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THE HISTORY OF EVERYDAY LIFE
IN CONTEMPORARY UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY:
FROM IMITATION TO FIRST RESULTS

Lyakh S. R.

INTRODUCTION

The history of everyday life has acquired citizenship rights in Ukrainian historiography since the late 1990s. Moreover, we can talk about a certain fashion for the use of the terms “everyday life”, “microhistory”, “life strategies”, “practices”. Another question is how these slogans correspond to the actual content of the new historical works.

It is natural that the systematic turn in approaches to the history of the writing begins with a thoughtful comprehension of the literature of the general epistemological plan. In Ukraine, the boom of theoretical and methodological formal interest in the foundations of the history of everyday life and even its peculiar propaganda fell on the period of 2006–2015. The achievement of the literature of such, “theoretical”, plan is to put into circulation a broad bibliography, to outline the ideas of Western colleagues on the prospects of enriching the research tools of historians, to develop the categorical apparatus of microhistory and history of everyday life.

All authors who have been advocates of the new direction of historical research invariably mark the series of collective monographs of the Institute of History of Ukraine of the NAS of Ukraine, published under the slogan “From the history of everyday life in Ukraine”¹. It is noteworthy that all of these volumes are opened by the interpretative historiographical essays with references to foreign authors, which carefully explain what the story “should be”. Moreover, in the following sections on specific historical topics, the actual history of everyday life is interspersed with the usual sociological-positivist discourse.

The first results of the work of Ukrainian historians in the field of history of everyday life and suggestions on the prospects of further concrete historical studies were considered at scientific-practical conferences.

In general, the first decade of active interest in the history of everyday life was marked by the predominance of theoretical and organizational searches over practical results. The significant problem remains the need to overcome such quasi-microhistoric actions as imitation of the history of everyday life, frank biography, empirical routine, factual mischief. Paul Ricoeur’s remarks should also be remembered: philosophers should study the experience of historians and be in no hurry to teach them how to learn history. So, it’s time for the hard work of “practicing historians”.

The publications of the last few years have provided the necessary material to see the difference between traditional historiography and the technology of everyday life, as well as to understand how these magic works when the essence emerges “using magic from specific historical studies, not just on the basis of historiographical speculation”.

1. Another look at the Hetmanate: a historical presentation by Tatyana Tairova-Yakovleva

The famous researcher of the history of the Hetmanate of the XVII – the beginning of XVIII centuries, Tatiana Tairova-Yakovleva, reaffirms her talent as a historian in her new book. Defining her work as a “story”, from the first page T. Tairova-Yakovleva puts the emphasis on a living person, not on institutions or structures. The author invites the reader to make a “journey... into the world of people... but at the same time raises the bar of conversation and notes that in reality it is a matter of principled ideals of truth. Beginning her book with the words “everyday life” and “leisure”, T. Tairova-Yakovleva directs the reader to a deep serious conversation about the “values” of the Ukrainian elite, about the “mentality of a free man who can manage his own destiny and control his country”. The components of this mentality are called

---

3 Рікер, Поль. Історія та істина. Київ, 2001. С. 30: “A philosopher cannot teach a historian something here; always the opposite – the philosopher learns from the practice of applying some branch of science. Therefore, we must first listen to the historian when he reflects on the problems of his scientific profession... – This is about interpreting the problem of objectivity, so the advice of philosophers to consider more carefully the cognitive experience of professional historians is appropriate when it comes to ways of research and presentation of the past.
“tradition of active participation in the life of the country”, “awareness of their own importance and independence”, “understanding of the knightly nature of the Cossack service”. The object of contemplation is “a society in which they believed in God, freedom and success”\(^5\). Therefore, before diving into the world of things and traditions, the author outlines a general plan of her research, sets the semantic framework of her discourse.

However, the historian relies not on ideologists, but on the world of things: “Go and see” (not “wisdom and teach”).

In the book, the historian’s attention is transferred from the battlefields, squares of big cities, corridors of power, Seimas, councils and doom to the periphery to the chamber, private houses, cellars (where barrels with precious coins are stored), to the cozy nooks of gardens and parks, to the realm of ideas, tastes, dreams, feelings.

The book is full of descriptions of “comfort and convenience”, details of the world that surrounded the Ukrainian elite. There is the variety of fabrics, accessories, motifs and techniques of embroidery; colour palette; jewellery; collections of rich weapons; it causes a genuine sympathy, genuine wonder. Wells, ponds, gardens, parks, stables, forges, bakeries, glaciers, baths, barns – all these objects appear as the natural environment of the collective hero of the book. Moldings, bas-reliefs, tiles, icons, mirrors, carpets, furniture, lamps, linen, curtains, porches, lamps are not collections and not artistic exercises of historian. This is a delineation of the living space of the elite of early modern Ukraine. This is an occasion to talk about how people met guests, how they communicated, discussed important matters, consulted. Dishes, drinks, spices and sweets, all this “variety of food on the tables of the Ukrainian elite” is a conversation about the world of care, the testament to the power of life. Family coat-of-arms on a silver household and on portraits, receptions, gatherings, travels, a marching way of life are an occasion to talk about the way of life and mentality of those same persons who in the previous monographs of Tairova-Yakovleva have appeared in the role of generals, officials, rebels, leaders, adventurers. The detailed list of musical instruments, analysis of musical tastes, descriptions of orchestras, descriptions of private libraries, chess games are evidence of the level of intelligence.

Household things in T. Tairova-Yakovleva’s book are not simply listed and described. They live the lives of their owners. They are used in ceremonies, accompanying their hosts on journeys. They are taken with them in exile to Siberia, they are ordered, inherited, used for posing in ceremonial portraits.

---

\(^5\) Same. P. 3, 8.
Wherever possible, the author clarifies under what circumstances “certain” items were illuminated: dowry, confiscation of property from a disgraced sergeant, scenario of receiving an embassy, performing duties, resting. Typically, descriptions of things are provided along with the names of their owners. So, there are no “general” things. Things are the environment and the continuation of a person. Whatever the detail of things, there is always a living person at the centre of the story with her aspirations, worries, ambitions, tastes. It is not a museum. It is the world of people, the history of society.

Thoroughly listing the details of the architectural decoration of the homes of Ukrainian hetmans and petty officers, T. Tairova-Yakovleva certainly finds the human equivalent of things: in all this there is “a lot of naivety and heartfelt simplicity”\textsuperscript{6}. She carefully examines the details of the portraits of the seventeenth century to “look at them clearly, better understand and imagine”. In portraits, the heroes of her book appear “happy and contented with life”; they are “strong and hardy”\textsuperscript{7}. The proficiency of the Latin by petty officers and hetmans, details of student life (debates, performances, poems, recitals, dialogues) give reason to say: “it was a society of educated people”\textsuperscript{8}. In the details of the Ukrainian early-fashioned vertebrate tradition (culture), the historian sees the civilizational characteristics: “Unlike in Western European Baroque, where much attention was paid to death ... for the Ukrainian baroque, the main subjects were military glory, sacrifice, high impulse, victory of life over death”\textsuperscript{9}.

After a generous presentation of all kinds of goods, attributes, things, family values, habits and customs, in the final section of her work, T. Tairova-Yakovleva comes to the integral characteristics: “it was a new elite, not yet tainted, restrained by laws and traditions.; “one of the defining features of that society was modesty”; “Ukrainian society of the hetman era was striking with the combination of southern temperament, Baroque sophistication and sentimentality”\textsuperscript{10}.

Testifying for property, disputes over the management of dowry, charity, founding monasteries, private correspondence, family disputes, private intrigues, which classical historiography mostly ignores as insignificant and insignificant, T. Tairova-Yakovleva uses them as an argument of historical weight. She describes in detail the facts of women’s involvement in both family affairs and formal receptions and ceremonies, and notes such features of their social status as “freedom, economic independence and serious legal

\begin{itemize}
  \item[7] Same. P. 90--91.
  \item[8] Same. P. 10.
  \item[9] Same. P. 131.
  \item[10] Same. P. 113, 148, 150.
\end{itemize}
rights”, “dignified place in society”\textsuperscript{11}. The author tells a series of “life stories” of bright and successful (but with dramatic biography) women of the Hetmanate region and is not afraid to hint at the role of passion in history – “fatal women”.

Ultimately, T. Tairova-Yakovleva rehabilitates the historical dignity of the Ukrainian elite of the period of the “Young Hetmanate”, removes from the image of the Cossack officers the stratification of class contempt, outrageous criticism, which several generations of historians and history buffs have hung on to this social stratum. It is not through contractual articles of the Ukrainian hetmans with the tsarist, royal, sultan governments. It is not through power intrigues, schemes, coalitions. Her view is “simple”, direct and immediate, naive in something (though the look of an experienced researcher cannot be truly naive, it is cunning naivety, not easy naivety).

In the array of things, in the atmosphere of traditions, rituals, etiquette, the author finds the phenomenon of dignity of these people. In her book, the Ukrainian elite of the XVII century emerges as a community of people that are positive, moderate, modest and mercantile in their own way, close to nature, with healthy instincts, with a sense of duty, entrepreneurial, hostess, devoted to family values, with a desire for beauty. Step by step, combining the mass of empirical material (“small” and marginal in terms of traditional historiography), the author creates a holistic image, conveys the taste of the era. It is not just detail; it is a purposeful feature. It is a work on entities and meanings.

Thus, T. Tairova-Yakovleva compensates for the outdated defect of Ukrainian historiography: the excessive politicization of the issue of the social face of the Cossack elders, the careless attribution of class selfishness, betrayal, pleasures, the fall of ideals. The small book by T. Tairova-Yakovleva elegantly and unobtrusively puts everything in its place. The Hetmanate appears before us as a living organism. It is not a chessboard for monarchs; it is a world where interesting, full-blooded people live, with healthy instincts and positive mentality.

\section*{2. Child and childhood in the Hetmanate of the XVIII century: version of Igor Serdiuk\textsuperscript{12}}

If in her book Tatiana Tayrova-Yakovleva fancies romantic optimism, then in the book of Igor Serdyuk another mood reigns. “Total patriarchal society” emerges here\textsuperscript{13}, social “lower classes” (“commoners”), including

\textsuperscript{11} Same. P. 50.
\textsuperscript{12} Сердюк І. Маленький дорослий: Дитина й дитинство в Гетьманщині XVIII ст. Київ: К.І.С., 2018. 456 с.
\textsuperscript{13} Same. P. 350.
orphans, beggars, artisan students, homeless people, are at the forefront here. There are always an accident and death. It cannot be said that each of these two historians knows only one side of society. T. Tairova-Yakovleva, who deliberately remains within the XVII century, is the author of a series of thorough studies on the military-political tussle from Khmelnytsky to Mazepa with its endless intrigues, defeats, victims, instability, political impasse, betrayal, betrayal, frustration. The researcher knows well this “difficult” side of life of the early modern Ukrainian society, she obviously has felt the need to balance the picture from the inside. At the same time, Igor Serdiuk, seeking comprehensiveness in the characterization of the society of the XVII century, intuitively knowing about the “bright” side of life, is forced to untangle the gloomy private stories recorded in court cases, patiently seeking “reservations” about the full “normal” life.

The author’s self-determination of Igor Serdiuk is a “new history”, cultural and historical anthropology. It can also be noted that the organizing core of I. Serdiuk’s book is the discourse of social history. This powerful systematic research claims to be complete. It is clear that this kind of research program cannot be limited to the use of only one method. The author uses a variety of research tools with all seriousness: mathematical statistics, microhistorical analysis, elements of psychoanalysis, many analytical analogies throughout Europe, and also (in this case it is the most important) the technique of everyday life. The presence of the latter is attested, first of all, by the author’s actual actions, but also by the presence of formal markers in the form of characteristic references to the titles of the subdivisions of the book, such as “everyday practices”, “children’s space”, “outsourcing”, “ideas and practices”.

I. Serdiuk’s source base consists mainly of texts capable of generously supplying material for the history of everyday life. These are the hetman’s diaries and “autobiographical works of local origin”, private correspondence, court cases.

The author points out: “In studies of the life of the common people of early modern Ukraine, the historian often has to go to sources, which is too attentive to casual cases”\textsuperscript{14}. Court cases is gloomy material. Inevitably their gloomy shadow falls on the whole story of the historian. However, it is well worth it: “The litigation contains valuable clauses and details that sometimes do not relate to the case itself, but reflect elements of everyday life, the emotional sphere, the material culture”. The author notes from the outset that “individual court cases have significant potential for anthropological reading”\textsuperscript{15}.

\textsuperscript{14} Same. P. 191.
\textsuperscript{15} Same. P. 38–39.
Igor Serdiuk’s history of everyday life is like a “servant” of “social history”; it has no coherent and separate localization. However, it is clearly present along with other research technologies. It is dissolved throughout the text. The book mentions hundreds of names, draws dozens of situations, sorts out a number of cases. There are “stories” about a shepherd, a bastard, a widow, an influential and successful godfather, a family couple, a priestly clan at every step. It lists a number of “biographies” of mercenary soldiers, artisans, students, childless families, heads of families. The heroes of the book are petty officers, commoners, clergy, beggars, dissenters.

For example, looking for the soil to determine the boundary between childhood and coming of age in the practices of the XVII century, Igor Serdyuk presents the “story” of the early marriage of the daughter of Nizhyn Colonel Vasily Kulakovsky, Evdokia. The circumstances of her life lead the author to the Shakespearean drama of private lives in the Ukrainian Hetmanate: “Juliette Capuletti and Evdokia Kulakovska were separated for two centuries, they belonged to different cultural spaces, and their stories demonstrate a change in public attitudes towards marriage at the unbrokenness of its legally allowed minimum limit”16.

The difficult story of the family from the Mrinske Village of the Kyiv Regiment begins with an epic introduction: “The drama happened on December 31…”17.


I. Serdiuk meticulously monitors the life practices of the investigated period: giving babies to “breastfeeding” mothers; contraception (or rather, its actual absence); overcoming infertility (including spellbinding); maternity infrastructure; baptism (baptized parents, institute of nepotism); “name-picking strategies” (every eighth boy in Poltava was Ivan, every eighth girl in Poltava was Mary); funeral ritual; swaddling clothes; childhood space (hut, stove, bench, dust, cradle, toys), “play practices”; search for fate outside the parental home.

A lot of shocking, extravagant, unique, unbelievable cases are presented in the book: birth of monstrosities and children with defects, accidents with children, infanticide, cases of refusal to bury the dead, the rite of chaining of the murderer to the dead body directly in the church, domestic beating and theft, arson. This kind of detailing may seem superfluous and unnecessary. However, it has a deep meaning: it is a cure for a simplistic view of historical reality.

16 Там само. С. 71.
17 Там само. С. 275.
On the example of I. Serdiuk’s book, one can trace such a feature of the history of everyday life as a certain unpredictability of the cognitive action of the historian. Thus, in the section “Child in the Face of Death”, the author has to describe the details of the funeral rites: church rules, practices of specific actors, burial place, money costs, force majeure. However, at the same time the author accompanies the description with such comments and remarks that at times it seems that the main characters of the section are clergy. The theme of infant mortality grows into another topic: the level of “professional capacity” of church ministers, the irony of fate, the borderline of the high with the banal. The details of the priestly life form an exotic spin where the earthly and the sacred intertwine intrinsically (singing of the dead next to harvesting hay or chopping firewood, church duty with money). Thus, the actual result (the priest’s fate) competes with the declared plot (society’s attitude to the child). There is the conclusion: “Disciplining of the church in the territory of the Hetmanate was slow and difficult...” The author summarizes this phenomenon of contemporary history as follows: “This edition is more about adults than children”.

By gathering a variety of information, I. Serdiuk opposes previous historiographic practices that have sinned with one-sidedness, exaggeration and straightforwardness in the estimates of the early modern Ukrainian society. He points that “...weaknesses in logical constructs built on broad demographic generalizations or general-oriented religious precepts”

There are:

1. Fantastic perceptions of the multiplicity in the XVII century, stereotypical perceptions of the fatalistic “callousness” of parents and almost indifference about the death of children.

2. The myth of the incredible size of the family: “The typical family in the Hetmanate, except for mother and father, consisted of 2-3 children under 14 years, not 5–10 as stereotypes and ethnographic intelligence suggest”.

3. The anachronism in the depiction of the education system of the time: “The word “pedagogy” ... is too artificial for the realities of the Hetmanate”.

4. Idyllic perceptions about the nature of interpersonal relationships: “Contrary to the numerous dissertations in the history of pedagogy, sources indicate the prevalence of “stick education” ... It must be remembered that physical violence in traditional society played an important role in building and maintaining hierarchical structures”.

---

18 Same. P. 237.
19 Same. P. 388.
20 Same. P. 260.
21 Same. P. 389.
22 Same. P. 298.
23 Same. P. 331.
Through the painstaking analysis of the infinite number of situations related to industrial activity, work, wages, etc., the author draws significant conclusions that characterize the early modern Ukrainian society: “the Hetmanate society was very young”; “children of the common people were not too attached to property and family...”; “a significant proportion of children in the Hetmanate region grew up and worked outside the family”; “staying with other people’s families was a common thing”; “people of that time hardly thought that they were living by the harsh laws”\(^{24}\).

3. Roman Lubavsky: “life practices, strategies and tactics of behaviour” in interwar Kharkiv\(^ {25}\)

Roman Lubavsky’s monograph is a consistent and expressive case of everyday life techniques. The author brings the category of everyday life to the title of his book. He specifically formulates a number of remarks about the methodological features of this modern technology, as well as he really writes the everyday life of industrial Kharkiv in the 1920–30s. Finally, R. Lyubavsky is aware of the right thing to do; he notes that often historians merely imitate “a new methodology for the Ukrainian community of historians”\(^ {26}\).

The intrigue is that, at the beginning of his monograph, R. Lyubavsky announces the concept of the then Communist Party’s power to form a “new person”: “new ideals and norms”, “education”, “Sovietization”, “utopianism”, etc. But then, from section to section, the author actually states the collapse of this policy. This objection is especially convincing when there are purely micro-historical plots.

The subjects and provisions of R. Lyubavsky’s monograph are taken from the microhistorical documentary routine. The author patiently searches for fragments of information in modest and unimaginable marginal sources: these are the minutes of meetings of commissions for establishing the living conditions of workers; lists of applicants for housing by trade union committees; minutes of meetings of factory committees; materials of surveys of the sanitary and technical condition of enterprises; correspondence of labour protection departments with central government agencies; applications and letters from workers to local authorities; acts of inspection of barracks, canteens, premises by inspectors of various structures; survey materials of workers’ clubs; letters to newspapers; memories of Kharkiv’s citizens.

\(^{26}\) Same. P. 22.
R. Lubavsky consciously and systematically uses the concepts and
categories characteristic of technology of everyday life: “lifestyle”, “way of
life”, “consumption practices”, “body techniques”.

The campaign “new power” as “housing redistribution” is the first under
the scalpel of the history of everyday life. Firstly, the ambitious programmatic
documents of the Bolsheviks of 1918–1920 about “living standards of
workers” have been cited. However, in the 1920s, Kharkiv’s workers did not
hurry to settle in the “bourgeois” quarters of the city, because they were afraid
to fall into this category of “Bolshevik activists”. Where macrohistorical
discourse can only ascertain the very fact of the deployment of an equalization
campaign, the microhistory is not content with merely analysing “general”
government regulations and reports and dives into the routine of local
traveling documentation; it finds out that everything was not so simple and
straightforward: workers were in no hurry to “be happy”! Next: the author
comes to the understanding that out-of-town migrant workers felt
uncomfortable in the city’s central neighbourhoods. It turns out that Kharkiv’s
workers remained conservatives in the housing issue, they got used to the
closest to nature, land. In addition, the “bourgeois” premises were expensive
to operate and far from the factory buildings. There is an extremely important
clarification to the overall political picture: “Workers used more concrete life
experiences than abstract political appeals to the authorities”\textsuperscript{27}. Reading
through the stacks of routine testimonies, the historian testifies that it was
beyond the power of his predecessors, namely: the gap between the working
mass and the party that seized power in the country on behalf of that mass.
What macro-history argues at best as a common assumption, the history of
everyday life shows convincingly and irrefutably: the Bolshevik power was
superficial and usurper.

In the same style, by similar means, the author estimates the results of
mass housing construction that began in the late 1920s: “the lifestyle of the
inhabitants of these settlements can be described as partially autonomous”;
“this way of life was familiar, traditional for the working population of the
city”; new working-class settlements “formed enclaves in the city with their
traditions and inner world”; “residents of individual homes were left out of the
Soviet project of restructuring of life”; “human relations between neighbours
often hindered the implementation of Bolshevik class politics”\textsuperscript{28}.

The new stage of housing construction, which began in the late 1920’s,
was presented by the authorities as something unique: “city-gardens”,
“commune-cities”, “New Kharkiv”, etc. Instead, by the means of everyday

\textsuperscript{27} Same. P. 41.
\textsuperscript{28} Same. P. 49, 55, 56.
history, R. Lubavsky disrupts the mask of social utopia and brings to light the divine earthly circumstances: “turn to shelter”; such surprising unexpected forms as the leasing of state-owned housing to leasehold of NEPmen (businesspeople in the early Soviet Union); “self-compacting” for the sake of renting out part of your living space; reluctance of the Soviet nomenclature (superiors) to live in commune houses. Thus: “...the workers were guided by the principles of economic benefit, vital rationality, not the sense of class solidarity that power sought to instil in them”; (P. 52) “the workers did not live up to the expectations of the Bolsheviks; they adapted to carry out “old” daily practices within the new living space” 29 (P. 66).

R. Lyubavsky found out that the idea of radical restructuring of the working life turned out to be unrealistic and not least because it was carried out on a residual principle.

Turning to the industrial sphere of working life, R. Lyubavsky is not limited to data on the growth of the number of enterprises and the number of workers on them, as to the saturation of production with new (mostly imported) machinery. He seeks “a study of the real state of affairs” 30. This real state is revealed precisely through the “inside” and “upside-down” look. The author draws attention to the shops swamped with manufactured products and the remnants of production materials, to the extreme congestion and accumulation of the shops with production equipment, crowding, excessive concentration of dust and harmful gases, poor ventilation, poor lighting of shops, lack of utility spaces, and, as a result, increased injuries.

These facts, actually, are well known and can be found in “standard” documents. However, these facts can be seen as “shortcomings” (and, if desired, as “temporary shortcomings”). There are the microhistorical subjects involved, and it becomes clear the fundamental impossibility of the “forcible satisfaction” of workers and the “assault” modernization of production. It turned out that the rules of industrial hygiene and safety were deliberately violated by the workers themselves. The equipment was set up in such an incomprehensibly logical way that under certain circumstances the workers themselves turned off the ventilation equipment because it prevented them from working: founders did not hear the instructions of the master during the smelting of the metal. In another situation, workers clogged the ventilation pipe with garbage because it arranged wild drafts 31.

The fact that many of the workers and the engineering intelligentsia had disdain for udarniks (shock workers), Stakhanovite workers and other “best”

29 Same. P. 52, 66.
30 Same. P. 171.
31 Same. P. 84.
people in the production for appearances, collusion with superiors, privileges, was demonstrable.

A number of similar verdicts confirmed that during the Stalin industrialization the working conditions at the enterprises significantly worsened, the aural, storming rhythm of labour was established.

The history of everyday life makes it possible to clearly emphasize in another story from the history of “socialist construction”: unification and standardization of nutrition.

Within the traditional methods of historical writing it can be quite simply shown that the authorities were forced to abandon their ambitious plans, to correct them, to solve problems of life and culture on a residual principle. In particular, there was a backlog in the implementation of food plans. According to the government documents, in 1930, from the planned 37 kitchen factories across the Ukrainian SSR, only 9 were built. Only the history of everyday life is able to put a real price on those nine kitchen factories that allegedly worked for the cause of socialism! Only microhistoric technology can show what these nine meant. These were not the kitchen factories that were able to build a “new” life. These were not the centres of the socialist dream. They were dominated by dirt, theft, unsanitary practices and rudeness. Employees of “advanced” food establishments avoided using expensive special machinery (automatic bread slicers, potato peelers, etc.), it rusted and failed. And where it did not become damaged, it was “helped” to break: “staff at food establishments perceived imported household machines as their worst enemies and did their best to disable them as they restricted the ability to speculate on food items”\textsuperscript{32}. Moreover, next to the claim to build a “new society” there was a banal patriarchal hierarchy. One of Kharkiv’s exemplary kitchens at a large “advanced” enterprise had a separate floor to serve the enterprise’s engineering staff: here, the overalls of the service personnel were cleaner, the behaviour was more polite and the food was more caloric\textsuperscript{33}. This is a separate fact, but it is no accident. This is a fact-sentence. One such fact is enough to overwhelm the whole system of propaganda noise.

It’s not just about the amount of food. The historian of the history of everyday life attaches no less importance to the mental aspect – the state of human dignity. “Queues, commodity deficits have become one of the characteristic features of the everyday life of Kharkiv’s workers in the 1920s and 1930s of the XX century, the sign of Soviet reality in the following decades”, the author writes\textsuperscript{34}. This is not a new position for our literature over

\textsuperscript{32} Same. P. 135.
\textsuperscript{33} Same. P. 127.
\textsuperscript{34} Same. P. 172.
the last two decades. However, R. Lyubavsky has been able to make additional arguments in support of this important provision and has every right to repeat it.

It is one thing to have statistics on consumption rates, size and filling of food rations and more and it is the other thing, when the “human” detail immeasurably shows the “real state of affairs”: when foreign specialists received products in the privileged store of the “Insnab” system, they felt such glowing views of the Kharkiv’s people that it seemed to them that they had stolen these products. Many of the foreign specialists were so dissatisfied with working and living conditions that they broke contracts and returned home early. The authorities tried to prevent their departure by every means possible: from endless promises to improve working conditions and accommodation to refusing to return passports.

Using similar explanatory means, R. Lyubavsky demonstrates the underdevelopment of infrastructure and public utilities of Kharkiv, unsatisfactory state of urban transport, primitive level of cultural and educational work among workers.

Following the usual way, we can operate “systematic” data and repeat the information accumulated by the authorities themselves: cultural workers in working clubs lacked professional training and adequate knowledge, etc. However, we can use the look “from the inside”: singers used church singing techniques to perform “revolutionary” songs at competitions of choral amateur groups; “being in the club’s Soviet space, they used the practices they borrowed from the old functional space (the church) and used them in new contexts (singing revolutionary songs)”.

Similarly, there were examples of testimony that boredom was prevalent in working clubs, as well as the talk of Kharkiv’s people that aesthetics in the church were higher than in the club.

“In everyday life, workers were guided more by rationality in life than political slogans,” sums up R. Lyubavsky. It is a sentence to the system, a sentence to the Communist Party.

4. The mystery of the Stalin’s sphinx: the project of Serhy Yekelchyk

The title of the original (English) edition of the monograph by Serhy Yekelchyk conveys the meaning of this project more accurately. The author

35 Same. P. 129–130.
36 Same. P. 142.
37 Same. P. 172.
concentrates and consistently prepares only one section – ideological, and anatomizes only the mechanism of contact between the authorities and citizens of the capital of Ukraine.

The first, but not the most essential, feature of the use of the tools of the history of everyday life is the use of the iconic categories inherent in this particular historiographic trend: “analysis of Soviet citizenship through the lens of daily practices”, “Soviet identity”, “daily political life” and “combination of political and personal in everyday life”, etc.

A prominent feature of the author’s style and a sign of the use of the technique of microhistory is that each section of his book Serhy Yekelchyk begins with a “story”: case, incident, situation, mise-en-scene. This further emphasizes the author’s willingness for narrative, for an interested consideration of human destinies and, ultimately, for the fate of the people. For example, the author describes an endless series of cases from the life of the first post-war months (in particular, a grisly picture of the public execution of German soldiers and police commanders – 200,000 spectators watched it on Khreshchatyk!) and at the same time organizes them, finds a common denominator: “the concept of hatred”.

On the example of the book by Serhy Yekelchyk, one can see and understand how laborious the cognitive approach is, which is called the history of everyday life. There are hundreds and hundreds of statements, testimonies (at least listened to by the secret services of the secret services), spontaneous dialogues, inscriptions (for example, made by voters on ballots before being thrown into the ballot box). There is endless quotation of newspaper material, speeches and speeches by the functionaries. There are slow calculations: how many people passed Khreschatyk during one or the other parade, how many portraits of Stalin, Molotov, Khrushchev, Lenin were carried (individually!), how many “negative” votes for which candidate – from Stalin to some local functionary – were thrown into ballot boxes. Hundreds of names of citizens who “lit up” in one or another situation were mentioned: they were exposed in anti-Soviet or simply negligent, put forward with an initiative, set themselves in the right place at the right time, exhibited as beacons, as a model for others; all these people were not famous, completely unknown for the reader, the peripheral, not even the second, but some seventh plan, pensioners, Stakhanovite workers, agitators, mother-heroines, spontaneous boozers, military men, priests, factory administration, builders. The book is densely populated and certified with all these people. Finally, there are dozens of personal stories of Kyiv’s residents with their troubles, demands, naive hopes, fears, sacrifice, scepticism.

40 Єкельчик С. Повсякденний сталінізм: Київ та кияни після Великої війни. С. 21.
Nevertheless, the endless stream of empiricism, and the narrative style of presentation is not purely rhetorical. They are strictly subordinated to one cognitive goal: to analyse the mechanism of formation and realization of citizens’ loyalty to the regime, to solve the problem of “touch” of the masses to the power. This is a deep conversation about significant processes.

In this book the refrain repeats the theoretical organizing research findings: “the symbolic unity of the state and the people”; “it was a world of political illusion, in which one side seemed to study and the other to control the process”; “agitators became intermediaries between the authorities and the population”; “the population sometimes played along with the leadership”; “agitators... knowingly or unknowingly bestowed a human face on Stalinism”; “Soviet elections were a ritual display of loyalty”; “participation in such events was not about a holistic set of Stalinist views, but about understanding the rules of daily political life and a willingness to adhere to them”; “in fact, Stalin’s officials were fortunate that the behaviour of good citizens had little to do with internal beliefs”\(^4^1\). This is no longer a “micro” research, this is a full-scale historical study.

The author does not allow all the involved empiricism to flow. His technique is a “rich description” technique (by Clifford Geertz). He comments and explains all the actions of his characters: gestures, phraseology, slang, intonations, facial expressions, entourage, interiors (such as polling stations with home furniture and houseplants). He accompanies these descriptions with catchphrases and ironic remarks.

Organizing categories in transforming the empirical array into a complex explanatory system in S. Yekelchyk’s book are such favourite formulas as “political ritual”, “practices”, “life strategies”. One of such system-forming “practices” is bidding with the authorities. Here S. Yekelchyk develops the idea of Stephen Kotkin outlined in his “Magnetic Mountain”\(^4^2\): the masses pretended to accept the rules of the game proposed by the authorities and patiently and relentlessly used this game to achieve their goals: to ensure at least minimal living conditions.

Among the “life strategies”, he describes: “mastering the art of Marxist phraseology and newspaper stamps”; desertion of workers from the largest industrial enterprises of Kyiv: they were not satisfied with the poor wages and food rations; elections as a springboard and a moment for bidding citizens with power: for pensions, registration, assistance to the needy, public transport, repair of residential buildings, electricity supply, cancellation of grocery cards and cheaper goods. The “protest inscriptions” on the ballot

\(^4^1\) Same. P. 79, 96, 170, 176, 191, 231, 234, 235.
papers before the vote were, in the understanding of S. Yekelchyk, a way of reporting daily problems: “Give bread”, “Down with hunger”, etc. The historian reflects on the contradictory nature of social protest in the Soviet system, when rhetoric, and approval, and protest are flowed in the same statements: “Long live the Soviet power! Down with Stalin!”; “I want to live as an unemployed person in America”\textsuperscript{43}.

Much of the author’s comments, by which the author “saturates” his descriptions, are ironic: “voluntary-forced”; importation of products before the holiday on May 1 as a “bribe to the people from power”; queues before polling stations as an archetype (“for decades, deficits and rations have instilled in the population the habit of queuing up”); schools of political education as “a world of political illusions, in which one side pretends to learn and the other to control the process”; political action as a fair (“adults combined love for Stalin with shopping, booze and dancing, often in the same room where they had just solemnly waited for the right to vote”); “the festive crowd glorifies the Soviet achievements for new consumer opportunities”; workers “were more willing to show love to the leader in elections than in daily casualties in the workplace”; the election results of 1950 “outweighed the results of previous elections.”\textsuperscript{44}. About the “patriotic inscriptions” on some ballots, the author’s comment is: “One voter wrote a poem where he asked to invent a way that would allow Stalin to live another two hundred years. Unfortunately, the 65-year-old Bogomolets died the same year, and this medical problem remained unsolved. This did not prevent another unknown voter from breaking the record in the 1950 election and wishing (in Ukrainian) “a thousand years of life for Stalin’s father!”\textsuperscript{45}.

Also, S. Yekelchyk introduces statistics. However, these are not traditional production or population data, etc. These are “human” statistics: emotions, idiocy, paradoxes, various incredible things. For example, the letter-poem “The Word of Stalin from the Ukrainian People” written by sixteen most prominent Ukrainian poets. It turned out that this letter was signed by 9,316,973 citizens of Ukraine in September-October 1944, including 158,272 from Kyiv (personally!)\textsuperscript{46}.

The historian ironically reports on the number of portraits of each of the heads of state, which “testifies to the official hierarchy of rulers whose wise rule should be glorified by the workers”: on May 1, 1949, the people of Kyiv carried: 799 portraits of Stalin, 583 portraits of the first deputy head of the

\textsuperscript{43} Єкельчик С. Повсякденний сталінізм: Київ та кияни після Великої війни. С. 99, 146, 223.
\textsuperscript{44} Same. P. 70, 96, 153, 201, 211, 216–217.
\textsuperscript{45} Same. P. 221.
\textsuperscript{46} Same. P. 48.
Council of Ministers, 563 portraits of Khrushchev – the former first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the patron of the republic in the Kremlin, and only 422 portraits of Lenin\textsuperscript{47}. This is a sort of personality cult in the details.

Our history, in the light of the history of everyday life, appears in a completely different form. Let’s take the moment that classical historiography knows about 99\% of the voter turnout of the USSR citizens for the elections and even makes ironic remarks about it. However, Serhy Yekelchyk disassembles the technology of preparation and holding elections, in addition, by writing a detailed scenario of voter behaviour. Here we are no longer a superficial statement – 99, but a complete understanding of the atmosphere, and we understand that before (before this study) we have not understood the true weight of this implausible indicator. That is not even an indicator, but a semiotic key to understanding the essence of the regime. Having recreated a number of incredible (in terms of classical historiography) situations, the author restores the true price of these 99. For example, the task was not only to get all 100\% of the electorate to vote, but to get everyone to vote by 8 am! Indeed, there were long queues and jolts before the doors of polling stations at the moment of their opening. Some people had occupied this queue the night before! At polling stations, citizens went not only with dense flows, but mostly with flags, orchestras, flowers, portraits of leaders and leaders – a picture that could be fully conveyed only by the means of microhistory.

Undoubtedly, the presentation of the elections to the authorities of 1946, 1947 and 1950, the unfolding of their dramaturgy are the best pages of Serhy Yekelchyk’s book (section “Election Day”, p. 193–232). Also, it is a demonstration of the techniques of everyday history.

In this section, the history of everyday life is presented in all its uniqueness and cognitive effectiveness. The leading place here belongs to the casus, mise-en-scene, natural bursts, anomalous acts, strange things. It is clear (as the author himself writes) that passive forms, daily and standard, are statistically dominant. However, the historian is aware that “social phenomena are best explored by deviating from them”. In addition, the spontaneous actions of real people (usually with names and realistic features) selected by the historian give the impression of authenticity, immediacy, they magnetize the reader’s attention and imagination.

Here are the voters of one labour collective go to the polls by march, columns, with slogans and posters, portraits of leaders and government, with songs, in festive clothing, with flowers and greenery. Just before the polling stations open (at 6 am!), there are short rallies at which the heads of election commissions greet voters with a holiday and invite them to fulfil their public

\textsuperscript{47} Same. P. 67.
duty. Here is the one member of the party that gets reprimanded for appearing at the polling station at 14:00 and being the last voter to vote at the 9th polling station of the Leninsky district of Kyiv in February 1947!

This is only the beginning. Further events develop according to the classic canons of drama – in an incremental manner. The contest for the right to go to the polling station is unfolding: “Being the first to cast a ballot in the ballot box at a metropolitan polling station was considered an extraordinary privilege and not only because the first voter could get to the pages of the morning newspaper… apparently, they thought that the one who votes first got higher status in their community”⁴⁸. Everything was solved by the situation, the moment, the impromptu. Officials and newspaper rhetoric insisted that the “famous people and heroes”, “the best citizens of Kyiv” – veterans, Heroes of Socialist Labour, Stakhanovite workers, inventors, actors, mother-heroines – should have voted first. However, in some places the people’s initiative won and the old-timers, the disabled people became lucky.

The Voting Atmosphere comes next. This is a “strictly regulated political space”, “a space filled with posters, slogans and portraits of leaders”. Election commission officials and campaigners watch every word and gesture of the voters and note what is happening. There are red brocade and silk. There are Soviet emblems on ballot boxes and booths. There are permanent pioneers that salute the flag. There is an idiocy of instructions: “Leave one candidate’s name on the ballot for which you vote, strike out the other”, but there is one and only one name in the ballot! Because of this, part of the voters simply did not know what to do and left ballots in the booth or asked for help from the polling station employees⁴⁹.

Stalin himself kept a close eye on the voters – from numerous posters, portraits (sometimes full-grown) and plaster busts. One of the portraits was arranged in such a way that “it seemed as if those who threw the ballot in the ballot box brought a symbolic gift to Stalin”.

The atmosphere of political annoyance is so affecting that the voters are subconsciously drawn into the tragedy: they are baptized before putting the ballot in the ballot box, saying “God, help our voters and the great Stalin”, kissing the ballots before lowering them in the ballot box, kissing the portrait of Stalin (like an icon). Citizens used to make “patriotic inscriptions” on the ballot papers; there were thousands of them. Among them, there were the wishes to live for Stalin for another two hundred years, as well as “a thousand years of life for Stalin’s father”. The ballot papers thrown into the ballot box in agreement with the election of a designated nominee to the council of one or another level were credited with: “and for Comrade Stalin”, “and for the Great Teacher Stalin”, and “death to the English

⁴⁸ Там само. С. 199.
⁴⁹ Same. P. 205–206.
and American warmongers!” etc. Such actions are small cases in the middle of a routine, but they throw bright light on the whole system.

After the election, there were celebrations and festivities with entertainments, a buffet, music, dances, free movie shows, performances of artists, professional orchestras, amateur choirs.

Serhy Yekelchyk also “forces” the procedure (action!) of vote count through a sieve of microhistorical analysis. Firstly, it turned out that the authorities did not know the exact number of voters. What was the turnout? In the 1946 elections, only 39 (!) voters were absent from the total number of 484 406. Thus, the turnout was 99.989884%! – officially announced 99.99%. After that, the historian draws out small manipulations, techniques by which he obtained a “smooth” picture of the consistent, year after year, growth of the “consciousness” of Soviet citizens. How can this increase be demonstrated from year to year? – “fine calculations were needed”. There are the hundreds of percentages in the indicators of positive voting for the nominated candidates: 99.27% in Kiev (1946), 99.46% (1947). Finally, in the 1950 elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, 99.8% of voters voted in favour (1200 voted against, 5 ballots were rejected).

Exotic statistics such as the number of votes against a particular candidate are also involved. Of course, then it was not made public. Thus, in the elections to the Verkhovna Rada of the USSR in February 1947, Stalin scored 0 votes against, Molotov – 60, Kaganovich – 696, the head of the Republic Khrushchev – 228, the first secretary of the Kyiv City Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine Petro Matsui – 223, chief architect of the city Alexander Vlasov – 230, city mayor Fyodor Chebotarev – 360 votes “against.”

In the end, using the tools of the history of everyday life, Serhy Yekelchyk brings the reader to the understanding that the Stalin authorities, albeit so omnipotent, were in fact panic-stricken with their people, closely watching their moods and carefully extinguishing the slightest threats of mass dissatisfaction. Even a minor failure in the elections to the authorities caused a stir in the Party Committees, in the corridors of power. The power was maintained while the citizens remained “conscious”.

The loyalty of Stalin’s citizens was ritual, superficial, not backed up by certain political convictions, without an organic assimilation of Bolsheviks’ ideology, pragmatic. In the days of late Stalinism, it was not about a holistic set of Stalinist views, but about understanding (required) rules of daily political life and their willingness to adhere to them.

50 Same. P. 206–221.
51 Same. P. 216–217.
52 Same. P. 217–218.
After all, not only what the historian claims is important, but also how he does it. He substantiates his vision undeniably. He maximizes the power of the reader’s attention. It creates a multidimensional image, a multifaceted model of historical reality, and ultimately leaves many other things in the reader’s mind besides the “direct” provisions regarding the era when the “Stalin’s citizens” lived.

CONCLUSIONS

Considering the works of four contemporary historians who specialize in the history of Ukraine from different periods, one can confidently point out a few fundamental points that identify the history of everyday life as a new historiographical approach and warn against lightening the problem.

1. The history of everyday life is not an “easy genre”, it is not “historical journalism”. It is not an escape from analytics. The history of everyday life is the search for meaning, truth, understanding, as the other types of history. Apparently, within one work, it is easily combined with other technologies of historical knowledge: social history, psychohistory, intellectual history, different variants of cultural and historical anthropology.

2. There are a number of issues on which the history of everyday life is more effective than classical historiography. These are thematic fields, such as the history of mentalities, the relationship of power and personality, the question of the survivability of certain regimes, the fate of certain doctrines and utopias. The essence is not only in the abstractions, but also in the details. The essence is in the details. There are such subjects and even topics that are different. It happens. And it must be accepted.

3. The history of everyday life is convincing of a special type. Moreover, the daily historian is more convincing not by some incomprehensible way, but by immersing himself in the thick of empiricism, which historians have neglected for decades. Thanks to this, the historian gets access to the peripheral expanses of society, to the “nooks and crannies” of history, and can see what has been previously “in the shadows” and therefore disregarded. Traditional methods, for the most part, give a one-sided picture: whether or not it was; what were the quantitative parameters. The history of everyday life shows everything stereoscopically and multifaceted, surrounded by human motives and emotions. Thus, the history of everyday life usually handles small details, but these are special details. They have considerable probative power. In them, like in the drop of morning dew, the whole world is reflected.

4. The best sources of evidence for this kind of history are mass or at least serial sources: private diaries (which usually record the same series of events over time); private correspondence (especially between mature couples of correspondents: husband and wife, student and teacher); transcripts of party
conferences; reporting of special services on the mood of the population; legal cases; acts of inspections of living conditions; collections.

5. The history in general is a special kind of intellectual pursuits. Any kind of story requires from a historian: empathy, advanced imagination, curiosity, mastery of the word. However, the history of everyday life seems to be particularly demanding in this context. Here, one can hardly count on success, focusing solely on formal prescriptions about how to “write” the story of everyday life, what categories to use or what ideologists to use. The secret of the success of historians who practice daily history is not in the grinding of objects of study, or in the observance of any special formal procedures. The secret lies in the talents of the historian, in his ingenuity, in his hard-working patience: the ability to shuffle through the mountains of routine documents in search of vivid testimony, candid confessions, shocking truths, power-laced expressions. They look for material for their generalizations not just in one or two archival funds, but literally everywhere. Therefore, the history of everyday life requires considerable erudition from the historian.

SUMMARY

The article traces the boom of theoretical and methodological formal interest in the foundations of the history of everyday life in Ukrainian historiography. It is argued that a significant problem remains the need to overcome such shortcomings as imitation of the history of everyday life, frank biography, empirical routine, factual mischief. The article calls on “practicing historians” to work hard. The author sets the task: not historiosophy for historiosophy, but historiosophy for historiography.

On the example of the works of four contemporary historians specializing in the history of Ukraine of different periods, Natalia Tairova-Yakovleva, Igor Serdiuk, Roman Lyubavsky and Serhy Yekelchyk, the author shows that the history of everyday life is an effective means of finding answers to the classic questions of historical science. The author tries to show the difference between traditional storytelling and the technology of everyday life, as well as to understand how this magic works when “from the smallest point” comes the essence. It is argued that the history of everyday life is most effective in such thematic fields as the history of mentalities, the relationship of power and personality, the question of the survivability of certain regimes, the fate of certain doctrines and utopias.
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INTRODUCTION

The contemporary society is becoming even more child-orientated. Meanwhile the childhood is vigorously leaving its established frameworks: family, study, a respective branch, and is globalizing, significantly influencing politics or becoming natural in international movements. Greta Thunberg is a bright example of this process, whose activity is highly evaluated (from condemnation to admiration) but nevertheless it’s impossible not to be noticeable. Probably this model is the brilliant embodiment of a gradually disappearing modernism childhood model formed in the XIXth century. On the other hand plenty of participants of the enhanced modern teenager movements discussions are extremely fond of the historical parallels research which has much in common with the so-called “childish crusade”. Such comparisons do not take into account the difference between current and pre-modernism societies particularly in understanding children’s things, the essence and nature of childhood. Such important components of culture as for example the value of children’s matters, family strategies, parental feelings are drastically changing during the couple of decades. Instead, these models are supposed to have been strictly represented in the past as fixed, unchangeable, “immortal”. Even more in modern Ukraine this alleged “immortality” of recognizing family and childhood is used even as the object of political manipulations. The matter is in the usage of fixed stereotypes about allegedly “ideal Ukrainian old times” to which we should return.

It’s very important to recognize that such stereotypes were formed by the ignorance of historical context and the false understanding of the heritage of the 19th century literature. Thus the most stable “childish” images in Ukrainian educational literature or science-fiction historical literature are an orphan boy who’s accompanied by Kobzar, a jura, an underage mercenary, a shepherd. Such figures are similar to each other, they are often tragic but their own charm is hidden in other positive examples of large families, mutual efforts from parents and numerous children in family business etc. The total anonymity of “girl’s attributes” and the absence of the proper vivid girls’ characters are the evidence of one-sided similar understanding. The
patriarchal culture is absolutely not decoded with a reference to childhood. Afterall the Ukrainian childhood in pre-modernism era hasn’t been researched yet properly and what is more even the exploring of something “childish” sometimes could be very extravagant for Ukrainian historiography but that can’t be said about the situation in Europe where it has been exploring actively for several decades. In this sense I try to determine the reasons of such a gap. So I am going to use the description of Western children orientated practices’ development and the history of childhood in early modernism period based on European examples simultaneously paying attention to the main legacy of Ukrainian historians. Respectively you can find the attempt of generalizing the problem and prospects of historiography of early modernism’s childhood in Ukraine.

1. The history of childhood before Philippe Ariès

Nowadays the role of children-orientated practices in modern global historiography is beyond any doubt. The practical elaboration of the topic is noticeable even institutionally – especially within professional scientific journals such as “Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth”\(^1\). However this phenomenon isn’t new. Twenty years ago Hugo Cunningham, a prolific British researcher, wrote in a special historiography review that the history of childhood is blooming. He explained the increasing demand for such practices. From the end of the 20\(^{th}\) century “Western world” has been worrying about children, their nurture, reconsideration of their rights and duties. Commercialization of children’s things and the whole industry is added to all aspects and that influences the society in its own way. It has often been resorted to historical researches while trying to explain these new phenomena. Scholars also promptly reacted on society’s demands to understand better the nature of a child. From historians people just started to expect the explanation of the historical origin of current problems relating to childhood and adulthood, conflicts between generations. The exploration of the reasons of childhood’s differentiation has become another direction of the observation because besides social well-being countries there are countries where children suffer from starvation, where pandemic is the cause of massive loss of children’s life and where children don’t get proper care and education\(^2\).

From my point of view Hugo Cunningham has explained the development of childhood’s history with a child-orientated modern society that is with “external” incentives but not with internal scientific demands. Instead of this a

\(^1\) https://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/journal-history-childhood-and-youth

well-known British historian Peter Burke explained the popularity of such themes with cultural relativism which make impossible division of historical field into “central” and “peripheral”. In other words Burke meant the negation of unimportant and uninteresting themes. This relativism (according to the scholar) was a significant peculiarity of “The New History” with its total nature and interdisciplinary approach. The examples of the interest of “The New History” given by Burke are in some ways similar to the famous on the post-Soviet territory prolific medieval Aron Gurevich’s list. This similarity is interesting for us due to the role of childhood in both cases. The reasons of a resurgence of interest to the early not interesting topics according to the Soviet scholar among other things are hidden in overcoming limits which separate a profession of historian from other humanities relating to human: ethnology, sociology, psychology, demography, linguistics, etc.

Both Burke and Gurevich meant the anthropological change in humanities and their consequences, they both discovered new spheres of study researching issues in a new way, in a study of seemingly conventional issues. 1960 became a symbolic boundary for history of childhood in this context. It was exactly the time when the work “Centuries of Childhood. A Social History of Family Life” (L’enfant et la vie familiale sous l’Ancien régime) by Philippe Ariès was published. This book is a starting point for a modern historian of childhood in spite of whether he accepts Ariès’ theses or denies them. The researchers of French scholar were like an intellectual provocation that induced the interest to the study of the topic and created a natural stir for such researches. At first sight it even seems that history of childhood before Ariès didn’t exist.

In fact a child didn’t belong directly to a sphere of interests of a wide range of historians. Clergymen, economists and sociologists are among the first who paid their attention to childhood. The impulse was the reducing of birth rate at the end of the 18th century that on the one hand increased the significance of the child but on the other hand became a cause for discussions about reasons of such reduction and its appraisal (is it good or bad?). Such arguments obligatory dealt with the issues of poorness, social inequality, children’s exploitation, delinquency, living from hand to mouth and so on.

---

Some theses turned into theories which had become out of date for example malthusianism which was founded by an English clergyman and economist Thomas Malthus. In his essay “On the Principle of Population” (1789) he argued that the population grows considerably faster than resources. According to Malthus that was the main cause of poorness. He was one of the first who appealed to limitations of birth rate with the help of self-control, entering into a marriage only if a person has financial ability to maintain children. These thoughts became the central idea of the study which was criticized by Soviet scholars in the past. And even now the materials about malthusianism are being sometimes written in an estimating mood (in most cases negative) in post-Soviet countries. At the same time it’s necessary to take into account that Malthus’ ideas were later significantly transformed but those were especially the issues relating to ecology, manufacturing efficiency.

In the XIXth century the topic of childhood became interesting for European lawyers. It was the time of discussion of legislative initiatives relating to an underage individuals, especially the issues about the custodianship and safety and also the change of the the status of illegitimate children. It’s very important that Ukrainian men of law of those times worked in a close collaboration with their European counterparts. Among them the most outstanding works belong to Oleksandr Bogdanovsky and Oleksandr Kistyakivskyi. These works contain numerous historical information and very useful facts. They were concerned not only about the delinquency (according to the title) but they also were focused on the approaches of discussion the age of children in context with the law in different countries. Thus they left their contribution in this sphere in large European annals. For modern historians the unreleased legacy of Kistyakivskyi can also be attractive especially due to his manuscript notes “The principles of children and underage’s behavior”.

These researches made by economists, sociologists, lawyers draw a distinction not only between precedents, facts or theories. They put into use a specialized brand of new notions and concepts which were set to be used by researchers from other branches of humanities who represent the conventional-based society. Thus starting from the middle of the 19th century ethnographers and ethnologists began taking children into consideration. The

---

8 Богдановский А. Развитие понятий о преступлении и наказании в русском праве до Петра Великого. Москва, 1857; Його ж. Молодые преступники: Вопрос уголовного права и уголовной политики. Санкт-Петербург, 1871; Кистяковский А. Молодые преступники и учреждения для их исправления, с обозрением русских учреждений. Киев, 1878.
9 Інститут рукопису Національної бібліотеки України імені Вернадського. Ф. 61. Спр. 127.
circle of issues which were studied in this context was multi-purposed for scholars from different countries: children’s ceremonies of birth and burial, rites and superstitious beliefs relating to pregnancy and caring for babies, conventional methods of early socialization, the work of children, materialistic culture of childhood, magic practices\textsuperscript{10}. Ukrainian ethnography developed in the similar way first of all paying its attention to the birth of a child. Especially the focus was on birth practices\textsuperscript{11}, ceremonies of birth giving\textsuperscript{12}, family budget\textsuperscript{13}. Two large articles made by Petro Ivanov\textsuperscript{14} and Mykola Sumtsov\textsuperscript{15}, prominent ethnographers and researchers from Slobozhanshchyna are distinguished among the other works. The last script was also notable for its bearing of foreign counterparts’ work and professional analysis.

In general Ukrainian ethnography of childhood of that time evolved as general ethnography. Maria Mayerchyk\textsuperscript{16} demonstrated in a brilliant manner its evolution from amateur practices on the level of folk romantism to professional researches in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. She also paid her attention to how researchers had created a relevant scientific instrument for dealing with the object of the research. Therefore contemporary notions with imaginary archaism were built in corpus of traditional culture. In other words new components became ancient and versatile\textsuperscript{17}. It’s significant that Maria Mayerchyk observed this modernization of the archaic (or vice versa – archaization of modern) on the example of the most valuable (till now)


\textsuperscript{11} Талько-Грнцевич Ю. Народное акушерство в Южной Руси. Чернигов, 1889.
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Ukrainian ethnographic research of childhood – “The role of a child in Ukrainian customs and beliefs”. Marko Hrushevsky, a clergyman from Kyiv county, was one of the creators of the research. He had rounded up materials about motherhood’s and childhood’s culture diligently including the direct speech straight from the horse’s mouth. Thanks for his holy orders Hrushevsky had gotten evidences which often had an intimate, private character and other researchers couldn’t get them. Zenon Kuzela put all information in order and prepared it for publishing. The work was released in 1906–1907 and till today it remains a real encyclopedia of everything relating to childhood in conventional culture – from the conception of taking care for a child and his adulthood. In spite of facts, Kuzela’s comments have a significant value. Thanks to them we can observe his erudition and comprehension of similar foreign works (first of all written in German). It was the result of his practices at the University of Vienna18. Despite the background of one of the compilers, this work has a prevailed descriptive character as well as the other precious research made by Nina Zaglada “The life of a country child”. The plot of the book is based on is rigorous ethnographic observations made in the village of Starosilja. It was dedicated to the life of the children from the age of about 3 to 15. In particular the book is about the way of dressing, nutrition, leisure activities, work and an authentic views of a child19.

Although the above mentioned Ukrainian ethnographers’ researches contained facts and necessary interpretations they didn’t become a real ground for theoretical general conclusions of their French counterpart Arnold van Gennep. In the book “The Rites of Passage” he managed to put rituals in the right order and combined them into one structural system where the child is one to play an important role in the process of growing20. Nevertheless the works of an American researcher Margaret Mead are considered classical and the most prominent in the sense of theoretical understanding of ethnography of childhood because she was the first who had made childhood’s world the main subject of research.

In a scientific bestseller “Coming of Age in Samoa”, released in 1928, Mead showed how culture influences the socialization of a child. According to her interpretation childhood and youth are the phenomena which are viewed in different ways in various societies, though taking into account identical
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biological premise. Later the methods of data collecting and deductions of Margaret Mead were severely criticized by the anthropologist Derek Freeman who in 1983 published the book named “Margaret Mead and Samoa: The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth”. However Mead’s researches remain valuable today because the author considers childhood a marker of society’s functioning and relies on her formation of three types of culture which have existed throughout all human history. I pay attention to one thing that Margaret Mead has founded—thanks to the results of her own research she explained the nature of problems of a modern society of her days in the nurture of children, relationships between parents and children, a generation gap. In this sense she made an opposition from coming of age in Samoa to American realities and a generation gap which in those times were called ideal. In general the works of this researcher might be considered as an apogee of such a stage when the study of childhood “in the past” was the monopoly of ethnologists. Unfortunately those methodological innovations weren’t put into Ukrainian practice. In the first half of the 20th century Ukrainian historiography has already been isolated from the Soviet scientific circle. Foreign ethnology was considered to be hostile and was a taboo. So in the first Russian translation of a selected Mead’s work appeared in 1988, there is no Ukrainian translation even till now. This fact speaks eloquently for understanding why Ukrainian historians begin to seriously observe childhood as one of the “keys” for comprehension society just at the end of the XXth century.

2. Philippe Ariès and development of the history of childhood

Margaret Mead’s ethnological monopoly had lasted until 1960 when Philippe Ariès’ the above mentioned work changed the situation. A French scholar’s book broke down the interdisciplinary boundaries and led to the transformation of a child from nothing to scientific interests of professional historians. The bottom line of the research is childhood observed as a changeable social component. On the example of pre-modernism France Aries demonstrates that there are several patterns of childhood’s perception in the same society and they are interchangeable. The research chronologically started from XII century when according to the thoughts of a French scholar a child wasn’t distinguished from the adult world and was treated like a little adult or a dwarf who was going to grow. Ariès showed how through centuries a baby was losing his anonymity. Childhood was considered as a special stage

of life (XVI century) but a child gradually moved from periphery of family’s attention to its center. Later some Ariès’ critics criticized him for the denial of childhood as the stage of life in pre-modernism society. However he hadn’t affirmed it. To make a long story short Ariès meant youth to be the latest component and it was distinguished from the end of the XVIIIth century. In the same time a modern pattern of childhood was set to be established, the base of which was already formed in the 19th century when mass education, specific social institutions, industrialization, changes in lawmaking, mass printing of specialized literature and the other things were put into lives of ordinary people. It’s worth noticing that such fundamental components for the establishment of childhood as family, parent’s love, the right treatment of a child weren’t stable according to Ariès, they were constantly changing transforming the image of childhood. These alterations aren’t thought to be the development or the unconditional welfare. Here the historians deal with the concept of discipline. Separating a child from their own world adults set numerous prohibitions, limitations, narrow definition of the right behavior. In such a way a child is restricted from a very young age and further it goes, less freedom the child has.

With this hypothesis Ariès also explained the hardships of a child’s socialization in France in the second half of the 20th century. He found the causes of psychological disturbance and intergenerational discords in the restrictions of a child by adults, the child’s upbringing in a small family and the establishment of a consumer’s outlook. The scholar came in contact with psychologists and found common grounds within research interests. Psychologists of that time also positively evaluated his works evolving them thanks to the achievements of their study. The most successful from their circle is an American psychohistorian Lloyd DeMause who proposed his original conception of a child’s evolution in the context of his study about psychohistory. The scholar presented a child’s evolution as a modern movement of getting closer parents and children by finding out how parents knew their descendants. That movement had six conditional stages (patterns): infanticide (before the 4th century), distant mode (4th – 13th century), ambivalent mode (14th – 17th century), imposition mode (18th century), socialization mode (19th – mid 20th century). I am convinced that “The Evolution of Childhood” in the light of research demonstrated a certain significance in the sense of interdisciplinarity’s problems. DeMause – a perfect pundit in the sphere of a child’s psychology and psychoanalysis gave superb positive comments of the historical aspect of the work. At the same
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time he criticized categorically historians’ job because they allegedly
extremely embellished the childhood in the past. Returning to the personality of Ariès I should notice that the innovation of his work was also in a wide range of references: from literature, diaries and letters to epitaphs, gravestone bas-reliefs, iconography and pictures. The scholar raised the issues which weren’t discussed at that time. His contribution was approved by fierce critics of Ariès although they didn’t accept his conclusions. The book of the French scholar completely coped with the role of intellectual provocation causing ardent discussions and numerous studies of the history of childhood. The most valuable works used Ariès’ approaches and conclusions in other materials (spheres of science) hence emphasizing their importance.

It’s interesting that even the weakest points of the French historian’s work provoked constructive criticism which later transformed into complete directions of researches. Maybe the largest part of criticism Ariès had ever got for his works containing iconography, pictures and materialistic monuments, for he allegedly didn’t pay attention to the proper selection of the items, i.e. he had chosen visual sources and artefacts in a chaotic order and did not apply a systematic approach. And then he described them in an exceedingly simplified way seeking something routine or “the imprint of the epoch” in canonical elements which passed through centuries without changes and hadn’t any correlation with reality.

3. The history of childhood after Philippe Ariès

After Ariès’ era the researchers very carefully and with trepidation used visual sources and gave explanations of artefacts. With coming out of numerous works the interest towards the material world of a child was renewed at the end of 1980-s because the authors had given up direct descriptive methods and concentrated on a detailed analysis of artefacts. Among other works Karin Calvert’s book is extremely significant because
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there the author studied the evolution of materialistic culture of an American childhood in the course of 1600–1900 years. A set of a child’s stuff (toys, furniture, clothes, plates and dishes etc.) and their usage were changed, thus due to these changes four periods of attitude towards a child were distinguished29. Calvert’s work can serve as an illustrative example of extensive difficulties in structuring of voluminous historiography of childhood after Ariès’ epoch. At a glance this work could be placed among “new (cultural) history of stuff” however stuff here is of a second-order and serves as an instrument but not as a purpose. It’s well seen from the introduction where the author polemized with Ariès and took into account his research questions raised in the issue.

In general the development of suchlike explorations after Ariès’ epoch isn’t caused by “research know-how” and new theories. As Anthony Burton thought, deep cataloguing of artefacts and their accumulation in specialized museums, the organization of thematic exhibition make the development of explorations possible30. He gives (as an example) the collections of materials originated in 17th – 18th centuries from the Museum of childhood in London31. Ukrainian museums haven’t got such systematic collections from the pre-modernism era. The only exception is an illustrative catalogue “Children and kiddies: the image of a child in an imitative arts in 17th – 20th centuries”. This edition containing compositions represented at a special exhibition is dedicated to collections of Lviv National Art Gallery and Lviv Sheptitsky National Museum. The above mentioned book is valuable for its illustrations. However it contains the work material from only one Ukrainian region32. Unfortunately we haven’t got any special catalogues of monuments and pictures which could accumulate the necessary data from various museums across the country. Probably the most suitable and successful suchlike project is a great colorful, thematically structured catalogue of “childish” portrayals which was represented in collections of museums in Poland. The compilers systematically classified pictures according to certain categories (a child in family, education, life’s hardships etc.), provided a professional review for each picture and wrote four introductory articles about different aspects of childhood in the history of Poland. Every picture is followed by a bulky
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reference of the object in turn making the historian’s job easier and giving explanations. The book with grand illustrations “Children’s routine described with a word and an image” written by outstanding Polish researchers of children’s history Dorota Żołądź-Strzelczyk and Katarzyna Kabacińska-Łuczak might be served as an example of practical realization of an informational potential for analogous compilations. In the book a materialistic world of childhood in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is explained by authors with the help of a plentiful iconography. I didn’t meet a fierce criticism of this research but in my opinion it is supposed to involve a dangerous scenario due to the straightforward explanation of the sense of canonical portrayals. Ukrainian historians should be inspired by the fact that their Polish counterparts start their report with the complaints of the way the visual sources are kept and preserved in comparison with the French work materials of pre-modernism times. But even after such complaints the researchers have completed a large complex of pictures which in turn could be the source of envy of historians from the Cossack Hetmanate. Regarding visual history Anita Shorsch’s and Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann’s researches are also considered classical.

One of the most famous Philippe Ariès’ opponent is a medievalist Shulamith Shahar. She had deeply analyzed medieval medical works, educational literature, moral treatises and came to the conclusion that childhood had been distinguished since the Middle Ages hence the medieval society was more advanced than the representatives of Early Modern period. Shahar stated that the attitude towards children of those days was more akin to current days than that used to be in the 18th century. She found a lot of descriptions of different stages of childhood, proofs of emotional affection for children, acts of care.

Even a more radical criticism of the main Ariès’ conclusions we can meet reading the work “Forgotten Children” by Linda Pollock. In her book the author deeply analyzed numerous diaries considering them as an expression of parental’s love, babies’ presence, warm family relations. According to her views from the 16th century till now childhood has changed a little. It means
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that irrespective of different culture in all societies the attitude towards children was determined by a biological instinct which at all costs provided survival of its own offspring. The rest is the details which don’t play any important role. Nicholas Orme wrote a little different research work “Medieval Children” where religious doctrine was the central idea. The church promoted bringing up children using a different pattern of childhood with its own focus on the culture separated from the world of adults.

Many of Ariès’ critics approved his conclusions. However they focused their attention on the fact that he had devoted his research primarily to the upper classes of society thus they tried to explore the other social classes. A perfect example is a collective compilation of John Henderson and Richard Wall’s researches containing a piece of scripts about childhood among impoverished surroundings, orphans, orphanages. The children’s life in an impecunious British families was depicted in Hugo Cunningham’s monography. He had been dealing with this issue since the 17th century. The next research of the scholar was a considerably advanced one regarding the problems and their chronology. The book “The Invention of Childhood” was published in 2006. It contains the history of childhood in Great Britain for 1500 years. The author is akin to Ariès using a great variety of sources: diaries, autobiographies, pictures, photographs. It’s important that Cunningham considers childhood not as a versatile tool but as a differential depending on ethnicity, residence, gender and so on. He demonstrates how the measure between childhood and becoming an adult has been altered throughout centuries, how uneven were those changes mainly due to large-scale historical events (for example wars).

An ingenious example of a chronological sequel of Ariès’ book is the work of a French researcher Elisabeth Badinter who showed how a motherly love in current meaning was brought about. She started her research with the information of the 17th century the time when there was no love of this kind and she examined its birth from the end of the 18th century. The work in some cases is an achingly contradictory issue. It could be criticized for a series of unproved facts which were targeted at convincing the readers in the rightfulness of the researcher’s conclusions. For example the case when a child was cared by the nurses or brought up in a village was treated by Badinter as a motherly indifference. Although it could have been perceived as taking care of a child. In spite of it the author showed the powerful influence of the Age of Enlightenment on bringing up children with a new concept of

---

motherhood and family. Such methods could also be used for the study of the similar processes in Russian Empire.\textsuperscript{40}

In fact they’re already being exploited and Russian Historical discipline is productive enough in this way. I stated above that in my review I didn’t have the aim of distinguishing some national historiographies. But the history of pre-modernism childhood in Russia is relevant for Ukrainian researchers with a common corpus of sources, analysis of initiatives “from the top” etc. Without going into detail I am going to recollect primarily two books devoted to theoretical-methodological analysis of studying childhood “in the past” – a well-known work of a Soviet researcher Igor Kon “A child and society” and a generalizing research of a Russian cultural historian Diana Mamichevac “Childhood is metamorphoses of cultural point of view”. To my mind both editions are doing their best to show groundworks of Soviet and Russian historians of childhood opening them for the rest of the world.\textsuperscript{41} Among practical groundworks which interested me in my research are the collective set of works “Underage Subjects of Great Empire”\textsuperscript{42} and Olga Kosheleva’s monography where the conception of childhood in Russia from the 16th to the 18th centuries is examined on the basis of recollections and information from autobiography.\textsuperscript{43} Natalia Pushkareva is the author of numerous well-known works about motherhood and family relationships in pre-modernism Russia. Instantly I recall her historiographic article devoted to the history of motherhood in an interpretation of Russian historians.\textsuperscript{44} In general the Russian historiography of childhood and family life evolved through anthropologisation, cultural history and historical-demographical groundworks. Childhood is considered in the context of deconstruction of patriarchal character, examination of emotions, gender and social roles, influence of the Age of Enlightenment etc.

An important benchmark for the Ukrainian historian is usually works of Polish counterparts who have firm groundworks in the history of childhood. Related practices in the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth societies provided a favorable background for comparison (for example data of demography), explanation of common legal field (Magdeburg rights) etc. From this point of
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view the most noticeable scripts belong to Małgorzata Delimata and Dorothy Zholyand. They focused on the issue which Ariès didn’t fully examined. It was about the multifactorial influence of Christianity on everything that is related to childhood. It’s important to notice that nowadays Polish historians tend to do descriptive, factual researches. The themes of the researches of great compilation “Family circle in ancient times. Childhood” can prove it. The publication of such special editions and thematic issues in the research journal is the evidence of keen interest to the “official historiography” and its vigorous development. Unfortunately the Ukrainian Historical discipline can’t make such a boast. At the same time the most significant domestic social-demographic researches are dedicated exactly to Ukrainian territories which belonged to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. It’s about Irina Voronchuk’s book “The population of Volhynia in the 16th – the first half of the 17th centuries” where in the context of comprehensive exploration of family the author turns to the key aspects of childhood first of all procreational behavior. The research except an important generalization has significant set of facts.

As for the direct study of childhood’s history at that time the general tendencies in Ukrainian humanities were analyzed in Natalia Marchenko’s article. Where the author came to conclusion that the discourse relating to the knowledge is concentrated mostly within pedagogy, psychology and partially ethnography. But the history of childhood as a historical subdiscipline is virtually absent. It’s rather important that the then well-known Ukrainian historian Volodymyr Masliychuk proclaimed a more radical position stating that the history of Ukrainian childhood doesn’t exist. At the same time Tatiana Orlova depicted the generating of childhood’s history as a new branch of social history in Ukraine. How do we get such a nonidentical assessment of historiographic situation? First of all through the ambiguous reflection of present colleagues’ achievements taken from the spheres relative to History.

The historians of Pedagogics have achieved more than others in studying childhood in the past. However a modern Ukrainian history of Pedagogics is a successor of the Soviet History of Pedagogics with its inclination to imitation, exceedingly ideologization, tend to be formal but not meaningful. Igor Kon paid attention to very important statistics. Thus 6774 works relating to History of Pedagogics and school system before World War I were published until 1977. Apparently most of them were dedicated to pedagogues, pedagogical institutions but there was no research devoted to a child directly\textsuperscript{53}. Nowadays it has been carrying on. At the same time even when the history of teaching and upbringing in “ancient Ukraine” is meant the historians of Pedagogics writes about a happy childhood with all its fictitious elements: total education (in contemporary sense), “child-orientated” national Pedagogics and the esteemed attitude towards a child. Professional historians cite such works as examples of evident manipulations with sources, direct explanations and complete misunderstanding of historical contexts. Nevertheless historical-pedagogical researches play a key role in the general discourse, especially due to the pedagogical invasion of respective textbooks for higher educational institution\textsuperscript{54}.

Most of the available ethnographical works concerning childhood are based generally on the sources of the 19th century. Although they are valuable for studying the History of pre-modernism times providing the consideration of “extremely continuous” phenomena appeared in 19th century and beyond. According to my observations modern Ukrainian ethnography (ethnology) in respect of studying history of childhood in general doesn’t significantly vary from the works of Marko Hrushevs’kyi, Zenon Kuzela and Nina Zaglada. Using this conclusions I don’t deny the presence of important works directing towards the deconstruction of “child-orientated” myth\textsuperscript{55}, studying of fundamental aspects of motherhood, playing culture etc.\textsuperscript{56} Their bibliography exceedingly
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varies. Although I want to notice the general concentration on “description” and “retelling” without conceptualization within special methodology. Relevant “children’s” volume of a special series “National Ukrainian culture: human lifetime” might serve as an example. “The chronologically earliest” storylines in the compilation are partially based on retelling of classics’ oeuvres from the second half of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century (for example the abovementioned Marko Hrushevs’kyi). As for the latter the situation with the reprinting of his book already in the 21st century is an illustrative example. The edition of 2006 is followed by illustrations and up-to-date quotes (about motherly energetic or immortal love to the child) which both are contrary to the text itself. A reprinted edition of 2017 is also deprived of an academic apparatus (except small prefaches). The absence of an informative commentary for the book is the evidence of that in a hundred years after the publication it is still considered as an “objective” source instead of just a script produced by specific authors in a specific epoch. Even more it’s perceived extremely pathetic and uncritical. The author of an academic preface for the edition of 2017 writes: “The world is believed that the first ethnographer of childhood is an American researcher M. Mead [...] M.F. Hrushevs’kyi’s research was published when the American researcher was an infant herself [...] Marko Hrushevs’kyi carried out an independent ingenious, fundamental, comprehensive research without professional knowledge in this sphere only possessing fragmented information about the world’s progress in studying of childhood [...] it absorbed all tendencies of the global researches of childhood...”.

Suchlike comparisons can prove that modern Ukrainian ethnology has many things to do in studying of a child and particularly in comprehension of Marko Hrushevs’kyi’s and Zenon Kuzela’s legacy. However Ukrainian historians of the earlier modernism have a more corresponding work. The bibliography of researches devoted to directly the history of childhood is paltry. One of the pioneers of this topic in terms of historical value was Volodymyr Masliychuk. Numerous pioneering researches about the age boundaries and materialistic world of childhood, juvenile delinquency, infanticides were released by him.

---
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Volodymyr Masliychuk’s texts are innovative because of the raised problems and they’re based on deep historiographical knowledge. The author came to rather ingenious conclusions regarding the peculiarities of attitude towards the child in a patriarchal society, the influence of the Age of Enlightenment and public policy in the Cossack Hetmanate and Slobozhanshchyna. These researches are extremely essential for the further exploration of childhood in the early modernism Ukraine. The book by Elena Dziuba touches upon very important things about the child in the aspect of Cossack chiefs’ way of life. The author analyzed a multitudinous number of letters and diaries about about their family members, especially about children, she also paid attention to the emotions’ demonstration, acts of care etc. At the same time she analyzed the representatives of the elite because ordinary people were still remaining an illiterate and silent majority. In the early modernism period in Ukraine the child was mentioned by the authors of historical-demographical practices: Elena Zamura studied the death rate of population and the attitude toward death and Yurii Voloshyn analyzed the birth rate as well. He is the author of the research works about the principles of name given to children, infanticides and juvenile’s hand working farm for children. The latter was also analyzed by Volodymyr Masliychuk. The issues of childhood’s history have recently been studied by Anastasia Podgorna. She has published some researches dealing with the issues of anthroponimic illegitimate birth, children’s diseases in Ukraine in the 18th and 19th centuries.
Ihor Serdiuk has been researching the childhood’s issue in Ukraine in the early modernism period on a more deep and profound level. He is the author of several dozen of works devoted to various children’s aspects: family life, a way of life, socialization, children’s conception, appropriate medical knowledge, emotions. These groundworks are generalized in some way in the special book “Little Grown Up: Child and Childhood in the 18th century Hetmanate”. The book’s content is focused on the main components of childhood’s lifestyle in a conventional Christian society: birth, baptism, growing and death. Among these main components are some additional subjects: midwifery, procreation and infertility, children’s exploitation, marginalization and the position of children amongst other social groups. These aspects are analyzed in terms of conception, practices and demographical “realities” reflected in various sources – from religious materials to court cases and letters. Therefore an attempt was made to consolidate the history of events and the analysis of incidents while combining the method of historical demography (taking into account the discourse of natural history and reflection of “reality”) with history (taking into consideration its analysis of rhetoric and concepts).

CONCLUSIONS

History of childhood in the early modernism epoch is poorly explored from the point of view of Ukrainian material. Lagging behind the European historiography is caused mostly by the isolation of Ukrainian historians during the Soviet period when the access to corresponding works of European counterparts was paltry. Thus the opportunity to take a look at European methodologies of children’s practices couldn’t be used and the important issues were left without attention. The main researches in history are not translated into Ukrainian until now. And it is one of the illustrative examples. As a result of it Ukrainian historians perceive the works through Russian historiography. Though even Russian translations of Margaret Mead’s and Philippe Ariès’ fundamental research works came out with a several dozen of different titles.


years’ delay. So their introduction to Ukrainian historians is viewed as a “catch-up”. Another important aspect is that the early period of modernism in Ukrainian history accounts for the Cossacks epoch which is the most important component of a Ukrainian national historical myth. When in the 1990-s Ukrainian historians got an opportunity to perform free, without any ideological censorship they were set to fill the gaps in the political, economic, military history and a biographical sphere. Cossacks epoch was full of important battles, political campaigns and social changes which overshadow children’s researches. While filling the main gaps from the start of the 21st century researchers’ attention was drawn also to anthropological issues, a little individual, childhood, family life of this epoch.

Today the researches of Ukrainian historians dealing with the childhood of the early modernism period are carried out primarily on the basis of combining two approaches. The first one uses the methodology of social anthropology and demography, while the second one is based on the traditions of cultural history and focuses its attention on social roles, family behavior, examining such phenomena as parenthood, death, growing up. The realization of these methodologies on chronologically and territorially different sources is considered as an important prospect of further children’s practices. As to the concrete problematic cases, the deepest examination of children’s stuff is needed relating to the medieval and early modernism Ukrainian religious culture – from the fundamental philosophical oeuvres to the preaching and practices of parochial clergy. The Pre-modern Ukrainian society had a religious conception of the world, church’s influence on understanding such things as childhood, family life which were determinative. The research of children’s materialistic world on the basis of iconography, museum monuments and archeological dig’s data is considered as an important prospect. Here we can mention cataloguing, distinguishing and deep research of corresponding subjects of cultural legacy. It is believed to be effective to perform micro historical researches directing to emotions, imaginations, daily routine, deviations. The realization of these prospects would significantly improve our knowledge about the childhood in pre-modern Ukraine. For full development of childhood’s history in Ukraine the institutionalization is utterly needed: specialized journals, corresponding conferences, grants, summer schools. Their function would significantly be a great contribution to further researches of the issues.

**SUMMARY**

Nowadays European historiography of childhood in early modernism epoch is sufficiently diverse and has a lot of groundworks. Instead of it the history of childhood in Ukraine remains to be poorly explored and it is not a
favorable topic for historical researches. In this work the author attempted to analyze the main tendencies in the development of European children’s practices and characterized the achievements of Ukrainian historians. The main conclusion was that lagging behind European historiography is caused mostly due to the isolation of Ukrainian historians in the Soviet period when the access to corresponding works of European counterparts was paltry. Thus the opportunity to take a look at European methodologies of children’s practices couldn’t be used and so the important issues were left without attention. The main researches in history are not translated into Ukrainian until now. As a result of it Ukrainian historians perceive them through Russian historiography with a significant delay. An early period of modernism in Ukrainian history can be accounted for the Cossacks epoch which is the most important component of the Ukrainian national historical myth which was studied primarily in the aspect of political, economic, military history and biographic data. There are solitary researches of Ukrainian historians relating to early modernism childhood which are performed on the basis of social anthropology, demography, cultural history. Correspondingly social roles, family behavior, parenthood, death and growing up are studied. The main prospect of further researches is the examination of children’s stuff in medieval and early modernism Ukrainian religious culture – from the fundamental philosophical oeuvres to the preaching and practices of parochial clergy. The research of children’s materialistic world on the basis of iconography, museum monuments and archeological data is a future perspective. Some institutionalization is also an urgent need for the full development of childhood’s history in Ukraine.
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THE SOUTH UKRAINE REGION
IN CONTEMPORARY HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Turchenko H. F.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last decades the scientific interest to regional history has significantly increased. Evolution of modern historical science involves not only all-Ukrainian issues, but also historical process analysis of particular regions of Ukraine. It is only possible to acknowledge all the peculiarities of general history of Ukraine by taking into consideration sociopolitical, socioeconomic and ethnocultural tendencies that manifest themselves in different parts of the country.

The importance of regional factor analysis in the history of Ukraine has been discussed by famous Ukrainian historians of the XIX c. – the beginning of the XXth c. Regional diversity of Ukraine was illustrated in the works of M. Kostomarov, V. Antonovych, D. Bahalii, M. Hrushevsky, O. Ohloblyn etc. In particular, M.Hrushevshky included regional history in the context of general history of Ukraine that contributed to overcoming the image of Ukraine as an isolated land – former “Polish”, “Russian” Ukraine and Novorossiya Region.

Among numerous historical research on regional issues (articles, monographs, theses etc.) there are many that are dedicated to Southern Ukraine. This article will be mostly dealing with theses on history of this region, which thematic reflects the main tendencies of scientific research in different branches of science. Bibliography “Scholars of History of Southern Ukraine”, made by historians of Berdyansk State University in cooperation with Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, provides information about 386 scholars who worked on South Ukraine issues. According to an estimate, in 1991–2019 more than 300 candidate and doctoral theses were defended regarding the history of Southern Ukraine. These research focus on various aspects of socioeconomic and social and political history of the South Ukraine Region. These research should be welcomed. However, a number of key methodological issues of historical research of Southern Ukraine in modern historiography are still unsolved. Particularly, contemporary research is

characterized by ambiguity and diversity of methods of understanding the territorial borders of this region and its place in the general history of Ukraine.

1. The South in the context of regional parting of Ukraine

Without going further into the technology of historical region geographical establishment on the map of Ukraine, it should be pointed out that there is no common point of view on its quantity and territorial configuration. That is quite understandable because every epoch has its own quantity and configuration of regions. Maybe this issue baffles many modern authors who determine the territorial boundaries of their research. Popular historians of the recent past suggest the way out.

M. Hrushevsky was one of the scholars who studied regions of Ukraine. After the return from emigration in Ukraine in 1924, he initiated the research of particular regions of Ukraine and coined the term “historical areal studies”. M. Hrushevsky suggested a plan to extend systematic research of particular historical areas of Ukraine. As a matter of fact, M. Hrushevsky laid the groundwork of historical regional science of Ukraine. He did not use the modern term “region” which is now an international word and is popular in modern historiography of Ukraine. There are such terms in his works as “area”, “areal research” etc². Still, the terms “area” and “region” are similar in their content meaning.

In his article “The Steppe and the Sea in the History of Ukraine” published in 1930 M. Hrushevsky had clearly defined the territory of Southern Ukraine. He described it as the unity of “Ukrainian Steppes and coastal areas of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov” including Crimea. M. Hrushevsky highlights the fragmentary character of research at all stages of history of the South and claims that this history has not yet developed as a holistic image and this process is still going on. M. Hrushevsky studies the history of the South Ukraine Region in the context of general history of Ukraine as its integral part and does not consider imperial perception of this region as “Novorossiya”³.

In 1970 popular Ukrainian historian and emigrant O. Ohloblyn made a statement that at the beginning of the XIX c. Ukraine was a “conglomerate of several different historical and geographical territories, each of which had its own historical destiny”⁴. He suggested this opinion at the scientific conference

---

⁴ Оглоблин О. Проблема схеми історії України 19–20 століття (до 1917 року) Студії з історії України: Статті і джерелні дослідження / Українське історичне товариство, Українська Вільна Академія наук у США. Нью-Йорк; Київ; Торонто, 1995. С. 47.
in New York in his speech “Scheme Issues of Ukrainian History of the 19–20 c. (till 1917)”. This historian gives the configuration of the territories, naming the main of them as a part of Russia / the Soviet Union – Left-bank, Right-bank and Southern Ukraine. The three of them are merged into the integrated term “Great Ukraine”. In addition, popular foreign Ukrainian scholar I. Lysiak-Rudnytsky also named Left-bank, Right-bank and Southern Ukraine as “the main” Ukrainian regions in the Russian Empire⁵.

O. Ohloblyn also mentions Southeast Ukraine as a single “historical and geographical territory” of Ukraine, the territories of new Ukrainian colonisation between Don and Volga and Caucasian Ridge. He describes Galicia, Bukovyna and Zakarpattia as a part of Western Ukraine⁶.

Southern Ukraine, as described by O. Ohloblyn, is a “vast area between Russian and Polish Ukraine, that for a long time has been organically connected to all complex of Ukrainian lands, in the new times (16–17 c.) to some extend separated from this complex and represented till 1775 as Zaporizhzhian Host and Turkish and Tatar landholdings on the south of the Black Sea, and later so called Novorossiya or Novorossiya Region, which Russia considered as an organic part of the Russian Empire even after the Revolution of 1917⁷.

Y. Vermenych, an absolute leader of modern historical regional science of Ukraine, suggests the historical and geographical structure of Rus-Ukraine lands in her monograph “Theoretical and Methodological Issues of Historical Regional Science of Ukraine”: Volhynia, Podolia, Kyivshchyna, Red Ruthenia (Galicia), Siberia, Zaporizhia, Polesia. As for the XIX – XX c. it was commonly accepted to divide Ukrainian lands into five big regions: Right-bank, Left-bank, Sloboda, Western Ukraine and Southern Ukraine.

Taking into consideration this common division Y. Vermenych suggests detailed division into historical and geographical zones or historical and geographical lands (areas). Sometimes bibliographies give different terms such as subregions, second-level regions. Y. Vermenych believes that it is optimal to determine such historical and geographical regions (including historical and geographical lands) as: Right-bank Ukraine (Kyivshchyna, Volhynia, Podolia), Western Ukraine (Galicia, Bukovyna, Zakarpattia, Chelm

---

Land, Podlachia), Left-bank Ukraine (Chernihivshchyna, Poltavshchyna), Sloboda Ukraine (Kharkivshchyna, Sumshchyna), Southern Ukraine (Zaporizhia, Black Sea coastal area (Taurica), Cisazovia, Donbass, Bessarabia)\textsuperscript{8}.

From the point of view of modern regional science the South Ukraine Region includes great landmass mostly populated with Ukrainians, which till 1917 included Katerynoslav, Kherson and Taurida Governorate. These territories bordered on certain regions of Bessarabia Governorate and Don Host mostly populated with Ukrainians. Back in the day they also were part of Southern Ukraine.

Crimea, from the other hand, has a lot of differences from other Ukrainian lands. These peculiarities derive from the historical development of the peninsula. Crimean Tatars were the native people of the peninsula. However, there are many historical, geographical, ethnic and national reasons to consider Crimea as part of the South Ukraine Region.

Russian historiography mythologizes the history of the peninsula and suggests the opposite to Ukrainian point of view on historical belonging of Crimea. The opinion of modern Russian historians is well known: Crimea is an “authentic Russian land”.

Y. Vermenych points out that several modern Ukrainian historians look at Crimea beyond the history of Ukraine\textsuperscript{9}. That is true because even more often scholars consider Crimea as a part of Ukraine, but not the part of the South Ukraine Region. They believe it is a separate region of Ukraine.

This point of view should be taken into consideration by historians who study the South of Ukraine.

Direction analysis of “historical movement” of particular regions of Ukraine is another important issue, without which it is impossible to imagine the history of Ukraine of the XIX – XX c.\textsuperscript{10}

O. Ohloblyn mentioned that in the course of historical development the differences between the largest historical and geographical territories of Ukraine – Left-bank, Right-bank and the South – gradually disappear and as a result they converged together and formed Ukrainian national and territorial

\textsuperscript{8} Верменич Я. В. Теоретико-методологічні проблеми історичної регіоналістики в Україні / Наук. ред. П. Т. Тронько. НАН України. Інститут історії України. Київ. Інститут історії України, 2003. С. 91–92.
\textsuperscript{9} Верменич Я. В. Теоретико-методологічні проблеми історичної регіоналістики в Україні / Наук. ред. П. Т. Тронько. НАН України. Інститут історії України. Київ. Інститут історії України, 2003. С. 25.
complex: O. Ohloblyn considered the “unity of all these individual areas into a unified national and territorial integrity” as “one of the most important processes in Ukrainian history of the 19–20 c.”.

However, despite the convergence, the differences between individual Ukrainian territories, as O. Ohloblyn points out, did not cease to exist even in the XX c. They occurred in culture, traditions, customs, mentality, population political preferences etc. In 1930 M. Hrushevsky also referred to this fact. The events of the last years highlight that the process of forming “national and territorial integrity” is still going on today. Moreover, it has slowed down in the last years of independence. It also becomes regressive under the influence of the Russian Federation, accompanied with disintegrative factors that threaten national and territorial integrity of Ukraine.

And the area of the Southeast Ukraine – territories of new Ukrainian colonisation between Don and Volga – under the influence of external factors drifted apart from Great Ukraine, same as Chelm Land and Podlachia in the West that remained outside of the Western Ukraine.

2. The boundaries of the Southern Ukraine in contemporary historical research

Let us deal with the issue of how modern historians, who work on the South Ukraine issues, define territorial boundaries of Southern Ukraine. Consider as an example thesis analysis defended in the last decades.

Thus, M. Mintz in his Candidate’s thesis “The Development of Primary Education in the South of Ukraine (1861–1917)”, limits territorial boundaries of the South only to “borders of Kherson Governorate (modern Mykolaiv, Odesa, Kherson Oblast, parts of Kirovohrad, Dnipropetrovsk Oblast and Moldova Republic)”12. That means he did not consider Katerynoslav and Taurida Governorates.

Another scholar O. Kulchytska in her Candidate’s thesis dedicated to the public and political organization activity analysis in the South of Ukraine in the end of XIX – the beginning of XX cc. also limited territorial boundaries of her research to the territory of Kherson Governorate13.

12 Мінц М.О. Розвиток початкової освіти на Півдні України (1861–1917 рр.): Автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Мінц Микола Олександрович ; Запорізький національний університет. Запоріжжя, 2007. С. 2.
With that in mind, these scholars expand their conclusions to the whole South Ukraine Region.

The scholar H. Vietrova in her population social change analysis in the South of Ukraine of the second half of the XIX c. is limited by the boundaries of Kherson and Katerynoslav Governorates. The conclusions are again applied to the whole South of Ukraine. So the work does not consider social change in Taurida Governorate, its mainland and the Crimean peninsula. It lacks consistency when dealing with the territorial boundaries of the South of Ukraine as a historical region. The scholar explains her opinion in the following way: “Population social change was intense in the developed Ukrainian Governorates. Kherson and Katerynoslav Governorates were characterized by great deposit of mineral resources, big trade centres, harbours, active road construction, huge amount of free land, which resulted in quick marketplace development and establishment of the main social stratae”\textsuperscript{14}.

We believe that conclusions based on only two Southern Governorate analysis cannot be used to characterise the whole South Ukraine Region.

O. Bielsky in his thesis has similar issues with perspective of the South of Ukraine. In the manuscript “Old-believers of Southern Ukraine: formation and development in the second half of the XVIII – in the beginning of the XX cc the author mentions that geographical boundaries of his work consist of Southern Ukraine. He then specifies that it ts “Taurida Governorate with the surrounding territories”\textsuperscript{15}.

O. Pryimak, in his Candidate’s thesis dedicated to the analysis of Stolypin agrarian reform peculiarities in the South of Ukraine, points out that territorial boundaries of this work include Katerynoslav, Kherson and Taurida Governorates. However, the author then specifies that he has studied 1906–1917 agrarian reformations “by examining several districts of Southern Ukraine: Berdyansk, Dnipro and Melitopol districts of Taurida Governorate, Katerynoslav, Oleksandrivsk districts of Katerynoslav Governorate and also Kherson district of the same name Governorate\textsuperscript{16}. So, Crimean districts and all those which were not included to the territorial boundaries Katerynoslav and

\textsuperscript{14} Вєтрова Г.В. Соціальні зміни у складі населення Півдня України у другій половині XIX ст. [Текст] : автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Вєтрова Ганна Володимирівна ; Одеський національний ун-т ім. І.І.Мечникова. О., 2008. С. 1.

\textsuperscript{15} Бєльський О.В. Старообрядництво в Південній Україні: формування та розвиток у другій половині XVIII – на початку XX ст. [Текст] : автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Бєльський Олександр Володимирович ; Запорізький національний ун-т. Запоріжжя, 2007. С. 17.

Kherson Governorate districts were left behind the scope of research without any argumentation.

The scholar V. Vakulyk wrote a thesis “Formation and development of district council veterinarian medicine of the Southeast Ukraine (1864–1918)”. However the territorial boundaries of his research included “steppe territories of the Southern Governorates (Katerynoslav, Kherson and mainland districts of Taurida Governorate) and Kharkiv Governorate where Kharkiv Veterinarian Institute was located. It has shaped in many ways scientific connections with district council veterinarian medicine”\(^\text{17}\).

Another author O. Hospodarenko studied local authorities and self-government activity in 1917–1920 in the South of Ukraine. His work includes the territories of the modern Odesa, Mykolaiv and Kherson Oblast\(^\text{18}\).

When studying international organizations activity in the South of Ukraine in 1921–1929, T. Mykhailovsky mentions that the territorial boundaries include “mostly Southern Black Sea coastal area, that nowadays consists of Odesa, Mykolaiv and Kherson Oblast”. The southern part of Kirovohrad Oblast with the city of Kropyvnytskyi, which during the 1920s was part of Mykolaiv (till 1922) and Odesa (1922–1925) Governorates, was also included to the territorial boundaries\(^\text{19}\).

In V. Kyrylenko’s research “The Hunger of 1921–1923 in Southern Ukraine” the reasons, scale and consequences of the 1921–1923 Hunger were studied within the territory limited to the borders of the modern Mykolaiv, Odesa and Kherson Oblast\(^\text{20}\). The author calls it “Southwest region of Ukraine”. However the subject of the thesis deals with the “South of Ukraine”. The question arose, is it correct to use the term “region” regarding the part of Southern Ukraine? The author did not explain this determination of territorial boundaries. Maybe the events of the 1921–1923 famine in Mykolaiv, Odesa and Kherson Oblast were fundamentally different in comparison with other South Ukraine territories? There is no answer to this


\(^{19}\) Михайловський Т.О. Діяльність міжнародних організацій на Півдні України (1921–1929 рр.) [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01 / Михайловський Тимур Олегович ; Чорномор. наук. ун-т ім. Петра Могили. Миколаїв, 2018. С. 2.

question, however the author outlined the aim of the research as “comprehensive study of the 1921–1923 famine peculiarities in Southern Ukraine”.

O. Boiko studied the opposition of the Orthodox Church and the public to state anti-religious movement on material of Southern Ukraine in the 20–30s of the XXc. The author mentions that “in the early 1920s, the geography of the South of Ukraine spreads to Katerynoslav, Zaporizhia, Odesa and Mykolaiv Governorates”. As of 1925, it was the territory of 11 districts: Katerynoslav, Pavlohrad, Zaporizhia, Kryvyi Rih, Melitopol, Kherson, Mykolaiv, Zinovivsk, Odesa, Pervomaisk and Balta.

For I. Kryvko, who studied land communities of Southern Ukraine in 1922–1930, the South Ukraine Region had different boundaries. The author states that “by Southern Ukraine we understand steppe natural and historical region”. Along with the Steppe, in her opinion, “considering climate, geographical distribution and agricultural methods” the 1920s Ukraine was represented by two more regions – Forest steppe and Polesia. I. Kryvko’s thesis states: “After the administrative and territorial reform of 1923–1925 14 districts were included into the steppe region – Artemivsk, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhia, Zinoviev, Kryvyi Rih, Luhansk, Mariupol, Melitopol, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Pervomaisk, Stalinske, Starobilsk, Kherson”.

So, taking into account all administrative and territorial changes of the 1920s, it is clear that O. Boiko’s and I. Kryvko’s points of view on territorial boundaries of Southern Ukraine are different. In contrast to O. Boiko, I. Kryvko includes several districts of Donetsk and Luhansk to the South Ukraine Region.

Similar examples are given in research dedicated to the present times. A. Shostak studies state-church relations, orthodox denomination peculiarities and their relations in Kherson, Mykolaiv and Odesa Oblast in the 90s of the XX c., drawing his conclusions to the whole South Ukraine Region.

The list of similar theses, articles and publications can be continued. Thus, there are different approaches on interpretation of the South of Ukraine. They

---


23 Шостак А.В. Православні конфесії півдня України у 90-х роках ХХ століття (на матеріалах Херсонської, Миколаївської, Одеської областей) [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01 / Шостак Андрій Васильович ; Миколаїв. нац. ун-т ім. В.О. Сухомлинського. Миколаїв, 2016. С. 2.
are mainly based on author’s vision of region’s territorial boundaries. This causes the term “the South of Ukraine” as a scientific construction lose its scientific value, and it’s territorial boundaries remain unclear. Moreover, the majority of scholars do not give enough reasoning or explanation on territorial boundaries of their work.

This leads to the fact that many scholars, who want to stay on the level of scientific analysis, find it hard to generalise the data. As a result, a question arises, how objective conclusions about the whole South Ukraine Region could be, if they are made on data analysis that only includes a part of this region? The answer is obvious.

There is no doubt that among analysed theses there are some that give scientific argumentation on territorial boundaries of Southern Ukraine of the XIX – XX cc. At least they include the territories of three Governorates (Katerynoslav, Kherson and Taurida in their pre-revolutionary administrative and territorial boundaries), and are supported by relevant historical sources. For example, territorial boundaries description of O. Cheremisin24, V. Dobrovolska25, Y. Bilai26, N. Sitalova27, T. Vintskovsky28 does not contradict the vision of the modern regional science.

3. The South of Ukraine in triad: Local History – Regional History – National History

There is a strong tendency in academic field to associate historical region studies with substantive knowledge and give local history an applied role – educational and conservation. However, scholars very often use the term historical “region” as a synonym for the term “locality” and do not specify what is meant by that term. In practice, some scholars equate historical regional science with historical local studies but it is not correct. Local history

28 Вінцковського Т.С. Формування і діяльність місцевих органів влади першої УНР на півдні України”: Автореф. дис... докт. іст. наук : 07.00.01 / Одеський національний університет ім. І. Мечникова. Одеса, 2016. С. 4.
is prone to developing microstories, detailed description of individual localities and small regions. It is based on amateurism and oriented toward educational activities.

On the other hand, historical regional science studies broader territories (regions), determines its influence on neighbouring and remote region development as well as the country itself, the influence on international landscape (if it is evident). Historical regional science develops region division criteria, directions of regional politics in the centre and local (regional) response etc. So, local history, regional science and national history can be seen as different levels of generalization about one object – the country.

Taking into consideration historical region territorial boundaries, similarities should be found in social and economic and sociocultural past, territorial distribution, in relationship system between neighbouring regions and border countries during long historical period.

When dealing with some modern research on the South Ukraine issues, it seems that their authors do not consider this problem. Manuscripts of O. Bielskiy, V. Hvozdyk, V. Dmitriev, V. Dobrovolska, M. Mints, O. Pryimak, analyzed by us, use the terms “region” and “locality” as synonyms. With that in mind, the authors do not specify the meaning of these terms. For example, O. Bielskiy in his work uses such terms as “region”, “Taurida region of Southern Ukraine”, “regions of the South” alongside.

---

33 Мінц М.О. Розвиток початкової освіти на Півдні України (1861–1917 рр.): Автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Мінц Микола Олександрович ; Запорізький національний університет. Запоріжжя, 2007. С. 1.
The author does not explain the meaning of these terms. There is some confusion in terminology.

Let us consider some more examples.

The scholar R. Kazaknov dedicated his article to the Black Sea region in the XIX c. Having read the article, one can conclude that the historian equates the territories of the “Black Sea region”, in his opinion, with three South Ukraine Governorates.

Nevertheless, there are no reasons for the substitution of the name “South Ukraine region” to the “Black Sea region”. Maybe the author does not see the difference?

Another example would be the scholar N. Maliarchuk. She analyzed population ethnic structure in “Southeast Ukraine”, which she refers to as macroregion. With that in mind, she doesn’t not specify the difference between macroregion and region and does not name other existing macroregions. The author believes it is an axiom that does not need any argumentation.

When analysing interdenominational relations in Sea of Azov South coast area in the end of the XVIII – the beginning of the XX cc., O. Avdeeva mentiones that this territory is a separate subregion of Southern Ukraine. “By Sea of Azov South coast area as a subregion of Southern Ukraine one understands area that by the end of the period under consideration covered the territory of three districts: Melitopol and Berdyansk of Taurida Governorates and Mariupol of Katerynoslav Governorate”.

However, the author states that the Sea of Azov South coast area as an object of regional studies in geography, geology etc. “is still insufficiently represented” in historical research. O. Avdieieva took the liberty of calling the Sea of Azov South coast area a subregion of Southern Ukraine and does not give any argumentation or opinion of credible historians to prove her ideas to be more convincing and reasonable.

What do modern regional historians think about the issue? Let us consider the opinion of credible scholar Y. Vermenych. It should be recalled that as of the end of the XVIII- the beginning of the XX cc. she describes such historical and geographical lands in Southern Ukraine: Zaporizhia, Black Sea coastal area (Taurida), Bessarabia and Sea of Azov coastal area. Thus, modern

---


Regional historians do not describe Sea of Azov South coast area (as a part of Sea of Azov coastal area) as a separate subregion. The territories of the Don Army populated mostly with Ukrainians were also a part of Southern Ukraine, and therefore a part of Sea of Azov coastal area. That is, the scholar’s statement that the Sea of Azov South coast area is a subregion of Southern Ukraine, requires more argumentation.

Therefore, even after rough introduction to the modern research on the South Ukraine issues it is possible to assume that some historians are either not familiar with scientific developments of modern regional science, or fail to consider them, suggesting in the scientific circulation their own vision of region division boundaries without any argumentation. This issue needs considerable adjustments. In 2003 Y. Veremenych rightly observed that a need to renew and specify the conceptual apparatus has been there for a long time, “yet there has been no visible breakthrough in that direction”. The breakthrough has not yet happened today. The one thing is clear: the value of regional research can be explained exactly by the fact that the authors go beyond local history. Between individual South Ukraine city, countryside or even Governorate from one side and Ukraine from another, there should be the whole region and local history should include its peculiarities. All of it will help improve the level of generality to all-Ukrainian.

The above-mentioned scholar Y. Veremenych suggests using the term “locality” in local history and the term “historical and geographical region” in research dedicated to region analysis. Historical and geographical region, as Y. Veremenych mentiones, is historically formed area with more or less homogeneous economic and geographical environment, population sociopolitical preferences, national and cultural aura. Region is characterized by specific mentality, common territorial interests, dominance of particular language and religious orientations among population. Regions can differ in specific political culture. On the base of regional identity a type of mentality can occur, that is characterized by specific regional patriotism.

Thus, region is a more or less homogeneous area. That is why it is essential to consider the South of Ukraine as a unified part and do not leave

---

behind individual Governorates or districts. Secondly, it is important to get up to the level of generality, to define the peculiarities of socioeconomic or sociopolitical processes in the region in comparison to other regions and in national context.

Unfortunately, there is little research of such level. Let us consider several names as an example. When studying South Ukraine peasantry during the times of the new 1921–1929 economic policy, Y. Kotliar analyzed South Ukraine peasant psychological and mental peculiarities. Another scholar, O. Cheremisin, reconstructed local government activity in the South of Ukraine in 1785–1917. He compares the state of affairs regarding this sphere with other Ukrainian regions and also with Russian territories. His geographical research includes three South Ukraine Governorates with the Crimean peninsula. The work is full of such comparisons and generalisation.

CONCLUSIONS

During the years of Ukrainian Independence history scholars have accumulated a huge amount of factual data. Special interest was drawn to socioeconomic, political, demographic, ethnic and ethnocultural processes in the South of Ukraine in the XIX – XX cc. However, the place and role of the region in the context of general history of Ukraine of the XIX – XX cc. has not yet received a balanced assessment.

Firstly, it happens quite often that only separate territorial fragments of the South Ukraine region are being explored, and conclusions are applied to the whole region. As a result, local process analysis in particular areas or territories of the South does not make a holistic representation of the whole region, which includes the territories of Katerynoslav, Kherson and Taurida Governorates in their pre-revolutionary administrative and territorial boundaries.

Secondly, the desire of scholars to get up to the level of all-Ukrainian generality with local facts and conclusions is not always successful. One of the most important reasons for this issue is that scholars have lack of understanding the idea about theoretical framework of historical regional science and its place in research technology structure. Moreover, there is lack of understanding the idea that a historian, who studies regional issues, in contrast to local historian, is not limited by local material analysis, local

---

41 Котляр Ю.В. Селянство Півдня України в період нової економічної політики (1921–1929 рр.): Автореф. дис... докт. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Котляр Юрій Вадимович ; Одеський національний університет ім. 1.І. Мечникова. Одеса, 2005. С. 14.

42 Черемісін О.В. Міське самоврядування на Півдні України в 1785–1917 рр. [Текст]: автореф. дис. ... д-ра іст. наук : 07.00.01 / Черемісін Олександр Вікторович ; Запоріз. нац. ун-т. Запоріжжя, 2017. С. 16, 24, 30.
processes studies and dissemination of information among local people. A historian, who studies regional issues, must always remember that their main goal is to indicate how regional processes are interwoven into all-Ukrainian ones and what is their influence.

In this context it is worth noting how O. Ohloblyn, a profound Ukrainian historian, understands this issue. In 1970 he encouraged his colleagues to pay attention to the role of regional factor in the history of Ukraine. He believed that this would make it possible to study one of the most important processes in the history of Ukraine of the XIX – XX cc. That is, the establishment of the uniform national and territorial body during the modernization on the base of conglomerate of historical and geographical territories, which Ukraine was at the beginning of the XIX c., modern Ukrainian nation formation and reasons for establishment of independent Ukraine.

The South Ukraine region played a huge role in this process. As all of the other regions, it gradually integrated into all-Ukrainian territorial body and transformed into an integral part of Great Ukraine. However, this process lacks appearance in modern historiography. There is little research dedicated to integration analysis of the South into Great Ukraine in economics, social structure, culture, traditions, customs, mentality, population political preferences etc. Without analysing these processes it is impossible to understand how unified Ukrainian identity was formed and how preconditions of Ukrainian Independence were gradually established, an integral part of which is the South Ukraine region.

**SUMMARY**

This article provides critical historical research analysis of the place and role of Southern Ukraine as a historical region in all-Ukrainian historical process of the XIX – XX cc. The works of prominent Ukrainian historians M. Hrushevsky and O. Ohloblyn were used as methodological framework for the analysis. In the context of their theoretical approach a number of theses were analysed, which went through the public defence procedure after declaration of Ukrainian Independence in 1991. It was noted that there is a great deal of interest among scholars to the South Ukraine issues. Moreover, a number of key matters in the history of the South of Ukraine are still unsolved in modern historiography, which is illustrated with particular examples. Particularly, a number of contemporary research is prone to ambiguity and diversity when interpreting territorial boundaries of the South Ukraine region. Little attention is given to identification of its place and role in all-Ukrainian historical process. It has been proven, that such approach reduces the qualitative research level. Materials and conclusions of the article offer prospects to deepen and update the scientific vision of the role of regional factor and the history of Ukraine.
REFERENCES


7. Вінцковського Т.С. Формування і діяльність місцевих органів влади першої УНР на півдні України: [Текст] : автореф. дис... докт. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Вінцковський Тарас Степанович ; Одеський національний університет ім. І.І.Мечникова. Одеса, 2016. 31 с.

8. Вінцковського Т.С. Формування і діяльність місцевих органів влади першої УНР на півдні України: [Текст] : автореф. дис... докт. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Вінцковський Тарас Степанович ; Одеський національний університет ім. І.І.Мечникова. Одеса, 2016. 31 с.


10. Гопошаренко О.В. Діяльність місцевих органів влади і самоврядування на Півдні України у 1917–1920 pp.: соціально-
економічний аспект [Текст] : автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Господаренко Оксана Валеріївна ; Донецький національний ун-т. Донецьк, 2005. 18 с.


18. Котляр Ю.В. Селянство Півдня України в період нової економічної політики (1921–1929 рр.): Автореф. дис... докт. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Котляр Юрій Вадимович ; Одеський національний ун-т. Одеса, 2005. 34 с.


24. Мінц М.О. Розвиток початкової освіти на Півдні України (1861–1917 pp.) : Автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Мінц Микола Олександрович ; Запорізький національний університет. Запоріжжя, 2007. 19 с.


27. Сіталова Н.О. Діяльність соціалістів-революціонерів Південної України напередодні та в період революції 1905–1907 рр. [Текст] : автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 / Сіталова Наталя Олександрівна ; Дніпропетровський національний ун-т ім. Олеся Гончара. Д., 2009. 20 с.


29. Шостак А.В. Православні конфесії півдня України у 90-х роках XX століття (на матеріалах Херсонської, Миколаївської, Одеської областей) [Текст] : автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01 / Шостак Андрій Васильович ; Миколаїв. нац. ун-т ім. В.О. Сухомлинського. – Миколаїв, 2016. 20 с.

Information about the author:

Turchenko H. F.

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor,
Zaporizhzhia National University
66, Zhukovskoho str., Zaporizhzhia, 69600, Ukraine
RESOLVING “BESSARABIA ISSUE” 
FOLLOWING THE OUTCOMES OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR: 
HISTORIOGRAPHIC REVIEW 

Popenko Ya. V. 

INTRODUCTION 
Modern period of the national state-building process probably more than in all the previous years of modern Ukrainian independence, require the society to be more attentive to the learning and understanding the events from the past. Moreover, people need this knowledge not only as background information but also for understanding their essence, taking into consideration their forerunner’s experience and generating of the model of the modern development of Ukrainian state. Since even now the catchphrase, “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it” is more than never relevant and and timely for modern Ukrainian nation”. 

The beginning of the 20th century formed the following tendencies of the political development of the European continent: a period “Pax Britannica” was gradually finished; existing system of the Vienna international relations were completely declining; German empire declared the beginning of the “era of world politics”; the process of delimiting of countries on military-political blocs etc. As a result, the First World War became an outcome of these tendencies. It is extremely important period for studying and rethinking, because due to its results the new geopolitical world configuration was created. Quite interesting and enlightening page of those times is a history of royal Romania and its role in Ukrainian state-building of the first quarter of the 20th century. 

At the initial stage of the new European and then a world war, Romania appeared to be virtually clutched between two military-political blocs – Quadruple Alliance and Entente. In such difficult military-political situation, the Roman government, due to their own foreign policy was managed to use it for saving sovereignty, pursue their national interests and significantly even for a short time to expand state borders.

In 1919 Paris became a center of the world diplomacy because even there the conference which had to “de jure “ sum up the First World War. In terms of tactical purpose, it had to work out a set of treaties with the conquered countries of the Quadruple Alliance. Strategically, it was about redistributing spheres of influence and creating a new map of Europe and the world.
Among others, discussions and contradictions in the leadership of the conference raised questions related to the territories of the former Russian Empire where civil war was going on at the time. One of the key problems was “the Bessarabia issue” which was hoped for by several statesmen: Romania, the Ukrainian People’s Republic (UNR), the governments of Generals A. Denikin and O. Kolchak, the RSFSR, the Ukrainian SSR. As a result of the open debates and arrangements, on October 28, 1920, the Paris Protocol was signed recognizing Romania’s sovereignty over Bessarabia.

The experience of “fair” solution to “Bessarabia issue” still remains of some practical and science interest. As nowadays experience confirms, the existing national borders are only notionally stable and, accordingly, due to the changing geopolitical situation in the world, they can be revised and changed in favour of the more powerful and influential players on the world political arena. This provokes the formation of new points of rivalry and conflicts and does not facilitate the establishment of a peaceful dialogue between the countries. On the other hand, the “historiographical work” on the topic also indicates the interest of scientists in its study and rethinking. The “Bessarabia issue” of 1918–1920 was evaluated, analyzed and characterized from completely diametrically opposed positions, starting with full approval and ending with unconditional condemnation.

The aim of the suggested further study is to analyze the scientific publications of the foreign and Ukrainian researchers, dedicated to the “Bessarabia issue” during the 1918–1920.

1. The territorial affiliation of Bessarabia in the Paris Conference decision-making process in Russian-language historiography

The first meetings of the Paris Conference confirmed the virtual rift of the team of the victorious states. France wanted to weaken the German in order to establish the hegemony in Europe and reinforce the eastern borders. However Great Britain and USA were more interested in saving of the military-political and economic equilibrium, so their representatives were more tolerant to take into account the interests of the defeated states.

The lively discussions and contradictions among the management of the conference raised questions related to the territories of the former Russian Empire. One was the “Bessarabia issue “ which was favored by several stakeholders: Royal Romania (actually annexed by Bessarabia in 1918 – ed.), The UNR, the governments of the White Guard Generals A. Denikin and

---

1 Clarification: a compromise draft of the Treaty of Bessarabia was prepared at the Paris Peace Conference on April 14, 1920. On August 10th, US diplomats refused to sign it. The remaining Allies (Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan) signed the Paris Protocol on October 28th, but it wasn’t ratified by Japan. According to the international law, it didn’t come into force.
O. Kolchak, the RSFSR, Bulgaria. However, the latter had minimal chances, since it belonged to the defeated states of the Quadruple Alliance. As a result of the open political debate and behind-the-scenes arrangements, on October 28, 1920, the Paris Protocol (the Bessarabian Protocol) was signed, recognizing Romania’s sovereignty over Bessarabia.

It should be noted that scientific publications of the foreign scientists, dedicated to “Bessarabia topic” is quite diverse. Some parts of them are dedicated to the general perspectives of this problem in the context of development of the new Versailles system of international relations, which was created on the basis of the First World War. In particular, the authors of the Russian Institute for Strategic Studies in their report stress that Bucharest began to create the Bessarabian map as early as the war of 1914–1918. According to experts, Romania has successfully implemented the chosen political strategy, its main components are:

- expected international neutrality;
- diplomatic maneuvering between the Entente and the Quadruple Alliance;
- constant manipulation of public opinion by disseminating the idea of the need to expand state borders by joining new territories;
- attempts to get political assurances from the “great powers” for the official entry of the kingdom into war, etc.

As a result, this enabled Bucharest to phase out the Greater Romania program.

In 1917, thanks to the Bolshevik coup and the actual withdrawal of the Russian Empire from World War II, Romania entered an active phase of annexation of new lands, including Bessarabia. However, the Romanian government continued to maneuver between the belligerent powers. By signing the April 24th (May 7th) 1918 Bucharest Peace Treaty with the Quadruple Alliance and having received guarantees from Germany on Bessarabia’s accession to the kingdom, in November 1918 Romania returned to the Entente camp. Alongside this diplomatic turmoil, its military contingents have already occupied a number of territories – Bessarabia, Bukovina and part of Transylvania. It was then, according to Russian researchers, that the Romanian government intensified the “Bessarabia issue”3. At the same time, it began to be actively used by the Romanian Foreign Office as an exclusively domestic issue in the European capitals (London and Paris) as well as in the USA.

---

According to V. Yastrebchak, Romanian diplomacy of 1918–1920 can serve as a “model” for others. We can also agree with the author, that Romania’s desire and ability to act independently when it comes to a real opportunity to become a regional leader should not be underestimated. The thesis of the kingdom’s status as a regional leader in the Danubian region is confirmed by other researchers. In particular, V. Vinogradov notes that the foreign policy program of Bucharest during the period of the end of the First World War and in the following years was aimed at the creation of “Greate Romania”. In support of his words, the author cites the words of the then Prime Minister of Romania, I. Bretian, who noted: “Romania will not allow Bulgaria’s expansion too much, and the balance in the Balkans should remain the leading state”. According to the implementation of this plan, it was necessary for Bucharest to get a control over all Bessarabia. In addition to the mentioned work, V. Vinogradov’s creative work is presented by other publications in which, among other issues, Bessarabian issues are analyzed.

In addition to the general works, dealing with “Bessarabia issue” of the first quarter of the twentieth century, there is a considerable number of publications in which the topic has been given close attention.

M. Meltyukhov’s study “The Bessarabia issue Between the World Wars of 1917–1940” focuses these aspects. By using a wide range of sources and new declassified archival materials, in this work the author analyzed both internal and external prerequisites for the occupation of Bessarabia by Romanians in 1918. In addition to it, is presents extremely important material on the history of Sfatul Tseriy (County Council) activity as a provisional elective authority on the territory of the former Bessarabia Governorate. The researcher completely rejects the claim of some Romanian historians that the

---

representatives of Sfatul Tseriy unanimously and voluntarily declared the need to annex the region exclusively to Romania.

Basing upon archival documents, M. Meltyukhov emphasizes that the situation during 1918–1919 was not as straightforward as Romanian historians have argued. Thus, in the Bessarabia government, there were completely opposite views on the future legal status of the region:

- some spoke in favor of joining Romania;
- others argued for the existence of the People’s Republic of Moldova (proclaimed December 2 (15), 1917);
- others sought its accession to the Ukrainian People’s Republic;
- some were willing to enter the Great Russian Federal Democratic Republic.
- some of the delegates supported the idea of an alliance with the Bolsheviks.

According to the author’s opinion, only the permission of the Quadruple Alliance (in 1918) was granted at first, and subsequently the Entente (1919) gave Romania the opportunity to occupy Bessarabia and legally consolidate it in 192010.

Among the monographs dedicated to the Bessarabia issue in the chronological period that have recently been released, the publication that’s worth mentioning is “Bessarabia issue in the context of international relations (1919–1920) Paris Peace Conference”11 by the Moldovan historian I. Levit. In his work, the author analyzed how and in what way the Bessarabia issue arose and was formalized, as it was perceived not only by Romanian governmental circles, but also by European and American diplomacy.

In the study I. Levitt proposed three main chronological stages of the existence and development of the “Bessarabia issue”:

- the first one was 1917–1918, when in the conditions of the First World War and the Civil War in the territory of the former Russian Empire it finally formed in the governmental circles of Bucharest and gradually began to enter the international diplomatic arena;
- the second – in 1919, when the “Bessarabia issue” was directly resolved at the level of the Paris Peace Conference;
- the third is 1920, when Bessarabia international legal status was enshrined in the notorious Paris Protocol.

It should be noted that the author had to analyze an extremely large amount of information related to the topic to maintain the principle of

historical objectivity. In particular, I. Levitt analyzes not only the “Romanian” vision of the problem in the interpretation of politicians and diplomats of the time (I. Bretian, T. Ionescu, V. Antonescu, K. Diamandi, A. Averescu, etc.), but also the attitude to him by other states. For example, how the Bessarabian issues were perceived and evaluated by representatives of France (J. Clemenceau and S. Pichon), the United Kingdom (A. Balfour and D. Lloyd George), the United States (C. Vopichka, F. Polk and R. Lansing) and others. Outside of the researcher’s attention, the media of the time were not left behind. In order to confirm or refute his own thoughts, I. Levitt quotes the press of the time, in particular, the publications “Le Temps”, “Excelsior”, “L’Humanité”, “Izvestiya CEC”, “Odessa listok”, etc.

For the purpose of objective research and presentation of his own positions, the author cites the material of archives and official collections of documents of the respective states (in particular, “Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States. The Paris Peace Conference. 1919”, “Documents on British Foreign Policy 1919–1939 “Documents of Foreign Policy of the USSR”).

The military-political situation around the territorial affiliation of Bessarabia was also reflected in the works of S. Nazaria\(^\text{12}\). In particular, in the article “Rakovsky – Averescu Agreement” “... the author covered the course of events related to the agreement of March 5–9, 1918. In the context of the agreement signed between the parties, the author analyzed the complex negotiation process between Romania, the Quadruple Alliance, the Entente which eventually ended with the military annexation of the Ukrainian territories of Bukovina and Bessarabia. According to the researcher, the new Romanian government, formed by General A. Averescu on February 5, 1918, was “to delay negotiations with the Germans and give the Entente the

impression of the” inevitability “of the signing of a separate peace by Romania”\(^{13}\).

At the same time, it should be noted that the researcher, in their coverage of the events, completely ignores all measures taken by the Ukrainian national governments to return the territories illegally occupied by the Romanian Kingdom. Although he stated that “the most difficult thing for Romania happened: it was necessary to provide the annexation of the region with at least the appearance of “legality” terms of international law”\(^{14}\).

In the the researcher states that during the 1918–1920’s the “Bessarabia issue” reflected the conflicts of interest of different international actors and different vectors of international relations, namely:

- the camp aimed at fighting the world communist revolution;
- supporters of the idea of forming a “sanitary border” against the penetration of Bolshevism in the West;
- geopolitical aspirations of the leading Western powers to obtain a convenient bridgehead for ousting Russia (with any government – the author) to the east and gaining full control of the Danube mouth;
- Bucharest’s immediate plans to create a Greater Romania;
- the desire of the great powers to conquer Romania in the interests of the victorious states in the First World War\(^{15}\).

Aspects of international law related to the annexation of Romania to the Bessarabian lands were analyzed in their work by V. Makarchuk and N. Rudy. Citing a number of international agreements (in particular, the treaty between Romania and the Entente of August 4, 1916) and from the point of view of international law in force at the time, the authors stated that “the Romanian occupation of Bessarabia could not be legitimized by either the Sfatum Cerai Initiative or the decision. conferences on the transfer of the Romanian region”\(^{16}\). Like S. Nazarius, the authors also ignored the fact that Ukrainian


\(^{14}\) Назария С.М. Соглашение Раковского – Авереску от 5–9 марта 1918 г. в историографии и мемуарах румынских политиков. Проблемы национальной стратегии. 2014, № 2 (23). С. 164.


\(^{16}\) Макарчук В., Рудый Н. Восточные границы межвоенной Румынии (1918–1940 гг.) : аспекты международного права. Русин. 2012. № 2 (28). С. 64.
national governments existed, and analyzed all the negotiations that took place around Bessarabia at the level of the Romania-RSFSR-USRR inter-governamental dialogue.

In a similar interpretation of historical events, the Bessarabian issue was presented by Moldovan researcher P. Boyko. By his definition, the problem of Bessarabia during the late 1918–1920ss is a conventional symbol of interstate relations between Soviet Russia (later the USSR) and royal Romania, caused by the occupation of Soviet territory, carried out by Romanian ruling circles in 1818 in world war conditions.

Of course, this is not the immediate objective of this publication, but it will not be superfluous to note that the author of the previous citation in some way ignores the following aspects:

- Firstly, in 1918 only a few were in force in Ukraine governments: the UPR of the Central Council and the Ukrainian State of P. Skoropadsky;
- Secondly, the definition of “Soviet territory” in relation to 1918 certain reservations since the USSR was formally established on December 30, 1922 at the First Congress of Soviets, where delegates from the RSFSR, the USSR, the BSSR and the Caucasus The SFRD reviewed and approved the draft Declaration and Treaty of formation USSR;
- Thirdly, the diplomatic struggle for Bessarabia was led by representatives Russian White Guard movement. For example, no question aside representatives of the Kolchak government remained. The leadership of the Paris conferences in 1919–1920 repeatedly received memoranda from G. Lvov, S. Sazonov, M. Tchaikovsky, V. Maklakov about groundlessness Romanian claims on the region. Moreover, there were Russian Political Meeting and Russian Political Delegation in Paris. It is the representatives the white movement told in Paris about the necessity to hold in Bessarabia a local plebiscite, which should finally define the state-political status of the region. By the way, V. Maklakov’s position on necessity The referendum was supported by US representatives R. Lansing and F. Polk.

This issue is more carefully and objectively reflected in publications of Russian historians I. Barinov and I. Strelkov “The Western Frontier in Ukrainian and Russian representation…” They also highlighted the individual issues related to the Ukrainian-Romanian confrontation around the territories Bukovina and Bessarabia during the Paris Conference. In particular, the researchers noted that all activities and appeals to the UNR government to

the leadership the Bessarabia peace conference has never been considered in favor of the Ukrainian side. Instead, the Romanian government considered it official inhabitants of the region (Moldovans, Ukrainians, Russians and others) exclusively “Romanian citizens who have forgotten their native language”\textsuperscript{20}.

Issues related to the situation around Bessarabia in the context of the interstate relations of the European states at the end of the First D. Maltsev also analyzed in his publication World War\textsuperscript{21}. He stated that that it became particularly acute after the revolutionary events in Russia, which caused the rise of disintegration processes and the rise of national liberation struggle in the territories of the former Romanov Empire. Author stressed that all territorial claims of Romania on the former Bessarabia the province had no real basis. In particular, D. Maltsev emphasized attention to the fact that Bessarabia remained aloof from the formation processes the newest Romanian statehood. Most Moldovans who populated the region never considered themselves Romanians. The land’s annexation to the kingdom has taken place contrary to the position of the local public. Moreover, the referendum on which the Entente leaders insisted, and there were no Kolchak government representatives supported by the Romanian side (this fact is confirmed by the official ones) documents of that time). Occupying Bessarabia, Romanian civilian and military administration resorted to the physical extermination of the local population. This fact also finds confirmation in both the official documents of the time and the latest scientific research\textsuperscript{22}.

Conclusions

To sum it up, the expansionist policy of Romania, formed from the postulates of “Greater Romania”, was to justify territorial claims on a number of lands, in particular Bessarabia, in the context of existing international relations. Moreover, the seizure of these lands was considered by the Romanian authorities to be a natural result of the Kingdom’s participation in World War I on the side of the victorious Entente.

It is a difficult task to put all the historiographical work on the topic within the limits of a separate publication, so the emphasis was placed on the works of Russian-speaking researchers. On the whole, we can say that the “

\textsuperscript{20} Баринов И., Стрелков И. Будущее Буковины в контексте русских, украинских и румынских предложений на Парижской мирной конференции 1919 г. Русин. 2012. № 2 (28). С. 38.

\textsuperscript{21} Баринов И., Стрелков И. Будущее Буковины в контексте русских, украинских и румынских предложений на Парижской мирной конференции 1919 г. Русин. 2012. № 2 (28). С. 38.

\textsuperscript{22} Суляк С. Русины в период Первой мировой войны и русской смуты. Русин. 2006. № 1 (3). С. 55–58.
Bessarabia issue” was reflected in the writings of modern historians, but needs further research, since the “Balkan issue” during 1918–1920 was one of the most difficult in the context of the nascent Versailles system of international relations.

2. The “Bessarabia issue” and Romanian Direction of Ukrainian Diplomacy in Recent National Historiography

The Ukrainian national liberation competitions of the first quarter of the twentieth century are an extremely important, complex and eventful period in the history of interstate relations between Ukraine and Romania. During the relatively short time of the first quarter of the twentieth century, the form and essence of statehood changed several times in Ukraine. At the end of April 1918, the conservative leadership of the Ukrainian State of Hetman P. Skoropadsky came to replace the revolutionary-socialist government of the First UNR. In December 1918, he also “descended” from the historic arena, giving way to the Second UNR Government of the Directory. In Western Ukraine, the state-making movement was also able to realize itself in the form of a democratic ZUNR government. It was during these turbulent years that both Ukraine and Romania jointly attempted to establish and establish interstate relations.

In general, the history of Ukrainian-Romanian relations was full of important events for both countries during the period. However, most of them have recently been considered by historians rather tendently, which did not allow, in accordance with the principles of objectivity, to cover the complex process of relations between states, especially in the context of the “Bessarabia issue”. Only the cardinal political changes that took place in the world at the end of the twentieth century were able to make things better. The entry of a sovereign Ukraine into the political arena, proclaiming it a Euro-Atlantic foreign policy course, has allowed modern researchers to “review” the historical stereotypes that formed in the enlightened relations between the states during the tumultuous times of the Ukrainian national liberation contests of the first quarter of the 20 century.

On the other hand, Romania, which has been a NATO member since March 2004 and the European Union since January 2007, is trying to change its attitude towards the ambiguous history of relations with Ukraine. Obviously, right now between the states there are quite favorable conditions for the scientific study and rethinking of many aspects of the common history of the first quarter of the twentieth century.

After all, we can say with confidence that research and an objective analysis of the topic will enable us to fully disclose the little-known pages of our common history through the lens of modern pan-European integration.
processes. This will avoid the mistakes of the past in forming the principles of mutually beneficial relations between Ukraine and Romania at the present stage of interstate relations. Moreover, right now, according to historian V. Kreutor, “favorable conditions are being created for the scientific and comprehensive coverage of many aspects of this problem”.

It should be noted that scientific publications analyzing interstate diplomatic, socio-economic, military, etc. aspects of Ukrainian-Romanian relations are quite diverse. Some of them are devoted to the general tendencies of development of relations between the countries in the context of the formation of a new European system of interstate relations, which was actively created and developed at the end of the First World War. And if Romania, as an ally in the military coalition of the Entente countries, managed to remain an integrated part of the European political and economic community, Ukraine lost that opportunity for some historical time. Among the works we should mention the research of V. Boechko, M. Derzhalyuk, O. Pavlyuk and others.

Significant Volume of the factual material on the history of Ukrainian-Romanian relations is presented in the thematic collection of scientific articles, which was based on the results of the International Scientific Conference held in Chernivtsi in 2001. The following articles deserve special attention in this collection:

- Goshuliak, in which the author analyzed the course of events in the direction of solving the “Bessarabian” issue “during the government of the First UNR;
- The Romanian factor and its direct influence on the establishment of Ukrainian statehood in 1918 were covered by T. Bevz and V. Yaremchuk;
- O. Lyubovets presented the analysis of the positions of Ukrainian political parties regarding the historical affiliation of Bukovina and Bessarabia with Ukraine;
- Poddubny described the course of diplomatic relations between Ukraine and the Kingdom of Romania during 1918–1923.

---

Summarizing their work, national scientists confirmed the fact that during the Ukrainian national liberation competitions of the first quarter of the twentieth century. Romania has been an important strategic political and economic partner of Ukraine throughout the Black Sea and Balkan regions. At the same time, it should be noted that the more “saturated” scientific publications of contemporaries on the history of Ukrainian-Romanian interstate relations of the 1917–1920’s are still the period of the Second UPR (the end of 1918–1921).

Among the studies that analyze the course of relations between Ukraine and the Kingdom of Romania during the days of the Central Council and Hetmanate P. Skoropadsky, one should single out the publication of P. Satsky. In his work, the author raises one of the most difficult issues in the relationship between Ukrainians and Romanians of the time – the signing of the Russian-Romanian treaty on March 5–9, 1918 on the state-legal status of Bessarabia and defining its historical knowledge defining its historical significance. According to the author, it is the objective study of the Bessarabia issue that will help to understand the specifics of interstate relations in Central Europe and the Balkan Peninsula and, most importantly, determine their place in Ukraine. The author cannot but agree that it was the military annexation of the historical Ukrainian territories by the Romanian troops that began the confrontation between the countries. On the other hand, it is quite correct to state that “with the changing situation in the former Russian Empire and the international status of Russia initiated by the Bolshevik government, it was important for Romania to confirm its allied relations with the Entente countries”\textsuperscript{28}.

It should be emphasized that if in the times of the Government of the Central Rada – the conflict had a more “paper” format (notes, appeals, memoranda other purely diplomatic steps), then the next government of P. Skoropadsky brought it into a more effective plane – economic. The numerical advantage of the Ukrainians, the economically advantageous location of the territory in the direction of establishing economic cooperation with other countries of the Balkan region, according to P. Satsky, “gave reason to the Ukrainian state to actively intervene in the affairs of this province, considering the territorial disputes between Ukraine and Romania”\textsuperscript{29}.

\textsuperscript{28} Сацький П.В. Українсько-румунські прикордонні відносини наприкінці 1917 – у 1918 рр. і роль російсько-румунського договору 5–9 березня 1918 р. Збірник наукових праць Науково-дослідного інституту українознавства. 2007. Т. 15. С. 442.

\textsuperscript{29} Сацький П.В. Українсько-румунські прикордонні відносини наприкінці 1917 – у 1918 рр. і роль російсько-румунського договору 5–9 березня 1918 р. Збірник наукових праць Науково-дослідного інституту українознавства. 2007. Т. 15. С. 449.
Issues related to the situation around the Ukrainian territories of Bessarabia (and Bukovina – Ed.) In the context of the interstate relations of European states at the end of World War I were also analyzed by S. Hakman in his works\textsuperscript{30}. He stated that they gained special tension between the parties after the revolutionary events in Russia, which caused the increase of disintegration processes and the rise of national liberation struggle in the territories of the former empire\textsuperscript{31}.

Separately in his publications, the author also analyzed the course of the diplomatic struggle for these lands during the Paris Conference. In particular, the researcher noted that the main problem of royal Romania in determining the international status of the Danube territories was the position of US representatives, who argued that the designated lands of the Romanian population did not represent a dominant majority. Moreover, before the outbreak of World War I, Bessarabia was generally part of the Romanov empire, which had never been in a state of military conflict with the kingdom. According to these considerations, US diplomats did not consider it appropriate to transfer these territories to the exclusive Romanian jurisdiction. But based on geopolitical considerations, fearing that the ideas of Bolshevism would spread further to the European continent and in connection with the military defeat of the UNR government, the Entente leaders ultimately adopted a positive decision for Romania. For example, on September 10, 1919, under the Saint-Germain Peace Treaty, Austria relinquished its claim to Bukovina in favor of Romania. The new borders of the kingdom were finally fixed by the Treaty of Sevres of August 10, 1920. Soon, on October 28, 1920, according to the Paris Protocol, Entente leaders signed an agreement to annex Bessarabia to Romania – the position of Ukrainian representatives was not taken into account, since he was in fact in exile.

In their article S. Appatov and I. Makan also state that the period of revolutionary changes in the territories of the former Russian Empire “constitutes a special stage in the Ukrainian-Romanian relations”\textsuperscript{32}. Yes, indeed the Kingdom of Romania was one of the first to recognize the Ukrainian government as “de facto”. Moreover, quite promising trade and


\textsuperscript{32} Аппатов С.Й., Макан І.М. Українсько-румунські відносини : історія та сучасність. Український історичний журнал. 1999. № 5. С. 91.
economic cooperation was opened between the states. At the same time, like previous authors, the researchers state that the annexation of the Romanians of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina has become a barrier to establishing good relations. The authors stress the attempts of the Ukrainian governments to return these territories to the jurisdiction of Kyiv, but in the end, they all failed. At the same time, if P. Skoropadsky’s government emphasized that “Ukraine has all the rights to this territory and the vast majority of its population wants it”33, the government of the UNR Directory, through its military-political and economic weakness, tried not to complicate relations with the kingdom (in fact, it refused) from these lands.

Of course, the fact that behind Romania in the Bessarabia issue there was an Entente that did not recognize Ukrainian sovereignty cannot be overlooked. This was clearly demonstrated by the final decisions of the Paris Peace Conference. On the other hand, it is not worth saying that the Entente carelessly supported Romania. In particular, only in 1924 did France finally ratify the Bessarabian Accords.

V. Lozov’s research is also devoted to relations between the UNR and the Kingdom of Romania. The author focused on relations between the parties during the so-called “Kamyanets” period of the Directory Government. In addition to the political format of the negotiations, the paper also analyzes the process of establishing trade and economic relations between the parties. According to V. Lozov, establishing full-fledged contacts was mutually beneficial for both countries. According to him, “the Romanian government, especially the military circles military circles, tried to keep in touch with the leadership of the UNR”34. One can not disagree with the conclusion of a researcher who claims that in the Kamyanets era the kingdom became one of the main directions of the diplomatic activity of the UNR. V. Lozov’s conclusion in some way refutes the stereotype that there was no independent “Ukrainian” issue in European politics during the formation of the Versailles system of international relations at all. It existed, moreover, to some extent or another, the states of the European continent often met with it when forming a new map of postwar Europe.

Military aspects of cooperation between Ukraine and Romania in 1919 dedicated to M. Kovalchuk’s publication. In the study, based on archival documents and memoirs, the author analyzed the thorny path of establishing Ukrainian-Romanian military cooperation.

33 Аппатов С.Й., Макан І.М. Українсько-румунські відносини : історія та сучасність. Український історичний журнал. 1999. № 5. С. 92.
Like previous researchers, M. Kovalchuk also confirms the thesis that the emergence of an independent Ukrainian state has caused mixed reactions from the Romanian side. On the one hand, Romania had to adhere to the position of the Entente leaders in support of the idea of reviving the “one and indivisible Russia”, but on the other, the very existence of Ukraine could have protected Romania from the spread of Bolshevism. At the same time, most Romanian leaders understood that sovereign Ukraine would sooner or later “raise” territorial claims against Romania regarding the occupation of the latter by Bessarabia and Bukovina.

Thus, according to M. Kovalchuk, it was “the threat of territorial contradictions, as well as the non-recognition of Ukraine by the Entente States that hindered the establishment of diplomatic relations between Bucharest and Kiev”. In addition, it should be remembered that during the interwar period, the political project of Greater Romania, which in fact envisaged the expansion of the country’s borders at the expense of its neighbors, was extremely popular and state-supported in the Romanian environment.

Speaking about the current state of research of these problems, one cannot ignore the scientific achievements of V. Kreutor. For the first time in national historical science, the author conducted a comprehensive study of the “Ukrainian issue” in Romanian politics during 1918–1927. conditions of existing international relations. Moreover, the seizure of these lands was considered by the Romanian authorities to be the natural result of the country’s “participation” in World War I.

A number of publications on the diplomatic struggle for the legal status of Bessarabia, especially in the context of the Paris Peace Conference, have also been published by the author of a collective monograph proposed to readers.

---

35 Ковальчук М.А. Відносини Румунії з урядом Української Народної Республіки в 1919 р. Український історичний журнал. 2010. № 4. С. 116.


37 Попенко Я.В. Румунська дипломатія в боротьбі за Бессарабію на Паризькій мирній конференції (січень – серпень 1919 р.). Русин. Междудержавний історичний журнал. 2018. Т. 53. Вип. 3. Кишинев, Молдова. С. 152–171. DOI: 10.17223/18572685/53/9; Попенко Я.
The author also analyzes the stories related to the difficult path of royal Romania during the First World War and the official ideology of the creation of Greater Romania by the official Bucharest. In a joint scientific article with Professor I. Srebnyak, the purely military-diplomatic moments of relations between Ukraine and Romania were reflected.

Actually, speaking of the current state of study of the history of the development of Ukrainian-Romanian interstate relations during the revolutionary events of the first quarter of the twentieth century, one should not overlook the scientific publications of archeographic character. For example, the opening of former special funds, intensification of the search activity of modern domestic scientists contribute to the publication of new or little-known archival documents that present the activities of the Ukrainian emergency diplomatic mission in Romania, in particular, the letters of K. Matsievich and others have seen the world.

It should be said about the publications that analyzed and characterized the activities of the UNR diplomatic mission in Romania, K. Macijevic, who held this position during 1919–1923. In addition to his direct duties, he was one of...
the few Ukrainian diplomats who actively cooperated the Romanian media, using them to spread a positive image for Ukraine to the European public.

According to the researcher L. Epic, being the head of the Ukrainian Embassy in Romania, in his activities K. Maciyevich “adhered to the basic principle of his life and work – to ensure above all the private interests of individuals, whatever they impatiently would be, but to satisfy the minimum needs of the institution and public affairs entrusted to me by the Government”.

CONCLUSIONS

As a conclusion, we can state, that even though the issue of Ukrainian-Romanian interstate relations during the first quarter of the twentieth century has received partial scholarly coverage in the papers by contemporary Ukrainian historians, it still needs further study, since the “Balkan direction” of Ukrainian diplomacy during the years of national liberation competitions has not been sufficiently described. Moreover, the complex relations between Ukraine and Romania around the “Bessarabian issue” still require further research and rethinking.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the publication is to analyze the Ukrainian-speaking and Russian-speaking historiographical heritage, devoted to the problem of determining the state-political status of Bessarabia following the results of the First World War. The tasks of the publication are to characterize the scientific achievements of national and foreign historians in describing the course of events around the decision-making regarding the territorial identity of the Bessarabian region during the formation of the Versailles system of international relations.

Due to the considerable amount of material, the author refers to only a few publications on the proposed topic, as they clearly show in what tense atmosphere a new map of postwar Europe was formed.
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THE FORMATION AND THE FIRST DAYS OF THE CENTRAL RADA: HISTORICAL RESEARCHES AND MEMOIRS

Turchenko F. H.

INTRODUCTION

In February 1917, in the midst of the First World War, there was a democratic revolution in Russia as a result of which the monarchic regime ceased to exist. The political situation in Ukraine changed radically. There was the development of the self-organization of the Ukrainians which resulted in the Ukrainian War of Independence. Political parties and self-sufficient public associations came up from the underground and initiated actions. They were confronted with the task to determining their plans for the near future and beyond.

Most politically active Ukrainians saw the collapse of autocracy as a chance to restore Ukrainian statehood. But there was no single point of view on this among them. Two positions were more or less clearly distinguished in the views on the future in the politically active segment of Ukrainian society: the autonomist and federalist one – its supporters advocated the restructuring of the unitary Russian state on the basis of a federation with autonomous Ukraine as a full member of the latter, and the independist one – the supporters of the complete Ukrainian independence. There was a fierce competition between them for leading the political process in the country which was particularly evident from the first days of the revolution when the formation of an all-Ukrainian social and political organization – the Ukrainian Central Rada (UCR) – began in early March 1917.

The Central Rada was the Ukrainian revolutionary parliament which worked from March 1917 to April 1918 and played an enormous role in the Ukrainian War of Independence. The activities of the Rada have been studied in Ukraine and abroad for a whole century and a considerable amount of scientific researches has been deposited. An anniversary International Scientific Conference on the 100th Anniversary of the Ukrainian War of Independence was held in Kyiv in 2017. The results of various revolutionary process aspect studies which had been conducted during the last three decades were summarized. Based on the results of the Conference, there was a publication of materials that inter alia deepen our understanding of the activities of the Central Rada1. At the same time, some

important pages of its history have not yet been adequately covered. Among them, one of the key pages is the formation and the first weeks of the UCR functioning and participation of various political forces’ representatives, in particular, of Ukrainian autonomists and federalists and Ukrainian independists, in the UCR formation.

Historical sources and scientific studies do not provide archival data on the issue, and then newspapers and the revolution participants’ memoirs written later give rather a contradictory picture. The author of this article has already made attempts to understand different points of view on the problem. But this work is still far from complete. There is an acute lack of information. The purpose of the article is to characterize the autonomists and federalists’ and independists’ participation in the UCR formation by using new sources. The analysis will help to determine how the political tendencies that began in the first revolution weeks influenced the further Ukrainian War of Independence development and the fate of Ukraine as a whole.

1. Beginning of the UCR formation

The Revolution in Petrograd won on February 27, 1917. In Kyiv, the official circles were silent about this event for some time hoping that “all this might be just a passing episode, and the old authorities would still recover their ground”, as M. Hrushevsky wrote about it. As a result, neither on March 1 nor on March 2 (hereinafter dates are given according to the old calendar) information on the government change did not get into the Kyiv newspapers, although various rumors about events in Petrograd were already spreading in the city. It was only on March 3 when the Kyivans finally learned from the press that a revolution had taken place in the capital and monarchical power had ceased to exist. This gave a powerful momentum to the beginning of political forces’ power struggle.

On March 4, there was a meeting of public organizations’ and political parties’ members, most of them having pro-Russian orientation, in the Kyiv City Duma who elected the Executive Committee of the United Public Organization Council. Ukrainian organizations were also represented at the meeting, including the Society of Ukrainian Progressives (TUP) members (progressists) and several socialists.

In the minority, Ukrainian organizations were represented in other power structures of the new regime, in particular, in the Governate Executive

---

2 Турченко Ф.Г. Утворення Української Центральної Ради: джерела та її інтерпретації. Український історичний журнал. 2007. № 2. С.63–73.
Committee attached to the Governate Commissioner of the Provisional Government, M. Sukovkin.

On March 4, another body was formed in Kyiv, which played an important role in the subsequent events – the Soviet of Workers’ Deputies, that had its founding meeting on March 4. This body was administered by representatives of the all-Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party (Esers) and the RSDLP – the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party. There was a radical wing among the Russian Social Democrats – the Bolsheviks, who gradually increased their influence on the Kyiv and other Dumas (given the composition, they were usually called the Soviets) eventually turning these structures into cover for their dictatorship.

Although expectations of changes increased among Ukrainians in the conditions of war, growing economic collapse, exacerbation of social and national contradictions, everyone was surprised by the speed with which they occurred. On the one hand, the Russian autocratic regime embodying centuries-old national enslavement of Ukraine collapsed just in a few days, and, on the other hand, crystallization of new political forces was passing abruptly, new authorities and social and political structures were forming. For the most part, they focused on the new Russian center – the Provisional Government and all-Russian political parties. The influence of Ukrainians – both liberals and socialists or non-party members – on these organizations was minor. In this situation, there was a strong need for a separate social and political structure that would clearly formulate the national requirements of Ukrainians in the new conditions and lead the struggle for their implementation.

It was against this political background that the Ukrainian Central Rada (UCR) was formed.

Most contemporary authors believe that the UCR was established by the progressists – members of the liberal and democratic union of the Society of Ukrainian Progressives (TUP) that favoured national and territorial autonomy of Ukraine. In particular, the famous Ukrainian historian V. Soldatenko provides us with the following scheme of the Central Rada formation in his fundamental monograph on the Ukrainian War of Independence published in 1999: “As early as on March 3, 1917, the Ukrainian organization representatives’ meeting took place at the initiative of the Society of Ukrainian Progressives (TUP) at the Kiev club “Rodina” (“Motherland”)... Besides the “old guard” – the TUP members – the meeting was attended by representatives of newly emerged national organizations formed mostly by student youth. It was then that the idea of creating a special organization for the Ukrainian movement coordination was born. The proposal to call it the Central Rada was also logical...
It is noteworthy that the TUP members’ efforts of the to assume the top functions did not find the meeting participants’ support. At the initiative of D. Antonovych and other participants of the meeting, it was decided to form a new body as a coalition one made up of representatives of all national organizations, although some of them were only in their infancy.5

This extensive quotation from the V. Soldatenko’s monograph is fully given there not by accident. It is a key component of the author’s scheme and fully reflects his vision of the Central Rada birth process. However, it is not the historian’s vision that matters for the reader but what historical sources confirm his view, and, therefore, how accurate his version of events is. And here the reader will be surprised. Instead of references to the sources, V. Soldatenko refers the reader to the historian V. Verstyuk’s monograph on the Ukrainian Central Rada published in 1997.6

We addressed this monograph, but we did not find any documentary confirmation of V. Soldatenko’s scheme there. V. Verstyuk formulated his vision of the problem as follows: “The sources, most of which are overwhelmingly memoirs, do not explain who was first who personally came up with the idea of creating such an organization and how its name was created.”7 It seems to be the researcher’s well-considered conclusion. After all a year earlier, in the Preface to the two-volume collection of documents and materials Ukrainian Central Rada published in 1996, V. Verstyuk had already admitted: “We do not even know what persons put forward the idea of the organization, created the name, made the first steps to shape it and took the organizational initiative.”8 Let us add that V. Verstyuk defends the progressist version of the UCR formation, but in the Preface cited above he does it cautiously: “Only in general terms is it known that the Society of Ukrainian Progressives did it.”9

But what do these “general terms” mean? What historical sources did they come from? What memoirs or other documents mention the TUP participation in the Central Rada formation? V. Verstyuk does not mention it in his monograph, however, he makes an attempt to argue his hypothesis somehow (not in a documented way). He writes: “In general, it is known that the initiative belonged to the Society of Ukrainian Progressives which was the

---

only Ukrainian social and political organization that managed to continue its activities half legally during the World War and another World War-related campaign of governmental pogroms of the Ukrainian movement.\footnote{Верстюк В, Українська Центральна Рада. Навчальний посібник. К.: Заповіт, 1997. С. 63.}

Even probably the author himself is not sure to call it a sufficient argument. In the conditions of the collapse of tsarism, the behavior of the TUP members – usually elderly, very cautious and balanced politicians – was more perplexing than decisive. These days, the youth activists of socialist and independist orientation were more radical and decisive. They were underground, but they began to take a decisive action immediately after the first, yet unconfirmed information on the revolution in Petrograd. But this is a topic that needs a separate discussion.

In addition, V. Verstyuk, being an experienced researcher, does not seem to stick much to his version of the so-called “general terms”. This is evidenced by the document on the Central Rada composition that he found and cited in his monograph. This document contradicts the pattern of the UCR formation mentioned above. It is about the information in the first issue of the newspaper News from the Ukrainian Central Rada dated March 19, 1917. The information is also provided in the collection of documents and materials by drafters headed by V. Verstyuk. We provide it with the preservation of the features of the original: “...the temporary composition of the Rada of the representatives of: the Ukrainian Scientific Society, the Ukrainian Technical and Agronomic Society, the National Ukrainian Union, cooperatives, students of all higher schools in Kyiv, the Union of Workers’ Cities of, troops, social and democratic groups, etc.)\footnote{Українська Центральна Рада: Документи і матеріали. К.: Наукова думка, 1996. С. 44–45.}”\footnote{Верстюк В, Українська Центральна Рада. Навчальний посібник. К.: Заповіт, 1997. С. 67.}. Thus, the names of ten subjects of the social and political representation are given and it is stated that this is a non-exhaustive list by using “... etc Historians know nothing on some of these representatives. V. Verstyuk calls them “paper tigers”. But it is surprising that the Society of Ukrainian Progressives is not mentioned among the real organizations. The historian expresses his surprise about this, but does not explain the fact in any way.\footnote{Верстюк В, Українська Центральна Рада. Навчальний посібник. К.: Заповіт, 1997. С. 67.} In our view, it deserves a serious comment by the researcher.

The supporters of the progressivist version of the UCR formation often refer to the memoirs of D. Doroshenko, an active participant of the events. At one time, we conducted a textological analysis of the relevant fragment of D. Doroshenko’s memoirs and made sure that there were no sufficient...
grounds to conclude on the TUP’s priority in the UCR formation on their basis.\textsuperscript{13}

Therefore, the question of the TUP’s dominant influence on the UCR formation remains unanswered. No one of the modern researchers cites any documents on the subject.

Given this, we at one time questioned the validity of the UCR formation scheme provided by V. Soldatenko and initiated a discussion on the subject.\textsuperscript{14} In this discussion, V. Soldatenko did not show his willingness to discuss the issues essentially and replied unequivocally: “The formation of the Central Rada initiated by the Society of Ukrainian Progressives” is “a real irrefutable knowledge having rather a wide documentary base.”\textsuperscript{15}

But the discussion did not end there. After all, the author did not provide any convincing specifics to confirm his version. In particular, it is unknown what historical sources are the basis of that it is “irrefutably” proven that the idea, name and initiative of the formation of the Central Rada belonged precisely to the TUP members and this process began on March 3, 1917. Therefore, we continued our search. Given the Central Rada’s enormous importance in the history of the Ukrainian state-building, our desire to find a convincing answer to this important question is completely natural.

This is also encouraged by the fact that there are other versions of UCR formation in the literature as well. For example, supporters of one of the versions formulated by P. Mirchuk in the USA in 1960 associate the beginning of the Ukrainian Central Rada institutionalization with the activities of Mykola Mikhnovsky and date it to March 3, 1917.\textsuperscript{16}

Let us recall you who M. Mikhnovsky was. He had already been known in political circles as one of the consistent Ukrainian independence supporters. At the beginning of the 20th century he founded the first independent political party in the Dnieper Ukraine – the Ukrainian People’s Party (UNP) and developed its ideological platform in the brochure \textit{Independent Ukraine}. In 1917, M. Mikhnovsky, being a military lawyer, served in the Kyiv District Military Court and was no doubt well informed of the events in Kyiv before and in the early days after the collapse of tsarism. Mikhnovsky personally knew both the figures of the Ukrainian movement who acted legally in the social and political arena of the capital of Ukraine before the revolution and

\textsuperscript{14} Див.: Турченко Ф. Г. Микола Міхновський. Життя і Слово. К.: Генеза, 2006. С. 210.
\textsuperscript{15} Солдатенко В. Ф. Ідейний опонент М. Грушевського. (Полемічні зауваги на полях книги Ф. Турченка “Микола Міхновський: Життя і Слово”). Український історичний журнал. 2006. № 5. С. 106.
\textsuperscript{16} Мірчук П. Микола Міхновський. Апостол української державності. – Філадельфія, 1960. С. 55.
those who had been underground and occupied the political life proscenium after February 1917. It was M. Mikhnovsky who was considered to be the initiator of the UCR formation by P. Mirchuk.

Another version of the UCR formation was formulated in exile by another foreign author and participant of the Ukrainian War of Independence R. Mlynovetsky (R. Brzeski) who claims that the Rada appearance was initiated on March 2, 1917 by a conspiratorial Ukrainian organization – the Brotherhood of Independists\(^{17}\). In both cases – of both P. Mirchuk and R. Mlynovetsky – it is about an initiative role of the independist political current representatives in the Central Rada formation. As for the Society of Ukrainian Progressives, according to the supporters of these versions, it entered the process of the Central Rada formation a little later seeking to take the political initiative out of the independists’ hands. Mlynovetsky writes about the parallel existence of two organizations for some time with the similar name – “the Ukrainian Central Rada” (the independist one) and “the Ukrainian Rada” (the progressist one) – for some time\(^ {18}\).

Unlike the progressist version which is perceived by V. Soldatenko as “a real irrefutable knowledge”, the “independist” versions of foreign authors are rejected by him as undocumented, contrived and groundless. He writes that at the beginning of March 1917 the TUP members went to “create the one and only Central Rada” which sought the autonomy of Ukraine as part of democratic federal Russia.

V. Soldatenko also points to the Ukrainian socialists’ activity in the process. But the historian perceives them as autonomists and federalists, that is, as the TUP liberals’ supporters in regard to the question of the future state status of Ukraine. As for independists, in his opinion, only “some of them did not form a separate (primary) Central Rada and participated in the formation and then the activities of a single body”\(^ {19}\).

However, let us emphasize for the second time that of neither V. Soldatenko nor other UCR formation “progressist scheme” supporters (and they are dominant among Ukrainian historians) propose any concrete evidence that could be provided in favour of their version. By the way, P. Mirchuk and his supporters who consider the Ukrainian independist M. Mikhnovsky to be the founder of UCR do not provide direct evidence to substantiate their concept. And it is not accidentally. The source base is too narrow for such evidence.


\(^{19}\) Солдатенко В. Ф. Ідейний опонент М. Грушевського. (Полемічні зауваги на полях книги Ф. Турченка “Микола Міхновський: Життя і Слово”). Український історичний журнал. 2006. № 5. С. 107.
However, one thing is clear: two political groups of Ukrainian society with different political orientations were engaged in the UCR formation: the first one was composed by supporters of the autonomy of Ukraine as part of federally restructured Russia, and the second one by supporters of full Ukrainian independence. The actual split in the Ukrainian national movement took shape long before the revolution, at the beginning of the 20th century, remained in the first days of the revolution and continued later when M. Hrushevsky was already at the head of the Ukrainian Central Rada. This is evidenced by the specific materials available to all researchers.

In particular, this is mentioned in the memoirs of O. Lototsky who headed the Petrograd Ukrainian National Rada, an organization standing on the TUP platform, after the February Revolution. When he arrived in Kiev in the 20 days of March, he was forced to state: “...The Ukrainian side was not yet organized and a rift was felt in it”. There was “a moderate group concentrated around the TUP” and “a young boarding house led by a newly minted three-day socialist... (A reference to M. Grushevsky, who declared himself a socialist and was just elected head of the UCR.—F. T.) “, A real abyss was formed in Kyiv between the two directions,”²⁰ O. Lototsky stated.

Thus, at the beginning of March 1917, the Ukrainian movement had two separate wings, each with its own vision of the future of Ukraine.

2. Formation of the unified UCR

In our view, the place and role of different political forces in the UCR formation can be clarified by carefully analyzing the composition of the progressists’ opponents, that is, D. Antonovych and M. Mikhnovsky with their supporters, as well as the group that O. Lototsky conditionally called “a young boarding house”.

Neither V. Soldatenko²¹, nor V. Verstyuk²², nor other historians specifically explored the group’s activities in their works on the Central Rada history. They are described in a confused and often biased way in the former TUP members’ memoirs. In particular, D. Doroshenko and Y. Chikalenko who were in Kyiv in March 1917, wrote about their opponents with unhidden antipathy. The reader sees unbalanced irresponsible individuals without clear ideological orientation inclined to political demagogy who are difficult to communicate with even on a personal level and who have failed the promising TUP political project.

---
For example, D. Doroshenko characterized them as “people with a demagogic inclination” while describing the TUP Council session “on the second or third day” after the February Revolution in Petrograd where the independists – Lieutenant Mikhnovsky and Captain Gan – were among the guests in his memoirs.23

The circle of people was characterized even more sharply by Y. Chikalenko: “Being sick, I was so discouraged with the cooperation with them, with such unprincipled demagogues as Stepanenko and others... that I have ceased to attend of the Central Rada sessions since that.”24

There is no doubt that this is not just an emotional approach but a biased one. But let us suppress the emotions. Let us pay attention to the facts of the TUP opponents’ concerted actions among whom the memoirists name two groups, I. Steshenko, D. Antonovych, O. Stepanenko on the one hand and M. Mikhnovsky and his supporters on the other one. This is evidenced by D. Doroschenko and M. Hrushevsky.25

The insufficiently informed reader is surprised by the alliance. These people were too different to unite on a common platform. In particular, D. Antonovych and I. Steshenko are known as socialists who were the Ukraine autonomist and federalist prospect supporters and were in an ideological conflict with the independists since the early 20th century. As for O. Stepanenko, he went down in history as a consistent independist, one of the Ukrainian People’s Party organizers, an M. Mikhnovsky’s associate, a participant of the 2nd All-Ukrainian Student Congress in Lviv (1913) that was held under the slogans of separation from Russia and where D. Dontsov performed his famous abstract.26

But the Ukrainian independence supporters’ participation in the Central Rada formation is not limited by these individuals. The 24-year-old independist V. Otamanovsky who is considered to be the ideological leader of the Brotherhood of Independists and a co-organizer of the publishing house “Vernygora” that issued mass independist leaflet and brochure editions in 1917 is also referred to them.27

---

In this context, let us return to the question. Why and how did Ukrainian independists, together with socialists, find themselves in such an important political project as the Ukrainian Central Rada formation?

There is an established view that has turned into a kind of myth that in March 1917, as in previous decades, independists had no significant influence, and the Ukrainian social and political environment was supremely dominated by the supporters of the national and territorial autonomy of Ukraine as part of Russia. It is believed that a similar situation was during the war years. It is on the basis of this myth that the concept of the TUP’s leading role of in the UCR formation was built. But in fact, it is not so.

The facts show that with the beginning of the World War separatist and independist sentiment began to spread rapidly in the Ukrainian society. Volodymyr Vynnychenko admitted that during the war Ukrainians split into the supporters of “the Russian orientation”, “the orientation towards Germans” (“out of two disasters, the orientation chose a more cultural ... disaster”), and “the orientation towards themselves and their own forces”28. Oleksandr Lototsky noted that in the conditions of war “[T]he idea of Ukrainian independence still had its convinced supporters who gave arguments that could not but convince, although it seemed unrealistic in the pre-war circumstances”29. The examples can be continued.

The answer to the question why it happened so may be suggested by the circumstances of wartime that showed the full futility of hopes for the “Ukrainian question” solution in the Russian Empire conditions. Instead of weakening national oppression, Ukrainians suffered from the rampant Russian great-power chauvinism. This triggered the evolution of some Ukrainian socialists’ ideas from territorial autonomy within Russia that they maintained at the beginning of the war to separation and independence. Thus, in these conditions the former differences between the socialists and autonomists and the independists began to take second place.

The literature provides many specific examples of such a political drift30. In particular, in his Memoirs, M. Hrushevsky writes that at the end of 1916 the youth from Ukraine who wanted him to be the national movement leader very often came to him in Moscow where he was under the supervision of Russian gendarmes: “I was clearly told about the organization of the youth who were

---

28 Винниченко В. Відродження нації. Ч. 1. Київ; Відень, 1921. С. 39–41.
also members of the military front formations and issued their own proclamations ... Among the youth, apparently, there were Austrophilic currents with the opposite ones: the independist ones [...] with the federalist ones”31.

Dmytro Antonovych, a Ukrainian social democrat and a son of the famous historian Volodymyr Antonovych, was also involved in the process. All memoirists and researchers write about the significant role of Dmytro Antonovych in the Central Rada formation. During the war, the Ukrainian social democrats led by him (referred to as the “D. Antonovych’s group” in the literature) defined themselves on the platform of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine and maintained links with it32.

However, let us return to O. Lototsky’s memoirs where he described his report to the Central Rada. He reported on the activities of the Ukrainian National Rada headed by him in Petrograd that consisted mainly of Ukrainian progressists. It was on March 24 when M. Hrushevsky had already presided over the UCR. O. Lototsky’s report was about the fact that the National Rada defended the various Ukrainians’ national and cultural and political demands, in particular, on the need for the Ukrainian representatives’ participation in the commission that should develop a law on the Constituent Assembly elections that should restore the national and territorial autonomy of Ukraine. These are the usual “standard” TUP demands both in the pre-war period and during the war. The speaker awaited the approval of his report. But some of the session attendees perceived the activities of the Petrograd progressists negatively as a manifestation of the “pettiness of the measures taken by the National Rada”. It turns out to be the part of the UCR dominated by supporters of D. Antonovych and M. Tkachenko.

D. Antonovych has already been mentioned. Now let us tell a few words about M. Tkachenko who is mentioned among the active members of the “Antonovych’s group”. Like some other members of the Central Rada, in March 1917, he stuck to a distinct independist orientation, although he remained a convinced left-wing Ukrainian social democrat33. Like his other supporters, he was “irreconcilably set against the central government”. In particular, unlike the TUP members, they did not consider the Ukrainian self-determination issue through the Russian Constituent Assembly the priority because it meant to pass the “Ukrainian question” into Russian hands. After a while, M. Tkachenko stated that “there is no use of the

discussion with the Provisional Government, and if we wish to address them, we should do it with other requirements”. In other words, as A. Lototsky stated, it meant breaking with the central government, that, in his firm belief, “was a practical absurdity in the then situation in Ukraine”34.

All this testifies that there were two political lines – the TUP and autonomist one and the socialist and independist one in the Central Rada at the beginning of its existence.

In the light of the mentioned above, the close cooperation of the Ukrainian socialists and independists in the first weeks of the revolution when the UCR was formed seems completely natural. The environment may not have been as clearly structured as its opponent – the Society of Ukrainian Progressives. But if we judge by specific actions, we can state that they had enough internal harmony and sense of common purpose. They had the appropriate human resources and political will to begin the Central Rada formation on their own. Finally, their representatives were united by a shared acute critical attitude towards their political opponents – the TUP members that served as an additional impetus for internal consolidation. They even had their own headquarters – the D. Antonovych’s apartment. In his Memoirs, M. Hrushevsky draws attention to “the long meetings that he (D. Antonovych – F. T.) had those days, on March 3–4”35. Elsewhere, he says that his daughter “accidentally came across this parliamentary meeting in the Antonovych’s apartment (it refers to the meeting that was about the need to invite M. Hrushevsky to lead the projected center – F. T.) on Friday, March 3 coming to his niece...”36 Without a doubt, M. Mikhnovsky also was in the the D. Antonovych’s house. At least, the fact of the Dmytro Volodymyrovych’s invitation of Mikhnovsky is fixed. His wife Kateryna left information on it37. It was in the D. Antonovych’s apartment, as R. Mlynovetsky writes, where there were the sessions of the organization that he calls the Ukrainian Central Rada organized by the Brotherhood of Independists38. Although the existence of such a Rada (as well as the progressist one) has not been proven, its “link” to the D. Antonovych’s house is representative.

To summarize, there is reason to state that the independists had no less (if not more) will and ability to initiate the UCR formation than the progressists – the TUP members. However, this is only our hypothesis,

37 Антонович К. З моїх споминів про Миколу Міхновського Самостійна Україна. 1957. № 11. С. 8.
because there is no direct irrefutable evidence that would directly show that it was these people who started to create the organization, gave it a name, and progressives joined the process later – no such evidence is found.

3. Course towards the united front and its failure.

Eventually, after the negotiations that were recorded in many sources, both groups of Ukrainian politicians united into a single coalition organization called the Ukrainian Central Rada. It happened after the M. Hrushevsky’s arrival to Kyiv. He headed the UCR on **March 9, 1917**.

The motives of the union are viewed in a different way. Some authors see it as a result of intrigue and outright deception of the independists by the federalists and *inter alia* by M. Hrushevsky. According to the others’ version, the union was the result of the independists’ desire to promote the consolidation of all Ukrainian forces without which, in their belief, state-building was impossible.

It was this point of view that was advocated in the 1920s by S. Shemet who was linked with Mikhnovsky by the commonality of political views and longstanding friendly relations. According to Shemet, Mikhnovsky was convinced that “whoever presided over the Central Rada, whatever party the old professor Mykhailo Hrushevsky joined, ... whatever Ukrainian party took the lead, these hands would rather succeed in creating the independent Ukrainian state than fail.”

In view of the mentioned above, there is every reason to state that it is about the independists’ political course correction. This is evidenced by the documents available to us that were from the independists’ environment, in particular, the declarations and proclamations of the Ukrainian People’s Party that resumed their legal activity in March 1917. These documents do not consist of direct appeals to struggle for Ukrainian independence contained in wartime materials. But there is evidence that they should wait with the independence declaration.

It is also confirmed by the memoirs of contemporaries who contacted M. Mikhnovsky in the first weeks of the revolution. In particular, in her memoirs, Kateryna Antonovych describes a conversation with Dmytro Antonovych, her husband, after his return from the Central Rada regular session:

- *Do you know whom I met and who followed me home?*
- *No. And who?*

---

40 Українська народна партия. Київська Мислив. 1917. 12 апрея; Декларація Української народної партії. Робітнича газета. 1917. 11 квітня.
Mykola Mikhnovsky. I invited him to come to us, but he did not come. He told me such a strange thing that I still do not know how to understand it: “Now do not insist on independent Ukraine in front of the Russian authorities, settle for the federation”. When I noticed that he had always stood for independent Ukraine and why he expressed a different opinion then, Mikhnovsky said that then was a very tragic moment in politics, everything could be lost, we had better wait with the demand for independence...  

Nestor Korol, a member of the UNP, wrote about a similar incident in his memoirs. He was a cavalry officer during the First World War who was close to Mykola Mikhnovsky in Kyiv in March 1917. In particular, N. Korol remembered a conversation with Mikhnovsky when they discussed the revolution development prospects. “For a while, forget about our most important goal – the struggle for Ukrainian independence. It is not yet clear what forms the revolution will take, but it is already quite clear that all Muscovites, regardless of political beliefs, economic and social position, will unite against us if we present the claim of Ukrainian state independence. Ukrainians will be squashed by Muscovites, and we, the politically minded layer, will be physically destroyed, regardless of our political beliefs. Our history has not seen such a high concentration of armed Muscovites in our territory as now.”

Here is another testimony that belongs to Ivan Marchenko. M. Mikhnovsky said in a conversation with him took place in 1923 in Kuban where fate lead to both of them: “I thought it was impossible to afford the national front partition then. And I think that I was right”. I remember that he asked himself for several times in a conversation with me: “Was I right without taking the plunge then?” – and all the time he told himself that he had been right... He asked the question even later when we already talked in Kyiv in 1924.

The above facts show that, after the collapse of the autocracy, Mikhnovsky fully realized that the independists would not be able to ensure the existence of an independent Ukraine without the participation of other political forces. The scale of the tasks required the participation of the maximum number of people who were not indifferent to the fate of Ukraine. There were relatively few people with such patriotism at the independists’ disposal. The necessity of action unity of different national movement currents’ representatives was...
dictated by life itself. That is why he stood on the positions of the united front of all national forces that could involve all the constructive society forces into the complex and difficult state-building work.

This was the independists’ point of view in the first weeks of the revolution. But Mikhnovsky and his independist supporters’ perceptions of the Ukrainian War of Independence prospects, on the one hand, and their Central Rada autonomist federalist partners’ ones on the other one, turned out to be different. Having gradually won the overwhelming majority in the Rada, the latter saw the future of Ukraine in the federal union with Russia. Most of those socialists who called for the Ukraine independence during the war and the first weeks of the revolution and turned out to be temporary independists’ allies also became autonomists and federalists. They followed the sentiment of the Ukrainian population majority who found themselves in a state of political freedom and captured by the Russian democracy magic after the collapse of the Russian imperial regime. Volodymyr Vynnychenko, the second most influential person (after M. Hrushevsky) in the UCR, described the situation as follows: “… Ukrainians felt at home in Russia, for the first time the interests of the former prison have become close and their own ones. Any separation and independence were out of the question…”

The theoretical basis was provided for the idea. M. Hrushevsky, being already the head of the UCR, said in the article “Where did Ukrainians come from and where do they go to?” written in the spring of 1917: “I firmly believe – and not only me – that the great Russian revolution – if only protected from the fall and anarchy – would greatly affect the restructuring of the whole Europe and its transformation into the European Federation. Such a federation had been thought of by politicians and state law practitioners for a long time: they considered it a logical final of all the European life development up to this. It just seemed very distant till the recent events – as it now seems close and feasible. And that is why others and we are not the least concerned about the full political independence of Ukraine, we do not give it any weight. Broad Ukrainian autonomy in the federal Russian Republic is entirely sufficient in the short term. And in the future, we hope that the Republic will join the European Federation and Ukraine will become one of the strongest, most powerful and certain constituent parts within the Republic – one of the European Federation bases.”

M. Hrushevsky and his supported have repeatedly mentioned the view. Thus, the political plans of the current represented by M. Hrushevsky and
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V. Vynnychenko – and it is the overwhelming majority of the Central Rada – were aimed at gaining “broad Ukrainian autonomy in the federal Russian Republic” in the short term and the expectations that in the future Ukraine would enter the European Federation as “one of the strongest, most powerful and certain constituent parts”.

To some extent, it was a pan-European vision. Not only the Ukrainian national liberation movement leaders were in the federalist sentiment captivity before and during the First World War. In particular, independists were neither influential in the environment of Poles and Czechs – the closest neighbours of Ukrainians. The overwhelming majority of Polish politicians believed that not the Polish independence but the establishment of the autonomous rights was possible. Most probably, J. Pilsudski, the founder of independent Poland, initially supported the concept of Austrian federal reorganization, according to which, the new state should consist of three equal parts, Poland being one of them\(^46\).

A real assessment of the forces kept most of the different Central and Eastern European peoples’ national leaders from taking steps to create their own independent state. It was the thing that united them with the Ukrainian political elite.

But there were significant differences between the Ukrainian federalism and the federalism of the Central and Eastern European peoples’ liberation struggle leaders. The most important of the differences lies in the fact that the Ukrainian elite was not aimed at the Ukrainian independence proclamation \textit{at all}, even in the vague distant future. Autonomy was the ultimate goal but not the stage for gaining independence, while the autonomy establishment was only a step towards the country’s independence proclamation for Poles and Czechs. Given the real possibilities, they chose the tactics of gradual statehood restoration in the independence struggle the first stage of which was to achieve the corresponding empire restructuring on federal principles. And when in the autumn of 1918 the Austrian Empire began to disintegrate, these countries had been already ready for independent existence.

In Ukraine, the independists neither rejected the idea of the federation at the beginning of the revolution. The motives were the same as in the neighbouring countries. But the independent Ukrainian state remained their ultimate goal. Back in 1900, in the brochure \textit{Independent Ukraine}, M. Mikhnovsky formulated a conclusion that confirmed the 20th century world, European, and, ultimately, Ukrainian historical experience: “... The state independence is the main condition for the nation existence, and the

state independence is the national ideal in the sphere of international relations”\textsuperscript{47}.

But, agreeing on the federation with Russia in the beginning of the revolution, the independists set clear boundaries of the Ukrainian sovereignty. In the brochure “The Tyrants’ Legacy” (the spring of 1917), emphasizing that “Russia must become a federal union and that Ukraine – within its national and territorial borders – must be a member of the federal union!”, M. Mikhnovsky immediately reveals what it means specifically: “The Ukrainian people want to live with the Muscovite one as equals – as our ancestors once wished in Pereiaslav in 1654”\textsuperscript{48}. M. Mikhnovsky gave his interpretation of the Pereiaslav Convent that emphasized the Ukrainian sovereign rights in Independent Ukraine in 1900. In essence, he saw the principles of relations in this document that went beyond the federal ones in the current understanding and was close to the confederation\textsuperscript{49}.

But since the late spring of 1917, the situation changed. Hopes for Russian democracy dissipated quickly. The Russian Provisional Government did not agree on the Ukrainian autonomy. In these conditions, Mikhnovsky began to perceive the future of Ukraine through the dilemma prism: to win the full independence, or remain within a unitary and even democratized empire with a republican system.

V. Martynets, one of the researchers of the M. Mikhnovsky’s worldview, testified the evolution of views: “…Since the beginning of the revolution in Russia and Ukraine, when all Ukrainian parties, all Ukrainian figures, and let us keep it real, the a mass of people were overwhelmed by the enthusiasm and belief in new democratic Russia, and Mikhnovsky followed the general psychosis, as well as our highest body – The Central Rada, and adopted the slogan of the federation; but the very first anti-Ukrainian initiatives by the Russian Provisional Government convinced Mikhnovsky in the fallacy of the situation, and he immediately abandoned such harmful and unrealistic positions\textsuperscript{50}.

And it is not about Mikhnovsky’s “excessive” nationalism that is often written about by underinformed or politically motivated authors. The matter is his assessment of the Russian society’s real state and the latter’s willingness to recognize the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people. After all, the federation

\textsuperscript{47}Міхновський М. Самостійна Україна. Промова. Українська суспільно-політична думка в 20 столітті. Т. 1. Сучасність, 1983. С. 62.
\textsuperscript{48}Міхновський М. Спадщина тиранів. К., 1917. С. 7.
\textsuperscript{50}Мартинець В. Ідеологія організованого й т. зв. волевого націоналізму. Аналітично-порівняльна студія. Вінніпег, 1954. С. 177.
idea requires the ruling nation’s consent. Without this, the federation is impossible. But Mikhnovsky was convinced that there were no influential political forces interested in rebuilding of Russia it on a federal basis at that time, and those who were in power (the liberals and socialists from the Provisional Government) or had a chance to take power into their own hands (the Bolsheviks) would not agree on the federation.

In the brochure *The Tyrants’ Legacy* mentioned above, M. Mikhnovsky represents the political priorities in the Russian society after the February Revolution: “All Russians want a unitary (joint) democratic republic, because Russians want to continue their former domination over Ukrainians, but Ukrainians want to get free from that domination... The Muscovite people – not one or another party but all the people – want to lord over the Ukrainian people. Here is the basis for the struggle between the two nations. One is fighting for their liberation, the other is fighting for their domination over the former”51.

The rigorous assessment of the Russian imperial mentality and Russian politics by Mikhnovsky turned out to be far more realistic than the utopian predictions of overcoming the “tyrants’ legacy” in Russia that were the basis for the Ukrainian socialist and liberal politicians’ projects. Mikhnovsky hopes that “the hardest means of struggle will not be needed At the same time, he was concerned about the the Ukrainian people’s willingness to protect their historical rights and he calles upon his compatriots to be resolved: “... When we show apathy, vacillation and indecision, the Ukrainian people will be crossed out of the book of life”52. Unfortunately, the following months confirmed the worst fears of Mykola Mikhnovsky. The leadership of the Central Rada did not show the determination that the political situation required. Ultimately, it had a harmful effect on the fate of the revolution and the future of Ukraine in general.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Despite the century-old Ukrainian War of Independence studying tradition, the first weeks of its history, that is, the period when the Ukrainian Central Rada was being formed and the political course was being determined, have not been adequately highlighted by scholars. Neither memoirs of witnesses and active participants in the revolution, nor archival documents, nor scientific researches will give the reader a clear answer to the question who began to form the UCR and what political views on the immediate and distant future of Ukraine these people had. Contemporary historians continue to spread the version, according to which, the initiative to create the UCR belongs to the Society of Ukrainian
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52 Міхновський М. Спадщина тиранів. К., 1917. С. 8.
Progressives that stood on the platform of Ukrainian autonomy. At the same time, nobody mentions any specific facts and names. The assurance that the version “has a quite wide documentary base... is not confirmed. In order to deny independist orientation politicians’ active participation in the UCR formation process, various methods are used in the discussion, including the ones that are far from scientific ones. And it is not just a matter of determining a priority of a particular political force and the figures who represented it in the Central Rada formation. The question is to determine how the process has influenced the further development of the Ukrainian War of Independence and the fate of Ukraine as a whole.

The experience of the neighbouring Central and Eastern European countries that became independent after the end of the First World War shows that federalism of the Ukrainian elite does not look like an anomalous phenomenon or evidence of their inferiority. On the contrary, it has its own rationale. And it is quite natural. But in this case, it is important to us why Ukrainians failed to do the thing that Czechs, Poles, Finns and other Central and Eastern European peoples did.

The most important difference between Ukrainian federalism and the federalism of the neighbouring European peoples’ liberation struggle leaders who gained independence in the early 20th century is that the Ukrainian elite was not aimed at the Ukrainian independence proclamation even in the vague future. Autonomy was the ultimate goal but not the stage for gaining independence. For the Polish or Czech elite the autonomy was considered to be only a step towards the independence proclamation. Both neighbouring Poland and Czechia have achieved their goal leaving an example for Ukraine.

SUMMARY
The article analyzes the content of historical memoirs and scientific researches that are about the formation and beginning of activity of the Ukrainian Central Rada that governed the national liberation movement at the first stage of the Ukrainian Revolution from 1917 to early 1918. It is shown that these publications do not have a balanced scientific assessment of the autonomists and federalists’ role, on the one hand, and the independists’ one, on the other one, in the process. A renewed vision of this issue is proposed on the basis of historical sources, including those that have been introduced into scientific circulation for the first time. It is concluded that independist orientation forces were very active in the early days of the UCR formation. But they did not emphasize the need for Ukrainian independence declaration believing that it would be possible when the conditions were ripe. Over time, the forces that focused on the autonomy of Ukraine as part of the federally restructured Russian state won in the UCR. It is argued that they did not
abandon this political line even when the policy failure became apparent. The independents were expelled from active participation in the Central Rada that had a harmful effect on the revolution process and the fate of Ukraine in general. The article compares the course of national liberation processes in Ukraine, on the one hand, and the neighbouring Central and Eastern European countries where independent states emerged after the end of World War I, on the other one. The article materials and conclusions open opportunities for deepening and modernization of the scientific vision of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921.
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PUBLIC OPINION AND HISTORICAL THOUGHT ON THE AUTOCEPHALY ACQUISITION IN UKRAINE (1917–1921): PARALLELS XX-XXI CC.

Ihnatusha O. M.

INTRODUCTION

In the Ukrainian Church recent history there is hardly an issue with a social response as powerful as that of autocephaly. At the meeting with the Ecumenical Patriarch in Istanbul on April 9, 2018 and later in his address to the Ukrainian Parliament on April 17, P. Poroshenko, the fifth President of Ukraine, put forward the initiative, supported by the Ukrainian episcopate, to join forces in getting Tomos (a document of Ukrainian Church autocephaly).

That’s how the last attempt to recognize the international status of the Autocephalous Church of Ukraine began.

The question of autocephaly was raised during the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council in 1918. On January 1, 1919 the Directorate of the UPR adopted the Law on Church Autocephaly in Ukraine. On May 5, 1920 the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council declared its withdrawal from the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. On October 14, 1921 on the wave of national exaltation, there emerged and started functioning the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC). It existed from 1921 to 1930 but without worldwide recognition was destroyed by the Soviet regime.

The idea of Ukrainian autocephaly was so meaningful that it became one of the main factor in proclaiming Ukrainization as the state policy, and resulted in autocephalous projects of other newly established Ukrainian churches – Synodal (1923–1941) and Cathedral-Episcopal (1925–1937). The fate of these churches was tragic as well.

Another attempt of getting autocephaly was made during the Second World War; the German occupation authorities, however, did not allow Ukrainian forces to unify.

By its social nature the pursuit of autocephaly is quite typical. All nations of the Orthodox world on a certain level of their national-state consolidation followed this path. There already are 16 autocephalous churches already that exist in the modern world.

In order to better understand both driving and braking factors of this path, we will examine the changes in social and historical thought about autocephaly among those who were the participators of the events of the
Ukrainian revolution of 1917–1921. Those years were the starting point of the long struggle which ended with acquisition of the Tomos on autocephaly only in 2019. We will describe the stages of the Ukrainian movement for autocephaly in 1917–1921 and define their common and distinctive features as well as investigate the society’s response to the need for an independent Ukrainian church.

The aim of the research predetermined the article’s structure; it consists of three chronological blocks: 1. The Struggle for autocephaly during the period of the Central Council of Ukraine (1917 – April 1918); 2. Autocephalous projects of the period of the Hetmanate of P. Skoropadskyi (May – December 1918); 3. The establishment of autocephaly during the time of the Directorate of the UPR.

Despite the availability of scholastic research on the history of the UAOC, (the author of this article analyzed in his PhD thesis in 1993), as well as other relevant historiographical articles, the mentioned problems are not fully disclosed. (We mean the research of I. Prelovaska, A Coridon and the author of this publication). Therefore, we will turn to the main idea – to show what was typical and specific in the need of Ukrainian society for autocephaly during the revolution of 1917–1921.

1. The struggle for autocephaly during the period of the Central Council of Ukraine (1917 – April 1918)

The issue of the Ukrainian Church autocephaly has been put on the agenda of Ukrainian history by the process of modernization. The formation of the modern Ukrainian nation, the appearance of the Ukrainian national movement in the political trajectory of its development were followed by certain transformations of religious consciousness. Secularization of these relations, as a manifestation of market relations, dramatic increase of the interest to the forms of national identity and appreciation of these forms among believers – all these phenomena became evident. They became aware of the inseparability between national-religious and political demands of Ukrainians. This prosess
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1 Ігнатуша О. М. Українська автокефальна православна церква (1917–1930 рр.): дис. … канд. іст. наук. 07.00.02 / Харківський державний університет. Харків, 1993. 255 с.
was described by the lines of Mykola Mikhnovskiy’s in “Independent Ukraine” (1900). The author called for restoration and continuation of the achievements of the Ukrainian national revolution of the 17th century, in which he saw the source of sociological-political development of Ukraine: “All those religious and cultural movements were the result of increased educational level and they disturbed our society in the 17th century, promised to become a source of not only freedom of conscience but also of political freedom”.

After the first newspaper publications in the Ukrainian democratic press, born by revolution of 1905, and in the brochures of the times of the Ukrainian revolutionary spring of 1917, there appeared well-argumented demands of autocephaly. The authors of these publications who relied on compelling historical facts were public figures. Most of them, for example, Oleksandr Lototskyi and Volodymyr Chekhivskyi had a special education in theology and history. They both came from priests’ families, graduated from the Kyiv Theological Academy at different times and actively participated in the Ukrainian political movement. More than anybody else they felt the deep religiosity of the Ukrainian people and at the same time understood the national issue significance in liberation struggle and state establishment. They were the representatives of the Ukrainian intellectuals who formulated the idea of the Ukrainian Church autocephaly and understood the necessity of its implementation.

Some of the activists, involved in a process of an independent Ukrainian Church establishment, had holy orders, which was quite natural. However, for a long time their active social and church activity did not allow them to fulfill themselves as church historians. Therefore, their studies came to light much later, after overcoming the unfavourable circumstances, created by the Soviet authorities. Such publications became possible mainly abroad, in the Ukrainian diaspora, so their intellectual inheritance returned to homeland only after Ukraine had gained independence. A lot of research of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskyi, Metropolitan Archpriest Mytrofan Yavdas, Protodiacon Vasyl Potiienko came to their reader in that way.

At that time of revolutionary events only small polemical articles of historical and journalistic character came to life, and they could hardly be attributed to the early historiography of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church. They produced necessary arguments for autocephaly. Among them it is worth to mention the brochure “On the Ukrainianization of the Church”6. It was published without the author’s signature but it became extremely popular with

---

6 Про українізацію церкви. 4-е вид. Лубні, 1917. 12 с.
readers and therefore, survived at least four editions in the same year of 1917. As it became known now, it was written by a priest, the future bishop, Feofil Buldovskyi. He reported on this issue at the Diocesan Congress of Poltava in May 1917. Relying to the authority of Scripture and his knowledge of church history, the author maintained the main idea: “The church can approach the ideal of christianization of life only when it relies on it’s nation”. On the examples of Apostle Paul’s mission in Macedonia, Cyril and Methodius in the Balkans, he tried to convince the readers of the vital necessity of national principles in church life organization, and emphasized the great responsibility of the clergy in this process. In his opinion they should “help the Ukrainian people not as if they were alien to them but as their allys, that is – speaking their language, respecting their national character, mentality, personal life, climate, nature – they have to Ukrainize the Church”. F. Buldovskyi showed deep historical traditions in the ecclesiastical life of the Ukrainians which were purposefully destroyed by the Russian state and ecclesiastical authorities in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They were mainly the traditions in ecclesiastical administration, in the ceremonial sphere, in the language of the certain religious texts and chants. In this way the author emphasized on the revival of the Ukrainian church traditions and on proclamation of the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine. He linked it, as the majority in our society, with the necessity of state establishment of Ukraine on the basis of “national territorial autonomy”. Thus the study of Scripture and historical examples had led the author to quite practical conclusions: “1. Independent and territorially autonomous Ukraine must have independent of the state, autocephalous Church”.

In the same year, 1917, Pavlo Maziukevych’s brochure “Christ and Ukrainism” was published in Zvenyhorodka, the contents of which are revealed in its subtitle: “Outline of the Path to Creation of a Free Ukrainian Orthodox Church”. P. Maziukevych is not a well-known figure in the Ukrainian movement but he managed to fulfil himself by his active citizenship, by his activity in the field of information support of the struggle for Ukrainian statehood, being an editor of the newspaper “Dzvin”. In the first lines of his publication the author stated that the issue of the Ukrainian Church began to appear on the agenda of national life of Ukraine more often. Analyzing the cause of the decadence of the Church, “clogged and neglected
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7 Про українізацію церкви. 4-е вид. Лубні, 1917. С. 3.
8 Про українізацію церкви. 4-е вид. Лубні, 1917. С. 5.
9 Про украинізацію церкви. 4-е вид. Лубні, 1917. С. 10.
10 Мазюкевич П. Христос і українство. Звенигородка, 1917. 8 с.
by foreign management”, P. Maziukevych emphasized the consequences of such management: “from exterior architectural look to and the way of prayers pronunciation, the Church in Ukraine looks more Russian than even the Russian Church itself: Russian-Orthodox character in it became so strong that there is no place there for the one with a Ukrainian-Orthodox soul. Not a single Christian feature is left there, as if Christ himself and Holy Spirit commanded the church to turn the rest of nations into the great Russians (velikorossy), or at least into southern Russians (yugorossy)\textsuperscript{12}.

Did the author of the cited brochure aptly mention the breeding ground of the “Russian world” in Ukraine? These destructive for Ukrainian culture and religious psychology consequences of the pro-Russian church activity in Ukraine urged (and are still urging now) those, who are not indifferent, to seek a solution from the situation. P. Maziukevych did not blame the clergy alone for all the troubles, he did not consider the proclamation of autocephaly to be a quite sufficient act. In his opinion, the only possible way to revive the Orthodox Church in Ukraine was an establishment of the smallest church units, e.g. brotherhoods.

The abovementioned ideas also arised from the front pages of the “Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council” newspaper on the eve of the opening of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council two issues of this unique edition (December 31, 1917 and January 5, 1918), prepared by its editorial board, were published under the slogan “Long Live the Free Independent Ukrainian Orthodox Church\textsuperscript{13}”.

The first issue began with the appeal of Archpriest Vasyl Lipkyvskyi (the future Archbishop and Metropolitan of the UAOC). He greeted the “faithful sons of the Orthodox Ukrainian Church” in such way: “We return home, begin our church establishment in a great and glorious time, time of the revival of the Ukrainian national state”\textsuperscript{14}. In the same issue a large article by priest S. Fylypenko was published. It contained a chronicle of events in the church in Ukraine on the eve of the Council, and described the struggle of national-democratic forces for the Council convocation.

In the second issue the text of the above mentioned P. Maziukevych’s essay was reprinted and the booklet “On Ukrainianization of the Church” was featured in the section “Bibliography”. In the same issue the publishers annotated a report of a Doctor of Church History Archbishop Oleksii Dorodnitsyn “A Historical Background of the Ukrainian Church

\textsuperscript{12} Мазюкевич П. Христос і українство. Звенигородка, 1917. С. 4‒5.
\textsuperscript{13} Вісті Українського Православного Церковного Собору. Київ. 1917. Ч. 1. 31 грудня; Вісті Українського Православного Церковного Собору. Київ, 1918. Ч. 2. 5 січня.
\textsuperscript{14} Ліпковський В., прот. Соборноправність православної церкви. Київ : Кирило-Мефодіївське братство, 1918. 15 с.
Subordination to the Moscow Patriarchy”. It combined the features of scientific and historical studies and theology. Both issues were imbued with the idea of the Ukrainian Church revival, the release of the powerful energy of the Ukrainian people, who were ready to establish the Ukrainian Church on the principles of autocephaly.

Such was the optimistic beginning and rapid burst of the Ukrainian church-liberation movement on the eve of the All-Ukrainian Church Council’s convocation, reflected in historical and theological promotional writing. But the coming events of political and church life put the question of autocephaly on a long pause. There began the phase of pro-Russian conservative forces mobilization, which slowed down the implementation of Ukrainian autocephaly for a century.

2. Autocephalous projects of the Hetmanate of P. Skoropadskyi (May – December 1918)

This pause was recorded in a certain issue, which contained historically grounded publication on the subject of Ukrainian autocephaly. Its author, Pavlo Mohor, a man whose name deserves recognition of our contemporaries. Unfortunately, we know little about his social background as well as his profession and education, so we can only make some assumptions about it. But his national convictions were quite obvious. He worked in the Cultural Commission under the Ministry of Confessions of the Hetmanate\(^\text{15}\). His further career after the defeat of the Ukrainian Revolution was typical for those participants in revolutionary events, who remained with the Bolsheviks. Like many of them he tried to fulfill himself in cooperative movement and scholastic activity.

On the pages of the democratic newspaper “Renaissance” P. Mohor published a substantial article entitled “Autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church”. The newspaper was published by the editorial and publishing department of the Military Ministry of the UPR.

Not only the place of the article publication is notable, but also the time of its appearance – the first days of the Hetmanate, when according to the words of the editorial board itself: “We can not even define in general the direction we will take: the direction of the consolidation of our statehood or the direction of its total loss”\(^\text{16}\).

\(^{15}\) Протоколи засідань Культурної комісії при Міністерстві исповеданий по вопроcам охорони древній церковної старины, памятников, возвращении части их по договору с РСФСР и др. 1918. Центральний архів Автономної Республіки Крим. Ф. 540. Оп. 1. Спр. 142. Арк. 1–4.

\(^{16}\) Переворот і українські політичні партії. Відродження. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).
These words demonstrate a well-considered state position of the author – a supporter of democratic forms of society, and thus – strong convictions of the social and political forces that he embodied.

In 1918, the same year the article was published by a separate brochure. It is worth to be given special attention, as the problems of the Ukrainian church-liberation movement in the past and nowadays in the 21st century are very much alike. P. Mohor analyzed the importance of the autocephalous church for the state building, society, church, and human personality.

He considered the state establishment and security, moral and cultural development of the nation, adherence to canons and traditions as the main aspects in this process. They have always been and still remain the cornerstones in the construction of the Ukrainian Church.

The author comes to a conclusion of the maturity of Ukrainian autocephaly and ends his article with the call: “Let the free autocephalous Ukrainian Church live for the benefit of its own state and the glory of its people”.

Mostly, P. Mohor emphasized the great responsibility of the authorities for the autocephaly establishment. He duly considered on the powerful resources of the Orthodox Church and its influence over Ukrainian society, therefore, stated, that it would not be difficult for Moscow to carry out its political plans in Ukraine under the religious banners.

According to the author, autocephaly is useful from a practical point of view. It allows us to develop the potential of the nation, both made by the community and the individuals. P. Mohor concluded: “For the future of our country from the political as well as moral and cultural view, we need to have autocephalous Moscow-free Ukrainian Orthodox Church”.

He debunked groundless intimidation about the catholization of Ukraine, a unification with Rome (which is still being heard from opponents of the Ukrainian autocephaly): “Let “the jealous followers of Orthodoxy” forgive us, but their fear of the Catholic Church can be explained either by their short-sightedness or, which is worse, by their wish to intimidate the people who are not very sophisticated in religious matters and thus, prevent the Ukrainian Church from becoming independent of Moscow”. Even then (in 1918) he noted that the signs of information warfare against autocephaly supporters. P. Mohor substantiated his view with the historical facts of the 15th – 18th centuries when unprecedented Catholic pressure in Ukraine had relied on the military power. But he asserted that times had changed. He also
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17 Мохор П. Автокефалія Української церкви. Київ, 1918. 12 с.
18 Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. Відродження. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).
What if the Catholic clergy advocates propaganda of their faith, or unity with the Pope, or unity – it is not dangerous, moreover, it is even desirable, because it will not let the Orthodox Church sleep, but will urge it to work, become ardent; this is what Apostle Paul demands for Christians"\(^1\).

At the same time, he believed that Ukrainian autocephaly would become the most important factor in overcoming the threat of atheism.

The author of the publication is aware of the specificity of the Orthodox world. This is what he said about national churches: “Each of them has the task not only of salvation of an individual, but of the whole nation, of promoting its spiritual development, of enlightening its ethnic identity\(^2\)”. P. Mohor concluded, that from the point of view of universal Orthodoxy, there were no obstacles to the emergence of new independent churches. “The Universal Church needs them so that in this way every nation can manifest its unique spirituality\(^3\)”. The author tried to prove that the history of the Ukrainian Church before joining Moscow was full of energy of life, which was crushed by “tsarism and spiritual centralism.

In a separate chapter, the author examines the issue of the Kyivan Metropolitanate subordination to the Moscow Patriarchate, opposition of the church hierarchy to this process, traces the chronology of events of the establishment of the Moscow’s superiority over the Ukrainian Church. To strengthen his arguments P. Mohor referred to such sources – “The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire”, “Archive of Southwestern Russia”.

The following argument is worthy of special consideration: “Moscow’s destructive influence on the Ukrainian Church does not deny the possibility of building friendly relations with other churches: the Ukrainian Church wants to be in ecclesiastical unity with the whole Christian world, but it also wants to preserve its uniqueness in religious creativity and sincerity of service for the benefit of its people\(^4\)”. P. Mohor gave the canonical and historical grounds of autocephaly and concluded: “Now Ukraine has become an independent People’s Republic and therefore, has a certain canonical right to the autocephalous church. Moreover, it has a historical right to it as well\(^5\)”.

The article ended with the conclusion: “The time has come to return to Ukraine its independent church life, its former rights and privileges\(^6\)”. 

\(^{19}\) Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. Відродження. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).
\(^{20}\) Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. Відродження. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).
\(^{21}\) Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. Відродження. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).
\(^{22}\) Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. Відродження. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).
\(^{23}\) Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. Відродження. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).
\(^{24}\) Мохор П. Автокефалія Української Церкви. Відродження. 1918. 12 травня (29 квітня).
The ideas of the first abstracts of the autocephaly publications sound very appropriate in the light of Russian-Ukrainian relations and the Kremlin’s hybrid war against Ukraine. The messages of the article of a hundred years ago are in line with those of modern historians and publicists. It confirms the nature of the time-delayed conflict and that the outcome logic did not follow the old scenario of Moscow but was according to the algorithm of universal Orthodoxy.

The internal and external challenges the Ukrainian Church is facing now, the threat to the integrity of the Ukrainian state which Russia poses – all these problems remained unsolved of the point of achieving autocephaly in the past (100 years ago) and the loss of Ukrainian statehood due to the lack of spiritual unity of Ukrainians.

Since May 1918 public sentiment on church issues had shifted to the right. Especially in the questions, in which the supporters of Ukrainian autocephaly did not have a strong position – mainly in the South and the East of Ukraine. There is a striking example of the Katerynoslav’s Diocesan Congress, where a famous historian Dmytro Yavornytskyi, a friend of the chairman of the presidium, took part. The congress adopted a number of controversial decisions as to the Ukrainianization of the church. The dramatic course of the dispute and the speakers’ arguments demonstrated immaturity of public opinion on this issue and lack of historical knowledge.

Analyzing the results of the congress let us draw attention to a fragment of the text of the plenary session: “The Holy Father ... declared ... saying that the Holy Patriarch claimed that he would not bless autocephaly now”. As we see, the bishop put direct pressure on the delegates. The heated dispute of autocephaly’s supporters should be viewed at an angle of this statement, which adds controversy to it.

After a two-day active debate on May 27, 1918 two draft resolutions of the autonomy and the autocephaly were put to the vote. The former gained the majority of votes. The resolution was formulated as follows: “Taking into consideration the long-lasting union of the Churches of Ukraine and Russia which enabled them to withstand all historical fallout, – the autocephaly of the Church in Ukraine has to be rejected; autonomy, as much as the Church of Ukraine needs, is accepted”. The second resolution with 11 votes

27 Труди Катеринославського екстреного з’їзду представників духівництва і мирян Православної Церкви 10–17 травня 1918 року. [Катеринослав, 1918]. С. 12.
28 Труди Катеринославського екстреного з’їзду представників духівництва і мирян Православної Церкви 10–17 травня 1918 року. [Катеринослав, 1918]. С. 22.
(against – 62, abstained – 4) proclaimed: “In the independent Ukrainian State the Ukrainian Orthodox Church which had been independent from the Russian Church until the mid-17th century, existed in close union with the State, consisted of more than 30 million Orthodox parishers, and thus, must be independent and loyal to the foundations of Orthodox teaching."

As we can see, the only argument against autocephaly was the stereotypical notion of a centuries-old common history of the Ukrainian and Russian churches as being the main condition for their existence and successful confrontation against alien influences.

Supporters of autocephaly stated that the status of the independent state should be in the conformity with the autocephalous structure of the church. Other points were also noteworthy: the historical fact of the Ukrainian Church independence from Moscow up to the 17th century; the number of its followers; the unity with the Orthodox world.

The texts of both resolutions stated the existence of two separate church communities – of the Ukrainian and Russian Churches. Therefore, we believe that in the autonomists’ consciousness there was a substantial precondition for the evolution of their views toward autocephaly. Later it took place, and existence of the state itself became a convincing argument for it.

Due to military situation in the country the congress was attended by representatives of the local state administration – Colonel Kravchenko, who congratulated the congress on behalf of the Ukrainian government. The interim commissioner for church affairs I. Umanskyi made a speech warning against disloyal statements about the possible restoration of all-Russian statehood.

As the young Dnipro researcher Y. Snida points out, that due to the authorities support of the nationally-oriented clergy, the question of autocephaly was put on the agenda again.

Archpriest Andrii Murin delivered a report on the nature of autocephaly. A board member of the Katerinoslav Theological College Father Serhii Mizetskyi spoke on the topic: autonomy or autocephaly. He drew attention to the practical aspect of autocephaly, which raised a lot of questions. Among them were such: if there was the necessity for autocephaly; whether it would lead to a break with the Russian Church; whether “both churches (especially Ukrainian) would not be subjected to the militant Catholicism with the Uniate
Bishop Sheptytskyi at the head, as the rumors had already said”; could it happen that the Patriarch of Constantinople will conquer the Ukrainian Church? The nature of these questions demonstrated the audience’s diversity, the different levels of understanding the issue, the overpowering stereotypes of prolonged Russian propaganda about the “horrors” of Catholicism and the “virtues” of unity with Moscow.

In his response speech Archpriest A. Murin argued that the historical path of the Ukrainian Church was canonical and secured by the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch. Whereas the Russian church went a way of schism. The same episode was mentioned by the priest S. Mizetskyi: “In 1448, the act of appointing Metropolitan Jonah without the knowledge and consent of the Patriarch of Constantinople, the council of Russian bishops also committed schism”. His speech ended with the words: “And the smallest autocephaly is still more real than the broadest autonomy”.

We can state that the certain part of the audience was familiar with in the historical material and used its argument during the dispute; they spoke boldly about the “schismatic” history of the Russian Church. These ideas were spread by priests – people who received not only theological but also historical education.

It is noteworthy, that the text of S. Mizetskyi’s report in the Congress publications was written in Russian. It indicates, that in 1918 the issue of autocephaly was understood by Russian-speaking Ukrainians not less adequately, than by Ukrainian-speaking ones. The historical parallels of 2018–2019 show, that Russian-speaking supporters of autocephaly of today had worthy predecessors.

At the plenary meeting on May 29, by request of those present, D. Yavornytskyi made a report on the Ukrainianization of the church. His speech, infused with love for his native Ukraine, was regarded as informative and extremely interesting. The speaker emphasized that contemporaries should appreciate everything that expresses the original national spirit. The Ukrainianization of the church, in his understanding, had to be manifested firstly in architecture, icon painting and hymns singing. At the same time, he believed that Church Slavonic should remain as the language of worship. It was a typical point of view even among those who sought autocephaly but understood the complexity and delicacy of introducing the Ukrainian language.
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33 Труди Катеринославського екстреного з'їзду представників духівництва і мирян Православної Церкви 10–17 травня 1918 року. [Катеринослав, 1918]. С. 15.
into worship. Most believers were unaware of the real threat of Russia’s speculation on this issue. A radical change of a language without proper preparation to it could have the opposite effect and discredit the very idea of reforming the church. It is known that D. Yavornytskyi consistently promoted the study of national church history. He offered to open a special department of the church Ukrainianization at the diocesan candle factory, where the samples of church memorials would be concentrated. D. Yavornytskyi also proposed the name to a new diocesan body – “The Church Herald of Zaporozhzhia”, which was supported by the congress. It is known, that by November 1918 at least 6 issues of this edition had been published.

There was a section of Ukrainianization of the Church at the congress. D. Yavornytsky spoke at it in favor of translation of liturgical literature and explained the use of language in church practice. The section adopted a resolution of 18 clauses. In particular, it recognized the need of immediate Ukrainianization in those parishes where Ukrainians were the majority. It allowed the Ukrainian pronunciation of the Church Slavonic text at the liturgy and reading the Gospel in Ukrainian. All priests were to know both Russian and Ukrainian. The language of the sermon could be chosen depending on the attendees of the liturgy. The section voted for the publication of explanations of the tenets of faith, sacraments, ordinances and worship in the Ukrainian language, in a convenient and comprehensible form. It supported the reprint of the Psalter, translated by P. Kulish. It was decided to buy and distribute among the parishes prof. I. Ohienko’s lecture “The Revival of the Ukrainian Church”. It is known, that Yavornytskyi’s speech made a strong impression on the delegates of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council and caused a storm of applause and ended up with singing the Ukrainian anthem “Shche ne vmerla Ukraina”.

The issue of autocephaly kept running on the pages of the local press. The special attention to it was given by the article “Autocephaly or Autonomy?”, published on July 12, 1918 in the newspaper “Pridneprovsky Krai”. Its author had pro-Russian sentiments and widely used the idea of a “common history”. He wrote: “The struggle for Orthodoxy against the Latin Cross and Mohammedian Crescent – that was of higher value of the Ukrainian soul and worldview in the past”.

34 Обіжник Катеринославського єпархіального місіонерського комітету благочинним Катеринославської єпархії про надіслання коштів від церков. 10 листопада 1918 р. Державний архів Запорізької області. Ф. 19. Оп. 1. Спр. 108. Арк. 755.
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In the horrors of the First World War and waves of refugees to the south and east, this idea has been reinforced. On June 25, 1918 the priest of the St. Mykolai’s church in Oleksandrivsk (now – Zaporizhzhia) informed that the territory of his parish (near the railway station where there was a constant flow of migrants) is inhabited by about 3,000 of Catholics, 2,000 of Protestants, 500 of Greek Catholic, 100 – of those belonging to sects and 30 – non Christians. Such facts gave rise to anti-Catholic and anti-autocephalous hysteria. Even more conservative was the mood at the next diocesan congress as reported by the newspaper “Pridneprovsky Krai”: “The sentiment of the congress was the most moderate – the turn to the right was fast and decisive”.

The society held in view the important events of church life. Local press reported recognition of the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Church and restoration of the Patriarchate in Russia, election of Patriarch Tikhon (Belavin), proclamation of the All-Ukrainian Council of Autonomy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. There appeared the information about the renewal of the Cabinet of Ministers and about the commitment to the autocephaly of the Minister of Confessions O. Lototsky.

The pro-Russian forces were not satisfied with the mere idea of the Ukrainian autocephaly. An anonymous opponent of autocephaly wrote: “… No wonder that people so often protest against attempts to “ukrainize” the school”. Rejection of Ukrainian forms of education, culture, and therefore, of statehood, all these were the links in the same chain of ideological obstacles to the Ukrainian autocephaly.

However, the development of the Ukrainian statehood required, first of all, the support of the autocephalous church. When O. Lototsky, a well-known public figure, a supporter of the idea of the Ukrainian Church independence, was inuced to the Hetmanate’s Cabinet of Ministers as a Minister of Confessions, it led to a sharpening of the relations between the government and the pro-Russian majority of the delegates of the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council. O. Lototsky formulated the state authorities’ desire for autocephaly. But the Hetmanate again swayed towards Moscow, so O. Lototsky’s activity in the government happened to be quite short.
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Supporters of autocephaly were convinced in inevitability of ecclesiastical independence of Ukraine. A lawyer and a diplomat V. P Hirchenko wrote: “The idea of the autocephaly of our church cannot be killed. Sooner or later people will demand its implementation because the rise of national consciousness will strengthen the pursuit for autocephaly.” He explained it with the psychological and political reasons. Firstly, “philosophical-rationalistical religious sentiment of Ukrainians cannot be reconciled with the mystical-ceremonial religious views of “the greats Russians””. Secondly, “the native church is the best foundation of the native state, as the religious-national boundaries, held in the people’s consciousness as a manifestation of the most intimate properties of the national spirit, must serve as a basis for dividing spheres of influence from the political side as well.”

Supporters of autocephaly have deployed national church establishment, referring to the historical traditions. This path was shown in the Archpriest Vasyl Lypkivskyi’s brochure, published by the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood.

The Brotherhood began to play the role of consolidating center. It was formed during the first session of the All-Ukrainian Council and organizationally emerged on April 30, 1918. The Brotherhood proclaimed the purpose of “revival of the Orthodox National Ukrainian Church” by awakening public opinion and popularizing the idea of the Ukrainian National Church by lecturing, excursion, and mainly publishing. In spring of 1918 it numbered 160 people.

The Hetmanate supported the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood financially and promotes the organization of fraternal groups under the ward of the state. The concept of the Hetmanate leadership in the church issue was: to build a canonical Ukrainian Orthodox Church independent of the ROC. However, the policy of P. Skoropadskyi’s Hetmanate was not always consistent. It eventually led to Orthodox Ukraine autonomy within the Moscow Patriarchate. The Third Session of the All-Ukrainian Church Council consolidated the act of granting the Ukrainian Orthodox Church autonomous status.
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It did not remove the question of the Ukrainian autocephaly from the agenda of the modern Ukraine state establishment process. The Ukrainian statehood was the fact of life, and the differences between it and Soviet Russia deepened. The autonomous status of our church was not approved by Russian White Guards, who made claims on Ukraine and considered “concessions” to Ukrainians to be excessive. All this intensified the autocephalous movement which eventually resulted in the radical initiative of the Directorate of the UPR, which proclaimed autocephaly by the state law of January 1, 1919.

3. Introduction of autocephaly during the time of Directorate of the UPR

The political instability of the UPR and the loss of its territory as a result of the interventions of communists and monarchists of Russia minimized the success of the Ukrainian autocephaly. It became possible for the Ukrainian Orthodoxy to establish independent from Moscow church only on the limited territories under the UPR troops control. Consequently, the number of the supporters of the autocephaly idea decreased. Its active leaders of the time – Prime Minister V. Chekhivskyi, Ministers of Confessions O. Lototsky and I. Ohienko did not have any possibility to carry out a broad work on popularization of this idea and, moreover, to resort to deep scientific, historical and theological studies that required time, sources of scholastic information, economic resources. Therefore, they were able to pay attention to its analysis only outside Ukraine, after the end of the active phase of this systemic conflict.

Among the publications of this time the work of Vasyl Bidnov should be mentioned firstly. Being in political exile, in 1921, he published a small sketch of the history of the Ukrainian people struggle for their church independence. V. Bidnov was a civic activist, a former member of the Central Council of Ukraine from the “Prosvita” of Katerynoslav, a member of the Ukrainian Socialist-Federalists Party, the Dean of the Theological Faculty of Kamianets-Podilskyi State University since January 1919, a member of the Ukrainian Church-Liberation Movement (member of the Council of the Ministry of Confessions, headed by Ivan Ohienko), the head of the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood. In his publication V. Bidnov analyzed and covered the most active stage of the struggle for the church independence of Ukraine – from 1917 to the end of 1920. He said “The Ukrainian people do not want to depend on Moscow in the sphere of religion... They want the Orthodox Church in Ukraine to be autocephalous.”

---
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V. Bidnov drew attention to the fact that the clergy, and the higher hierarchy in particular resisted autocephaly. He claimed that the clergy separated themselves from the ordinary people. “Our highest hierarchy stood on the basis of Moscow centralism and bureaucracy, hostile to our people, and supported Moscow policy of oppression.”

The activity of the bishop of Podillia Pymen Pehov, which unfolded on the territory controlled by the Directory, was destructive and anti-autocephalist. Born in Russia, bishop Pymen sabotaged the implementation of the laws of the Directory as for the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church in the diocese. He hindered the introduction of the Ukrainian language into church life. Later, when the Bolsheviks came to power, he cooperated with them, harassed supporters of autocephaly, in particular, members of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood. The bishop’s activities were regarded by the Directory as anti-state ones. On this occasion, he was investigated on charges of treason. When the Bolsheviks finally established themselves in Ukraine, bishop Pimen headed the church organization (the Synodal Church), directed against the UAOC.

Among the direct participants and organizers of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Movement and its first historians was Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskyi (1864–1937) – the first hierarch of the UAOC. He was the author of “History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church”, the only chapter of which survived. Later, it was published outside Ukraine. The time when the chapter was written is unknown, but it was here that the founder of the Ukrainian Church analyzed the most difficult and critical times of the autocephalous movement and the formation of the UAOC. He noted that his “pages are more of a memoir than of historical character”, as without proper sources, they were written only on the basis of his personal memories. Nevertheless, the author managed to convey the intense events from the beginning of the revolution to the First All-Ukrainian Church Council of the UAOC in 1921. He covered the historical background and ideological foundation of the Ukrainian church development, and referred to it as a history of “revival”, rather than building of a new church.

The author reconstructed the first steps of the autocephaly and gave his assessment to many events and public figures. He spoke about the progress and results of the All-Ukrainian Church Council in 1918, the establishment of the first parishes, the work of governing bodies and mainly about the All-
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Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council. He assessed the influence of political regimes of the Hetmanate, Directorate, Denikin and the Soviets on the autocephalous movement. He was the first to highlight the circumstances of autocephaly announcement on May 5, 1920 and the difficulties of acquiring a bishopric. Stories of the history of the autocephalous movement in Metropolitan Vasily Lypkivskyi’s interpretation have significantly influenced the historiography of the UAOC.

O. Lototskyi was one of the initiators of the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church. He played a special role in the theoretical grounding of the problems of church independence in the Orthodox world. It is a well-known fact that in the autumn of 1918, O. Lototskyi spoke at the All-Ukrainian Church Council about the setting a course of the Hetmanate for autocephaly. It was O. Lototsky, who during his brief term as the Minister of Confessions of the Directorate of the UPR, presented a draft law on the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church for Government’s approval. It was proclaimed on January 1, 1919.

Soon O. Lototskyi was sent to Constantinople with the mission to gain recognition of the Ukrainian Autocephaly by the Ecumenical Church. He left valuable memories about this event. Later, in the 1930s, while in Poland, O. Lototskiy outlined his fundamental theoretical research.

A special role in the affirmation of the idea of the Ukrainian autocephaly belonged to O. Lototskyi’s article “Ukrainian Sources of Church Law” which was published in Warsaw in 1931. Later, to commemorate the millennium of Baptism of Ukraine, it was reprinted by the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States in 1984. We quote the thesis of his report as Minister of Confessions at the All-Ukrainian Council of 1918, taken from the book by O. Lototskyi: “The autocephaly of the Ukrainian Church is not only the necessity of our church but also of our nation-state. This is the ultimate need of our church, our state, our nation. Those who understand and accept the interests of the Ukrainian people, also accept the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church. And vice versa”\(^\text{52}\).

In 1935 and 1938, two volumes of O. Lototskyi’s book “Autocephalia” were published as a serial edition of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw\(^\text{53}\). Giving reasons to canonical principles of church autonomy in Orthodoxy, O. Lototskyi showed historical ways of its origin, development and structure. He thoroughly analyzed the ecclesiastical and state-legal foundations of autocephaly. On the example of different churches, he

\(^{52}\) Лотоцький О. Українські джерела церковного права. Саут-Баунд-Брук; Нью-Йорк. 1984. С. 133‒134.

described the historical and canonical traditions of granting the complete ecclesiastical autonomy, he also figured out dogmas and the meaning of transformations of the church system, revealed the principles of sobornist (unity of the Christian churches), and characterized its concepts and forms of unity. He showed in details how the principles of autocephaly were embodied in the history of different national churches. It is worth to mention, that when at the end of the 20th century, a new wave of Ukrainian national revival rose and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate appeared in Ukraine in 1992, it reprinted the research of A.Lototsky.

The third volume of O. Lototskyi’s work “Autocephaly” is dedicated to the affirmation of the Ukrainian autocephaly. It was prepared for publication but never issued because it was destroyed in the hard times of World War II. Yet that part of O. Lototskyi’s creative heritage, that survived, showed that there had been grounds for recognizing the local status of a self-governing Ukrainian church.

One of the active supporters of the idea of the Ukrainian autocephaly during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921 was Volodyymyr Chekhivskyi. He was an author a number of historical, journalistic, scholastic and theological studies that prepared during the revolutionary events and later in the 1920s. This author is quite justifiably considered to be an ideologist of the UAOC. At the same time he was a well-known public and political figure – a member of the first the Ukrainian political party (the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party) in the Transdnieper region, later – the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers’ Party, a deputy of the 1st state Duma, a member of the Central Council and since April 1918 the Director of the department of Confessions in the Government of the UPR, the head of the first Government of the Directorate and the initiator of the autocephaly law of the Ukrainian Church (January 1, 1919).

In 1918 he published his work “Who Serves the Church Parish in Ukraine” and in 1919 it was republished in a modified form – “Church Parish in Ukraine.” These publications revealed the political link between the church and the imperial power of Russia which enslaved the Kyiv Metropolitanate. Relying on historical facts and church sources, the author claimed the right of the Ukrainian Church to autocephaly. Soon in 1922, the All-Ukrainian Orthodox Church Council (governing body of the UAOC), as well as the

---
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Church Council of the St. Mykolai Cathedral in Kharkiv, published the separate editions of a V. Chekhivskyi’s brochure “For the Church, Christ’s Community, Against the Kingdom of Darkness”\(^{56}\). These publications appeared when the UAOC had already been proclaimed. However, it became known that the procedure took place with a deviation from the canonical norms based on the historical precedents of Presbyterian ordination in the Church of Alexandria in the 2\(^{nd}\) century. This caused a flurry of criticism from ideological opponents. Therefore, in this study in addition to the theoretical regulations of the previous pamphlets, Chekhivskyi paid considerable attention to the moral and legal aspect and the canonical justification of the ordination of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskyi.

The publishers of one of the later reprints (it was repeatedly reprinted in emigration) wrote about the high scientific level of the publication, profound analysis and synthesis of its research, and emphasized that it shed light on the “tremendous movement of moral and religious national revival of the Ukrainian people after Revolution of 1917”\(^{57}\).

V. Chekhivskyi outlined the path of Ukrainian Orthodoxy to autocephaly relying on the history of the ecumenical and national churches, the Holy Scriptures, ecclesiastical canons, opinions of prominent Christian theologians and sources of theological literature. The UAOC’s proclamation in October 1921 was presented as a fact of liberation of the church “from dependency on the “kingdom of darkness”. It is not a coincidence, that the modern UAOC history researcher Iryna Prelovska recalls this publication by V. Chekhivskyi, saying that it has not lost its importance to the present day: “This research can be as a valuable source for analyzing not only the examples of argumentation in favour of separation from the Russian Church, but also for the study of the theological thought development during the Church-liberation processes in Ukraine during 1917–1921”\(^{58}\).

It is worth mentioning at least one of the fragments of V. Chekhivskyi’s vivid journalistic argumentation: “You are weak-minded! Do you think that the apostolic succession was preserved not by the church but by the ordinations of Moscow bishops, usurpers of the church in Ukraine? Don’t fool yourself! Either acknowledge that the tree is good and its fruit will be good, or
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admit that the tree is bad and its fruit will be bad because the tree is recognized by its fruit (Mat. 12:33). You see the fruit of the Moscow hierarchy activity in the Ukrainian Church: the fading of the faith of Christ, the work abuse of the faithful Ukrainian people, national oppression, fierce enmity, wars, murder.\textsuperscript{59}

As we see the scientific and theological nature of the first studies on Ukrainian, autocephaly was organically combined with a journalistic style of interpretation of facts which testified both to the high tension of this issue in the Ukrainian society hundred years ago, and to inevitable social radicalism in its solution.

V. Chekhivskyi was also the author of a number of other scientific and theological studies published in the journal “Church and Life”, which was allowed to be published by the UAOC during 1926–1928 by the Soviet authorities. It was the central and the only printed organ of this Church. In its several issues (in 1927–1928) an incomplete version of his theological research “The Basis for the Liberation of the Church from the Dark World of this Evilous Age (Eph. 6: 10–13)” was published. There the author asserted the legitimacy of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskyi’s consecration. The original of this substantial publication is stored in the archival fund of the UAOC. A short article by V. Chekhivskyi “Achievements of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church” remained unpublished\textsuperscript{60}. Thus, V. Chekhivskyi was one of the first theorists, organizers, and historians of the Ukrainian Church, who first proclaimed its autocephaly and struggled for it. His studies reflect the peculiarity of the Ukrainian national liberation movement of the first decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, during which the significance of the autocephaly of the Ukrainian church for establishing Ukrainian statehood, was established. In this way, the opinions of the supporters and opponents of this idea were formed and polarized. And the strengthening or weakening of different views was strongly associated with the victories of certain political forces that gained access to state establishment.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Having examined the Ukrainian public and historical opinion of 1917–1921 in favour of autocephaly, we become convinced of the resonant modernity of its ideas.
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The first attempt to assert the Ukrainian autocephaly brought up by a powerful rise of national consciousness – the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917. The foundation of the idea relied on the historical past and its use in the practice of national state establishment. However, Ukraine’s long dependence on Russia and its integration into the Russian state and culture formed strong mental stereotypes that hindered the maturing of the idea of autocephaly and its implementation at the all-Ukrainian level. The issue had an urgency of national importance and security, that is why the idea, put forward by the democratic forces, was approved even by the supporters of the Ukrainian right wing of the establishers of the Hetmanate. However, among the socialist and liberal conservative forces, there was neither a unity for implementation of this idea, nor necessary resources.

The first who drew attention to the idea of autocephaly were public figures – historians, priests, and journalists. They generated ideas, moods and spread them in the the society. Later, as the 21st century will prove, there are many analogies to this issue as well.

Even then, in the years of 1917–1921, the most controversial moments were being considered – the Ukrainian-Russian relations, the question of international legitimacy of the act of proclaiming the ecclesiastical independence of Ukraine. It was an invaluable experience that had been gained on the way to the Ukrainian autocephaly.

Historical thought was an active agent in this process. Promotion of the ideas was carried out by journalistic assays and spread from the congresses and meetings.

The century between the first autocephaly of January 1, 1919 and the autocephaly approved by the Tomos of the Ecumenical Patriarchate on January 5, 2019, convincingly affirms the vitality of the idea of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church national dignity.

Thus, the issue of the independence of the church in the independent state, the struggle for which lasted for the last century, proved that intellectual property of our predecessors of 1917–1921, is still topical and consistent.

The realia of establishing the Ukrainian statehood, with its inevitable liberation from the Russian governance, the question of national identity, which became even more significant during the Russian-Ukrainian war, proved that striving for the autocephaly had been the matter of vital importance for the Ukrainians. They proved the rightness of our choice of autocephaly as a means of normalizing the problems that were driven into the deadlock by the Russian centralism centuries ago.

We state that the origin of this movement is quite objective and natural for Ukrainian nation and at the same time, it is typical for the historical path of the world Orthodoxy.
Now that the United Orthodox Church in Ukraine has become a real fact, there appeared many new problems on the way to its unity, worldwide recognition; all this is a reflection of internal and external aspects of any development process. But this is another topic of proclaiming autocephaly, though closely related to that outlined in the article. And it is on the stage of its own historiography formation as well.

**SUMMARY**

The article analyzes the public and historical opinion of the supporters of the Ukrainian Church autocephaly, expressed by them during the Ukrainian National Revolution of 1917–1921. The foundation for our study comprised historical and journalistic writings of direct participants of the events, published and archive materials of the Orthdox Ukrainian Church of the time of revolution. In the article the circle of followers of this idea is outlined. The spectrum of thoughts and arguments in favour of the autocephaly under many political regimes that replaced each other during the Ukrainian Revolution, is described. It was showed how the process of national consciousness growth influenced our striving for church autocephaly. The attention is drawn to specificity of the Ukrainian path – the bitterness of Russian-Ukrainian issue, its connection with the imperial political course of Russia and its church. Historical thought is proved to be an active agent in the process of asserting autocephaly. It is stated that historical thought had always been an active agent in the process of obtaining autocephaly for the Ukrainian Church. The period analyzed is said to have invaluable experience on our path to the Tomos from the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The outcome of this process was the acquisition of the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine on January 5, 2019. It is suggested that the Ukrainian autocephaly has the potential to normalize the problems that has been driven into a deadlock of the Russian centralism.
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INTRODUCTION
The formation of views among Ukrainian scientists on the transformation of personality in the realities of the post-Stalin era took place within the conditions somewhat different from the Western or Russian cases. The renaissance of the Ukrainian state has raised the question of the study of “white” spots and frankly forged pages of national history. The main topics of historical research were aimed at the Cossacks period, the Ukrainian National Democratic Revolution (1917–1921), the Holodomor (1932–1933) and the mass repressions of the 1930s, the Ukrainian liberation movement of World War II, etc. From the Soviet period, the focus of attention was primarily on the Stalinism era. The period of 1953–1991 remained on the margins. Ukrainian science had to go through its own “re-Stalinization” of modern history.

1. Public consciousness of the inhabitants of the post-Stalin USSR in historiography
Only in the early 2000s there emerged dedicated studies on the mass consciousness of the citizens of the post-Stalin Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (Ukrainian SSR). In 2006 the articles, dedicated to the outlook of citizens of Ukraine during the ‘thaw’ period, were published. These were the first articles, written by Mykola Bregeda, postgraduate student of the Chair of Ukrainian History at Poltava State Pedagogical University. In his opinion, the destalinization process had a huge impact on public consciousness since it contributed to breaking down numerous stereotypes of the Stalinism era. The author outlined the specifics of changes in the outlook of the key social groups: peasants, working people, intellectuals, security workers, establishment. As his work shows, the proliferation of critical attitude, amid destalinization backdrop, towards the current authorities headed by M. Khruschev and freer interpretation of the facts of the authority’s abuse during Stalin’s “cult of personality” have become an unexpected challenge for USSR power elites1.

1 Брегеда М. Суспільно-політичні настрої української інтелігенції після XX з'їзду КПРС. Наукові записки ВДПУ імені М. Коцюбинського. Історія. Вінниця, 2006. Вип. 11.
In 2007 Vasyl Zemlyuk, researcher of Chernivtsi National University, defended his thesis work on the political identity of the citizens of Ukrainian SSR during 1960s–1980s. In the author’s opinion, political identity is manifested in the individual’s sense of belonging to a particular group (party, movement, ideological trend, etc) and/or identifying oneself with a particular political position. As a result of a purposeful state policy of inculcating communist values, the characteristic traits of the citizens of Ukrainian SSR were “almost complete sense loss of identity as a subject of history, master of his own destiny; political nihilism; inferiority, conformism; marginalism; indifference to civil-political rights, ambivalence (dissociation of personality, duality); ultimate obedience to authorities; life according to the principles: ‘it is no business of mine...’, ‘slow and easy wins the race’, etc; paternalism; incredulous attitude towards authorities and leaders; low level of political culture, political limitations. A greater part of the population was characterized by social apathy, passivity, opportunism, treating political actions as formal rituals, legal nihilism”.

The reaction of Ukraine citizens to the death of Stalin attracted the attention of Vasyl Shvidkiy, a senior researcher at the Institute of History of Ukraine of NASU. Quite rightly, he identifies it as a key factor in the evolution of public consciousness in the early 1950s and highlights the difference in the assessment of this event by representatives of different social groups (establishment, peasants, working people, intellectuals). At the same
time, the author’s hardly critical attitude towards the mood of the population of the Republic is surprising. In spite of the fact that this data wasn’t intended for a wide public, it also didn’t entirely reflect the full palette of public sentiment.

Yurii Kolesnyk, a professor of the Cherkasy State University, made a significant contribution to the study of the role of the media as an instrument for spreading communist ideology. He focused on the functioning of the Ukrainian SSR periodicity during the post-Stalin era and defined key methods of influence of the authorities on the public consciousness:

1) name-calling – using blatantly negative terms for characterizing people and events (‘pests’, ‘enemies’, ‘agents’);

2) ‘glowing generality’ – attributing generic names with a positive connotation to specific people or organizations (‘dear Party’, ‘Father-Lenin’, ‘fraternal peoples’);

3) ‘transfer’ – the positive side was the imperceptible distribution of the authority of a person/social institution to people or organization to be supported (Lenin Komsomol, ‘Children of October’), negative side – to associate with persistent repellent images (‘Hitler’s survivors’);

4) ‘plain folks’ – showcasing authorities as a part of common people;

5) ‘catch questions’ – using deformed logic for shaping up necessary conclusions, etc.

Natalia Gordina, a researcher from Chernihiv, completed her thesis work on “Social-political attitudes of the Ukrainian SSR population under the “perestroika” period (1985–1991)”. According to her observations, the period of Mikhail Gorbachev’s rule became a time of fundamental changes in the minds of Ukrainian people. If during 1985–1986, the mood of apathy and state abstention dominated by inertia, declaration of ‘glasnost’ shattered the taboo on discussing acute social-economic, and later political issues. As a result, society is starting to be rapidly politicized. The traditional social

---


contract of the late Soviet times – “silence in exchange for a minimum of material goods” was destroyed⁶.

The monograph of Donetsk scientist Olena Styazhkina “A Citizen in the Soviet province: Mastering the Language” turned out to be a real event in the Ukrainian academic discourse “homo sovieticus”. The researcher suggested an original vision for citizen’s life in the Donbass during Soviet times, showing it as a merger of peasant and urban traditions, different cultures and mentalities. What is important is to call not to treat a Communist “newspeak” solely as a way of stultification of the people or a pass to the world with better material goods. O. Styazhkina states: “The verbal codes of the soviet language “extended their hand” to those who wanted to change and change their way of life. This language, sometimes ugly, bureaucratic, forked, still had the kind of meanings that people were expecting. These meanings were shaped up around the desire for justice (it should be noticed, that the desire for mercy is what people often call the desire for justice”)⁷.

Manifestations of Soviet identity in the south of Ukraine became the subject of study by Zaporizhzhia scholar Tatiana Moldavska. Based on dozens of oral histories recorded in Zaporizhzhia, Mykolaiiv, Kherson and Odessa regions, she reproduced the system of values of the “Soviet citizen”:

1) assessment of the Soviet system as an order, discipline, “strong hand”;
2) acceptance of political terror as given, without which the country cannot exist;
3) sharp negative evaluation of democracy and free speech;
4) a negative attitude towards actualization of the topics related to Holodomors, World War II, repressions;
5) justification of existence of nepotism, careerism, bureaucratization during the USSR era – “it could not have been otherwise”;
6) pronounced paternalistic expectations of the state and authorities⁸.

---

Changes in the mass consciousness of Ukrainians of the post-Stalin era are studied by Nadiya Kindrachuk, a scientist at Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University. In her opinion, the process of constructing Soviet identity was conducted in conjunction with an erosion of Ukrainian national consciousness and culture. During 1950–1980 the course of propagation of the atheistic worldview, based on communist dogmas, continued to be incorporated, the manifestations of Ukrainian identity in the environment of the humanitarian intelligentsia were persecuted. Instead, the mass media, controlled by the government, shaped up a loyal value-based model of the information space. It was based on strict control over the content of print media and broadcast programs, impatience of views, which differed from the official point of view, prevention of negative evaluations of the authorities and communist ideology, blurring of national symbols and feelings.

2. The philosophical and cultural dimensions of the Ukrainian discourse of the “Soviet man”

The philosophical and cultural dimensions of the Ukrainian discourse on the “Soviet citizen” focused mainly on identifying their intrinsic characteristics in general, without raising the question of republican specificity. Kharkiv researcher Iryna Mukhina set a goal to figure out the system of values of the Soviet society. According to her statements, Soviet educational and cultural space was shaped up as a result of mixing up two social forces: radical intellectuals and the ones, who came from working – peasant masses. From the late 1930s, the second force became dominant, which marked the massification of USSR cultural space. The leading ideas, on which shaping up of the “New Man” was based, were the following: justice in the form of elimination of human exploitation by man; unity in the form of proletarian solidarity; collectivism as a basis of social life and building up an

---

ideal society where happiness, goodness, prosperity and inexhaustible forces of science, education, and culture prevail. In our opinion, the researcher described only the declarative part of the Communist personality project. Referring from official documents to the practice of upbringing the masses by the Soviet system, there is a great gap between the proclaimed and the real goals of shaping up a “New Man”. The biographies of dissidents and human rights activists, who seemed to meet the criteria of a “real Soviet citizen” can serve as a case study: convinced, politically active, stand for equality and democracy, fight for the implementation of the main theses of the USSR constitution. While in practice, they were severely persecuted for their unwillingness to suppress social problems and criticism of the authorities.

Olena Levchenko, a researcher at Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, based on the materials of cinema and theater, studied the impact of artistic culture on the mass consciousness of the USSR citizens. She suggested the view of Soviet culture as an encrypted text, which requires reading and has unexpected forms: lubok (folk forms of the art, brought to “high” art during massification), social order (a mechanism of the relations facilitation artist – authorities – society), terror (extreme mechanism of culture facilitation), etc. The USSR cinema and theater performed the role of the world picture compilers for enormous masses of people, who experienced a transition from an agricultural to an industrial society. The models they suggested were a common denominator between the expectations of the masses, authorities’ interests and a creative search for cultural figures.

Mary Stolyar, a philosopher at Chernihiv National Pedagogical University, studied the culture of laughter in Soviet society, which in the writings of the author appears as a powerful form of human resistance to the ideological pressure of the totalitarian regime. The main confrontation vectors turned out to be humanism as a denial of the class approach (revival of human values in contradiction to narrow political), moral denial of the morality (derision of
party moralizing), spiritual and moral as opposition to material and pragmatic (unlike Soviet ideology of the 1980s, which considered the main goal of meeting the material needs of people, the comedy genre pointed up spiritual values: friendship, love, respect), individualism against conformism (opposition of individual happiness to the practice of adjusting to the authorities requirements), creativity as an alternative to stagnation, and realism as a way to curb political myths.\(^\text{12}\)

There was an attempt to rethink the festive and ritual culture of the Soviet era through the prism of mundanity history, indicated by the studies of Oksana Penkova, Olha Tevikova.\(^\text{13}\)

Olena Nevmerzhitska, a scientist at the Drohobych State Pedagogical University of Ivan Franko, suggested the periodization of the development of the ideal of human in Marxist ideology. According to it, the main stages of Marxism evolution in the territory of the Russian Empire and the USSR were:

1) clandestine marxism with the ideal of a physically and spiritually evolved personality who has a materialistic outlook and is able to put into practice revolutionary ideas;

2) The Bolshevik vision of communism, supported by adamant revolutionary, who has a developed class consciousness, diligence, belief in a “bright future”;

3) Stalinist version of Marxism–Leninism focused on shaping up a person of socialist labor, educated and qualified, for whom the interests of the state and party are a priority.\(^\text{14}\)

Obviously, the suggested periodization lacks a post-Stalinist version of communist ideology with its thesis on a “state of the whole people”, “consumer turn”, and a direct approaching the communism. Unfortunately, other studies with a similar area of research did not develop this periodization for 1953–1991.\(^\text{15}\) It remains to be stated that this is a prospective subject for further research in the field of social philosophy and the history of pedagogy.


\(^\text{15}\) Залужна А. Людинонімірність культури у філософському дискурсі “пізнього радянського марксизму”. Наукові записки Національного університету “Острозька
The philosopher Oksana Demura attempted to apply the theoretical advances in psychoanalysis, neo-Kantianism and structuralism to determine the foundations of Soviet culture. She concluded, that the culture of the totalitarian era was based on several key archetypes (enemy – comrade, friend – foe, war – peace), which primitivized social morality and shaped a common person’s qualities such as exclusion, rationalization, “one-dimensionality”. The Soviet regime interpreted key aesthetic categories at its own discretion and distributed them among the population through an extensive propaganda system. The heroic was considered as the primary meaning of human life, the beautiful – as a correspondence to socialism ideals, the tragic – as a collision of opposing social forces, the sublime – as the scientific and technical transformation of the world and communism’s spread, the ugly – as the image of foe and anticommunism’s ideas. The author suggested the interpretation of Soviet reality as a sphere of special cultural practices similar to religious ones (mausoleum with V. Lenin’s body as a place of pilgrimage, acceptance into octobrists/pioneers/komsomol members/party members as a rite of initiation, belief in communism as a way of achieving a “happy consciousness”)\textsuperscript{16}.

Iryna Maslova-Lisichkina traced the shaping up of the community traits of “Soviet people” on the example of Kyiv citizens. In her opinion, the new Soviet rite, which had to replace the traditional Ukrainian holidays and traditions, played a significant role in the assimilation of communist values. It was based on the Marxism-Leninism elements as an ideological basis, utilized national symbols (emblem, flag, anthem of the USSR, portraits of Marxism classics), had to be inert. The intensive planting of a new rite during the “stagnation” period was evidenced by the creation of a separate commission on Soviet traditions, holidays and ceremonies at the Council of Ministers of the USSR in 1969 and prosecuting attempts to revive Ukrainian national traditions\textsuperscript{17}. I. Maslova-Lisichkina’s thoughts were supplemented by an article, written by an Associate Professor of Pereyaslav-Khmelnytskyi State Pedagogical University Vera Demyanenko. It revealed the impact of mass festivals and rituals of the late Soviet era as instruments of outlook militarization of the USSR citizens. “The idealization of military service, exaggerated expectations from the military methods use, assessing the strength and well-being of the nation in terms of military preparedness, the

\textsuperscript{16} Демура О. О. Архетипно-міфологічні структури радянської культури: естетичний аналіз : автореф. дис. … канд. філос. наук : 09.00.08. Київ, 2015. 20 с.

\textsuperscript{17} Маслова-Лисичкіна І. А. Масове свято як засіб виховання людини в радянську добу. Вісник КНУКіМ. Мистецтвознавство. 2016. Вип. 34. С. 104–110.
domination of the image of a real enemy and anticipation of unrelenting opposition to him” became a part of the public consciousness.  

Olena Markozova, a sociologist at Kharkiv National Auto-Road University, paid attention to the concept of “success” in post-Stalin society. In her opinion, the USSR power elites shaped up an orientation towards achieving collective success, being necessarily State-sanctioned. However, the “consumer turn” of the late 1950–1970s suggested the new models of success based on material well-being. The phenomenon of “black marketeering” (production and sale of short-supply things) has given rise to new practices, that have evolved into a completed prepared frame of success.

A greater part of the publications of Ukrainian scholars are devoted to certain aspects of shaping up the “Soviet citizen” in the territory of the Ukrainian SSR in the 1950s-1980s. The main topics for research were the influence of totalitarian culture on the personality, the role of the mass media and literature in the spread of communist values, the peculiarities of historical memory in the Ukrainian SSR, the struggle of ideology with religious outlook.

Roman Iesipenko’s thesis work showed contradictions of the Ukrainian theater development during the “stagnation” period: a struggle of creativity against formalism, national traditions versus cultural unification, human values against temporary political interests of the ruling top. The author has convincingly shown that the authorities tried to use the theater as a means of educating citizens through repertoire policy, leaving some room for creativity.

Ihor Losiev studied the mutual influences of communist and national values in Russian and Ukrainian cultures. In his opinion, if the RSFSR experienced a confluence of traditional values of Russian society with Soviet ones, then in the Ukrainian case, it was an aggressive suppression in favor of communist ideologemes. The influence of ideology on the cultural sphere of the Ukrainian SSR in the 1960s – 1980s as a factor in the spread of
“canonical” ideas can be found in the writings of Natalie Hovaiba\textsuperscript{23}, Markiyan Nestayko\textsuperscript{24}, Mykola Timoshik and Maryna Orieshkyna\textsuperscript{25}.

The importance of the mass media in the formation of mass representations touched the writings of Oksana Pochapskaya (the role of the USSR student periodicals in shaping up the consciousness of the republic citizens)\textsuperscript{26}, Iryna Ivanova (ideological vector of Soviet magazine advertising in Ukraine)\textsuperscript{27} and Kateryna Yeremieieva (“Perets” magazine in the formation of socio-cultural environment of Soviet Ukraine 1941–1991 years)\textsuperscript{28}.

The intervention of the totalitarian regime in the language practices sphere has attracted the attention of Ukrainian philologists. Natalia Rudnitskaya studied the ideological undernotes of fictional works’ translations in the Ukrainian SSR in the second half of the twentieth century. According to her conclusions, all translated literature was subject to ideological adaptation to bring the fictional work closer to official Soviet discourse\textsuperscript{29}. Oksana Kalinovskaya specified the means of ideologization of the Ukrainian language during the USSR era. They consisted of: invariable ideologized context; transformation of main political terms into ritual, without any specific meaning of the word; use of mythologized metaphors, the predominance of

\textsuperscript{22} Орешкіна М. О. Вплив ідеологічного фактора та командно-адміністративних методів управління на діяльність бібліотек УРСР у 40–80-рр. ХХ ст. : автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01. Луганськ, 2011. 21 с.


\textsuperscript{25} Орешкіна М. О. Вплив ідеологічного фактора та командно-адміністративних методів управління на діяльність бібліотек УРСР у 40–80-рр. ХХ ст. : автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01. Луганськ, 2011. 21 с.

\textsuperscript{26} Почапська О. І. Тотальний контроль: особливості використання пропаганди у студентських друкованих періодичних виданнях та її вплив на формування особистості : (за матеріалами газети “Радянський студент”). Наукові праці Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету ім. Івана Огієнка. Філологічні науки. 2009. Вип. 20. С. 532–535.

\textsuperscript{27} Іванова І. Радянська реклама журналістика в Україні: система сьт та ідеологічні константи. Вісник Львівського університету. Журналістика. 2017. Вип. 42. С. 121–125.

\textsuperscript{28} Єремєєва К. Бити сатyroю: журнал “Перець” в соціокультурному середовищі Радянської України. Харків : Раритети України, 2018. 197 c.

\textsuperscript{29} Рудницька Н. Маніпулювання ідеологеми у радянському перекладі. Мовні і концептуальні картини світу. 2015. Вип. 51. С. 443–450 ; Рудницька Н. Переклад як засіб формування радянського канону світової літератури: ідеологічний аспект. Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету ім. Лесі Українки. Філологічні науки. Мовознавство. 2015. № 3. С. 48–53.
evaluative semantics\textsuperscript{30}. Inna Renchka raised the question on the linguistic reflection of the Soviet identity formation. Based on the analysis of the semantics during Ukrainian SSR period, she figured out that the influence of ideology in the language sphere was manifested primarily in adding evaluative connotation to content-neutral terms. The national was displayed as a regressive, related to past and capitalist system; points of view, alternative to the official ones – as an expression of moral and intellectual decline\textsuperscript{31}.

Transformations of historical memory in the post-Stalin Ukrainian SSR are represented in a number of publications by Ukrainian historians. Liubov Krupnyk studied the persecution of attempts to revive the Cossacks legacy within the secretarship of Valentyn Malanchuk (1972–1979). They were presented as archaic, as repellent for a “modern” man, “equipped” with a communist outlook\textsuperscript{32}. Lyudmila Grinevich’s article by is dedicated to the Holodomor place during 1932–1933 in the official rhetoric of the 1950s-1990s. The researcher states that massacre of Ukrainians by the Stalin regime was an unacceptable topic neither during the Khrushchev’s “thaw”, nor Brezhnev’s “stagnation”, since it could lead the population to conclusions about the nature and goals of Stalin’s system\textsuperscript{33}. Dmitry Idrisov revealed the impact of ideology on researchers in the humanities and social sciences. The author reproduced the mandatory requirements for academic texts in the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR by reviewing thesis works: reliance on Marxism–Leninism, involvement in the current socio-political situation, the presence of ideological rhetorics\textsuperscript{34}. Vladimir Yurchenko’s article outlines the historical views of the Ukrainian SSR authorities during 1970s – early 1980s.


\textsuperscript{32} Крупник Л. О. Пам’яті про козацтво – мішень ідеологічної боротьби радянської тоталітарної системи в 70-х роках XX століття. Вісник Запорізького національного університету. Юридичні науки. Запоріжжя, 2005. № 2. С. 15–19.


\textsuperscript{34} Ідрісов Д. І. Державна ідеологія в дисертаційних працях з історії та відгук за них за радянської доби. Наукові записки НаУКМА. Історичні науки. 2012. Т. 130. С. 42–46.
According to his conclusion, the republic establishment considered history as an instrument to serve political needs, requiring the academic community to legitimize national politics in the USSR and provide evidence of the beginning of the “advanced socialism” phase\textsuperscript{35}.

Irina Sklokina revealed the features of the official memory politics of the Nazi occupation during 1943–1985. Considering an example of Kharkiv, the researcher highlighted that an abstract veneration of the memory, related to events of 1941–1943, without reference to specific events, prevailed in Soviet politics. This indicates the intention to start with creating “places of commemoration” to spread Soviet values, but not the “places of memory” with reference to a diverse and problematic occupation experience\textsuperscript{36}.

Studios on the religious history of Ukraine experienced the real “renaissance” (after 1991). Naturally, they could not avoid the question concerning the role of a religious factor in the process of shaping up a “Soviet new man”. Roman Boyko’s thesis work displayed the resistance of Ukrainian Greek Catholics to Soviet authorities during 1946–1989. The author proved that UGCC underground activities turned out to be a powerful factor in the preservation of national and religious identity in Western Ukraine in the late Soviet period\textsuperscript{37}. Peter Bondarchuk recreated a comprehensive picture of the religious consciousness of the Ukrainian SSR citizens in the 1940s-1980s. In his opinion, the atheistic policy of the Soviet authorities led to the displacement on the periphery of the public consciousness and decreasing the influence of religious ideas. Basically, the role of the “higher power” was taken over by the belief in communism in a distorted late Soviet interpretation\textsuperscript{38}. The author got the point across of this process with an exact


formula: “profanation of the sacred and sacramization of the profane”\textsuperscript{39}. His findings resonate with thoughts of Donetsk scientist Vladimir Gurzha, who established the directions of Soviet reality ritualization: 1) anti-religious propaganda and believers persecution; 2) replacement of church holidays with secular ones, filling of traditional rites with new meanings; 3) sacramization of the “Vozhd” (Great leader) figure and his burial place; 4) definition of “sacred” places, formulation of Soviet life postulates (tribunes of the party congress, the square close to the Lenin statue)\textsuperscript{40}.

Works on transformations of consciousness of certain social groups and institutions during the post-Stalin era form a great part of scientific studies in the Ukrainian discourse of “homo sovieticus”. Olexander Dodonov’s doctoral thesis (2001) showed the real workers’ attitude to the Soviet reality of 1961–1991. In the author’s opinion, the CPSU was a party of the party-state nomenclature, not the working class, and the USSR proletarians were well aware of this fact\textsuperscript{41}. Similar theses are substantiated in Victoria Kontsur’s work, dedicated to the role of trade unions in the ideology of the Ukrainian SSR population during the “thaw” era. The author described in detail the propagandistic errands performance by the trade union organizations received from CPSU, thus serving as a politicization instrument of industrial and social relations\textsuperscript{42}. Mariia Kahalna outlined the role of teachers in spreading communist values. In her opinion, the Soviet authorities created a system of political and ideological control over pedagogical workers. High levels of education and public authority have condemned teachers to actively engage in party propaganda\textsuperscript{43}. The works of Natalia Tararak, Svetlana Scheka and Lyudmila Sokurianska raised the question of the values among the Ukrainian SSR students in the 1950s-1980s. According to their findings, student youth was in the focus of ideologists. However, it is too early to talk about the total “communization” of people with higher education. Ideological brainwashing couldn’t erase the intellectual development and self-organization of youth\textsuperscript{44}.


\textsuperscript{40} Гуржи В. Релігійні мотиви смислового ядра радянської ідентичності. Схід. 2017. № 6. С. 84–90.


\textsuperscript{42} Концур В. В. Профспілки України в системі ідеологізації суспільства (1956–1964 pp.) : автореф. дис. ... канд. іст. наук : 07.00.01. Донецьк, 2006. 20 с.


\textsuperscript{44} Тарарак Н. Процес формування “ціннісних орієнтацій” студентів вищих навчальних закладів мистецького профілю України радянського періоду. Збірник наукових праць
CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the Ukrainian academic discourse of the “new man” touched upon both the peculiarities of the implementation of the “homo sovieticus” project in the Ukrainian SSR in the 1950s – 1980s, as well as the common consciousness features transformed by communist ideology. Questions about the cultural environment of the “Soviet citizen”, the role of the mass media and literature in the spread of the communist ideology values, changes in historical memory and religious consciousness in the Ukrainian SSR were covered in detail. Characteristic features of Ukrainian discourse against the background of others were the consideration of regional and social versions of shaping the “ideal Soviet citizen”, the practical absence of communist apologetics, and a general consensus on the forced nature of the CPSU’s values. This makes it possible to talk about the ideological similarity of the Ukrainian and Central European intellectual communities. Further logic of the national discourse evolution requires the synthesis of a holistic picture of the formation of the communist personality in Ukrainian society in the 1950–1980.

SUMMARY

The section is devoted to the analysis of contemporary Ukrainian historiography on the construction of the “Soviet man”. The analysis of academic discourses has shown considerable interest in the phenomenon of “homo sovieticus”, which has been converted into an array of scientific works. At the same time, against the background of a large number of generalizing studies, insufficient study of the features of designing a “New person” in post-Stalin Ukraine is drawing attention to itself. The Ukrainian historiography has drawn attention to regional and social versions of constructing the “ideal Soviet citizen”. Unlike Russian, it is almost completely devoid of communist apologetics and affirms the coercive nature of the CPSU’s values.
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