

## **Methodological Reorientation of Historians as Decommunisation of the Ukrainian Historiography**

**Yaroslav Kalakura\***

(ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9007-4991)

**Makale G6nderim Tarihi**  
20.11.2019

**Makale Kabul Tarihi**  
18.12.2019

### **Abstract**

The 30th Anniversary is approaching since the Soviet Union has collapsed, and an independent Ukraine has been restated, which has become a turning event in the development of the Ukrainian historical science too. A complicated and contradictory process is going on aimed at cleaning that science from the ideological clichés and layers related to its communist past, from the stereotypes of the Marxist methodology, falsifications and misinterpretations, while the historical truth is being restated, and the integration of the Ukrainian Historiography into the European and world scope is expanding. In this context a special significance should be paid to the thorough understanding of the process of the methodological reorientation of the post-Soviet historians, to the generalization of the experience in the formation of a new generation of scholars as of priority performers of a decolonisation, desovietisation and decommunisation of the historical science, and to the irradiation of remnants of the Soviet mentality. Grounds for the new phase of this process that was started yet in the 1990s, were provided by the Revolution of Dignity, European choice of the Ukrainian people, adoption of decommunisation laws, widening the access to archives, publication of some documents of the repressive bodies of the totalitarian regimes. Decommunisation, like derussianisation and domination of the Ukrainian centrism in Historiography, is focused on restatement of the truth, maintenance of a new paradigm in the history of Ukraine's subjectivity, as well as its state personality and integrity. Especially important it is in the context of the annexation by Putin's regime of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, of supporting the separatists forces on the occupied area of Donbas and the unleashed occupying and terroristic hybrid war, within the frames of which the central place was taken by "a war of histories", endeavors of the aggressor to impose on the society the Russian

---

\* Doctor of Historic Sciences, Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Archives And Special Historical Subjects Department, Kyiv, Ukraine, kalajar@ukr.net.

interpretation of the History of Ukraine, the concept of a common history and the paradigm of “the Russian world”.

The purpose of the paper is, while taking in consideration the available and imposed studies relating to the above formulated problem<sup>1</sup>, including also the author’s publications<sup>2</sup>, to clarify the point of the methodological reorientation of historians as the principal precondition and a constituent of decommunisation and derussianisation of the Ukrainian Historiography, to overcome the dangerous consequences of the imposition in that of the Marxist methodology, interpretation of history from the party- and class based positions, the great-power chauvinistic treatment of historic events, to clean the historical science from the communist and Soviet falsifications and misinterpretations, to trace the mutual dependence of the modernisation of the methodological instruments of the Ukrainian historians for their mastering the up-to-date civilizational theory, and also to put forward a few proposals, so as to make more active the decommunisation processes.

**Keywords:** Ukraine, historiography, decommunisation, derussianization.

### **Ukrayna Tarihçiliğinin Komünizmden Arınması ve Tarihçilerin Metodolojik Olarak Yeniden Yapılanması**

#### **Özet**

Sovyetler Birliği'nin çöküşünün neredeyse 30. yıldönümü yaklaşırken, Ukrayna tarih biliminin gelişiminde de önemli bir olay haline gelen bağımsız bir Ukrayna Devleti yeniden yapılanmaktadır. Ukrayna tarihçiliği Avrupa'ya entegre olup ve dünyaya yayılıp tarihsel gerçeği yeniden ifade ederken, bu bilimi komünist geçmişiyile ilgili ideolojik klişelerden ve katmanlardan, Marksist metodolojinin stereotiplerinden, yanlışlıklardan ve yanlış yorumlardan temizlemek için karmaşık ve çelişkili bir süreç de devam ediyor. Bu bağlamda,

<sup>1</sup> *Колесник І.* Інститут історії України – нове українське відродження. – Київ : Інститут історії України, 2016. – 273 с. – (*Kolesnyk I.* Instytut istoriyi Ukrainy – nove ukraïns'ke vidrozhennia. – Kyïv : Instytut istoriyi Ukrainy, 2016. – 273 s. (*Ukr*) – (*Kolesnyk I.* The Institute of the History of Ukraine: a new Ukrainian restoration. – Kyïv : Institute of the History of Ukraine, 2016. – 273 pp. (*Eng*).

<sup>2</sup> *Калакура Я.* Комплекс «совковості» пострадянської історіографії // Україна-Європа Світ. Збірник наукових праць. Вип. 17. – Тернопіль, 2016. – С. 163–174. – (*Kalakura Ya.* Kompleks “sovkovosti” post-radïans'koyi istoriohrafii // Ukrayina-Yevropa Svit. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats', Vyp. 17. – Ternopil', 2016. – s. 163–174. (*Ukr*) – (*Kalakura Ya.* The “sovieticism” in the post-Soviet Historiography // Ukrayina-Yevropa Svit. Collection of scientific papers. Issue 17. – Ternopil', 2016. – pp. 163–174 (*Eng*).

Sovyet sonrası tarihçilerin metodolojik olarak yeniden yapılandırılması sürecinin kapsamlı bir şekilde anlaşılması için, bir sömürgecilikten ayrışmanın öncelikli uygulayıcıları olarak yeni bir alim neslinin oluşmasındaki deneyimin genelleştirilmesinde tarih bilimine ve Sovyet zihniyetinin kalıntılarının temizlenmesine özel bir önem verilmelidir. Henüz 1990'larda başlatılmış olan bu sürecin yeni aşamasının gerekçeleri, itibar devrimi, Ukrayna halkının Avrupa seçimi, demokratikleşme yasalarının kabul edilmesi, arşivlere erişimin genişletilmesi totaliter rejimlerin baskıcı kuruluşlarının bazı belgelerinin yayınlanmasıyla sağlandı.

Tarihçilikteki Ukrayna merkeziliğinin egemenliği ve komünizmden uzaklaşmak gibi demokratikleşme gerçeğinin yeniden ifade edilmesi, Ukrayna'nın özneliği tarihinde yeni bir paradigmanın sürdürülmesinin, devlet kişiliğinin ve bütünlüğünün üzerinde durmaktadır. Özellikle önemli olan, Putin'in Kırım Özerk Cumhuriyeti'nin rejiminin ilhak etmesinde, Donbas'ın işgal altındaki bölgesi ve merkezi yerin ele geçiren vekalet savaşı yapan teröristlerin desteklemesi bağlamında ortak bir tarih algıysa Ukrayna tarihini de bir savaşla ele geçirerek, Ukrayna tarihinde Rus yorumunu ve Rus dünyasının paradigmasını empoze etme çabasıdır. Bu makalenin amacı, yazarların diğer yayınlarını da göz önüne alarak, Ukrayna Tarihçiliğinin, tarihçilerin temel önkoşul olarak metodolojik bakımdan yeniden yapılanmasını demokratikleşmesini ve Komünizmden uzaklaşması konularını açığa kavuştururken bir kurucu pozisyonda olmaktır. Ayrıca yukarıda zikredilen hususlara ek olarak Marksist metodolojideki dayatmanın tehlikeli sonuçlarının üstesinden gelmek, tarihin parti ve sınıf temelli konulardan yorumlanması, tarihî olayların üstün iktidar şovenist muamelesi, tarih bilimini komünist ve Sovyet sahtekarlıklarından ve yanlış yorumlarından temizlemek, Ukraynalı tarihçilerin metodolojik araçlarının modernleşmesinin güncel uygarlık teorisine hakim olmaları konusundaki karşılıklı bağımlılıklarını takip etmek ve ayrıca demokratikleşme sürecini daha aktif hale getirmek için birkaç öneride bulunmak çalışmanın ana hedefleri arasındadır.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Ukrayna, Tarihçilik, Demokratikleşme, Komünizmden Uzaklaşma

## **1. Ruining consequences of the imposition of the Marxist methodology and communisation of history**

Before beginning to analyse the interaction between the methodological reorientation of historians and the decommunication of the Ukrainian Historiography, we think it reasonable to remind, at least

schematically, the way, in which the imposition of the Marxist methodology of history and the colonisation of that one was going on, as well as what consequences those left as an inheritance to historians and society. The term “communisation” was invented by Lenin, and it was associated with the Russia’s type sovietisation (setting up the power of Soviets) on the territory of the Russian Empire, Ukraine including, or, in other words, with taking, expansion and usurpation of the power by the Bolsheviks, with providing the monopoly of the Communist Party and the maintenance of a total control in the political, economic, military, diplomatic, cultural, intellectual and other spheres of the state. That meant a planned, purposeful and forced expansion of the communist dictatorship and the Marxist ideology, restriction of human rights of the people of the intellectual work, removal of relief of the freedom of the creative activities<sup>3</sup>. Decommunisation of the Ukrainian historical studies began after the Bolsheviks occupation of Ukraine in 1919–1920, with the Russia’s type sovietisation of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, formation of special pro-Marxist scientific institutions, imposition of dogmatism, destruction of M.Hrushevskiy’s scholar school, with the marginalisation of Ukraine’s history and its reorientation according to the Cremlin’s principles and styles. What did it mean in fact? From the time of Lenin, and still more evidently from the time of Stalin’s epoch, the Soviet Communist-Party regime was steadily focused its course on centralisation and regulation of activities of historic institutions and their scientific staffs. Ukrainian historians had to be engaged in a certain diplomatic, sometimes even in a double game with the state authorities, demonstrate their loyalty to the authorities at power, to flirt from time to time with those ones, so as to find a way to the self-actualisation and to somehow be on the scientific platform. O. Ohloblyn noted, that the Ukrainian historian “was between two fires”: the ideological and the nationally political ones.

---

<sup>3</sup> Орлов И.Б. Историк сталинской эпохи на «фронте исторической науки» // Харківський історіографічний збірник: Випуск.11. – Харків : ХНУ ім. В.Каразіна, 2012. – С. 117-130. – (*Orlov I.B. Istorik stalinskoi epokhi na “fronte istoricheskoy nauki” // Harkivskiy istoriografichnyi zbirnyk, vyp. 11. – Harkiv : KhNU im. V. Karazina, 2012. – s. 117-130 (Rus).* – (*Orlov I.B. A Historian of the Stalin epoch on “the front of the historical studies” // “Kharkivsky Historiographic Collection, issue 11. – Kharkiv: V. Karazin KhNU, 2012. – pp. 117–130 (Eng).*

The Ukrainian historian had to continuously observe an official historic scheme and use an obligatory compelled and unified terminology<sup>4</sup>.

The Russia's type soviet concept of history functioned as a religion and was aggressive in nature in regard of any other, especially of a non-Russia's interpretation of historical events and important historic persons. The totalitarian regime made legal the official versions of history, due to which, for instance, the Ukrainians together with the Belorussians were referred to as a common historical community "the Russia's people" as the direct legatee of "the people of the Old Rus" living at the time of Kyiv State; on the other hand, inclusion of Ukraine to Russia after the Treaty of Pereyaslav, as well as the formation of the USSR, was considered as the actualization of "a long-time dream of the Ukrainians" that happened due to their own will and occurred for Ukraine to become "a good benefit" for Ukraine.

The Bolsheviks, being guided by the formational approach and the part-classic interpretation of the historic process, considered history as an important and efficient tool for an ideological influence on the society and manipulation of its mentality, while historians were supposed to be "warriors of the ideological front". They nationalised not only the factories, plants, land, but also the history, imposed a full control of the historic writing compelling the historians to observe a set up canon, when serving the Government and justifying its policy. Both the personality of the historian, and his creative work happened to get under a strict supervision of the totalitarian regime<sup>5</sup>. The historians who did not accept the Communist Party's line and its official historic canons suffered from repressions and prosecutions.

Communisation of the historic studies and their methodology was forced by nature and totalitarian, beginning from an artificial

---

<sup>4</sup> *Оглоблин О.* Думки про сучасну українську советську історіографію. – Нью-Йорк, 1963. – С. 57-59. — (*Ohloblyn O.* Dumky pro suchasnu ukrayins'ku istoriografiyu. – Nyu-York, 1963. – s. 57–59 (*Ukr*). (*Ohloblyn O.* Thoughts about the modern Ukrainian Russia's type Soviet historiography. – New-York, 1963. – pp. 57–59 (*Eng*).

<sup>5</sup> *Історик і влада / Відповідальний редактор В.Смолій.* – Київ : Інститут історії України, 2015. 543 с. – (*Istoryk i vlada / Vidpovidal'nyi redactor V. Smoliy.* – Kyiviv : Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny, 2015. – 543 s. (*Ukr*). – (A historian and power / Editor-in-charge V. Smoliy. – Kyiv : Institute of the History of Ukraine, 2015. – 543 pp. (*Eng*).

adjustment of the traditional historiography to the language of the vulgar Marxism, it was continued by applying to that of the status of “the ideological weaponry” in the struggle for socialism, as well as that of the methodological monism, “party-” and “class”-related principles, presenting all that as needs of objectivity and scientificity, absolutisation of the formational approach to a historical process, orientation not on the historical truth, but on ‘a revolutionary reason’. Especially negative effect on the historic studies was made by their stalinisation, that was implemented on a base of that Leader’s letter “About some points in the History of Bolshevism” to the editorial house of the magazine “The Proletarian Revolution” (1931), canonisation of “A Brief Course of the History of the VCP (B)”, pogroms of the traditions of the widely previously recognized scientific schools. An unimprovable harm to the historical studies as a science, to its moral and ethical foundations was made by the policy of a total and forced atheisation of the society. All that got also reflected on the situation of the historic studies as a science in Ukraine, which happened to get viced by a real totalitarian mechanism<sup>6</sup>.

Scientific studies delivered the idea of the priority importance of the methodology and source-based studies of the CPSU-documents, which were to be considered like “criteria for checking the ideological directivity and authenticity of the other sources”. That accounts for why a communisation constituent, that covered all the parts of the historic studies as a science, was obligatory citations of the Marxism-Leninism “classical leaders”, Communist party documents, which turned in a ritual<sup>7</sup>, and concerned even archeology, ancient history, medieval

---

<sup>6</sup> У лещатах тоталітаризму: перше двадцятиріччя Інституту історії НАН України (1936–1956 рр.) 36. документів і матеріалів у 2 част. - Ч. I. – Київ, 1996. 146 с. – (U leschatah totalitaryzmu: pershe dvadtsiatyrichchia Instytutu istoriyi NAN Ukrayiny (1936–1956) Zbirnyk dokumentiv i materualiv u 2-h chastynah. – Chast. I. – Kyiv, 1996. 146 s. (Ukr). – (In the vice of totalitarianism: the first 20th anniversary of the Institute of the History within the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (1936–1956). A collection of documents and materials in 2 parts. – Part 1. – Kyiv, 1996. 146 pp. (Eng).

<sup>7</sup> Сидорова Л.А. Руководящая цитата в советской историографии середины XX века / Любовь Сидорова // История и историки: историографический вестник, 2006. – Москва, 2007. – С. 135–171. – (Sidorova L.A. Rukovodiaschaya tsitata v sovetskoj istoriografiiy serediny XX veka / Liubov' Sidorova // Istoriya i istoriki: istoriograficheskiy

historical studies. That practice was carried out under the motto of the standardisation and “unavoidable sticking to the party- and class-based principles” as the highest form of objectivity, maintenance of a some kind of “the culture of the party-based principle”, which meant a uncompromising struggle of “the proletarian’ Russia’s type Soviet historiography against “the bourgeois one”, subordination and inspection of the views of a scholar in regard of an event in history according the criteria and stereotypes having been approved by the official government.

In fact, communisation of history resulted in stopping that one to be a science in the classical meaning of this word, while it acquired signs of an obedient servant of the regime and interpreter of the corresponding policy. The most negative consequences of the decommunisation of the historic studies as a science in Ukraine, which, due to L. Zashkilniak, was under a special control and pressure of the communist ideology and of the socio-economic determinism<sup>8</sup>, are associated with its deukrainisation, displacement of the Ukrainian language from the spheres of science, education and historic writing, and with erosion of everything related to the national awareness and national patriotism. It took seventy years of a total control of the historic science with Communist Party’s guiding methods, a kind of “a selection” by the regime of the pool, to form a special type of “the Russia’s type Soviet historian”<sup>9</sup>, who already was unable to live and work without

---

vestnik, 2006. – Moskva, 2007. – s. 135–171 (Rus). – (Sidorova L.A. The governing citation in the Soviet Historiography in the middle of the 20th century / Liubov Sidorova // History and historians: a Historiographic Bulletin, 2006. – Moscow, 2007. – pp. 135–171 (Eng).

<sup>8</sup> Зашкільняк Л.О. Замітки про сучасну українську історіографію // Україна ХХ століття: культура, ідеологія, політика. – №15. – Київ, 2009. – С. 13–29. – (Zashkil’niak L.O. Zamitky pro suchasnu ukrayins’ku istoriohrafiyu // Ukrayina XX stolittia: kultura, ideolohiya, polityka – №15. – Kyiv, 2009. – s. 13–29 (Ukr). – (Zashkilniak L.O. Notes about the modern Ukrainian Historiography // Ukraine of the 20th century: the culture, ideology, politics. – # 15. – Kyiv, 2009. – pp. 13–29 (Eng).

<sup>6</sup> Советская историография / Ред. Ю. Н. Афанасьев. – М. : РГГУ, 1996. – С. 37–38; Калакура Я. Образ українського радянського історика в контексті інтроспекції // Ейдос. – Вип.8. – Київ : Інститут історії України, 2015. – С. 41–53. – (Sovetskaya istoriografiya / Red. Yu.N. Afanasyev. – Moskva : RGGU, 1996. – s. 37–38 (Rus); Kalakura Ya. Obraz ukrayins’koho radians’koho istoryka v kontexti introspektsiyi // Eidos – Vyp. 8. – Kyiv : Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny, 2015. – s. 41– 53 (Ukr). – (Soviet Historiography /

instructions from the Communist Party, and was only waiting the next resolutions of a Party congress, plenary meeting, speech of the leader as his guidance signs. Some historians got degrading not only intellectually, but also morally, and they were engaged in submitting reports to the authorities about one another, false accusations, instigations, labeling one another, etc., in devaluation of the intellectual creative work<sup>10</sup>. The Ukrainian Soviet Historiography, being under such conditions and isolated from the global historic science and contacts with the diaspora historians, were doomed to become provincial and to marginalisation.

## **2. A contradictory character of a gap between the post-soviet historians and the monism of the Marxist methodology**

It has been noted, during the totalitarianism years a delicate system of communisation of the history and historians was formed which was prescribed from the upper authority levels: a) a unified methodology and ideological and political foundations of making studies; b) a requested themes of studies; c) an obligatory criticism of ‘the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists’; d) a severe censorship and reviewing (closed and public) of works at the stage of making a manuscript, typesetting and publication; e) a centralised system of organisation of the training of professional historians according to unified programs and on a base of severe individual selection of students due to their political qualities.

Nevertheless, the medium of the Russia’s type Soviet historians was not a homogeneous. It obviously consisted of a few groups: a) the so called “Russia’s type Soviet and Communist Party’s historians” –

---

Ed. Yu. N. Afanasyev – Moskva : RGGU, 1996. – s. 37–38 (*Rus*); Kalakura Ya. The image of the Ukrainian Soviet historian in the context of introspection // *Eidos*. – Issue 8. – Kyiv : Institute of History of Ukraine, 2015. – pp. 41–53 (*Eng*).

<sup>10</sup> Савенок Л. Вчений-історик і суспільство в УСРР часів непу: характер і наслідки взаємодії // *Проблеми історії України: факти, судження, пошуки*. – Київ, 2007. – №7. – С. 293–294). – (*Savenok L. Vchenyi-istoryk i suspil'stvo v UkrRSR chasiv nepu: harakter i naslidky vzayemodiyi // Problemy istoriyi Ukrayiny: fakty, sudzhennia, poshuky*. – Kyiv, 2007. – №7. – s. 293–294 (*Ukr*). – (*Savenok L. A scholar-historian and the society in the UkrRSR in the times of the New Economic Policy: the character and consequences of the interaction // Problems of the History of Ukraine: the facts, speculations, searches*. – Kyiv, 2007. – #7. – pp. 293–294 (*Eng*).



incorrigible dogmatics, Stalinists and Orthodoxes who served the regime very thoroughly, steadily, and were sometimes slaves to the Communist Party's conventions and instructions and distributed false ideas and stereotypes (among the people such representatives were called "Doctors of Falsification Sciences"); b) the Conformists who, for the sake of the market conditions or passively, accepted the existing them standards of the History description, mainly getting themselves fit to the conditions, were pressed and did not demonstrate their own positions; c) the Non-Conformists who, at the background of Khrushchov's "thawing" and "creatively", if not critically, agreed on the Communist Party's directives and accepted some differences in comparison with the traditional canonicity; d) the National Communists, who tried to interpret events and facts from the positions of the Communistic ideology with the national countenance and Ukrainian autonomism e) the masked oppositionists, who wrote "for keeping writings in drawers"; f) the dissident historians who were prosecuted severely<sup>11</sup>.

Representatives of each of the said groups differently reacted to breaking from the Marxist methodology and decommunisation of history, impacted by the Ukraine's sovereignisation and independent statehood at the background of the collapse of the USSR. It might seem surprising though, all that was started by the people, who was not aware well enough, or by inertia, was connected with the communisation of history. As if compensating for the conformism guiltiness, many historians of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet Union of the Soviet Republics (Yu. Horban, O. Horbul, S. Klapchuk, V. Kolesnyk, B. Koroliiov, S. Kulchytskyi, I. Kuras, V. Kurylo, H. Maryskevych, V. Ostafiychuk, V. Serhiychuk, A. Sliusarenko, V. Tantsiura, M. Panchuk, Ye. Pankiv, R. Pyrih, P. Fedorchak, V. Shevchuk, V. Khomenko, A. Chernenko, Yu. Shapoval and others) undertook the important mission of providing a transfer to studying the History of Ukraine, its teaching, organisation of corresponding training and

---

<sup>11</sup> Яремчук В. Минуле України в історичній науці УРСР післясталінської доби. – Острог, 2009. – С. 124. – (*Yaremchuk V. Mynule Ukrainy v istorychniy nauksi UkrRSR pislatalins'koyi doby.* – Ostroh, 2009. – s. 124 (*Ukr*). – (*Yaremchuk V. The part of Ukraine in the historic science of the UkrRSR in the post-Stalin period.* – Ostroh, 2009. – p. 124 (*Eng*).

methodical complexes and manual books, as well as training a young generation of ideologically-free historians without complexes<sup>12</sup>.

In Historiography, in the decommunisation process that coincided with a step-by-step involvement of Ukrainian historians to achievements of the Western Historiography, including the one of the Ukrainian Diaspora, while the post-Modernistic philosophy and pluralistic thinking was spreading, we can single out at least **three conventional periods**: **Period 1** – a transition from the Soviet paradigm to the post-Soviet one (the end of the 1980s – the middle of the 1990s) – a departure from the Soviet paradigm in the history of Ukraine and of the world, searching a new interpretation, a beginning of reforming the historic institutions and historic education, as well as the methodological reorientation of historians, provision of a new generation of a teaching literature on History; **Period 2** – a revival of the national traditions in the Ukrainian Historiography, its spiritual commonality, searching new historic concepts, cardinal changes in the thematic studies, formation of a new generation of Ukrainian historians (between the second half of the 1990s and 2015). The EuroMaidan and the Revolution of Dignity happened to be the beginning of **Period 3, the current period** of the decommunisation of Historiography accelerated by the pulse from the decommunisation laws passed by the Verkhovna Rada in 2015. The basic feature about this period is maintenance of the History of Ukraine and formation of its statehood, that are scientific in nature, civilisational methodologically and national in relation of their trends. Each of these periods can be characterised by both a progress, and by mistakes accounted for by the objective-subjective reasons, various problems and challenges, internal crisis phenomena and external factors, particularly by a strong counteraction of the national-democratic and conservative-prorussian forces.

Anyway, some historians inherited from the Russia's type Soviet period a kind of a **"communisation syndrome"**, that is a methodological

---

<sup>12</sup> *Калакура Я.* Українська історіографія: курс лекцій. Видання друге, доповнене. – Київ : Генеза, 2012. – С. 516–517. — (*Kalakura Ya.* Ukrayins'ka istoriohrafiiya: kurs lektsiy. Vydannia druhe, dopovnene. – Kyiv : Heneza, 2012. – pp. 516–517( (*Ukr*). *Kalakura Ya.* The Ukrainian Historiography: a course of lectures. Second issue, added. – Kyiv : Heneza, 2012. – pp. 516–517 (*Eng*).

collaboration, a conservative thinking and non-acceptance of a new, chronic dissatisfaction with the modern life, an enigmatic attitude to mother ideological theories, for instance, to the ideology of nationalism, religion, western values. What are the most typical **symptoms** of the communisation syndrome of historians nowadays? It is infantilism of some historians, their obedience and orientation at directive from the upper authorities, their ideological obsession with and relentless focusing, othodoxality and dogmatic thinking, the Russia-centrism, a citation-illustrative history-writing, an arbitral attitude to sources, unavailability of an own point of view, non-acceptance of pluralistic views, toadyism to the power authorities or separate political parties, representation of Ukraine's History in the context of the History of the USSR and separation from the global historical process. The transitional period from the Soviet totalitarianism to the transformation of the Ukrainian society on the foundations of democracy and Euro-integration manifested, that the communisation syndrome is transitional by nature. This transitivity most evidently can be seen as a discerned consciousness of some modern historians, in the styles of their intellectual thinking and studying practices, in tries to artificially narrow 'the historian's sphere'. It is not a secret, that some historians with a deformed consciousness still keep sticking to the Marxist methodology, to glorification of the Russia's type soviet reality, and many of those, having got the freedom of creative work, failed to take the advantage of that, and somebody got lost in the methodological and worldview orientation points. This syndrome continues to be an impediment of the decommunisation of Historiography, which, in its own turn, actualises the needs for **improving the methodology** of the negative consequences of the past.

### **3. The basis of the new methodology as a foundation for decommunisation of the Ukrainian Historiography**

Decommunisation objectively dictates needs for not only refusing the old methodology, but also for a profound mastering the new methodology, and namely the following: a) taking in account the anthropologic, socio-cultural, linguistic turns of the historic science, renewal of the historic semantics that underwent significant effects of

the Marxist and Russia's type soviet dogmas, filling the inherited notions, principles and terms with a modern content, adaptation of the terminology to the national cultural traditions of the Ukrainian people, to its speech practise; b) reformation of the historic didactics; c) a change in the problematics of the historical narrative, diversification of the metanarratives.

Historians started to put in practice the recommendations in regard of renaming inhabited settlements, streets, to work out criteria of demolishing the monuments which were symbols of the Communist regime. The anthropologic field of the Ukrainian History is getting cleaned from glorification of persons, involved in the destruction of Ukraine, in repressions, famine-genocides replacing their names with names of fighters for the Ukrainian independence. The history decommunisation became really possible resulting from a methodological reorientation of historians, consistent mastering the civilizational and synergetic approaches, observation **of the basic principles of the historic cognizance: historicism, systematicity, objectivity, comprehensiveness, consecution and others**. A special importance was got by the **principle of scientific refutation** of falsifications and misrepresentations, breaking from the historical truth. Implementation of these and new other orientation types used in historic studies as a science was accompanied by the involvement of a set of scientific methods, primarily the ones of historiographic analysis and synthesis, the systematically structural one, the method of logics, the history-comparative method, the historic situational one, the retrospective method, etc. However, this process proceeded not gradually, contradictively and slowly. In the historic sphere of Ukraine the complex of the colonial thinking was kept by inertia: conclusions of historians from Moscow or St. Petersburg were taken as patterns, though nobody there even did not think to begin the decommunisation, nothing to say about the deimperialisation of History, what the Ukrainian Historiography was traditionally suffering from. Many people did not understand that decommunisation is a way to stop the ideological and cultural expansion, which, within the frames of the imposition of the paradigm of 'the Russia's type world', produced preconditions for the intellectual and spiritual intervention and also prepared basis for a military occupation.

Separatist anti-Ukrainian forces acted in the interests of Russia in the Crimea, on Donbas and in some other regions, where for about twenty years the Communistic syndrome had been steadily supported with the help of the Ukrainian fobians, the Soviet stereotypes had been conserved, the Communistic symbols had been demonstratively used including portraits of Stalin. A lot of teachers of the History of Ukraine zombified by the Communist propaganda and touched by the nostalgia of the past times, were still acting due to the Russian scenarios, denying the facts of the Bolshevics' occupation of Ukraine, of famine-genocides, mass repressions, ruinous consequences of the Ethnocide and total Russification, while hushing the scopes of the Ukrainian national liberation and oppositional movements. Experience showed, that where the communisation syndrome managed to make the largest routes, and where the Russia's type soviet cliches and monuments "got frozen and preserved", later the Russian occupational troops came.

Unlike the decommunisation of the historic studies as a science, which was taking place dynamically and purposefully under the organizational and ideological administration of the ruling Communist Party with the participation of all the state institutions, including also the repressive bodies, and that in relation of all basic parameters lasted a decade, the decommunication took place slowly, in some places spontaneously, while some governmental institutions, especially at the locations, braked this process in any possible way, or even prevented that one. The decommunisation practice demonstrated rather different rates and depth of changes in different regions of Ukraine. It was developed more dynamically in the western and central oblasts, while it took place very slowly, and often even merely only formally, in the east and south of Ukraine, where still nowadays any subdivision of the historical area of Ukraine is considered as enemy's and bourgeois nationalistic actions.

During the Presidency of L. Kuchma, and still more under the President V. Yanukovich, there could be heard, that, as if it were not the time to deal with history; at first, the economic situation must be improved, and only then the order for bettering the education and culture was to come. As initially there was a Word, an idea, the belief in God, consciousness, the love of the Motherland. The deficit of the

attention from the state to the activities of historic institutions, manifestations in the discrimination in the reward for the work of historians, commercialisation of the publishing activity, tries to converse history into goods, while doing that with historians – into craftsmen who work on request, can exist even nowadays. There is also present deprofessionalisation of some employees in the sphere of the historic community, underestimation of the data from sources, ignoring identification of their authenticity, facts of the mechanical borrowing of doubtful information from other sources, misuse of the information obtained from sources available on the Internet and in social network. A typical disadvantage of the post-Soviet Russia's type Historiography is ***the thematic crisis*** as an element of stagnation phenomena in the Ukrainian historic studies as a science<sup>13</sup>. What is its point? Besides a number of new and actual themes we can see quite a lot of artificially actualised small problems and secondary individuals, reformed into ideological cliches. In the Russia's type Soviet time themes of the dissertational studies were formulated by the upper power authorities and centrally coordinated, then at the present time there is a lot of blind impulse and self-influence, and the said titles are mainly initiated and produced by either post-graduate students, or by their academic supervisors without a wide discussion, appropriate approbation of the academic significance of the studies and their expected outcomes.

The communisation syndrome left deep traces also in the system of the professional historic science, training of historians, including the specialists with university degrees. At the present time this communisation is concentrated in more than 40 institutions of college and university education, particularly in the leading national universities with a classical past: in Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv, Odesa, Chernivtsi. An essential contribution in this field was made by universities of Dniepro, Zaporizhia, Cherkasy, Chernihiv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Lutsk, Poltava and others. Unfortunately, even that one has remained in many points the Russian-type Soviet one with the typical severe standardisation and

---

<sup>13</sup> Головки В.В. Історіографія кризи історичної науки. Український аспект. – Київ: Інститут історії України, 2003. 228 с. – (*Holovko V.V. Istoriohrafiya kryzy istorichnoyi nauki. Ukrayins'kyi aspekt. – Kyiv : Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny, 2003. – 228 s. (Ukr).* – (*Holovko V.V. Historiography of a crisis in the Historic Science. The Ukrainian aspect. – Kyiv : The Institute of the History of Ukraine, 2003. – 228 pp. (Eng).*

reglamentation, that cannot be reformed quickly. There is remaining insufficient the methodological, historysofical, historygraphical, sources-studies and professionally historical training of future historians, lack of the critical thinking, narrow specialisation and individualisation of the Master's and Post-Graduate's study programmes. In spite of a notional renewal of the modern staff of historians (the majority of which are people that began to get professionally formed or were born in the time of Gorbachev's Perestroika and of the restoration of Ukraine's independence), the methods and style of the history writing differs slightly from the Soviet patterns. The communisation syndrome is associated with a kind of thinking of separate historians – the so called Russia's type Soviet consciousness, which is manifested as a fanatic belief in the Soviet ideological myths, in a slave mentality, populist rhetoric, aggression and maximalism. The Russia's type Soviet mentality exists on the foundations of the past, and it hates modern innovations, it supports a strong power and is an enemy of democracy and of western values. For people of that kind of mentality it is typical the same type of thinking, the Russia's type Soviet intelligence, a double morality, fright of the personal responsibility, abstract senses of justice and social equality, intolerance to the position of other people, expectation of custodianship from the state.

### **Conclusions and recommendations**

Hence, the methodological re-armament of historians and the decommunisation of the Ukrainian Historiography is a complicated, long-lasting, mutually conditioned, and in something a contradictive, but legal and objective process connected with the transformation of the Ukrainian society, its democratic and Euro-integrational choice. It is accompanied with mastering the methodology of the civilisational understanding of the historic development, involvement of historians in the work experience of western scientific schools, clearance of the historic science from ideological layers accumulations, falsifications and misinterpretations inherited from the totalitarian past. Historians are supposed to perceive and help the society to comprehend, that the Communist ideology, the Soviet historic science was pierced with, it is a

large evil that deformed the mentality of a few generations of Ukrainians. Its recurrences and syndrome kept affecting the society reformation processes and holding back on the Euro-integrational processes. Decommunisation is a warning for those, whose mentality is within the limits of the old ideology and old philosophic thinking. However, the interpretation of the notion “decommunisation” itself is still narrow, as it is also its legal base, consideration of its purpose as only expansion of the access to archives of the criminal and repressive organs, demolishing of monuments and renaming streets, which were named after Communist fringe figures. Instead, the priority direction of decommunisation actions – a change in the social and historic mentality – remains insufficiently active and efficient, though that can be successful providing a new policy of the historic memory and clearance of the historic science from the mythologemes of the totalitarian period.

Unfortunately, quite a lot of symptoms of the decommunisation syndrome, for example the myth of “the priority of ideology and policy over scientificity”, a habit to consider “the political reasonability superior to the historical truth”, etc., are still circulating in the modern practise of bce history writing. In this relation there should be supported works of scholars aimed at revealing crimes of the Communist regime, at ruining and denial of the Russia’s type soviet stereotypes and myths, at proving the futility of tries of their supporters to represent the failure of Communism as a fatal “distortion” of its idea, or a s a result of “undermining activity of the West”. The nostalgia of the “Russia’s type soviet project” is supported in any possible way by ideologists of the ‘Russia’s type world” and their servants in Ukraine. That is why it is necessary, on one hand, to improve the methodological maturity of the Ukrainian historians, to apply more actively the foreign experience of the other countries, for instance, that of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovakia, Czechia and others, which got rid of the communistic rudiments faster, and, on the other hand, to study more profoundly the decommunisation processes in an own medium: in academic and university communities, in archival and museum institutions, in the educational work among the population. A problem of many modern Ukrainian historians, including the ones from the new generation, is the worldviewing uncertainty and conflict of a few methodologies, in their



“floating” between the remnants of the Russia’s type soviet norming and the post-modernists approaches to history writing.

The creative contacts of the Ukrainian historians with their western colleagues are still episodic, innovational academic technologies are introduced too slowly, foreign grants are used weakly, only separate individuals take part in international projects.

Modernisation is needed of the state policy of the memory, in which the priority place should be taken by the domination of the new paradigm of the Ukrainian History on a base of the civilisational approach, and a further overcoming of remnants of the Communist understanding of the historic process. This work, besides the Ukrainian Institute of the National Memory, there must be joined by academic institutions and educational universities, institutions of the civil society, creative unions, media, etc. One should more attentively listen to the social dialogue, but the way leaders must be professional historians, especially the ones who have formed under the new conditions. Within the decommunisation frames it is extremely important to reconsider the history of the Crimea and that of Donbas – the territories closely connected with Ukraine, beginning from the time of the Kyiv Rus principalities and the Cossack times, meeting the social needs accounted for by the hybrid war between Russia and Ukraine, that in relation of its content also includes a war between historical memories, and it is very important as well to form among the Ukrainian historic community the sense of the national dignity, patriotism and civil responsibility. Unfortunately, quite a number of historians are still taking the position apart from the implementation of the laws on accusation of the Communist and nazi totalitarian regimes and on prohibition of propaganda of their ideologies and symbols.

### **Bibliography**

Afanasev, Yu. N. [Ed.]. (1996). *Sovetskaya istoriografiya*. Moskva: RHHU, 1996. [in Russian].

Holovko, V. V. (2003). *Istoriografija kryzy istorychnoyi nauky. Ukrains'kyi aspekt*. Kyiv: Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny. [in Ukrainian].

Kalakura, Ya. (2012). *Ukrains'ka istoriohrafiya: kurs leksiy*. (2nd ed.). Kyiv: Heneza.

[in Ukrainian].

Kalakura, Ya. (2015). Obraz ukrains'koho radians'koho istoryka v konteksti introspektsiyi.

*Eidos*, 8, 41–53. [in Ukrainian].

Kalakura, Ya. (2016). Kompleks «sovkovosti» postradians'koyi istoriohrafiyi. *Ukrayina-Yevropa-Svit*, 17, 163–174. [in Ukrainian].

Kolesnyk, I. (2016). *Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny – nove ukrains'ke vidrodzhennia*. Kyiv: Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny. [in Ukrainian].

Ohloblyn, O. (1963). *Dumky pro suchasnu ukrains'ku sovets'ku istoriohrafiyu*. NY: Orhanizatsiya

Oborony Chotyrioh Svobid Ukrayny. [in Ukrainian].

Orlov, I. B. (2012). Istorik stalinskoy epohi na «fronte istoricheskoy nauki». *Harkivskiy istoriohrafichnyi zbirnyk*, 11, 117–130. [in Russian].

Pyrih, R. & Smolii, V. [Eds.]. (1996). *U leshchatakh totalitaryzmu: pershe dvadtsiatyrichchia*

*Instytutu istoriyi NAN Ukrayiny (1936–1956 rr.): zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv u 2 chastynah*. (Ch. I). Kyiv: Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny [in Ukrainian].

Savenok, L. (2007). Vchenyi-istoryk i suspil'stvo v UkrRSR chasiv nepu: karakter i naslidky vzayemodiyi. *Problemy istoriyi Ukrayiny: fakty, sudzhennia, poshuky*, 7, 291–307. [in Ukrainian].

Sydorova, L. A. (2007). «Rukovodiashchaya tsytata» v sovetskoy istoriografiiy serediny 20 veka *Istoriya i istoriki, 2006: istoriograficheskyy vestnik*. (pp. 135–171). Moskva : Nauka. 2007. [in Russian].

Smolii, V. [Ed.]. (2015). *Istoryk i vlada*. Kyiv: Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny.[in Ukrainian].

Yaremchuk, V. (2009). *Mynule Ukrayiny v istorychniy nautsi UkrRSR pisliastalinskoyi doby*. Ostroh: Ostroz'ka akademiya. [in Ukrainian].

Zashkilniak, L. O. (2009). Zamitky pro suchasnu ukrains'ku istoriohrafiyu. *Ukrayna 20 stolittia: kultura, ideolohiya, polityka*, 15, 13–29. [in Ukrainian].