

ARCHIVAL STUDIES / АРХІВОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 94(477):930.25:323.2"19/20"

DOI: doi.org/10.21272/shaj.2020.i34.p.5

OLEXANDR M. IGNATUSHA

Dr (History), Professor, Zaporizhzhia National University (Ukraine)

ARCHIVES AND POLITICS IN UKRAINE OF THE XX-XXI CENTURIES

Abstract. Relations between state policy and the state of archival affairs in Ukraine during the XX – the beginning of the XXI centuries are analyzed. The content and forms of activity of the archives are characterized. Based on the legislative acts, the stages of evolution of archival institutions of Ukraine are given. The negative effects of the Soviet political system on the structure and network of archival bodies, qualitative composition of employees and biased nature of the formation of a documentary base are highlighted. The example of the fate of Ukrainian archivists illustrates the deformation of the archival industry. The existence of a separate vertical of the party archives, contrary to the idea of a single archival fund, is shown. The tragic role of the leadership of the branch by the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs-Ministry of Internal Affairs, which lasted from 1938 to 1961, is noted. The content of political orders from the authorities is disclosed. The presence of the Russian ideological factor in the publications of Ukrainian archivists is demonstrated. The importance of archival periodicals and information technologies is emphasized. Changes in archival construction after Ukraine acquired the state sovereignty are revealed: an update of the legal basis and philosophy of national archival construction. The importance of the establishment and operation of the Ukrainian Research Institute of Archival Affairs and Records Keeping was evaluated. Contemporary contradictions, relics and recurrences of the old political system in the practice of archival construction are outlined. An information breakthrough provided by free access for researchers to the Sectoral State Archives of the Security Service of Ukraine is acknowledged. By the permission dated 2019 free copy of archival documents promoted profound scientific researches and restoration of historical memory. Conclusion about the integral connection between the functioning of the archival system in Ukraine of the XX-XXI centuries and state-political and social transformations is made.

Keywords: archives, historical sources, politics, Soviet state, power, ideology, Communist Party, National Archival Fund.

Citation. Ignatusha O.M. Archives and politics in Ukraine of the XX-XXI centuries. *Sumskyi istoryko-arkhivnyy zhurnal* [Sumy historical and archival journal]. №XXXIV. 2020. Pp.5-20. DOI: doi.org/10.21272/shaj.2020.i34.p.5

ІГНАТУША О.М.

Доктор історичних наук, професор, Запорізький національний університет (Україна)

АРХІВИ І ПОЛІТИКА В УКРАЇНІ ХХ–ХХІ ст.

Анотація. Проаналізовано зв'язки між політикою держави та станом архівної справи в Україні протягом ХХ – початку ХХІ ст. Охарактеризовано зміст і форми діяльності архівів. Базуючись на законодавчих актах, показано етапи еволюції архівних інституцій України. Висвітлено негативні впливи радянської політичної системи на структуру і мережу архівних органів, якісний склад працівників, тенденційність формування документального масиву. На прикладі долі українських архівістів проілюстровано деформації архівної галузі. Показано існування окремої

вертикалі партійних архівів всупереч ідеї єдиного архівного фонду. Відзначено трагічну роль для галузі керівництва з боку Народного комісаріату внутрішніх справ – Міністерства внутрішніх справ (1938–1961 рр.). Розкрито зміст політичних замовлень влади, присутність російського ідеологічного чинника у публікаціях українських архівістів. Наголошено на значенні архівних періодичних фахових видань та інформаційних технологій. Розкрито зміни в архівному будівництві після здобуття Україною державного суверенітету: оновлення правових засад і філософії національного архівного будівництва. Оцінено значення створення і роботи Українського науково-дослідного інституту архівної справи та документознавства. Окреслено сучасні суперечності, зауважено релікти і рецидиви старої політичної системи у практиці архівного будівництва. Констатується інформаційний прорив, забезпечений відкриттям для дослідників Галузевого державного архіву Служби безпеки України, дозволом з 2019 р. безперешкодного копіювання архівних документів, що сприяє поглибленню наукових досліджень і відновленню історичної пам'яті. Робиться висновок про інтегральний зв'язок між функціонуванням архівної системи та державно-політичними і суспільними трансформаціям в Україні ХХ–ХХІ ст.

Ключові слова: архіви, історичні джерела, політика, радянська держава, влада, ідеологія, комуністична партія, Національний архівний фонд.

Цитування. Ігнатуша О.М. Архіви і політика в Україні ХХ–ХХІ ст. // Сумський історико-архівний журнал. №XXXIV. 2020. Рр.5-20. DOI: doi.org/10.21272/shaj.2020.i34.p.5

The impetus for writing the article was given by the development of an educational and professional program of “History and Politics” at the Faculty of History of Zaporizhzhya National University, which envisaged the formation of relevant components of the disciplines of bachelor’s training. The program developers decided to include the course of “Archives and Politics” into these disciplines.

The importance of archives in public life is extraordinary. Therefore, humanity has long since accumulated and stored valuable information sources and testimonies of important events. The archives became especially important with the development of the political structure of society.

The idea of preserving and using archival documents and materials has been spread with the development of socio-political movements, the struggle of different segments of society for the acquisition and assertion of their political rights and interests.

This task significantly strengthened the role of archival sources as a reliable documentary support of the organizational activities of political organizations, parties, and structures.

The emergence of official and unofficial sources of information, and subsequently – varieties of documentary, narrative and other sources that came from the political opposition environment – demanded specific conditions for their storage, protection and use. Therefore, in a politically structured society, many options have emerged for the formation and use of archives, and consequently, for the traditions of ensuring their existence, development, and even cessation of activity.

The problem of ensuring the efficient operation of archives is a multifaceted one.

In the process of accumulation of practical experience and theoretical development, it was divided into several important components: creating conditions for completing archives with the necessary documents and materials, ensuring their physical safety, introducing accounting and scientific reference apparatus, defining and adhering to the algorithm of using archival sources, creating an insurance fund, etc.

Setting and solving these tasks ended on the political culture of the society, understanding and capabilities of the political elite, which directed the development of all institutions.

The Ukrainian experience of archival history is not unique. Moreover, it has many typical aspects. At the same time, there are individual features of the Ukrainian archival system, especially the ways of its development related to other significant factors. The question arises about the role and place of the political factor in the development of the archival system of Ukraine in the XX-XXI centuries as a determining factor for understanding the status and prospects of the industry's development.

As the topic of the history of the archival system is a textbook topic, and the aim does not require the analysis of any specific sources apart from the well-known and generally available theoretical and scientific developments of Ukrainian archivists for all those years, in this article we will make separate generalizations to identify and show the most significant events and conceptual changes in the history of the archival system of Ukraine in the XX-XXI centuries, which determine its prospects in our opinion.

Ukraine entered the XXth century as an independent nation, which had to fight hard for political, national and social rights of the people.

The guards of the Russian imperial system implemented their economic projects in Ukraine, which were fundamentally different from the objectives of the Ukrainian community. These projects were implemented through the imperial state apparatus, primarily through local government agencies, such as provincial governments headed by governors, provincial and county gendarmerie departments, and judicial institutions. The documentation of these imperial authorities was accumulated in the archives and subsequently ended up in state custody.

The paradox was that the documents were collected and stored by those who called themselves opponents of imperial power and established their power after the overthrow of the empire.

The complexity of the political struggle in Ukraine and the subsequent change in political power showed the different options and priorities for building a national archival system.

The the Library and Archives Office of the Department of Arts of the General Secretariat of Educational Affairs of the Ukrainian People's Republic, established in September 1917 was the first state body to manage archival affairs in Ukraine.

O.S. Hrushevsky headed it. He began to work on the creation of the National Archives, expanding access to archival information, creating a broad publishing program, establishing an archeographic commission, and returning Ukrainian documents from Russian archives. (Кудлай, 2019: с.135–136).

The Archival-Book-Library Department of the Main Directorate of Arts and National Culture of the Ministry of National Education of the Ukrainian State, headed by V.L. Mozzalewski, deepened the areas of the national archival reform (April 1918 – January 1919). At the same time, the basic ideas were legislative consolidation of state ownership of archival documents, centralization of archival affairs, creation of the National Archives of the Ukrainian State with its subordinate archives and archival commissions on the ground and establishment of professional educational institutions (Історія і сьогодні, 2020). In addition, a Cultural Commission was created at the Ministry of Denominations of the Ukrainian State under the leadership of V.V. Zavetnevich, who was engaged in the preservation of church monuments, including archival ones, and returned some of them from the Russian Federation. The commission also included V.L. Modzalevsky, scientists D.I. Bogaliy, M.F. Bilyashevsky (author of the first draft law in Ukraine on the protection of monuments of history, culture and art), N.D. Polonskaya, V.M. Shcherbakovsky and other famous figures of Ukrainian science and culture. (ЦА АРК. Ф.540. Оп.1. Спр.142: 1 8).

At the time of the Directory, the Archival Commission of the Ministry of Public Education under the guidance of Professor P.V. Klimenko directed the activities of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UPR) archival institutions.

Thus, the Ukrainian governments began to develop a national archiving, guided by national-state, national-cultural and national-educational priorities. At the same time as a central task, they

clearly understood the need to preserve the archival heritage without being guided by narrow-class and party-corporate goals.

A fundamentally different philosophy of archival construction was offered by the Bolsheviks, who became victors in the struggle for power in Ukraine.

Their motivation for preserving the archives was not the tradition of respecting the cultural heritage of previous generations, but the political idea of debunking the anti-national essence of the tsarist regime and its social policy and promoting their political rightness.

Indeed, the archives of local authorities in Ukraine during the Russian Empire retained important information about the nature and content of this policy. They characterize even those aspects of which the Bolsheviks were least concerned - the policies of Russification and anti-Ukrainianism. Thus, the complex of documents of public authorities, provided that it is kept as complete as possible, provides the historian with valuable information about the different sides of political phenomena and processes, and not just the aspect that the organizer of such a compilation of documents wants to see first of all. The Bolsheviks tried to preserve the historical memory of the "class essence" of the old power, because it provided the key to asserting and extending their political power. However, their actions are also traced through archival documents and the selectivity of their preservation.

At the same time, the following significant fact should be taken into account: The transfer of documents of institutions and organizations of the times of the Russian Empire and first of all, of state authorities, government and local government to state institutions of Ukraine, did not happen immediately, but after some rather long time, creating the conditions for a significant loss of documents.

The Bolsheviks significantly extended their power in Ukraine in the spring of 1919, but in the summer they were again squeezed out by the White Guards, Makhnovists and the armed forces of the UPR. Therefore, a more complete assertion of their power occurred only at the end of 1920, and together with it, the approval of the Russian – Leninist version of the centralization of archiving began to take place.

On June 1, 1918, the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR, Lenin, signed the decree "On the reorganization and centralization of archival affairs in the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic". He proclaimed documentary materials of state institutions as popular property. It was forbidden to destroy them without the knowledge and permission of the General Directorate of Archival Affairs (Декрети, 1959: 383-385). All cases completed by clerical work on October 25, 1917 (the day of the Bolshevik coup) were to go to the State Archival Fund, and incomplete tasks were to remain in institutions by the deadline "which would be a special provision for each department". The idea of centralizing archives was explained as follows: "For the purpose of better scientific use, as well as for the convenience of storage and cost savings" (Декрет, 1959: 384).

According to the logic of Soviet construction, this decree of "federally significant importance" also extended to Ukraine. Subsequently, Ukrainian soviet legislation emerged in this area, but it completely copied Russian practice.

On February 10, 1920, the All-Ukrainian Revolutionary Committee adopted a resolution "On the use of all Russian, former state, public and private archives", but its direction was determined not by the need to preserve heritage, but by the possibility of using archival documents to write and print on their backside "in view of the acute paper crisis". The resolution only increased the threat of the destruction of archives: "To instruct the Commissioner for the Reconstruction of the Paper Industry to immediately begin the use of all Soviet, former state, public and private archives that have no historical or business value" (Про використання всіх Радянських, бувших державних, громадських і приватних архівів, 1920: 20).

The Soviet government did not provide for the participation of non-state structures in determining the historical and practical value of documents and the creation of archives of a non-state form of ownership. That is, no one could compete with state archives in the selection of

documents for transmission for long-term storage, determining the shelf life of documents, providing archive services, providing user access to archival documents and the like. The state monopoly created the conditions for manipulating public consciousness as a result of the biased nature of the examination of the value of documents. The lack of competition has become a way to bureaucratization, formalization, isolation of archival work from the real needs of society.

Paradoxically, the first Soviet archival structures, the archival sections of the All-Ukrainian Committee for the Protection of Monuments of Art and Antiquities (ВУКОПМІС [VUKOPMIS]) and its provincial committees, which began to be created since 1919, were a continuation of institutions initiated by political opponents of the Bolsheviks. Famous historians, archaeologists, and archaeographers such as D.I. Bagaliy, V. Barvinsky, V.L. Mozalevsky, O.P. Novitsky, N.D. Polonskaya, S.A. Taranushenko, M.F. Sumtsov and others (Кот, 2003: 659). VUKOPMIS was a part of the system of the People's Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR, its department of arts. In September 1921, the Main Archival Directorate (Golovarch) was formed on the basis of the Archival Department of VUKOPMIS. It continued to operate for a short time under the People's Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR headed by M.O. Skrypnyk. From the beginning of 1922, the provincial archival departments – “gubarchs” – were started to be created on the ground, and the provincial historical archives in their charge. Central historical archives have been created in Kharkiv, the capital, and Kyiv. However, despite the existing professional-scientific and national-patriotic potential of archival workers, the very construction of the archival system did not allow the authorities to fulfill their political tasks. Therefore, further repeated reorganizations of this system, the deprivation of its intellectual Ukrainian national-patriotic forces, the inclusion in a tougher connection with the communist party, administrative links of the state and even with the power structures, became inevitable, which we will discuss later.

The continuation of the armed resistance of the national-political organizations in 1921 to the Soviet government and the terrible famine of 1922-1923, the underdevelopment and imbalance of the Soviet state apparatus, which was entrusted with the political task of collecting and organizing archival documents of pre-revolutionary institutions, as well as the political ideologization of archival work, did not ensure the quality preservation of the archives of the tsarist regime.

As for the archives of state-political opponents of the Soviet regime – the Ukrainian Central Rada and the Hetman and their local bodies – their documents were also concentrated in the Soviet archives. Obviously, the Soviet government did not want these archives become uncontrollable, fall into the hands of “class enemies” – opponents of the Bolsheviks. Therefore, they were simply concentrated in state repositories, in which they were also provided with very limited access, creating for this a “special fund”. Until the 1990s, the documents of the Ukrainian Central Rada (F.1115), the General Secretariat of the Central Rada (F.1063), the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian Power (F.1064), etc. were in the “special fund” of the Central State Archive of the highest bodies of state power and administration Ukraine (then – the Central State Archive of the October Revolution of the Ukrainian SSR). Limited access to these documents was allowed only at the request of a state institution or educational institution with an appropriate level of “clearance” issued by the “special department”, which was controlled by the KGB. This guaranteed the political loyalty of the historian.

On October 31, 1922, the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR adopted a resolution “On the protection of archives”. This decree declared the creation of a “unified state archival fund”, meaning by it “work, documents and correspondence of all canceled and now existing governmental and public institutions” (Про охорону архівів, 1922: 804).

There was set a three-year storage period for the completed record-keeping cases in the institutions, after which they were to be transferred to the archives of the main archive.

Politically important information was contained in the notes to the first paragraph of this decision. The first note provided “Histpart” with “*all rights* [our emphasis. – O.I.] on archival materials relating to the history of the Revolution and the Communist Party in Ukraine”. The second one noted

that “Military archives and archival materials are to be handed over to Moscow at the Military Scientific Archive of the Central Archive of the RSFSR” (Про охорону архівів, 1922: 804).

Thus, the Communist Party bodies had the exclusive right and complete monopoly on archival documents of a political nature, and then could manipulate them in any way. The peak of national treason and servility of the Ukrainian Bolsheviks was the decision that the materials on the struggle of Ukraine against Russian military aggression of 1917-1920 were transferred to the aggressor country – the Russian Federation.

Since January 1923, copying Russian practice, the archival branch of the Ukrainian SSR has been granted the highest managerial and political status, removing from the sphere of competence of the People’s Commissariat of Education and subordinating it directly to the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee.

The archive system turned out to be extremely dependent on administrative-territorial reforms, the kaleidoscope of which began to spin after 1923. This testified to the centralized policy of state power. In 1925, with the liquidation of provinces, nine “provincial archives” were liquidated, creating in their place 40 “district archives” – district archival administrations. In 1930, with the liquidation of districts, they created 28 local archival administrations under city councils instead of these “district archives”. However, two years later in 1932, they also liquidated them, creating instead seven regional archival departments that controlled the activities of seven regional historical archives. In the course of these reorganizations, a number of central archives arose: the All-Ukrainian Central Archive of the Revolution, the All-Ukrainian Central Archive of Labor, and the All-Ukrainian Central State Archive in Kharkov, as in a capital city (1919-1934), the All-Ukrainian Central Archive of Ancient Acts and the All-Ukrainian Central Photo Film Archive in Kyiv. In 1934, the All-Ukrainian Military History Archive appeared there.

Administrative changes were accompanied by conflicting measures aimed at selecting documents and materials to be stored for a long time. The decree of the All-Union Central Executive Committee and Council of People’s Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR of December 16, 1925 “On the unified state archival fund of the Ukrainian SSR” only confirmed the main provisions of the government decree of October 31, 1922, introducing amendments to the management system of the industry, clarified the concept of “the unified state archival fund of the Ukrainian SSR”. The role of the Main Archival Directorate (until 1925 – “department”) and local archival bodies in the system of storage, movement and destruction of archival documents was determined. At the same time, the storage period of documents in departmental archives was increased to 5 years, which increased the risk of their loss, and the requirements for their preservation were weakened. In particular, the exclusive powers of the Communist Party structures were expanded: “Party archives should be transferred to the unified state archival fund only when appropriate party organizations recognize it as appropriate” (Про єдиний державний архівний фонд УСРР, 1925: 1431).

The positive results for the development of the industry were brought by the foundation of periodicals: the Bulletin of Ukrtsentrarkhiv (1925-1931) and the journal Archival Affairs (1925-1930). However, politicization was actively advancing along the archival and publishing lines, which was clearly shown by changes in the names of the mentioned above journal: In 1931-1932, it came out under the name “Soviet Archive” and in 1932-1933 – “Archive of the Soviet Ukraine”, subsequently ceasing to exist altogether.

Despite the ideological tendentiousness of the selection of materials that were published in this journal, they nevertheless updated the acute national-political issues of the history of Ukraine, in particular, the Ukrainian national revolution of 1917-1921. For example, one of the publications in this journal for 1932 drew attention to such an important subject of the socio-political struggle as the participation of the clergy in the national revolution.

In particular, P. Ptashinsky printed letters from Nikon (Bessonov) -the former Bishop of Krasnoyarsk, to the General Secretariat of the Ukrainian Central Rada about his willingness to

work for the benefit of the revival of Ukraine and its church (Пташинський, 1932: 54). This fact in itself attracted the attention of readers of the journal and researchers-scientists to the difficult issues of the Ukrainian revolution and the struggle for autocephaly of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, and objectively promoted the development of Ukrainian historiography and source studies.

An interesting publication of documents on the Black Sea Fleet in 1917 was placed in the next issue of the magazine. Some of these documents appeared under the headings “On separate ships, defencism acquired the color of Ukrainian nationalism” and “The Ukrainian Central Council is trying to take over the fleet”. They were about the support of the Ukrainian Central Radaby sailors and officers of the ship “Republican”, the national holiday organized by the Ukrainian Black Sea Fleet Society in Sevastopol, “raising the Ukrainian national flag instead of the Andreev flag” on the cruiser “Memory of Mercury”, the parade on the proclamation of the UPR, etc. (Похилевич, 1932: 23-24, 48-51).

In the context of the strengthening of Soviet totalitarianism, the presence of such publications caused more and more irritation by the Communist Party apologists, pushing to curtail the design of archival periodicals.

The intensification of totalitarian tendencies in Soviet society and constant reorganization caused irreparable damage to documents of historical significance. The practice of allocating archival materials for destruction and disposal has spread. The administration according to the party-class principle and political expediency led to the fact that the priority for the selection for permanent storage of documents was not information about social development and a person with his daily worries and achievements, but information about the grandiose plans and successes of the Soviet state and “the only correct” politics of the ruling Communist Party. At the same time, documents about political “mistakes” and unsightly actions of various branches of power, facts about the political opposition, about failures at industrial facilities, about the social consequences of collectivization, about the famine tragedy of 1932-1933, etc., went to waste paper.

The specifics of the soviet political system, which was strictly centralized and ensured the Communist Party’s monopoly on power, was manifested in the archival sphere by the creation of a system of party archives. The All-Ukrainian Histpart, a commission to study the history of the October Revolution and the history of the Communist Party, created in Kharkiv in 1921 under the People’s Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR, was its central link. Moscow Central Histpart was its prototype. However, since March 1922, the All-Ukrainian Histpart subordinated the Central Committee of the Communist Party (bolshevik) of Ukraine (CCCPbU) by Russian analogy, and since 1929, it was reorganized into the Institute of Party History and the October Revolution in Ukraine under the CCCPbU. It is from this time that the modern Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine keeps considering itself the heir to the created in July 1929 the Unified Party Archive of the Institute of Party History and the October Revolution in Ukraine under the CCCP(b)U (Історія архіву, 2020).

In the first half of the 1920s, provincial and later district and regional departments of Histpart acted as the departments of CP(b)U committees. Histpart massively printed collections of documents and materials, memoirs, and the “Chronicle of the Revolution” magazine (1922-1933). In 1939, the regional Histparts became part of the party archives of the regional committees of CP(b)U (Юркова, 2005: 640).

From the beginning of the creation of this system, the tendency of influence and establishment by the party of general political control over the entire archival industry of Ukraine was manifested and strengthened. In fact, the system of party archives managed by Eastpart made the existence of a unified state archival fund impossible. Istparty was given the right to appoint managers and commissioners in all archives and museums, and to give orders to these institutions. The direction of these orders is eloquent. Intolerance to the staff of the Ukrainian archives, in which the Communists saw the presence of their class enemies – historians and archivists of the “bourgeois-noble and

bourgeois-nationalist camps such as the Grushevsky brothers, Vasilenko, etc.” – is especially striking. [From Russian – O.I.] (Московченко, 2005: 12–13).

it would not be surprising if various political parties functioned in the state, and their documents were transferred to the archives of political parties, organizations and public associations on a common basis. But there were no other parties besides the Communist one. It was, in fact, a state party. Nevertheless, it created a separate legal archive vertical, not controlled by the General Archive. After the reorganization of the Histpart, the Central Party Archive under the Central Committee of CP(b)U took the role of the central institution for the archival party line. It was the highest authority for the party archives of the regional committees of CP(b)U, which were associated with local party organizations of districts, cities, state production associations, enterprises, government bodies, institutions, state farms, collective farms and the like. Responsible for the local archives – mainly the secretaries of party organizations – ensured the order, execution and transfer of documents for storage to the corresponding central or regional party archives. An examination of the value and transfer of documents for permanent storage to party archives was carried out according to other requirements than to state archives. Often, party documents of local organizations did not reflect the real state of affairs, but party authorities lacked the ability to establish this. For example, during the period of Brezhnev’s “stagnation”, documents of local party cells and especially party meetings and bureau meetings were often a fantasy of secretaries of party organizations who were forced to archive such “documents”. This created and maintained the illusion of “violent activity” of party organizations that had long been struck by formalism.

Thus, the Communist Party isolated itself from the potential users of the archives of that party, preventing it from analyzing and controlling the activities of its central and local authorities. Its documentaries contained elements of political commitment, imbalance, high levels of falsehood, reflecting political conditions, human weakness, and the product of communist monopoly on state power.

The system of party archives did not obey the rules of the state archives of Ukraine. This meant that its records, the order of registration of cases, the reference apparatus, and the rules of access to sources of information could be different than in the state archives of Ukraine. This exclusivity will manifest itself later, when the party archives in the days of state independence of Ukraine will be included in the unified state system of state archives of Ukraine.

The state policy of the 1930s brought severe trials to the Ukrainian archive system of “peace time”. It is difficult to agree with respected I.B. Matyash that the period before 1938 can be considered the “golden age” of the national archival studies (Матяш, 2008: 39). Moreover, the author of periodization itself ascertains the fact of moral and physical “destruction in 1931-1937 of representatives of “bourgeois archival studies” based on the results of “purges” and artificial accusations, as well as the complete ideologization of archival affairs (Матяш, 2008: 40).

The “period of centralization and restriction” began much earlier. The collapse of the NEP and the beginning of Stalin’s centralization modernization quickly affected the archives and archivists. It was mentioned above that in 1930 the system of district archives “flew by”. Its enlargement went without giving the local archives greater autonomy and authority. On the contrary, initiatives and projects were limited, the press lay down, science was silenced, and Ukrainianization was curtailed. In 1932-1933 Ukraine was released under the spit of the Holodomor. And they immediately launched a flywheel of mass repression. This is dramatically told by published documents. One of them is “Conclusions on the All-Ukrainian Archive of Ancient Acts in Kiev”, which served as a basis for dismissing practically all the staff of the Kiev Central Archive of Ancient Acts. The document tells about the allegations made by the staff of the archive on January 31 – February 3, 1934, against the employees of the collective for “bourgeois nationalism”, “fascism”, “harmful work”, “class hostility”, etc. (Страшко, 2013: 67–74).

The entrustment of the archival system to the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NKVD) in 1938 was almost the most significant administrative and political change. It was released from this burden only in 1961, when the Archival Department was subordinated to the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR. It is worth recalling that the peak of political repression in Ukraine occurred precisely in 1937-1938, as well as the mass destruction of potential opponents of the Soviet government, the perpetrators of which were precisely the NKVD bodies. Therefore, this submission was a kind of mobilization to identify political enemies.

The next stage of a long "era of centralization and restrictions" has begun (Матяш, 2008: 39–41).

To replace such archival managers, as, for example, M.A. Rubach (head of the Central Archive Directorate of the All-Union Central Executive Committee of the Ukrainian SSR), a researcher in the history of the "civil war" in Ukraine, a communist, an adversary of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Ukrainian state, a "denouncer" of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" (Рубач, 1955), came new, even more active and uncompromising in their party dogma, not burdened with moral obligations, when it was a question of blind devotion to the communist idea, the party and its leader. Former archival managers compromised by participating in collectivization campaigns, grain procurement, the famine of 1932-1933, defamation of M.S. Grushevsky, M.I. Yavorsky and others, were "removed."

According to the information resource of the Ukrainian State Archive about the end of the 1930s, A.I. Gromitsky, S.S. Senchilo and F.I. Brazhnik headed the highest state body for managing archival affairs (Історія і сьогодні, 2020). Unfortunately, we will not find any information about these figures in the public domain. Obviously, the system chose precisely such little-known, non-public and serviceable performers. It was easier for it to do with them. It was easier to write off political miscalculations, misconduct, and crimes into silent and inconspicuous, and then demonize them, throwing them into the millstones of political repression as waste material.

The leadership of archival institutions was not elected, but appointed "from above." And here the "tops" were guided by political expediency, and not by the idea of preserving the cultural heritage or social pragmatism.

Even if the appointees were practitioners and research scientists, such as the head of the Archival Directorate of the NKVD of the Ukrainian SSR since 1943,

P.P. Gudzenko, all the same, these were the officers of the NKVD, who, above all, who were guided by the logic of administrative subordination to the top and the execution of orders.

This was demanded of them by "people in uniform". During the Second World War, this fact also played a positive role, since archivists had to evacuate and re-evacuate archival documents, organize, systematize, and incorporate documents of institutions operating in the occupied territories into a single state archival fund. Let's say P.P. Gudzenko, on the instructions of L. Beria, conducted a special operation to identify and export from Romania large volumes of documents of the administrative bodies of the Transnistria governorate, which provoked a protest from the head of the Romanian government, General Radesku. The latter sent a note to the Allied Control Commission (ACC) on February 25, 1945, demanding the immediate return to Bucharest of the Transnistria archive, "which Captain Gudzenko sent to Moscow" (Вронська, Платонова, 2007: 64–65) Already in 1945, the NKVD authorities transferred some of these documents to the State Archives of Odessa Region, where they are still stored. At the same time P.P. Gudzenko received thanks for this from the Chief of Staff of the ACC Lieutenant General V.I. Vinogradov.

Example of P.P. Gudzenko, who successfully managed the archival department of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Ukrainian SSR in ranks from junior lieutenant to major for 10 years, but constantly experienced unfair accusations, "paying" for his social background, the biography of his father and his wife's father, and, finally, having been punished by dismissal, shows how ideologically

biased and brutal the Soviet system was and how unsocial the practical orientation of the archival industry was (Вронська, Платонова, 2007: 61–76).

Modern experts rightly claim that the archives of the Soviet era were globally integrated into the totalitarian system. The party-state dictatorship leading to the stagnation of the entire archival industry intensified. Archives lost leading scientists. The priority was the use of archives for political and operational purposes (Матяш, 2008: 41). From 1938 to 1946, archivists of Ukraine did not have any periodicals, and only in 1947 it was allowed to issue the “Scientific Information Bulletin of the Archival Department of the Ukrainian SSR”. Towards the end of the Soviet era, it remained the only professional periodical, changing its name to the modern one in 1965 – “Archives of Ukraine”, and since 1991 acquiring the status of a scientific and practical journal.

Restrictions and control over publishing were again combined with political orders for archivists. It is worth remembering the powerful political campaign, which marked the 40th anniversary of the victory of the Bolshevik revolution. Publications of collections of archival documents and materials on the occasion of this event were organized and financed throughout Ukraine. At that time, such collections were published not only by archivists of the capital of Ukraine, but also by all regional centers: Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhzhia, Kyiv, Kirovohrad, Poltava, Sumy, Kherson, Khmelnytsky, etc. Moreover, this political order also carried Russian national forms, most of the collections of documents, their archeographic part was in Russian.

The archivists of the central institutions had to join the promotion of the 300th anniversary of the “reunification of Ukraine with Russia, which resulted in the preparation and publication of collections “Reunification of Ukraine with Russia. Documents and Materials” (Воссоединение, 1953), “Documents on the Liberation War of the Ukrainian people of 1648–1654” (Документы об Освободительной войне, 1965).

However, the dialectic lies in the fact that this politicized issue of the national history allowed Ukrainian archivists to return to the revival of the traditions of Ukrainian archeography and historiography, to advance research on the history of the Ukrainian Cossacks. In 1961, a collection of archival documents by B. Khmelnytsky was published – letters, orders and other documents for 1648–1657, compiled by I.P. Kripyakevich and edited by F.P. Shevchenko (Документи Богдана Хмельницького, 1961). These developments formed the national traditions of Ukrainian archives and were continued during the years of state independence of Ukraine. The implementation of the project “Letters of Ukrainian Hetmans” is a vivid evidence of this (Універсали Богдана Хмельницького, 1998; Універсали Івана Мазепи, 2002; Універсали Павла Полуботка, 2008).

The logic of social development of the 1960s led to the creation of two new central archives – the Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and Art of the Ukrainian SSR (1966) and the Central State Archive of Scientific and Technical Documentation of the Ukrainian SSR (1969).

In the 1960s, most of the central and regional archives of Ukraine organized and published their guides, thereby opening up great opportunities for historians and researchers to study and comprehend the archival heritage.

It is noteworthy that the vast majority of them was in Ukrainian, which was a consequence of the liberalization of the political and intellectual climate in Ukraine. But the Russian ideological factor of Soviet policy manifested itself in the publications of Russian editions of guidebooks in the Zhytomyr, Crimean, Odessa, and Chernihiv regions. It is obvious that the publication of guides in Russian in Soviet Ukraine was prompted by the management of archives and local party-state authorities, and not by the language of the vast majority of the population of cities and regions.

The campaign to involve archivists in the preparation and holding of jubilee events dedicated to the 100th anniversary of Lenin’s birth was especially engaged. All central and regional archives were tasked with identifying documents and materials about Lenin’s activities. It was reported that more than 7,000 such documents were found and taken into special account (Державні

архіви, 1972: 26–27). A props of reports, records on the study of millions of cases and hundreds of thousands of volumes of printed publications, diplomas and solemn meetings – all these are typical signs of the political situation that the archives of Ukraine of the second half of the twentieth century lived in.

At the same time, in the 1960s, many valuable projects were launched, impossible without the will of the “upper classes”, among which the wind of political thaw passed. We mean such an “innovation” as the resuscitation of old as the world market mechanisms (while maintaining insufficiently effective administrative levers), namely the creation of a network of self-supporting departments in the archives. Such departments have significantly improved the condition and maintenance of departmental and current archives, facilitated the transfer to state custody of numerous funds of organizations, institutions and enterprises. Without economic liberalization, the state was unable to ensure the proper functioning of the archival industry. But the system did not go beyond limited steps.

A great positive was the participation of archivists in a scientific project of the 1960s – early 1970s, which of course, could not do without a vivid political component – the creation of the 26-volume “History of Cities and Villages of the Ukrainian SSR”.

The 70s of the twentieth century again strengthened the party-bureaucratic regulation of the archival sphere in Ukraine. The policy of “stagnation” preserved the content of the work of archival institutions, returned them to propaganda, anniversary events, to the exploitation of ideological myths, to a reference and information service, produced “small forms of using archival documents for political and economic purposes.”

By the middle of 1980s, the achievements of this era in the scientific-theoretical and socio-political terms were very modest. The archives of Ukraine remained the cogs of the Soviet political system, batteries and generators of the ideology of the “Russian world”, insulators and conductors of Russian-Soviet culture. An indicative fact: in the 70s and early 80s of the 20th century, Ukrainian archivists were once again successfully mobilized to work on an updated and supplemented version of the “History of Cities and Villages of the Ukrainian SSR” in Russian.

Topical socially significant scientific projects, qualitative restructuring of the Ukrainian national archival system and a fundamental change in its priorities became possible only with the acquisition of state independence by Ukraine.

These changes were ensured by Ukrainian legislation and, in particular, the Law of Ukraine on the National Archival Fund and Archival Institutions of December 24, 1993. It introduced a new concept – “National Archival Fund of Ukraine”. The philosophy of national archival business was conceptually changing. The content of state policy in the field of archiving was clearly declared: “Art. 3. The state guarantees the conditions for storage, augmentation and use of the National Archival Fund, contributes to the achievement of the world level in the development of archiving and record keeping (Про Національний архівний фонд та архівні установи, 1993).

The principal provisions of the law were depoliticization, political pluralism, and the openness of archives. Article six of the law states: “... It is forbidden to seize documents from the National Archival Fund for reasons of confidentiality or secrecy of the information contained in them, as well as for political or ideological reasons” (Про Національний архівний фонд та архівні установи, 1993).

Ensuring the rights and legitimate interests of citizens, organizations and institutions, preserving and enriching cultural heritage, and developing scientific research have become the priorities of this system.

Human centrism, civil rights and political equality have contributed to the emergence of new structures and institutions in the archival industry.

The inclusion of the former archives of the Communist Party in the system of state archives of Ukraine has become one of the priority measures. Immediately after the failure of the coup d’etat in

the USSR committed by the State Committee for Emergency Situations and the clarification of the criminal role of the communist party in these events, on August 27, 1991, the Presidium of the Supreme Council of Ukraine decided to transfer the documents of the Archive of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine to the Central Archive Administration under the Cabinet Ministers of Ukraine. And soon, on October 25, 1991, the Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine began to operate on this base.

The scientific direction of the archival system has gained powerful development. On November 1, 1994, the Ukrainian Research Institute of Archival and Documentation (UNDIASD) began its work.

Promoting the development of public initiatives, the Union of Archivists of Ukraine arose.

It was allowed to create organizations, unions and enterprises with the right to provide archival services.

New scientific publications appeared, initiated by archivists in collaboration with historians of science and education institutions, government agencies, public organizations, and the like. Even their names testified to the restoration of the traditions of Ukrainian archeography. In particular, in 1998, the archaeological yearbook "Sights" ["Pam'atky"] was founded. With that name back in 1917,

O.S. Grushevsky planned to publish a Ukrainian archive-related journal (Кудлай, 2019: 136). Some of these publications have received a high rating of recognition in the professional community, such as "Studios for Archival Affairs and Documentation", "Sights", and "Sumy Historical and Archival Journal". The latter, in particular, was included in the list of active professional publications of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine in 2020, in which the results of dissertations for the degree of Doctor of Science and the degree of Doctor of Philosophy can be published.

However, it should be noted that these successes cannot be taken for granted: they must be consolidated and confirmed. For example, in the second half of the second decade of the XXI century UNDIASD's publishing activity has significantly "thinned" compared to the previous two decades, which can be seen in the intensity of publications of periodicals of its scientific works. This can be fully noted in relation to the publishing activities of the most popular link - the local archives of Ukraine.

It is obvious that there is a certain symptomatology behind this. In particular, - the limited material resources, underfunding of this sphere, and hence the staffing shortages of archival institutions, the insufficient level of managerial independence of archives, limiting the archives' attention to scientific projects, imposing burdensome current tasks of a social and legal nature on them, the dependence of local archives on not always the constructive influence of regional authorities and their political situation, and the like.

At the same time, there have been achievements in the digitalization of central and regional archives in the last decade, the creation of electronic archives, insurance funds, electronic copies of archival documents for the fund of use, and so on.

However, many fair criticisms from researchers and experts remain on the issue of making copies of archival documents, in particular regarding restrictions, permits, and payments for these procedures. This problem is so acute that the need to amend the archival legislation, which should protect the interests of the citizen, is being discussed. There is still a noticeable post-Soviet syndrome of "keep and do not let" among the staff of archives, especially directors who suffer from underfunding of the industry and try to "compensate" it as a surrogate of "paid services". A significant part of archivists is unable to assess the importance for society of the openness of archival information – a sign of civil society knocking on Ukraine's door with the recommendations of the Council of Europe.

At the state level, there is a lack of proper understanding of the need to provide citizens with genuine archival services and, at the same time, the need to protect and preserve archives from their premature loss, physical aging of documents, their damage and destruction.

We need effective programs for the development of the archival industry, the creation of digital archives, supported by appropriate mechanisms for financial and technical assistance. All this is a manifestation and evidence of the neglect of archives by the state, for which archival problems are less valuable. To this is added the fact that there are people among the management of archives without proper training and education, without the practice of archival work, without understanding the historical, political and cultural significance of archival heritage (Чабарай, 2018).

Modern management of the archival industry is trying to make progress in this direction.

Although relics of the old political system and the latest political struggle in Ukraine are still subjects to relapse, these were precisely the phenomena that were political, essentially “quota”, principles for appointing the leaders of the State Committee on Archives of Ukraine. So, in September 2006 A.P. Ginzburg was appointed a chairman of the State Archive. She did not have a historical or archival education, and her professional career was very remote from the archival sphere: she was a mechanical engineer by training, she was a party member in the Communist Party, worked as deputy director of an industrial enterprise, then as a deputy of Ukraine of two convocations, a nominee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, and a member of the Verkhovna Rada Committee on Industrial Policy and Entrepreneurship. Her work caused a lot of objections among experts. No less scandalous was the defense of A.P. Ginzburg Ph.D. thesis, which resonated among historians, given the low professional quality of the work performed and its mismatch with qualification criteria.

But there are signs of a system recovery. In 2019, a competition was held for the first time to occupy the post of chairman of the State Archival Service of Ukraine. The government in this position approved a professional historian A.V. Khromov, in the past – an employee of the State Archive of Odessa Region, and later of the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory, deputy director of the State Security Branch of the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU).

Predecessors in this high position have done a lot of nationally important in the archival system of Ukraine. In particular, R. Ya. Pyrig – a highly respected historian-archivist, a deep researcher of the history of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921 and life and work of M.S. Hrushevsky, the first director of the Central State Archive of Public Associations of Ukraine, the head of the Board of Directors of the Central State Archives of Ukraine, one of the founders of the professional organization of the Union of Archivists of Ukraine and the initiator of the professional holiday of the Day of Archival Institutions of Ukraine (December 24).

Significant achievements also belong to G.V. Boryak, one of the initiators of the creation of the M. S. Grushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, deputy director for scientific work of this institute, initiator of a number of projects for integrating Ukrainian archives into the world archival community, and a developer of the national information archive system, the author of famous works on archaeological Ukrainian studies.

A huge breakthrough in the study of national history of the XXth century ensured the opening of the Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine to users. By a government decree of December 21, 2016, there has been established a separate civil state institution – the Sectoral State Archive of the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory – to which the media of repressive bodies for 1917-1991 will be transferred. All these are manifestations and consequences of qualitative political changes in the Ukrainian state, invaluable steps towards the democratization of society, ensuring the irreversibility of its development. Thus, archives in modern Ukraine are a factor of real and positive change in society.

And yet, the relics of the old political system are often beyond the archive subsystem, so they are difficult to overcome with rapid administrative measures.

Thus, despite the great idea of creating the Union of Archivists of Ukraine, this union was actively rebuilt in the 90s of the twentieth century, but could not develop into a real independent, effective, mass public-professional organization that would fight for the interests of archivists and users of archival heritage. It remains largely a professional and public attribute and an auxiliary lever of the state archival system of Ukraine. The fact that Ukrainian archivists participate in international forums thanks to this union, despite the positive experience gained, shows how episodic such contacts are and how insignificant their professional resonance is. Also the trade union archive system continues to function in the Soviet templates, giving little to workers and remaining occasionally the “necessary” resource for archive managers. Trade unions have not become an effective mechanism for the effective organization of labor and social protection of archive workers. These manifestations cannot be considered a special disease of the archival system, they are a reflection of the incompleteness of the political transformations of the entire Ukrainian society in transit from a totalitarian society to a civil one.

Thus, the documentary history of Ukraine, and especially the history of the political struggle for Ukrainian national statehood, depended on the state power and the political force that determined it. For almost the entire twentieth century, this was the dictates of the Communist Party, and the monopoly of this government on historical truth hampered historical research.

Restrictions on access to archives, controlled “products” of the historian were the algorithms of the Soviet political system. The built system of state archives ensured the political stagnation of the Soviet system.

Independence of Ukraine provided an opportunity to reform the archival industry.

We see the source of success in qualitative changes in the state-political system, the formation of civil society, the revival and development of Ukrainian national traditions. The successes of the archival sphere are manifested by democratization and depoliticization, the creation of modern legal and scientific and technical bases, the expansion of access to archival documents, the expansion of scientific research in the field of archival and document management, the organization of archival institutions on new principles of management, etc. (History and Present, 2020). It's hard to disagree. These successes are encouraging!

Thus, the history of archival affairs in Ukraine of the XX-XXI centuries demonstrates the integral connection between it and state-political and social transformations. The Soviet political system ideologized the archival industry, burdened the archives with the maintenance of political interests, demanded that they confirm political myths, and restricted creative initiative. The dismantling of this system has become a factor of real changes in society and the archival industry in particular. The archives have shown their ability to effectively promote these positive changes.

Acknowledgments. The author express their sincere gratitude to editorial board for their attention to the content of the article and helpful recommendations on text improvements.

Література:

Воссоединение, 1953 – Воссоединение Украины с Россией: Документы и материалы: В 3 т. Т. 3: 1651–1654 / Редкол.: П.П. Гудзенко и др. Москва: АН СССР, 1953. 546 с.

Вронська, Платонова, 2007 – *Вронська Т., Платонова Н.* Служба в НКВС та інші маловідомі сторінки життя П. Гудзенка (з архівних джерел спецслужб) // *Україна ХХ ст.: культура, ідеологія, політика*: 36. ст. Київ, 2007. Вип. 12. С. 61–76.

Декреты, 1959 – Декреты Советской власти. Т. II. 17 марта – 10 июля 1918 г. Москва: Гос. издат-во полит. литературы, 1959. 686 с.

Державні архіви, 1972 – Державні архіви Української РСР / відп. ред. О.Г. Мітюков. Київ: Наукова думка, 1972. 200 с.

Документи Богдана Хмельницького, 1961 – Документи Богдана Хмельницького (1648–1657) / відп. ред. Ф.П. Шевченко. Київ: АН УРСР, 1961. 738 с.

Документы об Освободительной войне, 1965 – Документы об Освободительной войне украинского народа 1648–1654 гг./ сост. А.З. Барабой и др. Киев, 1965. 828 с.

Історія архіву, 2020 – Історія архіву // Центральний державний архів громадських об'єднань України. URL: http://cdago.gov.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2&Itemid=6 сьогоднішня (дата звернення 02.04.2020).

Історія і сьогоднішня, 2020 – Історія і сьогоднішня // Державна архівна служба України. URL: <https://archives.gov.ua/ua/istoriya-i-syogodennya> (дата звернення 27.03.2020).

Кот, 2003 – *Кот С.І.* Всеукраїнський комітет охорони пам'яток мистецтва і старовини (ВУКОПМІС) // Енциклопедія історії України: Т. 1: А-В / Редкол.: В.А. Смолій (голова) та ін. НАН України. Інститут історії України. Київ: Наук. думка, 2003. 688 с.

Кудлай, 2019 – *Кудлай О. Б.* Міністерство освіти УНР доби Української Центральної Ради: створення, структура, діяльність. Київ: Інститут історії України, 2019. 160 с.

Матяш, 2008 – *Матяш І.* Архівознавство // Спеціальні історичні дисципліни: довідник. Київ: Либідь, 2008. С.37-46.

Московченко, 2005 – *Московченко Н.* Двозначність поняття “Єдиний державний архівний фонд” (роль Істпарту в розвитку архівної справи в Україні) // Студії з архівної справи та документознавства. Т. 13. Київ, 2005. С.9–13.

Похилевич, 1932 – *Похилевич Д.* Чорноморська фльота 1917 р. // Архів Радянської України: історично-архівознавчий журнал. 1932. № 4 5. С.3–57.

Про використання всіх Радянських, бувших державних, громадських і приватних архівів, 1920 – Про використання всіх Радянських, бувших державних, громадських і приватних архівів // Збірник узаконень та розпоряджень Всеукраїнського революційного комітету. 1920. Ч. 2. Ст.19. С.20.

Про єдиний державний архівний фонд УСРР, 1925 – Про єдиний державний архівний фонд УСРР // Збірник узаконень та розпоряджень робітничо-селянського уряду України. 1925. № 101. Ст. 556. С.1430–1433.

Про Національний архівний фонд та архівні установи, 1993 – Про Національний архівний фонд та архівні установи: Закон України № 3815–ХІІ від 24 грудня 1993 р. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/3814-12/ed20140419> (дата звернення 30.03.2020).

Про охорону архівів, 1922 – Про охорону архівів // Збірник узаконень та розпоряджень робітничо-селянського уряду України. 1922. № 46. Ст. 681. С.804-805.

Пташинський, 1932 – *Пташинський П.* Російські церковники і українська контрреволюція // Архів Радянської України. 1932. № 3. С. 54-56.

Рубач, 1955 – *Рубач М.А.* Реакційна суть націоналістичних “теорій” безкласовості та “єдиного потоку”. Київ: Держполітвидав УРСР, 1955. 72 с.

Страшко, 2013 – *Страшко В.* Архівне відродження також розстрілювали // Пам'ятки. Київ, 2013. Т.14. С.67–74.

Універсали Богдана Хмельницького, 1998 – Універсали Богдана Хмельницького. 1648–1657 / упоряд.: І. Крип'якевич, І. Бутич. Київ: Альтернативи, 1998. 381 с.

Універсали Івана Мазепи, 2002 – Універсали Івана Мазепи. 1687–1709 / упоряд.: І. Бутич. Київ, 2002. 780 с.

Універсали Павла Полуботка, 2008 – Універсали Павла Полуботка (1722–1723) / упоряд. В. Ринсевич. Київ, 2008. 721 с.

ЦА АРК – Центральний архів в Автономній Республіці Крим.

Чабарай, 2018 – *Чабарай Г.* Оцифрувати пам'ять. Чому Україні потрібна архівна реформа // Тиждень УА. 2018. 24 січня. URL: <https://tyzhden.ua/History/208256> (дата звернення 05.04.2020)

Юркова, 2005 – *Юркова О.В.* Істпарті. Енциклопедія історії України: Т. 3: Е-Й / Редкол.: В.А. Смолій (голова) та ін. НАН України. Інститут історії України. Київ: Наукова думка, 2005. 672 с.

References:

Vossoedinenie, 1953 – Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei: Dokumenty i materialy [The reunification of Ukraine with Russia: Documents and materials]: V 3 t. Т. 3: 1651–1654 / Redkol.: P.P. Gudzenko i dr. Moskva: ANSSSR, 1953. 546 s. [in Russian].

Vronska, Platonova, 2007 – *Vronska T., Platonova N.* Sluzhba v NKVS ta inshi malovidomi storinky zhyttia P. Hudzenka (z arkhivnykh dzherel spetssluzhb) [NKVD service and other little-known episodes of P. Hudzenko's life (basing on archival documents of secret services)] // Ukraina XX st.: kultura, ideolohiia, polityka: Zb. st. Kyiv, 2007. Vyp. 12. S. 61–76. [in Ukrainian].

Dekrety, 1959 – Dekrety Sovetskoi vlasti. Т. II. 17 marta – 10 iyulya 1918 g. [Decrees of the Soviet government. Vol. II. March 17 – July 10, 1918]. Moskva: Gos. izdat-vo polit. literatury, 1959. 686 s. [in Russian].

Derzhavni arkhivy, 1972 – Derzhavni arkhivy Ukrainskoi RSR [State archives of the Ukrainian SSR] / vidp. red. O.H. Mitiukov. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1972. 200 s. [in Ukrainian].

Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnytskoho, 1961 – Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnytskoho (1648–1657) [The documents of Bohdan Khmelnytsky (1648–1657)] / vidp. red. F.P. Shevchenko. Kyiv: AN URSR, 1961. 738 s. [in Ukrainian].

Dokumenty ob Osvoboditel'noi voine, 1965 – Dokumenty ob Osvoboditel'noi voine ukrainskogo naroda 1648–1654 gg. [The documents of the liberation war of Ukrainian people 1648–1654] / sost. A.Z. Baraboi i dr. Kiev, 1965. 828 s. [in Russian].

Istoriia arkhivu, 2020 – Istoriia arkhivu [History of the archive]. Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi arkhiv hromadskykh obiednan Ukrainy. URL: http://cdago.gov.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2&Itemid=6 (data zvernennia 02.04.2020) [in Ukrainian].

Istoriia i sohodennia, 2020 – Istoriia i sohodennia [History and the present] // Derzhavna arkhivna sluzhba Ukrainy. URL: <https://archives.gov.ua/ua/istoriia-i-sohodennia> (data zvernennia 27.03.2020). [in Ukrainian].

Kot, 2003 – Kot S.I. Vseukrainskyi komitet okhorony pamiatok mystetstva i starovyny (VUKOPMIS) [All-Ukrainian Committee of Monuments, Art and Antiquities Protection (VUKOPMIS)]. *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy*: T. 1: A-V / Redkol.: V.A. Smolii (holova) ta in. NAN Ukrainy. Instytut istorii Ukrainy. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 2003. 688 s. [in Ukrainian].

Kudlai, 2019 – Kudlai O.B. Ministerstvo osvity UNR doby Ukrainiskoi Tsentralnoi Rady: stvorennia, struktura, diialnist [The UNR Ministry of Education at the period of Ukrainian Central Council: establishment, structure, activity]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy, 2019. 160 s. [in Ukrainian].

Matiash, 2008 – Matiash I. Arkhivoznavstvo [The Archival Study Disciplines]. *Spetsialni istorichni dystsypliny: dovidnyk*. Kyiv: Lybid, 2008. S.37–46. [in Ukrainian].

Moskovchenko, 2005 – Moskovchenko N. Dvoznachnist poniattia “Yedynyi derzhavnyi arkhivnyi fond” (rol Istpartu v rozvytku arkhivnoi spravy v Ukraini) [The ambiguity of the “Unified State Archival Fund” definition (Eastpart’s role in development of archival affairs in Ukraine)]. *Studii z arkhivnoi spravy ta dokumentoznavstva*. T. 13. Kyiv, 2005. S.9–13. [in Ukrainian].

Pokhylevych, 1932 – Pokhylevych D. Chornomorska flota 1917 r. [The Black Sea Fleet in 1917]. *Arkhiv Radianskoi Ukrainy: istorychno-arkhivnozhnavchyi zhurnal*. 1932. № 4 5. S.3–57. [in Ukrainian].

Pro vykorystannia vsikh Radianskykh, buvshykh derzhavnykh, hromadskykh i pryvatnykh arkhiviv, 1920 – Pro vykorystannia vsikh Radianskykh, buvshykh derzhavnykh, hromadskykh i pryvatnykh arkhiviv [About the use of all Soviet, former state, public and private archives]. *Zbirnyk uzakonen ta rozporiadzhen Vseukrainskoho revoliutsiinoho komitetu*. 1920. Ch. 2. St. 19. S.20. [in Ukrainian].

Pro yedynyi derzhavnyi arkhivnyi fond USRR, 1925 – Pro yedynyi derzhavnyi arkhivnyi fond USRR [About the single state archival fund of the Ukrainian SSR]. *Zbirnyk uzakonen ta rozporiadzhen robinycho-selianskoho uriadu Ukrainy*. 1925. № 101. St. 556. S.1430–1433. [in Ukrainian].

Pro Natsionalnyi arkhivnyi fond ta arkhivni ustanovy, 1993 – Pro Natsionalnyi arkhivnyi fond ta arkhivni ustanovy: Zakon Ukrainy № 3815–XII vid 24 hrudnia 1993 r. [About the National Archival Fund and archival institutions: the Law of Ukraine № 3815–XII of December 24, 1993]. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/3814-12/ed20140419> (data zvernennia 30.03.2020). [in Ukrainian].

Pro okhoronu arkhiviv, 1922 – Pro okhoronu arkhiviv [About archives protection]. *Zbirnyk uzakonen ta rozporiadzhen robinycho-selianskoho uriadu Ukrainy*. 1922. № 46. St. 681. S.804–805. [in Ukrainian].

Ptashynskiy, 1932 – Ptashynskiy P. Rosiiski tserkovnyky i ukrainska kontrevoliutsiia [Russian churchmen and the Ukrainian counter-revolution]. *Arkhiv Radianskoi Ukrainy*. 1932. № 3. S.54–56. [in Ukrainian].

Rubach, 1955 – Rubach M.A. Reaktsiina sut natsionalistychnykh “teorii” bezklasovosti ta “yedynoho potoku”. [The reactionary essence of nationalist “theories” of classlessness and “single flow”]. Kyiv: Derzhpolityvdav URSS, 1955. 72 s. [in Ukrainian].

Strashko, 2013 – Strashko V. Arkhivne vidrozhennia takozh rozstriliuvaly [The archival revival has also been shot]. *Pamiatky*. Kyiv, 2013. T.14. S.67–74. [in Ukrainian].

Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho, 1998 – Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho. 1648–1657 [The universals of Bohdan Khmelnytsky 1648–1657] / uporiad.: I. Krypiakevych, I. Butych. Kyiv: Alternatyvy, 1998. 381 s. [in Ukrainian].

Universaly Ivana Mazepy, 2002 – Universaly Ivana Mazepy. 1687–1709 [The universals of Ivan Mazepa 1687–1709] / uporiad.: I. Butych. Kyiv, 2002. 780 s. [in Ukrainian].

Universaly Pavla Polubotka, 2008 – Universaly Pavla Polubotka (1722–1723) [The universals of Pavlo Polubotok (1722–1723)] / uporiad. V. Rynsevych. Kyiv, 2008. 721 s. [in Ukrainian].

TsA ARK – Tsentralnyi arkhiv v Avtonomnii Respublitsi Krym [Central Archives in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea]. [in Ukrainian].

Chabaraï H., 2018 – Chabaraï H. Otsyfruvaty pamiat. Chomu Ukraini potribna arkhivna reforma [Memory digitisation. Why Ukraine needs archival reform]. *Tyzhden UA*. 2018. 24 sichnia. URL: <https://tyzhden.ua/History/208256> (data zvernennia 05.04.2020) [in Ukrainian].

Yurkova, 2005 – Yurkova O.V. Istparty [The Istparts]. *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy*: T. 3: E-Y / Redkol.: V.A. Smolii (holova) ta in. NAN Ukrainy. Instytut istorii Ukrainy. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 2005. 672 s. [in Ukrainian].

*The article was received on February 04, 2020.
Article recommended for publishing 26/03/2020*