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This dissertation addresses identity and cultural nonconformity in the western Ukrainian city of L'viv from 1953, after the death of Soviet leader Joseph Stalin, to 1975, when a human rights movement critical of the Soviet state had emerged throughout the Soviet Union. It examines the way in which intellectuals, students, and young people, while maintaining loyalty to the Soviet state, failed to conform to its expectations.

Recent scholarship has suggested that the Soviet state did much to promote the formation of national identities and the values of those who became opponents of the regime by the mid-1970s. Building on this rich field of studies on national identity and dissent in the Soviet Union, as well as on methodologies from other disciplines and fields of history, this dissertation takes the issues of national identity and dissent in the Soviet Union in a new direction. It examines the evolution of national identity in tandem with other identities, such as a multinational Soviet identity, a regional identity, a Central European identity, and a postwar youth identity. It suggests that Ukrainians in L'viv made use of previous colonial legacies, such as those of Poland and Austria-Hungary, to resist the hegemony of official Soviet culture. This dissertation also considers the role of state cultural institutions, such as the artists' and writers' unions, in generating values that at times conflicted with the
regime's expectations. Drawing on theories of modernity and tradition, it seeks to understand intellectuals' responses to the modern industrialized society that emerged in western Ukraine after 1945.

Research for this dissertation is mainly based on materials from state and former Party archives in L'viv and Kyiv, as well as on literary and artistic sources and a number of oral interviews. Such sources have shown that the Soviet state, in addition to dealing with political opponents by the mid-1970s, confronted conflicting values and forms of behavior that also proved difficult to accommodate, contributing to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. In L'viv, Polish-language media, contacts with Poles, and contacts with Ukrainians living in the capitalist West undermined official Soviet culture and provided more insight into cultural and social developments taking part in the rest of the world. Ukrainians from L'viv, particularly in the early 1960s, provided others in the republic with sources of a national identity that official Soviet culture did not welcome. Students and other young people in the city formed subcultures that adopted the values of American mass culture and in some cases began to question the status of Ukrainians' language and culture in the Soviet Union and challenged gender roles.

Intellectuals in artistic unions, while loyal Soviet citizens, were in serious disagreement over accepted standards in art and literature and also criticized neglect of the Ukrainian language in public life. Social scientists and writers represented a useable past for the region that conflicted with official perceptions on Ukrainian history and also fueled personal vendettas among establishment intellectuals. In art and literature, intellectuals of various political persuasions sought to come to terms
with modernity in its Soviet context, seeking to represent in tradition and in abstract art forms a sense of meaning in a world where traditional village life not long ago had been disrupted.
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INTRODUCTION

The role national identities played in the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 has taken on vital significance for Soviet historians. This is particularly true for the Soviet republic of Ukraine. Close linguistic and cultural ties with Russians did not impede the evolution of a distinct Ukrainian national identity from the early nineteenth century onward.\(^1\) As the largest of the non-Russian republics in terms of population, Soviet Ukraine figured prominently in efforts by Soviet Communist Party leaders to deal with nationality issues facing the Soviet state.\(^2\) Despite efforts by the Soviet state to control national expression, it nonetheless chose to promote it in Ukraine and other republics in the 1920s and 1930s, legitimating their secession from the Soviet Union.

This dissertation takes the study of national identity in Soviet Ukraine in a new direction by concentrating on students, other young people, and broader intellectual circles in the western city of L’viv who came into conflict with the Soviet state despite

---


their ostensible loyalty to it. From 1953, the year of Stalin’s death, to 1975, when the Soviet Union’s signing of the Helsinki Accords gave further legitimacy to the Soviet human rights movement, the vast majority of intellectuals and young people in L’viv and other Soviet cities did not resort to political protest. While Ukrainians and non-Russians did not rebel, widespread resistance to Soviet rule, as one scholar has perceptively noted, did take place. In L’viv, intellectuals and young people formed identities as Ukrainians, youth, artists, Galician villagers, Central Europeans, and the like in ways that posed problems that the Soviet state had to accommodate as well as control. In this sense, they formed national identities in tandem with other identities, posing long-term challenges to the Soviet regime that encouraged its collapse by 1991.

Recent scholars have assessed national identity in the Soviet Union in terms of the evolution of the Soviet regime’s nationality policy. Kenneth Farmer’s study on Ukrainian nationalism demonstrates convincingly that competing myths and symbols associated with official policies had a crucial influence on Ukrainians’ sense of nationhood and dissent in the post-Stalin era. The Soviet state’s myths of the “nation” of “proletarian internationalism,” while encouraging the dominance of Russians’ language and culture, also legitimated the development of non-Russian nations’ languages and cultures. Official notions of a “merging (sliianie)” of nations taking place in the Soviet

---

3 Ibid., xii.
Union and the formation of the Soviet people (sovetskii narod) as a “new historical community” reflected efforts to find a compromise over serious disagreements about the state’s nationality policy.\(^4\)

Other scholars of national identity in the Soviet Union have further supported this contention, suggesting that the Soviet state throughout its history did much to legitimize at least formal aspects of nationhood for Ukrainians and other nationalities. From the early 1920s, Soviet Party and state leaders sought to co-opt nationalist movements emerging in the former Russian Empire in a policy known as “nativization” or korenizatsiia. Aiming to combat Russian national chauvinism and encourage a spirit of proletarian internationalism, they designated ethnic territorial units, classified ethnic groups, and promoted native languages, cultures, and elites among non-Russians. Resentment by Russians, social upheavals caused by industrialization and collectivization, and perceived threats to the Soviet state’s border regions from capitalist powers and diaspora nations caused Soviet leaders in the early 1930s to tone down their policy of korenizatsiia. By 1938, the Soviet state promoted the “friendship of peoples” as the imagined community of the Soviet Union. Various peoples of the Soviet state shared common ties across time and space based on their own ethnic differences and their adoption of the language and culture of the Russian people, perceived as the most revolutionary and progressive.\(^5\) But while the Russian people’s language and culture took a dominant role in Soviet society, non-Russians’ language and culture continued to


develop alongside them. Ethnic and national differences moreover had become immutable categories biologically passed down, making ethnic differences replace those of class as a daily part of life in Soviet society.\(^6\)

Recent scholarship also has stressed convincingly that national dissent in Ukraine and other Soviet republics after 1953 was very closely connected to official values. According to Farmer, national symbols permitted in official discourse after Stalin’s death encouraged a “myth of national moral patrimony” supported by intellectuals who advocated either greater cultural pluralism favoring Ukrainians or a rejection of “proletarian internationalism” altogether. Both intellectuals in the establishment, such as members of the writers’ union, and those who later came to oppose the regime shared values that supported this myth. Studies on dissent in Soviet Ukraine likewise suggest that many who turned to political opposition initially shared official values on matters of national identity and culture. While some opposed Soviet rule from the beginning, many others prior to their arrests sought to improve Ukrainians’ national self-expression in the official culture as Stalin’s cult of personality became subject to official criticism.\(^7\)

---


Other scholars confirm this link between dissent and official values among other Soviet intellectuals after 1953, pointing out the influence of such values even when they directly opposed the regime. Dissidents’ connections to official values in the post-Stalin period suggest a dialogue between state and society taking place on many different levels, which recent scholarship has stressed taking place in Soviet Russian society in the 1930s. In this context, negotiations between segments of society and the state played a highly significant role in official Soviet Ukrainian culture’s development, suggesting that the lines between loyal Soviet citizens and dissidents in the post-Stalin era were blurred.

Recent scholarship furthermore suggests that the emergence of a modern industrial society in the Soviet Union under Stalin played a considerable role in shaping the identity of Ukrainians and others in the post-Stalin period. Bohdan Krawchenko, for instance, has argued that urbanization and industrialization resulted in greater social mobility for Ukrainians in the years after World War II and that competition with ethnic Russians in the cities brought about greater national consciousness among them. While

---


this link between competition with ethnic Russians and national consciousness has been challenged, Krawchenko’s study does suggest that modernity had much to do with the evolution of Ukrainians’ national identity in the post-Stalin era.\footnote{Alexander Motyl has challenged this view in his Will the Non-Russians Rebel? Motyl, 131-34.}

Modernity, as defined by sociologist Anthony Giddens, is a social condition marked by global, impersonal institutions, systematic rational knowledge, a departure from traditional village life, and a sense of existential uncertainty.\footnote{This definition comes from Anthony Giddens, The Consequences of Modernity (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).} While Giddens has done much to explain the discontinuities between pre-modern and modern societies, other scholars, such as Ernest Gellner and Eric Hobsbawm, have pointed out the role of invented traditions, including national traditions, in mobilizing mass societies created in an age of modernity.\footnote{Ernest Gellner, Nations and Nationalism (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983); Eric Hobsbawm, “Introduction: Inventing Traditions,” in The Invention of Tradition, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1-14.} Such scholars’ accounts of modernity and tradition suggest that studies of national identity in Soviet Ukraine need to take into account such phenomena in the postwar decades, particularly since a modern industrial society came to dominate the republic only then, in the mid-1960s.\footnote{Krawchenko estimates that real postwar urban growth only took place in Soviet Ukraine in the 1960s, and that a majority of the republic’s population lived in cities only as late as 1966. Krawchenko, 178.}

Connections between national identity, official values, and modernity suggested by these scholars indicate that the evolution of national identities takes place in tandem with a variety of other identities. Recent scholarship on national identity in Asia has underscored the need to understand national identity as a Western construction that
obscures other identities, such as gender, caste identity, or other traditional social identities that evolve over time. Paul Robert Magoci has argued for a similar understanding of national identity regarding Ukrainian history in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Ukrainian national revival, Magoci argues, involved multiple layers of identity, such as being Ukrainian, yet also being Russian or Polish, as well as belonging to either the Russian or Austrian empires.

This dissertation consequently builds on this rich field of studies on national identity by seeking to understand the way in which intellectuals, students, and young people in L’viv after 1953, came to form a number of identities that challenged the regime, resulting in acts of nonconformity. Regarding students and young people in the post-Stalin era, it considers the impact of youth identities forming worldwide after 1945 as well as issues of national identity. It reflects on conflicts between intellectuals in the cultural establishment – members of artistic unions and scholars in the social sciences – over standards in literature and art, representations of Ukrainians’ past, and the status of Ukrainians’ language and culture in the Soviet Union. Drawing on Giddens, Hobsbawm,

---


as well as recent scholarship on Soviet modernity in the 1930s, it examines Ukrainian artists’ and writers’ perceptions of modernity and invented tradition in L’viv as well as their depiction of national themes.¹⁸

In examining national identity’s coexistence with other identities, this dissertation focuses in particular on the way in which regional identities brought about a new form of Ukrainian national identity that conflicted with the Soviet regime’s expectations. In Soviet Ukraine, L’viv was the cultural, economic, and political center of the region of Western Ukraine. This territory comprised the regions of L’viv, Volhyn’, Ternopol’, Transcarpathia, Rivne, and Chernivtsi, which had come under Soviet control in 1939 from territory belonging to Poland and Romania, with the Czech lands of Ruthenia added to Soviet Ukraine in 1945.

L’viv became the capital of a region that had played its own particular role in the evolution of Ukrainians’ national identity and in the formation of national dissent in the post-Stalin period. According to one study, L’viv was the second leading city, behind the capital, Kyiv, for the dissident movement that had emerged by the early 1970s. Of 749 active participants in acts of political opposition to the regime in 1969-72, a total of 283, or 38 percent, were from the republic’s capital, Kyiv, while 190 were from L’viv, 25 percent, comprising a total of 63 percent of the dissident movement.¹⁹ With the arrival of democratization under Gorbachev, the city became a major center of demonstrations and


¹⁹ Krawchenko, 251.
meetings in support of Ukrainian independence. A number of former dissidents as well as broader segments of intellectuals from L’viv took part in the political movement Ukrainian Popular Movement for Restructuring (Rukh). This civic organization of various political groupings went from supporting Gorbachev’s reforms to outright demands for Ukrainian independence. This organization later became Ukraine’s leading liberal democratic party, the Peoples’ Movement of Ukraine (Narodnyi Rukh Ukrainy).  

L’viv took on a particularly prominent role in Ukraine’s independence movement because Western Ukraine had developed mass national movements very much tied to historical developments in Central and Eastern Europe. The kingdom of Galicia-Volhynia, whose center was L’viv, had come under the control of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the late fourteenth century. When the European powers of Russia, Prussia, and the Habsburg Empire divided a considerable portion of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1772, this region came under the rule of the Habsburgs as the Kingdom of Galicia-Lodomeria, known also as Galicia.

Under Habsburg rule, Galicia witnessed the emergence of both Polish and Ukrainian national movements, particularly in L’viv, which was the kingdom’s capital, in the nineteenth century. While Habsburg treatment of ethnic groups in Galicia varied over time, often favoring Polish domination over Ukrainians, the constitutional system of the Habsburg Empire encouraged Ukrainians in this region and many other nationalities in the empire to develop their own schools, newspapers, cultural organizations, and political

---

20 On L’viv’s role as an important center of Ukraine’s independence movement, see Taras Kuzio and Andrew Wilson, Ukraine: Perestroika to Independence, foreword by Norman Stone (Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1994).
parties.\textsuperscript{21} By the end of the century, Ukrainians in L’viv and other parts of Galicia consequently were ahead of their counterparts in the Russian Empire in forming national mass organizations and political movements. Ukrainians in the Russian Empire by contrast faced political oppression, hindering the development of a national movement among broader segments of the population until after the Russian Revolution of 1905.\textsuperscript{22}

In Galicia, a great sense of political and social activism among Ukrainians, inspired by cultural exchanges with counterparts in the Russian Empire, precipitated a national revolution at the close of World War I. As with the empire’s other nationalities, the collapse of Habsburg rule in 1918 sparked a national revolution in Galicia favoring an independent Ukrainian state. In November 1918, young Ukrainian officers and local parliamentary figures in L’viv declared an independent West Ukrainian People’s Republic (ZUNR). Supported by an efficient administration from Austrian rule and a strong degree of social organization among Ukrainians in Galicia, this new state managed to mobilize a strong, effective army of over 100,000 men. The Ukrainian Galician Army, made up of many members of the Sich Riflemen, a former Habsburg Ukrainian military unit, put up a heroic struggle against increasingly more powerful and well-equipped Polish forces and ultimately were forced to flee to Eastern Ukraine (Ukrainian lands in the Soviet Union) in July 1919.\textsuperscript{23}


\textsuperscript{22} See Subtelny, 306-35.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 367-72.
Concerned with the possible spread of Bolshevism after the Russian Revolution, the Allies after World War I, at the urging of France, allowed a reconstituted Polish state temporary control over Galicia, on the condition that autonomy for Ukrainians be guaranteed. In 1923, the Council of Ambassadors recognized the region’s incorporation into Poland. In the years prior to World War II, Polish statesmen to an extent attempted to guarantee rights for Ukrainians and other national minorities. Some of them, such as Marshal Jozef Pilsudski, aspired to a multiethnic, federalist system of government for Poles and the country’s ethnic minorities. Ukrainian artistic and literary organizations, learned societies, cooperatives, schools, and political parties continued to function in Galicia. Many Ukrainian political leaders after 1923 sought to cooperate with the regime on behalf of their fellow nationals. Yet Ukrainians in Galicia between the world wars faced economic exploitation, Polish colonization, Polonization in language and cultural life, restricted access to higher education and state careers, and gerrymandered underrepresentation in parliament.

Efforts to cope with the defeat of Ukrainian independence movements in World War I, increased economic hardship in the Great Depression, and discrimination against national minorities encouraged by Poland’s right, led younger generations of Ukrainians in Galicia and Volhynia to take part in integral national movements by the 1930s. Ukrainian integral nationalists stressed authority, solidarity, faith, and organization as

---

24 On diplomatic efforts by France and other Allied nations to recognize Polish rule over Galicia, see Piotr S. Wandycz, France and Her Eastern Allies, 1919-1925: French-Czecho-Slovak-Polish Relations from the Paris Peace Conference to Locarno (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1962).

compensation for the socialism, democracy, and perceived lack of will that allegedly led to the defeat of Ukrainian independence movements in the war years. 26 Young activists in the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), founded in Vienna in 1929, desperately fought a national liberation struggle through bombings, sabotage, “expropriations,” and assassinations of major Polish and Ukrainian political figures, Polish policemen, undercover agents, informants, and suspected Ukrainian “collaborators” in Galicia and Volhynia. While acts of terrorism, used more frequently against fellow Ukrainians, ultimately kept the OUN from gaining a mass following on the eve of World War II, they did indicate the degree to which a failure to gain statehood, national discrimination, and increasingly authoritarian rule in interwar Poland had alienated Ukrainians. 27

Well-organized national movements, mass support for Ukrainian statehood during World War I, and the emergence of integral nationalism in the inter-war period brought about a different sense of national identity to Western Ukraine before its incorporation into the Soviet Union in World War II. This different sense of national identity in Western Ukraine and among nationalities of other regions bordering the Soviet Union particularly troubled Soviet leaders, leading them to conduct neo-colonialist practices in these Western border regions during and after the war years. Unrest during


27 See Alexander J. Motyl, “Ukrainian Nationalist Political Violence in Inter-War Poland, 1921-1939,” East European Quarterly 19 (March 1985): 45-55. Motyl notes that of 63 actual and attempted killings by Ukrainian nationalists between 1921 and 1939, the majority, 36, were made on the lives of Ukrainians, while 25 Poles, one Russian, and one Jew were affected. Ibid., 50.
collectivization in the early 1930s brought an ethnic dimension to Soviet xenophobia, leading to the notion of “enemy nations” threatening the Soviet Union and serving as a justification for the mass deportation of such nations during the Great Terror of the late 1930s. 28 This Soviet version of “ethnic cleansing” took place in Western Ukraine, Western Belorussia, and in the Baltic States following their annexation by the Soviet Union in 1939-40. In 1940-41, the Soviet state deported en masse to Siberia approximately half a million people from Western Ukraine and Western Belorussia, as well as less than sixty thousand from the Baltic states. 29

The war itself intensified suspicions toward these western regions, which had fallen under German occupation and whose populations to varying degrees collaborated with occupation authorities. As Amir Weiner has convincingly demonstrated, the Soviet regime and broader segments of the population came to see all those living on occupied territories as untrustworthy and potentially “contaminated.” All collaborators, real and imagined, were perceived as irredeemable elements deserving to be excised from the Soviet body politic. 30 Unrest against Soviet rule in these regions after their liberation by the Red Army only further justified these perceptions. In Western Ukraine, guerrilla units of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army


(OUN-UPA) waged an intense war against the secret police (NKVD) in the immediate postwar years. This guerrilla warfare took on ritual acts of violence on both rebel and Soviet sides and validated official assumptions that natives of Western Ukraine and others on the western borderlands were contaminated by foreign elements, collectively hostile, and politically unreliable.\(^{31}\)

This dissertation consequently takes into account the way in which Galicia’s past, as well as official suspicion toward Ukrainians in this region during and after World War II, brought about neo-colonial practices by the Soviet state in Western Ukraine. While not the voiceless subjects typically treated in studies of subalterns, Ukrainian intellectuals, students, and young people in L’viv who were natives of the region became much like subalterns of a colonial empire in the postwar years. Deemed politically unreliable, collectively hostile, and “contaminated” by foreign ideological influences, these Ukrainians, like other nationalities on the Soviet Union’s western borderlands, faced exclusion from major positions of power in the region. The state imposed on them a different language, Russian, and an official Soviet culture, aiming to strengthen Stalinist rule on the country’s western border.

By considering Ukrainians from this region as subalterns subjected to neo-colonial practices, this dissertation makes use of a postcolonial studies concept of border thinking as a way that subalterns resist larger colonial projects by living in between

---

languages of different colonial legacies. Through Polish language media and direct contacts with Poles from across the border, Ukrainian intellectuals, students, and young people in L’viv in the post-Stalin era resisted the hegemony of official Soviet culture through border thinking. They gained greater access to cultural and intellectual developments taking place in the rest of the world, overcoming the marginalized position they and others faced on the Soviet Union’s western borderlands. Connections with the Ukrainian diaspora in the capitalist West, as well as Galicia’s recent past, furthermore provided them with a different perception of a Ukrainian national identity. In the early 1960s, during Ukraine’s cultural renaissance, young intellectuals from Kyiv drew on this different sense of being Ukrainian as they asserted a new national identity that challenged the Soviet state. L’viv therefore deserves to be examined as a “window to the West” for Ukrainians both in L’viv and other parts of the republic, providing for a new sense of Ukrainian identity that posed problems for the Soviet state after 1953.

Documents from the L’viv State Regional Archives (DALO) constitute a fundamental source for this dissertation. These archives consist of state documents as well as documents from the region’s former Party organization. The most useful sources for this dissertation have been protocols of Party committees for the artists’ and writers’ unions, L’viv State University, the L’viv State Conservatory, and the L’viv State Polytechnic Institute, as well as the Communist Youth (komsomol) committee for these educational institutions. Annual Party meetings for such cultural and educational institutions give a general sense of what ideological, scholarly, or cultural matters had

acquired vital importance. In relatively liberal times, such as between 1956 and 1965, some general meetings are quite informative about Party and non-Party members’ attitudes toward art, literature, scholarly endeavors, and most importantly, the status of the Ukrainian language. Specific acts of nonconformity, by contrast, receive bare mention.

More insightful accounts of nonconformity can be obtained in closed Party meetings or Party committee bureau meetings that discuss individual Party members’ personal cases. Such cases sometimes contain detailed exchanges of questions and answers that shed much more light on what unofficial activities were taking place among intellectuals and young people that could be perceived as “nationalist” or “anti-Soviet.” As the political climate grew increasingly hostile toward incidents of national self-expression in the late 1960s and early 1970s, some Party members’ personal cases indicated important personal rivalries and intellectual disagreements as well as specific incidents of “nationalist” or “anti-Soviet” behavior taking place. Protocols of Communist Youth (komsomol) committee meetings discussing students’ personal cases have also been very informative when it comes to undesirable activities taking place among young people.

Some state documents from these archives, such as protocols of meetings of artists’, composers’ and writers’ unions and their correspondence from 1956 to the mid-1960s, also give insight into the role played by artistic unions in forming intellectuals’ identities and promoting their cultural interests. Some protocols of meetings reveal significant debates taking place about the role of literature, art, and music in society.
While not disclosing much about cases of intellectual nonconformity, since Party organizations largely dealt with these matters, these materials do say much about the role of institutions in promoting cultural activities that inspired acts of nonconformity.

Documents from the Central State Archive of Civic Organizations of Ukraine (TsDAHOU), the former Party archives of the republic in Kyiv, have also been a useful source of information for this dissertation. These archives contain some highly valuable reports by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine as well as some from the L’viv regional party committee not found at DALO. Central Committee reports in particular give a greater sense of what regional Party authorities were not saying in their campaigns against “nationalist” and “anti-Soviet” manifestations. A few letters sent to the Central Committee in Kyiv from intellectuals in L’viv also revealed the extent to which regional Party authorities were exaggerating their claims or omitting information. Top secret reports, “okremy papky (for your eyes only),” that the republic’s Central Committee issued to regional Party leaderships, are also at these archives and may also yield further insight into events. However, only such materials prior to 1941 were available to readers at the time of my dissertation research.

Archival sources at the Central State Archive Museum of Literature and Art of Ukraine (TsDAMLMU) in Kyiv to some extent have been of use for this dissertation, particularly correspondence from intellectuals from L’viv and other parts of Ukraine. As would be expected of a state archives, these intellectuals or their surviving family members did not contribute materials considered highly controversial. Yet some of these letters, not intended for public use, give insight into the private lives of members of artists’, writers’, and composers’ unions. In one case, a small diary by the head of the
L’viv writers’ union, Petro Kozlaniuk, describing his travels through East Germany in 1955, did reveal the values and assumptions of an establishment writer loyal to the Soviet regime and very devoted to serving the Ukrainian nation. Some intellectuals from L’viv willing to share materials from their own archives gave much further insight into unofficial cultural activities. I was able to make a copy of one issue of the underground journal The Chest (Skrynia), compiled in 1971 by literary youth in L’viv, that was in the personal papers of Halyna Chubaj, wife of the late poet Hryhorii Chubai.

I also conducted interviews with about 55 intellectuals in L’viv and Kyiv. These interviews, nearly all of which were tape-recorded, reflect the times in which they were made. My interview subjects generally refrained from speaking about moments in which they cooperated with the regime and took part in actions in support of the Party’s campaign against national dissent and nonconformity. When they focused on particular things that they had done, many of them directed my attention to their connections with dissidents or other nonconformists. Intellectuals who had belonged to artists’ and writers’ unions sometimes viewed their actions as opposing the official values of the regime when in fact such values had been encouraged by that regime. Those who did become involved in the dissident movement or in underground cultural activities by contrast stressed that counterparts in the establishment did not share their values. As expected for oral interviews, memories of some events were hazy or confused. Yet oral interviews provided detailed accounts of private discussions and meetings that official records failed to mention or interpreted in such simplified, sometimes misleading, terms as “nationalist,” “bourgeois,” “ideologically unsound,” or “anti-Soviet” manifestations or remarks. Interviews also revealed information about activities such as listening to rock
music, reading Polish-language journals, or visiting Ukrainians from abroad that on many occasions did not become items of discussion for Party leaders, unless they had to report diligently on shortcomings in ideological work in the region.

Increasing numbers of intellectuals from L’viv and elsewhere have been writing or compiling memoirs on influential writers, scholars, and artistic figures of the period. Some of these have been in book form, while other accounts have surfaced in various journals and newspapers in Ukraine. There have also been some biographies on such intellectual figures, and particularly those who came to oppose the regime openly. These memoir and biographical materials, like oral interviews, pay considerable attention to their subjects as opponents of the regime who stood for higher values in art, literature, and scholarship. While these sources tend to neglect the complex exchanges between the Soviet regime and social forces, they do contribute to our understanding of unofficial cultural activities taking place. They also suggest that intellectuals in state cultural institutions did not identify themselves with the Soviet state so unambiguously.

33 Among such books on cultural figures in L’viv and Kyiv, see Mykhajlo Nechytaliuk, “Chest’ prasi!”; Akademik Mykhajlo Vozniak u spohadakh ta publikatsiakh (“Glory to work!” Academician Mykhajlo Vozniak in memoirs and publications) (L’viv: Vydavnichyj tsentr L’vivs’koho natsional’noho universytetu im. Ivana Franka, 2000); Valerij Shevchuk et al., eds., Dobrokyj: spohady pro Ivana Svitlychnoho (A caring man: recollections of Ivan Svitlychnyi) (Kyiv: Vy’cyanystvo “Chas,” 1998); Ivan Hushchak, Pleiada zaboronena, pryzabuta (A Pleiad of the banned and half-forgotten) (L’viv: “Kobzar,” 1998); and Roman Ivanychuk, Blahoslovy, dushe moja, Hospoda... shchodennykovi zapyty, spohady i rozdumy (Bless the Lord, oh my soul... diary entries, recollections, and reflections) (L’viv: “Prosvita,” 1993).

34 See in particular Petro Shkrab’iuk, Popid zoloti vosota: shist’ elehij pro rodynu Kalyntsiiv (Under the golden gates: six elegies on the Kalynets’ family) (L’viv: Instytut ukraïnoznavstva im. I. Kryp’iakevycha, 1997), as well as Taras Batenko, “Ja povstanu, oithe, ja isnuu...”: Politychnyi protret Ivana Helia (“I rebel, therefore I am...”: a political portrait of Ivan Hel) (L’viv: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1999); and idem, Opozysniia osobystist’: politychnyi protret Bohdana Horynia (A personality from the opposition: a political portrait of Bohdan Horyn) (L’viv: Kal’varia, 1997).
My dissertation also makes use of literary and artistic sources from the 1960s to the middle of the 1970s. Many literary works by L’viv writers written for the shelf or refused publication are now available to the reading public. Some official literary works, while subject to rigorous censorship, nonetheless contain important attitudes toward Ukrainian history and modernity among more conformist segments of the population. Reproductions of artistic works come from recent publications of personal art exhibits, published collections of works, and photo reproductions given by the artists themselves. I also had photographed some paintings and sculptures in artists’ shops. These drawings, paintings, and sculptures, along with novels and poems, offer a glimpse into intellectuals’ world view, particularly their reception of modernity in both official and underground venues.

There were a number of archival sources of which this dissertation did not make use. State and Party archival materials in Moscow, particularly those of the Presidential Archives of the President of the Russian Federation (APRF), the State Archives of the Russian Federation (GARF), and the Center for the Preservation of Contemporary Documents (TsKhSD), were not consulted. Such sources may indicate the greater


significance events in L'viv had for the rest of the Soviet Union. Yet the most detailed materials about Ukrainians in L'viv can be obtained from former Party and state archives in L'viv.

My dissertation research also did not involve consulting materials at the former KGB archives for the L'viv Region and for the republic. Access to such materials required very specific requests as well as permission from the subjects mentioned in the documents or their surviving next of kin. Scholars who have made use of these sources have gained much insight into the activities of those arrested by KGB organs. However, their findings suggest that only those who came into direct conflict with the regime were subjects of these extremely valuable primary sources.37

The first chapter of this dissertation points out that in L'viv, Ukrainians' location at the borders of different imperial legacies as well as geographic proximity to Central Europe played a vital role in shaping an alternative national identity after 1953. Ukrainian intellectuals, students, and young people in L'viv from the late 1950s resisted their subaltern status through border thinking, gaining insight into artistic and literary developments in the rest of the world through Polish-language media. L'viv's geographic location did much to provide Ukrainian intellectuals with a different kind of national identity. Located at a site of considerable migrations to the West in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Ukrainians in L'viv and much of Western Ukraine shared ties with the diaspora in the capitalist West which gave them a different perception of the

Soviet system. A legacy of Austrian and Polish rule made it possible for young intellectuals in L'viv to acquaint their counterparts in Kyiv with an East Central European identity found in prewar Ukrainian publications, at Sich Riflemen's graves, and in meetings with surviving literary and artistic figures from interwar Galicia.

The second chapter treats intellectual nonconformity in the context of student and youth subcultures emerging globally in the post-1945 era. Youth who challenged restrictions on Ukrainian literature and art, rebelled against conservative values, and took on aspects of a worldwide popular culture in L'viv were in many ways defining themselves differently as Ukrainians and as youth in a post-1945 world. Youth subcultures evolved from groups listening to jazz and rock music and engaging in fights and drinking bouts in the late 1950s to Soviet "hippies" roaming city streets in the early 1970s. In official organizations like the Club of Artistic Youth in the early 1960s and in secret groups of their own, young people posed important questions about the status of the Ukrainian language and culture, sometimes turning to underground political action. While not taking to the streets in protests, students, young intellectuals, and other young people were engaged in their own quiet cultural revolution.

In the third chapter my dissertation emphasizes the crucial role played by the cultural establishment - members of artistic unions - in generating identities that came into conflict with the Soviet regime. In the city's artists' and writers' unions, intellectuals from 1956 to the mid-1960s debated standards on art and literature and the status of the Ukrainian language. The writers' union journal, Zhovten', became an important forum for writers from all over Ukraine under conditions of severe censorship from 1963 to 1965.
Establishment intellectuals furthermore had close affinities with the emerging opposition movement in Ukraine, as seen when members of writers’ and artists’ unions tried in 1966 to defend a young art critic on trial with many others for “anti-Soviet” activities. Conflicts between establishment intellectuals over standard in art and literature and the status of the Ukrainian language also reflected personal rivalries and contested perceptions of what constituted an acceptable official Soviet culture after Stalin’s cult of personality came under official assault in 1956.

The fourth and fifth chapters stress that intellectuals in both the cultural establishment and in the underground were articulating a particular Ukrainian national identity through different historical memories of interwar Galicia and varied responses to modernity. The fourth chapter shows that efforts to create a useable past from events in interwar Galicia by writers and scholars in L’viv resonated with popular memories, questioned officially accepted interpretations, and exacerbated personal rivalries among scholars in the social sciences.

The fifth chapter makes crucial connections between the formation of national identity and responses to modernity among Ukrainian intellectuals. In both the cultural establishment and the cultural underground, artists and writers in L’viv in defining themselves as Ukrainians tried to come to terms with the more impersonal and fragmented world that modernity in its Soviet context had produced. Young artists and writers in L’viv from the mid-1950s onward made use of modernist trends passed down from surviving masters of the interwar period, invented traditions of village life, and official themes to provide a sense of continuity and sense of meaning.

Українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича, НАН України, 1996), 543-610.
CHAPTER 1

UKRAINE’S WINDOW TO THE WEST: L’VIV AS AN ALTERNATIVE CULTURAL CENTER

Ievhen Lazarenko, chancellor of L’viv State University, shocked his fellow Party members by comparing them to the capitalist enemy. At the time, 12 June 1953, Lazarenko and other Communists of the L’viv Region in Soviet Ukraine were in a secret plenary session of the regional Party committee. They were discussing a report by secret police chief Lavrentii Beria to the Central Committee in Moscow about national discrimination against native Ukrainians in the republic’s western regions. Lazarenko declared, “Sometimes the policy conducted in the L’viv Region was similar to the policy that colonizers conduct.” Fellow Party members were quick to berate Lazarenko for making such a comparison, and at later meetings some even called for the Party to discipline him severely. Lazarenko had clearly stepped out of bounds when he insinuated that the Soviet regime treated native Ukrainians from Western Ukraine as colonial subjects.

1 Lazarenko’s speech and other excerpts from the transcript of this meeting are reproduced in Tamara Halajchak et al. eds., Zakhidni zemli, 1953–1966 (The western lands, 1953–1966), vol. 2 of Kul’turne zhyttia v Ukraini (Culture in Ukraine) (L’viv: Instytut Ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp’lakevycha, NAN Ukrainy, 1996), 40.

2 Ibid., 40, 80; Derzhavnyj arkhiv L’vivs’koi oblasti (DALO), fond P-3, opys 4, sprava 692, ark. 190-91, 216, 218-20, 230, 271-72, DALO, fond P-3, opys 4, sprava 694, ark. 120-21.
Lazarenko’s comparison of Soviet policies in L’viv Region to those of colonial powers must have troubled other Party members because Ukrainians in this region had experienced a long legacy of colonial rule. L’viv, the city in which this plenary session was held, epitomized this long colonial legacy. The onetime capital of the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, L’viv came under the control of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1387. When the European powers of Russia, Prussia, and the Habsburg Empire partitioned the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1772, the city came under Habsburg rule as the capital of the Kingdom of Galicia-Lodomeria, otherwise known as Galicia. The city served as a major economic, administrative, and cultural center for Galicia until the Habsburg Empire’s collapse in 1918. Bordering on the Russian Empire during Habsburg rule, L’viv for Ukrainian scholars and writers from both Galicia and the Russian Empire became a major center for the Ukrainian national revival in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Ukrainians in L’viv Region were well acquainted with the colonial legacies of Polish, Russian, and Austrian rule. Yet Soviet rule for these Communists listening to Lazarenko was supposed to be the antithesis of colonialism.

This chapter addresses how Ukrainian intellectuals, students, and other youth in L’viv from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s resisted what university chancellor Lazarenko had suggested in 1953 was a subaltern position in a colonial empire. These Ukrainians, many of whom were natives of Galicia, were not voiceless as typical subjects of subaltern studies in history. Yet like subalterns, they occupied a disadvantaged

---

3 For instance, see Ranajit Guha, *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983). In a similar manner, Partha Chatterjee assesses such voiceless subalterns
position in society, excluded from nearly all the region’s leadership posts in the Party and state apparatuses. For these Ukrainians, the Soviet Union was an empire engaged in colonial practices. The Soviet state through its appointed officials suppressed politically “unreliable” elements and imposed the language of another people, the Russians, and the culture of another community, the multiethnic Soviet people, on them after Soviet rule was established in 1939. After the Red Army had liberated Western Ukraine from German occupation, state officials, suspicious of German collaborators and at war with Ukrainian nationalist guerillas in the countryside, conducted these colonial practices with impunity.

Recent scholarship has shown that the Soviet Union did much in its history to promote the elites, languages, and cultures of non-Russians while at the same time engaging in the practices of a colonial empire. In the 1920s and 1930s, the Soviet state’s informal constitution was that of an “affirmative action empire,” engaging in policies favorable to non-Russian elites, languages, and cultures. Yet as it promoted non-Russians to positions of power in places such as Central Asia, the Soviet state actively strove in colonial fashion to replace traditional values and forms of behavior with modern, Soviet, ones. While affirming the multiethnic state as the imagined community

---


26
and continuing some aspects of affirmative action for non-Russians, the Soviet state on
the eve of World War Two began to stress the leading role of the Russian language and
Russian culture in Soviet society.\textsuperscript{6}

The Soviet Union also engaged in practices toward nationalities on its borderlands
that were colonial. During the Great Terror of the late 1930s, the Soviet state began
identifying “enemy nations” and deporting them from border regions out of increased
fears that they were in danger of being contaminated by foreign elements. Soviet
xenophobia, encouraged by unrest during collectivization of agriculture in the early
1930s, had taken on an ethnic content, and it set an important precedent for the full-scale
deportation of “enemy” nationalities after World War Two.\textsuperscript{7} The war itself intensified
such perceptions of certain nations being hostile to the Soviet regime. The Soviet regime
and broader segments of the population involved in the war saw all collaborators, real
and imagined, as irredeemable elements that had to be excised from the Soviet body
politic.\textsuperscript{8}

In the postwar years, nationalities on the Soviet Union’s western borderlands,
such as Ukrainians in L’viv, thus became elements not to be trusted, encouraging colonial
practices of imposing an outside power’s language, culture, and personnel. The Soviet
state already had begun deporting “enemy” nationalities from Western Ukraine, Western
Belorussia, and the Baltic States after occupying them as part of secret protocols to the

\textsuperscript{6} Martin, 919-982.


Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939. Unrest in Western Ukraine and other western borderland regions after the war only reinforced suspicions toward these nationalities. In Western Ukraine, guerrilla units of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (OUN-UPA) became engaged in vicious fighting with the secret police (NKVD) in the immediate postwar years. In military and paramilitary operations conducted by the Soviet regime from February 1944 to October 1945, a total of 98,696 Ukrainian rebels from this region were killed, and 107,485 were captured and arrested. Both Soviet and rebel sides engaged in ritual acts of violence against each other and those suspected of helping the enemy side. Such violence, which also took place in the Baltic States, further validated official perceptions of natives of Western Ukraine and others on the western borderlands as contaminated by foreign elements, collectively hostile to the Soviet regime, and politically unreliable.

---


10 The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) was established in 1929 in Vienna and functioned as a militant nationalist movement in Galicia throughout the 1930s. The Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) emerged from it after July 1941, during German occupation. While initially cooperating with the Nazis, both the OUN and the UPA turned against German occupation in 1943. After the Soviet Army’s reoccupation of Galicia in 1944, the OUN and the UPA waged partisan warfare against Soviet rule until about 1950. Rival bands with different tactics and goals comprised this partisan resistance to Soviet rule. On the history of the OUN and UPA, see John A. Armstrong, Ukrainian Nationalism, third edition (Englewood, NJ: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1990).


12 Ibid, 104-111.

13 On postwar policies in the Baltic States and the emergence of partisan guerilla movements opposing Soviet rule there, see Misiusas and Taagepera, “Postwar Stalinism, 1945-1953,” chapter in The Baltic...
Ukrainians in postwar L’viv, occupying a subaltern position in the Soviet empire in the sense mentioned above, resisted that position by living at the borders of different imperial legacies. Walter Mignolo’s postcolonial concept of border thinking suggests an explanation for this process. Mignolo defines border thinking as a way that subalterns resist the epistemologies of global (colonial) projects. They occupy a position of thinking and feeling in between the epistemologies of different colonial legacies, such as living in between languages left behind by different colonial pasts, known as bilanguaging.\textsuperscript{14} In this aspect of bilanguaging, Mignolo refers to subalterns whose epistemologies differ greatly from those of colonial projects they face. He makes reference to Amerindians confronting the radically different world view of Spanish colonizers in North America and Africans in the Caribbean dealing with the epistemology of French colonial masters.\textsuperscript{15} Yet subjects of colonial practices who are living in between cultures of current and past imperial legacies engage in an analogous process. This chapter will demonstrate that Ukrainians in postwar L’viv, for instance, made use of the language of a previous imperial legacy, Polish, to resist their marginalized position as “bourgeois nationalist” elements on the western periphery of the Soviet empire. Polish language media and direct contacts with Poland gave Ukrainians in L’viv an alternative to official Soviet culture and greater access to cultural developments in the West.

In addition to Polish media, geographic proximity to Central Europe and specific historical circumstances gave Ukrainian intellectuals and youth in L’viv a “window to the West.” As one of the most impoverished regions of the Habsburg Empire and later Poland, Galicia witnessed considerable emigration of Ukrainians to America and Canada.\textsuperscript{16} Many natives of Western Ukraine continued ties with Ukrainians abroad, however tenuous, and therefore acquired a different perspective on the West and the Soviet system.

For other Ukrainians in the republic, L’viv became for them a “window to the West” as well. Habsburg reforms in the second half of the nineteenth century had encouraged Ukrainian intellectuals to form a strong national movement among the Galician peasantry through reading rooms, cooperatives, political parties, and other institutions forbidden to Ukrainians in the Russian Empire.\textsuperscript{17} Ukrainians in Galicia consequently took part in national movements that contributed to the Habsburg Empire’s dissolution in 1918, forming the West Ukrainian People’s Republic (ZUNR) and going to war with rival Polish armies in the Ukrainian Galician Army, popularly known as the Sich Riflemen. National activism continued in Galicia under Polish rule from 1918 to 1939.

\textsuperscript{15} See ibid., 239-47, 250-77.


\textsuperscript{17} John-Paul Himka, \textit{Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century} (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukranian Studies, 1987).
The Soviet regime in the 1920s sought to promote Soviet Ukraine as a homeland for Ukrainians in Galicia and encouraged contact between intellectuals in Soviet Ukraine and Galicia. However, after Jozef Pilsudski took power in Poland in a coup in 1926 and sought to co-opt the sympathies of Ukrainians, the Soviet state withdrew its support for these contacts and perceived Ukrainians in Galicia as a potential threat to Soviet rule.\(^1\)

The Soviet regime thus declared an anathema on many past cultural and political movements among Ukrainians in Galicia, perceiving leaders of these movements as “enemies” of the Ukrainian people. Yet young intellectuals in Kyiv in the early 1960s who were challenging the official culture during relatively more liberal times became friends with counterparts in L’viv and acquired firsthand knowledge of these past movements. Their personal discovery of Ukrainian national movements outside the influence of the Communist Party and cultural developments outside official Soviet restrictions on art and literature gave them insight into quite a different national identity than what the Soviet system encouraged, a “window to the West.”

1.1 Postwar L’viv and Soviet Colonial Practices

In the immediate years after World War Two, Soviet rule greatly transformed Western Ukraine and also implemented colonial practices. Party and state functionaries and specialists with higher education arrived in vast numbers after the war to rebuild the region. In the case of L’viv, they also oversaw a transformation of the city into a major Soviet industrial center. While these outside officials took part in making L’viv a Ukrainian city and a major cultural center for Ukrainians in the region, they also

---

excluded Ukrainians from the region from positions of power. These officials imposed on them with impunity the Russian language and the values of a more “progressive” Soviet culture. In the immediate postwar years, as Soviet xenophobia toward its western borderlands increased and as nationalist rebel resistance escalated, officials went even further, repressing intellectuals and broader segments of the native population.

World War Two, the Holocaust, and forced transfers of Poles from L’viv to Poland in the immediate postwar years dramatically transformed the face of L’viv’s population. In 1931, ethnic Ukrainians had made up only 16.3 percent of the city’s approximately 312,200 inhabitants, while Poles comprised 50 percent and Jews 31.9 percent. By the time of the 1959 Census, ethnic Ukrainians constituted 60 percent of about 411,000 residents of L’viv, with ethnic Russians comprising 27 percent, Jews 6 percent, and Poles 4 percent. The number of ethnic Ukrainians increased even further by the 1979 census, making up 74 percent of the city’s population of approximately 665,000 inhabitants. While some of these population figures most likely include people who had changed their nationality, they nonetheless demonstrate that ethnic Ukrainians formed a majority of the city’s population in the postwar era. As L’viv underwent a

---


21 For instance, it was rumored that writer Volodymyr Bieliaiev was actually a Pole named Dombrows’kyj, and that regional Party secretary Valentyn Malanchuk was a Jew named Milman. Interview by the author with Iurij Slyvka, L’viv, tape recording, 18 May 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University; Iaroslav Dashkevych, “Borot’ba z hrushevs’kym ta ioho shkoloiu u L’vivs’komu universyteti za radians’kykh chasiv” (The struggle with Hrushevsky’s school and his school at L’viv University in Soviet times), in Mykhailo Hrushevsky’s tsi i l’vivs’ka istorychna shkola: materialy konferentsii, L’viv, 24-25 zhovtня 1994.
demographic metamorphosis, a considerable number of educated specialists and state and Party workers moved to the city and other parts of the region in the immediate years after the war. In L’viv, a total of about 2,000 engineers and technical workers and 13,800 workers arrived from various parts of the Soviet Union in the first three years after the war’s end.22

As late as May 1953, Ukrainians from other parts of the republic as well as other Soviet nationalities held the overwhelming majority of positions of power in Party and state administration and in industry in the western regions. The L’viv Region offered striking examples of this trend. Of 848 chief party workers for the L’viv Region, only 50 were from the local population.23 Outsiders in particular prevailed in positions of power in the city of L’viv. Of 18 secretaries of the city Party committee and district Party committees of the city, only one had been born and raised in Western Ukraine. Of 28 heads of departments of the city Party committee and the district committees of the Party, only 3 had come from the region. Not a single native of Western Ukraine was among those 38 heads of administrative organs of the city.24 Among city industries in L’viv, of 130 directors of enterprises, only 10 were from the local population, and natives made up only 20 of 70 heads of artels.25

---


23 Halajchak et al, 13.

24 Ibid., 29.
Ukrainians who were originally from the western regions of the republic in effect had assumed the role of subalterns at the hands of an outside colonial power. Outsiders whom the Soviet regime greatly trusted were zealously imposing its policies on the local population. Those from the local intelligentsia wanting to work for the Soviet regime quite often found themselves only in symbolic posts that excluded them from real decision making. For example, Petro Kozlaniuk, a local writer who was head of the L’viv regional soviet, complained before Communists in June 1953 that local authorities excluded him from making decisions in the campaign against “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism.” Locals like himself received positions of authority “only for show (tilk’ky dlia blahoustroiu).”

As native speakers of Ukrainian, local Ukrainians in L’viv also faced a Russian-speaking environment imposed from outside. Fellow Communists in the region claimed in June 1953 that of 1,732 professors and instructors in the city’s institutions of higher education, only 469 of them lectured in Ukrainian, while the rest lectured in Russian. Broader segments of the population, despite being natives of the region, encountered a Russian-language work environment. Many factories and shops in the city had slogans and wall newspapers written only in Russian, while at the shoe factory, for instance, over 70 percent of the workers were natives of the region who spoke Ukrainian.

---

25 Ibid., 29.
26 Ibid., 37-38; DALO, fond P-3, opys 4, sprava 692, ark. 124.
27 Halajchak et al, 17.
28 DALO, fond P-3, opys 4, sprava 692, ark. 215.
Officials carrying out the Party’s nationality policy in the L’viv Region quite understandably saw nationality as determined not by language, but by other criteria such as territorial belonging or passport identification.\textsuperscript{29} In Soviet Ukraine, the regime’s efforts to mandate the use of the Ukrainian language in the workplace and other state institutions, begun in the 1920s, had failed by 1932. On the eve of World War Two, the Friendship of Peoples as the Soviet state’s informal constitution designated the Russian language as the leading language among all peoples of this multiethnic state.\textsuperscript{30} Many ethnic Ukrainians serving as Party and state officials in postwar L’viv consequently saw nothing wrong with relegating the Ukrainian language to a secondary status in public discourse.

Yet these ethnic Ukrainians and other local officials in the view of natives of the region were encouraging prejudiced assumptions about the Ukrainian language. Writer Petro Kozlaniuk in June 1953 claimed that many ethnic Ukrainians in party and state jobs, “Little Russians,” saw the Ukrainian language as one suitable only for collective farms and that only Russian, “the language of Lenin and Stalin,” was suitable for cities like L’viv.\textsuperscript{31} Kozlaniuk, born and raised in Western Ukraine, clearly perceived ethnic Ukrainians as encouraging unmerited stereotypes of the Ukrainian language. His comments reflected a legacy of national movements in Galicia that had encouraged literacy in Ukrainian among peasants of the region.\textsuperscript{32} They also suggested that ethnic

\textsuperscript{29} When the Soviet regime in 1932 began to issue internal passports to its citizens, these passports all bore the person’s nationality as well as other important data.

\textsuperscript{30} See Martin, “Affirmative Action Empire,” 63-173, 919-82.

\textsuperscript{31} Halajchak et al, 39-40.

\textsuperscript{32} On this legacy, see Himka.
Ukrainians and others in the Party and state apparatuses were engaging in colonial practices in the region by insinuating that Russian and not Ukrainian was to be the language spoken in the modern, industrial L’viv they were building.

Party and state functionaries sent by the Soviet regime to Western Ukraine were also engaging in colonial practices as they militantly imposed the values of official Soviet culture on the region’s local population. Authorities sent a host of former district Party committee secretaries and demobilized officers from the war years with some experience in writing or in art to the writers’ union and the artists’ union in L’viv to serve as Party committee secretaries.\(^{33}\) The republic’s Committee on Art Affairs and the republic’s Union of Artists as of 29 June 1946 had sent to L’viv as many as 10 families of such artists. Almost all of them were demobilized Red Army officers who had finished school before the war in Soviet Ukrainian art institutes, and most of them were Party members.\(^{34}\)

Artists who came from the central and eastern regions of Ukraine at times gained an appreciation for the traditions of L’viv’s surviving art community, which had close ties with artistic trends in interwar Central Europe. Two such “Easterners,” Mykhailo Lishchyn and Rostyslav Syl’vestrov, despite earlier training in Kyiv, became more innovative painters under the influence of colleagues in L’viv.\(^{35}\) But others were quite insistent on categorically promoting a Soviet style of art that for them was clearly

\(^{33}\) Emmanuil Mys’ko and Mykola Petrenko, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 24 March 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.

\(^{34}\) O. S. Rub’lov and Iu. A. Cherchenko, Stalinshchyna i dolia zakhidnoukrains’koi intelihentsii (Stalinism and the fate of the western Ukrainian intelligentsia, 1920s-30s) (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1994), 238.

\(^{35}\) Danylo Dovboshys’kyj, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 19 March 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.
superior to “formalist” tendencies of the West. Quite often tempered by military service at the front lines in World War Two, such artists without a doubt questioned the achievements of “bourgeois” masters from Galicia who had studied in the capitalist world and had recently been “corrupted” by the influence of German occupation. One student at the L’viv State Institute of Applied and Decorative Art in the early 1960s, Roman Petruk, recalled that his instructors from the East more often than native artists from the region treated art from the West with contempt. In the spirit of the Friendship of Peoples, they tended to praise the progressive role of Russian art in Soviet culture.\footnote{Roman Petruk, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 21 June 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.}

It was in this militant spirit, reinforced by the recent victory over German aggressors in war, that Party and state officials launched a campaign against “Ukrainian-German bourgeois nationalism” and other perceived ideological deviations in Western Ukraine in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Intellectuals and youth alike in L’viv became engulfed in hysterical charges of “bourgeois nationalism,” “formalism,” and “anti-Soviet” sentiments. Natives of the region among the city’s writers, artists, scholars, and composers faced such intense criticism in the late 1940s and had to renounce their past works, views, and activities in order to maintain a livelihood.\footnote{Jaroslav Dashkevych, “Borot’ba z hrushevs’kym ta ioho shkoloiu u l’vivs’komu universyteti za radians’kyyh chasiv” (The struggle with Hrushevskyy and his school at L’viv University in Soviet times), Mykhajlo Hrushevs’kyi i l’vivs’ka istorichna shkola: materialy konferentsii, L’viv, 24-25 zhovtnya 1994 r., ed. L. Vynar et al, L’vivs’ki istorichni pratsi, materialy zasydan’i konferentsii (L’viv historical works and materials of meetings and conferences), no. 1 (New York-Lviv: Ukrain’s’ke istorychno tovarystvo, 1995), 32-94; Rublov and Cherchenko, 216, 219, 227-30; Pater, 512.}

Mass firings, expulsions, and arrests took place in the city’s institutions of higher education and vocational schools.
Many natives of the region saw family members either arrested or deported to Siberia for allegedly assisting nationalist partisans in their struggle against Soviet rule. A Central Committee report from Moscow, according to one local Communist, in late May 1953 had noted that authorities in this way had illegally repressed approximately 500,000 people in Western Ukraine.  

After Stalin’s death in 1953, secret police chief Lavrentii Beria, a member of the Party’s Politburo in Moscow, in a succeeding power struggle wrote a report for the Central Committee criticizing Party practices in Western Ukraine. Local Communists in L’viv in response did condemn incidents of national discrimination, neglect of the Ukrainian language, and violations of the law in regional Party meetings in June. The chancellor of L’viv State University, Ievhen Lazarenko, claimed at these meetings that actions taken in the L’viv Region were “similar to the policy that colonizers carry out.” Attempts to promote natives from the region to some positions of power in artistic unions, cultural centers, and research and educational institutions did take place even after Beria had been arrested and later executed. Yet these appointments were marginal, and as one historian recalled from his undergraduate years at L’viv State

---


39 Halajchak et al, 37.

40 Excerpts of a discussion of Beria’s report that took place at the L’viv Region party committee plenary session of 12 June 1953 have been published in Halajchak et al, but I have also made use of the original stenogram in DALO (fond P-3, opys 4, sprava 692).

41 Halajchak et al, 40.

42 Ibid., 63-84; Dalo, fond P-3, opys 4, sprava 791, ark. 65-66.
University (1951-56), Beria’s report essentially did not change the state of Ukrainian language instruction in higher education. While given some elements of social mobility, Ukrainians born and raised in the western regions still faced exclusion from major positions of authority and witnessed an outside power imposing its language, Russian, on official discourse.

While becoming Sovietized, Ukrainians in L’viv and other parts of Western Ukraine shared a complicated relationship with outsiders. Many professionals from other parts of the Soviet Union presumably did want to help local Ukrainians rebuild after the war and prosper. One such professional, the chancellor of the city’s veterinary institute, took strong exception to Lazarenko’s allegation that Soviet rule resembled colonialism, insisting he had come to the region to help train specialists in agriculture. Speaking before Communists in the region, he fumed, “I never thought that in working here I would up in the role of a colonizer.”

While educated professionals did help Ukrainians in L’viv achieve a higher education, colonial practices remained a fact of life. Some Party and state functionaries continued to remind natives of their secondary status in society. Vasyl Liubchyk, an artist sent in from Eastern Ukraine and appointed assistant director of the city’s Ukrainian Museum of Art, told a conference of artists of Western Ukraine in 1953 that a lack of “political consciousness” in the region made it impossible for artists to choose their own

---


44 DALO, fond P-3, opys 4, sprava 692, ark. 218-20.
subjects. Writer Volodymyr Bieliaiev, a military correspondent during the war who moved to L’viv in 1944, displayed similar colonial assumptions when criticizing a report made by a young literary critic, Stepan Trofymuk, a native of Western Ukraine, in December 1956. Criticizing Trofymuk’s emphasis on writers repressed under Stalin in Soviet Ukraine, he claimed that Trofymuk had forgotten that if it were not for Soviet rule liberating Ukrainians in 1939, he under Polish rule “would have remained illiterate, would have walked barefoot and would not have been a graduate student.”

Bieliaiev’s assumption that Trofymuk needed to be more grateful to the Soviet regime was a reminder that Party and state functionaries saw themselves as carrying out the tasks of a state power superior to the “alien,” “reactionary,” and “backward” natives of Western Ukraine. While Ukrainians, mindful of recent repression, could not openly protest such domination, feelings of resentment toward outsiders’ rule did show up in everyday life in the city in succeeding years. In early 1965 one Communist at L’viv State University told comrades that a drunkard, presumably a native of the region, swaggered up to him and called him a “crook” and “occupier” who “stole our land.”

The derogatory term moskali, which referred to Russians or Russian speakers from outside Western Ukraine, still held power among youth in L’viv in the mid-1960s. In June 1966, another university Communist said, “You still hear from students such a word like ‘moskali.’ They still don’t say ‘Soviets (sovety).’”

Youth from Western Ukraine


46 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 115-116.

47 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 753, ark. 30-31.

48 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 759, ark. 61.
studying in L’viv saw non-natives in the city as occupiers, despite nearly twenty years of Sovietization. Workers, professionals, and Party and state officials who had recently moved to the city in effect represented an outside power engaged in colonial practices.

In the postwar years Ukrainians native to the republic’s western regions faced in L’viv a position akin to subalterns in a colonial empire. In L’viv and other parts of Western Ukraine, Soviet rule did not bring about a major clash in languages and in world views such as what peoples in Central Asia, for instance, had experienced in the 1920s and 1930s. Instead, like in other parts of the Soviet Union’s western borderlands, the Soviet regime viewed the local population in Western Ukraine as politically unreliable. They were contaminated by Western influences, had been in real or imagined collusion with the Nazis during the war, and possibly had been allied with “bandits” in mortal combat with Soviet rule afterwards.

Ukrainians in L’viv, like their counterparts in the Soviet Union’s western borderlands, thus faced exclusion from positions of power and witnessed outsiders imposing a different language and different values and practices upon them. In this sense, they became subalterns subject to the colonial practices of a regime fearful of becoming contaminated by alien “bourgeois” or “fascist” influences from the West rather than the colonial practices of an outside power interested in “civilizing” a “backwards” people. It was in this position as subalterns subject to colonial practices that Ukrainians in L’viv sought to define themselves as Soviet and Ukrainian in a way that reflected their own position at the borders of colonial legacies and their proximity to Central Europe.

49 On this clash of world views in Central Asia in the 1920s and 1930s, see Michaels and Northrop.
1.2 L’viv’s “Window to the West”: Polish Media as a Source of Bilanguaging

As loyal citizens of the Soviet regime, Ukrainian intellectuals, students, and other youth in L’viv attempted to define themselves in ways that resisted their second-class status as Ukrainians stigmatized by their recent “bourgeois nationalist” past on the Soviet Union’s western borderlands. One important way they could do this was through living in between a number of languages, namely, Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian. Polish-language media for Ukrainians in L’viv and other parts of Western Ukraine became a source of bilanguaging. In bilanguaging, Ukrainians made use of Polish-language media, the media of the culture of a previous imperial legacy, as an alternative to official Soviet culture, the culture of a new colonial power. In the process, they gained access to intellectual and cultural developments in the West and resisted their marginalized position in Soviet Ukraine.

In 1956, Poland’s Communist regime underwent a series of comparatively liberal reforms that allowed for much fewer restrictions on official media than in the Soviet Union. Inhabiting a city where Polish speakers were still quite prominent well into the 1960s, Ukrainians in L’viv made use of Polish language newspapers, journals, and books that had become more readily available after 1956. City kiosks, the city bookstore Friendship (Druzhba), the Library of Foreign Literature, the Intourist Hotel downtown, and subscriptions through the local post office became important sources of Polish-language media for Ukrainians in L’viv. Ukrainian intellectuals in the city became
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50 Isaievych, interview; Nina Bichua, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 20 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L'viv National University; Natalia Chernysh, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 26 July 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L'viv National University; Iurij
frequent consumers of Polish-language newspapers, journals, and books. One Polish
journalist visiting in the city in November 1956 was impressed with the fact that many
young writers he had met in L’viv were passionate readers of literary journals and
newspapers from Poland.\textsuperscript{51} A young writer in the early 1970s, Mykola Riabchuk,
recalled that at nearly every intellectual’s home in L’viv there were at least some Polish-
language books on the bookshelves.\textsuperscript{52}

Polish-language journals and books became critical sources for intellectuals and
students who wanted to gain access to important literary and artistic developments in the
West. Literary and artistic journals from Poland provided a healthy alternative to official
Soviet publications that denounced various contemporary innovations in the West.\textsuperscript{53}
Through the bookstore Druzhba, Ukrainian intellectuals gained access to Polish-language
translations of existentialist philosophers like Heidegger and Camus and contemporary
writers like Sylvia Plath from the “decadent” capitalist West. By contrast, Soviet
translations of them were not allowed or were produced in such small quantities that no
one could find them or afford to pay for them on the black market.\textsuperscript{54}

\begin{flushright}
Sandurs’kyj and Mykola Petrenko, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 24 March 1999. Institute
of Historical Research, L’viv National University; Teodozij Starak, interview by the author, L’viv, tape
recording, 26 February 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University, Mykola Riabchuk,
“Pol’shcha, pol’s’kyj, poliaky: Sproba filolohichnoho kraieznавstva” (Pol’shcha, pol’s’kyj, poliaky: an
attempt at philological regional studies) \textit{Suchasnist’} 11 (November 1998): 143-44.
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{51} Excerpts from a series of articles by this journalist, A. Ziemil’skyj, on his trip to L’viv, published in the
Warsaw newspaper \textit{Tribuna liudu} in December 1956, are reproduced in Halajchak et al, 221-24.

\textsuperscript{52} Riabchuk, 139.

\textsuperscript{53} Dovboshyns’kyj, interview; Petruk, interview; Sandurs’kyj and Petrenko, interview.

\textsuperscript{54} Riabchuk, 139, 144.
Publications from Poland also provided Ukrainian intellectuals in L’viv with an alternative past. Polish military history journals and propaganda works gave more information than official Soviet sources on the OUN and UPA, who had resisted Soviet rule in Western Ukraine in the immediate postwar years, providing further insight into historical alternatives to the Soviet system.55

For these Ukrainian intellectuals in L’viv, Polish-language publications became a crucial source for bilanguaging. Newspapers, books, and journals from Poland oriented them toward cultural events in the West and undermined official Soviet culture’s condemnation of “formalist” and other “decadent” trends in contemporary art and literature. Despite being on the periphery of the Soviet Union, these intellectuals made use of the language of a previous imperial legacy, Polish, to gain access to developments of worldwide significance that official Soviet culture either ignored or disparaged. They also found a way to evade official censors and find out more about aspects of their own past too taboo to mention in public sources or in private conversations.

In artistic and literary circles, Ukrainian intellectuals, drawing on these Polish-language sources, subverted or provided underground alternatives to official Soviet culture in the city. Members of the city’s artists’ union the late 1950s had become so attracted to avant-garde trends in the Polish art journal Przegląd that their own works had taken on “undesirable” influences, earning the rebuke of a high ranking artists’ union

---

Such rebukes suggested that L'viv artists in the establishment in effect were undermining official Soviet art from within, adapting contemporary Western art trends they had noticed in Polish media.

In the early 1970s, a group of literary youth would gather at the home of underground poet Hryhorij Chubaj to share Polish-language translations of avant-garde literature from the West, popular jazz music from Poland, and Polish reproductions of surrealist and other Western art masters. This group, recalls one of its participants, Mykola Riabchuk, deliberately rebelled against official Soviet culture through such Polish-language sources as they engaged in writing for friends and the desk drawer.

As artists and writers subverted or defied official standards in art and literature through Polish-language publications, Ukrainians among broader segments of the city’s population also engaged in their own bilanguaging as they consumed Polish-language mass media. Sports magazines circulated among Ukrainians and presented more information about teams and athletes from around the world, and women’s fashion magazines also enjoyed popularity. City residents in the 1960s and early 1970s had access to radio stations from Poland, which gave them sources of world news less encumbered by state ideology than Soviet channels and also American rock music, which was banned from broadcasting or distribution in the Soviet Union. Through relatives
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56 DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 217, ark. 58-59.

57 Riabchuk, 144-45, 147.

58 Ibid., 143-44.

59 Ibid., 143; interview with Mykola Riabchuk, Kyiv, tape recording, 4 November 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L'viv National University; Chernysh interview. Riabchuk and Chernysh indicate that Polish television became another valuable source of alternative information, but in later years, when television antennas could locate Polish stations.
from Poland or the black market, students and other youth in L’viv in the late 1960s and early 1970s found records of American rock music and made copies of them on tape. They also discovered Polish-style rock groups that imitated Western counterparts and gave them further insight into popular culture in the West.60

By tuning in to Polish radio stations, flipping through popular magazines from Poland, and listening to bootlegged copies of American rock music or Polish imitators, broader segments of L’viv’s population were taking part in their own subversion of official Soviet culture. These consumers of items of Polish mass culture became acquainted with information about international events that Soviet media censored. They moreover took part in a global consumer culture influenced by American hegemony after 1945. Rock music, fashion images, and sports heroes from abroad all became incorporated into these Ukrainians’ lives. Polish-language media and items of popular culture from the West obtained through Poland became sources of a more widespread version of bilanguaging that gave Ukrainians in the region greater access to a worldwide consumer culture at the expense of official Soviet culture’s hegemony. Despite being in the provinces, Ukrainians in L’viv were finding their own way to the rest of the world.

Party and state officials were well aware of Polish-language media being sources of alternative information to official Soviet ones and did seek to point out their negative influence as they enforced ideological vigilance in the region. The regional Party committee in L’viv in a secret telegram to superiors in the republic on 30 November 1956
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60 Volodymyr Iavors’kyj, interview by the author, Kyiv, tape recording, 7 November 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University; Riabchuk, interview; Chernysh, interview; Riabchuk, 143-44.
asked that the sale of Polish-language newspapers in the city be curbed. A number of them had lately contained controversial items relating to Soviet forces’ violent suppression of the recent anti-Communist uprising in Hungary, as well as articles that compromised Soviet literature and the world Communist movement.\(^{61}\) When regional Party leaders faced demands by the party’s Central Committee in Moscow to improve ideological work with the local population, they noted in one report in 1973 that, among other things, foreign radio station broadcasts in Polish disoriented local residents.\(^{62}\) While political crises compelled officials to point out the dangers of Polish-language media, such media continued to find their way to Ukrainians in the city all the way until the fall of the Soviet Union. As a result, Ukrainians participated in cultural and intellectual developments taking part in the rest of the world, challenged the hegemony of official Soviet culture, and resisted that culture’s marginalization of them as “reactionary” elements unworthy of positions of power on the Soviet Union’s western periphery.

1.3 Polish Encounters as a Means of Bilanguaging

Official and unofficial ties with Poland as well as geographic proximity to Poland itself further facilitated this process of bilanguaging among Ukrainians in L’viv. Located less than one hour by bus from the Polish border, L’viv served as a major stopping point for Polish visitors to Ukraine and black market trade between Poles and Ukrainians.

\(^{61}\) DALO, fond P-3, opys 5, sprava 397, ark. 206, quoted in Halajchak et al., 220.

\(^{62}\) DALO, fond P-3, opys 25, sprava 52, ark. 21. The Soviet state did not jam Polish-language radio programming that reached L’viv, and so many could listen to Polish-language broadcasts of the BBC. Isaievych, interview.
Party authorities in Moscow in 1956 had become quite distressed that a lot of the approximately 700 Poles that had visited the L’viv Region in the past several months were engaged in speculating in Polish consumer goods. In early November 1956, some city students were also expressing concern about visitors to L’viv from Poland engaged in illegal trading and spreading “slanderous remarks about L’viv.” A black market, with its own dialogue between Poles and Ukrainians, was thriving. This black market was still alive and well by the late 1960s and early 1970s as a source of American and other foreign rock-n-roll records.

These personal contacts with Poles or Ukrainians living in Poland had become a crucial channel of information because it was still difficult for people in L’viv to obtain permission to travel even to Poland, a “brother socialist” country. Those who did have the opportunity to visit Poland understandably needed to have the necessary political credentials. Yet those who managed to get official approval for trips to Poland did have opportunities — whether visiting relatives, participating in student exchange programs, or taking part in official delegations — to take part directly in the relatively more liberal atmosphere that Polish-language media represented. In the process, many of them came
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face-to-face with a world that subverted the hegemony of official Soviet culture. For those less politically engaged, such trips therefore must have been a moment of discovery on a very basic level.

In some ways Soviet authorities encouraged such contacts through exchanges of official delegations from Poland and Soviet Ukraine from 1956 onward. They sought to encourage these exchanges ostensibly to encourage stronger ties between socialist countries and have a positive influence on the Soviet Union’s satellite states. Such motives led them to establish stronger contacts between the western regions of Ukraine and their counterparts on the other side of the Polish border.

The L’viv Region in this manner developed official ties with adjacent regions in Poland that led to a number of official exchanges over the 1950s and 1960s. A Central Committee decree from Moscow had established ties of friendship with Lublin Region (voevod) and L’viv Region as early as 17 May 1956. Such ties took on added importance in February 1958. In that month the Society of Polish-Soviet Friendship (PORP) and the Ukrainian Association of Cultural Ties with Abroad (UTKZ) developed an extensive program of exchanges of delegations between neighboring border regions of Ukraine and Poland. A total of 240 people from Ukrainian border regions were to visit the Polish border regions of Zheshuv and Lublin in small delegations for that year, as well as in 8 artistic ensembles that made up 370 people in all. After this trial
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68 DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 275, ark. 5.
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experiment, such exchanges of delegations from border regions continued for a number of years to come. After L’viv had established ties with Zheshuv Region in 1959, a total of 100 delegations and groups visited each side by 1966.\textsuperscript{70}

Plans drawn up by PORP for the first year of exchanges suggest that a number of different segments of the population were involved in these official ties with Polish counterparts. Soccer teams, theater, music, and dance ensembles, delegations of factory workers, and writers, artists, and scholars were among those to take part in exchanges with the Zheshuv Region and the Lublin Region in Poland.\textsuperscript{71} It was in the spirit of border exchanges between Poland and Soviet Ukraine that special ties developed between L’viv State University and Lublin University in Poland in 1956-58, with both sides exchanging delegations of students and faculty.\textsuperscript{72}

Despite the variety of exchanges that took place between Poles and Ukrainians in 1958 and in succeeding years, delegates had to conform to rigorous standards of selection set by not only the Party, but also state security organs. In the former Party archives, a list of workers of culture from the L’viv Region recommended for a trip to Zheshuv Region for 19-23 April 1958 had the signature of regional KGB chief Shevchenko in the margins. Shevchenko clearly had to give his approval to the final list of people suggested for this delegation. He most likely was the one crossing out names on the list and

\textsuperscript{70} DALO, fond P-3, opys 9, sprava 225, ark. 133.

\textsuperscript{71} DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 275, ark. 6-8.

\textsuperscript{72} See DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 110, ark. 66-69; DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 276, ark. 143-45; DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 412, ark. 23, personal conversation with Roman Szporluk, Cambridge, MA, 16 March 1998.
suggesting for at least one person an alternate. Good political credentials also were a must for other exchange programs that took place over the years. At L'viv State Polytechnic Institute, students who wanted to take part in student construction battalions in Poland and other “brother socialist” countries had to be, in the eyes of Communist Youth organs, “the best students who have actively taken part in the public life of the institute.” The same rules presumably held for 22 students, all Communist Youth members, applying for work experience (praktyka) in Poland through the institute’s Communist Youth committee on 25 May 1974.

Yet even those activists who did go to Poland on various delegation visits and so forth took part in their own sort of bilanguaging, encountering Polish speakers who had closer ties to the West and lived under significantly fewer ideological restrictions. Delegation reports to L’viv regional Party leaders in 1958, the first year of extensive border exchanges between Soviet Ukraine and Poland, are revealing in this respect. Party activists and officials filing such reports on a visit to the Zhashiv Region on 15-22 April, for instance, noted with disapproval that so many foreign films playing were corrupting youth with “bourgeois ideology.” Some theaters were promoting plays that lacked a Party spirit. A number of films, songs, paintings, and musical works were “pessimistic” and “isolated from life,” works “with an orientation toward the capitalist West.”
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Needless to say, delegation participants happened to be consuming such attributes of “bourgeois ideology.” The delegation to the Zheshuv Region had watched a French film and had been to a play that smacked of formalism.\textsuperscript{76}

A group of 15 Pioneer youth from the L’viv Region traveling through Poland in June of 1958 encountered all sorts of “harmful” influences.\textsuperscript{77} At a Pioneer camp in the Lublin Region, “Girls perm their hair (nakruchivaiut volosi), paint their toenails, sing adult songs, and dance to rock-n-roll.” The Pioneers furthermore heard from Polish school children on their trip to Warsaw that Poles, supplied with cars and other American goods, lived much better than they did. While in the Polish capital, residents made unkind remarks about them, and Polish Pioneers (gartsezhi) had the audacity to say that the Poles, not the Soviet Union, had supplied the funds for the city’s Palace of Culture.\textsuperscript{78} For many Pioneers from L’viv on the trip, direct contact with Poles must have been quite a revelation about what the Soviet system was not and how others viewed the Soviets negatively.

Despite close restrictions on travel, evidence from former Party archives clearly indicate that private visits to Poland, presumably to relatives there, were taking place in the L’viv Region on a fairly large scale. A regional Party committee report to the Central Committee in Kyiv, dated 24 October 1973, indicated a noticeable contingent of people going abroad for private purposes. In 1972, for instance, there were as many as 20,452 Soviet citizens from the region going abroad privately. By contrast, those going abroad

\textsuperscript{76} DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 275, ark. 74, 82-84.

\textsuperscript{77} DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 276, ark. 125-26. The Pioneers were a Communist Youth organization for school children.
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in tourist groups only amounted to a total of 3,690 that year. Since the report emphasized that a large portion of the population of the L’viv Region had relatives living in Poland, these people going abroad for private reasons were most definitely in the main going to see family there. Official institutions, to be sure, had to support applications for such trips. The L’viv State Conservatory’s Party committee, for instance, in June 1971 issued a number of recommendations (kharakterystyky) to students who needed permission to go on trips to see relatives in Poland. Yet these figures for the region indicate that it was possible for at least a portion of the population to visit Poland on their own.

In these official and unofficial visits to Poland, Ukrainians from L’viv in some cases had opportunities to engage in a much more free intellectual climate compared to the Soviet Union. Iaroslav Isaievych, as a scholar in medieval Ukrainian history at the Institute of Social Sciences in L’viv, in trips to Poland (first in 1961, then yearly from 1967) enjoyed much easier access to Western publications, being able to read them in libraries and even in coffeehouses. In libraries, access to closed depositaries did not require permission from police organs or other state institutions, as they did in the Soviet Union. Yet others simply became acquainted with foreign films, popular music, fashions, and attitudes toward the Soviet system that simply could not be found at home.
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78 DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 276, ark. 125-26.
79 Tsentral’nyj Derzhavnyj Arhiv Hromads’kykh Ob’iednan’ Ukrainy (TsDAHOU), fond 1, opys 25, sprava 878, ark. 17.
80 TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 25, sprava 878, ark. 16.
81 DALO, fond P-576, opys 1, sprava 82, ark. 108, 117.
82 Isaievych, interview.
Private visits to Poland and participation in official exchanges to Poland enabled some Ukrainians in L’viv to take part in a full-fledged process of bilanguaging, challenging the legitimacy of official Soviet culture through information gained from daily interaction with Polish speakers.

While deprived of many positions of power in L’viv, Ukrainians native to this region on the Soviet Union’s western borderlands managed to resist their status through a process of bilanguaging. In living between the language of one previous imperial legacy, Polish, and Ukrainian, Ukrainians native to the region made use of Polish-language media in ways that challenged the hegemony of the official Soviet culture imposed on them from outside. Reading Polish-language newspapers and journals, listening to Polish radio, discovering contemporary artists and writers from the West through Polish-language translations, and sometimes directly engaging in daily life in nearby Poland provided these Ukrainians with an alternative to official Soviet culture. Through this alternative, Ukrainians took part in intellectual and broader cultural developments unfolding in the rest of the world, resisting an atmosphere of ideological scrutiny of any “harmful” elements from abroad that they faced at home in L’viv.

1.4 The Ukrainian Diaspora as a Window to the West

As Ukrainians made use of Polish-language media and contacts with Poles to find alternatives to official Soviet culture, they also opened their own “window to the West” through the Ukrainian diaspora in Canada, the United States, and other capitalist countries. Contacts with relatives or Ukrainian tourists from capitalist countries, like
Polish-language media and direct encounters with Poles, gave them a different perspective on events abroad and challenged the hegemony of official Soviet culture.

Ukrainians in L’viv and other parts of the western regions had limited, yet important, contacts with compatriots abroad in the years after 1953. Personal contacts at first were restricted to occasional meetings with members of the “progressive” diaspora in the West whose views were deemed compatible with the Soviet regime. For example, in the late 1950s, the chancellor of L’viv State University, Ievhen Lazarenko, developed contacts with Petro Kravchuk of the “progressive” Society of United Ukrainians of Canada (TOUK). He also tried to invite some “progressive” Ukrainians to academic conferences in the early 1960s.83 Contacts with such “progressive” Ukrainians gave students and other Ukrainians in L’viv a chance to encounter Communists who were more outspoken about the state of Russification in Soviet Ukraine and more open-minded than traditional Soviet party functionaries.84 As Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev in the late 1950s encouraged greater contacts with the West, Westerners had greater opportunities to visit L’viv and took advantage of the opportunity. By late May 1961, the number of foreign visitors from capitalist countries served by the region’s Intourist agency in the city of L’viv had gone up 21 times from 1958.85
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83 DALO, fond R-119, opys 6, sprava 176, ark. 8; Roman Ivanychuk, Blahoslov'y, dushe moia, Hospoda... Shchodennykovi zapsy, spohady i rozdumy (Bless the Lord, oh my soul... diary entries, recollections, and reflections) (L’viv: “Prosvita,” 1993), 78-79.

84 Ivanychuk, 77-78; Roman Ivanychuk, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 19 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University; personal conversation with Iaroslav Isaievych, L’viv, 10 April 2000.

85 DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 273, ark. 152. This sprava has a number of reports on foreign tourists, most of them Americans and Canadians of Ukrainian descent, who had traveled to rural districts, towns, and other parts of L’viv Region.
The number of tourists from the capitalist West visiting the region was
presumably quite small compared to those visiting major cities like Kyiv, Leningrad, or
Moscow. A total of 3,841 foreign tourists from capitalist countries visited the city of
L’viv in 1965. By 1971, there were 8,175 foreigners from capitalist countries visiting
the L’viv Region as tourists. Yet these figures were growing, and there were also a
significant number of foreigners visiting on private visas. A total of 25,150 had done so
in 1972 in the L’viv Region. While many of these private visitors presumably were
relatives from Poland, some foreigners from the capitalist West visited on private visas as
well, such as a Philadelphia architect and his wife in 1967.

To some extent, contact with these tourists, many of whom were from the
Ukrainian diaspora, provided Ukrainians in L’viv with a different perspective on the
West. Such contacts consequently became a regular source of concern for local Party
authorities and their superiors in the republic in the first half of the 1960s as they pointed
out instances where tourists praised life in the United States and other capitalist countries
or tried to circulate “anti-Soviet” literature. Tourists from the diaspora in the capitalist
West quite often met with Ukrainian intellectuals in L’viv in the 1960s without problems
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from authorities.\footnote{Iryna Kalynets’, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 12 April 2000, L’viv National University.} By the early 1970s, officials heavily discouraged such encounters as the Soviet regime became more intolerant of dissent and foreign visitors’ support of it.\footnote{Bohdan Soroka, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 11 April 2000, L’viv National University.}

Authorities’ alarmed response to informal meetings between foreign tourists from the Ukrainian diaspora and Ukrainian intellectuals in L’viv underscored the way in which direct personal contacts with representatives of the capitalist West could undermine Soviet hegemony. Relatives or curious tourists from the diaspora conveyed valuable information to Ukrainians about daily life abroad through informal conversations that may not have concerned politics at all. These more personal encounters with the capitalist West thus undermined assumptions about it that official Soviet culture promoted. Despite inhabiting a subaltern position on the Soviet empire’s western periphery, Ukrainians in L’viv thus gained a different perspective on world events and resisted restrictions that official Soviet culture imposed on them.

Correspondence and various gifts from relatives in capitalist countries similarly encouraged this different perspective. A report by the regional Party committee leadership to the republic’s Central Committee on 24 October 1973 gives a sense that even these channels of communication had become a source of unwanted influence. A considerable volume of correspondence – a total of 229,505 items – had arrived in the region from capitalist countries in the first nine months of 1973.\footnote{This figure represented how correspondence received from capitalist countries was steadily growing in the early 1970s. In 1970, there were 180,216 such items received in the region. This figure grew slightly to 189,096 in 1971 and then increased to 213,835 items in 1972. TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 25, sprava 878, ark. 16.} Ukrainians from the United States, Canada, and Britain were mailing significant numbers of packages to
family and friends in the L’viv Region as well. For example, a total of 24,900 packages arrived from Canada for the first nine months of 1973.\(^4\) There were also Ukrainians from these countries mailing printed matter (banderoli) to relatives and friends in the region. As many as 58,880 items of printed matter from the United States arrived in the region for the first nine months of 1973.\(^5\) Many residents of the region were also receiving through the postal agency Vneshposyltorg invitations for private visits and tourist trips abroad and certificates for purchasing private automobiles in the Soviet Union.\(^6\)

These channels of contact with friends and relatives abroad were limited in what information they conveyed about the outside world. Yet in times of nearly total control of information by Party and state authorities, correspondence and gifts from abroad did have an impact on their recipients in the L’viv Region. Letters from relatives in Canada and the United States reached some people in L’viv. While their recipients were careful about discussing them, these letters did become an important channel of information in the late 1960s and early 1970s, according to one scholar in L’viv.\(^7\)

This report by regional Party authorities about correspondence and packages received from abroad suggests Party leaders in the region and in the republic were keenly aware of this alternative channel of information. Private cars as gifts were encouraging

\(^4\) For the first nine months of 1973, a total of 12,320 packages from the United States and 6,043 from Britain arrived in the region. TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 25, sprava 878, ark. 17.

\(^5\) By comparison, for the first nine months of 1973, approximately 2,700 items of printed matter from Canada and 1,560 from Britain arrived in the region. Ibid.

\(^6\) TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 25, sprava 878, ark. 16.

\(^7\) Chernysh, interview.
“bourgeois ideology,” “private property habits,” and “extolling the capitalist way of life” among “politically immature people or those who actively fought against Soviet rule in the past.”98 Since Soviet citizens had to wait for years to receive a car, such gifts must have been incredible objects of envy for fellow citizens and an item of nuisance (and envy) for local authorities. This report also noted other unwelcome comments about Soviet life. Some recipients were making “anti-Soviet” remarks around peers, attempting to emigrate, and in one case, making fun of collective farmers who depended on their low salaries for a living.99

Farmers scorning their coworkers’ salaries epitomized how contact with Ukrainians from abroad in the most banal form could have its own subversive effects on citizens from all walks of life. Letters conveying even the suggestion of a better life abroad to people facing chronic shortages in consumer goods became a source of information about the rest of the world, dispelling officially supported myths about the capitalist system and the superiority of the Soviet way of life. On the western periphery of the Soviet Union, Ukrainians in L’viv and in surrounding towns and villages had contacts with the West that, however slight, contained their own sustaining power that Party officials had to reckon with. As with tourists and with “progressive” Ukrainians abroad, these levels of contact with the Ukrainian diaspora had become a source of consternation for party and state officials. Such informal contacts and the concerns they

98 Friends and relatives from abroad had sent as many as 587 certificates to automobiles to residents of L’viv Region in 1970-73. TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 25, sprava 878, ark. 17-18.

99 TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 25, sprava 878, ark. 19.
provoked among Party and state officials suggest that Ukrainians in this region of the republic had come to identify themselves more sympathetically with the capitalist West through its Ukrainian diaspora.

As with Polish-language media and contacts with Poles, the Ukrainian diaspora in Western capitalist countries served as a crucial channel of alternative information for Ukrainians in L’viv from the mid-1950s to the early 1970s. Personal encounters with various elements of the Ukrainian diaspora and letters, packages, and gifts received from family and friends in the capitalist West all gave Ukrainians in L’viv and other parts of Western Ukraine information about the rest of the world that official Soviet culture tried to suppress. Despite being subalterns excluded from many positions of power, Ukrainians native to the region found ways to interact with the rest of the world and overcome the stereotypes of it promoted by an outside colonial ruler.

1.5 L’viv as an Alternative Source of Ukrainian Identity

Ukrainians native to the republic’s western regions overcame their marginalization as unreliable “bourgeois nationalist” elements on the Soviet Union’s western frontier through their position at the borders of different imperial legacies. The language of one imperial legacy, Polish, provided them with access to cultural and intellectual developments taking part in the rest of the world. It consequently helped them undermine the monopoly of power that official Soviet culture, imposed on them from outside, had enjoyed since the immediate postwar years. In addition, connections with the Ukrainian diaspora in the capitalist West, many of whom had emigrated from Galicia under Austrian and Polish rule, also helped undermine myths about the rest of the
world sustained by official Soviet culture. As Ukrainians native to the region thus gained their own “window to the West,” other Ukrainians in the republic found in this region sources of a Ukrainian identity different from that supported by the Soviet regime.

As Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev denounced Stalin’s cult of personality in 1956 and initiated a more liberal approach to politics and culture, Soviet Ukraine in the late 1950s and early 1960s underwent a national cultural renaissance. Young intellectuals in Kyiv, the republic’s capital, took the lead in discussing the Stalinist past, criticizing neglect of the Ukrainian language, and challenging assumptions about art and literature in the establishment.\textsuperscript{100} By contrast, their counterparts in L’viv were very cautious and uncertain after not so distant waves of repression under Stalin. It was only in May 1962, when young literary critic Ivan Dziuba and the poets Ivan Drach and Mykola Vinhranovs’kyj from Kyiv appeared before enthralled audiences in L’viv, that young intellectuals in the city witnessed real opposition to the existing regime.\textsuperscript{101}

While intellectual figures from the republic’s capital played a key role in stirring up acts of nonconformity in L’viv in the early 1960s, young writers, artists, and scholars from Kyiv discovered from counterparts in L’viv a different understanding of what it was to be Ukrainian. In the early 1960s, artistic youth in L’viv formed friendships with


\textsuperscript{101} Mykhailo Horyn’, a literary scholar and psychologist who became involved in dissident activities in the 1960s, notes that this event occurred in the spring of 1963, but a document from the republic’s writers’ union dated 23 June 1962 condemning Ivan Dziuba’s remarks at these evening appearances, as well as recollections by novelist Roman Ivanychuk, clearly suggest that it was instead in May 1962. See DALO, fond R-2009, opys 1, sprava 121, ark. 8-10, cited in Halajchak et al, 532-34; Ivanychuk, 98-100; Mykhailo Horyn’, “Arkhteekt shistdesiatsytyts’koho rukhu” (The architect of the sixtieths’ movement), in Dobrokyj spohady pro Ivana Svitlychnoho (A caring man: recollections of Ivan Svitlychyn), ed. Valerij Shevchuk et al (Kyiv: “Chas,” 1998), 269; and Petro Shkrab’iuk, Pupid zoloti vorota: shist’ elehij pro rodu Mykhaila Kalynutsi (Under the golden gates: six elegies on the Kalynets’ family) (L’viv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp’iakevycha, NAN Ukrainy, 1997), 42.

Through these friendships, young writers, artists, and scholars visited L’viv and become familiar with publications, surviving intellectual figures, and historical developments from interwar Galicia that affected their national identity.

Young intellectuals through friends in L’viv found literary works, journals, and scholarly publications that had been put away in special depositories or destroyed in the 1930s in Soviet Ukraine. As an editor for the republic journal Dnipro, Ivan Dziuba in 1957 had already received from a library worker a number of extra copies of books by an interwar scholarly organization, the Shevchenko Scientific Society, that were to be destroyed. In succeeding years, through friends in L’viv, he found Soviet Ukrainian authors and scholars repressed in the 1930s and non-Marxist literary, scholarly, and political works published by Ukrainians in Galicia.\footnote{Ivan Dziuba, interview by the author, Kyiv, tape recording, 18 November 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.} In a similar manner Kyiv poet Ivan Svitlychnyj collected books on Ukrainian history not produced by Soviet scholarship, various Ukrainian literary works, particularly those of the 1920s and 1930s, and as many as 153 volumes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society’s scholarly journal, Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. T. H. Shevchenka.\footnote{Bohdan Horyn’, 264, 266; Roman Kohorods’kyj, “Sadivnyk” (The Gardener), in Dobrookyy: spohady pro Ivana Svitlychnoho (A caring man: recollections of Ivan Svitlychny), ed. Valerij Shevchuk et al (Kyiv:}
As young intellectuals in Kyiv discovered books and journals that Soviet authorities had suppressed in other parts of Ukraine, they also personally met intellectual figures from the older generation still living in L’viv. Critic Ivan Dziuba became acquainted in those years with Mykhailo Rudnyts’kyj, a literary scholar whose interwar works on Ukrainian literature had been denounced as “bourgeois nationalist.” Rudnyts’kyj, a distant relative of Dziuba’s future wife Marta, gave him some books and to an extent helped him further develop as a critic. Two of Rudnyts’kyj’s works in literary criticism from the interwar period, Between Idea and Form (Mizh ideieiu i formoiu) and From Myrhnyj to Khvyl’ovyj, banned by Soviet authorities, became popular among Dziuba’s friends in the 1960s.\(^5\) Bohdan Horyn’ also introduced counterparts in Kyiv to Rudnyts’kyj, as well as Iryna Vil’dé, a novelist active in inter-war Galicia.\(^6\) Through acquaintances in L’viv, Roman Kohorods’kyj met Leopol’d Levyts’kyj, a graphics artist in L’viv active since the interwar years, and became familiar with an entirely different, more European school of art than what he had known in Kyiv.\(^7\)

Besides introducing them to living witnesses of cultural life in interwar Galicia, young intellectuals in L’viv in the early 1960s showed their counterparts from Kyiv the graves of the Sich Riflemen, soldiers who had fought for the West Ukrainian People’s
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\(^5\) Dziuba, interview.

\(^6\) Bohdan Horyn’, 263-64.

\(^7\) Roman Kohorods’kyj, interview by the author, Kyiv, tape recording, 4 November 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv State University.
Republic (ZUNR) against Polish and Soviet forces in 1918-19. When Drach, Vinhranovs’kyj, and Dziuba made their sensational appearances in L’viv in May 1962, poetess Iryna Kalynets’ and her husband Ihor, also a poet, and some others took Drach and Dziuba to see the graves of Sich Riflemen at Ianivs’kyj Cemetery. Such visits by Kyivans to Lychakivs’kyj and Ianivs’kyj cemeteries in L’viv, arranged by their friends in the city, made a great impression on them. In this manner intellectuals from Kyiv became acquainted with “forgotten” aspects of Ukrainian history deemed “anti-Soviet” at the time, namely the ZUNR. They found out more about a national liberation movement that did not fit in the Soviet scheme of things, one connected with national revolutions that had originated in the former Habsburg Empire and not on the streets of Petrograd in Russia.

Writers like Iryna and Ihor Kalynets’ and other young intellectuals in L’viv also introduced counterparts in Kyiv to the works of poet Bohdan-Ihor Antonych, whose works, published in interwar L’viv, Party authorities had deemed too “anti-Soviet.” The Kalynets’ couple showed Roman Kohorods’kyj Antonych’s sorely neglected grave at Ianivs’kyj Cemetery, which left a great impression on him. In the fall of 1963, when avant-garde Kyiv prose writer Valerij Shevchuk contacted the Horyn’ brothers, Mykhailo and Bohdan, in L’viv, he found out about Antonych’s works for the first time and became moved “to the depths of my soul.” Making pilgrimages to Antonych’s grave as well as
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discovering his “forgotten” works was one way in which young intellectuals in Kyiv in the early 1960s found out more about different trends in Ukrainian literature, ones connected with cultural developments in Central Europe.

In visits with friends in L’viv, young Ukrainian intellectuals from the republic’s capital became aware of a different way of being Ukrainian. They found out more about the ZUNR, a state that official Soviet sources claimed was organized by “bourgeois nationalist” traitors. They discovered Ukrainian writers’ works long suppressed by authorities in Soviet Ukraine. They met other Ukrainian intellectuals from a different world than the Soviet one they had known all their lives and thus came to appreciate the “bourgeois nationalist” Ukrainians from the western regions. It was in this sense that L’viv became a “window to the West” for other Ukrainians, making them familiar with a Ukrainian national identity more closely tied to Central Europe.

1.6 Conclusion

Ievhen Lazareiko’s claim that Soviet rule in postwar Western Ukraine resembled colonialism was a fair one to make. As with other parts of the western borderlands of the Soviet empire, the Soviet state for domestic and international reasons had grown suspicious of “enemy nations” threatening its periphery by the late 1930s. Deportations of nationalities in the Baltic States, Western Ukraine, and Western Belorussia on the eve of World War Two were a consequence of these suspicions. As World War Two rejuvenated the Soviet state’s revolutionary ethos, Party and state leaders and broader segments of Soviet society involved in the war effort began to view collaborators as
irredeemable enemies of Soviet rule and those who wound up under German occupation as unreliable. In this sense, Western Ukraine, along with the Baltic States and Western Belorussia, wound up outside the Soviet body politic. Guerilla warfare by nationalist partisans in much of these borderlands further confirmed this state of affairs in the minds of Party and state leaders. In Western Ukraine and in the Baltic States, Soviet officials in the immediate postwar years imposed the Russian language and official Soviet culture with impunity and deprived natives of most positions of power.

Deprived of most positions of authority and faced with a culture and language imposed by an outside power, native Ukrainians of L’viv and other parts of Galicia had become subalterns in a colonial empire, as did their counterparts in the Baltic States.¹¹² Ukrainians in L’viv managed to resist their status as subalterns and challenge the hegemony of official Soviet culture because of their location at the border of various imperial legacies. They made use of the language of a previous imperial legacy, Polish, to gain access to major intellectual and cultural developments taking part in the rest of the world. Contacts with the Ukrainian diaspora, however limited, likewise undermined certain myths perpetuated by official Soviet culture and brought Ukrainians closer to the West.

Similar processes were taking place in the Baltic States, another part of the Soviet Union’s western periphery. Lithuanians made use of Polish-language publications, personal contacts across the border, and radio and television as alternative channels of information not available in the Soviet Union. Similar connections were taking place

¹¹² On similarities between the Baltic States and Ukrainians in Western Ukraine, see Misiunas and Taagepera, “Postwar Stalinism,” 76-130.
between Finland and Estonia, though to a lesser extent. In all three Baltic States, contacts with their diasporas in the capitalist West improved in the years after Stalin’s death and also served as an alternative channel of information to official Soviet culture. ¹¹³

Unlike in Western Ukraine, nationalities of the Baltic States spoke languages considerably more different from Russian, and Soviet policies toward culture in these republics were markedly more liberal than elsewhere in the Soviet Union. ¹¹⁴ Yet nationalities native to the Baltic States and Western Ukraine faced strikingly similar circumstances and opened for themselves comparable “windows to the West.” Located at the western border of the Soviet Union, they made use of their connections with Poland (and to an extent for Estonia, Finland) as well as ties with their diasporas in the capitalist West in ways that undermined the hegemony of official Soviet culture. Ukrainians in L’viv thus played a significant role in opening a “window to the West” on the Soviet empire’s periphery and offering a different kind of Ukrainian identity for others in their republic.


¹¹⁴ Ibid., 179, 243-44.
CHAPTER 2

STUDENTS, YOUTH SUBCULTURES, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN L’VIV, 1953-75

The year 1968 for much of the world represented a “year of the barricades,” in which a generation that had come of age after World War II formed a counter-culture that opposed the values of their elders and in some cases led to mass political protests.\(^1\) In March of that year, Party authorities reported that a fourth-year student at L’viv State University, who knew about student revolts in Poland that month and heard of young people demanding change in Czechoslovakia, said in private that such events could happen in the Soviet Union. Yet she also admitted that students were not as active as their counterparts in Moscow, and in the end, no mass protests broke out in L’viv or in other Soviet cities that year.\(^2\)

---


Yet from the year of Stalin's death, 1953, to the rise of a human rights movement across the Soviet Union in the mid-1970s, a cultural revolution was taking place in L'viv and other Soviet cities. Students and other young people in their "uncultured" behavior and forms of self-expression were resisting the restraints of official Soviet culture as they defined themselves as youth. In the case of L'viv, some of them defined themselves as Ukrainians differently from the Soviet regime's expectations. This chapter addresses ways in which students and young people in L'viv, while not engaging in political opposition, managed to create subcultures whose values resisted those promoted by the Soviet regime. Soviet high culture and folk culture occupied a central role in the lives of students and young intellectuals. Yet growing numbers of young people, like their counterparts in other Soviet cities and in neighboring Eastern Bloc states, were taking part in a mass culture affected by traditional village life and postwar American consumer culture. While participating in folk ensembles and singing folk songs with family and friends, jazz music, the boogie woogie, and rock and roll affected the values and behavior of students and young people in L'viv from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s. By the beginning of the 1970s, a counter-culture associated with rock music, the hippie movement, had found its own Soviet version on the city's streets as well.

---

As these aspects of a counter-culture took hold in L'viv, some students and young intellectuals were also reassessing what it meant for them to be Ukrainian. Many of them were natives of Western Ukraine and had some knowledge of repression under Stalin in the immediate postwar years. With the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, which began public criticism of Stalin's cult of personality for the first time, students and young intellectuals in L'viv had formed a private discourse that challenged the ideological restrictions that Soviet Ukrainian culture had imposed on them.

While the regime tried to accommodate these challenges by supporting young intellectuals' activities in the early 1960s, by the time of Khrushchev's thaw, more reactionary policies followed. As in other republics of the Soviet Union, the spread of underground literature (samvydav in Ukrainian) led to a number of arrests of intellectuals in 1965-66.4 The Soviet regime's crackdown on underground political protest grew more intense after Soviet forces in August 1968 brought down Alexander Dubchek's attempts to bring "socialism with a human face" in Czechoslovakia. In early 1972, arrests of members of the intelligentsia in Soviet Ukraine and a number of other republics, which signaled even further repression of dissent, made any form of national expression acquire a dubious political shade. This was especially true for Soviet Ukraine, where the removal of the republic's first Party secretary brought a heightened campaign against "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism."5 As official cultural
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4 Heorhii Kas'ianov, Nez hodni: ukrains'ka intelyhentsiya v russi oporu 1960-80-x rokiv (Dissenters: the Ukrainian intelligentsia in the opposition movement, 1960s-80s) (Kyiv: "Lybid'", 1995), 47.

5 On this wave of political repression in 1972-73, called the "general pogrom" by one scholar, see ibid., 121-41.
activities became increasingly repressive, students and young intellectuals sought underground sources for inspiration, sometimes colliding with the regime in the process.

This chapter concludes by examining the way in which this underground cultural revolution among young people affected assumptions about gender. While women often did not enjoy positions of power in the Soviet regime officially, they did take on significant roles in the informal networks of power present in Soviet society. In the case of L’viv, subcultures that resisted the values of official Soviet culture and offered alternative forms of national self-expression for Ukrainians at times subverted notions of the ideal woman. For women intellectuals who did not directly challenge the roles expected of them, these subcultures and at times the cultural establishment itself gave them opportunities to assert positions of moral authority among men and women alike.

2.1 Student Masses and Youth Subcultures

In the decades after World War Two the Soviet regime created in L’viv a mass society of students. By the beginning of 1958, there were 12 institutions of higher education, 32 technical schools (tekhnikumy), and numerous research institutes involving young people. Every tenth inhabitant in the city then was a student. By the

---


7 DAiLO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 208, ark. 41.
end of 1971, the number of students at various institutions of higher learning in L’viv Region had reached over 120,000, and the vast majority of them were in the city of L’viv. 8

It was among these thousands of students, their counterparts in factories and technical schools, and young intellectuals that subcultures emerged that resisted official values and provided alternative sources of a Ukrainian national identity. This chapter considers the activities of two cohorts of young people that took part in this underground cultural revolution after Stalin's death. A majority of the first cohort, consisting of those born roughly between 1934 and 1944, had grown up in villages of Western Ukraine. Some in their early childhood had witnessed the arrival of Soviet rule and German occupation in World War II. A majority remembered as children guerilla resistance by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against Soviet rule in the immediate postwar years and the political repression that came with it. Accustomed to Soviet rule under Stalin, they refrained from political opposition, yet they also saw much promise in the Twentieth Party Congress of 1956 that denounced Stalin’s cult of personality. Closely connected to village life, many of them identified with folk songs and other village traditions while adapting to urban mass culture.

The second cohort of young people, those born approximately between 1944 and 1954, did not remember the war at all. Some had childhood recollections of the UPA fighting Soviet rule in the early 1950s and Stalin's death in 1953, but for the most part, these young people did not have any memories of Stalinism in Western Ukraine.

8 DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 22, ark. 8.
Many of them began higher education or factory work already in Khrushchev's "thaw," but only in its last stages. As students, members of this cohort saw the political climate grow more reactionary, particularly with the arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals in 1972. While many of this cohort still had relatives living in the village, this cohort came to enter higher education or the industrial work force in Lviv as part of an advanced industrial society. This factor in turn facilitated their reception of the rock revolution and other trends affecting young people in Soviet cities by the mid-1960s.

2.2 Between Village and Boogie-Woogie: Youth Subcultures, 1953-63

Not long after the fires of an anti-Communist revolution had been put out in Budapest in November 1956, Party leaders in the Lviv Region, as in other parts of the Soviet Union, had to root out "anti-Soviet" moods that events in Hungary allegedly had encouraged among young people. As they and their superiors in Moscow sought to explain "anti-Soviet" moods among young people, they blamed not just Hungary, "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" and religious belief, but also an urban scene in
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9 A Central Committee letter from Moscow, "On Strengthening the Political Work of Party Organizations and Halting Sorties (vylyazki) by Anti-Soviet, Hostile Elements," dated 19 December 1956, led to numerous Party meetings and denunciations. On reports by regional and city Party committee secretaries on the fulfillment of this letter in Lviv, see Dalo, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 82, ark. 1-5; and Dalo, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 116, ark. 71-79. The letter also led to a Central Committee report from Moscow, "On Shortcomings in the Work of Party Organizations of the Western Regions of Ukraine in the Ideological-Political Education of Youth," sent to the Lviv regional Party committee on 8 June 1957, and a plenary session of the Lviv regional Party committee on 26 July 1957 on the theme, "On the Ideological-Political Education of Youth." See Dalo, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 82, ark. 52-63; Dalo, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, passim.

The regional Party committee of the Subcarpathian Region held a similar plenary session on the same day. See an excerpt from the session published in Tamara Halajchak et al., eds., Zakhidni zemli, 1953-1966 (The western lands, 1953-1966), vol. 2 of Kul'turne zhyttia v Ukraini (Culture in Ukraine) (Lviv: Instytut Ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp'yakevycha, NAN Ukrainy, 1995), 277-81.
L’viv that for them was very disquieting. In their view, a club hosting dances for young workers, L’vovgaz, along with others in the city, hardly fostered the values of a society that was building Communism. It had become “a den for loafers, Western fashion chasers (stiliagi), and drunkards,” and “rarely an evening passes without drinking bouts and fights.” Instead of playing Soviet music to young audiences, it blared popular music from the West, inciting them to dance “only foxtrots and other boogie-woogies.”

For these Party leaders, rustic village ways and the boogie woogie had figured in with the Hungarian uprising as threats to Soviet society’s well being.

The displeasure that Party leaders expressed toward L’vovgaz and other city clubs indicated that students and other young people in L’viv, as in other Soviet cities, in the decade after Stalin’s death were forming their own values independent of state control. For these officials, the “uncultured” manners of village life proved to be a common appearance at city dances, though urban people no doubt also took part in such acts. In 1957, the city’s polytechnic institute was hosting evenings that quite often ended with students gambling for liquor bottles and fights breaking out. Similar disturbances took place in clubs, cultural centers, and restaurants in the city. A report for the Party committee of L’viv State University on 10 January 1958 raised similar apprehensions that “not a few uncultured, dissolute (rozviazannyj) people” showed up at evening dances at city clubs, bringing with them a lot of smoking, spitting on floors,

---

10 DALO, fond P-3, opys 1, sprava 82, ark. 60-61; DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 32.

11 DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 19, 134; DALO, fond P-3, opys 1, sprava 82, ark. 60-61.
and tracking in dirt. Outside the influence of the Communist Youth and other public institutions, such students and other young people in the city continued to be the subject of Party and state officials’ criticisms in the 1960s.

Along with the drinking bouts, spitting on floors, and tracking in of dirt associated with village life, students and other young people in the city also had incorporated jazz and the beginnings of rock and roll in their daily discourse. According to one report on by Communists at L’viv State University in early 1958, many students’ preferred dances featuring rock and roll, the foxtrot, the tango, and the “boogie-woogie.” In the opinion of this report, students needed to learn more appropriate Soviet dances like the krokov’jak, the waltz, and the polka, popular dances among young people in the mid-nineteenth century. Authorities had become distraught with a growing trend among young people in the Soviet Union and other Eastern Bloc countries after Stalin’s death. As early as 1954 students, factory workers, and even firmly dedicated Communists danced various “boogies” and “rock and rolls” in clubs throughout the Soviet Union, followed by Chubby Checker’s “the twist” by the early 1960s.

---

12 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 412, ark. 119-20.

13 See, for instance, remarks by a city people’s militia (druzhyna) at a Party conference at the L’viv State Polytechnic Institute on 5 June 1963 in DALO, fond P-380, opys 1, sprava 270, ark. 94, as well as remarks on youth in a republic Central Committee report of 31 August 1965 on ideological work in the L’viv Region in Tsentral’nyj derzhavnij arkhiv hromads’kykh ob’iednan’ Ukrainy (TsDAHOU), fond 1, opys 6, sprava 3859, ark. 37.

14 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 412, ark. 119-20.

Besides the boogie woogie and rock and roll at dances, jazz music had drawn young audiences in L’viv by the late 1950s, also drawing alarm from Party leaders. Speaking to fellow Communists from L’viv Region in 1957, one regional Party committee secretary vented his disgust for several jazz artists who recently started performing Polish “blue jazz (goluboi dzhaz)” in L’viv. Performances by the Polish Blue Jazz Band in the Soviet Union in the summer of 1956 had no doubt inspired such music. In this regional Party secretary's view, Polish blue jazz was nothing more than “a cacophony, a squeaking (pisk), a screeching (vizg), a roaring (rev) of wild animals.” “Stiliagy roared, I don’t know,” he said. “Maybe out of fascination (uvlechenie), maybe from the awakening of a truly animal instinct.”

Party leaders and other spokespersons in the cultural establishment also expressed general unease with the way that many young people simply did not identify with the values of Soviet high culture. Party officials in the Central Committee in Moscow in 1957 and university Communists in 1958 lamented in their reports mentioned above that many young people had no desire to hear classical music, preferring Soviet popular tunes instead, or had no interest in recent congresses of Soviet composers, writers, and artists. Regional Party committee secretary Ivan


17 DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 164-65.

18 DALO, fond P-3, opys 1, sprava 82, ark. 55; DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 412, ark. 119-20.
Hrushets'kyj in 1962 bemoaned the fact that some young people, including Communist Youth and Party members, in private company listened to music taped from Voice of America radio broadcasts and danced the "boogie-woogie." Such young people in his view were a stark contrast to their counterparts in the progressive Russian intelligentsia of the nineteenth century, who listened to such classics as Glinka and Tchaikovsky and danced to folk music.\textsuperscript{19}

Hrushets'kyj presumably evoked sympathy among fellow Party members and leaders in the cultural establishment. But in the late 1950s and early 1960s, divisions existed among them over growing interest among young people in jazz and popular music. Some took a hard line against these influences from the "rotten West," seeing Soviet high culture and folk culture as more healthy forms of entertainment. Others took a more flexible line, sensing a need to promote an indigenous popular culture that could compete with influences from abroad.

While local authorities Hrushets'kyj soundly condemned jazz music, others tolerated or even supported it. The official media sometimes spoke highly of Polish blue jazz, as a regional Communist Youth leader complained in 1957.\textsuperscript{20} Besides the official media, some local authorities in L'viv sponsored the activities of jazz bands. According to remarks by the region's Administration of Culture and a regional Party committee report in January 1962, a jazz orchestra directed by Ihor Khoma enjoyed the

\textsuperscript{19} See remarks in Hrushets'kyj's speech to general Party meetings of the L'viv State Polytechnic Institute on 16 April 1962 in DALO, fond P-380, opys 1, sprava 261, ark. 317, as well as Hrushets'kyj's remarks at a L'viv regional Party committee meeting with representatives of the intelligentsia of the city of L'viv on 12 May 1962 in DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 424, ark. 22.

\textsuperscript{20} DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 164-65.
support of Panas Iur, a regional Party committee official, and “various unions” in the city.\textsuperscript{21} Events taking place in Moscow encouraged such support. After the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, jazz music, banned in the postwar years under Stalin, received official recognition and experienced a revival throughout the Soviet Union from the late 1950s to the fall of 1962. While momentarily condemned by Khrushchev in 1962, jazz music went on to reach its peak in popularity in the mid-1960s with the support of Khrushchev’s successors.\textsuperscript{22}

Opinion about popular music was also not unanimous among leading intellectuals in the establishment. The poet Rostyslav Bratun’, speaking before a Party meeting of the writers’ union in 1959, wholeheartedly condemned young people’s poor tastes in popular Soviet romance music, demanding more state support for better theater performances, books, and music records.\textsuperscript{23} Yet others stressed that Party and state leaders needed to do more to accommodate young people’s changing needs, particularly at regional Party committee meetings with the intelligentsia in L’viv on 18 December 1961 and 12 May 1962. Poet Dmytro Pavlychko asserted that Communists needed to understand the new age of rockets, television, and radio affecting young people, as well as influences of “bourgeois” culture from neighboring socialist countries, instead of dismissing young people as “stiliagi” and “discontented

\textsuperscript{21} DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 446, ark. 3; DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 422, ark. 126.

\textsuperscript{22} Starr, 248-51, 261, 270-75.

\textsuperscript{23} DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 32, ark. 1.
Both he and senior composer Anatolij Kos-Anatol’s’kyj suggested that better Soviet popular music, rather than categorical condemnation of jazz and the like, was the best solution to this growing mass consumer culture from the West.25

While this mass popular culture showed its first signs of emergence in the late 1950s with the "boogie-woogie" and "rock-n-roll" at club dances, high culture and village traditions still had a very strong presence among young people in L’viv. Many who were students in the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s recalled that they often went to see plays in city theaters and listened to classical music at the opera house or the philharmonic orchestra.26 Particularly in the 1950s, the majority of students at L’viv State University, were natives of villages from Western Ukraine. For these students, as well as other young people, their core values came from traditional village life. One former university student from the mid-1950s claimed that students quite

---

24 DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 255, ark. 158-60; DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 424, ark. 71-72, 74.

25 DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 255, ark. 158; DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 424, ark. 46-47, 72-73.

26 Mykhajlo Ksiv, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 2 January 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University. Kosiv, born in 1934 in the Ivano-Frankivs’k Region, studied at L’viv State University from 1955 to 1960, entered graduate school at the university, and became a literary scholar. Stefaniia Shabatura recalls similar experiences in Petro Shkrab’iuk, Popid zolotí vorota: shist’ elehij pro rodyu Kalynivsiv (Under the golden gates: six elegies on the Kalynets’ family) (L’viv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp’iakevycha, 1997), 204.

Shabatura was born in 1938 in the Ternopil’ Region of Western Ukraine. She studied at the L’viv School (uchlyshche) of Applied and Decorative Art, finishing in 1955. After some work as a textile artist, she received her higher education at the L’viv Institute of Applied and Decorative Art from 1961 to 1967. She went on to complete a number of Gobelin tapestries and was arrested for distributing samvyday literature in 1972. Stefaniia Shabatura, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 10 December 1998, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.
often sang folk songs in hallway corners during class breaks. Religious customs also still played a role in students' lives despite the fact that formal religious worship was not allowed. At L'viv State University, students from Western Ukraine in the mid-1950s, for instance, set their dormitory tables for Christmas Eve dinners and Easter.

Traditional village life as well as official cultural institutions influenced much of student life in the 1950s. Yet an amalgam of village traditions and popular culture from abroad was taking shape among young people in the city. As mentioned above, a university Party report in 1958 claimed that young people attending clubs that featured the "boogie-woogie" and "rock-n-roll" of the West not rarely brought with them such habits from the village as spitting on floors, smoking profusely, and tracking in dirt. According to one former university student from the mid-1950s, nearly all the young men wore embroidered shirts from the village. Yet when they began to find out about Elvis Presley, nearly all of them began to sport his cocked hairstyle, and some began to wear light blue outfits (holubi kostiumy), even if they had not even heard his music.

---

27 Mykola Petrenko, interview by the author, L'viv, tape recording, 12 February 1999, Institute of Historical Research, Lviv State University. Petrenko, born in 1925 in the Poltava Region, had been sent to Germany as a forced laborer. He was repatriated to the Soviet Union after the war and served in the Soviet Army from 1947 to 1951, working in labor battalions first in the Donbass mines and later on the Kamechatka Peninsula in Siberia. In 1951, Petrenko came to the L'viv Region to work as a newspaper reporter. He was a correspondent student first at the L'viv State Printing Institute in 1952 and then transferred to correspondence studies at L'viv State University, where he completed his degree in 1957. During his studies, he worked as a journalist and lived in a dormitory. Later he joined the writers' union in L'viv and established a career as a poet and journalist.

28 Kosiv, interview.

29 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 412, ark. 119-20.

30 Oleksandr Zelins'kyj, interview by the author, L'viv, tape recording, 22 June 1999, Institute of Historical Research, Lviv National University. Zelins'kyj, though born in Kyiv, spent his early childhood in L'viv and went on to study philology at L'viv State University from 1954 to 1959 and later at the L'viv State Conservatory from 1961 to 1967, where he became a professor.
By the early 1960s, students and other young people had begun combining elements of their traditional world view with elements of a consumer culture for young people emerging globally after 1945.

2.3 Rock Culture, Soviet Hippies, and the Postwar Generation, 1965-75

After efforts to head off or accommodate the screeching wail of Polish blue jazz and the wild gyrations of the boogie woogie in the late 1950s and early 1960s, local authorities in L’viv confronted yet another wave of mass culture from the capitalist West, the rock revolution. By the beginning of the 1970s, rock music and the counter-culture associated with it had surfaced on the crumbling walls of Lychakivs’kyj Cemetery near the center of L’viv. According to poet and rock musician Viktor Morozov, the cemetery’s walls had become an unofficial gallery of hippie artwork, including portraits of American rock star Jimmy Hendrix and such graffiti slogans as “Make love, not war.”31 Rock music and Soviet hippies had made their way into the lives of students and other young people born after World War II.

As other scholars of Soviet popular culture have convincingly shown, rock music began to flourish in underground form by the mid-1960s among young people throughout the Soviet Union, inspired by the worldwide popularity of the Beatles.32

---

31 Viktor Morozov, “‘Nasha osin’ z malen’kymy drevamy duzhe shvydco mynula...’” (“Our fall of small trees passed quickly...”), in Hryts’ko Chubaj, Plach Ieremii: Poeziiia, pereklady, spohady (Jeremiah’s coat: poetry, translations, recollections) (L’viv: Kal’varia, 1998), 266.

While the Beatles made it to radio stations in such Eastern Bloc countries as Poland and Hungary and caused a public fury, young people in the Soviet Union only found out about the Beatles through rumors and then through official media that criticized this rock group’s antics. But starting with the Beatles, copies of music by rock groups from Britain and the United States began to circulate secretly, first on discarded X-ray plates and then on reel-to-reel tapes. Unofficial rock bands began to surface across the country, playing mostly American and British music or writing their own songs in English.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, American and British rock flourished among students and other young people in L’viv. Recordings by American rock groups and pop artists made their way to people’s homes through underground connections. Beginning in school in the mid-1960s, Natalia Chernysh copied onto tape or collected a total of 14 records from American rock groups or pop artists. In this way she listened to such groups from the 1960s and 1970s as Tom Jones, Aretha Franklin, Credence...

---

33 Ryback, 62-63. On the reception of Beatlemania in the Soviet bloc, see ibid., 50-62. Writer Mykola Riabchuk was born in 1953 in the Western Ukrainian city of Luts’k and spent his childhood in L’viv. He studied at the L’viv State Polytechnic Institute from 1971 to 1973. Riabchuk recalled first hearing vague rumors about the Beatles while in school in L’viv in the mid-1960s and then finding out more about them through official propaganda. Mykola Riabchuk, interview by the author, Kyiv, tape recording, 4 November 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.

34 Bahry, 243; Gurevich, 127-30; Ramet, Zamascikov, and Bird, 182; Ryback, 63-64; Troitsky, 12-19.
Clearwater Revival, and The Mommas The Pappas. At the polytechnic institute in the early 1970s, students privately listened to such groups as Uriah Heep and Deep Purple. By the end of the 1970s, as authorities momentarily tolerated disco music and encouraged the development of discotheques, rare recordings of the Swedish group Abba also made their way through the underground.

Like their counterparts in other Soviet cities, young people in L'viv made copies of rock music through foreign radio broadcasts. Such incidents had already occurred with young people, including Party members, in the late 1950s and early 1960s. As rock music gained popularity, broadcasts of Radio Liberty or Voice of America, or broadcasts from Poland and Romania, became sources for taping it.

Young people eager to listen to rock music also made use of black market connections

35 Natalia Chernysh, interview by the author, L'viv, tape recording, 26 July 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L'viv National University. Chernysh, a sociologist at L'viv State University, was born in 1948 in L'viv and attended L'viv State University from 1966 to 1971.

36 Rjabchuk, interview.

37 Halyna Chubaj, interview by the author, L'viv, tape recording, 6 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L'viv National University. Chubaj, currently a high school Spanish teacher, attended L'viv State University in the late 1960s. Her husband, poet Hryhorij (Hryts'ko) Chubaj, managed to find these records from Abba at the end of the 1970s. Ryback points out the Soviet regime's brief tolerance of disco music from abroad in the late 1970s. Ryback, 159-61.

38 Regional KGB chief Shevchenko told the region's Communists on 26 July 1957 of young people copying foreign radio broadcasts onto records. DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 143. Regional Party secretary Ivan Hrushets'kyj, speaking before Party members of the city's polytechnic institute and representatives of the city's intelligentsia in 1962, claimed that some young people were listening to music taped from Voice of America. DALO, fond P-380, opys 1, sprava 261, ark. 317; DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 424, ark. 22.

39 Rjabchuk interview; Volodymyr Iavors'kyj, interview by the author, Kyiv, tape recording, 7 November 1999. Institute of Historical Research, L'viv National University. Iavors'kyj, a journalist and prose writer, was born in 1953 in the small town of Pustomty near L'viv. He and his parents moved to L'viv in his childhood. Entering the philology faculty at L'viv State University in 1971, he quit in his second year because of what he said was an oppressive political climate there. After serving in the army, he returned to L'viv in 1974.
to find records and make copies of them. Some of them had relatives in Poland or the
capitalist West who sent them records. In one case, a young man in the 1960s even
subscribed to the Elvis Presley Fan Club in the West and received records that way,
though not without problems with the police.\textsuperscript{40}

Inspired by these recordings of American and British rock groups, rock and jazz
groups began to surface in L’viv, as they did in other Soviet cities. Some groups
became professional Vocal-Instrumental Ensembles (VIAs) affiliated with local
philharmonic orchestras. While these ensembles enjoyed state support, they had to
conform to the expectations of philharmonic orchestras’ state art councils. These
councils, under the guidance of the Ministry of Culture, set standards on members’ hair
length, the decibel level of performances, and members’ repertoire.\textsuperscript{41} At least in L’viv,
some groups got around regulations by not playing according to the approved
repertoire, but they did so at a loss of potential earnings, according to one listener of
popular music there in the early 1970s.\textsuperscript{42} Some official VIAs in the late 1960s and
early 1970s included Medikus, a jazz-pop quintet led by Ihor Khoma, and the folk-pop
group Bonfire (Vatra), organized by jazz artist Mykhajlo Manuliak under the city’s
philharmonic orchestra in February 1971.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{40} Chernysh, interview.

\textsuperscript{41} Ryback, 150-52; Troitsky, 18-19.

\textsuperscript{42} Riabchuk, interview.

\textsuperscript{43} Bahry, 244, 253; K. Stetsenko, “Ukraina: rok muzyka” (Ukraine: rock music), in Rok muzyka v SSSR: opyt popularnoi entsiklopedii (Rock music in the USSR: a popular encyclopedia), ed. Artemii Kirovich Troitskii (Moskva: “Kniga,” 1990), 344; Riabchuk interview; TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 25, sprava 515, ark. 10, Shkrab’iuk, 249-50. According to Shkrab’iuk, the name for the group came from one of
But in addition to professional VIAs, there were countless more amateur groups performing in L'viv and other Soviet cities. One scholar says that by the mid-1970s, there were about 100,000 unofficial VIAs in the Soviet Union compared to less than 150 professional VIAs. These amateur groups by law could not earn any money from their performances and did not receive any state support for equipment, which was usually scarce and very expensive on the black market. But as long as there was a willing sponsor, usually a school, a factory, a union, or another state institution, these groups had more opportunities to perform their own music and Western hits. In L'viv, one such group, Arnika, led by rock artist and poet Viktor Morozov, played at the Police Club, a major dance hall on 17th of September Street downtown, and also once at the railroad workers' cultural center, ROKS, another popular concert hall for young people. The builder's club, Gazkhub, in those years featured a Russian Jewish rock group, The Drum (Balaban).

Manuliak’s songs, “The Bonfire’s Smoke (Vatrovyj dym),” based on the words of poet Ihor Kalynets’, a good friend of Manuliak. Ibid., 249.

44 Ryback, 152.

45 Troitsky, 18; Ryback, 152. On amateur musicians' problems obtaining equipment, see Ryback, 157-59.

46 Bahry, 253; Riabchuk interview; Volodymyr Iavors'kyj interview. Morozov also led the unofficial group Quo Vadis at the beginning of the 1970s. Stetsenko, 345. Ihor Hun'ko was one of the members of Arnika, and Vika Vradij at the age of sixteen sang for the group in the 1970s before becoming a major rock figure in Ukraine at the end of the 1980s. Bahry, 253; Volodymyr Kaufman, “Hryts'ko Chubaj i L'viv” (Hryts'ko Chubaj and L'viv), in Hryts'ko Chubaj, Plach Jeremii: poeziiia, pereklady, spohady (Jeremiah's coat: poetry, translations, recollections) (L'viv: Kal'varia, 1998), 303.

47 Riabchuk, interview. Other unofficial rock groups in L'viv that enjoyed large audiences included Prometheus (Prometej), led by Iaroslav Vydzhal, and Eureka (Evryka), led by Iurij Varum. Stetsenko, 345.
Several amateur rock groups also performed privately for each other and their friends. In the early 1970s, underground rock musicians from across the city got together yearly at city clubs for what were called “sessions (sejsheny),” a term that young people in the Soviet Union co-opted from English to refer to anything associated with rock concerts.48 Lasting all night, musicians in front of small groups of invited guests played their music, improvising and switching around band members from time to time.49

As jazz, pop, and rock groups emerged in the city, bands from other parts of the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc also came to L’viv to perform. Jazz-rock bands like Time Machine (Mashina vremeni) and Arsenal (Arsenal) from Moscow drew packed audiences in L’viv in the 1970s.50 Czeslaw Nieman, a jazz-rock artist from Poland who moved further into avant-garde rock compositions at the end of the 1960s, also had a popular following in L’viv. According to one scholar, Nieman’s 1977 concert in L’viv and other Polish artists’ appearances were major events in the history of rock

48 Riabchuk, interview. For the term “session,” see Troitsky, 27.

49 Riabchuk, interview. Riabchuk as a teenager was one of those invited to attend.

music in that city.\textsuperscript{51} Developments in popular music in the Soviet bloc as well as in America and Britain thus had a significant impact on the evolution of jazz, pop, and rock groups in L’viv.

Rock, jazz, and pop bands from L’viv in the late 1960s and early 1970s quite often imitated Western rock bands or conformed to official standards as professional VIAs. Yet some also drew from the invented traditions Ukrainian folk culture and came up with highly original works. According to one scholar, the L’viv jazz-pop quintet Medikus, whose composers included M. Skoryk and B. Ianiv’s’kyj, was among several Soviet bands making highly original use of Ukrainian folk songs by the end of the 1960s, bringing about a truly indigenous jazz style.\textsuperscript{52} The repertoire of Manuliak’s ensemble, Vatra, while including official Soviet composers’ works, also featured pop and jazz songs by Manuliak and others incorporating Ukrainian folk motifs.\textsuperscript{53} While

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{51} Bahry, 253. Bahry also mentions that a concert by Tadeusz Nalepa, another Polish rock artist, in 1976, also had a significant effect on the development of rock music in L’viv. On Nieman’s experiments with rock music in the 1970s, see Alex Kan and Nick Hayes, “Big Beat in Poland,” in Rocking the State: Rock Music and Politics in Eastern Europe and Russia, ed. Sabrina Petra Ramet (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994), 46-49.

\textsuperscript{52} Starr, 279-80; Stetsenko, 344.

\textsuperscript{53} Shkrab’iuk, 249-50. The official repertoire, among other works, mentions arrangements by M. Manuliak and independent composers and works of L’viv composers A. Kos-Anatol’s’kyi, V. Ianiv’s’kyi, E. Shyk, and R. Khabal’, with words by L’viv poets R. Bratun’ and B. Stel’makh and others. Also featured in the program is “Chervona ruta (Red Rue)” by independent composer Volodymyr Ivasiuk. See the official repertoire in TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 25, sprava 515, ark. 12-13. One song, “The Bonfire’s Smoke (Vatroyvdy dym),” obviously was absent from this list because authorities forbade the author of its lyrics, Ihor Kalynets’, from publishing in the early 1970s. On Kalynets’ and Manuliak, see Shkrab’iuk, 249-52.
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Viktor Morozov and his group, Arnika, sang hits by Janis Joplin and Uriah Heep to crowds in the Police Club in the early 1970s, Morozov also adapted Ukrainian folk songs and works by Soviet Ukrainian poets to rock and jazz music.\(^54\)

As one popular Ukrainian musician suggests, such jazz, pop, and rock groups in L’viv that incorporated elements of Ukrainian folk music were taking part in an upsurge in the use of national folk elements across the republic. Unofficial rock groups, as well as professional VIAs, like writers and film artists, were adapting Ukrainian folk music to a variety of jazz, rock, and pop genres in cities throughout Soviet Ukraine. This trend reached its peak in 1972 and lasted until the beginning of the 1980s.\(^55\) Popular musicians turning to Ukrainian folk music also paralleled rock musicians becoming more indigenous in Soviet culture. Soviet rock bands, beginning in the mid-to-late 1960s, gradually moved away from English-language lyrics and Western imitations. By the 1980s, they were singing in their native languages and developing their own original styles.\(^56\)

But efforts to adapt Ukrainian folk music to jazz, rock, and pop genres became increasingly difficult for popular musicians as the political climate grew more hostile. As Kyiv rock musician Kyrylo Stetsenko indicates, authorities increasingly accused

---

\(^{54}\) Bahry, 253; Riaichuk, interview; Ivors’kyj, interview. Ivors’kyj, a friend of Morozov’s, mentioned Morozov’s original adaptations of Soviet Ukrainian poet Pavlo Tychyna to music. According to Riaichuk, another friend, Morozov put poetry to song out of inspiration from Polish “sung poetry (spivana poezija)” Mykola Riaichuk, “Po’shcha, po’s’kyj, poliaky: sproba filolohichnoho kraieznavstva” (Po’shcha, po’s’kyj, poliaky: an attempt at philological regional studies) Suchasniats’ 11 (November 1998): 147.

\(^{55}\) Stetsenko, 340.

\(^{56}\) Ramet, Zamascikov, and Bird, 182, 209; Troitsky recalls that by 1983, English-language rock bands in the Soviet Union were a thing of the past. Troitsky, 82.
pop groups of engaging in “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism” as repression of dissent in Ukraine intensified in 1972.\footnote{Stetsenko, 342.} The Party’s Central Committee by October 1971 had ordered that Mykhajlo Manuliak be removed as leader of the group Vatra for having made “politically immature remarks” that the KGB had caught wind of by August. The philharmonic orchestra, under pressure from the KGB, regional Party authorities, and the Central Committee in Kyiv, removed Manuliak as director and “strengthened” the ensemble’s leadership.\footnote{TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 25, sprava 515, ark. 10-11; Petro Shkrab’iuk, Popid zoloti vorota: shist’ elohii pro rodynu Kalynitsiv (Under the golden gates: six elegies on the Kalynets’ family) (L’viv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp’tikeyycha NAN Ukrainy, 1997), 249-50. Manuliak later performed independently at the restaurant Vysokyj zamok, attracting crowds of listeners in the 1970s. Riachuk, interview.} While Viktor Morozov’s unofficial group, Arnika, won a Union-wide televised talent show in Moscow in 1972, it, too, fell prey to political charges. When they returned home to L’viv after the contest, authorities there ordered the band to dissolve, claiming that “Black Field (Chorna rillia),” a Ukrainian folk song they had performed, was “nationalist.”\footnote{The band Arnika played in the televised talent show, “Hello, We Want Talent (Allo, my ishchem talanty)!” Stetsenko, 345.}

Rock music, while not enjoying official approval, thus attracted a generation of listeners born after World War II. It inspired unofficial rock bands and affected the repertoire of officially approved groups. Party archives suggest that local authorities, unlike in the late 1950s, had tacitly accepted rock music. A plenary session of the regional Party committee in July 1957 included speakers who condemned the influence
of jazz music on youth. Yet when Communists in November 1971 discussed a Central
Committee resolution from Moscow highly critical of ideological work in the L’viv
Region, no one talked about rock music.⁶⁰

As rock music won millions of young listeners in the Soviet Union in the late
1960s and early 1970s, the counter-culture associated with it also made considerable
inroads. At the end of the 1960s, a Soviet hippie movement had surfaced in Moscow,
Tallinn, Riga, and other Soviet cities, largely inspired by official propaganda
condemning American hippies.⁶¹ Soviet hippies rebelled against society through music
and self-expression as they congregated at makeshift urban hangouts and migrated
from city to city over the summer. Soviet hippies shocked passerby with their long
hair, bell bottoms (often homemade), beards, and strings of beads. They also
distinguished themselves by listening to rock music and by speaking a jargon sprinkled
with a number of English words. They usually identified themselves as members of
“the system,” one opposed to the rest of “normal” Soviet society. In their music and in
their self-expression, Soviet hippies created their own communal life based on sex,
drugs, and rock and roll that lasted as late as the end of the 1970s.⁶²

---

⁶⁰ See the transcript of the fourth plenary session of the regional Party committee of 20 November 1971
in DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 22, passim. Remarks condemning jazz music at the regional Party
committee’s plenary session of 26 July 1957 are in DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 164-65.

⁶¹ Ryback, 112. Evidence of this counter-culture in Moscow impressed many American journalists
visiting the city in November 1967, the fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution. Ryback, 102.

⁶² Ibid., 112-13; Starr, 297; Richard Stites, Russian Popular Culture: Entertainment and Society since
1900 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 161; Troitsky, 22-24. Common reference to the
Soviet hippie movement as “the system” is in Ida Vors, “Kudy klykala surma? Ukrain’s’ki hipi: patsient
skorish mertvyij, anizh zhyvij” (Where did the trumpet sound? Ukrainian hippies: a patient more dead
than alive), Polityka i kul’tura (Kyiv), 24-30 March 2000, 34-36.
Soviet hippies began appearing in L’viv as early as 1970 and gathered in a number of places in the city through much of the decade.\(^{63}\) As with their counterparts in other Soviet cities, L’viv hippies had found out about hippies in the West through official media and became attracted to their lifestyle. Despite harassment by the police, druzhiniki, and vigilantes, young hippies, informed by rumors and their common appearance, spontaneously gathered at a number of places in town for their own “sessions,” usually listening to tape-recorded rock music from the West, but sometimes hosting amateur bands.\(^{64}\) Some hippies also used narcotics.\(^{65}\) Many left behind their own graffiti, as Communist Youth hearings at the city’s polytechnic institute early 1971 suggest.\(^{66}\) During their summer pilgrimages, counterparts from other Soviet cities flocked to these “sessions” in L’viv as well.\(^{67}\)

---

\(^{63}\) A letter from L’viv poet Rostyslav Bratun’ to a colleague in Moscow, Iurij Barabash, dated 10 January 1970, suggests that the hippie movement was already firmly in place at the beginning of the decade. Bratun’ writes of a “sensation” in town, “a group of hippies, domestic, homegrown.” He says, “Oh! Even you, in the capital, don’t have such a thing, there aren’t any of them . . .” Rostyslav Bratun’ to Iurij Barabash, L’viv, 10 January 1970. In Tsentral’nyj Derzhavnyj Arkhiv-Muzej Literatury i Mysletstva Ukrainy (TsDAMLMU), fond 842, opys 1, sprava 12, ark. 1. The Soviet hippie movement in L’viv was alive and well in the mid-1970s, when Volodymyr lavors’kyj, after finishing military service in 1974, began to make friends among Soviet hippies. lavors’kyj interview.

\(^{64}\) lavors’kyj, interview; Riabchuk, interview. Ida Vors recalls that at one hangout, “anti-Soviet raves (shabashi)” at concerts of the rock group “The Uncles (Vujky)” took place. Vors, 36.

\(^{65}\) lavors’kyj, interview. Apparently the authorities knew that narcotic use was going on among these youth. When the Communist Youth committee at the L’viv State Polytechnic Institute on 18 December 1970 investigated a student for his connections to the hippie movement, a committee member asked if they had used narcotics. The student denied that they had, but the fact that the question had been raised was telling in itself. DALO, fond P-3568, opys 1, sprava 88, ark. 97.

\(^{66}\) Among these slogans, according to these hearings, were “Don’t drink,” “Don’t be rude,” “Don’t swear,” “Don’t use narcotics,” “Be good to girls,” “For peace!” “For Good,” “For a good attitude toward women,” “Against drunkenness,” “Be yourself,” “Love the one next to you,” “Love flowers and don’t make politics out of it,” and “Make nature your home.” Some of these slogans may have been mentioned before authorities to avoid punishment. A Communist Youth committee bureau member at L’viv State Polytechnic Institute alleged that some hippies had also used slogans like “Ideology and religion are for idiots.” DALO, fond P-3568, opys 1, sprava 88, ark. 84, 92.
In L’viv, Soviet hippies most often got together in a garden behind a dilapidated Carmelite Roman Catholic Church at the beginning of Lysenko Street. According to some Communist Youth hearings involving friends of hippies, other popular haunts included Lychakivs’kyj Cemetery; Vysokij Zamok, the highest point in L’viv; the Dominican Cathedral, located in the city’s old center; the Lenin Monument in front of the city opera house; and the neighborhood of Pohulianka, a wooded neighborhood not far from Lychakivs’kyj Cemetery. Hippies chose public places in the center of town to shock passerby with their rebellious appearance.

As with other members of “the system,” Soviet hippies in L’viv generally refrained from political and intellectual activities, which sometimes turned off some young people who had befriended them. Some young people simply may have gotten together to listen to music, as some Communist Youth hearings from the city’s polytechnic institute in 1970-71 suggest. Yet the hippie movement in L’viv also had

---

67 Ifors'kyj, interview.

68 Ibid. Ida Vors recalls that at this “holy garden,” “anti-Soviet raves (shabashi)” at concerts of the rock group “Vyky (The Uncles).” Hippies had to find out about such raves through a code word written on the walls of buildings: “The dog shit! – With barbed wire on red clover (Srav pes! – Koliuchym drotom na chervonu koniushynu).” Vors, 36. Ifors'kyj recalled that hippies spontaneously showed up there as well, knowing that it was a regular gathering place. Ifors'kyj, interview.

69 DALO, fond P-3568, opys 1, sprava 88, ark. 88, 92, 97.

70 Ifors'kyj, interview.

71 One young poet, Hryhorij (Hryts’ko) Chubaj, disapproved of Volodymyr Ifors’kyj’s cavorting with hippies, calling it a waste of time. Ifors'kyj, interview. Another young writer, Mykola Riabchuk, recalled that hippies tended to be apolitical and not interested in ideas that he and other literary friends shared. Riabchuk, interview.

72 DALO, fond P-3568, opys 1, sprava 88, ark. 88, 97, 99.
an intellectual fringe interested in reading underground works in Eastern philosophy, mostly in Russian translation. Hippies circulated among such friends as Mykola Riabchuk and Volodymyr Iavors’kyj a variety of Buddhist and yoga texts, Persian religious works, and more contemporary Eastern religious philosophers such as Rama Krishna, Rajnish (also known as Osho), and Jido Krishnamurti.\footnote{Riabchuk, interview; Iavors’kyj, interview. Iavors’kyj recalled exchanging such literature and discussing Eastern religious philosophy with Ihor Vakhula, Stanislav Hors’kyj, Heorhij Lazeba, a Kozachuk, and many others in L’viv. He also said that some of these works were available in Polish translation at the Academy of Sciences library in town.}

In turning to such texts, the more intellectual fringe of the Soviet hippie movement in L’viv were much like the Beatles and other pop culture figures in the West who were searching for alternative values in Indian religions in the late 1960s.\footnote{Cauter neglects the role Eastern religions and philosophies played in the counterculture of 1968. He only mentions in passing the Beatles’ February 1968 pilgrimage to Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, president of the Academy of Transcendental Meditation in the Himalayan foothills of India. Cauter, 51.} Alienated from the official ideology of Marxism-Leninism taught in schools and at universities, unable to turn to organized religion, many students and youth involved in this intellectual side of the hippie movement found spiritual guidance in these texts. Volodymyr Iavors’kyj claimed he had turned to the hippie movement after military service precisely to respond to his own spiritual crisis.\footnote{Iavors’kyj recalls that he had become disillusioned with the underground political activities of the university student journal Progress (Postup) as well as with mass arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals in 1972. Unable to return to university life and unwilling to go underground as a dissident, he sought to address this identity crisis of his through the hippie movement. Iavors’kyj, interview.}

As some more intellectually inclined hippies turned to Eastern religious texts as sources of alternative spiritual values, some also did engage in political discussions. One participant, Volodymyr Iavors’kyj, recalled that many hippies were sympathetic
toward the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) because it had opposed the Soviet
system. Some hippies may have been discussing the UPA and other national
questions when a young man with a “dark past,” Viacheslav Eres’ko, appeared among
their members and egged them on to form an organization. Eres’ko wore a “fascist
uniform,” possibly that of the UPA, and began to make a speech in front of some
hippies at a gathering in the nearby town of Briukhovychy on 7 November 1970, the
anniversary of the October Revolution. It was at this meeting in Briukhovychy that
Eres’ko and presumably others were arrested.77

This gathering of hippies clearly had all the makings of a police provocation.
Eres’ko’s plans to form an armed political organization sounded more like
underground nationalist groups that security organs in Western Ukraine regularly
uncovered.78 Students from the L’viv State Polytechnic Institute, speaking before the
Communist Youth committee bureau in December 1970 and February 1971,
vehemently denied that they had planned to form an organization.79 Yet as Eres’ko
tried to form an organization, it is very likely that these hippies discussed such
“fascist” organizations as the UPA and momentarily dabbled in politics.

76 Ibid.

77 This scenario is based on a surmising of documents of Communist Youth cases involving students from
the polytechnic institute accused of backing away from the organization and not telling about its activities.
See DALO, fond P-3568, opys 1, sprava 88, ark. 82-104; DALO, fond P-3568, opys 1, sprava 104, ark.
6-8.

78 On such underground nationalist groups, see especially Anatolij Rusnachenko, Natsional’no-vyzvol’nyj
rukh v Ukraini: seredyna 1950-x – pochatok 1990-x rokiv (The national liberation movement in Ukraine:
mid-1950s to the beginning of the 1990s) (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo imeni Oleny Telihy, 1998).

79 DALO, fond P-3568, opys 1, sprava 88, ark. 88, 97, 99.
The incident at Briukhovychny suggested that Soviet hippies in L’viv, while not involved in political protest like their Western counterparts, took part in a cultural revolution that resembled that of various student protest movements in the West in the late 1960s. Students and other young people in the Soviet Union understandably did not enjoy the institutionalized political pluralism or the media coverage that made student protests in the United States and Western Europe possible. Yet many protest movements in Western Europe and the United States that occupied the attention of the media in 1968 were about overcoming human alienation through spontaneous acts rather than through hierarchically structured political organizations. This general focus on action and spontaneity, reflected in the works of postwar existentialist philosophers and other activists of the New Left, epitomized the Soviet hippie movement in L’viv. In evading the police and the KGB, students and other youth were taking part in an amorphous movement that lacked any sort of organization or hierarchy. In rejecting society’s norms outright and shocking the public with their appearance, Soviet hippies in L’viv, like elements of the New Left in the West, were making daily life itself the scene of a vaguely defined revolutionary struggle.

---


Students and other young people in L'viv born in the first decade after World War II thus took part in forming a counter-culture that was affecting much of the world by the late 1960s. Rock music, which was reaching worldwide audiences with the arrival of the Beatles, was blaring on cassette tracks and record players in young people's homes. Underground rock bands were playing at dances in city clubs, and more official groups also were incorporating elements of popular music from the West. A counter-culture associated with rock music began to make its presence known by the 1970s as Soviet hippies roamed the streets of L'viv and shocked the public with their appearance.

While students and other young people born after the war listened to rock music and sometimes took part in the counter-culture associated with it, traditional village life and high culture still had a strong presence in L'viv. Students from the village or those with relatives from the village knew many Ukrainian folk songs by heart. In the case of students with family ties in Western Ukrainian villages, they sang songs from “bourgeois nationalist” organizations like the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) or the Sich Riflemen. Students in the late 1960s and early 1970s avidly went to the theater and to concerts, participated in sports, sang in folk ensembles, and took part in other officially sponsored activities. While many of these activities were mandatory, they nonetheless played a central role in students’ lives.

---

82 Iavors'kyj, interview; Riachuk, interview.

83 Chernysh, interview; Bohdan Yakymovych, interview by the author, L'viv, tape recording, 21 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L'viv National University. Bohdan Yakymovych was born in the village of Serafymka in the Horodets'kyj District of the Ivano-Frankivs'k Region in 1952. The family
As with their earlier counterparts, students and other young people from this cohort reaffirmed their connections with an imagined folk community and blended this identity with the emerging mass culture affecting their counterparts worldwide. While folk songs, the theater, and other aspects of official culture still had a strong presence among youth by the end of the 1970s, the city had a total of 16 discotheques equipped with British sound systems by the end of 1978.\textsuperscript{84} In L’viv, Soviet hippies were the radical fringe of a broader trend occurring among students and other young people born after World War II, one in which the village, official institutions, and largely American popular culture became central to their identity.

2.4 Student Subcultures and National Identity after Stalin

At a L’viv State University dormitory on 49 Pushkin Street, eight students from the philological faculty on 18 February 1954 wrote a furious letter to their Communist Youth bureau about a roommate of theirs, Iurii Shymans’kyj. In this letter and in a hearing of Shymans’kyj’s personal case before the faculty’s Communist Youth bureau, they accused their roommate of imposing “anti-Soviet and nationalist views” on them.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{84} Ryback, 160.

\textsuperscript{85} DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 392, ark. 47. Shymans’kyj’s personal case, heard before the Communist Youth bureau of the university’s philological faculty on 20 February 1954, resulted in his expulsion. See DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 392, ark. 39-45.
These students from the dorm on Pushkin Street may have exaggerated the extent of Shymans’kyj’s “nationalist” and “anti-Soviet” views as relations with him deteriorated. Many of their grievances in fact had to do with Shymans’kyj getting into fights with roommates and calling them and their parents all sorts of vulgar names. More revealing was what “nationalist” and “anti-Soviet” matters they had managed to talk about with him over the course of three years, as their list of 14 statements attributed to Shymans’kyj suggest. Shymans’kyj deeply resented what Soviet rule had brought to Western Ukraine, of which he presumably was a native. The “moskali,” he said, using the derogatory term for Russians and Russian speakers, “lord over the land of my grandfather (rozporiadzhajut’ sia na zemli moho dida).” Russians and Jews, he supposedly said, ate his ancestors’ bread, and most of them in L’viv “are scoundrels and bandits.” Despite making such bold statements, none of

---

86 Shymans’kyj may not have been all that disloyal toward the Soviet regime. The room’s elder claimed, for instance, that two days prior to the Communist Youth meeting discussing his case, Shymans’kyj in a discussion about what country Alaska belongs to claimed that it belonged to the USSR, which provoked objections from the rest of the group. Also, at this Communist Youth meeting, Shymans’kyj demanded “cross-examination (nachini fakty)” regarding claims that he defended Mykhajlo Hrushev’skyj, known for “bourgeois nationalist” views, as a historian. DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 392, ark. 39, 43, 47.

87 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 392, ark. 39, 41. The list of 14 statements, included in the letter, is in DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 392, ark. 47.

88 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 392, ark. 43, 47. The secretary of the faculty Communist Youth organization would allege that Shymans’kyj had made this statement about Russians and Jews.
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his roommates had immediately turned him in. Since many university students were
natives of villages from Western Ukraine, they most likely even shared his
sentiments.  

Quarrels among students of the philological faculty with Iurij Shymans’kyj that
erupted into a denunciation in February 1954 suggested that students already in the
months after Stalin’s death were intensely debating the regime’s policies toward
toward Ukrainians’ language, literature, and history. Speaking before roommates,
Shymans’kyj allegedly made disparaging remarks about Soviet writers and books on
Ukrainian history, and complained about deteriorating standards of living.  
Questioning the legitimacy of Soviet rule and its policies toward Ukrainians’ literature
and history may have given Shymans’kyj’s roommates that he was a foolish
provocateur and a nuisance. Yet they must have been at least somewhat sympathetic
to the views of this willful roommate of theirs, not turning him in until he had become
too much of an annoyance or a threat.

These discussions at a student dormitory on Pushkin Street epitomized an
unofficial student culture that functioned alongside formal lessons and officially
sanctioned activities at the city’s institutions of higher education. In dormitories and

90 For the 1953-54 academic year, of 840 people entering the university after passing exams (1,733 of
2,364 applicants passed exams.), 325 (39%) were natives of western regions. The party committee
secretary for L’viv Region told university Communists in late September of 1953 that about 2/3 of all
students had connections with the village. DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 354, ark. 66, 137.

91 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 392, ark. 40, 47.

92 Historian Iaroslav Isaievych was born in 1938 in the L’viv Region and attended L’viv State University
from 1952 to 1957, going on to attend graduate studies at the Institute of Social Sciences in L’viv. He
claimed that students as a rule perceived such outspoken classmates as provocateurs recruited by police
private apartments, students and graduate students got together informally mostly to have a good time. But they also entered intense discussions about the status of Ukrainians' language, literature, and history, sometimes exchanging literature that had been banned by authorities as “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist.” With many of them natives of Western Ukraine, such activities naturally led to discussions about recent repression under Stalin, particularly after the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956 allowed public criticism of Stalin’s cult of personality.

A number of these informal gatherings were taking place among students around 1956. In the late 1950s one informal grouping of philology students, nicknamed "The Senate," got together to drink beer, vacation in the Carpathian mountains, write humorous poems, and go together to New Year celebrations at university dormitories. Students and graduate students from the physics faculty toward the end of 1957 formed a group they called "The Bachelor" (Kholostiak). It met at the physics faculty dormitory to play cards, drink Ukrainian vodka (horilka), and put together an informal collection of writings named Kholostiak as part of celebrations for the New Year.

93 Ihor Kalynets’, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 7 February 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University. Kalynets’ was born in the town of Khodoriv in the L’viv Region in 1939. He attended L’viv State University from 1956 to 1961 and began a career as a poet. Later on he worked for the L’viv State Regional Archive and circulated poems through samvyday before his arrest in 1972.

94 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, pravy 412, ark. 73-79; fond P-92, opys 1, pravy 412, ark. 53-54.
Informal gatherings like these were mostly about having a good time, celebrating official holidays, birthdays, and the like. Yet they also provided a more intimate forum where students and young intellectuals evaded official restrictions on culture and expressed their attitudes toward the Soviet regime more openly. In "The Senate," older students arrested in Stalinist times told younger classmates about the postwar repression of Ukrainians.  

Young men from "The Bachelor" also tended to discuss politics among themselves, a fact that troubled university Party members.

In addition to these private discussions, students were finding out books and other publications banned by Soviet authorities, offering them a different perspective on their past and their literature. Through his friendship with older classmates in "The Senate," poet Ihor Kalynets' in the late 1950s gained access to a number of works by inter-war Galician writers, Ukrainian writers in inter-war Prague, and repressed Soviet Ukrainian writers from the 1920s and 1930s. These older classmates, survivors of Stalin’s camps, also shared with him *Nationalism*, a work by Dmytro Dontsov, a controversial writer from inter-war L’viv, as well as several copies of a literary journal that he edited in the inter-war years. Some students from the philological faculty in 1958 in their dormitory were reading Ukrainian novelists from interwar Galicia banned by Soviet authorities as “bourgeois nationalist,” which resulted in their expulsion.

---

95 Kalynets', interview.

96 However, the notebook of writings, which was presented at an evening at the faculty dormitory, had included the first statute of the Communist Party on the front page. DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 412, ark. 73-76.

97 Kalynets', interview; Shkrab’iuk, 30.
This underground culture of private meetings and exchanges of literature took on political dimensions that troubled local authorities, particularly after a worker uprising in Poland and a violent anti-Communist revolution in Hungary in the fall of 1956. Following the instructions of the Central Committee in Moscow of December 1956, local Party leaders by January 1957 found out a number of incidents of “anti-Soviet” remarks surfacing among students. According to one report, at a question-and-answer session at L’viv State University, a number of students had submitted anonymous questions that allegedly supported the Hungarian uprising, spoke favorably of “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists,” and paraphrased “anti-Soviet” remarks made by foreign radio stations.  

It was also in January that university Party leaders discovered that Ukrainian students in the university’s philological faculty were questioning the collectivization of agriculture and the Soviet state’s one-party system, as well as criticizing authorities’ treatment of Ukrainian literature.

While organized political opposition was impossible at the time, students in the aftermath of the Twentieth Party Congress of 1956, which criticized Stalin’s cult of personality, were debating the regime’s policies toward Ukrainians and suggesting a

---

98 These students, Mykhajlo Honchar, Iulian Lomnyts’kyj, and Levko Volovets’, were expelled from the Communist Youth and the university in June 1958 for reading in their dormitory and circulating among other students openly “nationalist” works, including the novels Poltava, by Bohdan Lepkyj, War and Revolution (Vijna i revolutsija), Volyn’, by Senchuk, and at least one work by Samchuk. Such works allegedly promoted Ukraine’s separation from Russia. DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 413, ark. 13, 15-16.

99 DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 116, ark. 72-73.

100 Regional Party committee official Chernysh made these comments before the regional Party committee’s plenum of 26 July 1957, dedicated to improving ideological and political work among youth. DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 137-39.
need for positive changes. While the regime tried to crack down on “anti-Soviet” remarks made in these debates, its ability to control these discussions was limited. “Anti-Soviet” remarks made at the university’s philological faculty did not become common knowledge until January 1957, when Communist Youth activists in the faculty, responding to Party leaders’ orders to root out “anti-Soviet” elements, began to uncover them.\textsuperscript{101} This fact brought accusations that the philological faculty’s Party committee had been too passive toward its students.\textsuperscript{102} Party leaders’ late response to “anti-Soviet” manifestations moreover was no isolated phenomenon. An all-Union Central Committee report acknowledged in 1957 that instructors and even Party and Communist Youth workers at institutions of higher education in L’viv only bothered to investigate students’ moods at during major crises like the Hungarian uprising.\textsuperscript{103}

For L’viv State University, a lack of housing space in the late 1950s, typical for many postwar Soviet cities, exacerbated this problem of not intervening more directly in students’ lives. In July 1957, university Party leaders, in speaking before the region’s Communists on ways to improve ideological work among students, pointed out that only 1,200 students of a student body of 4,300 lived in student dormitories while the rest had to fend for rooms in private apartments.\textsuperscript{104} According to university

\textsuperscript{101} The faculty Party committee, meeting in the first days of January 1957 voiced the need for better ideological work among students. Two days later, at a meeting of Communist Youth activists of the faculty, students made allegations of these discussions taking place. DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 137-39.

\textsuperscript{102} DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 138-39.

\textsuperscript{103} DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 56.

\textsuperscript{104} DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 7, ark. 98. Not all students would be lucky in finding apartments, either. The dean of the university’s chemistry faculty in 1957 claimed that students were spending the
chancellor Levhen Lazarenko, as of January 1958, over 60 percent of the student body was comprised of workers and peasants from Western Ukraine who came to L’viv without any place to live.\textsuperscript{105} According to university Party members in the late 1950s and early 1960s, such students faced a number of “harmful” influences outside their control, such as religious grandmothers who kept icons in their homes.\textsuperscript{106}

University Party leaders, attempting to win over students to the regime and also control their behavior, were justified in their concern about students who lived in private apartments. In the late 1950s, some students from L’viv State University found in apartments a refuge for important discussions on literature, politics, and other matters that dormitories discouraged. At private apartments, a small gathering of philology students, nicknamed the “Homorosy,” was able to debate the viability of the Soviet regime without reprisal.\textsuperscript{107} For philological students who were in “The Senate,” older classmates hosted their friends at their own apartments, and in this way they

\textsuperscript{105} DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 681, ark. 72.

\textsuperscript{106} DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 155, ark. 231.

\textsuperscript{107} Roman Ivanychuk, Blahoslovy, dushe moia, Hospoda… shchoden’nykovi zapysy, spohady i rozdumy (Bless the Lord, oh my soul… diary entries, recollections, and reflections) (L’viv: “Prosvita,” 1993), 83. The group’s name of “Homorosy” came from the names of members of this informal gathering of students, which included, besides Roman Ivanychuk and Anton Dotsenko, Ihor Motorniuk and two other classmates, Soltys and Holombiovs’kyj. Roman Ivanychuk was born in 1929 in the village of Trach in the Kosiv District of the Ivano-Frankiv’s’k Region. Expelled from L’viv State University because of his brother’s involvement in the UPA, he returned as a full-time student after Stalin’s death, finishing in 1957. He went on to become a member of the writers’ union in L’viv and work for the literary journal Zhovten’ in the 1960s.
exchanged banned literature and spoke more openly against the regime. As long as there were no informers around, students and other young intellectuals continued to ask questions among themselves about the Soviet regime’s future and investigate aspects of their culture that their professors were not allowed to teach them.

Local Party authorities did express great concern about “anti-Soviet” conversations and activities taking place among students and young intellectuals in L’viv. In all likelihood, however, they only took decisive action when a major political crisis, denunciations, or orders from above demanded it. Their late response to “anti-Soviet” moods among students at L’viv State University after the Hungarian revolt characterized this line of thinking. On the other hand, like their counterparts in the republic and the Soviet Union as a whole, they also sought to accommodate changes taking place in Soviet society after Stalin’s death. They did so by supporting cultural organizations for students and young intellectuals that were to foster more “healthy” developments among young scholars, writers, artists, and musicians that would promote a Ukrainian culture that was “national in form and socialist in content.” As the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956 criticized Stalin’s cult of personality, literary associations for young writers emerged at institutions of higher education and at nearly all city and district newspapers in the L’viv Region. As the regime began to relax its

108 Kalynets’, interview.

109 Volodymyr Kvitenyj, “Na shliakhu bor’by za ukrains’ke vidrodzhennia (iz spohadiy pro ‘shistsdesiatnykiv’)” (On the way to the struggle for the Ukrainian renaissance [from recollections of the “Sixtiers”]), Zhyvotoky (L’viv) 1 (January-March 1994), 12. Roman Ivanchuk in his memoirs recalls poet Dmytro Pavlychko directing a literary studio at L’viv State University in the late 1950s. Ivanchuk, 79. Ivanchuk has in mind Pavlychko as head of this studio, but by the early 1960s, when Pavlychko was in Kyiv, Rostislav Bratun’ began directing it. L’viv writers’ union protocols on 29 January 1962 mention Rostislav Bratun’ being appointed head of its literary studio for young writers. DALO, fond R-2009, 105
control over literature and allow young talents the opportunity to win readers’ hearts and minds, poet Rostyslav Bratun’, head of the writers’ union’s Office of the Young Writer, organized public poetry readings in front of the Lenin Monument downtown. At these Sunday poetry readings, known as the Young Writers’ Square, young poets, literary critics, and prose writers performed their works before the public. Soon actors, artists, and musicians joined in the festivities, thus renaming it Young Artist’s Square.\footnote{Iurii Zaitsev, “Antyrezhymnyj rukh (1956-1991)” (The anti-regime movement [1956-1991]), in L’viv: Istorychni narysy (L’viv: historical sketches), by Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp’iakevycha, NAN Ukrainy (L’viv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp’iakevycha, NAN Ukrainy, 1996), 564.}

The Club of Artistic Youth that became active in the Ukrainian cultural renaissance in L’viv from 1963 to 1965 was the clearest example of the regime encouraging nationally oriented activities among students and young intellectuals. In the republic’s capital, Kyiv, Party and Communist Youth leaders established the first such club in the late 1950s. It was meant to establish greater control over spontaneous gatherings that were taking place among the city’s young artists, writers, musicians, and scholars that did not belong to artistic unions.\footnote{See Kasianov, 18-21. The club was finally dissolved in 1964. As with other organizations, the city’s Communist Youth committee made this “initiative” to form this club.} Visits by young intellectuals from Kyiv in 1962 and friendships formed with them led counterparts in L’viv to consider organizing their own Club of Artistic Youth.\footnote{Ibid., 21. Kasianov suggests that this visit was in response to official pressure on the club in Kyiv that began in the fall of 1962, but Zaitsev, apparently from an oral interview, concludes that this trip had occurred earlier, around January-March 1962. Zaitsev, 563-64.}
As in other cities of Ukraine, a Club of Artistic Youth emerged in L’viv through the support of local Party and state authorities. This club, initiated in December 1962 and in its official organization phase by late May 1963, functioned under the department of mass cultural work of the regional committee of the Communist Youth. Writer Volodymyr Kvitnev'yj, a member of the regional committee, was officially in charge of the club, although Mykhajlo Kosiv, a graduate student in the history of Ukrainian literature at L’viv State University, was elected its president. At the organization’s beginning, there were about forty members from various fields of the arts. Active members in the organization included young intellectuals from all walks of life, older members of the intelligentsia, and some students as well.

---

113 Similar branches of the Club of Artistic Youth emerged in Odessa, Dnipropetrovs’k, Cherkassy, and other cities that young poets, critics, and directors from Kyiv, often on trips arranged by the Central Committee of the republic’s Communist Youth organization, would visit in the early 1960s. Kasiyov, 23.

114 Kvitnev'yj, 12; Zaitsev, 564. Zaitsev gives the time of the club’s organization as December 1962, when an initiative group formally met at the regional committee of the Communist Youth and made its appeal. Some of its activities were already taking place in early 1963, since club members first organized a literary evening in memory of the 50th anniversary of the death of Ukrainian poet Lesia Ukrainka in February of 1963. However, it may not have been fully organized at that point. Kvitnev'yj, who was also active with the local writers’ union, told fellow writers at open party meetings of the union on 24 May 1963 that this club of artistic youth, “Prolisok,” was currently being organized. DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 38, ark. 20.

115 Kvitnev'yj, 12-13. Those entering the presidia of this organization included music scholar Oleksandr Zelins’kyj, actor Iurij Brylins’kyj, writer Volodymyr Kvitnev’yj, art and literary scholar Bohdan Horyn’, musician Mariia Krushel’nys’tka, literary critic Mykola Il’nyts’kyj, and writer Volodymyr Luchuk. Mykhailo Kosiv, a literary scholar, became the organization’s chief secretary. Horyn’ was elected as his assistant. Kvitnev’yj became the organization’s chief secretary. Ibid., 12.

116 For a list of those who took part in Prolisok, see ibid.
This club, known also as “Prolisok (a Carpathian flower that blooms during late winter thaws),” encouraged within official channels a number of controversial activities among artistically inclined students and young intellectuals in L’viv. Like its counterpart in Kyiv, Prolisok sought to challenge official restrictions on culture through various literary evenings and concerts. With the premature death of poet Vasyl’ Symonenko in 1963, some of whose works authorities did not allow to be published, the club devoted a literary evening dedicated to his memory. Members of the club in 1964 had a literary evening for the "forgotten" writer Bohdan-Ihor Antonych, an inter-war Galician poet party officials saw as too supportive of "bourgeois nationalist" views. Shortly afterwards, they restored Antonych’s grave in Ianivs’kyj Cemetery in L’viv. Besides these evenings dedicated to cultural events, members also read and exchanged Ukrainian newspapers from abroad, articles on cultural and political issues, and works by contemporaries that were not officially published, such as manuscripts of the diary and unpublished poetry of Vasyl’ Symonenko.

117 According to one scholar, the club’s first activity, a literary evening dedicated to poet Lesia Ukrainka in February 1963, was held at the Actors’ Building. A city doctor, Olena Antoniv, one of those presiding over the evening, had placed a small bouquet of prolishok flowers from the Carpathians on the presidium table. The flower’s name thus became the name of the club. Zaitsev, 564.

118 Kvitnevyy, 13.

119 Shkrab’lick, 43-44.

120 Kvitnevyy, 13.
The club’s most controversial acts were connected with celebrations of the 150th anniversary of the birth of poet Taras Shevchenko, a Nineteenth Century national hero, in 1964. In early March, they held an alternative celebration of Shevchenko’s birth before an overflowing crowd at the city’s Palace of Professional Technical Education without local Party leaders’ approval. In May, club members sparked another scandal when, without local Party authorities’ permission, they went to Shevchenko’s grave in Kaniv to take part in the republic’s commemoration of Shevchenko’s burial there and laid a wreath before it. In conducting unorthodox literary evenings, reading underground literature, and commemorating Shevchenko outside the sanction of local Party authorities, both Party and Communist Youth leaders for the region began to take Kvitnevij to task. They accused him of making the Club of Artistic Youth into an organization of “nationalists” and “Banderites.” After strengthening their control over the club and harassing club members, local authorities went on to replace the club’s leadership altogether by the end of August 1965, after several arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals, particularly from L’viv.

Local officials’ support of the organization Prolisok was brief and reluctant. Yet it indicated the degree to which the regime attempted to co-opt and direct a number of unofficially sanctioned activities taking place among students and young

121 Ibid.
122 Ibid., 13-14.
123 Ibid.
124 Ibid; Zelins’kyj, interview.
intellectuals in the years after Stalin's death. While conforming to officials' expectations at school and in artistic and scholarly organizations, students and other young intellectuals born around the years 1934-44 were privately talking about the Soviet regime and its treatment of Ukrainians. In turning to repressed Soviet Ukrainian writers, literary movements popular in inter-war Galicia, and works in Ukrainian history condemned by the regime, they were exploring alternatives to the official Ukrainian culture that Stalinism had promoted. Official condemnation of Stalin's cult of personality only further encouraged these private discussions and investigations. But while officials tried to co-opt these activities and control them through official youth organizations, these organizations themselves became the source of further underground activities that the regime finally could no longer tolerate.

2.5 National Identity, Nonconformity, and the Post-Thaw Generation

As Party and state leaders in Soviet Ukraine and other republics cracked down on intellectuals who distributed samvydav materials in 1965-66, L'viv State University's Communists reacted swiftly, particularly since a number of those arrested and on trial were either from the university or university alumni.\(^{125}\) Old stalwarts who had struggled against "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" in Stalinist times, like historian Vasyl' Osechyn's'kyj, complained at a closed meeting on 15 June 1966 that

---

\(^{125}\) These included university correspondent student Ivan Heli, university instructors Mykhajlo Osadchyj and Mykhajlo Kosiv; psychologist Mykhajlo Horyn' and his brother Bohdan, an art scholar, university graduates; and archives worker Myroslava Zvarychevs'ka, also an alumnus of L'viv State University. Kas'tanov, 47-48.
they had gone too soft on the ideological front.\textsuperscript{126} As Osechyns'kyj and others called for greater vigilance, officially supported activities among students and young intellectuals faced greater scrutiny. At L'viv State University, even the repertoire of folk songs for the student choral ensemble, Cheremosh, came under fire from university chancellor Mykola Maksymovych on 15 June 1966 for manifesting “national particularism.”\textsuperscript{127}

As the political climate grew even more reactionary with the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the arrest of intellectuals in Soviet Ukraine and other republics in early 1972, literary associations and Communist Youth organizations lacked the dynamism of more relatively liberal years.

While refraining from political protest, many students and young intellectuals by the early 1970s had retreated to their own apartments in order to address questions they had about Ukrainian history and current developments in art, literature, and music. A few began to engage in dissident activity, circulating underground political materials critical of the regime’s policies toward Ukrainians. Yet many more simply sought out alternatives to official Soviet culture, reading foreign works in translation or seeking out copies of works that authorities had banned.

Some students from the history faculty of L'viv State University in the early 1970s were among those who were compelled to turn to underground activities to answer questions they had about Ukraine's past. In April 1971, five of them formed an unofficial circle to pursue questions in the history of Ukraine and its culture that the

\textsuperscript{126} DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 759, ark. 53.

\textsuperscript{127} DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 759, ark. 14-15.
official curriculum did not permit in class. At cafés and apartments, they met in secret to study works by historians of Ukraine that the authorities had banned, such as Mykhajlo Hrushev’s’kyj and Mykola Kostomarov, and study topics not offered at the university, such as “Ukrainian folklore as a source” and “Nechui-Levyts’kyj as a historian.”

By December 1972, members of this secret group of historians had turned to dissident activities. They began discussing the prospects of Ukraine’s peaceful secession from the Soviet Union as a socialist state, free of the Communist Party’s control. Through one of them, Ihor Khudyj, they joined up with another group of students and young people planning on distributing an underground journal, Progress (Postup). The group read articles from Postup, whose first issue was for November-December 1972. They also were reading underground works by Ivan Dziuba, a critic of Russification in Ukraine, and Valentyn Moroz, a political prisoner opposed to Soviet rule. Both Dziuba and Moroz were two prominent figures in Ukrainian underground literature (samvyday).

---

128 DALO, fond P-3567, opys 1, sprava 149, ark. 94-95. Members of this group of historians included Ihor Kozhan, Ivan Svarnyk, Stepan Sluka (leader of the group), Roman Kozovsky, Leonid Filonov, Ihor Khudyj, and Mar’iana Dolyns’ka. Rusnachenko, 199.

129 DALO, fond P-3567, opys 1, sprava 149, ark. 94-95; DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 1007, ark. 53.

130 Leonid Filonov, who had joined the research group at the university’s department of the history of Ukraine in November 1972, told the history faculty’s Party organization that he did not read “nationalist” literature until December of that year. DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 1007, ark. 53. Zaitsev, citing another secondary source, argues that this group became more involved in political activities after October 1972, turning to underground political literature and considering Ukraine’s secession from the Soviet Union. Zaitsev, 592.

131 Rusnachenko, 198-99.

132 DALO, fond P-3567, opys 1, sprava 149, ark. 94-95; Rusnachenko, 199.
By February 1973, this small cohort of history students had come up with a political program for Ukraine's independence. On 27-28 March, their activities came to the attention of state security organs when a number of them were arrested for putting up leaflets protesting the local authorities' suspension of annual public celebrations of the birth and death of Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko. The university's Communist Youth committee as a result expelled these students from their ranks and had them dismissed from school.¹³³

This informal gathering of students from the history faculty had definitely crossed the line into dissident activity by considering plans for Ukraine's secession from the Soviet Union. According to one of the participants, reading political tracts by Dziuba and Moroz, two prominent figures in Ukraine's dissident movement by the early 1970s, as well as articles from the underground journal Postup were major reasons why they had turned to political protest.¹³⁴

Yet political protest was not one of their initial motives for meeting secretly. If anything, they had questions about Ukrainian history and such political issues as discrimination against Ukrainians' language and culture that they feared sharing with classmates or faculty.¹³⁵ One student told faculty Party members that one of the reasons he and others had turned to these secret scholarly investigations and political

¹³³ Ibid., 204-205; Zaitsev, 593-94.

¹³⁴ DALO, fond P-3567, opys 1, sprava 149, ark. 94-95.

¹³⁵ This group of students had agreed not to extend its membership without all the members' consent, indicating the degree to which these students feared reprisals by potential informers. Zaitsev, 592.
discussions because they were reluctant to talk about these things with instructors, fearing they would not understand their motives. Another student suggested that she had gotten involved in these secret meetings because Ukrainian students were being falsely accused of "nationalism," and she was too afraid to raise her objections to faculty members, afraid that she, too, would be perceived as a "nationalist." Furthering their interests in Ukrainian history and culture rather than political protest remained their main goals. These history students had turned to underground activities and then political activities because they simply could no longer in any public forum address major questions they had about their nation's past and discrimination against Ukrainians.

With authorities suspicious of any manifestation of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism," any sort of independent student activity by these students and others had become a locus of suspected rebellion. At one Communist Youth committee hearing for these students, one member complained of a “certain passivity” among the university’s Communist Youth students. The committee resolved to intensify control over students’ lives, such as conducting individual discussions with them, evening programs on political events with question and answer sessions, and further study of

---

136 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 1007, ark. 53.

137 DALO, fond P-3567, opys 1, sprava 149, ark. 97.

138 The fact that these students in the history faculty prior to their discovery by state security organs continued to act autonomously of the group associated with the underground political journal Postup suggests that these students were more concerned with furthering their interests in Ukrainian history and culture than with actual political programs. See Rusnachenko, 205.
students' time spent outside class. Like others, this small group of students from the history faculty were part of a wider phenomenon of young people withdrawing from the greater collective and asserting their own identities, in this case as young scholars concerned about the fate of Ukrainians' language, history, and culture. Unlike the early 1960s, however, there was no university organization willing to accommodate their needs.

These history faculty students were not alone in their retreat underground. Ukrainian literature in the years after the “thaw” became more reactionary, and increasing numbers of innovative writers no longer found publishers willing to accept them. In L'viv, young writers and artists in their late teens and early twenties who gathered at the apartment of poet Hryhorij (Hryts'ko) Chubaj consequently sought to prove their literary talents in private in the early 1970s. In 1971, those literary youth closest to Chubaj came up with the idea to compile an underground journal for themselves, called The Chest (Skrynia).

---

139 DALO, fond P-3567, opys 1, sprava 149, ark. 117.

140 On writers in the late 1960s and beyond who were barred from official publication, see Kas'ianov, 82.

141 Recent memoirs by visitors to the Chubaj home on Pohulianka Street, published in the first comprehensive collection of Chubaj’s works, give a good impression of this intellectual exchange that took place. See Volodymyr Ivor's'kyj, “Vse sti dvo spavyzhniym lyshe pid osin’” (Only with fall does everything become real), in Hryts'ko Chubaj, Plach Jeremii: poeziiia, pereklady, spohady (Jeremiah's coat: poetry, translations, recollections) (L'viv: Kal'varia, 1998), 235-86; Volodymyr Kaufman, “Hryts'ko Chubaj i L'viv” (Hryts'ko Chubaj and L'viv), in idem, 301-303; Iurko Kokh, “Vidnajdeni fajly” (Retrieved files), in idem, 260-62; Viktor Morozov, ‘Nasha osin’ z malen'kymy derevamy duzhe shvydko mnyula…” (“Our fall of small trees passed quickly…”), in idem, 267; and Mykola Riabchuk, “Kinets’ odnii epokhy” (The end of an epoch), in idem, 276-77.
The idea for the journal came from an innocent game these literary friends played while at the Chubaj home on Pohulianka Street. In the toilet room, they pasted up various combinations of newspapers and headlines that were completely incompatible with each other, making ridiculous news stories that would make people laugh. It was most likely from this game that Chubaj apparently encouraged his literary friends to put this journal together.\(^{142}\) As one of the journal’s participants, Mykola Riabchuk, recalled years later, everyone involved in the journal consciously strove to make it purely aesthetic and not political. They aimed to begin a journal of avant-garde works by those who knew they stood no chance of being published officially. If anything was “anti-Soviet” in Chubaj’s company, writes Riabchuk, it was the fact that this company of friends, in being intellectually independent and at least internally free, had an aesthetic scorn for the “socialist realism” of official culture.\(^{143}\)

Chubaj and other contributors to this underground journal suffered from various forms of harassment by the KGB in early 1972 and 1973. Chubaj’s connections with the Ihor and Iryna Kalynets’, two poets from L’viv arrested for dissident activities, as well as with other dissidents such as Viacheslav Chornovil’, most likely provoked his arrest in the first half of 1972.\(^{144}\) With Chubaj’s arrest, KGB

\(^{142}\) Riabchuk, “Kinets’ odnii epokhy,” 278; interview. On these humorous toilet collages, see also Halyna Chubaj, “Z vesny – u vichnist’” (From spring to eternity), in Piach Jeremii: poeziiia, pereklady, spohady (Jeremiah’s coat: poetry, translations, recollections), by Hryts’ko Chubaj, (L’viv: Kal’varia, 1998), 308-309.

\(^{143}\) Riabchuk, “Kinets’ odnii epokhy,” 278; interview.

\(^{144}\) Riabchuk, 273, 278-79. Riabchuk recalls Halyna Chubaj telling him of her husband’s arrest on 13 January 1972, the day after these mass arrests. On arrests throughout Ukraine on 12 January 1972, see Kas’ianov, 122-23.
investigators confiscated a copy of the journal and began to question its contributors.  

The KGB investigations and the Communist Youth hearings that followed at some of these youths’ institutions of higher education bore all the traces of a witch-hunt. 

While artistically-oriented students and young intellectuals like Chubaj and his friends retreated from official literary activities, there were also broader segments among the student body that also must have been disaffected with the official culture by the beginning of the 1970s. According to one regional Party committee official in 1971, students at the state conservatory in L’viv were spending too little time reading the classics of Soviet literature, a must for “Soviet patriotism.” In 1970, of 1,439 copies of artistic literature borrowed by patrons from the conservatory library, 866 copies were of foreign works and only 573 were by domestic writers. A similar situation existed among students at the art institute. Officially published literary works must have been turning off significant portions of the student body in addition to those more artistically inclined.

---

145 Riaibchuk, 273. Riaibchuk recalls cowardly rumors spreading through town about Chubaj cooperating with the KGB, rumors which he says were completely false. He suggests that Chubaj simply could not withstand the psychological torture and was more a poet than a fighter. Ibid., 278-81. Halyna Chubaj, recalling her husband’s return from the KGB, suspects that investigators may have beaten him, based on his physical appearance. Chubaj, interview.

146 Mykola Riaibchuk was expelled from the city’s polytechnic institute in the spring of 1973. Oleh Lysheha and Viktor Morozov were expelled from the university the preceding fall, as was Orest Ivors’kyj from the city’s Institute of Decorative and Applied Art. Kateryna Morozova, on leave, managed to survive expulsion, and Roman Kis’ and Volodymyr Onyshchenko were able to finish school in the spring of 1972. Riaibchuk, 281. None of the participants faced prison, presumably because there was no “anti-Soviet” political material in the journal. Riaibchuk, interview.

147 DALO, Fond P-3, opys 16, sprava 51, ark. 121-22.
In the early 1970s, students and young intellectuals were resisting official restrictions on Ukrainians' history and culture despite the end of Khrushchev's "thaw." For those Ukrainian youth interested in finding out more about their nation’s history and culture, official institutions had become too reactionary to provide a place for self-discovery and fulfillment. For budding historians, ideological restraints and an increasingly reactionary atmosphere at such institutions as L'viv State University alienated them from instructors and caused them to look in secret to other sources for answers. For literary youth, literary studios, unlike during the “thaw,” were no longer places for innovation and experiment. Instead, trips to the Chubaj home became regular visits to more amorphous literary studios completely outside official control. Potential readers of Soviet Ukrainian writers’ works likewise were heading off to read foreign works available in translation at institute (and presumably university) libraries. While party and state officials may have won the political battle against opponents of the regime by the mid-1970s, the cultural war was far from over.

2.6 Women in the Underground Cultural Revolution

Subcultures that resisted the constraints of official Soviet culture and proposed an alternative national identity for Ukrainians also affected gender roles among young people in L'viv. Some women from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s took on values and forms of behavior that clashed with official assumptions about women's roles in society. As students and young intellectuals gathered informally to debate the regime's treatment of Ukrainians and their language and culture, women took on important roles
supporting and leading this underground movement. They also figured prominently in what eventually became the human rights movement in Soviet Ukraine by the mid-1970s.

As Party and state leaders in L’viv from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s dealt with the “harmful” values created by young people’s subcultures, women faced particular scrutiny. First Party secretary Ivan Hrushets’kyj, for instance, touched on what he deemed was acceptable behavior for women when in 1962, before Party and public meetings, he denounced young people who “bowed before” popular culture from the capitalist West. Besides taking young people to task for listening to rock and roll music and dancing the boogie woogie, he emphasized that some young women spent too much time following the West in the latest fashions in hairstyle and dress. By contrast, nineteenth century scholar and revolutionary Sofiia Kovalevskaia, was far more modest, wearing a white blouse and black skirt, “clothes worthy of Russian women.”

Hrushets’kyj’s sympathetic references to Kovalevskaia were ironic, since she and other “New Women” of the mid-nineteenth century dressed modestly and pursued a higher education to rebel against the established order. Yet Hrushets'kyj was suggesting that women’s proper role in society was to be modest and self-sacrificing, not giving into the “excesses” of the bourgeois West’s consumer culture. His speech

---

148 DALO, fond P-380, opys 1, sprava 261, ark. 316; DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 424, ark. 23.

no doubt resonated with broader segments of the population accustomed to scarce consumer goods. One former student at L’viv State University from 1956 to 1961, poet Ihor Kalynets’, recalled that his female classmates, a majority of whom were natives of Western Ukraine, tended to be very modest in their dress. By contrast, daughters of military officers who came to live in the city in the immediate postwar years tended to be stylish and immodest.¹⁵⁰ Since military officers’ families did represent a privileged elite in the city, these daughters no doubt did have better access to new fashions from the West. Party leaders like Hrushets’kyj may have been concerned about such outward manifestations of privilege by a few, advocating as an alternative ideal the “feminine beauty” that Kovalevskaja in his view represented.¹⁵¹

Similar allusions to women’s ideal behavior surfaced when a Communist Youth leader at L’viv State University in 1968 complained about female students from the philological faculty who smoked in student bathrooms. This leader’s report claimed that “girls smoke like Zaporizhian Cossacks,” referring to Ukrainian peasant rebels of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, “sucking it all in (hlyboko zatiahuiuchys’), (with) even tears in their eyes.” Taking exception to these women’s justification that “even boys smoke,” this report called on philology faculty students to live up to higher moral standards.¹⁵² In making negative comparisons to Cossack warriors and calling on these philology students to be more attentive to the image they

¹⁵⁰ Kalynets’, interview.

¹⁵¹ DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 424, ark. 23.

¹⁵² DALO, fond P-3567, opys 1, sprava 63, ark. 59.
were projecting, this Communist Youth leader suggested that young women were not living up to the model of moral purity they were expected to emulate. Similar complaints had also surfaced in the Russian Empire in the mid-nineteenth century as women revolutionaries took to smoking as a form of social protest.\textsuperscript{153}

Drinking bouts, a fascination for jazz and rock music and Western fashions, and other aspects of the cultural revolution taking place among young people in L’viv in this manner affected perceptions of gender roles among local authorities. In chastising young people who failed to behave as “cultured” Soviet citizens, Party and state leaders in the city assumed an ideal role for young women as modest, self-sacrificing, and wholesome. Following Western fashion and smoking for them were either representative of the “decadent” West or male behavior unbecoming for women. Those who behaved this way were violating gender roles deemed acceptable for young people in Soviet society.

Subcultures of students and young intellectuals who questioned the Soviet regime’s policies toward Ukrainians and their language and culture also challenged women’s expected role in society. In the cultural establishment, women’s roles were quite often marginal. For instance, when poet Ivan Hushchak recalled members of the writers’ union, journalists, and publishers drinking together in a city bar nicknamed the “Village Soviet (Sil’rada)” from the early 1950s to the 1970s, nearly all the guests he

\textsuperscript{153}On this trend among women revolutionaries in mid-nineteenth century Russia, see Pushkareva.
mentioned were men. Men also dominated some underground circles of students and young intellectuals. Besides the informal group of university physics students and graduate students nicknamed “The Bachelor” in the late 1950s, the company of young writers that gathered at the home of Hryhorij Chubaj in 1970-72 and put together the journal The Chest (Skrynia) was mostly male. Yet women in official circles and more often in unofficial ones did become significant participants in Ukrainians’ cultural renaissance that local authorities had perceived as a “nationalist” threat by the mid-1960s.

Novelist Iryna Vîl’dë (1907-1982), a prominent member of the writers’ union and its head in the second half of the 1960s, had acquired a reputation for defending Ukrainians in L’viv. Vîl’dë, a member of the older intelligentsia of inter-war Galicia, as a loyal Soviet citizen wrote a letter to Stalin in the late 1940s criticizing discrimination against natives of Western Ukraine and their language and culture. In more liberal times, she vigorously supported cultural activities for young people. In late 1961, she urged regional Party secretary Hrushets’kyj to consider establishing a

---


155 On the informal group known as “The Bachelor,” see DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 412, ark. 73-79; fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 412, ark. 53-54. Memoirs by Chubaj’s friends suggest that this circle of literary friends in 1971-72, except for Viktor Morozov’s wife Kateryna and Chubaj’s wife Halyna, was male. See Hryts’ko Chubaj, Plach Jeremi, poeziiia, pereklady, spohady (Jeremiah’s coat: poetry, translations, recollections) (L’viv: Kal’varia, 1998), 253-310.

156 This letter to Stalin, dated 3 October 1949, is from TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 23, sprava 5686, and reproduced in full in Viktor Kostiuchenko, “Zapytannia Irynî Vîl’dë ‘Vozhdevi’ Stalini i s’ohodnîsh’onu dniu” (Iryna Vîl’dë’s question to the ‘Leader’ Stalin and today), Dzvin (L’viv) 2 (February 2000): 113-14.
coffee shop to foster more constructive activities among them. Writers and artists who began their careers in the late 1950s and early 1960s recalled Vil’de hosting young intellectuals at her home and at her dacha in the Carpathian Mountains, as well as leading them on trips to various parts of Ukraine.

Finding her a source of moral support, young intellectuals in the 1960s nicknamed Vil’de “Nanasha,” which meant “godmother” in West Ukrainian. In the years after Stalin’s death, Vil’de, perceived as the traditional “godmother,” had become a major authority figure in the more official side of the national cultural revolution taking place in L’viv. Vil’de was an example of intellectuals who used their traditional roles as women as mothers to resist official restrictions on culture within the intellectual establishment.

---

157 DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 255, ark. 20.

158 Emmanuil Mys’ko and Mykola Petrenko, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 24 March 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University. Mys’ko (1929-2000), a sculptor who became head of the artists’ union in L’viv in the mid-1960s and who was chancellor of the L’viv State Academy of Art from the late 1980s until his death, was born in present-day Poland. As with other Ukrainians, he was resettled with his family to Western Ukraine after the war. He studied at the L’viv School (uchlyshche) of Applied and Decorative Art from 1945 to 1950 and then at the L’viv Institute of Applied and Decorative Art from 1950 to 1956. Novelist Roman Fedoriv (1930-2001), at the time a journalist in nearby Ivano-Frankivs’k, recalled such gatherings with Vil’de in the 1960s and in later years in “Derevo Iryny Vil’de” (Iryna Vil’de’s tree), in Skrypka, sbcho hrai tysiacli lit (The fiddle that plays for a thousand years) (L’viv: “Chervona Kalyna,” 1991), 168. See also recollections of Vil’de in Ivanychuk, 92-93.

159 Kosiv, interview; Larysa Kadyrova, interview by the author, Kyiv, tape recording, 10 November 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University; Fedoriv, 158; Roman Ivanychuk, 91. Kadyrova, born in 1943 in L’viv, became an actress at the Maria Zan’kovets’ka Theater in L’viv. Among other productions at this theater, she starred in a dramatization of Vil’de’s novel, The Richyns’kyj Sisters (Sestry Richyns’ki), in the late 1960s.

160 The Writers’ Union of Ukraine, recommending Vil’de to succeed the late Petro Kozlaniuk as head of the writers’ union in L’viv on 5 April 1965, noted that Vil’de, who had just won the republic Shevchenko Prize for her novel, The Richyns’ki Sisters (Sestry Richyns’ki), enjoyed authority among L’viv writers and Ukrainian writers in general. TsDAMLIMU, fond 590, opys 1, sprava 696, ark. 16.
While Vil’de had become a mother figure for young intellectuals in the early 1960s, younger contemporaries also took part in encouraging unofficial activities supporting Ukrainians’ culture. The art studio of sculptor Feodosiia Bryzh (1929-1999) hosted intellectuals young and old in the late 1950s and early 1960s. According to some of Bryzh’s friends, as well as her husband, Ievhen Beznisko, people at these gatherings sang Ukrainian folk songs, talked about literature, philosophy, and art, and celebrated official holidays together.\textsuperscript{161} Women played a significant role in private circles of students and young people who grew up under the influence of village folk culture. Ihor Kalynets’ recalled that at the Ukrainian department of the university’s philological faculty, where he was a student from 1956 to 1961, a majority of the students were women, and these women often sang Ukrainian folk songs with each other.\textsuperscript{162}

Young women also became particularly prominent in the cultural underground that began to challenge the regime in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Poet Iryna Kalynets’ recalled that many of her friends who had become political prisoners by the early 1970s were women, and male and female political prisoners commonly referred

\textsuperscript{161} Ievhen Beznisko, interview by author, L’viv, tape recording, 20 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University; Marynia Uhliar, interview by author, L’viv, tape recording, 11 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University; Roman Ivanychuk, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 19 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University. Beznisko, a graphic artist and monumental painter, was born in 1937. He completed his education at the L’viv Institute of Applied and Decorative Art in 1964. Uhliar, a native of the Ternopil’ Region, studied music at the L’viv State Conservatory in the mid-1950s. The child of musicians, she became an instructor at this conservatory. On these gatherings at Bryzh’s shop, see also Ivanychuk, 98.

\textsuperscript{162} Kalynets’ interview.
to each other on equal terms as “brothers and sisters,” much like the early Christians in Roman times. Her husband, Ihor, wrote many poems to women who had become political prisoners or suspected victims of police organs in the 1970s. Recent scholars’ accounts of dissent in Soviet Ukraine likewise suggest that women played an active role either as political prisoners or as an informal network of support for them.

Women therefore were both affirming and subverting accepted gender roles as they took part in the subcultures forming among young people in the two decades after Stalin’s death. Among young people who resisted the rules they were expected to follow in Soviet society, either by “bowing to the West” or by engaging in “uncultured” habits like smoking, women came into conflict with the ideal woman constructed by Party and state leaders and broader segments of society. When it came to matters of national self-expression, women quite often did not enjoy positions of

163 Iryna (Stasiv) Kalynets’, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 12 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University. Kalynets’, born in 1940 in L’viv, studied philology at L’viv State University from 1959 to 1964. As with her husband Ihor, she became a poet, circulating her works in samvydav form. She worked at the regional People’s Art Center in L’viv and then at various teaching and library jobs before her arrest in 1972.

164 Among such poems that Kalynets’ wrote were two poems for Alla Hors’ka, an outspoken artist from Kyiv murdered possibly by the KGB in 1970, “Triptych for Alla Hors’ka (Tryptykh dla Ally Hors’koj)” and “Conversation with a Princess (Rozmova z kniazhoj)” in Wine for a Princess (Vino dla kniazhny) (1971), a collection of poems dedicated to his imprisoned wife, Iryna, entitled Realities (Realii) (1972), and a number of other poems when Kalynets’ was imprisoned and exiled in 1973-81. See Ihor Kalynets’, Slovo tryvauche: poezii (The enduring word: poetry) (Kharkiv: “Folio,” 1997).

power in the intellectual establishment, and in some cases they were not involved in underground circles as much as men. Yet in a time of social and cultural upheaval, where the beginnings of a dissident movement took shape in Soviet Ukraine, women were at the forefront.\(^{166}\) While not directly challenging women’s role in society, they were subverting it by assuming positions of moral authority in informal cultural activities, at times in the cultural establishment, and quite often in matters of political opposition.

2.7 Conclusion

While students and other youth in L’viv were not taking to the streets in protest as their counterparts did in many parts of the world in 1968, they did share many of the same values emerging among youth worldwide in the decades after World War II. They were involved in the emergence of youth subcultures that challenged authority in both ways of thinking and in modes of behavior. In L’viv and other Soviet cities, urban gangs and unofficial gatherings engaged in drinking bouts and the like challenged mainstream society. Consumer culture from America and Western Europe found its way to youth in L’viv and other cities and caused them to blend their own mixture of rock and roll, village folk culture, and official cultural activities in their daily behavior. By the 1970s, a Soviet hippie movement and growing popularity of Western rock demonstrated the degree to which Party and state officials had to tolerate or

\(^{166}\) I owe this to a personal conversation with literary scholar Solomea Pavlychko, Kyiv, on 25 October 1999.
accommodate youth subcultures. Such subcultures, while perhaps loyal to the Soviet
regime, challenged the regime’s official values, such as an emphasis on modesty,
chastity, collective behavior, and a refusal to “bow to the West.”

As some youth subcultures increasingly turned to patterns of young behavior
found in the postwar West, others involving students and young intellectuals with
interests in Ukrainian literature, history, music, art, and the like also took shape in the
years after Stalin’s death. Some engaged in heated political discussions, reflecting the
particular situation that native Ukrainians from the western regions faced after the war,
with memories of repression under Stalin still fresh in their memories. Other young
people turned to their interests in the history and culture of Ukraine through official
organizations, whose activities were being increasingly encouraged by the more liberal
political climate of the “thaw.” In the early 1960s, such organizations eventually
paved the way for the emergence of the Club of Artistic Youth, known as “Prolisok,”
which encouraged closer associations with nationally oriented students and young
intellectuals. This club to a considerable degree encouraged a more critical stance
toward official culture on the part of youth. Increasingly independent activities of the
club’s members, accompanied by a more reactionary regime, brought about the club’s
demise in 1965.

As party and state authorities in the late 1960s and early 1970s cracked down
on all forms of dissent and national self-expression, their ability to accommodate such
young energies diminished. Students and other youth turned to a variety of unofficial
activities to further their interests in art, literature, history, and the like. More
reactionary times in fact led to greater alienation among youth and caused them to revolt in their own quiet way, in people’s apartments, in cafés, behind the covers of foreign books, and sometimes under the sound of Western rock music. Among more intellectually inclined youth and their less articulate counterparts, an underground cultural revolution of its own had taken place in L’viv by the middle of the 1970s. This revolution in turn challenged perceptions of women’s roles in society and gave women positions of power in the cultural underground and at times in the cultural establishment.
CHAPTER 3

COOPERATION, CONFLICT, AND RESISTANCE IN THE CULTURAL ESTABLISHMENT

L’viv’s establishment intellectuals – members of artistic unions – faced very turbulent years when political dissent emerged in Ukraine and other parts of the Soviet Union in the mid-1960s. With Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev’s fall from power in late 1964, central party leaders sought to crack down on dissent and soften criticism of Stalin’s legacy. In Moscow in February 1966, Andrei Siniavskii and Iulii Daniel, two satirists who had published abroad, were put on trial for “anti-Soviet” activity and were given long prison sentences. Dozen of arrests occurred in Soviet Ukraine at the end of August and the beginning of September 1965 among members of the intelligentsia that were involved in such “anti-Soviet” activity as possessing and circulating underground (samvyday) literature.¹

Many of those arrested in Soviet Ukraine were young intellectuals from L’viv. The authorities put them on trial in a closed courtroom in the city the following spring. At one of these trials, the first sounds of open political protest since the defeat of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) in the early 1950s began to resound on the

¹ On these arrests in Ukraine, see especially Heorhij Kas’ianov, Nezhodni: ukraïns’ka intelihentsiia v russi oporu 1960-80-x rokiv (Dissenters: the Ukrainian intelligentsia in the opposition movement, 1960s-80s) (Kyiv: “Lybid’,” 1995), 47-64.
city streets in mid-April 1966. Novelist Roman Ivanychuk describes in his memoirs the tense atmosphere as demonstrators, mostly youth, assembled outside the court building on 16 April 1966. Demanding entry into the trial chambers, they protested the authorities’ arbitrariness, greeted the prisoners with “Glory (slava)!” and shouted “Shame (han’ba)!“ at policemen. Ivanychuk took part in these demonstrations – involving the first picketers in Soviet times, he claims – more as an outraged observer. Once he tried to approach one of the prisoners, his friend Bohdan Horyn’, only to be pushed away by one of the policemen separating demonstrators from where the accused were being escorted into the regional prosecutor’s office on Pekars’ka Street.

Ivanychuk goes on to describe arriving in the offices of the journal Zhovten (October), soaking wet from fire hoses sprayed onto the crowd. In the offices of this republic-level literary journal, some members of artistic unions and workers of major cultural institutions had assembled to respond to this situation. Deciding that a direct

---

2 Among those from L’viv arrested were white collar workers S. Baturyn and Hana Sadovs’ka, correspondence student Ivan Hel’, psychologist Mykhajlo Horyn’, art scholar Bohdan Horyn’, university instructors Mykhajlo Osadchij and Mykhajlo Kosiv, literary critic and artist Mykhajlo Masiutko, modeller Jaroslav Menkush, and archival worker Myroslava Zvarychevs’ka. Ibid., 47-48, 55-56.

3 Rroman Ivanychuk, Blahoslovy, dushe moja, Hospod’a... shchodennykovi zapysy, spohady i rozdumy (Bless the Lord, oh my soul... diary entries, recollections, and reflections) (L’viv: “Prosvita,” 1993), 123. Ivanychuk describes these events of 16 April 1966, while such demonstrations also occurred on 15 and 18 April. In a report to the republic’s Central Committee, regional Party committee secretary Vasylo Kutsevol estimated the crowd outside the court building on 15 April to have been about 30 people in all. Ivanychuk must have witnessed a similar-sized crowd the next day. Derzhavnyj Arkhiv L’vivs’koi Oblasti (DALO), fond P-3, opys 9, sprava 225, ark. 57-63, in Tamara Halajchak et al., eds., Zakhidni zemli, 1953-1966 (The western lands, 1953-1966), vol. 2 of Kul’turne zhytтя v Ukraini (Culture in Ukraine) (L’viv: Instytut Ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp’iakevycha, NAN Ukrainy, 1995), 691.

4 Ivanychuk, 123.
protest was too risky, the group chose to submit to the court a petition asking that Horyn’, the youngest of those arrested, be freed on their guarantee as members of the intelligentsia.  

Ivanychuk, himself then a rather young novelist at the time in his late 30s, looks back on their act to protect his friend Horyn’ as a noble moment of alliance with those defending Ukraine’s freedom from behind bars. He mentions that they had to leave the offices of Zhovten’ because one poet, Mykola Romanchenko, whom he calls the KGB’s main man at the journal, was listening in on them behind an office door. They went to the home of Iryna Vil’de, a prominent writer from the interwar generation of Galician intellectuals who had just been awarded the republic’s Shevchenko prize for her novel, Sestry Richyns’ki. “Boys, we’re doing a great thing!” she said proudly as she signed her name to the petition, which Ivanychuk and writer Iakiv Stetsiuk took to a reluctant prosecutor. Signatories of the petition became objects of scorn at Party, institute, and union meetings shortly thereafter and had to repent. Yet in the end, Ivanychuk recalls the signing of this petition as a heroic moment where the “barricades,” as he puts it, were being drawn in literary life in Soviet Ukraine.  

How much is Ivanychuk telling the truth, two years after the Soviet Union collapsed, Ukraine became an independent state, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union a historical relic? The answer may be not very much. Ivanychuk was a member of the Communist Party, and he and the writers of this petition all refused to

5 Ibid.
6 Ibid., 123-124.
join the underground political opposition whose ideas were being circulated in
samvyday manuscripts in L’viv and other Ukrainian cities in the 1960s and 1970s.

Yet Ivanchuk’s story suggests that in protecting one of their colleagues, who
was an opponent of the regime, there were intellectuals in the cultural establishment
who negotiated with the Soviet state as they maintained loyalty to it. It also indicates
that there were divisions within the cultural establishment, as evinced by
Romanchenko’s spying on his fellow writers. Writers and artists were taking
positions in the establishment that some of their colleagues, supported by regional
Party leaders, perceived as a threat. In this manner they participated in a discourse
with the state that legitimized and undermined Soviet authority at the same time.

This chapter considers how members of the artists’ and writers’ unions in
L’viv engaged in a dual process of legitimation and subversion after the death of
Soviet leader Joseph Stalin in 1953. Khrushchev, one of Stalin’s successors,
criticized Stalin’s cult of personality in 1956. In succeeding years, he began to widen
popular participation within Party and state institutions. Members of the artists’ and
writers’ unions in L’viv took advantage of the occasion. Besides seeking to improve
working and living conditions for colleagues, members of the artists’ union promoted
regional artistic traditions and defended artistic innovations against critics. Members
of the writers’ union demanded fairer conditions for provincial writers, a
reassessment of the official canon of Ukrainian literature, and greater respect for the
Ukrainian language.
Artists and writers who took these positions maintained their loyalty to the Soviet state, yet others perceived them to be supporting "ideologically unsound" views. Colleagues in the artists' union clashed over what exactly constituted acceptable Soviet art. They were also not in total agreement with what aspects of Soviet Ukrainian culture could be commemorated. In the writers' union, fierce disagreements broke out over the status of the Ukrainian language, revisions of the official literary canon, and what standards could be applied to new literary works. This chapter will suggest that these disputes, which led to charges of "formalism," "nationalism," and other ideological deviations, were often fueled by personal rivalries and a competition for power, privileges, and scarce resources. Yet real differences in perception of national identity and what was acceptable art and literature also played a major role in fueling these antagonisms.

3.1 Co-optation and Cooperation: Establishment Artists and Their Privileges

L'viv artists and other Soviet citizens experienced chronic housing shortages for decades after the war. Local officials in L'viv compounded this problem by arbitrarily taking over artists' studios and apartments to give to more privileged members of society. Senior sculptor Ivan Severa experienced this firsthand when military officers took over his shop and apartment in the winter of 1945, destroying
some of his works in the process. Shortly afterward, a military officer, twice awarded Hero of the Soviet Union, took an apartment the city Soviet had already given Severa.\(^7\)

The artists’ union thus performed no small task as a crucial agency to help artists find housing space and studios for sculpting, painting, and graphic work. In 1956, for instance, the union supported legal claims a member made to a home lost during World War II and intervened to help another colleague register as a city resident.\(^8\) Providing more studios for artists was a regular item on the union’s agenda, and artists for their part sought to point out the need for more studios whenever the occasion arose. Some artists, for example, claimed at a union meeting on 25 February 1959 that they were not prepared enough for a major exhibit of Ukrainian art to be held in Moscow in 1960 because they lacked art studios. While one of their union leaders doubted that they were giving a valid reason, he suggested that the republic’s government agencies could include room for new art studios in upcoming construction plans for the city.\(^9\)

As artists struggled to find apartments and studios for their work, they reflected the degree to which establishment intellectuals throughout the 1950s and 1960s were competing for scarce resources, quite often at odds with local Party and

\(^{7}\) Bohdan Bohdan Horyn’, U poshukakh bereha: zhyttia i tvorchist’ skulptora Ivana Severa (In search of glory: the life and art of sculptor Ivan Severa) (L’viv: Instytut Ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp’ta kvy cha, 1995), 197. In the winter of 1945, soldiers of the headquarters of the Sub-Carpathian Military Okrug took over Severa’s apartment and shop, throwing out his recent works on Ivan Honta, Ivan Franko, Taras Shevchenko, and Lesia Ukrainka. Ibid., 196-97.

\(^{8}\) DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 183, ark. 156, 167.

\(^{9}\) DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 217, ark. 14.
state officials. Besides the incident with Severa in 1945, another artist speaking before a union meeting in 1959 complained of local authorities trying to evict him from his studio for no just cause.\textsuperscript{10} The competition for scarce living space also took on tensions between natives of Western Ukraine and outsiders who came to the city after the war. The head of the writers’ union, Petro Kozlaniuk, a native of the region, enjoyed many of the privileges of the Soviet elite. Yet he complained in his diary in 1959 that twenty years of Soviet rule in the region did more to benefit outsiders when it came who received the best apartments, the best jobs, and other privileges.\textsuperscript{11}

The artists’ union, as with other cultural institutions, thus offered important advantages to its members. Some artists, to be sure, managed to make a living despite not belonging to the union. An artists’ union memo to the city’s Party committee in September 1959, for instance, pointed out that there were artists privately sculpting memorial stones for cemeteries, which the memo claimed had lowered the quality of memorial stones in the city’s historic Lychakivs’kyj Cemetery.\textsuperscript{12} Besides private work, some independent artists found jobs at state projects. Bohdan Soroka in an interview said that he was able to find such work in the 1960s without joining the union.\textsuperscript{13} Yet membership in the union offered its material advantages, including a much better chance to obtain studios and improved housing space in an economy of scarcity.

\textsuperscript{10} DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 217, ark. 46.


\textsuperscript{12} DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 225, ark. 112-113.

\textsuperscript{13} Interview with Bohdan Soroka, L’viv, tape recording, April 11, 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.
The artists’ union, besides providing material advantages to its members, also became an important forum for debate over what standards for art were acceptable after the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956. At this congress, Khrushchev’s “secret speech” denouncing Stalin’s cult of personality led to artists, writers, and musicians in the late 1950s reassessing what constituted acceptable guidelines for the “socialist realism” they were expected to follow. While Khrushchev in 1962 turned against “abstractionism” and other “decadent” trends in culture, “socialist realism” itself remained a category open to competing interpretations. From the late 1950s, artists and other intellectuals appropriated the category of “socialist realism” to advance their own artistic agendas within the establishment.\(^\text{14}\)

In the artists’ union in L’viv, debates over what constituted acceptable “socialist realism” in art became particularly intense because of competing artistic traditions within members’ ranks. On the one hand, the artistic community in L’viv still maintained ties to traditions from the inter-war period. A small group of artists schooled in Paris, Vienna, and other European cities, participants in the art trends of Western and Central Europe of the 1920s and 1930s, remained in L’viv and had an influence on younger colleagues.\(^\text{15}\) On the other hand, cultural institutions in Moscow and Kyiv in the immediate postwar years sent a number of artists from other parts of the republic and the Soviet Union to L’viv. Some of these artists had

---


\(^\text{15}\) For a monograph that explores these trends among interwar artists in Galicia, see Olena Ripko, *U poshukakh stracheno ho mynuloho (In search of a lost past)* (L’viv: Kameniar, 1996).
received an education under more avant-garde masters in the Soviet Union.

However, a great many more had been educated in Stalinist times, where a simple, grandiose, optimistic depiction of a reality interpreted by Party and state decisions, known as “socialist realism,” came to dominate sculpture, painting, and graphic works.16

Conflicts between artists oriented toward inter-war Galicia and those toward official Soviet culture under Stalin to some extent reflected personal rivalries between natives of Western Ukraine and outsiders who came to L’viv after the war.17 As with other outside specialists sent to L’viv in the immediate postwar years, many of these artists were veterans of the war and Party members, entitling them to apartments and other privileges. As two scholars suggest, antagonisms between “locals” and “arrivals” had become especially strained over the issue of receiving apartments, compelling one republic official in 1946 to express reservations about sending additional artists to L’viv because of the housing shortage there.18

In addition, many of these artists who arrived in L’viv after the war assumed key leadership positions at the Institute of Applied and Decorative Art, the artists’ union, and other institutions. With the support of local Party leaders, they sought to impose what they regarded as the “superior” traditions of Soviet “socialist realism”

16 On this conflict between inter-war Galician artistic trends and those from the Soviet establishment under Stalin, see Roman Iatsiv, “Mystets’kyj L’viv do i pislia 1956 roku: imunitet contra kanon” (Artistic L’viv before and after 1956: immunity against the canon), Narodoznavchi zoshyty (L’viv) 4 (July-August 1998): 434-41.

17 See Chapter One.

on colleagues influenced by “formalist” trends in Western Europe. Colleagues who
began their careers in L’viv before Soviet rule had to renounce their previous views
on art and “overcome” past habits in new exhibits.\textsuperscript{19} Imposing the practices of
“socialist realism” thus amounted to an elite of artists trained in Stalin’s time
exercising dominance over colleagues influenced by the artistic trends of inter-war
Galicia.

As a result, competition for positions of power and scarce resources, as well as
different artistic tastes, affected debates in the L’viv artists’ union over what were the
criteria for “socialist realism” after 1956. Such debates took place over what artistic
traditions from Galicia were suitable for co-optation and what standards painters were
to follow in their new works.

Public commemoration of artists was one way in which members of the union
managed to co-opt local artistic traditions, giving them legitimacy in official Soviet
culture. In this manner the artists’ union observed the fifteenth anniversary of the
death of impressionist painter Ivan Trush (1869-1941), who from the turn of the
century had been actively involved in L’viv’s artistic circles.\textsuperscript{20} In its plans to mark
the occasion, which included exhibits, public ceremonies, articles and films, and the
renaming of a major city art school after him, the artists’ union stressed the
“progressive” aspects of Trush’s work.\textsuperscript{21} It cast Trush in the role of a painter who

\textsuperscript{19} Iatsiv, 437-39. On this trend at the Institute of Applied and Decorative Art, see Horyn’, 199-200,
210-17.

\textsuperscript{20} For biographical information on Trush, see Ripko, 278.

\textsuperscript{21} DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 183, ark. 4, 7-8.
sought to present “a true, realistic portrayal of the life of simple people” of Western Ukraine. It also stressed that Trush was the first L’viv artist who established direct contact with leading art circles of pre-revolutionary Russia.  

By emphasizing Trush’s themes on “simple people,” his “realistic” portrayal of his subject, and his ties to “progressive” artists in Russia, the union presented him as one of those true adherents of “socialist realism” deemed acceptable to official Soviet culture. Yet union leaders were also dealing with a painter who had already gained recognition in Soviet culture earlier. Shortly before his death, Trush took part in the organizing committee for the future Soviet artists’ union in L’viv. His works were among those by Western Ukrainian artists exhibited in Moscow in December 1940, receiving great acclaim there by critics and viewers alike.  

The commemoration of other artists, particularly those still living, by contrast provoked fierce controversy at times among union members. Efforts to honor the accomplishments of senior sculptor Ivan Severa (1891-1971) in the first half of the 1960s were one leading example. Severa, a native of the L’viv Region, had studied art in Prague and Rome and became noted for his sculptures based on major Ukrainian literary figures and various historical themes. He witnessed some of the

---

22 DAGO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 183, ark. 9-10.

23 Ripko, 108-110.
most dramatic events of the first half of the twentieth century, including the Russian Revolution in Petrograd, the Civil War in southern Russia, Stalin’s purges in Kharkiv, and Nazi terror in Berlin.\textsuperscript{24}

Severa’s career as a sculptor did not pass without trouble from Soviet colleagues. He had to leave teaching jobs at the Kyiv Art Institute in 1929 and the Kharkiv Art Institute in 1934 because of harrassment from directors and fellow instructors.\textsuperscript{25} As an instructor at the L’\textsuperscript{v}iv State Institute of Applied and Decorative Art from 1947 until his retirement in the late 1950s, Severa faced regular accusations at institute reviews and commissions of encouraging “formalism” and other “unhealthy” ideological tendencies among his students.\textsuperscript{26} Such claims led to Severa being demoted from head of the institute’s department of sculpture to a rank-and-file instructor, as a regional Party secretary revealed before fellow Communists of the region in 1953.\textsuperscript{27}

In 1961, on the occasion of Severa’s seventieth birthday, the artists’ union recommended him for the title of Worthy Leader of Arts of the Ukrainian SSR. In its resolution, the union cited Severa’s undeviating commitment to the principles of “socialist realism” and listed students of his who had achieved fame in the Soviet

\textsuperscript{24} The best account of Severa’s life is by Bohdan Horyn’, U poshukakh bereha, zhyttia i tvorchist’ skul'ptora Ivana Severy (In search of glory: the life and art of sculptor Ivan Severa) (L’\textsuperscript{v}iv: Instytut Ukrainoznavstva im. I. Kryp'iakevycha, 1995).

\textsuperscript{25} On Severa’s years in Kyiv and Kharkiv, see Horyn’, 91-159, passim.

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 211-17.

\textsuperscript{27} Party secretary Zinovij Serdiuk mentioned this before a plenary session of the regional Party committee on 12 June 1953, asserting that accusations of Severa encouraging “formalism” and a “lack of ideological spirit” (bezidejinist’) were groundless. See this excerpt from Serdiuk’s speech, published in Halajchak, Luts’kyj, et al, 16.
Union for their sculpture. In a similar manner, fellow artists and students from the L’viv Institute of Applied and Decorative Art that year asked the republic’s artist union leadership to support a jubilee personal exhibit in Severa’s honor. They pointed out that Severa for the past thirty-five years had helped younger colleagues unfold their talents “in a realistic direction,” noting students of his who had received awards at a major week-long exhibit of Ukrainian art and literature in Moscow in 1960. Members of the artists’ union, as well as institute instructors and students, co-opted the category of “socialist realism” to justify honoring this respected teacher and colleague of theirs.

While artists in the cultural establishment sought to commemorate Severa’s achievements, one attempt to emphasize Severa’s contributions to the development of sculpture in Western Ukraine produced considerable controversy in late 1964. On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Western Ukraine’s incorporation into Soviet Ukraine, art critic Bohdan’ Horyn’ on 23 December 1964 published a newspaper article in the regional Party committee newspaper, Vil’na Ukraina, on sculpture in Western Ukraine since Soviet rule. The article emphasized Severa’s role in the emergence of a new cohort of enterprising young sculptors who were natives of the region.

---

28 DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 249, ark. 10-13.

29 DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 255, ark. 33-34.

30 Horyn’, 218-19. Horyn’ recalled that this article first aired on the radio of the L’viv Region before being published in Vil’na Ukraina.
Horyn’s article caused outrage among artists who had moved to L’viv from other parts of the republic and the Soviet Union after the war, since their achievements were not mentioned at all. At a public discussion of this article at the artists’ union building on 9 January 1965, in which hundreds of members of the city’s intelligentsia attended, they objected to Severa and others from Western Ukraine being given special treatment in the article, accusing Horyn’ of displaying local prejudices. While a number of artists and other intellectuals supported Horyn’s article, closed Party meetings of the artists’ union condemned it categorically. A closed meeting of institute instructors took to task not just Horyn’ but also Severa, with some instructors pointing out that Severa had worked in L’viv under German occupation and had even been interviewed by an occupation-era newspaper.\(^{31}\)

The intense public scrutiny and scathing criticism directed toward Horyn’s article suggested sharp disagreements among artists over what artistic traditions were worthy of co-optation. Some artists sought to include Severa and his students as some of the region’s best representatives of “socialist realism” in Western Ukraine. Yet others hinted that too much of an emphasis on Severa’s contributions to the field of sculpture represented favoritism for natives of Western Ukraine at the expense of other Soviet artists. Some even continued to question Severa’s credentials, as other Soviet artists had done to him in the 1930s in Ukraine and in L’viv in the immediate postwar years. Long-standing antagonisms between outsiders who came to L’viv

\(^{31}\)Ibid., 219-22. For the protocol of the closed Party meeting of the artists’ union, held 29 December 1964, and its resolution, see DALO, fond P-3810, opys 1, sprava 17, ark. 34-44.
after the war and natives of Western Ukraine remained strong within the artistic community, making discussions over who could be honored as contributors to “socialist realism” politically charged.

While efforts to give recognition to Severa’s contributions to official Soviet art produced controversy among colleagues at the artists’ union, some senior artists in the union who strove to accommodate “socialist realism” in their works began to challenge its conventionally-held standards after 1956. Graphic artist Leopold Levyts’kyj (1906-1973) was an active underground Communist in interwar Galicia. He took an active role in establishing Soviet power in Western Ukraine in 1939, heading the People’s Soviet in his home village of Chortkova in Ternopil’ Region. When the Soviet army retreated from Western Ukraine, he and his wife went to Central Asia. They moved to L’viv in 1944, when Levyts’kyj became head of the artists’ union.³²

While Levyts’kyj firmly supported Soviet power in Western Ukraine, his approach to art conflicted with Soviet power’s official culture. From 1928 to 1933, he studied at the Academy of Art in Krakow and became associated with the “Krakow Group,” avant-garde artists influenced by expressionism and other more abstract artistic developments of the early twentieth century.³³ While his biographer from the Soviet period stressed Levyts’yj’s “progressive” orientation toward social themes within the “Krakow Group,” Levyts’kyj in the postwar years had to re-


³³ Ibid., 9; Ripko, 260.
educate himself in order to conform to artistic life in Soviet Ukraine.\textsuperscript{34} By 1955, he had become a prime example for the republic artists’ union of “socialist realism” turning Western Ukrainian artists away from the sins of “bourgeois formalist art” and its abstractions to “realism.”\textsuperscript{35}

But by the late 1950s, as the political climate thawed in the Soviet Union, Levyts’kyj began to show that he had not entirely broken with “abstractions” and in fact tried to defend artistic innovations within the establishment. In a 5 January 1958 artists’ union discussion on portrait painting, Levyts’kyj criticized what he regarded as dogmatic views on the genre. While acknowledging that life was the best school for an artist, a central tenet of “socialist realism,” he asserted that standards of beauty in art changed over time. For him, nineteenth century realist masters such as Russian painter Il’ya Repin no longer were worthy of emulation. In today’s day, an age of atomic energy, artists no longer could represent reality according to a simple three-dimensional scheme that such artists had followed, Levyts’kyj claimed.\textsuperscript{36}

When some colleagues took Levyts’kyj to task for “formalism” and began to criticize his own manner of portrait painting, others stepped in to support Levyts’kyj and his criticisms. Manastyr’skyj, another artist from the inter-war period, supported Levyts’kyj’s view that painters should innovate and not blindly follow the classics. Regarding those who took exception to Levyts’kyj’s own work, he retorted, “You’ve

\textsuperscript{34} Ostrovskii, 9.

\textsuperscript{35} This remark was made by M. H. Derehus, a member of the presidia of the republic’s union organization before a 4 June 1955 conference of artists of the western regions of Ukraine. It is from excerpts of a protocol of the meeting in DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 153, that has been reprinted in Halajchak et al, 132.

\textsuperscript{36} DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 203, ark. 20-21.
got to wait a long time until you like Levyts’kyj.” Art critic and fellow painter Volodymyr Ostrovs’kyj also supported Levyts’kyj when he stressed the need for an artist to be current and not follow the classics, citing progressive artists like Picasso as positive examples of this kind of portrait innovation.37

Levyts’kyj’s criticism of those who blindly followed Repin clearly was an affront to many artists who had received their training in Soviet art institutes before coming to L’viv after World War II.38 Charges of Levyts’kyj engaging in “formalism” no doubt were their way of responding in kind. Such animosity between artists oriented toward official Soviet art and those oriented toward developments in Western and Central Europe came to the surface at another union meeting on 25 November of that year. At this meeting, during discussion of a personal exhibit of Viktor Savin (1907-1971), a painter and graphic artist trained in Kharkiv in the 1920s, Levyts’kyj tried to pay Savin compliments. A colleague, recalling that his friendship with Savin dated back to World War II, when they served in a squadron together, accused Levyts’kyj of speaking “like a Nazi who shouldn’t have been here.”39 Artists who had made their careers in the 1930s under Stalin, served in the war, and came to L’viv as part of the Soviet elite had scores to settle with those trying to challenge the criteria for “socialist realism.”40

---

37 Ibid. Manastyr’s’kyj may have been Antin (1878-1969) or his son Vitovt (1915-1992), both of whom were painters. The protocol does not clearly indicate which Manastyr’s’kyj was present.

38 One art student at the L’viv State Institute of Applied and Decorative Art in the late 1950s, Roman Petruk, pointed out that instructors from eastern regions of Soviet Ukraine and other parts of the Soviet Union tended to praise Repin as an artist to be emulated. Roman Petruk, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 21 June 1999, institute of historical research, L'viv National University.

39 DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 208, ark 34.
Levyts’kyj’s polemic with artists trained in Soviet institutes reflected the uneasy coexistence in L’viv between official Soviet culture and local artistic traditions influenced by Western and Central Europe. While members of the artists’ union at times were able to incorporate past masters like Ivan Trush in the official canon, others such as Ivan Severa and Leopol’d Levyts’kyj caused tensions within the artistic establishment. Severa and his pupils could not be represented as a distinct achievement in Soviet art without offending colleagues who had moved to Western Ukraine after the war. Levyts’kyj, while “re-educating” himself as a follower of “socialist realism,” began to challenge its accepted standards when they came into question after 1956.

Just as co-opting local artistic traditions created disagreement within the cultural establishment, so too did attempts to revise standards in official Soviet art. As Levyts’kyj’s debates with colleagues demonstrated, considerable divisions existed among artists as to what constituted acceptable painting after the Twentieth Party Congress.

In 1958, other passionate exchanges among union members over recent exhibits in L’viv illustrated these divisions over what was proper “socialist realism” for painters. A review published in the local newspaper L’yovskaia pravda in early 1958 provoked L’viv painter Benjamin Faivovich Siper to submit an anonymous

---

40 Savin’s premiere works, “The First Tractor Column in the Village” (1930) and “Karmeliuk” (1937), were completed in the Stalinist 1930s. See his brief biography in Ie. P. Mis’ko, Izobrazitel’noe iskusstvo L’vova: zhivopis’, skulptura, grafika (The fine art of L’viv: painting, sculpture, graphic works) (Moskva: “Sovetski khudozhnik,” 1978).
letter expressing his outrage toward the review’s assumptions of what was acceptable portrait painting. The review, written by a local critic, Riabinskii, concerned a recent exhibit of portrait paintings by L’viv union members.41

Accusing him of trying to turn art back to the “epoch of suppression,” Siper blasted Riabinskii for praising portraits that in his view repeated the “photograph-style simplicity (fotografichnost’)” and “pseudo-socialist pathos” that had been imposed on artists’ works in Stalin’s time. He also suggested that Riabinskii had a narrow conception of who could be worthy subjects of paintings, limiting them to factory and collective farm workers.42 But what most strongly vexed Siper was Riabinskii’s insinuation that painters at the exhibit were imitating Western styles, a suggestion that they were too “decadent” for “socialist realism.” Siper called this a “new type of wrecking” by critics willing to call any innovative artists “formalists,” retarding the development of Soviet art and doing a disservice to a country that had recently launched the world’s first satellite.43

A similar exchange flared up when two other union members, Ia. Zapasko and P. Tsybenko, published a review for the 25 September 1958 edition of the republic newspaper, Radians’ka kul’tura. This review, “Notes from an Exhibition of a Landscape Painting,” caused the artist union leadership in L’viv to submit a rebuttal to the newspaper staff. Their rebuttal, dated 17 November of that year, claimed that

41 Siper wrote his letter of 11 April 1958 under the name of Bulgakov, another artist, and sent it to L’vovskaia pravda. DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 209, ark. 41.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid.
Zapasko and Tsybenko had grossly mischaracterized colleagues' work in painting and had tried to divide the union’s collective “into artists of realist and non-realist orientations.” These exhibits by L’viv artists, maintained the union chief, Chajka, were in the spirit of “socialist realism” and not, as the article alleged, “spitting on the classics of Russian and Ukrainian art within the confines of the Union.”

These exchanges between union members and the press underscored the lack of consensus over what constituted acceptable standards for “socialist realism” after the Twentieth Party Congress. Remarks at a meeting of the union’s painting section on 19 February of that year furthermore suggested that painters barely spoke to each other and even submitted works for a recent republic exhibit as individuals. Such divisions between artists to some degree reflected personal antagonisms between natives of the region and outsiders who came to L’viv after the war. But they also represented serious differences over what constituted “socialist realism,” with some artists demanding that more liberal standards be applied to artists than what Stalin’s cult of personality had encouraged. Siper, one of those painters accused of committing “formalism,” demonstrated that these debates over “socialist realism” were not merely between natives of the region and outsiders, as he had been trained at

---

44 DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 209, ark. 96.
45 DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 203, ark. 2.
the All Russian Academy of Art in Leningrad in the late 1920s. His role in these
debates also suggests that the issue of "formalism" crossed nationality lines, as he
was known by one art scholar to be Jewish. 46

While the artists' union in L'viv played an important role in improving
material conditions for its members, giving them advantages in an economy of
scarcity, it also became a source of division and controversy among establishment
artists in the years after the Twentieth Party Congress. It became a forum for
deciding which local artistic traditions could be co-opted into official Soviet culture.
It brought together artists with contrasting views on what standards were permissible
under the canon of "socialist realism" in sculpture, painting, and graphic works.
While some of these divisions were the result of personal conflicts between
colleagues, they also reflected real disagreement over what role art was to play in
society. Sometimes this disagreement was the result of local artistic traditions that
were connected with artistic developments in Western and Central Europe between
the world wars.

3.2 Literary and Language Politics after the Twentieth Party Congress

When Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev in his "secret speech" before the
Twentieth Party Congress in March 1956 criticized Stalin's cult of personality, it sent
shock waves through Soviet society. The literary establishment in particular
underwent upheaval. Writers in Russia and Eastern Europe had traditionally served

46 Bohdan Horyn', interview by the author, Kyiv, tape recording, 7 November 1999, Institute of
Historical Research, L'viv National University; Mis'ko, Izobrazitel'noe iskusstvo L'vova.
as social spokespersons, and in the Soviet Union under Stalin, they had played a key role in justifying Stalin’s policies and negotiating relations between society and the state.\textsuperscript{47} As Khrushchev subjected Stalin’s legacy to criticism for the first time, writers began to debate what new standards were to guide their work. For Soviet Ukrainian writers, discussed what role Ukrainians’ language and culture now had in society. Writers in L’viv for their part had an opportunity to press for better working conditions in the provinces.

Writers in L’viv at first reacted to the Twentieth Party Congress with great caution. The editor of the literary journal \textit{Zhovten’}, Iurij Mel’nychuk, noted that many of his colleagues withdrew their manuscripts for publication after hearing about the Congress, afraid of repercussions.\textsuperscript{48} Open Party meetings on 9 March 1956 produced some comments, but as Mel’nychuk observed, much more lively discussion followed on 5 June of that year when literary scholar Semen Shakhovs’kyj gave a report on tasks writers faced in light of the Congress’s decisions.\textsuperscript{49} In these meetings, where both Party and non-Party members could participate, writers pointed out disadvantages they faced in the provinces and problems affecting wider segments of society. They noted discrimination against the Ukrainian language by state employees and called for new criteria for writers’ new works, studies in Ukrainian literature, and the literary canon as a whole.


\textsuperscript{48} DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 40.

\textsuperscript{49} DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 43-44.
In this respect the Twentieth Party Congress gave writers in L’viv an opportunity to challenge existing conventions for Ukrainian literature and redress national grievances experienced by Ukrainians under Stalinism. Yet writers were far from unanimous in deciding what exactly the Congress meant for Ukrainians. Writers who were natives of the former Austro-Hungarian province of Galicia had a different orientation toward the Party’s nationality policy and the role literature played in society. Galicia had a legacy of highly organized national movements that since the nineteenth century had encouraged the development of the Ukrainian language and national consciousness among the peasantry. Senior members of the writers’ union moreover had taken part in literary movements in inter-war Galicia and had not spent their formative years under Stalin’s rule. Writers from Western Ukraine and Galicia in particular thus saw in the Twentieth Party Congress an opportunity to demand more respect for the Ukrainian language in the republic and seek relatively more liberal standards in literature than those fostered under Stalinism.

In addition, writers from Western Ukraine and those from other regions of the republic pressed for such claims based on alternative readings of the Party’s nationality policy itself. As Khrushchev and others downgraded Stalin’s role as the

---

50 John-Paul Himka, *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987). Writers from the inter-war period who took part in these discussions of the Twentieth Party Congress included Iryna Vil’de, Mykhajlo Rudnyts’kyj, and Andrij Voloshchak.

51 Iakiv Stetsiuk was one of these writers from outside Western Ukraine who supported this reading of the Party’s nationality policy. He was born in 1922 in the Zhytomyr Region and began his studies in 1939 at the Zhytomyr Pedagogical Institute, and during the war, he fought in a Soviet regional partisan division behind enemy lines. “Iakiv Stetsiuk,” in *Pys’ mennyky radians’koi Ukrainy: dovidnyk (Writers of Soviet Ukraine: a directory)*, ed. V. P. Pasichnyj (Kyiv:Radians’kyj pys’ mennyk, 1960), 460.
Party’s leading theorist and placed greater emphasis on Lenin, Party members in Soviet Ukraine and other republics turned to Lenin for guidance on the nationality policy. This “Leninist position” had its origins in a program of “nativization,” known in Russian as korenizatsiia, which Lenin and other Party leaders had adopted in the early 1920s to give preferential treatment to non-Russian languages, cultures, and national elites of the various republics and autonomous regions of the Soviet Union. The program of korenizatsiia was intended to combat the legacy of Great Russian chauvinism of the tsarist regime, undermine “bourgeois nationalist” movements, and encourage a spirit of genuine “proletarian internationalism” to help build socialism in the Soviet Union.\(^{52}\)

While some writers in L’viv perceived the program of korenizatsiia to be the Party’s true nationality policy, others had reservations about attempts to discredit Stalin’s cult of personality and Stalin’s interpretation of the Party’s nationality policy. These writers, many of whom had come to Western Ukraine after the war, had a very different perception of what it meant to be Ukrainian. They identified with a Soviet Ukrainian culture that reflected the Soviet state’s promotion of a “friendship of peoples” as its informal constitution by 1938. Under the “friendship of peoples,”


Ukrainians and other non-Russians developed their languages and cultures as members of a Soviet family of nations where the language and culture of the Great Russian people was the most progressive and revolutionary. Such writers defined nationality much less in terms of language than in terms of territory and such formal categories as passport identities.\(^53\)

As with other members of the Soviet elite tempered by collectivization, industrialization, and World War II, writers from outside Western Ukraine often had very different perceptions of Stalinism. Stalinism, while having its shortcomings, represented for them a superior way of life that had triumphed over the evil forces of capitalist reaction and Nazism. Many of these writers who came to L’viv in the immediate postwar years had contributed to the fight against the Nazis either as war correspondents, front line soldiers, or as partisans waging guerilla warfare behind enemy lines.\(^54\) For much of Soviet society, the war rejuvenated revolutionary myths and restored confidence in the Soviet system, gave veterans a privileged status in society, and fostered distrust toward those in Western Ukraine and other regions who

---


\(^54\) Among L’viv writers’ union members from outside Western Ukraine who had served in the war were Mykhajlo Briukov, Hryhorij Hlazov, Vasyl’ Hlotov, Ivan Hrebeniuk, Mykola Dalekyj, Dmytro Derech, Anatolij Dimarof, Ivan Doroshenko, Petro Inhul’s’kyj, Heorhij Kaysh, Vasyl’ Kolodij, Mykola Matviichuk, Tymish Odud’ko, Mykola Romanchenko, Ivan Svarnyk, Iakiv Stetsiuk, Mykola Tarsovs’kyj, Hryhorij Titiunnyk, Dmytro Tsmokalenko, and Anton Shmyhel’s’kyj. This list is based on a cursory reading of biographical entries in Oleh Kulyminyk and Oleksandr Petrovs’kyj, Pys’mennyky Radian’skoi Ukrainy: biobibliohrafichnyi dovidnyk (Writers of Soviet Ukraine: a biographical-bibliographical directory) (Kyiv: Rad’ians’kyj pys’mennyk, 1970).
had fallen behind enemy lines or had collaborated in some way with the Nazis. Some writers who had taken part in the war effort consequently feared that any concessions to “revisionists” and “nationalists” in the Party’s nationality policy undermined the Soviet system’s achievements gained since the war’s end. A violent anti-Communist uprising in Hungary in November of 1956 confirmed their fears that the specter of “fascism” could return to the Soviet Union.

Personal antagonisms and competition for resources and privileges also no doubt played a major role in these conflicts between writers in the year after the Twentieth Party Congress. As with establishment artists, writers who had contributed to the Soviet war effort as front soldiers, reporters, and the like were members of an elite that received scarce housing space in L'viv after the war. As they differed with members of this elite over the implications of the Twentieth Party Congress, writers also made references to gaping inequalities between writers and more privileged elements of the city. For instance, Iakiv Stetsiuk on 7 December 1956, besides criticizing officials’ neglect of the Ukrainian language, complained of poor housing conditions he and other writers faced in the city. He gave as an example the 15 square meters of apartment space in a highly dilapidated building that he and his family lived in. City Party committee secretary Pashchenko, one of those in attendance, owned a private house, Stetsiuk noted in passing. Grievances over apartment spaces and the like intensified passions as writers expressed fundamentally different views on what was to be Ukrainian and Soviet.

---

In discussions on the Twentieth Party Congress and its implications for literature, members of the writers’ union assumed important roles as spokespersons for the local intelligentsia and the larger public. Some pointed out the disadvantages they faced in the provinces compared to such capitals as Kyiv and Moscow, particularly when it came to access to new literary works from abroad.\(^{57}\) Others called on greater support for L’viv as a regional cultural center in the republic, proposing a regional literary journal and other periodicals to feature artists and writers from Western Ukraine.\(^{58}\) Besides demanding better conditions for artists and writers, some union members also took on important issues such the economy and health care. One writer called attention to the need to improve workers’ wages and abolish closed hospitals for Party and state leaders.\(^{59}\) As public spokespersons, members of the writers’ union stressed improvement of the Soviet system rather than directly criticizing it. Writers tended to voice their criticisms in the past tense, refraining from any direct references to the present.\(^{60}\) As one writer said, L’viv had rid itself of its old face, but it had not yet gained “its own face,” a “new, truly Soviet face.”\(^{61}\)

---

\(^{56}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 85, 143-44.

\(^{57}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 38.

\(^{58}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 35-37.

\(^{59}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 19-21.

\(^{60}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 34-35, 42. Andrij Voloshchak only referred to abuses in the management of the economy in the present tense, and he did so very inspecifically. DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 42.

\(^{61}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 39.
While seeking better conditions for intellectuals and broader segments of the population in L’viv, members of the writers’ union also took to task the existing literary canon. Writers, pointing out that the history of Ukrainian literature had suffered excessive censorship under Stalin, stressed the need to publish new, more comprehensive anthologies and studies of Ukrainian writers. Some called on rehabilitating writers unjustly repressed or “forgotten” under Stalin, suggesting that some of their works be removed from special closed depositories (spetsfondy) of libraries and be published in the city’s literary journal, Zhovten.

Others sought to vindicate literary developments in Western Ukraine before Soviet rule that in their view had become misperceived. Senior writer Andrij Voloshchak defended the merits of the literary organization Prosvita (Enlightenment), which provided reading rooms and other cultural activities for Ukrainian peasants in Galicia beginning in the Nineteenth Century. While admitting that it did have many “reactionary” elements in it, this institution, he argued, had wrongly been perceived as “retrograde” and in fact performed many progressive functions. In a similar manner literary scholar Semen Shakhovs’kyj stressed contributions by L’viv State University to the history of Ukrainian literature. Its Department of Ukrainian Literature, founded in 1848, accomplished this despite the presence of “reactionary” professors in it.

---

62 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 20, 34-35, 39.

63 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 19-20, 34-35, 39.

64 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 31.

65 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 34-35. Actually, the university was nearly 300 years old by then, as its 300th anniversary was officially celebrated in 1961.
While writers argued for rehabilitating repressed and “forgotten” writers and removing old stereotypes encouraged by Stalin’s cult of personality, they disagreed over what extent the canon of Soviet Ukrainian literature was in need of revision. Semen Shakhovs’kyj in his report warned that some of his colleagues in the union as a result of the Congress had become excessively critical of the state of Soviet Ukrainian literature.\(^{66}\) Fellow literary scholar Mykhajlo Parkhomenko, while admitting that new works needed to be more truthful about reality than they had been under Stalin, also warned of the danger of crossing out all of their literature’s past achievements.\(^{67}\) Senior poet Antin Shmyhel’s’kyj went further, asserting that Stalin had represented the spirit of the Party and that writers’ works produced under the cult of personality therefore did not deserve to be rewritten.\(^{68}\)

As writers disagreed over what works under Stalin could be criticized, they also lacked consensus over what writers and works could now be added to the literary canon. Such disagreements came to the surface later that year after literary scholar Stepan Trofymuk of the Institute of Social Sciences presented a report to a meeting of the writers’ union on literary events in Western Ukraine in the 1920s and 1930s.

This report by Trofymuk, given on 15 November 1956, a few days after the Soviet army’s bloody suppression of an anti-Communist uprising in Hungary, met a lively debate among writers over what literary figures from inter-war Galicia merited

---

\(^{66}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 34.

\(^{67}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 19.

\(^{68}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 20.
rehabilitation. Some colleagues defended Trofymuk and claimed that many writers from Galicia had been unjustly banned. Others accused him of ignoring the attitudes of writers who had become disillusioned with Stalinist rule in Soviet Ukraine in the 1930s, recommending a number of them for official recognition without justification.69 Trofymuk’s paper had made so much controversy that the regional Party committee bureau in a resolution on 4 December 1956 supported Trofymuk’s critics, claiming that his report amounted to an attempt “to give an amnesty to many nationalist writers of Western Ukraine.” It also took to task some colleagues who had defended him.70

Novelist and journalist Volodymyr Bieliaiev most vehemently denounced Trofymuk’s report and its defenders at Party meetings of the writers’ union on 7 December 1956, a few days after the regional Party commmittee’s resolution on the matter.71 The report, he alleged, smelled of the same “nationalism” that had reared its head on the streets of Budapest that month. Trofymuk and others, he claimed, saw Soviet Ukraine as “a whole series of shootings of the intelligentsia” and “a nightmare of concentration camps.”72 During discussion of the report before the writers’ union, Bieliaiev took offense at what he perceived was Trofymuk’s indictment of the entire

---

69 The protocol of this meeting of the writers’ union is in DALO, fond R-2009, opys 1, sprava 74, ark. 23-31.

70 A copy of the resolution of 4 December 1956, which is in the protocol for the regional Party committee bureau meeting of 24 December of that year, is in DALO, fond P-3, opys 5, sprava 360, ark. 95-97.

71 Bieliaiev, speaking on 7 December 1956, said that he and other colleagues had submitted written comments on Trofymuk’s report to the regional Party committee upon its request, what other writers, he claimed, had regarded as “denunciations.” DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 115.

72 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 115-16.
Soviet system, pointing out that Soviet citizens such as Leningrad writer Ol’ga Bergol’ts did not lose their faith in it despite unjust imprisonment during the terror of the 1930s.73

The outrage Bieliaiev expressed toward Trofymuk’s report represented the degree to which different perceptions of the Soviet regime as well as personal antagonisms had divided members of the writers’ union after the Twentieth Party Congress. According to remarks by Bieliaiev and others at this Party meeting of 7 December, there had been a falling out between Bieliaiev and Party organization secretary Iurij Mel'nychuk. Bieliaiev allegedly had claimed that Mel’nychuk wanted to run him, scholar Mykhajlo Parkhomenko, and other outsiders to Western Ukraine out of L’viv.74 Bieliaiev had also contributed to feelings of enmity some years earlier, when he accused Mel’nychuk and the writers’ union chief Kozlaniuk of engaging in “nationalism,” causing the regional Party committee bureau to investigate.75

Yet much of Bieliaiev’s comments came from a different perception he and other colleagues had over what it was to be Ukrainian. Bieliaiev, born in 1909 in Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’kyj, had spent his formative years as a factory worker, journalist, and soldier in Soviet Ukraine and then in Leningrad. He came to L’viv as a special

---

73 DALO, fond R-2009, opys 1, sprava 74, ark. 24.

74 Bieliaiev’s long, rambling speech before this Party meeting of the writers’ union, as well as remarks by colleagues during the meeting, suggest that Bieliaiev suspected union Party secretary Iurij Mel’nychuk and others of waging a campaign against his book against Ukrainian “bourgeois nationalists,” Under Foe’s Banners (Pid chuzhymy praporamy), first published in 1954. DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 102-107, 157.

75 Mel’nychuk pointed this out at a regional Party committee plenary session on 12 June 1953. See excerpts of his speech at this meeting published in Halažchak et al, 45.
state radio correspondent after service as a correspondent on the front lines during World War II. Bieliaiev was among those writers who had come to identify with the Soviet system through collectivization, industrialization, and the war.

Bieliaiev admittedly was one of the more notorious members of this Soviet elite. In L'viv, he became known as a “militant Ukranophile” with special ties with state security organs in Moscow. Supposedly he took part in drunken orgies with Ivan Biliakevych, onetime chancellor of L'viv State University, and other members of the Soviet elite, wounding a university instructor with a gun during one of their drinking bouts. His book, Under Foes' Banners (Pid chuzhymy praporamy), made false claims that some members of the Ukrainian intelligentsia in Galicia actively supported the Nazis during German occupation.


77 Ivanychuk, 80. Historian Iaroslav Dashkevych, citing no sources, says that Bieliaiev, a Pole whose surname had been Dombrovsky, had immediate contacts with Moscow as a high-ranking agent of state security organs and engaged in drunken orgies with Biliakevych and others. This presumably was from Dashkevych’s own personal recollections of Bieliaiev and other figures in L'viv in the late 1940s. Iaroslav Dashkevych, “Borot’ba z Hrushevsky’m ta ioho shkoloiu u L’vivs’komu universyteti za radians’kykh chasiv” (The struggle with Hrushevsky and his school at L'viv University in Soviet times), in Mykhajlo Hrushevskyi i L’vivs’ka istorichna shkola: Materialy konferentsii. L'viv, 24-25 zhoctvnia 1994 r. (Mykhajlo Hrushevskyi and the L'viv historical school: materials for a conference, L'viv, 24-25 October 1994), ed. L. Vynar et al, L’ivs'ki istorichni pratsi, materialy zasydan’i konferentsii (L'viv historical works and materials of meetings and conferences), no. 1 (New York and L’viv: Ukrains’ke istorichne tovarystvo, 1995), 44, n. 21. A record of Bieliaiev's personal case regarding this shooting, heard before the writers' union's Party organization in January 1957, handwritten and nearly illegible, is in DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 27, ark. 1-9.

78 V. Bieliaiev and Mykhajlo Rudnyts’kyj, Pid chuzhymy praporamy (Under foes' banners) (Kyiv: Rad’ians’kyj pys’mennyk, 1956). One chapter in particular, “A Dynasty of Spies (Dynastia shpyhuniv),” accused composer Vasyl Barvins’kyj and his family of collaborating with the Germans during occupation. Ibid., 124-39. While Mykhajlo Rudnyts’kyj was one of the book’s authors, he in fact added his signature under pressure from authorities to recant from his own “bourgeois nationalist” views held in the past. Rublov and Cherchenko, 334-35, n. 73. On Barvins’kyj’s refutation of the charges made by Bieliaiev, see a copy of his appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet, written in August 1956, in Halajchak et al, 183-201.
Yet Bieliaiev’s adamant defense of the Soviet system expressed views shared by many of his generation who feared that “revisionist” critics such as Trofymuk threatened to undermine a way of life that had triumphed over the forces of Nazism during the war. Bieliaiev’s disparaging attack on writers attempting to rehabilitate “anti-Soviet” literary figures reflected the unease with which some members of the writers’ union viewed the more liberal atmosphere after the Twentieth Party Congress. Just as Shmyhel’s’kyj and Parkhomenko urged colleagues not to cross out achievements Soviet Ukrainian writers had made in Stalin’s time, Bieliaiev warned them not to forgive writers from inter-war Galicia who had criticized Soviet rule in the 1930s.

Controversy over the rehabilitation of writers also extended to debates over what role the Ukrainian language was to have in society. During discussions of the Twentieth Party Congress on 5 June 1956, senior writer Andrij Voloshchak took to task Stalin’s cult of personality for encouraging prejudiced views of the Ukrainian language. Under Stalin, he claimed, it had become acceptable to refer to those who spoke Ukrainian as “nationalists” and pressuring those who migrated to cities to stop speaking it. He added with dismay that it was rare to hear Ukrainian spoken even at the local Ukrainian-language newspaper, Vil’na Ukraina, and maintained that Ukrainian should be spoken at Ukrainian institutions.79

Others such as Bieliaiev voiced sharp disagreement with writers such as Voloshchak who, in their opinion, paid excessive attention to discrimination against the Ukrainian language in the city. Besides criticizing efforts to rehabilitate
questionable writers, Bieliaiev at Party meetings of the writers’ union on 7 December 1956 his contempt for colleagues who were complaining about Russian-language signs in the center of town and officials who spoke in Russian in public. Such writers, in his view, had completely forgotten more urgent tasks facing Ukrainian culture, such as protesting the suspension of propaganda plays against “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism” by Iaroslav Halan that had been regularly featured at the city’s Maria Zan’kovets’ka Theater.80

Poet Tymish Odud’ko, speaking at the same meeting, also took colleagues to task for drawing unnecessary attention to the status of the Ukrainian language. While admitting that not enough state employees knew Ukrainian, he claimed that fellow writer lakiv Stetsiuk was making this problem into a political issue. When other writers at the meeting told him that his children did not know Ukrainian, he countered by pointing out his daughter’s high grades on her university entrance exams in Ukrainian and shot back, “I won’t make my children nationalists. They really will be Communists.”81

79 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 42.

80 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 109-111.

81 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 121, 148.
As with Bieliaiev, Odud'ko was also a military correspondent who came to L'viv after the war.\(^{82}\) While both knew Ukrainian and communicated in it, the language and culture of the Great Russian people for them was essential for building a Communist society.\(^{83}\) Writers such as Voloshchak and Stetsiuk who insisted on greater public use of Ukrainian were giving legitimacy to "nationalist" elements that threatened the Soviet project of building Communism, just as the "fascists" in Hungary had attempted to accomplish only a few weeks earlier.

On the other hand, Voloshchak, Stetsiuk, and others criticized for supposedly making politics out of the language issue legitimated their claims based on the Party's nationality policy adopted by Lenin and others in the early 1920s. In justifying claims that state employees needed to know Ukrainian, Stetsiuk responded to Bieliaiev and Odud'ko's scathing speeches by citing passages from Lenin in 1919 and early Party decisions condemning great-Russian imperialism and national chauvinism and mandating that state employees in Soviet Ukraine master the Ukrainian language.\(^{84}\) One of his younger colleagues, poet Dmytro Pavlychko, insisted at these meetings that writers such as himself, Trofymuk, and Stetsiuk were Marxists and not

---

\(^{82}\) His obituary in *Literaturna Ukraina* indicates that he was born in 1912 in the Khmel'nyts'kyj Region. Prior to World War Two, he worked in a number of provincial newspapers in Soviet Ukraine. During the war, he was a correspondent on the Stalingrad and First Ukrainian Fronts. After the war, he came to L'viv to work first as editor of *Lvovskaia pravda* and then as director of the L'viv Book-Journal Publishing Agency. He also worked as director of the L'viv Regional Administration in publishing, printing, and book trade matters. “Tymish Odud’ko,” *Literaturna Ukraina* (Kyiv) 5 August 1982.

\(^{83}\) Odud'ko spoke in Ukrainian at this meeting, judging from the meeting's protocol. Bieliaiev did not, but a letter that he had written to Petro Kozlaniuk in 1954 indicates that he knew Ukrainian well enough to communicate in it. Volodymyr Bieliaiev to Petro Kozlaniuk, Moscow, 26 June 1954. In Tsentral'nyj Derzhavnyj Arkhiv-Muzej Literatury i Mystetsva Ukrainy (TsDAMI,MU), fond 86, opys 1, sprava 156, ark. 1-2.

\(^{84}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 81, 144-148.
nationalists as Bieliaiev and Oduď'ko alleged.\textsuperscript{85} As they called on greater respect for 
the Ukrainian language by officials and state employees, Pavlychko, Voloshchak, and 
others in various Party meetings in 1956 furthermore expressed their love for 
Russians' language and culture and insisted that all citizens in the republic learn 
Russian.\textsuperscript{86}

As they clashed with their colleagues over the language issue, Stetsiuk and 
others were trying to put the Ukrainian language on equal footing with Russian rather 
than replacing the latter. For them, Russian also was an important element in 
building a Communist society, but in their opinion, colleagues such as Bieliaiev and 
Oduď'ko were in favor of replacing Ukrainian altogether with Russian. As he 
defended himself before attacks by these two colleagues, Stetsiuk claimed that there 
were "some people" who maintained that the Ukrainian language was destined to die 
out and be replaced by Russian. While Stetsiuk refused requests from his audience to 
give names, city Party committee secretary Pashchenko suggested that others shared 
Stetsiuk's opinions. He called for an end to the "babbling (bazikannia)" about what 
he referred to as "the theory of the Ukrainian language's demise" and other 
unwelcome discussions about the Party's nationality policy.\textsuperscript{87}

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{85} DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 155.
\item \textsuperscript{86} DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 42, 147, 154.
\item \textsuperscript{87} DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 132, 147.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Pashchenko's remarks indicated local Party leaders' support for these criticisms by Bieliaiev and others. In pointing out recent successes promoting Ukrainian-language instruction in institutions of higher learning, Pashchenko stressed the difficulty of trying to reverse past mistakes regarding language policies and warned that Stetsiuk and other writers had gone too far in "the so-called national question."\(^{88}\)

While admitting the difficulty of trying to encourage greater use of the Ukrainian language in public, Pashchenko suggested that any attempt to raise public awareness of the problem was encouraging "unhealthy" tendencies among intelligentsia circles. It was no surprise, then, that the regional Party committee in a March 1957 report criticized Pavlychko and prose writer Iryna Vil'de for publishing the previous year works critical of Ukrainians' neglect of their native language, claiming that both writers regardless of intention were supporting "nationalist" views.\(^{89}\) Nearly two years later, in February 1959, a collection of poems by Pavlychko, The Truth Calls! (Pravda klyche!), that criticized discrimination against the Ukrainian language, earned official condemnation by the regional Party

---

\(^{88}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 132.

\(^{89}\) This report, by a regional Party committee instructor, concerned an article by Vil'de in the 23 December 1956 issue of the regional newspaper, Vil'na Ukraina, entitled, "The Most Troublesome Question (Najbol"ile pytannia)." It claimed Vil'de's comments echoed those of a poem recently published by Pavlychko. DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 40, ark. 21-22.
committee bureau and was removed from public book shelves.⁹⁰ For local Party leaders, demands that the Ukrainian language to be given the same status as Russian amounted to no less than the dreaded ideology of "nationalism."

The Twentieth Party Congress and Khrushchev's "secret speech" denouncing Stalin's cult of personality consequently produced two responses among writers in the establishment in 1956. For some, it represented an opportunity to rejuvenate intellectual life in the city, provide more liberal standards for writers and scholars, and grant more respect to Ukrainians' language and culture in the republic. Yet others saw the Soviet dream that had been won through decades of struggle in danger of being lost to "revisionists" and "nationalists." The pursuit of privilege and power and the settling of personal scores no doubt motivated conflicts over the future of the Ukrainian language and Soviet Ukrainian literature, as seen with Bieliaiev's own antagonisms with Mel'nychuk and Shtesiuik's grievances over poor housing conditions. Yet they also demonstrated that different perceptions of what it was to be Ukrainian and Soviet were dividing members of the writers' union.

3.3 Zhovten' and Literature's Thaw and Freeze, 1963-66

Conflicts between writers in the establishment in L'viv became most intense in the mid-1960s, when poet Rostyslav Bratun' in 1963 succeeded the late Iurij Mel'nychuk as chief editor of the republic literary journal, Zhovten', which the

---

writers’ union in L’viv directed. In May 1965, the regional Party committee decided to remove Bratun’ as editor, citing a number of ideological “shortcomings” in the journal. While the republic writers’ union tried to defend Bratun’, local and republic Party leaders successfully fired Bratun’ the next year.\textsuperscript{91} Accusations of ideological “shortcomings,” while quite often motivated by personal vendettas, also reflected real divisions among writers in the establishment over what constituted acceptable standards for Soviet Ukrainian literature.

According to one fellow poet of his generation, Bratun' (1927-1994), a native of the Volyn' Region of Western Ukraine, gained fame in the postwar years as a young poet whose works praised "Golden September," when Soviet forces brought this region under one Soviet Ukrainian state.\textsuperscript{92} Yet as with other natives of the region, his loyalty to the Soviet state for some colleagues was questionable. During World War Two, Bratun' as a teenager had briefly taken part in a youth division of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), serving as a district leader. While working at the L'viv newspaper L'vovskaia pravda, Bratun' admitted of his past activities with "bourgeois nationalists" in January 1952, which resulted in him being expelled from the ranks of the writers' union Party organization.\textsuperscript{93}

\textsuperscript{91} For the Party committee bureau’s 14 May 1965 discussion of the journal’s ideological “shortcomings” and its subsequent resolution, see DALO, fond P-3, opys 9, sprava 45, ark. 16-18; DALO, fond P-3, opys 9, sprava 51, ark. 144-53. The presidia of the republic’s writers’ union discussed the journal on 11 June 1965. Its discussion and resolution are in TsDAMLMU, fond 590, opys 1, sprava 601, ark. 6-12. The Secretariat of the Central Committee of the republic’s Party organization approved Bratun’s firing on 6 May 1966. Tsentral’nyj Derzhavnyj Arkhiv Hromads’kykh Ob’iednan’ Ukrainy (TsDAHOU), fond 1, opys 8, sprava 3258, ark. 30.


\textsuperscript{93} DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 3, ark. 1-13.
Bratun's commitment to the cause of "bourgeois nationalists" probably was not very strong. At his Party hearing on 10 January 1952, Bratun' claimed that he had joined the OUN because they were fighting the Germans at the time. He also pointed out efforts by himself and others to help a Soviet partisan agent behind German lines. While Bratun' understandably was trying to distance himself from his past before fellow writers, he suggested that young people like him in Western Ukraine faced no easy task deciding who the real enemy was.

Bratun' repented for his actions, yet others still viewed him with suspicion or made use of his past to compromise him before colleagues. In March 1956, while on a trip to Luts'k in the Volyn' Region, poet Tymish Odu'd'ko provoked Bratun' to talk about his "Banderite" past during a drinking bout in their hotel and then informed the union's Party bureau that the latter had made a number of "anti-Soviet" remarks. While fellow writers took Odu'd'ko to task for a lack of principles, the head of the writers' union, Petro Kozlaniuk, told Bratun' that he had not yet truly "repented" for his past.

Personal rivalries also figured into doubts about Bratun's character. Since his days at L'viv State University, Bratun' had been bitter rivals with Valentyn Malanchuk. Malanchuk, a historian had moved up the ranks of the local Party hierarchy and was regional Party secretary in L'viv at the time Bratun' had become

---

94 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 3, ark. 2-3, 12.

95 DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 25, ark. 1-4; DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 24, ark. 137, 153. Bratun' and Odu'd'ko, as well as fellow brigade member Mykhajlo Biriukov, all received a general notice from the union Party committee bureau about poor conduct, which included a charge of carousing and drinking in their hotel in Luts'k late at night.
editor of Zhovten’. He also had good connections with the republic’s Party leadership, and according to scholars, he was a protégé of Mikhail Suslov, chief ideologue in the Politburo in Moscow.\(^{96}\) Malanchuk also had allies within the writers' union, particularly since Bratun' had outmaneuvered prose writer Petro Inhul's'kyj to take over the position of chief editor of Zhovten’.\(^{97}\)

Both personal rivalries and supicions about Bratun's past had much to do with his downfall as editor of Zhovten’. Regional Party committee secretary Malanchuk, who according to Bratun' had objected to his appointment from the very beginning, did much to call Bratun's leadership of the journal into question.\(^{98}\) Speaking before the regional Party committee bureau on 14 May 1965, Malanchuk made hints to his audience reminding them that Bratun’ had been expelled from the Party in 1952 for belonging to the OUN and had made "anti-Soviet" remarks in 1956. He added that republic Central Committee Party secretary Andrij Skaba had warned Bratun’ that he would lose his job if he made the slightest mistake.\(^{99}\) Bratun in a written appeal to

\(^{96}\) Mykola Petrenko, interview by the author, L'viv, tape recording, 2 February 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L'viv National University. Suslov's direct ties with Malanchuk are noted in Kas'ianov, 47, as well as in Borys Lewytzkyj, Politics and Society in Soviet Ukraine: 1953-1980 (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1984), 97.

\(^{97}\) According to Roman Ivanychuk, a member of the journal's staff at the time, Inhul's'kyj had expected to succeed the late Iurij Mel'nychuk as editor of Zhovten', but Bratun', behind Inhul's'kyj's back, went to Kyiv and won the position from him. Ivanychuk, 118-19.

\(^{98}\) TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 24, sprava 6001, ark. 82-83.

\(^{99}\) DALO, fond P-3, opys 9, sprava 51, ark. 151.
the republic's Central Committee, dated 3 June 1965, claimed that Malanchuk harrassed him with accusations of being an "abstractionist" and a "formalist" rather than giving any kind of helpful advice. 100

Other local officials, as well as Bratun's rivals, took an active role discrediting the journal. According to one writer, Inhul's'kyj, who had planned on becoming editor, zealously helped the censor for the Regional Administration of Literature (Oblit), Savchuk, search for errors on the journals' pages, identifying the most innocent materials as ideologically suspect. 101 A republic Central Committee report noted that for the year of 1964 alone, state censors intervened over 40 times, with 15 various materials removed altogether and some issues completely revised. 102 As the regional Party committee in 1965-66 sought to unseat Bratun', Odud'ko, who had tried to provoke "anti-Soviet" remarks from Bratun' some years earlier, cast doubts on the journal's political line in a city newspaper and at a regional Party conference. 103

100 TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 24, sprava 6001, ark. 81-83.

101 Ivanychuk, 118-19. Bratun' in his written appeal to the republic's Central Committee said that the regional Party committee on one occasion even even brought up accusations like, "Why do you oppose using the word ‘miropriemstvo’?" Party officials were objecting to a Ukrainian word being used instead of what was closer to a Russian equivalent, meropriiatie (arrangement). TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 24, sprava 6001, ark. 75.

102 TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 24, sprava 6001, ark. 68.

103 Odud'ko's remarks earned a rebuke from the republic's Central Committee because of "unconstructive criticism" and Odud'ko's own responsibility for censorship over the journal as a member of its editorial board and as head of the region's Committee on the Press. TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 8, sprava 3290, ark. 171.
Much of the criticism surrounding Zhovten' had much to do with personal rivalries between Malanchuk and Bratun', as well as animosity from such writers as Inhul's'kyi and Oduď'ko. Yet accusations of Bratun' encouraging "formalism" and "abstractionism" in the journal also reflected real differences in perception over what were acceptable standards for Soviet Ukrainian literature.

Bratun' as a loyal Soviet writer ought to give a relatively more liberal interpretation of those standards, particularly after the Twenty-Second Party Congress in 1961 had denounced Stalin's cult of personality more rigorously. Speaking before a writers' union meeting on 25 January 1962, Bratun' emphasized that Ukrainian writers needed to win back the trust of their readers with works that were more "sincere, bold, and truthful" than works that Stalin's cult of personality had encouraged.\(^{104}\) In private he shared an interest in literary trends that fell outside the bounds of acceptable literature. One poet recalled in the 1950s when Bratun' at his home let him read a Polish translation of *Flowers of Evil* by the French modernist poet Charles Baudelaire and other works deemed too "apolitical" or "bourgeois nationalist" for the average Soviet reader.\(^{105}\)

As editor of Zhovten', Bratun' tried to support innovative young writers and artists throughout the republic. Some of them included members of the Club of Artistic Youth in L'viv and its counterpart in Kyiv, intellectuals active in the national

---

\(^{104}\) DALO, fond R-2009, opys 1, sprava 119, ark. 3.

\(^{105}\) Petrenko, “Chy i my buly bohemoi?’” (Were we, too, bohemians?) *Postup* (L’viv) 6 February 1999.
revival affecting Soviet Ukraine in the early 1960s.\textsuperscript{106} According to Bratun', Malanchuk preferred banning such young talents rather than promoting them.\textsuperscript{107} Regional Party committee reports suggest that local authorities were actively opposed to these leaders of this cultural renaissance. One report alleged that three young critics from L'viv, Bohdan Horyn', Mykhajlo Kosiv, and Mykola Il'nyts'kyj, along with others "impose (navigiu) subjective views" and "defend formalist exercises of some artists and writers" in their articles.\textsuperscript{108} Another report claimed that Ivan Drach, a prominent member of Kyiv's Club of Artistic Youth, had published a number of poems in the journal's March 1964 issue that equated national oppression under Tsarist Russia to present conditions in the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{109}

Besides perceiving works by young artists and writers as ideologically "harmful," local Party leaders like Malanchuk also took strong exception to efforts by Bratun' and others to publish writers whose works had been "forgotten" or banned in Stalin's time. According to Malanchuk, \textit{Zhowten} had devoted an "excessive" amount of space to discussing writers of the past, "exaggerating their significance and place in Ukrainian literature" as well as trying to "tone down (zatushuvaty) their ideological deviations (khytannia)."\textsuperscript{110}

Malanchuk and others in the regional Party committee

\textsuperscript{106} On this club and its role in the Ukrainian cultural renaissance in L'viv, see Chapter Two.

\textsuperscript{107} TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 24, sprava 6001, ark. 77.

\textsuperscript{108} DALO, fond P-3, opys 9, sprava 34, ark. 17.

\textsuperscript{109} DALO, fond P-2941, opys 1, sprava 159, ark. 37.

\textsuperscript{110} TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 24, sprava 6001, ark. 68.
bureau objected in particular to a recent publication of poems by Bohdan-Ihor
Antonych, an inter-war Galician poet, citing a prize he had won from a Catholic
foundation in L'viv.\textsuperscript{111}

Local Party leaders moreover were greatly concerned that \textit{Zhovten}' was
gaining popularity among "unsound" elements in the city of L'viv. One regional
Party committee report on 4 March 1964 noted with alarm that among some
intellectuals, "there has spread the opinion that ‘L'viv finally has received a free
Ukrainian journal.'\textsuperscript{112} A republic Central Committee report shared similar concerns,
pointing out that people hostile to the Party and others from the city's "philistine
environment (mishchans'ke seredovyshche)" actively supported Bratun's opposition
to regional Party committee authorities. It also noted that repeated cases of
censorship of the journal by \textit{Obliit} caused rumors to spread throughout town that
made Bratun' into a hero.\textsuperscript{113} In creating a relatively more liberal journal within
official channels, Bratun' had become for both local and republic Party leaders a
rallying point for those critical of Soviet rule in L'viv.

The battle over the journal \textit{Zhovten}' in 1965-66 accordingly represented more
than the settling of personal scores between Rostyslav Bratun' and his rivals. As
chief editor, Bratun' attempted to challenge certain standards set for Ukrainian
literature in the establishment. Under his leadership, \textit{Zhovten}' featured works by
young writers from the republic who were challenging the criteria set for writers

\textsuperscript{111} DALO, fond P-3, opys 9, sprava 51, ark. 148, 151; DALO, fond P-3, opys 9, sprava 34, ark. 16-17.

\textsuperscript{112} DALO, fond P-2941, opys 1, sprava 159, ark. 38.

\textsuperscript{113} TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 8, sprava 3290, ark. 170.
during Stalin’s cult of personality. It devoted space to Ukrainian writers suppressed or “forgotten” in Stalinist times, some of whom were still subjects of controversy in the establishment. The journal, whose subscriptions were rising considerably under Bratun’s tenure, had attracted many readers exactly because it offered an alternative presentation of official Soviet culture. As local and republic Party leaders and writers who shared their views grew concerned about the specter of “bourgeois nationalism,” such enthusiasm for Zhovten’ became in their view an act of political protest.

3.4 Establishment Intellectuals and the Dissident Movement

As closed trials of “anti-Soviet” and “nationalist” elements took place throughout Soviet Ukraine in 1966, local and republic security organs met unexpected opposition in written appeals and, in the case of L’viv, in a street protest. The closed trial of Bohdan Horyn’ and others in L’viv in mid-May of that year brought together members of the cultural establishment in their own form of protest that demonstrated their common links with what in succeeding years became a political opposition in the republic.

---

114 As a report by the republic’s writers’ union noted, the journal’s subscribers had gone up significantly throughout Soviet Ukraine, from about 12,000 when Bratun’ took over to as much as 17,400 copies as of June 1965. TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 24, sprava 6001, ark. 64, 80.

115 Kas’ianov stresses the state’s lack of preparation for public response to the trials in Kas’ianov, 62-63.
Horyn', born in 1936 in the village of Knisel' in the L'viv Region, came from a family actively opposed to Soviet rule. His father, Mykola, an activist in the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) in Polish times, fled Soviet forces returning to Western Ukraine in 1944 and joined the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) waging guerilla warfare against Soviet rule. Security forces rounded up Horyn', along with his brother Mykhajlo and mother Stefaniia, for deportation, but all three managed to escape separately and reunite with their father, who left the UPA and posed as a Red Army deserter. 116 After studying philology at L'viv State University from 1954 to 1959, Horyn' worked as a tour guide at the L'viv Museum of Ukrainian Art, took part in state literary conferences, and published articles on contemporary Ukrainian artists and writers. Beginning in the early 1960s, he became involved with other Ukrainian intellectuals in the circulation of samvyday materials, first forbidden literary works and then political protest essays, which led to a number of their arrests at the end of August 1965. 117

When Horyn' and others were put on trial for “anti-Soviet” and “nationalist” activity in closed chambers in L'viv on 15-18 May 1966, a group of writers from Kyiv active in the republic’s cultural renaissance came to the city to protest. Poets Ivan Drach, Lina Kostenko, and Mykola Kholodnyj, along with journalist Viacheslav Chornovil and critic Ivan Dziuba, denounced the secret nature of the trials and offered

116 Taras Batenko, Opozytsiina osobystist' druha polovyna XX st.: politychnyi portret Bohdana Horynia (A personality from the opposition: a political portrait of Bohdan Horyn') (L'viv: Kal'variia, 1997), 24-26.

117 Ibid., 35-60, 71.
support to those prosecuted and their families.\textsuperscript{118} As they sought to rally public opposition to the trials, Drach and Kostenko visited the offices of Zhovten\textsuperscript{1} on 16 May 1966, where the trials had also become the chief topic of discussion among members of the writers’ union. Drach and Kostenko urged the group of writers assembled there to sign a petition, a collective appeal to the court by representatives of the intelligentsia of L’viv, asking it to release Horyn’, their friend and contributor, on their oath (vziaty na poruky) as the youngest of those on trial.\textsuperscript{119}

Those who signed the petition all had been intellectuals from the establishment: Iryna Vil’dé (head of the L’viv writers’ union), Roman Ivanychuk (a member of the editorial collegiate of Zhovten\textsuperscript{1}), Iakiv Stetsiuk (secretary of the L’viv writers’ union), Volodymyr Luchuk (a poet), Volodymyr Hzyts’kyi (a writer of the older generation), Roman Lubkivs’kyi (a poet), Emmanuil Mys’ko (head of the L’viv artists’ union), and Stepan Trofymuk (a literary critic and research worker at the Institute of Social Sciences in L’viv).\textsuperscript{120} In addition, Ivanychuk was a candidate member of the city’s Party committee and a Party group organizer at the journal, Stetsiuk was in the Party bureau of the writers’ union, and Luchuk at the time was a member of the city soviet.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{118} Ivanychuk, 123; DALO, fond P-3, opys 9, sprava 225, ark. 57-63, in Halajchak et al, 691-692; Kas’ianov, 55-56.

\textsuperscript{119} Ivanychuk, 123.

\textsuperscript{120} DALO, fond P-3, opys 9, sprava 225, ark. 57-63, in Halajchak et al, 692.

\textsuperscript{121} DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 45, ark. 15-16.
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The petition produced a backlash from local Party leaders. Regional Party committee secretary Valentyn Malanchuk, assisted by writer and retired colonel Mykola Romanchenko, investigated party members of the writers’ union who had signed the petition in a closed party meeting of the writers’ union party organization on 20 May 1966. In discussing the personal cases of Iakiv Stetsiuk, Roman Ivanychuk, and Volodymyr Luchuk, Party activists at this meeting thoroughly denounced these writers for their “thoughtless” actions. Convinced that Mykola Il’nyts’kyi also had been unprincipled for discussing the petition, many of them also directed their fire at him.\(^{122}\) Ivanychuk recalled Malanchuk haranguing them, exclaiming, “Whom are you with, whom are you with, workers of culture!?\(^{123}\)

In this closed party meeting, Stetsiuk was removed from the writers’ union Party bureau, he and Ivanychuk and Luchuk were given reprimands with remarks on their files, and Il’nyts’kyi only received a severe warning, apparently because he had not signed the petition.\(^{124}\) Stepan Trofymuk, also a Party member, received a reprimand with remarks on his file as well, at the Party organization of L’viv State University.\(^{125}\) Emmanuil Mys’ko, in confessing that he had made a mistake, claiming

\(^{122}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 45, ark. 14-31.

\(^{123}\) Ivanychuk, 124.

\(^{124}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 45, ark. 30.

\(^{125}\) DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 756, ark. 33-36.
that he had known nothing about Horyn’s “nationalist” activity until after he had
signed, received no punishment, and his case was limited to a discussion at open
Party meetings of the artists’ union.\textsuperscript{126}

The petition that Mys’ko and others had signed on Horyn’s behalf was the
closest that members of the cultural establishment in L’viv came to collective protest
in the two decades after Stalin’s death. When in 1972 nearly 100 Ukrainians were
arrested for samvyday activity, hundreds more investigated, and hundreds, if not
thousands, involved in closed trials as witnesses, the shock of the repression made
any form of public protest impossible.\textsuperscript{127} Even associating with people back from
prison had become hazardous. In 1973, Roman Ivanychuk, Roman Lubkivs’kyi, and
Mykola Petrenko all received reprimands with remarks in their files for attending a
wedding party for Horyn’ long since the latter had completed his sentence and tried to
resume a normal life.\textsuperscript{128}

This petition furthermore had fairly modest goals. As one of the signatories
recalled, everyone involved in the petition had decided that an open protest of the
trials involving Horyn’ and others was too risky.\textsuperscript{129} During Party hearings for writers
who had signed the appeal, Stetsyuk, one of the signatories, even claimed that he had

\textsuperscript{126} DALO, fond P-3810, opys 1, sprava 18, ark. 41-44.

\textsuperscript{127} Kas’ianov, 125. For an approximation of the scope of the 1972 “general pogrom” in Soviet
Ukraine, see ibid., 125-26.

\textsuperscript{128} Ivanychuk, 165; DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 52, ark. 26-29, 97-101.

\textsuperscript{129} Ivanychuk, 123.
signed after the region’s KGB chief, Poluden’, suggested that he and other writers were collectively responsible for Horyn’s “anti-Soviet” behavior. Stetsiuk saw the petition as a way to give Horyn’ a chance to redeem himself.\(^{130}\)

Yet in seeking Horyn’s release from jail, Stetsiuk and others were taking part in a number of collective protests in the republic and in the Soviet Union in the mid-1960s. As the Soviet state after Khrushchev’s fall sought to crack down on all underground forms of opposition, Soviet citizens, primarily intellectuals, began to criticize the violation of their rights under the Soviet Constitution. In written appeals and in some cases public protest, they took part in an emerging human rights movement.\(^{131}\) Throughout Soviet Ukraine, intellectuals from the establishment were signing collective appeals on behalf of those arrested in 1965 and others on trial in the late 1960s. In taking part in these written appeals, Stetsiuk and others in L’viv’s cultural establishment, while maintaining loyalty to the Soviet state, were expressing their own sympathy for those who were to come increasingly in conflict with that state.

Members of the cultural establishment and those arrested in the mid-1960s moreover shared a common discourse. As one scholar of dissent in Ukraine has noted, many of those involved in the circulation of samvydav materials were not prepared for an open political struggle when first arrested. Those who protested the

\(^{130}\) DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 44, ark. 16-18.

arrests quite often were loyal Soviet citizens concerned about the re-emergence of the Stalinist terror of the late 1930s. The emergence of political opposition came only after the arrests of 1965, the trials that followed the next year, and efforts by the state to intimidate those not behind bars. In the second half of the 1960s, many works circulating in samvyday expressed an aim to improve the Soviet state and secure the constitutional rights of its citizens rather than overthrowing it. It therefore was no accident that writers who joined in the criticism of colleagues who had signed a petition for Horyn’ accused them also of stirring up what they perceived as unwarranted political controversies.

When writers and artists in L’viv’s cultural establishment signed this petition for one of their colleagues, they consequently revealed their own participation in a wider discourse affecting Soviet society in the two decades after Stalin’s death. Members of artistic unions as loyal Soviet citizens sought more liberal standards in art and literature than what had developed under Stalin’s cult of personality. In Soviet Ukraine, as in other non-Russian republics, Ukrainian writers, artists, and other intellectuals endeavored to give greater dignity to their nation’s language and culture. They also supported efforts by the Soviet state to give more rights to republics. But as the state began to crack down on unofficial works critical of shortcomings in the Soviet system, a political opposition began to emerge, tempered

---

132 Kas’ianov, 52, 55-58, 62-64.

133 On Kas’ianov’s discussion of the evolution of samvyday works, see ibid., 88-120.

134 See remarks from the closed Party meetings of the writers’ union of 20 May 1966 in DALO, fond P-3808, opys 1, sprava 45, ark. 14-15, 19, 22-23, 26-29.
by arrests, firings, expulsions, and intimidation. Barricades were being drawn between those loyal to the state and those opposed to it, but the people on both sides of them shared much in common.

3.5 Conclusion

Efforts by Ivanychuk and others to free Horyn’ from prison in May of 1966 suggested that a political opposition in L’viv and other cities of the Soviet Union was emerging out of a common discourse affecting intellectuals throughout the country. The few who dared to circulate political protests underground shared the sentiments of many of their peers in artistic unions. Members of artists’ and writers’ unions after the Twentieth Party Congress had called for a reassessment of the standards placed on literature and art during Stalin’s cult of personality. In the case of Soviet Ukrainian writers, they pressed for better enforcement of the Party’s nationality policy, including more official support for the Ukrainian language in L’viv and other cities. Ten years later, as the Soviet state cracked down on dissent in Ukraine and other republics, many of those arrested had not really considered themselves opponents of the regime. Instead, like their peers in the establishment, they demanded its improvement.

But while some members of the cultural establishment sympathized with those arrested in the mid-1960s, many others accused both of having “anti-Soviet” views. Members of artists’ and writers’ unions, while maintaining loyalty to the Soviet state, lacked a common vision of the future after Khrushchev had denounced Stalin’s Cult of Personality in 1956. Some saw opportunities to challenge established conventions
in art and literature. In the case of Soviet Ukraine, some hoped to improve the status of Ukrainians’ language and culture in the Soviet Union. Yet others feared that a way of life they had fought for in the years of collectivization, industrialization, and the life-or-death struggle against Nazi aggression was in danger of collapse. Many of them also saw their own positions of power in the cultural establishment coming under fire, endangering privileges that they had won in an economy of scarce living space and few consumer goods. Not a few writers and artists who had made their careers in the Stalin era probably feared that their own life’s work would wind up in the dustbin of history as well.

In L’viv, these conflicts among members of the cultural establishment had their sources in Western Ukraine’s own troubled history after World War II. A long history of national movements affecting the peasantry of Galicia had produced different assumptions of what it was to be Ukrainian. Suppression of these movements under Soviet rule likewise affected their perceptions of what it was to be Soviet. Natives of Western Ukraine who became writers and artists in L’viv identified with artistic and literary trends from Galicia that had more in common with Western and Central Europe than with official Soviet culture under Stalinism.

Writers and artists who moved from other parts of the republic and the Soviet Union to L’viv at times shared their concerns about art, literature, and issues affecting Ukrainians’ language and culture. But others, tempered by experiences of collectivization, industrialization, and war, and furthermore supported by local Party and state authorities, suspected both of harboring “formalist” and “nationalist” sentiments. Natives of Western Ukraine for their part resented the better housing
space and other privileges that outsiders had received after the war. Personal rivalries thus fueled these divided opinions over the future of art, literature, and the Party’s nationality policy.

In a society where every aspect of culture had become politicized, it was no wonder that such accusations of “nationalism,” “formalism,” and other “anti-Soviet” sentiments surfaced among writers and artists, regardless of their professed loyalty to the Soviet state. Because of culture’s political function in Soviet society, artists and writers had become indispensable as well, causing the state to support as well as control their activities. As writers, artists, and scholars represented the past in inter-war Galicia and dealt with Soviet modernity, their acts acquired political significance. In this manner they came to affirm and also subvert the values legitimating Soviet rule in L’viv and in the republic.
CHAPTER 4

THE GALICIAN HISTORICAL MEMORY AS NONCONFORMITY

When political economist Stepan Zlupko attended a conference at the Academy of Sciences in Moscow in 1964, he could not believe the incredible claims that one of his teachers, Vasyl’ Osechyn’s’kyj, made in his report about Galicia during the First World War. Osechyn’s’kyj claimed that Galicians had acted as hirelings of foreign imperialists, particularly the Germans. In impromptu remarks during the conference, Zlupko maintained that the situation was not so simple. His people were not simply working for outside powers such as Austria-Hungary. Divided among several states, the Ukrainians took part in the national liberation movement in different ways, and so historians needed to treat the various political parties in Galicia during those years with greater sympathy.¹

Osechyn’s’kyj did not take kindly to his junior colleague’s criticism. He told Zlupko curtly, “We’ll talk about this in L’viv.” In L’viv, Osechyn’s’kyj alleged that Zlupko was trying to rehabilitate a whole host of “bourgeois nationalist” parties in wartime Galicia, including the West Ukrainian People’s Republic (ZUNR) and the

Sich Riflemen, who constituted its armed forces. The university Party committee, based on Osechyns’kyj’s report, expelled Zlupko from the university’s doctoral program and removed him from the position of senior research worker. In later ideological controversies, Zlupko and a number of social scientists in the early 1970s were to lose their jobs in L’viv and fall to public ridicule for their attempt to speculate with such controversial figures of the past in a way that distorted “Marxist-Leninist” teachings.

The discrediting of Stepan Zlupko and other social scientists by the early 1970s reflected the degree to which the historical memory of inter-war Galicia had become an item of major ideological contention for the Soviet regime in Western Ukraine and in particular L’viv in the post-Stalin era. Trying to create a “useable past” for this region was especially problematic. Galicia’s political parties in Austrian times derived as much of their inspiration from national movements in Central Europe as from revolutionary movements in Imperial Russia. The integral nationalism of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) in the inter-war years and guerilla resistance to Soviet rule under the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) in the years after World War Two hardly could have provided for a useable past in the Soviet context.

Yet efforts to present a more sympathetic account of Galicia’s past did take place, as Zlupko’s ex-promptu remarks indicate. The social sciences in L’viv were subject to the most rigorous forms of censorship and ideological conformity. Yet
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2 Golubka and Golubka, 24; DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 725, ark. 243-45.
scholars, regardless of intention, did reassess the historical record in Galicia and point out the way in which certain figures and movements were involved in the process of building a Ukrainian national state.

These efforts to show "national liberation" at work among movements previously deemed reactionary or "anti-Soviet" were encouraged in particular by the Institute of Social Sciences under Ivan Petrovych Kryp'iakevych. While this historian had "recanted" his interpretation of Ukrainian history formed under the influence of the "bourgeois nationalist" historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky, he tried to work within the system and present a past that was less burdened with ideological stereotypes. Yet others contested such efforts, sometimes due to personal grievances with colleagues rather than out of scholarly disagreement. An increasingly reactionary political climate in Soviet Ukraine, particularly by the end of the 1960s, gave colleagues and regional, republic, and all-Union Party leaders who supported them a chance to label their opponents "bourgeois nationalists" or "propagandists of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism." It was no coincidence, therefore, that scholars from the Institute of Social Science along with figures such as Zlupko came under assault by Party organs in the early 1970s and that the department of literature of this institute was liquidated.

As with other scholars in the republic and in the Soviet Union, changing Party policies and competition for scarce resources among scholars had much to do with controversies over representations of the past. Yet the ideological assault on social

---

scientists in L’viv represented more than just a backlash against those determined to
wrest history and literary criticism from the ideological straight-jacket imposed in
L’viv and other Soviet cities after the end of World War Two. It also suggested that
within intellectual circles of varying political orientation, the historical memory of
inter-war Galicia was very much alive and a source of trouble for the Soviet regime.
The historical memory of Galicians also came to the forefront of criticism with the
dramatization of Iryna Vil’de’s novel, The Richyns’kyj Sisters, in the Maria
Zan’kovets’ka Theater in L’viv. In showing the follies of Galicia’s “bourgeois” past,
the novel, particularly in its staging in the late 1960s, suggested that “bourgeois
nationalism” in Galician life was very much a human tragedy that deserved readers’
sympathy. Vil’de’s attempt to depart from a stereotyped, black-and-white depiction of
“nationalists” in Galicia raised scorn among local Party leaders and won praise in the
audience in the first dramatization of the novel staged in L’viv. In this play the subject
of national resistance in inter-war Galicia had become a source of controversy because
it was such an endearing subject for the older generation and the source of a very
different Ukrainian past for younger generations.

4.1 Social Scientists and the Representation of History under Ivan Kryp’iakevych

History and the social sciences in L’viv enjoyed very little freedom in the
Soviet period, particularly after World War Two. At L’viv State University in the late
1940s, party leaders orchestrated serial denunciations of the historical school of
Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyj, focusing on the “bourgeois nationalist” distortions of Ivan
Kryp’iakevych, Mykhailo Rudnyts’kyj, Mykhailo Vozniak, and others at the
university. Vasyl’ Osechyns’kyj played a significant role in these public trials of L’viv’s scholars, and in later years he acquired a notorious reputation at the university’s Department of History of the USSR.⁴

L’viv State University became one of the most reactionary institutions regarding the field of Ukrainian history, largely due to the complete discrediting of followers of Hrushevs’kyj and those such as Osechyns’kyj who sought out any forms of “nationalism” in the works and lectures of university instructors and students. In following years scholars were censored for the slightest lack of “vigilance” on the ideological front. In 1960, for instance, the Regional Administration of Literature (oblilit) removed from publication an article by a L’viv State University scholar that indicated large numbers of people in L’viv Region deserting the UPA (a total of about 15,000 in the spring of 1945). In expressing reservations about mentioning this fact, regional officials were definitely afraid of people reading in between the lines, seeing the nationalist underground as a mass movement.⁵ Students in the university’s history

⁴ On this campaign against the “Hrushevsky school” in L’viv in the postwar years, see Iaroslav Dashkevych, “Borot’ba z hrushevs’kyym ta ioho shkoloiu u l’viv’s’komu universytytci za radians’kykh chasiv” (The struggle with Hrushevs’kyj and his school at L’viv University in Soviet times), Mykhajlo Hrushevs’kyj i l’viv’s’ka istorychna shkola: materialy konferentsii, L’viv, 24-25 zhovtnia 1994 r., ed. L. Vynar et al, L’viv’s’ki istorychni pratsi, materialy zasydan’ i konferentsii (L’viv historical works and materials of meetings and conferences), no. 1 (New York-Lviv: Ukrain’s’ke istorychne tovarystvo, 1995), 32-94.

faculty and in other faculties of the social sciences got into trouble for citing a work that mentioned Hrushevskýj in a positive sense in their undergraduate theses or mentioning something about Hrushevskýj in their school notebooks.⁶

There is no doubt that the social sciences in L’viv were riddled with scholastic citations of Marxist-Leninist classics, a lack of analysis, and a preoccupation with satisfying censors and would-be censors. Yet at the same time cracks within the mighty edifice of that great ideological institution, the discipline of the social sciences, appeared, particularly in the post-Stalin period at the Institute of Social Sciences in L’viv. Under the direction of Ivan Kryp’iakevych from 1953 to 1962, it fostered an atmosphere that tried to soften ideological stereotypes and promote a less provincial role for Ukrainian history. As the ideological climate grew more militant in the Soviet Union in the years after Kryp’iakevych’s retirement, this relatively tolerant setting diminished.

In many ways Ivan Petrovych Kryp’iakevych (1886-1967) did not fit the suitable description of a director of such an important ideological center as the Institute of Social Sciences. In the early years of the twentieth century, he became a mature scholar of early Ukrainian history in L’viv under the influence of the “bourgeois nationalist” historian Mykhajlo Hrushevskýj. Prior to World War One, Hrushevskýj supervised many of his first works in history, first as a student at L’viv University and then as a gymnasium teacher and member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society
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⁶ One student received a reprimand for such an undergraduate thesis in the 1950s. Iaroslav Isaiyevych, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 18 May 1998. Župko as a university student in those years received a reprimand because he had written a brief note about a book by Hrushevskýj in one of his notebooks. Golubka and Golubka, 17.
(NTSh.). Their friendship continued through visits and then through correspondence until Hrushevs’kyj’s death in Soviet Ukraine in 1934, and in the following year Kryp’iakevych wrote a study of him in his memory.7

While scrupulously devoted to historical research, Kryp’iakevych wound up in the heart of national movements in Galicia from his student years in L’viv. Authorities in L’viv jailed him for three weeks in 1907 for voicing public demands for a Ukrainian university in the city, whose university was run by Polish officials that discriminated against Ukrainians. In the early 1920s, he took part in lecturing at an underground Ukrainian university in L’viv set up in defiance of the Polish state.8 In the First World War he was active in the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU).9 During the war and after, as he moved from job to job as a gymnasium teacher, Kryp’iakevych produced a whole series of textbooks and popular works in Ukrainian history, some illustrated for children, to instill in Ukrainian youth a greater sense of national consciousness.10

With the beginning of Soviet rule, Kryp’iakevych in 1939 became professor of Ukrainian history at L’viv State University and head its Department of the History of Ukraine. He headed the Institute of History for the republic Academy of Sciences

---

7 For biographical information on Kryp’iakevych, see Iaroslav Dashkevych, Preface to Istoriia Ukrainy (A history of Ukraine), by I. P. Kryp’iakevych, Pamyatky istorychnoi dumky Ukrainy (Memorials to Ukrainian historical thought) (L’viv: “Svit,” 1990), 7-15.

8 Ibid., 7.


10 Dashkevych, Preface to Istoriia Ukrainy, 10, 15-18.
branch in L’viv the next year. But after World War Two, Kryp’iakevych fell from grace for allegedly sharing the “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist” views of Hrushevsky’s school of history and refusing to break with them. After a series of public meetings in 1946 denouncing Kryp’iakevych and others, the Institute of History and other institutions in the humanities were dissolved in August, with a number of scholars transferred to the republic’s capital, Kyiv.11

After working there as a research worker at the Institute of History, Kryp’iakevych returned to L’viv in 1948. After some years of work at the Ukrainian Museum of Ethnography and Art Industry in L’viv, he resumed scholarly research at the newly established Institute of Social Sciences in 1951. In 1953, as party leaders sought to promote natives of the region to some positions of power in Western Ukraine, Kryp’iakevych became the Institute’s director. He published his monograph on Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyj in 1954, as officials marked the 300th anniversary of the Council of Pereiaslav’ whose agreement, signed by Khmel’nyts’kyj, they interpreted as a historic moment uniting both Russian and Ukrainian peoples.12 With this monograph and a series articles connected with it, Kryp’iakevych had won back official respect as a scholar. By 1958, the republic’s Academy of Sciences had elected him as an academician.13
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11 Ibid., 11-12. On campaigns in 1946 against Kryp’iakevych and other L’viv scholars, see idem, “Borot’ba z hrushevsky’m ta ioho shkoloiu.”


13 Slyvka, 7.
As director of the Institute of Social Sciences in L’viv, Kryp’iakevych encouraged a relatively liberal atmosphere among its scholars from 1953 until his retirement in July 1962. Despite directing an institution in charge of important ideological tasks for the party and state, Kryp’iakevych was not a Party member. Unable to read Party documents on ideological matters because so many of them were marked “secret,” “top secret,” “only for professional use” and so on, Kryp’iakevych posed a major obstacle for the Institute’s party bureau.

In this respect, Kryp’iakevych constantly found himself in the center of controversy among Party and state leaders interested in presenting a strong ideological front against “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists.” As one Institute scholar of the late 1950s recalled, various sorts of people would pressure Kryp’iakevych to agree to publish materials or even sign articles that Kryp’iakevych had not written, claiming that some Party or state official wanted him to do it. One official, Valentyn Malanchuk, who worked at the regional party committee in 1958-63, made a regular habit of summoning the elderly scholar to his office and “call him on the carpet.” Malanchuk also called general Institute meetings and accuse its leaders of various “isms.”

While at odds with local Party figures such as Malanchuk, Kryp’iakevych managed to offer protection for Institute scholars. His enjoyed a reputation among colleagues not just in L’viv, but in Kyiv, Moscow, and fellow socialist countries. In the late 1950s an American colleague, Omelian Prytsak, visited his office, an
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15 Slyvka, 20.

unprecedented event for scholars in L’viv. Because of this reputation in the Soviet Union and abroad, Kryp’tiakevych became for the Institute an important “protective seal” against interference by Party and state organs.\textsuperscript{17}

Because of this authority, Kryp’tiakevych could prevent Party authorities from enjoying thorough control over the Institute of Social Sciences. Malanchuk, head of the regional Party committee’s Department of Science and Culture, complained about the weak influence of the Institute’s Party organization over Institute affairs. In a report to the regional Party committee’s bureau on 27 February 1959, he pointed this out and also noted that Institute leaders were doing a poor job selecting personnel. It selected some people because, claimed Malanchuk, they were cronies of Institute scholars. The Institute's leaders moreover hired some personnel without thoroughly checking their backgrounds, allowing a number of people prosecuted for “nationalist” and “anti-Soviet” activity to work there as scholars.\textsuperscript{18} A republic Central Committee report that same year added that Kryp’tiakevych in this manner had hired literary scholars Hryhorij Nud’ha and Oleksij Moroz, as well as historian Iaroslav Dashkevych, all of whom had been prosecuted for "nationalist" or "anti-Soviet" activities. By contrast, he had ignored candidates recommended by Party organizations.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{17} Slyvka, 12-15.

\textsuperscript{18} See this report, whose original is in DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 360, ark. 2-6, in Halajchak et al, 369-70.

\textsuperscript{19} Iu. Kondufor, Head of the Department of Science and Culture of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, “O nekotorykh nedostatkakh v rabote intelligentsii L’vovskoi partinoi organizatsii” (On certain shortcomings in the work of the intelligentsia by the L’viv Party organization), 23 April 1959, in Halajchak et al, 388.
While keeping his distance from Party officials whenever possible, Kryp’iakevych strove to instill a sense of scholarly enterprise that in many ways reflected the academic environment of interwar L’viv. Iurij Slyvka, who first arrived to work at the Insitute in the fall of 1953 as a graduate student, recalled that Kryp’iakevych and his assistant, Markiian Smishko, were highly cultured (intelihentnyi) people not preoccupied with ideological purity, true scholars who treated graduate students and other colleagues as equals.20 Kryp’iakevych’s son, Roman, remembered him as a true educator who tried to suggest good books and other things to his children rather than impose his views. He cautioned them to avoid political extremes and avoid foolhardly confrontations with authorities.21

In fostering this atmosphere of tolerance and moderation among colleagues and in his family life, Kryp’iakevych brought to an ideological institution a different approach to the study of Ukrainian history and culture. Though he had repudiated his previous historical interpretations in public, Kryp’iakevych in retirement told his doctoral student, Iurij Slyvka, in private that official publications had wrongly criticized Hrushevs’kyj’s interpretation of Ukrainian history. For Kryp’iakevych, official ideological positions were a necessary ritual and nothing more. As he confided
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20 Slyvka, 5-8, 14-16.

21 Roman Kryp’iakevych, interview by the author, L’viv, taped recording, 24 November 1998, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.
with Slyvka, Kryp’iakevych included Marxist citations in his works’ introductions and sometimes in the main texts as a means of protection, giving his own interpretation of events in the rest.  

Shortly after retirement, Kryp’iakevych showed his support for a more nuanced interpretation of Ukraine’s past when he spoke at a meeting on ideological work in the western regions of Ukraine on 12 September 1962. Taking advantage of more rigorous criticism of Stalin’s cult of personality in the Twenty-Second Congress held the previous year, he called for an end to “old vulgar theses” in historians’ works about the recent Soviet past. Studies on the history of collectivization, culture, and so on “avoid all the difficult questions and try to simplify the matter — the CC [Central Committee] led us, and we did it.” Studies on the Soviet period of Ukrainian history needed to overcome the consequences of Stalin’s cult of personality. They had to show history as a more multifaceted process, involving all the people not in the party and various historical trends connected with party decisions.  

Kryp’iakevych also defended scholars like himself who studied the medieval period of Ukrainian history. In this instance, he was responding to remarks made at this same meeting by Andrij Skaba, a republic Central Committee secretary. Skaba had claimed that scholars in the social sciences needed to pursue more “relevant” themes, such as recent transformations in Western Ukraine under Soviet rule and works
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22 Slyvka, 27, 32-33.

23 DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 421, ark. 69-72.

24 Ibid.
condemning the activities of “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists.” Kryp’iakevych by contrast maintained that teachers and scholars alike in Ukraine had sorely neglected the field of medieval Ukrainian history, and colleagues in Poland and Czechoslovakia to their shame were publishing whole volumes on the feudal and capitalist periods of their own history.

As Kryp’iakevych called for an end to old stereotypes about Soviet Ukrainian history and Ukraine’s more distant past, he suggested that historians needed more ideological space to deal with Ukrainian history. They needed to focus on all periods of Ukrainian history instead of focusing merely on Soviet rule’s accomplishments. As for studies of those accomplishments, they needed to be presented in a more nuanced manner, instead of focusing on certain ideological stamps. In advocating these changes, Kryp’iakevych reflected his own more liberal approach to the discipline of history. Like many other scholars in the Soviet Union, he made use of the conventions of his discipline to further his own intellectual agenda.

Continuities with the Shevchenko Scientific Society (N.T.Sh.) no doubt encouraged study of Ukrainian history and culture in a more liberal manner than what was expected of Soviet ideological institutions. This society, which Ukrainians from the Russian Empire initiated and financially supported, began in L’viv in 1873. Modeled on the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna, it became a leading center of scholarship in Ukrainian studies. At the beginning of 1940, Soviet authorities
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25 For these remarks by Skaba, see DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 420, ark. 48-49.

26 DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 421, ark. 69-72.

presided over the Society's liquidation as an institution deemed no longer needed.\textsuperscript{28} While the Shevchenko Scientific Society had closed, quite a few of its scholars worked at the Institute of Social Sciences. Moreover, the Institute took over both the building that housed the Society and its library when it was founded in 1951. Jurij Slyvka as a graduate student at the Institute in the mid-1950s sensed there the spirit of the Shevchenko Scientific Society through its former scholars and long-term patrons of its former library.\textsuperscript{29}

In emphasizing these strong ties to the Shevchenko Scientific Society, Slyvka presumably was attempting to distance the Institute from its own Soviet past. Yet a different atmosphere existed at the Institute, compared to other institutions in the city that stressed the social sciences almost exclusively in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. A considerable number of people associated with the Shevchenko Scientific Society worked there. As such, they carried with them assumptions about scholarship that Party functionaries who had studied history in other Soviet institutions would have considered "bourgeois nationalist" or too "apolitical" for such an "ideological" field as the social sciences.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} O. S. Rubl'ov and Iu. A. Cherchenko, \textit{Stalinshehyna i dolia zakhidnoukrains'koi intelihentsii (Stalinism and the fate of the western Ukrainian intelligentsia, 1920s-30s)} (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1994), 200-201.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Besides Smishko and Kryp'iakevych, other scholars still working in 1953 who had established their careers under this society included academic Mykhailo Vozniak, professor Ilarion Sventits'kyi, Anton Hensior's'kyi, Mariia Derkach, Oleksandr Tysovs'kyi, Dmytro Bandrivs'kyi, Volodymyr Ohonovs'kyi, Lukii Humets'ka, and Ievhen Iatskevych. This whole cohort gave Slyvka and others a sense of being connected to the older institution and its academic traditions. Slyvka, 16.
\end{itemize}
The Institute of Social Sciences under Kryp’iakevych's direction thus encouraged a more tolerant atmosphere than many other institutions dealing with the social sciences in L’viv. This was especially true for L’viv State University, which by contrast had become a very reactionary institution under the leadership of Vasył’ Osechyns’kyj and others determined to maintain a firm Party line in history and other social science fields. As a result, young scholars at the Institute held Kryp’iakevych in great esteem, while regarding Osechyns’kyj as an unwelcome spirit in the academic community. One ditty that colleagues recited at an evening Institute party expressed it this way:

Step aside, historians,  
Get lost Osechyns’kyi,  
Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi himself  
Is greeting Kryp’iakevych!

[Roztupit’sia, istoryka,  
Shchezny Osechyns’kyi,  
Kryp’iakevycha vitaj! –  
Sam Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi!]³⁰

Vasył’ Osechyns’kyj had tried to discredit Kryp’iakevych and others manifesting “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism” in their scholarship in the late 1940s. For these young scholars and others at the Institute, Osechyns’kyj was no real historian at all compared to their director, Kryp’iakevych.³¹

---

³⁰ Slyvka, 21.

³¹ On Osechyns’kyj’s role in discrediting Hrushev’s’kyj and his followers in L’viv, see Dashkevych, “Borot’ba z hrushev’s’kym ta ioho shkoloiu.”
With Kryp’iakevych’s protection, many Institute colleagues represented
Ukrainians’ past and culture in ways that troubled Party officials. For instance, new
interpretations of the West Ukrainian People’s Republic (ZUNR) in the late 1950s by
one scholar threatened to revise official assumptions of the October Revolution in
Russia. Soviet historians officially regarded this state, set up in Eastern Galicia in
1918-19, as a “bourgeois nationalist” republic controlled by imperialist powers. But in
1957-58, two major anniversaries gave scholars an opportunity to challenge this view.
The first one, in 1957, was the Fortieth Anniversary of the October Revolution. The
second one came in 1958, when scholars in the Soviet bloc observed the Fortieth
Anniversary of “bourgeois-democratic revolutions” that swept Central European
countries in 1918 and brought down the Austro-Hungarian Empire. These two
anniversaries encouraged historian Oleksandr Karpenko, a senior research worker at
the Institute’s Department of the History of Ukraine, to reconsider events that led to the
formation of the ZUNR.

Karpenko sought to demonstrate in one article that the ZUNR reflected one of
many “bourgeois-democratic” revolutions taking place in the Austro-Hungarian
Empire that led to the formation of national states. Instead of revolutionary
movements in Eastern Galicia being integrally connected with the October Revolution
in Petrograd, they were part of a major set of national revolutions affecting Central

---

32 Iu. Iu. Slyvka, “Etapy ta holovni napriamky doslidzhennia ZUNR ukrains’koi istoriohrafiei’u” (Stages and main directions of researching the ZUNR in Ukrainian historiography), n.d., typed computer
manuscript from the personal papers of Iu. Iu. Slyvka, 4; Slyvka, “Ivan Kryp’iakevych,” 12, 14.
Karpenko’s work was “On the issue of the revolutionary movement’s character in Eastern Galicia in
1918 (Do pytannia pro kharakter revoliutsiinoho rukhu v Skhidnii Halychyni v 1918 rotsi),” Z istorii
zakhidnoukrains’kykh zemel’ (From the history of the western Ukrainian lands), vol. 1, Kyiv, 1957.
Europe toward the end of World War One. Karpenko consequently was challenging the official historiography’s assumption that all true revolutionary movements among Ukrainians were derived from the October Revolution.

Local Party organs that caught wind of this article’s contents eventually cited Karpenko and the Institute’s collective for encouraging what amounted to a significant revision of the official historical narrative. A regional Party committee bureau report of 27 February 1959, citing shortcomings in ideological work at the Institute, claimed that Karpenko had taken “bourgeois nationalist” positions in evaluating revolutionary events in Eastern Galicia in 1918 that led to the formation of the ZUNR. Instead of properly citing the ZUNR as a “counter-revolutionary” phenomenon, Karpenko linked its emergence with a “general national uprising” and a “bourgeois-democratic revolution.” Karpenko furthermore had treated the revolutionary movement in this region as isolated from the workers’ revolutionary movement in Soviet Ukraine. Despite the fact that Party meetings at the institute as well as articles in the Party press had condemned his interpretation, Karpenko “continues to stand for the majority of his unhealthy positions.”

The regional Party committee bureau also complained in its report that Karpenko’s colleagues, especially those in the Department of the History of Ukraine, had joined in his defense. Ievhen Latskevyh and Iurii Slyvka in 1957 had written

33 Slyvka, “Etapy,” 5.

34 For more background on the official narrative regarding Ukraine, the October Revolution, and the ZUNR, see studies by Tillet and Velychenko cited above.

35 DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 360, ark. 2-6, in Halajchak et al, 369.
positive reviews of two of Karpenko’s works that also had wrongly reassessed the historical role of the ZUNR.36 These reviews “went even further in the defense (apolohtyzatsiia) of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie.” Slyvka, for instance, argued that government policies of the ZUNR, rather than betraying the workers’ revolution in Eastern Galicia, had contained “certain mistakes” in the state’s struggle against foreign aggressors. The Ukrainian bourgeoisie, instead of selling out the workers, were in fact leading their revolutionary struggle as they governed this new state.37

Slyvka recalls that at the Institute of Social Sciences, “almost the whole collective, if not officially, then in backdoor (koluarnyi) discussions,” agreed completely with Karpenko’s interpretation of events. Kryp’iakevych for his part tried to soften the blows made by Party zealots in department and Academic Council discussions of Karpenko’s case.38 While Kryp’iakevych, head of the Department of the History of Ukraine, and other department colleagues such as Iatskevych and Slyvka supported Karpenko, some other colleagues were not so solid in their agreement with Karpenko’s interpretation. Years later, when Mykola Kravets’, another department

36 These two works were “The October Revolution and the Revolutionary Movement in the Western Ukrainian Lands, 1918-1920 (Zhovtneva revoliutsiia i revoliutsiinyi rukh na zakhidnoukrains’kykh zemliakh v 1918-1920 rr.),” and “International Imperialism – the organizer of the occupation of the Western Ukrainian Lands (1918-1919) (Mizhnarodnyi imperialism – orhanizator okupatsii zakhidnoukrains’kykh zemel’ [1918-1919]).” Ibid., 367.

37 DALO, fond P-3, opys 6, sprava 360, ark. 2-6, in Halajchak et al, 367-68.

38 Slyvka, “Ivan Kryp’iakevych,” 12.
colleague, faced charges of supporting “bourgeois nationalist” views at L’viv State University in January 1972, he stressed that in Party meetings at the Institute of Social Sciences in 1959, he had sharply condemned Karpenko for such deviations.\footnote{DALO, fond P-3, opys 1, sprava 960, ark. 85-86.}

Yet Karpenko’s conclusions about ZUNR must have enjoyed considerable private support at the Institute, particularly among department colleagues. As one colleague, Stepan Shchurat, noted during public criticism of Karpenko in late 1958, “It’s very sad that public criticism through the press, and not workers of our Institute, exposed this harmful conception.”\footnote{The press quoted Shchurat, head of the Institute’s Department of Literature, as having said this at recent annual party meetings of the Institute. See P. Mat’ora, “Vyshche idejno-teoretychnyi riven’ naukovoi roboty: iz zvitno-vybornykh zboriv partorhanizatsii Naukovo-doslidnogo instytutu suspil’nykh nauk Akademii nauk URSR” (For a higher ideological-theoretical level of research work: from report-election meetings of the Party organization of the Scientific Research Institute of Social Sciences, Academy of Sciences, Ukrainian SSR), Radians’ka Ukraina (Kyiv) 4 December 1958.} In being reluctant to “expose” Karpenko’s “harmful conception,” Institute colleagues in essence were protecting their colleague and tolerating his ideas. One department colleague of Karpenko’s pointed out that the Institute did have the reputation of being somewhat like a “clan” protecting its own.\footnote{Feodosij Steblrij, interview by the author, L’viv, taped recording, 13 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.} Karpenko’s controversial remarks as well as the “scandalous” burial of one of the institute’s workers with Christian church ceremonies may have brought about Kryp’iakevyh stepping down as head of the Department of the History of Ukraine at the end of 1958.\footnote{DALO, fond P-3, opys 1, sprava 960, ark. 85-86.}
Colleagues at the Institute in fact could mount only a modest defense of Karpenko’s assessment of the ZUNR. Along with the regional Party committee bureau report’s scathing remarks about Karpenko and his colleagues, a number of particularly militant academic figures from the historical faculty of L’viv State University and the L’viv Polytechnic Institute also had joined in the all-out assault. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, too, had thrown in its weight.\textsuperscript{43} Karpenko eventually had to leave the Institute, but he managed to secure an academic position in the historical faculty at L’viv State University in 1960.\textsuperscript{44}

Despite Karpenko’s public humiliation, revisions of the historical role of the ZUNR did continue among historians in Soviet Ukraine, as Slyvka points out in a review of Ukrainian historiography on the ZUNR. Soviet scholars gained greater appreciation of the ZUNR’s role in history as colleagues in neighboring socialist countries such as Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia discussed national-democratic processes among their peoples in 1918 more openly. Scholars in Soviet Ukraine had more opportunities to address events surrounding the emergence of the ZUNR with the rehabilitation of the Communist Party of Western Ukraine (KPZU) and more open access to the interwar press.\textsuperscript{45} Scholars “under loud ideological stamps” began to treat

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{42} Slyvka, “Ivan Kryp’iakevych,” 14.
\item\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 12.
\item\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.; DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 993, ark. 53.
\item\textsuperscript{45} Slyvka, “Etapy,” 6.
\end{itemize}
the ZUNR as an international entity. They also began to show its connections to popular acts of resistance against Polish occupation in 1919-23 and to the actions of interwar political parties, including the KPZU, in Eastern Galicia.\textsuperscript{46}

In stressing the significance of the ZUNR in Soviet scholars’ publications, Slyvka may be attempting to rehabilitate scholarly works that had strongly condemned this “bourgeois national” republic. Yet works by scholars at the Institute of Social Sciences that focused on interwar Galicia’s past ultimately did cause problems for authorities. In attempting to satisfy censors, scholars very likely were trying to convey some kind of insight in between the lines, as did many of their colleagues in the Soviet Union. Criticism of the Institute and its scholars in succeeding years suggests that a relatively liberal treatment of interwar Galicia and other aspects of Ukrainian history and culture must have been taking place among Institute scholars.

By late 1971, scholars at the institute came under fire for their attempts to promote certain events in their publications that the official narrative had officially condemned. It was then that the regional Party committee took the Institute to task regarding two major collections of essays, \textit{A Celebration of Historic Justice: The Organic Nature (zakonomirmist’) of the Unification of the Western Ukrainian Lands with Soviet Ukraine} (1968), as well as \textit{A History of Towns and Villages of Ukrainian SSR: L’viv Region} (1968).\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 6-7.

\textsuperscript{47} V. Iu. Malanchuk et al., eds., \textit{Istoriiia mist i sviy Ukrain’s’koj SSR: L’viv’s’ka oblast’} (A history of towns and villages of the Ukrainian SSR: the L’viv Region) (Kyiv: Holovna redaktsiia Ukrain’s’koj Radians’koj Entsyklopedii AN URSR, 1968); M. M. Oleksiuk, ed., \textit{Torzhestvo Historychnoi spravedlivosti: zakonomirmist’ vozv’edinennia zakhidno-ukraïns’kykh zemel’ v jedyni Ukraïns’koi derzhavi} (A triumph of historic justice: the normality of the unification of the western Ukrainian lands into one Ukrainian state) (L’viv: Vydavnytstvo L’viv’s’koho Universytetu, 1968).
Both collections of essays sought to highlight the "progressive" forces at work in the history of Western Ukraine and L'viv Region both before and during Soviet rule. Kryp'iakевич just after his retirement in 1962 called on Party leaders in the western regions to support the History of Towns and Villages of the Ukrainian SSR series as a way of demonstrating the heroic past of Western Ukraine and its new Soviet face.48

The collection of articles, Celebration of Historic Justice, presented an opportunity for the Institute's scholars to address the history of Ukraine as that of a separate national unit in the Soviet system. It had received official support in the ideological struggle with Chinese Communists as a way of showing the historical unity of Soviet Ukraine's lands and assess those historical forces leading to the creation of one united Soviet Ukrainian state. In the mid-1960s, Chinese Communist leader Mao Tse-Tung began to criticize his Soviet counterparts for bureaucratism and for annexing the Baltic States and eastern Poland illegally.49 As Party and state leaders sought to counter Mao's criticisms, they gave support to Celebration of Historic Justice as an important work in the ideological struggle with Maoism. They saw it as a way to prove that the annexation of Western Ukraine was not illegal. Instead, it satisfied a centuries long yearning by Ukrainians there to unite with their countrymen in one Ukrainian state under the Soviet Union.50 In the case of Celebration of Historic Justice, scholars

48 DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 421, ark. 72-73.


50 Isaievych, interview.
contributing articles went to Moscow and had access for the first time to works by "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist" counterparts in the West.\textsuperscript{51} Scholars even sought to nominate \textit{Celebration of Historic Justice} for a republic prize.\textsuperscript{52}

Yet the regional Party committee in late 1971 insinuated that both works tacitly supported "bourgeois nationalist" assumptions. V. S. Kutsevol, regional Party committee secretary, at a regional Party committee plenary session on 20 November 1971, claimed that both works contained a number of "gross political mistakes." Both works, Kutsevol claimed, had toned down the class struggle and had been too superficial in their exposure of "the treacherous (zlovorozhnyi) activity of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, their armed struggle against Soviet power, their servility before Hitlerite occupants, and their bestial destruction of the region's civilian population.” They also had ignored figures that had truly struggled for Soviet rule in Western Ukraine while including figures not worthy of any mention at all. Taking scholars to task for neglecting these shortcomings, he asked, “Why have leading scholar-communists who work at the university and at the Institute of Social Sciences wound up in the positions of passive observers?”\textsuperscript{53}

In making these criticisms, Kutsevol suggested that institute and university scholars had been too lenient in their treatment of class struggle over national concerns and too indulgent toward "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists." One of the scholars who

\textsuperscript{51} Steblij was one of the scholars participating in this research trip to Moscow. He stressed that no such materials were available in L'viv, unless received through underground channels. Steblij, interview.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{53} DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 22, ark. 19.
had participated in the project later claimed that critics began to disparage *Celebration of Historic Justice* in particular because it “gave an advantage to national problems over social ones, and the main thing, analyzed the history of Ukraine not as an integral part of Russia.” Because this collection of essays had been intended to convey the historic ties between Western Ukraine and the rest of the republic, and since local Party leaders faulted the collection for toning down issues of class struggle, this claim by one of those involved in the project was probably correct.

While this work did not necessarily support "bourgeois nationalist" views, it did suggest between the lines an approach to Ukrainians' past that was less vociferous in its criticism of "bourgeois nationalism" and more oriented to specifically national concerns. Such an approach to Western Ukraine's past by 1971 could not find official support. Scholars and former colleagues of the Institute of Social Sciences would face mounting criticism of aiding and abetting "bourgeois nationalist" elements in their depiction of the Galician past. It was no wonder that Vasyl' Osechyn's'kyj, who had so vociferously denounced Kryp'iakevych in the late 1940s, had become one of the central figures at the university writing scathing reviews of *Celebration of Historic Justice* in the early 1970s.55

54 Slyvka, “Ivan Kryp'iakevych,” 23.

55 Steblij, interview.
4.2 Reaction and Repression in Ukrainian Studies

Claims that colleagues at the Institute of Social Sciences were too neutral in the ideological struggle were not the only case where historians and other scholars found themselves in trouble with authorities. By the early 1970s, a number of local scholars in political economy, history, and literature bore the brunt of criticism by Party activists and their supporters at the local, republic, and even all-Union party level. They came under fire for not condemning “bourgeois nationalist” views sharply enough or for hiding their own connections to the “bourgeois nationalist” past in Western Ukraine. Some critics even claimed that their colleagues were actively promoting “bourgeois nationalist” thinkers from the past in between the lines.

These accusations of defending harmful conceptions in scholarship or having compromised pasts to a great extent emerged out of personal conflicts among colleagues. To an extent these conflicts had arisen because these scholars accused were from the western regions of Ukraine. But investigations of incidents of “bourgeois nationalism” at L’viv State University and its subordinate institution, the Institute of Social Sciences, also reflected tensions within representations of Galicia’s past, particularly the interwar period. Those most active in rooting out “bourgeois nationalism” at L’viv State University and elsewhere challenged the legitimacy of important social and political movements in interwar Galicia’s past. They suggested that more liberal interpretations of this past in fact promoted “bourgeois nationalist”
views. In assailing these “harmful” scholarly works, they called attention to the
difficulty of representing Galicia’s past as a “progressive” phenomenon that fit within
official interpretations of Ukrainian history.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, three major conflicts broke out among
scholars involving either the Institute of Social Sciences or L’viv State University. In
these conflicts, scholars accused colleagues of either supporting “bourgeois nationalist”
conceptions in scholarship or being “unreliable” for various reasons. All of these
conflicts suggested not only intense personal conflicts taking place among scholars, but
also assumptions of scholars being “unreliable,” either because of their backgrounds or
because of their representation of Ukraine’s past.

In 1970, one literary scholar’s grievances with colleagues at the Department of
Literature of the Institute of Social Sciences turned into a campaign against the
department and the institute itself. Myroslava Hurladi, a senior research worker whose
husband worked for the regional Party committee, became incensed at department
colleagues who almost unanimously refused to approve her dissertation, citing it as
unfinished and superficial. Highly offended by her critics, she promised them, “You’ll
remember me.”

56 Steblij, interview; Mykhajlo Nechytailiuk, “Interv’iu z Mariieiu Val’o” (an interview with Maria
Val’o), in “Chest’ pratsi” akademik Mykhajlo Vozniak u spohadakh ta publikatsiakh (“Glory to work!”
Academician Mykhajlo Vozniak in memoirs and publications) (L’viv: U’viv’s’kyj natsional’nyj
universytet im. Ivana Franka, 2000), 414-15. A university scholar affiliated with the institute lended
credence to Hurladi’s claim when he recalled that department colleagues saw an opportunity to get rid of
Hurladi, a mediocre scholar, during her dissertation defense. Steblij, interview.
Hurladi went on to write a number of appeals, from Party authorities in L’viv and Kyiv to the Central Committee in Moscow, denouncing her department. She also wrote an appeal to the director of the Institute of Literature in Kyiv, Mykola Shamota, who already had perceived Hurladi’s department as “salt in the eye (sil’ v otsi)” and resented its plans to publish The History of Ukrainian Literary Studies (Istoria ukrains’koho literaturoznavstva).57 In written and verbal statements, Hurladi claimed that the department was full of “ardent Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists (zapekli ukrains’ki burzhuazni natsionalisty).” She also questioned the Institute’s very existence.58 One such appeal had arrived at the regional Party secretary’s desk in March 1970. It claimed that Institute leaders had falsely reported that planned research works had been completed and had tolerated “unreliable” workers who had compromised themselves politically.59

Hurladi’s appeals had the effect of a firestorm in the institute. In less than a year, a total of 17 commissions investigated the department and compiled reports in Hurladi’s favor.60 The institute for its part sought to protect the Department of Literature and counter Hurladi. Its party bureau and Party organization on 28-29 May 1970 soundly condemned Hurladi’s appeal to the regional Party committee as false and sought to discipline her as a party member.61 At the republic’s Academy of Sciences, a

57 Nechytiuliuk, 415.
58 Ibid.; Steblij, interview.
59 Tsentral’nyi derzhavnij arkhiv hromads’kykh ob’iednan’ Ukrainy (TsDAHOU), fond 1, opys 25, sprava 368, ark. 62-66; DALO, fond P-3, opys 16, sprava 28, ark. 39-41.
60 Nechytiuliuk, 415-16.
61 TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 25, sprava 368, ark. 65.
prominent historian, Fedir Shevchenko, also discredited Huriadi’s claims. But the regional Party committee bureau sided with Huriadi in its decision of 15 August 1970. In the end, a total of 14 institute colleagues, deemed politically “unreliable,” lost their jobs. The Department of Literature’s major two-volume work in progress, The History of Ukrainian Literary Studies, was confiscated during investigations and never returned. Eventually the Institute of Literature in Kyiv liquidated Huriadi’s department and ignored her protests.

To a considerable extent these charges of “nationalism” coming from various directions at the university and the institute surfaced due to personal conflicts among colleagues. At the institute’s Department of Literature, accounts of Huriadi’s accusations clearly suggest that misunderstandings about Huriadi’s dissertation had egged on a full-fledged campaign against the whole Institute of Social Sciences. Huriadi clearly had important connections with the regional Party committee, since her husband worked there. These connections without a doubt helped her launch a series of investigations into the institute’s activities and personnel.

At L’viv State University, similar conflicts broke out between colleagues at the Department of Political Economy, leading to an all-out campaign against propagandists of “bourgeois nationalism” in their works on Galicia’s past. Friction had already begun to surface in the late 1950s between supporters of the department chair, M. I.

---

62 Steblij, interview.
63 DALO, fond P-3, opys 16, sprava 28, ark. 40-41; DALO, fond P-3, opys 22, sprava 139, ark. 201-202.
64 Nechytaliuk, 414-15; Steblij, interview.
65 Steblij, interview.
Petrovs’kyj, and Petrovs’kyj’s opponents. This friction by 1968-69 had peaked into an all-out struggle for power in the department, resulting among other things in Petrovs’kyj’s removal and his replacement by assistant professor I. M. Tomenchuk, head of the Department of Scientific Communism, at the end of June 1970.66

In the Department of Political Economy, these opponents of Petrovs’kyj – F. P. Trubitsyn, M. D. Men’shov, F. N. Nazarenko, and M. N. Bil’chenko – and later Tomenchuk as head of the department directed much of their fire at one of their junior colleagues, Stepan Zlupko. Zlupko already had been on bad terms with his accusers in the Department of Political Economy already in 1963, when a number of them voted against him entering the university’s doctoral program.67 As mentioned in this chapter’s introduction, he furthermore had caused a scandal in Moscow in 1964 when speaking at an academic conference there, resulting in the university Party committee on 12 November 1964 removing him from the university’s doctoral program and depriving him of his position as senior research worker.68

Zlupko continued to teach as an assistant professor at the department, and by 1970, he was preparing a doctoral dissertation for defense through the republic’s Institute of Economics in Kyiv.69 At the time of Petrovs’kyj’s firing, he, too, had

---

66 DALO, fond P-92, opys 19, sprava 206, ark. 228; DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 960, ark. 19; DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 960, ark. 19, 85-86. F. P. Trubitsyn, one of Petrovs’kyj’s opponents, suggested that these conflicts had begun already in the late 1950s, when he claimed before the university Party committee on 15 June 1970 that the university should have fired Petrovs’kyj back in 1958, after he had published a work that was “politically harmful.” DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 908, ark. 64.

67 Golubka and Golubka, 23.

68 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprva 725, ark. 243-45.

69 Golubka and Golubka, 24-25.
figured into criticisms by Petrovs’kyj’s opponents. As Party meetings dealing with this department’s conflicts indicate, Petrovs’kyj’s opponents among other things claimed that Petrovs’kyj had favored Zlupko over others prior to Petrovs’kyj’s dismissal.\(^70\) Petrovs’kyj’s opponents also were apparently Zlupko directly through denunciations to the graduate school at the Institute of Economics. Zlupko claimed before Party meetings over the situation at the department anonymous letters denouncing his works were reaching the graduate school administration (VAK) even before they had been submitted for the VAK’s approval.\(^71\)

Trubitsyn, Men’shov, Bil’chenko, and Nazarenko, after removing Petrovs’kyj, thus joined with Tomenchuk, Petrovs’kyj’s successor, to attack their rival Zlupko and others who in their view had “distorted” various figures from Galicia’s past in their scholarly works. They focused their criticism in particular on scholars who by the beginning of the 1970s had begun to portray Volodymyr Levyns’kyj as an early propagandist of Marxism in Galicia.

Levyns’kyj (1880-1953) had been a journalist and editor, as well as a political leader and theorist in L’viv. He had broken ranks with the Ukrainian Radical Party in Galicia in 1900 and became one of the organizers of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party (USDP) in the years before World War One. Prior to the war, he edited two of the party’s newspapers, as well as the journal The Bell (Dzvin) in Kyiv. He worked at Vienna and Geneva during the war. Levyns’kyj then joined the External Group of the

\(^{70}\) DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 908, ark. 62-64, 66, 92; DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 960, ark. 17.

\(^{71}\) Golubka and Golubka, 23; DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 908, ark. 78.
Ukrainian Communist Party in Vienna. It was here that he joined Volodymyr Vynnychenko, who had been active in the Ukrainian People’s Republic’s Directory, in editing the party’s weekly journal. He returned to L’viv in the 1930s. After fleeing to German-occupied territory in 1939, Levyns’kyj returned to the city under German occupation in 1941 and fled in 1944 to Vienna, where he died some years later.\footnote{72}

In various reports, the republic’s Central Committee as well as regional Party authorities in L’viv stressed that these scholars had ignored Levyns’kyj’s increasingly hostile attitudes toward the October Revolution and the Soviet Union. Levyns’kyj’s party, the USDP, stood for “Ukrainian petty-bourgeois national socialism” before 1917. After the October Revolution, Levyns’kyj became an enemy of the Soviet state. In 1933 he claimed that he had worked for “progressive” journals to discredit Leninism and, in his words, “the nationalities policy of Muscovite Bolsheviks in Soviet Ukraine.” In interwar Galicia, the KPZU press and other “progressive publications” denounced Levyns’kyj’s views. During German occupation of L’viv, Levyns’kyj denounced collectivization in Ukraine, called Western Ukraine’s union with Soviet Ukraine a “Bolshevik occupation,” and “propagandized the Nazi conception of patriotism and the ‘superman.’”\footnote{73}


\footnote{73} TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 10, sprava 1309, ark. 15; DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 49, ark. 47. A letter from M. D. Men’shov, F. I. Nazarenko, I. M. Tomenchuk, and F. P. Trubitsyn to regional party committee secretary, V. S. Kutsevol, and L. V. Stupnyts’kyj, editor of Vil’na Ukraina, mentions that in 1943 Levyns’kyj had referred to Western Ukraine’s union with Soviet Ukraine as a “Bolshevik occupation.” DALO, fond P-3, opys 22, sprava 139, ark. 175-76.
As a republic Central Committee report noted in 1972, scholars and journalists, mainly from L’viv, began to analyze Levyns’kyj’s life and activities in an “objectivist” manner on the encouragement of regional Party secretary Valentyn Malanchuk and another functionary, M. Volaniuk, who had written positive articles on Levyns’kyj in 1960. One of these scholars from L’viv writing about Levyns’kyj included Stepan Zlupko, who in 1970 had published an article in the Ukrainian Historical Journal (Ukrains’kyj istorychnyj zhurnal), “On the 90th Anniversary of the Birth of V. P. Levyns’kyj,” which epitomized these “objectivist” interpretations. In this article, Zlupko treated Levyns’kyj as someone who had promoted socialist ideas all his life and had done much to popularize Marxist philosophical views in Western Ukraine.

In 1970, Zlupko’s colleagues at the university’s Department of Political Economy most likely had initiated this campaign against himself and other scholars who had “distorted” the record on Levyns’kyj. That year, Men’shov, Bil’chenko, Trubitsyn, Nazarenko, and Tomenchuk, as mentioned above, most likely had been writing denunciations to Kyiv about Zlupko.

Party decisions and reports made at the all-Union, republic, and regional level in 1970-71 suggest others’ claims that these university scholars, in direct contact with Mikhail Suslov, in charge of ideology in Moscow, had kept Party leaders at all levels

---
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informed about these “distortions.” The republic’s Central Committee investigated them after “signals” in October, possibly denunciations based on Zlupko’s article that had recently appeared. When the regional Party committee in L’viv investigated these scholars, most of whom were from the city, in November 1970, Tomenchuk prepared a report on their works on Levyns’kyj and other “bourgeois nationalist” figures from the past. Tomenchuk’s report led to the regional Party committee bureau on 26 March 1971 passing a resolution condemning “serious distortions” and “political mistakes” made by scholars on Levyns’kyj and a whole host of other historical figures from inter-war Galicia.

Tomenchuk and other colleagues from the university’s Department of Political Economy apparently contributed material for the Party’s Central Committee in Moscow on 28 September 1971 issued a resolution, “On Political Work among the Population of L’viv Region.” One point of this resolution stressed that Party organizations in L’viv Region “did not organize public criticism of ideologically...

77 Jurij Slyvka, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 18 May 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.

78 TsDAHOU, fond 1, opys 10, sprava 1309, ark. 15-16. This republic Central Committee report on the matter, dated 25 July 1972, says that the Central Committee’s attention had been directed to these publications first in April 1970. After receiving “signals” in October, it had a party commission investigate these claims. Zlupko’s article on Levyns’kyj had been published in the seventh issue that year of Ukrains’kyj istorichniy zhurnal (Kyiv).

79 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 993, ark. 34; DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 22, ark. 142; DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 206, ark. 229-30.

80 For this resolution, “On Serious Distortions and Political Mistakes by Some Scholars in L’viv in Publications in the Evaluation of the Historical Role of Certain People,” see DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 49, ark. 47-49. Other historical figures from Galicia mentioned in the resolution are Bohdan Ihor-Antonych, Jurij Bachyns’kyj, S. Danylovich, R. Iarosevych, V. Budzyns’kyj, K. Studyns’kyj, and Vasyl’ Barvins’kyj.
harmful works” and did not lead in exposing “the true face of ideologues of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism.” Tomenchuk, as well as Men’shov, Nazarenko, and Trubitsyn, took part in a regional Party committee commission investigating scholars’ works on Levyns’kyj and other historical figures from the region, including works by Zlupko, in response to Moscow’s resolution. They sent their report to regional Party secretary Kutsevol on 13 November 1971, and Kutsevol made use of their findings in his report to the regional Party committee’s plenary session of 20 November discussing the Moscow’s 28 September resolution.  

Tomenchuk, Trubitsyn, Bil’chenko, Nazarenko, and Men’shov in short had support from all levels of the Party hierarchy as they took their Zlupko, their department rival, and other scholars to task for allegedly misrepresenting Galicia’s past. Yet these scholars from the Department of Political Economy quite soon came into conflict with their colleagues at the university over how to punish Zlupko.

Based on a report by a university Party committee commision of 23 November 1971, Zlupko lost his teaching job at L’viv State University and was expelled from the Party on 20 January 1972. Yet Zlupko’s colleagues from the Department of Political
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81 DALO, fond P-3, opys 22, sprava 139, ark. 178. A copy of this resolution was not in DALO, but party members speaking at a regional party committee discussion of this decree on 20 November 1971 made important references to some of the resolution’s criticisms. See DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 22, passim.

82 DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 206, ark. 219. Hints as to who was on this commission are in DALO, fond P-3, opys 22, sprava 139, ark. 172.

83 The party committee in this decision approved the decision of the university’s Academic Council to fire him. DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 962, ark. 23. The party committee’s commission headed by I. T. Ts’okh, head of the department of journalism, doctor of historical sciences, also included professor A. I. Pashchuk, doctor of philosophical sciences; professor I. I. Doroshenko, head of the department of the history of Ukrainian literature and doctor of philological sciences; professor A. S. Zashkil’niak, head of the department of history of the CPSU, doctor of historical sciences; professor V. S. Petrov, professor of the department of political economy, doctor of economic sciences; professor B. M. Faremchysyn,
Economy demanded more rigorous punishment. Men’shov, Bil’chenko, Nazarenko, and Trubitsyn challenged this commission’s report in a letter to regional Party committee secretary Kutsevol dated 23 December 1971. In their opinion, the commission had clearly chosen to “whitewash” Zlupko’s scholarly activities and reduce the significance of his guilt. The university Party commission moreover attacked those Communists who, working with the regional Party committee, had presented Zlupko as he really was, a “masked propagandist of bourgeois nationalist ideology and one of its carriers.”  

Men’shov and Trubitsyn raised similar protests before university Communists on 20 January 1972, the day after Zlupko had been expelled from the Party. These colleagues and their allies apparently had been kept out of debates over Zlupko’s personal hearing the day before.  

University Party members on 21 January 1972 and afterwards defended their commission’s report and denounced colleagues for indulging in intrigue against the university. Besides expressing amazement at charges that they had been too lenient toward Zlupko, Party members claimed that Tomenchuk, Trubitsyn, and others had organized a “parallel ideological center” acting in secret. With their stream of reports
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84 DALO, fond P-3, opys 22, sprava 206, ark. 218-26.

85 DALO, fond P-3, opys 1, sprava 960, ark. 14-15. When Zlupko’s personal case was heard on 20 January 1972, none of these party members had left any remarks in the protocol. Tomenchuk, whose name was on the list of university commission members in the copy of the commission report that these Communists had sent to Kutsevol as part of their protest on 23 December 1971, was not on the list for the final report that the party committee approved when it expelled Zlupko. DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 962, ark. 12-24; DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 206, ark. 232.
and letters, they were causing rumors to spread through town that the university was a "hive of nationalism," disorienting students and outsiders alike. When one Party member recommended that Trubitsyn and Tomenchuk deserved a party investigation after their remarks at the Academic Council meeting deciding Zlupko’s fate, she was greeted with applause.86

While the university defeated attempts by Trubitsyn and others to impose a more harsh punishment on Zlupko and put these colleagues on the defensive, a new scandal shook the university in late March 1973. The KGB arrested a group of university students supposedly involved in a "nationalist" organization that demanded Ukraine's separation from the Soviet Union.87 This incident brought forth visits by commissions from the Central Committee in Moscow and Kyiv investigating university personnel and their activities.88

As a result of these investigations, university chancellor Mykola Maksymovych and Party committee secretary Tamara Starchenko received severe reprimands from the Party. Faculty deans and chiefs of departments lost their jobs and received Party penalties.89 Security organs produced compromising materials on a total of 29 instructors and laboratory assistants.90 Considerable numbers of these personnel also

86 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 960, ark. 19, 26-27, 34-35, 37-41, 45, 49, 55, 70-71, 76, 86-87; DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 963, ark. 24.

87 DALO, fond P-3, opys 25, sprava 28, ark. 115. On students from the history faculty involved in this group, see Chapter 2.

88 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 1029, ark. 91.

89 DALO, fond P-3, opys 25, sprava 17, ark. 4.

90 DALO, fond P-3, opys 25, sprava 28, ark. 115-16.
lost their jobs or faced early retirement. Scholars from the Department of Political Economy, who in the past had denounced some of those faculty fired, were quick to point out that their criticisms over “lenient” treatment of Zlupko and others were justified, given the discovery of these “nationalist” students.

As with Myroslava Hurladi’s dispute with the Institute of Social Sciences, personal vendettas played a significant role behind the campaign by colleagues of the university’s Department of Political Economy against Stepan Zlupko and others in 1971-72. A longstanding struggle for power with the department’s chair, M. I. Petrovs’kyj, had extended to Petrovs’kyj’s protégés, such as Zlupko, by 1970. Grievances between department colleagues and the rest of the university intensified when university chancellor Maksymovych and the university’s Party leadership supposedly “persecuted” Petrovs’kyj’s successor, Tomenchuk, for half a year, forcing him to leave the university by April 1972.

Yet in fiercely settling these personal scores, scholars from the university’s Department of Political Economy suggested that the useable past available to Ukrainians from Galicia had to be much more limited in scope. One of these scholars, Trubitsyn, claimed at a university Party committee meeting on 12 May 1973, a few
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92 See Trubitsyn’s speech in DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 993, ark. 29-37. Trubitsyn, Men’shov, Bil’chenko, Tomenchuk, and Nazarenko had contributed to letters to the regional Party committee in 1972 condemning “distortions” in works by Mykola Kravets’ from the history faculty and Myroslav Oleksiuk, director of the Institute of Social Sciences. DALO, fond P-3, opys 22, sprava 139, ark. 164-76, 178-99.

93 According to an appeal made by Tomenchuk to regional Party committee secretary Kutsevol on 15 April 1972, Maksymovych and the university Party leadership had “persecuted” him for about half a year, forcing him to leave the university. Reference to this allegation is made in DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 963, ark. 29.
days after the arrest of a “nationalist” group of students mentioned above, linked these arrests to a “revisionist” line taken by local scholars on Galicia’s past. He stressed that ever since Oleksandr Karpenko’s “revisionist” remarks reassessing the role of the ZUNR in 1958, local scholars, including Zlupko, had taken a similar line toward Party evaluations of “ideologists of the past, some reactionary parties, and important events in Galicia.”94 Trubitsyn went on to warn that such literature by "revisionists," in popularizing the literature of various reactionary figures as Marxists, encouraged the growth of “bourgeois-nationalist separatism" and "remnants of nationalism" among politically "immature" youth.95

At earlier university Party meetings in January 1972, when colleagues from the Department of Political Economy took the university to task for its “lenience” toward Zlupko, others from the university voiced concern that Trubitsyn and other Communists were setting a dangerous precedent in scholarship dealing with Galicia’s recent past. Men’shov and Trubitsyn, said one Party member, were insinuating that no revolutionary-democratic camp had ever existed in Galicia at all and that Ivan Franko, a turn-of-the-century Galician poet revered by official Soviet culture, held “nationalist” and other mistaken views.96 Trubitsyn in particular suggested this at these meetings when he claimed that university historian Mykola Kravets’s Ivan Franko and His Work in Ukraine and the Institute of Social Sciences’ Celebration of Historic Justice

94 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 993, ark. 29-37.
95 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 993, ark. 35.
96 DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 960, ark. 34, 40.
contained over 150 people presented in a “positive light.” When he called for these people to be investigated so that the situation that had occurred with Levyns’kyj would not be repeated, Kravets’ replied, “Maybe Comrade Trubitsyn has doubts about Franko himself.”

As scholars at the university and the Institute of Social Sciences in L'viv came under fire in the late 1960s and early 1970s on charges of "nationalism" and a lack of political reliability, they faced colleagues who were quite often engaged in various sorts of personal conflicts. Yet as Trubitsyn, Men'shov, and their colleagues went after "serious distortions" and "political mistakes" in scholars' works on Ukrainian history and culture, quite often with official support, they suggested that much more was at stake. Scholars, regardless of their efforts to conform to standard practices of their disciplines, were taking on certain representations of Galicia's past that easily served as grounds for controversy. As they analyzed developments such as the ZUNR and other political, social, and cultural trends in Galicia prior to 1939, these scholars faced considerable difficulties explaining major developments within official interpretations. As a part of Central Europe affected by other historical trends besides the October Revolution in the Russian Empire, Galicia witnessed "revolutionary" or "progressive" developments that for officials were too connected to "bourgeois nationalism" and other trends alien to the main narrative of Soviet history. These scholars’ representations of the past compromised themselves before colleagues determined to enforce official interpretations.

97 Trubitsyn then protested, saying that in his documents, Franko, as well as others, was a “great revolutionary.” DALO, fond P-92, opys 1, sprava 960, ark. 88-89.
4.3 The Richyns’kyj Sisters and Historical Memory of Interwar Galicia

Controversy over the representation of Galicia’s past in scholars’ works was not merely confined to political repression at the university or at the Institute of Social Sciences. It reflected larger problems of how the past in Galicia was to be portrayed and remembered by the intelligentsia. Literary, musical, and artistic representations of the past as well as rituals commemorating the past also challenged official constructions of what was the true loyal Soviet account of these events. Iryna Vil’de’s novel, The Richyns’kyj Sisters (Sestry Richyns’ki), challenged the officially constructed historical memory of inter-war Galicia. This novel, whose first part won a state Shevchenko Prize in 1965, is largely critical of “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists” and Greek Catholicism. Yet it also offers an account of the situation in inter-war Galicia that troubled authorities. When the novel was performed onstage at the Zan’kovets’ka Theater in L’viv at the end of the decade, more reactionary times had made its depiction of Galicia’s past especially controversial for audiences.98

Iryna Vil’de’s novel, The Richyns’kyj Sisters, is based on events in Polish-occupied Eastern Galicia in the late 1930s, on the eve of its “liberation” by the Soviets in 1939. Citing in its opening lines Marx’s principle that comedy enables people to break from past stages of history, the novel aims ostensibly to show the follies of inter-war Galician social life that became superseded by the higher, Soviet, stage of

---

98 This chapter’s summary of the novel is based on the final version of the latter edited in 1977. The first edition was published as a book in 1958. In its second edition (1967-68), it was divided into two books, with the second book divided into two parts. The third and final edition (1977)departed from the previous two editions only insofar as one additional chapter at the novel’s end is included. It is based on the short story, “There Will Be No Diners (Stolivnykiv ne bude),” published in Zhovten’ (L’viv) 19
history. It describes the story of five sisters, Kateryna, Ol’ha, Sofiia (Zonia), Nelia, and Iaroslava (Slava) Richyns’kyj, the daughters of a Greek Catholic cathedral priest (kanonik), Arkadij Richyns’kyj, and his wife Olena, who live in the fictitious provincial town of Nashe not far from L’viv.

Upon the father's sudden death, the Richyns’kyj sisters and their mother lose the comfortable, protected world that Arkadij had provided them and set out to build new lives. Ol’ha falls in love with a young Communist named Bronko Zavadka. Kateryna, who tricks a young doctor into marrying her for her father’s "fortune," plunges deeply into debt, along with her husband, to Rafail Suliman, a hapless Jewish usurer who lusts after Kateryna's sister Nelia. Nelia, caught between Suleiman's advances and Kateryna's demands to satisfy them, finds salvation in marrying a prisoner, a former member of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), Markiian Ivashkiv.

Two other sisters, Zonia and Slava, become independent women in the working world. The mother, Olena, eventually moves into a small house on the outskirts of town with the family’s servant, Marynia.

While much of the novel is about the Richyns’kyj sisters and their mother coming to terms with life after Arkadij, it also presents a usable past for Ukrainians from Galicia. Many Ukrainians from the region had fought as Sich Riflemen for the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR) in 1918-19. Others had tried to boycott Polish rule in the early 1920s or had taken part in the OUN’s struggle against Polish

---


rule during the 1930s. The Richyns’kyj Sisters quite often portrays these events not so much as moments of betrayal by "bourgeois nationalists" and foreign powers but as tragedies for all Ukrainians.

Through the characters of Orest Bilyns’kyj, the former boyfriend of Olena Richyns’ka, and the Richyns’kyj sisters’ uncle, Zenko Richyns’kyj, the novel shows sympathy for Ukrainians who fought for the ZUNR or resisted Polish rule in later years. Orest and Zenko do not consider those who fought for the ZUNR in 1918-19 as traitors of the Ukrainian people. While the leaders of the ZUNR were corrupt and manipulative, many Sich Riflemen were simple people, often peasants, taking up arms against foreign occupiers of their native land.

As Orest sees it, members of the Ukrainian intelligentsia in Galicia have failed to serve their people under Polish rule not because of a lack of principles, but because of circumstances beyond their control by the end of the 1930s. For educated Ukrainians, the choice is resisting Polish rule and losing state employment, assimilation as Poles, or reliance on patriotic Ukrainian businesses and organizations that live off an already downtrodden Ukrainian peasantry. Zenko Richyns’kyj has become one clear example of this. After going into theology to boycott the Polish university system and forego employment in the Polish state, he is at a loss to answer one young Communist’s accusation that he exploits peasants and has no true convictions.
The novel moreover gives a sympathetic account of the younger generation of Ukrainians who in some cases, like Nelia Richyns’ka’s husband Markiian Ivashkiv, join the OUN to fight Polish rule. While leaders of the OUN, such as the Richyns’kyj sister’s cousin, Slavko Ilakovych, turn out to be vile, unprincipled agents of Nazi and Polish agents, rank-and-file members like Markiian are truly devoted to serving the Ukrainian people and freeing their land from Polish occupation. Markiian, a simple peasant beaten up by Polish chauvinists in L’viv and the victim of discrimination by officials at L’viv University, has joined the cause to fight for the dignity of Ukrainians’ language and culture and serve his native land. Like the generation before his that fought in the Sich Riflemen, Markiian and others have joined the OUN’s underground struggle out of genuine convictions, only to be fooled by corrupt leaders.

In highlighting the more complicated reality faced by the Sich Riflemen, the Ukrainian intelligentsia, and young OUN members in Galicia, The Richyns’kyj Sisters could not but have provoked controversy. Scholars could not write sympathetic accounts about the Sich Riflemen because they constituted a “bourgeois nationalist” organization that cooperated with German and Austrian imperialists. The OUN had waged bloody guerilla warfare against Soviet rule in the immediate postwar years as the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), and so no positive treatment of this organization could even be imagined. Such controversy came to the surface in late 1968, when this novel was staged before the public in L’viv at the Maria Zan’kovets’ka Theater.
A scandal over the novel’s dramatization followed its premiere showing at the M. Zan’kovets’ka Theater on 19-20 October 1968. By then, the play had already been shown without proper sanctioning by the republic’s Ministry of Culture in Kharkiv in June of that year and three times in L’viv in October. As regional Party committee secretary Vasyl’ Kutsevol indicated, a number of “ideologically incorrect accentuations that could call forth in a certain portion of viewers unhealthy reactions and analogues in a political sense.”

O. Miroshnychenko, instructor of the republic’s Central Committee, who was in L’viv on 17-21 October and became familiar with work on the play, pointed out that, despite revisions, the play upon its premiere on 19 October contained such politically controversial messages. Miroshnychenko held strong reservations about the play’s sense of class approach. The director, O. Ripko, had in his view wrongly made the usurer Rafail Suliman the center of the play, especially in the first part. As a result, the Richyns’kyj family’s woes “and a majority of events” involve Suliman as the central figure, with Suliman “depicted in a caricatured, simplified means of expression.” He complained, “The viewer rather lively reacts to his appearance, unfortunately, more lively than to the character of the Communist, Bronko Zavadka, who is left somewhere on the periphery of the dramatized work.”

---
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But the greatest criticisms in this report were directed at how Ripko had cast two major characters in the play, Orest Bilyns’kyj and Markiian Ivashkiv. In the scene where Orest Bilyns’kyj refuses to work with the local communist newspaper, citing that any struggle under Polish occupation is hopeless, “this turned out to be too little for the director, and he decided to interpret these words of Orest so that they would sound ‘contemporary’.” A scene was created where Orest Bilyns’kyj steps out to the front of the stage, directly speaking to the audience. In this scene, “he tells them, even angrily and indignantly, that today, so to speak, history is being falsified, ‘heroism is called treason,’ ‘memorials of the ancient past are being plundered (obkradaiut’sia),’ and so on.” The report added, “Unfortunately, a certain portion of the viewers perceives this incorrectly and responds to this with applause.” As for the character of Markiian Ivashkiv, “a terrorist and member of a nationalist organization,” he became the play’s “ideological center.” Though only appearing in one scene, “an awful lot is said about him, and the best of the Richyns’kyi sisters, Nelia, dedicates herself to him.” The scene where Nelia meets Markiian in prison became for Miroshnychenko particularly dubious, because it took place, “in emphatically moving tones,” in a way that made Markiian look like “a patriot and fighter for the independence of the Fatherland.” In some remarks “he even makes accusations at posterity that they will ‘curse’ him, such a dedicated and courageous one in his struggle.” At one point
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Markiian “looks like a hero in comparison with the communist Zavadka,” where he proclaims, “The party stands behind Zavadka, but behind me? Behind me is the Fatherland, the people.” Nelia, in response “exclaims to him half-hysterically (hukaie iomu napivisterychno): ‘I love you! I love you!’.”

Mirosnychenko’s report also voiced dismay with members of the intelligentsia involved in public discussion of the play during the time of its premiere and with the play’s authors, Vil’de and Bohdan Antkiv. Most of those speaking during this public discussion “pronounced the play ‘a theatrical success,’ ‘an artistic victory,’ and so on.” Vil’de tried to justify “dubious political motives” by claiming that the so-called “falsification of history” needed to come to an end and that phenomena should not be divided into “black and white.” The report also noted with disdain that Vil’de had said, “Communists and nationalists were only twenty percent, while all the rest were patriots.” Vil’de thus, it claimed, “demanding a rehabilitation and heroization of this character and all those who stand behind him.”

This report by a republic Central Committee instructor on the play’s premiere in L’viv underscores the fact that The Richyns’kyi Sisters embodied specific features of the Galician historical memory in a way that could undermine the Soviet project. Vil’de had chosen to show the inter-war past not as black-and-white, but in a way that pointed out that so many Ukrainians were in fact just plain patriots. Markiian Ivashkiv for her was one of them: a fighter for the Ukrainian people, misguided, yet sincere.
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Orest Bilyn’s’kyj likewise represented many members of the intelligentsia who witnessed Ukrainian culture on the brink of extinction under Polish rule and were looking for some way out.

The premiere of this play, instead of showing a better present, seemed to mock the Galician “bourgeois” past in the likes of Suliman, a shifty, yet bungling, Jewish speculator. One contemporary viewer from Kyiv, Roman Kohorods’kyi, recalls that this play brought down the house in the way that it portrayed this family and “bourgeois nationalists” comically, in an authentic way the audience could identify with. Indeed, the play became a popular item over over the next twenty years at the Zan’kovets’ka Theater, shown over 300 times. Many indeed may have come to see the play for its comedy and its ridicule of Jews like Suliman.

Yet judging from the monologue given by Orest Bilyn’s’kyj in the premiere, the audience applauded when Orest angrily tells his audience about how history is being falsified and memorials to the past are being destroyed. While Orest’s monologue and Nelia’s meeting with Markiian in prison were cut out in succeeding versions of the play, the audience was very well acquainted with the book and apparently knew what was said of such characters as Markiian and Orest. While this comedy in many ways made people laugh about old Galicia, it also suggested that viewers knew that
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there was another story out there as well, one in which they saw a very different Galicia from what party and state officials were willing to admit. They saw a Galicia that was very much involved in efforts to liberate the Ukrainian people and encourage the formation of a Ukrainian state, but not at the behest of Moscow and the October Revolution.

Iryna Vil’de’s perception of the Galician past in The Richyntsy Sisters demonstrates that Ukrainians in L’viv simply could not help but view themselves as connected to historical developments that were alien to what fit official expectations of what the historical memory was to be. Like social scientists in L’viv, Vil’de and her readers were aware that the revolutionary aspirations of Ukrainians in Galicia were tied less with “Great October” and more with national movements in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. National oppression by Poles after the fall of this empire became a vital issue not just for Communists or the OUN, but for many “normal,” patriotic Ukrainians who realized that they were not masters of their own land, as Markiian Ivashkiv indicates in his prison diary entry. Past efforts to liberate the Ukrainian people may have been viewed in the post-Stalin period as foolhardy and futile. One writer from L’viv recalled as a child in the early 1960s that his grandmother saw fighters for the OUN-UPA as fools, yet also sympathized for them.\footnote{Mykola Riabchuk, interview by the author, Kyiv, taped recording, 4 November 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.}

Vil’de as well as many of the viewers of her play probably also thought the same way; Markiian in the end is willing to run to the arms of the Party if it means that his dreams for the Ukrainian people will be realized. Yet many Ukrainian intellectuals
from this region familiar with these events or acquainted with them through family
members also did not want to disavow themselves of the national revolution altogether,
even if it meant only looking back on such events as lost, yet noble, causes. And for
those who came to confront authorities politically as dissidents, such a sense of
nostalgia also became wrapped in acts of resistance on a symbolic level. “Nationalists”
like Markiian may have been cursed officially, but privately they were not forgotten.

Vil’de’s rendition of the past also suggested that “unhealthy” parallels could be
drawn between Polish times and Soviet ones. Orest Bilyns’kyj’s own pain at seeing his
culture trampled on and values being sold out under the Poles understandably received
applause amid local viewers at the play’s premiere. This was a time of the “merger of
nations” where the Ukrainian language and efforts to assert some kind of Ukrainian
culture received a very hostile reception from party authorities. The novel’s
exploration of the Richyns’kyj sisters’ coming to grips of the falsities of their world
also could have struck a chord with viewers, particularly as Soviet reality also had its
own false conventions. The Galician past became a potential sore spot not just for its
divergence with official dogmas regarding Ukrainian history, but also because in some
cases it resonated too well with Soviet reality.

As The Richyns’kyj Sisters and L’viv scholars’ accounts of inter-war Galicia
regardless of intention eventually challenged the official Soviet version of events,
within the larger public there seemed to be a perception of this period that resisted
official ideological restrictions. The innocent singing of songs of the Sich Riflemen in
private company could be seen as purely cultural or potentially political. Visits to the
graves of Sich Riflemen were more bold acts, since party leaders both locally and on
the republic and all-union level connected them with the “counter-revolutionary” aspects of Ukrainian history. Such rituals, be they public or private, indicated how for Ukrainians, from intellectuals to regular workers, the Galician historical memory, despite all attempts at Sovietizing it, could not easily be categorized and contained.

Songs by and about the Ukrainian Galician Army (the Sich Riflemen) that fought for the Ukrainian People’s Republic in the years after World War One were one important element of popular culture in L’viv. Singing songs of the Sich Riflemen could be a very dangerous act, both under Stalin and long afterwards, for the Sich Riflemen were seen as “counter-revolutionary,” even though some of their ranks had even gone over to the Red Army and took part in the Communist Party of Western Ukraine. For instance, merely making reference to the Sich Riflemen in a Soviet song at an informal wedding party in their dormitory resulted in a young couple being expelled from the L’viv State Pedagogical Institute in late 1952.115

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, Petro Kozlaniuk, head of the L’viv writers’ union, while very much a loyal Soviet writer who denounced “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism,” encountered unpleasantries of his own when caught up in a desire to sing songs of the Sich Riflemen. Erstwhile flatterers such as Mykola Romanchenko sent out denunciations whenever Kozlaniuk, when drunk, would start singing lines from the Sich Riflemen’s song, “Those Sich Riflemen will return, and Warsaw then will tremble

115 DALO, fond P-3, opys 4, sprava 800, ark. 247-49.
People for that very reason sang songs about the Sich Riflemen in private, sometimes inserting words “Red Riflemen” for added insurance.\textsuperscript{117}

Whether using the words “Red Riflemen” or not, the singing of these songs had become a ritual in which Galicians of all kinds, from the apolitical to the supposedly most active supporters of the regime, participated. For writer Roman Ivanychuk, his generation, born at the end of the 1920s, in fact had been brought up on such songs in family and other private gatherings.\textsuperscript{118} Calician families carried on this tradition of singing Sich Riflemen songs before younger generations such as that of Mykola Riabchuk, a writer born in the early 1950s. Riabchuk saw these spontaneous moments of song, usually when people in the party were drunk, as a kind of “imagined community” that bonded them in such private moments.\textsuperscript{119} This sort of identity very much demonstrated that the legacy of the the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic, while officially condemned, still resonated in positive terms among ordinary people as well as scholars and writers who in one way or another took exception to official interpretations of these phenomena.

\textsuperscript{116} Roman Ivanychuk, Blahoslovy, dushe moja, Hospoda... Shchodennykovi zapysy, spohady i rozdumy (Bless the Lord, oh my Soul... diary entries, recollections, and reflections) (L’viv: “Prosvita,” 1993), 93.

\textsuperscript{117} Marynia Uhlia, interview by the author, L’viv, taped recording, 11 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.

\textsuperscript{118} Roman Ivanychuk, interview by the author, L’viv, taped recording, 19 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.

\textsuperscript{119} Riabchuk, interview.
The legacy of the Sich Riflemen not only had become a source of an alternative identity for Ukrainians in Galicia in song but in various acts of private commemoration at the site of a mass grave of Sich Riflemen at Ianivs’kyj Cemetery in L’viv. When three noted “Sixtiers,” Ivan Dziuba, Mykola Vinhranovs’kyi, and Ivan Drach came to L’viv in May 1962 to read poems and deliver speeches on Ukrainian literature to an ecstatic audience at L’viv State University, Ihor and Iryna Kalynets, Mykhailo and Bohdan Horyn’, and others took them to see these graves. “That’s just like the history of Ukraine (Otkoiu i i istorii Ukrainy),” Mykhailo Horyn told them as they gazed upon tombstones slowly falling into ruin. From 1961 to 1972, prior to their arrests, both Ihor and Iryna Kalynets’ along with friends made regular pilgrimages on Green Holidays in May to Ianivs’kyj Cemetery to visit the graves of Sich Riflemen and other Ukrainian heroes of theirs. The KGB cynically attacked them, taking photographs of them or even apprehending them and putting them in police cars for paying their respects.

At times these visitations coincided with the anniversary of the founding of the West Ukrainian People’s Republic on 1 November, which resulted in direct confrontation with the KGB. When Ihor and Iryna Kalynets’ took their daughter, Dzvinka, to see the graves on 1 November 1971, people had gathered in the allies of Ianivs’kyj Cemetery to pray before the Sich Riflemen’s graves were not allowed by

---


121 Ibid., 71, 159, 230.
KGB agents even to approach them. Iryna and one grandmother in the crowd summoned the courage to go up to the graves to pray, and Iryna managed to deter the KGB men by insisting on seeing their documents.  

In late fall of that year, authorities ordered that these tombstones be destroyed. Iryna Kalynets’ and her father, Onufrij Stasiv, upon hearing the news, rushed to the cemetery and saw Communist Youth breaking up both Polish and Ukrainian soldiers’ tombstones. Party authorities that year showed no mercy to those attempting to honor the Sich Riflemen’s memory. Regional party committee secretary V. S. Kutsevol at a plenum of the region’s Communist Youth organization on 1 December 1971 condemned those who had been organizing the honoring of the Sich Riflemen’s memory. He noted that the Sich Riflemen had always been against the Communists’ cause, fighting Budyony’s army in 1918-1920 with the White Guards and waging battle with workers at the “Arsenal” factory in Kyiv during the Civil War.  

For Ukrainians such as Iryna Kalynets’, the Sich Riflemen’s graves in Ianivs’kyj Cemetery had become important symbols for Ukrainian patriotism. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, while temporarily employed in the preparatory department of the L’viv State Polytechnic Institute and at a middle school, Kalynets’ tried to make students aware that the Sich Riflemen, instead of being “traitors” and “counter-revolutionaries,” were genuine Ukrainian patriots. As a school librarian and substitute

---

122 Ibid., 159.
123 Ibid., 159-60.
124 DALO, fond P-66, opys 25, sprava 3, ark. 135.
teacher, she took some middle school children to see the Sich Riflemen graves at Ianivs’kyj Cemetery, and prior to her arrest in January 1972, as a teacher’s substitute, she gave a lesson on the Sich Riflemen to fifth graders. Amid lessons on Ukrainian literature in the Polytechnic Institute, she sometimes would talk about the Sich Riflemen in favorable terms there as well.\footnote{Shkrab’iuk, 171-72.} As komsooms began hammering away at these graves in late 1971, she was moved to write about this great historical injustice. In a collection of poems written prior to her arrest in 1972, Oranty, she included “Requiem (At the Riflemen’s Graves) (Rekviem [Na stil’ s’kykh mohylakh]).”\footnote{Ibid., 159-60.}

The destruction of some of these graves in late 1971 certainly must have aroused indignation among broader segments of the population in L’viv and Western Ukraine as well. Besides Mykhailo Horyn’ and the Kalynets’ family, there were other people lining the alleys of the cemetery on 1 November 1971. At the cemetery entrance KGB agents were even checking the documents of a third grader and fifth grader trying to get in.\footnote{Ibid., 159.} Ukrainians of a number of political persuasions had found this mass grave at Ianivs’kyj Cemetery to be an important element of their identity. Attempts by the party and KGB to discourage visitation and literally erase the Sich Riflemen from L’viv must have only reinforced a sense that the Sich Riflemen, far from being traitors, were in fact martyrs as well as patriots.
The novel *The Richyns'kyj Sisters* and its premiere onstage in L’viv in 1968 thus reflected a sense of historical memory among Ukrainians from Galicia that resisted official interpretations of Ukrainians’ past. In paying tribute to honest soldiers of the ZUNR, the Sich Riflemen, and well-intentioned members of the OUN facing national discrimination under Polish rule, Vil’de challenged official assumptions that the ZUNR was “counterrevolutionary” in nature and that OUN was merely a tool of the Germans and Poles. She offered an account of interwar Galicia that for audiences aroused comparisons with the Soviet present, making her account of the past even more dangerous. In rendering a more sympathetic account of Galicia’s past, *The Richyns’kyj Sisters* for readers and also theater audiences must have struck a chord with people from all walks of life and political conviction who saw such men as the Sich Riflemen as heroes in song and in other acts of commemoration.

### 4.4 Conclusion

Stepan Zlupko’s impromptu speech in Moscow in 1964 represented not just one scholar’s ambitious attempt to reconceptualize historical events in Galicia. It also displayed a sense of belonging to a people that honestly sought its liberation in a dizzying whirlpool of events that comprised World War One and the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. For historians and other scholars who worked under Ivan Kryp’iakevych at the Institute of Social Sciences in L’viv, there was also a strong sense that historical phenomena concerning inter-war Galicia merited greater sympathy to a number of movements that supported the cause of liberating the Ukrainian people. The
political climate, however, grew worse over the 1960s, and historians and other social scientists were actively persecuted for ideological “distortions” that hinted of this complicated picture.

While a number of social scientists lost their jobs as the “Band of Four” and others sought to purify the social sciences at L’viv State University in the early 1970s, their interpretations of Galicia’s past demonstrated that the battle over the historical record was far from over. Party authorities could not in the years after Stalin completely cross out the Galician past and repeat old stereotypes. The historical memory of Ukrainians in Galicia was too strong. As Iryna Vil’de in The Richyns’kyi Sisters dealt with life in inter-war Galicia and presented it for audiences at the M. Zan’kovets’ka Theater in L’viv, she showed that many Ukrainians from that period were sincerely committed to liberate their people and were worthy of sympathy.

Readers of this novel and those who viewed its rendition on the stage could identify with confused youth like Markiian Ivashkiv and frustrated, well-intentioned intellectuals like Orest Bilyn’s’kyj. Like many other Ukrainians in L’viv, they saw themselves as part of a community that, while aware of mistakes of the past and Polish oppression, were not convinced that Soviet power was any better. Devoid of any means to express these sentiments aloud, let alone in public, they participated in acts of commemorating the scorned and forgotten Sich Riflemen. Party activists may have been able to do much to tighten ideological restrictions on what could be said by scholars about the Galician past, but they could not stamp out a sense of regional identity that made efforts to create one Soviet family of nations very problematic.
CHAPTER 5

PERCEPTIONS OF MODERNITY AND TRADITION AMONG ESTABLISHMENT INTELLECTUALS AND THE CULTURAL UNDERGROUND

Local Party authorities in L’viv grew furious when a poet in his early thirties, Ihor Kalynets’, had the audacity to refuse to condemn those who had published a collection of his poems abroad in 1970. At one regional Party committee plenary session in late 1971, regional Party committee secretary Vasyl’ Kutsevol read some of Kalynets’s poems to indignant and enraged party members, pointing out what sordid things Ukrainian “bourgeois nationalists” were spreading thanks to Kalynets’.¹

At this same meeting, Roman Fedoriv, editor of the city’s literary journal Zhovten’, came under fire for not bringing Kalynets’ under control and giving him the proper party criticism he deserved. Eventually, authorities arrested and imprisoned Kalynets’ along with other Ukrainian intellectuals in 1972. Fedoriv remained in charge of Zhovten’ and, with other writers, continued serving the Soviet state. Kalynets’ while in prison followed literary events in L’viv and in 1976

circulated an open letter in which he declared that his former literary friends had died
and that Fedoriv had become the “chief gravedigger” in the cemetery of Zhovten.’ In
serving the state with odes to the “school of Lenin” and other anti-nationalist
propaganda, these writers, Kalynets’ insisted, had spiritually died.²

As Kalynets’s letter demonstrates, writers and other intellectuals that openly
rebelled against official pronouncements on literature and art had little official
support in the early 1970s in L’viv and other cultural centers of the Soviet Union.
Yet this did not necessarily mean that they had ceased to share similar assumptions
about the world they lived in and their place in that world. As conformist writers and
artists in L’viv as well as among those who went underground, intellectuals in various
ways came to grips with the dilemmas of modernity and the fast-paced world it
presented.

These writers and artists to varying degrees faced anxieties about modernity
as theorized by sociologist Anthony Giddens. For Giddens, modernity concerns
social practices and ways of organization that emerged in the seventeenth century and
in subsequent centuries achieved worldwide significance in three significant ways.
First, modern institutions have brought about a condition of modernity where
people’s notions of time and space have become abstract categories separated from
each other. Second, through these abstract notions of time and space that modern
institutions have generated, social relations have moved from such immediate,
localized contexts as the village to more global ones such as the nation-state and mass

² Ihor Kalynets’, “Pohoron druha” (Burial of a friend), Suchasnist’ (Munich) 12 (1976): 102-104.
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urban society. Third, through modern institutions, systematic knowledge of society becomes essential to modern society’s reproduction, and the production of this knowledge in effect orients society away from tradition.³

These three main dynamics that characterize modernity have become intensified to the point where modernity for Giddens a “juggernaut” that threatens to rush from human control and self-destruct. Because humans do not have complete control over the forces of modernity, institutions associated with modernity in Giddens’ view have encouraged among people a sense of existential anxiety as well as a general sense of security gained by habit.⁴ Modern notions of trust and risk most clearly convey this sense of anxiety in modernity. Modern institutions have placed trust in global abstract systems produced by human reason rather than in more localized sources such as kinship relations and religious cosmologies. Notions of risk consequently have changed. In the pre-modern world, humans faced such risks as the forces of nature, the evil forces of magic, a loss of religious grace, or personalized forms of human violence. In modernity, humans risk encountering potential dangers produced by humans in the modern world, including industrialized violence, and face the threat of personal meaninglessness in modern society.⁵


⁴ Ibid., 139.

⁵ Ibid., 102.
While Giddens has aptly noted modernity's discontinuities with the pre-modern world, he is still unclear about what ways in which societies cope with modernity, particularly those still closely connected with traditional village life such as in Eastern Europe and Russia. Other scholars have more persuasively identified the power of invented tradition as a way in which such societies have coped with modernity. As Eric Hobsbawm has defined it, invented traditions are practices embodied in rituals and symbols that convey through repetition certain values and norms of behavior suggesting a continuity with the past. The construction of such traditions took place in an industrializing Europe in the late nineteenth century and in the years immediately before World War I, both through the policies of regimes and spontaneously from below. Many of these traditions not only passed down certain beliefs, assumptions of behavior, and attitudes toward authority, but they also gave a sense of belonging to some kind of "community" that institutions expressed, represented, or symbolized as a "nation." Ernest Gellner has similarly pointed out the incorporation of invented traditions of village life into the high culture of mass societies created by industrialization, bringing about a sense of belonging to a nation in an age of modernity.7

---


In Eastern Europe and in Russia, such invented traditions developed among intellectuals and broader segments of society in the late nineteenth century, as the industrial age first began to affect this part of the world.8 For the Soviet Union under Stalin, invented folk traditions became an essential part of Soviet high culture as Soviet society underwent rapid industrialization in the 1930s. Under Stalinism and afterwards, the Soviet regime legitimated national folk cultures as part of one high Soviet culture and in this sense also promoted nationality as a primordial, essential category among Soviet citizens.9 The invented traditions of village folk life consequently became an important way for intellectuals and others in Soviet society in Soviet Ukraine and other republics to respond to the disruption of traditional village ties caused by industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture.

This chapter will demonstrate that writers and artists in L’viv, both nonconformists and those who conformed to the official culture, attempted to deal with the threat of a loss of personal meaning in modern Soviet urban life through invented traditions and abstract art forms. Both Kalynets’ and Fedoriv, writing in the late 1960s and early 1970s, turned to idealized representations of village life and Ukrainians’ mythical past as sources of identity in Soviet modernity. Artists in L’viv, both in the artistic union and in the cultural underground, also confronted problems with Soviet modernity in their painting and graphics. Raised on surviving artistic

---

8 See, for instance, Cathy A. Frierson, Peasant Icons: Representations of Rural People in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); and John-Paul Himka, Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987).

traditions of inter-war Galicia and contemporary artistic developments in Polish-language media, they made use of traditional folk motifs and elements of postwar abstract art to create a sense of meaning amid a world of fast-paced change and impersonal social relations characterized as the “juggernaut” of modernity.

Writers and artists who challenged the regime through an idealized village life or a mythical Ukrainian past thus took part in a larger discourse supported to an extent by the Soviet regime. The invented tradition of national folk cultures and a primordial sense of nationality were both products of Soviet modernity. They could become sources of legitimacy as well as challenges to the official Soviet high culture. Writers and artists, whether working under conditions of censorship or forced underground, shared assumptions of the world that showed that the dilemmas of modern life had become an integral part of people’s experiences in L’viv in the post-Stalin era.

5.1 Galician Representations of Soviet Modernity

Prior to 1939, L’viv had become an important center in painting, graphics, and sculpture for many struggling Ukrainian intellectuals. Despite facing discrimination under Polish rule, Ukrainian artists in L’viv formed associations, published journals, and gained a valuable education both in Poland and abroad in European trends in art.10 Soviet rule and the impact of World War Two considerably transformed L’viv’s artistic community. By the end of the 1940s, Polish artists had left the city,

---

10 Olena Ripko, U poshukakh stracheneho mynuho (in search of a lost past) (L’viv: Kameniar, 1996).
Jewish artists had perished in the Holocaust, and a vast majority of Ukrainian artists chose to flee to the West during the war. To neutralize the threat of "bourgeois nationalist" influences among L'viv's intellectuals, Party and state officials sent in Soviet artists from outside Western Ukraine, mainly Party members and veterans of World War Two, schooled in official Soviet culture's principles of "socialist realism."\textsuperscript{11}

Artists faced considerable ideological restrictions from authorities long after Stalin's death in 1953. Yet there did emerge what one scholar calls an "immunity contra canon," a situation in which artistic traditions in L'viv, oriented toward contemporary art trends in Central and Western Europe, survived within conditions of censorship.\textsuperscript{12} It was in this environment that artists resisted the hegemony of official Soviet culture and dealt with important issues facing the self in light of modernity. L'viv artists in both official artists' union capacities and the cultural underground continued the connections that their counterparts from inter-war Galicia had with contemporary artistic trends in Central and Western Europe. They did so through personal contacts with inter-war Galician artists, Polish-language media, and connections with sympathetic artists from other parts of the Soviet Union.

\textsuperscript{11} On this practice, see Chapter 1.

Ukrainian artists from inter-war Galicia were few in numbers, but they did
come to be important role models for their younger counterparts in the post-Stalin era.
As instructors at the city’s Institute of Applied and Decorative Art, or as members of
the artists’ union in retirement, these were sculptors, graphics artists, and painters
who had studied or lived among art circles in such cities as Krakow, Warsaw, Vienna,
Rome, Munich, Prague, and Paris. Many of them had studied in L’viv itself and took
part in artistic activities there before 1939. After 1956, senior artists took on guru-
like roles among artistic circles in the city, conveying their knowledge of European
art and past artistic traditions of L’viv that official Soviet culture did not discuss.
They did so through an elaborate network of informal gatherings at people’s art shops
or homes, or on private outings to the Carpathian Mountains (for instance, at the town
of Tsembron’) not far from L’viv. Senior artists also quite often passed down their
knowledge on a one-to-one basis through younger protégés.13

The painters Roman (1903-1990) and Marhit (Rajkh) (1903-1980) Sel’s’kyj
exemplified this passing down of artistic traditions of inter-war Galicia to younger
generations of artists in the post-Stalin era. Roman Sel’s’kyj, an instructor at the
L’viv State Institute of Applied and Decorative Art from 1947 to 1976, had studied in
the Cracow Academy of Art and in Paris in the 1920s and had taken part in the
multiethnic artistic organization Artes in L’viv in the 1930s. His wife, Marhit,

13 Iatsiv discusses such gatherings taking place after 1956 at the homes or shops of such masters from
the interwar period as sculptor Ivan Severa (1891-1971), graphics artists Leopol’d Levys’kyj (1906-
1973), Iaroslava Muzyka (1894-1973), and Olena Kul’chyn’ska (1877-1967), the painters Roman
(1903-1990) and Marhit (Rajkh) (1903-1980) Sel’s’kyj, Hryhorij Smol’s’kyj (1893-1985), and the
graphics artist Halyna Zakhar’iasevych (1910-1968). In addition, other senior artists, namely painter
Roman Turyn (1900-1979), painter and graphics artist Oleksa Shatkivs’kyj (1908-1979), and painter,
graphics artist, and sculptor Mykhailo Fediuk (1885-1962), became important role models for young
artists. On these networks of informal gatherings and associations, see ibid., 442-44.
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similarly had studied in Krakow, Paris, and Vienna in the 1920s and also had been a member of Artes. The Sel’s’kyjs’ home became an important gathering place for senior artists and also younger colleagues who began their careers in painting in the 1950s. Younger generations of painters also visited them in the 1960s and 1970s. At private meetings like these, the Sel’s’kyjs passed down their experiences in artistic movements Paris and other parts of Europe as well as past artistic traditions in L’viv. Roman Petruk, who with other artists visited them in the 1960s, heard about how art was created in Fernand Léger’s art school in Paris. They also let them look at artistic journals from pre-war L’viv that they kept at their home as well as reproductions of their own works. In a similar manner, other senior artists revealed to younger colleagues a plethora of half-forgotten events, names, and developments as discussions often brought up memories of cultural happenings in Krakow, Paris, Vienna, Warsaw, and L’viv. Young artists, for instance, found out about inter-war associations in L’viv like Artes and the Association of Independent Ukrainian Artists (ANUM) as well as the avant-garde school of painting centered around Oleksij Novakivs’kyj (1872-1935). These senior artists also conveyed such information to an extent in the classroom. Former students recall that Roman Sel’s’kyj, for instance, when teaching at the L’viv Institute of Applied and Decorative Art strove to be less

14 Biographical data on the Sel’s’kyjs is from Ripko, 273-74.
15 Iatskiv, 442-43.
16 Roman Petruk, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 21 June 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University.
17 Iatsiv, 442-43. On such inter-war artistic organizations, see Ripko, 81-114.
dogmatic teaching artistic techniques than other instructors and cautiously mentioned
the names of past Ukrainian masters. Some artists passed down the legacy of the
inter-war art association ANUM by privately circulating back issues of its journal
from the 1930s, Mystetyvko, hundreds of which still survived at the artists’ union.

In one case, a painter from the younger generation, Karlo Zviryns'kyj (1923-
1997), conveyed artistic traditions of inter-war Galicia in an underground academy at
his apartment in L'viv in the 1960s and 1970s. Zviryns'kyj during World War Two
(1942–44) had attended the L'viv Art Industrial School set up under German
occupation. In the postwar years he had been expelled from the L'viv Institute of
Applied and Decorative Art for a fascination with "formalist" tendencies in Western
art. As a pupil of Roman Sel's'kyj and other masters from the inter-war period,
Zviryns'kyj sought to pass down to some of his students a more comprehensive
knowledge of art and the humanities that Soviet educational institutions did not
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18 Danylo Dovboshyns'kyj, interview by the author, L'viv, tape recording, 19 March 1999, Institute of
Historical Research, L'viv National University; Petruk, interview.

19 As sculptor Dmytro Kravych related to art scholar Roman Iatsiv, L'viv artists gave some of these
back issues to counterparts in Odessa, Kyiv, and the Crimea, spreading the traditions of the L'viv
school of art to other parts of the republic. Iatsiv, 439, n. 43.

20 Krystyna Chaban-Zviryns'ka, untitled essay in Karlo Zviryns'kyj i mystetyvko 1960-x rr. (Karlo

21 Syl'vestr Kordyn, “Karlo Zviryns'kyj – mystets’ i vchytel’” (Karlo Zviryns'kyj - artist and teacher),
Beginning in January 1959, he hosted trusted students from the L’viv School (uchylyshche) of Applied Art at his home to study philosophy, religion, history, literature, and music as well as art.²³

In this underground academy, Zviryns’kyj, trying to encourage rather than impose his views on trusted pupils, privately introduced a cohort of young avant-garde artists to a number of developments in art that often did not fit in the canon of official Soviet culture. In the company of no more than 8-9 students, he told them about Ukrainian artists from inter-war Galicia. Through photographed reproductions of works by Western masters such as Paul Gaughin, Vincent Van Gogh, Paul Cezanne, and copies of the Polish art journal, Przegląd artystyczny, he introduced them to Western artists and art trends deemed too "decadent" for the Soviet curriculum.²⁴ In the early 1960s, members of this underground academy organized their own private exhibits in the apartment of the mother of a city art collector, where two of them, Oleh Min’ko and Petro Markovych, lived. In one of the apartment’s vacant rooms, Zviryns’kyj got together with his pupils to discuss exhibits on display, inviting two trustworthy members of the artists' union, painters Vitol’d Manastyrs’kyj

---

²² Petruk, interview.

²³ The first students associated with this academy were Bohdan Halyts’kyj, Bohdan Sojko, Andrij Bokotej, Zinovij Flinta, Ivan Marchuk, Lesia Tsehel’nyj, Petro Markovych, Roman Petruk, and Oleh Min’ko. Iatsiv, 443.

²⁴ Petruk, interview.
and Roman Sel’s’kyj, to make comments as well. Zviryn's'kyj in this way encouraged further investigation of art trends not mentioned in the official curriculum and encouraged innovation free from official control.

This underground academy, according to recollections by its participants, included a comprehensive curriculum of its own that went beyond informal discussions on art. Zviryn's'kyj introduced his pupils to a number of Soviet Ukrainian writers repressed during the 1930s, as well as Western modernists like Baudelaire and Camus and recent Nobel Prize winners. He and his students read such philosophers outside the canon of Marxism-Leninism as the existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre. A conservatory professor introduced them to modernist composers from the West. This secret academy took on its own informal system of lectures by Zviryn's'kyj or his guests, and young artists in attendance often wrote conspectuses of them.

Zviryn's'kyj also sought to orient his pupils toward religious and national issues that the Soviet regime discouraged. At Zviryn's'kyj’s apartment, a Greek Catholic priest who had been imprisoned in Siberia after the war for his church activities lectured to Zviryn's'kyj’s pupils on modern views on religion. Zviryn's'kyj

25 Ibid.

26 Ibid.

27 Andrij Bokotej, interview by the author, L’viv, tape recording, 17 February 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L’viv National University; Petruk interview.

28 Petruk, interview.

29 Petruk, interview. Zviryn’s’kyj, who had been a frequent guest at the Sel’s’kyj home since February 1946, years later admitted in an interview with Roman Iatsiv that he tried to provoke discussion of national and religious issues with Roman Sel’s’kyj and tended to be more outspoken on them than Sel's'kyj was. Iatsiv, 443-44, n. 59.

30 Petruk, interview.
suggested to his pupils an alternative Ukrainian past and national identity to that which the Soviet regime supported. He urged them to honor privately the anniversary of the Battle of the Krut, where soldiers of the Ukrainian People’s Republic were wiped out by Bolshevik forces near Kyiv in 1919. Zviryns’kyj also told them about recent developments among nationalist organizations in the early 1960s that had emerged in Western Ukraine.31 Besides giving his pupils broader perspectives on art and culture, he also suggested to them a sense of national identity connected to groups fighting Soviet rule and a religious orientation that opposed the atheist values of official Soviet culture.

Pupils of Zviryns'kyj's underground academy have largely constructed this academy in their memories as a national underground institution. Yet they do indicate that informal discussions on art, literature, history, and other subjects were taking place systematically, with Zviryns'kyj encouraging a different perspective on art and its role in society than what he could have taught at the L'viv School of Applied Art. As with other personal ties developing throughout the city between artists of inter-war Galicia and their younger counterparts, generations of artists who came of age after World War Two became acquainted with artistic traditions connected more closely with Central and Western Europe than with the Soviet Union. As one art scholar and contemporaries have recently noted, other artists from the

31 Ibid.
older and younger generations also organized their own one-day private exhibits at their apartments or shops. In these makeshift salons, they would discuss works that had been rejected for official exhibits.\textsuperscript{32}

Other artists in L'viv besides Zviryns'kyj's circle also took part in discussions of contemporary art trends, which they discovered through Polish publications. Zviryns'kyj urged his pupils to learn Polish so that they could read Polish-language translations of modernist writers such as the nineteenth century French poet Baudelaire and the art journal \textit{Przegląd artystyczny}, which contained valuable information on contemporary art trends abroad.\textsuperscript{33} Zviryns’kyj himself made use of the Polish-language radio service of the BBC to find out about art trends in the West, which led him to the American abstract expressionist Jackson Pollock as a source of inspiration for some of his own abstract paintings at the end of the 1950s.\textsuperscript{34}

Other artists more closely connected with the establishment, such as members of the city's artist union, as well as other art students in L'viv also read Polish art journals and journals of other Soviet Bloc countries. Such journals gave a more liberal treatment of new trends in contemporary art in the West than their official Soviet counterparts, and so they became especially popular for young artists in search

\textsuperscript{32} Iatsiv, 443; Emmanuil Mys'ko and Mykola Petrenko, interview by the author, L'viv, tape recording, 24 March 1999, Institute of Historical Research, L'viv National University.

\textsuperscript{33} Iatsiv, 443.

\textsuperscript{34} Khrystyna Chaban-Zviryns'ka, “Karlo Zviryns'kyj i ioho 'dukhovna' shkola” (Karlo Zviryns'kyj and his “spiritual” school), n.d., typed computer manuscript from the personal papers of Khrystyna Chaban-Zviryns'ka, 3; Kordyn, 156; Karlo Zviryns'kyj, “Chomu abstraktsiiia?” (Why abstractionism?), in Karlo Zviryns'kyj ta ioho ‘dukhovna’ shkola (Karlo Zviryns'kyj and his “spiritual” school), (L’viv: “IuEKS,” 1999), 4.
of their own breakthroughs. In the late 1950s, this attraction to Polish art journals and others featuring contemporary art trends abroad already troubled regional Party authorities. A report on ideological work among the artistic intelligentsia of 8 March 1957 suggested that journals and albums promoting "contemporary modernism," recently made available in city libraries, were having negative effects on art students’ education. A penchant for following Polish publications on art, like the journal Przegląd artystyczny, earned an official rebuke from the head of the presidia of the Union of Artists of the republic from Kyiv, M. H. Derehus, who spoke at an artists’ union meeting in L’viv on 17 October 1959. Artists in the cultural underground, like Zviryns'kyj's secret academy, as well as art students and those in the establishment were making use of Polish-language media in ways that disrupted the hegemony of official Soviet culture as they sought new sources of artistic inspiration.

As artists both in the establishment and in the underground turned to Polish-language media and older Galician masters for inspiration, they also turned to artists in different parts of the Soviet Union for support. Young artists in the late 1950s and early 1960s drew inspiration from exceptional masters in Kyiv and from non-conformist trends in Tallinn, Moscow, Leningrad, Riga, and Vilnius.

35 Dovboshyns'kyj, interview; Mys'ko and Petrenko, interview.
36 DALO, fond p-3, opys 6, sprava 40, ark. 23-24.
37 Derehus complained that in L'viv, "too many pay attention to Przegląd artystyczny." DALO, fond R-1694, opys 1, sprava 217, ark. 58-59.
38 See Chapter One.
39 fatsiv, 444.
For members of the artists’ union, direct contacts with Moscow artists and art institutions there proved vital in helping protect as well as promote innovative artists’ careers. As the former head of the artists’ union in L’viv suggested, a Moscow exhibit of L’viv artists’ works in the second half of the 1960s turned out to be crucial for raising the prestige and protecting the reputations of innovative local artists. Famous all-Union artists and members of the all-Union artists’ union presidia praised the works on display and acknowledged their originality.⁴⁰ In a similar manner, an artists’ union commission from Moscow headed by Bilashova, a prominent Moscow sculptor, vindicated the work of Danylo Dovboshyns’kyj and other L’viv artists whom officials in Kyiv had considered “formalists.” Dovboshyns’kyj and other painters from L’viv consequently had greater opportunities to have their works exhibited.⁴¹

For artists of a provincial city such as L’viv, connections with other centers of culture in the Soviet Union, especially the capital, Moscow, had become crucial to their future professional development. While maintaining an identity of their own that was close to Central and Eastern Europe, these artists also participated in a Soviet identity as well, looking to Moscow and other cities for artistic inspiration as well as protection.

⁴⁰ Emmanuil Mys’ko, head of the artists’ union in L’viv at the time, helped organize the exhibit, which comprised about 14 works in all. It included the works of such artists from both younger and older generations as Feodosiia Bryzh, Leopold Levyts’kyj, Marhit Sel’s’ka, Roman Sel’s’kyj, and Volodymyr Patyk. Mys’ko and Petrenko, interview.

⁴¹ Dovboshyns’kyj, interview.
The artists' union in L'viv and the Institute of Applied and Decorative Art for their part also supported some elements of the artistic traditions of interwar L'viv within the bounds of official Soviet culture. As establishment intellectuals, they quite often worked within institutions to advance their own artistic agendas. Artists in the establishment conveyed artistic traditions of inter-war Galicia through innovations in form, while adhering to accepted themes and genres in official Soviet culture. Sculptors, for instance, who belonged to the artists' union, despite extreme censorship from state art councils, had relatively more freedom for artistic innovation in village memorials to victims of World War Two.

The Soviet regime's support of folk art enabled artists to make innovative use of folk themes and folk genres within official guidelines and thus resist official restrictions on culture. As the head of L'viv's artists' union recalled, the Institute of Applied and Decorative Art stressed education in folk art and crafts rather than such disciplines as painting and sculpture, yet students acquired methods and subjects in folk art that preceded Soviet rule. While socialist realism remained a trend for artists who chose to conform, these folk elements connected them with earlier, more enduring artistic traditions. Such recollections suggest the power of "invented tradition" in Soviet culture, where Soviet institutions stressed the importance of folk
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42 See Chapter 3.

43 Mys'ko and Petrenko, interview.

44 Ibid.
themes and folk genres in art, literature, music, and dance.\textsuperscript{45} Yet they also indicate that artists in the establishment made use of accepted genres and themes in ways that resisted other aspects of official Soviet culture.

Within official art circles, colleagues and Party and state officials supporting them quite often contested the legitimacy of works by L’viv artists despite these artists’ attempts to conform to the rules of their discipline. Charges of “formalism” quite often surfaced at such institutions as the artists’ union and the Institute of Applied and Decorative Art. As with any “ism,” artists and officials used this term very loosely. According to a former head of the L’viv artists’ union in the late 1960s and early 1970s, instructors at the Institute of Applied and Decorative Art regularly sought out students’ works that could be used before the regional Party committee as examples of “formalism” infecting young artists. The artists’ union often held exhibits of “experimental” works closed to the public to keep representatives of the regional Party committee, eager to denounce young artists, from attending.\textsuperscript{46} Yet judging from regional Party committee reports and recollections of artists from L’viv, “formalism” tended to characterize those works of art that did not portray relevant propaganda themes or present subjects clearly and simply, following a scholastic application of artistic techniques. Such charges of “formalism,” presumably generated by professional rivalries as well as by rival conceptions of art, showed a pattern of resistance to official restrictions on art among both in the cultural underground and within the artists’ union itself.

\textsuperscript{45} See Martin, 171-74, as well as Hobsbawm, passim.

\textsuperscript{46} Mys’ko and Petenko, interview.
Regional Party committee reports reveal a host of accusations of artist union members failing to live up to the tasks of portraying "Soviet reality" or failing to enforce ideological vigilance among their members. While acknowledging the contributions of L'viv artists to works that praised Soviet reality and inspired the workers, regional and republic Party and state officials in the early 1960s warned that some young artists had received too much praise in their achievements. One republic Party secretary, Andrij Skaba, claimed before ideological workers of Western Ukraine in 1962 that one such young talent, the painter Volodymyr Patyk, "is on the edge of formalism (balansuir na hrani formatvorchosti)."\textsuperscript{47} Painters in particular faced such claims, as regional Party committee bureau discussions of 12 July 1963 on the L’viv artists’ union suggests. Of 299 works by L’viv artists sent to a recent republic exhibit, a total of 132 were rejected, "primarily landscapes, still lifes, or canvases completed without profound reflection on the subject and at a low artistic level." Of 96 works that L’viv painters had submitted for a recent republic exhibit, only 14 in all were accepted.\textsuperscript{48} Authorities suggested that L’viv painters were failing to live up to the standards of Soviet artists, offering clear, moving examples with a convincing political message for viewers.

\textsuperscript{47} DALO, fond P-3, opys 8, sprava 420, ark. 64-65; DALO, fond P-2941, opys 1, sprava 21, ark. 208; DALO, fond P-2941, opys 1, sprava 32, ark. 174.

\textsuperscript{48} DALO, fond P-2941, opys 1, sprava 21, ark. 208; DALO, fond P-2941, opys 1, sprava 32, ark. 171-72.
In the early 1970s, as the Soviet regime sought to repress the growing dissident movement among nationalities, local Party and state leaders suggested that many artists in the establishment had fallen under the influences of "formalism" in both their techniques and choice of subjects. In discussing the state of ideological work with other Communists from the region on 30 November 1970, regional Party secretary Kutsevol took to task members of the L'viv artists’ union for misguided experiments and poor choice of themes. Many painters were depicting their subjects primitives, showing people in a vulgarized manner, "without a shade of thought or live human feelings." Artists’ main themes were in “landscapes, portraits, genre pictures from daily folk life [z narodnoho pobutu] and the historical past of the Ukrainian people,” rather than in more current themes about workers, World War Two soldiers, and other, more “contemporary,” heroes. 49 Similar charges of “distorting” reality and engaging in “irrelevant” subjects surfaced in late 1971 and early 1972, as Party leaders in the region sought to crack down on ideological deviations among the intelligentsia. 50

Such criticism of “formalism” among L’viv artists most likely reflected stereotypes of the city’s artistic community and its recent “bourgeois nationalist” past. L’viv painter Danylo Dovboshyns’kyj recalled that in the mid-1960s, a republic official objected to exhibiting a portrait he and a colleague had done of coal miners

49 Kutsevol, in his criticism of painters, mentioned in particular union members Mykola Andrushchenko, Volodymyr Patyk, and Mykola Krystopchuk. DALO, fond P-3, opys 16, sprava 10, ark. 30.

50 See, for instance, remarks made by regional Party and state officials at a plenary session of the regional Party committee on 20 November 1971 in DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 22, ark. 90; and at expanded closed meetings of the Party organization of the L’viv artists’ union on 4 January 1972 in DALO, fond P-3810, opys 1, sprava 23, ark. 9-12.
because it was an example of "formalism" from the "L'vov school." He and other artists had become an "eyesore (bil'mo v ochakh)" for Party and state officials in the republic.\textsuperscript{51} Regional Party committee reports such as those cited above suggest that L'viv artists had become an eyesore, despite even efforts to conform to the official canon. Like Dovboshyns'kyj, L'viv artists in the years after Stalin's death faced suspicions of revolting against officially approved methods of expression. One scholar claims that such a process had begun to emerge at the beginning of the 1960s, among artists' works produced outside the establishment.\textsuperscript{52} With so many informal ties to the prewar generation of L'viv artists, connections with other less conservative Soviet artists, and access to Polish media, painters, sculptors, and graphics artists who began their careers in the post-Stalin era quite naturally shared such values being expressed underground. They consequently became suspected supporters of "formalism" as well.

In this manner, L'viv artists, regardless of their efforts to conform to the regime's expectations, were perceived to be challenging them. Many members of the artists' union admittedly made works that glorified Soviet workers and peasants, Soviet patriotism in World War Two, and other "more contemporary" achievements of the state and its people. Yet they also were producing graphics and paintings that dealt with the mythical past, rural scenes, and other less politically engaging subjects.

\textsuperscript{51} Dovboshyns'kyj said that the republic's Minister of Culture, Babijchuk, on inspecting the portrait, exclaimed, "Get it away from my eyes, so I don't see that L'vov school, that damned thing, that formalism!" Dovboshyns'kyj, interview.

\textsuperscript{52} latsiv, 444-45.
Some of them had become involved in artistic forms that “disoriented” viewers, indicating that painters and graphics artists were turning to more abstract methods of depiction associated with the art community of inter-war L’viv. As graphics artists and painters sought to understand the Soviet modernity they faced, they made use of these artistic traditions, as well as Polish media, connections with other Soviet artists, and the norms of Soviet establishment art to resist official restrictions on culture.

5.2 Representing Soviet Modernity in Art

Soviet institutions and cultural centers, Polish publications, and artistic traditions from inter-war Western and Central Europe helped L’viv artists in both the underground and in the establishment grasp with Soviet modernity in their works. In painting and graphics, L’viv artists in one way or another confronted the impersonal, potentially meaningless world that modernity as a “juggernaut” represents for Giddens. In the cultural underground, L’viv artists did so making use of abstract art and folk themes not permitted in official Soviet culture. Those in the artistic establishment, namely members of the artists’ union in L’viv, understandably had more limited options. As intellectuals who served the Soviet state and “the people,” they had to work according to subjects and methods that the regime permitted. Yet they also dealt with important issues of Soviet modernity as some of them turned to the “invented tradition” of village folk life and Ukraine’s mythical past. In other officially approved themes like World War Two, they represented their subjects in ways that challenged more simplistic, straightforward versions of reality that Party and state officials often demanded.
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Paintings by Karlo Zviryns’kyj and his “underground academy” student Oleh Min’ko illustrate how much L’viv artists had become drawn to a depiction of reality that had become more fragmented, irrational, and deeply introverted and introspective. Zviryns’kyj at the beginning of the 1950s started to move away from post-impressionist directions fostered by his mentor, Roman Sel’s’kyj, and inter-war artists from Western Ukraine. Profoundly disillusioned with the traumatic experiences of World War Two and the Soviet regime, he abandoned a figurative reflection of the world and turned to his own inner world for artistic investigation. Aware of new developments occurring among other post-war artists in Western Europe, he offered a more positive presentation of his inner world by creating his own ethical and plastic concept derived from a Christian humanistic system of values. As he would tell his underground pupils, “Find God in your own soul and only then create it in an image or stone.” This effort to resurrect universal Christian humanist values in a world alienated and depersonalized by modernity became a central activity in Zviryns’kyj’s informal meetings with students and in his own artistic investigations.

Zviryns’kyj’s color applications and relief paintings from the late 1950s and early 1960s illustrate how much this artist had turned to abstract forms to transcend the reality in which he lived and assert another order. Application-5, made in 1957 out of colored paper and glue, comprises a set of mostly rectangular shapes in black, various shades of brown, and gray. Inspired by stories of artistic life in Paris from the

Sel’s’kyjs, Polish publications, and Polish-language BBC broadcasts on artistic life in the West, it and other applications by Zviryns’kyj attempt to use various patterns of colored sheets of paper to evoke certain moods and feelings that he sensed intuitively.\(^{54}\) This combination of figures in black, shades of brown, and gray seem to draw the viewer to some inner, more tranquil world. It conjures a village setting, field, or some other realm that is exclusively accessible only to the individual attempting to fathom meaning in these abstract forms (Figure 1).

For Zviryns’kyj, foreign radio reports about the abstract expressionist Jackson Pollock inspired in the late 1950s a number of relief paintings made of string, yarn, plaster, and other materials in addition to paint.\(^ {55}\) Zviryns’kyj’s Relief-V, made in 1960, indicates how much the random wanderings of rope on a canvas evoke a series of associations, such as wandering through a dense forest or trying to untangle some deep cosmic mystery (Figure 2). In the same sense Epitaph-II from 1960, made of cardboard, paper, glue, and paint, conveys various emotions in a raised, textured column in shades of black and white, set against a stark gray background (Figure 3). It may appear to represent some kind of worn tombstone, yet in its use of relief figures and contrasting colors, it suggests the stark realities of death and human suffering. Zviryns’kyj’s Relief-VI (1960), made of wooden decorations, glue, thread, and paint, is arranged as a checkerboard of geometric shapes and combination of blue and earthy colors (Figure 4). This combination of pieces of wood and color may

\(^{54}\) Zviryns’kyj, 4; Chaban-Zviryns’ka, “Karlo Zviryns’kyj,” 3.

\(^{55}\) Kordyn, 156.
illustrate the crowded hustle of urban life or some sense of being crowded. In Relief-
I (1958), also made of wooden decorations as well as wood, glue, and paint, there
seems to be a central message present with blocks and pieces of wood of various
heights and in different colors arranged against a dark blue field (Figure 5). These
wooden objects may designate a crowd of different people, a patch of wild flowers, or
more simply an urban skyline from above. Yet most importantly, this abstract
painting and others by Zviryns’kyj mentioned above offer a variety of very intimate
interpretations. Such works by Zviryns’kyj break down the impersonal, universal
structures of meaning in modernity and offer ones that individuals construct for
themselves.

Zviryns’kyj began to use abstract forms not just out of disillusionment with
post-war Soviet modernity, but also in an effort to reshape meaning in a way that
affirmed higher spiritual truths in the contemporary world in which he lived. As his
daughter, Khrystyna Chaban-Zviryns’ka, notes in her study of his private papers,
Zviryns’kyj was very much a Christian artist attempting to rebel in his own way
against the spiritual emptiness of Soviet establishment art. Zviryns’kyj asserted in
one interview with A. Zemko that “my painting is a prayer.” In each work he painted
he tried to “express my wonder at the great creation of God.” In this manner he
took an interest in the French philosopher and paleontologist Pierre Teilhard de
Chardin (1881-1955), whose posthumous works sought to reconcile religion,
traditional philosophy, and recent discoveries in modern science. In the late 1950s

Zviryns’kyj at the Academy of Sciences Library in L’viv ran across and had photocopied Teilhard de Chardin’s *Phenomenon of Man* (1955), published in Polish translation. This philosopher left a great impression on Zviryns’kyj, because he proved that the Christian faith was not incompatible with scientific achievements.  

Zviryns’kyj was drawn to abstract art forms not to duplicate cultural achievements in the West, but out of a spontaneous feeling to move with the times and to create something original. According to his daughter’s interpretation, his archives’ numerous notes and theoretical formulations indicate that he investigated abstract forms as protest against the official canon of socialist realism and to oppose the injustice and arbitrariness taking place in his world. As he was to tell A. Zemko, “There exists a hierarchy of values. Art is an integral part of the people’s spirit. If the very basis of art, the people’s spirit, is in danger, should one forget about the fate of the integral part? . . . How can you love drawing an apple when a person near you dies.”

Official Soviet art, of course, also assumed art as integral to the people’s spirit. Soviet artists, like their counterparts in literature and music, shared a sense of social duty like Zviryns’kyj did. Yet his daughter’s interpretation, that he was an artist with a social conscience, does reveal that Zviryns’kyj through abstract art was interested in reasserting meaning in a world perceived to be spiritually bankrupt. As Zviryns’kyj and his pupils in his “underground academy” discussed philosophy, literature, religion, and history, as well as art, they were drawn to making use of
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57 Ibid., 3.

58 Ibid., 4.
abstract art forms in a way that reaffirmed spiritual values. By emphasizing art forms and rebelling against a more direct, simplified depiction of their external world, Zviryns’kyj and younger artists studying under him were in fact attempting to confront their world without giving into the pressures to conform. Zviryns’kyj in fact never exhibited any of his works during the Soviet period, because he refused to make the compromises necessary to be accepted in exhibits. His refusal to participate in public exhibits of any sort illustrated how much he and his pupils had created values of their own deemed more personally fulfilling than those that official Soviet culture promoted. Yet Zviryns’kyj’s actions also suggested that he and his pupils were determined to follow the social calling that was expected of Soviet artists, by reasserting spiritual values through means that official Soviet culture did not allow.

One of Zviryns’kyj’s “underground” pupils, Oleh Min’ko, created unofficial works in the 1960s that also sought to create a more intimate, individualized interpretation of reality than what official Soviet art at the time allowed. Min’ko’s paintings of deliberately distorted human figures draw the viewer to issues of larger significance. In the painting The Card Game (1961), the two people playing cards become almost like furniture looking over enlarged symbols of various cards, with a giant spade seemingly suspended from the ceiling (Figure 6). The combination of dark and light shades of blue establish an intense mood over the game, and the card symbols draw the viewer to the emotions associated with the revealing of each card.

59 Ibid., 4-5.
Min’ko’s portrait, The Wound (1968), depicts simultaneously two facial expressions, one smiling at the viewer and the other, on the left side, exclaiming in pain at the sight of a nail pierced through the subject’s hand (Figure 7). In depicting these two facial expressions of conflicting emotions in grotesque form on a disproportionately elongated head, Min’ko emphasizes the human psyche’s ability to hide its wounds and contain conflicting emotions at the same time. He also evokes the iconography of Jesus in his depiction of the person's facial features and the nail in his hand. In Senselessness (1968) a conglomeration of human and animal features draws viewers to various paradoxes in the human condition (Figure 8). One foot is chained and unable to reach out to a flower that another hoof or claw is able to grasp. It almost seems as if there are two creatures joined together. One creature with a black leg is sticking out of a light beige-colored counterpart. This beige-colored creature has an elephant-like trunk raised high, crying out with the teeth and lips of a human mouth.

Min’ko’s distorted figures in The Wound, Senselessness, and The Card Game escape a simple, direct message that official Soviet art at the time tried to convey. In Senselessness, for instance, the juxtaposition of various body parts in awkward positions for some viewers at the time may have reflected the absurdity of modern life. As one of Zviryns’kyj’s pupils recalls, the “underground academy” which Min’ko participated in discussed such modernist writers as Kafka, Sartre, Proust, and others through Polish translation. Such writers, like Min’ko’s paintings, also viewed reality as absurd and infinitely complex. Min’ko and others studying
privately under Zvirys'kyj very likely brought with them influences from such literary works as they attempted to depict reality in their paintings and graphics. At any rate, Min’ko’s portraits clearly represented a reality that individual viewers understood on a very personal, subjective level, sometimes evoking religious motifs as well.

Zvirys’kyj and pupils in his “underground academy” did much to rebel against existing formal conventions and turn inward, generating intense individual reflection through forms that echoed the artist’s own introspection. Yet this underground circle represented a more radical version of an orientation towards art shared by broader segments of the artistic community in L’viv. Within unofficial circles and in a public forum, artists sought to resist the scholastic, simplified portrayal of natural phenomena and propaganda messages that Party and state officials in the city encouraged. Through folk and literary motifs that officials Soviet culture promoted and inspiration from new trends in art developing abroad, members of the artistic community sought to assert their own diverse responses to the modern condition in which they lived.

Liubomyr Medvid’, while too afraid to take part in Zvirys’kyj’s “underground academy,” did his formal studies with Zvirys’kyj at the L’viv State Institute of Applied and Decorative Art. In the mid-1960s he actively took part in discussions about art, literature, and the like at private evenings with Zvirys’kyj’s unofficial pupils, the poets Ihor and Iryna Kalynets’, and other intellectuals in their own underground salon. Medvid’ also became interested in the surrealist paintings of
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60 Bokotej, interview.
Salvador Dali and therefore was also seeking in some way to take part in new artistic techniques of expression developing in Western Europe. State officials did not look kindly on his works. Medvid’s last name figured in a group of artists accused by one regional Party committee instructor in January 1972 of promoting narrow themes, “subjectivism,” and a lack of common sense in their works.

Medvid’s paintings evoke not the abstract expressionism of Zviryns’kyj or Min’ko. But they depict reality in ways that also demand greater introspection by the individual viewer. The work Evacuation (1965) calls forth the sufferings of Ukrainian refugees and the realities of World War Two in grotesque forms often seen in Dali (Figure 9). In this column of refugees, the elongated bodies and hands, the human with the head of a goose or a snake, and one refugee frantically gesturing after its head that has been taken by a raven all bring out the sense of trauma, grief, and fear present in this crowd. The wavy horizontal lines across the painting, representing the sky, a log wood, or even a plowed field, intensify this mood.

Even while engaged in more straightforward and conformist works such as The First Collective Farmers in L’viv Oblast (1971), Medvid’s use of artistic forms also challenges the viewer’s impressions (Figure 10). Medvid’s color scheme and choice of composition subvert the seemingly photographic qualities of this scene of a couple’s son joining in the new collective farm. The dark brown tones of the broad
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62 On these remarks by regional Party committee instructor V. M. Vysots’kyj before closed Party meetings of the artists’ union on 4 January 1972, see DALO, fond P-3810, opys 1, sprava 23, ark. 12.
stretch of soil, the focus on the foreground rather than the sky, the pale white faces of
the future collective farmer and his forlorn father staring off into the distance in
disbelief, and the speechless stare of the mother all suggest dramatic tension. While
presenting this scene in a more naturalistic fashion, there is a sense of a family
breaking apart as well as a new Soviet life about to take shape, not something that
official Soviet culture welcomed.

Painters like Medvid’, Min’ko, and Zviryns’kyj represented ways in which
L’viv artists, both in the underground and in officially commissioned works, came to
grips with Soviet modernity. In the case of Min’ko and Zviryns’kyj, abstract forms
became a means of creating meaning out of an impersonal world fraught with
existential uncertainties. Postwar Soviet urban life in L’viv had become a
“juggernaut” threatening to run out of control. Party and state institutions firmly
regulated culture. Artists such as Zviryns’kyj and Medvid’, villagers from Western
Ukraine, began their careers in L’viv, a growing postwar industrial center, with a
radically different world view and social relations from traditional peasant life in
Galicia. Intellectuals and others from the village no doubt found the presence of
modern state institutions as well as more impersonal relations in the city to be very
disconcerting as well as intriguing.

As these artists began to cope with the fragmentation of meaning in modern
urban life, they no doubt found appeal in modernist trends in Western art such as
Jackson Pollock and Salvador Dali. Through abstract forms, and in the case of
Medvid’, distorted figures and color schemes, they tried to depict reality in ways that
more directly affected the individual viewer. Paintings by Min’ko and Zviryns’kyj, for instance, made use of abstract forms and distorted human figures to represent a reality open to multiple interpretations. Medvid’s paintings, while depicting real situations, drew viewers more directly into the emotions of the characters portrayed through grotesque human figures and provocative color schemes. Instead of focusing on a bright, optimistic representation of Soviet reality, these painters strove to capture the complexity and tensions in modern Soviet life in ways that more directly appealed to the individual viewer.

While painters like Medvid’, Zviryns’kyj, and Min'ko sought to challenge more straightforward, positive representations of Soviet reality through unorthodox artistic forms, others challenged the Soviet present by turning to the invented tradition of folk themes and Ukrainians' mythical past. Official Soviet art admittedly encouraged such themes as part of the "imagined community" of Soviet nations bound by a common history and territory. Since Stalinist times, folk themes played a central role in the national cultures of the Soviet Union. In L'viv, artists in the cultural underground and in the establishment made use of this "invented tradition," constructing a sense of continuity with traditional village life and a mythical national past. In creating these continuities with an imagined past, they affirmed a different identity from the urban Soviet landscape they confronted. Such artists, regardless of their loyalty to the Soviet state, resisted the values of Soviet
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64 See Martin, 171-74.
modernity by emphasizing the perceived timelessness of village life and heroic figures from Ukrainians' past. In some cases, they directly challenged the regime by promoting religious values or suggesting unwelcome historical analogies to the present.

Graphics artist Ivan Ostafijchuk, one of Roman Sel's'kyj's students at the Institute of Applied and Decorative Art, was one such artist who employed folk themes as a ways of resisting Soviet modernity. In the 1960s, inspired by such graphics artists of interwar L'viv as Leopol'd Levyts'kyj and Iaroslava Muzyka, Ostafijchuk moved increasingly from the abstract forms of graphics art he had learned from Sel's'kyj to folk themes. The graphics work Arkan Dance (1965) portrays Hutsul men engaged in their people's traditional dance, decked out in folk costumes and bearing axes, a prized object for this mountain people in the Carpathians, where Ostafijchuk had grown up in the 1940s and 1950s (Figure 11). The simple pattern of lines for a backdrop, the stark lines of the human figures and minimalist portrayal of facial expressions all tend to draw the viewer to the sense of belonging and community displayed in this invented folk tradition.

A later work, Dovbush (1973), from a series by the same name, suggests that Ostafijchuk also used folk traditions to reflect parallels with the reality of modern Soviet life (Figure 12). Oleksa Dovbush has been the Robin Hood of Carpathian Mountain folk legends, often portrayed in literary, artistic, and other texts as a champion of social justice and national liberation among the Ukrainians of that
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65 Ivan and Dzvinka Ostafijchuk, interview by the author, L'viv, tape recording, 17 April 2000, Institute of Historical Research, L'viv National University.
region. This etching features a lone Dovbush set against a densely crowded cluster of buildings, people, and animals, and the fallen cupola of a church that rise up vertically like the Carpathian mountains. Some of the densely packed scenes of village life include violent exchanges among ax-wielding peasants, with one apparently slain body lying not far from Dovbush’s feet. As Daria Darewych sees it, this series of etchings may reflect Ostafijchuk’s own response to the wave of repression against intellectuals in Ukraine in 1972, many of whom were his friends.⁶⁶

Ostafijchuk admittedly did not join the political opposition to the Soviet regime in the early 1970s. He was one of a number of artists in 1972 who signed their names to a letter denouncing an exhibit of their works by a "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist" organization, Plast, in New York City.⁶⁷ Yet in the 1960s, he had many friends who joined the political opposition, and he exchanged underground (samvyday) literature with them.⁶⁸ Ostafijchuk, while not engaging in political opposition, did sympathize with its participants. His graphic work portrays a downcast Dovbush looking away from a fallen church and outbreaks of violence in the Carpathian villages around him. It suggests that Ostafijchuk, also, was critical of the spiritual decay, corruption, and injustice in Soviet life that his fellow thinkers pointed out.


⁶⁷ “Deshcho pro ‘nimi tvory’ i halastyvykh komentatoriv” (Something about “Still works” and loud-mouthed commentators), Vil’na Ukraina (L’viv), 23 January 1972.

⁶⁸ Ostafijchuk, interview.
Tapestry artist Stefaniia Shabatura, who studied under such avant-garde painters as Sel's'kyj, Dovboshyn's'kyj, and Zviryn's'kyj, also made use of folk themes in ways that challenged Soviet modernity. One clear example of this was the preliminary model of a Gobelin tapestry, Cassandra (Figure 13). This preliminary model was for the final version made in 1971 in honor of the centennial of the birth of Ukrainian poet Lesia Ukrainka.

Based on one of Ukrainka's poems, this tapestry makes use of the Greek tragic heroine Cassandra, whose words, “Wake up, Troy! Death is coming for you!!!” are woven at the top of the tapestry. The tapestry portrays the apocalyptic scenes of Troy’s imminent destruction with characters from Ukrainian village life. The personification of Death holding chains and a sword, with its gruesome skull-like face and bared teeth, the pair of eyes lurking behind Cassandra, and scenes of beasts and serpents devouring a village all intensify the emotions connected with Cassandra’s ominous prophecy. Cassandra’s gigantically disproportionate hands, outstretched, draw viewers to the all-seeing eye of God on her chest and call on them to behold the power of her words. The exaggerated shapes of Cassandra’s hands as well as the one-dimensional figures of slain victims and terrified villagers all suggest a convergence of classical literary traditions, village scenes, elements of cubism, and religious iconography. One of Shabatura’s contemporaries, Ihor Kalynets’, noted how this
tapestry has been compared to Picasso’s Guernica in its stark portrayal of destruction and terror. Yet it also evokes the religious imagery of an icon as well, suggesting images of Hell and moreover the Mother of God as mortals’ intercessor.

Shabatura claims that she was one of Zviryn’s’kyj’s pupils, visiting him and other members of his “underground academy” from time to time at his apartment. Her tapestry no doubt reflects an effort to bring together traditional elements of Ukrainian decorative art and more contemporary art movements of Western Europe. It also has very strong political undertones. Shabatura was one of many Ukrainian intellectuals arrested in January 1972 for possessing and distributing "anti-Soviet" underground literature. Years later, she told writer Petro Shkrab’iuk that at the time of her arrest and trial, she expressed confidence that the Soviet system's days were numbered. Shabatura’s tapestry, Cassandra, may have reflected this confidence that the Soviet system was about to collapse. A general warning of impending calamity, such as the threat of nuclear war that had become a reality throughout the postwar world, also may have inspired this tapestry. Shabatura’s sources of inspiration presumably were broader than specific political ones. In an interview, she said that she could not recall a specific event that had inspired her to make this tapestry. Cassandra at any rate represents a general warning for contemporary viewers,
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suggesting that modern times, like ancient Troy, were not so stable and secure. In this sense Shabatura made use of a central figure in Soviet Ukraine's literary canon, Lesia Ukrainka, as well as folk themes, religious motifs, references to classical literature, and scenes from Ukraine's mythical past, in ways that challenged confident assumptions in an age of Soviet modernity.

For graphic artist Bohdan Soroka, pagan gods and traditional religious symbolism also served as means to cope with the impersonality and loss of meaning associated with Soviet modernity. Soroka, born in 1940, was the son of two active members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) suppressed under Soviet rule. He grew up under the care of his maternal grandfather, a mathematics professor at L'viv State University, and received his education in ceramics at the L'viv Institute of Applied and Decorative Art from 1958 to 1964. As the son of firm opponents of Soviet rule, Soroka made friends with such Ukrainian intellectuals in Kyiv as poet Ivan Svitlychnyi who challenged the Soviet regime's nationality policy in the 1960s. Svitlychnyi's poetry inspired Soroka at the end of the 1960s to experiment in graphic art. Graphic artist Iaroslava Muzyka, herself arrested and exiled to Siberia in the late 1940s, also gave him useful advice in this craft. In graphic art, Soroka turned to pagan and Christian folk themes. Such themes of Slavic pagan gods provoked scorn among some local Party authorities in the early 1970s, particularly since some of his works served as illustrations to a collection of poems by Ihor Kalynets', one of his friends, published abroad in 1970. At a closed
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Party meeting of the artists’ union on 4 January 1972, a regional Party committee instructor complained about Soroka’s “Peruns, Dashbohs, and others” receiving support among union members with “unhealthy tendencies.”

Two graphic illustrations to Kalynets’s *Opening of Vertep* (Vertepnu), *Carolers* and *Stone Women* (1969), are key examples of this turn to the mythical past of folk life that local Party leaders found so objectionable. These two works offer very simple, one-dimensional figures that evoke the magic in village life and its ancient beliefs (*Figures 14-15*). The Christmas carolers in their traditional village costumes are carrying with them a symbol of the sun and the horned effigy of a pagan spirit. These carolers are taking part in a ritual that could be seen very much as an act of rebellion against modern Soviet society, where religious rituals were to have no place. In *Stone Women* (*Figure 15*), female stone effigies from pagan times are flanked by various devils, birds, and the sun with the simplicity of icon painting, evoking the power of ancient spirits as they rush to confront these idols, which, as Kalynets’s poem notes, are to be sent to drown.

Two graphic works on Slavic pagan gods, *Lada* (1972), and *Iarylo* (1970), also draw viewers to this world of traditional religious beliefs (*Figures 16-17*). Lada is the goddess of family well being and happiness, while Iarylo is the god of spring and the eroticism associated with it. Lada becomes a pagan version of the Madonna with child, flanked by decorative leaves and flowers, signifying birth and reproduction. Iarylo sits before two couples engaged in the spring ritual of love, with
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leaves, a garland, and grasses symbolizing the season’s arrival. These references to pagan gods and rituals connected with the pagan world often became the source of an alternative set of beliefs in modern Soviet civilization, a return to the idealized intimacy and spiritual purity of premodern village life and its rituals.

Soroka’s turn to Slavic pagan gods and rituals did not reflect an overt political protest against the regime. Soroka admitted in an interview that he became subject to a witch hunt after the publication of Kalynets’s book of poems abroad, causing the KGB and other authorities to look for some “anti-Soviet” subtext to his illustrations.76 Such illustrations as Stone Women, Lada, and Jarylo nonetheless promised a different set of values from what the regime promoted. While not being Christian, these Slavic pagan gods and goddesses represented a distant past seen as too “irrelevant” to modern Soviet times. Party leaders’ criticism of Soroka’s depiction of pagan gods and goddesses reflected the disapproval that the chief of the region’s Administration of Culture, Vitoshyns’kyj, voiced toward young artists. Speaking before regional Communists on 20 November, he claimed that young artists had wrongly taken a liking in “gloomy landscapes, so-called outskirts of towns in the form of burned out remains [zharyshchyy], and the archaism and primitivism of the past.”77

Local officials like Vitoshyns’kyj clearly perceived pagan gods and goddesses, as well as village ruins, as subjects not appropriate for modern Soviet times. Artists like Soroka who dealt with them had distanced themselves too much

76 Soroka, interview.
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from more “contemporary” developments, focusing on a stage of history long past. In this sense Soroka’s illustrations offered an alternative set of values, ones anchored in a mythical past far removed from the “progressive” ones that Soviet civilization offered. In distancing viewers from the Soviet present, Soroka’s graphic works resisted modernity, with its impersonal, global institutions and lack of stable meaning, replacing it with the invented traditions of “timeless” pagan folklore.

Painter Volodymyr Patyk in the late 1960s had also turned to the invented traditions of village life and the pre-Christian past for sources of inspiration. Easter Egg (1967) and Trypiliia (1967) demonstrate Patyk’s use of color schemes and geometric shapes found in abstract art to represent important artifacts of traditional folk culture found in Ukraine (Figures 18-19). Easter Egg comprises a set of geometric patterns symbolizing that lustrous combination of colors found on Easter eggs in Western Ukraine. Like a cubist portrait, it emphasizes geometric shapes and bright color combinations to convey the emotional power of the Easter egg. As with any abstract expressionist painting, it compels individual viewers to derive their own meaning from it.

The idea for another painting made that year (1967), Trypiliia (Figure 20), emerged when Patyk was visiting a folk museum in Central Ukraine and saw folk artifacts of this mythical bird central to pre-Christian culture in Ukraine. This bird is portrayed, like the Easter egg, in a combination of bright colors, including shades of yellow, red, and green. In capturing this object of folk culture in primitive terms,
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with a simple, geometric etching of the bird and its wings, Trypiliia brings Ukrainian folk culture alive in almost cubist terms, resurrecting itself before viewers with its lines, colors, and geometric forms. In this manner Patyk brought to life aspects of folk culture in order to spark personal reflection and introspection. Abstract representations of folk culture, like Soroka’s graphic illustrations of pagan gods and goddesses, offered viewers a sense of belonging to more age-old problems and values in a world of rapid, arbitrary, and overpowering change.

The invented traditions of Slavic pagan gods and goddesses, village religious rituals, and other artifacts of folk culture all had achieved added significance for L’viv artists in the establishment and in the underground. Scenes of Christmas carolers, pagan gods, and other objects with religious connotations or “nationalist” subtexts obviously could not be exhibited publicly or printed in Soviet publications at this time. Yet they did emerge from a broader discourse in which objects of folk culture had become essential objects of artistic depiction. Folk culture, as invented tradition, had become central to official Soviet culture. Within the rules of the official Soviet canon, artists had the chance to affirm a sense of belonging to one’s native soil and its people. By expressing an identity connected with their native soil and its people, artists within official media resisted the “juggernaut” that Soviet modernity presented with its impersonality and lack of meaning.
Some linocuts by two graphic artists from L’viv, Zenovij Ketsalo and Sofiia Karaffa-Korbut, published in Soviet Ukraine in the early 1970s, demonstrate the power of village life and folk culture among officially accepted works.\(^7^9\) Karaffa-Korbut’s linocuts for works by major figures in the Soviet Ukrainian literary canon, Nineteenth Century writers Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko, are two such examples. **Maksym Zalizniak** (1963), an illustration to a 1963 Soviet publication of Shevchenko’s “The Hajdamaks (Hajdamaky),” uses bold lines and the gigantic proportions of Zalizniak’s body to convey the might and noble spirit of this Cossack rebel who fought foreign oppression in the eighteenth century (**Figure 20**). Another graphics work, **Boryslav is Laughing (Boryslav smiie’t’sia)**, an illustration to a 1966 publication of Ivan Franko’s story of the same title, evokes sympathy for Ukrainian workers oppressed in Galicia at the turn of the century (**Figure 21**). The miner’s enlarged hands and arms, the solid black outline of his figure, and his crumpled body exhausting from heavy labor bring forth the despair faced by simple people and at the same time suggests their willingness to endure and triumph in the end.

Zenovij Ketsalo’s graphic works on the life of the Hutsul people in the Carpathians affirms a sense of loyalty to village life there as well as Soviet patriotism. His **Young Women from Kryvorivnia** (1966) depicts two young women from the mountains dressed in elaborate folk costumes (**Figure 22**). Making use of fine dark lines to illustrate the decorativeness of the costumes they wear and the bags and baskets they are carrying, it draws attention to the beauty of Carpathian village life.

\(^7^9\) Reproductions of these works are in Z. Ie. Ketsalo, ed., Hrafika L’vova (The graphic art works of L’viv) (Kyiv: “Mystetstvo,” 1971).
News (1965) ostensibly serves a propaganda purpose, with Carpathian villagers gathered around a young boy reading a book about space (Figure 23). Such themes as those of a child reading were typical in Soviet propaganda posters of the 1920s and 1930s aimed at promoting literacy among peasants. Yet much of this linocut glorifies traditional village life. All of the villagers are dressed in elaborate mountain folk costumes. The village hut’s tile stove with its traditional illustrations is depicted in considerable detail, as is the pottery placed on it. The emphasis on the decorativeness of village folk art within this mountain villagers’ home seems to draw attention to the beauty of village life and its age-old traditions. One’s native land, in this case the Carpathian Mountains, becomes the crucial center of one’s identity, one’s place in the Cosmos that these villagers are reading about.

In tapestries, graphic works, and paintings, L’viv artists, whether members of the official union or not, took part in representing a reality that provided a sense of meaning and identity in Soviet modernity. In Soviet modernity, they faced a world of more impersonal relations (as seen in mass urban societies), forms of knowledge that challenged pre-modern traditions, and general fears of a loss of meaning amid certitude. Making use of the genre of folk culture, these artists took on this “juggernaut” of modern life by asserting continuity with a mythical Ukrainian past, an idealized village life, or pre-Christian Slavic religious beliefs. At times their works challenged official Soviet culture by following “formalist” methods from the West (Patyk), evoking religious beliefs (Soroka), or expressing analogies openly
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critical of the Soviet present (Shabatura). Yet invented tradition, in either Ukrainians’
heroic past (Karaffa-Korbut) or in the idealized Hutsul village community (Ketsalo),
enjoyed respect in official works as well. Continuity with Ukrainian village life or
the mythical past provided important sources of identity among Ukrainian artists in
L’viv regardless of their attitudes toward the Soviet regime.

Artists in L’viv also made use of other official genres in ways that resisted the
“juggernaut” of Soviet modernity. For vast segments of the population, World War
Two and the struggle against Fascism served as an important source of meaning that
the regime actively promoted, providing new impetus to the ethos of the Russian
Revolution of 1917. Artists, writers, and other intellectuals in L’viv and other cities
of the Soviet Union took part in commemorating and fostering myths about the war,
and the Soviet regime strove to make the war a central theme in their activities. In
graphic art and paintings, some L’viv artists who contributed to this genre offered a
sense of devotion to their native land. In the process, they also offered a sense of
identity in a world fraught with a potential loss of meaning.

Graphic artist Sofiia Karaffa-Korbut’s Avengers (1975), a three-part painting,
illustrates three crucial events in the war: the German invasion, the beginnings of
partisan resistance, and the Soviet Army’s counter-offensive (Figures 24-26). Its use
of color is particularly striking. Stripes of red and light blue, indicating flames and
the severity of war, give power to the scene of male and female peasants and young
boys taking up arms against German occupation. The elongated bodies of the war’s

81 See Amir Weiner, Making Sense of War: The Second World War and the Fate of the Bolshevik
victims and gigantic arms and hands of peasants summoned to arms convey sympathy for the fallen and admiration for those who have chosen to resist. Here, as in her linotypes, Karaffa-Korbut makes use of the proportions of human features to evoke qualities of suffering and heroism among simple people who are devoted to their native land.

Another effort to evoke compassion and sympathy for the war's victims can be seen in Mykhailo Lyshchiner's Requiem (1970) (Figure 27). Depicting an elderly woman mourning the loss of a Red Army soldier fallen in the war, it summons forth the grim realities of war with the woman’s disproportionately large, worn, almost masculine pair of hands placing a red banner on the soldier’s grave. He woman’s face is not visible, and her identity seems irrelevant as well, with her clothes hiding the rest of her features. This act of mourning has become like a still life, with the soldier’s helmet, rifle, and a small bouquet of red carnations arranged on the tombstone. The sharply drawn lines of the woman’s body, the grave, and the items placed on it give this painting a bold, disturbing quality, recalling the reality of war and the destruction caused by it.

Ivan Kryslach, a graphics artist, in Through Roads of War (1974) also calls attention to the war’s victims by making tanks’ tire treads across a village field the key area of focus (Figure 28). These tire treads wind like snakes down from the remote horizon and pass through the entire field of vision, halted only by the figures
of two forlorn children, victims of the war. Twisting lines from the tracks, resembling patterns of embroidery, evoke the enormous sense of loss that has occurred on these children’s native land.

These graphic works and paintings on World War Two themes suggest that L’viv artists made use of more “contemporary” official themes as well as those from folk life to deal with the more impersonal and less certain world of modernity. Through highly expressive artistic forms, Karaffa-Korbut, for instance, draws viewers to simply men, women, and children who identify with their native land and liberate it from Nazi invaders. Lishchyner’s grieving mother and Kryuch’s forlorn children and devastated landscape evoke sympathy for their native land and their people who have suffered from the war. All of these works served an important function in making patriotic Soviet citizens devoted to the defense and welfare of their country. They also no doubt served as a source of inspiration for Ukrainians committed to bettering their nation in a Soviet Ukrainian state, showing the Soviet people determined to liberate Ukrainians from Nazi invaders. But besides this, these artists offered a sense of belonging to a community brought together by common sufferings and a common cause, providing meaning in a world of uncertainty and alienation associated with modernity.

In a number of different ways, then, L’viv artists in the underground and in the establishment sought to resist the “juggernaut” of Soviet modernity and affirm a sense of identity and meaning within it. Painters influenced by abstract expressionism and surrealism in the West sought to represent reality in more complex ways than the bright, simplistic account that official Soviet art often presented at the
time. In abstract expressionism in particular, individual viewers had to form their own judgments about what that reality was. In the invented tradition of folk culture, graphic artists and painters alike offered a sense of continuity with the seemingly age-old traditions of the village and its pre-Christian spiritual life. While abstract, "formalist" representations of reality and the "archaism" and "primitivism" of folk themes offered direct resistance to Soviet modernity, highly expressive representations of an official genre, World War Two, also resisted it by giving a sense of devotion to a land and its people. An abstract or expressionist depiction of reality, folk themes, and patriotic themes all offered the self a sense of belonging and purpose in a world of impersonal relations and uncertainty.

5.3 The People and the Self: Official and Underground Literature's Perceptions of Soviet Modernity

As artists both in the underground and in public in L’viv created a sense of identity and meaning in the rapidly changing world in which they lived, writers in publications and in privately circulated manuscripts confronted similar problems. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, writers in the city increasingly took different stands toward the regime, yet on all sides of the political spectrum they dealt with problems posed by the "juggernaut" of modernity: alienation, fragmentation, and nihilism. Ihor Kalynets' was in underground circles writing poems in a new style with many themes reflecting his own sense of being ostracized from the intellectual establishment. He epitomized the city's radical fringe, whose members wrote and exchanged their works
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free of censorship, openly criticizing the established order. Yet writers who chose to work within the system in those years, such as the novelist Roman Fedoriv, also sought at times to discuss such values as honesty, integrity, and devotion to one’s land and people in a world that challenged them. In doing so, they reflected similar concerns about modernity being raised underground.

Ihor Kalynets’, born in 1939 in the small town of Khodoriv in the L’viv Region, began his career as a writer while as student at L’viv State University from 1956 to 1961. As with many natives of Western Ukraine, members of his family supported rebels fighting for the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against Soviet rule in the immediate postwar years. From his grandmother he found out about an uncle who died in mass shootings of political prisoners in L’viv by the Soviet regime in early 1941. As a student in L’viv, Kalynets’ befriended amnestied prisoners from the postwar years, read works by inter-war Ukrainian nationalist Dmytro Dontsov, and became acquainted with literary events of inter-war L’viv and suppressed Soviet Ukrainian writers. The national cultural renaissance in the republic’s capital, Kyiv, encouraged by more liberal policies under Soviet leader Khrushchev, inspired Kalynets’ to break new ground as a poet. In the 1960s, many writers and other intellectuals from Kyiv became his friends and sources of moral support.
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As a young poet in the 1960s, Kalynets’ thus became active in challenging official Soviet culture and in turn the regime. During a relatively more liberal political atmosphere, he managed to publish some of his poems in Ukrainian newspapers and journals, first as a student and then as a researcher at the regional state archives in L’viv. In 1966, Kalynets’ published a small collection of poems, *Kupalo’s Fire (Vohn’ Kupala)* and made plans to enter the writers’ union. But as his poems took on controversial themes such as the church and the Soviet regime’s political opponents, and as friends were arrested in the regime’s repression of Ukrainian intellectuals, he fell out of favor with authorities. Despite good recommendations from fellow writers, he was not accepted into the writers’ union. While his second collection of poems, *The Opening of the Nativity Scene (Vidchynennia vertepu)* (1967) received praise from novelist Iryna Vil’de, head of the writers’ union in L’viv, it was not accepted for publication.86

Kalynets’ had become an undesirable figure among party and state authorities, and editors in L’viv and Kyiv feared publishing him. Rejected by the literary establishment, Kalynets’ turned to the cultural underground for encouragement and inspiration. Along with reading about new literary developments in the West through Polish publications, he and his wife, poet Iryna (Stasiv) Kalynets’, became close friends with L’viv artists who had studied in Karlo Zviryns’kyj’s “underground academy.” In private meetings at friends’ homes, they exchanged ideas about
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contemporary art and literature. Kalynets’ turned to writing poems for friends in underground (samvydyv) form. A collection of these underground works made their way abroad, and a Ukrainian nationalist organization in Britain published them in a book entitled Poetry from Ukraine (Poezii z Ukrainy) in 1970, using the name of a Belgian publisher to distract the KGB. Eventually party authorities from abroad found out about the book’s publication, and in 1971 Kalynets’ came under heavy pressure to denounce the work. Kalynets’ refused to do so, and his wife and then Kalynets’ himself were arrested in the wave of repression against Ukrainian intellectuals in 1972.  

Kalynets’s poetry already had sparked controversy in L’viv in the early years of his career. Regional Party committee leaders summoned him to their offices after he read poems with a religious content in them at a literary evening for colleagues at the Museum of Ukrainian Art in May 1962. The content of his first published collection of poems, Kupalo’s Fire (1966), provoked yet another interrogation before the regional Party committee. When members of the writers’ union were to discuss Kalynets’s Kupalo’s Fire on 30 March 1967, the union’s Party secretary, Mykola Romanchenko, in charge of the discussion, canceled it on his own without consulting
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other union leaders. Kalynets’ and others in L’viv at that time made claims that local authorities were trying to obstruct his work as a writer.\textsuperscript{92} Strident criticism of Kalynets’ poems came at a regional Party committee plenary session on 20 November 1971, on the heels of a Central Committee report from Moscow about poor political work in the L’viv Region. Besides criticizing the fact that Kalynets’ had allowed his poems to be published abroad by “bourgeois nationalists” in 1970, regional Party committee secretary claimed that Kalynets’ poems, as well as others’, were “immature (nezrylyj)” and “ideologically-deprived (bezideinyj),” containing at times “a dubious subtext.” Critical of those in the writers’ union who allegedly were defending Kalynets’, he read aloud one of Kalynets’ poems to make his point.\textsuperscript{93}

In short, Kalynets’ had become too dangerous in the eyes of Party and state authorities to be published in Soviet Ukraine. Circulating in samvyday form in the cultural underground, they took on major themes free of official control, quite often critical of official Soviet culture and the regime itself. But in both works officially published and those circulated secretly from the 1960s to his arrest in 1972, Kalynets’ took on important issues that represented an attempt to deal with modernity and its loss of meaning. Turning to the invented tradition of village folk culture, Ukrainians’

\textsuperscript{91} Kalynets’ recalls this interrogation in an interview with Petro Shkrab’iuk in ibid., 63.

\textsuperscript{92} Kalynets’ letter of protest to the regional Party committee about Romanchenko’s alleged behavior, dated 31 March 1967, is in DALO, fond P-3, opys 10, sprava 61, ark. 41-42. Discussion of Kalynets’ and others’ complaints about local authorities interfering in his work surfaced at a meeting between regional Party committee representative V. P. Chuhajov and former members of the Communist Party of Western Ukraine held on 8 April 1967. See DALO, fond P-3, opys 10, sprava 61, ark. 183, 198-99.

\textsuperscript{93} DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 22, ark. 30, 110.
mythical past, and ancient Slavic gods and goddesses, he offered a sense of continuity with an idealized, allegedly timeless past whose values were superior to those found in Soviet modernity.

Kalynets’s *Opening of the Nativity Scene (Vidchynennia vertepu)* (1967) contains many poems that express a desire to embrace tradition and the vital energies of ancient rituals and customs. This set of poems consists of three acts, with intermissions that are comprised of selections from earlier poems. These poems cover a number of subjects, from village scenes and folk customs to poems dedicated to historical events and friends, yet there is a recurrent theme of tradition and the ancient past becoming a redeeming force in an age of modernity. The opening poem, “The Nativity Scene (*Vertep*),” is in reference to a Ukrainian religious custom, *vertep*, where at Christmas Ukrainians re-enact the nativity scene and also portray Ukrainian historical figures in drama and in Christmas carols. In it he affirms that, “having donned the cloak of traditions,/ I bid farewell to the atomic age, because I am not satisfied (natiahnuvshy kyreu tradytsij,/proshchau’s z vikom atomnym,/bo shchos’ men ne sydyt’sia).” He walks over snow drifts as a “wandering bursar (*spudej*)” who has exchanged “the salt mine of cells (*zhupysche kelij*)/for the biblical box of the manger (*vertep*).” Tradition has become a source of new inspiration, since the atomic age, modernity, has not provided fulfillment.
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Kalynets’ in this collection makes frequent references to what in the past had once offered renewing power in village life. In “The Well,” he says that this abandoned, algae-ridden village well once was “a goddess in the ancient Fatherland,” and “ancestors prayed to your purity (molylysia predky do tvoho neporochchia).” People used to drink “eagerly your most pure body” and “cleanse their eyes with sweet water.” The well had magical powers for these people and had even given them wisdom and power. Mourning the loss of this magical world, he asks of the well, “Who deprived you of your virgin charm (Khto tebe charu divotstva pozbavyv)?”

While Kalynets’ mourns the loss of such village traditions, he also sees redemptive power in the village’s Christian and pre-Christian rituals that have continued. The poem “Khodoriv 1967” describes the magic of Kalynets’s home village celebrating Easter. As the sun beams and boys ring out the Easter bells, Kalynets’ says, “So let’s not waste time sleeping: what will come of us?/Let’s say it better (zostanovimosia lipshe), who are we and what are we for./Are we the earth which we haven’t loved for a long time,/or aluminum (diuraliuminievyj) wings that we haven’t grown up to yet.” Reflecting on the majesty of his village’s celebration of Easter, Kalynets’ pauses to think about what people have been striving for and what they have really become. Easter becomes a time for meditation. It is an important source of identity for Kalynets’ and others of his village.
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The holiday of Christmas, with its connections to the pre-Christian world, also becomes an important source of continuity both in the pagan, Christian, and national sense. "Christmas" describes his wonder at Holy Night, when barn animals take on human powers. At this moment, Kalynets’ says that he has been “reborn” and that “I’ve forsaken a weak age (brezklyj vik).” Noting how he has begun life anew as one of these young goats in the barn, he says, “I’ve become cleansed of the polyps of politics/I re-gather (perebyrai) black beads,” referring to the worry beads used for prayer in the Church. This moment of Holy Night before the animals has become a time of rediscovering the self in an age that has become stale. He says, “I’ve found myself in the country of carols/on the coarse straw carpet.” It is a time where the magic of pagan gods has come alive as well. He says, “Cherry-mouthed Lada leaned over me/like a cherry tree (Nadi mnoiu kalynoust Lada/skhylulas’ vyshnevoiu kalyнюю).” The cherry tree (kalyna) symbolizes the presence of Lada, the Slavic goddess of motherhood and family happiness, and Ukrainians’ national tree. Holy Night has become the focal point of what is Christian, pagan, and also national.

But among these village rituais, fire, with its connections to the pre-Christian world, contains for Kalynets’ a timeless magic that surpasses all the latest wonders of modernity, represented as the atomic age. In an earlier collection, Kupalo’s Fire (1966), a poem by the same name praises the magic of the holiday of Ivan Kupalo (St. John’s Eve). This holiday, adopted by Christians to observe the anniversary of the birth of St. John the Baptist, is derived from a pagan ritual of love among young men
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and women that takes place during summer solstice on June 23. The fire that is one highlight of this traditional festival of love becomes a purifying force whose power has endured over the centuries and unites people with their ancestral past. Kalynets’ writes, “Let us pray to the fire that is born with our blood, /that lights the papyrus of our heart with the call of ancestors.” Ivan Kupalo’s fire, with its “brightened cover” protecting its worshippers, is summoned to “purify us from wrong.” In the morning, it “cleanses its fiery body in the rivers of the Fatherland.” Fire can link people to what is pure and to their native land. The fire of Ivan Kupalo after all becomes pure and expiates the people’s sins through washing itself in the Fatherland’s rivers.

In one of Kalynets’s later collections circulated underground, Memoir of the World (Spohad pro Svit) (1970), the poem “Complicity of Origins (pyschetniš’ do rodovodu)” also represents fire as a vital, redeeming force. Pagans, he says, in threes “burn/their sufferings,” both present, past, and future. Each fire “liberates people/from bodies,” enabling them to wander “after their fathers/in paradise (u virij).” By contrast, people in the present have lost the magic of this time, wasting their energies “on searches/for new gods/in laboratories/on creating rituals of the atom,” when in fact “it is necessary/only to recall/the single word/the true word of fire.” In an age where people are seeking new rituals for redemption in modern forms of knowledge, the old ones alone will stand the test of time.

101 Ibid., 40.

102 Ibid., 111-112.

103 Ibid., 113.
In these poems from the late 1960s and early 1970s, Kalynets’ suggests that the village and its traditions, both Christian and pagan, had acquired significance for Ukrainian intellectuals critical of not only the Soviet system but also the project of modernity that it fostered. The atomic age that had become a reality for Soviet life and the rest of the modern world after 1945 had led people astray from those events and symbols that contained a redemptive power. Pre-Christian rituals associated with fire and the Christian-pagan rituals connected with Easter and Christmas all become sources of continuity and moral renewal in an age where meaning itself is in danger of being lost.

By contrast, modern urban life for Kalynets’ fosters a sense of nihilism that threatens but does not overcome these sources of timeless values. In “Night Odyssey,” included in the collection Memoir on the World (1970), a member of “our elite” describes this elite’s night odyssey in which “we had happily avoided/the Silla and Charybdis/of syphilis.” Inspired by alcohol, it is an adventure involving “a mixing/of language with language,/the prelude to a night/mixing of races.” In this night odyssey, “royal cursing of outsiders (zajdy)/are spit out like shells,” referring to Russian curse words brought in by Russian speakers who came to L’viv after the war and villagers’ practice of spitting out shells of seeds in public places. In this world, “we give to Eros what is Eros’s.” Sexual encounters take place on the streets, “under
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the false/stars of neon/in a stone courtyard,” and members of this elite go home to bed “in the expectation of erections/in wet dreams.” On this evening, the atomic age has become a place of emptiness and a lack of fulfillment.

In these poems, Kalynets’ resorts at times to clearly “anti-Soviet” themes, such as religious rituals. Fire in one of his poems, “Perun” (1967), named after the Slavic god of thunder, symbolizes the Soviet regime’s mass destruction of church buildings. His poem, “Night Odyssey,” in voicing disapproval of the mixing of languages and races, suggests an affinity for the integral nationalism of inter-war Galician writer Dmytro Dontsov, whose major work, Nationalism, Kalynets’ had read as a student. Dontsov’s antipathies toward other ethnic groups such as Russians, Poles, and Jews may have inspired these fears of other races and their languages.

Yet Kalynets’ in many of his works also expressed concerns about modernity that the Soviet establishment supported. Criticism of sexual promiscuity, cursing, spitting seed shells, and alcoholism in “Night Odyssey” presumably would have appealed to members of the Soviet establishment concerned about the moral health of young people in the city. Most importantly, Kalynets’s poems talk about people’s need to return to the redeeming power of the fire worshipped by their ancestors over the centuries. Connections with the land and its people were values highly
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106 Ibid., 79.
108 On the regime’s concern about the moral health of students and other young people in the city, see Chapter 2.
compatible within Soviet culture, which had actively promoted the invented traditions of folk culture since Stalinist times. However, the invented traditions of folk culture that Kalynets’ employed fell increasingly suspect to charges of containing “anti-Soviet” subtexts, particularly as he and his wife became active in reading and distributing underground political texts. Kalynets’s poetry moreover from the mid-1960s became increasingly political as he dedicated poems to fellow dissidents arrested, persecuted, or even murdered.\(^{109}\) Yet it is one of many similar responses, official and unofficial, to the problems posed by modernity’s breaking up of traditional loyalties and beliefs.

Prose writer Roman Fedoriv (1930-2001) was one officially recognized Soviet writer who also made use of the invented tradition of the village to cope with the modern world. Fedoriv grew up in a poor peasant family in the Hutsul village of Bratkivtsi in the Stanislav (now Ivano-Frankivs’k) Region. From his early years he became interested in Ukrainian literature, particularly historical novelists whose works later were banned in Soviet times.\(^{110}\) He witnessed discrimination under Polish rule. As he told one scholar years later, his Polish school teacher laughed at his plans to become a writer.\(^{111}\) According to one of his later essays, when the Soviet army arrived in Galicia in 1939, he and other villagers welcomed the chance to unite with

\(^{109}\) On such themes, see in particular The Summing up of Silence (Pidsumovuiuchy movchannia) (1970), Wine for a Princess (Vino dlaia kniazchny) (1971), Verdict in Free Verse (Verlibrovi vyrok) (1971), and Realities (Realii) (1972), in Kalynets’, Slovo trvaiuche, 130-212.

\(^{110}\) Roman Fedoriv, L’viv, interviews by the author, tape recordings, 15 and 17 December 1998, Institute of Historical Studies, L’viv National University.

\(^{111}\) Anatolij Pohribnyj, Preface to Tvory v tr’okh tomakh (Works in three volumes), by Roman Fedoriv, (Kyiv: “Dnipro,” 1990), 12.
the rest of Soviet Ukraine, which they called “Great Ukraine,” and he believed that better times ahead.\textsuperscript{112} However, in the early postwar years, during the UPA’s guerrilla war against Soviet rule, two of his brothers were arrested, two of his sisters were exiled, and three of his cousins died as active members of the UPA.\textsuperscript{113}

It was in the midst this violence that Fedoriv began his careers as a journalist and prose writer. He attended a pedagogical institute in Stanislav (later Ivano-Frankivs’k) in the immediate postwar years, worked as a journalist for district and regional newspapers, and finished correspondence school in journalism at L’viv State University in 1954. From about 1956 to 1965, he was a correspondent for Western Ukraine for the republic newspaper Molod’ Ukrayiny, living in Ivano-Frankivs’k. At the end of 1967, he moved to L’viv and became editor of the literary journal there, Zhovten’ (later Dzvin), serving as its editor until his death.\textsuperscript{114}

In the early 1970s, when poet Ihor Kalynets’ came under fire for circulating his poems “illegally,” Fedoriv had become a major figure in the intellectual establishment in L’viv as a Party member and editor of Zhovten’. Fedoriv tried to shield Kalynets’ from criticism during a regional Party committee plenary session on 20 November 1971, pointing out Kalynets’s talent and the lack of an “anti-Soviet” content in his poems.

\textsuperscript{112} Roman Fedoriv, “Mohyla na Ukraini” (The Grave in Ukraine), in Skrypka, shcho briaie tysiachu lit (The fiddle that plays for a thousand years) (L’viv: “Chervona Kalyna,” 1991), 92-93.

\textsuperscript{113} Fedoriv, interviews.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid.
However, he had no choice but to agree with claims that in terms of their style, his poems were “not very clear (vyznachennyi) in a political sense,” “far from life,” and “not permeated with the spirit of Soviet reality.”

In the fall of 1974, as the Soviet regime cracked down on national dissent in Ukraine and other republics, Fedoriv had earned enough trust from Party authorities to serve as a member of Soviet Ukraine’s delegation to the 29th Session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York. On 20 December 1974 he dutifully reported on his trip to regional Party committee secretary F. F. Dobryk about the activities of “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists” he had met in the New York City area and suggested steps to counter their propaganda. While he was under constant watch, as his report notes, and could not express his own opinions freely, Fedoriv did perform the duties he was to carry out as a loyal Soviet citizen, Party member, and chief editor of a republic journal.

Unlike the poet Ihor Kalynets’, Fedoriv therefore was a writer who fully cooperated with the Soviet regime. As one obituary rightly noted, Fedoriv never called himself a nonconformist, and he had been active in state affairs throughout his life, as an editor and also two times as a deputy in the USSR Supreme Soviet. Yet his short stories and novels in the early 1970s did face hostile criticism from authorities for unwelcome references to Ukrainians’ past. One short story, “The
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115 DALO, fond P-3, opys 19, sprava 22, ark. 109-110.

116 Fedoriv’s report to Dobryk is in DALO, fond P-3, opys 31, sprava 93, ark. 53-65.

Turkish Bridge (Turets’kyj mist),” published in the republic journal Dnipro in December 1970, became the subject of a republic Central Committee report and a KGB investigation. In the opinion of republic officials, it had defied an “objective” class approach to literature by suggesting that a Soviet worker and a Cossack ruler had both betrayed their native land. In the early 1970s, Fedoriv’s last name figured among Ukrainian writers whom the press and writers’ union meetings accused of “idealizing the past.” In one essay Fedoriv said that factory workers’ collectives, egged on by district Party functionaries, also condemned some of his short stories for having “anti-Soviet” subtexts.

Fedoriv’s novels and short stories, which mostly dealt with Ukrainians’ past, thus attracted controversy despite his efforts to prove his loyalty to the regime. An analysis of his historical novels, The Father’s Lamp (Otchyj svityl’nyk) (1972), illustrates ways in which representations of Ukrainians’ past resisted as well as affirmed the values of official Soviet culture. It also suggests that Fedoriv, like the poet Ihor Kalynets’ in the cultural underground, offered links to a timeless mythical past found in idealized village folk traditions.

According to Fedoriv, the idea for writing The Father’s Lamp came in 1961-62, when reporting for the newspaper Molod’ Ukrainy on a rural school’s lessons in Ukrainian history in the village of Vyktoriv, near the capital of the medieval
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120 Roman Fedoriv, “Slovo do chytacha” (To the reader), in Skrypka, shcho hriaie tyxiachu lit (The fiddle that plays for a thousand years) (L’viv: “Chervona Kalyna,” 1991), 4.
principality of Halych-Volyn’. In visiting this school’s eighth grade, he became alarmed by school children’s ignorance of this principality’s history and the fact that their teachers had no access to textbooks on it. Fedoriv decided to write a historical novel based on this principality so that future generations of Ukrainians would know their own history. He spent ten years in all, mostly consulting archeological studies and other sources, in writing this novel, based on events surrounding the life and death of Prince Iaroslav Os’momysl, in the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{121}

The novel centers on a dying Prince Iaroslav reflecting on his life and the chronicles of one of his court poets, Ivan Rusyn’. Prince Iaroslav, who at first sought to become a wise leader, falls to the temptations of power and becomes corrupt. Instead of trusting the people, he fears that they will overthrow him, as they nearly had done to his father. Prince Iaroslav turns to corrupt boyars and an obsequious poet named Ian, Son of Chahr, for support. After years of costly wars and intrigue with boyar factions, Prince Iaroslav in his dying days realizes that the state he had spent so much time building is in danger of falling apart as his two sons, Volodymyr and Oleh, vie for power.

By contrast, Rusyn’, a writer “without roots and without a memory of my kin” in Constantinople, rediscovers his mother’s family ties to Kyivan Rus’ and finds his place in life.\textsuperscript{122} As he tells Grand Prince Iurij, “I’m neither a Kyivan, nor one from

\textsuperscript{121} Fedoriv, interviews.

\textsuperscript{122} Analysis of the novel is based on the following edition: Roman Fedoriv, Otchyi svityl’nyk: roman (The father’s candlestick: a novel), vol. 1 of Tyvry v tr’okh tomakh (Works in three volumes) (Kyiv: “Dnipro,” 1990), 69. This edition indicates that the L’viv state publishing agency, “Kameniar,” first printed it in 1976.
Suzdal’, nor a Galician. I’m a Rusyn’. Dedicated to the people of Kyivan Rus’, Rusyn’ as one of Prince Iaroslav’s court poets sets up schools, promotes new talents, translates works into his people’s native language, and gathers ancient legends showing ancestor’s past glories. Unlike fellow poet Ian, the son of a simple woodcutter and a native of Halych, who uses his talents to flatter leaders and make a career off the people, Rusyn’ has become a true son of the soil, not even fearing to tell Prince Iaroslav the truth. “I want to serve my father’s land,” he tells Prince Iaroslav when the latter criticizes him for not giving enough praise to the Prince’s army in one part of his chronicle. After Prince Iaroslav’s death, Rusyn’, writing his chronicle, expresses his own fears for the future of Kyivan Rus’. For him, its princes, like Iaroslav, are spilling blood needlessly, settling personal scores instead of identifying with and serving the people.

Fedoriv’s The Father’s Lamp offers a response to Soviet modernity as it seeks to link readers to an imagined community whose roots extend back to the days of Kyivan Rus’. In a world of more impersonal relations, rapid change, and existential uncertainty, the past becomes a crucial source of identity for those who are “without roots.” One scholar has noted that Fedoriv’s theme of people’s devotion to their native land, epitomized by Ivan Rusyn’, could be seen as a protest against the “national nihilism” practiced by Party and state leaders in the 1970s. Migration
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policies and other actions encouraged people to neglect their past, their language, their traditions, and their culture. Yet the Soviet regime since Stalinist times had encouraged the development of nationalities’ folk cultures. In late 1975, the Party bureau secretary of the writers’ union in L’viv stressed that while some colleagues had recently paid excessive attention to historical subjects, such subjects, taken from a “class position,” were essential in promoting patriotic Soviet citizens.

Rather than protesting the Soviet system, Fedoriv’s novel presents to patriotic Soviet citizens a sense of belonging to an imagined Ukrainian community that has organically evolved over the ages. In Kyivan Rus’, Ivan Rusyn’ finds a spiritual refuge after spending a lifetime “without roots” in Constantinople, the cosmopolitan capital of the Byzantine Empire. In meeting Vavylo, a slave from Kyivan Rus’, he becomes aware of this need to rediscover his roots, because, says Vavylo, “A man must bear in his soul some church so that he has somewhere to run off to pray.”

Rusyn’ finds his connections to these roots in almost a genetic sense as he tends his garden in Halych. The smell of the earth’s spirit brings forth vague memories of his ancestors from Suzdal’ and Peremyshl’, principalities of Kyivan Rus’, that convince him that his ties to the soil are “primeval (pervynyi).”
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Rusyn’s chronicle itself becomes a way of preserving these organic links for future generations. He claims, “It’s like I’m digging to the western root of that mighty tree that was planted by ancestors in Kyiv and saying, look, Rusyns, how firmly and long ago you’ve grown in the earth under the Hungarian mountains.” In one entry, he pleads to posterity, “Do not wander the earth with a short memory. Remember us. We are the root from which your tree ascends above.” In these passages, Fedoriv suggests to his readers that they, too, are organically tied to this community of Kyivan Rus’ and are obliged to remember it in an age where those ties are in danger of being lost.

Like poet Ihor Kalynets’, Fedoriv in The Father’s Lamp also represents an idealized pre-Christian past as a source of timeless values in an age of existential uncertainty. On the summer holiday of Ivan Kupalo Night, the fire of Kupalo, around which young men and women sing to Lada, the Slavic goddess of love and motherhood, becomes for Prince Iaroslav represents a lost opportunity to join with the people. Together with his lover Nastusia, he joins one such group of young men and women around this fire. Before this fire, he momentarily finds “blood links (pokrevennist)’’ with the local inhabitants, the earth, and the nearby river where young women float wreaths for good luck. However, Prince Iaroslav fails to join in the spirit of the circle of dancers around the fire, feeling like “like an accidental
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wanderer in a foreign church.”134 Fallen to the whims of political ambition and intrigue, Prince Iaroslav fails to identify with the communal spirit that Kupalo’s fire generates. Towards the end of his life, he confesses to Rusyn, “I sought my whole life how to enter the circle of Kupalo and be a link in its chain... I would go away from and get closer to it. It passed me by and frightened me.”135

Kupalo’s fire, in providing spiritual energy for its worshippers, represents in Fedoriv’s novel a timeless force associated with folk life that withstands the political intrigues of Iaroslav and his boyars. In The Father’s Lamp, fire for one villager, Bojan, is a purifying force, associated with the Slavic god Perun, whom he still worships despite the introduction of Christianity.136 The woodsman Vasyl’ko, still believes that the pagan gods are watching him and must be given sacrifices through fire. Fearing for the future of his and Anna’s unborn child after a bear suddenly appears, he starts a sacred fire for the first time and prays to these ancient gods for forgiveness.137 In recounting his own good deeds to Kyivan Rus’, Ivan Rusyn’ says that he has protected “the father’s lamp,” giving it oil.138 As with Kalynets’s references to fire as a source of redemption in the atomic age, as seen above in “Complicity of Origins” (1970), fire in The Father’s Lamp symbolizes a source of

134 Ibid., 389.
135 Ibid., 413.
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purity and spiritual power. It offers a source of enduring value in an age where people’s connections to their “roots” are in danger of being torn up by modern life.\(^{139}\)

In occupying different ends of the political spectrum, both Kalynets’ and Fedoriv as writers in the late 1960s and early 1970s addressed similar concerns about finding identity and sources of certainty in modernity. The mythical past, the invented traditions of village life, and the idealized pre-Christian world become in Kalynets’s underground poems a source of refuge from the atomic age and a source of redemption. In Fedoriv’s historical novel, which was published by the state, they are intended to inspire in readers devotion to their native land and its people.

While both writers faced criticism from the regime for becoming too distanced from more “contemporary” events and issues, they addressed major problems that concerned state and society alike. The invented traditions of folk culture had taken on a special role for the Soviet regime as it sought to mold patriotic citizens of an imagined community of Soviet nations.\(^{140}\) As the impersonal institutions associated with modernity disrupted traditional social ties and forms of belief, the regime promoted invented traditions as a way of establishing new identities to cope with this less certain age. Both Kalynets’ and Fedoriv also were seeking such identities, but in ways that resisted official Soviet culture. To various degrees they overstepped the boundaries of the invented traditions permitted by official Soviet culture, Kalynets’ outright and Fedoriv more modestly.

\(^{139}\) See Kalynets’, *Tryvainche slovo*, 111-13.

\(^{140}\) See Martin, 171-74.
5.4 Conclusion

While the young poet Ihor Kalynets’ and his elder colleague, prose writer Roman Fedoriv, responded differently to the Soviet regime as it grew more hostile to national dissent, by the early 1970s both of them shared a common discourse. Like their counterparts in the art world in L’viv, they tried to come to grips with modern urban life under Soviet rule. Artists and writers in both the underground and in professional unions faced the “juggernaut” of modernity in its Soviet context. As Giddens has pointed out persuasively, societies in modernity have witnessed impersonal, global institutions break up more intimate social ties and sources of unquestioned belief found in the pre-modern world of the village. Modern Soviet society also broke up the pre-modern world as it formed mass urban societies in Western Ukraine in the postwar years.

In artistic and literary circles, intellectuals in L’viv, regardless of their stance toward the regime, attempted to resist modernity in its Soviet context in different ways. Underground art circles through abstract forms conveyed meaning on a more intimate level than many official Soviet works. Yet artists and writers also resisted the existentialist uncertainty contained in modernity by turning to the invented traditions of Ukrainians’ village folk life, their mythical past, and their Slavic pre-Christian roots. Others found Soviet patriotic themes, either in World War Two or in Kyivan Rus’, as sources of meaning in a world threatened by a lack of it.
When Party and state leaders in the 1960s and early 1970s took to task writers and artists in L’viv who departed from the official Soviet canon, they touched on a wider discourse than that of the dissident movement emerging in the Soviet Union. As in other Soviet cities, writers and artists were attempting to come to terms with the modern urban postwar world in which they lived. For such intellectuals in L’viv, this required turning to national themes, more avant-garde forms of expression, and invented folk traditions that easily became sources of controversy in a society where Party and state authorities determined what could be said. Despite taking a loyal stance to the Soviet regime in most cases, writers and artists in L’viv could not help but take part in one of many cultural revolutions taking place in a global age of modernity.
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CONCLUSION

National identities played a significant role in the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. As other scholars have shown, efforts by the Soviet state to co-opt national movements that had emerged in the Russian Empire by 1917 did much to promote attributes of nationhood in all of the Soviet republics. In forming national republics, promoting national elites to power in these republics, and in designating nationality as an essential category, the Soviet state in the long run made its republics potential nation-states, alternatives to the existing political order.¹ In this manner Ukraine, the most populous non-Russian republic in the Soviet Union, took on attributes of nationhood and upon declaring its independence in 1991 participated in the collapse of the Soviet state. Events in Soviet Ukraine moreover epitomized the way in which the Soviet state brought about its own demise, as efforts to promote ethnic particularism in the early 1920s were largely a response to national movements that had swept Ukraine after 1917.²


² Martin, 3-4.
Yet by 1991, a Ukrainian national identity had not become a clearly defined category for the republic's citizens. While in the western regions being Ukrainian meant communicating in the Ukrainian language, for example, in other regions it meant people bearing the nationality of Ukrainian on their Soviet passports. Furthermore, the Ukrainian national identity was closely interwoven with others as well. In L'viv and other parts of the republic, a sense of being Ukrainian coexisted with belonging to youth subcultures, a Soviet family of nations, specific regions of the republic, and also personal rivalries within professions of the Soviet cultural establishment, namely in artists' unions and at academic institutions.

This dissertation has shown that students and other young people, as well as intellectuals in L'viv from 1953 to 1975 took on a number of identities alongside that of being Ukrainian. They identified with their own regions' history and invented traditions. For Western Ukraine, such regional differences led to Ukrainians resisting their region's marginalization under Soviet rule through past colonial legacies. They also provided an alternative sense of national identity for other Ukrainians in the republic. Different historical legacies for their part led to Ukrainians in the region attempting to present a useable past that at times came into conflict with local, republic, and all-Union authorities and some of their peers.
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3 Contested assumptions about Ukrainians' national identity, which vary from region to region, persist in independent Ukraine and are convincingly pointed out in Catherine Wanner, Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998).
For intellectuals, students, and other young people in L'viv, the Ukrainian national identity not only coexisted with a sense of regional identity, but with others as well. As students and other young people, Ukrainians in L'viv identified with subcultures of their peers, village folk traditions and Soviet high culture, and with the growing mass culture of their counterparts in America and Western Europe. In artistic unions and in academic life, professional rivalries as well as different perceptions on national identity and culture became central events defining the lives of writers, artists, historians, and other Ukrainian intellectuals.

Besides being linked with other identities, the Ukrainian national identity for intellectuals and young people in L'viv moreover evolved amid a postwar crisis for official Soviet culture. In L’viv, this crisis manifested itself in Polish-language media, youth consumer culture from abroad, and disputes over the role of art, literature, and Galicia’s past in official Soviet culture.

After 1945, on the eve of tensions with the United States and other allies, Party and state leaders under Stalin grew increasingly hostile toward displays of national self-expression among non-Russians and cultural influences from the "rotten West." Campaigns against "cosmopolitanism," "zionism," and "bourgeois nationalism" reflected World War II's transformation of Soviet society. Western lands occupied by the Nazis, including Ukraine, contained a host of elements threatening to "contaminate" Soviet society and undermine the goals of the Russian
Revolution. Suspicions became particularly acute in Western Ukraine and in the Baltic republics, where nationalist rebels waged guerilla warfare against Soviet rule well into the postwar years.

As the West, particularly the United States, replaced the Nazi Germany as the Soviet Union's new mortal enemy, jazz music and its fans among the "fashion hounds (stiliagi)," came under fire for "bowing to the West," aping Western tastes in fashion and music. Works in music, art, literature, and scholarship likewise were accused of following the "objectivism" and "formalism" practiced in America and other Western capitalist countries.

Hostility toward various outside influences from the capitalist West gradually lessened in the years after Stalin's death. This shift became particularly noticeable after the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, in which Stalin's cult of personality came under public criticism for the first time. For decades to come, culture wars heated up within Soviet society, lasting long after Soviet leaders had toned down their criticism of Stalin's legacy. In artists' and writers' unions, opinions were divided over what was acceptable "socialist realism." Some saw opportunities to challenge existing conventions and encourage further innovation. Others, either out of a desire for personal advancement, out of revenge, or out of a fear of Soviet art and literature taking the wrong path, denounced them as "formalists" or as "nationalists." While

public disagreements over the role of art and literature in Soviet society only briefly surfaced, they reflected the challenges official Soviet culture faced from both the cultural establishment and the cultural underground in L'viv.

In L'viv, Polish-language media sources posed a significant challenge to official Soviet culture in a variety of forms. Writers, artists, and other educated people in the city turned to newspapers, journals, books, and magazines from Poland, where literature, art, and scholarship faced more liberal conditions of censorship than in the Soviet Union after 1956. In a similar manner, Ukrainians from broader segments of the city's population bought copies of Polish-language sports and fashion magazines, finding in them sources of information unavailable in official Soviet counterparts. Polish radio, and eventually Polish TV, provided sources of news and entertainment available to Ukrainians and other residents in L'viv as well. In underground intellectual circles, among colleagues at writers' and artists' unions, and among friends in broader segments of the city's population, Polish-language media, and in some cases direct contacts with Poles, provided L'viv with a "window to the West" that resisted the hegemony enjoyed by official Soviet culture.

Attributes of a consumer culture from the capitalist West, particularly popular music and fashions from America and Britain, reached L’viv also posed alternative values to those of official Soviet culture. Students and other young people in L’viv, as with their counterparts in other Soviet cities, discovered Western fashions, the boogie-woogie, jazz music, rock and roll, and American hippies through various channels of information. Village folk culture and Soviet high culture continued to
have a strong influence on young people in the Soviet Union. Popular jazz and rock
groups in L’viv turned to Ukrainian folk songs for inspiration. Yet these influences
from the West significantly affected young people’s values and behavior from the
mid-1950s to the mid-1970s, forcing Party and state leaders to accommodate or
tolerate them.

Popular music, dance, and fashions posed a challenge not just to Party and
state functionaries, but also to intellectuals who identified with Ukrainian folk music
and high culture that the Soviet state promoted. Some sought to co-opt these
influences from abroad and provide better Soviet music for young people. Yet for
intellectuals and officials, regardless of their national identity or attitudes toward the
Soviet states, aspects of an American consumer culture affecting many young people
around the world after 1945 challenged their values and behavior.

In a similar manner, assumptions about modernity in official Soviet culture,
particularly in the areas of art and literature, also came under question. In
modernity’s Soviet context, impersonal institutions and rational, systematic
knowledge disrupted the values of traditional village life. In Western Ukraine, this
took place in the immediate postwar years as it underwent rapid industrialization and
Ukrainian peasants on a large scale moved to L’viv, the region’s chief industrial
center.

In some underground art circles, artists resisted the fragmented world
modernity presented through abstract artistic forms accessible only to introspective
individuals. But artists and writers also turned to the invented traditions of village
folk culture as a way to provide a sense of meaning in mass societies in L’viv whose
ties with traditional village life had been disrupted. Such invented traditions reflected the power of invented folk traditions in the nineteenth century among intellectuals in cities in Russia and Eastern Europe. They furthermore enjoyed the support of the Soviet state, where folk cultures became part of the “imagined community” of the Soviet family of nations. Yet they also became a source of controversy for local Party leaders in L’viv, particularly as they took artists and writers to task at the beginning of the 1970s for concentrating too much on the “patriarchal” world of the “distant past” instead of the Soviet present. While in some ways legitimating their works through official assumptions on folk culture, writers and artists also offered an alternative to the impersonalized world of Soviet modernity that in some ways troubled local and republic officials concerned with any manifestations of “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism” in village folk themes.

As art, literature, and popular music and fashion from the West became sources of controversy for official Soviet culture, unresolved tensions over what constituted a useable past for Western Ukraine also posed major problems for scholars, writers, and others in the cultural establishment in L’viv. Disputes among scholars in the social sciences over the representation of inter-war Galicia definitely reflected personal conflicts among scholars and tensions among Party and state officials in the republic and in Moscow. Yet in some cases they also demonstrated serious disagreement over what features in Galicia’s recent past deserved more sympathetic treatment.
More sympathetic treatment of such phenomena as the Sich Riflemen who fought for the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic (ZUNR) in 1918-19 and members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) offered alternative versions of a usable past that natives of the region could identify with. In this way, dramatization of the novel, The Richyns’kyi Sisters, in 1968 caused concern for local and republic Party leaders alike. This region’s past, with its connections to national movements in Central Europe, presented difficulties for anyone trying to represent its past in ways that were “progressive,” leading to the emergence of Soviet rule.

A failure to conform to official expectations by intellectuals, students, and other young people in L’viv therefore illustrated the complex and contested nature of national identity for Ukrainians in L’viv and other parts of the republic in the two decades after Stalin’s death. In L’viv, a national identity was evolving among Ukrainians in this period alongside a host of other identities. Intellectuals, students, and others furthermore did not entirely agree on what it meant to be Ukrainian.

But most importantly, within broader segments of the population that might not have even considered themselves to be Ukrainian at all, the official high culture that the Soviet regime supported confronted significant challenges after 1945. These challenges, which were not resolved with Khrushchev’s “thaw,” increased indifference to or sometimes hidden contempt for official Soviet values. Such disaffection with official values increased divisions between state and society in the last years of the Soviet Union’s existence, encouraging its disintegration by 1991. In
L’viv and in other parts of the republic, continued problems representing nationhood and the state’s inability to live up to changing values and expectations affecting the world after 1945 eventually brought the Soviet system down.
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