COURAGE

Cultural Opposition: Understanding the Cultural Heritage of Dissent in the Former Socialist Countries

Country Reports

UKRAINE

Authors
Orysia Maria Kulick

Regensburg 2018

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 692919.

About the authors

Orysia Kulick is Petro Jacyk Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Toronto. She was postdoctoral fellow at Trinity College Dublin in 2016-2018.
omkulick@gmail.com

To quote this report:
Orysia Maria Kulick: "Ukraine", COURAGE Country Reports. Regensburg, November 2018, DOI: http://doi.org/10.24389/cr-ukraine

Table of Contents

Summary

The Ukrainian collections in COURAGE challenge traditional chronologies of cultural opposition to Soviet rule, as they demonstrate the importance of culture in questioning dominant narratives promoted by the Bolsheviks since 1917. They also underscore the role of diaspora communities in preserving and promoting the cultural heritage of cultural opposition. Collections in Ukraine generally struggle with inadequate levels of funding and staffing, despite the fact that narratives of opposition feature public political discourse prominently. The radical shifts in Ukrainian memory politics with regard to the communist past significantly conditions the operational trajectory of state institutions in the country.

Introduction

In Ukraine, the theme of cultural opposition to communism has considerable public relevance, particularly in recent years. New legislation passed in the wake of the Euromaidan protests of 2014 thrust memory politics more forcefully into the public sphere and to the forefront of politics. With the country at war and bracing for its next presidential election in 2019, the past has become politicized and historical amnesia about complex and complicated events more prevalent.

Ukraine's relationship to communism was complex, as Ukrainians were both involved in the building of the communist utopia, and were among the Soviet regime's fiercest opponents at the same time. Like many former Soviet and socialist countries, the nation-building process involved a concerted distancing from the communist past, including the adoption of new symbols and the elevation of figures who were involved in oppositionist movements. Dissidents entered into politics in the late 1980s, archives opened after 1991, but evaluation of the crimes of communism did not proceed quickly. Lustration, understood as the vetting of public officials for links to communist-era security services, did not take place in Ukraine, not only preventing public discussion of the crimes of communism, but also allowing the old guard to transition fairly seamlessly into leadership positions after independence.

The massive social unrest that led to the ouster of President Viktor Yanukovych and his government in February 2014 also set in motion numerous legislative changes. Among the new laws was a lustration bill aimed at removing officials in the Yanukovych government who had engaged in corrupt practices. This was a narrow interpretation of a process that in some Central and East European countries resulted in a broad-based social and political reckoning following the collapse of communism in 1989, and ultimately was not successful. The Ukrainian government also passed in April 2015 a far more controversial packet of "decommunization bills" that were formally enacted by President Poroshenko the following month. Most critics have argued that these laws intervened too aggressively in memory politics by prioritizing nationalist historical narratives and promoting as heroes controversial figures, while also prohibiting open discussion of these matters. These laws also introduced

freer access to archival materials, particulary to documents held in the archives of the Soviet state security services and other repressive organs.

For researchers, this improved archival access has been beneficial, but scholars, human rights activists and others wonder about the longer term effects. For instance, the materials from the state security archives are now under the jurisdiction of the Ukrainian Institute of National Rememberance, a research institute that was initially created during Viktor Yushchenko's presidency as a central governmental institution with special status, which was then made into a research institute under Yanukovych within the budget of the Cabinet of Ministers. Although no documents have been transferred, the priorities of the institute's leadership, particularly its director have been a source of concern.

The full impact of these legislative changes remains unknown, particularly in light of Ukraine's highly polarized political context. Nonetheless, they have allowed for greater access to materials that focus on cultural opposition to communism and were previously not open to the public.

Background and Legislative Framework

Alongside the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the Ukrainian parliament (Verkhovna Rada) abolished the Soviet-era Communist Party of Ukraine (CPSU) as well as the KGB, symbolically relegating these institutions to the dustbin of history without actually demanding accountability or assigning responsibility for what had happened under communism. Though the KGB was replaced with the State Security Services of Ukraine (SBU) in 1991, roughly two-thirds of the officers remained. Ukraine saw the same kind of continuity across many institutions, with many holdovers from the old system taking on leadership positions in the new Ukraine.

Scholars who have studied the evolution of Ukraine's legal framework and its engagement with lustration, like Cynthia Horne, suggest that this continuity is the main reason why the country did not seriously undertake retributive or restorative justice measures. Opening up the KGB archives would have exposed the extent to which the leadership (and also the average citizen) was complicit in systems of surveillance and repression. Moreover, many files had either been transferred to Moscow in 1991 or destroyed by the SBU, purportedly out of fear of self-incrimination. Alexei Trochev notes that 2010 estimates suggested that just 2% of classified documents from the post-1953 period remained in the hands of Ukrainian authorities. Although Ukraine had a file sharing agreement with Russia, it was

apparently never exercised and given the rapid deterioration of the relationship between the two countries that is unlikely to change soon.[1]

Lustration bills were proposed regularly during the Yushchenko and Yanukovych presidencies to no avail, likely due to low public support and even lower political will. The events of 2014 reopened the issue of lustration and introduced additional "decommunization bills" into Ukraine's legal framework. They include the following four laws, submitted to the Verkhovna Rada only a few days before they were adopted in their first and final reading (without public or parliamentary debate) in April 2015.

- Law No. 2558: "On the condemnation of the communist and national socialist (Nazi) regimes, and prohibition of propaganda of their symbols."
- Law No. 2538-1: "On the legal status and honoring of fighters for Ukraine's independence in the 20th century."
- Law No. 2539: "On remembering the victory over Nazism in the Second World War."
- Law No. 2540: "On access to the archives of repressive bodies of the communist totalitarian regime from 1917-1991."

This legislation was controversial, and, as Oxana Shevel indicates, was criticized instantly by the Russian government, Ukrainian and international human rights groups, political factions in Ukraine, including the Communist Party (established anew in 1993 as a successor to the CPSU), the Party of Regions (based largely in south-eastern Ukraine) and Opposition Bloc (formed in 2014 as the successor to the Party of Regions, which disintegrated along with the Yanukovych presidency), as well as Ukrainian and Western scholars. It was thought that these laws would further foment conflicts in Ukraine, infringe on free speech and free academic inquiry, and prioritize certain historical narratives over others in a country already deeply divided about the communist past.[2]

Developments regarding memory politics and archival access should be watched closely by interested parties in and outside Ukraine, as the situation remains in flux. The full impact of this legislation remains to be seen and, with Ukraine bracing for another round of elections in 2019, further changes are likely on the horizon.

However, formalizing greater access to communist-era archival materials with the 2014 legislation has made it easier to find documents related to dissent and cultural opposition to communism in the party and state archives from the Soviet period, as well as those formerly

[1] Horne, Cynthia M. *Building Trust and Democracy: Transitional Justice in Post-Communist Countries*, Oxford Studies in Democratization. Oxford University Press, 2017; Trochev, Alexei. "Ukraine," in *Encyclopedia of Transitional Justice*, ed. Lavinia Stan & Nadya Nedelsky (Cambridge University Press, 2013), 490-497.
[2] Shevel, Oxana. "Decommunization in Post-Euromaidan Ukraine: Law and Practice," PONARS Eurasia Policy Memo No. 411, January 2016. URL accessed September 8, 2018: http://www.ponarseurasia.org/memo/decommunization-post-euromaidan-ukraine-law-and-practice.

affiliated with the KGB and other Soviet repressive organs. Even with the documentation that was taken to Moscow in 1991 or destroyed on site, there are still ample rich collections to work with that are preserved in state institutions. Ukrainian archivists are working to make maximally accessible what documents they can under the current legislative framework.

Major Collections in Ukraine

In the author's conversations with SBU archivists in the summer of 2014, it was revealed that the archives were found in a chaotic state after the ouster of the Yanukovych government. Files had been unbound and disorganized, suggesting yet another purge of the documentation, although this would have to verified. The author of this report was able to work freely with fully digitized copies of files from *opis* 16, largely made up of KGB reports to the Central Committees in Kyiv and Moscow. Figuring prominently among those documents were surveillance reports relating to Ukrainian dissidents, as well as unrest in factories, cooperatives, among the youth. There were also regular reports on the comings and goings of foreigners and any other expressions of discontent among the populace, some of which were tied directly to the Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia in 1968. The SBU has prioritized making public *fondy* and *opisi* in the digital reading room that focuses on the research priorities of its new leadership (like the collection titled *The Fight Against Anti-Totalitarian Resistance, 1950-1991* and opis 16). However, the archivists are also responsive to requests for other kinds of materials.[3]

Greater access extends beyond the SBU files to collections in other state archives from the Soviet period, like the Central State Archive of Public Organizations of Ukraine (TsDAHOU) and the Central State Archive of the Higher Organs of Power and Administration of Ukraine (TsDAVOVU). These are not specialized institutions researching state socialism, but archives of core institutions, or organs of government, that organically produced collections based on their own bureaucratic systems. They also became much more open in the wake of the decommunization laws. In the summer of 2014, the author accessed many hitherto classified files, mostly classified Ukrainian politburo files and military-industrial production, but also *obkom* level protocols dealing with intraparty democracy, collective leadership, education and recruitment of cadres, problems with discipline and production in key sectors of the economy, and the implementation of new civilian defense protocols (also possibly in response to the Prague Spring). At the local level, archival practices and access at party and state archives have been slower to change.

Ukraine took ownership of its archival heritage in 1991, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. As documents of great "historical, scientific and social-legal value," materials from the archives of the Communist Party of Ukraine were subordinated to the Cabinet of

[3] Based on Orysia Maria Kulick's experiences in the SBU archives in July-August 2014.

Minister of Ukraine in 1991 and "its local institutions together with its premises, technological equipment and employees."[4] It was the responsibility of the Cabinet of Ministers to secure and keep safe the Community Party archives at all rungs of the hierarchy. As early as 1993, the Rada passed legislation allowing repressed persons to access "manuscripts, photographs, and other personal items," which were confiscated from them and kept in their files.[5] In some cases those retrieved materials made their way into other collections in Ukraine over the years, both private and state supported, as in the case of the Prison on Lonskogo Street and the Sixtiers Museum.[6]

State-run archives remain largely centralized, subordinated to a National Archival Fond, whilst also replicating at the national, state, and local level the bureaucratic structures of the relevant government body. These institutions rely upon state funding and normally do not engage in fundraising, grant writing, or any other searches for external funds. The sources and documents such institutions hold, reflect the perspective of the Soviet state, each bureaucracy's self-justifying logic and view on a variety of societal issues and each government office's place within the larger hierarchy. Therefore, collections about cultural opposition and dissent in state-run archives have an authorial voice shaped strongly by Soviet bureaucrats.

Among the many collections that are supported from state budgets include those at TSDAHOU, which cover documents dealing with the activities of Communist Party leadership, its role in the political, economic and cultural life of the Republic. Topics relevant to cultural opposition include the politics of Ukrainization and the development of Ukrainian culture in the 1920s, and the consequences of the reversal of those policies in the 1930s, Stalinist repressions of Ukrainian intellectuals, the clergy, and cultural figures, ideological changes affecting social and political life in Ukraine during 1960s- 1980s and the concerted struggle by the party against various forms of dissent.

Similar topics are covered in the SBU archives, as already mentioned, but from the perspective of KGB operatives. There are also other vast state-supported archives, such as the Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Arts (TsDAMLM), which has collections related to a number of important cultural figures involved in oppositionist activities, including O. Dovzhenko, M. Stelmah, I. Kalynets, I. Svitlychnyi, D. Shumuk, I. Dzyuba, V. Stus, L. Kostenko, N. Svitlychna, M. Horyn and others. Documents from the post-World War II era include criminal cases filed against writers and artists for engaging in anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation, critical reviews of their artistic and literary works by their peers, stenograms of interrogations of members of the creative intelligentsia suspected of anti-Soviet dealings, as well as interviews with witnesses. They also include official responses to publications like Ivan Dziuba's "Internationalism or Russificiation."

---

[4] *Archival Legislation of Ukraine, 1991-2011*, 5.
[5] *Archival Legislation of Ukraine, 1991-2011 (fourth extended edition),* The State Archival Service of Ukraine, Kyiv 2012.
[6] COURAGE Registry, "Prison on Lonskogo Street." Accessed April 5, 2018. http://cultural-opposition.eu/registry/?uri=http://courage.btk.mta.hu/courage/individual/n6390

For the purposes of COURAGE, these archives were far too vast for us to engage in greater depth, given our resources and focus on the provenance and histories of individual collections. These institutions are mentioned here, because they are part of a vast and valuable network of archives produced by the Soviet state and subsequently supported by Ukrainian governmental budgetary resources, which are difficult to quantify without in-depth quantitative research and much more extensive interviewing of hundreds if not thousands of archivists and directors at the national, regional and local level. The archivists we did manage to interview, declined to answer questions about financing, largely because that knowledge is outside their purview.

We did engage several collections about cultural opposition that are part of this larger tapestry, including the Vasyl Stus and Zina Genyk-Berezovska collections at the T.H. Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in Kyiv and the emergent collection at the National Museum-Memorial to the Victims of Occupation "Prison on Lonskogo Street" in Lviv. The Institute of Literature has the status of a national heritage repository, and thus receives funds from the state to ensure its facilities are up to date.[7] The Prison on Lonskogo Street has the designation of a national museum-memorial and also benefits from financial support from the state.

The creation of the museum-memorial at the prison was possible because of the shift in political climate that followed President Viktor Yushchenko's election in 2004, which precipitated a change in leadership at the SBU and its archives. Support from then SBU chief Valentyn Nalyvaichenko and the newly appointed head of the SBU archives Volodymyr Viatrovych was crucial for pushing the project forward and transforming the prison into one of Ukraine's most visible sites of public memory. Viatrovych has been criticized quite vociferously by scholars both in Ukraine and outside the country for his myopic views of the past, particularly with regard to the role of Ukrainian nationalist insurgents. Nalyvaichenko was also condemned for statements made during the museum's opening in 2009 for lumping together the Polish police, the Gestapo and the Soviet NKVD, all of whom used the prison to hold inmates. Nevertheless, interviews conducted with curators and other researchers in the context of the COURAGE project indicate that they are trying to counteract some of this on the ground, with more thoughtful and inclusive representation of former inmates, which were of many nationalities, in their exhibits and events.

As there were many underground networks and cultural, religious, political and artistic communities that existed outside state structures, there are also collections that exist independently of state institutions. Some remain in private hands, while others have been donated to newly established archives, like the Sixtiers Museum in Kyiv. After Ukrainian

[7] Amar, Tarik Cyril "Memory of a Prison or a Prison of Memory?" English version of "Лонцького: пам'ять про тюрму чи ув'язнена пам'ять?" published on Zaxid.Net, 3 August 2009. Accessed September 10, 2018: https://www.academia.edu/3610895/Tarik_Cyril_Amar_Memory_of_a_Prison_or_a_Prison_of_Memory ; Mcbride, Jared. "How Ukraine's New Memory Commissar Is Controlling the Nation's Past," *The Nation*, August 13, 2015. URL accessed September 8, 2018: https://www.thenation.com/article/how-ukraines-new-memory-commissar-is-controlling-the-nations-past/.

independence in 1991, former political prisoners created an NGO called the "Sixtiers Museum" with the express intent of gathering materials about the dissident movement that would eventually be displayed in a museum-archive. This museum took 18 years to open. Yushchenko issued a presidential decree in support of the Museum right after becoming president in 2004, but parliament and the local authorities stalled on implementation, even after he reissued the decree a few times. MPs from Rukh (People's Movement of Ukraine, founded in 1989 as a civil-political movement), like Ivan Drach and Mykhailo Horyn, who were also sixtiers, were advocates of the project in the Verkhovna Rada. The first tranche of money that was secured for the Sixtiers Museum from federal funds was reallocated to open a different museum in Kyiv. Quite paradoxically, the museum finally opened under President Viktor Yanukovych in 2012, but only as an affiliate of the Kyiv History Museum, which encompasses a network of eight museums throughout the city. The curator believes that the Sixtiers Museum should be given the status of a national museum, given the scope and reach of the sixtiers work, which would allow the institution to tap into alternative sources of budgetary funding.

Organizations like the Kharkiv Human Rights Group (the successor to the Kharkiv branch of "Memorial") have their own independent archives, both on paper and online, and are supported largely through external grants from a variety of sources. These include the UNHCR, the French and American embassies, the International Renaissance Foundation (IRF), the European Union, the National Endowment for Democracy, and other similar organizations.[8] Apart from collecting interviews, biographies and other documentation for its virtual online museum to the dissident movement, KHPG has actively monitored human rights violations in Ukraine and has attempted to influence legislators to improve the political and social climate since independence.

The Centre for Urban History in Lviv is a research center with a digital urban media archive, which also finances its activities through external funding. The Centre sets its own agenda regarding the preservation of collections, some deal with cultural opposition and dissent as a matter of course, but they include these collections in the database because they enrich understanding of urban milieus under socialism.[9]

Ukrainian Collections in the COURAGE registry

The main types of collections about Ukraine in the registry are large state-run institutions, non-governmental organizations supported by the state as well as those that finance their activities with other sources of funding. Ukrainian collections are also found in research centres drawing on a wide range of financial and in-kind supporters and in private collections

[8] "Plan stratehichnoho rozvytku Kharkivskoyi Pravozakhytsnoyi Hruppy (KHPG) 2016-2019 rr., (Onovleno), *KHPG.org*, Accessed September 10, 2018: http://khpg.org/index.php?id=1489698369.
[9] Interview with Bohdan Shumylovych at the Centre of Urban History in Lviv, March 2017.

that have only recently begun to surface. The collections in the COURAGE registry and handbook are by no means representative. Nonetheless, they provide an important window into a much larger world of public and private repositories documenting the history and heritage of cultural opposition to communism.

Our coverage was limited to twelve collections located in three Ukrainian cities—Kyiv, Lviv and Kharkiv—and three North American cities—Stanford, California; Cleveland, Ohio; and Waco, Texas. Preliminary research was done about archives and collections about cultural opposition and dissent in UK (London), Germany, Canada, US (Chicago, Washington D.C.), as well as other Ukrainian cities, such as Dnipro (former Dnipropetrovsk), Odesa / Odessa and Kharkiv, but our capacity to conduct the in-depth interview and background research on those collections was hampered by time constraints and limited personnel.

Nevertheless, the material gathered about our 12 collections illuminated a great deal about Ukraine's legislative framework shaping archival access. We also learned a great deal about how cultural opposition to communism in Ukraine differed from its East-Central European neighbours.

Collectively these collections underscore the fact that Ukraine's long-term engagement with communism, and opposition to it, began in the early twentieth century with the onset of the Russian Civil War in 1917.[10] Many émigré collections (Zina Genyk-Berezovska, Ukrainian Museum Archives of Cleveland) originated at this time, as anti-Bolshevik refugees relocated to European and North American capitals as well as cities further afield. The Special Collection at NAMU and the Marian Kropyvnytskyi papers were a by-product of the late 1920s and 1930s, and deal with themes central to the onset of Stalinism and cultural orthodoxy in the Soviet Union and the crushing of the avant-garde. The Prison on Lonskogo Street's collection is shaped largely by the cataclysmic confrontation between the Nazis and the Soviets during World War II, while also including materials from Lviv dissidents held there in the 1970s. The Vasyl Stus, Smoloskyp, Sixters Museum collections were also formed during the post-Stalin period, when Ukrainian human rights and cultural activists were reinvigorated by Khrushchev's Thaw. (They were suppressed later.) The Keston Collection's documentation of religious persecution also largely focuses on the 1960s-1980s. The Kendzior collection captures activism that took place on the cusp of dissolution, filming demonstrations, religious services, meetings of political prisoners, cultural events, and many other happenings in Western Ukraine as Soviet authorities slowly lost their grip.

These collections were chosen to demonstrate Ukraine's unique position within the larger COURAGE project. The Ukrainian collections served as an important reminder that temporalities and geographies of opposition are different in Soviet core. The Ukrainian case represents a century of cultural opposition rather than simply a post-war and Cold War phenomenon. Therefore, the Ukrainian collections enrich the registry in important ways, and point the way toward other potentially fruitful avenues of archival exploration.

[10] Mykhailo Minakov, "(Not Only a) Russian Revolution: Centennial Meditations," *Kennan Institute: Focus Ukraine*, November 7, 2017.

Aggregate Information from Registry and Background

The main types of collections from Ukraine that were described in the registry are public, or private with some public access. The most common founders are government organs, private individuals or non-governmental organizations. Four of the described collections are located in large government-run institutions—the Special Collection at the Ukrainian National Museum of Art in Kyiv, the Vasyl Stus and Zina-Genyk Berezovska collections at the T. H. Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in Kyiv, and the general collection at The National Museum-Memorial to the Victims of Occupation "Prison on Lonskogo Street" in Lviv. The Smoloskyp Collection was formed in the Ukrainian diaspora by the Smoloskyp Publishing House and repatriated to Kyiv from the US after independence. The collection is now held at the Museum-Archive and Documentation Centre of Ukrainian Samvydav in Kyiv and is supported in part by the SMOLOSKYP International Charity Foundation. As mentioned earlier, the Kharkiv Human Rights Group's (KHPG) created the *Virtual Museum of the Dissident Movement in Ukraine* online, where it is accessible in two languages Ukrainian and English. This organization is funded entirely by outside sources and exists independently of state funds.[11] The Sixtiers Museum is an affiliate of the Kyiv History Museum and relies on funds from the capital city, but desires to be given national status. The Yaroslav Kendzior Collection is a private collection still owned by Kendzior himself in Lviv, Ukraine. It is made up of 54 boxes of SVHS tapes from the late 1980s and early 1990s that Kenzdior recorded. One of these boxes was digitized by the Centre of Urban History in Lviv and is available to researchers in the reading room. The remaining three collections are held in the United States. The Andrei Siniavskii Papers (Stanford, California, USA) and the Keston Center for Religion, Politics, and Society Collection (Waco, Texas, USA) are held in university archives, at Stanford University and Baylor University, respectively. The third North American collection belong to the Ukrainian Museum-Archives of Cleveland (Ohio, USA), a registered non-profit organization whose operations are financed through donations, member dues, and a variety of governmental and non-governmental grants and in-kind and volunteer support.[12]

Though small in number, the geographic and thematic scope of these collections was vast. Most of these are large collections, with documents, photos, and other materials numbers in the thousands. Not as abundant were artifacts, handicrafts, embroidery, clothing, typewriters and other similar items.

[11] For more information see the website of the organization at http://museum.khpg.org/en/. Accessed, September 5, 2018.

[12] Institutions in Western Europe with sizeable Ukrainian collections include, but are not limited to: Ukrainische Freie Universität in Munich, Research Centre for East European Studies, University of Bremen (Forschungsstelle Osteuropa), the Archive of the Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic, the Departmental Office for the Documents Accessibility and Filling in Gdansk, Institute of National Remembrance, The Shevchenko Library and Archive of AUGB in London, and many others.

The life trajectories of the creators of archival materials extended deep into hard labour camps in Siberia (locations including Kuchino, Mordovia, Perm, and others), exile near Mongolia and China, émigré communities in Paris, London, and Prague, deported persons camps in Austria and Germany, as well as new communities in North America. Thematically, these collections focused for the most part on human rights activism, émigré life and exile, the production of *samizdat* and *tamizdat*, folk art, fine art, opposition within official structures like the writers and artist unions in the Soviet Union. Other prominent themes include nationalist opposition, severe punitive measures enacted by the Soviet regime, the idea of internal exile and solidarity forged between nationalities in the camps.

In terms of events stimulating the creation and development of collections, one can readily point to moments of tumult and migration from Ukraine (the Russian Civil War, World War II), which created many collections in émigré communities, as well as the dissolution of the Soviet Union, which inspired a number of individuals to send materials back to Ukraine. The post-Stalin conjuncture was also important as it resulted in a renewed flourishing of local and national cultures. Another wave of activism followed the passage of the Helsinki Accords, which focused the attention of the cultural opposition on international institutions and norms. Domestic political upheaval has also had a direct impact on the preservation and promulgation of information about collections in Ukraine. The 2004 presidential elections ushered into power Viktor Yushchenko, who entered into memory politics quite forcefully and supported major shifts in the organization and leadership of the SBU (former KGB) archives. The 2014 Euromaidan protests provoked further transformations, therefore, we can only assume that further domestic tumult will lead to new developments.

The collections are mostly run by full or part-time professional archivists, but also volunteers. All the archives are underfunded and understaffed, some more critically than others. The state-run institutions have more catalogued collections, while collections in private hands or managed by NGOs tend to be less systematically organized. Digitization is uneven and pursued intermittently by most of the institutions surveyed. The most active in this regard are NGOs whose activities are financed by outside funds, and also the SBU archives, which prioritizes maximum public access to Soviet-era documents. Access to all collections listed in this report is transparent. One must typically contact the archivists and reading room in advance, and provide the necessary documentation or justification, but there are no major hurdles to overcome.

Most of these collections attract an academic audience, students, historians, and researchers focused on the issue of cultural opposition to communism. The Ukrainian Museum Archives in Cleveland and the Sixtiers Museum also engage the general public and school children that come on field trips. For the most part, working conditions are more than adequate, with ample desk space and reasonable access to documents. Each institution determines how many documents and items can be viewed at any given time. At TsDAHOU, for instance, the archivists release 10 *delo* per day, while at the archives of the T.H. Shevchenko Institute of Literature, archivists will provide materials as fast as they can be

processed. For the SBU archives and also the Centre for Urban History in Lviv, digitized materials are made available in the reading rooms on computers, but they can only be copied with permission from the institutions themselves. Online content for these collections is sparse, but intermittently available. The major hurdles for digitization are funds, personnel and permissions from the original copyright holders.

The key stakeholders in these collections tend to be individuals who have a sense of the historical importance of the materials found therein. They are typically individuals close to the source. For instance, Mykhailyna Kostiubynska was a sixtier, a literary scholar, the niece of a major modernist Ukrainian writer and a mentor to Vasyl Stus, the poet and political prisoner, and very close friend to Zina Genyk-Berezovska, a Czech Ukrainian literary scholar with whom she exchanged hundreds of letters. Kotsiubynska was instrumental in bringing both the Stus and Genyk-Berezovska collections to the Institute of Literature in Kyiv, clearly recognizing their value not only personally, but professionally, and ultimately historically for Ukraine. Proximity to the people and institutions involved in creating collections defines most of the stakeholders in these collections. Rarely is there an outsider, who comes into the situation and determines whether something is valuable. These decisions are part of an internal and intimate process.

The Ukrainian public cares about the COURAGE collections that are known. However, general awareness about the existence of collections related to cultural opposition and dissent remains limited. Smaller institutions and NGOs tend to seek out visitors—students, scholars, and the general public—in order to draw attention to the subject matter. The Ukrainian public, researchers in the West, and even specialists in East-Central European studies do not always know the names central to Ukrainian resistance. Alla Horska, Vasyl Stus, Mykhilyna Kotsiubynska, Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets, and others are mysteries to be discovered by broader European audiences, while domestic audiences have yet to discover the depth and complexity of cultural opposition in Ukraine in the Soviet period. They are hardly to be faulted as these stories were suppressed in Soviet times and were not discussed in detail in public during the tumultuous post-Soviet period either.

Most collections in Ukraine have limited networking potential. This mostly has to do with the institutional and legal framework in which they are operating, but also with the additional burden imposed upon the country by the war with Russia. Large state-run museums and archives are largely dependent on state funds, and they are also more exposed to the radical zig-zags in Ukrainian memory politics since 1991 than smaller, private collections. There are professional organizations, but the use of social media and other forms of promoting individual collections is very limited. There are notable exceptions to this trend including the Centre for Urban History of East Central Europe in Lviv, which has a substantial international network of partner institutions, runs various events, hosts scholars through a scholarship scheme and promotes some of its collections through various means. The networking potential of diaspora collections depends largely on the host environment in which they are operating. Some North American collections, such as the Cleveland Museum-Archives were

successful in tapping into various funds, establish partnerships with prominent institutions and promote their collections through educational activities as well as through social media.

Best Practice and Recommendations

Museums, archives and private collections in Ukraine generally suffer from the same structural problems: the lack of funding, the shortage of space, and the shortage of trained personnel. They also struggle to cope with the sometimes unpredictable shifts in Ukrainian memory politics. The institutions that seem to navigate the troubled waters of Ukrainian cultural heritage well include the Centre for Urban History of East Central Europe that runs digitization projects, promotes its collections domestically and to an international audience, and taps into various networks in Ukraine as well as abroad. Among the diaspora collections explored by COURAGE, the Cleveland Museum-Archives deserves special mention due to the successful networking, digitization and educational projects that were organized in the last few years. The Hoover Institute at Stanford University, which contains numerous collections relevant to COURAGE, is an exceptional organization with funding and staffing levels most Ukrainian collections could only dream of. While its professional practices could serve as an example for institutions in Ukraine, their implementation would require a radical improvement in the financial situation of museums and archives, which currently seems unfeasible.

Significant improvement of the social function of collections of cultural opposition in Ukraine could only be expected if the following conditions are met: 1) significantly increased funding levels; 2) a radical decrease of political pressure; 3) increased professionalization; and 4) an increase in networking activities and the sharing of best practices. Although in the context of war funding levels are unlikely to increase, it is very important to create a legal, political and financial framework which creates stability and predictability. Such an environment would reduce the collections' exposure to shifts in memory politics and would pave the way for the enhancement of professional practices at the respective institutions that take the specific conditions and needs of the collections into consideration. Professional practices at the various institutions could also be enhanced by the intensification of networking activities at a domestic as well as an international level. Increased networking could potentially result in the sharing of best practices, the wider visibility of the collections and increased funding opportunities for joint projects. It is inevitable that state institutions reach out to smaller collections run by private individuals or organizations in order to raise awareness of the different conditions in which collections operate and increase trust between state actors and non-state associations or private individuals. Although all stakeholders have a role to play in promoting the heritage of cultural opposition in Ukraine, the state should make the first radical step towards the de-politicisation of the topic and the creation of a professional atmosphere that takes the needs of the relevant collections into consideration. The

development of a long-term strategic plan that leads in that direction and is observed by the current and subsequent governments would be highly advisable.

Further Reading

Archival Legislation of Ukraine, 1991-2011 (fourth extended edition), The State Archival Service of Ukraine, Kyiv 2012.

Druhyj den' pospil' SBU provodyt' dopytiv pratsivnykiv "Tyurmy na Lonskogo," *Gazeta.ua*, 6 Lypnia 2011. URL last accessed May 24, 2017: https://gazeta.ua/articles/life/_drugij-den-pospil-sbu-provodit-dopiti-pracivnikiv-tyurmi-na-lonckogo/389438.

"Eks-director SBU: "Sluzhba bazopastnosti nashala, izvynite, putat'sia v pokazaniyakh," *Censor.net.ua*, 15 sentabria 2010. URL last accessed May 24, 2017: http://censor.net.ua/news/132190/eksdirektor_arhiva_sbu_quotslujba_bezopasnosti_nachala_izvinite_putatsya_v_pokazaniyahquot.

"SBU vyvchaye istorychni dokumenty, za yaki zatrymaly istoryka Zabilogo," *24Kanal*, 15 sentiabria 2010. URL last accessed May 24, 2017: http://24tv.ua/ru/sbu_vivcha_istorichni_dokumenti_za_yaki_zatrimala_istorika_zabilogo_n47409

"UWinnipeg Fellowship to crack open KGB archives: A new source for Mennonite stories," *Canadian Mennonite*, March 6, 2018. URL accessed September 8, 2018: https://www.canadianmennonite.org/stories/uwinnipeg-fellowship-crack-open-kgb-archives.

Amar, Tarik Cyril "Memory of a Prison or a Prison of Memory?" English version of "Лонцького: пам'ять про тюрму чи ув'язнена пам'ять?" published on Zaxid.Net, 3 August 2009. Accessed September 10, 2018: https://www.academia.edu/3610895/Tarik_Cyril_Amar_Memory_of_a_Prison_or_a_Prison_of_Memory.

Borzenko, Aleksandr. "'Russia will cover up Stalinist crimes': Ukraine opens its KGB archives. Historian Nikita Petrov reflects on what this means for Russia," *Meduza.io*, 08:44, April 21, 2015. URL accessed September 8, 2018: https://meduza.io/en/feature/2015/04/21/russia-will-cover-up-stalinist-crimes.

Cohen, Josh. "The Historian Whitewashing Ukraine's Past." *Foreign Policy*, May 2, 2016. URL accessed September 7, 2018: https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/05/02/the-historian-whitewashing-ukraines-past-volodymyr-viatrovych/

Coynash, Halyna. "'Decommunization' in Ukraine Carried Out Using Communist Methods," KHPG.org, Human Rights in Ukraine, September 6, 2016. URL accessed September 8, 2018: http://khpg.org/en/index.php?id=1462928536.

Gawur, Luba. *The Ukrainian Museum-Archives in Cleveland, Ohio: A Historical Study*. Unpublished Master's Research Paper. Kent State University, 1994.

Gilley, Christopher and Per Anders Rudling. "The History Wars in Ukraine Are Heating Up," *History News Network*, May 9, 2015. URL accessed September 8, 2018: https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/159301.

Grimstead, Patricia Kennedy. *Trophies of War and Empire: The Archival Heritage of Ukraine, World War II, and the Politics of Restitution.* Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute; State Committee on Archives of Ukraine; State Service for the Control of the Transmission of Cultural Treasures Across the Borders of Ukraine. - Cambridge, MA, 2001. - (Harvard Papers of Ukrainian Studies)

Grimstead, Patricia Kennedy. “Russia’s “Trophy” Archives: Still Prisoners of World War II?” *The National Council for Eurasian and East European Research*, February 4, 2002.

Himka, John-Paul. "The Lontsky Street Prison Memorial Museum: An Example of Post-Communist Negationism," in *Perspectives on the Entangled History of Communism and Nazism: A Comnaz Analysis,* eds. Klas Goran Karlsson, Johan Stenfeldt and Ulf Zander (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2015), 137-166.

Horne, Cynthia M. *Building Trust and Democracy: Transitional Justice in Post-Communist Countries*, Oxford Studies in Democratization. Oxford University Press, 2017.

Horne, Cynthia M. “Lustration in Ukraine: Temporal, Scope and Implementation Considerations,” Preprint version--Chapter in Cynthia M. Horne and Lavinia Stan (eds). *Transitional Justice and the Former Soviet Union: Reviewing the Past, Looking Forward to the Future* (under contract with Cambridge Univ Press. URL accessed May 24,
2017: https://www.academia.edu/30637886/Lustration_in_Ukraine_Temporal_Scope_and_Implementation_Considerations.

Kramer, Mark. “Archival Policies and Historical Memory in the Post-Soviet Era.” *Demokratizatsiya*, Summer 2012, Vol. 20 Issue 3, 204-215.

Kurina, Aksinya. “Istoryk Georgii Kasianov: Sposoby zdisnennya dekomunizatsii nahaduyut komunistychni praktyky,” *Ukrainska Pravda*, May 7, 2016.

Marples, David R. “Open Letter from Scholars and Experts on Ukraine Re. the So-Called "Anti-Communist Law,” *Krytyka*, April 2015. URL accessed September 8, 2018: https://krytyka.com/en/articles/open-letter-scholars-and-experts-ukraine-re-so-called-anti-communist-law

Mcbride, Jared. “How Ukraine’s New Memory Commissar Is Controlling the Nation’s Past,” *The Nation*, August 13, 2015. URL accessed September 8, 2018: https://www.thenation.com/article/how-ukraines-new-memory-commissar-is-controlling-the-nations-past/.

Popova, Maria and Vincent Post. “What is lustration and is it a good idea for Ukraine to adopt it?” *Monkey Cage*, April 9, 2014. URL accessed September 7, 2018: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2014/04/09/what-is-lustration-and-is-it-a-good-idea-for-ukraine-to-adopt-it/?utm_term=.d333268ec9f0.

Rudling, Per Anders and Christopher Gilley. “Laws 2558 and 2538-1: On Critical Inquiry, the Holocaust, and Academic Freedom in Ukraine,” *Politychna Krytyka*, April 29, 2015. URL accessed September 8, 2018: http://ukraine.politicalcritique.org/2015/04/29/laws-2558-and-2538-1-on-critical-inquiry-the-holocaust-and-academic-freedom-in-ukraine/

Shevel, Oxana. “Decommunization in Post-Euromaidan Ukraine: Law and Practice,” PONARS Eurasia Policy Memo No. 411, January 2016. URL accessed September 8, 2018: http://www.ponarseurasia.org/memo/decommunization-post-euromaidan-ukraine-law-and-practice.

Statiev, Alexander. *The Soviet Counterinsurgency in the Western Borderlands*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Trochev, Alexei. “Ukraine,” in *Encyclopedia of Transitional Justice*, ed. Lavinia Stan & Nadya Nedelsky (Cambridge University Press, 2013), 490-497.

Yekelchyk, Serhy. “Archiving Heteroglossia: Writing Reports and Controlling Mass Culture under Stalin,” in Francis X. Blouin, and William G. Rosenberg, *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006), 459-465

List of Collections Described

1. Kharkiv Human Rights Group’s (KHPG) Virtual Museum of the Dissident Movement in Ukraine (Kharkiv, Ukraine)*
2. Marian Kropyvnytskyi Personal Archive (Kyiv, Ukraine)
3. Prison on Lonskogo Street (Lviv, Ukraine)
4. Sixtiers Museum Collection (Kyiv, Ukraine)
5. Smoloskyp Collection (Museum-Archive and Documentation Centre of Ukrainian Samvydav in Kyiv)
6. Special Collection (NAMU) (Kyiv, Ukraine)
7. Vasyl Stus Collection (Kyiv, Ukraine)
8. Yaroslav Kendzior Collection (Lviv, Ukraine)
9. Zina Genyk-Berezovska Collection (Kyiv, Ukraine)
10. Andrei Siniavskii Papers (Stanford, California, USA)
11. Ukrainian Museum-Archives of Cleveland (Ohio, USA)
12. Keston Center for Religion, Politics, and Society (Waco, Texas, USA)

List of Operating Institutions and Owners

- Andriy Bojarov (Hryt’sko Porytskyi (a.k.a “Greg” and “Greg Ostrozkyi”) Collection)
- Anonymous Private Individual (Marian Kropyvnytskyi Personal Archive)
- Centre for Urban History of East Central Europe (Yaroslav Kendzior Collection, Mykhailo Frantsuzov Collection, Hryt’sko Porytskyi (a.k.a “Greg” and “Greg Ostrozkyi”) Collection)
- Hoover Institution Library and Archive (Andrei Siniavskii Papers)
- Leonid Bachynsky (Ukrainian Museum Archives of Cleveland)
- Evhan Batchinsky (Ukrainian Museum Archives of Cleveland)
- Mykhailo Frantsuzov (Mykhailo Frantsuzov Collection)
- Zina Genyk-Berezovska (Zina Genyk-Berezovska Collection)
- Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets (Prison on Lonskogo Street)
- Marian Kropyvnytskyi (Marian Kropyvnytskyi Personal Archive)
- Yaroslav Kendzior (Yaroslav Kendzior Collection)
- Keston Center for Religion, Politics, and Society (Keston Collection)
- Keston Institute (Keston Center for Religion, Politics, and Society)
- Kharkiv Human Rights Group (KHPG) (Virtual Museum of the Dissident Movement in Ukraine)*

- Museum-Archive and Documentation Centre of Ukrainian Samvydav (Smoloskyp Collection)
- National Art Museum of Ukraine (Special Collection (NAMU))
- The National Museum-Memorial to the Victims of Occupation “Prison on Lonskogo Street” (Prison on Lonskogo Street Collection)
- Valentyna Popeliukh (Vasyl Stus Collection)
- T. H. Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Zina Genyk-Berezovska Collection, Vasyl Stus Collection)
- Sixtiers Museum (Sixtiers Museum Collection)
- Vasyl Stus (Vasyl Stus Collection)
- Ukrainian Museum Archives of Cleveland (Ukrainian Museum Archives of Cleveland)
- Yaroslav Kendzior (Yaroslav Kendzior Collection)

List of People Researched

- Leonid Bachynsky
- Evhen Batchinsky
- Zina Genyk-Berezovska
- Kost’ Genyk-Berezovsky
- Oleksandr Bohomazov
- Mykhailo Boichuk
- David Burliuk
- Viacheslav Chornovil
- Aleksandra Ekster
- Petro Grigorenko
- Dmytro Gorbachev
- Ivan Horbachevsky
- Alla Horska
- Ihor Kalynets
- Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets
- Yaroslav Kendzior
- Mykhailyna Kotsiubynska
- Marian Kropyvnytskyi
- Roman Lubkivsky
- Osyp Maidaniuk
- Kazimir Malevich
- Oleksandr Oles
- Aleksandr Parnis
- Mykola Plakhotniuk
- Viktoriya Poltaryeva
- Andriy Richytsky

- Stefaniya Shabatura
- Platonida Shurovska-Rossinevych
- Mariia Rozanova
- Vasyl Sedliar
- Liudmila Semykina
- Halyna Sevruk
- Yuriy Shcherbak
- Iwan Shuljak
- Andrei Siniavskii
- Dmytro Stus
- Vasyl Stus
- Yevhen Sverstiuk
- Ivan Svitlychny
- Nadiya Svitlychna
- Vasyl Symonenko
- Ivan Vrona
- Volodymyr Vynnychenko
- Opanas Zalyvakha

List of People Interviewed

- Andrij Bojarov
- Galyna M. Burlaka
- Tetyana Filevska
- Andrew Fedynsky
- Kathy Hillman
- Aniza Kraus
- Olena O. Lodzynska
- Yuliya Lytvynets
- Ludmila Pekarska
- Rostyslav Semkiv
- Anatol Shmelev
- Bohdan Shumylovych
- Iryna Yezerska
- Olia Zbrozhko

*KHPG's Virtual Online Museum was described in the COURAGE handbook rather than the registry.