ukraine, Mykolaiv) nefyodovdv@gmail.com

THE UKRAINIAN SSR POSTWAR WORKING CLASS (1946 – 1965) IN THE EVALUATION OF THE SOVIETOLOGY IN THE WEST

The article describes the most important tendencies in the study of the history of the Ukrainian Soviet working class of the postwar period (1946 – 1965) in Western historiography. The achievements, main ideas and peculiarities of the historiographical process, methods of historical research, influence of socio-political phenomena on the themes and content of works of Sovietologists are determined.

The main thesis of the article is the statement that Western historical science paid much attention to the study of the Ukrainian Soviet society of postwar twenty years, in particular to the study of the situation of the Soviet workers as the most mass class of the society.

The key thesis of the Western Sovietology regarding the problems of Ukrainian Soviet postwar working class was the emphasis on the complete lack of workers' rights. According to the Sovietologists, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union pursued a policy of industrial totalitarianism towards the Soviet working class, imposing on workers the orientation of accelerated forced industrial development at any cost, causing the workers a direct material as well as indirect social and moral damage.

One of the central places in the study of the situation of Ukrainian working class in the first postwar twenty years is obtained by the conclusion of the Western scholars regarding the strengthening of the targeted Russianization policy of Moscow, including the method of relocating a significant number of Russian workers to the cities of South-Eastern Ukraine.

Key words: *Ukrainian SSR, working class, historiography, Sovietology.*

Дмитро НЕФЬОДОВ,

кандидат історичних наук, докторант кафедри історії Миколаївського національного університету імені В. О. Сухомлинського (Україна, Миколаїв) nefyodovdv@gmail.com

ПОВОЄННЕ РОБІТНИЦТВО УРСР (1946 – 1965 рр.) В ОЦІНЦІ ЗАХІДНОЇ РАДЯНОЛОГІЇ

У статті охарактеризовано найважливіші тенденції дослідження історії українського радянського робітництва повоєнного періоду (1946 – 1965 рр.) в західній історіографії. Визначено досягнення, головні ідеї та особливості історіографічного процесу, методи історичного дослідження, вплив суспільно-політичних явищ на тематику та зміст праць радянологів.

Основною тезою статті є твердження про те, що західна історична наука велику увагу приділяла вивченню українського радянського суспільства в повоєнні двадцятиріччя, зокрема дослідженню становища радянських робітників як найбільш масового класу соціуму.

Ключовими тезами західної радянології стосовно проблематики українського радянського повоєнного робітництва стало акцентування уваги на повному безправ'ї робітників. На переконання радянологів, стосовно радянського робітництва КІПС проводила політику індустріального тоталітаризму, нав'язуючи робітникам установки пришивишеного форсованого інду-

сприального розвитку будь-якою ціною, завдаючи робітникам як прямого матеріального, так і непрямого соціального та морального збитку.

Одне з центральних місць при дослідженні становища українського робітництва в перше повоєнне двадцятиріччя займає висновок західних науковців щодо посилення цілеспрямованої політики русифікації з боку Москви у тому числі методом переселення значної кількості російських робітників до міст Південно-Східної України.

Ключові слова: УРСР, робітництво, історіографія, радянологія.

The statement of the problem. The historiographic development of the situation of the Ukrainian SSR working class during postwar twenty years is incomplete without analyzing the achievements of foreign historical science. Democratic conditions for the development of the historical science in the western world and the absence of populist barriers became the main condition for the high effectiveness of foreign scientists' scientific creativity. In addition, the entry of domestic Clio to the world scientific community requires carrying out of holistic and complex historiographical studies involving the entire array of available sources, but not only with the use of domestic works.

The analysis of sources and recent researches. Having analyzed the state of the scientific development of the problem, we must emphasize the fact that the historiographical works on the subject of the Soviet working class with the use of works by Western researchers are in fact absent in modern Ukrainian historical science. On the related issue, the attention is drawn to the dissertation of the researcher N. Laas (Laas, 2009), which is devoted to a broader topic, i.e., the determination of the level of Sovietology on the problems of social and cultural history of Ukraine during the postwar period on the basis of the analysis of English-language works. N. Laas paid special attention to the analysis of Sovietologist concepts of Ukrainian Soviet society and social stratification. The dissertation partly presents the working class topic. Certain All-Union working class topics were discovered in the dissertations of such Russian researchers as V. Drozdov (Drozdov, 1998), Ye. Kodin (Kodin, 1998), and A. Nekrasov (Nekrasov, 2001) devoted to the analysis of the Sovietology level.

Thus, in modern historical science there is no historiographical development of the situation of the Ukrainian Soviet working class in the postwar period based on the analysis of Sovietology scientific works by Western scholars.

The publication's purpose is to characterize the most important tendencies in the study of the Ukrainian SSR postwar working class (1946 – 1965) by Western historical science, to determine the achievements, the main ideas and the peculiarities of the historiographical process, the methods of historical research, the influence of socio-political phenomena on the subject and content of Sovietologists' works.

Statement of the basic material. The establishment of Western Sovietology began in the context of the Cold War development, which led to a corresponding vector of Soviet studies in integration of the academic sciences of the socio-humanitarian spectrum with military specialist programs. At the initial stage of the development, Sovietology had to provide the applied data for a more precise study of the potential enemy and understanding of the situation in which large social groups of the Soviet society, including the Soviet working class, were at that time. Measures of a victorious nature were to be used in propaganda against the USSR and the countries of the socialist camp, as well as in order to curb the further spread of the «communist threat» across the Atlantic Ocean. The pragmatic nature and participation in creating «the image of the enemy» in the subconscious of ordinary Americans led to a significant politicization of the Sovietology works of the first postwar years. However, these

circumstances did not become fatal for the Western historical science and did not drastically lower the professional level of the first works.

The similar approaches of the historians of Great Britain and the USA to the study of post-war Soviet society allowed us to define in our study the term «Sovietology» as the works, first and foremost, of the representatives of English-speaking Western historiography. It should be noted that the American Sovietology goes beyond the US boundaries because of the fact that the US Sovietology was directly developing in close connection with the historical and political sciences of Great Britain and Canada and which had a great influence on it. In subsequent postwar decades, scientists from Australia, France, Germany, Japan and several other countries of the world also studied the USSR, but the primacy throughout the studied period was kept by the English-language science.

In the second half of the 1940s – early 1950s, primarily through the efforts of the US government, as well as the grant support of a number of philanthropic foundations at the universities of the United States and Great Britain, a number of specialized centers for the study of both the USSR as a whole and the Ukrainian SSR in particular were created. The preference was given, first of all, to the study of the Russian and Ukrainian languages, the study of the Soviet economy, the situation of large social groups (first of all, the working class). In addition to the methodological tools of purely historical science, the study of Soviet society actively used means of economics, political science, sociology, and cultural studies. Lack of access to Soviet archives, the need to use open Soviet data with their secondary analysis led to the formation of a specific multidisciplinary methodological tool.

The totalitarian paradigm became the first universal Sovietology concept, designed to answer any question regarding the Soviet reality. Aimed at ensuring the national interests of the United States and supporting the evidence base of the advantage of the Western capitalist world over the Soviet socialism it was actively used in applied political research, providing support for US foreign policy towards confrontation with the USSR.

In 1951, the first book of the researcher H. Arendt «Sources of Totalitarianism» was published in the United States (Arendt, 1951). With the reissue in 1958, 1966, 1968, 1973, 1976, 1979 in the United States and a huge number of reprints in other countries, this work became an indispensable guide of the totalitarian direction of Sovietology. According to H. Arendt, totalitarianism led to the destruction of all social, legislative and political traditions in the USSR, the elimination of classes and the creation of a classless society took place. Only in a classless society, according to H. Arendt, totalitarianism is possible (Arendt, 1951: 459).

The analysis of the «anatomy» of Soviet totalitarianism is highlighted in the work of Professor M. Fainsod «How is Russia Ruled» (Fainsod, 1963), published in 1953 and which also got through a large number of reprints. This work greatly strengthened the position of the totalitarian direction in Sovietology and became a peculiar beacon for all subsequent works of this school. According to historian A. Gleason, the work of M. Fainsod not only «defined the strategic thinking of American Sovietologists about the USSR for twenty years ahead», but also created a «totalitarianism syndrome with a culmination in the form of a totalitarian model of American Sovietology» (Gleason, 1984: 151).

In 1953, Professor of Harvard University C. Friedrich organized a scientific conference on totalitarianism, in which such Sovietologists as B. Wolf, G. Kennan, A. Ulam and M. Fainsod took part. Soon, a specialist from the USSR Z. Brzezinski joined the group, and in the co-authorship of C. Friedrich and Z. Brzezinski, a third peculiar pillar of the totalitarian concept was created, i.e. the book «Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy» (Friedrich, Brzezinski, 1956).

The official Washington highly praised the work of the Sovietologists of the totalitarian direction, as evidenced by their involvement in the service as presidential advisers. So, in J. Carter's administration Z. Brzezinski worked as a National Security Adviser, M. Schulman worked as a USSR adviser. The private negative attitude towards the USSR manifested itself both in the political sphere and in scientific opinions on the pages of Sovietology studies.

According to this concept, the Soviet government has a pronounced totalitarian nature and periods that change each other, which is just a succession of generations. Characterizing the Post-Stalin decade, the representatives of the totalitarian direction call it «developed totalitarianism» (by analogy with the Soviet concept of the transition period of «developed socialism»), and «the internal logic of totalitarianism» is called the driving force of the Soviet society development (Cohen, 1985: 42). Sovietologists of the totalitarian direction explain the partial liberalization and democratization of socio-political life in the USSR during M. Khrushchov's rule by the lack of the need for the continuation of mass political repression through the destruction of any opposition in principle. In general, «totalitarians» emphasize that the Soviet power had the anti-people nature and was supported not by the working class, as declared in all party documents and speeches, but by the so-called narrow stratum of the party's «ruling elite» (Fainsod, 1963: 375).

The partial liberalization of all spheres of social and political life in the USSR, connected with M. Khrushchov's coming to power and the political crisis in the USA itself, led to the weakening of the positions of the Sovietology totalitarian direction. The desire of the younger generation of professional historians to oppose totalitarian historians who came to science after service in intelligence agencies and the desire to reduce the level of politicization of historical science led to actualization of the study of the socio-economic history of the USSR, the strengthening of the position of representatives of the Sovietology revisionist direction. In the works of Sh. Fitzpatrick, A. Meyer, W. Chase, H. Kumor, L. Siegelbaum, the monotheistic conception of the Soviet system is denied, the attention is focused on social history and the situation of Soviet workers. Unlike historians of totalitarian direction, who viewed the Soviet social system as a unique phenomenon in the organization of human civilization, the revisionists sought to find common ground between the situation of working class in the USSR and the West.

The new wave of intensification of Sovietophobia in the 1970s was caused by sending in Soviet troops to Afghanistan and a new turning point in the fight against the «evil empire» headed by the US President R. Reagan. Again a powerful funding of Sovietology think tanks and strengthening of the totalitarian direction in Sovietology began.

In 1983, the US Congress passed the Act on Soviet-East European Studies and training of specialists with financial federal support from American universities. As a result, in the late 1980s, 250 universities in the United States contained about two thousand teachers and 7,000 courses devoted mainly to the recent history of the USSR.

A great financial support to the Sovietology think tanks of the United States and Great Britain was provided by the so-called «philanthropic foundations». In the USA, about 30 thousand funds with a total capital of over 30 billion dollars annually appropriates more than 2 billion dollars to fund 150 institutions and 200 university departments. Thus, the Ford Foundation provides support to 107 of the 200 US Sovietology Centers, the Rockefeller Foundation provides support to 18 and the Carnegie Corporation to 17 Sovietology Centers. Funded by the Ford Foundation in 1967, the Center for International Studies of the School of Economic Sciences in London was founded.

The theme of the social structure of the Soviet society remained the very topical direction of the Western Sovietology research throughout the period under study. Contrasted with other themes, the working class attracted the greatest attention as the largest social group and the driving force of the industrial development of the USSR. A special interest in the study of the Soviet working class is observed in the revisionists' community, for which in the Sovietology the latter received appreciation of social historians of the USSR.

One of the first English-language works devoted to the analysis of the political situation of Ukraine under the authority of the USSR is the monograph by C. Manning «Ukraine under the Soviets» (Manning, 1953), on the pages of which Ukraine and the Ukrainian population are presented as an experimental field in the hands of the Soviet regime, in which they polished methods that were later used in the Baltic and Eastern European countries.

An important conceptual component of Sovietology studies of the first postwar five-year plans was the thesis about the nature of the relations between the Ukrainian SSR and Moscow in the «metropolis-colony» wake. Western researchers focus on the fact that during the fourth five-year plan they set the hidden task to further link the Ukrainian economy to the center, increase the percentage of the raw materials of the Ukrainian industry. Also, the scientists pay attention to the slow pace of rebuilding work, the frank failure in the industry of group «B», which was deliberate in their opinion, the containment of the industrial development of the Ukrainian SSR at the expense of the predominant development of the RSFSR eastern regions.

A number of Western Sovietologists focus on the fact that the rapid rebuilding of the Ukrainian SSR heavy industry did not correspond to the interests of the Ukrainian population. But at the same time, T. Dunmore emphasizes that efforts were focused on the reconstruction of the civilian sectors of heavy industry, while in the eastern RSFSR defense enterprises were of greater importance (Dunmore, 1980: 37).

Evaluating the level of development of «B» industries, aimed at the production of consumer goods and services, Western Sovietologists state that they are secondary in comparison with heavy industry, military and space industries. According to A. Nove, during postwar twenty years the light industry suffered heavy losses and was funded by the residual principle owing to the fact that the Soviet political leaders and planners chose to develop the economic growth and military weapons. Bringing a number of industries to the rank of «non-priority» led to the fact that they could not claim to get proper attention and funding (Nove, 1978: 70). Researcher B. Gwertzman does not exclude a deliberate policy, targeted to curb the development of the service sector in the USSR (Gwertzman, 1982: 11).

Western Sovietology denies the class nature of the CPSU. Thus, professor of the University of California R. Gripp argues that the analysis of the CPSU structure does not provide any ground for expressions of interest of the working class (Gripp, 1973: 180). In the interpretation of the Western Sovietologists the Communist Party represented itself as a narrow group of party leaders, separated from the people and having no relation to society in its goals and objectives (Pethybridge, 1974: 3).

The representatives of the American and Western European Sovietology suggested replacing the concept of «vanguard», which is often used by Soviet historical-party science, by a much more objective term, namely «elite». Thus, according to Sovietologist J. Blondel, the Communist Party is proclaimed to be the vanguard of the proletariat, therefore, it is not a mere representative of the people and Soviet workers, but represents the elite of the Soviet society (Blondel, 1973: 191).

J. Armstrong emphasizes that the Communist Party, by virtue of its monopoly position in the Soviet society and the authoritarian nature of governance, does not express in its policy the interests of the grass-roots (Armstrong, 1974: 135). In particular, researchers exclude any opportunities for the bottom-up initiative of the working class (Duverger, 1972: 14). F. Parkin, a professor at the University of Kent, develops in more detail the concept that socialist societies have a totalitarian power structure in which the party monopolizes the process of making practical decisions at all levels and denies the independence of other political organizations of society (Parkin, 1968: 140). Research scientist of the Emory University R. Blackwell supports this concept and denies any significant influence of workers on decision making within the CPSU (Blackwell, 1972: 137).

According to the Western Sovietologists of the totalitarian direction, the working class in the Soviet society can be exploited, and as a consequence, its leading role is out of the question. Researcher M. Harrington comes to the conclusion that «the Bolsheviki did not create the society that would free workers from exploitation» (Harrington, 1972: 155). Western scholars categorically disagree with the thesis of the Soviet historical science on the fact that state ownership of the main means of production is the economic basis of the leading role of the working class. Thus, Sovietologist M. Markovic draws attention to the fact that the presence of labor exploitation in the USSR and other countries of the socialist camp results primarily from the fact that the means of production are nationalized, but they have never really become public property, but are still alienated from the producers and are in the hands of the ruling elite (Markovic, 1974: 196). Such situation, according to Sovietologists, was established due to the fact that the ruling regime departed from the Marxism postulates and did not transfer the means of production to the direct ownership of producers' cooperatives.

Researchers emphasize that the situation of workers in the USSR does not differ from the position of workers in the countries of the Western capitalist world, and that, as a result of the socialist revolution, the working class's positions did not improve at all (Hollander, 1978: 112). Moreover, Western researchers argue that it is impossible for the working class to play a leading role because of the existence in the USSR of the alienation of producers from the results of their work and the resulting disinterest of the Soviet workers in production. According to scientists, such alienation is inherent in both capitalist and socialist systems, but contrary to the Soviet propaganda, the alienation in the USSR was not only not overcome, but rather intensified, and the worker was transformed into a mere appendage of the technological process. This explains the facts of dishonest attitude to labor and violation of labor discipline (Knight, 1978: 58).

The Western Sovietologists devoted much attention to the debunking of Soviet propaganda's assertion about the «central role» of workers in the management of the state and production, known in Soviet science under the set expression, namely «the development of the social and political activity of the working class». American political scientists and historians Z. Brzezinski, L. Bauman, R. Knight, M. Helen argue that the party and Soviet governmental bodies are isolated from the grass-roots, and the working class does not have democratic rights and is excluded from participation in political processes, and from production management (Bauman, 1976: 92). It is the party leadership, according to Western Sovietologists, which is an insurmountable obstacle for the working class to express true democracy, for the true manifestation of initiatives by the councils in solving problems within their competence (Armstrong, 1974: 84). Councils are viewed by Western researchers as auxiliary agents, which don't make decisions, peculiar symbols of local democracy, which

only legitimize and coordinate decisions that emanate from a monopoly comprehensive party power, and are actually an appendage of the party apparatus (Schapiro, 1970: 78).

Evaluating the participation of the working class in the production management, Western researchers proclaim the removal of Soviet workers from production management in principle (Nove, 1978: 227). In their view, the Soviet working class has no say in the solution of production issues (Conquest, 1967: 7). According to researcher R. Gripp, the participation of workers in production management depends on the boundaries set by the Communist Party (Gripp, 1973: 139).

In general, Western historiography of the totalitarian direction treats the economic policy of the CPSU and the attitude towards the representatives of the working class from the standpoint of an elitist concept. According to Sovietologists, the party's economic policy is subordinated not to the interests of the workers, but to the interests of the ruling elite (Pallet, Shaw, 1981: 28).

The classical «orthodox» model of the Soviet social organization is considered to be presented by the division proposed by the famous representative of the totalitarian direction of Soviet science A. Inkeles. The scientist distinguished the parts of the working class: the so-called «labor aristocracy», represented by workers of higher qualification, «middle workers», low-income workers, as well as workers of concentration camps, which he equated with state slaves (Inkeles, 1968: 152). In the division proposed by A. Inkeles profit plays the decisive role in the stratification.

This concept was used by Sovietologists during the 1960s in the period of the total domination of a totalitarian model of studying Soviet reality. In the 1970s, with the development of the revisionist concept with its bias in sociological science and the use of data from the Soviet population census in 1959, the interest of Sovietologists in the Soviet society class structure increased markedly. The concept of the researcher M. Matthews, who believes that the division of the «inhabitants» of the Soviet «world» into the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia is very simplistic, became popular. According to the scholar, each of these vast social groups consisted of more compact levels in terms of education, professional activity, lifestyle and regional ethnicity (Matthews, 1972: 78).

Describing the intraclass structure of the Soviet working class, a number of Western Sovietologists distinguish in it a series of strata arranged vertically on the basis of the presence or absence of privileges, which is referred in the first place to a high level of remuneration. Thus, the German Sovietologist W. Teckenberg points out the existence of a labor aristocracy in the USSR (Teckenberg, 1981 – 1982: 90). At the same time, according to the researcher, the number of unskilled and auxiliary workers in the USSR is constantly increasing.

Having provided a comprehensive analysis of such strategically important direction of Soviet reality and propaganda as a socialist competition, Western scholars are extremely critical of its true nature and essence. Scientists J. Armstrong (Armstrong, 1974: 70) and J. Berliner (Berliner, 1978: 120) proclaim the fundamental impossibility of productive competition in a socialist society, justifying their point of view by arguing that competition is possible only in the presence of private entrepreneurship. The researchers argue about the impossibility of a genuine competition in the USSR as a result of the state monopoly on means of production that constrains the competition, gives it an artificial character and deprives of the incentives for development (Krylov, 1979: 146). Proclaiming the ruthless exploitation of Soviet workers by the party elite, one of the main methods of this process is recognized by the Sovietologists as a socialist competition (Nove, 1978: 227).

The main idea of the monograph by the British Sovietologist T. Dunmore, which is considered to be a profound and thorough work not only in the Western but also in the World historiography on the subject of the Soviet postwar economy, is the assertion that during the late Stalinist postwar period, the Soviet Union's command economy reached its peak, but at the same time, the economic policy of enterprises was not always determined by the administrative center. This affected workers' situation: the real labor market was significantly different from the theoretical one, specified in government and party documents. So, as T. Dunmore points out, despite the prohibition of changing jobs, during the first postwar years, the level of staff turnover was quite high. The ministries, ignoring the party directives, competed for the workforce and violated the centralized rates of wages. According to the researcher, this factor became one of the reasons for very significant differences in remuneration for the same work in various areas (Dunmore, 1980: 147).

The work of the American economist J. Berliner «Soviet Industry from Stalin to Gorbachev» (Berliner, 1988), an appropriate paragraph of the monograph by British researcher A. Nove (Nove, 1970: 322–368), a collective monograph «Khrushchev and Khrushchevism», published in 1987 under the general editorship of M. McCauley (Khrushchev and Khrushchevism, 1987) and an analytical article by D. Filtzer, devoted to the study of the tariff reform of 1956 (Filtzer, 1989), are of great significance for all further development of Western historiography on the problem of M. Khrushchov's economic policy and the situation of workers in the second postwar decade. The most important conclusion obtained in the process of studying the economic causes of M. Khrushchov's reforms was the one about the need to meet the basic material needs of the population. The research confirms the fact that by the middle of the 1850s the limit in «tightening belts» had been reached and a further development of the Soviet state became impossible without reforms aimed at the material interests of workers. Also, in connection with the expansion of labor freedom in the choice of jobs, the problem of more effective use of the limited resources emerged, that led to the crisis of the planned economy and attempts to find a way out of it (Nove, 1970: 357).

Assessing Khrushchov's social policy, Western scholars state that in this regard the Soviet government «resolutely broke away from the Stalinist past» (McAuley, 1979: 149), positively evaluate the role of trade unions, the increase of the quantity and quality of consumer goods, and the growth of real wages. Having studied the tariff reform of 1956, Western scholars consider it as the most important part of M. Khrushchov's social policy aimed at ensuring productivity growth during the abolition of Stalin's labor legislation in 1940 as well as legitimation of the regime in the eyes of the public (Filtzer, 1989: 95).

At the same time, despite the growth of wages and security of the correspondence of actual and planned growth rates of workers' incomes, historian D. Filtzer states the failure of the tariff reform in many aspects. In particular, the researcher negatively evaluates the process of converting premiums into a permanent part of earnings and as a consequence the decrease of workers' interest to overfulfil the norms. Based on the analysis of the failures of the tariff reform, D. Filtzer comes to the conclusion that it is impossible in principle to create in the Soviet economy a system of economic incentives aimed at the fulfilment and overfulfilment of production norms. According to the scientist, the most important reason for this, besides the absence of a mechanism of market relations, are factors that do not depend on the will of the workers, namely interruptions in the supply of materials to productions, different levels of mechanization and automation of production, irrational division of labor (Filtzer, 1989: 104). Paying great attention to the negative tendencies in the tariff reform, A. McAuley, in the first place, indicates

an insufficient increase in wages, in the result of which the workers had to survive and were not able to keep their families (McAuley, 1979: 151). Scientist M. Kaser points out that the declared increase in wages of low-paid categories of workers during the tariff reform of 1956 was largely offset by rising prices in the following 1958 – 1962 (Kaser, 1970: 143).

In their research, Western Sovietologists constantly emphasize the total lack of Soviet workers' rights (Giddens 1973: 249; Bergson, 1978: 12) and the ineffectiveness of the Soviet economy (Katsenelinboigen, 1978: 28). According to Western researchers, the CPSU pursued a policy of industrial totalitarianism, being a dictator in the field of industrial production, and imposing on the Soviet workers completely alien goals for accelerated economic growth at all costs (Millar, 1981: 64). Typically, the representatives of the totalitarian direction of Sovietology, evaluating the economic policy of the Communist Party in the USSR, identify it with the economy of Hitler's Germany and Nazi Italy (Society and Politics, 1976: 21).

According to Western scholars, the CPSU owned a monopoly on means of production (Neuberger, Duffy, 1976: 177), and workers were completely deprived of their rights (Neuberger, Duffy, 1976: 236). Soviet workers are identified by Sovietologists with workers from Western countries and act, in their opinion, as a workforce (Millar, 1981: 105). Proclaiming the complete removal of workers from property, Western economists and historians proclaim the existence in the USSR of an advanced bureaucracy, which has the right to own means of production. The centralized planning regime, controlled by engineering and technical bureaucracy, is proclaimed by researchers as one of the key factors that deprives workers in the USSR of any real opportunity to participate in production management (Fisk, 1980: 259).

Conclusions. Thus, Western historical science paid a lot of attention to the study of the Ukrainian Soviet society in the postwar twenty years, the study of the situation of Soviet workers as the most mass class of the society in particular.

The peculiarity of Western European and American historiography is the consideration of these issues through the prism of the analysis of the USSR economy, as well as social history. Describing the first postwar decade as the peak of Stalin's conservative economic policy and recognizing the outstanding achievements in the process of the Soviet economic recovery, Western scholars observed the return to the economic model of the 1930s with the accelerated development of industry and an even more significant deterioration in the standard of Soviet workers' living standards. According to Western researchers, during the period of the first two postwar five-year plans, the crisis of the Stalinist economy was clearly established.

Deeply analyzing the reasons and preconditions for economic reforms by M. Khrushchov, the representatives of Western historiography note their positive influence on the workers' situation. In general, Western scholars more objectively evaluate the economic policy of M. Khrushchov than Soviet scholars, and its failures are connected with factors of a systemic nature.

Considering the problems of economic development of the USSR republics, and, accordingly, the situation of workers in these republics, most Western scholars state the imperial character of the center and Moscow's center-periphery colonial policy.

The formation of Sovietology took place under extremely tense conditions of the Cold War mongering. Due to the high level of politicization, Western researchers were set the task to study the state of the Soviet society, including its most numerous representative, namely working class. In the works of A. Meyer, R. Aron, W. Rostow, they formed the concept of «dissolution» of the Soviet working class in the so-called middle class and the final displacement of workers from the sphere of management.

A further evolutionary development of Sovietology and the formation of the younger generation of historians led to the loss of a totalitarian direction's positions and the strengthening of the revisionist direction. In the writings of Sh. Fitzpatrick, A. Meyer, W. Chase, H. Kumor, L. Siegelbaum, the monotheistic conception of the Soviet system is denied, the attention is focused on the social history, the situation of Soviet workers. Unlike historians of the totalitarian direction, who viewed the Soviet social system as a unique phenomenon in the organization of human civilization, the revisionists sought to find common ground between the workers' situation in the USSR and the West.

The 1970s are characterized by a new turn of tension in the international environment and as a consequence of the strengthening of the Sovietology totalitarian direction. In the works of Z. Brzezinski, R. Pipes, A. Ulam, A. Nove, L. Shapiro, R. Aron the concept of stratification of the Soviet working class is formed. According to Western researchers, in the postwar decades the differentiation among the Soviet workers, the formation of the so-called «labor aristocracy» and the reduction of the total number of the working class under the influence of processes of mechanization and automation of production, scientific and technological progress, took place. Much attention of Western researchers was devoted to the search for elements of a market economy and the formation of contradictions in the working environment as a result of hidden unemployment and equal pay.

In the 1980s – 2010s, in Sovietology a whole series of new sociological concepts of studying Soviet society and the workers' situation replaced the confrontation between totalitarianism and revisionism. Among the large number of paradigms, particular attention should be paid to the theory of «convergence», «united industrial society», and «post-industrial society», whose representatives tried to prove the existence of stratification in the Soviet working class and rebirth for the capitalist formation. At the same time, the focus was focused on the totalitarian bureaucratic system and the elitist nature of the USSR power.

One of the central places in the study of the situation of Ukrainian workers in the first postwar twenty years belongs to the conclusion of Western scholars regarding the strengthening of the targeted Russianization policy of Moscow, including the method of relocating a significant number of Russian workers to the cities of Southeast Ukraine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Дроздов, 1998 – Дроздов В. В. Современная зарубежная историография экономической политики СССР в 1946 – 1985 гг.: Дис. ... доктора эконом. наук: 08.00.02; 08.00.03 / Московский государственный университет имени М. В. Ломоносова. Москва, 1998. 466 с.

Кодин, 1998 – Кодин Е. В. Американская послевоенная советология: методология и источниковая база: Дис. ... доктора ист. наук: 07.00.09 / Смоленский государственный педагогический университет. Москва, 1998. 510 с.

Лаас, 2009 – Лаас Н. О. Проблеми соціальної історії України другої половини 40-х – середини 60-х рр. XX ст. в англійській історіографії: Дис. ... кандидата іст. наук: 07.00.06 / Інститут історії України НАН України. Київ, 2009. 245 с.

Некрасов, 2001 – Некрасов А. А. Становление и этапы развития англо-американской советологии: Дис. ... кандидата ист. наук: 07.00.09 / Ярославский государственный университет им. П. Г. Демидова. Ярославль, 2001. 181 с.

Arendt, 1951 – Arendt H. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1951. 477 p.

Armstrong, 1974 – Armstrong J. *Ideology, Politics and Government in the Soviet Union*. London: Nelson, 1974. 236 p.

Bauman, 1976 – Bauman Z. *Socialism. The Active Utopia*. London: Routledge, 1976. 154 p.

Bergson, 1978 – Bergson A. *Productivity and the Social System: The USSR and the West*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 1978. 256 p.

- Berliner, 1978 – Berliner J. *The Innovation Decision in the Soviet Industry*. Cambridge (Mass.); London: MIT Press, 1978. 561 p.
- Berliner, 1988 – Berliner J. S. *Soviet Industry from Stalin to Gorbachev. Essays on Management and Innovation*. Gower House et al., 1988. 327 p.
- Blackwell, 1972 – Blackwell R. *Elite Resruitment and Functional Change: In Analysis of the Soviet Obkom Elite // Journal of Politics*. 1972. № 1. P. 124–152.
- Blondel, 1973 – Blondel J. *Comparing Political System*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973. 260 p.
- Cohen, 1985 – Cohen S. F. *Rethinking the Soviet Experience: Politics and History since 1917*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985. 211 p.
- Conquest, 1967 – Conquest R. *Industrial Workers in the USSR*. London: Bodley Head, 1967. 359 p.
- Dunmore, 1980 – Dunmore T. *The Stalinist Command Economy. The Soviet state apparatus and economic policy 1945–53*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1980. 176 p.
- Duverger, 1972 – Duverger M. *Party Politics and Pressure Groups. A Comparative Introduction*. New York: Crowell, 1972. 158 p.
- Fainsod, 1963 – Fainsod M. *How Russia Is Ruled*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963. 411 p.
- Filtzer, 1989 – Filtzer D. A. *The Soviet wage reform of 1956 – 1962 // Soviet Studies*. 1989. Vol. XLI. № 1. P. 88–110.
- Fisk, 1980 – Fisk M. *Ethics and Society. A Marxist Interpretation of Value*. Indiana univ.; The Harvester press, 1980. 268 p.
- Friedrich, Brzezinski, 1956 – Friedrich C., Brzezinski Z. *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1956. 456 p.
- Giddens, 1973 – Giddens A. *The Glass Structure of the Advanced Societies*. London: Hutchinson univ. library, 1973. 336 p.
- Gleaso, 1984 – Gleaso A. «Totalitarianism» in 1984 // *Russian Review*. 1984. № 43, P. 145–159.
- Gripp, 1973 – Gripp R. C. *The Political System of Communism*, New York: Dodd, Mead, 1973. 209 p.
- Gwertzman, 1982 – Gwertzman B. *U.S. Survey Shows a Steady Growth in Soviets G.N.P. // The New York Times*. December 26. 1982. P. A6.
- Harrington, 1972 – Harrington M. *Socialism: Past and Future*. New York: Bantam, 1972. 336 p.
- Hollander, 1978 – Hollander P. *Soviet and American Society. A Comparison*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978. 496 p.
- Inkeles, 1968 – Inkeles A. *Social Change in Soviet Russia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968. 475 p.
- Kaser, 1970 – Kaser M. *Soviet economics*. London: Routledge, 1970. 311 p.
- Katsenelinboigen, 1978 – Katsenelinboigen A. *Studies in Soviet Economic Planning*. New York: White Plains, 1978. 229 p.
- Khrushchev and khrushchevism, 1987 – Khrushchev and khrushchevism / Ed. by M. McCauley. Houndmills et al., 1987. 391 p.
- Knight, 1978 – Knight R. *Why Workers Want to flee USSR // US News and World Report*. 1978. Vol. 84. № 21. P. 51–60.
- Krylov, 1979 – Krylov C. A. *The Soviet Economy: How It Really Works*. Lexington (Massach.): Lexington Books; Heath and Company, 1979. 257 p.
- Manning, 1953 – Manning C. *Ukraine under the Soviets*. New York: Bookman associates, 1953. 223 p.
- Markovic, 1974 – Markovic M. *The Contemporary Marx*. Nottingham: Spokesman Books, 1974. 217 p.
- Matthews, 1972 – Matthews M. *Class and society in Soviet Russia*. London: Penguin, 1972. 366 p.
- Millar, 1981 – Millar J. R. *The ABC's of Soviet Socialism*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois press, 1981. 215 p.
- McAuley, 1979 – McAuley A. *Economic Welfare in the Soviet Union*. Madison, 1979. 269 p.
- Neuberger, Duffy, 1976 – Neuberger E., Duffy W. *Comparative Economic Systems: A Decision – making Approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976. 354 p.
- Nove, 1970 – Nove A. *An Economic History of the U.S.S.R*. London: Penguin, 1970. 448 p.
- Nove, 1978 – Nove A. *The Soviet Economic System*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1978. 318 p.
- Pallet, Shaw, 1981 – Pallet J., Shaw D. *Planning in the Soviet Union*. London: George Allen a. Unwin, 1981. 250 p.
- Parkin, 1968 – Parkin F. *Middle Class Radicalism. The Social Basis of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament*. Manchester: University Press, 1968. 207 p.

- Pethybridge, 1974 – Pethybridge R. *The Social Prelude to Stalinism* London: Macmillan, 1974. 343 p.
- Schapiro, 1970 – Schapiro L. *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. London: University Paperbacks, 1970. 631 p.
- Society and Politics, 1976 – Society and Politics. Ed. by R. G. Braungert. New Jersey: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1976. 368 p.
- Teckenberg, 1981–1982 – Teckenberg W. *The Social Structure of the Soviet Working Class. Toward an Estatist Society?* // *International Journal of Sociology*. 1981 – 1982. Vol. XI. № 4. P. 1–163.

REFERENCES

- Drozdov, 1998 – Drozdov V. V. *Sovremennaya zarubezhnaya istoriografiya ekonomicheskoy politiki SSSR v 1946–1985 gg.* [Modern foreign historiography of the USSR economic policy in 1946–1985]: Dis. ... doktora ekonom. nauk: 08.00.02; 08.00.03 / *Moskovskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet imeni M. V. Lomonosova*. Moskva, 1998. 466 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Kodin, 1998 – Kodin E. V. *Amerikanskaya poslevoennaya sovetologiya: metodologiya i istochnikovaya baza* [American postwar Sovietology: methodology and source base]: Dis. ... doktora ist. nauk: 07.00.09 / *Smolenskiy gosudarstvennyy pedagogicheskiy universitet*. Moskva, 1998. 510 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Laas, 2009 – Laas N. O. *Problemy sotsialnoi istorii Ukrainy druhoi polovyny 40-kh – seredyny 60-kh rr. XX st. v anhlomovnij istoriohrafii* [Problems of the Ukrainian social history of the second half of the 1940s – the middle of the 1960s in English-language historiography]: Dys. ... kandydata ist. nauk: 07.00.06 / *Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy*. Kyiv, 2009. 245 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Nekrasov, 2001 – Nekrasov A. A. *Stanovlenie i etapy razvitiya anglo-amerikanskoy sovetologii* [Formation and stages of Anglo-American Sovietology development]: Dis. ... kandidata ist. nauk: 07.00.09 / *Yaroslavskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet im. P. G. Demidova*. Yaroslavl, 2001. 181 p. [in Russian]
- Arendt, 1951 – Arendt H. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1951. 477 p. [in English]
- Armstrong, 1974 – Armstrong J. *Ideology, Politics and Government in the Soviet Union*. London: Nelson, 1974. 236 p. [in English]
- Bauman, 1976 – Bauman Z. *Socialism. The Active Utopia*. London: Routledge, 1976. 154 p. [in English]
- Bergson, 1978 – Bergson A. *Productivity and the Social System: The USSR and the West*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press, 1978. 256 p. [in English]
- Berliner, 1978 – Berliner J. *The Innovation Decision in the Soviet Industry*. Cambridge (Mass.); London: MIT Press, 1978. 561 p. [in English]
- Berliner, 1988 – Berliner J. S. *Soviet Industry from Stalin to Gorbachev. Essays on Management and Innovation*. Gower House et al., 1988. 327 p. [in English]
- Blackwell, 1972 – Blackwell R. *Elite Resruitment and Functional Change: In Analysis of the Soviet Obkom Elite* // *Journal of Politics*. 1972. № 1. P. 124–152. [in English]
- Blondel, 1973 – Blondel J. *Comparing Political System*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973. 260 p. [in English]
- Cohen, 1985 – Cohen S. F. *Rethinking the Soviet Experience: Politics and History since 1917*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985. 211 p. [in English]
- Conquest, 1967 – Conquest R. *Industrial Workers in the USSR*. London: Bodley Head, 1967. 359 p. [in English]
- Dunmore, 1980 – Dunmore T. *The Stalinist Command Economy. The Soviet state apparatus and economic policy 1945–53*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1980. 176 p. [in English]
- Duverger, 1972 – Duverger M. *Party Politics and Pressure Groups. A Comparative Introduction*. New York: Crowell, 1972. 158 p. [in English]
- Fainsod, 1963 – Fainsod M. *How Russia Is Ruled*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963. 411 p. [in English]
- Filtzer, 1989 – Filtzer D. A. *The Soviet wage reform of 1956 – 1962* // *Soviet Studies*. 1989. Vol. XLI. № 1. P. 88–110.
- Fisk, 1980 – Fisk M. *Ethics and Society. A Marxist Interpretation of Value*. Indiana univ.; The Harvester press, 1980. 268 p. [in English]
- Friedrich, Brzezinski, 1956 – Friedrich C., Brzezinski Z. *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1956. 456 p. [in English]

- Giddens, 1973 – Giddens A. The Glass Structure of the Advanced Societies. London: Hutchinson univ. library, 1973. 336 p. [in English]
- Gleaso, 1984 – Gleaso A. «Totalitarianism» in 1984 // Russian Review. 1984. № 43, P. 145–159. [in English]
- Gripp, 1973 – Gripp R. C. The Political System of Communism, New York: Dodd, Mead, 1973. 209 p. [in English]
- Gwertzman, 1982 – Gwertzman B. U.S. Survey Shows a Steady Growth in Soviets G.N.P. // The New York Times. December 26. 1982. P. A6. [in English]
- Harrington, 1972 – Harrington M. Socialism: Past and Future. New York: Bantam, 1972. 336 p. [in English]
- Hollander, 1978 – Hollander P. Soviet and American Society. A Comparison. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978. 496 p. [in English]
- Inkeles, 1968 – Inkeles A. Social Change in Soviet Russia. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968. 475 p. [in English]
- Kaser, 1970 – Kaser M. Soviet economics. London: Routledge, 1970. 311 p. [in English]
- Katsenelinboigen, 1978 – Katsenelinboigen A. Studies in Soviet Economic Planning. New York: White Plains, 1978. 229 p. [in English]
- Khrushchev and khrushchevism, 1987 – Khrushchev and khrushchevism / Ed. by M. McCauley. Houndmills et al., 1987. 391 p. [in English]
- Knight, 1978 – Knight R. Why Workers Want to flee USSR // US News and World Report. 1978. Vol. 84. № 21. Pp. 51–60. [in English]
- Krylov, 1979 – Krylov C. A. The Soviet Economy: How It Really Works. Lexington (Massach.): Lexington Books; Heath and Company, 1979. 257 p. [in English]
- Manning, 1953 – Manning C. Ukraine under the Soviets. New York: Bookman associates, 1953. 223 p. [in English]
- Markovic, 1974 – Markovic M. The Contemporary Marx. Nottingham: Spokesman Books, 1974. 217 p. [in English]
- Matthews, 1972 – Matthews M. Class and society in Soviet Russia. London: Penguin, 1972. 366 p. [in English]
- Millar, 1981 – Millar J. R. The ABC's of Soviet Socialism. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois press, 1981. 215 p. [in English]
- McAuley, 1979 – McAuley A. Economic Welfare in the Soviet Union. Madison, 1979. 269 p. [in English]
- Neuberger, Duffy, 1976 – Neuberger E., Duffy W. Comparative Economic Systems: A Decision – making Approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976. 354 p. [in English]
- Nove, 1970 – Nove A. An Economic History of the U.S.S.R. London: Penguin, 1970. 448 p. [in English]
- Nove, 1978 – Nove A. The Soviet Economic System. London: Allen and Unwin, 1978. 318 p. [in English]
- Pallet, Shaw, 1981 – Pallet J., Shaw D. Planning in the Soviet Union. London: George Allen a. Unwin, 1981. 250 p. [in English]
- Parkin, 1968 – Parkin F. Middle Class Radicalism. The Social Basis of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Manchester: University Press, 1968. 207 p. [in English]
- Pethybridge, 1974 – Pethybridge R. The Social Prelude to Stalinism London: Macmillan, 1974. 343 p. [in English]
- Schapiro, 1970 – Schapiro L. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union. London: University Paperbacks, 1970. 631 p. [in English]
- Society and Politics, 1976 – Society and Politics. Ed. by R. G. Braungert. New Jersey: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1976. 368 p. [in English]
- Teckenberg, 1981–1982 – Teckenberg W. The Social Structure of the Soviet Working Class. Toward an Estatist Society? // International Journal of Sociology. 1981 – 1982. Vol. XI. № 4. P. 1–163. [in English]
- Стаття надійшла до редакції 18.04.2018 р.*

UDC 94(477.83)«1945/1954»
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131213

Vasyl ILNYTSKYI,
orcid.org/0000-0002-4969-052X
Ph D hab. (History), Associate Professor, Head of Department of Ukraine's History of Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University (Ukraine, Drohobych) vilnickiy@gmail.com

Natalia KANTOR,
orcid.org/0000-0001-9533-0851
Senior Lecturer of Law, Sociology and Political Science Department, Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University (Ukraine, Drohobych) natali.kantor@gmail.com

REPRISALS OF THE SOVIET ADMINISTRATION AGAINST FAMILIES OF INSURGENTS IN KARPATSKYI KRAI OF THE OUN (1945 – 1954)¹

In the article on the basis of unknown and little-known documents the problem of use of families of nationalists in the combinations of Soviet law enforcement agencies is investigated for the first time. The basic directions of this policy of the repressive bodies are singled out. The author has proved that this line of activity of the special agents was an extremely important factor to play.

Key words: Karpatskyi Krai of the OUN, liberation movement, nationalists, families, repressive bodies.

Василь ІЛЬНИЦЬКИЙ,
доктор історичних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри історії України Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка (Україна, Дрогобич) vilnickiy@gmail.com

Наталія КАНТОР,
старший викладач кафедри правознавства, соціології та політології Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка (Україна, Дрогобич) natali.kantor@gmail.com

РЕПРЕСІЇ РАДЯНСЬКОЇ АДМІНІСТРАЦІЇ ПРОТИ РОДИН ПОВСТАНЦІВ У КАРПАТСЬКОМУ КРАЇ ОУН (1945 – 1954)

У статті вперше на основі невідомих та маловідомих документів досліджується проблема використання сімей націоналістів в агентурних комбінаціях. Виокремлюються основні напрямки цієї політики репресивно-каральних органів. Автор довів, що цей напрям діяльності спецорганів відіграв надзвичайно важливу роль.

Ключові слова: Карпатський край ОУН, визвольний рух, націоналісти, родини, репресивно-каральні органи.

The statement of the problem. It is difficult enough to describe in words the tragic situation in which Western Ukraine's population found itself in the 1940s – 1950s. The antago-

¹ Публікація містить результати досліджень, проведених при грантовій підтримці Державного фонду фундаментальних досліджень за конкурсним проектом Ф77/80 – 2018 (договір від 29.03.2018)

nism in the society which the Soviet administration tried in all possible ways to ignite during that period eventually reached its peak. Not only the direct participants of the liberation movement and its sympathizer, but also their families became the victims of cruel repressions. The scales of reprisals of the Soviet administration against families of nationalists are literally unimaginable.

The analysis of researches. Whereas the deportation policy has already been reflected in a number of works, the problem of the use by repressive bodies of families of insurgents as hostages, and recruitments of their relatives for the control over the underground is practically not elucidated. This question has been sporadically studied by such researchers as I. Bilas, D. Vedeneyev and H. Bystrukhin, A. Kentiy, Y. Kyrychuk, and A. Rusnachenko in generalising works on the history of the Ukrainian liberation movement (Bilas, 1994; Vedeneyev, Bystrukhin, 2007; Kentiy, 1999a; Kentiy, 1999b; Kyrychuk, 2003; Rusnachenko, 2002). V. Serhiychuk was the first to publish a fundamental documentary base for the study of the question of reprisals against members of families of OUN and UPA fighters (Roman Shukhevych, 2007a; Roman Shukhevych, 2007b; Serhiychuk, 2006; Serhiychuk, 2005). Deportation, that most widespread form of the repressive policy of the Soviet administration has found expression in Y. Nadolskyi's investigation (Nadolskyi, 2008), in which the author analyzes the reasons, methods and stages of carrying out of deportations. T. Vrons'ka compiled a serious theoretical-methodological and archeographical work devoted to reprisals against families of insurgents (Vrons'ka, 2009). However, a complex research of the Soviet administration's repressive policy against families of nationalists in the Carpathian area (alias Karpatskyi Krai) of the OUN is still absent.

The article's purpose is – on the basis of unknown documents and materials – to shed more light on the repressive policy against families of the Ukrainian nationalists as one of forms of struggle of the retaliatory system against movements for Ukrainian independence. At the same time, the author intentionally pays little attention to deportation campaigns as they make up a separate matter which deserves special research.

The statement of the basic material. The love and support of the near and dear ones in difficult conditions of the underground were – and have always been – of enormous moral and psychological value, and the leaders of the underground well understood that. Sharing common views, the wives of insurgents sacrificed all they could in order not only to support their husbands and be near them, but also to conduct the struggle together with them. As a matter of fact, it is necessary to underline, that families were the most sensitive point of the nationalists. The special organs well understood that and effectively used that.

Almost all the commanders of regional, district, and county leaderships were married men (BSA SSU (the Branch State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine). File 2. Description 59 (1953). Case 5. Vol. 4. Page 142; D. 34 (1960). C. 18. P. 72–73). In somewhat lesser degree the managerial personnel of regional and sectional leadership married. That situation, first of all, is explained that they were of considerably younger age in comparison with the former. It is necessary to notice, that in the underground a marriage took place with the permission of the leadership members. In particular, V. Livyi, a security service responsible of Karpatskyi Krai regional leadership of OUN informed the leader of this area V. Sydor-«Shelest» on August 19th, 1948, that OUN's security service responsible in Drohobych district Vasyl Shevaniuk-«Zaliznyi» («Iron-made») had asked of the permission to marry Natalia Posatska-«Uliana» and received such a permission (BSA SSU. F. 2. D. 98 (1954). C. 8. P. 83). Such situations were caused by difficult conditions of struggle and possibilities of influencing underground members through families.

In most cases wives of underground members, especially, of their leaders, worked side-by-side with them, like, for example, typists, combating with them and, unfortunately, perishing together with their husbands. For instance, like Mykola Tverdokhlib-«Hrim» («Thunder») with his wife Olha Herasymovych (both lost their lives on 5 May 1954), or Volodymyr Livyi-«Jordan» and his wife Dariya Tsymbalist-«Olia» (perished on 12 April 1948, in the village of Topilske of Rozhniativ district), like Ivan Lavriv-«Nechai» together with Haly-na Moroka-«Of the steppe», the Ukrainian Red Cross (further on referred to as URC) responsible Nadvirna county leadership of OUN Mariya Mytsko-«Mariya» in the underground married «Kolia», Mykola Korzhenivskyi, deputy responsible of SS of Bukovyna district leadership of OUN, and the SS' responsible person in Drohobych regional leadership of OUN Vasyl' Medvid-«Vasylchenko» was married to Vasyl' Kuk-«Lemish» sister (BSA SSU. F. 5. C. 67448. V. 1. P. 37. P. 37; F. 2. D. 56 (1953). C. 6., V. 5., P. 112; D. 60 (1953). C. 14. P. 245-246; D. 93 (1954). C. 2. P. 45; D. 110 (1954). C. 2. V. 5. P. 135; F. 13. C. 372. V. 95. P. 164-165; F. 65. C. 9112. V. 2. P. 145). The responsible for propagation of Karpatskyi Krai regional leadership of the OUN Mykhailo Diachenko was married to Maria Savchuk (in 1942 their son Sviatoslav was born) (Kohut, 2002: 20–21).

The majority of the administrative board got married during the German occupation. The nationalists often married in the conditions of the underground.

The repressive-retaliatory bodies mainly carried out their influence on the underground members through their families. For this purpose, first of all, arrests, recruitments, blackmails, hostage taking, and deportations of whole families were carried out. In particular, the Cheka agents, having learnt that the SS responsible «Cossack» of Kolomyia district leadership of the OUN had married one Nadiya, they – on condition of no possibility of catching «Cossack» – but began searching for his wife. During a searching operation on July 28th, 1951 she was captured wounded. During the interrogation «Nadia» had to confess that she and «Cossack» had a son, whose name was Stepan and who lived with her parents. Further on, the investigators learnt that «Cossack» loved his wife and son very much and for their sake was ready to fulfil any possible requirements, even to begin all sorts of cooperation. Having checked up this information, the Cheka agents captured «Cossack's» security bodyguards of and by means of correspondence convinced him to the cooperation with them. In «Cossack's» first letter to the special agencies the depth of his feelings is felt, which tore his heart apart and because of which he turned to such extreme actions: «I answer the raised question... What concerns Nadia, I may agree that there are drawbacks with her, but let's do all that all would be all right. It is enough for me that she is alive and recovering. Of course, you can organize a meeting with the parents, but not for the sake of convincing me, but in order that Nadia could console them. I am very sorry for them, for me they are the next after Stepanko.... I wish our personal meeting happened as quick as possible, so that everything could have been fixed, including the discussion of the communication plan, code numbers, and protection signs» (BSA SSU. F. 13. C. 372. V. 56. P. 185–187; F. 2. D. 28 (1960). C. 18. P. 200).

The policy of the Soviet power concerning nationalists was a terrorist one, as to families of insurgents not only reprisals were implemented, but they also used them as banal hostages. The Cheka agents tried to play on holy parental feelings. So, while carrying out the search of Mykola Tverdohlib-«Hrim», the Chekists determined that in 1948 his wife Olha Herasymovych, having passed to an illegal position, had left her son Yarema in the care of her sister Ivanna Herasymovych. In August, 1949, for her links with the underground, Ivanna Herasymovych was exiled in Khabarovsk region, whereas «Hrim's» son was placed in a

children's home in Rohatyn wherein he lived and studied in the first grade under the name Yakiv Oleksandrovykh Dyhin. M. Tverdokhlib asked Anna Dmytriv to kidnap his son. The Cheka agent wanted to use «Hrim's» and Olha Herasymovych's parental feelings to their son and to carry out actions (simultaneously promising to him of the preservation of his son's life and return) which would make «Hrim» to cooperation with the organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. With that end in view the investigators photographed his son in different foreshortenings, and then – with the help of the teacher – wrote a letter (forging his son's handwriting) to the father and mother, passing it to «Hrim» together with the photos (BSA SSU. F. 2. D. 19 (1959). C. 6. P. 6).

As the majority of the managerial cadres in Karpatskyi Krai were married and had children, they tried to secure them as much as possible against possible reprisals, and in the future – against the use of them by the repressive organs for an influence on their parents. An awful tragedy happened to Bohdan Yatskiv-«Safron» alias «Denys», the assistant of the responsible of the OUN SS member of the Karpatskyi Krai regional leadership. In May 1949 his wife was killed during a special operation, and the Soviet bodies allocated his 4 year old son into a children's home in Stanislaviv. The Chekists – for the purpose of capturing «Safron» – tried to make use of his ten year old daughter who was hiding in Lviv in her uncle Dmytro's dwelling. However, despite his great love of children, they could not make Bohdan Yatskiv to agree to a cooperation with them (BSA SSU. F. 2. D. 110 (1954). C. 2. V. 5. P. 367–370).

The Chekists were also chasing the wife of the last leader of Bukovyna county Yulian Matviyiv-«Nedobytyi». In the night from the 2nd to the 3rd of February, 1951 his wife – Liubov Mykhailivna Matviyiv-Dytsio-Kubranovych (b. 1911 in the town of Kutu, Stanislaviv region) was arrested in the town of Stryi. At the interrogation she told nothing, therefore the Chekists decided to «elaborate» her by help of the internal agents. After a chain of attempts, it became clear that she had married Y. Matviyiv yet in 1939. Then, for conspiracy reasons in view of the repressive organs, she announced her fictitious marriage with a Pole, Ditsio. After the re-conspiration L. Matviyiv was necessitated to move to the town of Stryi. With Yulian she had children, of whose health the father constantly showed his interested in letters. In November of 1950 «Nedobytyi» gave 2 thousand roubles to his wife through mediators. After his arrest the Cheka agents wanted – through the forced influence of his wife – to make Yulian Matviyiv to confess his guilt. However, that brought about no results (BSA SSU. F. 2. D. 34 (1960). C. 15. P. 38–39; D. 59 (1953). C. 5. V. 6. P. 239; D. 98 (1954). C. 5. V. 1. P. 24–26; T. 2. P. 175–177; D. 99 (1954). C. 15. P. 62–81).

A practice of the Soviet bodies to find out and through the relatives to enlist the insurgents into their case or make them confess their guilt lasted for long. In all complex inquiries concerning the secret agents' cases on administrative boards of some or other leadership, all their relation links, places of residence, and the agents directed to the «elaboration» of the latter were fully described, the relatives who had already suffered reprisals were notified, as well as possible secret-service combinations concerning those who had necessarily be subjected to repressions (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 60. C. 16. P. 2–7, 319–320; D. 99. C. 2. V. 3. P. 263–265). The Cheka agents, knowing the vulnerable points of underground activists, i. e., their families and relations, constantly conducted searches.

The families of nationalists were sieged by agents from their nearest environment which could not even be suspected in the cooperation with the Soviet power (BSA SSU. F. 71. D. 6. C. 387. V. 1. P. 175–176). The Cheka agents were not particularly selective in methods

applied to an influence on underground workers. Members of OUN and commanders of UPA were but usual people who loved, married, had children, and wanted to live in the independent Ukrainian state.

Throughout 1945 – 1950s the Cheka agents actively arrested the relatives of underground members whom they tried to use for their special purposes. The fates of relatives and even of the children of the killed leaders were rather tragic. As a rule, those were adopted by the families of the Soviet administration workers or the security officers. On 29 April 1956 Yevheniya Andrusiak had been released from imprisonment and she began searching for her son. After titanic efforts, she managed to find out that her son was adopted by a family of the KGB officer Korsakov. The latter, after moving from Stanislaviv, lived in the town of Yeln in Smolensk region (Russia) (Kohut, 2001: 33).

Almost each underground worker had to risk not only his own life and health, but also the life and health of his relatives. The Cheka agents carefully worked over revealing not only the wives and children, but also the parents and close relatives of the leaders of the underground of Karpatskyi Krai of OUN. The parents and relatives of almost all underground leaders were subjected to repressions in different ways. In particular, the Cheka agents yet in 1941 found the father of the chief of Karpatskyi Krai regional leadership of the OUN Mykola Melnyk (b. 1891, in the village of Berezhnytsia) who worked as a deacon. Before he should be moved out, he was transferred into an illegal position, and during the German occupation he worked as the head of a rural government. With the arrival of the Bolsheviks he passed to an illegal position. The mother of «Robert», Melnyk Ustyna Andriyivna (b. 1893, the resident of the village of Berezhnytsia), in May, 1941 was sent into exile in the remote areas of the USSR (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 55 (1953). C. 6. V. 1. P. 399, 401). Already after the German-Soviet war in the village of Berezhnytsia four uncle of Ya. Melnyk were found out: Andriy Melnyk (a smith), Yuriy Melnyk (an office worker of the local village Soviet), Dmytro Melnyk and Petro Melnyk (farmers) (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 55 (1953). C. 6. V. 1. P. 399–401). In 1949 the Cheka agents carried out an active search for Ya. Melnyk's sister, Volodymyra Mykolayivna Melnyk who in February 1948 fled from a special detention settlement and illegally lived in the village of Broshniv. Furthermore, after all the tests which that woman had to suffer, she did not changed her outlook. Having arrived at the village of Berezhnytsia she began a vigorous activity in support of the underground, gathering combat intelligence information, delivering foodstuff, etc. (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 98 (1954). C. 1. V. 2. P. 30–31).

Many members of families of underground workers could not stand severe realities of everyday life and ended in giving up their underground work, so to say, coming with cap in hand. However, such give-ups were caused by the objective reasons. So, operational agents of MMSS (Management of Ministry of State Security) of Chernivtsi region on April 2nd, 1949 forced Mykola Dmytriuk-«Quick» alias «Ruban», the commander of Sadrhrya district leadership of the OUN, to legalize. However, it was preceded by an arrest and sentence of his father Vasyl Dmytriuk. Eventually, the father had appeared a hostage, and after his son's confession of his guilt, V. Dmytriuk was released (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 60 (1953). C. 4. V. 2. P. 240–242; F. 13. C. 372. V. 86. P. 121–122). Special agents intentionally made use of strong filial and parental feelings of the underground workers which allowed them to manipulate the latter.

Attempts of enlisting of family members and distant relatives and through them to influence the underground made up an important direction of the repressive policy of the Soviet power. However, such an activity in very many cases was ineffectual. Not many people gave in to recruitment.

Usually, those on whom pressure was made, changed their position into the illegal one. So, in January of 1950 Victoria Valihura, the wife of S. Khodok-«Spartak», the responsible of the SS of Drohobych county leadership of OUN, came to the 2nd police station of Drohobych to confess her guilt. Prior to 1947 V. Valihura had lived legally in Drohobych together with her mother, and after an attempt to enlist her she immediately passed to an illegal position. By the way, after the underground had learnt about that, it forbade «Spartak» to meet with the wife. However, the her husband ignored the prohibition. The chekists considered two variants of the succession of events. The first, – due to the close common ties of «Spartak» and Valihura, the possibility of their secret meetings was absolutely real. The second implied that all the materials and facts should be use for the sake of compromising of «Spartak» (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 60. C. 16. P. 288–290).

It was through an active operational work of special agents the underground's leadership did not approve of insurgents' meetings with their families and relatives who lived legally.

In was a particularly hard time for the wives of the underground leaders, because their wives frequently became objects of repressive measures. Here again not only arrests, recruitment, or blackmail of the health and life of children took place, but the percent of destruction of wives of the underground members was high.

Not seldom the whole families worked in the underground and, unfortunately, together they also perished. There were cases with the underground activists that matrimonial member had to suffer the pain of the loss of his or her dear, beloved, or close ones.

Actually, almost each nationalist had to endure a personal tragedy. Someone's relatives were evicted into the remote areas of the Soviet Union, some others' relatives perished, cases of destruction of the underground leaders together with their wives were widespread.

The destruction of children of underground workers, without doubt, was the greatest tragedy. For the parents of West Ukrainian region in he 1940s – 1950s losses of their children became an almost usual event. During a special operation on 25 December, 1950 Zeno-viy-Peter-«Bohdan» was killed (b. 1930, the security guard of a technical link of Stanislaviv district leadership of OUN): he was the son of Kostiantyn Peter, the head of this structure (BSA SSU. F. 2-H. D. 60 (1953). C. 3. V. 5. P. 194).

In the end of the 1940s – beginning of the 1950s deported families of nationalists started returning from their exile. Having arrived back to their native places, members of families started restoring their former links with the underground. Among nationalists they enjoyed great trust, and – in their turn – their families gave a considerable aid to the underground. In other words, neither terror, nor reprisals, humiliation, and physical tortures could break and «re-educate» the people. For example, in the beginning of 1946 the family (father, mother, and brother) of Hryhoriy Sokolyk-«Zymnyi», head of Sambir county leadership of OUN, came back in the village of Bereznyzia. from exile, which had been sent out in 1940 – 1941. Yuliya Hanushchak's family (mother and sister) also returned from exile. In even larger scales families of ordinary underground members came back and at once started working on in the underground. That is to say, that despite all miseries, troubles, losses of family members and relations, the Soviet power was no success in suppressing and breaking of the patriotic feelings (BSA SSU. F. 71. D. 6. C. 105. P. 154–155). That all effected in a desperate act of V. Mastruk, the chief of MMSS of Drohobych region, who addressed a suggestion of prohibiting returns of families of the exiled nationalists to the ministry.

The conclusions. The family and a circle of relations are the greatest values which each person has. In its struggle against the underground, the repressive system, using all possible mean methods, fought with the Ukrainian liberation movement even by means of reprisals

against their families, its agencies used even the near and dear ones in their operational combinations. The majority of these actions contradicted the international conventions and moral-ethical bases. In other words, the Soviet power combated not only direct participants of the liberation movement, but also their families. In fact, the official power at the state level carried out terrorist policy. Such actions of the administration in a still greater extent ignited the local population's anger. Studies of the other forms of struggle against insurgents in the Carpathian area alias Karpatskyi Krai of the OUN form a perspective direction of research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Білас, 1994 – Білас І. Репресивно-каральна система в Україні 1917 – 1953. Суспільно-політичний та історико-правовий аналіз. У двох книгах. Книга перша. К.: Либідь; Військо України, 1994. 432 с.
- Веденеев, Биструхін, 2007 – Веденеев Д., Биструхін Г. Двобій без компромісів. Протиборство спецпідрозділів ОУН та радянських сил спецоперацій. 1945 – 1980-ті роки: Монографія. К.: К.І.С., 2007. 568 с.
- Вронська, 2009 – Вронська Т. Заручники тоталітарного режиму: репресії проти родин «ворогів народу» в Україні (1917 – 1953 рр.). К.: Інститут історії України, 2009. 486 с.
- ГДА СБУ – Галузевий державний архів Служби безпеки України.
- Кентій, 1999а – Кентій А. Нарис боротьби ОУН–УПА в Україні (1946 – 1956 рр.). К.: Інститут історії України НАН України, 1999. 111 с.
- Кентій, 1999б – Кентій А. Українська повстанська армія в 1944 – 1945 рр.. К.: Інститут історії України НАН України, 1999. 220 с.
- Киричук, 2003 – Киричук Ю. Український національний рух 40–50-х років ХХ століття: ідеологія та практика. Львів: Добра справа, 2003. 464 с.
- Когут, 2002 – Когут М. Герої не вмирають... Кн. 2. Калуш: «Артекс», 2002. 72 с.
- Когут, 2001а – Когут М. Командир Різун. Дрогобич: Видавнича фірма «Відродження», 2001. 38 с.
- Когут, 2001б – Когут М. Герої не вмирають... Кн. 1. Дрогобич: Видавнича фірма «Відродження», 2001. 62 с.
- Літопис УПА, 1995 – Літопис УПА. Т. 28: Марія Савчин: Тисяча доріг. (Спомини). Торонто – Львів: Видавництво Літопис УПА, 1995. 598 с.
- Надольський Й. Е. Депортаційна політика сталінського тоталітарного режиму в західних областях України (1939 – 1953 рр.). Луцьк: РВВ «Вежа» Волин. нац. ун-ту ім. Лесі Українки, 2008. 260 с.
- Роман Шухевич, 2007а – Роман Шухевич у документах радянських органів державної безпеки (1940 – 1950). К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2007. Т. 1. 640 с.
- Роман Шухевич, 2007б – Роман Шухевич у документах радянських органів державної безпеки (1940 – 1950). К.: ПП Сергійчук М. І., 2007. Т. 2. 584 с.
- Русначенко, 2002 – Русначенко А. Народ збурений: Національно-визвольний рух в Україні й національні рухи опору в Білорусії, Литві, Латвії, Естонії у 1940 – 50-х роках / Анатолій Русначенко. К.: Університетське видавництво «Пульсари», 2002. 519 с.
- Сергійчук, 2006 – Сергійчук В. Тавруючи визвольний прапор. Діяльність агентури та спецб'юро НКВС-НКДБ під виглядом ОУН-УПА. Видання друге, доповнене. К.: ПП Сергійчук М.І., 2006. 184 с.
- Сергійчук, 2005 – Сергійчук В. Український здвиг: Прикарпаття. 1939 – 1955 рр. К.: Українська Видавнича Спілка, 2005. 840 с.
- Стародубець, 2006 – Стародубець Г. Українське повстанське запілля (друга пол. 1943 – поч. 1946 років). Тернопіль: Підручники і посібники, 2006. 527 с.

REFERENCES

- Bilas, 1994 – Bilas I. Represyvnno-karalna systema v Ukraini 1917 – 1953 [The repressive system in Ukraine in 1917 – 1953]. Suspilno-politychnyi ta istoryko-pravovyi analiz. U dvokh knykhakh. K.: Lybid; Viisko Ukrainy, 1994. Kn. 1. 432 p. [in Ukrainian]

- Viedenieiev, Bystrukhin, 2007 – Viedenieiev D., Bystrukhin H. Dvobii bez kompromisiv. Protystorstvo spetspidrozdiliv OUN ta radianskykh syl spetsoperatsii [An Uncompromising Combat. The Opposition of Special Subdivisions of OUN with Soviet Special Operations Forces]. 1945 – 1980-ti roky. Kyev: K.I.S., 2007. 568 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Vronska, 2009 – Vronska T. Zaruchnyky totalitarnoho rezhymu: represii proty rodyn «vorohiv narodu» v Ukraini (1917 – 1953 pp.) [Hostages of the totalitarian regime: reprisals against families of «enemies of the people» in Ukraine (1917 – 1953)]. K.: Instytut istorii Ukrainy, 2009. 486 p.
- HDA SBU – Haluzevyi derzhavnyi arkhiv Sluzhby bezpeky Ukrainy [Sectoral State Archive of Security Service of Ukraine]. [in Ukrainian].
- Kentii, 1999a – Kentii A. Narys borotby OUN–UPA v Ukraini (1946 – 1956 rr.) [On functioning of UPA departments in Chernivtsi land; An outline of the struggle of OUN-UPA in Ukraine (1946 – 1956)]. Kyiv, Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 1999. 111 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Kentii, 1999b – Kentii A. V. Ukrainska povstanska armiiia v 1944 – 1945 rr. [Ukrainian Insurgent Army in 1944 – 1945] Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 1999. 220 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Kyrychuk, 2003 – Kyrychuk Yu. Ukrainskyi natsionalnyi rukh 40–50-kh rokiv XX stolittia: ideolohiia ta praktyka [Ukrainian Nationalist Movement of 1940s–1950s: Ideology and Practice]. Lviv, Dobra sprava, 2003. 464 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Kohut, 2001a – Kohut M. Heroi ne vmyraiut... [Heroes Do Not Die] Kn. 1. Drohobych: Vidrozhennia, 2001. 62 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Kohut, 2001b – Kohut M. Komandyr Rizun [Commander Rizun]. Drohobych: Vydavnycha firma «Vidrozhennia», 2001. 38 p.
- Kohut, 2002 – Kohut M. Heroi ne vmyraiut... [Heroes Do Not Die] Kn. 2. Kalush: Arteks, 2002. 72 p. [in Ukrainian].
- Litopys UPA, 1995 – Litopys UPA. T. 28: Mariia Savchyn: Tysiacha dorih. (Spomyny) [Mariya Savchyn: a thousand of ways. (Recollections)]. Toronto – Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Litopys UPA, 1995. 598 p.
- Nadolskyi Y. E. Deportatsiina polityka stalinskoho totalitarnoho rezhymu v zachidnykh oblastiakh Ukrainy (1939 – 1953 rr.) [Deportation policy of Stalin totalitarian regime in western areas of Ukraine (1939 – 1953)]. Lutsk: RVV «Vezha» Volyn. nats. un-tu im. Lesi Ukrainky, 2008. 260 p.
- Roman Shukhevych, 2007a – Roman Shukhevych u dokumentakh radianskykh orhaniv derzhavnoi bezpeky (1940 – 1950) [Roman Shukhevych in documents of the Soviet agencies of state security (1940 – 1950)]. K.: PP Serhiichuk M. I., 2007. T. 1. 640 p.
- Roman Shukhevych, 2007b – Roman Shukhevych u dokumentakh radianskykh orhaniv derzhavnoi bezpeky (1940 – 1950) [Roman Shukhevych in documents of the Soviet agencies of state security (1940 – 1950)]. K.: PP Serhiichuk M. I., 2007. T. 2. 584 p.
- Rusnachenko, 2002 – Rusnachenko A. Narod zburenyi: Natsionalno-vyzvolnyi rukh v Ukraini y natsionalni rukhy oporu v Bilorusii, Lytvi, Latvii, Estonii u 1940 – 50-kh rokakh [The Revolted People: National liberation movement in Ukraine and national resistance movements in Belarus', Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the 1940s – 1950s]. Kyiv, Universytetske vydavnytstvo «Pulsary», 2002. 519 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Serhiichuk, 2006 – Serhiichuk V. Tavruichy vyvolnyi prapor. Diialnist ahentury ta spetsboivok NKVS-NKDB pid vyhliadom OUN-UPA [Blaspheming the flag of liberation. The activity of agencies and special groups of NKVS-NKGB under the image of OUN-UPA]. Vydannia druhe, dopovnene. K.: PP Serhiichuk M.I., 2006. 184 p.
- Serhiichuk, 2005 – Serhiichuk V. Ukrainskyi zdvyh: Prykarpattia [the Ukrainian revolt: Sub-Carpathia]. 1939 – 1955 rr. K.: Ukrainska Vydavnycha Spilka, 2005. 840 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Starodubets, 2006 – Starodubets H. Ukrainske povstanske zapillia (druga pol. 1943 – poch. 1946 rokiv) [Ukrainian insurgent underground (the second half of 1943 – beginning of 1946)]. Ternopil: Pidruchnyky i posibnyky, 2006. 527 p.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 8.04.2018 р.

UDC 94 (477) «1991/2017»-058.232.6
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130673

Yanina FEDORENKO,
orcid.org/0000-0002-5206-0705
Ph D hab. (History), Associate Professor of
Department of Social Sciences.
Chernobyl Heroes NUCP Institute of Fire Safety of Ukraine
(Ukraine, Cherkasy) yanava@ukr.net

DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL HOLDING STRUCTURES IN UKRAINE'S COUNTRYSIDE (TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES AND SOCIAL THREATS)

The article is devoted to the study of the development of agro-holding structures in Ukraine. There are three periods in the development and functioning of these subjects of the agrarian market. A detailed analysis and assessment of the technological advantages of business giants, and the social threats they present for rural areas, have been conducted. The author concludes that the role of agro-holdings in terms of restructuring of the Ukrainian village can be estimated in two ways. On the one hand, they are well caring for their business, and on the other hand, they also contribute to increasing unemployment in the villages, because only a small part of the rural population is provided with jobs.

Key words: agricultural holdings, rural areas, agricultural sector, economic strength.

Яніна ФЕДОРЕНКО
доктор історичних наук, доцент кафедри суспільних наук
Черкаського інституту пожежної безпеки імені Героїв Чорнобиля НУЦЗ України
yanava@ukr.net

РОЗВИТОК АГРОХОЛДИНГОВИХ СТРУКТУР У СІЛЬСЬКІЙ МІСЦЕВОСТІ УКРАЇНИ (ТЕХНОЛОГІЧНІ ПЕРЕВАГИ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНІ ЗАГРОЗИ)

Статтю присвячено дослідженню розвитку агрохолдингових структур в Україні. Виокремлено три періоди у створенні та функціонуванні цих суб'єктів аграрного ринку. Також зроблений детальний аналіз та оцінка технологічних переваг бізнес-гігантів та соціальних загроз, які вони являють для сільської місцевості. Автором зроблено висновок, що роль агрохолдингів в умовах перебудови українського села можна оцінити двояко. З одного боку вони добре піклуються про об'єкти свого господарювання, а з іншого – вони ж сприяють і збільшенню безробіття в селах, тому що забезпечують роботою лише невелику частину сільського населення.

Ключові слова: агрохолдинги, сільська місцевість, агросектор, економічний потенціал

The statement of the problem. The restructuring of the collective and state farm system, after the independence of our country had been proclaimed, marked a full-scale socio-political transformation in the agricultural sector. As a result of the restructuring of collective farms and state farms, which were the basis of Soviet power, new organizational forms of entrepreneurship were formed on their ground. Among them, powerful agro-holdings found their peculiar niche in the system. It is with the activity of these business giants that the government of our country has associated Ukraine's food security. Therefore, the research of the activities of agricultural holdings, as well as the study of their impact on the life of the

Ukrainian village, is a very relevant issue that requires a special study and may be useful in generalizing material related to the reformed experience of 1991 – 2017 for the election of new economic landmarks. Thus, the chosen topic has a scientific-practical and socio-political significance. These are the evidences that prove the urgency of the research.

The analysis of sources and recent researches. The topic of research into the activity of agro-holding structures as a new organizational form of entrepreneurship is relatively new in historical science. Therefore, there is an insufficient quantity of papers the authors of which paid their main attention to these business giants of the agricultural sector of Ukraine. Though, there is a large number of works by economists-agrarians who study the functioning of agroholdings. Among them the papers by Demyanenko S.I., Meers V., Johnson T. and Andriichuk V.G. should be marked as really meaningful. It is the study of the activities of agroholdings from the historical point of view that predetermined the author's appeal to this topic.

The publication's purpose. The purpose of the study is, on the basis of the analysis of the materials studied, using the latest principles and methods of scientific and historical knowledge, to investigate the development of agroholding structures in Ukraine, and to assess in detail their technological advantages and social threats to the countryside.

Statement of the basic material. The changes that resulted from the reform of the agrarian sector after the proclamation of independence of our state influenced significantly the emergence and development of new organizational forms of entrepreneurship. One of them – agroholdings – has, indeed, become a priority for Ukraine. It is one of the variations of holding companies – the system of commercial organizations, which includes a «management company», holding hold majority shares or shares of subsidiaries of subsidiaries, and subsidiaries.

The practice of creating agroholding structures is characteristic of countries that until 1991 belonged to the so-called socialist camp. The main drivers were imperfections and failures in the functioning of the economy, the lack of necessary institutional and legal conditions for conducting effective business, imperfect state policy, especially regarding the issues related to the formation of a full-fledged agricultural land market.

In our opinion, it is quite reasonable to isolate the three periods in the development and functioning of agricultural holding structures as full-fledged participants in the agrarian market. More specifically, the first phase lasted ten years from 1995 to 2005. It was the time of the creation of the regulatory framework necessary for the full operation of business giants, as well as the accumulation of agricultural land and the practice of creating of the first holding agricultural companies.

Thus, as for our state, the processes of corporatization and privatization of large state enterprises and associations has been one of the main economic drivers for the formation of holding companies. A number of Laws of Ukraine «On Entrepreneurship», «On Enterprises», «On Privatization of State Property» and the Decree of the President of Ukraine of May 11, 1994 «On Holding Companies Created in the Process of Corporatization and Privatization» laid down the legal basis for their foundation and operation. According to the latter, the flotation of a holding company in the form of an open joint stock company was envisaged by way of merging in the authorized share capital majority shares of subsidiaries and other assets by means of establishing them by the agencies authorized to manage state property, state privatization bodies, either independently or together with other founders, or by means of the acquisition of one economic entity by another (buyout) in the process of privatization (in this case, the acquiring company is considered from now on the holding company, and the target company – a subsidiary).

In fact, during the first period in Ukraine, 35 holding companies and state-owned joint-stock companies which authorized share capital received holdings of stocks of 305 business associations were set up. Agroholdings, acting as business structures under the reformed agriculture of the independent Ukraine with the main purpose of increasing their capital due to profits and surplus profit in the form of rent, turned out to be the most successful model of activity of holding companies.

The first agroholding companies appeared in the early 2000's. The accumulation of agricultural land was an important prerequisite for their formation and activity. In December 1999, the President of Ukraine L. Kuchma signed the above-mentioned Decree «On urgent measures for accelerated reformation of the agrarian sector of the economy», the implementation of which led to the development of a new form of economic structures. It is fully proved by S. I. Demianenko, that this decree was a turning point in the privatization of agricultural land and the restructuring of the economy (Demianenko, Meyers, Johnson, Zorya, 2005: 63). Giant holding companies hurried up to take advantage of the basic provisions of the Decree and began to quickly accumulate agricultural land. It resulted in the social tension in the countryside. In order to deescalate tensions, as well as to right peasants' private ownership of farmland allotment (shares), in January 2001 a moratorium on the purchase and sale of land plots (shares) was introduced.

With the adoption of the Land Code in 2001, the moratorium was never removed. Therefore, which is not surprising, the incompleteness of institutional transformations in the agrarian sector has led to the formation of mechanisms for shadow control over the distribution of agricultural land, which resulted in the emergence of a shadow land market. A special under-the-table system of them moratorium has been developed: the conclusion of a preliminary sales purchase agreement under the condition that it fully comes into force after the moratorium expires; execution of a power of attorney with the right to dispose of land; conclusion of the lease with the subsequent right of priority redemption.

Many of those agroholding companies left the economic arena in a short time. V. G. Andriichuk made a good point saying that many companies and businessmen who invested their capital into agribusiness, quickly «left» it because of the absence of the fundamental motive (obtaining assets of agrarian enterprises to repay debts, hope to buy low and to sell high, expecting a quick return at any price, etc.). Therefore, the process of capitalization of agriculture in the direction of capital infusion from other spheres of the economy at an early stage was often chaotic, inaccurate, there was a process of reselling assets from one business group to another. However, at the end of the mentioned period, the concentration of agribusiness began to be realized in quite clear-cut outlined directions (Andriichuk, 2009: 7).

The second stage of the activity of agroholding structures began in 2006 and lasted until 2008. In this period, the process of formation of agriholdings, as well as their continued accumulation of land bank through the acquisition by giants of lands of weaker competitors might be called forcing. In particular, during the given period of time, an entire scheme for the multi-stage formation of agroholdings was developed. At the first stage there was the investment of capital, of domestic or (often) foreign origin, into the processing industry which provided a faster turnover and payback. In particular, it concerned oil and fat production, flour, baking, sugar, meat and dairy industries. The next stage of investment was the sales of products through the development of logistics and its own trading network. With the accumulation of necessary financial resources at the third stage it created its own agricultural production through the lease of land and partly property shares and the purchase of the necessary resources, especially modern technology.

There was also one more easy way of creating agroholdings – the development of agribusiness companies, whose main activity was not related to the agrarian sphere. An example of such an agroholding was a subsidiary of the Zasiadko mine (agricultural company «Shakhtar»). It comprised twenty-two agricultural enterprises of different legal status with a total area of about 100 thousand hectares of agricultural land, including over 90 thousand hectares of arable land. In 2010, 6 thousand cows, 25 thousand pigs, 500 thousand broilers, 1 million adult chickens were managed in its branches. The refining capacities of the company were located at the Kramatorsk Meat Processing Plant and the Slovianskyi Dairy Factory. The agribusiness began to conduct a great innovation activity, having established contacts with six research institutes of Ukraine. As a result of such cooperation, «Shakhtar» started to grow Holshtynska and Simental breeds of cows on its own breeder. It used the most modern crosses in poultry farming: the chicken crosses of Hein-Lyntha Bowanda-Goldline, the Cobb-500 and Gibro broilers crosses (Informatsiia z ofitsiinoho sait u orendnoho pidpriemstva «Shakhta imeni A. F. Zasiadka»).

By 2008, the process of creating large holdings that rented 50–100 thousand hectares of land continued to be carried out at a gigantic pace. Moreover, the «agrarian lobby» was formed that relied on the rapid abolition of the moratorium and the legalization of ownership of captured land massifs. However, in 2008, the financial crisis, which brought significant material losses to holders of agroholdings, triggered a financial crisis and contributed to the regrouping of strategic investors who directed their interests in the agro-food sector, which at that time was in a better position than other sectors of the economy.

It is the global financial crisis that has triggered the third stage of agroholding business development in the countryside, which began in 2009 and continues up to now. The most typical feature of this period is the completion of the formation of the most powerful agro-structures in Ukraine. The largest land use agroholdings (from 400 to 600 thousand hectares) have their production in the best farming areas – Poltava, Vinnytsa, Sumy, Khmelnytsky and Chernihiv regions; from 200 to 400 thousand hectares – in Cherkassy, Kharkiv, Ternopil, Donetsk and Zhytomyr regions. In 2010, 40 most powerful agricultural holding structures controlled 4.5 million hectares of land, which was 13% of cultivated agricultural land (Deininger, Byerlee, 2011: 23).

Among them, one of the most powerful was the agribusiness «NIBULON», which started its history in 1991 (initially as a small enterprise supplying high-yield corn and sunflower seeds of foreign breeding and selling them). Alexey Vadatursky, its general director, was a co-founders of the Hungarian company KOMBISEED KFT and the English company Meridian Commodities Ltd. In general, the name of the company «NIBULON» is made up of the first letters of the name of the founding cities: Mykolayiv, Budapest, London. The initial capital of the future powerful agriholding reached only \$ 50,000.

During its existence, the company has turned into a vertically integrated agrocompany, which has independently cultivated 43 thousand hectares of farm field in four regions of Ukraine, cultivated agricultural products (more than 100 thousand tons of grain and oilseeds per year), transported, processed, brought to commodity conditions, sold and shipped for export, had a developed livestock industry. It should be noted that it was largely assisted by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which in 1998 helped the company out with five million dollars (Vid zernyny – do khlibyny).

Over the years of its existence, «NIBULON» has invested more than UAH 600 million into the agrarian sector of the economy and has become a leading national farmer of grain

traders and exporters. In the marketing year 2004 – 2005 only, the volume of grain and oilseeds sales exceeded 1.4 million tons, including 1.3 million tons of grain shipped for export. By the end of 2012, «NIBULON» has had 23 production branches throughout Ukraine, a transshipment terminal for transshipment of grain and oilseeds in Mykolayiv, three elevators and 18 transshipment terminals, a shipping company and a shipbuilding and ship repairing plant «NIBULON» (Fili «NIBULONA»).

Among the largest agricultural holdings of independent Ukraine, «Ukrlandfarming» founded by Oleg Bakhmatyuk must be marked out. In March 2011, the American magazine Forbes estimated the wealth of a businessman in \$ 1 billion (7th among the Ukrainian billionaires and 1140 in the world). And in November 2012, the Ukrainian counterpart of «Forbes» gave Oleg Bakhmatyuk 11th place in the list of 100 richest people of Ukraine, estimating his profits at 877 million dollars (Biznesportret: Bakhmatiuk Oleh Romanovych).

It should be noted that the Agroholding Land Bank of the holding «Ukrlandfarming» is constantly extending due to the acquisition of other companies. One of the most famous was the company «Rise». It started its activity in 1992 as a supplier of plant protection products. Over the next three years, the company has opened three branches. And in 1998 it already had 10 branches throughout Ukraine. Since then it has been engaged in deliveries of agricultural machinery.

In 2000, «Rise» created a new subsidiary – «Rise-Agro» in Kyiv, with its offices in Ternopil, Sumy, Kirovograd and Zaporizhzhia regions. In 2002, the unit dealing with accounts payable and accounts receivable was allocated to a separate company, Rise-Agrotrade, whose task was to export agricultural products. In 2003, a subsidiary company Rise-South in Rostov-on-Don with offices in Krasnodar and Stavropol was opened. And in 2004 a subsidiary company «Rise-Central Chernozemia» was established in Belgorod (Russia).

In May 2005, the company had 64 representative offices in Ukraine, 2 subsidiaries in Russia, and one in Moldova. «Rise» had two or three representative offices in each region of Ukraine to be closer to its customers. At the same time, the company «Rise» comprised five structures: «Rise-Agro» – production of agricultural products; «Rise-Agroservice» – supply of material resources; «Rise-Agrotehnika» – sales of equipment, spare parts; provision of service; «Rise-Agrotrade» – export of agricultural products; «Rise-Transservice» – international transportation, customs-license warehouses, etc. The holding employed 2870 specialists serving 10 thousand customers (Shchorichno kompaniia «Raiz» provodyt «Dni polia», yaki vidviduiut ponad 2 tys. kliientiv).

In 2006, «Rise» started its work in the sugar processing industry and founded Rise-Sugar and Maksimko companies. By that time, the company had already had 47 branches throughout Ukraine, and its land bank amounted to more than 60 thousand hectares. In 2010, the entire production activity of the company was concentrated in «Rise-Maksimko», and the enterprises of agricultural land expanded to 180 thousand hectares (Istoriia kompanii «Raiz»). Such a pleasant thing could not but attract the owners of other agroholdings, therefore in the same year «Rise» became part of Ukrlandfarming. Similarly, the agro company Dakar Agro Holding suffered the acquisition by Land Holding owned by Oleg Bakhmatyuk. Thanks to this, his land Bank exceeded 500 thousand hectares, which made it the largest in Eastern Europe in terms of the number of cultivated land. Moreover, these acquisitions allowed O. Bakhmatyuk to take serious positions in sugar production in the country.

The «Avangard» agroholding, which also belonged to the above-mentioned Bahmatiuk, should be mentioned separately: although it practically did not have any land, it became

known as the largest producer of poultry meat in Ukraine. The production facilities of the company were located in 14 regions of Ukraine and consisted of 19 poultry farms, 3 reproducers, 9 zones for poultry rearing, an egg processing plant, 6 feed mills, and three warehouses for long-term storage of eggs. The overall production was also quite decent: in 2011, the average annual chicken-bear stock amounted to 20.5 million heads, 12,200 tons of dry egg products, and egg production varied at 6 billion units per annum, accounting for more than 51% of gross production of this kind of products in Ukraine (AVANGARD. CO).

October 5, 2010 Avangard became part of Ukrlandfarming. Currently, the company owns 18 meat factories, two refineries, six seed plants, six sugar factories, three elevators with a capacity of 645 thousand tons of one-time storage, four grain storage facilities and 110 horizontal storage facilities (Ukrainski ahrokhodynhy «Ukrlandfarminh» i «Avanhard» zavershyly obiednannia).

Kernel Holding SA, owned by Andrei Verevsky, became one of the largest agro-operators on the grain and oil market. In 2010, Kernel acquired controlling stakes in two agro companies in Poltava and Khmelnytsky regions. The total area of these agricultural enterprises exceeded 119,000 hectares. In 2010, the company also entered the sugar market by purchasing Enselco and Sugar Union. In addition to «sugar» capacities, the land bank of the holding has replenished with more than 120,000 hectares.

The «Mriia Agroholding», founded by Ivan Huta, was considered a powerful agroholding at the end of the first decade of the XXI century. In 2011, the holding increased its net profit by 3.9% (to \$ 149,978,000), while the revenues grew by 66.1% (to \$ 268,308 million) (Dvadsat samikh uspeshnikh ahraryev Ukrainy).

The process of creating new agroholdings continued at the beginning of the second decade of the XXI century. In 2011, the Group of Companies «System Capital Management» under the leadership of Renat Akhmetov, and Smart-Holding Group headed by Vadim Novinsky, founded on the agricultural assets of the Illich Mariupol Metallurgical Plant an agroholding with a land bank of 225 thousand hectares (Dvadsat samikh uspeshnikh ahraryev Ukrainy).

Analyzing the production direction of agroholdings, it should be noted that in the majority of cases, their activities were directed at the production of grain and oilseeds, as well as at the production of raw materials for their own processing industry (sugar beet, milk, meat of cattle, pigs, poultry, etc.).

As for the Ukrainian village, the emergence and active functioning of agricultural holdings had double significance. On the one hand, they provided employment for the rural population. However, on the other side, industrial production is less labor-intensive and can be used for employment of only 2 million people (according to researches of Ukrainian economists, taking into account one hundred percent of all land resources of Ukraine). It can be supported by the fact that by the end of 2012, there were more than 14 million people in the domestic agrarian sector, and only 620 thousand of them were employed in agroholdings (Ahrokhodynhy unychtozhaiut ukraynskoe selo).

During the years of their functioning, agroholding companies have also developed a somewhat diverse approach to the development of rural areas where they conducted their business. Very few of them began to take care of the population of the region, fully developing rural infrastructure and improving the well-being of villagers. Some only partially helped local residents to build their living space. However, this assistance was small compared to the possibilities these giants of agribusiness had. The majority of such units were agroholdings, which generally refused to streamline social infrastructure and operated on the basis of maxi-

mizing profits. Their leaders were not interested in the social sphere of the Ukrainian village, since the main labor force in agroenterprises was part-time (or seasonal) hired workers who carried out agricultural operations by moving from one branch to another.

Conclusions. Thus, the formation and development of agricultural holdings in Ukraine against the background of global changes in the historical process has become a logical result of the transformation of the agrarian sector in the process of globalization of agriculture. In our opinion, it is necessary to separate out three periods of development and functioning of the operators of the agrarian market through the lens of the development of agrarian history:

I stage (2000 – 2005) – formation of the regulatory framework and the beginning of the accumulation of agricultural land, the spread of the practice of creating and operating of the first holding agricultural companies;

II stage (2006 – 2008) – forcing the process of creation of agroholdings, advancing their accumulation by the land bank due to the acquisition of weaker competitors by the land giants,

III stage (2009 – 2014) – the allocation of the most powerful agricultural structures that control currently most of the agricultural land in Ukraine: Ukrlandfarming, Kernel, Mriia Agroholding and their competitors, such as HarvEast Holding.

As for the role of agroholdings in terms of Ukrainian village restructuring, it can be estimated in two ways. On the one hand, business giants have taken good care of their business – agricultural land, employing the most advanced technologies for their cultivation, and for a certain number of villagers they offered real employment. But on the other hand, the big problem was that there was virtually no interaction between the owners of large agricultural holdings and ordinary peasants. The agroholdings capital was mostly built on bank loans or funds borrowed from placement of bonds. This, to a certain extent, created serious social risks for the Ukrainian village. After all, agroholdings were interested, first of all, in their enrichment through the expansion of the land bank. In addition, they contributed to the increase in unemployment in villages, because, according to scientists' researches, provided work only for one in ten peasants, while other residents were forced to look for other ways of earning. In addition, most of these operators in the agrarian market simply ignored the specifics of Ukrainian villages, without paying any attention (especially financial) to their infrastructure development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Андрійчук, 2009 – Андрійчук В. Г. Надконцентрація агропромислового виробництва і земельних ресурсів та її наслідки// Економіка АПК, 2009. № 2. С. 3–10.

Агрохолдинги уничтожают украинское село. URL: <http://www.ukrnews24.net/agroxoldingi-unichtozhayut-ukrainskoe-selo/>

Бізнеспортрет: Бахматюк Олег Романович. URL: <http://bp.ubr.ua/profile/bahmatuk-oleg-romanovich>.

Від зернини – до хлібини // Урядовий кур'єр, 2005. № 209. 3 листопада.

Двадцать самых успешных аграриев Украины. URL: : <http://www.focus.ua/charts/235005/>

Дем'яненко, Меєрс, Джонсон, Зоря, 2005 – Дем'яненко С. І., Меєрс В., Джонсон Т., Зоря С. Зміна фокусу аграрної політики та розвитку села в Україні: висновки та перспективи для руху вперед. Київ, КНЕУ, 2005. 172 с.

Інформація з офіційного сайту орендного підприємства «Шахта імені А. Ф. Засядька». URL: <http://zasyadko.net/m1/uk/apk/eor>.

Історія компанії «Райз». URL: <http://rise.ua/ua/history.html>.

Українські агрохолдинги «Укрлендфармінг» і «Авангард» завершили об'єднання. URL: <http://www.ukragroleasing.com.ua/ukrayinski-agroholdingi-ukrlendfarming-i-avangard-zavershili-ob-ednannya.html>

- Філії «НІБУЛОНА». URL: <http://www.nibulon.com/data/filii/virobnichi-filii-tov-sp-nibulon/karta.html>.
- Щорічно компанія «Райз» проводить «Дні поля», які відвідують понад 2 тис. клієнтів // Агробізнес сьогодні. Газета підприємців АПК. 2005. № 10 (75). Червень.
- AVANGARD. CO. URL: <http://www.avangard.co.Uk/rus/news1.html>.
- Deininger, Byerlee, 2011 – Deininger, Byerlee D. The Rise of Large Farms in Land Abundant Countries: Do They Have a Future? // Policy Research Working Paper of World Bank. March, 2011. 35 p.

REFERENCES

- Andriichuk, 2009 – Andriichuk V. H. Nadkotsentratsiia ahropromyslovoho vyrobnytstva i zemelnykh resursiv ta yii naslidky [Overconcentration of agro-industrial production and land resources and its consequences]. Ekonomika APK, 2009. № 2. Pp. 3–10. [in Ukrainian]
- Ahrokhodynhy unychtozhaiut ukraynskoe село [Agroholdings destroy the Ukrainian village]. URL: <http://www.ukrnews24.net/agroxoldingi-unichtozhayut-ukraynskoe-selo/> [in Russian]
- Biznesportret: Bakhmatiuk Oleh Romanovych [Biznesportret: Oleg Romanovych Bakhmatyuk]. URL: <http://bp.ubr.ua/profile/bahmatuk-oleg-romanovich>. [in Russian]
- Vid zernyny – do khlibyny [From grain – to bread]. Uriadovyi kurier, 2005. № 209. 3 lystopada. [in Ukrainian]
- Dvadsat samikh uspeshnykh ahraryev Ukrainy [Twenty most successful farmers in Ukraine]. URL: <http://www.focus.ua/charts/235005/> [in Ukrainian]
- Demyanenko, Meyers, Dzhonson, Zorya, 2005 – Demyanenko S. I., Meyers V., Dzhonson T., Zoria S. Zmina fokusu ahrarynoi polityky ta rozvytku sela v Ukraini: vysnovky ta perspektyvy dlia rukhu vpered [Change in the focus of agrarian policy and village development in Ukraine: conclusions and perspectives for moving forward]. Kyiv, KNEU, 2005. 172 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Informatsiia z ofitsiinoho сайту orendnoho pidpriemstva «Shakhta imeni A. F. Zasyadka» [Information from the official site of the leasing company «Mine named after A. F. Zasyadko»]. URL: <http://zasyadko.net/m1/uk/apk/eor>. [in Ukrainian]
- Istoriia kompanii «Raiz» [History of the company «Rise»]. URL: <http://rise.ua/ua/history.html>. [in Ukrainian]
- Ukrainski ahrokhodynhy «Ukrlandfarminh» i «Avanhard» zavershyly obiednannia [Ukrainian agroholdings Ukrlandfarming and Avangard completed the association]. URL: <http://www.ukragroleasing.com.ua/ukrayinski-agroholdingi-ukrlandfarming-i-avangard-zavershili-ob-ednannya.html> [in Ukrainian]
- Filii «NIBULONA» [Branches «NIBULON»]. URL: <http://www.nibulon.com/data/filii/virobnichi-filii-tov-sp-nibulon/karta.html>. [in Ukrainian]
- Shchorichno kompaniia «Raiz» provodyt «Dni polia», yaki vidviduiut ponad 2 tys. kliientiv [Every year, «Rise» company conducts «Field Days», which is visited by more than 2 thousand clients]. Ahrobiznes sohodni. Hazeta pidpriemstsv APK. 2005. № 10 (75). Cherven. [in Ukrainian]
- AVANGARD. CO. URL: <http://www.avangard.co.Uk/rus/news1.html>. [in Ukrainian]
- Deininger, Byerlee, 2011 – Deininger, Byerlee D. The Rise of Large Farms in Land Abundant Countries: Do They Have a Future? // Policy Research Working Paper of World Bank. March, 2011. 35 p. [in English]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 20.04.2018 р.

UDC 343.979:94(477) «2014/2018»
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.130669

Yuriy SLUSARENKO,
orcid.org/0000-0001-6772-4386
*Ph D (juridical sciences), Associate Professor of constitutional right
Taras Shevchenko Kiev National University
(Ukraine, Kyiv) yuanatolievich@ukr.net*

LEGAL REGULATION OF ECOLOGICAL SAFETY DURING THE OIL AND GAS EXTRACTION IN UKRAINE

The features of the legal regulation of the environment protection during oil and gas extraction in Ukraine at the beginning of the XXI century were analyzed and promising directions of its improvement were defined. The reasons of increasing attention to the extraction of these types of fuel were defined. Measures dependence in the field of ecological safety from legal personality of legal entities in the sphere of oil and gas extraction in Ukraine were discovered. The process of Ukrainian cooperation with Shell and Chevron companies in context of the defining the conditions of the most acceptable for foreign investors, who are planning to invest in oil or gas extraction in Ukraine was highlighted. The process of adapting Ukrainian legislation for interests and needs of investors and with taking onto account the need in providing environmental protection in the process of mining was highlighted. The reasons and the character of the changes of legislation, aimed for deregulation in the oil and gas industry of Ukraine were defined. The influence of economic factors on the changes of legislation character, which regulates the legal relationships that arise in the process of organizing oil and gas production in Ukraine and in the distribution of mined minerals, was analyzed.

Key words: natural gas, oil, legal regulation, legal status, legal personality, gas extraction companies.

Юрій СЛЮСАРЕНКО,
кандидат юридичних наук, доцент кафедри конституційного права
Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка
(Україна, Київ) yuanatolievich@ukr.net

ПРАВОВЕ РЕГУЛЮВАННЯ ЕКОЛОГІЧНОЇ БЕЗПЕКИ ПІД ЧАС ВИДОБУТКУ НАФТИ ТА ГАЗУ В УКРАЇНІ

Проаналізовано особливості правового регулювання захисту навколишнього середовища в ході видобутку нафти та газу в Україні на початку XXI ст. та визначено перспективні напрями його вдосконалення. Визначено причини посилення уваги до видобутку цих видів палива. Виявлено залежність заходів у сфері екологічної безпеки від правосуб'єктності юридичних осіб у сфері видобутку нафти та газу в Україні. Висвітлено процес співробітництва України із компаніями Shell та Chevron у контексті визначення умов, найбільш прийнятних для іноземних інвесторів, що планують вкладати кошти у видобутку нафти або газу в Україні. Висвітлено процес пристосування українського законодавства до інтересів та потреб інвесторів із урахуванням необхідності забезпечення захисту навколишнього середовища у процесі проведення гірничих робіт. Визначено причини та характер змін законодавства, спрямованих на дерегуляцію у нафтогазовій галузі України. Визначено вплив економічних чинників на характер змін законодавства, що регулює правовідносини, які виникають у процесі організації видобутку нафти та газу в Україні та при розподілі видобутих корисних копалин.

Ключові слова: природний газ, нафта, правове регулювання, правовий статус, правосуб'єктність, газовидобувні компанії.

Formulation of the problem. The legislation changes in ecological law sphere in Ukraine at the beginning of XXI century were caused by a number of political and social-economic factors, among which it is worthwhile to highlight the interests of large Ukrainian financial-industrial groups, foreign investors and individuals in international politics who are interested in destabilizing of the situation in Ukraine. As the neo-liberal reforms implementing experience in Ukraine proved, representatives of large financial and industrial groups often preferred to violate legislation if it could provide high profits. There was no exception to the legislation, which regulated various aspects of environmental protection, including the definition of safe rules for the extraction and transportation of oil and gas. The establishment of the «oligarchy» as a combination form of corrupt political power, the shadow economy and the criminal world, and as the nomenclature and corporate clan's domination, made the utilitarian use of democratic norms and procedures possible for oligarchs, so a peculiar symbiosis of the oligarchy and authoritarianism was formed (Рафальський, 2016: 422). One of its consequences was the change in the legislation of Ukraine in favor of large financial and industrial groups. Attempts to change the legislation were motivated by the desire to monopolize the market, to provide favorable conditions for work, including through the neglect of the rules designed to ensure the protection of the environment. At the same time, the development of market relations gradually made adjustments to the activities of financially-industrial groups controlled by the oligarchs, as monopolistic competition in the long run, according to the model of the American economist Paul Krugman, contributes to the reduction of profits up to zero. The development of Ukrainian legislation has had a significant impact from the aggressive actions of the Russian Federation, namely the annexation of the Crimea and the resolution of the war on the Donbas. In order to confront «gas blackmail» on the part of the Russian Federation, Ukraine for some time completely abandoned the purchase of Russian gas, preferring the acquisition of «blue fuel» from European suppliers. This action allowed the Ukrainian side to win a lawsuit against Russia in the Stockholm Arbitration. However, the problem of providing Ukrainian consumers with energy carriers for an adequate price is, up to date, among the main priorities for the government. Thus, a complex of threats now to the energy security of Ukraine has been formed. Many researchers see the overcoming of such threats, firstly, in the natural gas increasing production on the Ukrainian territory. However, the maintenance of environmental safety in the areas of extraction and transportation remains important. Therefore, the analysis of the legal regulation effectiveness of environmental safety during mining operations remains extremely relevant, since in world practice, often in order to increase profits of mining companies the protection of the environment was sacrificed.

The analysis of the last research and publications. In the context of the study of a particular problem, one should note the theoretical developments of A. Matsko (legal protection of employees, implementation of norms of international standards for maintaining law and order in the national legislation of the states), Y. Patsurkivskyi (legal regime of property of subjects of entrepreneurial activity), R. Maydanyk (peculiarities of protection subjective civil rights to immovable property). At the same time, the analysis of the content and procedure for the adoption of the latest regulatory acts (2018) related to the environmental safety protection during the oil and gas extraction, was carried out for the first time.

The purpose of the article: an assessment of the state of the legal regulation of environmental protection during oil and gas production in Ukraine with the definition of the state body's role, including large financial-industrial groups, civil society and territorial communities in this process.

Description of the main results of the study. For a long time, the regulation of legal relations that arose in the field of oil and gas production in Ukraine was regulated by the Code of Ukraine «On Subsoil» (Про надра, 1994), the Land Code of Ukraine (Земельний кодекс України), the Mining Law of Ukraine (Гірничий закон України), the Laws of Ukraine «On Oil and Gas» (Про нафту і газ, 2001), «On the Regulation of Urban Development» (Про врегулювання), «On Land Management» (Про землеустрій), «On Environmental Expertise» (Про екологічну експертизу), «On Protection of Population and Territories against Manmade and Natural Emergencies» (Про захист населення), «On protection of the environment» (Про охорону). In addition, there were rules of environmental safety, defined by a number of state standards, namely GATS 41-00032626-00-007-97 Environmental protection. Construction of exploration and exploitation wells for oil and gas on land; GATS 41-0032626-00-011-99 Steps and stages of exploration for oil and gas. They also defined the basic rules, which were supposed to ensure environmental safety at oil and gas fields, as well as in the areas where they were transported. However, over the time, the magnitude and methods of gas extraction have been significantly expanded. At the beginning of the XXI century there was a so-called «shale revolution», when leading mining companies mastered deep drilling technologies (about 4000 m), which allowed the shale gas extraction. For this purpose, the so-called cracking or hydro-rupture method was used, for which relatively large volumes of water were needed. Their use increased the level of potential threat to the environment, which required improvement of the legal regulation of environmental safety during mining. The first place of its implementation belongs to the United States. The US experience in this area has been widely discussed in the European Union.

In November 2012, the European Parliament refused to extend the moratorium on shale gas extraction. Such a decision was taken under the influence of the «shale revolution» in the United States, where standards for deep drilling were developed. They determined the maximum volumes of methane emissions, limited pollution of reservoirs, groundwater and ground areas on territories where drilling was carried out. Additionally, acceptable levels of compensation to citizens were identified for harming their interests, including the ability to be engaged in economic activity because of the installation and use of mining equipment and pipelines, which are necessary for the mined minerals transportation.

However, the economic opportunities of the world leading countries, and above all the USA, allow us to resort to relatively high costs for environmental cleanliness during drilling operations. On the other hand, leading mining companies are trying to reduce such costs by placing wells in other countries where the interests of the local government, the general poverty of citizens, the unsettled legal relationship associated with environmental threats due to shale gas production, allow you to work without respecting the strict norms of protection of the environment the environment.

Against the background of the complication of relations with the Russian Federation and the use of Russian gas supply and transit through Ukraine to Western European consumers as a means of pressure on the Ukrainian authorities, attempts have been made repeatedly to conclude agreements with foreign companies for developing their Ukrainian gas reserves. The appeal to foreign investors was not necessarily due to the need to use modern drilling equipment and to attract relatively large funds for the organization of work.

At the same time, as the content of the agreements showed, foreign companies were offered a significant reduction of expenditures for carrying out works. In particular, it was also about certain restrictions on compliance with the rules of environmental safety, which

could cause pollution of the environment. At the same time, the initiative to provide such opportunities for foreign entrepreneurs mainly came from the Ukrainian leadership. It was believed that it would be possible to ensure the foreign investment growth. This approach was potentially dangerous for Ukrainian citizens who lived in those regions where they planned to mine minerals. This, accordingly, caused a negative reaction and protests. At the same time, ordinary citizens were largely unaware of the peculiarities of, for example, shale gas extraction, and often in their actions were driven by emotions or by the influence of interested parties, who at all costs sought to disrupt the expansion of gas production in Ukraine. Against this backdrop, a discussion was held in the scientific community on the possible risks identification to the environment in the event of the gas extraction organization. In debates participated not only economists, but the specialists in the environment sphere, and also political scientists, who wanted to evaluate the opportunities of territorial communities influence for accommodation on their territory of drilling stations. The object of the analysis became the current legislation and possible options of its changes. It was repeatedly suggested that the interests of large financial and industrial groups could outweigh the interest of territorial communities in preserving a safe environment. At the same time, it was emphasized on the possibility of using the US's positive experience in complying with environmental safety standards when organizing shale gas production.

The interest of Shell in reducing its cost of production was evident during the conclusion of an agreement on the development of shale gas deposits in Ukraine. One of the biggest problems was the strengthening of the adaptation of Ukrainian legislation to the International Recommended Practice for the exploitation of oil and gas deposits, which means uses and practices that at some point are generally accepted under similar circumstances in the international oil and gas industry. Certification of the main operating facilities was foreseen according to the standards of an internationally recognized independent environmental management system and only if such installations involve significant environmental risks. The removal of technological wastewater and extracted water, as well as the transport and disposal of waste, should take place in accordance with internationally recognized standards. Conducting the assessment and management of the risks of soil and water pollution only concerned their surface parts, except for the monitoring of groundwater. Shell received the right to use water without complying with rational water use rules. The draft agreement with the investor provided for the use of wells for the injection of sewage (Жиравецький та ін., 2013). The agreement with Chevron did not provide the collection of environmental data before the work begin and to analyze its impact on the environment in order to assess possible negative effects (Сланцева угода). Thus, the terms of the shale gas extraction laid in the draft agreement formed a rather high probability of the environmental threat from the chemical substances necessary for the extraction of shale gas, including contamination of groundwater.

In July 2013, a hearing was held at the Committee on Environmental Policy, Environmental Use and Elimination of the Consequences of the Chernobyl Disaster of the Verkhovna Rada (Parliament of Ukraine) on the topic «Environmental problems of shale gas extraction in Ukraine». People's deputies of Ukraine and employees of the Verkhovna Rada, National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine, representatives of the Ministry of Energy and Coal Industry, The State Service of Geology and Mineral Resources of Ukraine, «Bosom of Ukraine», «Naftogaz of Ukraine», National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Lviv Oblast Council, Ivano-Frankivsk Regional State Administration, Embassies of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States in Ukraine, the American Chamber of Commerce in

Ukraine, the Office of the US Department of Energy in Ukraine, «Shell» and «Chevron», scientists, representatives of non-governmental organizations, mass media and the public had been participating in the hearing. The result of the hearings was the adoption of a decision on the recommendation of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine before the start of work by Shell and Chevron to ensure the organization of a permanent system of environmental monitoring and environmental control of in places of exploration and extraction of shale gas. It provided for control of radiation pollution, the state of drinking water, determination of volumes and sources of water collection for hydro-disruption in contact with local authorities and central executive authorities, etc. It was also planned to build storage facilities for liquid waste and prohibit the transfer of polluted water to wastewater treatment facilities where there is no possibility of neutralizing toxic and radioactive materials. The document also provided for the public ahead of information on the benefits and risks of shale gas development (Екологічні проблеми).

In November 2013, Ukraine signed an agreement on the distribution of hydrocarbons extracted from the «Chevron Ukraine». It was also agreed to conduct geological exploration with «Shell». In November 2014, the Ukrainian side announced the fulfillment of the conditions set for signing an operating agreement with «Chevron». Confirmation of such agreements was expected in mid-December 2014 (Украина ожидает). However, «Chevron» refused to cooperate further, motivating its decision to drop global oil and gas prices. In the context of adopting such a decision it is not necessary to discard possible risks associated with the continuation of the war on the Donbass.

However, the economic attractiveness of gas production in Ukraine has forced to continue work in this direction. The problem was aggravated also in connection with the continuation of the «gas confrontation» with Russia, whose leaders have repeatedly expressed their opposition to the implementation of the Stockholm arbitration, and in March 2018 the Russian side appealed. At the same time, the position of the Ukrainian side required intensification. During 1991 – 2017 Ukraine reduced the volume of gas consumption and the extent of its purchases in Russia. So, if in 1991 it was used 118.2 m², then in 2017 – 31.9 m², if in 1991 91.6 billion m² of gas were imported, then in 2017 only 14.1. The least gas was imported in 2016 – only 11.1 billion m². From 2013 Ukraine began to buy gas in Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, and from November 2015 Ukraine stopped purchasing gas in Russia (Импорт газа).

In February 2018, the Prime Minister of Ukraine V. Groysman expressed the opinion that in a few years the increase in gas production in Ukrainian deposits would allow a gradual reduction of its prices for the population. Moreover, earlier, the ex-prime minister A. Yatsenyuk argued about enough gas that was extracted in Ukraine to meet the needs of the population. The sharp rise in gas prices for the population, whose solvency remained relatively small, was one of the reasons for the accumulation of debts for gas and heat supply to ordinary consumers. Cross-subsidization, in which the tariffs for gas supplied to industrial consumers grew by their unchanged for the population, proved to be ineffective, as the growth of tariffs was set at the price of industrial goods. Subsidizing the population to pay higher bills for gas was also ineffective because it remained non-addressable. It actually only increased the profits of large financial-industrial groups by transferring them from public funds within the framework of subsidizing the population. At the same time, a significant part of those who received subsidies was not interested in saving energy, since it counted exclusively on the subsidy. This forced the government to reconsider the conditions for subsidies due to its reduction. At the same time, the absence of large-scale state measures in the area of insulation

of residential buildings and the deterioration of the heating networks, as well as the lack of local attention to the use of alternative energy sources, were an obstacle to further reduction of gas consumption. At the same time, the reduction of its consumption took place over the last few years due to the loss of control over part of the territory of the Donbas and the Crimea, and this can not be attributed to the merits of the Ukrainian governments.

Against this backdrop, it was proposed to amend the legislation to facilitate gas extraction. Draft bill No. 3096-d was prepared, which provided for the simplification of some aspects of the oil and gas industry. At that, important changes were foreseen precisely in the field of ensuring environmental safety. So, to Article 97 of the Land Code of Ukraine (Земельний кодекс України) it was proposed to amend part 6 where it was argued that during the transition from the state of experimental-industrial development to industrial development for enterprises, establishments and organizations conducting exploration works, it is permitted to use a land plot on the basis of an agreement on conducting reconnaissance works with the land owner or with the consent of the land user for the period of execution of documents certifying the right to use it. In fact, this would allow agreements with land owners to be concluded, which would greatly simplify the procedure for obtaining the right to carry out works. Article 99 of the Land Code, which referred to the types of rights of land servitude (right to walk and travel on bicycles, travel along the existing route and the right to place temporary structures) was supplemented with the right to construct and deploy oil and gas extraction facilities and placement of pipeline facilities. At the same time, according to the changes that were proposed to make to Article 156 for the needs of the oil and gas industry allowed the use of agricultural land. And thanks to the changes made to Article 168, which allowed the movement of soils for drilling and construction of oil and gas wells, construction, maintenance, repair and reconstruction of oil and gas wells and associated facilities, pipeline transport, production facilities, access roads, lines power transmission and communication, underground cable power supply networks. As well as for work related to the liquidation and prevention of oil and gas wells and associated emergencies their operation sites of pipelines, production facilities, access roads, power lines and communication networks of underground power cable. At that, Article 168 of the Land Code of Ukraine prohibited the movement of soils without the special permission of the central executive authority, which implements the state policy in the sphere of implementation of state supervision (control) in the agro-industrial complex. Thus, the need to coordinate the movement of soils with the profile ministry was eliminated.

An extremely important task for ensuring environmental safety was the introduction of the Code of Ukraine «On Subsoil» (Про надра, 1994) Article 17, where it was a question of mining removal. Mining was determined part of the subsoil, provided to users for the industrial development of mineral deposits and purposes not related to the extraction of minerals. The use of subsoil outside the mining area was prohibited. At the same time, mining pits for the development of mineral deposits of national importance, the construction and operation of underground structures and other purposes not related to the extraction of minerals, were to be provided exclusively by the central executive body, which implements state policy in the field of labor protection. However, thanks to the changes introduced, users of oil and gas subsoil who received special permits for the use of such subsoil do not require mining. In fact, mining companies were able to exploit subsoil without clearly defined boundaries of the mine, which potentially carries a significant risk of soil contamination.

To facilitate the extraction of oil and gas by Article 18 of the Law of Ukraine «On Oil and Gas» (Про нафту і газ, 2001) should have been supplemented by establishing in it the

rights of holders of special permits for the use of oil and gas minerals for the construction, placement and exploitation of oil and gas extraction facilities and arrangement of deposits by land plots of all forms of ownership and all categories without changes in the purpose of these land plots, except for the lands of the nature reserve fund, recreational purposes, recreational appointment, historical and cultural destination and water fund. The right to use such plots was acquired by establishing land easements. It is important that eliminating the need to comply with the requirements of the legislation on changing the purpose of the land significantly simplified the implementation of mining operations, but also involved potential threats of soil pollution, or even the creation of conditions for the impossibility of their subsequent use by previous users or owners. At the same time, it seems rather doubtful that individual landowners will be able to obtain appropriate reimbursement in Ukrainian realities through litigation with powerful oil and gas companies.

At the same time, the proposed amendments to the Law of Ukraine «On Oil and Gas» (Про нафту і газ, 2001) determined the actual responsibility of the central bodies for environmental protection in the conditions of mining operations. Article 36 was to be supplemented with the definition that the industrial development of the deposit is carried out after the submission by the user of oil and gas mines copies of the technological project (schemes) of industrial development of the deposit and copies of the complex project of its arrangement to the central executive authority, which implements state policy in the field of geological study and rational use of subsoil.

In May 2017, the Mining Law of Ukraine was amended to supplement Article 22, where it was determined that the environmental impact assessment and examination were carried out in order to determine the absence of an unacceptable risk associated with the possibility of causing any damage to the life, health and property of citizens, as well as the natural environment and objects of management and Article 24 the mandatory presence of a mining outlet for mining operations was determined (Гірничий закон України).

And already in late March 2018, the President of Ukraine signed the Law of Ukraine «On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine Concerning Deregulation in the Oil and Gas Industry» adopted by the Parliament as a whole on March 1 (Про внесення змін). It is important that in it the possibility of land removal for the needs of oil and gas companies was foreseen solely on the basis of a working project of land management. In addition, this Law excludes the definition of «mining exclusion» from the Law of Ukraine «On Oil and Gas». Instead, several new terms were introduced. Thus, objects of oil and gas extraction included objects intended for geological study, including experimental and industrial development and extraction of hydrocarbons. Oil and gas production facilities were supposed to include oil and gas wells, gas pipelines, gas preparation complexes, gas preparation units, pre-gas preparation plants, integrated oil preparation facilities, temporary pilot and industrial plants for oil and gas preparation, compressor stations and other objects connected with exploitation of oil and gas facilities. The term «arrangement of the deposit» was defined as a complex of design, surveying, construction and other works that should be carried out for the introduction of the deposit into industrial (experimental and industrial) development, or construction, overhaul, reconstruction and technical re-equipment on operating (equipped) fields. Definition of «exploration works» was provided as geological surveying, exploration, geodetic works, geological exploration of oil and gas bearing depths; work on exploration and exploration of deposits. That is including drilling, arrangement and operation of oil and gas wells, for new construction, maintenance, major overhaul and reconstruction of oil and gas wells and asso-

ciated facilities, pipeline transport, industrial facilities, access roads, electric power lines and communication. Thus, the Law «On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine Concerning Deregulation in the Oil and Gas Industry» envisaged a further simplification of the organization of oil and gas extraction in comparison with the previous draft laws of Ukraine in this area.

At the same time, according to the Law of Ukraine «On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine Concerning Deregulation in the Oil and Gas Industry» Part 3 of Article 14 of the Law of Ukraine «On Oil and Gas» provided some changes. It has to be worded as follows: «the granting of special permits for the extraction of oil and gas (industrial development of deposits) is carried out taking into account the results of environmental impact assessment». However, the nature of taking into account such results and the dependence of obtaining permits for mining operations in the long-term perspective has not been determined.

At the same time, under pressure from the European Union, Ukraine adopted an important Law on Securing Transparency in the Extractive Industries, which defined the legal framework for regulating and organizing the collection, disclosure and dissemination of information in order to ensure transparency and prevention of corruption in the extractive industries in Ukraine. It also provided for the provision to the public of access to complete and objective information on payments by business entities operating in the extractive industries in favor of payment receivers, creating prerequisites for publicly responsible use of such entities of national importance. As well as for public awareness and discussion of issues related to the use and management by the state and territorial communities of useful minerals of national importance. Thus, representatives of territorial communities were given an opportunity to respond to potential environmental threats, which became possible due to mining.

Conclusion. An analysis of changes in the legislative acts of Ukraine related to the regulation of environmental safety during the extraction of oil and gas, suggests that among such changes are potentially dangerous for the protection of the environment. Yes, it is doubtful that expanding the possibilities for removing and moving the soil during gas production will not lead to abuses, which will result in damage to large volumes of land, including agricultural land. Abuse is also possible in the allocation of land for mining. The possibility of concluding agreements directly with their own can be a reason to ignore the general interests of territorial communities. The absence of the need to determine the boundaries of the mining drainage may also entail the danger of uncontrolled pollution of the subsoil. The obligation to inform local residents about mining operations does not mean eliminating opportunities for abuse in the field of environmental safety, because of lack of awareness of citizens with the specifics of carrying out works, or through knowingly incomplete or inaccurate information about the nature of their conduct. Moreover, taking into account the results of environmental impact assessment when granting special permits for the use of oil and gas subsoil does not guarantee that, it will be carried out of such possible consequences to the fullest extent possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Гірничий закон України – Гірничий закон України. URL: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1127-14>.

Екологічні проблеми – Екологічні проблеми видобування сланцевого газу в Україні / Рішення комітету з питань екологічної політики, природокористування та ліквідації наслідків Чорнобильської катастрофи. URL: http://komekolog.rada.gov.ua/komekolog/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=50631&cat_id=47174.

Жиравецький та ін., 2013 – Жиравецький Т. М., Кравченко О. В., Проць Б. Г., Харкевич В. В., Хомечко Г. І. Розвідка та видобуток сланцевого газу: соціальні, правові та екологічні виклики (короткий огляд питання). Львів, 2013. 56 с. URL: <http://www.uk.xlibx.com/4yuridicheskie/99400-8-rozvidka-vidobutok-slancevogo-gazu-socialni-pravovi-ekologichni-vikliki-korotkiy-oglyad-korotkiy-oglyad-lviv.php>.

Земельний кодекс України – Земельний кодекс України // Відомості Верховної Ради України. 2002. № 3–4. Ст. 27.

Импорт газа – Импорт газа: сколько голубого топлива Украина закупила с 1991 года. URL: <https://ru.slovoidilo.ua/2018/03/09/infografika/jekonomika/import-gaza-skolko-golubogo-topliva-ukraina-zakupila-1991-goda>.

Про внесення змін – Про внесення змін до деяких законодавчих актів України щодо дерегуляції в нафтогазовій галузі / Закон України. URL: <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2314-19>.

Про врегулювання – Про врегулювання містобудівної діяльності / Закон України. URL: <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/3038-17>.

Про екологічну експертизу – Про екологічну експертизу / Закон України. URL: <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/45/95-%D0%B2%D1%80>.

Про захист населення – Про захист населення і територій від надзвичайних ситуацій техногенного та природного характеру / Закон України. URL: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1809-14>.

Про землеустрій – Про землеустрій / Закон України. URL: <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/858-15>.

Про надра, 1994 – Про надра / Кодекс України // Відомості Верховної Ради України. 1994. № 36, Ст. 340.

Про нафту і газ, 2001 – Про нафту і газ / Закон України // Відомості Верховної Ради України. 2001. № 50. Ст. 262.

Про охорону – Про охорону навколишнього природного середовища / Закон України. URL: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1264-12>.

Рафальський, 2016 – Рафальський І. Національно-державне самовизначення України: внутрішні чинники та зовнішні впливи. Київ: ІПіЕНД ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України; Ніжин: Видавць ПП Лисенко М. М., 2016. 480 с.

Сланцева угода – Сланцева угода № 2. Текст УПІ з Chevron. URL: <http://www.epravda.com.ua/publications/2013/06/12/379523/>.

Украина ожидает – Украина ожидает подписания газового соглашения с Шеврон. URL: <http://biz.liga.net/ekonomika/tek/novosti/2890628-ukraina-ozhidaet-podpisaniya-gazovogo-soglasheniya-s-chevron-.htm>.

REFERENCES

Hirnychi zakon Ukrainy – Hirnychi zakon Ukrainy. [Mining Law of Ukraine]. URL: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1127-14> [in Ukrainian]

Ekolohichni problemy – Ekolohichni problemy vydobuvannya slantsevoho hazu v Ukraini [Environmental problems of shale gas extraction in Ukraine] / Rishennia komitetu z pytan ekolohichnoi polityky, pryrodokorystuvannya ta likvidatsii naslidkiv Chornobylskoi katastrofy. URL: http://komekolog.rada.gov.ua/komekolog/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=50631&cat_id=47174 [in Ukrainian]

Zhyravetskyi ta in., 2013 – Zhyravetskyi T. M., Kravchenko O. V., Prots B. H., Kharkevych V. V., Khometchko H. I. Rozvidka ta vydobutok slantsevoho hazu: sotsialni, pravovi ta ekolohichni vyklyky (korotkyi ohliad pytannia) [Exploration and extraction of shale gas: social, legal and environmental challenges (brief overview of the issue)]. Lviv, 2013. 56 s. URL: <http://www.uk.xlibx.com/4yuridicheskie/99400-8-rozvidka-vidobutok-slancevogo-gazu-socialni-pravovi-ekologichni-vikliki-korotkiy-oglyad-korotkiy-oglyad-lviv.php> [in Ukrainian]

Zemelnyi kodeks Ukrainy – Zemelnyi kodeks Ukrainy [Land Code of Ukraine] // Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy. 2002. № 3–4. St. 27 [in Ukrainian]

Import gaza – Import gaza: skolko golubogo topliva Ukraina zakupila s 1991 goda [Import of gas: how many blue fuel Ukraine purchased from 1991]. URL: <https://ru.slovoidilo.ua/2018/03/09/>

infografika/jekonomika/import-gaza-skolko-golubogo-topлива-ukraina-zakupila-1991-goda [in Russian]

Pro vnesennia zmin – Pro vnesennia zmin do deiakykh zakonodavchykh aktiv Ukrainy shchodo deregulatsii v naftohazovii haluzi [On amendments to certain legislative acts of Ukraine concerning deregulation in the oil and gas industry] / Zakon Ukrainy. URL: <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2314-19> [in Ukrainian]

Pro vrehuliuvannia – Pro vrehuliuvannia mistobudivnoi diialnosti [On regulation of urban development] / Zakon Ukrainy. URL: <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/3038-17> [in Ukrainian]

Pro ekolohichnu ekspertyzu – Pro ekolohichnu ekspertyzu [About ecological expertise] / Zakon Ukrainy. URL: <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/45/95-%D0%B2%D1%80> [in Ukrainian]

Pro zakhyst naseleennia – Pro zakhyst naseleennia i terytorii vid nadzvychainykh sytuatsii tekhnogenoho ta pryrodnoho kharakteru [On protection of population and territories from emergencies of anthropogenic and natural character] / Zakon Ukrainy. URL: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1809-14> [in Ukrainian]

Pro zemleustrii – Pro zemleustrii [About the land system] / Zakon Ukrainy. URL: <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/858-15> [in Ukrainian]

Pro nadra, 1994 – Pro nadra [About subsoil] / Kodeks Ukrainy // Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy. 1994. № 36, St. 340 [in Ukrainian]

Pro naftu i haz, 2001 – Pro naftu i haz [About oil and gas] / Zakon Ukrainy // Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy. 2001. № 50, St. 262 [in Ukrainian]

Pro okhoronu – Pro okhoronu navkolyshnoho pryrodnoho seredovyscha [About the protection of the environment] / Zakon Ukrainy. URL: <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1264-12> [in Ukrainian]

Rafalskyi, 2016 – Rafalskyi I. Natsionalno-derzhavne samovyznachennia Ukrainy: vnutrishni chynnyky ta zovnishni vplyvy [National self-determination of Ukraine: internal factors and external influences]. Kyiv: IPIEND im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy; Nizhyn: Vydavets PP Lysenko M. M., 2016. 480 p. [in Ukrainian]

Slantseva uhoda – Slantseva uhoda № 2 [Slate agreement № 2]. Tekst URP z Chevron. URL: <http://www.epravda.com.ua/publications/2013/06/12/379523/> [in Ukrainian]

Ukraina ozhidaet – Ukraina ozhidaet podpisaniya gazovogo soglasheniya s Shevron [Ukraine expects to sign a gas agreement with Chevron]. URL: <http://biz.liga.net/ekonomika/tek/novosti/2890628-ukraina-ozhidaet-podpisaniya-gazovogo-soglasheniya-s-chevron-.htm> [in Russian]

Стаття надійшла до редакції 6.04.2018 р.

УДК 94(477)(092):930(091) Гирич І. Львівська історична школа М. Грушевського
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131217

Ihor HYRYCH,
*Ph D hab. (History), Head of Department of Source Studies
of Modern History of Ukraine of the Institute of Ukrainian
Historiography (Ukraine, Kyiv) ihor_hyrych@ukr.net*

Ігор ГИРИЧ,
*доктор історичних наук, завідувач відділу джерелознавства нової історії України
Інституту української археографії та джерелознавства (Україна, Київ)
ihor_hyrych@ukr.net*

**MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYYI LVIV HISTORICAL SCHOOL:
A NEW HISTORIOGRAPHIC SYNTHESIS**

Review of:

Vitalii Telvak, Vasyl Pedych.

Lvivska istorychna shkola Mykhaila Hrushevskoho. Lviv: Svit, 2016. 440 s.

**ЛЬВІВСЬКА ІСТОРИЧНА ШКОЛА МИХАЙЛА ГРУШЕВСЬКОГО:
НОВИЙ ІСТОРИОГРАФІЧНИЙ СИНТЕЗ**

Рецензія на:

**Віталій Тельвак, Василь Педич. Львівська історична школа
Михайла Грушевського. Львів: Світ, 2016. 440 с.**

The work about Lviv historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevskyyi is written by two renowned scholars with a solid scientific experience. In 1996 Vasyl Pedych defended his thesis on this topic in IUASC. Vitaliy Telvak, being occupied with this issue for many years, has been collecting materials about Hrushevskyyi's disciples, who, in their turn, avoided the most considerable amount of reviews on the works of their teacher. The scholar assembled the evaluations of the historiographical heritage of the greatest Ukrainian historian of the XX century. Some of them have already been published in Additional series of the 50-volume «Works» of M. Hrushevskyyi. Undoubtedly, V. Telvak and V. Pedych appear to be resplendent authors for investigating the issue of Hrushevskyyi's historical school.

Vasyl Pedych is less active as the author of original works. On the contrary, Vitaliy Telvak is one of the most productive authors in the sphere of Hrushevskyyi studies, an authority in the field of research of the scholar's biography, an author of twelve books about the historian. He is an expert in the realm of investigation of the way Hrushevskyyi's works are perceived in the Ukrainian and world's historiography. However, V. Telvak has recently been mainly writing biographical outlines about M. Hrushevskyyi's activity. Notwithstanding that, this work is a research study, investigating one of the chief problems of Hrushevskyyi studies, what is Lviv school of M. Hrushevskyyi, what is the content of his disciples' works. In my view, this monograph is one of the most valuable works of these historians from the point of originality and achieving new results.

The book consists of three chapters: 1) a review of historiography and sources, 2) Lviv Historic school of M. Hrushevskyi as a scholarly community and sociocultural phenomenon, 3) the Ukrainian past in M. Hrushevskyi's disciples' researches. Considering the interests and previous scholarly works, it may be deduced that the first two chapters were written by V. Telvak and the last one by V. Pedych. An appendix contains valuable archeographic publications – evaluations of theses of M. Hrushevskyi's disciples, written by M. Hrushevskyi, Ludvic Finkl and Bronislav Dembinsky. The authors found these texts in the State archive of Lviv region in the fund of Lviv University among records where protocols about passing doctoral exams with conclusions of scientific advisers and opponents about doctoral candidates were stored. Non-printed archive materials representing unknown before special works of Mykhailo Hrushevskyi that were not published in 50 volumes of «M. Hrushevskyi. Works», were introduced for scientific usage. Biographemes of M. Hrushevskyi's disciples as well as photos of all known up until now representatives of this schools are a valuable contribution too. Some of these photos are printed for the first time. For instance, it has been unknown how Vasyl Herasymchuk looked like so far.

The reviewed book is based on rich unknown or little-known archival documents and on an extremely wide range of publications. The authors raised all the n and half-forgotten memories, diaries and epistolary sources of Hrushevskyi and his students. The greatest achievement was the elaboration of Lviv University Archives of History and Philosophy Faculties, where researchers have investigated a case concerning Hrushevskyi's scholarly seminar, namely «Historical exercises». The lists of all the students who attended the seminar have been thoroughly investigated, which assumes a high degree of accuracy in defining the number of people whom Hrushevskyi instructed during his 20 years of work in Lviv University. It is worth admiring, that the authors managed to «rise» above sources, demonstrated a fluent command of the topic, which is possible only with a deep immersion in the investigation of source documents, archives, acquiring certain source-erudition. Researchers communicate with the reader not only through narrating a certain source, but they fluently operate with sources, juxtapose contradictory facts, consider all the «pros» and «cons» expressed in the sources often representing the opposing views. They managed to pull away from the main character of the research, resisted to the temptation to support a side of a source that shows only Hrushevsky's or a student's rightness. The study of V. Telvak and V. Pedych appeared to be stereoscopic, multifaceted, free of schematization and simplification, as the authors have not concealed any «unfavorable» source that does not fit in a predetermined concept. Because of that, their book is read with great interest and the conclusions are persuasive and trustworthy.

As V. Telvak have correctly stated, to establish a complete list of school members in Lviv period of Hrushevskyi's activity, there should be given the word to his disciples – there should be an evidence that disciples recognize Hrushevskyi as their teacher. For this purpose there was raised all the rich epistolary material, letters of students to Hrushevskyi, and their correspondence with each other, all the available epistolary material from the archives of Kyiv and Lviv. The source base of the investigation is made up of documents of the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv fund №1235, funds of Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, personal archive of Central State Historical Archives in Lviv and Manuscript section of V. Stefanyk library plus additional documents as diaries and memoirs.

The first researchers who investigated the issue of Lviv school were the disciples of the school themselves, especially Myron Korduba and Ivan Krypjakevych. They were the first

to declare the existence of such scientific formation of history scholars. It was mentioned by main historiographers of Ukraine, authors of Ukraine's and world's history textbooks – Dmytro Doroshenko, Boris Krupnytskyi, Natalia Vasilenko-Polonska, Dmitry Bahaliy, Oleksander Ohloblyn. Vitaly Telvak justly notes that the second stage of the research of this scholarly phenomenon is marked by achievements of one of the greatest scholars and founder of Hrushevskiy studies – Ljubomyr Vynar. Moreover, if the historians of the 1920s – 1950s distributed M. Hrushevskiy and his students into different historiosophical areas: S. Tomashivsky, M. Koduba, I. Kryp'jakevych, I. Krevetsky – were assigned to the state (derzhavnytska) school and their teacher was assigned to the preliminary stage – populist (narodnytsky) historiography, L. Vynar was the first to declare that there is no apparent antagonism between Hrushevskiy and state historians, on the contrary he demonstrated historiosophical genetic relationship between teacher and his disciples.

Vitaly Telvak logically opposes Lubomyr Vynar to Omelian Pritsak and his famous article for the 100th anniversary of the historian in 1966 in the journal «Letters to friends». Referring to the opinion of the remarkable contemporary historian Oleksander Yas, V. Telvak considers this article a continuation of the controversy between «populists» and «state historians» in the embodiment of personal discussion of L. Vynar and O. Pritsak. In my opinion the issue is a bit more complicated, as it was mentioned in the article of the journal «Modern Ukraine». The opinion of O. Pritsak seemed to be a strange anachronism, rehearsing old patterns of state historians of early 1920s, when the Hetman ideology of Pavlo Skoropadsky and USHD in which state school acted as the ideological core arose. The paradoxical situation evolved: historians who belonged to the state school were taught by a person who did not have any state aspirations being a federalist. Unfortunately, this aspect of the relationship between Hrushevskiy and his disciples is not represented in the book that thoroughly. However, one book cannot cover all the aspects concerning Lviv historical school of Hrushevskiy. An interesting fact is that later O. Pritsak himself seemed to be a bit embarrassed by this article written 30 years ago. At least in private conversation with the author of the review, he did not answer affirmatively whether he continued to believe that Hrushevskiy contributed to the destruction of Ukrainian aristocracy at the times of Ukrainian revolution.

The third stage of Hrushevky's school research in 1890 – 1914 Vitaliy Telvak naturally assigns to the modern era of Ukrainian independence. In the 1990s – 2000s while exploring the works and activity of Hrushevskiy, the scholars began to investigate the activity of his disciples. The authors of the book mention a range of books and articles about Hrushevskiy's students. In particular, V. Pryshlyak from Lutsk published more than a dozen of publications about one of the representatives of the school – Ivan Dzhydzhora. Ya. Fedoruk wrote about V. Herasymchuk, the former head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Oleg Kupchinsky made a research about M. Koduba, I. Kryp'jakevych was in the focus of study for I. Zabolotna, R. Kryp'yakevych, Ya. Dashkevych and others. V. Telvak cited a long list of bibliography of the issue. However, despite the existence of a number of outstanding research works a major problem remained – what is the Lviv historical school of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy, who are to be considered its members, what are the scholarly peculiarities of the school formation, what are the main criteria of defining who can be considered the member of the school?

The sufficient and persuasive answer is given in the second chapter of the book. This chapter is divided into five parts: 1) The formation, structure and functioning of the school,

2) members of the school, 3) communicative nature and psychological climate, 4) students and teachers during the war and postwar period, 5) teacher assessed by students. In my opinion, the part about «the staff» in the second chapter is the most valuable part of the study, which also provides an answer to all the previously mentioned issues. There are many criteria to determine the parameters of the scientific school. V. Telvak has chosen Hrushevskyi's seminar in Lviv as the main one. He believes that the school of our most renowned historian is determined by three elements: 1) seminar «Historical exercises», 2) the fact of being the member of the corporation of professional scientists, and 3) a representative of the school had to write at least one independent work (those who wrote only reviews were not included). Definitely there should be included the fourth criterion – a student had to consider himself the representative of Hrushevky's school and be recognized as such by his teacher.

The authors of the monograph referred to the definition of school by L. Vynar, according to which the school should consist of several components: 1) organizational structure – scientific and educational institutions and research centers, 2) common historiographical concepts shared by teacher and students, 3) common research methodology, 4) common historiosophical base, 5) the existence of a common periodical (journal), 5) specific problems of historical research. Paragraphs two, three and four are sufficiently close and connected. They can cover the scholar structure of the group, which was Hrushevky's seminar in Lviv University. O. Yas in his turn distinguishes school only by three main components: 1) common intellectual (conceptual) models, 2) education and educational components (seminars, lectures, regular forums), 3) technical and organizational component (periodicals). O. Yas considers a certain research program to be a necessary feature of school. Institutionalizational consciousness of the scientific community, according to O. Yas, required the functioning of two important things: 1) the circulation of ideas or concepts that define the orientation of the educational process and 2) personal communication among scientists within the school.

The need to represent the vertical connection between historians called to life two important terms – the course and the movement. According to O. Yas, the movements are distinguished by historiosophic ideas (populist (narodnyky), state (derzhavnyky), neopopulist (neoderzhavnyky) etc.), the paradigms of scientific thinking (rationalistic, Enlightenment, romantic, positivistic etc.), political or ideological entity (royalist, republican, conservative, liberal, Marxist). There are other variations of structural separation. As far as I am concerned, the first and third factors are interrelated in the case of Ukrainian historiography. Thus, the historians of the state school linked republican ideology to populist historical trend. The same state course they correlated with the type of conservative thinking and interpretation of history. In such a way, the state historiography became the ideological foundation of the Hetman's ideology. It is important to keep in mind the fact that the most remarkable students were assigned to the state school. So it turns out that the school of Hrushevky actually represents two opposing camps, but are they opposite indeed?

On the other hand, we have another example where among V. Antonovych's students there were *okremishnyky* (people who recognized the distinctiveness of Ukrainian culture) M. Hrushevskyi, V. Domanytsky, brothers Volodymyr and D. Scherbakivsky, and at the same time – Russian centralists – *velykoderzhavnyky* (those who declared the restoration of a great country) I. Lynnychenko, A. Storozhenko, F. Nikolaychuk. In a narrow sense, all these people are members of one documentalist school of Volody-

myr Antonovich, on the other hand, they are representing two opposite historiographical or rather conceptual (historiosophical) movements. In terms of thematic focus I. Lynnychenko and A. Storozhenko may be assigned to the school of V. Antonovych as representatives of study of Ukraine-Rus and Cossack history of XVI-XVII centuries. But in terms of the leading historiosophical course these historians can not be considered as students of the Kiev school of V. Antonovych, although they were disciples of the latter.

V. Telvak justly states that unlike V. Antonovych's school, students of whom were representing the Russian historiography as they denied the Ukrainian historical process, all the students of Hrushevky were conscious political Ukrainians. Therefore, these schools should not be defined as similar, mixed in one as offered by O. Dombrovskiy – the school of V. Antonovych and M. Hrushevskiy. In terms of leading creative ideas, ideological courses, there is a distance, if not a gap, between V. Antonovych and M. Hrushevskiy.

There is still popular Ivan Krypiakevych's statement that the author of «History of Ukraine-Rus» had about a hundred students. Historians have interpreted this expression literally and it became an axiom for the issue of the number of representatives of the Lviv historical school. V. Telvak declared that it is not a large number of mythical representatives of the school, but their real presence. Not all students, i.e. those who attended lectures of Hrushevky were professional historians and only professional historians should be considered the members Lviv school of historians. Professionalism is a relative thing. Professionals are not only those who work in the sphere of higher education and write scientific papers, but also those who declared their professionalism by some publications, and then moved to another field of activity. Typically, most of Hrushevskiy's students worked as teachers in Grammar schools and did not show themselves as historians. Such teachers were not included to the school by V. Telvak.

Basing on the premise of his governing criterion, Vitaliy Telvak lists 22 students of Hrushevskiy Lviv Historical School. Hrushevskiy himself names 15 people in his «Autobiography», dated by 1906: O. Terletsky, D. Korenets, M. Korduba, S. Tomashivsky, S. Rudnytsky, O. Tselevych, Yu. Kmit, Z. Kuzelya, O. Chaykivsky, V. Herasymchuk, O. Sushko, F. Holychuk, I. Dzhydzhora, I. Krevetsky, I. Krypiakevych. V. Telvak adds seven more people to the 15 above mentioned: B. Barvinsky, I. Shpytkovsky, M. Zaliznyak, B. Buchynsky, F. Sribny, M. Bordun, M. Stadnyk. A small essay about each of them including biographical and artistic characteristics is given in the book. V. Telvak describes the time of seminar studies, scientific merits, the election as the full members of the Archaeological Commission of the Shevchenko Scientific Society or as the ordinary and active members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. He also tried to file collective prosopographic portrait of the representatives of the school: their social status, age, thematic areas of their experiments.

Not all the members of M. Hrushevskiy school were historians. S. Rudnytsky started as a historian, but later became a geographer, one of the founders of the national geography. Zenon Kuzelia put himself on record in the history of science as an outstanding ethnographer. Mykola Zaliznyak became a politician and political scientist after the seminar studies, investigated the political structure of the countries of the world that used federal model of the state. Inclusion of M. Zaliznyak into M. Hrushevskiy school is one of the achievements of V. Telvak and V. Pedych research. Mykola Stadnyk investigated Hadiach agreement but left the field of history and then studied in Krakow as a lawyer. Yu. Kmit did not study in

Lviv University at all. He was the student of the seminary, but passed a historical seminar of M. Hrushevskyi and therefore, was logically included in the school of Lviv professor by V. Telvak. Oleksandr Sushko at first studied at K.Studynsky, literary critic, and can be considered a mutual student. B. Barvinsky defended his doctorate under the authority of L. Finkl but was close to M. Hrushevskyi by his conceptual approaches. Melania Bordun was the only female student in the school. V. Telvak did not include Mykola Chubaty in M. Hrushevskyi School, because he only attended lectures and did not pass the seminar training, and defended the doctorate after the World War I, when M. Hrushevskyi was not in Lviv. As for me, this argument is not entirely convincing. In fact, if to consider the methodological principles and conceptual approaches, M.Chubaty ticks all the boxes for M. Hrushevskyi School.

Several M. Hrushevskyi's students were not included to the school. Yevhen Barvinsky really turned to Polish historiography, lost historiosophical communication with the school of the author of «History of Ukraine-Rus», and worked for the Polish historiography. The objection to his including in the school looks quite reasonable. I. Flunt and Y. Forostyna attended the seminar, prepared to defend their doctorate, but did not create their original works, thus V. Telvak did not include them to M. Hrushevskyi's school.

Including the lists of all students or individuals who attended the seminar into the book would be an obvious thing. Also, it would be interesting to have a list of Lviv University students who listened to M. Hrushevskyi's lectures. Among them we could find a people who did not write highbrow scientific papers, but could have become the authors of popular books, articles in the press, etc. In this way, we could create a circle of students of the second order who did not become historians and researchers, though they were the mentors of young representatives of Ukrainian intelligentsia in Galicia, and therefore the public figures that influenced the cultural life of Western Ukraine.

By putting the criterion of belonging to Hrushevskyi's school – studying at the undergraduate seminar, V.Telvak exhaustively and consistently transferred it to the sphere of life, listed all the people who, under this definition, belong to the school of Lviv professor. This is one of the greatest achievements of reviewed publication.

On the other hand, whether it is right to assume the criterion of seminarium as the only possible one? Should we include only historians to Hrushevskyi's school? In my opinion, it is worth involving researchers that belonged to related disciplines: publicists, literary scholars, political and social scientists. These related experts were historians at the same time – the authors of a number of valuable works that often exceed quantity of works of the people who have passed «historical exercises» of Lviv professor. As for me, we have no right to reject the second criterion of belonging to the school – work in journals, edited by M. Hrushevskyi, such as «Memoirs of the Shevchenko Scientific Society», «Literary and Scientific Journal», «Publishing Union» and other special collections of the Society. They were the school no less than the seminar. These publications were also a scientific training, tantamount to the seminar. Moreover, some of these Hrushevskyi's employees belonged to his «Familia» – close collaborators of the historian.

V. Telvak agrees with the definition of S.Pankova concerning the existence of Hrushevskyi's journalistic school. Therefore, in my view, we should also look broader at the representation of Hrushevskyi's school in Lviv. Moreover, there were only 18 people doing only practices on history, from 22 representatives of school listed by Drohobych historian.

Volodymyr Hnatiuk was one of Hrushevskyy's students at the faculty, the latter graduated from Lviv University during the years of active teaching work of Hrushevskyy. I believe that when we include Z. Kuzelya, an ethnographer, into students, then we should have included V. Hnatiuk as well. V. Hnatiuk was only a year older than Yu. Kmit' and four – than Stepan Tomaszewski. Hrushevskyy was one of the founders of the national school of Ukrainian ethnography, and had an impact on V. Hnatiuk, regarding his ethnographic activity.

In my opinion, we can include Mykhailo Wozniak to the disciples of Hrushevskyy with some justification. Not only did he attend Hrushevskyy's lectures at the University, but what is most important, he was actively published in «Memoirs of the Shevchenko Scientific Society» and in the 1920s performed the orders of the academician on the research of links of unity concerning Galicia with the Great Ukraine. Wozniak's publications entirely fit into M. Hrushevskyy's interpretation of the nineteenth century in the context of conceptuality, and that is the main thing for us. Hrushevskyy also considered his disciple, prominent literary critic. Works of M. Yevshan as a critic fit into the context of literary interests of Hrushevskyy. In his writings, M. Yevshan uses historical and literary method, while being a historian of culture. Hrushevskyy not only ordered the articles to M. Yevshan, but also discussed the conceptual aspects in the assessment of Ukrainian literary process of early twentieth century. Mykola Hrushevskyy compares Mykola Yevshan to Ivan Dzhyzhzhora by his value and closeness to himself.

As far as I am concerned, we should not forget about the representatives of the young «Familia» of Hrushevskyy that signed his answer «In defense of truth» to the libelous brochure of S. Tomashivsky «Before the General Meeting of the Shevchenko Scientific Society», dated by 1913. We are talking about Osy Rozdolsky and Mykhailo Mochulsky. The latter was, moreover, a distant cousin-in-law of Hrushevskyy. There is no escaping from the fact of the impact of Hrushevskyy's concepts of the social New Age in Ukraine on his studies of historical and literary life of the nineteenth century. Mykhailo Lozynskyy, journalist and social scientist, is famous for very fruitful work in the journals of Hrushevskyy. He himself gave place in the library of the Shevchenko Scientific Society to bibliographer Volodymyr Doroshenko and cooperated with him actively. Furthermore, Doroshenko was a prominent historian of the political movement of the XIX – early XX century that was the object of Hrushevskyy's studies at the time.

The second chapter of the book – «The communicative nature and psychological climate [of Hrushevskyy school]» tends to be yet another most important chapter from the point of scientific findings, that solves many controversial issues of Hrushevskyy studies. V. Telvak managed to describe the relationship between the mentor and his students in a sensitive and tactful manner, not to come down on the side of any party during mentioning the inevitable conflicts that took place between M. Hrushevskyy and his environment, to cover all the complexities of the personal relationship, and even perspective of their time genesis, as objectively as possible. The false stereotype of «exploitation of the students» by professor has been discarded in the work. Another trend has been highlighted instead; the professor took care of material condition of his students, was concerned about their employment and gave them a start in the independent scientific life. It was very difficult to implement all of it in the conditions of colonial reality of Western Ukraine, as it was necessary for Hrushevskyy to find the additional sources of financing, and sometimes to give his own money. V. Telvak

gives an interesting list of appeals of students to the mentor and vice versa, that indicates the relationships based on positivity and trust in the team ipso facto. All the students were friendly to each other to different extents. They had active epistolary contact with each other, which would have been impossible if the historical school of Hrushevskyi would have been just a usual formality, if all the students would not have been united by the joint public and cultural ideals.

In this chapter, V. Telvak emphasizes on the fact that the relationship between the mentor and the representatives of his school may quite fit in the generally known communicative issue of conflict called «Fathers and Sons». «Sons» continue the father's work, go further by growing up from the «short pants» of the «half-baked» scientists, thus being involved in the building of their own models of historiographical process. The fact that during the conflict in 1913 almost all the students were on the side of the opposition or held a neutral position, thus just a few of them supported Hrushevskyi, tends to be an evidence to it.

The book shows how S. Tomashivsky, a person that spared no effort to support the expansion of public popularity of Hrushevskyi to 1905, begins to confront the teacher from 1906, and in the 1911 – 1913 becomes a major oppositionist to Lviv Professor in the middle of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the author of some anonymous lampoons on its political, scientific and organizational activities in Lviv. V. Telvak considers the personal reasons to be the catalyst of this sudden change in the relationship. I think that the reason there consisted also in the other conceptual vision of the political development of Ukraine. Communalism theory of Hrushevskyi included the domination of the interests of Great Ukraine, as the main part of the all-Ukrainian territory, above the Galicia – as the mandatory element. At the beginning of his scientific career, Stepan Teodorovich shared these thoughts of mentor. Once getting into the governing nucleus of the National Democratic Party, S. Tomashivsky begins to consider Galicia as the flagship of Ukrainian liberation movement, and the «Russian» Ukraine – only as a reservoir of personnel, as an auxiliary link in this process. S. Tomashivsky was a consistent supporter of the compromising policy concerning the governing political circles of Poland. He failed to win Hrushevskyi over, so he began a consistent fight against Hrushevskyi's concept of the Ukraine's past and his political action on the eve of the First World War. However, he was doing this in quite an unsympathetic and immoral way of anonymous mischief-making, distortions of facts, slandering. It is interesting that in the times of war M. Korduba took the part of Hrushevskyi concerning his political strategy on the eve of the revolution and declared the vision of S. Tomashivsky as the false one. Because of the conceptual views of historians of Hrushevskyi's school, M. Korduba's letters to his mentor, dated by the 1910s, in which he criticized S. Tomashivsky for an insufficient attention to the state-building moments in Ukrainian history during the period of the Cossack state, are considered interesting.

I. Krypiakivych has been the closest one to S. Tomashivsky from all the students of Hrushevskyi, and it has been rightly observed by V. Telvak. An extensive correspondence between them, mainly from the 1920s, has been preserved. Both were the co-founders of the statist vision of Ukrainian history, both had chilled relationship with M. Hrushevskyi in the mid-1910s to the early 1920s. But it was Mykhailo Serhiyovych who has made the first steps towards reconciliation after returning to Kyiv in 1924 by bringing all his disciples except for S. Tomashivsky, I. Krevetsky, and some others, in the work in the structures of the historical section of UAS.

V. Telvak describes the picture of the formation of relationships with each student in detail, and they were very different. Ironically, despite the incredibly hostile relations of Hrushevskyyi with O. Barvinsky, the son of the latter – Bogdan Barvinsky – was among the students of Lviv professor. A number of works of this talented young scientist was written under the leadership of Hrushevskyyi. So, Hrushevskyyi could rise above the level of personal relationships. For that matter, it is hard to miss the conceptual continuity with thoughts of Mykhailo Hrushevskyyi in Barvinsky's book «Historical Development of the Name of Ukrainian-Rus People», written after the diffidation of the mentor and the student in 1908.

Oleksandr Sushko has spoiled the relations with M. Hrushevskyyi very soon by spreading false rumors about the trip of I. Franko and Lviv professor to Rome in carriages of different classes. Due to the cooling of relations O. Sushko passed his doctoral exams with Polish professors, and not with Hrushevskyyi. Stepan Rudnytsky, who was a distant relative of S. Dnistriansky and one of the main antagonists of Hrushevskyyi, was a member of various oppositions in the Shevchenko Scientific Society.

Those were Hrushevskyyi's students, especially I. Krypiakivych, M. Korduba and V. Herasymchuk, who wrote the most fundamental evaluation of scientific heritage of Hrushevskyyi, concerning the contribution of his «History of Ukraine-Rus» to the treasury of Ukrainian and world historiography. The chapters «The students and mentor during the war and post-war period» and «Mentor in the assessments of students» mention about it as well as about the relationship of the academician with students in the 1920-1930s.

The third chapter «Ukrainian pastimes in the studies of Hrushevskyyi's students», written by Vasyl Pedych, has been dedicated to the historiographical problems of works of representatives of Hrushevskyyi Lviv Historical school. He has withdrawn from the tradition concerning the individual description of each student's heritage and combined all the students in thematic clusters by areas of their studies' activity. As a result, V. Pedych has identified seven thematic clusters: the Princely era and the Lithuanian-Polish period, Ukrainian Cossackdom to the middle of XVII century, Khmelnychchyna, the Ruin, Mazepa Hetmanate and the times after it, and Koliyivshchyna, which together make up the era of Cossackdom and Galician history of the XIX century.

This section is the first attempt to describe the historiographical contribution of each Hrushevskyyi's student by chronological and thematic principle in our historiography. The attempt is successful as a whole, as it will be useful not only for researchers, but also can successfully be used for the educational process in the universities of Ukraine. The period of the rise of Kyiv Rus state to the days of Ivan Mazepa has been the most prolific for the experiment. S. Tomashivsky, M. Korduba and I. Krypiakivych were primarily synthetic historians and analysts at the same time in all these periods. It is no coincidence that we consider them the most talented students of Hrushevskyyi. All of them have written about the princely Ukraine-Rus, while being insightful researchers of Khmelnychchyna. M. Korduba specialized in international politics and diplomatic history, S. Tomashivsky – on the popular movements in Galicia; I. Krypiakivych investigated the internal structure of the state of B. Khmelnytsky, and in times of Hrushevskyyi's life in Lviv – the issue of urban population of Lviv (Ukrainian presence) of the XVI century. The rest of the historians have shown themselves in specific thematic niches: F. Sribny studied Stauropegial brotherhood in Lviv, I. Shpytkovsky – Koliyivshchyna, I. Dzhydzhora – trade of Hetmanshchyna during the times of Danylo Apostol

at the beginning of the XVIII century, V.Herasymchuk – the times of Ruin, hetmanship of Ivan Vyhovsky and Hadiach treatise, M.Stadnyk – Hadiach treatise, D.Korenets – Martyn Pushkar rebellion (as well as times of Vyhovsky), O. Sushko – the Union of the middle of the XV century, B. Barvinsky – Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the XIV – XV centuries, B. Buchynsky – the Union of the XVI century. I. Krevetsky, who specialized in Ukrainian public life in the times of European revolutions in 1848 and Yu. Kmit, who was interested in the religious life of the mid-nineteenth century, based their studies on the history of the nineteenth century. We cannot mention of all students and subjects here. A church history, on which O. Sushko, B. Buchynsky, M. Bordun, Yu. Kmit worked, is a group of great interest that deserves a separate mentioning.

There is hardly a topic that can be completely covered by only one study, but the research of V. Telvak and V. Pedych is related to the editions, after the publication of which any subsequent researcher dealing with the problems of Hrushevskyyi Lviv historical school will be unable to pass by it without having a look at the findings and evaluation of the two authoritative scholars. The benefits of the work should include such a moment: its content is much richer than the issue indicated on the cover of it. In a broader sense, this is a story of socio-cultural and scientific life of Galicia in the late XIX – early XX century. The image of Hrushevskyyi Lviv historical school has been masterfully inscribed in the broader context of social life in Galicia, Polish-Ukrainian relations, contacts with Naddniprovyanshchyna (the Dniper Ukraine) on the issues of unity, and the like. In my opinion, this work is one of the best books in the field of Hrushevskyyi studies for the last 10–15 years.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 02.03.2018 р.

УДК 94(477)»19»:355 Литвин М. Літопис укр. визвольного руху середини ХХ ст.
на укр.-пол. пограниччі
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131215

Mykola LYTVYN,
orcid.org/0000-003-3346-6774
Ph D hab. (History), Professor,
Director of Ivan Kryp'iakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies
of the NAS of Ukraine (Ukraine, Lviv) inukr@inst-ukr.lviv.ua

Микола ЛИТВИН,
доктор історичних наук, професор, директор Інституту українознавства
імені І. Крип'якевича НАН України
(Україна, Львів) inukr@inst-ukr.lviv.ua

**THE CHRONICLE OF THE UKRAINIAN LIBERATION
MOVEMENT OF THE MIDDLE OF THE XX CENTURY
ON THE UKRAINIAN-POLISH BORDER**

Review of:

**V. I. Ilnytsky. The OUN Carpathian region in Ukrainian liberation movement (1945 – 1954):
monograph / Ivan Kryp'iakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies of National Academy
of Sciences of Ukraine; Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University.
Drohobych: Posvit, 2016. 696 p.**

**ЛІТОПИС УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ВИЗВОЛЬНОГО РУХУ СЕРЕДИНИ
ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ НА УКРАЇНСЬКО-ПОЛЬСЬКОМУ ПОГРАНИЧЧІ**

Рецензія на:

**В. І. Ільницький. Карпатський край ОУН в українському
визвольному русі (1945–1954): монографія / Інститут українознавства
ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України; Дрогобицький державний педагогічний
університет імені Івана Франка. Дрогобич: Посвіт, 2016. 696 с.**

The topicality of V. I. Ilnytskyi's scientific research gives rise to no doubts. At the present stage of the development of Ukrainian society the interest to the problem of the Ukrainian liberation movement's history of 1940 – 1950 has considerably increased. It has been caused not merely by the social-political circumstances, but also by the scientific ones, such as disclosing of archives and the need to process a considerable bulk of sources. In particular, the interest to this problem has generated with the Russian aggression against the Crimea and in the East of Ukraine as in this connection the Ukrainian national armed forces began its revival after many dozens of years. It can definitively have crystallized and tempered, but mainly thanks to its historical traditions. It is clear, that the UPA's experience of military actions, as well as, in fact, its organisation as an armed force, can be in many respects transformed into the development of the modern Ukraine's military doctrine and of working out of its separate military operations. The scientific novelty of the research under

review is strengthened also by a regional aspect, id est, by the first complete consideration of the history of the OUN's underground structures' activities in a separate area.

After the acquaintance with Vasyl' Ilnytskyi's monograph one may easily come to a conclusion that the work structure is very logical. It is necessary to underline, that the general scientific level of Ilnytskyi's research is based on the association of philosophy of history and determinative theoretic-methodological approaches to the solution of a chain of scientific problems, namely axiological, synergetic, hermeneutic, civilization and phenomenological. For example, the axiological approach enabled to conduct the research altogether, first of all, its interpretational and evaluating judgements, made on a firm basis of the universal (Christian) and national values.

The synergetic approach in the work is manifested by the interpretation of the Carpathian Area of the OUN (Karpatskyi Krai) as an organised system which contains many components in structural, personnel, military-material and functional measurements. The concretely scientific level of the research methodology is represented by the synchronously-diachronic, regional, system and complex approaches, and also by an association of principles of historicism, scientific character, objectivity and factor multiplicity, priority of documentary facts.

All this can be well seen in the description of the basic sections of the work. In particular, the author has diligently analysed the problem historiography, source base, has proved the theoretical-methodological bases of his research, has elucidated the activity of the Carpathian Area of the OUN, the functioning of UPA's Military District – 4 «Hoverlia», everyday routine and the life of underground activists and insurgents, the repressive policy of the communist party authorities concerning the liberation movement. In the course of the work the purpose and research task have been completely fulfilled, which fact is displayed in the resumptive conclusions. The list of the sources and literature totalling 1137 positions is really impressive.

What is characteristic of V. I. Ilnytskyi's monograph is the innovative approach in solution of certain scientific problems. First, he has managed with the greatest possible accuracy to find out the changes in territorial, and, furthermore, in supervising structures of the Carpathian Area of the OUN, to define nearly a hundred persons who worked as leaders and consultants in the six district and a regional OUN headquarters, to discover their real surnames, names and biographic data (by the way, for the first time about many separate persons). Secondly, the forms and methods of propaganda activities has been accurately analysed (the social objects of nationalist information influence and, also, its separate results have been specified), the basic directions of the OUN's fighting and economic activities in the Karpatskyi Krai have been singled out. Thirdly, the fifth section, featuring the life, moral-psychological climate and the planes of conflicts is marked with author's originality. Fourthly, the mechanism of the struggle of Soviet special bodies against the nationalist underground in the Karpatskyi Krai has been disclosed in details, particularly, what concerns the variety of special means and methods implemented by the structures of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and KGB in the opposition with the OUN.

The scientific and practical value of the monograph is incontestable: it is a significant contribution into the elaboration and study in depth of the Ukrainian liberation movement in 1940 – 1950 on the wholly and of its separate segment – the Carpathian Area of the OUN's activities in particular.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 2.02.2018 р.

НОТАТКИ

НАУКОВЕ ВИДАННЯ

**СХІДНОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ
ІСТОРИЧНИЙ ВІСНИК**

**EAST EUROPEAN
HISTORICAL BULLETIN**

**ВИПУСК 7
ISSUE 7**

Головний редактор
Василь Ільницький

Відповідальний редактор
Микола Галів

Літературне редагування
Ірина Невмержицька

Редагування англomовних текстів
Олег Шалата

Технічний редактор
Лілія Гриник

Макетування та верстка
Наталія Кузнєцова

Дизайн обкладинки
Олег Лазебний

Здано до набору 21.05.2018 р. Підписано до друку 04.06.2018 р.
Гарнітура Times. Формат 70x100 1/16.
Друк офсетний. Папір офсетний.
Ум. друк. арк. 24,65. Зам. № 0618/54
Наклад 300 примірників

Друкарня – Видавничий дім «Гельветика»
73034, м. Херсон, вул. Паровозна, 46-а, офіс 105.
Телефон +38 (0552) 39-95-80
E-mail: mailbox@helvetica.com.ua
Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи
ДК № 4392 від 20.08.2012 р.