Milestones of Cultural Opposition

Ukraine occupies a special, even unique, place in COURAGE. As the only country in the project that was part of the Soviet sphere of influence from the outset, and because its historical evolution under communism was inextricable from that of Russia’s, Ukraine has a longer history of anti-communist opposition than the other countries under scrutiny, and this history has exerted a more significant influence on present-day politics than in the other countries under examination in the project. Some phases of Ukraine’s Sovietization went hand in hand with the intensified Russification of the country. Hence, the history of opposition in Ukraine was no less ethnic than ideological in nature, although Ukrainians did not respond to communism in a unified way. Nationalism was a form of opposition that was integral to Ukraine’s resistance and embedded in the consciousness of the population more so perhaps than in the cultural and social practices witnessed elsewhere in the Soviet bloc. Manifestations of Ukrainian dissent and resistance emerged in connection to the various phases of a developing communism, starting with the Bolshevik and Stalinist periods and continuing into post-Stalinist times and well into the Brezhnev regime. The ongoing war with Russia in Eastern Ukraine today further amplifies the symbolic value of anti-communist resistance and contributes to the re-evaluation of the legacy of opposition to Soviet (and Russian) rule.

Ukraine’s long engagement with the Soviet project meant that the country went through various phases of Sovietization, which resulted in the transformation and diversification of opposition strategies over time. Due to its geopolitical position, the repeated changes of the country’s borders and ethnic composition, the geographical distribution of resistance activities remained somewhat uneven in Ukraine and also changed over time. Although Kyiv retained its status as the hub of cultural opposition for the duration of the Soviet project, Lviv and Western Ukraine emerged as important spaces for religious and nationalist types of opposition after World War II, while Kharkiv became a major spot for human rights activism in the 1960s. Odessa, too, was a prominent place for non-conformist art in the 1970s.

As was the case in all societies under Soviet influence, there emerged a plethora of social attitudes among Ukrainians ranging from resistance to non-conformism and accommodation to manifestations of support. In addition, due to the changes in the nature of the Soviet regime, the boundaries and
meaning of opposition were constantly shifting. In contrast to most of the other countries in the project, Ukraine witnessed the unfolding of the most traumatic episodes in the history of communism: it was ravaged by Civil War and the struggle for independence in the 1910s, devastated by the Stalinist collectivization campaign and the ensuing famine in the 1930s, ruined during World War II, and shocked by the Chernobyl catastrophe in the 1980s. These dramatic experiences shaped the trajectory of opposition to Soviet rule and significantly impacted resistance activities in the country.

The first major milestone in the history of cultural opposition in Ukraine was the Civil War, which lasted from 1917 until 1922, engulfing most of the central and eastern territories of the land. Between 1917 and 1920, the Central Rada, Hetman Pavlo Skoropadsky, the Directory of the Ukrainian People’s Republic and the Central Powers all attempted to establish their own versions of a sovereign state comprising nine southwestern provinces of the former Russian Empire. Internal strife among Ukrainian leaders led to a victory for the Bolsheviks, who regarded these provinces as a single political unit. This led to Ukraine’s integration into the Soviet Union as one of its core republics in 1922.¹ The Bolshevik victory forced alternative visions for the future, including Symon Petliura’s nationalism and Nestor Makhno’s anarchism, to go underground or disintegrate. Anti-Bolshevik émigrés found themselves scattered in communities across Europe in the major European cities of Prague, Vienna, Paris, Munich, and London, as well as the Americas. They anchored the Ukrainian diaspora during three waves of emigration that followed in the twentieth century—after World Wars I and II and before the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Inspired by revolutionary idealism, there were many Ukrainians—both at home and abroad—who engaged with the ideas of communism. The involvement of the cultural Avantgarde of the 1920s was unprecedented. Many believed in the goals of the movement and contributed to its monumental effort to construct a utopian society and a new civilization. Ukrainian artists, actors, and other intellectuals were at the forefront of the Soviet Avantgarde movement, and their efforts defined the experimental arts of the 1920s.² Representatives of the first generation of radical, innovative modernists, who came from the multicultural, multi-confessional, and multi-ethnic imperial southwest, where Jews, Ukrainians, Poles, Russians, and others intermingled before the revolution, fashioned a cultural synergy that produced a vibrant theatre and art scene and contributed significantly to the formation of the culture of a new, modern civilization.³ There were others who converted to the Soviet project in emigration, for instance the celebrated historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky. As the former head of the Central Rada, Hrushevsky was
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forced into emigration in 1919. Over time, he became a supporter of the Bolshevik cause mostly because of its professed nationality policies and their potential for Ukraine, and he returned to the Soviet Union in 1924.4

With the rise of Stalinism, the regime changed its approach to cultural policy, ushering in Socialist Realism as official doctrine in the mid-1930s. This shift made many intellectuals and artists—most famously, Kazimir Malevich—unwittingly oppositionist. Cultural figures whose inimitable work over two decades captured the universalist ethos of Modernity were suddenly denounced and suppressed and their works banned from public viewing. For example, the Berezil Theatre, which became one of the most prominent and innovative theatre groups in the 1920s under the directorship of Oleksandr “Les” Kurbas, was thoroughly expunged under Stalinism and its actors were arrested, exiled or shot.5 Hrushevsky inadvertently became an oppositionist as well, denouncing Soviet propaganda. He was exiled to Moscow in 1931, where he died a few years later. Other representatives of the Ukrainian cultural, political, and economic elite were also arrested and killed during the Stalinist purges of the late 1930s.

In Ukraine, the total obliteration of a national modernist culture began with the removal of Mykola Skrypnyk as Commissar of Enlightenment in 1933 and the arrival of high-ranking party member Pavel Potyshiev, who oversaw the arrest of key members of the literary scene. An entire generation of Ukrainian writers and poets—known as the “executed Renaissance”—mostly based in Kharkiv during the period of Ukrainianization in the mid-1920s, was liquidated. The victims included Mykola Ialovyi, poet, dramaturge and best friend of Mykola Khvylovyi, and many others who lived in a creative commune in an apartment building called “Slovo” (Word). Khvylovyi was a staunch believer in the potential for communism to transform Ukraine, and he played a major role in redirecting Ukrainian Modernist culture away from Moscow and toward Europe. However, his influential pamphlet “Ukraine or Little Russia” had caught the attention of the Soviet authorities, who perceived it a threat to the regime. By 1934, Kharkiv’s “literary fair” was over, as by then Khvylovyi and Skrypnyk had both committed suicide and the GPU had arrested communist politician Oleksandr Shumskyi, writer Ostap Vysnia, playwright Mykola Kulish, actor Iosyp Hirniak, as well as Kurbas, shipping them off to camps in the north.6 The painter Mykola Boichuk, one of the founders of the Association of Revolutionary Art of Ukraine (ARMU) who revived the medieval art forms of Byzantine art that characterized the interiors of Ukrainian churches, was arrested in 1936 for “being an agent of the Vatican.” Interrogated and tortured, he was shot on the same day as his two
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leading students, Ivan Padalka and Vasyl Sedliar. Sedliar produced the haunting images found in the 1933 edition of Taras Shevchenko’s *Kobzar*, a featured item in the COURAGE Registry from the Ukrainian Museum-Archives collection in Cleveland, OH.

The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939 and the subsequent war on Soviet territory eventually resulted in the annexation and Sovietization of Volyn, Galicia, Rivne, parts of Bessarabia, and other territories into a more expansive Soviet Ukraine. The territorial enlargement of Ukraine meant that the Soviet Union was able to absorb into the social fabric some of its fiercest ideological opponents, including Ukrainian nationalists and the Greek Catholic Church, which actively opposed communist influence. This irrevocably altered the internal politics of Soviet Ukraine and resulted in another wave of mass migration of displaced persons during World War II, which included concentration camp survivors, *Ostarbeiter*, and refugees to Europe and North America. These Ukrainian émigrés tended to be more resolutely anti-Soviet (and nationalist) than their predecessors.

As was the case in most of the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc, Stalin’s death in 1953 provided a momentary reprieve from the pressure of economic and social transformations that had been taking place at breakneck speeds. The so-called Thaw also created new opportunities, at least temporarily, for a younger generation of cultural figures to acknowledge the crimes of the Stalinist past and imagine positive alternatives for the future. De-Stalinization thus paved the way for the emergence of some of the most-prominent members of Ukraine’s cultural opposition in the late 1950s and early 1960s, a dissenting generation known as the Sixtiers. The moniker *shestydesiatnyky* (Sixtiers) denotes a generation of cultural figures that challenged the master narrative of the Socialist Realist aesthetic. The Sixtiers resurrected the idea of a national communism in literature and the visual and performing arts, which spilled over into the spheres of politics and economics. In exploring national motifs, the generation of the Sixtiers touched upon taboo issues regarding the history of the recent past, particularly about responsibility for Stalinist terror and mass repressions. As a case in point, courageous members of this generation set out to identify on the outskirts of Kyiv the mass graves of NKVD victims who had been shot during the purges. As a result of such brazenly unorthodox acts, individuals such as artist Alla Horska together with the poet Vasyl Symonenko and theatre director Les Taniuk were singled out for constant surveillance by the KGB and were repeatedly harassed by the authorities.

Khrushchev’s ouster from power in 1964 marked yet another turning point in the history of cultural opposition in Ukraine. Kyivan officials who
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had supported the cultural renaissance under Khrushchev found themselves in a tenuous and vulnerable position after his removal. Their opponents capitalized on this backlash in cultural policy by openly campaigning against Ukrainian themes and motifs in art, literature, and film. Meanwhile, officials who had advocated for greater political and cultural autonomy for Ukraine in the 1950s were unseated in the mid-1960s and early 1970s by appointees from eastern, party-infiltrated regions such as Dnipropetrovsk and Donetsk, centres considered to be more loyal to communism than Moscow itself.

Strong censorship quickly dampened the zealous pursuits of the Sixtiers. By the early 1970s, many had been tried for “anti-Soviet” activities and sent to the gulag, including journalist and human rights activist Viacheslav Chornovil; historian and radical Valentyn Moroz, who became a symbol of an implacable resistance; textile artist turned political prisoner Stepania Shabatura; poet and artist Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets, who was married to lyrical poet turned political prisoner Ihor Kalynets; journalist, translator, and poet Vasyl Stus; essayist, literary historian, and poet, Yevhen Sverstiuk; gulag survivor Nadia Svitlychna, who later became a key member of the Ukrainian Helsinki group; her brother Ivan Svitlychny, a poet; and the symbolist painter Opanas Zalyvakhin. Others, such as the Odessa artist Vladimir Strelnikov, were marginalized and could only present their artwork at small-scale exhibitions in private apartments. (Strelnikov eventually emigrated to Germany.) By the time Volodymyr Shcherbitskyi had replaced Petro Shelest as first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine in 1973, considerable changes had taken place within the Ukrainian bureaucracy and in society more broadly. Although the consequences of recentralization enforced by Moscow were, for the most part, less severe than during the Stalinist 1930s, the early 1970s marked the onset of yet another ideologically conservative period. In Ukraine, this shift was reinforced by the appointment of a new head of the Ukrainian KGB, Vitalii Fedorchuk, who showed little tolerance for the already limited intellectual autonomy enjoyed by the creative intelligentsia during the Thaw.

The crackdown in the mid-1970s ushered in a very grey period for the republic, when most of the cultural opposition was driven underground. Many in the Sixtiers group remained under surveillance, only to be arrested and serve time in hard labor camps. Musical groups that offered a repertoire of widely popular protest lyrics were banned altogether. Artists continued to be persecuted or forced into exile. Human rights activists affiliated with the Helsinki movement chronicled the cycle of repression as smuggled publications and reports on human rights violations made their way abroad through surreptitious channels. Despite testimonials, the resistance was muted, and it remained so for the rest of the Brezhnev era. It was Mikhail Gorbachev’s election as General Secretary in 1984 and his announcement of Glasnost and perestroika that reenergized dissent throughout the Soviet Union. However, it was the Chernobyl catastrophe and the government’s attempts to cover it up that galvanized Ukrainian opposition and put it out in the open. For many Ukrain-
ians, it marked a definitive break with the policies and principles that guided the Soviet Union at large. The fact that a full eighteen days lapsed between the explosion of the nuclear reactor at the end of April in 1986 and Gorbachev’s belated press conference about the incident incensed the public, especially Kyivans, who, unbeknownst to them, were required by the party leadership to participate in the May Day parade on contaminated streets of the capital as if nothing had happened. The incident further deepened the wedge between Moscow and the Kyivan elites and accelerated the erosion of Soviet power in Ukraine.9

Types of Cultural Opposition

As the second largest Soviet republic, Ukraine witnessed various forms of passive and covert opposition, even toying with communism as a form of dissent. Armed resistance was particularly strong during the Civil War and during and after World War II, when the Soviet Union annexed Western Ukraine. In the countryside, peasants resorted to the same patterns of resistance as described by James C. Scott that were employed during the period of Stalinist collectivization in the 1930s. These included “foot-dragging, dissimulation, desertion, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage and so on.”10 Peasants also attacked local officials and kolkhoz (collective farm) directors, killed livestock rather than turning it over to the authorities, and sometimes mobilized and armed themselves with torches and pitchforks, as weapons were confiscated from the populace ahead of the collectivization drive.

While acts of physical violence featured prominently in the history of opposition in Soviet Ukraine in the first half of the twentieth century, the country also witnessed the emergence of a range of cultural activities that challenged the aspirations of the communist establishment in subtler ways. The Stalinist shift towards cultural dogmatism in the 1930s and the emergence of socialist realism as a cultural doctrine were the main catalysts that purged the cultural landscape, marginalized the forward-looking efforts of the generation of modernists, forcing many into isolation, and prompting them to create a symbolic art of opposition, oftentimes abandoning abstraction for a return to figuration. Actors, painters, and writers who once had shaped the meaning of the revolution were eventually consumed and cast out by it. Not until the de-Stalinization campaign of the late-1950s did a new wave of cultural opposition manifest itself, continuing into the second half of the century. This wave of opposition was dominated by cultural activities rather than physical violence.
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The period known as the Thaw provoked a burgeoning dissident art scene in the major cities of Soviet Ukraine—Kyiv, Lviv, Odessa—and led to the emergence of the most significant cultural movement in the history of opposition in Soviet Ukraine: the previously mentioned shestydesiatnyky, or the Sixtiers movement. While the Sixtiers consisted mostly of literary figures, such as writers (Chornovil, Lina Kostenko), poets (Ivan Drach, Stus,斯塔西-Калыннєт, Свидицький, Симоненко, Mykola Vinhranovsky), and literary critics (Ivan Dziuba, Mykhailyna Kotsiubynska, Sverstiuk), there were also artists (Horska, Shabatura, Halyna Sevrak, Zalyvakha) and other intellectuals (the historian Moroz, for example) in the movement who challenged rigid ideological conventions in their work. They also became involved in other forms of dissent, including human rights activism and/or the dissemination of samizdat literature in Soviet Ukraine and abroad; many of them joined the Ukrainian Helsinki Group in the late 1970s. Paradoxically, the end of the Thaw gave stimulus to human rights activism and the growth and circulation of underground literature. Ukrainian samizdat publications (Ukr. samvydav) contained mostly literature—the works of the Sixtiers among others—but they also addressed national themes, reflected on human rights issues, and advocated religious freedom. Many of the samizdat publications were smuggled abroad and were disseminated among the Ukrainian diaspora. Osyp Zinkevych, the founder of the Smoloskyp Publishing House, played a crucial role in coordinating these activities.

The 1960s also had an impact on the development of Ukraine’s underground music scene and youth subcultures. Counterculture communities represented the less visible and direct manifestations of cultural opposition in Ukraine. Some of these groups, for example Lviv’s hippies, who formed an informal organization called the Republic of the Holy Garden in 1968, managed to carve out their own space outside of Soviet public life and organize various events and rock concerts. Since opting out or disengaging from Soviet society was considered a threat by the authorities, counterculture groups were often kept under surveillance and harassed as intensely as poets, writers, and painters. Similarly, music bands the styles of which were influenced by “Western” trends—rock and roll, beat, hard rock, punk, etc.—were forced underground and barred from performing at state-sanctioned events. The band “Eney” [Aeneas], which was largely inspired by the Beatles, was effectively banned in the 1970s, and their recordings were destroyed. When Mikhail Gorbachev’s perestroika in the mid-1980s revitalized the underground music scene, music festivals with subversive subtexts were organized, the most famous of which was the Chervona Ruta Festival held in the western
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Ukrainian city of Chernivtsi in 1989. The festival featured traditional ballad-
eers and Ukrainian rock artists, which—according to Catherine Wanner—of-
fered an unapologetic celebration of Ukrainianness and bolstered conceptions
of Soviet rule as a foreign imposition.14

National motifs were not only used by musicians. Folkloristic themes, as
well as symbols and ideas of Ukrainian nationhood were incorporated into
the works of artists, writers and poets—including the Sixtiers—and were even
used by some counterculture communities. The suppression of the Greek
Catholic Church by the Soviet authorities also added a national layer to the
struggle—in Western Ukraine at least—over beliefs between state and church.
The Greek Catholic Church was outlawed in 1946, but it became a fierce
source of opposition, both abroad, in Rome, where the church leadership re-
located, and in Soviet Ukraine, where religious communities continued to
practice and organize underground liturgies and other services.15 There were
disparate faith communities, including Baptists and Latter-Day Saints, that
continued to gather and cultivate alternatives to the Soviet socialist world-
view, as missionaries from the West persisted in evangelizing to the atheistic
society.

Apart from the Ukrainians who challenged the regime’s ideological pil-
lars by keeping religious traditions alive, there were also those who stood up
for secular values of universal relevance. Ukraine was prominent in the hu-
man rights movement, which gained traction in the Khrushchev period. After
the signing of the Helsinki Accords in 1975, Ukrainians formed their own Hel-
sinki Group (Petro Grigorenko, Leonid Plyushch, Svitllychna, Nina Strok-
ta-Karavanska), which cooperated with their counterparts in Moscow, as well
as activists in North America and Europe. Many of these activists were arrest-
ed, tried, and forced to serve time in strict regime hard labour camps in Mor-
dovia and Perm (Chornovil, Stus, Stasiv-Kalynets, Shabatura, Svitllychna).
Some were given less extreme sentences, but were excluded from writers’ and
artists’ unions and the party and were often unable to find work or creative
outlets. For instance, literary scholar Kotsiubynska lost her job at the T.H.
Shevchenko Institute of Literature in 1966 following her participation in a
protest staged at a Kyiv screening of Sergei Paradzhanov’s film “Shadow of
Forgotten Ancestors,” a film that challenged Socialist Realist aesthetics by
evoking religious and Ukrainian folkloristic themes in a highly symbolic—
rather than realistic—manner. Despite the oppressive measures, human rights
activism continued well into the 1980s. In the city of Kharkiv, participants in
the movement crystallized into a group under the aegis of Memorial in the
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late 1980s and eventually formed the Kharkiv Human Rights Protection Group in 1992.\textsuperscript{16}

The late socialist period also witnessed the emergence of environmental activism—which grew in significance after the Chernobyl catastrophe—as well as the resurgence of political oppositionism. Gorbachev’s reforms paved the way for the formation of alternative political organizations—collectively referred to as “the democratic opposition.” The most significant such organization was Rukh, or the People’s Movement of Ukraine, which was created in 1989 and which had strong ties to the dissident movement through the involvement of Chornovil—a former Sixthier and member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group—in the party leadership. Independent papers and periodicals also sprouted like mushrooms in the wake of Gorbachev’s reforms, some lasting a short time and some managing to publish for years outside the confines of the eroding Soviet censorship. They pushed for greater plurality and representativeness in the political sphere.

Collections of Cultural Opposition in Ukraine

The lasting historical legacy and the significance of the cultural heritage of opposition in Ukraine are demonstrated by the rich variety of collections that emerged during and after the period of Soviet rule in the country and abroad. The initial tide of gathering reactions to the Soviet project began with the emigration of anti-Bolshevik groups after the October Revolution of 1917. These groups settled abroad and created collections documenting alternative visions for Ukraine, including monarchist, nationalist, or democratic. The Stalinist shift towards cultural dogmatism in the mid-1930s constituted another major turning point in the history of collections in Soviet Ukraine. Prominent Avantgarde artists unwittingly became counterrevolutionaries overnight; their works were confiscated, banned, or destroyed. In some instances, as in the case of the Special Collection at the National Art Museum of Ukraine (NAMU), curators were able secretly to preserve materials that had been slated for destruction.\textsuperscript{17} This material, which eventually became the permanent collection of the museum, was originally gathered and documented in 1937. It consists of a now well-known body of premier works of the Ukrainian Avantgarde and monumental art. It is comprised mostly of paintings and drawings that were considered inappropriate and unacceptable by the Stalinist regime and were confiscated by the secret police over a two-year span from museums
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in Kharkiv, Odessa, Kyiv, and Poltava. Many of the artists represented in the collection were either repressed or executed for “formalism” or “bourgeois nationalism.”

World War II and the ensuing counterinsurgency, which the Red Army and the secret police fought in the belt between the Baltic and Black seas, left its mark on the nature of collections about opposition movements. Many materials in the KGB archives were deliberately destroyed in 1940–1980 as a by-product of decrees regulating the process of accepting, cataloguing, and filing of archival materials. Among them were documents of the Fifth Department of the Ukrainian KGB, which was responsible for combating internal enemies, criminals, and dissidents, as well as conducting covert operations and surveillance about Ukraine’s liberation movement. Archivists at the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU) have noted that valuable documents relating to the counterinsurgency in Western Ukraine were destroyed after Khrushchev became General Secretary during the Thaw.\textsuperscript{18} Many materials migrated from Ukraine to Moscow after his ouster in 1964, as Leonid Brezhnev and his counterparts ordered the recentralization of government institutions, including the archives. At the same time, the post-war migration of Ukrainians to other parts of the world contributed significantly to the multiplication of diaspora organizations and the enlargement of their collections regarding this period, especially in the United Kingdom and North America.

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the reopening of the Soviet archives, collections began to return to Ukraine from the diaspora. Dissident journalist Nadia Svitlychna, living in the United States since 1976, sent back her personal archive to Kyiv, and in 2012 it became one of The Sixtiers Museum’s core collections. The Shevchenko Institute of Literature now holds the personal archive of Zina Genyk-Berezovska, a literary scholar born on the outskirts of Prague who was also deeply involved with the Sixtiers movement.\textsuperscript{19} People she corresponded with readily smuggled out speeches and other texts; she also physically transported \textit{samizdat} materials from Kyiv to Prague during her many trips back and forth. This collection was moved to Kyiv with the help of the Ukrainian ambassador to the Czech Republic Roman Lubkivsky in stages, beginning in 1993. It plays a singular role in pointing to the transnational networks underpinning the documentation of cultural opposition in Ukraine and offers important insights into the Ukrainian diaspora community in Prague since the interwar period.\textsuperscript{20}

The historical legacy of Soviet rule, including the heritage of cultural opposition, continue to shape Ukrainian political affairs until the present day, as former dissidents entered politics in the early 1990s. Some, like Ivan Drach,
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represented and took on leadership roles in new movements, such as “Rukh.” Others, such as the former Sixtier and human rights activist Chornovil, was campaigning to become a presidential candidate for the opposition in 1999 when he passed away under mysterious circumstances. At the same time, aspects of the Soviet past became targets of memory politics, such as the remembrance of the famine of 1932–33, the Holodomor. They remained highly contested issues in Ukrainian political life and propelled a fact-finding crusade. Viktor Yushchenko’s presidency (2005–10) was marred by his controversial decisions in the sphere of memory politics, which bestowed upon nationalist leaders, such as Stepan Bandera, the designation “heroes of Ukraine.” In 2008, Yuschchenko appointed Volodymyr Viatrovyčh head of the archives of the SBU. Some scholars suggested that Viatrovyčh used his position to “whitewash” the involvement of Ukrainian nationalists in the Holocaust and the mass cleansing of Poles during World War II.\footnote{Cohen, “The Historian Whitewashing Ukraine’s Past,” McBride, Rudling, and Amar, “Ukraine’s struggle with the past is ours too.”} Viatrovyčh was replaced as head of the SBU archives in 2010 after Viktor Yanukovyčh’s election as president of Ukraine. As a result of the upheaval in Ukraine in 2014 (the Euromaidan Revolution), some archives have become more accessible, even though the paper holdings remained in a chaotic state. Under new leadership, the SBU archives, for example, have allowed more digitized (and therefore well-screened) files into the reading room. In May 2015, the new President Petro Poroshenko signed a law that mandated the transfer of Ukrainian archives pertaining to “Soviet organs of repression,” such as the KGB and its successor, the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU), to a government organization called the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory, which was created in 2006. To date, the documents have not been transferred.

Types of Collections

The types of collections that testify to cultural opposition to the Soviet communist system vary considerably from country to country where Ukrainian émigré communities continue to thrive. However, most in-country archival evidence of opposition in Ukraine is to be found among materials housed in vast state-run institutions at the national, regional, and local levels. The distribution of archival data among these bodies reflects the institutional and administrative legacy of the Soviet Union, requiring that each government organ maintain its own repository of documents. Such large archives hold files related to the work of Soviet-era institutions (e.g., the State Security Services, the Communist Party of Ukraine, and its regional and local affiliates). The Central State Archive of Public Organizations of Ukraine (TsDAHOU) holds internal party documents, periodicals, correspondence, letters of complaint,
and meeting stenograms. This archive also contains documents related to expulsions from the Communist Party, artists’ and writers’ unions, and other organizations during periods of cultural repression. The State Archives Department of the Security Service of Ukraine (GDA SBU) has an extensive collection, covering state surveillance of almost all forms of societal protest and resistance. It maintains documentation on the surveillance of cultural organizations, the Ukrainian Helsinki Human Rights group, and other very specific incidents such as attempts by miners in the Kuzbas to organize a strike inspired by Solidarity in Poland. Other materials refer to specific individuals and include the personal files of people sentenced for anti-Soviet activities, and even those who were released later from Soviet prison camps. Not surprisingly, there is also documentation that tracks publications generated by émigré communities, including coverage in the Western press about the treatment of dissidents. Other materials relate to the surveillance of environmental protests in Kyiv in the 1980s, along with the impact of glasnost and perestroika on the Academy of Sciences, in addition to many other topics.

Other state-run archives, such as the Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Arts (TsDAMLM), which might be described as media-specific, are also useful for gathering information on cultural opposition. This collection includes books, artworks, correspondence, photos, drafts of literary works, reports, and the documents of criminal cases dealing with prominent literary figures and artists. Documents from the post-World War II era include the materials from criminal cases filed against writers and artists for engaging in “anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation,” reviews of artistic and literary works, stenograms of interrogations of members of the creative intelligentsia suspected of anti-Soviet dealings, and interviews with witnesses. Similar collections are held by the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature at the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, which has its own archive that contains the personal papers of Stus, Kotsiubynska, Genyk-Berezovska, and other important literary figures from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Most large state archives are located in Kyiv, as it was the capital city of Soviet Ukraine from 1934 onward. Every region has its own affiliates of these major archives, reproducing the organizational hierarchy of the Soviet Union. One of these regional affiliates—the State Archive of the Lviv (DALO), holds, for instance, materials on youth counterculture in Lviv (e.g. hippies) in the 1960s and 1980s, official party and Komsomol documents, lyrics, music notes, letters, drawings, memoirs, newspaper clippings, and photos from the years 1956–92. Such state-run institutions are supported largely through budgetary allocations. As a result, many are understaffed and underfunded. The collections are mostly visited by scholars and students doing archival research. There are important smaller collections in Kharkiv, also supported by the state, which are related to the city’s brief reign as the capital of Soviet Ukraine from 1922–34. Such archives in Kharkiv capture that ephemeral period and include the Museum of Literature in Kharkiv, which collects and holds mate-
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materials relating to the repressions of the 1960s and 1970s. As with larger state institutions, these smaller archives are also used primarily by scholars and students conducting historical research.

Despite the dominance of state-funded institutions, personal collections also play a role in shaping the legacy of opposition in Ukraine. There were several private individuals, who, at personal risk, clandestinely compiled data capturing alternative, oppositionist narratives. One example is the digital archive of Yaroslav Kendzior, a collection now housed in the Centre for Urban History in Lviv. In the 1980s, Kendzior used a large VHS SVHS film camera to document the activities of the burgeoning political opposition in Lviv, particularly during the election campaign in 1989. His materials are described as media activism. They offer unique perspective on events which took place at a time when the state controlled almost entirely what was shown on the airways. Some private collections, including Vakhtang Kipiani’s samizdat collection in Kyiv, only emerged in recent years, so their use tends to be somewhat limited. There are also personal collections abroad. The private papers of Dr. Semyon Gluzman, which was deposited at the Research Centre for East European Studies (Forschungsstelle OstEuropa) in Bremen in the aftermath of the Euromaidan protests and the outbreak of war in Ukraine, demonstrate important intergenerational dimensions of cultural opposition. Gluzman witnessed and recorded the abuse of psychiatry by the Soviets who incarcerated and punished people who were of sound mind. While he was serving his own sentence in the camps, he met the so-called 25-ers, members of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) during World War II, and prisoners from other national resistance forces, especially from the Baltic States and the western borderlands of the USSR. Remaining incarcerated, these people met the oppositionists of subsequent generations, specifically members of the “sixti- ers” movement and human rights activists arrested in the 1960s and 1970s.

Alongside private individuals, non-governmental organizations were also actively engaged in collecting material on cultural opposition in Ukraine. The Kharkiv Human Rights Group, for example, has both a physical archive and a virtual online museum and library documenting the efforts of human rights activists to reform socialism from the 1960s to the 1980s and uphold the rule of law after independence. This organization has been operating formally since the late 1980s as part of Memorial, which has a vast online presence that includes the Archive of the History of Dissent in the USSR (1953–1987), the archive of the Helsinki Watch Group, and issues of The Chronicle of Current Events and the Ukrainian Herald.

Faith communities which operated underground under communism also created extensive archives. After the Ukrainian Byzantine Catholic Church was abolished in the Soviet Union in 1946, its considerable archive was relocated to Rome. Another major repository of religious opposition is found in the archive and library of the Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv. Additionally, the Institute of Church History keeps its archive at the University, a
collection that documents religious opposition in the Ukrainian SSR and includes biographical interviews (video and text) with the clergy, monks, nuns, and laity of the clandestine Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (1946–89). The Baptists, who increased in numbers since the 1970s, maintain several online collections, including mostly digitized religious journals in Russian and Ukrainian. One of the most remarkable collections on religious life under Soviet rule in Ukraine is housed at the Keston Center for Religion Politics and Society at Baylor University in Texas. The institution’s holdings originated as the personal collection of Reverend Michael Bordeaux, who spent a year in Moscow as an exchange student in the 1950s and was shocked by the extent of religious repressions. It grew exponentially after Bordeaux established his research center focusing on religious dissent in 1969.

After independence in Ukraine, new and more diverse collections emerged, including the ones found at The National Museum-Memorial to the Victims of Occupation “Prison on Lonskogo Street” in Lviv and The Sixtiers Museum in Kyiv. The “Prison on Lonskogo Street” has a small but growing archival collection. Curators have amassed 2,000 items since the museum’s opening in 2009. In addition to World War II propaganda from Nazi and Soviet forces, it holds the personal belongings of political prisoners and detainees—letters, personal documents, and samizdat publications used to prosecute dissidents, artists, and human rights activists in Lviv and its surrounding environs in the 1960s and 1970s. The latter is an ad hoc collection of about 50 items, which includes embroidery, rosaries made out of breadcrumbs, and other materials created by prisoners serving lengthy sentences in Siberian labor camps under Brezhnev. Situated within the larger context of the museum-memorial’s holdings, these materials about Lviv’s dissidents are important to a nuanced understanding of the Soviet Union’s treatment of its most intransigent opponents.

The Sixtiers Museum Collection is located in a small museum in Kyiv in a building belonging to the Ukrainian political party Rukh. Nadia Svitlychna and Mykola Plakhnotniuk founded this museum as way of honouring and documenting the struggles of a cohort of Soviet Ukrainian dissidents from the 1960s to the 1980s. Included in the permanent exhibition are paintings, graphics, sculptures, embroidery, and other artworks produced by artists affiliated with the Sixtiers movement. The museum also displays the poems, letters, and literary works of the writers in their midst, as well as their typewriters, handcrafted items made while in the gulag, or clothes worn while living in exile, like Svitlychna’s camp uniform. Also figuring prominently are posters for events and exhibitions organized by this group. The guided tour offers a
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moving, concise rendition of their struggle, and it is aimed at the museum’s target audiences, i.e. young students, scholars, and members of the general public.24

The establishment of numerous collections abroad is correlated to the scale of emigration from Ukraine throughout the twentieth century. The most prominent collections of the Ukrainian diaspora are located in the major cities in Europe, Canada, and the United States where Ukrainians settled in multiple waves of emigration after World War I. Such collections are organized mainly as small museum-archives, university libraries, and publishing houses. A case in point is the publisher Smoloskyp, which was founded in Paris and then moved to the US. Smoloskyp created one of the largest archival collections of Ukrainian samizdat in the world, smuggled abroad by intrepid activists, literary figures, and émigrés who managed to cross the Iron Curtain in the 1970s. After Ukraine gained independence in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union, Smoloskyp transferred its archives to Ukraine, and it continues to collect documents and publish findings on the dissident actions. The resources at Smoloskyp include informal records of about 1,000 titles, including samizdat journals, almanacs, photos, and letters, as well as articles, interviews, and texts of Radio Liberty programs (1968–2007).

Diaspora collections developed organically as an extension of the priorities of the local communities which rescued various memorabilia and documents relating to their displaced lives. The size of these collections varied at the outset, but many continue to grow. Ukrainian émigrés created cultural centers, universities, museums, and archives in several countries during the tumultuous and disruptive twentieth century. World War II immigrants, for instance, bought communal real estate that they turned into centers of community life where meetings and even church services were held. Various social groups, youth and women’s societies gathered here, establishing small libraries which later became repositories for books and personal archives.

Those who fled the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 gathered in Prague, Munich, London, Paris, Vienna, and other European capitals. Although the Museum of the Ukrainian Independence Movement in Prague (1925–48) was mostly destroyed by the Soviets and some of its contents were distributed among archives in Russia, Ukraine, Slovakia, and other locations, the Ukrainian Free University in Munich, which was originally established by émigrés in Vienna in January 1921, continues to function. This institution aimed to create a collection that documented the struggles of Ukrainians against Soviet and imperial acculturation. After World War II, a wave of Ukrainian émigrés moved to North America and established a range of cultural institutions in Canada and the United States. The Ukrainian Museum-Archives in Cleveland and its counterparts offer additional examples of institutions with a broad
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range of purposes that collect textiles, folk art, books, stamps, postcards, and other memorabilia documenting the life of a community. In Europe, London remained an important cultural center for the Ukrainian diaspora, and its significance grew with the establishment of the Shevchenko Library and Archive in 1946, which created important collections regarding Ukrainian culture at home and abroad. Financial support for the maintenance and preservation of these collections still comes primarily from generous donations from the community who ascribes value to the establishment of a historical legacy.

As the Ukrainian diaspora was largely anti-Soviet in orientation, especially those displaced by World War II, these archives reflect the many ways in which émigrés resisted communism worldwide. They continue to operate as community centers, but also regularly curate exhibitions about culture and cultural opposition. The Ukrainian Museums in New York and Chicago specialize in this, although the Ukrainian Museum Archives in Cleveland also has a rich collection. The UMA in Cleveland is visited by students learning about immigrant life in the city as well as scholars and researchers interested in the UMA’s archive and library. The institution has secured several external grants to expand its operations in Cleveland, including a climate controlled archival building, and it has cooperated successfully with other institutions, including the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, which has funded several phases of digitization of the museum’s materials from the DP camps in Germany.25

The Ukrainian collections in the COURAGE project serve an essential purpose in highlighting Ukraine’s multifaceted and multigenerational encounter with communism. They open a window onto a century of cultural opposition that not only challenges conventional typologies but also prevalent periodizations of opposition used in studies of Central and Eastern Europe. Such chronologies normally begin with the establishment of communist regimes in the late 1940s, whereas Ukraine’s ambivalent and conflictual cultural encounter with communism was seeded by the revolution of 1917. Due to the length and often traumatic nature of Ukraine’s engagement with the Soviet project, opposition in the country—political, military, and cultural—often revolved around the national question. Arguably, national themes and concerns were integrated into manifestations of cultural opposition to a much greater extent than in other parts of the Soviet universe. Therefore, the Ukrainian collections within COURAGE encourage scholars to address not only the competing visions of statehood that emerged out of the rubble of the Russian Empire, but also the subtle complexities faced by a polity that was both central to the building of Soviet communism and bore the full force of some of its most ruthless policies.
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