

# HISTORICAL SCIENCES

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF UKRAINIAN ETHNOLOGY UNDER THE SOVIET REGIME POLICIES DURING 1920S

*Chernyshuk N.*

*Candidate of Historical Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Department of Law,  
Vinnytsia National Agrarian University*

### ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the problems of development of Ukrainian ethnology under the influence of Soviet government policies in the 1920s. The article analyses the basic principles of Soviet government and Communist Party policies in the field of science and culture, their relations with scientific institutions and scientists as a social class. The main achievements of Ukrainian ethnology in this period, the process of its institutionalization and theoretical and methodological formation, as well as the peculiarities of its development in the European context are considered. The author analyses the evolution of the Bolshevik government policies in the direction of strengthening control over the professional activities and personal life of Ukrainian ethnologists. It was concluded that a certain liberalization of the policy of the Soviet government in the field of science in 1920-1927 contributed to the emergence of a large number of new ethnographic studies and the entry of Ukrainian ethnology to a qualitatively new level of development.

**Keywords:** ethnography, ethnology, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, People's Commissariat for Education of Ukrainian SSR, Ethnographic Commission

### Analysis of recent research and publications.

The development of Ukrainian ethnology during the 20s of the twentieth century has been studied by Borisenko V., Gorlenko, Dmitrenko M., Kapelyushny V., Kazakevich G., Kirchiv R., Sapelyak O. and others. However, the problem of the influence of the policy of the Soviet government on the development of Ukrainian ethnology remains relevant and requires further research.

**Purpose of the article.** To reveal the main directions of development of the Ukrainian ethnological school in the conditions of the liberalized political regime in the period of national revival and to investigate the activity of scientific centers of ethnographic researches in the 1920s.

**Presentation of the main material.** The 1920s of the XX century are often referred to as the "golden age of the Ukrainian humanities", and for Ukrainian ethnology the 1920s became an era in which this scientific field reached a qualitatively new level of development. The end of the First World War and the collapse of conservative European monarchies, the spread of new socio-political trends and ideologies, enormous scientific and technological progress – these and other global phenomena created the preconditions for significant modernization of scientific approaches in the socio-humanitarian sphere in general and ethnology and social anthropology. The specifics of the development of humanitarian knowledge in Ukraine was determined by several trends. First, the Ukrainian national revolution of 1917-1921 generated a huge wave of interest in the historical past and cultural heritage of the Ukrainian people. The establishment of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and a number of educational and scientific institutions, the rapid flourishing of book publishing – all this contributed to the development of scientific infrastructure. Secondly, the defeat of pro-Ukrainian forces led to the fact that a large part of the national scientific elite found themselves abroad, primarily in

European countries. There, despite the social and domestic hardships, researchers had great prospects and opportunities in the perception of the latest achievements of European science. In the mid-1920s, scientists such as M. Hrushevsky, K. Hrushevskya, M. Drahomanov, M. Lysenko, F. Vovk, G. Pavlutsky, K. Shirotsky, E. Kagarov and others took the opportunity to return to Ukraine and conduct relatively independent and very productive research. This was largely due to the peculiarities of the Soviet government's policy in the field of science and culture, which in the 1920s went through a period of liberalization, which gave Ukrainian scholars some autonomy and created opportunities for independent research.

In the Russian Empire the most powerful centers of ethnological research were universities, that not only served as higher education institutions, but also conducted research and training of highly qualified scientific personnel. These were, first of all, Kyiv, Kharkiv and Novorossiysk Imperial Universities. However, with the formation of the USSR, the Bolshevik government conducted a reform of higher education, according to which in 1920 the above-mentioned educational institutions were eliminated and replaced with institutes of public education, which did not conduct scientific research. Thus, the place of the main scientific centre on the territory of Ukraine passed to the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, established on November 14, 1918 in accordance with the law signed by Hetman P. Skoropadsky. The founding of the Academy was initiated by scholars, and it was created as a self-governing institution, guided by its own Statute, while receiving state funding. From 1907 another scientific centre operated in Kyiv – the Ukrainian Scientific Society, which was not a state institution and was funded by membership fees and donations of patrons. However, due to the difficult financial situation in the early 1920's, the Society was not very active, many of its

members began working as part of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. After the establishment of power in Kyiv, the Bolsheviks did not create their own scientific institution, but instead began to cooperate quite actively with the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. This was largely due to the initiative of the scientists themselves, especially the Permanent Secretary of the Academy A. Krymsky, who positioned the Academy as an apolitical institution and tried to establish contact and receive support and funding from the whichever government was in charge at the time. Thus, as a result of A. Krymsky's meeting with People's Commissar for Education V. Zatonksy, the People's Commissariat of Education issued an order to transfer the premises and estates of the former boarding house of Countess Levashova of February 11, 1919. It was this date that the Soviet authorities later began to use as the founding date of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, attributing to themselves the merit of its establishment. The first comprehensive document of the Bolshevik government, which directly regulated the work of the Academy, was a special resolution of the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR "On the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences" of January 25, 1921. The resolution contained 6 points, 4 of which summarized previous government orders regarding the transfer of Levashova boarding house premises, as well as the First Kyiv Gymnasium and the printing house to the Academy ownership, provision of wages, paper supply for scientific publications, etc. At the same time, the last two points provided for a significant restriction of the autonomy of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and its administrative subordination to the People's Commissar for Education, which was tasked with developing a new Statute of the Academy. In addition, the government appointed A. Krymsky President of the Academy – a position that was previously elective. After resolutions "On the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences" and "On Science and Higher Education" were adopted in late January – early February 1921, People's Commissariat of Education, headed by G. Grinko began to interfere more actively in the work of the Academy [31, p. 29-31]. Thus, he started the procedure of integration of the Ukrainian Scientific Society into the Academy. It would significantly simplify control over the activities of branches and self-governing associations of the Society, which had not previously received state funding and to some extent was in opposition to the Academy, which advocated for a rigid structure in management hierarchy. Furthermore, G. Hrynko started the process of developing a new Statute of the Academy, which was to be developed by party officials and academics. A. Krymsky was appointed Chairman of the Commission for the Development of the Statute. The process of discussing the draft of the new statute and merging the Ukrainian Scientific Society with the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was not easy: the commission and subcommissions met 14 times, and H. Hrynko came to Kyiv specifically to approve the provisions of the Statute. After the merger of the Society with the Academy was completed on June 1, 1921 Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR adopted a special resolution of the new Statute of the

Academy on June 14. According to the new Statute, the Academy was named All-Ukrainian, and its status as a higher scientific institution was also confirmed. At the same time, the autonomy of the Academy was significantly limited: it was directly subordinated to the People's Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR, which received the right to approve the leadership of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, as well as all academics. Instead of the Joint Assembly, which previously addressed key issues of the Academy, a Council of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was formed, which necessarily included employees of the People's Commissariat of Education [12, p.125-126].

Despite the approved Statute and numerous attempts by the government to reform the management system of All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and influence personnel policy, during 1921-1928 the Academy managed to maintain relative autonomy due to the active efforts of its members who tried to defend their academic freedoms and conduct independent research and adhered to the principles laid down in 1918. Contrary to the adopted Statute, until the early 1930s, the meetings of the Council of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences were not held, but, as before, the main issues wereresolved by the Joint Assembly. It was during this period of 1920-1925 that most scientific ethnographic centres were established in the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences system: the Ethnographic Commission (1921-1933) chaired by Andriy Loboda, the F. Vovk Cabinet of Anthropology and Ethnology (1921-1934), and the Primitive Culture Cabinet of the Department of History of Ukraine (1925-1933) under the direction of Mykhailo Hrushevsky, the Cabinet of Musical Ethnography (1922-1933) under the direction of Klyment Kvitka and Local History Commission (1922). The Office for the Study of National Minorities and the Office for the Monographic Study of the Village began to function as part of the Ethnographic Commission [11, p. 26]. Active work was carried out by the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnology named after F. Vovk (since 1922 – Cabinet), founded in 1921. Among the initiators of the Museum was a student of F. Vovk O. Alesho, who became its director, as well as A. Nosiv, A. Onyschuk, M. Gaidai, Y. Pavlovich, N. Zaglada, L. Shulgina, L. Demutsky and others. O. Alesho I a large book and photo library of F. Vovk from Petrograd to Kyiv, which became the basis for the Museum. It was the Cabinet of Anthropology and Ethnology that initiated stationary research, monographic descriptions of ancient villages, organized ethnographic exhibitions, put together a wide collection of ethnographic exhibits for the Museum, and prepared three books of Materials for Ethnology. An important role in the development of ethnology and folklore research was played by the Ethnographic Society, established on January 13, 1925 at the F. Vovk Cabinet of Anthropology and Ethnology. The society operated on a voluntary basis and in 1928 was renamed the All-Ukrainian Ethnographic Society. It brought together public ethnographic centres from different parts of Ukraine, with more than 160 members. In Kyiv and other regions, the Society's branches involved local intellectuals, teachers, and doctors in

their research work, who were actively engaged in collecting folklore and other ethnographic materials. Members of the Academy conducted special free courses for amateur collectors, as well as organized presentations of ethnographic publications. Such ethnologists as A. Onyschuk, L. Shulhyna, N. Malecha, N. Zaglada, D. Shcherbakivsky took an active part in the work of the Society. Due to their activities, a large number of monographs, articles and folklore and ethnographic materials were published [11, p. 38-39]. As a result of the education system reorganization in which was conducted during 1921-1922, a system of research departments was created to replace research institutions at universities and institutes. They were organized in those cities where major universities or scientific institutions were located. The departments had a certain specialization and developed primarily topics defined by the government. The departments were subordinated to the Scientific Committee, which approved the staffing and funding of the departments, and the scientific work was carried out in contact with the Academy. Scientific societies and regional commissions of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences played an extremely important role in the development of ethnology and local lore research, the study of the history of local crafts, traditions and customs of national minorities, the staffing of regional archives and museums and conducting expeditions. The largest scientific societies appeared in Kharkiv, Poltava and Katerynoslav, as well as in a number of other cities. They united local scientists, students, intellectuals, officials and were formed mostly on the basis of educational institutions, museums and archives [26, p.34-35].

The study of ethnography and folklore was carried out by purely historical institutions of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and research departments as well. The work of the Historical Section, established at the Historical and Philological Department in 1921, played an important role in this context. Within the Historical section the Research Department of History of Ukraine was founded, which in turn included the Cabinet of primitive culture and its remnants in life and folklore of the people, Cultural and Historical Commission, Historical Commission and other vocal groups and historical societies [4, p. 54-56]. The Department published journals and collections: "Ukraina" "Naukovi zapysky Istorychnoi sektsii VUAN", "Zapysky Istoryko-filolohichnoho viddilu VUAN", "Pervisne hromadianstvo ta yoho perezhytky na Ukraini". Mykhailo Hrushevsky headed the Historical Section, as well as its other subdivisions. In general, the period of the 1920s was marked by the emergence of Ukrainian ethnology to a qualitatively new level of institutionalization. In particular, during this period numerous ethnological periodicals were published: «Etnohrafichnyi visnyk», «Biuletyn Etnohrafichnoi komisii», «Biuletyn kabinetu antropologii ta etnologii im. F. Vovka», «Materialy do etnologii», «Pervisne hromadianstvo», «Pobut» etc. Among the most essential ones were «Etnohrafichnyi visnyk», published by A. Loboda and V. Petrov, as well as «Pervisne hromadianstvo», edited by K. Hrushevskya. A distinguishing feature of these publica-

tions was that analytical studies of folklore and ethnographic material, methodological works, reviews of European and American ethnological research, original works of Western scholars etc. were published on their pages [21, p. 215]. The «Etnohrafichnyi visnyk» and «Pervisne hromadianstvo», in the context of insufficient funding for the scientific field in general and publishing in particular, have become the main platform for publishing research by Ukrainian ethnologists. Ten books of the «Etnohrafichnyi visnyk» characterize the scientific directions of the Ukrainian ethnological school. The first book contained articles by A. Loboda – "The current state and the next tasks of Ukrainian ethnography"; K. Kvitka – "Musical Ethnography in the West"; O. Pchilka – "Ukrainian folk legends of the last time"; V. Petrov – "Attempts at a monographic study of the village" and others. Reviews, critiques and bibliographies were also published. In subsequent editions of the «Etnohrafichnyi visnyk», members of the Ethnographic Commission reviewed foreign publications and reviewed the works of German, Czech, English, and French scholars. Theoretical articles "The Mythology of the Sun in Ukrainian Folk Beliefs and the Byzantine-Hellenistic Cultural Cycle" by V. Petrov, "Harvest Rites of the Slavic Peoples in the Earliest Era of Development" were published. N. Dmytruk published his publication on the famine in Ukraine in 1921. The fifth book of the «Etnohrafichnyi visnyk» became a jubilee collection in honour of Academician Dmytro Bagaliy on the occasion of the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his birth and the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his scientific activity. Prominent scientists such as D. Zelenin, V. Kaminsky, and D. Yavornytsky, A. Nosov and others published their materials in it [5, p.116]. The Ethnographic Commission has set up a wide network of correspondents by distributing free of charge programs for collecting folk customs, proverbs, beliefs, children's toys, folk knowledge, etc. In total, more than six thousand copies of various programs were distributed. In the late 1920s more than ten thousand amateur collectors collaborated with the Commission. Factual material was collected primarily from different areas of traditional culture of Ukrainians and national minorities from different regions of Ukraine. In the development of theoretical and methodological problems of ethnology a special role belonged to the journal «Pervisne hromadianstvo», which according to M. Hrushevsky was to play the role of "a laboratory" for testing the latest research methods of ethnological research. According to I. Matyash, the journal «Pervisne hromadianstvo» immediately attracted the attention of scientists in Ukraine and abroad [21, p. 217].

Thus, during the 1920s, a wide network of scientific institutions in Ukraine was formed. It consisted of All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, research departments and scientific societies associated with it, which were engaged in the development of ethnology and folklore studies, conducted field research and involved amateur researchers, published a large number of scientific publications. Despite numerous attempts by the government to reorganize and interfere in the work of the Academy, the policy of the Bolshevik government in the early 1920s was generally favourable to its work.

The government actively cooperated with the Academy, provided premises and printing houses, provided them with paper for the publications of monographs and periodicals, paid salaries to members of the Academy, financed ethnographic expeditions (many of which, however, were aimed not only at research but also propaganda), provided discounts for postal services for the needs of the Academy, which was especially relevant for the work of the Ethnographic Commission, which conducted correspondence with its respondents in fairly large volumes. In contrast to the relatively loyal attitude of the Bolshevik government to the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences as a scientific institution, the government's policy toward scientists as a social class was radically different. The basic principles of the Bolsheviks' attitude toward "bourgeois specialists," as they called the scholars of the pre-revolutionary school, can be clearly traced in the program documents of the RCP (B). They were unequivocally considered a hostile bourgeois class whose counter-revolutionary intentions had to be ruthlessly suppressed. On the other hand, the Soviet government did not set itself the task of exterminating "bourgeois specialists" for purely utilitarian reasons. Thus, at the VIII Congress of the RCP (B) in March 1919, the document was adopted in which the implementation of the main tasks of the Soviet government was attributed to the broad and comprehensive "use of specialists in science and technology" [9, p.382]. The program assumed that higher remuneration of specialists and even a system of bonuses for them should be maintained for some time, "so that they could work not worse, but even better than before" [9, p.384]. That is why scholars, especially those associated with the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, found themselves in a somewhat better position than other "enemies of the proletariat." As S. Tymoshenko noted, it was then considered that "involvement with the Academy could serve as some kind of protection in these troubled times" [23, p.164]. Many researchers tried to get a position at the Academy. Thus, to protect the property (mostly apartments) of academics from requisitions, the government issued special "protection certificates". Eventually, the Decree "On Certificates of Protection for Academicians and Directors of Institutions of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences" by Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR was signed by H. Rakovsky. It stated that the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences is of special importance for the development of science in Ukraine, so the apartments and property of members of the Academy and their families were not subject to confiscation. The President of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences had the right to issue "protection certificates". Unfortunately, "protection certificates" did not always save the property of scientists, so A. Krymsky, writing them out, often resorted to tricks, marking the apartments of academics as premises of various institutions of the Academy, and assigned a status of "state property of the highest scientific institution of the Ukrainian SSR" to the property on the premises [1, p. 494]. On the other hand, in public discourse, "bourgeois specialists" were unequivocally included in the list of enemies

of the proletariat. According to the detailed classification of one of the theorists of Bolshevism M. Bukharin, these groups of enemies who inevitably waged an active struggle against the proletariat and whose attacks had to be repulsed and suppressed themselves were: 1) parasitic strata (former landlords, rentiers, bourgeoisie entrepreneurs), trade capitalists, speculators, stock-brokers and bankers, 2) administrative aristocracy (big bureaucrats, generals, bishops), 3) bourgeois entrepreneurs-organizers and directors (organizers of trusts and syndicates, the greatest engineers, inventors, "directly related to capitalist world"), 4) skilled bureaucracy (civil, military and spiritual), 5) technical intelligentsia and intellectuals in general, 6) officers, 7) large wealthy peasantry, 8) middle and partly small urban bourgeoisie, 9) clergy [7, p. 140]. The scholars of the old school fell under the definition of the enemies of the proletariat in accordance with several points at once. That is why they could be recruited only if they worked together with the working class under the leadership of "conscious communists," which was to promote "mutual understanding and rapprochement between the workers of physical and mental labor separated by capitalism". At the same time, Lenin, setting the task of subordinating the "bourgeois specialists" of the proletariat, noted that they could be used in an "old-fashioned, bourgeois way (that is, for a high salary), or in a new way, proletarian..." [19, p.168]. (by coercion). Non-economic coercion – violence – was still considered the main method. This followed directly from the doctrinal position of the "dictatorship of the proletariat". Lenin recognized the revolutionary violence of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie for its destruction as a natural right of the former oppressed classes [20, p.241-242], and, according to Bukharin, the enemies of the proletariat were subject to "concentrated violence". A few days before the opening of the VIII Congress of the RCP (B), at a meeting of the Petrograd Soviet in a report on domestic and foreign policy to the People's Commissar, Lenin pragmatically stressed the need to use violence in the "use" of old bourgeois specialists. The corresponding vocabulary he uses is noteworthy: "we must use them in all branches of construction", "we use the material left to us by the old capitalist world", "we put old people in new conditions, surround them with appropriate control... supervision by the proletariat and forcing them to do the work we need". "Violence is necessary here first of all", - he concluded [20, p.5-6]. All specialists were registered and deprived of the right to leave the service or place of residence. At the meetings of the Politburo of the All-Union Communist Party Central Committee and the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee a narrow circle of Bolshevik leaders often addressed issues crucial to Ukrainian scholars. They decided whether to issue arrest or release permits, whom to deport, whom to return from exile; discussed personnel appointments and other issues [17, p. 131].

Among the acute issues addressed by the party leadership was the issue of research trips abroad and contacts with foreign science in general. These trips were initiated by the scientists themselves, and the process of obtaining a research trip permit was extremely

difficult. The Bolsheviks were especially picky about Ukrainian humanitarian scholars, including ethnologists and historians. It took almost a year for the head of the Cabinet of Primitive Culture at the Research Department of History of Ukraine K. Hrushevka to obtain all permits for a research trip to Europe at her own expense. As early as 1926, Ukrnauka allowed the researcher to visit France, Germany and Austria to get acquainted with the latest research on primitive culture and folklore and to replenish the library of the Cabinet. At the end of January 1927, the Kyiv District Executive Committee received a petition signed by Deputy People's Commissar for Education J. Ryappo, and almost two months later the scientist received an official letter from the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, which was established to monitor international contacts. K. Hrushevka received permission from the People's Commissariat and a passport only in the autumn of 1927. In Paris K. Hrushevka got acquainted with the activities of the French Ethnological Institute at the University of Paris, attended a special course on ethnological research methodology, participated in seminars, studied and acquired textbooks and programs of the Institute for the Cabinet and agreed on the regular supply of periodicals [22, p.191]. K. Hrushevka not only acquainted Ukrainian scientists with the latest achievements of European science in such centers as Paris, Berlin, Vienna, but also encouraged Western European scientists to become interested in the scientific plans and achievements of Ukrainian scholars. According to V. Borysenko, at the request of the London Anthropological Institute, K. Hrushevka prepared a "Program for collecting materials for the Ukrainian folk dream book" for comparative analysis [6, p. 81]. Despite the fact that K. Hrushevka's research trip abroad was carried out at the researcher's own expense, in the future the Soviet authorities prevented Ukrainian scientists from visiting European countries in every possible way, fearing their possible emigration. Requests for research trips for Ukrainian scholars were often rejected, despite invitations from reputable foreign institutions. In particular, Academician M. Hrushevsky and Professor M. Slabchenko were denied a trip abroad to participate in the VI International Congress of Historians in Oslo, even though both were included in the Soviet congressional delegation. M. Hrushevsky was not allowed to Germany to participate in the so-called "Russian Week of Historians", which was organized in Berlin in October 1928 by the German Society for the Study of Eastern Europe. Instead, Marxist historians represented Ukraine at these forums. Ukrainian scholars also did not receive permission to participate in the Prague Ethnographic Congress held in October 1928, the Brussels Exhibition of Folk Art, for which the staff of the Cultural and Historical Commission prepared objects of folk cult, toys, costumes and other things for the Ukrainian ethnographic department [31, p. 31-33]. As N. Polonska-Vasylenko recalls, in 1929 ethnologist V. Petrov was invited to the Congress of Philologists in Prague, "but the the People's Commissariat of Education did not grant permission" [29, p. 99]. Refusal to issue a research trip permit

was often justified by foreign currency savings. The authorities controlled the visits of foreign scientists to Ukraine no less meticulously. It was the government officials who determined who should be allowed to visit and who should be denied, planned the program of the visit and determined the limited range of communication for the guests. A particular big problem was the import of scientific literature from abroad, which faced many obstacles – from lack of foreign currency for the purchase of foreign publications and imposing high tariffs, sometimes exceeding the cost of books, to censorship restrictions that led to delays or even blocked the receipt of literature by the scientists, as well as the absence of postal conventions between the USSR and other states, in particular with Poland. Publications came to Ukrainian scientists in a circular way – through Moscow, where they were inspected, repackaged and only then sent to the address of research institutions of the Ukrainian SSR. The Academy of Sciences tried to defend its autonomy in the acquisition of literature and property with the funds allocated for this purpose in the academic budget and to purchase everything it needed on its own. Due to the difficulties in obtaining the scientific literature necessary for normal work, scientists resorted to detours. Those who received permission to travel abroad also took the opportunity to buy the necessary books and journals on the spot and bring them to academic libraries and their own book collections. Personal contacts with representatives of Soviet diplomatic missions and consulates were also of great value [31, p. 34-35].

Despite the above-mentioned significant ideological pressure and obstacles in accessing the leading achievements of world ethnological thought, Ukrainian ethnographic science has been largely integrated into the European scientific space. Ukrainian researchers followed the latest scientific literature published in leading European countries, comprehended the methods and approaches used by scientists from different countries, offered their own ideas for their improvement. In particular, S. Muzychenko notes that the Ethnographic Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences maintained contacts and exchanged scientific literature with the Vienna Ethnographic Society (Austria), the Institute for Eastern European Studies (Italy), the Berlin Society of Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory, the Leipzig People's Institute. ), The Institute for the Study of Slavism (France), the Portuguese Society of Anthropology and Ethnography, the Finno-Ugric Scientific Society (Finland), the Norwegian Ethnographic Institute, the Ethnographic Commission of the Polish Academy of Sciences and many others. Foreign researchers were interested in the works of Ukrainian ethnographers and repeatedly asked to submit a broad summary in German or English in the Commission's publications [25, p.74]. It was in such conditions that a new stage of reforming the theoretical and methodological foundations of Ukrainian ethnology began in the 1920's. The most actively theoretical and methodological developments in Western European science were used by those Ukrainian scientists who had the opportunity to get acquainted with the work of foreign research centres during studies, research trips or exile.

This applies, in particular, to such scientists as M. Drachomanov, M. Lysenko, F. Vovk, G. Pavlutsky, K. Shirotsky, M. Hrushevsky, K. Hrushevskaya, E. Kagarov and some others. M. Hrushevsky was the author of a number of scientific papers on theoretical and methodological aspects of ethnology [32, p.24-25]. In the pages of the monograph "The Beginnings of Citizenship", the scholar for the first time in Ukrainian science presented a synthesis of world ethnological thought. M. Hrushevsky himself considered French sociological school of E. Durkheim to be the most promising, which at that time continued the traditions of European evolutionism [15, p.114-116]. On the pages of his folklore and ethnographic research, M. Hrushevsky actively applied the concepts of this school to collective ideas, social solidarity, pre-logical thinking, and so on [18, p.107]. On the other hand, using his undeniable authority in the Ukrainian scientific community, M. Hrushevsky with his works contributed to the growing interest of domestic researchers in promising scientific ideas and outlined new areas of research developed by his students and followers, including those in the field of ethnographic research [13, p.34-35]. During the studied period, a whole generation of young researchers-ethnologists was formed around the institutions of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, among whom were both brilliant collectors of field ethnographic material and scientists-analysts, whose works demonstrate the highest level of ethnological theory. Among them were K. Hrushevskaya, K. Koperzhynsky, E. Kagarov, A. Loboda, V. Petrov, K. Shtepa, A. Krymsky and many others. In the scientific environment an active search for the most effective theoretical and methodological approaches and methods of processing sources was in progress [32, p. 22].

In 1924 the Bolsheviks renewed active attempts to eventually subjugate the Academy, in particular by supporting and exploiting internal conflicts among the members of the Academy. The most significant and destructive for the Academy was the conflict between A. Krymsky and M. Hrushevsky, who returned from emigration in 1924 and headed the Historical Section of the Historical and Philological Department, the Archaeographic Commission and several other units. Back in 1923, during negotiations with the authorities on Hrushevsky's return to Ukraine, the government promised him the post of president of the Academy, which eventually turned out to be a manipulation. At the same time, the Department of History and Philology at that time was headed by A. Krymsky, the secretary of the department was Efremov. Relations between Hrushevsky and Krymsky were already quite tense at the time, as Hrushevsky, given his authority, could not accept second roles in the academy, and resented Krymsky for his involvement in the disbandment of the Ukrainian Scientific Society. For his part, Krymsky could not forgive Hrushevsky for his criticism and unfriendly remarks about the Academy and its staff at the beginning of its activities. The struggle for power in the Academy between Hrushevsky and his supporters on the one hand and the Krymsky-Efremov group on the other was encouraged and supported by the central government, which was in Kharkiv at the time. A. Krymsky always

worked to maintain friendly relations with the Bolsheviks to ensure the viability of the Academy. At the same time, upon his arrival, Hrushevsky also began to actively use his connections with the authorities, which only deepened the conflict. According to Polonska-Vasylenko: "The situation at the Academy was aggravated by the fact that taking advantage of friendly relations in Kharkiv, M. Hrushevsky, bypassing the Presidium of the Academy, the Department and the Joint Assembly, had constant relations with O. Shumsky, and the Kharkiv government in general...» [29, p.46]. By 1927, the tension in the conflict between M. Hrushevsky and A. Krymsky and S. Efremov had decreased. M. Hrushevsky took a step towards his opponents, realizing that constant quarrels and numerous confrontational "personal speculations" expressed by him did not add to his authority. However, the possibility of uniting the two groups in the Academy was not included in the plans of government officials. On December 13, 1927, the Politburo of the Central Committee heard a report by M. Skrypnyk on the situation in the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and decided to "declare the formation of a united front between Hrushevsky, Efremov, and Krymsky inadmissible". And two weeks later, at a meeting of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP (B) U with the participation of the Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU (B) V. Molotov, a directive was adopted by People's Commissar for Education M. Skrypnyk. It was about supporting scientists loyal to the Bolsheviks and involving them in the presidium, removing S. Efremov and A. Krymsky from the leadership of the Academy of Sciences, and preventing Hrushevsky from acquiring leading positions on the other hand. Reconciliation of the two warring groups took place in 1928, but it did not save the Academy [28, p. 355 – 359].

Simultaneously with the inspections and the process of reforming the structures of the Academy, purposeful work was carried out to form public opinion and discredit scholars in academic circles, to combat "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" and "pseudo-Marxism". Humanitarian scholars, in particular the staff of the Department of History and Philology, were among the most persecuted. During 1928 there was a public slander of Hrushevsky, Krymsky, Efremov, Bagali and many other scientists. During this period, the so-called "concentric harassment" became a popular and effective method of retaliation against scientists. Intellectuals were forced to expose each other and even themselves through "self-criticism" and remorse for previous mistakes. An illustrative case was the scientific and political exposure of A. Krymsky by V. Petrov for his book "Intelligence, Articles and Notes". The book dealt primarily with ethnographic issues, so the exposure had to be made by one of the ethnographers [5, p.76]. Victor Petrov was a representative of the younger generation of employees of the Academy of Sciences. He received great education, spoke foreign languages and had a deep knowledge of contemporary scientific trends in ethnology. In 1924 he became secretary of the Ethnographic Commission, headed by his mentor A. Loboda. From 1927, due to Loboda's illness, Efremov practi-

cally directed the work of the Ethnographic Commission, edited its various publications. During the 1920s he published a great number of studies, reviews and notes on ethnography. Such articles by V. Petrov as “The place of folklore in local lore”, “Old and new life in the countryside. From ethnographic observations”, “The mythology of the sun in Ukrainian folk beliefs and the Byzantine-Hellenistic cultural cycle”, “Kuzma-De-myana in Ukrainian folklore” and others were of great importance for the development of Ukrainian ethnology. The scholar’s scientific interests also extended to the problems of the history of Ukrainian ethnography. In a number of his publications he addressed the life and work of famous Ukrainian scientists M. Sumtsov, V. Hnatiuk, D. Yavornytsky, noted their important role in the development of scientific knowledge and the formation of modern Ukrainian ethnography. In the late 1920’s, the Ethnographic Commission headed by A. Loboda and V. Petrov was instructed to focus on the folklore of modern workers, builders of Dniprostan and so on. But Petrov not only fulfilled government’s orders, but also tried to develop much more complex and interesting topics. He managed to maintain friendly relations with the Bolshevik authorities, and at the same time to conduct independent research. The ethnographic commission regularly sent Petrov on a research trips to Moscow and Leningrad, and he maintained close personal ties with a number of Russian scholars [2, p.684–685]. The success of the Commission and its staff under Petrov was highly praised by the scientific community at the time, and it was even believed that Ukraine was “setting the tone” in the field of ethnography and folklore in the USSR. On March 17, 1927, at the annual meeting of the State Russian Geographical Society in Leningrad, a decision was made to award V. Petrov with a silver medal. On this occasion, on April 19, he was sent a letter of signature signed by the then president of the society I. Shokalsky. A. Loboda was also awarded a gold medal for the work of the Ethnographic Commission, and V. Kaminsky received a gold medal from the USSR Academy of Sciences for his individual work. Subsequently, in 1928, V. Petrov was elected a full member of the State Russian Geographical Society in Leningrad. So it is not surprising that Petrov was chosen as the executor of the exposure of A. Krymsky, who had to be discredited before being removed from the leadership of the Academy. Petrov wrote a devastating review of Krymsky’s book entitled “Scientific and Political Activities of A. Krymsky,” in which he accused the scholar of adhering to the “national-liberal bourgeoisie,” “low value, pointlessness, inaction,” “methodological and conceptual emptiness”. The review was never published, but Petrov criticized Krymsky at a meeting of the Academy, using the draft of the article as a basis for his speech. This speech played an important role in the process of discrediting Krymsky and removing him from the leadership of the Academy [28, p. 348-350].

After “studying the work” of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences by a special commission headed by Ozersky, whose activities were aimed at identifying shortcomings in the work of the Academy and its fur-

ther Sovietization, the Politburo of the Central Committee made radical decisions. It was acknowledged that the Academy had drifted away from “the life and needs of the Soviet republic” and that the presidium of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences had failed in fulfilling its duties. Therefore, it was considered necessary to immediately re-elect the presidium of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, headed by the president. The final loss of autonomy by the Academy occurred during the re-election of the Presidium. A. Krymsky was not confirmed as a permanent secretary, and Efremov, who was later repressed during the Union for the Freedom of Ukraine trial, also lost his positions. Hrushevsky, who later lost all his academic positions after a devastating campaign in the press, did not get a single managerial position [31, p. 38-41]. In 1928, the Bolshevik leadership managed to actually implement what was formally recorded in 1921, namely to make the Academy one of the state agencies. During the reorganization of the Academy in 1929 and 1930, the commissions and institutions headed by Hrushevsky and Krymsky underwent the greatest changes. Most of them were abolished or transferred to the leadership of Bolshevik-friendly scholars. According to Polonska-Vasylenko, in 1929–1930: “all scientific institutions of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences underwent changes that were initially made gradually, step by step, until the time of brutal destruction came” [29, p. 163]. V. Petrov also failed to escape persecution. When the Ethnographic Commission received an invitation to a congress of philologists in Prague in October, the People’s Commissariat of Education did not give its leader permission to travel. At the Union for the Freedom of Ukraine trial, S. Efremov, while confessing, mentioned V. Petrov among other members of the anti-Soviet circle. In 1930, the commission that purged the staff of the Academy of Sciences came to the conclusion that V. Petrov should be removed from the head of the Ethnographic Commission post for “political dislocations and distortions,” both in his work and in some materials of the commission. However, the verdict was somewhat mitigated due to the fact that V. Petrov admitted his mistakes and recently “showed civic activity.” It was decided to keep him in a non-managerial position as a researcher [2, p. 387]. Thus, by the end of the 1920s, virtually all members of the Ukrainian ethnological school formed during the previous decades had been deprived of the opportunity to conduct research and removed from administrative positions at the Academy of Sciences, or placed within the rigid framework of Marxist methodology, non-compliance with which meant destruction both professional and physical.

**Conclusions.** The 1920s period in Ukraine is often referred to as the era of national renaissance. Indeed, in the conditions of a liberalized, albeit dictatorial political regime and a rather moderate economic policy of the Kremlin, the creative potential of the Ukrainian people for the first time was able to unfold in many areas, including ethnography. The main centre of ethnological research in Ukraine during this period was the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, its departments and regional centers, as well as research departments

within higher educational institutions. The Soviet government, although perceiving scientists as a hostile social class, realized that the functioning and development of science was impossible without the work of specialists of the pre-revolutionary school. Therefore, despite numerous attempts to subordinate the Academy directly to the government and limiting contacts with foreign scholars and institutions, during 1920-1928 Ukrainian scientists managed to work in a relatively free atmosphere and bring Ukrainian ethnological science to a qualitatively new level of development. During the period under study, a large number of institutions and regional centres engaged in ethnographic research were established, a huge fund of ethnographic materials was collected, and numerous works devoted to theoretical and methodological approaches in ethnological research were published. As a result, instead of mainly descriptive and ethnographic works of the previous period, based on the classical positivist and evolutionary methodology, the new scientific works by Ukrainian authors were characterized by a high level of theoretical elaboration of the material and did not yield to the highest world standards. Along with the representatives of the old school during the 1920s, a whole generation of young researchers was formed around the institutions of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, among whom were both brilliant theorists and ethnographers-practitioners. Unfortunately, this period also included the process of strengthening the dictatorship of the Bolshevik government, the gradual strengthening of total control over the work and private life of scholars, and the formation of a system that would soon repress and destroy virtually the entire ethnographic school formed in the 1920s.

### References

1. Ahatanhel Krymsky. Essays on life and work / NAS of Ukraine; Institute of Oriental Studies named after A. Krymsky / O. Vasilyuk (ed.), E. Tsigankova (foreword). - Kyiv: Stilos Publishing House, 2006. - 563 p.
2. Andreev V. V. Petrov: career of the Ukrainian Soviet academic scientist and relations with the authorities (1920s - 1941) / V. Andreev // Historiographical research in Ukraine. - Kyiv: Institute of History of Ukraine, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 2012. - Issue. 22. - P. 681-712.
3. Borysenko V. Ahatanhel Krymsky as a folklorist and ethnographer / Valentina Borysenko // Folk art and ethnography. - Kyiv, 1991. - № 3. - P. 39-42.
4. Borysenko V. Essays on the history of Ukrainian ethnology of 1920-1930s / Center for Ukrainian Studies of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv / Valentyna Kyrylivna Borysenko. - Kyiv: Uniserv, 2002. - 94 p.
5. Borysenko V. From the history of Ukrainian ethnology // Ukrainian ethnology: Textbook / Ed. V. Borisenko. - Kyiv: Lybid, 2007. - P. 70-92.
6. Borysenko V. On the thorny field of Ukrainian ethnology: Kateryna Hrushevskaya, Nina Zaglada, Lidia Shulhyna, Yevhenia Spaska, Raisa Dankivska, Sofia Tereshchenko / Valentyna Kyrylivna Borysenko // Ukrainky v istorii / Ed. V.K. Borisenko. - Kyiv: Lybid, 2004. - P. 78-89.
7. Bukharin N. Economics of the transition period. - Moscow, 1920. - 157 p.
8. Chernyschuk N. (Krasnitska N.) Theoretical and methodological discussion in the Ukrainian ethnological periodicals of the second half of the 20s of the XX century. // Gileya: Scientific Bulletin. - 2012. - Issue 61. - P. 167-171.
9. Eighth Congress of the RCP (b). March 1919. Protocols. - M., 1959. - 602 p.
10. Gorlenko V., Kirchiv R. History of Ukrainian ethnography / Volodymyr Gorlenko, Roman Kirchiv. - Kyiv: PolihrafKonchaltinh, 2005. - 400 p.
11. Gurzhiy O., Parakhina M. Ethnological centers of Ukraine in the 20s-early 30s of the XX century: Essay of activity / NAS of Ukraine; Institute of History of Ukraine - Kyiv: Institute of History of Ukraine, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 2004. - 248 p.
12. History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. 1924-1928: Documents and materials / red. V. Kuchmarenko [etc.]; resp. O. Onishchenko [etc.]; NAS of Ukraine. National Library of Ukraine named after V. Vernadsky, Institute of Ukrainian Archaeography and Source Studies. MS Hrushevsky. - Kyiv, 1998. - 762 p.
13. Homotyuk O. Mykhailo Hrushevsky - architect of the science of Ukrainians / Oksana Homotyuk // Psychology and Society. - 2010. - № 2. - P. 26-52.
14. Hrushevskaya K. Two centers of ethnological science (From travel impressions) / Kateryna Hrushevskaya // Primitive citizenship and its remnants in Ukraine. - 1928. - Vip. 2-3. - P. 81-96.
15. Hrushevsky M. Revival of the French sociological school / Mykhailo Serhiyovych Hrushevsky // Primitive citizenship. - 1926. - № 1-2. - P. 113-117.
16. Hrymch M. Method, methodology and methodology in modern ethnological science / M. Grimych // Ethnic history of the peoples of Europe. 2006. - Issue 21. - P. 5-9.
17. Kasyanov G. Ukrainian intelligentsia of the 1920s - 30s: social portrait and historical destiny / Georgy Kasyanov. - Kyiv: K - Edmonton. : Globe, VIK, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1992. - 176 p.
18. Krasnitska N. M. Hrushevsky's contribution in the integration of Ukrainian ethnology into the European scientific space of the 1920s. / Natalia Krasnitskaya // Ethnic history of the peoples of Europe. - 2011. - №36. - p. 102-108.
19. Lenin V. Complete Works - Volume 36. - Moscow, 1974. - 741 p.
20. Lenin V. Complete Works - Volume 37. - Moscow, 1969. - 748 p.
21. Matyash I. "Pervisne Hromadyanstvo" - the first scientific ethnographic journal in Ukraine in the 1920s (on the materials of the archival fund) / Manuscript and book heritage of Ukraine: Archaeogr. research of unique arch. and libr. funds. - Kyiv, 1996. - Issue 3. - P. 213-220.
22. Matyash I. Kateryna Hrushevskaya: Life and activity / Iryna Borysivna Matyash. - K., Ukraine, 2004. - 240 p.



23. *Memories* / Tymoshenko S.; [ed. Afterword Pisarenko G.]. - Ed. 2nd. - Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1993. - 424 p.
24. Muzychenko S. Born with new life (About the Bulletin of the Ethnographic Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences) // *Folk art and ethnography*. - 1971. - № 5. - P. 39-41.
25. Muzychenko S. *Ethnographic Commission of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (1921-1933)* / C. Muzychenko // *Essays on the history of Ukrainian ethnology of the 1920-1930s* / Center for Ukrainian Studies of Kyiv National University. Taras Shevchenko / Valentyna Kyrylivna Borysenko. - Kyiv: Uniserv, 2002.
26. Parakhina M. *Activity of ethnological centers of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in the 1920s - early 1930s: dissertation of Cand. ist. Sciences: 07.00.05* / Maria Bogdanovna Parakhina // *Kyiv National Taras Shevchenko University*. - K., 2003. - 209p.
27. Parakhina M. *The contribution of scientific societies at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences to the development of ethnological research in the 1920s and early 1930s*. / *Ukrainskiy Istorychnyi Zhurnal*. - 2002. - № 6. - p. 32-41.
28. Pavlychko S. *Orientalism, sexuality, nationalism. The complex world of Agatangel Krymsky* / Solomiya Pavlychko. - Kyiv: Osnovy Publishing House, 2016. - 398 p.
29. Polonska-Vasylenko N. *Ukrainian Academy of Sciences: Essays on History* / N. Polonska-Vasylenko. - K.: Naukova Dumka, 1993. - 416 p.
30. *Repressed regional studies (20-30s)* / Institute of History of Ukraine; All-Ukrainian Union of Local Historians; Ministry of Culture of Ukraine. - K.: Ridnyi Krai, 1991. - 478 p.
31. *Society and authorities in Soviet Ukraine during NEP (1921–1928)*. Collective monograph. - Volume 2 / Main. ed. S. Kulchytsky; Author Col.: L. Hrynevych, T. Evseeva, G. Yefimenko and others. NAS of Ukraine. Institute of History of Ukraine. - Kyiv: Institute of History of Ukraine, 2015. - 599 p.
32. *Ukrainian ethnology in the European context (second half of the XIX century - 20s of the XX century)* / Kapelyushny V., Kazakevich G., Chernyschuk N. - Vinnytsia: [Nilan-LTD], 2013. - 209p.