



Prelude to a Revolution: Reflections on Observing
the 2004 Presidential Elections in Ukraine

Politics and Orthodoxy in Independent Ukraine

Facing Ukraine's Russian Legacy:
Politics and History in the Late Kuchma Era

The NKVD File of Mykhailo Drai-Khmara

The Famine of 1932-33 in the Discussion of
Russian-Ukrainian Relations

THE HARRIMAN REVIEW

Volume 15, Numbers 2-3

May 2005

Rory Finnin & Adriana Helbig
*Prelude to a Revolution: Reflections on Observing
the 2004 Presidential Elections in Ukraine* 1

Frank E. Sysyn
Politics and Orthodoxy in Independent Ukraine 8

Zenon E. Kohut
*Facing Ukraine's Russian Legacy:
Politics and History in the Late Kuchma Era* 20

Vitaly Chernetsky
The NKVD File of Mykhailo Drai-Khmara 25

Frank E. Sysyn
*The Famine of 1932-33 in the Discussion
of Russian-Ukrainian Relations* 77

*Cover photograph by Kyrylo Kysliakov, from the exhibition "Faces of the Orange Revolution,"
mounted by the Ukrainian Studies Program, Columbia University, at Lehman Library
and Low Library (February-April 2005).*

Note: Due to a technical error in printing, Frank E. Sysyn's article, "The Famine of 1932-33 in the Discussion of Russian-Ukrainian Relations," originally published in the last issue of the *Harriman Review* (Fall 2004), appeared with garbled text on page 2, and on pages 4-5 the same text was printed twice, thereby leaving out a page. Rather than simply printing corrections, we are reprinting the corrected article in full. We extend our apologies to our readers, and more importantly, to Professor Sysyn, a valued colleague.—Ronald Meyer

THE HARRIMAN REVIEW, successor to *The Harriman Institute Forum*, is published quarterly by the Harriman Institute, Columbia University. Copyright ©2005 by the Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York. All rights reserved. Reproduction of any kind without written permission is strictly forbidden. Annual subscription rates: U.S. and Canada: \$35.00 (1 year), \$60.00 (2 years); elsewhere: \$45.00 (1 year), \$85.00 (2 years). Back issues: \$10.00. Check or money order should be made payable to Columbia University. U.S. funds only. Send all orders, changes of address, and subscription inquiries to: *The Harriman Review*, 1218 International Affairs Building, Columbia University, 420 West 118th Street, New York, New York 10027. FAX: (212) 666-3481. *The Harriman Review* is indexed by PAIS and ABSEES.

Prelude to a Revolution: Reflections on Observing the 2004 Presidential Elections in Ukraine

Rory Finnin and Adriana Helbig

Over the course of the highly contested 2004 presidential elections in Ukraine, two graduate students from Columbia University served as International Election Observers. Rory Finnin, doctoral student in the Department of Slavic Languages and the Center for Comparative Literature and Society, and Adriana Helbig, PhD candidate in the Department of Music, were members of delegations fielded by the Ukrainian Congressional Committee of America (UCCA), a U.S.-based non-governmental organization founded in 1940 and registered with the Central Election Commission of Ukraine. Rory served in the Cherkasy oblast in central Ukraine during the first round of the elections on October 31, 2004, and Adriana served in the Transcarpathian oblast in western Ukraine during both the first round on October 31 and the second round on November 21, 2004.

This article is comprised of two sections, organized by electoral round and region. Based on Rory's observations, the first section addresses the October 31 poll in Cherkasy, briefly reviewing the electoral significance of the oblast before elaborating upon the corrupted voter registries and the state's use of "soft" intimidation that undermined the voting process there. The second section, based on Adriana's observations, deals with the November 21 poll in Transcarpathia; the account is prefaced with a discussion of the political machinations in Uzhhorod prior to the elections between the pro-government *Sotsial-demokratychna Partiiia Ukraïny-obiednana* (Social Democratic Party of Ukraine-united; SDPU-o) and the opposition party, *Nasha Ukraïna* (Our Ukraine). It then proceeds to describe many of the ways in which local officials intimidated voters and manipulated marginalized constituencies in a campaign of falsification and fraud.

First Round: Cherkasy Oblast

As crowds in the hundreds of thousands swelled Kyiv's *Maidan Nezalezhnosti* (Independence Square) to protest widespread electoral fraud following the November 21 run-off between Viktor Yushchenko and Viktor Yanukovich, journalists in Europe and the United States tended to cast the dramatic events of the Orange Revolution in binary terms, as the outcome of a conflict not only between a "pro-Western reformer" and a "Kremlin-backed prime minister," but also between "western" and "eastern" Ukraine. "Ukraine's East and West Are Miles Apart on the Issues," declared one headline on the front page of the *Los Angeles Times*,¹ while television commentators in the United States depicted the crisis as a confrontation between a "Red State vs. Blue State" Ukraine.² This regional cleavage, while qualified by some, was frequently depicted in the popular media with Manichean simplicity, offering journalists a convenient analogue to the international power play putatively taking place between Moscow, on one hand, and Washington and Brussels, on the other, over the election row.³

Of course, the thesis of "two Ukraines" is nothing new. In 1992, the Ukrainian intellectual Mykola Riabchuk introduced the concept *per se* in an article entitled "Two Ukraines?" in the *East European*

1. Kim Murphy, "Ukraine's East and West Are Miles Away on the Issues," *Los Angeles Times*, December 3, 2004, front page.

2. See Michael McFaul's conversation with Jim Lehrer of the *PBS NewsHour* on November 23, 2004, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/international/july-dec04/ukraine_11-23.html.

3. See, for example, Fred Weir and Howard Lafranchi, "The East-West Stakes over Ukraine," *Christian Science Monitor*, November 25-26, 2004, front page.

*Reporter*⁴; in 2002 he sought to update and clarify it in an article entitled “One State: Two Countries?” in *Transit*.⁵ Nor is it necessarily misleading. Differing historical, linguistic, and cultural circumstances have produced something of a political divergence that can be drawn along a geographical imaginary in Ukraine, and it is one that Yushchenko himself effectively acknowledged in a campaign slogan, “Donets'k + L'viv = Peremoha” (Donets'k + L'viv = Victory).⁶ It is rather when the concept of “two Ukraines” participates in essentializing these differences, casting them as irrevocably black and white and devoid of shades of gray, that it becomes not only grossly simplistic but also dangerous fodder for political manipulation.⁷

Orest Subtelny, among others, has argued for an evaluation of Ukraine's political geography in terms of “a three-part rather than a two-part scheme,” which identifies three basic regions that, notably, may be broken down further:

western Ukraine; central Ukraine, encompassing what was traditionally called Right- and Left-Bank Ukraine, with Kyiv at its center; and the southeast, which includes such areas as the Donbas, the Crimea, and the Odessa regions. In this scheme, the west and the southeast represent the two extremes of the national consciousness spectrum, while the center occupies an intermediate position.⁸

Central Ukraine's intermediacy, Subtelny points out, stems from the fact that it did not experience the degree of “ethnic confrontation” that historically beleaguered western Ukraine, nor was it subject to the degree of

“ethnic homogenization” that took place in southeastern Ukraine.⁹ As a result, the region has tended to mediate the “national extremism of the west” and the “national nihilism of the southeast,” acting as a glue, as it were, that keeps Ukraine together.¹⁰

This accommodation of differing political viewpoints has been especially evident in presidential election years. In the run-off between Leonid Kuchma and Leonid Kravchuk in 1994, for example, the most highly contested oblasts were Cherkasy and Kirovohrad, where Kuchma garnered 45.7% (compared to Kravchuk's 50.8%) and 49.7% (to Kravchuk's 45.7%) of the vote, respectively. In 1999, when the Kyiv oblast and the city of Kyiv cast their lots with Kuchma over the Communist Petro Symonenko, the Cherkasy oblast joined those of Luhans'k, Kherson, and Crimea, among others, in supporting the latter candidate. This potential to “swing” made central Ukraine a linchpin in the 2004 presidential elections, “the region that will most likely decide [their] outcome,”¹¹ and its importance meant that it was never far from the threat of electoral foul play.

When our team of six observers arrived in the city of Cherkasy on October 30, the day before the first-round contest, we met with Maksym Mykhlyk, head of the local branch of the independent nongovernmental organization *Komitet Vyboriv Ukraïny* (Committee of Voters of Ukraine; CVU), to gauge the pre-election atmosphere in the Cherkasy oblast and identify the polling stations that were feared particularly susceptible to falsification and fraud.¹² Only the day before, the

4. Mykola Riabchuk, “Two Ukraines?” *East European Reporter* 5:4 (July-August 1992).

5. Mykola Riabchuk, “One State, Two Countries?” *Transit-Europäische Revue* 23 (2002).

6. *Bez Tsenzury: Hromads'ko-Politychnyi tyzhnevnyk* 34 (October 31-November 6, 2003), 1; quoted in Yaroslav Hytsak, “On the Relevance and Irrelevance of Nationalism in Ukraine” (paper presented at the Second Annual Cambridge-Stasiuk Lecture on Ukraine, University of Alberta, February 20, 2004), http://www.ualberta.ca/~cius/stasiuk/st-articles/2004-02-20_Cambridge%20Lecture%202004.pdf, 8.

7. In this regard, we need only look to the events in Severodonets'k on November 28, 2004, when 3,500 pro-Yanukovych officials from seventeen eastern regions mobilized the rhetoric of regionalism and threatened secession and Ukraine's territorial integrity.

8. Orest Subtelny, “Introduction” in Sharon L. Wolchik and Volodymyr Zvighyanich (eds.), *Ukraine: The Search for a National Identity* (New York and Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), 5. As we shall see in the second section of this article, western Ukraine is a very complicated tableau itself. One would be mistaken to equate the level of “national consciousness” in Uzhhorod with that of L'viv, for example.

9. *Ibid.*

10. *Ibid.*, 6.

11. Taras Kuzio, “Front Runners Battle It Out in Ukraine's Last Presidential Polls,” *Eurasian Daily Monitor*, October 22, 2004.

12. An independent NGO active throughout Ukraine, the CVU also organized approximately 10,000 domestic observers for the first round. The polling stations on our itinerary were often full of domestic observers, as most of the 24 candidates for president had their own corps of them. A place for chairs, resembling a jury box, was usually cordoned off inside the voting premises to accommodate them, and most sat there throughout the day, content to “observe” from a distance. Observers from the CVU and Our Ukraine were exceptional in this regard, however; they tended to move about the polling stations, anticipating potential problems, and were very eager to work with us. Observers from the Yanukovych camp, meanwhile, were eager to photograph us, and to our amusement, one woman in Korsun'-Shevchenkivs'kyi, wearing black sunglasses, went to great lengths to do so while hiding behind voters and members of the election commission. Two days earlier in Kyiv, rather less amusingly, two thugs accosted me for taking a photo of a Yanukovych campaign truck. Taking campaign- or election-related photos is the right of all observers upon their registration with the Central Election Commission, but even after seeing my credentials, they did not relent in fighting, ultimately unsuccessfully, for the film in

CVU had released a report alleging a number of recent incidents of violent intimidation of political activists in Cherkasy, which included the poisoning of animals on the farm of a leader of a “pro-Yushchenko civic group” on October 5 and the destruction of a Socialist Party print shop on October 10.¹³ These acts portended the possibility of active voter intimidation in *Cherkashchyna* on Election Day. The CVU also informed us of its concern about the integrity of ballot papers and voter registries, and we compiled a list of polling stations in the oblast considered at risk to these problems, mapping out an itinerary for the next day.

Our team split into three mobile groups of two on Election Day, and I worked with Stefan Petelycky, an Auschwitz survivor, representing the Ukrainian Canadian Congress,¹⁴ throughout territorial election district 199, a predominantly rural consistency of approximately 140,000 voters and 177 polling stations.¹⁵ Together we visited two polling stations in the town of Horodyshe, eight in the town of Korsun'-Shevchenkivs'kyi, and two in the district of Lysianka. We were permitted entry at every stage, and the chairpersons of the polling station election commissions were, by and large, friendly and cooperative. Similarly, the members of the election commissions who checked voter identification, distributed the ballots, and counted the votes were, on the whole, diligent and well-trained. Of course, as in any country, conditions were far from perfect—the voting premises in polling station #2 in Horodyshe, for example, failed to meet size specifications, and the subsequent overcrowding undermined the secrecy of the voting process there—but upon being informed of our observations, the election commissions tended to act quickly and professionally to remediate any problems.

With twenty-four candidates vying for the presidency in the first round, the election ballot consisted of a long sheet of paper consisting of a control

coupon, which contained the numbers of the territorial election district and the polling station, and the body of the ballot itself, which listed the surnames, names, and patronymics of the candidates next to brief summaries of their respective platforms. By law, each voter is to receive one ballot upon presentation of valid identification, and its receipt is confirmed by the voter's signature on the control coupon, which is then separated from the body of the ballot and kept for the record before the vote is cast in anonymity. When issuing a ballot, the member of the election commission must sign both the control coupon and the body of the ballot; otherwise, it is *nediisnyi* (invalid). In polling station #2 in Horodyshe, we observed one member of the election commission repeatedly fail to append her signature to the ballots that she distributed, in effect invalidating votes before they were cast. Upon our deposit of an *akt pro porushennia* (violation report form), this individual was apparently relieved of her post, although we cannot confirm that she did not return to it later in the day.

The problem that pervaded every polling station on our itinerary was not within the primary purview of the polling station election commissions, however. Incomplete and often woefully inaccurate voter registries were commonplace, and their assembly was the responsibility of the Central Election Commission and the executive bodies of local municipalities. We observed scores of prospective voters in electoral precinct 199 being turned away from polling stations and instructed to go to the local court in order to submit a complaint (in accordance with Article 34, part 3 of the law, “On Elections of the President of Ukraine”) and petition for their immediate inclusion in the relevant voter registry. Only with a positive decision from the court could they return to the polling station and cast their vote. Many of the voters affected by this problem informed us that they were lifelong residents of their towns or villages and had even voted in the same polling station in the 1994 and 1999 presidential elections. The perception of injustice among the disenfranchised was often so acute that some adamantly refused to go to the local court, accusing the polling station election commissions of misdeeds and insisting that the matter be resolved then and there. In fact, two residents of Korsun'-Shevchenkivs'kyi nearly came to blows with members of the election commission in polling station #43 over their exclusion from the voter registry, and it was only upon the intervention of a police officer that they reluctantly acquiesced and departed for the local court.¹⁶

my camera. Adorned with Yanukovich's likeness, the campaign truck bore the slogan “Hadiia – dobre, nadiinist' – krashche” (Hope is good; certainty is better).

13. Committee of Voters of Ukraine, “Report on the Pre-Election Environment for October 4-15, 2004,” *CVU Events Chronicle*, October 29, 2004, http://www.cvu.org.ua/?menu=chronicles&po=doc&lang=eng&date_end=2004-07-14&date_beg=2005-01-10&id=646. These acts of violence in the Cherkasy oblast would culminate in the second round in the murder of police captain Petro Potiekhin, who was guarding ballot papers in the village of Molodets'k in election district 202, which abuts district 199.

14. Mr. Petelycky has recounted his ordeal in Auschwitz in his autobiography, *Into Auschwitz, For Ukraine* (Kingston, Ontario: Kashtan Press, 1999).

15. The chairperson of territorial election district 199 was Tamara Mosenko, a supporter of Victor Yanukovich.

16. A more than 10% increase in eligible voters in polling station #43 between the first round on October 31 (1,730) and the repeat run-off on December 26 (1,908) testifies to the extent of the voter registry debacle.

The majority of these disenfranchised voters appeared middle-aged, and a number of them told us that their demographic had been deliberately targeted for its pro-Yushchenko sympathies. They suspected that old-age pensioners, who by contrast were inclined to vote for Yanukovych, had not been as widely omitted from the voter registries.¹⁷ (Irrespective of the legitimacy of this claim, we did observe that a number of pensioners were indeed turned away from polling stations in electoral precinct 199, and we met one elderly woman in Korsun'-Shevchenkivs'kyi who, like many others, had to walk over a kilometer to the local court and back again.) Word quickly spread of long lines at the local courts, and some of the residents excluded from the voter registries seemed to leave the polling stations frustrated and discouraged upon hearing this news. It was impossible for us to know whether they went to appeal their exclusion or simply returned home in resignation.

Rumors ran rampant on Election Day, and the grapevine worked to the advantage of the state and its party of power. In Lysianka, a district with a population of approximately 28,000, we observed an armed contingent of what appeared to be *Berkuty* (Golden Eagles), an elite police force under the command of the Ministry of the Interior, disembark from two buses near the center of town. They did not approach a polling station or physically intimidate voters, but rather congregated outside the buses for a half an hour. What the *Berkuty* were doing in Lysianka on a Sunday afternoon remains a mystery—indeed, the mayor of Lysianka, a member of Yushchenko's Our Ukraine party, had not been informed in advance of their arrival—but their presence alone was enough to frighten voters and contribute to an already tense atmosphere. Similar visits reportedly occurred throughout central Ukraine on October 31, evidently part of a larger program of what might be called “soft” intimidation, whereby the state conspicuously wields its stick, as it were, without using it.

The arrival of the *Berkuty* proved a distraction in Lysianka, but the counting of the votes in polling station #96 nonetheless proceeded apace when the polls closed at 8:00 PM. Members of the election commission manually conducted the count well past midnight, and I remained there until the election materials were secured and prepared for transport to the territorial election commission. The count was orderly and thorough, with only one exception. Superfluous marks on a ballot may invalidate it, and two members of the election commission were counting with pens in their hands. A domestic observer and I raised the issue to the

chairperson of the election commission, who then made adjustments accordingly. At the conclusion of the count, I retrieved a copy of the result protocol, signed and sealed by the election commission; of the 2,093 votes cast in polling station #96, a resounding 1,477 (or 71%) were for Yushchenko, 232 (11%) for the Socialist Oleksandr Moroz, and 165 (or 8%) for Yanukovych. Results later published by the Central Election Committee of Ukraine revealed that, out of the 108,940 votes cast in election district 199, 65,426 (60%) were for Yushchenko, 16,940 (16%) for Yanukovych, and 14,716 (14%) for Moroz. After winning 76% of the vote in district 199 in the invalidated second round on November 21, Yushchenko went on to win 85% there in the repeat run-off on December 26. Indeed, at the turn of 2005, district 199 and the entire Cherkasy oblast had unequivocally become Yushchenko country.

Second Round: Transcarpathia

Whereas the regions indicated in Yushchenko's slogan “Dontes'k + L'viv = Victory” represent two relatively homogenous electorates—the former being predominantly Russophone Orthodox, the latter largely Ukrainophone Greek Catholic—the oblast of Transcarpathia is a collage of diverse ethnic, religious, and linguistic affiliations. More than seventeen changes of statehood over the course of its history have greatly influenced the sense of identity in Transcarpathia.¹⁸ Since constituting part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the region has been a part of Czechoslovakia (1919-38), Hungary (1938-44), the USSR (1945-91), and Ukraine (1991-present). The oblast is home to more than seventy ethnic groups and twelve ethnic minorities, among them Russians, Hungarians, Slovaks, Roma (Gypsies), and Jews. Ukrainian, Russian, Hungarian, and Slovak are commonly spoken in Transcarpathia, and Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Orthodox, and Baptist are among the most common religious affiliations. Identity is extremely open to fluidity in Transcarpathia, differentiating it from other western oblasts like Ternopil', L'viv, and Ivano-Frankivs'k, where the majority of the electorate expresses a relatively strong Ukrainian patriotic sentiment. While political analysts never doubted a strong win for Viktor Yushchenko in these oblasts, they considered Transcarpathia, like Cherkasy to some extent, something of a “swing state.” This ambivalence, however, did not stem from a lack of clarity regarding which candidate particular ethnic groups would support, but rather from the degree of influence that the political

17. In October 2004, only weeks before the first round, Yanukovych had raised pensions and public sector pay in a naked campaign appeal to pensioners and civil servants.

18. Judy Batt, “Transcarpathia: Peripheral Region at the ‘Centre of Europe,’” *Regional and Federal Studies* 12:2 (Summer 2002), pp. 155-77.

and economic party of power in the region, namely, the Social Democratic Party of Ukraine-United (SDPU-o), would have over the electorate on Election Day.

Transcarpathia is the poorest and least developed region in western Ukraine, and with unemployment at 70%, it was not difficult for a group of Kyiv oligarchs with Transcarpathian family connections to take control in the region. For close to a decade, the SDPU-o, which is closely allied to President Leonid Kuchma, considered Transcarpathia a solid home base.¹⁹ An Uzhhorod resident best described the party's financial and political monopoly in the region in this way: "If you were for them, you had money in your pocket. If you weren't, you got left behind."²⁰ On April 18, 2003, the mayoral elections in the Transcarpathian town of Mukachevo proved to be a harbinger of the struggle for power that would occur between the SDPU-o and the increasingly popular Our Ukraine party during the 2004 presidential elections. In Mukachevo, independent exit polls and voting protocols indicated that the Our Ukraine candidate for mayor, Viktor Baloha, had won the elections with 57% of the vote over SDPU-o candidate Ernest Nusser, who had received 40%. The election commission in Mukachevo nonetheless announced Nusser the official winner. Observers of the mayoral elections noted serious violations during the voting: skinhead groups harassed voters and exit poll workers, international observers were not allowed to enter polling stations, ballots were manipulated, and ballot boxes were stolen.²¹ On May 29, 2004, following more than a year of protests and legal appeals from the opposition, Nusser resigned. While the events in Mukachevo were an indication that the SDPU-o was slowly losing its grip in the region, SDPU-o loyalists remained determined to prevent Viktor Yushchenko from winning in the oblast in the presidential elections.

Between the first and second rounds of the presidential elections (October 31–November 21, 2004),

19. Much of my knowledge regarding the role of SDPU-o in Transcarpathia is rooted in first-hand experience, because in 2001-2002, I conducted dissertation research among Roma in the region. I chose to serve as an election observer in Uzhhorod because I felt that, in order to be effective, one had to have a grasp of local politics. My sister Zenia Helbig and I worked as a two-person observer team, whose task was to monitor the larger, more problematic polling stations in central Uzhhorod. In both rounds of the elections, I recognized and knew many members of the voting commissions as well as the voters themselves. Being aware of people's social and political positions helped me discern which people to monitor more closely than others.

20. Interview with an anonymous voter, Uzhhorod, Transcarpathia, November 21, 2004.

21. "Elections Put Democracy, Rule of Law to a Test in Ukraine," *USA Today*, August 14, 2004, http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2004-08-14-ukraine-elections_x.htm.

twenty school directors in Uzhhorod, Transcarpathia, were removed from their posts. They had received significant bribes to influence the vote in polling stations set up in their respective schools and were instructed to choose trusted teachers to comprise local polling station election commissions. These teachers were to work in a way that would ensure a final vote count that favored the pro-government candidate, Viktor Yanukovich.²² Such hand-picked commissions were meant to ensure that pro-government supporters outnumbered opposition supporters at the local level. It was ultimately Viktor Yushchenko, however, who won the first round of the elections in the Transcarpathia oblast with 47% of the vote; the school directors were presumably punished for his victory.

Despite numerous complaints lodged by local and international observers over the imbalance of representative power in election commissions, the structure of the commissions remained the same in the second round of elections. In the first round, for example, I had served as an international observer in polling station #7, among the largest of the 41 polling districts in Uzhhorod's territorial election district 70. The head of the polling station election commission there, Maria Zhebliak, had kept 1,739 unused ballots in an open, unguarded safe out of the view of observers and other commission members. The ballots were placed beneath a desk in a side room where Ms. Zhebliak and her assistant claimed they were "doing paperwork." In response, representatives from Our Ukraine immediately filed a criminal complaint in the local courts, at which time we counted the unused ballots. They were all accounted for, but during the eventual vote count, many cast ballots were deemed invalid (*nediisni*) because they had been stamped with two seals from the election commission rather than one. (Had 10% of the ballots been deemed *nediisni*, the voting in polling station #7 would have been invalidated, nullifying Viktor Yushchenko's 68% win in the polling station.) Despite these suspicious incidents in the first round, the courts dismissed the criminal complaint against Ms. Zhebliak filed by Our Ukraine and signed by local observers and myself. In fact, she was reappointed chairperson of the election commission for polling station #7 in the second round of the presidential elections on November 21, 2004.²³

22. Interview with an anonymous member of the election commission at polling station #6, Uzhhorod, Transcarpathia, November, 21, 2004.

23. On November 21, my sister Zenia served as an election observer in Ms. Zhebliak's polling station. Commission members forbade Zenia, along with other local observers, to walk freely throughout the station. Zenia filed a complaint against Ms. Zhebliak for allowing commission members to commit this violation, among others. Unfortunately, even after the rights of the observers had been "reinstated" at the

Our Ukraine representatives who served on electoral commissions were harassed and threatened even more during the second round of elections than they had been during the first. For example, the former head of the electoral commission in polling station #6, an Our Ukraine supporter, was pressured to resign; a Yanukovich representative replaced her. At the same polling station, pro-Yanukovich commission members relegated the greatly outnumbered Our Ukraine representatives to the post of observers and prohibited them from distributing ballots to voters.

During the second round on November 21, one figure who immediately caught my eye in Uzhhorod's polling station #7 was a school director, who was lingering around the voting premises. When I asked him to leave the polling station because he had already voted and had no reason to stay since he was not a member of the electoral commission, he replied that he ran the school where the voting was taking place and had to stay to ensure that voters did not damage school property. The school director neglected to admit, however, that he was an elected SDPU-o official on the city council and by law could not be present on the premises at all. Nonetheless, he greeted voters at the door and, with a firm handshake, a smile, or stern look, "reminded" them for whom to vote. Days before he had instructed the schoolchildren in a homework assignment to write an essay about the candidate for whom their parents would vote. At a dinner on the eve of the elections, Vera Madiar-Novak, a music professor whose children attend the particular school in question, told me that the director had actively encouraged parents to vote for Viktor Yanukovich in the presidential elections.²⁴ The director hinted that such a vote would benefit their children's "progress" in the school.

Transcarpathia's university students were coerced as well. Students from Uzhhorod informed us that they were forced to vote by absentee ballot in polling stations outside the city. Before they cast their ballots, the students had to hold them in such a way that the Yanukovich representative lingering near the ballot boxes could ensure that they voted for the "correct" candidate. Students who did not cooperate were expelled, fined, or given low marks.

Particular segments of the voting public were especially vulnerable to manipulation, and Roma voters are among the poorest and most marginalized members of Transcarpathian society. Roma activists Aladar Adam and Evhenija Navrotska reported that, throughout

the region, Roma passports were taken away for "routine inspection" a few days prior to both the first and second round of elections.²⁵ Third parties submitted these documents to obtain absentee ballots, which were then used to cast votes for Viktor Yanukovich. Many Roma in rural settings were physically harassed and transported to polling stations where they received instructions to cast pre-checked ballots in favor of Yanukovich. In a village a few kilometers from Uzhhorod, a local official attempted to accompany Roma voters into the voting booths, stating that they were illiterate and that he had to help them read the ballot.

Perhaps the most elaborate violation scheme uncovered in Uzhhorod was a vote-rigging system known as a "carousel." An operative outside the polling station paid a voter to bring out a blank ballot. The operative marked the ballot for a particular candidate and gave it to the next voter, who then dropped it in the ballot box and brought back a blank ballot. Such a system was very difficult to identify; in fact, an investigation only began when a voter mistook an observer as the contact person for a local "carousel."

As in Cherkasy, the fear factor was among the more effective forces utilized by pro-government factions during the pre-electoral campaign and during both rounds of the presidential elections. One voter called our observer team "the Ukrainian people's only hope," and an election commission member from the Our Ukraine party pointed out that the presence of international figures in the polling stations was a form of moral support. Seeing international observers gave her the confidence to stand up against the commission members who were breaking election laws.

Working together, my sister Zenia Helbig and I noticed that at numerous polling stations, however, local election observers did not report election violations. When I asked one observer to sign a violation report form as a witness, he declined, stating, "Tomorrow you will leave, but I have to live here." Such a statement implies that the observer, an Our Ukraine supporter, did not believe that Viktor Yushchenko would be pronounced the winner of the second round of elections. The statement also indicates that the observer had been intimidated or feared harassment by those in power. Among the observers who refused to sign my violation report forms, however, were also those who had been paid to look the other way.

Despite the violations my sister and I witnessed as election observers in Uzhhorod, and despite the stronghold that the SDPU-o had had in the region in the past, Viktor Yushchenko won the second round of the

polling station, the commission's boldness intimidated local observers to the point that none felt comfortable monitoring the commission members closely.

24. Personal communication, Vera Madiar-Novak, Uzhhorod, Transcarpathia.

25. Interviews with Aladar Adam and Evhenija Navrotska, editors of the *Romani Yag* newspaper in Uzhhorod, Transcarpathia.

elections in Transcarpathia with 55% of the vote. In the repeat run-off on December 26, 2004, he won the region with a solid 67% of the vote. His margin of victory nationwide was approximately 3 million votes.

Conclusion

When a record number of more than 12,000 international observers walked into polling stations across Ukraine on the morning of December 26, 2004, they encountered an electoral atmosphere marked by significant improvement. After the Ukrainian Supreme Court's dramatic ruling on December 3 that invalidated the November 21 poll, the *Verkhovna Rada* (Supreme Council, Ukraine's Parliament) implemented a number of measures designed to curb future falsification and fraud. Several members of the Ukrainian Central Election Commission were replaced, for example, and territorial and polling station election commissions were restructured as well. Polling station commissions were no longer comprised of thirty or more members; rather, each election commission had twelve members with equal representation afforded to both candidates. Crucial modifications were also made to numerous election laws. Because absentee ballots were so extensively abused in the first and second rounds, the percentage of absentee ballots allowed in the December 26 run-off was reduced from 4% to 0.5% of all ballots cast. All ballots were also imprinted with the registration number of their respective polling stations in order to ensure that voters only cast ballots in the stations where they were registered. New regulations also stated that the results in a particular polling station could be annulled if observers, journalists, or commission members were not allowed entrance into the polling station or prevented from attending commission meetings or the vote count.

The efforts of international and domestic observers were instrumental in bringing world opinion to bear on the Ukrainian presidential elections and highlighting the electoral violations that prompted the *Verkhovna Rada* to adopt these changes. But it was the tremendous will of the people of Ukraine—who came together from all regions of the country to defend the integrity of their vote in a peaceful “Orange Revolution”—that ultimately made the 2004 Ukrainian presidential elections a true victory for democracy.

Rory Finnin is a doctoral student in the Department of Slavic Languages and the Center for Comparative Literature and Society at Columbia University. His primary field of study is the interplay of nationalism, human rights discourse, and literature in Soviet and post-Soviet space, particularly in Ukraine.

Adriana Helbig is a doctoral candidate in Ethnomusicology at Columbia University. Her dissertation, “‘Play for Me Old Gypsy’: Music as Political Resource in the Roma Rights Movement in Ukraine,” is based on fieldwork conducted among Roma communities in Transcarpathia in 2002.

Politics and Orthodoxy in Independent Ukraine

Frank E. Sysyn

Independent Ukraine has faced a momentous conundrum in dealing with Orthodox believers and churches and their aspirations and demands on political authorities. The Ukrainian government has pursued varied policies towards a changing structure of Orthodox bodies. Although independent Ukraine was far from a fully functioning democracy or even on a consistent democratizing trajectory before the Orange Revolution, the new state has certainly been far removed from the Soviet totalitarian model from which it emerged. This paper will explore how political transformation has affected the Orthodox in Ukraine, above all the structures of their churches, and how the Orthodox and their churches have influenced Ukrainian democracy and political life.

The 14,954 Orthodox communities in Ukraine on January 1, 2004, made up a majority (52.2 percent) of all religious communities in the country.¹ In declarations of religious adherence Orthodoxy commanded an imposing percentage of Ukraine's population. In this land where a considerable group had no religious allegiance, approximately 40 to 50 percent of the population considered itself Orthodox in the 1990s.² Polling in recent years reveals that 27.8 percent of the population considers itself members of one of the Orthodox churches, and an additional 53.2 percent as "Orthodox," though the latter figure includes a considerable number of "culturally

Orthodox" atheists and agnostics.³ Therefore, although Ukraine has much greater religious pluralism than other traditionally Orthodox countries such as Georgia, Greece, or Serbia, in part because of its large Catholic and Protestant populations, Orthodoxy constitutes a major presence in the country and its self-image. At the same time, with 47 million people, Ukraine is the second largest traditionally Orthodox country and, although its population is only about a third of Russia's, Ukraine has a larger number of Orthodox communities than does its northern neighbor.⁴

The importance of Orthodoxy within Ukraine and of Ukraine for the Orthodox world explains why the division of Ukraine's believers into three Orthodox churches has had such far-reaching reverberations. In early 2004, 10,384 (9049 in 2001) of the Orthodox communities were part of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC-MP), a body having some elements of autonomy under the Moscow Patriarchate.⁵ The UOC-MP held the allegiance of 69.4 percent of all Orthodox communities, a slight, but steady decline in percentage from 72.2 percent in 1995 and 70.4 percent in 2001. The Moscow Patriarchate, therefore, had almost as many religious communities in Ukraine as in Russia, since the entire patriarchate lists 23,000 parishes in Russia, Ukraine, and all other former

¹ See the press release of the Religious Information Service of Ukraine of April 16, 2004, and its table of "Religious Organizations in Ukraine as of 1 January, 2004," taken here from the newspaper of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada, *The Herald* (Winnipeg) June 1/15, 2004. Statistics for 2004 are from this source.

² See the Sotsis-Gallup poll of February 1998, published in *Den'* on February 26, 1998, cited in Andrew Wilson, *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation* (New Haven-London, 2000), 349, fn. 9, with 45.7 percent answering Orthodox in some form.

³ See Iuryi Chernomoretz, "Sotsial'naia baza ukrainskogo pravoslavia" <http://www.risu.ua/ukr/religion.and.society/chernomorec-sozbaza/p.2>.

⁴ A December 2, 2002, article in the newspaper *Den'* asserted that there were then 11,000 Orthodox parishes in Russia and 15,000 in Ukraine, of which more than 10,000 were part of the Moscow Patriarchate (www.day.kiev.ua). This proportion appears in line with the statistics for 2004 mentioned below.

⁵ Statistics on religious communities in Ukraine, other than those for 2004, unless otherwise indicated come from the tables compiled by A. Zaiarniuk and Y. Komar. I am grateful to Rev. Dr. Borys Gudziak for providing me with copies.

Soviet republics.⁶ Alongside the UOC-MP communities in 2004, there were 3395 communities of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church-Kyiv Patriarchate (UOC-KP), constituting 22.7 percent of all Orthodox communities. The Kyiv Patriarchate was the most rapidly growing Orthodox Church, having increased its parish communities from 2,781 in 2001, or by 22.1 percent as opposed to a 14.8 percent increase for the Moscow Patriarchate.⁷ In contrast, the 1,156 communities of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC), 7.7 percent of the total, had grown a more modest 13.9 percent from 1015 communities in 2001. The breakdown in religious communities is at variance with polls of the population that have consistently shown supporters of the Moscow Patriarchate to be supported by a smaller percentage of believers than its percentage of religious communities would indicate and frequently shown the Kyiv Patriarchate to have a larger number of supporters.⁸

⁶ "Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' na sovremennom etape," on www.mospat.ru/text/history/id/10.html.

⁷ On the rapid growth of the Kyiv Patriarchate, especially in southern and eastern Ukraine, see "Interview with Patriarch Filaret (Denysenko)," conducted on November 16, 2003, and disseminated by the Religious Information Service of Ukraine (www.risu.org.ua/content.php?page_id=162&l=en).

⁸ See the statistics on the Sotsis-Gallup poll mentioned in note 2, revealing for the total population 20.4 percent UOC-KP, 7.5 percent UOC-MP and 1.8 percent UAOC, though with 16 percent just answering Orthodox. A 1997 comprehensive survey discussed by Wilson (pp. 236-37) found that of the 65.7 percent of the population that considered themselves believers, 23.9 percent supported the Moscow Patriarchate, 43 percent the Kyiv Patriarchate, and 4 percent the UAOC. A poll conducted by the Ukrainian Sociology Service on November 5-21, 2003, for the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church revealed that of the 27.8 percent of the population that professed allegiance to a specific Orthodox church, 15.4 percent adhered to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, 11.7 percent to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate, and 0.7 percent to the UAOC. The religious allegiance of the larger group that was simply Orthodox was very amorphous. Chornomorets, "Sotsial'naia baza," pp. 2-3. Possible reasons for the discrepancy of the polls and the number of communities may include that the polls include the large number of non-practicing Orthodox who may lean toward the Kyiv Patriarchate, that Kyiv Patriarchate churches may have larger constituencies, that the disposition of the churches may reflect the clergy's preference and not the laity's, or that local authorities may have preferred the Moscow patriarchate in assigning church buildings and registering communities in many areas of Ukraine.

The distribution of religious communities in Ukraine in general, including Orthodox churches, is subject to great regional differentiation. The western areas annexed by the Soviet Union only during and after World War II have the highest per capita percentage of religious communities and religious practice. The industrial regions of southeast Ukraine have the lowest, as they did in Soviet times, although the difference is diminishing. Thus while in 1989 Lviv oblast in the west had approximately the same number of inhabitants as Luhansk oblast in the southeast (2,727,000 to 2,864,000), in 1992 Lviv oblast had 2,206 religious communities, or 13 times as many as Luhansk oblast's 166.⁹ In 2000 the discrepancy was still 2,541 to 463, or 5.5 times greater. In general, the predominantly Ukrainian-speaking regions of west and central Ukraine have a much higher rate of religious practice and a disproportionate share of Orthodox communities for all three Orthodox churches. Even the Moscow Patriarchate has the majority of its parishes in central and western Ukraine, despite the wave of church openings in southern and eastern Ukraine in the late 1990s.¹⁰

The Soviet Legacy

The relationship between Orthodoxy and the independent Ukrainian state unfolded out of the legacy of Soviet religious policy. That policy prescribed persecution of all religious life, including its virtual decimation in the 1930s, forced secularization of the population, and manipulation and infiltration of those religious institutions allowed by the Soviet government. With the wartime decision to permit the restoration of the patriarchate in the Russian Orthodox church in 1943 and the postwar return to Soviet control of Ukraine and Belarus, where the Germans had permitted churches that had been closed by the Soviets to be re-opened, and the

⁹ Oblast populations are taken from the *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, vol. 3 (Toronto-Buffalo-London, 1993), 201, 234.

¹⁰ In 2000 it had 2,045 parishes in western Ukrainian oblasts (chiefly in Chernivtsi, Transcarpathia, Volyn and Rivne oblasts, with a few in the three Galician oblasts) and 1948 in the three Right Bank oblasts of Vinnytsia, Zhytomyr and Khmel'nyts'kyi). Adding the communities on the Right Bank of Cherkasy and Kyiv oblasts gives it a clear majority with its 8490 communities. Given the higher percentage of religious belief and practice in these regions, the parishes there were likely to be more numerous and vibrant.

annexation of western Ukraine and Belarus, the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) was given a monopoly of control over Eastern Christians. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, founded in 1921, destroyed during the 1930s, and revived in German-occupied territories during World War II, was banned.¹¹ The Uniate or Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) was forcibly dissolved through a sham council in 1946 at which no bishops agreed to attend, and its parishes were turned over to the Russian Orthodox Church. Thus the Soviet state completed the Russian Imperial government's policy of stamping out the Uniate church in lands that it annexed, though at that time the Russian Orthodox Church bore more of the responsibility than it did in the Soviet period.¹² The Soviet government controlled all religious edifices and required registration of church communities. The entire Soviet legacy was one of weakened religious structures, an inequity in its treatment of churches by favoring the Moscow Patriarchate, and a government accustomed to controlling the disposition and actions of religious institutions.

The Soviet government also pursued a policy of treating the formerly Uniate areas of Galicia and Transcarpathia differently than all the other regions of Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia. Throughout the postwar period, even after the church closings in western Ukraine in the 1960s, almost one-quarter of all the functioning parishes of the Moscow Patriarchate in the entire Soviet Union were to be found in formerly predominantly Uniate areas (and over half were in Ukraine).¹³ In 1989, of the 3971 Russian Orthodox communities in Ukraine, 1688 (42.5 percent) were in the three Galician oblasts. With the Transcarpathian oblast, the number reached 2116 (53.3 percent).¹⁴ The Soviet authorities had permitted this

anomaly, in part, because they did not want to drive the population into the arms of the underground UGCC, which had survived more than forty years of repression.

The disproportionate concentration of the Russian Orthodox Church in the traditional Uniate areas explains the alarm with which it reacted to the possibility of glasnost and perestroika extending religious freedom to the Ukrainian Greek Catholics. Quite simply, if the Uniates were to reclaim their former faithful and parishes, the Russian Orthodox Church in the entire Soviet Union would be greatly weakened and its exarchate in Ukraine would be near collapse. This situation meant that when the reforms initiated in Moscow in the mid-1980s reached Ukraine a few years later, the Russian Orthodox Church opposed the organization of civic and political groups in Ukraine espousing reform but really challenging the Soviet totalitarian legacy. These forces that coalesced into Rukh (Popular Movement in Support of Perestroika) demanded a righting of the wrongs of the Soviet regime, including the Soviet destruction of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. In Galicia, the heartland of the movement, Rukh and the newly emerging civil society enjoyed the support of the Ukrainian Greek Catholics, who were emerging from the underground, and of the large number of Galician city dwellers and villagers who saw restoration of the church buildings to the Greek Catholics as a central point in establishing civil liberties.

Initially the Russian Orthodox Church even benefited from the surfacing of the underground Uniates, because the Soviet authorities turned over many closed church buildings to the Russian Orthodox to keep the still illegal Uniates from taking possession of them. That gain was temporary. By 1989, with Soviet controls crumbling, the Uniates repossessed churches throughout the three oblasts. In the summer of 1989 the situation merely worsened for the Russian Orthodox as a Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was resurrected by the declaration of a pastor and parish in Lviv. It seems likely that UAOC grew so quickly, because clergy who did not want their parishes to go Uniate joined it, while its enemies argued that it had been inspired by the KGB for the same purpose. In any event, the Russian Orthodox Church in Galicia was rapidly disintegrating. While the Moscow Patriarchate emphasized the role of force in taking over churches, it avoided the central issue that the Russian Orthodox Church could not compete effectively for the loyalty of a Galician population that viewed Russian Orthodoxy as imposed by the Soviet regime and associated with Russian imperialism. The elections of March 1990 in which the Communists were defeated in Galicia meant that the

¹¹ On the situation of the Orthodox Churches in Ukraine in this period, see my "The Ukrainian Orthodox Question in the USSR," in Serhii Plokyh and Frank E. Sysyn, *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine* (Edmonton and Toronto, 2003), 74-87.

¹² On the abolition of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, see Bohdan Bociurkiw, *The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the Soviet State (1939-1950)* (Edmonton-Toronto, 1996).

¹³ For statistics on the proportion of churches in western Ukraine, see Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, "The Orthodox Church and the Soviet Regime in Ukraine, 1953-1971," *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 14, no. 2 (Summer 1972): 193-94 and 196.

¹⁴ Adding the other three traditionally Orthodox western Ukrainian oblasts, the western Ukrainian total was 2881 or 72.6 percent.

Russian Orthodox Church could no longer depend on the civil authorities. From 1989 to 1992 the communities of the Moscow Patriarchate in Galicia decreased from 1,688 to 457, while Ukrainian Catholic communities increased to 2,441 and Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox to 1,339. The majority of these communities were newly founded, but others represented Russian Orthodox parishes that were matters of dispute between the Ukrainian Catholics and Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox.¹⁵

In contrast to Russia, where the Gorbachev policies of liberalization had offered many new opportunities for the Russian Orthodox Church, they presented a much more mixed bag of losses and opportunities for the church in Ukraine. Indeed, the belated legalization of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church that had so embarrassed the Soviet government internationally had been vehemently opposed by Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi's government in Ukraine and the exarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church, because they realized what an avalanche it would unleash. The reemergence of the UAOC was potentially more dangerous as a church that could compete for Orthodox believers throughout the country. Like the Ukrainian Catholics, the UAOC drew support and a hierarchy, Metropolitan Mstyslav, from the Ukrainian diaspora. Its traditions of martyrdom, conciliarism, autocephaly, and Ukrainianization were in keeping with the tone of the times and offered a model of Orthodoxy very different from that of the Russian Orthodox Church.

The restoration of the UGCC and the UAOC had been accomplished even before the declaration of Ukrainian sovereignty in July 1990. Consequently, the new Ukrainian state had to face an already tense religious situation. In the same way, the Orthodox world had to deal with the declaration of an autocephalous church in Ukraine largely as a movement of clergy and laity undertaken even before an independent Ukrainian state existed. At the same time, the Russian Orthodox Church had found itself greatly weakened and on the side of the old Soviet order during an anti-Soviet and Ukrainian national groundswell that in the late 1980s and early 1990s had tremendous impact in western Ukraine, including Orthodox Volhynia, Kyiv, and among the intelligentsia throughout Ukraine. The national movement did not take deep root in the south and east or the central Ukrainian villages, which with the loss of Galicia were to

be increasingly important to the Russian Orthodox Church.

Two types of democratization challenged the Russian Orthodox Church. The breakdown of the Soviet political monolith had allowed the church's rivals to reemerge in western Ukraine and had brought political groups to influence and local power that favored its religious opponents. At the same time, the rebirth of the UAOC had revived modernizing influences that arose in the Russian Empire just prior to the Revolution.¹⁶ These tendencies advocating conciliar governance and greater influence of the parish clergy and laity were intrinsic to the UAOC tradition, and the church had reemerged through the efforts of these groups and the religious brotherhoods. In June 1990, when the reform movement in Ukraine was in full swing, the UAOC was even able to hold a council in Kyiv in a municipal facility and to declare a patriarchate. The ROC exarchate's being renamed Ukrainian Orthodox in October 1990 and obtaining some measure of autonomy largely represented reaction to events rather than a thought-out and voluntary policy. The UOC-MP did benefit from the new situation in Ukraine in having latitude to form new parishes, and its de facto alliance with the old Soviet elite in central and eastern Ukraine meant that it was handed over church properties, especially if newly forming autocephalous communities tried to claim them. The hierarchs also took part in the electoral process, with Metropolitan Agafangel of Vinnytsia (later of Odesa), elected to the Supreme Rada in 1990, making common cause with the Communists.¹⁷ While the church of the Moscow Patriarchate declined from 6,505 communities in January 1990 to 5,031 on January 1, 1991, because of its losses in Galicia, it was still stronger than it had been in the pre-perestroika period.

The Kravchuk Presidency

The new Ukrainian state that declared its

¹⁵ On this period, see my "The Third Rebirth of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Religious Situation in Ukraine 1989-1991," in Plokhly and Sysyn, *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine*, 88-119.

¹⁶ On the UAOC as a modernizing and reform movement, see Bohdan Bociurkiw, "The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, 1920-1930: A Study in Modernization," in Dennis Dunn, ed., *Religion and Modernization in the Soviet Union* (Boulder, Colo., 1977), 310-47.

¹⁷ On Agafangel (Savin)'s role as leader of the Russian nationalist wing in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, see Ihor Isichenko, "Lektsiia 15. Pravoslavna Tserkva v nezalezhnii Ukraïni: 1991-2002," in his book *Istoriia Khrystovoi tserkvy v Ukraïni: konspekt lektsii dlia studentiv dukhovnykh shkyl*, 2d ed. (Kharkiv, 2003).

independence on August 24, 1991 (and received international recognition after a referendum on December 1, followed by the official dissolution of the Soviet Union) emerged in part as the result of the activities of the Ukrainian national-democratic movement that had driven the political agenda in the republic from 1989. Essential for its creation, however, was the shift to a pro-independence policy on the part of the old Soviet elite and nomenklatura. They recognized the strength of Ukrainian decentralizing sentiments and sought a way out of the chaos after the August coup in Moscow, which resulted in declarations of independence for all the Soviet republics (except in the Baltic region where declarations had been made earlier). The Communist Party secretary for ideology, Leonid Kravchuk, from western Ukrainian Volhynia, underwent this transformation. He convinced a number of Ukraine's old elite to accept their opponents' objective of national independence by winning an election on December 1 for president over his major opponent, the dissident and Rukh leader Viacheslav Chornovil (62 percent to 23 percent).¹⁸

Having embarked on the path of forming a Ukrainian state, Kravchuk sought to use his contacts with Metropolitan Filaret of Kyiv, exarch of the UOC-MP, to give Ukraine the full attributes of statehood, including an autocephalous church, and thereby steal the march from the UAOC, which, like the UGCC, was associated with the national democratic faction.¹⁹ Kravchuk overestimated the power of Filaret and the new Ukrainian state against the entrenched position of the Moscow Patriarchate. Although Filaret carried a majority of his bishops in a request for autocephaly in November 1991, a Moscow synod in April 1992 refused the request, forced his resignation, and authorized an episcopal synod in Ukraine in May to elect a successor, who was in fact a hierarch from Russia (Metropolitan Volodymyr of Novocherkask).²⁰ Facing the fiasco of the failed attempt to secure autocephaly, the Kravchuk government and parliamentary deputies from the national democratic camp, intent on removing Ukraine's Orthodox from

Moscow's control, orchestrated a union of the UAOC with Metropolitan Filaret, the few bishops and the clergy that adhered to him, creating the Ukrainian Orthodox Church-Kyiv Patriarchate in June 1992.²¹ Patriarch Mstyslav of the UAOC had not been consulted in the union. He was pronounced head of the church, but refused to approve fully this union with his former opponent, now deposed by the Moscow Patriarchate. Reservations about Metropolitan Filaret explain why the new church elected the former dissident priest Volodymyr Romaniuk as patriarch on Patriarch Mstyslav's death in June 1993 and why a sizable faction of the UAOC rejected the union and restored their church by electing in September their own patriarch, Dmytrii (Yarema). The UAOC also saw the UOC-KP as opposed to many of the conciliar elements of its program and in favor of the form of governance that Metropolitan Filaret and the bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church had practised. The UAOC had no influence with the Kyiv government, which saw the UOC-KP as an incipient state church and favored that church over the UOC-MP throughout 1992-93. The Kravchuk government had badly calculated the strength of the Moscow Patriarchate, above all, to remain the only church recognized by the Orthodox world combatting the UOC-KP's and the Ukrainian state's requests to the Constantinople Patriarchate to recognize the autocephaly. It also overestimated its own influence in the Ukrainian provinces among local former Soviet elites, especially in times of economic decline, fully apparent by 1993.

By the 1994 presidential election, the failure of the Kravchuk policy to obtain a single autocephalous church for the new state was apparent. The Moscow Patriarchate had remained the largest Orthodox Church, even if its growth was slow in this period (from 5,473 communities on January 1, 1992, to 5,998 on January 1, 1994). The Kyiv Patriarchate's 1,932 communities represented a considerable church, but it did not rival the Moscow Patriarchate's size and already had seen 289 communities return to the UAOC and legally register. The Ukrainian state faced presidential elections with Orthodox religious divides increasingly politicized just at the time that language issues and attitudes toward Russia had heated up. The campaign of Leonid Kravchuk against Leonid Kuchma took on the rhetoric of a decision between those who supported full Ukrainian independence, integration into Europe, and recognition of Ukrainian as the state

¹⁸ See Wilson, *The Ukrainians*, 206.

¹⁹ See Serhii Plokyh, "Kyiv vs. Moscow: The Autocephalous Movement in Independent Ukraine," in Plokyh and Sysyn, *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine*, 136-45.

²⁰ See my "The Russian Sobor and the Rejection of Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephaly," in Plokyh and Sysyn, *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine*, 120-27.

²¹ See Serhii Plokyh, "Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephaly and Metropolitan Filaret," in Plokyh and Sysyn, *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine*, 128-35.

language versus those who wished for a closer relationship (and in some cases integration) with Russia and official status for the Russian language. Ukraine divided regionally, with Kravchuk, now fully supported by his former national democratic political foes, gaining 94.80 percent of the vote in Ternopil oblast and 93.77 percent in Lviv oblast in the west and Kuchma obtaining 89.70 percent in the Crimea and 88.00 percent in Luhansk oblast in the east and south. The churches had defined political interests in supporting one or the other of the candidates, and the loss by Kravchuk (45 percent to 52 percent) weakened the position of the Kyiv Patriarchate and strengthened the position of the Moscow Patriarchate.²² How much the churches influenced the elections is more difficult to ascertain, with the most likely possibility being that of the UOC-MP influencing an undecided electorate in the Right Bank Central Ukraine, where the relatively dense network of Moscow Patriarchal churches may have elevated the Kuchma vote somewhat in territories with a rather passive rural electorate. More importantly, the various Orthodox churches merely served to deepen the chasm among Ukraine's population and elections were now essential in deciding the churches' situations.

The Kuchma Years

The Kuchma election appeared to represent a full victory for the east and south of Ukraine, the Russian-speaking population, and the Moscow Patriarchate. In dealing with regional and linguistic issues, the new president soon showed that electioneering was one thing but governing was another. In order to carry on his programs and to serve the interests of state-building, the government turned for support to central and western Ukraine and to Ukrainian-speakers, not least because of the power of the Communists and the hard line left in the south and east, which still included a large segment of the population opposed to Ukrainian statehood and all reforms. In contrast, the Moscow Patriarchate seemed to emerge strengthened, since the Ministry of Religious Affairs that the Kravchuk government had used to support the Kyiv Patriarchate was abolished and the church's allies in local administrations in the large areas of the south, east, and even the center could work to its advantage in turning over church buildings and registering

congregations now that Kyiv's support for the Kyiv Patriarchate had been removed. In popular belief, Kuchma's Russian wife Liudmila was portrayed as an ardent adherent of the Moscow Patriarchate.

In contrast, at a time when the state became antagonistic, the Kyiv Patriarchate faced a loss of parishes, largely in Galicia, to the UAOC (in 1994 the UAOC grew from 289 to 612 communities, while the KP decreased from 1932 to 1753). In 1995, religious affairs in Ukraine reached a boiling point. The death of Patriarch Volodymyr (Romaniuk) in a manner that many considered suspiciously convenient for Metropolitan Filaret was followed by a funeral that the Ukrainian state largely ignored. Metropolitan Filaret insisted on the right to bury the patriarch on the territory of the St. Sophia Cathedral, the mother church of Ukraine still held by the state as a museum, in part because of the contentious claimants to the cathedral. The funeral procession, escorted by some paramilitary units of the radical right but which also included deputies to the parliament, was brutally attacked by OMON police, events which came to be known as Black Tuesday (July 18, 1995). Up until this point, the entire transition to independence and the transfer of power in Ukraine had been peaceful (especially when viewed in conjunction with Yeltsin's attack on the Russian parliament). The bloodshed, therefore, had tremendous resonance in Ukraine, threatening Kuchma with loss of support in Ukrainian patriotic circles. While Metropolitan Filaret had transgressed the line of legality, he had positioned his church as a patriotic body and had delivered a firm message that the government's tilt toward the Moscow Patriarchate might be costly. He also positioned himself for assuming the post of patriarch in October, which was a difficult step in light of the government's antagonism to the metropolitan and the opposition by the former UAOC groups to this authoritarian church leader who was seen as tainted by his past as an exponent of the ROC. Government policies and reaction against Filaret's election continued to undermine the KP's structure as it declined to 1332 communities by the end of 1995 and the UAOC grew to 1209.²³ Nevertheless, the Kyiv Patriarchate showed that not only could it continue without government support, but it could also resist a hostile government.

The government found the alienation of the national democratic camp to be too costly, especially at a time

²² "7/10/94 Presidential Election Results in Ukraine," on www.brama.com/ua-gov/el-94pre.html.

²³ On church affairs in this period, see, Serhii Plokhyy, "Church, State, and Nation in Ukraine," in Plokhyy and Sysyn, *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine*, 166-98.

when it needed its support for enacting a new Ukrainian constitution. It therefore moved toward a more even-handed approach in church affairs in 1996. The adoption of the Ukrainian constitution mandating separation of church from state represented repudiation by the government of the Soviet legacy of interference in church affairs and the independent Ukrainian government's attempts to regulate Orthodox affairs by favoring one church over another. The government initially followed a policy of encouraging tolerance among the Orthodox groups, partially by encouraging a declaration by religious leaders on peaceful resolution of conflicts in 1997 and by issuing a statement, condemning Soviet persecution of churches and promising the return of religious institutions before the 1999 presidential elections. Property controversies, especially over the holy sites in Kyiv, continued to be heated and to try the policy of even-handedness. The shift of the government to a more neutral position was also motivated by the decision of the UOC-MP in 1996 to withdraw the request to the Moscow Patriarchate for autocephaly made in 1991. This decision placed the Ukrainian government in the awkward position of seeing no end to the division and turmoil among Orthodox believers. In many circles the rejection of autocephaly as a goal was seen as reluctance by some in the UOC-MP and of the Moscow Patriarchate to accept Ukraine as an independent country or to desist from pressure for a new Slavic union. Certainly the existence of factions within the UOC-MP—in which Metropolitan Agafangel of Odesa, an ethnic Russian, played a major role—that denied even the existence of a Ukrainian nation and culture and organized Russian nationalist groups caused concern to the Ukrainian state.²⁴ The ardent advocacy by the Communist Party of Ukraine for the UOC-MP, including by its head Petro Symonenko, Kuchma's opponent in the run-off election for the presidency in 1999, also drove a wedge between the presidential administration and the UOC-MP. The anathemization of Patriarch Filaret by the Moscow synod in 1997 undermined the government's policy of building tolerance, and excesses such as the physical attacks by followers of the Moscow Patriarchate when Patriarch Filaret visited Donetsk oblast on April 30, 1999, placed the UOC-MP on the wrong side of the issue of public order and blunted its charges that during the Kravchuk years the Kyiv Patriarchate had used force against it.²⁵

²⁴ See Isichenko, "Lektsiia 15. Pravoslavna Tserkva v nezalezhnii Ukraini: 1991-2002," in his book *Istoriia Khrystovoi tserkvy v Ukraini*.

²⁵ See Roman Woronowycz, "Patriarch Filaret attacked by faithful of

Above all, the increasing claims by the UOC-MP to preferential treatment by the government, similar to that which the Moscow Patriarchate received in Russia and Belarus, including even criticism of the president for attending Kyiv Patriarchate services in addition to Moscow Patriarchate services, placed the Ukrainian government in a difficult situation.²⁶

By the late 1990s, the government found its policy of even-handedness was not calming the Orthodox divisions and returned to a more activist policy. The increasing interest of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in Ukrainian church affairs was signalled in part by its subordination of the Ukrainian Orthodox churches in the diaspora to its jurisdiction and its negotiation through them with the UAOC, which had not elected a new patriarch at the death of Patriarch Dmytrii in early 2000.²⁷ Events such as the meeting of autocephalous and autonomous churches in Jerusalem, in which presidents and premiers of "Orthodox lands" were in attendance, placed the Ukrainian president and the state in an awkward position, since only the UOC-MP was represented, and not fully as a church but as part of the ROC.

Throughout 2000, the president made official announcements on the need for one Orthodox Church and supported unity talks between the UOC-KP and UAOC with participation of the Constantinople Patriarchate. The Ukrainian government's policy collided with the increasing intervention by the Moscow Patriarchate and the Russian government in Orthodox Church affairs in Ukraine. Not only did the Moscow Patriarchate refuse to grant a request for full autonomy from the UOC-MP in 2000, but President Vladimir Putin and Patriarch Aleksei began to sound themes of East Slavic unity more consistently. The refusal of the UOC-MP to agree to a visit by Pope John Paul to Ukraine in 2001, which did take place despite this obstruction, and the statement of the Russian ambassador to Kyiv Viktor Chernomyrdin that the visit was ill-advised challenged the Ukrainian government and permitted Patriarch Filaret and the UAOC to point to their tolerant position toward other religious groups in contrast to the UOC-MP's

revival Church during visit to Mariupol," *Ukrainian Weekly* 67, no. 19 (May 19, 1999).

²⁶ See Plokyh, "Church, Nation, and State," 194.

²⁷ For the situation in the UAOC, see *Diiannia pomisnoho soboru Ukrain's'koï avtokefal'noi pravoslavnoi tserkvy Kyïv, 14-15 veresnia 2000 roku* (Kyiv, 2000).

intransigence.²⁸ By the end of 2001, the Ukrainian government and the head of the State Committee for Religious Affairs, Viktor Bondarenko, were active participants in discussion between the Moscow and Constantinople patriarchates about the church situation in Ukraine, which were reported to center on the acceptance of two autonomous churches, the UOC-MP under the Moscow Patriarchate and the UAOC under the Constantinople Patriarchate. These discussions drew sharp criticism of the government by Patriarch Filaret as abandonment of the principle of autocephaly as well as an obvious attempt to undermine the UOC-KP.²⁹ Though the government denied such a plan was its policy, the increasing strength of Russia in Ukrainian internal affairs under Putin and the weakened position of Kuchma after the Gongadze affair may explain this new tilt. The government was also complicit in undermining contacts of the UAOC with Constantinople through the intermediacy of the hierarchy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States. A combination of the government's desire to limit the influence of the Ukrainian hierarchy in the West and the plan of the Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (United) to use the church for its own political goals resulted in a virtual coup d'état in the church in early 2001 by Metropolitan Mefodii and a split in the UAOC.³⁰

The parliamentary elections in the spring of 2002 in which the forces of the opposition did well ensured that unlike in Russia, where President Putin was asserting increasing control over civil society and the parliament, while allying with the Russian Orthodox Church, Ukraine would remain a more pluralistic society in which institutions such as the churches would have to be courted. The complexity of the situation was evident in that the two largest blocs of the opposition were Our Ukraine, which largely favored the independent Ukrainian Orthodox churches, and the Communist Party, the supporter of the Moscow Patriarchate. The degree to which politicians were now courting and even subverting churches was apparent in Metropolitan Mefodii's support of the Social

Democratic Party (United) in the elections and his later condemnation of the campaign for "Ukraine without Kuchma" in the fall.³¹

²⁸ On the papal visit, see Gerd Stricker, "On a Delicate Mission: Pope John Paul II in Ukraine," *Religion, State and Society* 29, no. 3 (2001):215-25.

²⁹ See Jan Maksymiuk, "Kyiv Patriarch Warns against Liquidation of Independent Church," *The Ukrainian Weekly* (2 December 2001), 2.

³⁰ See the "Khronolohichna tablytsia" at the end of Isichenko, "Lektsiia 15. Pravoslavna Tserkva v nezalezhnii Ukraïni: 1991-2002," in his book *Istoriia Khrystovoi tserkvy v Ukraïni*.

³¹ See the "Khronolohichna tablytsia" at the end of Isichenko, "Lektsiia 15. Pravoslavna Tserkva v nezalezhnii Ukraïni: 1991-2002," in his book *Istoriia Khrystovoi tserkvy v Ukraïni*.

The 2004 Election and the Orange Revolution

As Kuchma and his regime faced criminal allegations over the Gongadze affair and themselves became subject to opprobrium from much of the international community, government forces and allied oligarchs mounted an all-out campaign to stop Viktor Yushchenko and Our Ukraine from winning the presidential elections in the fall of 2004. After failing to carry out a political reform that would have shifted powers to the parliament, they concentrated on engineering the election of Premier Viktor Yanukovich as president. Determined to elect their candidate come what may, they increasingly undermined the democratic processes of Ukraine. Although elections and contending political groups were more significant in Ukraine than in Russia and Belarus, the decline of freedom of the press and increased pressure on all groups who challenged the government was dramatic. Still the undecided nature of the upcoming election and the significance of religious leaders as figures accorded trust ensured that political factions in Ukraine paid attention to the Orthodox churches and that the religious leaders addressed the issue of the upcoming elections.³² Therefore, Patriarch Filaret's statement that concern for Ukrainian independence is intrinsic to the UOC-KP and that the believers of the church naturally support those politicians who support the church may be seen as staking out the church's stance in the election. Although it expressed the hope that Yanukovich would express such support, it commented on the support already demonstrated by Yushchenko. In contrast, the spokesman for the UOC-MP Archbishop Mitrofan declared that the church would not take part in political agitation, but pointed out the help that Viktor Yanukovich has rendered the church in Donetsk oblast. Meanwhile, statements issued by Patriarch Aleksii to a Slavic council held in Zaporizhzhia praising the Pereiaslav Agreement of 1654 made clear where he wanted his followers to stand on the Russia or Europe issue that underlay the Ukrainian election.³³

Political advisers and spin doctors were well aware of how playing on the religious divides of the Orthodox

³² On the political and church leaders' statements, see "Tserkvi na starte prezidentskoi kampanii v Ukraine," in the internet journal *Religiia i obshchestvo* No. 39 (2004) (vloz@yandex.ru).

³³ See the protest document (unpublished) by F.H. Turchenko, "Sobor ilizii," disseminated after the events of May 17-19, 2004.

might influence the voters. A Russian advisers' plan from 2003, when a run by Kuchma was still possible, surfaced that urged organizing provocations between followers of the Kyiv Patriarchate and Moscow Patriarchate in order to firm up support for Kuchma.³⁴ After the decision was made by the presidential administration and its allies to coalesce around Yanukovich in the stop Yushchenko campaign, religious questions came increasingly to the fore in the search for wedge issues to build support for a candidate who had numerous personal drawbacks, including criminal convictions for violent crimes. Yanukovich increasingly posed as the candidate of the east and south of the country and a proponent of Russian as a state language and closer ties with Russia. All these issues resonated with much of the leadership of the UOC-MP and its constituency. Yanukovich had close relations with clergy in Donetsk oblast and used them to cast himself as the "Orthodox candidate" and to use the structures of the church in his political campaigns.³⁵ The hierarchs of the UOC-MP and much of the clergy increasingly became advocates of the Yanukovich candidacy by passing out religious literature and holy pictures endorsing Yanukovich and agitating their faithful to support him.³⁶ When Metropolitan Volodymyr of the UOC-MP met with Yanukovich, he blessed him as an Orthodox person worthy of heading the state, and when he later met with Yushchenko, who had been a patron of the UOC-MP, he blessed him but then announced that this was a different type, a personal blessing.³⁷ Other hierarchs took an even more active role. The Metropolitan of Donetsk, Ilarion, called Yanukovich an Orthodox president and Yushchenko a servant of Satan.³⁸

³⁴ See "Tretii termin Kuchmy. Iak tse povinno bulo buty," in *Ukrains'ka pravda*, June 25, 2004 (www.pravda.com.ua).

³⁵ On the piety of Yanukovich, see Tetiana Nikoaienko, "Chy molyvsia za Ianukovycha?" *Ukrains'ka pravda*, 11.11.2004, 21:15 (<http://www2.pravda.com.ua/archive/2004/november/11/5.shtml>)

³⁶ See Serhii Harmash, "Resprotekyva dvokh turiv vyboriv-2004 u Donbasi" <http://www.maidan.org.ua/static/mai/1103719306.html> for a discussion of the political agitation of priests in the Donbas and the distribution of images of the Archangel Michael and prayers for Yanukovich.

³⁷ "Hlava UPTS(MP)'na prezidentstvo blahoslovyy v. Ianukovycha, a V. Iushchenka lyshe iak blahoslovliaie usikh viruiuchykh liudei," 10.11.2004 RISU-UOC MP: Election 2004, [http://www.risu.or.ua/ukr/news/hot theme/vybory2004/](http://www.risu.or.ua/ukr/news/hot%20theme/vybory2004/)

³⁸ "Metropolit Donets'kyi UPTS(MP) nazvav V. Ianukovycha 'pravoslavnym prezidentom', a V. Iushchenka-'sluhouiu satana'," 16.11.2004 RISU-UOC MP: Election 2004,

Metropolitan Agafangel of Odesa actively agitated for voting for Yanukovich, while the bishop of Kirovhrad, Panteleimon, announced his apparitions of the Mother of God predicting a Yanukovich victory.³⁹ In some cases, the hierarchy's pressure on the clergy to work for Yanukovich was so high that a priest in Chernihiv was dismissed for resisting.⁴⁰ Priests broke the law not only by using religious institutions for political propaganda, but also by continuing political activity in the last days before the election when it was banned. Even after the second round of voting and the emergence of the Maidan protesting electoral fraud, monks of the Kyiv Caves Monastery organized processions against the pro-Yushchenko demonstrators. On December 27, 2004, after the Yushchenko victory in the election was certain, Patriarch Aleksii thanked Cossack formations in Ukraine for guarding Orthodox holy places, an action he saw as especially needed in view of the Yushchenko victory.⁴¹

The engagement of the UOC-MP on the Yanukovich side called forth negative reactions from its own faithful. In the west and center of Ukraine, where the majority of its parishes were located, anti-Yanukovich and pro-Yushchenko sentiments were very strong with all probability also among the faithful of the Moscow Patriarchate. The church in some cases antagonized its own faithful and in others compromised them before their fellow citizens.⁴² Groups of youth and clergy protested the political activity of their church. A group of clergy and laity went as far as asking that they be taken under the protection of the patriarch of Constantinople in order to be disassociated from the political activity of their church.⁴³

[http://www.risu.or.ua/ukr/news/hot theme/vybory2004/](http://www.risu.or.ua/ukr/news/hot%20theme/vybory2004/)

³⁹ See, "UPTS(MP) v Odesi pidtrymaie V. Ianukovycha" 10.09.2004 in RISU-UOC MP: Election 2004,

[http://www.risu.or.ua/ukr/news/hot theme/vybory2004/](http://www.risu.or.ua/ukr/news/hot%20theme/vybory2004/) and "Za Ianukovycha zmusyly ahituvaty Bozhu Matir," 22.12.2004. <http://www.maidan.org.static.news/1103735196.html>

⁴⁰ See the interview with Protoierei Serhii Ivanenko-Kolenda, "Oni govoriat, im nel'zia risikovat', potomu chto u nikh est' dom..." <http://maidan.org/static/mai/1103130442.html>

⁴¹ "Russian Orthodox Patriarch Asks Cossack Army of Ukraine to Protect Church," <http://www.risu.org.ua/eng/news/article:4215/>

⁴² See Andrei Iurash, "Revoliutsiia i Tserkov'," *Religiia i obshchestvo* 43 (2004) internet version of the journal *Liudyna i svit*.

⁴³ "Hrupa virnykh UPTS (MP) prosyt' Vselens'koho Patriarkha vrehuliuvaty relihiinu sytuatsiiu v Ukraini," 29.12.2004 RISU-UOC MP: Election 2004, [http://www.risu.or.ua/ukr/news/hot theme/vybory2004/](http://www.risu.or.ua/ukr/news/hot%20theme/vybory2004/)

With the triumph of the Orange Revolution, the position of the UOC-MP was extremely difficult, because it had engaged itself so actively against the new regime and had lost all claims to political neutrality. In contrast, the Kyiv Patriarchate had come through the electoral process more successfully. Obviously a Yanukovich government would have followed policies detrimental to the church, while a Yushchenko government could be expected to be at least neutral in church affairs and to follow a policy on national independence, relations with Russia, and Ukrainian language that would be in line with that of the UOC-KP. Although there had been some accusations against support for Yushchenko in parishes of the UOC-KP, the hierarchy and clergy on the UOC-KP had been much more muted in showing any political support than those of the UOC-MP had been, not least because a Yanukovich victory seemed likely and the political authorities in most regions initially supported Yanukovich. Therefore Patriarch Filaret had joined other confessions in Ukraine in calling for fairness of the elections, and only after the fraudulent second round and massive demonstrations at the Maidan came to support Yushchenko as the duly elected president.⁴⁴ The splintered UAOC had little political significance in the elections. The connection of Metropolitan Mefodii with the Social Democrat Party (United) placed the church in Western Ukraine on the side of Yanukovich, though the church had little impact in a region so pro-Yushchenko. The faction dominant in the East under Archbishop Ihor followed a policy similar to that of the Kyiv Patriarchate. In contrast to the Moscow patriarch who clearly favored Yanukovich, Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople had come out with two messages supporting democratic processes in Ukraine. In his second message that greeted Yushchenko with his electoral victory, the Patriarch offered his services in healing schisms among Orthodox believers in Ukraine.⁴⁵

Orthodoxy was politicized and the churches, above all the Moscow Patriarchate, took part in electoral politics during the elections in late 2004 to a much greater degree than they had ever done before. Unquestionably Yanukovich gained considerable advantage from the

⁴⁴ On Patriarch Filaret's statements in the early part of the elections and the position of the UAOC, see Kateryna Shchotkina, "Mandat nebesnyi," *Dzerkalo tyzhnia*, no. 37, 18-24 September 2004 and Oleksandr Sahan, "Tserkvy obyraiut' prezidenta," 18.10.2004. RISU-UOC MP: Election 2004, [http://www.risu.or.ua/ukr/news/hot theme/vybory2004/](http://www.risu.or.ua/ukr/news/hot%20theme/vybory2004/)

⁴⁵ Klara Gudzyk, "A Place in the Hierarchy," <http://www.day.kiev.ua/130700/>

support of the UOC-MP, and he and the new opposition in Ukraine will turn to the church again for support. Yushchenko benefited from the refusal of the UOC-KP and part of the UAOC to support the government candidate and their joining the protests for democracy and against fraud after the second round of the elections. Although Yushchenko consistently declared after the elections that the state should not determine religious issues, the new Ukrainian government has to face the reality that a major Orthodox church tied to a center in Russia had campaigned against it. On the other hand, the UOC-MP had to deal with the consequences of its political choices and loss, both among its constituency and in determining relations with the state.

How then have the Ukrainian state and church affected each other in the partial democratization process in Ukraine? Neutrality in Orthodox affairs is, in fact, an impossible goal for the Ukrainian central or regional governments as long as there are church buildings it controls or other public buildings that the churches seek to obtain. At the same time, the concept of Ukraine as an Orthodox land and the claims of three Orthodox churches (as well as of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church) to be guardians of the national patrimony make it impossible for any Ukrainian government to divorce itself from religious issues. In Russia the public role of the patriarch and the attendance of the president and members of the government at holiday services of the ROC are easily accepted as fitting. In Ukraine similar functionalities must carefully plot each step just as the state media must plan its broadcast of various services.

In addition, the history of granting autocephaly in predominantly Orthodox lands has involved state support and in the case of the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church in 1924 was even orchestrated by a state in which the Orthodox were a minority. The importance of Orthodox allegiance to states that had emerged from the USSR was demonstrated by the Estonian state, which saw the revival of the pre-World War II autonomous Orthodox Church under Constantinople replacing the Soviet legacy of all Orthodox being under the Moscow Patriarchate as a matter of state sovereignty. Hence the contacts of the Kuchma government with Constantinople and the president's expressions of hopes for Orthodox unity were a form of state activism that has a considerable tradition. In general, the churches have argued against state intervention when it would oppose their interests, as the MP has demonstrated in its objections to the Ukrainian state's actions on autocephaly and unity issues. On the other hand, the Orthodox churches still make claims to special rights in an Orthodox land. The Ukrainian

Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate has held up Russia as an example of what its own relations should be with the Ukrainian state.⁴⁶

How then has Orthodoxy influenced the political transformation in Ukraine? Although the Orthodox leaders conceive of Ukraine as an Orthodox land and the Orthodox hierarchs are given symbolic precedence by government officials, even in matters such as army chaplaincies, the Orthodox have not been able to assume the leading position that the church has in Russia, Georgia or Romania or that the Catholic church has in Poland. In part this situation results from the greater activity of non-Orthodox Christian groups, especially the existence of a Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church in Galicia and Transcarpathia that also claims the mantle of a traditional national faith and because of the very active Protestant groups, missionizing in the south and east. Just as important has been the split among the Orthodox groups and their varied stance on political and national agendas, above all the ambivalence to hostility in some quarters of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Moscow Patriarchate, to Ukrainian independence and Ukrainian language and culture (especially in the south and east).

As a result, the Orthodox have not been able to take an authoritative position in Ukraine commensurate with their large numbers and organizational network. This situation has strengthened religious pluralism in Ukrainian political life. On the other hand, the Orthodox churches have turned to political leaders and the political process in order to further their own jurisdictions' interests, thereby deepening cleavages among Ukrainian political groups and interjecting church affairs into the political process. This process has not resulted in the formation of significant religious parties in Ukraine, but it has identified religious allegiance with certain political orientations. Given that the parties and churches already have linguistic-cultural and regional colorings, the religious factor only increases the divides in a fractious Ukrainian political life. The progressive distribution of church buildings somewhat lessens the political jockeying of the church groups, but complaints continue over whether the distribution has occurred in an equitable manner and the continued control by government of edifices that could be used for churches, especially in the south and east where surviving church buildings are few, keeps the pot boiling. As the central administrations of the

⁴⁶ See the Itar Tass article of April 9, 2004 "Some Ukraine Politicians Create Difficulties for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church," reproduced on UR-2004, #58 April 12.

Orthodox churches and the parishes control great revenues and property and economic rights they also have reason to maintain political and administrative allies and political alliances.

The breakdown of the Soviet system and the establishment of a semi-democratic system in Ukraine with multi-foci of power and elements of civil society has permitted the breakdown of the enforced unity of Orthodox believers and the surfacing of contending Orthodox traditions. Just as the state had to deal with the Soviet legacy, the Russian Orthodox Church had to deal with these traditions as well as the reemergence of the early twentieth-century questions of Ukrainian autocephaly, Ukrainization, and conciliarism. The radically divergent views that Orthodox clergy and laity held on these questions and the fact that they had surfaced and been debated before and had been kept alive by the religious institutions of the Ukrainian diaspora meant that positions were staked out and the church split even before Ukrainian independence. For the UAOC and the UOC-KP this has left the primary question recognition by the Orthodox Oecumene, apparently advanced somewhat in the last few years through contacts with the Constantinople Patriarchate, as well as the question of unity, despite the differing modes of church governance in the UAOC and the UOC-KP. In contrast, the UOC-MP still finds these questions unresolved as well as the attitude of the church on Ukraine's political status and orientation and on national-cultural issues. In many ways, the defection of the UAOC and UOC-KP and of the many believers who went over to the UGCC has diminished the group within the UOC-MP that advocates autocephaly and Ukrainization. The losses have in some ways made the church suspicious of any discussion and more dependent on the Moscow Patriarchate (hence the withdrawal of the autocephaly request), though the various regional and national constituencies of the UOC-MP ensure that differing views are held within the church.

In no country that emerged from the former Soviet bloc did the state and Orthodox church face so many explosive and divisive issues as in Ukraine. The learning process for the government and the religious leaders has been a difficult one. The adoption of Western models, in particular American ones, was impossible, given the Soviet legacy and the Orthodox tradition. Even today the state does not view the division of the Orthodox as conducive to social order and the tendency to see autocephaly as an attribute of an independent country is strong, in part because those who wish a renewed Slavic union reject it. Political, linguistic and cultural groups have all turned to the Orthodox churches as institutional

sources of support or an arena for propagating their agenda. Though the three churches have defined constituencies, groups from Russian nationalist to Ukrainian autocephalists in the UOC-MP create opposing pressures. Yet in the last decade the state and Orthodox churches have dealt with a limited democratization and the development of contending political groups. The issues of state- and nation-building have intertwined with Orthodox affairs in forming independent Ukraine. The new government in Ukraine will have to deal with a situation in which the Orthodox issue has moved to the fore in political life just as the question of the situation of Orthodoxy in Ukraine has assumed a higher profile in international Orthodox circles. Whether a stable, more democratic Ukraine will emerge from the Orange Revolution is still uncertain. What is certain is that a more democratic Ukraine would pose new opportunities and challenges for the Orthodox churches.

Frank E. Sysyn is the Director of the Peter Jacyk Center for Ukrainian Historical Research, University of Alberta. Professor Sysyn was named the Jacyk Visiting Professor of Ukrainian Studies at the Harriman Institute for the spring 2004 semester. Sysyn's recent publications include *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine*, co-authored with Serhii Plokyh, and *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: Historian and National Awakener*, both published in 2003. He is co-editor of *Culture, Nation and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter* (2003) and editor-in-chief of the English translation of Hrushevsky's multivolume *History of Ukraine-Rus'*.

Facing Ukraine's Russian Legacy: Politics and History in the Late Kuchma Era

Zenon E. Kohut

Upon achieving independence, Ukrainians had to face a legacy of over 300 years of Russian rule over parts of Ukraine. The most difficult question to resolve was the degree of distinctiveness of Ukrainians in the wake of the long-standing and officially promulgated Russian-Ukrainian unity doctrine. This doctrine posited a fundamental historical, linguistic, cultural and even spiritual unity between Russia and Ukraine. One of the pillars of the unity doctrine was a specific interpretation of a historical event that occurred in the town of Pereiaslav in January 1654. At that time Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky and the Ukrainian Cossack council recognized the suzerainty of the Muscovite tsar. While historians interpreted this event in many ways, Pereiaslav as *myth* has become much more important than the actual event. To some extent, attitudes towards Pereiaslav can be used as a barometer of the type of identities that exist in Ukraine today.

The Pereiaslav myth asserted that the same nation had been split by the Mongol invasion and subsequent Lithuanian/Polish rule and was “reunited” in Pereiaslav. While enjoying currency in imperial Russia, this myth was thoroughly elaborated by the Soviets, culminating in the celebration of the 300th anniversary in 1954.¹ The main postulates of the Pereiaslav myth were the following:

1. Ukrainians were threatened with national annihilation under the yoke of Poland and Catholicism.
2. Ukrainians sought to overthrow this yoke and to reunite with their Russian brethren.
3. Russians benevolently provided the needed assistance, thus saving the Ukrainian people from complete destruction.

¹ Ivan L. Rudnytsky, “Pereiaslav: History and Myth,” in John Basarab, *Pereiaslav: A Historiographical Study* (Edmonton: The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies; The University of Alberta, 1982), xi; Serhii Plokhyy, “The Ghosts of Pereiaslav: Russo-Ukrainian Historical Debates in the Post-Soviet Era,” *Europe-Asia Studies*, vol. 53, № 3 (July 24, 2001), 489-505 (on page 489).

Other notions that supported these postulates included the following:

1. Russians represented the “elder brothers” who were to protect and guide the Ukrainian “younger brother.”
2. the idea of Orthodox Pan-Slavism—the common faith.
3. an almost mystical appeal to blood relations—*yedynokrovni*.
4. the idea of irreversibility—having chosen reunion, nothing can ever separate the two again.
5. the Russian civilizing mission, i.e., only through Russia is the way open to progress and civilization.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union formally codified these notions in 1954 by defining the Pereiaslav agreement as a permanent voluntary reunion of two fraternal peoples—a mythology that remained compulsory until the collapse of the Soviet Union.² These concepts were incorporated not only in histories and publicist works, but were also included in theater, opera, and paintings—all produced to commemorate the official celebrations. For example, M. I. Khmelko painted a monumental mural, “Forever with the Russian People: The Pereiaslav Rada of January 8, 1654.”³

While reviled in the Diaspora, the Pereiaslav myth remained compulsory in Ukraine virtually until the break-up of the Soviet Union. The only challenge to it came from Mykhailo Braichevsky’s “Unification or Reunification?” which was circulated in the form of *samizdat* in the 1960s. Braichevsky, who criticized the official mythology from a Marxist position, ridiculed the whole idea of “reunion,” stating that Ukrainians and Russians were separate peoples in separate states

²John Basarab, *Pereiaslav: A Historiographical Study* (Edmonton: The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1982), 179-180.

³This mural was painted in 1951 and often used as an illustration in textbooks and reproduced in art collections, etc.

that had never constituted a whole. Braichevsky did see a “unification,” but not of peoples, rather of ruling classes which continued to rule over and exploit the masses. He negated the idea of a civilizing mission, instead viewing the Khmelnytsky Uprising as part of the construction of a bourgeois Ukrainian nation.⁴

The further deconstruction of the Pereiaslav myth by Ukrainian historians came in the 1990s (starting just prior to independence). The most dominant trend was the construction of a Ukrainian national paradigm. These historians denied the notion of “reunion” or Russia’s civilizing mission, instead viewing the 1654 agreement primarily as a military alliance. There was considerable debate over whether the Khmelnytsky Uprising was a War of National Liberation as well as the nature and extent of Ukrainian statehood. The many works by V. Stepankov, co-authored with V. Smolii, the director of the Institute of History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, espousing a strong national-statist interpretation, could be considered as the semi-official position of the historical establishment.⁵ Soon the national-statist paradigm was criticized by a modernist, Natalia Yakovenko, who charged that the Russian imperial mythology was merely being replaced in a mechanically Soviet manner by a Ukrainian national paradigm.⁶ Meanwhile, the Russo-Ukrainian unity myth continued to hold sway among historians in Russia.⁷

Pereiaslav did not receive much emphasis in the media in post-independence Ukraine. It was too much a reminder of Ukraine’s inferior or, to some minds, colonial status vis-à-vis Russia. In 1992, the former dissident and political activist, V. Chornovil, heading a newly formed Cossack organization, went to Pereiaslav-Khmelnytsky and held a new council that denounced and abrogated all ties with Russia established by their ancestors in 1654.⁸ But such theatrics were rare and those who espoused Ukraine’s independence touched upon Pereiaslav only in response to pro-integrationist forces.

Pereiaslav did remain an important symbol for those forces that favored Russian-Ukrainian unity, for example, the Communist Party of Ukraine, Russophile political movements, and the Orthodox Church of the Muscovite Patriarchate. This was already evident in the commemoration-celebration of the 340th anniversary of

Pereiaslav and the 400th anniversary of the birth of Bohdan Khmelnytsky in 1994. The Crimean pro-Russian leader, Yuri Meshkov, held a celebration of the anniversary of the Pereiaslav Council. However, the link between the Pereiaslav legacy and politics became much more apparent in the 1999 commemoration of the 345th anniversary of Pereiaslav.⁹ The newspaper *Den* ran a series of articles on Pereiaslav, Russian-Ukrainian relations, and the ratification of the Russo-Ukrainian treaty of 1997 by the Russian Duma. Some authors expressed fears that just as Pereiaslav had led to unintended consequences and the ultimate abolition of Ukrainian autonomy, so the current drive to join the Interparliamentary Assembly and the Commonwealth of Independent States could have equally disastrous results.¹⁰ On the other hand, Volodymyr Moiseyenko, a leading Communist parliamentarian, complained that the Pereiaslav agreement was better than the current treaty, because it abolished borders between Ukraine and Russia rather than confirming them.¹¹ The discussion revealed that while many authors were willing to shake off the Pereiaslav legacy a significant number still clung to Pereiaslav as the historical symbol of Russo-Ukrainian unity.

Perhaps in order to placate such a pro-Russian constituency, to signal a more pro-Russian tilt in foreign policy, and to please President Putin, President Kuchma issued a decree on March 13, 2002, calling for a national commemoration of the 350th anniversary of the Pereiaslav agreement.¹² The decree created a state committee of high officials and academics to organize the celebration, headed first by V. Lytvyn and then by vice-premier D. Tabachnyk, and called for academic conferences, popular lectures and meetings, concerts, and museum exhibits; it also instructed oblasts to develop detailed plans for oblast-level activities (Kharkiv, Donetsk, and Mykolaiv oblast administrations had posted preliminary plans on the internet).¹³ While not equaling the scale of the 1954 celebration, the decree’s contents, as well as the membership of the organizing committee, indicated the serious nature and breadth of scope of the intended commemoration.

⁴ Basarab, 203-210. Also see Mykhailo Braichevsky, “Pryednannia chy vozvednannia” [Annexation or Reunion?] in *Pereiaslavska rada 1654 roku (istoriografii i doslidzhennia)* (Kyiv: Smoloskyp, 2003), 294-418.

⁵ Ploky, 491.

⁶ Natalya Yakovenko, *Paralelnyi svit. Doslidzhennia z istorii uivlen ta idei v Ukraini XVI-XVII st.* [Parallel World. Studies in the History of Images and Ideas in Ukraine in the 16th-17th Centuries] (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2002), 352-353, 360-361.

⁷ Ploky, 492-494.

⁸ Ploky, 490.

⁹ Ibid. 499.

¹⁰ Ploky, 499.

¹¹ Ibid. 500.

¹² This document is known as “A Decree of the President of Ukraine from March 13, 2002, № 238”.

¹³ See the rulings, made by the state administration of Kharkiv, Donetsk and Mykolayiv *oblast* regarding the fulfillment of Presidential decree “Regarding the Fulfillment of a Decree of the President of Ukraine from March 13, 2002 № 238” (<http://www.regionnet.kharkov.ua/zakons/211.html>; <http://www.info.dn.ua/authorities/list.shtml>; <http://www.oga.mk.ua/php/rozp.php?=#oga>).

The obvious parallels to the 1954 celebrations elicited a storm of protests against the president's decree. Letters and open letters were published in various newspapers and journals, including "An open letter of Ukrainian historians, intelligentsia, and members of society in response to the danger of a political revision of Ukrainian history," "The Citizens of Ternopil alarmed by the President's ukaz," and, most significantly, a petition by the participants of the Fifth International Congress of Ukrainianists meeting in Chernivtsi, August 26-27, 2002.¹⁴ Open letters were also written outside of Ukraine. On June 14, 2002, Zenon Kohut, Serhii Plokhii, and Frank Sysyn of the Canadian Institute for Ukrainian Studies wrote an open letter to their colleagues in Ukraine, calling on them not to be seduced by the authorities' blandishments to take part in this obvious political gambit.¹⁵ The letter was widely discussed in Ukraine. Similar letters were distributed by the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the World Congress of Ukrainians, and other civic organizations.¹⁶

A lively discussion in the newspapers focused not only on the presidential decree, but also on evaluating the Pereiaslav event. Again the newspaper *Den'* featured a series of articles in 2002. Serhii Makhun concluded that in 1654, without much bloodshed, the empire of the Romanovs achieved a great victory—a collecting of lands that was subsequently continued by the Soviets.¹⁷ Serhii Bovkun focused on the manipulative nature of the *ukaz* and astutely predicted that an all-national commemoration of Pereiaslav would not succeed.¹⁸ Maksym Strikha drew the connection between the *ukaz* and the President's increasing drift towards dictatorship.¹⁹

There were also defenders of the presidential decree. The most authoritative voice to weigh in was academician Petro Tolochko, a noted archaeologist, former vice-president of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, and parliamentary deputy. He called the president's decree absolutely normal and

civilized. Tolochko then proceeded to give a remarkably standard interpretation of the Pereiaslav myth: the close religious and ethnic ties with Russia, Ukraine's hopeless situation within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Ukraine's seeking and yearning for Russian support, and how Russia's assistance saved Ukraine from certain destruction.²⁰ A much more sophisticated defense came from Stanislav Kulchytsky, the deputy director of the Institute of History of the Ukrainian National Academy. In his article "The Three Images of Pereiaslav," Kulchytsky calls upon the protestors to take part in a dialogue by participating in the 350-anniversary events, thus stimulating a re-evaluation of the essence and meaning of Pereiaslav.²¹

Kulchytsky attempted to give a positive spin to what was becoming an embarrassment to the Kuchma administration. Opponents of the *ukaz* had, in fact, already begun the academic discussion. Realizing the importance of providing reliable historical information on the Pereiaslav events, the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS) undertook a number of steps to provide such scholarly information to the academic communities in Ukraine as well as the public at large.

The CIUS Press promoted John Basarab's book *Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study*, a thorough study of the documents of the Ukrainian-Russian negotiations, including translations of the most important texts. The volume examines the views of the most important scholars to write on the Pereiaslav treaty from the seventeenth century to the 1970s.²² Together with the Institute of Archaeography and the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the CIUS also undertook an active role in funding and producing a major volume on Pereiaslav, published in Kyiv by Smolokyp Press. Entitled *Pereiaslavs'ka rada 1654 roku (istoriografii ta doslidzhennia)* (The Pereiaslav Council of 1654 [Historiography and Research]), the 888-page volume includes twenty-one articles by prominent historians, past and current.²³

In order to permit the Ukrainian public to gain a deeper understanding of the historical events of 1654 and how they have been interpreted, CIUS co-sponsored a series of events in Ukraine and even in Russia. In addition to supporting and participating in some of the

¹⁴ Information about this resolution is available on the official site of the International Congress of Ukrainianists at <http://www.mau.org.ua/ukrainian/about/resolutions.html>.

¹⁵ Press release is available at www.ualberta.ca/~cius/announce/media/ and <http://www.brama.com/news/press/2003/11/031114cius.html>.

¹⁶ Press release of Shevchenko Scientific society (July 8, 2002) is available at <http://www.shevchenko.org/users/shevchenko-cgi/>.

¹⁷ Serhii Makhun, "Iuvilei Pereiaslavskoi rady: vidznachaemo chy sviatkuemo?" [An Anniversary of Pereiaslav: Marking the Calendar or Celebrating?] *Den'*, July 19, 2002 (№ 128). See <http://www.day.kiev.ua/69451/>.

¹⁸ Serhii Bovkun, "Pam'iat bez hordosti – khvoroblyva? Tiahar radians'koi mental'nosti" [Is Memory Without Pride Pathological? The Burden of Soviet Mentality] *Den'*, August 3, 2002 (№ 139). See <http://www.day.kiev.ua/70183/>.

¹⁹ Maksym Strikha, "Uzhodzhenia istorii – pryvilei demokratii, perezysuvannia ii – praktyka totalitarizmu" [Discussion on History – the Privilege of Democracy, its Rewriting – The Practice of Totalitarianism] *Kobza*, June 12, 2002.

²⁰ Petro Tolochko, "Komu i chym zavynyla Pereiaslavska rada?" [Scorning the Pereiaslav Council? Who? and Why?] *Holos Ukrainy*, August 3, 2002 (№ 140 (2891)).

²¹ Stanislav Kulchytsky, "Try Pereiaslavy" [Three Images of Pereiaslav] *Dzerkalo tyzhnia*, August 31 – September 7, 2002 (№ 33 (408)).

²² See John Basarab, *Pereiaslav: A Historiographical Study* (Edmonton: The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies; The University of Alberta, 1982).

²³ See *Pereiaslavska rada 1654 roku (istoriografii i doslidzhennia)* [The Pereiaslav Council of 1654], ed. Pavlo Sokhan', et. al. (Kyiv: Smolokyp, 2003).

launches of the Pereiaslav Rada book throughout Ukraine organized by Smoloskyp, the CIUS co-sponsored three international conferences on the Pereiaslav events. The first was held in Kyiv in January 2004, precisely 350 years after the meeting of the council. The conference sought to provide a forum for scholarly discussion of the Pereiaslav Agreement and its consequences and to counter the anticipated official celebrations. Over thirty scholars from Ukraine, Russia, Poland, the U.S. and Canada participated; the conference was widely reported in the Ukrainian media.²⁴ The second symposium, organized by the Kowalsky Eastern Ukrainian Institute in Kharkiv (March 2004), focused on the question of “Myths and Reality.” The third conference met in May 2004 in St. Petersburg, Russia. The goal of the conference was to gather an international group of scholars in a Russian setting to discuss various interpretations of Russian-Ukrainian relations, including the Pereiaslav events. It featured fourteen presentations, arranged in five panels.²⁵

What were the results of such intensive efforts? On the academic side, much more authoritative material was made available on the Pereiaslav council and agreement, on seventeenth-century Ukrainian-Russian relations and Khmelnytsky’s relations with Poland, the Tatars, Ottomans, Moldova, and Transylvania. Although the various scholars presented a multiplicity of views, not one academic work attempted to justify the old Pereiaslav myth as expressed in the 1954 theses. Nor was such a justification to be found in the mainstream press and media. While some newspapers were more pro-Russian than others, there was some recognition of the ambiguity of the Pereiaslav anniversary.

But what of the grandiose official “commemoration” plans? Although the national committee continued to exist and new members were even appointed to it, the committee de facto ceased to function. It seems that the storm of protests caught the presidential administration by surprise and, perhaps, compounded by other problems in Russian-Ukrainian relations (e.g., the Tuzla events), a definite cooling to the Pereiaslav commemorations was felt on the official level.

²⁴ Anastasia Khoniakina, “885 storinok nablyzhennia do pravdy” [885 Pages of Approaching the Truth] *Ukrains'ka hazeta*, November 20, 2003 (№ 43 (279)); Viktor Horobets, “Pereiaslav 1654: chy mozhlyvo zvil'nennia vid mifiv?” [Pereiaslav 1654: Is Liberation from Myths Possible?] *Den'*, January 17, 2004 (№ 6). See <http://www.day.kiev.ua/2004/6/1-page1p4.htm>; Iaroslava Muzychenko, “Usi dorohy vely v Pereiaslav? Shcho obyрав i vid choho vidmovliavsia u 1654 rotsi Bohdan Khmelnytsky, toruiuchy shliakh do Moskvu” [Did All Roads Lead to Pereiaslav? What Was Chosen and Abandoned by Bohdan Khmelnytsky in 1654 While Paving His Way to Moscow] *Ukraina moloda*, January 17, 2004 (№ 8).

²⁵ Zenon Kohut “From Mythology to History: Responding to the Pereiaslav Anniversary” in *CIUS Newsletter* (Fall 2004), 1, 9.

That some commemoration on the highest level was considered could be surmised by President Putin’s visit to close the Year of Russia in Ukraine—a visit that happened to coincide with the anniversary of Pereiaslav (technically the Year of Russia was over at the end of December 2003, not January 23, 2004, when Putin formally concluded it). As Moscow TV reported,

Ukraine is celebrating the 350th anniversary of the Pereiaslavskaya Rada [a public rally held in the Ukrainian town of Pereiaslav in 1654 in support of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky's proposal to form a union with Russia against Poland], a symbol of Russian-Ukrainian unity. The Russian president will participate in the celebration. Putin is expected to arrive in Kiev in the afternoon. He will also attend the ceremony closing a Year of Russia in Ukraine.

The reporter also noted, “There is nothing in the streets of Kiev to remind one either of the 350th anniversary of the Pereiaslavskaya Rada, which is described by historians as a moment of union of the two countries, or about the Year of Russia in Ukraine, or about the Russian president's forthcoming visit.”²⁶

While no celebrations awaited Putin, both presidents managed to incorporate a few lines in their Year of Russia closing ceremony speeches. President Putin stated,

The 350th anniversary of the Pereiaslav Council is being celebrated this weekend. This event had a great influence on relations between our countries, and on the development of our states. I believe that it also had a significant effect on Russia's development. We talk all the time about what significance it had for Ukraine, but I think it also had great significance for Russia. I have in mind building, state building, and cultural exchange between two brotherly Slavic peoples. I am absolutely sure and I do not doubt for a second that it had a great and positive influence on Ukraine's development.²⁷

President Kuchma mused,

...in order to build the right kind of relationship with a partner, it is necessary to have an adequate idea of him, rather than proceeding from long outdated stereotypes. I believe that Russia

²⁶ The remarks by special correspondent of Moscow TV Aleksey Zubov can be found on *Gateway to Russia* site at http://www.gateway2russia.com/st/art_202683.php.

²⁷ The complete text of President Putin’s speech at the closing ceremony can be found at <http://194.226.82.50/text/appears/2004/01/59739.shtml>.

understands this as well as Ukraine. All the more so because the 350th anniversary of the Pereiaslav Council is a good opportunity to look back at the past in order to build the future of our relations in a sincere and civilized way, on the basis of a mutual liking between our peoples. Today many historical events are viewed differently than they were by our ancestors, and this is quite natural. But I would like to stress that the documents signed in Pereiaslav 350 years ago were the only opportunity to avert Ukraine's inevitable defeat. Incidentally, back then in Pereiaslav it was decided that the Russian-Ukrainian treaty should be renewed every year. The parties intended to follow and take account of the realities of the time. I am convinced that today both Moscow and Kiev have mastered this art better than yesterday.²⁸

While there were no official celebrations or commemorations, those forces that aim at a merger of Ukraine and Russia did utilize the Pereiaslav anniversary to promote their cause. Thus, on January 17, 2004, the Union of Orthodox Communities, the clergy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, and Natalia Vitrenko's Progressive Socialist Party held a Pereiaslav commemorative march from the Uspensky Cathedral of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra to Sofiia Square. At the square, the participants prayed for the reunification of Ukraine and Russia.²⁹ In Crimea on January 20th a bloc of center left political forces created an assembly dedicated to the 350th anniversary of Ukraine's reunification with Russia (the Pereiaslav treaty). This bloc included the Successors of Ukrainian Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, headed by Crimean Communist leader MP Leonid Hrach and the Russian Movement of Ukraine. These two organizations pledged to create a united front in support of the unification of Russia, Ukraine and Belarus.³⁰ In addition, a Sobor (assembly) of the Peoples of Belarus, Russia and Ukraine was held on May 17-19, 2004, in Zaporizhzhia. Patriarch Alexy II of the Russian Orthodox Church called upon the participants of this Sobor to remain faithful to the ideas of union

proclaimed 350 years ago during the Pereiaslav Council.³¹

These were the only "celebrations" of Pereiaslav that I have been able to identify. For most Ukrainians, the image of Pereiaslav proved to be ambiguous. Although the official Soviet interpretation touted Ukrainian-Russian friendship, in reality it promoted inferiority to and dependency upon Russia. This image of Pereiaslav had been rejected by Ukrainian historians. The Kuchma government's attempt to manipulate the Pereiaslav image backfired. Pereiaslav as a symbol simply had too many negative connotations to be celebrated or commemorated in Ukraine. However, the rejection of the Pereiaslav myth can hardly be equated with the demise of the Russian-Ukrainian unity paradigm. Although, in Ukraine, Pan-Russian movements have been largely marginalized, these forces do have powerful backers in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, the Communist Party, and several Russian and Russophile groupings. Thus, the Russian legacy in Ukraine will continue to be a subject of controversy, debate, and politics.

Zenon E. Kohut, who holds his doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania, has taught there and at Michigan State University. He has been a long-time associate of Harvard University's Ukrainian Research Institute, the compiler and editor of the *American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies*, and a Senior Research Specialist for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union at the Library of Congress. Since 1994, he is the director of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta. His many works on Early-Modern Ukraine, historiography, and the development of Ukrainian identity, include *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate* (English version, 1988; revised Ukrainian version, 1996) and *Korinnia identychnosti: Studii z ranno'omodernoi ta modernoi istorii Ukrainy (Roots of Identity: Studies on Early Modern and Modern Ukraine, Kyiv, 2004)*.

²⁸ See "Moskva i Kiev reshat problemu Tuzly, uveren Putin" [Moscow and Kiev Will Solve the Problem of Island of Tuzla, Putin is Convinced] *Izvestia*, January 31, 2004. See the article at <http://main.news.izvestia.ru/politic/news72094>.

²⁹ Ivanna Gorina, "Duma – ne Rada" [The Parliament is Not a Council] *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, January 19, 2004. See this article at <http://www.rg.ru/2004/01/19/kiiev.html>.

³⁰ Ivanna Gorina, "Nasledniki Bogdana" [The Descendants of Bogdan] *Rossiiskaia gazeta*, January 19, 2004. See this article at <http://www.rg.ru/2004/01/19/istoria.html>.

³¹ See the *Orthodox Encyclopedia* (under the blessing of Patriarch of Moscow) at <http://www.sedmitza.ru/?sid=81&did=13250> and <http://www.sedmitza.ru/index.html?sid=393&did=13266>.

The NKVD File of Mykhailo Drai-Khmara

Preface to the Translation

Vitaly Chernetsky

In this issue of the *Harriman Review* the reader will find the complete annotated translation of the NKVD file of Mykhailo Drai-Khmara (1889–1939), a major Ukrainian poet and intellectual figure of the early Soviet era. Together with several other poets/scholars, Drai-Khmara belonged to the group of the so-called “Neoclassicist” poets (the others were Oswald Burghardt [a.k.a. Iurii Klen], Pavlo Fylypovych, Maksym Ryl'skyi, and Mykola Zerov; the prose writer and scholar Viktor Petrov [a.k.a. V. Domontovych] was their close associate). This appellation may sound a little misleading in English, as the Ukrainian “Neoclassicists” had little in common with European neoclassicist writing of the eighteenth century. Rather, they sought to counter the dominant populist trends of modern Ukrainian literature by introducing the aesthetic heritage of Classical Latin and Greek poetry and of the French nineteenth-century poets of the “Parnassian” school, through both original writing and translation.

Like many—indeed, most—of the Ukrainian intellectuals of his generation, Drai-Khmara suffered vicious, groundless persecution by the Stalinist authorities. Twice arrested in the 1930s, he perished in the infamous Kolyma camps of the Gulag in 1939. His wife and daughter were exiled as “members of the family of an enemy of the people,” but were allowed to return to Ukraine shortly before the outbreak of World War II. After the war, they arrived in the U.S. as refugees and settled in New York City, dedicating much effort to preserving his memory.

The file, recovered from the archives of the former KGB, was first published in Ukraine in 2002, as an appendix to a volume of Drai-Khmara’s scholarly writings, essays, diaries, and selected letters. That publication was the product of the efforts of several Ukrainian scholars, first and foremost Serhii Hal'chenko, head of the Manuscripts and Textology Department of the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

This document represents an important addition to our understanding of the cynical and vicious functioning

of the Stalinist terror machine and its particularly thorough sweep of the Ukrainian intelligentsia. The earlier published personal testimonies and letters¹—and in the case of Drai-Khmara, some of his letters from the Gulag reached his wife and daughter, who preserved and later published them—give us an intimate personal look at the tragic fates of these terror victims and their families. Complementing them, these official archival documents throw light on the perverted logic of the terror machine and also testify to the dignified resistance of many of the innocently arrested. Despite torture and intimidation, Drai-Khmara stoically resisted accepting any of the absurd fabricated accusations against him (together with several other writers and literary scholars, he was accused of being a member of a “counter-revolutionary terrorist organization,” whose plans allegedly included the assassination of several Soviet leaders in Ukraine during a May Day parade). As in other cases, the NKVD concocted such “organizations” and their supposed programs, and then attempted to force the reality to corroborate these sinister fictions. Ironically, the two Soviet functionaries whose names appear in the file as the supposed targets of this “organization,” Pavel Postyshev and Vsevolod Balyts'kyi, were themselves soon devoured by the same terror machine.

The documents in the file also provide a distorted but nevertheless thorough and informative portrayal of some key currents and events in Ukraine’s cultural and intellectual life in the 1910s–1920s. An extraordinarily gifted person who rose from humble origins to a prominent position among Ukraine’s intellectual elite of his era, Drai-Khmara through his life and career offers a fascinating and informative insight into Ukrainian cultural life of the early Soviet period and of Soviet cultural politics more broadly.

Born in 1889 into a Cossack family in the village of Mali Kanivtsi in the Kyiv *guberniia* (now in Cherkasy

¹ For the case of Drai-Khmara, see in particular the volume by his daughter, Oksana Asher: *Letters from the Gulag: The Life, Letters, and Poetry of Michael Dray-Khmara* (New York: R. Speller, 1983).

oblast), Drai-Khmara received his elementary education in state schools in the towns of Zolotonosha and Cherkasy. His extraordinary promise as a student led Drai-Khmara to win full scholarship to Ukraine's leading elite private school, the Pavel (Pavlo) Galagan College. The fellow future Neoclassicist poet and literary scholar, Pavlo Fylypovych, was among his classmates. In 1910–1915 Drai-Khmara studied in the Faculty of History and Philology of Kyiv University, winning a gold medal for a student research paper based on an archival research trip to L'viv, Budapest, Zagreb, Belgrade, and Bucharest, which he undertook in 1912. He was selected to continue at the university in preparation for a professorship, but due to Kyiv University's evacuation during World War I was transferred to St. Petersburg. In 1918 Drai-Khmara accepted an invitation to become a faculty member at the newly founded Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University in southwestern Ukraine; in 1923 he moved to Kyiv where he remained until his second arrest, in 1935. For ten years, he taught Ukrainian language and literature at several higher education institutions and worked as a researcher at the Academy of Sciences, but after his first arrest and a three-month term of imprisonment in 1933 Drai-Khmara was deprived of the possibility of steady work and the final months until his second arrest read as a chronicle of awaiting the horrible but inescapable end.

Drai-Khmara began publishing poetry relatively late, in 1920. Only one collection of his original poetry was able to see the light during his lifetime, in 1926. Although during his Kyiv years he was considered one of the Neoclassicists, his earlier poetry is much closer to Symbolism in both ideology and aesthetics. His work as a literary scholar focused primarily on late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Ukrainian, Belarusian, and Polish literature, and included a monograph on Ukraine's leading woman writer of this period, Lesia Ukrainka, published in 1926. From 1931 on, following the controversy surrounding his sonnet "Swans" ("Lebedi"), which had appeared in the almanac *Literaturnyi iarmarok*, Drai-Khmara was prevented from publishing either poetry or scholarly writings. After his first arrest, his books were expunged from libraries and his name could not be mentioned. A partial rehabilitation led to the publication of a slim volume of his selected poetry in Soviet Ukraine in 1969 (a comprehensive collection was published by his widow in the U.S. in 1964); Drai-Khmara was fully rehabilitated only in 1989.

* * *

I would like to thank Mykhailo Drai-Khmara's daughter, Dr. Oksana Asher, and Prof. Mark von Hagen for bringing these documents to my attention and for their encouragement of this translation project.

Note: Annotations to the translation, organized by document number, are printed at the end of the text, beginning on page 70.

Vitaly Chernetsky, a specialist in contemporary Russian and Ukrainian literatures and cultures, is a Research Associate at the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and Lecturer in the Cinema Studies Program at Northeastern University. In addition to his articles and book chapters on Russian and Ukrainian literature, problems of post-coloniality and post-modernity, Chernetsky is co-editor of *Crossing Centuries: The New Generation in Russian Poetry* (Talisman House Publishers), and translator of a number of Ukrainian authors, including Andrukhovych, Makhno, and Zabuzhko.

THE NKVD FILE OF MYKHAILO DRAI-KHMARA

published in Mykhailo Draï-Khmara, *Literaturno-naukova spadshchyna*,
ed. Serhii A. Hal'chenko, A. V. Ripnenko, O. F. Tomchuk
(Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 2002), pp. 477–558.
Prepared for publication by Serhii A. Hal'chenko

Translated and Annotated by Vitaly Chernetsky

No. 1

EMPLOYMENT RECORD

Last Name: DRAI-KHMARA

First Name: Mykhailo

Patronymic: Opanasovych

Part One

GENERAL INFORMATION

Item No.	Question	Basis
1	Born 28 September 1889, old style	Certificate from Poltava Religious Consistory, 8 April 1910, section 9930
2	Nationality	Ukrainian
3	Social Status	
	2. Peasant	Son of a Cossack peasant (Family registry 1910)
4	Education	
	5. Higher	Higher: graduated from the Faculty of History and Philology, Kyiv University (provisional certificate no. 17852, 30 May 1915)
5	Profession: professor of Slavic philology with 15 years of experience	1. Entrance document no. 55, 7 Sept. 1915 2. Telegram no. 7299, 16 Aug. 1918 3. Extract from the Protocol, part 13, of the session of the Chair of Linguistics, 9 Apr. 1930, etc.
6	1. Non-party member	No party membership
7	2. Member of the Trade Union of Education Workers since 1921	Member of the Trade Union of Education Workers since 1921
8	Not registered for military service; 1) political staff, medium group, 6 category	Military Registry card no. 1754

8 July 1930

Signature of the person providing information
Mykhailo Draï-Khmara

Part Two

EMPLOYMENT AND SERVICE INFORMATION

Record No.	Date: Year, Month, Day	Fact	Basis
1	1914/01/26	Received a gold medal from the faculty of History and Philology for the composition "Razgovor ugodni naroda slovinskoga by A. Kačić-Miošić," written after a research trip to	1. Letter No. 199 by Rector of Kyiv University, 23 Jan. 1914 2. "Report on a Research Trip Abroad," <i>University News</i> , Sept. 1914

		Zagreb and Belgrade in 1913	3. Review by Prof. O. M. Luk'ianenko, <i>University News</i> , Sept. 1914
2	1915–1918	Having graduated from Kyiv University, was retained at the school for preparation to a professorial appointment; the same year was dispatched to St. Petersburg University where remained a professorial stipend holder until 1918; in 1918 returned to Kyiv University	1. Lecture Admission Card no. 55, 7 Sept. 1915 2. ID Card no. 20, 5 Jan. 1918 3. Passport No. 1089, 28 June 1918
3	1916/02–03	Participated in the Ukrainian Studies scholarly circle at Petrograd University	Three letters of notification from 28 Feb., 13 mar. and 20 Mar. 1916, from the Ukrainian Studies scholarly circle at Petrograd University
4	1916/11, 1917/02	Participated in the Balkan Studies scholarly circle at Petrograd University	Three letters of notification from 30 June and 20 Dec. 1916 from the Balkan Studies scholarly circle at Petrograd University
5	1917/10/15	Elected full member of the Historical-Literary Society at Kyiv University	Letter of notification from the founders of the Historical-Literary Society at Kyiv University (printed)
6	1917–1918 (summers)	Delivered lectures on Ukrainian literature at teachers' courses in Kam'ianets', Ol'hopil', and Haisyn	1. Telegram from dept. head Leshchenko, no. 7049, 19 July 1918 2. Letter of recommendation no. 445 from Ol'hopil' School District, 17 Apr. 1918
7	1918–1923	Appointed <i>privat-dotsent</i> , later professor, at Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University (later Institute of People's Education), teaching Slavic studies subjects	1. Telegram from dept. head Sushyts'kyi, no. 7299 from 16 Aug. 1918 2. Relation of Rector of Kyiv University, no. 37, 17 Jan. 1919 3. Letter of notification from Rector of Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University, no. 861, 17 Apr. 1919 4. Business trip dispatch, no. 1391, 23 June 1923, etc.
8	1919/06/18	Elected by the Council of Kasm'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University editor of <i>University Transactions</i>	Notification from Council secretary P. Klepats'kyi, no. 889, 20 June 1919
9*	1921–1922	Served as the Dean of the Faculty of the Humanities and Social Sciences (formerly of History and Philology) at the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi Institute of People's Education	Not supported by documents, will be added later
10*	1922–1923	Served as the head of local executive committee at the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi Institute of People's Education	
11	1922–1923	Taught Ukrainian language at the Workers' Courses at the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi Agriculture Institute	Vacation certificate, 6 June 1923
12	1923	Served as a researched at the Research Chair of the History and Economics of Podillia	Certificate, no. 26, 23 June 1923
13	1923/02/15	Entered into the list of scholars of the All-Ukrainian Commission for Aiding Scholars	Card no. 2895, 15 Feb. 1923
14	Since 1923	Member of the Kyiv Section of Scholars' Association	Certificate, no. 10037, 29 June 1927
15	1923–1925	Served as staff Ukrainian language instructor at the S.S. Kamenev Higher United Military School, Kyiv	1. ID, 27 June 1923 2. Military Registry card, no. 1754
16	1923/10/15–1929	Served as a non-staff professor of 2 nd category at the Kyiv Medical Institute, teaching Ukrainian studies	1. Personal certificate, issued 1927, no. 290 2. Relation, no. 9924, 30 Sept. 1929 3. Letter to the Competition Committee from the Dean's office at the KMI
17	Since 1925	Served as a non-staff professor of 1 st category at the Kyiv Agricultural Institute and at the Pedagogical Division at KAI	1. Certificate, no. 46, 16 Jan. 1929 2. Certificate, 21 Feb. 1930 3. Letters of notification from the Academic Council of the Pedagogical Division from 14 Nov. and 15 Nov. 1929
18	1928	Taught Ukrainian language at the Collective Farm Heads' Courses at the KAI	Two letters of notification from the courses office, nos. 851 and 861 from 22 Nov. 1929
19*	1924	Elected full member of the Historical-Literary Society at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences	Documents will be added. Not supported by documents.
20	1925–1930	Served as a staff researcher at the Kyiv Chair	1. Newspaper notification (<i>Proletars'ka</i>

		of Linguistics, chairing the seminars in Slavic languages and literatures	<i>pravda</i> , 15 Nov. 1929) 2. Extract, protocol no. 13 of the session of the Research Chair of Linguistics, 1 July 1930
21	1930/04/09	Elected full member of the Chair of Linguistics	Extract, protocol no. 13 of the session of the Research Chair of Linguistics, 1 July 1930
22	1924–1925	Worked at the academic commission for compiling the Dictionary of Living Ukrainian Language	<i>Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary</i> (Kyiv: DVU, 1929), vol. 2, p. vii.
23	1928–1929	Took part in the work of the Literature and Arts Commission at the House of Scholars (social assignment)	Ten letters of notification from 16 Mar., 29 Oct., 18 Nov., 24 Nov., 28 Nov. and 6 Dec. 1928 and from 18 Jan., 25 Jan., 25 Mar. and 13 Apr. 1929
24	Since 1929	Part of the <i>aktiv</i> of the House of Scholars	Three notifications from 18 Mar. and 27 Sept. 1929 & from 3 Dec. 1930. Invitation from the Kyiv branch of the Shevchenko Committee, no. 547, 5 June 1929
25	1929/11/09	**	
26	1929/12/01	Elected staff researcher at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (Commission for Researching the History of the Ukrainian Language)	Relation from the office of the Permanent Secretary of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, no. 5702, 3 Dec. 1929
27	1930/04/01	Elected staff researcher of the Institute of Linguistics (Assistant)	Relation, no. 2597, 23 Mar. 1930
28	1929–1930	Took part in the work of the Marxist-Leninist circle at the House of Scholars	Six letters of notification from 24 Dec. 1929, 5 Mar., 15 Apr. and 28 June 1930.
29	1930/07/09	Mobilized from the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences for scholarly-cultural work at the Donbas for 3 weeks	Relation from the Presidium of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, no. 01, 28 June 1930
29a*		Worked as the head of the Slavic linguistics section	1931–1933
30*	1930/08/06	"Passed the purge of the apparatus of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences." Permanent Secretary of the Academy Academician O. Korchak-Chepurkivs'kyi	Protocol of the apparatus purge commission of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, no. 13 (par. 198), 36 Aug. 1930 [sic] [Signature, seal]
31*	1933/02/05	Dismissed from the position of researcher at the Linguistics Research Institute. Secretary of the Institute	Decree of the Institute of Linguistics, part II, 21 Feb. 1934 [Signature, seal]

*Record not in M. Drai-Khmara's handwriting.

**All records in par. 25 are crossed out and the text of column 3 is completely illegible.

Agreed: Head of 4th subdivision of Special Section [signature]

Authorized: Deputy Head of Special Section of the State Security Authority [signature]

5 September 1935
No. 2

RESOLUTION

City of Kyiv, 5 September 1935, I, Examining Magistrate of the Special Section of the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD) of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Bondarenko, having considered the materials on the criminal activity of citizen Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, born 1889, non-party member, Ukrainian language instructor, resident of the city of Kyiv, which consists in his having been an active participant in a counter-revolutionary terrorist organization, and perceived in the acts committed by the accused Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, the features of crimes that fall under articles 54–11 and 54–8 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR,

Resolved:

On the basis of articles 93, par. 2 and 103 of the Criminal Procedural Code of the Ukrainian SSR to initiate the preliminary investigation on the present file.

A copy of the present file is to be forwarded to the military prosecutor.

Examining Magistrate of Special Section
Bondarenko [signature]

5 September 1935
No. 3

RESOLUTION

City of Kyiv, 5 September 1935, I, Examining Magistrate of the Special Section of the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD) of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Bondarenko, having considered the materials on the charges against citizen Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, born 1889, non-party member, Ukrainian language instructor, resident of the city of Kyiv, of the crimes falling under articles 54–11 and 54–8 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, consisting in his being an active participant in a counter-revolutionary terrorist organization, determined that he may attempt to avoid the trial and investigation.

On the basis of the above and following the articles 143, 145 and 146 of the Criminal Procedural Code of the Ukrainian SSR,

Resolved:

To choose as a measure of prevention of means of avoiding trial and investigation by the accused Draï-Khmara, M. P., detention under guard in the prison subdivision of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR.

The present resolution is to be forwarded to the military prosecutor.

Examining Magistrate of Special Section *Bondarenko* [signature]

Agreed: Head of 4th subdivision of Special Section [signature]

Authorized: Deputy Head of Special Section of the State Security Authority [signature]

5 September 1935

No. 4

RESOLUTION

City of Kyiv, 5 September 1935, I, Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District *Perfil'ev*, having examined the materials on the charges against citizen Draï-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, born 1889, educator, resident of the city of Kyiv, in the crimes falling under articles 54-11 and 54-8 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, consisting in his being an active participant in a counter-revolutionary terrorist organization, and taking into account that his being free from custody may influence the conduct of the investigation,

Resolved:

To choose as a measure of prevention of means of avoiding trial and investigation by the citizen Draï-Khmara, M. P., detention under guard at the premises of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR.

Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District (*Perfil'ev*)

[Signature, seal]

5 September 1935

No. 5

Ukrainian SSR

People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs

(NKVD)

State Security Authority

Warrant no. 28

Issued 5 September 1935

Valid for 24 hours.

Staff members of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR Comrades Serhievs'kyi and Bondarenko are hereby instructed to conduct a search and arrest citizen Draï-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, residing at 1 Sadova St., Apt. 5.

All organs of Soviet power and citizens of the Ukrainian SSR are required to provide legal assistance to the presenter of the order during the performance of his duties.

Deputy People's Commissar for Internal Affairs of the Ukrainian SSR [Signature]

Secretary [Signature]

[Seal of the NKVD]

September 1936

No. 6

Ukrainian SSR

People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs

Search Protocol

On 6 September 1935, I, Examining Magistrate of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD) of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Kyiv Military District Serhievs'kyi, on the basis of order no. 28, issued by the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR, conducted a search at the residence of citizen Draï-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, in the city of Kyiv, at 1 Sadova St., Apt. 5.

During the execution of the search the following were present: representative of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR Kosylo, representative of the Housing Office no. 016 Mitsmakher, I. V., janitor of building no. 1 Mel'nyk, P. O.

In accordance with the instructions received citizen Draï-Khmara, M. P. was detained.

The following were seized for presentation at the Special Section of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR.

Item nos.	Seized items	Quantity	Quality
1	Passport for Draï-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, no.	1	valid until 1936

	014012		
2	Trade union card no. 1534944	1	
3	Military service card		
4	Miscellaneous correspondence and one set of photographs		
5	<i>Chervonyi shliakh</i> (journal)	64	
6	<i>Zhyttia i revoliutsiia</i> and <i>Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk</i> (journals)	153	
7	Employment history	1	
8	Vynnychenko, <i>Works</i>	11	
9	Hrushevs'kyi, <i>History of Ukrainian Literature</i>	22	
10	Hrushevs'kyi's journal <i>Ukraïna</i>	35	
11	Mykola Voronyi	4	
12	<i>Nova Generatsiia</i> (journal)	21	
13	<i>Ukrainian Dumy, Ukrainian People, etc.</i>	8	
14	Hrushevs'kyi, <i>Ukraine under Capitalism</i>	4	
15	Trotsky, <i>Literature and Revolution</i>	1	
16	<i>Origins of Peasantry</i>	1	
17	<i>Literaturnyi iarmarok</i> (almanac)	10	
18	<i>Shliakh</i> (journal)	14	
19	Khvylovyi, Ryl's'kyi, Iefremov and Drai-Khmara	9	
20	Ukrainian poetry	4	
21	Newspaper <i>Izvestiia</i> , 1917	4	
22	Letterhead with the seal of the Ukrainian History Museum of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences	4	
23	<i>New Ukrainian Literature</i> , ed. Hrushevs'kyi	14	

Complaints of irregularities during the execution of the search, loss of personal items, valuables and documents: none.

All items were correctly noted in the protocol, the protocol was read out to us, as we attest by our signatures:

The person searched *M. Drai-Khmara* [Signature]
Representative of the Housing Office *Mel'nyk* [Signature]

Search conducted by *S. Serhievs'kyi, A. Kosylo* [Signatures]

Copy of protocol received by *M. Drai-Khmara* [Signature]

Note:

1. All claims and declarations must be entered in the protocol before it is signed. After it is signed no complaints or declarations will be considered.

2. Inquiries should be addressed to the Special Section of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR at 5 Instytut's'ka St., Passes Office of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR.

Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR.

8 September 1935

No. 7

DETAINEE PERSONAL DATA FORM

1. Drai-Khmara
2. Mykhailo Panasovych
3. Date of birth: 28 September 1889.
4. Place of birth: the village of Mali Kanivtsi, Chornobai district, Kyiv oblast.
5. Place of residence (address): Kyiv, 1 Sadova St., Apt. 5.

6. Profession and specialty: scholar, writer.

7. Place of work and position or occupation: Ukrainian language instructor at the courses of the Oblast Committee of Friends of Children.

8. Passport: issued by the Leninsky district militia office of Kyiv oblast; residence registered by the same office. No. 014012, 30 May '33.

9. Social origin: son of a mid-income peasant (*seredniak*).

10. Social status

a) before the revolution: none

b) after the revolution: none

11. Education (general and specialized): higher; graduated from the Faculty of History and Philology of Kyiv University, 1915.

12. Party membership (past and present): did not belong to any parties at any time.

13. Nationality and citizenship: Ukrainian; Ukrainian SSR.

14. Category of reserve military service and place of registry: Polish language translator.

15. Service in White and other counter-revolutionary armies, participation in gangs and uprisings against Soviet power: no.

16. Repressions underwent during Soviet rule: trials, arrests, etc. (when, by which organ, and what for): arrested in 1933 by the Kyiv district GPU. Kept under arrest for about 4 months, then released.

17. Family members: wife, Nina Petrivna Dluhopol's'ka, works at the Construction Trust, assistant accountant; daughter Oksana, 12 years old, student; mother-in-law, Dluhopol's'ka, Anna Antonivna.

Signature of the detainee

M. Drai-Khmara

1. Special markings

2. When arrested and by whom: 6 September 1935, Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR.

3. Where kept under arrest: special corps of detention facility no. 1.

4. Special notes

Signature of the officer filling out the form

Pisarev [Signature]

8 September 1935

19 September 1935

No. 8

RESOLUTION

City of Kyiv, 1935, I, head of the 4th subdivision of the Special Section of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR *Pisarev*, having examined the documents of the investigation on the charges against citizen *Drai-Khmara*, *Mykhailo Panasovych*, in the crimes falling under article 54, par. 8 and 11, of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, have found that the investigation conducted has verified his belonging to a Ukrainian counter-revolutionary nationalist organization that had set for itself the task of armed struggle against Soviet power and the conduct of terrorist actions against its specific representatives.

On the basis of article 126 of the Criminal Procedural Code and following article 127 of the Criminal Procedural Code of the Ukrainian SSR,

Resolved:

To prosecute citizen *Drai-Khmara*, *Mykhailo Panasovych*, in court, charging him in accordance with article 54, par. 8 and 11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, informing the Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District of this decision through a copy of the present resolution.

Head of the 4th subdivision of the Special Section
Pisarev [Signature]

Authorized: Deputy Head of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR *Samoilov* [Signature]

The resolution has been presented to me *M. Drai-Khmara* [Signature]

19 September 1935

19 September 1935

No. 9

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION

of *Drai-Khmara*, *Mykhailo Panasovych*, 19
September 1935

Question: At what time did you begin active participation in the nationalist movement in Ukraine?

Answer: From 1918 to 1923 I worked as a professor at Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi Institute of People's Education. The rector of that institute was Petliura's Minister of Religion, Ivan OHIENKO.

A number of ideologues of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism worked at this institute at the time, such as *BIDNOV*, *Petro BILETS'KYI*, *BUCHYNS'KYI*, *HERINOVYCH*, *LIUBARS'KYI*, *VASYL'KIVS'KYI* and others.

Of those OHIENKO, *BIDNOV* and *BILETS'KYI* left the country with the Petliurite forces, and the rest

were subsequently repressed by Soviet power for counter-revolutionary nationalist activities.

Before that time I was a professorial stipend holder at Leningrad University in Slavic Languages. In 1918 I was offered the chair of Slavic Languages at the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi Institute through a notification from OHIENKO.

The Ukrainian nationalist sentiment which had been gestating inside me already in 1916–1918 was quite satisfied by this offer and I left for Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi.

Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University at the time was a stronghold of Petliurite power. The professors were engaged in cultivating in Ukrainian students an extreme nationalist direction. On the one hand, the Kamianets' Institute attracted Ukrainian nationalist professors who considered it a stronghold and basis for their nationalist activities, and on the other, it was flooded by student masses who knew that Kam'ianets' Institute and its professors would nourish and strengthen their nationalist ideas and educate them into cadre of the Ukrainian nationalist movement.

Such was the role of the institute not only under Petliura, but also under the Poles and later for a long time already during Soviet rule.

The university was a transitional institution during Soviet rule; several professors and students used it as a platform for leaving the country. Professors *KOSYNS'KYI*, *ISAKOVYCH*, *SHYMANOVYCH*, *RUSOVA*, *POPOVYCH* and others illegally left for Poland.

Already while in emigration, the Petliurite government illegally subsidized the university from Poland through Prof. *HAIIEV'S'KYI* and others, who gave out monies without hiding the fact that this was a subsidy from the Petliurite government.

At the time I was an active proponent of the developing nationalist movement in Ukraine. I saw the Petliurite government as the government of the Ukrainian people which reflected the national ideals of the Ukrainian masses, and first and foremost the Ukrainian petit bourgeoisie and intelligentsia.

In the period 1921–1922 I did not exhibit any particular nationalist activity, focusing instead on thoroughly analyzing the errors of the Petliurites.

In 1923 I moved to Kyiv where I began a strong relapse in the direction of nationalist activities and views.

Question: Under whose direct influence did you undergo this break, and what was the essence of the nationalist views that strengthened again inside you at the time?

Answer: After the move to Kyiv, on the pretext of scholarly activity I began attending the scholarly philological society, which was headed by *IEFREMOV*. The society's meetings were attended not only by literary historians, but also by members of the Kyiv Ukrainian intelligentsia. In essence, this was not a historical-literary society, but this was a society which was an incubator for nationalist ideas.

That society's activity in general, and later the personal influence of *IEFREMOV*, an indisputable authority in Ukrainian nationalist circles, and also of

Mohylians'kyi and others, led to my return to my former nationalist positions which fully regenerated inside me.

Simultaneously I joined the literary group of the Neoclassicists, which consisted of ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI and FYLYPOVYCH.

The essence of this literary movement consisted in moving away from revolutionary reality, from literature's class content into the realm of classical antiquity, nature, aesthetics, and so forth. Essentially it pursued the goal of emasculating class content in literature in order to resist revolutionary reality, or more correctly, Soviet power.

Question: Having returned to your nationalist counter-revolutionary positions and being under the influence of IEFREMOV and MOHYLIANS'KYI, well-known in Ukraine as ideologues and organizers of Ukrainian nationalist counter-revolution, how did you define at the time your attitude to Soviet power, what were your political views at the time?

Answer: Under the influence of the above-mentioned persons and as a result of attending the evenings of the Historical-Philological Society my nationalist views had strengthened.

Question: You assert that you had returned to your nationalist views, which had strengthened again inside you. Did it follow from here that you again embarked on a path of counter-revolutionary activity directed against Soviet power, whose presence in Ukraine did not answer in any way your political strivings?

The investigation insists on a clear and categorical answer: what were your political views at the time, what determined your attitude towards Soviet power, what was the expression of your activity aimed at realization of the nationalist counter-revolutionary ideas reborn inside you?

Answer: I did not express political views clearly directed against Soviet power. I expressed dissatisfaction with national policy, which was in turn reflected in my literary activity.

Question: You assert that the influence of IEFREMOV, MOHYLIANS'KYI, ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI and FYLYPOVYCH led you to return to a nationalist path. How did they argue the erroneousness of Soviet power's national policy in Ukraine, what were their ideals, which form of power did they see as enabling the correct resolution of the national question in Ukraine?

If you were fully under their influence, expressed full solidarity with them and reflected their political views, then this means you had fully embarked on the path of vigorous counter-revolutionary activity, as it is common knowledge that all the above-mentioned persons were repressed by Soviet power, some earlier, others later, for their counter-revolutionary nationalist activity directed at bringing down Soviet power in Ukraine.

Due to this the investigation insists on a categorically clear answer to the above question.

Answer: My disposition was hostile to Soviet power, as a reflection of the strivings of nationalist counter-revolutionaries who had embarked on a path of struggle against Soviet power. I expressed this in my literary activity. Thereby I had placed myself in the ranks of active proponents of Ukrainian nationalist counter-revolutionary movement in Ukraine.

The testimony has been read to me. It was taken down correctly, following my words, which I certify by signature.

Drai-Khmara

Interrogated by: Head of the 4th subdivision of the Special Section (*Pisarev*)

[Signature]

20 September 1935

No. 10

RESOLUTION

City of Kyiv, 20 September 1935, I, head of the 4th subdivision of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR *Pisarev*, having considered on this date certain testimonies of persons convicted in 1933 in the case of the Polish Military Organization, namely, *Politur*, H. I., *Krzyzewski*, L. S., *Pyshchalko*, V. F., *Korycinski*, Leon,

Established:

The testimony of these persons at the time already established the presence of a working relationship between them and the Kyiv linguistics professor *Drai-Khmara*, M. P. He knew about their membership in the PMO and the counter-revolutionary activity they conducted, and rendered assistance to them. Due to this they recruited him for teaching at Polish institutions of higher education, where, following the orders of PMO members, he delivered lectures that reflected nationalist counter-revolutionary premises in questions of nationality, the teaching of Slavic languages, etc.

Drai-Khmara, M. P. is currently under arrest as an active member of a Ukrainian counter-revolutionary nationalist organization. In this context his closeness to the already repressed active members of the PMO in Ukraine acquires special significance, taking into consideration the possible contacts between them in joint counter-revolutionary activity.

On the basis of the above and of the articles of the Criminal Procedural Code of the Ukrainian SSR,

Resolved:

The testimony of *Politur*, *Krzyzewski*, *Pyshchalko* and *Korycinski*, convicted in the PMO case, about *Drai-Khmara* is to be attached to the latter's investigation file. The investigation is to clarify their testimony on their use of *DRAI-KHMARA* in their counter-revolutionary activities.

A copy of the present resolution is to be forwarded to the Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District.

Head of the 4th subdivision of the Special Section (*Pisarev*)

[Signature]

Authorized: Deputy Head of the of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Kyiv Military District

(*Samoilov*) [Signature]

19 October 1933

No. 11

EXTRACT

from the protocol of the interrogation of *POLITUR*, *Henrykh Ihnatovych*
from 19 October 1933

The SOCHACKI group caused even greater damage in education and production than in management. Thus, for example, admitting students to the Polish Pedagogical Institute should require a minimum of completed secondary education. It was normal to make concessions in this and, for example, in the Ukrainian Institute of People's Education students were admitted with certified seven-degree education if they also had had teaching experience. Among those admitted into the Polish Institute were people with only five grades of village secondary schools, frequently not even Polish but Ukrainian, thus the majority of the students read and wrote in Polish very poorly, and sometimes one came across completely illiterate ones.

This student contingent was taught by instructors selected amongst hostile elements (VUITSYK, EGOROV, KALYNOVYCH, DRAI-KHMARA, VINNYTS'KYI and others), and by instructors who taught them nothing because they did not show up for the classes.

Verified: [Signature]

25 October 1933
No. 12

EXTRACT

from the protocol of the interrogation of
KRZYZEWSKI, Ludwig Sigizmundovich
from 25 October 1933

Instead of the proper use of social choice in student admissions, many hostile class elements, Polish nationalists, were admitted. Admissions were supervised by REMSKI, MULKO and PYSHCHALKO (to confirm this fact, let me point out the students SZPILMAN, PAROKONNYK, KOWALEWSKA, FIGEL, all of them of hostile class background).

An analogous situation was consciously perpetrated in the hiring of instructors (the lecturers DRAI-KHMARA, CHERNETS'KA, VUITSYK) by SOCHACKI and other members of the PMO at the helm of the Institute.

Verified: [Signature]

19 September 1933
No. 13

EXTRACT

from the Testimony of PYSHCHALKO, V. F.
from 19 September 1933

...Considerable attention was given to the management of the question of nurturing the spirit of nationalism among the students. For this purpose SOCHACKI staffed the Institute with lecturers and professors who displayed a hostile disposition towards Soviet power. It is enough to mention that the basic disciplines were taught by DRAI-KHMARA, VINNYTS'KYI, VUITSYK and RUDNYTS'KYI to judge the results of such teaching . . .

Verified: [Signature]

28 June 1933
No. 14

EXTRACT

from the Protocol of the Testimony of the Detainee
KORYCINSKI, Leon
from 28 June 1933

At the Institute in Kyiv I involuntarily reached out towards the older professors, knowing that they would support me in my scholarly endeavors. Together with Prof. Drai-Khmara, to whom I became close, we tried to smuggle through the Indo-Europeanist theory of linguistics: he was pushing it, while I, the most advanced among the students, kept silent, and the rest of the audience was blind.

Verified: [Signature]

2 July 1933
No. 15

EXTRACT

from the Testimony of the Accused KORYCINSKI
from 2 July 1933

...At the institute I first took a job at workers' courses, and then since February 1932 at the vocational school as a Polish language instructor. There I became acquainted with Professors DRAI-KHMARA, EGOROV, VUITSYK and BERNACKI, about whom I have testified earlier, with GLINSKI, MODZELEWSKI, SNADSKI, the graduate students from the Polish Culture Institute, POLITUR and SKARBK, whom I had also met earlier, the former in January 1931, the latter back in 1927 in Markhlevsk where he was present at the congress as a representative of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee (VUTsVK) and I was a delegate. With some of these persons, such as DRAI-KHMARA, VUITSYK, EGOROV, LIASHEVYCH, MININ and his wife, and SYKORA, the owner of the apartment at 5 Sviatoslavs'ka St., I carried on anti-Soviet conversations, in which both they and I expressed counter-revolutionary views (DRAI-KHMARA, MININ, VUITSYK, EGOROV, SYKORA) on the dangers for the old intelligentsia because of the training of the new cadre (LIASHEVYCH), disrespect towards the arts and sciences by the Bolsheviks (DRAI-KHMARA), and SHUMOVYCH's group (with LIASHEVYCH). In general I was at the time dissatisfied with my situation, as I was unable to get admission to graduate school and this enhanced my counter-revolutionary disposition . . .

Verified: [Signature]

7 October 1935
No. 16

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION
of Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych
from 7 October 1935

Question: Of the persons who had worked with you at Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University and to whom you

had been close, who was arrested by Soviet power? What was the reason for their repression?

Answer: Of the colleagues from my time of employment at Kam'ianets'-Podil'skyi in 1918–1923, Professors HAMORAK, HERINOVYCH, LIUBARS'KYI, HRINCHENKO, POPOVYCH and HAIEVS'KYI were arrested.

I do not know the exact reasons for their arrests. From what I know about them I suppose they were arrested for counter-revolutionary activities.

Question: Were all the above-mentioned persons arrested at the same time?

Answer: No, not all of them. POPOVYCH was arrested for ties with Romania, apparently he had been accused of spying. This was either in 1921 or 1922. Apparently he escaped from detention and illegally crossed the border into Romania or Poland.

HAIEVS'KYI was arrested in late 1932 or early 1933 in Kyiv. This is the HAIEVS'KYI about whom I testified earlier as the person who received from the Petliurites, after they had retreated across the border, subsidies for the faculty, which he then distributed. I know him as an extreme, obvious nationalist.

HAMORAK, HERINOVYCH and LIUBARS'KYI were arrested almost simultaneously, in late 1932 or early 1933, in different cities, apparently as part of one case, for counter-revolutionary activities.

HRINCHENKO was arrested together with me in February 1933. Subsequently we were also released together.

Question: Of the persons who had worked with you after 1923, who was arrested and what for?

Answer: Of the persons who had worked with me at the Institute of Linguistics, KURYLO, TROKHIMENKO, VOIKOV and BUINYI were arrested.

KURYLO, Olena Borysivna, was arrested in Kyiv in 1933, approximately at the same time as me.

TROKHIMENKO was arrested shortly before me. He is now in exile.

VOIKOV was arrested in 1931, as was BUINYI. I do not know of BUINYI's present whereabouts. VOIKOV apparently is now in Alma-Ata.

I do not know the reasons for the arrests of these persons.

Of my co-workers at the Polish Pedagogical Institute, KALYNOVYCH, SKARBEB's wife, POLITUR, SOCHACKI, GRODECKI, BERNACKI, KOWALCZYK and others were arrested.

POLITUR, SOCHACKI, GRODECKI and BERNACKI were arrested in the fall of 1933 at the same time. I am not aware either of the reasons for their arrest or of their present whereabouts.

Question: What was your relationship with POLITUR, SOCHACKI, GRODECKI and BERNACKI?

Answer: I know POLITUR from the Scholars' House, where he frequently delivered public lectures. I have known him since 1932 or 1933. I wasn't in contact with him when working at the Polish Institute.

I know SOCHACKI as the Institute's director who appointed me at the Institute in early 1931. I was recommended to him by ANGELCZYK, a Polish

language instructor at the Institute. She knows me well, she is a former graduate student of mine.

I have known GRODECKI since 1931. I heard him speak once at a student meeting. I wasn't close to him when working at the Institute.

BERNACKI was the editor of Polish language and literature textbooks. I reviewed the language textbooks. Due to this we were in touch in 1932, but we weren't closely acquainted.

Of the persons who had worked with me at the Linguistics Institute, Ivan SIIAK was arrested. I do not know the reasons for his arrest or his subsequent fate.

Of the members of the Historical-Literary Society, IEFREMOV, DOROSHKEVYCH and LEBID' were arrested at different times.

The reason for IEFREMOV's arrest and court sentence is widely known, since his role in the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU) is widely known.

I do not know the reasons for the arrests of DOROSHKEVYCH and LEBID'.

Of the Neoclassicist group, RYL'S'KYI was arrested in 1930. Later ZEROV and FYLYPOVYCH as well.

Question: What was your relationship with IEFREMOV, DOROSHKEVYCH and LEBID'?

Answer: I did not know IEFREMOV closely, I only met him at the sessions of the Historical-Literary Society. I saw him once at one of RYL'S'KYI's birthday parties.

I knew DOROSHKEVYCH at the university before the revolutions. Then we met again in 1924. We visited each other frequently. I have no knowledge of the reasons for his arrest.

I do not know LEBID' that well, although I have had a number of meetings with him. I have no knowledge of the reasons for his arrest in 1930, when he received a suspended sentence of three years in a concentration camp. I also do not know what he has been arrested for now.

Question: Which interests formed the basis of you becoming close with RYL'S'KYI, ZEROV and FYLYPOVYCH? How much time did it take for this closeness to develop?

Answer: I have known FYLYPOVYCH since 1906 through our studies together in secondary school, then at the university, and then we met again in 1923 after an 8-year break.

I have known ZEROV since my university days. We grew closer in 1923.

I have known RYL'S'KYI since 1924. We were introduced by FYLYPOVYCH. Our closeness developed on literary grounds. There were no political reasons for our growing closer, in our further collaborative work, in the organization of the Neoclassicist group and the later literary activity.

Question: For a distinct group of people to get organized into a coherent whole, in order to work out a joint line in literature, in your worldview, you gathered together, discussed together the methods and forms of joint activities, etc. Was this how it happened with you? How often did you meet, at whose place, who led the group, what were the main topics of your conversations?

Answer: We did not organize special meetings. I only remember all of us gathering together once and

discussing the quality of our literary work, my book and their writings. Generally two or three of us would meet in various places: at a library, at each other's apartments, etc.

The Neoclassicists did not have a unified coherent worldview. While ZEROV and RYL'S'KYI cultivated a classical style, I for a long time felt myself to be a symbolist and cultivated the style of Russian and Ukrainian symbolists (BLOK, TYCHYNA).

ZEROV was considered the leader of the group, but I personally have seldom visited his place. Among us, FYLYPOVYCH visited him most frequently.

RYL'S'KYI didn't do it as much because ZEROV also stopped by his place. As for me, I visited RYL'S'KYI most often.

Question: In your earlier testimony you stated that, having arrived in Kyiv in 1923, you were born again as a nationalist and reflected your nationalism and counter-revolutionary worldview in literature. You also testified that your nationalist worldview grew and strengthened on the grounds of getting closer to and under the influence of IEFREMOV, ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH and others. You are contradicting yourself and are telling the investigation clearly implausible things about growing closer to the Neoclassicist group, ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH and RYL'S'KYI, only on the basis of common literary interests, since you not only strengthened your nationalist views under their influence, but—as you testify yourself—reflected your nationalism in the very literature, in the creative work which each of you produced separately but which you thoroughly discussed together and decided the question of launching it into print.

The investigation demands from you a clear answer on the question of your common political disposition at the time, on the common political paths you had worked out together, the methods and forms of struggle against Soviet power.

Answer: I do not deny that in those years I experienced a relapse in the direction of a return to nationalism. I confirm that this happened as a result of the environment and the situation I found myself in then. By the environment and the situation I mean people, scholarship and literature.

Of the people who influenced me at the time I can name KALYNOVYCH, HRINCHENKO, PETROV, TYCHYNA, NOVYTS'KYI, IAKUBOV'S'KYI, RYL'S'KYI; I know that the literary works of RYL'S'KYI and ZEROV reflected the same nationalist disposition as mine.

Question: You continue to give confused and implausible answers to the concrete questions posed to you by the investigation.

I again demand an answer to the question, were all the Neoclassicists—ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH and RYL'S'KYI—nationalists at the time?

Answer: They were, with the exception of Fylypovych. I do not remember any of his work that would indicate his nationalism.

Question: Having come to a decision on the formation of the Neoclassicist group, did you know from one another about your nationalist disposition, on the basis of which your literary activity unfolded?

Answer: I did not know at first, but later, becoming acquainted with the literary work of each of us, it became clear to me that we reflected, in essence, a common nationalist disposition.

The testimony was taken down correctly, following my words, and has been read by me, which I certify by signature. *Drai-Khmara*

Interrogated by: Head of the 4th subdivision of the Special Section (*Pisarev*)

15 October 1935

No. 17

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION

of the Accused *Drai-Khmara*, Mykhailo Panasovych from 15 October 1935

Question: To the repeated demands from the investigation for a clear and lucid answer on the essence of your counter-revolutionary activity you continually offer evasive answers, attempting to blur the main part of your counter-revolutionary activity.

Are you a Ukrainian nationalist, and since when?

Answer: My nationalism manifested itself most clearly in 1918–1920. A relapse of nationalism took place in Kyiv in 1923–1929. I finally parted ways with nationalism in 1933, following the release after my arrest.

Question: The investigation, having in possession exhaustive information about your nationalist worldview, about your participation at various time periods in nationalist counter-revolutionary groupings, which conducted organized counter-revolutionary work directed against Soviet power, demands from you a sincere answer to the following questions:

1. Your nationalist worldview during such a protracted period was in its essence purely counter-revolutionary.

2. To which groups, nationalist in their content and, in fact, counter-revolutionary, were you close during this time period?

Answer: At the time I did not consider my nationalist worldview to be counter-revolutionary. I believe now that the entire period of my nationalist worldview in its essence and content was counter-revolutionary.

In 1918–1923 I was part of the faculty of the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University, where there were no non-nationalists at all. I discussed in detail all these professors and their political counter-revolutionary activities in my earlier testimony.

From 1923 to 1929 I was part of the Neoclassicist literary group, with ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI and FYLYPOVYCH. I now consider the literary activity of this group, of which I was a part, nationalist, that is, counter-revolutionary.

Drai-Khmara

Interrogated by: Head of the 4th subdivision of the Special Section (*Pisarev*)

14 November 1935

No. 18

[STATEMENT BY MYKOLA ZEROV]

Copy

To the question posed to me by the investigative organs of the NKVD and the Prosecution about my role in the nationalist counter-revolutionary movement in Ukraine, I give the following answer:

1. In my sociopolitical upbringing I am a Ukrainian nationalist. My entire path from the beginning of the October Revolution until my arrest in April 1935 was the path of a Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist activist who played a significant role in shaping the nationalist counter-revolutionary cadre. I fulfilled this role in various ways and by various means, depending upon the general and political situation in Ukraine.

From the first years after the revolution and up until my arrest I occupied a leading position in nationalist counter-revolutionary circles, being an ideologue, a leader, a source of inspiration for and an organizer of distinct counter-revolutionary nationalist groupings which were part of a unified chain of the nationalist underground that stood up against Soviet power in an organized fashion.

For more than a decade I used all legal means available for the path of struggle against Soviet power, of which I have given a detailed account in my testimony on several occasions.

2. In recent years the crowning successes of socialist construction in the USSR finally pushed me fully onto the road to fascism and to organizing around myself various nationalist elements for the purpose of activating my struggle against Soviet power, ultimately directed at tearing Ukraine away from the USSR. I supposed that the international political situation would favor such fascist European countries as Germany and Poland and they would intervene in Ukraine's affairs and aid both the foreign and domestic nationalist circles and embark on the path of armed struggle against the Soviets. Through my political accomplices Maksym RYL'S'LYI and Ananii LEBID' I conducted active work directed at drawing the Ukrainian intelligentsia into our sphere of influence, and shared with them my counter-revolutionary judgments that attempted to discredit the Party's cultural construction work in Ukraine.

The poem "To the Kobza" by Panteleimon KULISH which I recited at RYL'S'KYI's, giving one of its stanzas the meaning of a wake for the executed KOSYNKA and other Ukrainian nationalists who had embarked on the path of terror, was a direct invitation to terror issued by me. My recitation resounded as a declaration of solidarity with the executed, as a voice of regret about their fate, as a call to vengeance against party and state leaders in Ukraine. Such practical conclusions were drawn, quite logically, by ZHYHALKO, who was present at the event and testified about this when we were made to confront each other on August 5.

3. I consider myself guilty, having been for a number of years an active proponent, an ideologue of nationalism, an organizer of nationalist groupings and promoter of such sentiments, of arming them ideologically for the struggle against Soviet power and the ideological principles of its cultural construction work. I am unquestionably guilty of the growing activity, both mine and of my accomplices, in the struggle against Soviet power. I bear responsibility for

the terrorist tendencies and attempts which were a result of my ideological influence on nationalist circles.

4. I submit the present declaration as a summarized conclusion from my testimony about my counter-revolutionary activity and as evidence of my having embarked on a path of recanting the crimes I have committed against Soviet power over many years, since the first years of October Revolution.

Mykola Zerov

[Signature absent]

14 November 1935

Zerov's declaration, in addition to the written document, accepted by me orally in its entirety.

15 November 1935

Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District
PERFIL'EV

Present: Head of the 4th subdivision of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and the Kyiv Military District
(Pisarev)

[Signature]

19 November 1935

No. 19

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION

of the Accused Fylypovych, Pavlo Petrovych
from 19 November 1935

Question: At previous interrogations you testified that the ideological and practical leadership in the organization in recent years was headed by ZEROV, LEBID', DOROSHKEVYCH, RYL'S'KYI and others. You also testified that along with other persons DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, who in his activities had close ties with ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI and DOROSHKEVYCH, also took an active part in counter-revolutionary nationalist activities.

State in detail what you know about concrete counter-revolutionary nationalist activities, conducted by the named persons, first of all, ZEROV, LEBID', RYL'S'KYI, DOROSHKEVYCH and DRAI-KHMARA.

Answer: I fully and entirely confirm my earlier testimony and assert once again that in recent years the ideological and practical leadership in the counter-revolutionary organization and the nationalist underground was headed by: ZEROV, LEBID', MYSELF-FYLYPOVYCH, DOROSHKEVYCH, RYL'S'KYI and others.

Among the active participants in the counter-revolutionary nationalist organization, closely connected in their counter-revolutionary activities with ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI and DOROSHKEVYCH was DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych.

About their counter-revolutionary activities which they had conducted individually I know the following:

1. ZEROV, Mykola Kostevych, I know him well since 1918. Already at the dawn of the revolution

ZEROV played a prominent role in the counter-revolutionary nationalist movement.

In 1918 ZEROV edited the counter-revolutionary nationalist magazine *KNYHAR*, and also involved me in its work. At the time ZEROV was already closely connected with IEFREMOV and other prominent Ukrainian counter-revolutionary activists.

With the demise of the Petliurites, ZEROV went into the underground, shifting his educational activities to the periphery.

I remember that in that period (1920–1924) ZEROV compiled a collection of clearly counter-revolutionary poems he had authored, among which the poem “Maundy Thursday” stood out in particular. These poems were not intended for publication but for circulation among “our own.” Among others, ZEROV gave a copy of this collection to IEFREMOV.

In 1922 ZEROV together with me organized the counter-revolutionary nationalist Neoclassicist literary group. Since that time ZEROV was the ideologue of and the source of inspiration for this counter-revolutionary trend in Ukrainian literature.

At that time we drew into the group first RYL'S'KYI, and later also DRAI-KHMARA and BURGHARDT.

The Neoclassicist group, led by ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI and myself, carried on an active struggle with the developing proletarian dictatorship. We organized literary readings, panels at the Academy of Sciences, the Pedagogical Vocational School, and so forth.

The main goal of our activity was to hamper the development of proletarian literature, to educate novice writers and students in the bourgeois nationalist spirit, using the traditions of bourgeois literature.

In our activity we formed blocs with other nationalist groups, such as LANKA-MARS and others.

After the well-known statements of KHVYL'OVYI (1924–1925), when he lifted ZEROV onto his shield as the banner of the so-called “Psychological Europe,” ZEROV strengthened his ties with KHVYL'OVYI's group, and in particular established especially close ties with KHVYL'OVYI himself and with KULISH.

ZEROV began a lively correspondence with KHVYL'OVYI, received from him the manuscript of the latter's article “Ukraine or Little Russia,” which had not been allowed into print, and was taken by KHVYL'OVYI and his friends under full protection. ZEROV told me on occasion that KHVYL'OVYI would protect him in case of trouble.

ZEROV viewed KHVYL'OVYI's suicide as a protest against the Party's national policy and against collectivization in Ukraine.

In his literary-historical and teaching activities ZEROV performed as an active nationalist who modernized counter-revolutionary iefremovism with the help of the latest “achievements” of bourgeois scholarship (Formalism) and inculcated these habits among the youth.

It was in this vein that he worked within advanced seminars and at the Historical-Literary Society of the Academy of Sciences.

It was with his intimate participation that a counter-revolutionary nationalist student group called HUKUS

(the Ukrainian Word Circle) was organized at the Institute of People's Education for the purpose of forging a nationalist cadre.

Singling out among his students nationalistically minded persons, ZEROV always strove to arm them with knowledge, to promote them, to usher them into print, and so forth. Among such persons are POKAL'CHUK, KYRYLIUK, KOSTIUK, and others.

Viewing the policies of recent years of the Party and of Soviet power (the demise of several nationalist organizations, the arrests and dismissal from work of bourgeois nationalists, the struggle against nationalism on the cultural front) as persecution of the Ukrainian intelligentsia and Ukrainian culture, and viewing the policy of collectivization as a policy that led to the complete ruin of village life (famine), ZEROV, continuing in general his former line of active struggle with Soviet power, began in this period his own transition towards new forms and methods of struggle with Soviet power, and thereby sent a signal to all nationalist elements that were under his influence.

These new forms consist, on the one hand, in sabotage and departure from working on topical issues of contemporary cultural life, and on the other, in the use of forms of mimicry in teaching activities.

In the last two to three years ZEROV, DOROSHKEVYCH and others gave the nationalist elements, through their own example, an orientation towards mass escape from Ukraine into Russia, where the conditions of the intelligentsia's cultural work were allegedly more favorable.

At the same time ZEROV did not sever ties with the nationalist elements remaining in Ukraine.

In this condensed atmosphere [sic] certain members of the unified chain of the nationalist underground, which had been led by ZEROV, myself, LEBID', DOROSHKEVYCH and RYL'S'KYI, embarked on the path of fighting with Soviet power by means of terror.

ZEROV, too, bears responsibility for this as one of the leading sources of inspiration for the nationalist underground.

In his counter-revolutionary nationalist work, ZEROV followed the trends emanating from the national-fascism of Western Ukraine (Galicia), of DONTSOV and others.

He not only displayed interest in DONTSOV's activities, but in his work on Lesia UKRAINKA quoted his (DONTSOV's) ideas.

During the visit of scholars from Galicia to Kyiv, ZEROV had meetings with them, with STUDYNS'KYI and SHCHURAT, and told me about this.

2. LEBID', Ananii Dmytrovych. I have known him approximately since 1924, when he moved from Chernihiv to Kyiv and was appointed by DOROSHKEVYCH the secretary of the journal *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia* (Life and Revolution) and apparently with DOROSHKEVYCH's assistance found employment as an instructor at the Hrinchenko Pedagogical Vocational School.

In Kyiv, LEBID', who already had ties with the counter-revolutionary nationalist movement, immediately entered the circle of leading nationalist activists among writers and scholars and assumed a prominent position within it.

The journal *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia*, although it was a legally published periodical, was to a large extent taken over by nationalists who used it for nationalist purposes.

It was mostly nationalists that were brought in to work there. In this work, at the time of his tenure as the secretary, LEBID' promoted the nationalist line, being closely tied in his activities with DOROSHKEVYCH, ZEROV and others.

LEBID' was closely tied to the nationalist groups of the Neoclassicists and of Lanka-Mars. He always took an active part in literary evenings and disputes, mounting harsh attacks against the representatives of proletarian literature.

Being an educator by profession, a teacher of the history of Ukrainian literature, LEBID' worked actively at nurturing a nationalist cadre among the young. He developed this work in particular at the Hrinchenko Pedagogical Vocational School where Ukrainian literature instruction was in his hands.

In order to enhance the cultivation of nationalist work at this school, Lebid' organized there literary evenings to which he invited nationalist writers, thereby creating a tribune for counter-revolutionary nationalist goals.

When representatives of proletarian literature and criticism took the floor at those evenings, LEBID' and the nationalist students trained by him would try by all possible means to make the speeches of those representatives of proletarian literature and criticism a failure.

In his literary-historical writings LEBID' shared the position of counter-revolutionary iefremovism, which emerged with greatest clarity in his book on the life and work of KOTSIUBYNS'KYI, which developed the theses of Iefremov's study of KOTSIUBYNS'KYI, depicting this greatest representative of Ukrainian revolutionary-democratic literature as a nationalist, an aesthete and a "European."

Together with MOHYLIANS'KYI and with RYL'S'KYI's participation, LEBID' compiled an anthology of Ukrainian literature of the last 25 years whose nationalist character was disclosed by proletarian critics, after which it was withdrawn from circulation.

LEBID' played an intimate role at the nationalist publishing house SIAIVO, led by the energetic nationalist activist KOMENDANT, later sentenced for his counter-revolutionary activities.

In all his counter-revolutionary activities in the past, LEBID' enjoyed close ties with the leadership of the counter-revolutionary organization Union for the Liberation of Ukraine, with IEFREMOV and others.

At that trial or at that time, LEBID' received a suspended three-year sentence.

After that LEBID' did not make a break with his counter-revolutionary past, nor did he sever ties with nationalists, but he did not act as openly as before.

He embarked on the path of sabotage in his research work and tried to instill in others the thought that it was impossible for the Ukrainian intelligentsia to work at the cultural front under Soviet conditions.

Lately LEBID' has been among the active disseminators of clearly manifested counter-revolutionary nationalist propaganda, spreading various

rumors of a counter-revolutionary and provocative nature.

Approximately at the end of winter or the beginning of spring of 1935, LEBID', upon meeting me, told me I had been dismissed from my position at the Pedagogical Vocational School. When I denied this he asserted that he had information about this from one of the faculty members. At another meeting, prior to this one, LEBID' said that sooner or later I would be removed from my job, just as had happened to other representatives of the older Ukrainian intelligentsia. When I told LEBID' once that I was invited to take part in developing textbooks, LEBID' tried to persuade me that I was only being used.

After the execution of KOSYNKA and other terrorists, LEBID' assured me that they were not terrorists and told me that it was a mistake for me to believe what was written about the trials.

I must say that LEBID' for a long time was on friendly terms with KOSYNKA.

From Professor ASTRAB, LEBID's neighbor, I heard in early 1935 that LEBID' had recently been harshly hostile to Soviet reality; he said that LEBID' saw all manifestations of this reality in a black light.

LEBID' retained his active leadership role within the counter-revolutionary nationalist underground until recently.

3. DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, was my classmate at secondary school and at university.

At the beginning of the revolution, on the invitation from the Petliurite activist OHIIENKO, DRAI-KHMARA left for Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi as an instructor at the university founded there by the Petliurite authorities. Upon his return from Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi to Kyiv (in 1923) he soon joined the counter-revolutionary nationalist group of the Neoclassicists we had organized and also became close with the nationalist group LANKA-MARS, in particular with ZEROV, RY'S'KYI, ANTONENKO-DAVYDOVYCH, KOSYNKA and others. Additionally, DRAI-KHMARA established close ties with DOROSHKEVYCH.

DRAI-KHMARA was known to all of us as a Ukrainian nationalist and through his literary nationalist work (poetry and literary-historical articles) assumed a rather prominent position in nationalist circles.

A characteristic moment in his activity is that DRAI-KHMARA in one of his poems, "SWANS," called upon nationalist writers not to give up their positions. When the proletarian critics disclosed the counter-revolutionary essence of this poem masked by symbolism, DRAI-KHMARA published in the newspaper *Proletars'ka pravda* a clearly [word missing] and false explanation of this poem.

Together with academician KRYMS'KYI, DRAI-KHMARA edited a nationalist collection of articles on the history of the Ukrainian language. KRYMS'KYI supported his candidacy for the literary committee of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1930.

At the beginning of the developing socialist offensive and the collectivization, DRAI-KHMARA, like all of us, expressed dissatisfaction with the policies of the Party and the government, spreading rumors about the famine and so forth.

In 1932-1933 DRAI-KHMARA was removed from his position at the Linguistics Research Institute as a

nationalist and, it seems, was arrested the same year or shortly thereafter by the NKVD.

After his release DRAI-KHMARA retained his nationalist views.

Like ZEROV, LEBID', and others, DRAI-KHMARA withdrew from participation in literary and scholarly work and embarked on the path of sabotage. He continued to maintain ties with ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI, DOROSHKEVYCH and other nationalists, retaining the view that Soviet power persecutes the Ukrainian intelligentsia as such, does not allow Ukrainian culture to develop and so forth.

DRAI-KHMARA expressed such views at a meeting with me in the spring of 1935.

Written down correctly, read by *Fylypovych*

[Signature missing]

Interrogated by: Examining Magistrate of the Special Section (*Bondarenko*)

[Signature missing]

Verified by: [Signed by *Pisarev*]

21 November 1935

No. 20

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION

of the Accused Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych
from 21 November 1935

Question: To the repeated demands from the investigation for clear and sincere testimony about your counter-revolutionary activities you continually give evasive answers in which you acknowledge that you are a nationalist and have been one for decades, but refuse to state clearly and precisely what concrete counter-revolutionary activities you conducted in those years as a nationalist.

Since what time are you a nationalist?

Answer: My nationalism manifested itself most clearly in 1918–1920. A relapse of my nationalism occurred in the years 1923–1929. I finally parted ways with nationalism in 1933, after release from detention.

Question: Your nationalist worldview over the course of so many years is in its essence counter-revolutionary.

Of which nationalist groupings were you a part in all those years?

Answer: The entire period of my nationalist worldview in its essence and content is counter-revolutionary.

In 1918–1923 I was part of the faculty of the Kam'ianets'-Podil'skyi University, where there were no non-nationalists. I have already testified in detail earlier about all those professors and their political counter-revolutionary activities.

From 1923 to 1929 I was part of the Neoclassicist group with ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH and RYL'S'KYI. The literary activities of this group, of which I was a part, I now consider nationalist, that is, counter-revolutionary.

Question: The Historical-Literary Society, which existed as a private society and which worked under the leadership of IEFREMOV, was it really a veiled venue for gatherings and discussions of the members of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine in Kyiv?

Answer: I know nothing about this.

Question: In your earlier testimony you confirmed that this society, led by Iefremov, only admitted into its ranks those nationalists who blindly followed him in questions of ideology and worldview.

For how many years were you a member of that society, which works of yours were presented there and for what political reasons were you admitted into this society?

Answer: I was a member of the Historical-Literary Society for about 3 to 4 years. I presented there articles on the poetry of Lesia Ukrainka, on Lesia Ukrainka's poem "Villa-posestra," based on Serbian and Ukrainian epic poetry. I submitted an application and was admitted through the regular procedure.

Question: In your testimony you repeatedly state that in Kyiv, after the departure from Kam'ianets', you again slid towards nationalism. Who influenced you in this relapse, how exactly did this nationalist relapse, which lasted about ten to eleven years, manifest itself?

Answer: The greatest impression upon me was made by the nationalist writings of TYCHYNA, IAKUBS'KYI, SAVCHENKO, the members of the Historical-Literary Society and others.

Question: And how did you personally express your nationalism in those years?

Answer: I made nationalist mistakes in my literary work, about which I have already testified earlier.

Question: You testify that from 1918 until 1929, and then again until 1933 you were a convinced nationalist. Now that you call your nationalist literary work a mistake, when exactly did you begin to view your nationalism as a "political mistake"?

Answer: Since 1929.

Question: In your earlier testimony you stated that ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH, RYL'S'KYI, VORONYI, ZHYHALKO and others never were truly Soviet people and have the same nationalist past as you.

What do you know about the counter-revolutionary activities of each of the above-mentioned persons?

Answer: Of the concrete details of nationalist activities of the stated persons I am only aware of nationalist mistakes by ZEROV and RYL'S'KYI in their literary work.

Question: The investigation knows that after your release from detention in 1933 you again returned to active counter-revolutionary work and became an active member of a counter-revolutionary organization which was preparing armed struggle against Soviet power in Ukraine.

You again became close with RYL'S'KYI, you knew from him that ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH, VORONYI and others were part of a counter-revolutionary organization.

You are trying to delude the investigation by testifying that you and the persons mentioned above only committed nationalist mistakes.

You met with these persons repeatedly, were quite close to them on the basis of shared counter-revolutionary convictions, and precisely for this reason you jointly organized a unified counter-revolutionary organization and conducted energetic counter-revolutionary activity up until your arrest in 1935.

The investigation demands from you sincere and exhaustive answers about your and your accomplices' counter-revolutionary activities.

Answer: I was not a member of any counter-revolutionary organization in 1933, 1934, or 1935. With the exception of RYL'SKYI, I did not have close relations with any of the above-mentioned persons. With RYL'SKYI I maintained close ties on literary grounds.

Question: A large amount of nationalist literature, of publications from the time of the Civil War and from recent years was confiscated at your place. All this counter-revolutionary literature was to be destroyed. Why did you continue keeping it at your place?

Answer: I did not know that all the Ukrainian literature that was kept at my place was to be destroyed. I also did not know that the ban on this literature applied to private individuals. I had not gone through my library at all since 1933.

Question: During the search several sheets of blank letterhead with the seal of the Kyiv History Museum were found and confiscated at your place. How did you get them?

Answer: They are not mine. My wife worked there and took them from the museum. I can't explain the exact reasons why she took them.

Question: Your coworkers at the Polish Pedagogical Institute in Kyiv, POLITUR, PYSHCHALKO, KORYCINSKI, who had been under investigation for their counter-revolutionary activities and have since been sentenced for their participation in a counter-revolutionary organization, exposed you as a committed nationalist with whom they grew close as an active counter-revolutionary. The investigation materials from their case and their testimony exposes you as a nationalist who was aware of their counter-revolutionary convictions and energetic counter-revolutionary activities in which you assisted them, conducting together with them counter-revolutionary nationalist educational work among the students of the Polish Pedagogical Institute in Kyiv.

Disclose to the investigation the full essence of your and their counter-revolutionary activities.

Answer: I remember well only POLITUR. I do not remember the others. I did not have close ties with POLITUR and did not meet with any of the mentioned persons and did not know about their counter-revolutionary activities.

The testimony has been taken down correctly from my words, which I certify by signature.

Drai-Khmara

[Signature missing]

Interrogated by: Head of the 4th subdivision of the Special Section *Pisarev*

[Signature]

22 November 1935

No. 21

RESOLUTION

City of Kyiv, 22 November 1935, I, Examining Magistrate of the Special Section of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Kyiv Military District Bondarenko, having considered the materials of the investigation of case no. 99 on the charges against

FYLYPOVYCH, Pavlo Petrovych, and DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, in the crimes that fall under articles 54-11 and 54-8 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR,

Found:

1. The accused FYLYPOVYCH, P.P., and DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., were arrested and charged under articles 54-8 and 54-11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR on the basis of materials obtained by the investigation of case no. 1377 that confirm their active participation in a Ukrainian counter-revolutionary nationalist and terrorist organization that was called UNSP (the Ukrainian National-Socialist Party).

2. At the interrogations the accused FYLYPOVYCH confirmed the testimony of ZEROV, VORONYI and others charged in case no. 1377 and demonstrated that for a number of years he conducted counter-revolutionary nationalist work, occupying a leadership position in a counter-revolutionary nationalist organization, and that in his counter-revolutionary activities he was closely tied with its ideologue and leader ZEROV, its active participants LEBID', DRAI-KHMARA and others.

3. The accused DRAI-KHMARA, denying his membership in a counter-revolutionary terrorist organization, is sufficiently exposed by the materials of the investigation, namely, the testimony of the accused VORONYI, FYLYPOVYCH and others.

DRAI-KHMARA's energetic counter-revolutionary activity is also confirmed by the active participants of the liquidated counter-revolutionary organization PMO (POLITUR, KRZYZEWSKI, PYSHCHALKO, KORYCINSKI) with whom DRAI-KHMARA had close ties.

Taking into consideration that the investigation materials of case no. 1377, of charges against ZEROV, M.K., LEBID', A.D., VORONYI, M.M. and others, forwarded to the Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District to be submitted to the judgment of the Military Tribunal, have not yet been considered, that the accused FYLYPOVYCH and DRAI-KHMARA were in their activities closely tied with ZEROV and LEBID', and that all these circumstances were fully reflected in the statement of charges in case no. 1377, and following the suggestion from the Prosecutor's office,

Resolved,

Case no. 99 on the charges against:

1. FYLYPOVYCH, Pavlo Petrovych, born 1891 in the village of Kal'tanivka of Zvenyhorod district, son of a priest, non-Party member, Ukrainian, university graduate, literary scholar, according to his testimony with no prior criminal record, married, resident of the city of Kyiv.

2. DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, born 1889 in the village of Mali Kanivtsi, Chornobai district, son of a mid-income peasant (*seredniak*), non-Party member, Ukrainian, married, university graduate, Ukrainian language instructor, previously arrested in 1933 for counter-revolutionary activities, resident of the city of Kyiv.

In the crimes that fall under articles 54-11 and 54-8 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, to be forwarded to the Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military

District for the purpose of attachment to the special case no. 1377.

Note:

1. The personal documents of the accused are added to the file in a special package.

The accused FYLYPOVYCH and DRAI-KHMARA currently kept at the prison subdivision of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and on this day are transferred under the authority of the Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District.

Examining Magistrate of the Special Section
(*Bondarenko*)

[Signature]

Agreed: Head of the 4th division of the Special Section (*Pisarev*)

Approved by: Deputy Head of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR (*Samoilov*)

23 November 1935

No. 22

PROTOCOL

of the presentation of the investigation

City of Kyiv, 23 November 1935, Examining Magistrate of the Special Section of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Kyiv Military District Bondarenko, following article 200 of the Criminal Procedural Code, presented to the accused DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, the investigation dossier on the present case and asked if he desired to add anything to the investigation, to which the accused DRAI-KHMARA stated that he had no additions to make.

Signature of the accused *M. Drai-Khmara*

[Signature missing]

Examining Magistrate *Bondarenko*

[Signature missing]

25 November 1935

No. 23

COUPON OF THE ORDER NO. 1022

from 25 November 1935

To the Head of the Special Corps of the NKVD

The detainee DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, under the jurisdiction of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR, is to be immediately transferred to the jurisdiction of the Military Prosecutor's Office of the Kyiv Military District.

Head of the USO [?] of the State Security Committee of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR
[Signature]

Head of the 1st Division [Signature]

3 December 1935

No. 24

[STATEMENT BY M.K. ZEROV]

Copy

To provide some additions and further details to my statement from 14 November of this year, answering the questions posed to me about FYLYPOVYCH, LEBID',

RYL'SKYI, and DRAI-KHMARA as active members of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary underground and their leading role in organized counter-revolutionary activity, I state:

I have known FYLYPOVYCH, P.P., since 1913/1914, from the university, as a person quite distant from the Ukrainian bourgeois-nationalist movement. He only established ties with Ukrainian nationalism in 1918 or 1919 in the context of the noticeable ukrainization of Kyiv's socio-cultural life registered at the time. He took part in nationalist publications: *KNYHAR* [The Bookseller], *NASHE MYNULE* [Our Past], *MUZAHET* [Musagetes]. It was at the same time that he renewed his acquaintanceship with me and I, concerned about the expansion of the cadre at the magazine *KNYHAR*, brought him in as a regular contributor.

FYLYPOVYCH tied himself to the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist camp more firmly during my absence from Kyiv (1920–1923). He became IEFREMOV's close collaborator in scholarly work at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and a secretary of the Historical-Literary Society at the Academy. He became a board member of the publishing house SIAIVO, where alongside my, his (FYLYPOVYCH's) and RYL'SKYI's work the historical-literary monographs of IEFREMOV were also brought out. It was he who took the initiative of contacting in writing RYL'SKYI, who lived in the provinces at the time; the idea of a literary event at the Academy's hall, at which I for the first time expressed publicly the idea about the value of the bourgeois legacy in the creation of post-revolutionary Ukrainian literature, was also his. He was also the one who coined the nickname "Neoclassicism" to signify this tendency (in the summer of 1921).

From 1923 until 1930 we worked together at the Institute of People's Education. As a Ukrainian literature instructor at the Institute, FYLYPOVYCH at the time adhered to the nationalist schema, following the bourgeois scholarly tradition, sometimes from IEFREMOV, sometimes from my synthesizing theses, but invariably as an experienced literary scholar, introducing his own judgments and corrections. As a rule, class analysis was absent from his readings. The nationalist schemata were refreshed through comparative-historical studies and documentalism. It was in the same spirit that he conducted the advanced seminar which he and I co-chaired, as I have noted earlier in my testimony.

In the literary discussion of 1925–1926 FYLYPOVYCH, like me and RYL'SKYI, spoke out in defense of KHVYL'OVYI, propagandizing bourgeois cultural values and working for the secession of Ukraine from the USSR; he struggled against the representatives of the young proletarian and Soviet literature. He did not come to the forefront of the discussion, but his involvement in the cause of raising a nationalist cadre is indisputable.

FYLYPOVYCH was in contact with the nationalist circles at the Academy primarily through IEFREMOV, with whom he was not particularly close personally, but got along well at work, did not raise his disagreements to the matter of principle, and through his organizational scholarly work strengthened IEFREMOV's positions

(the academic edition of SHEVCHENKO, the collection *LITERATURE*).

After the trial of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine, FYLYPOVYCH engaged in self-criticism, several times spoke out both verbally and in print with a methodological denunciation of IEFREMOV, criticized his own earlier work, and sought a rapprochement with the leading circles and personalities at the Shevchenko Institute and the Writers' Union. In his literary scholarship from this period (1930–1934) and in his teaching work he pursued the line of false accommodation (*prisposoblenchestvo*) and double-dealing, since his nationalist views were not eradicated.

My relationship with him after 1930–1931 became somewhat less close, as our ties in university work had weakened. I saw him fairly frequently. In 1934 I spoke to him about my “persecution,” kept him informed about my situation at the university, shared with him my plans for literary work for Moscow and my thoughts about the more careful attitudes there towards persons with high qualifications.

FYLYPOVYCH's energetic nationalist activity, his organizational role at the Historical-Literary Society undoubtedly led to an ideological consolidation and the organizational cultivating of a counter-revolutionary nationalist cadre. In the context of his status as a university professor this made him a leading personality in Ukrainian nationalist circles.

I know LEBID', A.D., to be a more organic nationalist who had received a bourgeois nationalist upbringing at home and distinguished himself as a clear nationalist in Chernihiv already in the first years of the revolution. Such at least was his reputation when I met him in 1924, when I was in Chernihiv at teachers' courses and worked at the museum.

With his move to Kyiv I became closer to him and was in particularly frequent touch with him in the years 1925–1926.

LEBID'’s work in nationalist education of the cadre took place at the journal *ZHYTTIA I REVOLIUTSIIA*, where he was secretary of the editorial board, if I am not mistaken, in 1925–1926, and at the Hrinchenko Pedagogical Vocational School, where he was a literature instructor and organized a literary evening, in which I, RYL'S'KYI and DRAI-KHMARA took part.

In 1925–1926 LEBID' supported the statements of KHVYL'OVYI. Although he did not develop the general theses of the latter's nationalist concepts, he persistently argued against many representatives of the young proletarian and Soviet literature. His judgments expressed in my presence were, as a rule, harsh, and frequently condescending.

As a literary scholar LEBID' followed the nationalist scheme, supporting it by the documentary study of the facts. As a teacher his strength was in the knowledge of the material and his gift of persuasion. In my earlier testimony I have stated all I know regarding his impact on the audience whom he persuaded to follow his literary scholarship judgments, and through these also the nationalist principles on which they rested. In the matter of arousing nationalist dispositions in the time under discussion he is guilty without any doubt or reservation, guilty more than anyone else among the

persons I am writing about—except, of course, my own articles and public statements from 1925–1927.

LEBID' was in contact with members of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine both in Chernihiv and in Kyiv. In particular, he was in contact with IEFREMOV as a graduate student at the Ukrainian literature department of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (his scholarly advisers were academicians LOBODA and IEFREMOV) and as a guide to Chernihiv literary archives (the TARNOVS'KYI Museum) which he knew well.

My meetings with LEBID' in 1933–1934 were infrequent; I have spoken about them in my testimony. I spoke to LEBID' about the Party's policy in the area of the construction of Ukrainian Soviet culture, and expressed my disbelief in the efficacy of the Central Committee's resolution on the reorganization of literary life in the context of the Ukrainian SSR, about my “persecution” at the university and in general about the “persecution” of the Ukrainian cadre, about the ripening of nationalist moods as a reaction to the Party's line regarding Ukrainian cultural cadre. Through such statements we strengthened our counter-revolutionary nationalist positions and were turning into instigators of organized counter-revolutionary activity. As far as I can judge by LEBID'’s statements in my presence, he knew no doubt or hesitation in his nationalist views, and in this he was particularly powerful as a leader of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary underground.

I have known RYL'S'KYI, M.T., personally, since the fall of 1923, since his move to Kyiv. I came to value him highly as a poet earlier, in 1919 (review in *MUZAHET*) which prepared the ground for our rapprochement.

In his socio-political upbringing RYL'S'KYI is tied to the leaders of Ukrainian nationalism of the 1890s–1900s. A major role in the shaping of his social and literary views was played by the journal *Ukrains'ka khata* (1909–1914), an organ of militant nationalism. It was there, by the way, that the theses of “looking towards Europe,” later revived in KHVYL'OVYI's concepts and in the statements of the Neoclassicists during the discussion, were first formulated. As a participant in the discussion RYL'S'KYI spoke at the dispute at the Academy in 1925, orienting himself towards the cultural, and hence, also the political (since the discussion positions were supported by the reactionary nationalist circles abroad) break of Ukraine from the USSR. He struggled with the young cadre of Soviet and proletarian literature by way of a series of poems, improvisations and epigrams, and supported the nationalist moods nurtured by the discussion. His poetic talent, beyond question for everyone, was likewise an organizing force, since the interpretation of his new poetic works was one of the forms of Neoclassicist propaganda.

In 1933–1934, at my meetings with RYL'S'KYI, I spoke to him about the persecution of Ukrainian cadre, heard from him a series of updates about certain counter-revolutionary nationalist writers repressed by Soviet power (Ostap VYSHNIA), words of regret for their fate and admissions that testified to the unchanged essence of his nationalist beliefs (despite the revolutionary themes in his new poetry).

At RYL'S'KYI's apartment in late 1934 I met with him and ZHYHALKO and recited in their presence KULISH's poem "To the Kobza," giving one of its stanzas the meaning of a wake for KOSYNKA and others executed for their terrorist activities. I provided the qualification of this action of mine in my statement from 14 November of this year.

I first came to know DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., in late 1923–early 1924, when he had moved to Kyiv. Regarding his being a nationalist I know that he was one of the founding faculty members of the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University created by the government of the Ukrainian People's Republic, that he enjoyed fairly high visibility among this university's faculty, whose nationalist appearance is common knowledge.

In Kyiv DRAI-KHMARA took part in the work of the Historical-Literary Society of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. In his literary scholarship he was a nationalist hostile to the task of class-based interpretation of facts, conservative in his methodology, characterizing writers in a iefremovian fashion, portraying them as carriers of national spirit, and only diversifying his presentation with subjective statistical commentary (works on Lesia UKRAINKA).

He assisted in the inculcation of nationalist moods by participating in the discussion as a writer in solidarity with the Neoclassicists: he spoke publicly together with them (at the Pedagogical Vocational School in 1926), and as one of the contributors to the almanac *Literaturnyi iarmarok* founded by KHVYL'OVYI.

DRAI-KHMARA was one of the most conservative, internally inert representatives of Ukrainian nationalism from the ideological and psychological point of view.

3 December 1935

Mykola Zerov

[Signature missing]

ZEROV's testimony accepted by me, 4 December 1935

Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District—*Perfil'ev*.

Present: Head of the 4th Division of the Special Section—*Pisarev*

Examining Magistrate—*Bondarenko*

Verified: Examining Magistrate of the Special Section (*Bondarenko*)

[Signature]

No. 25

[No date]

Copy

**[STATEMENT BY P.P. FYLYPOVYCH]
TO THE MILITARY PROSECUTOR OF THE
KYIV MILITARY DISTRICT
STATEMENT**

Summing up my earlier testimony on the counter-revolutionary activities pursued by me and by other members of the counter-revolutionary nationalist organization of the nationalist underground, I confirm that this nationalist activity was aimed at deposing Soviet power and that at different stages of class struggle it used a variety of forms and methods. Since the very beginning of my counter-revolutionary

nationalist activity (1918) I concentrated on the cultural front, more specifically on the section of creative writing and literary scholarship, which have always been used (including the post-revolution years) by Ukrainian nationalists for the purpose of propaganda of nationalism and raising new cadre. Transferring to my work in the field of Ukrainian literature the methodological skills and ideological underpinnings which I developed in my earlier work in the field of Russian bourgeois literature, I, together with other Ukrainian nationalists (ZEROV, DOROSHKEVYCH, RYL'S'KYI, LEBID' et al.) carried on intensive activities aimed at raising Ukrainian literature and literary scholarship to the level of other, more developed bourgeois literatures. The political meaning of this work consisted in an attempt to strengthen ideologically the Ukrainian nationalist counter-revolution in its struggle for the "independence" of the Ukrainian nation, to draw new cadre of bourgeois intelligentsia to "Ukrainian books" and to hamper the development of proletarian literature. It was on this plane that I carried on my counter-revolutionary nationalist activity in the group of "Neoclassicist" writers created (in 1922) with my close participation, at the SLOVO publishing house, at the literary commission and the literary society of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. I brought the same aspirations to my educational work at the pedagogical institutions of higher learning.

Neoclassicism was a clearly manifested restorationist trend in Ukrainian literature. While reviving the reactionary concepts of "free art" and "art for art's sake" with its allegedly "eternal" motifs of nature, love and so forth, and cultivating old artistic forms, Ukrainian Neoclassicism struggled with proletarian literature not only by these means. In the writings of Ukrainian Neoclassicists, including my own, there were manifestations of the motifs of: (1) hostility towards proletarian revolution, depicted as a purely destructive element; (2) opposition of the city and the country, the latter allegedly being the "foundation of the Ukrainian nation"; (3) idealization of Ukraine's past. These counter-revolutionary nationalist motifs testify to Ukrainian Neoclassicism fusion of the aestheticism of urban bourgeoisie, which saw a revival during the NEP era, and the ideology of the Ukrainian kulaks.

Like other Neoclassicists, I did not limit myself to disseminating my nationalist productions in print (the editions brought out by SLOVO, the journal *ZHYTTIA I REVOLIUTSIIA* and others), but also spoke at several literary evenings, joining the bloc of the participants of the nationalist literary group LANKA-MARS and conducting during the discussion joint struggle against the growing Ukrainian proletarian literature and criticism. The organization of such evenings also had as its goal the nationalist nurturing of the college and university youth attending them.

In my literary-historical work (conducted in close contact with ZEROV) I advocated Formalism and the comparativist method, which were supposed to "take over" from primitive journalistic iefremovism as the latest "accomplishments" of bourgeois scholarship, and thereby strengthen Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist literary scholarship, while maintaining ties with

counter-revolutionary iefremovism in the line of interpreting the Ukrainian literary process as “one stream,” without class struggle, etc. These ties were strengthened by personal communication with IEFREMOV, then the head of the literature commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, who invited me to work there in 1919. Having begun my work at the Academy, which for a long time was a key center of Ukrainian nationalist counter-revolution, later organized into the counter-revolutionary Union for the Liberation of Ukraine, I joined the Academy’s intense actions aimed at speeding up and widening the growth of Ukrainian bourgeois culture, which, in turn, was an ideological weapon in the hands of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie struggling against Soviet power. I took an active part in the Historical-Literary Society led by IEFREMOV. The society’s meetings, which had an open attendance policy, gathered a lot of student youth and cultivated in them the nationalist spirit and trained nationalist cadre.

I also conducted the work of raising nationalist cadre by means of my educational activities, teaching the course of the history of Ukrainian literature in the bourgeois nationalist spirit, introducing the methodology of bourgeois scholarship, such as formalism and the comparativist method. At the same time in my literary-historical research I limited myself to pre-October literature; in my teaching at first I did touch upon post-October literature, but granted it little space within the course and passed over in silence the development of proletarian literature. Later the teaching of courses on post-October literature was assigned to other faculty members, and I did not approach the manifestations of revolutionary literary modernity either in my research or in my teaching, which was a consequence of my anti-Soviet nationalist positions.

The above-mentioned counter-revolutionary activities developed in the period 1922–1929, when the Ukrainian nationalists of all groups strove to seize control (and often did seize it) of leadership positions in various organizations (especially cultural ones), hoping for a mutation of Soviet power and the restoration of capitalist relations, intensively using all legal means to stimulate the development of Ukrainian bourgeois culture.

After the demise of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine and the beginning of the widespread socialist offensive and the conduct of collectivization, I, remaining true to my earlier counter-revolutionary nationalist positions, shifted along with other members of the nationalist underground to other forms and methods of struggle against Soviet power. While not openly advocating nationalist ideas in my literary, scholarly and teaching work and gradually adjusting to the demands of Marxist criticism and to the programs for the study of Ukrainian literature approved by the People’s Commissariat for Education, I at the same time did not sever my ties with the counter-revolutionary nationalist underground and remained one of its leaders. In my critical and self-critical statements I did not cross the limits of “academism” and did not expose openly and clearly the counter-revolutionary nationalist essence of various literary-historical concepts in the work of

nationalist close to me (ZEROV, DOROSHKEVYCH and others).

When collectivization had begun, I, along with all the nationalists, was against the Party’s and Soviet power’s policy in the countryside, depicting it as leading to the complete ruin of rural economic life (famine). I interpreted the demise of counter-revolutionary nationalist organizations, the arrests and firings of nationalists as persecution of the Ukrainian intelligentsia. I read the struggle against nationalism on the cultural front, the closing of the literature commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences where I had been working, as a “crusade against Ukrainian culture” and expressed my solidarity with those nationalists (DOROSHKEVYCH, ZEROV and others) who “fled” to Soviet Russia where the intelligentsia’s working conditions were allegedly more favorable. The counter-revolutionary nationalist activities of ZEROV, LEBID’ DOROSHKEVYCH and other Kyiv- and Kharkiv-based (KHVYL’OVYI’s group) nationalists who constituted a unified nationalist underground impacted the growth of nationalist ideas among other people working on the cultural front, as well as of the student youth. In this condensed [sic] counter-revolutionary atmosphere which took shape in recent years (especially after the suicides of KHVYL’OVYI and SKRYPNYK and the arrests of prominent nationalists), certain extremist and embittered elements (KOSYNKA et al.) sank into terrorism. All of us who in one way or another occupied a prominent position in the counter-revolutionary nationalist underground bear responsibility for this.

Through my long-lasting counter-revolutionary activity I caused a lot of harm to socialist construction in Soviet Ukraine and must bear responsibility for this.

The testimony I gave during the investigation is dictated by my realization of my crimes against Soviet power and a sincere striving to cut ties with counter-revolutionary Ukrainian nationalism once and for all.

P. Fylypovych

[Signature missing]

On the basis of what I know about LEBID’ I can place him among those elements who, like KOSYNKA, have embarked on the path of terror.

P. Fylypovych

[Signature missing]

My and other Ukrainian nationalists’ counter-revolutionary nationalist activity was directed against Soviet power and naturally resulted in various repressions by Soviet power. In response to this the counter-revolutionary nationalist organization embarked on the path of terror.

P. Fylypovych

[Signature missing]

The statement with *Fylypovych*’s additions accepted by: Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District—*Perfil’ev*.

Present: Head of the 4th Division of the Special Section—*Pisarev*

Examining Magistrate—*Bondarenko*

Verified: Examining Magistrate of the Special Section (*Bondarenko*)

[Signature]

5 January 1936

No. 26

[Copy]

Series K

To the Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District
Comrade PERFIL'EV

Special Section

5 January 1936

80573

Enclosed please find an extract from the protocol of the session of the VKP(b) purge commission of the Linguistics Institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, to be added to the investigation file of DRAI-KHMARA and others.

Enclosure: stated above.

Deputy Head of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Kyiv Military District (*Samoilov*)

Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section (*Pisarev*)

8 January 1936

Secret

No. 27

RESOLUTION

On 8 January 1936, Prosecutor of the Chief Military Prosecution Office (GVP) Lipov, G.P., having considered the case of FYLYPOVYCH, Pavlo Petrovych, and DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, charged in accordance with articles 54-8 and 54-11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR,

Established:

A resolution of the Special Section of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR the case of FYLYPOVYCH and DRAI-KHMARA was joined with the case (reg. no. 48570 KGB of the Ukrainian SSR) of ZEROV and others. Taking into consideration that the investigation materials established that FYLYPOVYCH, being of counter-revolutionary disposition, recently for a number of years was part of the counter-revolutionary group of ZEROV and others, being one of its leaders, and that for ZEROV, VORONYI, LEBID' and others there exist separate criminal case paperwork establishing that FYLYPOVYCH registers there as an active participant of the given group, this situation requires that the materials of the present case pertaining to the counter-revolutionary activity of FYLYPOVYCH are to be joined with the case of ZEROV and others.

Regarding DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., sufficient data was not obtained establishing his participation in the counter-revolutionary group of ZEROV and others, therefore the materials concerning him are to be extracted and developed into a separate criminal case, and therefore,

Resolved:

1) The materials of the present case pertaining to FYLYPOVYCH, P.P., are to be joined into one criminal case with that of ZEROV, VORONYI and others and

2) The materials pertaining to DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., are to be extracted from the present case and turned into a separate criminal case to be sent to the Special Section of the Chief State Security Authority of

the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR for further investigation.

Prosecutor of the Chief Military Prosecutor's Office of the RKKA (Workers' and Peasants' Red Army) (*Lipov*) [Signature]

AGREED

Deputy Chief Military Prosecutor of the RKKA (*Kozarinskii*)

[Signature]

15, 19 January 1936

No. 28

To: Deputy Head of the Special Section
Comrade SAMOILOV

From: detainee M. DRAI-KHMARA

STATEMENT

I have come to the conclusion that during the investigation a series of facts that would have an important, essential role for my case have not been established. These facts are as follows.

1. My non-belonging to a counter-revolutionary organization. I assert now, as I did from the very beginning, that I have never belonged to any counter-revolutionary organization. Judging by the data of the investigation, I belonged to no less than three organizations simultaneously, since the organizations of KÖZUB and VORONYI apparently are two separate ones, and neither of them has anything in common with the Neoclassicist group, to which I belonged until 1929 and which the investigation wishes to see as a political organization.

Both KÖZUB and VORONYI are persons almost unknown to me. I have not had any meetings with the former for a long time, and with the latter I only had a few chance meetings in the street. It is incomprehensible and strange to me that they list me as belonging to their counter-revolutionary organizations. I believe that a personal confrontation would clarify the falseness of their testimony.

As for the Neoclassicist group, I consider its literary activity to have been nationalist, but I do not consider this group a political organization, for I have no information whatsoever that would support this idea. I circulated for 6 years (1923–1929) among the Neoclassicists but never considered them to be politicians. None of the Neoclassicists has ever spoken to me about this group as a political one. All that connects me to the Neoclassicists is of a literary, not political character.

2. My break with Neoclassicism and nationalism. In 1929 I severed my ties with Neoclassicism and nationalism. This means that I had severed my ties with Zerov and Fylypovych, stopped visiting them, and they stopped visiting me, we met only by accident, in the street, and did not maintain any working relationships.

In the sphere of ideology the break manifested itself in the following facts:

1) In my writing the book *Iron Horizon* (*Zaliznyi obrii*) which contains many revolutionary poems. The book's idea is reflected in the introductory poem:

**Step out on a strict and sober path,
don't stop, do not look back:**

both oak and birch tree have been stripped by
the somber chilly falling of the leaves.

**Break down the eternal rock, tradition,
shake off the dust of smoldering life:**

for those who've drunk the cup of magic potion
there is **no option of returning back.** (1929)

A characterization of this book pointing out my decisive step in the direction of Soviet life was given in a review by the LIM (Literature and Art) publishing house. I read this book to Zerov in the fall of 1929 during my last visit to him.

2) In public statements, both oral and in print, about Ukrainian proletarian culture in several cities of the Donbas region in 1930. This is certified by reference documents from professional organizations in Zaporizhzhia, Staline and Makiivka which my wife showed to comrade investigator on 10 January 1936, and the newspaper articles I published in *Chervone Zaporizhzhia* and Makiivka's *Domna*.

3) In public statements against iefremovism in Kirov (former Zinovievsk) at the congress of collective farm members and at the agricultural machinery plant (a trip organized by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1931).

4) In the self-critical article, printed in the newspaper *Lingua* in 1932, on the volume I had co-published with Academician Kryms'kyi, *Collection on the History of the Ukrainian Language*.

5) In the article on Polish nationalism written in 1932–33 (I think it has been included in the materials of the investigation).

3. Relations with Ryl's'kyi. Having broken off my relationship with Zerov and Fylypovych, I maintained one with Ryl's'kyi, because I considered him a Soviet poet. In 1933–34 I visited him rarely, but in 1935 I visited him frequently as we were tied by a number of literary projects (Lermontov, my collection, and so forth). My conversation remarks were always businesslike, and I tried to treat him the way a Soviet person would, but he, perhaps not taking this into consideration, allowed himself to make remarks that were nationalist in their essence. Thus, for example, speaking about Pushkin's departure for the north, he mentioned the words of his investigator ("The Cossack heads for the north, the Cossack wants no reprieve"), desiring to emphasize in this way the unnecessary tactlessness in the dealings with the convict. I do not know why he told me this. Once I expressed my admiration of Tychyna's poem "A Song Accompanied by a Harmonica" ("Pisnia pid harmoniiu"). Ryl's'kyi said that Tychyna's greatest work was "Mother" ("Maty," a nationalist work). I did not agree with him. I did not like his behavior, or his friends, or the atmosphere in which he circulated. I once told him that because of his behavior his situation was worsening: he was being pushed to the margins. He seemed to agree with this. I told him openly that I was working to rehabilitate myself within Soviet society. He wished me success but still did not abandon his manner of sometimes speaking in a nationalist manner. Since I

depended upon him and was waiting for his assistance, frequently I did not object and simply remained silent. I consider myself guilty of an appeasing attitude to these remarks of Ryl's'kyi's, nationalist in their essence. A confrontation with him would establish precisely this and not any other kind of relationship between us.

4. My rebirth. From 1929 to 1933 I apprehended Soviet life through reason. In 1933–35 I took it in both through reason and emotion. I was being reborn in my creative work. Every new work I wrote was a victory over the old worldview. The book *Sunny Marches* (Soniachni marshi), completed by August 1935, is a document testifying to my full and unequivocal acceptance of Soviet life. Not to take this book into consideration would mean to cross out 99% of the content of the last 3 years of my life. Spiritually I lived entirely through **this book.**

15 January 1936

M. Drai-Khmara

What had led me to the revolution and to my internal rebirth?

For a long time nationalism, which I understood as serving my people, stood between me and social revolution. There is no need for me to expand here on national liberation of the Ukrainian people always having been the supreme ideal for me. I only did not know which party was bringing about this liberation. I cried when I learned in a distant Podillia village that the Germans had broken up the Central Rada. I considered my work at the Kam'ianets' University a noble mission, and so on and so forth.

I think that I was successful in breaking away from nationalism and joining social revolution, because there were no cardinal contradictions between me and the working class: I was never a proprietor or an exploiter. On the contrary, until the age of 14 I was linked with this class by hard physical labor. My father first was a hired laborer, traveled for seasonal work to the Azov Sea coast, but then became a mid-income peasant (*seredniak*, owning 9 desiatinas of land with 8 people to feed). In the summer there was a lot of work to be done. Until about the age of 10 I was a shepherd, then worked with a plough and a harrow, carried sheaves from the field, piled them into stacks with a pitchfork, winnowed and so forth. The psychology of the working class, their needs and woes were always closer and more understandable to me than to other nationalists, for example, the Neoclassicists.

I lived through my first disappointment with nationalism already in Kam'ianets', when I learned that in many places Ukrainian peasants were rising up against Petliura. At the same place, in Kam'ianets', I experienced the first flashes of class consciousness which expressed themselves in the writing of a cycle of revolutionary poems. This was happening under the influence of Kulyk, a poet and the secretary of a party committee. The romantic period of my revolutionary disposition lasted until 1925–26, when I spoke out in print against the Ukrainian fascist Dmytro Dontsov.

Nationalism again started taking hold of me in 1926–29, when I was a Neoclassicist (in 1923–26 my ties with Neoclassicism were few). The reasons for this relapse were (1) the misunderstanding of the essence of the

NEP, (2) nationalist surroundings (the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, the Historical-Philological Society, the Neoclassicists). I was dissatisfied with the ways in which ukrainization was carried out; I suffered when I saw only Ukrainian headlines in newspapers (with the rest of the text in Russian), I waited for Skrypnyk's prophecy about people starting to speak Ukrainian in Ukrainian cities to come true. Perhaps I perceived the phenomena of national life more deeply and sharply than the other Neoclassicists, but I also perceived more deeply and sharply than they the manifestations of social life, and this gave grounds for misunderstandings between us.

One cannot say that I was a Neoclassicist until a certain day and then suddenly, out of the blue, I stopped being one. There was a covert, barely perceptible struggle going on between me and the Neoclassicist group, especially Zerov, which eventually led to my break with Neoclassicism. In this struggle I relied on Tychyna who once instigated my nationalism, but now, having become a Soviet poet, influenced me in a most beneficial way.

I remember writing a poem in 1926, dedicated to Tychyna as a Soviet, revolutionary bard. In it I expressed the thought that Ukraine will find its calling on the path of international social revolution and will become a happy Hellas (Greece). In response Zerov wrote a sarcastic and, in essence, counter-revolutionary poem, "No, You Are Not Hellas" ("Ni, ne Ellada ty") in which he ridiculed my idea.

Zerov strove to emasculate the revolutionary content of my poems. It was on his advice that on the second publication the ending of the poem "Under the Springtime Blue" ("Pid blakytiiu vesnianoiu"), available in the Kam'ianets' publication and giving the entire poem a revolutionary meaning, was dropped.

In the fall of 1929 I read to Zerov my new book of poems, *Iron Horizon*. These were mostly revolutionary poems. The very first, introductory poem clearly speaks about my break with the old world, that is, with nationalism and Neoclassicism:

Step out on a strict and sober path,
don't stop, do not look back:
both oak and birch tree have been stripped by
the somber chilly falling of the leaves.

Break down the eternal rock, tradition,
shake off the dust of smoldering life:
for those who've drunk the cup of magic potion
there is no option of returning back.

The reviewer of the LIM publishing house also regards this book as revolutionary, noting in his review my departure from Neoclassicism and my drawing nearer to Soviet positions. But when I read this book to Zerov, he did not make a single remark, thus expressing his scorn for my daring to write in a revolutionary spirit. After this I never visited Zerov again. This was the formal moment of my break both with Zerov and with Neoclassicism.

In 1929 a number of negative reviews of my sonnet "The Swans" ("Lebedi") had appeared. Instead of candidly admitting my error and saying that "The Swans" objectively were a hymn to Neoclassicism, I

embraced a subjective point of view, explaining this sonnet's origins by French influences, which naturally could not satisfy anyone. But this did not prevent me from concluding that I had to break with the Neoclassicists once and for all. The affair with "The Swans" served as the initial push towards this break.

In early 1930 the trial of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine took place. It revealed the roots of Ukrainian nationalism, proving its ties with the Petliurite emigration, with Western Ukrainian fascism, and with the 2nd Division of the Polish General Staff. The revelation at the trial of all the dirty and vile machinations of Ukrainian chauvinists led by Iefremov forced me to reevaluate my national convictions and clearly disassociate myself from these counter-revolutionaries.

They placed their bets on fascist Poland. I had experienced Polish rule on my own skin back in Kam'ianets' in 1919–20, and therefore never felt any sympathy towards it (see, for example, my poem "Halychyna," describing the Polish "pacification" in western Ukraine, in the journal *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia* in 1928). Now it is even more obvious to me that Polish bourgeoisie dreams of turning Soviet Ukraine into a colony, and that conversations about "independent" Ukraine are only carried on to conceal predatory plans. Later, the example of the Japanese-Chinese war convincingly showed me one more time how the imperialists "take care" of the territorial integrity of weak states. There is no sense in breaking spears over a Ukrainian Manchukuo!

A serious obstacle in the task of adopting a Marxist understanding of the world was presented by: (1) lack of knowledge of the classics of Marxism; (2) the contamination of my mind with the idealistic schemata of European and Russian symbolists. Together with Doroshkevych, I organized at the House of Scholars a seminar for the study of dialectical materialism, led by Prof. Nyrchuk, in which I took an active part. During these study meetings I mastered the essence of Leninist-Stalinist national policy which does not allow the national to be shorn from the social. I understood that the Ukrainian nation is fully valued only in the Soviet Union, while in the capitalist world it would only have served as manure for the more "cultured" nations. It also became clear to me that a member of the Ukrainian intelligentsia who honestly works within the Soviet state enjoys better material conditions than, for example, a western Ukrainian member of the intelligentsia who lives and works within the Polish state.

While studying dialectical materialism I was able to put the methodology of my scholarship on a Marxist track. The results of this study were (1) the self-critical article on the volume I had co-published with Academician Kryms'kyi, *Collection on the History of the Ukrainian Language (Lingua, 1932)*; (2) the article on Polish nationalism in the field of language, written for the journal *Na movoznavchomu fronti* (On the Linguistic Front) in 1932.

I publicly expressed my new convictions on several occasions. Already prior to the beginning of the trial of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine I appeared before a large student gathering at the Agriculture

Institute, where I was teaching Ukrainian studies, with an expository speech against Iefremov.

In the summer of 1930 the Kyiv Oblast' council of trade union organizations delegated me to the Donbas area for cultural work. I traveled Zaporizhzhia, Staline and Makiivka, visited many mines and everywhere spoke to workers, exposing Ukrainian nationalism and explaining the true Soviet meaning of ukrainization (see my articles on these topics in Makiivka's *Domna*, Staline's *Trud* and *Chervone Zaporizhzhia*, and also reports from Party professional organizations on my work in the Donbas that are now in the possession of the prosecutor's office). The Donbas made an indelible impression on me and even found reflection in my creative work (see the journal *Chervonyi shliakh*, 1930).

In 1931 the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences delegated me, together with researcher Gratsiansky, to Kirov (former Zinovievsk), to a congress of collective farm workers. There I delivered a speech about iefremovism. I also repeated this speech to the workers of the agricultural machinery plant.

In 1932 there was famine in Ukraine, which was particularly acutely felt in the villages. I did not know how to explain it and experienced this as a tormenting pain. It provoked serious hesitation in me, although it did not divert me from the new course I had planned. I was told about the famine by Academician Kryms'kyi.

In 1933 I was arrested, but then released for lack of incriminating evidence. Upon leaving prison, I swore to myself to take the process of rebirth to its full extent, since until then it had been limited to the intellectual field.

However, finding myself free again, I saw I was cut off from scholarly life; I did not return either to the Academy or to the Polish Institute. Then I accepted a lectureship at some low-level courses. It did not satisfy me, and it seemed to me that I was being treated unfairly, that I was paid with mistrust for my sincere feelings and intentions. This situation prepared the ground for the mutual mistrust between the NKVD and me. Perhaps this feeling was the reason for my appeasing attitude to Ryl's'kyi's conversations, nationalist in essence, about Pluzhnyk and Herasymenko.

In 1933 I was offered a scholarly position in Leningrad, but I did not go there, deciding to rehabilitate myself in Kyiv. At the time socialist construction was developing at an unprecedented scale. Only the blind could fail to notice it. Although I had only seen the Dnieper hydroelectric dam, the mines of the Donbas and metallurgic plants, this was enough to comprehend the amazing speed of the changes on the face of our land under the pressure of Bolshevik will. The successes of socialist construction, the abundance of foodstuffs in the country and the state's military might convinced me of the final and irreversible victory of proletarian revolution.

Under the influence of all this I began to write poems in the spirit of socialist realism. The first attempt turned out unsuccessful, and I thought the new style was inaccessible to me. But the second attempt ("The Death of Koloman Vallit") demonstrated that I knew how to find my own artistic forms for new socialist ideas and how to convey these ideas to the people around me.

This gave me enormous satisfaction, for I saw that I had bridged the gap between the spheres of reason and emotion. I sent this poem to comrade Dimitrov with a request to publish it in German. Dimitrov replied that he had forwarded the manuscript to the Foreign Workers Publishers.

When I wrote *Sunny Marches*, dedicated to the fifteenth anniversary of the liberation of Kyiv from White Polish troops, when I wrote "Ballad about Bozhenko and Shchors," "Spanish Ballad" (about the Asturian uprising), a poem on the death of Kirov, the poems "Telman," "Fatherland" and others, I noted that new feelings had grown inside me which began to speak in the poems in a strange and wondrous language. I saw that love for my socialist homeland had been born inside me, a love for its leaders and for the greatest of ideas, the idea of liberation of the workers of the entire world, which lives in the heart of every struggling proletarian and in every stone of socialist construction. This love did not fade in prison, for here I have written "The Combine Drivers' Song" and "The Stakhanovites." This love was my only consolation in the darkness of sorrow into which my soul had plunged.

Through creativity I came to love the new socialist world and through creativity became part of this new life, full of the deepest meaning and joy.

19 January 1936
M. Drai-Khmara

20 January 1936
No. 29

RESOLUTION

City of Kyiv, 20 January 1936. Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Kyiv Military District, PISAREV, having reviewed today the investigation materials of the case of the accused DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, Ukrainian language instructor, resident of the city of Kyiv, on his belonging to a Ukrainian counter-revolutionary terrorist organization,

Established:

On 6 September 1935, DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, born 1889, Ukrainian, resident of the city of Kyiv, was arrested by the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR on the charge of his belonging to a counter-revolutionary organization, whose participants included ZEROV, LEBID', VORONYI and others arrested earlier in this case.

Due to the above on 22 November 1935 the investigation materials on the accusation of Drai-Khmara in committing the crimes falling under articles 54-8 and 54-11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR were forwarded to the Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District for their addition to the case of ZEROV, LEBID' and others with whom DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., was to face the trial.

On the basis of the suggestion from the Chief Military Prosecutor that the case of DRAI-KHMARA, M.P. be extracted into a separate case and in accordance with article 370 of the Criminal Procedural Code of the Ukrainian SSR

Resolved:

The case on the accusation of DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., in committing the crimes falling under articles 54-8 and 54-11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, as due for further investigation, is to be accepted for our processing, of which the Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District is to be notified by a copy of the present resolution.

Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section
Pisarev

[Signature]

Approved by: Deputy Head of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Kyiv Military District
Samoilov

[Signature]

20 January 1936
No. 30

RESOLUTION

(on the Extension of the Term of Incarceration)

City of Kyiv, 20 January 1936. Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Kyiv Military District, PISAREV, having reviewed today the investigation materials of the case of the accused, DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, born 1889, resident of the city of Kyiv, educator, in committing the crimes falling under articles 54-8 and 54-11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, forwarded to the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR by the Chief Military Prosecutor's Office for extraction from the case of the accused ZEROV, M.K., LEBID', A.D. and others in committing analogous crimes,

Established:

The case of the accused DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., has been forwarded in accordance with article 370 of the Criminal Procedural Code of the Ukrainian SSR for additional investigative actions.

Personal confrontations between DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., and ZEROV, VORONYI, LEBID' and others are necessary. The conduct of the confrontations and additional investigative materials fully expose DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., in the crimes he had committed.

Since the criminal case of the accused, DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., has been returned to the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR on 20 January 1936, and the necessary additional investigative actions can be conducted in the course of one month,

Resolved:

To initiate a petition to the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR on the extension of the term of investigation of the case of DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., and his incarceration from 20 January to 20 February 1936.

Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section
Pisarev

[Signature]

Agreed: Deputy Head of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Kyiv Military District
Samoilov

[Signature]

Approved by: Head of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and of the Kyiv Military District
Aleksandrovskii

[Signature]

19, 20 January 1936

Secret

No. 31

MILITARY PROSECUTOR OF THE UKRAINIAN MILITARY DISTRICT

Kyiv, 56 Korolenko St.

Tel. 13-98, 25-49

To: Head of the USO of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR

No. 464, 19 January 1936

Enclosed please find the case of the accused DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, extracted from the case of ZEROV, VORONYI and others for additional investigation, following the resolution of the Prosecutor of the Chief Military Prosecutor's Office of the RKKA from 8 January 1936.

The detainee from this day is transferred to your jurisdiction.

Enclosure: as stated above.

Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District
(*Perfil'ev*) [Signature]

25 January 1936

No. 32

To: the Investigator
Comrade Pisarev

From: Detainee M. DRAI-KHMARA
STATEMENT

In my statement addressed to comrade Samoilov I asked the investigation to consider my book *Sunny Marches*, which constitutes clear proof of my Soviet worldview. As if in response to that you suggested that I write which motivations had led me to my rebirth. I listed many such motivations, but I believe that even one of them is sufficient: the conviction that the Ukrainian people, under the leadership of the Communist Party and the great Stalin, is on the path to a happy and cultured life.

But the essence of things is not in the motivations that had led me to new creative work and to internal rebirth, but in this very creative work, in those of my works that reflect socialist construction and simultaneously speak of my new worldview. The investigation cannot deny that in the course of 1933-35 I wrote a book of revolutionary poems, *Sunny Marches*, which is available at the prosecutor's office and of which many people know. I request that you acknowledge this fact and note it down on paper in an appropriate manner.

Further, I request that you read my book, or at least a few poems from it, to establish that they are a reflection of my new Soviet worldview. The following can serve as a basis for this:

1) The book itself, which is the best witness of the author's spiritual experience. I do not believe what you

told me about a “good” revolutionary poem by Zerov: only a work written sincerely can be a good one. Besides, it is one thing to write in the course of the day a couple of worthless little poems (so that they “let you be”), and it is an altogether different thing to write revolutionary poems for a number of years and as a result to produce an entire book that reflects the era of socialist construction.

2) The review of *Sunny Marches* written for the State Literary Publishers (available at the prosecutor’s office).

3) Testimony of the people who read or listened to my book (B. Petrushevs’kyi, a writer, V. Kolodub, an educator, E. Gadlevs’ka, an employee of the newspaper *Proletars’ka pravda*, A. Chvanov, a student of the Land Reclamation Institute, and others).

4) The revolutionary poems written when I was a Neoclassicist, which became part of the book *Iron Horizon* (the revolutionary nature of these poems is confirmed by the review of LIM publishing house from 1931, available at the prosecutor’s office. These poems testify that my nationalism in the Neoclassicist period did not constitute a holistic worldview but was only expressed in discrete nationalist mistakes which did not hamper me from having a generally Soviet worldview.

5) The revolutionary poems written in the pre-Neoclassicist period which became part of the book *Sprouting Growth (Prorosten’)*, 1922–26). I wrote these poems, just like the revolutionary poems of the Neoclassicist period, entirely of my own free will: no one was pressuring my conscience then. But if at that time, when I had some nationalist elements in my worldview, I was capable of sincerely writing revolutionary poetry, why wouldn’t I be able to write revolutionary poetry even more sincerely in 1933–35, when not only my rational worldview, but also my emotional connection to the world became Soviet?

6) Absence of any fact which could prove that my book *Sunny Marches* was not a reflection of my new Soviet worldview. If you do not believe me, you also should not believe Bazhan, who was also named by Voronyi as a member of his counter-revolutionary organization; in the meantime, recently, in December or January, Comrade Postyshev praised Bazhan for his revolutionary poem “Kirov.” It seems to me that if comrade Postyshev had read my “Combine Drivers’ Song,” or “The Stakhanovites,” or “Ballad about Bozhenko,” or *Sunny Marches*, I would not be sitting in prison today.

I request that the present statement be added to my file.

25 January 1936
M. Draï-Khmara

7 February 1936
No. 33

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Military Commissariat of Internal Affairs
Records and Statistics Section of the Chief State
Security Authority
7 February 1936
No. 19-101
2 Dzerzhinsky Square, Moscow

Re: No. 101 from 27 January 1936

To: Head of the Records and Statistics section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR

For your information, we report that we have initiated a petition to the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR on the extension of the term of investigation of the case and of the incarceration of DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, to 20 February 1936.

The date and protocol number of the session of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR will be reported separately.

Deputy Head of the Records and Statistics Section of the Chief State Security Authority of the NKVD
[Signature]

Head of the 2nd Division [Signature]

11 April 1935

No. 34

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION

of the Accused, VORONYI, Marko Mykolaiovych
from 11 April 1935

Question: Who are the participants in the counter-revolutionary nationalist organization to which you belonged? Where do they currently reside?

Answer: The participants of our counter-revolutionary nationalist organization at present are as follows:

1. BAZHAN, Mykola Platonovych, Ukrainian writer, residing in Kyiv.

2. RYL'S'KYI, Maksym Tadeiovych, Ukrainian writer, residing in Kyiv.

3. LEBID', Ananii Dmytrovych, Ukrainian language and literature instructor, residing in Kyiv.

4. IAROSHENKO, Volodymyr Matviiiovych, Ukrainian writer, residing in Kyiv.

5. KACHURA, Iakiv Dem'ianovych, former head of the local committee of the Kyiv writers collective, recently expelled from the Union as a nationalist, residing in Kyiv.

6. DRAI-KHMARA, Ukrainian literature professor, residing in Kyiv.

7. FYLYPOVYCH, Pavlo, literature professor and Ukrainian writer, residing in Kyiv.

8. GUDZENKO, Dmytro, Ukrainian language editor of the Kyiv Radio Authority, residing in Kyiv.

9. IANOV'S'KYI, Iurii, Ukrainian writer, residing in Kyiv.

10. MOHYLIANS'KYI, Dmytro Mykhailiovych, newspaper and magazine worker, works in Kharkiv.

11. SHRAH-CHUDNOV'S'KA, Olena Givinichna, museum worker, residing in Kharkiv.

12. MEZHENKO-IVANIV, Iurii Oleksiiovych, literary scholar, former director of the Kyiv Bibliographic Institute, now residing in Kharkiv.

13. ZEROV, Mykola Kostevych, Ukrainian literature professor, now residing in Moscow.

14. MYTKEVYCH, Leonid Ivanovych, educator, residing in Moscow.

15. CHIRKOV, Nikolai, Russian literature professor, residing in Moscow.

16. PYLYPENKO, Borys Kuz'mych, museum worker, residing in Kyiv.

17. ZHUK, Mykhailo Ivanovych, professor of the Art Institute in Odessa, where he resides.

As I have testified earlier, the activity of our counter-revolutionary organization took place during an earlier period.

Among those already arrested for counter-revolutionary activities who were members of our counter-revolutionary organization I know:

ANTONENKO-DAVYDOVYCH, Borys, Ukrainian writer.

PIDMOHYL'NYI, Valeriiian, Ukrainian writer.

VRAZHLYVYI, Vasyli', Ukrainian writer.

PLUZHNYK, Ievhen, Ukrainian writer.

IAKOVENKO, Volodymyr, Ukrainian writer.

ZHYHALKO, Serhii, Ukrainian writer.

TENETA, Borys, Ukrainian writer.

EPIK, Ukrainian writer.

Additionally, prior to that the following were arrested and sentenced:

My father, Mykola VORONYI, who had arrived from abroad in 1926.

SHRAH, Mykola, former high-level employee of Gosplan, who had arrived from abroad in 1923.

CHUDNOV'S'KYI, Vasyli', publishing worker, who had arrived from abroad in 1924.

KOSYNKA, Hryhorii, Ukrainian writer.

FAL'KIV'S'KYI, Dmytro, Ukrainian writer.

VL'YZ'KO, Oleksa, Ukrainian writer, and others.

Question: Who personally occupied the leadership position in the ideological and practical guidance of the entire activity of the counter-revolutionary organization?

Answer: The main leadership core in ideological and practical guidance in recent times in the areas known to me consisted of:

BAZHAN, ZEROV, LEBID', ANTONENKO-DAVYDOVYCH, PLUZHNYK, Mykola VORONYI, EPIK, IANOV'S'KYI and SHKURUPII.

BAZHAN, ANTONENKO-DAVYDOVYCH, PLUZHNYK, Mykola VORONYI, EPIK, IANOV'S'KYI and SHKURUPII in their basic counter-revolutionary nationalist activities united the literary-nationalist circles and through them penetrated the literary youth and the Ukrainian intelligentsia and involved them in the work of the counter-revolutionary organization.

All practical work in general was directed towards recruitment into the counter-revolutionary organization on the basis of this social base [sic].

LEBID' and ZEROV conducted analogous work among the faculty and students of higher educational establishments.

The practical work in ideological education, preliminary testing and further recruitment and penetration into peasant masses and rural intelligentsia was conducted through these two channels.

The members of our counter-revolutionary organization listed above who earlier resided or currently reside outside Kyiv in practice conducted and continue working in an analogous direction.

Question: What is the essence of the political orientation you followed in the recent period?

Answer: The political orientation of our counter-revolutionary organization in the course of recent years, as I have testified earlier, changed depending on the internal situation and taking into account the possibilities arising abroad which could support the Ukrainian nationalist movement.

The latest period is characterized by:

a) Absence of disagreement, even taking into account the political divergences of particular individuals.

b) There was a uniform striving, based on the growing tendencies among the Ukrainian youth, to use in our orientation towards Germany and Poland [sic].

The main goal is the armed seizure of power through all possible means and methods, including terror.

A fascist dictatorship, a strong power based on full consolidation of all Ukrainian nationalist elements here and in the foreign emigration—this was our main goal.

I am a nationalist, an active proponent of bourgeois nationalist Ukraine. I conducted counter-revolutionary work directly in my literary activities. Thus, for example, in the period 1923–26 I sent my poems to Poland where they were published in the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist press. In my poems I undoubtedly not merely reflected my own intellectual dispositions and political views, but also demonstrated the presence and growth of nationalist tendencies and cadre in Soviet Ukraine, on which one could rely in the struggle with Soviet power.

This played into the hands of the entire foreign Ukrainian counter-revolution, this inspired them and signaled to them that they were not alone in the struggle with Soviet power and could count on assistance from the inside.

I was eagerly published and praised as the one who had proven my dedication to Ukrainian nationalism, thus showing a promising example to other nationalist elements in Ukraine.

My later literary activities in Ukraine did not constitute a valuable contribution to Soviet Ukrainian literature by any means, since I was in essence forced to accommodate, and in certain particular elements reached clear counter-revolutionary manifestations.

My poems, such as “ZMOVA KART” (The Conspiracy of Cards), “KR,” “POSHTOVYI HOLUB” (Carrier Pigeon) and others, written in the period of collectivization (1929–31), in the period of fierce class struggle in Ukraine, did not serve the goals of struggle against the opposition to Soviet power by any means; on the contrary, thanks to their hidden counter-revolutionary core they served only to strengthen the nationalist tendencies and to raise nationalist cadre in Ukraine.

In recent years, up to the day of my arrest, due to the increasingly complex situation, in my literary activity I, like other members of our counter-revolutionary organization, following a preliminary agreement, engaged in sabotage, and in order to have means of existence, I started writing for popular entertainment, doing shoddy work, in other words was simply biding time from the political point of view.

M. Voronyi [Signature missing]

Interrogated by: Examining Magistrate of the Special Section *Bondarenko* [Signature missing]

Verified by: *Pisarev* [Signature]

14 April 1935

No. 35

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION

of the Accused, VORONYI, Marko Mykolaiovych
from 14 April 1935

Question: Who personally led ideologically the preparation of the cadre for terrorist acts, and who was selected for conducting these terrorist acts?

Answer: The terrorist goals followed from the essence of the tasks we had set for ourselves as one of the paths and methods of struggle with Soviet power. I have spoken about this in my earlier testimony.

Our leadership core, ZEROV, LEBID', FYLYPOVYCH, RYL'S'KYI, DRAI-KHMARA, BAZHAN and IANOV'S'KYI, argued for the necessity

of terrorist actions, trying to prove that this way we would achieve effectiveness in two directions:

a) The leaders of the CP(b)U and of Soviet power in Ukraine, such as comrades POSTYSHEV and BALYTS'KYI, specially sent by Moscow for the final uprooting of everything nationalist that is still alive in Ukraine, will in fact be liquidated.

b) We will let all our sympathizers here and outside the USSR perceive that we are well organized, that we are working and that we have established a powerful human base that is a real force in the struggle against Soviet power in the case of a war with the USSR.

Soon after the sentencing and the execution of KOSYNKA and others a “wake” for the executed took place at RYL'S'KYI's apartment.

A participant in this wake, ZHYHALKO, told me about this, and on the basis of my conversation with him I concluded that in essence this was a sanctification ceremony where the memory of the fallen fighters for the nationalist liberation of Ukraine was honored. A poem was read, or rather, a song was sung (lyrics by P. Kulish), “Let us sing, brothers, at empty tables, let us grieve, brothers, for the dead brothers.”

After this they moved to the practical discussion of the questions of further preparation of the cadre to replace those who perished.

As I have understood, the newly organized group includes:

1. Zhyhalko, Serhii.
2. Ryl's'kyi, Maksym.
3. Mel'nyk, Petro, married to the sister of the wife of the executed terrorist Vlyz'ko.
4. Iaroshenko, Volodymyr Moiseiovych.
5. Deinar, an opera singer from Luhans'k.

Taking into consideration the ongoing arrests, continuing without interruption, and seeing them as a consistent and strict continuation of the line towards the elimination and uprooting of the shrinking numbers of nationalist cadre, it was suggested that the preparation for terrorist acts was to be conducted in a most thorough manner, and that they were to be scheduled for the May Day celebrations, since that would undoubtedly provide an opportunity to carry out the terrorist intentions.

This was based on the supposition that the Ukrainian leadership, Comrades POSTYSHEV, BALYTS'KYI and others, in addition to overseeing the parade and the demonstration, would also attend the meeting at the opera house and perhaps also visit the new construction sites or industrial enterprises in Kyiv or the surrounding area.

Question: Against whom personally were these terrorist intentions directed?

Answer: For the most part, Comrades POSTYSHEV and BALYTS'KYI were personally discussed as objects of terror. The reasons for this I noted earlier. It was believed that with their return to Ukraine they launched a comprehensive campaign of pressure against the nationalist elements and developed a struggle on the nationalist front.

POSTYSHEV, as the one who carries out Moscow's decisions, directly leads this work in Ukraine.

BALYTS'KYI, as the one who has destroyed the cream of the Ukrainian nationalist cadre.

Question: As a rule, you were always present at the meetings of the organization?

Answer: In the spring of 1934 I took part in the meetings that were conducted in Kharkiv, attended by BAZHAN, IANOV'S'KYI, VRAZHLYVYI, MOHYLIANS'KYI.

They took place several times at the homes of BAZHAN, MOHYLIANS'KYI and VRAZHLYVYI.

With my arrival to Kyiv analogous meetings took place under the guise of "political checkers" and parties. They took place at the homes of RYL'S'KYI, BAZHAN and SHCHERBATYNS'KYI.

In 1934–1935 at different times the following members of the counter-revolutionary organization participated in those meetings: PLUZHNYK, TENETA, VOLOSHYN, SHERBATYNS'KYI, me, VORONYI, VOLKOVYCH, VOSKREKASENKO, ZHYHALKO, IAROSHENKO, MEL'NYK, SHEVCHENKO, DEINAR and BAZHAN's brother.

I am also aware of several analogous meetings that took place without my participation at SHCHERBATYNS'KYI's. I know about these meetings from SHCHERBATYNS'KYI, RYL'S'KYI and ZHYHALKO. They were attended by RYL'S'KYI, PLUZHNYK, ZHYHALKO, IAKOVENKO and VOLKOVYCH.

In Kharkiv, and also later in Kyiv, the themes we discussed were as follows:

a) The questions of national oppression of everything still called purely national Ukrainian culture. In particular, this referred to the literary work of the nationalists, the writers whose work could not be published, which was considered by us to be the true representation of the Ukrainian masses.

b) Political questions of both an internal and international nature. The results of the collectivization were considered a distortion of the fact that this undertaking led to the mass impoverishment of peasant masses [sic], the forecasts of famine, the final ruin of the countryside, where at the best collective farms only the selected few, the super shock-workers, could feed their families by their labor, given satisfactory results per day of work (2–3 kilos).

On the basis of trips out to the collective farms and new construction projects the feebleness of the collective farms was revealed, the worthlessness of the new construction projects, the lack of skill to master either one. All this despite colossal human sacrifice and waste of large monetary sums, which also as a result leads to the impoverishment and ruin of the peasantry.

Taking into account the argument that the Ukrainian youth, looking at all this in its natural state, and feeling the full burden of the situation, saw and became convinced that the only way out for Ukraine from the position of being exploited by and economically dependent on Moscow was the path to fascism [sic].

Here began the deeper study of the situation in fascist countries, and sympathy towards fascism was increasingly revealed, with the conclusion that the salvation for Ukraine was only in fascism, with outside assistance.

Analogous ascertainment was also reached on the basis of surveying the nationalistically minded writers, artists and the intelligentsia.

From all this followed only one thing:

The base for the invigoration of counter-revolutionary nationalist activity, despite the unending arrests and repressions, does exist. But it is necessary, by all means, to use for greater recruitment and involvement into our counter-revolutionary organization from the top to the peasant bottom [sic, ungrammatical sentence].

As far as I know, practical work in this direction was conducted by every member of our counter-revolutionary organization.

Particularly massive ideological recruitment activity was conducted by the members of the counter-revolutionary organization I have listed here, as they have been its ideologues and leaders in recent times.

Voronyi [Signature missing]

Interrogated by: Head of the 4th Division of the Special Section (*Pisarev*)

Examining Magistrate (*Bondarenko*)

Verified by: [Signed by *Pisarev*] (*Bondarenko*)

15 April 1935

No. 36

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION
of the Accused, VORONYI, Marko Mykolaiovych
from 15 April 1935

Question: The materials of the investigation have ascertained that the counter-revolutionary organization of which you are a member used in its activities the methods of double-dealing and covert sabotage. What do you know regarding this question?

Answer: In my testimony from April 11, I stated that I had been bidding my time, working for popular entertainment. In this way I first and foremost avoided working on political topics. I absolutely did not work on the topics of socialist construction, the strengthening of collective farms, cultural growth, etc. The stakes were defined particularly sharply in terms of avoiding touching in a direct or indirect fashion the questions of a national kind.

In reality this line of behavior is a result of the earlier developed system of our external behavior following a particular mutual agreement of the members of our counter-revolutionary organization.

Specific discussions of our external tactics took place between BAZHAN and me. Bazhan is the initiator and the organizer of this tactic, suggested to me and to other members of our organization.

On this topic I conducted personal discussions with ANTONENKO-DAVYDOVYCH, PLUZHNYK and others. As a result, the group of members of the counter-revolutionary organization I had listed, namely:

BAZHAN, RYL'S'KYI, IANOV'S'KYI, KACHURA, IAROSHENKO, MOHYLIANS'KYI, LEBID', FYLYPOVYCH, DRAI-KHMARA, ZEROV, I, VORONYI, and others absolutely did not express ourselves through literary creative work.

There was clear double-dealing in those necessary cases when one of us was faced by exceptional circumstances to express himself publicly on a particular question.

This diverges sharply from earlier methods used by the participants in the counter-revolutionary

organization, namely, earlier nationalist content was inserted in various ways through all available means and opportunities in literature, education, art and so forth.

Now this threatened us with a fiasco, and we considered it necessary to move from earlier methods and forms to such paths that would not threaten to wreck our main political goals.

Question: With whom did you personally discuss the necessity of forms and methods of counter-revolutionary activity?

Answer: I personally discussed this during my meetings with BAZHAN.

BAZHAN, speaking with [one word undecipherable] me, stressed that the exceptionally difficult situation in which Ukraine found itself at present and the increasing national oppression could not go on any longer.

Now it was necessary more than ever to push forward the idea of the fascization of Ukraine and all the work of our counter-revolutionary organization should be carried under the slogans of the inevitability of fascism in Ukraine. In fact, BAZHAN's conversations with me were summed up by the final formulation of the activity of the counter-revolutionary organization as a fascist core that now needed to invigorate its counter-revolutionary activity precisely in this direction.

From this I personally concluded that I had to carry on these political points to those participants in the counter-revolutionary organization with whom I was personally connected or to those who through me were connected to BAZHAN.

It became clear to me that our organization was taking on a clearly manifested fascist character.

Question: While discussing the need for a reconstruction of the counter-revolutionary organization, how did you envision it?

Answer: During the discussion and while coming to the decision to shift to a clearly fascist path, BAZHAN told me that our organization was to be regarded the Ukrainian National Socialist Party, the UNSP.

Tying this with assistance from the outside, BAZHAN told me that he was speaking not only about Ukraine, but about a whole series of free republics that were to break away from the USSR, in particular the Caucasus, and their development was to be based on broader nationalism and democracy.

Question: What was the organizational structure of the leadership of the counter-revolutionary organization?

Answer: In my testimony from April 11 and 14, I already stated that the leadership of our organization was: BAZHAN, IANOV'S'KYI, RYL'S'KYI, ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH, DRAI-KHMARA, LEBID' and my father, Mykola VORONYI.

The leadership of the counter-revolutionary organization was placed in such a way so as to embrace through its influence and leadership diverse strata of the Ukrainian intelligentsia.

Thus, for example:

BAZHAN, IANOV'S'KYI, Mykola VORONYI and I, Marko VORONYI—counter-revolutionary nationalist elements in the literary circles;

RYL'S'KYI, ZHYHALKO, KACHURA, IAROSHENKO, MEL'NYK, SHCHERBATYNS'KYI

—also elements of the literary circles and a terrorist group;

FYLYPOVYCH and DRAI-KHMARA—professional members of the organization;

LEBID' and PYLYPENKO—educators and artists, members of the counter-revolutionary organization;

ZEROV, CHIRKOV and MYTKEVYCH—Moscow branch of the counter-revolutionary organization;

MOHYLIANS'KYI and KONOVAL—Kharkiv branch of the organization.

These groups were connected with one another in the following manner:

the groups of ZEROV, LEBID', FYLYPOVYCH, BAZHAN and RYL'S'KYI were directly connected with one another. Through me BAZHAN's group was connected with KONOVAL's group in Kharkiv, the connection between BAZHAN's and RYL'S'KYI's group was also in part conducted through me.

Question: With whom were you personally connected in actual counter-revolutionary activity?

Answer: In my counter-revolutionary activity I was directly connected with BAZHAN, IANOV'S'KYI, RYL'S'KYI in Kyiv, with MOHYLIANS'KYI and KONOVAL in Kharkiv, with CHIRKOV and MYTKEVYCH in Moscow.

Question: In your testimony from April 10 and 14 you stated that the leadership of the counter-revolutionary organization was pushing forward the question of terror. Who personally promoted this question?

Answer: I confirm one more time my testimony from April 14 that:

a) the terrorist objectives followed from the fascist essence of our organization and the tasks we had set for ourselves in our struggle with Soviet power;

b) the grounds for and the necessity of terrorist action originated from the leadership of ZEROV, DRAI-KHMARA, LEBID', RYL'S'KYI, BAZHAN, IANOV'S'KYI and FYLYPOVYCH.

I understood about concrete preparations for terrorist objectives from what ZHYHALKO told me after he had attended the wake at RYL'S'KYI's apartment commemorating the executed KOSYNKA and others.

Question: When exactly did the wake commemorating KOSYNKA and others take place? Whom do you know among the participants of this meeting?

Answer: This was a few days after the publication in the press of a notice about the execution of KOSYNKA and others. With ZHYHALKO I had a conversation about this only once, as he was soon arrested. Therefore I do not know the details.

Knowing the composition of the group that RYL'S'KYI was cobbling together around himself, and on the basis of the conversation with ZHYHALKO, I conclude that the participants of the wake were: RYL'S'KYI, ZHYHALKO, MEL'NYK, IAROSHENKO, DEINAR. They comprised the terrorist group that was called upon to replace the executed. That is why they were participants in this consultation.

Question: What decisions were made at the wake?

Answer: I do not know the details of all the conversations that took place at this wake, but from ZHYHALKO's words it became clear to me that the

main decision was to organize a terrorist group with the above-mentioned composition.

The circumstances of the wake itself and the earlier prepared verse about “perished brothers” were directed at binding the group closer and providing for the upcoming terrorist acts.

Question: At the interrogations on April 10 and 14 you testified that the planned objects of terrorist acts were Comrades POSTYSHEV and BALYTS'KYI. From whom did you learn this?

Answer: Terror against the leaders of the CP(b)U and Soviet power in Ukraine was a key element of the tasks the counter-revolutionary organization had set for itself.

The political conversations which we conducted on a daily basis also continuously circled around the question that comrades POSTYSHEV and BALYTS'KYI embodied national oppression in Ukraine, which in fact provided the ground for terrorist acts against them. I conducted such conversations repeatedly with RYL'S'KYI, BAZHAN, MOHYLIANS'KYI and others.

Question: How was the practical implementation of terrorist objectives planned out and at which time periods?

Answer: The terrorist objectives began manifesting themselves more sharply in recent times. This is connected with the ongoing arrests, pressure on the Ukrainian nationalist elements, firing and dismissal and general continuing pressure on all the nationalist elements.

It is completely natural that when ZHYHALKO had told me about the wake at RYL'S'KYI's, I understood that a new terrorist group was being cobbled together, and from this followed that its objects could only be comrades POSTYSHEV and BALYTS'KYI.

The period of May Day celebrations was the most convenient, as the convenience was provided by mass gatherings both in the streets and in certain public buildings. Precisely at this time Comrades POSTYSHEV, BALYTS'KYI and others are always in close touch with the main masses of people and this would favor the planned tendencies.

This was taken down from my words correctly, I have read this, and certify by signature.

M. Voronyi [Signature missing]

Interrogated by: Head of the 4th Division of the Special Section

Examining magistrate (*Bondarenko*)

Verified by: [signed by *Pisarev*]

8 February 1936

No. 37

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION
of VORONYI, Marko Mykolaiovych
from 8 February 1936

Question: In your testimony about the leadership of the counter-revolutionary organization in Kyiv in which you had participated, you also testified that an active leadership role both in the guidance and in the practical counter-revolutionary activities was played by DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych.

From whom did you personally learn about this?

Answer: I know DRAI-KHMARA well as a man who stood quite close to ZEROV, FYLYPOVCH, RYL'S'KYI and others. During the entire period of my residence in Kyiv, DRAI-KHMARA, just like all the above-mentioned persons, was an active member of the Neoclassicist group led by ZEROV. Just as in their case, all his literary output was saturated by nationalism and served nationalist goals.

Nobody had told me personally that DRAI-KHMARA was one of the leaders of the counter-revolutionary organization.

Knowing well all the counter-revolutionary activities conducted by ZEROV, FYLYPOVCH, RYL'S'KYI and others as a leadership group, knowing that DRAI-KHMARA also occupied a similarly active nationalist place and was by no means in the rear nationalist ranks in this group, and also about DRAI-KHMARA's particular closeness to RYL'S'KYI, I drew from this the conclusion about the leadership role DRAI-KHMARA had played in the counter-revolutionary organization.

Question: What interaction did you have with DRAI-KHMARA in actual counter-revolutionary nationalist activities?

Answer: Although I did not have direct ties with DRAI-KHMARA in joint counter-revolutionary activities, I have enough to base my judgments about them.

I know from ZHYHALKO about the meeting at RYL'S'KYI's, about KOSYNKA et al., that a new terrorist group was being prepared for organization, I knew about all the nationalist counter-revolutionary activity of RYL'S'KYI and his circle.

It is quite natural and fully justified that I now confirm one more time my testimony about the active counter-revolutionary nationalist activities of DRAI-KHMARA, one of those who was the closest to and most strongly tied to RYL'S'KYI.

In our circles of active participants in the counter-revolutionary nationalist organization, DRAI-KHMARA was known as a convinced, firm nationalist, close to ZEROV and RYL'S'KYI. From here follow the grounds for DRAI-KHMARA's active role in all our nationalist counter-revolutionary activity [sic].

Taken down from my words correctly, which I certify by signature.

M. Voronyi [Signature missing]

Interrogated by: Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section *Pisarev*

Verified by: [Signed by *Pisarev*]

11 February 1936

No. 38

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION

of the Accused, ZEROV, Mykola Kostevych
from 11 February 1936

DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, is known to me as a participant in the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary underground since the fall of 1923, when we met for the first time in Kyiv.

I know that until then he had been a professor at Kam'ianets'-Podil'skyi University, organized by the Secretariat of Education of the Central Rada, and later enjoyed special protection from the Directory as a cultural citadel preparing counter-revolutionary nationalist cadre, for the purpose of organized struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat and against the workers' and peasants' government of Soviet Ukraine that carried it out. The university carried out its nationalist tasks under the leadership of hardcore nationalist Ivan OHIENKO, and each of the native faculty members, including DRAI-KHMARA, due to the political situation as well as to the educational one, was a direct organizer both of this nest of nationalism and of the nationalist cadre raised there.

Upon his arrival in Kyiv, M.P. DRAI-KHMARA sought ties with bourgeois literary groups, ASPYS and the Neoclassicists, which were a literary branch of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary nationalist camp. He did this firmly and without hesitation. I remember the words he said in the first days of our acquaintance about the need for us to stick together.

As a writer close to the Neoclassicists and openly allied with them, DRAI-KHMARA in 1926 took part in the literary evening at the HRINCHENKO Pedagogical Vocational School, joined the counter-revolutionary struggle of bourgeois nationalist writers against the young Soviet and proletarian literary cadre; upon his own initiative he got in touch with the SLOVO publishing house which propagandized nationalist authors, he was a member of the Historical-Literary Society at the Academy of Sciences which strengthened the academic position of IEFREMOV; as a counter-revolutionary nationalist he took part in the almanac *Literaturnyi iarmarok* organized by KHVYL'OVYI (1929).

As an author of literary-historical works (the studies of Lesia UKRAINKA), he propagandized nationalist views, overemphasizing nationalist motifs in the creative work of Ukrainian writers, not making any attempts to explain their class essence, and moreover, thoroughly avoiding and obscuring all problems of the socialist study of literary facts, and thus actively served the cause of ideological upbringing of nationalist cadre.

As a Ukrainian language instructor at the Medical Institute, DRAI-KHMARA was one of the pillars of the nationalist course followed at that institution of learning during the rectorship of L.M. LEVYTS'KYI who always supported him.

His recently written poems on Soviet themes are characteristic of the tactic of masking and double-dealing typical of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary nationalist circles who strove to save themselves and their cadre at the time of the unfolding socialist offensive along the entire front. I also supported his

tactic of double-dealing at our meeting in the fall of 1934 in Lypky.

M. DRAI-KHMARA's connections kept him until recently within the nationalist circles: he was close to O.K. DOROSHKEVYCH, to some of his colleagues and accomplices from Kam'ianets' (F.V. KLYMENKO, S.E. HAIIEVS'KYI), gravitated towards RYL'S'KYI, who was the center of attraction for nationalist writers.

I was never in doubt about the nationalist orientation of his thought.

The entire structure of his thought and all his connections show DRAI-KHMARA to belong to the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary nationalist underground and due to his position as a faculty member and a writer occupied one of the notable places within it.

M. Zerov

[Signature missing]

Interrogated by: Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section *Pisarev*

[Signature]

13 February 1936

No. 39

PROTOCOL

of the Confrontation between DRAI-KHMARA,
Mykhailo Panasovych,
and ZEROV, Mykola Kostevych
conducted 13 February 1936

Question: Accused DRAI-KHMARA! Do you know the citizen sitting across from you?

Answer: Yes, I do. This is ZEROV, Mykola Kostevych, whom I know well.

Question to ZEROV: Do you know the citizen sitting across from you?

Answer: I do. This is DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych. I am acquainted with him and know him well.

Question to DRAI-KHMARA, M.P.: Have you ever had any personal scores to settle with citizen ZEROV?

Answer: Yes. There were occasionally semi-hostile relations between me, him and FYLYPOVYCH, due to competition for positions at the Medical Institute and at the Academy of Sciences, where we had advanced our candidacies simultaneously. This was in 1929. After 1929 we did not have any personal scores to settle.

Question to ZEROV: Do you confirm the presence of personal scores to settle between you and DRAI-KHMARA?

Answer: In 1923 we simultaneously applied for the position of Ukrainian studies instructor at the Medical Institute. But this did not lead to any cooling of our relations which were being established then.

In 1929 a similar situation was provoked by DRAI-KHMARA's letter to me, where he objected to certain words I had said about his candidacy at the Literature Commission of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

Our relations were strained for some time, but I have no personal hostility towards DRAI-KHMARA.

Question to ZEROV: Did these conflicts reflect in any way on your and DRAI-KHMARA's common worldview, did you ever have disagreements of a political nature during your joint work in the

Neoclassicist group, precisely on the basis of personal conflicts?

Answer: No, they didn't.

Question to DRAI-KHMARA: Do you confirm this?

Answer: I think this was related in some way. Please correct this. On the basis of personal scores there were no political disagreements between us.

Question to ZEROV: For how many years have you known DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., how long did you work together, to which nationalist counter-revolutionary groups was he close, what do you know about the counter-revolutionary nationalist activities of DRAI-KHMARA?

Answer: I have known DRAI-KHMARA since the fall of 1923, our paths of social and literary work did not diverge until the end of 1934, until the time of our last meeting in the fall of 1934.

DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., was part of the literary studio ASPYS, and later allied himself with the Neoclassicist group. Both ASPYS and the Neoclassicist group were branches of the Ukrainian nationalist counter-revolutionary underground.

I know that DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., had been a professor at Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University which enjoyed special protection from the government of the Ukrainian People's Republic, that he occupied a prominent place in the university's structure. Due to the political and educational situation, DRAI-KHMARA was an organizer of the nationalist cadre raised at that university; on his arrival in Kyiv in 1923, on his own initiative, he sought contacts with bourgeois nationalist circles and organizations, about which he spoke directly to me; together with the Neoclassicist group he took part in the literary evening of the Neoclassicists organized by LEBID' at the Hrinchenko Pedagogical Vocational School, an evening that was a link in the system of raising nationalist cadre and one of the methods of counter-revolutionary nationalist activity.

DRAI-KHMARA took part in the work of the Historical-Literary Society of the Academy of Sciences, which strengthened the academic position, and therefore the sociopolitical influence, of IEFREMOV; the scholarly writings of DRAI-KHMARA found their distinct place in the development of the nationalist trend in literary scholarship. This means that DRAI-KHMARA negated the class issues in literature, considered Ukrainian literature to be an expression of the national and nothing else, which was a manifestation of kulak nationalism within the particular field of literary scholarship.

In recent years, approximately from 1930 until 1934, DRAI-KHMARA was connected with DOROSHKEVYCH and RYL'S'KYI, to whom the nationalist writers in Kyiv gravitated, as to their center; the poems DRAI-KHMARA read to me at our last meeting were characteristic of nationalist writers who resorted to the method of masking their nationalist double-dealing with revolutionary verbiage. This is how I understood those poems at our last meeting, and this is how I judge them now. This spurious revolutionariness is called double-dealing, or accommodationism (*prisposoblenchestvo*).

In 1934 DRAI-KHMARA was a nationalist due to his past and present position as a person with

qualifications and scholarly baggage; he was a prominent participant in the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary underground.

Having spoken in my testimony about RYL'S'KYI as a leading figure among nationalist counter-revolutionary writers, as a person who organized the counter-revolutionary activities of nationalist literary circles, and testifying here to the closeness between DRAI-KHMARA and RYL'S'KYI, I suppose that DRAI-KHMARA was also involved in this organized counter-revolutionary activity.

Question to DRAI-KHMARA: Do you confirm the correctness of ZEROV's testimony?

Answer: No. I confirm certain details; I do not confirm certain other details at all.

Question to DRAI-KHMARA: Which details do you confirm?

Answer: I confirm that my activities in Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi until 1922 were nationalist.

I confirm that I was part of the Neoclassicist group and a member of the Historical-Literary Society; from 1923 to 1929 there were some nationalist elements in my worldview. In 1929 I rectified these nationalist elements. I eliminated the remnants of the nationalist elements in 1933. In 1934 I displayed an attitude of appeasement towards the essentially nationalist statements of RYL'S'KYI. I also behaved in an appeasing way towards conversations with and reports from RYL'S'KYI that bore a nationalist character.

I confirm my closeness to DOROSHKEVYCH, up until his departure for Izhevsk in 1933, when he was arrested and then deported.

My and ZEROV's paths finally diverged in 1929, for after 1929, except for the conversation in 1934, we did not have any notable conversations.

The Neoclassicist group as a whole was a counter-revolutionary phenomenon within Ukrainian literature, but it wasn't a branch of the nationalist underground. Besides, I disagreed with them on several occasions, I do not remember exactly how many, but it seems at four different times I read to ZEROV my revolutionary poems to which he reacted extremely negatively.

While being a member of the Historical-Philological Society I did not make nationalist presentations and did not carry out any nationalist activities.

I categorically deny ZEROV's assertions that my poems written in 1933-35 were a form of masking and double-dealing. Although I noticed some nationalist manifestations in RYL'S'KYI, I considered him a Soviet person when I visited him.

I had absolutely no part in the counter-revolutionary activities of RYL'S'KYI about which ZEROV testifies here at this confrontation.

The testimony is taken down correctly, which we certify by our signatures.

Drai-Khmara [signature missing]

Zerov [Signature missing]

The confrontation was conducted by: Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section *Pisarev*
[Signature]

17 February 1936
No. 40

PROTOCOL

of the Confrontation between VORONYI, M.M.,
and DRAI-KHMARA, M.P.
conducted 17 February 1936

Question to VORONYI, M.M.: Do you know the citizen sitting across from you?

Answer: I do. The person sitting across from me is DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych; we have been well acquainted for a long time.

Question to DRAI-KHMARA, M. P.: Do you know the citizen present here?

Answer: Yes. This is VORONYI, Marko Mykolaiovych, I have known him since 1929.

Question to VORONYI, M. M.: Were there ever personal scores to settle between you and DRAI-KHMARA?

Answer: No.

Question to DRAI-KHMARA, M. P.: Were there ever personal scores to settle between you and VORONYI and any mutual hostility based on that?

Answer: No.

Question to VORONYI, M. M.: Do you know that DRAI-KHMARA is a member of a nationalist counter-revolutionary organization?

Answer: Yes. In my testimony during the investigation I have already testified that DRAI-KHMARA is known to me as a leading person in the counter-revolutionary nationalist organization.

Question to VORONYI, M.M.: How did you learn about DRAI-KHMARA's leading role in the counter-revolutionary organization, for how long have you known about his nationalist counter-revolutionary activities, who was he conducting these activities with?

Answer: I've been living in Kyiv since 1927. Since then, or perhaps a little later than that, I am acquainted with DRAI-KHMARA.

DRAI-KHMARA is known to me as a person close to ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI, FYLYPOVYCH, LEBID', that is, to the Neoclassicist group which expressed the most extreme nationalist positions. I know that within this group DRAI-KHMARA occupied a far from marginal role and was part of its leadership. DRAI-KHMARA's nationalism is known to me also on the basis of our personal conversations, and conversations between him and the group mentioned above. I recall one such meeting at RYL'S'KYI's with NIKOV'S'KYI and IEFREMOV present.

Knowing about the recently reinvigorated counter-revolutionary activities of RYL'S'KYI and ZEROV, knowing from ZHYHALKO about the wake that took place at RYL'S'KYI's for the executed KOSYNKA and other terrorists, where RYL'S'KYI and ZHYHALKO were present, which in essence was a cobbling together of a new terrorist group, knowing also from conversations with RYL'S'KYI about the extreme tenseness of his counter-revolutionary moods, pointing out that our counter-revolutionary organization in the underground began seeking unprincipled ties to blocs, and knowing that the leadership of the former Neoclassicist group was turning into the leadership core of our counter-revolutionary organization in Kyiv—on the basis of all of this and taking into consideration the closeness of DRAI-KHMARA to RYL'S'KYI and ZEROV, and considering that as a person of our

persuasion, DRAI-KHMARA is on the same path as all of us, I pointed to DRAI-KHMARA as a person who was part of the leadership core of our counter-revolutionary organization.

In my counter-revolutionary activity in recent years I was closely connected with RYL'S'KYI and his circle, in particular with the group of younger people, such as ZHYHALKO, MEL'NYK, SHCHERBATYNS'KYI and others.

At the same time it was known that RYL'S'KYI's old contacts from the earlier nationalist years still grouped around him; DRAI-KHMARA belongs to them.

Question to DRAI-KHMARA, M. P.: Do you confirm belonging to the nationalist movement when you exhibited a nationalist worldview?

Answer: I was part of the Neoclassicist group until 1929. I did commit mistakes of a nationalist nature, but I was not allied with the core of the Neoclassicists.

Question to DRAI-KHMARA, M.P.: Do you confirm the correctness of VORONYI's testimony about your closeness to RYL'S'KYI and ZEROV and about conducting counter-revolutionary nationalist activities together with them?

Answer: I was never on close terms with ZEROV. I was on close terms with RYL'S'KYI as a writer. I did not conduct any joint counter-revolutionary activities together with them.

The testimony is taken down correctly, which we certify by our signatures.

Drai-Khmara [signature missing]

M. Voronyi [signature missing]

The confrontation was conducted by: Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section *Pisarev*
[Signature]

17 February 1936

No. 41

PROTOCOL

of the Confrontation between
Convict Fylypovych, P.P.,
and the Accused, Drai-Khmara, M.P.,
conducted 17 February 1936

Question to FYLYPOVYCH: Is the citizen sitting across from you known to you? If yes, since when, and what are your mutual relations?

Answer: Citizen DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, is known to me approximately since 1926. Our relations until the arrest were of the best kind, friendly.

Question to DRAI-KHMARA: Do you confirm the testimony by FYLYPOVYCH on the essence of the question posed to him?

Answer: I confirm the testimony by FYLYPOVYCH and state that we have not had any personal scores to settle and that our relations were those of good acquaintances.

Question to FYLYPOVYCH: During the investigation you testified that DRAI-KHMARA was a participant in the counter-revolutionary nationalist underground. What do you know about the concrete counter-revolutionary nationalist activities of DRAI-KHMARA?

Answer: Already in the first years of the revolution DRAI-KHMARA took part in the Ukrainian nationalist movement, and during the rule of Hetman Skoropads'kyi, on the invitation from the well-known Ukrainian nationalist activist, and later a minister in the Petliurite government, OHIENKO, he went to Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University, founded by Hetman's authorities, as a faculty member.

Upon his return from Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi to Kyiv in 1923, DRAI-KHMARA became close to Kyiv nationalist literary groups, and in particular allied himself with the group of the Neoclassicists, becoming close, besides me, also to ZEROV and RYL'S'KYI, the leaders of the Neoclassicist group; he performed together with them at literary evenings, where nationalist literature was propagandized and a struggle with proletarian literature was carried out.

When Soviet proletarian criticism began revealing the anti-Soviet nationalist character of the literary output of the Neoclassicists, DRAI-KHMARA wrote the poem "SWANS," which was a call to the Neoclassicists not to yield their positions. This poem was produced in consultation with us, ZEROV and me, and later published in the journal *Literaturnyi iarmarok*, edited by KHVYL'OVYI.

When Soviet criticism revealed the nationalist character of this poem, DRAI-KHMARA published in the newspaper *Proletars'ka pravda* an obviously far-fetched and artificial explanation of this poem, allegedly addressed not to the Neoclassicists but to the French Abbéist poets.

DRAI-KHMARA did not sever his ties to the Neoclassicists, especially to RYL'S'KYI, who until very recently occupied a leadership position in the nationalist Neoclassicist group.

At the same time DRAI-KHMARA maintained close ties with DOROSHKEVYCH, who occupied a leadership position in the counter-revolutionary nationalist underground.

In 1929, when DRAI-KHMARA tried to enter through a competition the Literature Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, he found support from the well-known nationalist activist KRYMS'KYI, with whom he later co-edited a collection of articles on the Ukrainian language.

DRAI-KHMARA was also close to such Ukrainian nationalist writers as ANTONENKO-DAVYDOVYCH, KHVYL'OVYI and others.

On the basis of all this we—I, ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI and others—considered DRAI-KHMARA a member of the Ukrainian nationalist underground.

Just like all of us listed above, DRAI-KHMARA, in numerous conversations with us, and with me in particular, expressed in the most recent years his clearly counter-revolutionary views on the questions of the Party's policy in the countryside and its national policy.

It is on this basis that I consider DRAI-KHMARA a member of the nationalist underground to which I also have belonged.

Question to DRAI-KHMARA: Do you confirm the testimony of FYLYPOVYCH?

Answer: I admit that indeed starting from 1918 and up until 1929 I took part in the nationalist movement in Ukraine, first in Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi, and later in

Kyiv. Indeed, upon my return to Kyiv from Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi I joined the nationalist group of the Neoclassicists and became close to its leaders ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI and FYLYPOVYCH.

I admit that together with the Neoclassicists, in particular with ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI, FYLYPOVYCH and others, I took part in nationalist activities on the literary front, carrying on a struggle with proletarian literature. My work "SWANS" testifies to this. I admit that during all this time I was close to Prof. DOROSHKEVYCH, but I did not know he was a leader of the Ukrainian nationalist underground or that he was a nationalist to begin with. I only knew that DOROSHKEVYCH used to be a nationalist prior to the establishment of Soviet power.

I deny having close ties with FYLYPOVYCH and ZEROV after 1929. I also deny that from 1929 and up until my arrest I remained a nationalist and that I expressed counter-revolutionary nationalist views in a conversation with FYLYPOVYCH. In any case, I do not recall any conversations with FYLYPOVYCH in recent years on the topic of the Party's policy in the countryside and its national policy. Due to this I deny my belonging in recent years to the counter-revolutionary nationalist underground.

Fylypovych [signature missing]

Drai-Khmara [Signature missing]

The confrontation was conducted by: Deputy Head of the 10th Division *Bondarenko*

Verified by: *Pisarev* [Signature]

11 June 1935

No. 42

PROTOCOL OF THE INTERROGATION
of the Accused, KOZUB, Mykola Syl'vestrovych
from 11 June 1935

Question: You have been served an indictment of participating in the counter-revolutionary activities of the Ukrainian nationalist terrorist organization. Tell us about the counter-revolutionary work you have been conducting within it.

Answer: I was recruited into the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary nationalist organization by Ivan KOZUB during his visit from Moscow in the summer of 1934.

By this time in my political convictions I was a fully ripe Ukrainian nationalist.

The main assignments I received from Ivan KOZUB were: a) to rejoin the ranks of the Party in order to make the struggle against it maximally effective and b) to create Ukrainian counter-revolutionary nationalist cadre out of Ukrainian youth.

To carry out the assignments I had received I took the most energetic measures directed at rejoining the ranks of the Party and tried to shift to educational work, having in mind a rapprochement with Ukrainian student youth. With this goal in mind, in January of this year I found employment as an ancient history instructor at the Kyiv Industrial Worker's Courses; however, up until the day of my arrest I did not carry out any concrete activities aimed at cobbling together nationalist cadre out of the students of the courses.

Question: Name the members of the Ukrainian counter-revolutionary nationalist organization known to you.

Answer: Of the persons carrying out energetic counter-revolutionary activities within the Ukrainian nationalist organization I know the following:

KOZUB, Ivan Ihnatovych, born in the village of Kapustyntsi, Berlivs'kyi district, a former Borot'bist, served in Hetman's guard. At the time of my arrest worked in Moscow.

KOZUB, Serhii Ihnatovych, brother of Ivan KOZUB, former officer in the Tsarist army, in 1923–24 graduated from the History and Philology Faculty of Kyiv University. Worked at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, under the leadership of HRUSHEVS'KYI and IEFREMOV. A disciple of ZEROV and FYLYPOVYCH at the university. Worked in Zhytomyr and Nizhyn as an educator; removed from this work for smuggling counter-revolutionary nationalist contraband into the educational system. Most recently resided in Kyiv at 36 L'vivs'ka st., Apt. 9, and did not have any employment.

LEBID', Ananii Dmytrovych, writer, educator. Worked at the Kyiv Evening Communist University and at the Kyiv Industrial Workers' Courses where I taught as well. Was in close contact with Serhii KOZUB. Was arrested earlier in connection with the case of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine.

SABALDYR, Hryhorii, educator, Ukrainian language and literature instructor. Worked at several educational institutions in Kyiv. A close friend of Ivan KOZUB, Serhii KOZUB and Ananii LEBID'.

KULISH, Petro Ovrarmovych, born in the village of Pluzhnyky, Berlivs'kyi district, of mid-income peasant background. Before the revolution studied at the Pereiaslav *gimnazii*. During the Civil War commanded a guerilla detachment, and with a part of it switched to the side of the Petliurite troops. Most recently worked in the city of Vinnytsia. A cousin of Ivan and Serhii KOZUB. maintains regular ties with the latter two.

ZEROV, Mykola Kostevych, professor of literature at Kyiv University. Enjoyed a close acquaintanceship with Ananii LEBID', also acquainted with Serhii KOZUB.

FYLYPOVYCH, Pavlo, Ukrainian literature professor, teaches at Kyiv University, a close friend of ZEROV and LEBID'. Acquainted with Serhii KOZUB.

DRAI-KHMARA, Ukrainian language professor, taught at several higher educational institutions in Kyiv. Enjoys a close acquaintanceship with ZEROV, LEBID' and FYLYPOVYCH. Acquainted with Serhii KOZUB.

KALYNOVYCH, professor of linguistics, teaches at Kyiv University, a researched at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, enjoys a close acquaintanceship with ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH and LEBID'.

The testimony was taken down correctly, following my words, and has been read by me, which I certify by signature.

M. Kozub

Interrogated by: Examining Magistrate of the Special Section [Ovchinnikov]

Verified by: [Signed by Pisarev]

19 February 1936

No. 43

CONCLUDING STATEMENT OF THE PROSECUTION

in the Case of DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, with reference to articles 54-8 and 11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR

In 1935 the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR revealed and liquidated a counter-revolutionary nationalist organization which energetically conducted counter-revolutionary activities and prepared for a terrorist attempt on the lives of the leaders of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolshevik) in Ukraine.

The leadership of the counter-revolutionary nationalist organization, Prof. ZEROV, Prof. FYLYPOVYCH, LEBID', PYLYPENKO, VORONYI and others in the process of the investigation were exposed and confessed to being the ideologues and leaders of the counter-revolutionary nationalist organization for a number of years and to having set for themselves terrorist goals, with an intention of realizing them in 1935.

Among the active participants in this counter-revolutionary organization was DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, former professor of Ukrainian studies and literature, later Ukrainian studies instructor in Kyiv.

The preliminary data and the investigation materials establish that:

DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., joined the Ukrainian nationalist counter-revolutionary movement as early as 1916. At the time of the Petliurite government, the Central Rada and Hetman's rule, DRAI-KHMARA was a professor at Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University, specially created to concentrate, raise and educate the most reliable Ukrainian nationalist cadre.

Upon departing abroad, the Petliurite government continued illegally subsidizing the faculty members of Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University, including DRAI-KHMARA (case ff. 13, 42).

Upon his arrival in Kyiv in 1923, DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., became close to IEFREMOV and others sentenced in the case of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine, and became an active participant in the work of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and its Historical-Literary Society led by IEFREMOV, who at the time conducted his nationalist counter-revolutionary work through this society (14, 15, 16, 32, 43).

In later years DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., was part of the group of Ukrainian Neoclassicists, with ZEROV, RYL'S'KYI, FYLYPOVYCH, and others, who carried out rather significant nationalist counter-revolutionary activities in Ukrainian literature (ff. 44, 55, 62).

Like ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH, LEBID', and others, DRAI-KHMARA became one of the ideologues and leaders of Ukrainian counter-revolutionary nationalism in literature, carrying out rather energetic activities in this direction up until his second arrest.

The testimony of ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH, VORONYI, and KOZUB (ff. 69, 71, 72, 82, 101-104, 108-110, 114-116) exposes DRAI-KHMARA as

conducting nationalist counter-revolutionary activities together with them up until their arrests in 1935.

Reference: In February 1936 the Military Tribunal of the Kyiv Military District sentenced ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH, and LEBID' in accordance with art. 54-8 and 11 to 10 years of corrective labor camps; VORONYI and KOZUB to 8 years of corrective labor camps.

DRAI-KHMARA partially confirms his participation in nationalist counter-revolutionary activities from 1916 to 1929, pointing to the presence in his activities of nationalist mistakes and tendencies which did not grow into active forms of nationalist counter-revolutionary activities. Admitting his appeasing attitude towards nationalism, DRAI-KHMARA denies his participation in active counter-revolutionary work together with ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH, LEBID' and others.

Taking into consideration the nationalist counter-revolutionary activities of DRAI-KHMARA over the course of a number of years and the exposure of his nationalist activities by convicted accomplices,

I recommend that

Case no. 101, on the accusation of DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, born 1889 in the village of Mali Kanivtsi of the Chornobai district of Kyiv oblast, presently residing in Kyiv, former professor of Ukrainian studies, dismissed from work for nationalism, former university professor during the rule of the Central Rada, earlier arrested for nationalist counter-revolutionary manifestations, in committing crimes that fall under articles 54-8 and 11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, is to be sent for consideration to the Special Council of the NKVD of the USSR with a petition to incarcerate DRAI-KHMARA, M.P. as a socially dangerous person, in a concentration camp, for the term of FIVE years.

Reference: DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., is presently being detained at the Special Block of Kyiv Prison and is hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of the Special Council of the NKVD of the USSR on this date.

The case includes a parcel with all the personal documents of DRAI-KHMARA, in accordance with the protocol of the search (f. 9).

Attached to the case is a parcel with blank letterhead of state institutions seized during the search at DRAI-KHMARA's (f. 142).

Attached also are the parcels with DRAI-KHMARA's statements and the parcel with materials for the chair of the Special Council of the NKVD of the USSR.

The nationalist literature listed in the protocol of the search has been expropriated and is due to be destroyed.

Compiled 19 February 1936.

Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section
Senior Lieutenant of State Security (*Pisarev*)

[Signature]

Approved by: Deputy Head of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and of Kyiv Military District

Captain of State Security (*Samoilov*)

[Signature]

19 February 1936

No. 44

RESOLUTION

Kyiv, 19 February 1936. I, head of the 10th Division of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR Pisarev, having examined the nationalist literature seized from citizen DRAI-KHMARA, M.P., following warrant no. 28 from 5 September 1935 and the search protocol from 5 September 1935,

Established:

In the course of DRAI-KHMARA's arrest and the conduct of the search at his apartment, according to the search protocol from 5 September 1935 (case f. 9) literature of nationalist content was seized, listed in the search protocol from no. 5 through no. 23, in the amount of 373 copies.

The seized journals, books, and newspapers are partly of foreign, partly of pre-revolutionary and partly of Soviet origin.

Due to the above, resolved:

The nationalist literature listed in the search protocol from no. 5 through no. 23 in the amount of three hundred and seventy-three (373) copies is to be BURNED.

Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR *Pisarev*

[Signature]

Approved by: Deputy head of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR *Samoilov*

[Signature]

20 February 1936

No. 45

DEED

City of Kyiv, 20 February 1936

We, the undersigned, head of the 10th Division of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR Pisarev and deputy head of the same division Bondarenko, composed the present deed stating that on this day in our presence the literature formerly in possession of Drai-Khmara, M.P., arrested by the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR on the accusation in committing crimes falling under articles 54-8 and 11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, has been burned.

Literature has been destroyed in the amount of three hundred and seventy-three (373) copies, seized from Drai-Khmara, M.P. during his arrest on 5 September 1935, according to the search protocol from the same day (f. 9).

Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR *Pisarev*

[Signature]

Deputy Head of the 10th Division of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR *Bondarenko*

[Signature]

21 February 1936
No. 46

RESOLUTION

City of Kyiv, 21 February 1936. Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District Perfil'ev, having examined the materials of the investigation of case no. 101 of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR on the accusation of DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, born 1889 in the village of Mali Kanivtsi, Chronobai district, Kyiv oblast, former professor of Ukrainian studies, dismissed from work for nationalism, former university professor during the rule of the Central Rada, arrested for nationalist manifestations in 1933, citizen of the USSR, university graduate, of mid-income peasant background, recently employed as Ukrainian language instructor at the courses run by the Oblast Committee of Friends of Children, non-party member, not previously tried, in the crimes falling under articles 54-8 and 54-11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR,

Found:

1. The materials of the investigation have established that:

a) DRAI-KHMARA since 1916 allied himself with the Ukrainian nationalist movement. During the rule of Petliura, the Central Rada, and Hetman in Ukraine, DRAI-KHMARA worked on raising cadre for those governments.

b) Since 1923 DRAI-KHMARA had close contact with IEFREMOV (sentenced in the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine case) and actively worked in the Historical-Literary Society which conducted counter-revolutionary nationalist work.

c) Later DRAI-KHMARA joined the group of the Neoclassicists in Ukraine and together with them conducted large-scale counter-revolutionary nationalist work.

d) The testimony by ZEROV, FYLYPOVYCH, VORONYI exposes DRAI-KHMARA in joint active counter-revolutionary work, which in 1935 grew into acceptance of individual terror as a method of struggle with Soviet power in Ukraine.

2. The materials of the case are insufficient for trying DRAI-KHMARA by the Military Tribunal of the Kyiv Military District on articles 54-11 and 54-8 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, but they characterize DRAI-KHMARA as an active counter-revolutionary nationalist who is socially dangerous.

I recommend that:

The case of DRAI-KHMARA be forwarded to be resolved by the Special Council of the NKVD of the USSR on the subject of his incarceration in a concentration camp.

Military Prosecutor of the Kyiv Military District
(*Perfil'ev*)

[Signature]

23 February 1936
No. 47

REFERENCE

Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, was arrested 6 September 1935. Presently detained at the Kyiv pretrial detention facility and on this day transferred to the jurisdiction of the Special Council of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR.

Representative of the Records and Statistics Division of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR *Mitzelmacher*

[Signature]

23 February 1936

23 February 1936
No. 48

Coupon of Warrant No. 129

23 February 1936

To: Head of the Special Block of the NKVD

Detainee Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, presently under the jurisdiction of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR, is to be immediately transferred to the jurisdiction of the Special Council of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR.

Head of the Records and Statistics Division of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR, Senior Lieutenant of State Security [Signature]

Head of the 1st Division, Lieutenant of State Security [Signature]

23 February 1936
No. 49

NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR

State Security Authority

23 February 1936

No. 101

City of Kyiv

To: Records and Statistics Division of the Chief State Security Authority of the NKVD of the USSR

/2nd Division/

City of Moscow

Re: Investigation case no. 101

Enclosed please find investigation case no. 101 of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR on the accusation of Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, for consideration by the Special Council of the NKVD of the USSR.

The accused is presently detained under guard at the Special Block of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR and has been transferred to the jurisdiction of the Special Council.

Enclosures: investigation case, passport ET No. 014012, memorandum and other documents.

Head of the Records and Statistics Division of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR, Senior Lieutenant of State Security *Bukshtan*

[Signature]

Head of the 1st Division, Lieutenant of State Security *Grossman* [Signature]

28 March 1936
No. 50

EXTRACT FROM THE PROTOCOL

of the Special Council of the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs of the USSR

from 28 March 1936

Heard: 188. Case no. 101/Ukrainian SSR, of Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, born 1889.

Resolved: Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, for counter-revolutionary activities is to be placed in a correctional labor camp for the term of FIVE years, counting the term from 5 September 1935.

The file is to be deposited in the archive.

Head Secretary of the Special Council [Facsimile of signature, seal]

4 April 1936

No. 51

MB 188 101
Chief State Security Authority

4 April 1936

30/101/L

To: Head of the Records and Statistics Division of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR,

Hereby forwarded for execution and declaration an extract from the resolution of the Special Council of the NKVD of the USSR from 28 March 1936 on case no. 101 of citizen DRAI-KHMARA, Mykhailo Panasovych, who is to be dispatched with the first departing echelon to the city of Vladivostok, into the jurisdiction of the head of the TRANSFER POINT of the NORTHEASTERN CAMPS of the NKVD, to be sent to Kolyma. Confirm the date of dispatch by 5 May 1936.

The NKVD to take SPECIAL NOTICE of this, according to order no. 257/s-33.

Enclosure: 2: extract.

Head of the Records and Statistics Division of the Chief State Security Authority of the NKVD of the USSR

Head of the 2nd Division of the Records and Statistics Division

17 April 1936

No. 52

REFERENCE

In 1936, in the process of the development of the archive of the VChK/OGPU/NKVD, investigation case 101-35 of the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR on the accusation of Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, in participation in a counter-revolutionary nationalist organization, registered under no. 239442.

The case consists of 2 volumes and is stored in the General Archive.

Composition of case documents:

- 1) concluding statement of the prosecution // vol. no. 2, f. 138-140
- 2) resolution on the case // vol. no. 2, f. 146
- 3) material evidence // vol. no. 2, f. 151
- 4) personal documents // vol. no. ... f. ... deposited in the archive
- 5) photos of the accused // vol. no. ... f. ...
- 6) secret materials // vol. no. 2, f. 150

Head of the 6th Division

Records and Statistics Division of the Chief State Security Authority of the NKVD [Signature]

Inspector [Signature]

17 April 1936

19 April 1936

No. 53

Secret

19 April 1936

Re: No. 101 from 23 February 1936

To: Head of the Records and Statistics Division of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR

Kyiv

We report that investigation archive file no. 101 on the accusation of Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, has been retained for storage at the archive of the Records and Statistics Division of the Chief State Security Authority of the NKVD and registered under no. 239442.

Deputy Head of the Records and Statistics Division of the Chief State Security Authority of the NKVD
Zubkin

Head of the 5th Division *Ivanov*

7 September 1938

No. 54

Secret

NKVD of the USSR
Northeastern Camps
Nagaev Bay
Far Eastern Krai
1/87293

7 September 1938

To: Records Office of the Chief State Security
Authority of the NKVD of the USSR
Moscow
Cc: OMZ UNKVD

NOTICE

1. Last name, first name, patronymic: Draï-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych
2. Year of birth: 1889
3. Name of the sentencing organ: Special Council of the NKVD
4. When, on which article of the Criminal Code and prison term:
28 March 1936, counter-revolutionary activities, 5 years.
5. Arrived from the UNKVD DS 31 August 1938.
6. Departed:
Head of the URO of the Northeastern Camps of the NKVD
Colonel *Komarov*
[Signature]
Head of the Records and Statistics Division of the URO [Signature undecipherable]

12, 14 August 1989

No. 55

Approved by: Deputy Prosecutor General of the
Ukrainian SSR
State Jurisprudence Officer of the 3rd Class S.F.
Lytvynchuk
14 August 1989

RESOLUTION

- regarding Draï-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, in the materials of the criminal case (archive no. 47461).
- Last name, first name, patronymic: Draï-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych
Date of birth: 28 September 1889
Place of birth: village of Mali Kanivtsi, Chornobai district, Kyiv oblast
Party membership info. (including party card no.):
Place of work and job title prior to arrest: Ukrainian language instructor at the courses of the Oblast Committee of Friends of Children
Place of residence prior to arrest: Kyiv, 1 Sadova St., Apt. 5
Information about relatives: measures undertaken failed to locate Draï-Khmara and his relatives
Date of arrest, charges, when and where and which judicial organ resolved the case:
Draï-Khmara, M.P., arrested by the Special Section of the State Security Authority of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR on 6 September 1935.
He was accused of being an active participant in a counter-revolutionary nationalist organization, conducted nationalist activities, which was partially

confirmed by the testimony of Zerov, M.K., Voronyi, M.M., Fylypovych, P.P., Kozub, M.S., and also by the testimony of Draï-Khmara, M.P., himself.

The Special Council of the NKVD of the USSR on 28 March 1936 Draï-Khmara, M.P., in accordance with articles 54-8 and 54-11 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR was subjected to incarceration at corrective labor camps for 5 years.

Draï-Khmara, Mykhailo Panasovych, falls under the action of article 1 of the Decree by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR from 16 January 1989, "On Additional Measures to Restore Justice Concerning the Victims of Repressions that Took Place in the Period of the 1930s–1940s and early 1950s."

Head of the Department of Supervision of Investigation in Security Organs of the Prosecutor General's Office of the Ukrainian SSR
Senior Jurisprudence Officer *V.I. Lesnoi*
[Signature]
Deputy Head of the Investigation Department of the KGB of the Ukrainian SSR
Lieutenant Colonel *V.I. Prystaiko*
[Signature]
12 August 1989

ANNOTATIONS

Mykhailo Draï-Khmara's investigation dossier is currently housed in the Central State Archive of Civic Associations of Ukraine (TsDAHOU), fond 263, op. 1, file 62245. It was transferred there from the archives of the former KGB. The details and organization of many of the interrogations suggest that those interrogated were frequently forced to sign detailed accusatory statements prepared in advance.

No. 6

In rows 11 and 19 only the authors of confiscated volumes are noted.

Chervonyi shliakh (Red Pathway), a leading Ukrainian monthly "thick" journal in the 1920s, published in Kharkiv in 1923–1936; noted for its independent, although official attitude. It incurred many personnel changes during the 1930s purges and was eventually closed.

Vynnychenko, Volodymyr (1880–1951), writer, statesman, and politician. Began to study law at Kyiv University in 1901, but expelled in 1902 for revolutionary activity. One of the leaders of the Ukrainian Social-Democratic Workers' Party. Between 1903 and 1917, to avoid arrest, fled abroad many times and returned clandestinely to Ukraine or Russia. Imprisoned 1903–1904. During World War I lived illegally in Moscow, returned to Ukraine in 1917 and elected one of the two vice presidents of the Central Rada, Ukraine's first government. During the Skoropads'kyi government in 1918 headed the oppositional Ukrainian National Union, and from the fall of 1918 until February 1919, served as president of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR). Upon resigning the presidency left for Vienna and attempted to negotiate with Lenin an independent socialist Ukrainian state. A renewed such attempt during a visit to Ukraine in 1920 proved unsuccessful, and Vynnychenko emigrated, settling in France, devoting himself almost exclusively to the literary career. The very first story he published in 1902 created a sensation and brought him into the leading ranks of Ukrainian literature. A prolific prose writer and playwright, Vynnychenko's works were distinguished by a fresh and open approach to realistic narrative, a dynamic narrative style and modern urban diction, as well as attention to sexuality and other "morally controversial" themes. After the revolution, his writing turned more to social and political issues. His works were published widely in Soviet Ukraine until 1931, and his 1928 utopian novel *Soniachna mashyna* (The Solar Machine) was arguably the most popular Ukrainian novel of the decade. From the 1930s until the late 1980s, Vynnychenko and his writings were proscribed in Ukraine.

Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo (1866–1934), historian, civic and political leader. Graduated from the Historical-Philological Faculty of Kyiv University, 1890. Professor at the newly created chair of Ukrainian history at L'viv University, 1893–1913. From the 1890s on worked on his magnum opus *History of Ukraine-Rus'* (first volume published in 1898, wrote nine volumes, taking it to 1658). Active in St. Petersburg and in Russian-ruled Ukraine 1905–1914, arrested and exiled during World War I. In March 1917 elected Chairman of the Central Rada, the newly established Ukrainian government in Kyiv. Elected President of the Ukrainian People's Republic in April 1918. In emigration since 1919, returned to Kyiv in 1924 as a full member of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Exiled to Moscow in March 1931. His *History of Ukrainian Literature*, written in the 1920s, examined Ukrainian literature from its beginnings through the seventeenth century.

Voronyi, Mykola (1871–1938), poet, cultural figure, one of the first Ukrainian modernist authors. Grew up in Rostov-on-the-Don and Kharkiv; his studies were frequently interrupted by arrests for revolutionary activity. Emigrated to Galicia in the early 1890s, studied at the universities in L'viv and Vienna, and served as the director of the Ukrainian theater in Ternopil'. In 1897 returned to Russian-ruled Ukraine, acted in Ukrainian theater troupes. In 1917 directed the National Theater in Kyiv. In 1920–1921 member of the UNR government-in-exile, then taught at the L'viv Higher Institute of Music and its drama school. Returned to Soviet-ruled Ukraine in 1926, taught at the Kharkiv Music and Drama Institute. An important figure in Ukrainian poetry of the early twentieth century, Voronyi is remembered in particular for his 1901 modernist manifesto which generated considerable debate. Arrested in 1934, exiled to Voronezh. Returned to Ukraine in 1937, worked briefly as a village schoolteacher, rearrested and executed in 1938.

Nova generatsiia (New Generation), a prominent monthly “thick” journal, published in Kharkiv from October 1927 to December 1930, under the editorship of the leader of the Ukrainian Futurist movement, Mykhail' Semenko. Much of its contents were devoted to contemporary literary polemics and to the popularization of Western avant-garde literature and art.

Literaturnyi iarmarok (Literary Fair), a literary and art almanac, published in Kharkiv under the editorship of Mykola Khvyly'ovyi. Twelve issues appeared between December 1928 and February 1930. Officially nonpartisan, it was in essence an organ of the former members of the dissolved VAPLITE group, and represented one of the last organized attempts to resist the forced imposition of aesthetic and ideological uniformity in Soviet Ukrainian literature.

Shliakh (Pathway), a monthly Ukrainian literary and arts journal established in Moscow in March 1917, transferred to Kyiv in August 1917, published until 1919. Continued the traditions of the prewar modernist journal *Ukraïns'ka khata*. A total of 25 issues appeared.

Khvyly'ovyi (Fitilev), Mykola (1893–1933), writer and publicist, a leading figure of the Ukrainian cultural renaissance of the 1920s. Based in Kharkiv after 1921, when his first works of poetry were published. He soon switched to prose fiction and essay writing, and established himself as Ukraine's most influential prose writer of the 1920s by combining aesthetic innovation with ardent but nonconformist communist belief and with emphatic national orientation. As such, he became a target of personal attacks by Stalin. A founder and leader of the literary group VAPLITE (Free Academy of Proletarian Literature, 1925–1928), and later of the almanac *Literaturnyi iarmarok* (1928–1930) and the literary group Prolifront (1930–1931). The confiscation and banning of the issue of the VAPLITE almanac containing the second half of his novel *Val'dshnepy*, and later also of his cycle of polemical pamphlets *Ukraina chy Malorosiiia?* became pivotal events in the nation's cultural history, as did his suicide in 1933. All his writings were banned in the Soviet Union from 1934 until 1990.

Ryl's'kyi, Maksym (1895–1964), major poet, translator, civic figure. Published his first poem in 1907 and his first book of poetry in 1910. Between 1918 and 1929 published six collections of poetry that showcase his talent at its peak. Associated with the Neoclassicists in the 1920s. Briefly arrested in 1931; upon release from prison declared himself “reformed” and became an official Soviet poet. From 1944 until the end of his life he also headed the Institute of Fine Arts, Folklore, and Ethnography of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. His major translations include the works of Shakespeare, Mickiewicz, Pushkin, Verlaine, and Victor Hugo. In the final years of his life, after the death of Stalin, while not regaining the level of his earlier original poetry, he was instrumental in the process of republication of many of his repressed colleagues and defended Ukrainian culture against the pressure of russification.

Iefremov, Serhii (1876–1939), literary scholar, critic, civic leader. Author of an influential history of Ukrainian literature (1st ed.

1911, rev. ed. 1924); a leading representative of populist criticism in the first decades of the twentieth century. Member of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences from 1919, its vice president from 1922. Graduated from the Faculty of Law of Kyiv University in 1901, yet dedicated all his later scholarly activities to literary history and criticism. Active in the Ukrainian national-democratic movement, member of the Central Rada. Arrested in July 1929 and tried in the case of the GPU-fabricated “Union for the Liberation of Ukraine” (SVU), the first Stalinist show trial in Ukraine (1930), as the chief defendant. Died in the Gulag.

No. 9

Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi Ukrainian State University, first university founded in independent Ukraine; chartered in October 1918; attracted many prominent scholars. When the Bolsheviks gained control of the city at the end of 1920, the theology and law faculties were abolished and the university was reorganized into the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi Institute of People's Education and the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi Agricultural Institute. Most of the original faculty members who did not emigrate in the early 1920s were purged in the 1930s and died in prison or exile.

Petliura, Symon (1879–1926), statesman and publicist. Born and grew up in Poltava, studied at the seminary there (1895–1901), expelled for political activity. In 1902 moved to Katerynodar (Ekaterinodar) in the Kuban' region and worked as a teacher, and also began publishing publicistic essays. Arrested 1903, released on bail March 1904, left for L'viv; returned to Kyiv in 1905 after the general amnesty. From 1906 active as a journalist in Ukrainian periodicals in St. Petersburg, Kyiv and Moscow (co-edited the monthly *Vil'na Ukraïna*, the newspaper *Slovo*, and the Russian-language monthly *Ukrainskaia zhizn'*; worked as a secretary at the leading Ukrainian newspaper, *Rada*; etc.). In 1916–early 1917 deputy plenipotentiary of the All-Russian Union of Zemstvos aid committee on the Russian Western front. After the February 1917 revolution elected head of the Ukrainian Military Committee of the Western Front. In June 1917 appointed general secretary of military affairs in the first General Secretariat of the Central Rada, Ukraine's government, and dedicated all his energies to organizing and building up the Ukrainian armed forces. Resigned in late 1917 and formed a military unit under the name of the Haidamaka battalion of Slobids'ka Ukraine. Arrested for four months in mid-1918 by the Skoropads'kyi government. In the fall of 1918 elected a member of the UNR directory and head of the UNR army. In February 1919 succeeded Volodymyr Vynnychenko as President of the Directory, and for the next ten months commanded the UNR and later the joined UNR—Ukrainian Galician army. Fleed to Poland in December 1919 and led the UNR army in the joint offensive with Polish troops onto Bolshevik-held territory in April—May 1920. After the Polish—Soviet armistice of October 1920 the UNR army retreated to Polish-held territory and had to submit to internment. In late 1923 Petliura was forced to leave Poland under Soviet pressure; in late 1924 he settled in Paris where he founded the weekly *Truz'yb* and oversaw the activities of the UNR government-in-exile until his assassination in May 1926. Since the mid-1920s personified, perhaps more than any other person, the struggle for the Ukrainian independence; the Russian and Soviet authorities also made him a symbol of Ukrainian efforts at non-communist independence, and widely used “Petliurite” as a pejorative, demonizing label.

Ohienko, Ivan (monastic name: Ilarion) (1882–1972), Orthodox metropolitan, linguist, church historian, and cultural figure. Graduated from the Historical-Philological faculty of Kyiv University in 1909. Taught at the Kyiv Commercial Institute (from 1912) and at Kyiv University (from 1915). In 1918 helped organize and became the first rector of the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi Ukrainian State University. In 1919 served as minister of education and later as minister of religious affairs in the government of the Ukrainian People's Republic (in 1920–1924 minister of religious affairs in the Ukrainian government-in-exile). From 1926 professor at the Orthodox Faculty of Theology at Warsaw University; fired in 1932 during the anti-Ukrainian campaign, worked as an independent scholar and published the journals *Ridna mova* and *Nasha kul'tura*, and resumed work on the translation of the Bible into Ukrainian (complete trans. pub. 1962). In October 1940 tonsured and consecrated bishop of Kholm in the Polish Autocephalous Orthodox Church; began ukrainianizing the church services. Elevated to metropolitan in March 1944, but soon forced to flee the advancing Soviet troops to Austria and then Switzerland. Invited to Canada in 1947; in 1951 elected metropolitan of Winnipeg and head of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada. Author of numerous scholarly works in linguistics (esp. historical), Ukrainian history and church history.

Bidnov, Vasyl' (1874–1935), church historian, educator, and civic leader. In 1918–1920 professor at the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University and head of its Theology Faculty; in 1922–1929 professor of church history at the Ukrainian Free University in Prague; in 1929–1935 professor of church history at the University of Warsaw.

Liubars'kyi, Semen (1878–1944), educator, civic and church activist. Member of the Central Rada (1917–1918), taught at the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University (1918–1919); deputy to the Polish Sejm (1922–1928). Author of studies on the history and ethnography of the Kholm region.

Rusova, Sofiia (1856–1940), educator and political activist. Member of the Central Rada; founding member and first president of the National Council of Ukrainian Women. Headed the Department of Pre-School and Adult Education in the Ministry of Education in the Skoropads'kyi government; later taught at the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University. Escaped from Soviet Ukraine in 1922; settled in Prague, where she taught at the Ukrainian Pedagogical Institute until 1939. Also served as the honorary president of the World Union of Ukrainian Women.

Haiivs'kyi, Syl'vestr (1876–1975), scholar and religious leader. Graduated from the Historical-Philological faculty of Kyiv University in 1912. Served in the government of the Ukrainian People's Republic in 1918–1919. Appointed professor at the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University in 1921. Arrested in 1922 and again in 1932, exiled to Central Asia. Consecrated bishop of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in 1942; emigrated to Australia in 1949 and served as the archbishop of the UAOC for Australia and New Zealand until 1963.

Zerov, Mykola (1890–1937), prominent poet, translator, literary scholar; the leader of the Neoclassicist group of poets. Graduated in philology from Kyiv University. In 1917–1920 edited the journal *Knyhar*. Professor at the Kyiv Institute of People's Education, 1925–1935. Author of a numerically small but polished and influential body of poetry and a large body of translations (especially of Roman poetry) and works of criticism and scholarship on modern Ukrainian literature. Arrested April 1935, perished in the Gulag.

Fylypovych, Pavlo (1891–1937), poet and literary scholar. Son of a village priest from the Kyiv guberniia; studied at the Galagan College and later at Kyiv University (1910–1915). Professor at Kyiv University/Institute of People's Education (1917–1935). Until the revolution of 1917 wrote poetry and literary scholarship in Russian (including a monograph on E. A. Baratynskii, 1917), but then switched exclusively to Ukrainian. Contributed to the symbolist almanac *Muzahet* (1919). Member of the Neoclassicist group of poets in the 1920s. Published two collections of poetry and numerous scholarly works. Arrested in August 1935, died in the Gulag.

Mohylians'kyi, Mykhailo (1873–1942), literary scholar, publicist, translator, writer. Born in Chernihiv, studied law in St. Petersburg and practiced law in Kyiv and in St. Petersburg. An active member of the Russian Constitutional-Democratic Party, contributed articles on Ukrainian topics to the newspaper *Rech'* and the journals *Russkaia mysl'* and *Ukrainskaia zhizn'*. Translated Mykhailo Kotsiubyn's'kyi's writings into Russian. From 1911 published short stories in Ukrainian. After the revolution of 1917 lived in Kyiv, published articles on literary theory and Ukrainian literature, contributed to *Knyhar*, *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia* and other periodicals, worked at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. A close associate of the Neoclassicist poets. During the Stalinist terror of the 1930s his son and daughter were arrested and sent to the Gulag and he was purged from the Academy. He voluntarily moved to northern Russia to be near his daughter, who was shot in 1937. During World War II he was evacuated to Siberia, where he died.

No. 10

Politur, Henrykh, a graduate student at the Polish Culture Institute; repressed in the case of the “Polish Military Organization.”

Krzyzewski, Ludwig, repressed in the case of the “Polish Military Organization.”

Pyshchalko, V. F., an instructor at the Polish Pedagogical Institute.

Korycynski, Leon, a Polish language instructor.

No. 11

Sochacki, director of the Polish Pedagogical Institute.

No. 15

Skarbek, a graduate student at the Polish Culture Institute.

No. 16

Hrinchenko, Mykola (1888–1942), musicologist, historian, and folklorist. Graduate of the Kyiv Music School (1912) and the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University (1920). Author of the fundamental *History of Ukrainian Music* (1922). Taught at the Lysenko Music and Drama Institute (1925–1933) and the Kyiv Conservatory (1934–1937); also worked as a researcher at the Academy of Sciences. In 1933 arrested and forced to renounce his “nationalist deviations.” Died in evacuation in Ufa.

Kurylo, Olena (1890–?), linguist. Born in Belarus', studied at Warsaw University, an associate of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences since 1918. Author of a widely used elementary Ukrainian grammar (1918, 11th ed., 1926), several influential monographs and terminological dictionaries. During the purge of the Academy in the early 1930s sought refuge in Moscow. Briefly arrested in 1933; second arrest 1938, sent to the Karaganda Gulag camp. Reportedly released in 1946; her further fate is unknown.

Siitak, Ivan (1887–1937), civic, military, and political figure. Born in Galicia, a lawyer by training, by 1914 a leading member of the Ukrainian Social-Democratic Party. During World War I fought for the Sich Riflemen and led the Railway Engineering Corps of the Ukrainian Galician Army. Captured by the Bolsheviks in 1919, joined the Red Army. During the 1920s taught at educational institutions in Kyiv and Kharkiv, and briefly held a position with the Soviet embassy in Warsaw. From 1930 headed the Ukrainian Institute of Linguistic Education in Kharkiv. Arrested 1933, perished in the Gulag.

Doroshkevych, Oleksandr (1889–1946), literary scholar, educator, and critic. Graduated from Kyiv University in 1913. In the 1920s, professor at the Kyiv Institute of People's Education, and associate of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and director of the Kyiv branch of the Institute of Literature. Arrested and exiled to the Ural region in the 1930s, returned to Kyiv in 1943. In the last years of his life, professor at Kyiv University and a department director at the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences.

Lebid', Ananii (1889–1939?), literary scholar, poet. Member of the literary group Pluh. Together with Maksym Ryl's'kyi compiled an anthology of modern Ukrainian poetry, *Za 25 lit* (In 25 Years, 1926). Published a book on Mykhailo Kotsiubyn's'kyi (1929). Arrested in 1929 in connection with the trial of the “Union for the Liberation of Ukraine,” but was released. Arrested again in 1935, perished in the Gulag.

Tychyna, Pavlo (1891–1967), poet and cultural figure. Graduated from the Chernihiv Theological Seminary, 1913. First extant poem dated 1906; first publication 1912. From 1913 studied at the Kyiv Commercial Institute, worked on the editorial boards of the newspapers *Rada* and *Svitlo*. His first collection of poetry, *Soniashni kliarnety* (Clarinetts of the Sun, 1918) is a programmatic work and the peak achievement of Ukrainian Symbolism. Together with his other poetry of the 1910s–early 1920s it forms a key contribution to Ukrainian literature. Moved to Kharkiv in 1923, participated in the literary groups Hart and VAPLITE. One of his poems published in the VAPLITE almanac (1927) provoked harsh official criticism. Soon after, Tychyna capitulated to the Soviet regime and wrote fully orthodox Soviet poetry for the rest of his life, including the post-Stalin years. Awarded the Stalin Prize in 1941; served as the director of the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences in 1936–1939 and 1941–1943, as minister of education of the Ukrainian SSR in 1943–1948, and as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR in 1953–1959.

Petrov, Viktor (pseud. V. Domontovych) (1894–1969), writer, literary scholar, archeologist, ethnographer. A graduate of Kyiv University (1918), worked at the Academy of Sciences from 1920. An associate of the Neoclassicist poets; married Mykola Zerov's widow. In the late 1920s published a scholarly study of Panteleimon Kulish and three novels. Evacuated to the Urals in 1941, reappeared in German-occupied Kharkiv and edited the literary journal *Ukrains'kyi zasiv* (1942–1943) under German rule. As a refugee in postwar Munich published many literary and scholarly works and took a leading part in organizing the diasporic Ukrainian intellectual life. Disappeared in April 1949 and “reappeared” in Moscow, where he worked at the Institute of the History of Material Culture of the USSR Academy of Sciences. In 1956 returned to Kyiv and worked at the Institute of Archeology of the Academy of Sciences, publishing several scholarly monographs in the final years of his life. His literary activity and biography details were not discussed in Ukraine until the collapse of the USSR.

Novyts'kyi, Mykhailo (1892–1964), literary scholar, specializing in Shevchenko studies. Graduated from Petrograd University (1919).

Worked at the Kyiv branch of the Taras Shevchenko Scholarly Research Institute from 1921. Arrested in 1933 and again in 1937; in 1956 released from the Gulag and rehabilitated.

Iakubovs'kyi, Feliks (1902–1937), literary scholar and critic. Graduated from the Kyiv Institute of People's Education, 1926. Author of numerous articles and introductory essays to literary publications, as well as of four books of criticism; member of the All-Ukrainian Association of Proletarian Writers. Arrested and executed in 1937.

No. 18

Kulish, Panteleimon (1819–1897), prominent writer, poet, historian, ethnographer, translator. Member of the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood in the 1840s. Taught at St. Petersburg University since 1845. Arrested and exiled 1847, but allowed to return to St. Petersburg in 1850. Author of the first Ukrainian-language historical novel, *Chrona Rada* (The Black Council, written mid-1840s, published 1857), and of many influential scholarly works. Developed the first standardized Ukrainian orthography and composed the first Ukrainian primer (1857). Launched the first Ukrainian "thick" journal, *Osnova* (1860–1862). Dedicated much effort to the translation into Ukrainian of the Bible, as well as of the works of Shakespeare, Goethe and Byron. Made many politically controversial decisions in the 1860s–1880s and found himself in intellectual isolation by the mid-1880s. Subject of considerable literary attention and scholarly study in the 1900s–1920s, but virtually fully proscribed in the USSR from the mid-1930s until the late 1960s.

Kosynka (Strilets'), Hryhorii (1899–1934), writer. Based in Kyiv since 1920; a major short story writer, published since 1919. Member of the groups Lanka and MARS. Arrested and shot in December 1934 along with 28 other Ukrainian intellectuals.

Zhyhalko, Serhii (1902–1938), writer. Repressed in 1935.

No. 19

Burghardt, Oswald (1891–1947), poet, literary scholar, translator. Graduated from Kyiv University; during World War I exiled as an ethnic German to the Arkhangel'sk region. Returned to Ukraine in 1917, renewed his friendship with Mykola Zerov, and began writing poetry in Ukrainian. Associated with the Neoclassicist poets group, he published his poetry and translations from 1924. Emigrated to Germany in 1931; taught Slavic literatures at several German universities. After emigrating signed his poetry by the pseudonym Iurii Klen. Author of an important volume of memoirs about the Neoclassicists (1947).

Lanka—MARS, a literary organization, established in Kyiv in 1924 under the name Lanka (Chain); renamed itself MARS (Workshop of Revolutionary Word) in 1926. Brought together a group of writers of various predilections but united by their desire to be independent of the official politics in the area of literature; on friendly terms with the Neoclassicist poets. Many of them were also members of the editorial board of the journal *Zhyt'ia i revoliutsiia*. Forced to disband in 1929; most of its members perished in the Stalinist terror of the 1930s.

Kulish, Mykola (1892–1937), leading playwright of the Ukrainian cultural renaissance of the 1920s. Became famous following the success of his play *97* (1924). In the mid-1920s–early 1930s associated with Les' Kurbas's Berezil' theater in Kharkiv, for which he wrote his best work. Member of the literary groups Hart, VAPLITE (president of VAPLITE, 1926–1928) and Prolitfront. His play *Sonata Pathetique* was banned in Ukraine but was staged in the Russian translation in Moscow and Leningrad in 1931. Not allowed to join the Writers' Union; arrested in 1937; died in the Gulag.

Pokal'chuk, Volodymyr (1897–1985), scholar, educator. Studied at the Kyiv Institute of People's Education (1923–1928); in 1928 began graduate study under Mykola Zerov. Published book reviews and articles in *Zhyt'ia i revoliutsiia*. Arrested in 1930 in connection with the case of the "Union for the Liberation of Ukraine"; released in 1932 but barred from pursuing a scholarly career. Allowed to teach in 1939, taught at the Pedagogical Institutes in Poltava and Krem'ianets'; after World War II taught at the Luts'k Pedagogical Institute and until his retirement in 1980 suffered occasional persecution by the Soviet authorities.

Kyryliuk, Ievhen (1902–1989), literary scholar, a leading specialist in nineteenth-century Ukrainian literature. Graduate of the Kyiv Institute of People's Education (1926), an associate of the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences and, from 1944, professor at Kyiv University. Some of his scholarly works were criticized as "nationalist" and banned in the Stalinist years.

Kostiuk, Hryhorii (b. 1902), literary scholar, publicist. Studied at the Kyiv Institute of People's Education (1925–1929) and at the Shevchenko Institute of Literature in Kharkiv. Taught at Kharkiv University (1932–1933) and at the Luhans'k Pedagogical Institute (1933–1934). Published literary reviews and essays since 1927. Arrested and sent to the Gulag in 1935, released in 1940. As a post-World War II refugee in West Germany co-founded the MUR literary organization. Based in the U.S. since 1952.

Dontsov, Dmytro (1883–1973), political journalist and theorist, editor, literary critic. Born in Melitopol'; in 1900–1907 studied law in St. Petersburg where he became active in Ukrainian revolutionary circles. Fled to Galicia in 1908; active in leftist politics in exile in Austria, Switzerland and Germany. In Kyiv during the Hetman government, then a Ukrainian diplomat in Bern in 1919–1921. By the early 1920s rejected his earlier socialist and Marxist ideas and became a leading ideologue of Ukrainian antidemocratic "integral nationalism." In L'viv as a journal editor in 1922–1939, fled to the West from the Soviet troops. In 1947 settled in Canada; taught at the University of Montreal (1947–1952).

Ukraïnka, Lesia (Larysa Kosach-Kvitka) (1871–1913), poet, playwright, translator, prose writer, critic; Ukraine's greatest woman writer. A child prodigy who received home schooling, she began writing poetry at age nine and published her first poems at age eleven. Her early poetry was influenced by the democratic/populist outlook of her mother, Olena Pchilka, and her uncle, Mykhailo Drahomanov, a major intellectual. Her plays and dramatic poems written from 1901 are recognized as her greatest literary achievement; they combine openness to global themes with bold modernist innovation and a programmatic feminist standpoint. She suffered from tuberculosis for most of her life and spent the final years convalescing in Egypt and the Caucasus.

Studyns'kyi, Kyrilo (1868–1941), literary scholar and community activist. Studied at the L'viv and Vienna Universities. In 1897–1899 a docent at Cracow University, in 1900–1918, 1939–1941 a professor at L'viv University. A leading member of the Christian Social Party in Galicia, head of the Teachers' Hromada (1916–1920) and of the Ukrainian National Council (1921–1922). Head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1925–1931; instrumental in establishing relations between the Society and the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kyiv. Elected full member of the Academy in 1929; dismissed in 1934 for "counterrevolutionary activities"; readmitted 1939. During the first Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine in 1939–1941 headed the People's Assembly of Western Ukraine; his influential positions enabled him to intervene and save many Ukrainians from Soviet repressions. Deported during Soviet evacuation from L'viv in June 1941; the circumstances of his death are unclear.

Shchurat, Vasyl' (1871–1948), literary scholar, community leader, writer and translator. Graduated from L'viv University (1895), received a Ph.D. in Slavic philology from Vienna University (1896). Published poetry, essays, stories and translations from 1890 in many leading Ukrainian periodicals. Co-edited the modernist journal *Svit* (1906–1907). President of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in L'viv (1919–1923); elected a full member of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, but resigned in 1930 in protest of the "Union for the Liberation of Ukraine" show trial. After the Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine in 1939 again elected full member of the Academy. In his final years served as the director of the Academy's L'viv Scientific Library and was a professor at L'viv University.

Kotsiubyns'kyi, Mykhailo (1864–1913), major Ukrainian prose writer whose work evolved from realism to an impressionistic form of modernism. His major works include the novels *Fata Morgana* (1910) and *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors* (1911), as well as a number of influential short stories, among them "Apple Blossoms" (1902) and "Intermezzo" (1908). In his final years a mentor to the young Pavlo Tychyna. The orthodox Soviet interpretation emphasized his friendship with Maksim Gorky and simplistically labeled him a "revolutionary democrat."

Siaivo Publishers, a prominent private publishing house in Kyiv. Operated in 1913–1914, 1918–1919, and 1926–1929; run by P. Komendant. Closed by the tsarist government in 1914 and by the Bolsheviks in 1919 and 1929. Published books by many major Ukrainian writers, including Mykola Voronyi, Pavlo Tychyna, and Mykhail' Semenko, as well as translations of Western literature into Ukrainian.

SVU, "Union for the Liberation of Ukraine," a fictitious political organization invented by the GPU for the purpose of staging a show trial to intimidate the Ukrainian intelligentsia and put an end to the policy of ukrainization. The trial of 45 non-Communist Ukrainian intellectuals was held at the Kharkiv Opera House in March—April 1930. Most of the defendants were associated with the All-Ukrainian

Academy of Sciences; a second largest group consisted of secondary and higher school educators. Others were students, cooperative movement activists and representatives of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. Besides the 45 accused who were put on trial, thousands of others were arrested for “belonging” to the SVU or to its alleged youth organization. The SVU, it was alleged, sought to overthrow the Soviet regime, restore capitalism in Ukraine, and establish a fascist dictatorship headed by Serhii Iefremov. All the defendants were convicted but given relatively lenient sentences ranging from three to ten years’ imprisonment. Almost all of them were subsequently rearrested and perished in the Gulag. Only in 1989 the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR admitted that the charges against the defendants were groundless and annulled their sentences.

Antonenko-Davydovych, Borys (1899–1984), writer, journalist, a prominent figure in the Ukrainian cultural renaissance of the 1920s. Published from 1923, member of the literary groups Lanka and MARS. His 1928 novel *Smert'* (Death) was very popular at the time but also generated considerable controversy and accusations of nationalism. Arrested in 1935, in the Gulag until 1956. His 1963 novel *Za shyrmoiu* (Behind the Screen) was also harshly criticized for deviation from the principles of socialist realism. He exercised considerable influence on the Ukrainian intellectuals of the 1960s generation; his protests against russification and defense of Ukrainian dissidents led to a renewed persecution and ban on publications in the 1970s.

Kryms'kyi, Ahatanhel (1871–1942), eminent Ukrainian Orientalist scholar, linguist, literary scholar, folklorist, poet, prose writer and translator. Graduate of Galagan College in Kyiv (1889), the Lazarev Institute of Oriental Languages in Moscow (1891) and Moscow University (1896). Professor at the Lazarev Institute, 1900–1917. A founding member of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (1918) and the academy’s first Permanent Secretary. Director of the Institute of Ukrainian Scientific Language (1921–1929). Persecuted by the Soviet authorities throughout the 1930s; arrested in July 1941; died in the Gulag.

No. 20

Iakubs'kyi, Borys (1889–?), literary scholar and critic. Member of the Bolshevik party in 1905–1919. Graduate of Kyiv University, 1914. An associate of the Neoclassicist poets, published a book on versification; also pioneered sociological criticism in Ukrainian letters. Edited scholarly editions of the writings of Lesia Ukraïnka and Taras Shevchenko, as well as many other publications. In the 1930s reviled as formalist but apparently survived the Stalinist terror and was still alive in Kyiv in 1943; his subsequent fate is unknown.

Savchenko, Iakiv (1890–1937), poet, literary and film critic. Associated with the Ukrainian Symbolist movement. Published poetry since 1913; his first collection came out in 1918. In the 1920s joined the All-Ukrainian Association of Proletarian Writers. Contributed criticism to *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia*, *Nova generatsiia* and other journals; published a book on Dovzhenko’s films (1930). By the mid-1920s fully expounded the Party line in his polemical writings and spoke out as an opponent of Khvyly'ovyi and Zerov. Arrested and executed during the Stalinist terror.

Voronyi, Marko (pseud. Marko Antiokh) (1904–1937), poet, son of Mykola Voronyi. Began publishing poetry in the mid-1920s, first in L'viv, then in Soviet Ukraine. Arrested in March 1935, perished in the Gulag.

No. 24

Knyhar (Bookseller), a monthly literary magazine published in Kyiv from September 1917 to March 1920, co-edited by Mykola Zerov. Contained a large section of reviews and bibliography, as well as articles on various aspects of book production. Contributors included many prominent writers and scholars.

Nashe mynule (Our Past), a literary and scholarly journal published in Kyiv in 1918–1919, with contributions by many prominent cultural figures of the time.

Muzahet (Musagetes), a symbolist literary and artistic publication (and eponymous artistic group) founded in 1919. Its chief aim was an attempt at Europeanization of Ukrainian art and departure from the populist tendencies. Only one issue was published, containing important articles of literary theory and criticism, including a manifesto by Iurii Mezhenko-Ivaniv, “Creativity of the Individual and the Collective,” which caused the Bolshevik authorities to outlaw the publication.

Zhyttia i revoliutsiia (Life and Revolution), a monthly “thick” journal of literature, arts, politics, and scholarship, published in Kyiv

in 1925–1933. Similar in outlook to the Kharkiv-based *Chervonyi shliakh*, it served as a national forum for a broad spectrum of Ukrainian writers and intellectuals. Shut down in the midst of the onslaught of Stalinist terror; most of its contributors repressed.

Tarnovs'kyi, a prominent Ukrainian Cossack noble family, dating from the late seventeenth century. Vasyl' Tarnovs'kyi (1837–1899) founded a museum dedicated to Cossack history in Chernihiv (bequeathed 1897, opened 1901). He also supported various other Ukrainian cultural developments, such as the publication of the journal *Kievskaiia starina* and of many scholarly and art books, the founding of the Kyiv Historical Museum, and the upkeep of Taras Shevchenko’s grave in Kaniv. At his estate, Kachanivka, he hosted many prominent Ukrainian writers and scholars.

Ukraïns'ka khata (Ukrainian House), a monthly journal of literature and criticism, of modernist orientation, published in Kyiv from March 1909 to August 1914. A major forum of the younger generation of Ukrainian intelligentsia; promoted Nietzscheanism and aestheticism, simultaneously with a strong national orientation. Published many of the leading authors of the time, as well as translations of contemporary European literature.

No. 25

Slovo Publishers, a privately owned publishing house in Kyiv, operated in 1922–1926. Pavlo Fylypovych was one of its co-directors. Published several poetry collections by the Neoclassicists (Drai-Khmara, Fylypovych, Ryl's'kyi, Zerov), as well as two books of essays by Zerov, and collections of poetry and prose by other notable writers (Kosynka, Os'machka, etc.).

Skrypnyk, Mykola (1872–1933), Bolshevik leader and Soviet Ukrainian statesman. Born in the Donbas, after his first arrest in 1901 in St. Petersburg abandoned his studies and became a full-time revolutionary. By 1917 arrested 15 times and exiled 7 times. In Petrograd during the Bolshevik coup. In December 1917 elected in absentia to the first Soviet government in Ukraine, and in March 1918 appointed its head by Lenin. In late 1918–early 1919 worked for the All-Russian Cheka, then returned to Ukraine as people’s commissar of worker-peasant inspection (1920–1921), internal affairs (1921–1922), justice (1922–1927), and education (1927–1933); in February–July 1933 head of the Ukrainian State Planning Commission. At the same time rose within the CP(b)U to Politburo member. Also took part in the organizing of the Communist International, was a member of its Executive Committee and headed its CP(b)U delegation. Persuaded the CP(b)U Central Committee to introduce ukrainization policies and actively advocated the development of Ukrainian proletarian culture and literature and Ukraine’s cultural and political autonomy. In 1927 convened an all-Ukrainian conference to standardize Ukrainian orthography (the adopted 1928 standard is known as the Kharkiv orthography or the “Skrypnykivka”). When Stalin sent Postyshev to Ukraine as his personal representative in January 1933, Skrypnyk was removed from his position as education commissar and his policies and theories were condemned. Foreseeing his inevitable liquidation as an opponent of Stalin, he committed suicide.

No. 28

LIM [Literatura i mystetstvo, ‘Literature and Art’] Publishers, a state-owned publishing house founded in Kharkiv in 1930. Renamed “Khudozhnia literatura” in 1934; Derzhlitvydav (State Literary Publishers) in 1935; “Dnipro” in 1964.

Kulyk, Ivan (Izraïl') (1897–1937), poet and political figure. In 1914 joined the Bolshevik party and emigrated to Pennsylvania; began publishing poetry and political articles in the émigré Ukrainian socialist press in the US and Canada. Returned to Ukraine in June 1917; member of the first Soviet government in Ukraine in Kharkiv (1918). In 1924–1927 Soviet consul in Montreal. Member of the literary group Hart from 1923; a founding member of the All-Ukrainian Association of Proletarian Writers (1927) and editor of its journal *Hart*. Translated an anthology of American poets into Ukrainian (1928). From 1932 head of the organizing committee of the Writers’ Union of Ukraine; head of the Union in 1934–1935. Purged in 1937.

Pluzhnyiuk, Ievhen (1898–1936), writer, translator. In 1923–1928 belonged to the literary groups Aspys, Lanka, and MARS. Received the most acclaim as a poet, but published only two poetry collections in his lifetime; a third collection was banned and published posthumously in the West. He also authored a novel and several plays which were subsequently banned as well, and translated Russian literature into Ukrainian. Arrested in 1934, died of tuberculosis in the Solovki camp in the Gulag.

Herasymenko, Kost' (1907–1942), poet, playwright. A war correspondent, killed on the Caucasian front.

No. 32

Bazhan, Mykola (1904–1983), poet, translator, cultural and political figure. One of the leading representatives of the Ukrainian cultural renaissance in the 1920s–early 1930s. Associated with the Futurists in the mid-1920s. Editor of the journal *Kino*, 1925–1932; authored several film scripts. His best and most innovative poetry dates from 1927–1933. In 1934 switched to writing fully orthodox Soviet poetry. Spared in the purges; awarded the Stalin Prize in 1946 and 1949. From the 1940s onward also served in various official positions, including those of head of the Ukrainian Writers' Union (1953–1959) and head of the Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia publishing house (from 1958 until his death). Did not deviate from the official Soviet line in his writings after the death of Stalin; however, his poetic translations from those years (e.g., of Rilke) testify to the endurance of his talent.

Postyshev, Pavel (1887–1939), Communist functionary. Born in Ivanovo-Voznevensk. In 1923 recalled from the Far Eastern Republic to oversee organizational work on the Party's Kyiv guberniia committee. By the end of 1925 became secretary of the central Committee of the CP(b)U; member of its Politburo (1926–1930). As secretary of the Kharkiv district and city party committees played a leading role in the purges of Trotskyists and Ukrainian national-Communists and in the industrialization and collectivization campaigns in the Kharkiv region. From July 1930 secretary of the Central Committee of the VKP(b) in charge of propaganda and organization. In January 1933 sent back to Ukraine as Stalin's personal representative, accompanied by thousands of political cadre from Russia, and immediately elected second secretary of the Central Committee of the CP(b)U and first secretary of the Kharkiv city and oblast' party organizations. In 1934–1937 head of the Kyiv oblast' Party organization. As second secretary he was the real power in Ukraine, overshadowing Stanislav Kosior, the first secretary. Was instrumental in the man-made famine of 1933 and oversaw a major russification drive in Ukraine. By 1936, however, he began losing Stalin's trust. In 1937 he was removed from Ukraine and appointed first secretary of the Kuibyshev Oblast' Party Committee. Arrested in January 1938; shot the following year; rehabilitated in 1956.

No. 34

Iaroshenko, Volodymyr (1898–1937), poet, prose writer. Began writing in Russian, switched to Ukrainian in 1917. Published seven books of poetry, a novel, and a collection of short stories. Author of a popular play, *Shpana*, staged at the Berezil' theater in 1922. Belonged to the literary groups MARS and Pluh. Arrested in 1933 but subsequently released; rearrested 1936; perished in the Gulag.

Kachura, Iakiv (1897–1943), writer. Member of the literary group Pluh and of the All-Ukrainian Association of Proletarian Writers. A war correspondent, captured by the Germans in 1942 and died in a concentration camp.

Ianovs'kyi, Iurii (1902–1954), writer. A leading representative of neoromanticism in Ukrainian literature, whose favorite subject was the sea. Debuted as a poet in 1924 but soon switched to prose. Also worked in the Ukrainian film industry and authored a number of film scripts. His 1931 novel *Chotyry shabli* (Four Sabers) was harshly criticized and banned for a long time, as was his 1947 novel *Zhyva voda* (Live Water). Yet his 1935 novel *Vershnyky* (The Horsemen), about the civil war in post-1917 Ukraine, received wide acclaim and was allowed into the Soviet Ukrainian canon. During World War II served as an army correspondent, covered the Nuremberg trials. Never arrested by the Stalinist authorities, but spiritually and physically broken in his final years.

Mohylians'kyi, Dmytro (pseud. Dmytro Tas') (1901–1937?), writer, son of Mykhailo Mohylians'kyi. Began publishing poems in 1918; active in the Ukrainian literary life in Kyiv (from 1925) and Kharkiv (from 1930). His modernist, urban-themed poetry and short stories were published in leading Ukrainian periodicals. Arrested in the 1930s, perished in the Gulag.

Mezhenko-Ivaniv (or Ivaniv-Mezhenko), Iurii (1892–1969), literary scholar, bibliographer, and collector. Born in Kharkiv, graduated from Moscow University in 1917. Head of the Council of the National Library of Ukraine (1919–1922), director of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute of Bibliology (1922–1931); after the liquidation of the institute and accusations of nationalism forced to move to Leningrad. Returned to Ukraine in 1945 and assumed the directorship of the library of the Academy of Sciences (1945–1948) in

Kyiv. Amassed a unique collection of rare books and manuscripts, bequeathed to the Academy. In the early years of the revolution wrote a number of critical essays, including the influential manifesto "Creativity of the Individual and the Collective" (1919).

Pylypenko, Borys (1892–1937), historian. Worked at the All-Ukrainian History museum in 1928–1933; arrested in 1933, perished in the Gulag.

Zhuk, Mykhailo (1883–1964), painter, graphic artist, writer. Studied art in Kyiv, Moscow, and Cracow. From 1905 taught art in Chernihiv. In 1925–1953 professor at the Odessa Art School. Known in particular for his series of portraits of Ukrainian writers and artists. Also published a book of poems (1912) and contributed poetry, fiction, and criticism to Ukrainian periodicals.

Pidmohyl'nyi, Valeriian (1901–1937), major prose writer and translator of the 1920s generation, author of the influential novels *Misto* (The City, 1928) and *Nevelychka drama* (A Little Touch of Drama, 1930), as well as several collections of short stories. Born in the Katerynoslav area, based in Kyiv since 1920. Worked at various publishing houses and served on the editorial board of the journal *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia*. His translations from the French, in particular of Anatole France and Maupassant, were extremely influential as well. Member of the literary groups Lanka and MARS. Removed from his editorial and publishing posts in 1930, attempted restarting his career in Kharkiv. Arrested in 1934, perished in the Gulag.

Vrazhlyvyi, Vasyli' (1903–1937), writer. Member of the literary groups VAPLITE and Prolitfront. His first collection of short stories came out in 1924, followed by seven others, as well as two novels. Arrested December 1934, perished in the Gulag.

Tenet, Borys (1903–1935), writer. Began publishing poetry in 1924, but better known for his several collections of short stories. Member of the literary group MARS. Arrested 1935, committed suicide in prison.

Epik, Hryhorii (1901–1937), novelist, short story writer and critic, published since 1923. Young Communist League activist in 1920–1925. Student at the Kharkiv Institute of Red Professors, 1925–1929. Member of the literary organizations Pluh, VAPLITE and Prolitfront. Director of the Derzhlitvydav (State Literary Publishers) publishing house in 1929–1934. Arrested 1934, died in the Gulag.

Shrah, Mykola (1894–1970), economist and political leader. Vice president of the Central Rada (1917–1918), a leader of the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries (UPSR). A consul for the Ukrainian diplomatic mission in Budapest (1919); a socialist activist in Vienna (1920–1924); returned to Ukraine with Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, worked in various minor official positions. Imprisoned during the Stalinist terror. Taught at the Kharkiv Institute of National Economy from 1952; professor at the L'viv Polytechnical Institute (from 1966).

Fal'kivs'kyi, Dmytro (1898–1934), poet of a neo-romantic orientation. Born in Polissia; served in the Cheka in Belarus' in 1920–23, then lived in Kyiv. Member of the literary organizations Hart, Lanka and MARS; published since 1924. Author of three books of poetry; also worked at the journal *Kino* (1927–1933). Arrested an executed along with 28 other cultural figures in December 1934.

Vlyz'ko, Oleksa (1908–1934), poet. Belonged to the literary organizations Molodniak and the All-Union Organization of Proletarian Writers; later worked at the journal *Nova generatsiia*. His poetry, published from 1925, was marked by a cheerful romanticism and interest in people of strong character. Arrested and executed in December 1934 along with 28 other Ukrainian intellectuals.

Shkurupii, Geo (Iurii) (1903–1937), poet, prose writer. Published since 1920, an active member of the Ukrainian Futurist movement. Published four collections of poetry, four novels and a number of short stories. Arrested in 1934, perished in the Gulag.

No. 35

Balyts'kyi, Vsevolod (1892–1937), head of the GPU of the Ukrainian SSR in 1923–1931 and 1933–1934; People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the Ukrainian SSR in 1924–1930 and 1934–1937.

Deinar, Mykola (1888–1968), opera singer (bass).

Voloshyn, Ievhen, taught Ukrainian language and literature in Kyiv in the 1920s. Arrested and imprisoned for nine months in connection with the case of the "Union for the Liberation of Ukraine"; in December 1934 fled Ukraine to Samarkand. His further fate is unknown.

Voskrekasenko, Serhii (1906–1979), poet, journalist. Based in Kyiv, began publishing in Komsomol press in 1928.

Shevchenko, Iona (1887–1940?), actor, drama critic. Graduated from the Lysenko Music and Drama School, worked at the Molodyi Teatr (1917–1919) and at the Berezil' theater (1922–1924). Author of

a book on contemporary Ukrainian theater and on Ukrainian playwrights (both 1929). Arrested in 1936, perished in the Gulag.

No. 38

Aspys (Asotsiatsiia pys'mennykiv), a writers' association in Kyiv in 1923–1924 of moderate “fellow-traveler” orientation. In 1924 split into the Neoclassicist group and the group Lanka (later renamed MARS).

Klymenko, Pylyp (1887–1955), historian. Graduated from the St. Petersburg Polytechnical Institute and from Kyiv University. After teaching for a short time at the Kam'ianets'-Podil's'kyi University moved to Kyiv and worked at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, specializing in seventeenth–nineteenth century Ukrainian history. Arrested in 1936, died in the Gulag.

No. 40

Nikovs'kyi, Andrii (1885–1942?), literary scholar, journalist, civic figure. Editor of the newspapers *Rada* (1913–1914) and *Nova Rada* (1917–1919). Member of the Central Rada, minister of foreign affairs of the Ukrainian People's Republic. Returned from emigration in 1924; worked at the Academy of Sciences. Arrested in the case of the “Union for the Liberation of Ukraine”; sentenced to ten years' imprisonment. Upon release in 1940 moved to Leningrad, where he died during the blockade.

No. 42

Sabal'dyr, Hryhorii (1883–?), linguist, author of a handbook of Ukrainian orthography (1924) and several dictionaries. Disappeared during the terror of the 1930s.

The Famine of 1932-33 in the Discussion of Russian-Ukrainian Relations

Frank E. Sysyn

The commemoration in 2003 of the seventieth anniversary of the Great Ukrainian Famine has brought the tragedy to the forefront of Ukrainian domestic and foreign affairs. Despite the opposition of the Communists and the indifference of much of the former Soviet nomenklatura, the parliament passed a resolution recognizing the famine as genocide and placing blame on the Soviet authorities.¹ The Ukrainian government had initiated an action in the United Nations to recognize the genocidal nature of the famine. Here, however, the Russian delegation seems to have opposed the Ukrainian initiative behind the scenes. Calls from civic organizations, such as Ukraine's Memorial, that Moscow issue an acknowledgment and an apology have met with dismissal and even derision by the Russian ambassador to Ukraine, Viktor Chernomyrdin, and by Vladimir Putin. As in so many questions of Ukrainian-Russian relations, dialogue has not even begun.²

The relatively short time since the fall of the Soviet Union and the opening up of archival materials explains why attention has focused on gathering new evidence and studying specific events in Soviet history rather than on constructing new syntheses and tackling complex abstract issues, such as the nature of Russian-Ukrainian relations.³

¹ On the parliamentary hearings, see *Parlamentars'ki slukhannia shchodo shanuvannia pam'iaty zhertyv holodomoru 1932-1933 rokiv 12 liutoho 2003 r.* (Kyiv, 2003).

² On discussions of international recognition of the Famine as genocide, see *Ukrains'ka pravda* www.pravda.com.ua, 25 September 2003, "Kuchma ziznavsia, shcho ne khoche `zvodyty rakhunky' za Holodomor-33."

³ Some of the questions of Ukrainian-Russian relations in the Soviet period are addressed in the introduction and essays in Andreas Kappeler, Zenon E. Kohut, Frank E. Sysyn, and Mark von Hagen, eds., *Culture,*

At the same time, the emergence of independent Russian and Ukrainian states has focused attention in both states on writing national history rather than on re-examining the relations of the two peoples and cultures within the Soviet Union. Indeed, the breakdown of scholarly contacts and even the exchange of literature has discouraged such discussions between what are now two historiographies that have developed out of the disintegration of Soviet historiography. The remarks that follow are intended to raise some of the issues of Russian-Ukrainian relations that should be examined in discussions of the Famine of 1932-33. They aim to provoke discussion rather than to present a hypothesis.

Perhaps no event in Soviet history has been transformed as rapidly from a "white spot" into a major focus of popular consciousness as the Famine of 1932-33. In contrast to events such as the purges, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, and the Katyn massacre, which have long received scholarly and popular attention outside the Soviet Union, the Famine had been relatively neglected by academics and by the Western public until the 1980s. The Famine became a subject of scholarly study and public attention in the West largely through the efforts of the Ukrainian diaspora communities centering on the fiftieth anniversary of the Famine in 1983.⁴ The film, *Harvest of Despair*, the US Congressional Resolution and the Commission on the Ukrainian Famine, and the International Commission of Enquiry on the Ukrainian

Nation, and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter, 1600-1945 (Toronto-Edmonton, 2003).

⁴ Frank E. Sysyn, "The Ukrainian Famine of 1932-3: The Role of the Ukrainian Diaspora in Research and Public Discussion," in Levron Chorbajian and George Shirinian, *Studies in Comparative Genocide* (New York-London, 1999), 182-215.

Famine brought the event to public attention. Robert Conquest's monograph *Harvest of Sorrow* and the publications of James Mace placed the Famine on the Western scholarly agenda.⁵

The period of glasnost in the USSR permitted the Famine issue to emerge among the numerous historical revelations and re-evaluations of the late 1980s. The issue was first broached in Moscow, but by 1989 it took on widespread popular resonance in Ukraine. The public manifestations, erection of monuments, international conferences, and scholarly publications of the 1990s have made the Famine one of the central issues of historical discussion in contemporary Ukraine.⁶

For both the Ukrainian diaspora and the Ukrainian national movement in Ukraine, the Famine issue has functioned as a rallying point. From the 1930s to the 1990s, anti-Soviet Ukrainians outside the USSR pointed to the Famine as proof of the criminal and anti-Ukrainian nature of the Soviet regime. Within these circles, the Moscow government held responsible was seen as both Communist and Russian. The lesson drawn was that only an independent Ukraine would have guaranteed against such tragedies and could avoid them in the future. The refusal of the Soviet government to admit that a famine had occurred, much less to admit that it bore responsibility, transformed all discussions of the Famine into an ideological confrontation. The issue was particularly important in right-left polemics, because if the Soviet Union was seen as comparable in evil to Nazi Germany, all discussions of the Eastern Front of World War II took on a different coloration. At the same time, Ukrainians in the diaspora found the Famine an important means of questioning the stereotype of "Ukrainians" as victimizers (Nazi collaborators, pogromists) rather than victimized. Attention to the Famine also made more

explicable why some Ukrainians would have little loyalty to the Soviet Union in 1941 or might at first have viewed German rule as even a possible improvement. The debate on the Famine also influenced discussions of the Holocaust for these issues, as well as for the significance of the tragedy in explaining the brutalization and demoralization of Ukraine's population prior to the war.

By the 1980s the Famine had become a central focus of identity and rallying point for diaspora Ukrainians who aspired to establish an independent Ukrainian state. At the end of the decade, it played a similar role in Ukraine. As the degree of mendacity of the Soviet propagandists about numerous issues became known to wider circles of the population of Ukraine, the official negation of the Famine crumbled before a groundswell of eyewitness testimony. At the same time, the Soviet demonization of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" lost potency as voices were raised against the Russification of Ukraine and the sham nature of Soviet internationalism. In 1988-91 a general oppositional groundswell arose in Ukraine that combined anti-totalitarian, democratic, ecological, cultural, religious, and national issues. Its influence extended far beyond Rukh, the organized oppositional movement that had its main base in western Ukraine. Distrust of the authorities and the Moscow-center was intensified by the experience of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster of 1986. This recent catastrophe made plausible the allegations about the Famine and the arguments that the Soviet authorities cared little for the people and that the Moscow-center treated Ukraine with little regard. For the Ukrainian national movement, the Famine issue served as an effective vehicle for undermining the Communist authorities and the Soviet mythology in eastern Ukraine. The national interpretation of the Famine current in the Ukrainian diaspora spread in Ukraine as the country opened up to contacts with the West, and the projects of the 1980s in the West legitimized and served as models for activities in Ukraine.⁷ By 1991 even the authorities had come to acquiesce that a man-made Famine had occurred in Ukraine, though they were reluctant to deal with the issue of responsibility.

The August 1991 coup in Moscow and the shift of the authorities in Ukraine to a pro-independence stance radically changed the political climate in Ukraine. The

⁵ Robert Conquest, *Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror Famine* (New York-London, 1986) and James Mace, "Famine and Nationalism in Soviet Ukraine," *Problems of Communism* (May-June, 1984): 37-57 and "The Man-Made Famine of 1933: What Happened and Why," in Israel W. Charny, ed., *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of Genocide: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide* (Boulder, CO, 1984), 67-83.

⁶ Of great importance was the official and still Soviet *Holod 1932-1933 na Ukraïni: Ochyma istoriykiv, movoiu dokumentiv* (Kyiv, 1990) and the Memorial "opposition" volume L. Kovalenko and V. Maniak, *Holod 33. Narodna knyha-memorial* (Kyiv, 1991).

⁷ Conquest's book was published in translation in fragments in the early 1990s and in full in 1993 in Kyiv as *Zhnyva skorboty: Radians'ka kolektyvizatsiia i Holodomor*.

ruling former Communist elite adopted many of the symbols of the Ukrainian national movement (the blue-and-yellow flag) and elements of the Ukrainian national historical vision, including the view of the Famine. Attention to the Famine in the Ukrainian media before the December 1, 1991, referendum was one of the means the government used to build pro-independence sentiment. The banning of the Communist Party removed the organization that could be seen as bearing the responsibility for the Famine from Ukrainian public life. However one evaluates the adoption of Ukrainian national positions by the old elite and its cooptation of the agenda of the Ukrainian democratic national movement, the government in Kyiv did make the commemoration of the Famine one of its elements in establishing the identity of the Ukrainian state.

By the time that the Ukrainian government organized the commemoration of the Ukrainian Famine's sixtieth anniversary in mid-1993, the economic crisis in the new state and its failure to find adequate support in the West had made an increasingly weary population wary of Ukrainian independence and apathetic toward public issues. The re-emergence of the Communist Party and of pro-Russian and pro-Soviet sympathies in late 1993 and 1994 also changed the political and cultural climate in Ukraine. Those forces that had found the commemoration of the Famine inconvenient and the interpretation of the event by the Ukrainian national movement unacceptable had more influence at a national level. Certainly, the Famine had receded as a public issue by 1995 as the Kuchma government returned to many of the propagandists of the old order for setting the cultural-political agenda. Despite the financial crisis in Ukrainian scholarship and publishing, scholarly and popular writing on the Famine, including indictments of the tragedy as a Soviet or even Russian genocide against the Ukrainian nation, continued.⁸ With the subsequent falling out of the Communists with the Kuchma regime and the oligarchs in the late 1990s, the Famine issue could be more readily embraced by the government, even if only as a way of dealing with the patriotic segment of the Ukrainian electorate. Hence the presidential ukaz on the Famine in 2002 opened the way for greater attention to the Famine in 2003 as part of presidential political tactics.

Discussions of the Famine have centered on a number

⁸ See the report on the Second Congress of Famine Researchers in December 1994 in *News from Ukraine* 1995, np. 1.

of controversies. Arguments that a Famine did not occur, that it was the result of drought or poor harvests, or that it was the result of anarchy during the collectivization drive have generally been discredited.⁹ Although assertions that deaths from the Famine losses were limited have been abandoned, the number of millions of demographic losses is still debated. Intentionality and responsibility for the disaster remain disputed. While assertions that the Famine had no specific geographic limits have ceased, debates continue over whether it resulted from similar policies in all grain-growing regions in the Soviet Union. In particular, assertions that it occurred because of specific policies toward Ukraine, that anti-Ukrainian attitudes explain the failure to render assistance or that the Famine was planned are still hotly debated.

In the initial controversies in the West, the debates were largely between representatives of the Ukrainian diaspora and scholars who defended some of their viewpoints, and representatives of the Soviet government and scholars who opposed these views, some of whom held pro-Soviet, Ukrainophobe, or Russophilic views. The Famine also became a point of controversy in the debates of the Revisionists and their opponents. Of late, the increasing scholarly attention to the Famine and the ability to research specific topics with access to archival materials and demographic data in the former Soviet Union have reduced the ideological heat surrounding the topic. More and more of the scholarship is written in Ukraine and Russia. While the Famine is not a major public issue in Russia, Russian scholars have taken positions on the issue of whether the Famine had a specific Ukrainian character.¹⁰ In this way, the issue of the Famine has emerged as an incident of Russian-Ukrainian issues in the 1930s as well as in contemporary relations.

The demographic consequence of the Famine is an essential issue for Russian-Ukrainian relations. The twentieth century was a period in which the demographic balance of Ukrainians and Russians shifted drastically in favor of the latter. In 1926, there were 78,453,000 Russians and 34,882,000 Ukrainians in the territories of

⁹ One scholar making some of these arguments is Mark B. Tauger. See his *Natural Disaster and Human Actions in the Soviet Famine of 1931-1933* (Pittsburgh, 2001) (The Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies, no. 1506).

¹⁰ V. P. Danilov, "Diskussiiia v zapadnoi presse o golode 1932-33 gg. i 'demograficheskoi katastrofe' 30-40kh godov v SSSR," *Voprosy istorii*, 3 (1998):116-21.

the former Soviet Union (as well as the western Ukrainian territories later annexed), a ratio of 2.25 Russians to one Ukrainian.¹¹ By 1959, there were 114,114,000 Russians and 37,253,000 Ukrainians (a ratio of 3.06 to 1), and by 1989 there were 145,072,000 and 44,136,000 (a ratio of 3.29 to 1). In other terms, while Ukrainians were outnumbered by Russians by 2.25 to 1 in 1926, for every one addition to the number of Ukrainians over the next 63 years (a total of 9,254,000), there were an additional 7.2 Russians (66,619,000). The fighting of World War II on Ukrainian territories, resulting in large civilian casualties, partially explains this phenomenon. Events such as the Famine of 1947 encompassed all of Ukraine and only parts of Russia. The emigration of many Ukrainians to Russia and the assimilation of the Ukrainian communities in Russia, particularly rapid since the abolition of Ukrainian cultural institutions in the 1930s and the arbitrary reclassification of Ukrainians as Russians in Kuban and other regions, also offer a partial explanation. In addition, numerous Ukrainians in Ukraine in those years designated themselves as Russians and the children of mixed marriages showed a preference for Russian nationality. Yet these factors are not sufficient to explain the relative demographic decline of Ukrainians, particularly in Ukraine itself. From 1926 to 1959, within the borders of the pre-1939 Ukrainian SSR, the Ukrainian population increased by only 1,879,000 (from 23,219,000 to 25,098,000), while the Russian population increased by 3,160,000 (from 2,676,000 to 5,836,000).¹²

The Famine of 1932-33 played a significant role in this relative decline of Ukrainians within the Soviet Union as a whole and in Soviet Ukraine in particular. The exact figures of the victims of the Famine are still being disputed, but by the mid-1990s the new sources and research in Ukraine showed how disproportionately Ukraine had suffered during the Famine. Robert Conquest had estimated 5 million losses in Ukraine and 2 million in Russia, of whom, he estimated, probably 1 million were

Ukrainians because of the geography of the Famine in Russia. (He also estimated 1 million Kazakh losses in 1932, but did not see this tragedy as part of the policies that brought about the Famine.) In his studies in the mid-1990s, Stephen Wheatcroft raised his estimate of mortality from the Famine of 1932-33 upward from 3-4 million to 4-5 million.¹³ While he did not give absolute figures for Ukraine, he estimated that the elevation of mortality in Ukraine in 1933 was 189.5 percent compared to 51.7 percent in Russia and 23.6 percent in Belarus, that the Ukrainian oblasts of Kyiv and Kharkiv had the highest rates anywhere in the USSR (respectively 268.4 and 281.3 percent), and that it was high even in non-grain-growing regions of Ukraine such as Chernihiv (111 percent).¹⁴ Stanislav Kul'chyts'kyi contended that Wheatcroft underestimated the number of deaths, and on the basis of the 1937 census argued there were 3 to 3.5 million deaths in Ukraine and 1 to 1.3 million unborn children because of the Famine.¹⁵ A. Maksudov estimated 4.5 to 5 million demographic loss in Ukraine and a Soviet total of 7 million, in which he included Kazakh losses, while Alec Nove accepted Conquest's figure as essentially correct if "somewhat too high for the Ukraine, but somewhat too low for Kazakhstan."¹⁶ In sum, the demographic losses variously estimated as 4 to 7 million were predominantly in Ukraine, which had less than a third of the population that Russia did. In addition, many of the areas of Russia affected by the Famine such as Kuban had high percentages of Ukrainian population. In essence, the Famine represented a demographic disaster for Ukraine and the Ukrainian population of the Soviet Union on a scale that it did not for Russia and the Russian population. Therefore, the Famine provides an important part of the explanation of the decline of Ukrainians in relation to Russians within the entire former Soviet Union.

¹¹ Population statistics come from Ralph Clem, "Demographic Change among Russians and Ukrainians in the Soviet Union: Social, Economic, and Political Implications," in Peter Potichnyj et. al. eds., *Ukraine and Russia in their Historical Encounter* (Edmonton, 1992), 288.

¹² Data is taken from Bohdan Krawchenko, *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine* (n.p., 1985), 176, with the population of Crimea, taken from the article in the *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, subtracted from the southern region.

¹³ Stephen Wheatcroft, "More Light on the Scale of Repression and the Excess Mortality in the Soviet Union in the 1930s," in J. Arch Getty and Roberta Manning, eds. *Stalinist Terror: New Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1993), 280.

¹⁴ Wheatcroft, 282.

¹⁵ Unpublished paper "Ukrainian Demographic Losses from the Famine in 1932-33 according to the General Census of the Ukrainian Population in 1937" (1994).

¹⁶ Alec Nove, "Victims of Stalinism: How Many?" in Getty and Manning, *Stalinist Terror*, 266,274.

Within Soviet Ukraine, the Famine reduced the Ukrainian and increased the Russian percentage of the population. The relatively high Ukrainian birthrate made for a rapidly growing Ukrainian population in the republic and an increase of their percentage throughout the 1920s and into the early 1930s. Yet from 1926 to 1937, Ukrainians decreased by 433,000 (1.9 percent), while Russians increased by 904,000 (39 percent).¹⁷ This represented a shift from 1 Russian for every 9.77 Ukrainians to 1 Russian for every 6.89 Ukrainians. The rural-urban difference of national composition ensured that Ukrainians made up a higher percentage of victims of the Famine than was their percentage in the general population, while the more urbanized Russians in Ukraine were likely to have a smaller proportion of victims. (In 1926, 77 percent of Jews and 50 percent of Russians lived in the cities, but only 10 percent of Ukrainians.)¹⁸ Some of this change occurred because of migration into Ukraine after the Famine, including into rural areas.

By a rapid decimation of the fecund Ukrainian village, the Famine reduced its potential to serve as the source of urban migrants in the future. While it is difficult to differentiate the impact of the Famine from that of World War II on the Ukrainian village, the reasons for the massive Russian influx into Ukraine from 1926 to 1959 can only be explained by the reduced population increase in the rural areas that were in pre-1939 Soviet Ukraine. Had it not been for the west Ukrainian village as a source of population growth and migrants, that influx might have been even greater. Nevertheless, by 1959 there were only 4.30 Ukrainians in the area of pre-1939 Ukraine for every Russian (3.79 if Crimea is included).¹⁹

The Famine also had significant impact on the nature of Ukrainian-Russian linguistic and cultural relations in Ukraine. The demographic change only partially explains this shift. The cessation of Ukrainianization and the attacks on Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism undermined the position of the Ukrainian language and the status of Ukrainians. They accompanied the collectivization and

assault on the Ukrainian village, the traditional bearer of the Ukrainian language and culture. This would have favored the Russian language and the Russian-based Soviet proletarian culture in any case. Nevertheless, had the Famine not decimated the village, wiped out so many bearers of Ukrainian language and traditional culture, produced a generation of orphans who did not remember their elders, issued forth a stream of refugees to the industrial centers who wished to forget the horror they had endured in the villages and in many cases had no relatives left there, Ukrainian language and identity would have been more resilient and Russification would have proceeded more slowly.

Discussion of the Famine also involves the question of whether Ukraine and Ukrainians were targeted for persecution and discrimination by the Soviet system as well as the degree to which this system and its elite should be seen as Russian. Three issues remain at the core of the question of special treatment of Ukraine before and during the Famine.

The first is whether Ukraine was treated differently than other republics of the Soviet Union in the apportioning of grain requisitions. Some scholars argue that Ukraine was treated no differently than other grain-growing regions of Russia. This contention must demonstrate that all grain-growing regions of Russia were affected to the degree of grain-growing regions in Ukraine. It also must explain why the non-grain-growing areas of Ukraine seem to have been affected more than the non-grain-growing regions of Russia were, and in some cases more than grain-growing regions were.

The second issue involves the question of whether the refusal to listen to the Kyiv leadership's pleas on the Famine and the willingness to permit massive losses of life constituted a Moscow-centric indifference or even an anti-Ukraine or an anti-Ukrainian bias. The question of the place and treatment of Ukraine and Russia within the Soviet Union during the Famine must be examined. Central to this discussion is the question of closing Ukraine's borders. This question initially evoked much controversy in the West, including the dismissal of survivor testimony, and has ultimately been proven by documentary evidence. This issue also involves the attitudes of the Soviet elite and, above all, of Stalin toward Ukraine and Ukrainians.

The third issue relates to whether or not the actions of the Kremlin or of the Soviet government can be seen as Russian, especially in light of Stalin's Georgian origins.

¹⁷ "National Composition of Ukraine," *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, 3 (Toronto, 1993), 542. The statistics for both Ukrainians and Russians in 1926 are somewhat smaller than in the data taken from Krawchenko above, presumably because of a different interpretation of the borders of Ukraine.

¹⁸ Krawchenko, 50.

¹⁹ Krawchenko, 176, see note 2.

This issue involves the complex gamut of questions of the degree to which the Soviet Union was a successor to the Russian Empire and maintained Russian imperialist or nationalist policies. The question has become even more complicated with the emergence of a Russian state that is viewed and often views itself as the successor state of the USSR. In popular perception in the former non-Russian republics, the wedding of Russian identity and Russian language to Soviet identity and pro-Communist sentiment in the post-independence era has strengthened this view. In examining the situation in Ukraine in the 1930s, “Russian” and “Ukrainian” relate to complex social (urban-rural), political (the national composition and linguistic characteristics of the CP) and cultural characteristics. In examining the Famine of 1932-33, topics such as the national composition of the twenty-five thousanders relate to the question of Russian-Ukrainian relations, and in particular stereotypes.

Numerous questions remain unresolved in the study of the Famine of 1932-33. As they are studied, the research will permit more informed discussion of the relevance of the Famine for Russian-Ukrainian relations. Clearly the Famine had a great impact on the demographic relations of Ukrainians and Russians and on the linguistic and cultural situation in Ukraine. More complex is the significance of the Famine as an event in Russian-Ukrainian relations and the attitudes of various groups of the two peoples toward each other. Differing interpretations of the Famine and its differing function in popular consciousness also affect Russian-Ukrainian contemporary relations. Examination of many of these topics will assist in our conceptualization of Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Soviet period.

Frank E. Sysyn is the Director of the Peter Jacyk Center for Ukrainian Historical Research, University of Alberta. Professor Sysyn was named the Jacyk Visiting Professor of Ukrainian Studies at the Harriman Institute for the spring 2004 semester. Sysyn’s recent publications include *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine*, co-authored with Serhii Plokyh, and *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: Historian and National Awakener*, both published in 2003. He is co-editor of *Culture, Nation and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter* (2003) and editor-in-chief of the English translation of Hrushevsky’s multivolume *History of Ukraine-Rus’*.