TARAS SHEVCHENKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF KYIV
NATIONAL MUSEUM "HOLODOMOR VICTIMS MEMORIAL"
UKRAINIAN GENOCIDE FAMINE FOUNDATION – USA, INC.
MAKSYM RYLSKY INSTITUTE OF ART, FOLKLORE STUDIES, AND ETHNOLOGY
MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY INSTITUTE OF UKRAINIAN ARCHAEOGRAPHY AND SOURCE STUDIES
PUBLIC COMMITTEE FOR THE COMMEMORATION OF THE VICTIMS OF HOLODOMOR-GENOCIDE 1932–1933 IN UKRAINE
ASSOCIATION OF FAMINE RESEARCHERS IN UKRAINE
VASYL STUS ALL-UKRAINIAN SOCIETY "MEMORIAL"

PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC-EDUCATIONAL WORKING CONFERENCE "GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR 1932–1933: THE LOSSES OF THE UKRAINIAN NATION"

(October 4, 2016, Kyiv)

Kyiv 2018

УДК 94:323.25 (477) “1932/1933” (063)

Proceedings of the International Scientific-Educational Working Conference “Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933: The Losses of the Ukrainian Nation” (October 4, 2016, Kyiv). – Kyiv – Drohobych: National Museum “Holodomor Victims Memorial”, 2018. x + 119.

This collection of articles of the International Scientific-Educational Working Conference “Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933: The Losses of the Ukrainian Nation” reveals the preconditions and causes of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, and the mechanism of its creation and its consequences leading to significant cultural, social, moral, and psychological losses. The key issue of this collection of articles is the problem of the Ukrainian national demographic losses. This publication is intended for historians, researchers, ethnologists, teachers, and all those interested in the catastrophe of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933.

Approved for publication by the Scientific and Methodological Council of the National Museum “Holodomor Victims Memorial” (Protocol No. 9 of 25 September 2018).

Editorial Board: Cand. Sc. (Hist.) Olesia Stasiuk, Dr. Sc. (Hist.) Vasyl Marochko, Dr. Sc. (Hist.), Prof. Volodymyr Serhijchuk, Dr. Sc. (Hist.), Prof. Yaroslav Kalakura, Dr. Sc. (Law), Prof. Volodymyr Vasylenko, Nina Lapchynska, Cand. Sc. (Hist.) Yuliya Kotsur (Compiler).

Translation: Anna Zakharchuk, Antonia Rybka, Nataliya Tkachuk – Staff of the National Museum “Holodomor Victims Memorial”

Edited by: Cheryl A. Madden, M.A., Rev. Myron Panchuk, Ph.D., Mykola Kotcherha

The publication is supported by:
The Ukrainian Genocide Famine Foundation USA, Inc.
President: Mykola Kotcherha
Marie Slobidska: Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Throughout recorded history, people experienced a wide variety of significant events, all while basing decisions on insufficiently understood or unknown facts. This historiographical formula is classic, but its components are not always taken into consideration. Rumors, fabrications, assumptions, and hypotheses create the informational base, in which any given informational set is only a potentially viable informational source. Historical knowledge, that is: scientifically proven facts of the past; discovered phenomena of social life; distinguished patterns of socio-economic processes; and biographical portraits of prominent persons are the intellectual scientist's production. Therefore, the presence of a subjective segment is inevitable, even if the researcher proclaims to be completely objective. Truth cannot be absolute, as the absolute truth does not exist. Therefore, our knowledge is relative. In modern historiography, a playful juggling of the terms “objective approach” and “scientifically well-grounded” is common, especially during public discussions between opponents. The falsification of events, facts, and phenomena also can be alluded to as scientific; thereby, gaining a special intellectual and socio-political status.

Objectivism in historical research is an applied principle, not a theoretical abstraction or a mystical incident. Usually, it is opposed to the existence of ideological, political, and situational priorities in the mind of the historian. In the historiographic tradition, it is difficult to find historians without distinctive ideological and political beliefs. Therefore, pure “objectivism,” under such circumstances, one perceives as an antithesis of “ideology.” The ideologically-biased historian is a subjective idealist, because he adores the object of his research; ignores the sources of information that destroy his mental stereotypes and his hypothetical-historical constructs of the past and his glorification of heroic or tragic events. For such a researcher, there are no other thoughts or facts, because the past for the historian-subjectivist is the intellectual product of his own imagination. He interprets and utilizes facts at his own discretion, without a properly documented basis.

The understanding of objectivism in the context of the source-study paradigm acquires a different discourse. Positivist deification of the source dominates, in spite of his systematic and applied criticism. In inflammatory discussions, among irreconcilable opponents, who deplete theoretical and methodological discourse techniques, always conclude with the classic argument, “Show the

sources" or "Name the facts." Facts can be stated as such, but do they have proper documentary basis? The objects of historical research, even under these conditions, are not classical sources, such as archives, statistics, periodicals, etc., but the overview the information recorded in them. Therefore, a professional historian must be scientifically selective with their sources, make their subject selection and classification objectively (systematically, critically, structurally, and functionally), without using their own ideological biases. Only in this way, we can avoid (if one chooses to) a conscious and scientific falsification of the historical past.

Sources, especially statistics, are created by people. Therefore, these require special consideration. Natural phenomena occur according to their own laws, but social systems, especially under the conditions of totalitarian political regimes, develop according to ideological canons, resulting in a classic surrealism. The "objective" Soviet statistics of the 1920s and 1930s recorded socio-economic phenomena and processes, but the completeness and consistency, exhaustiveness, and credibility of which cannot be taken at face value. Therefore, we are dealing with the reality of kinetic daily life of a society in a presentation of "static-statistical." The mysterious discrete "static," that is, the registration of events and phenomena in the Ukrainian SSR by industry statistics, did not always intersect with the real statistics of dynamic changes. The discrepancy between them has acquired special distortions at the epicenter of socio-demographic statistics of the 1930s, causing an artificial deformation of information sources (current, departmental statistics, census materials).

The well-known Ukrainian demographer A.P. Khomenko has repeatedly drawn attention to this fact. The theoretical and most advanced methods of analysis used by historians and demographers for decades, in the presence of controversial statistics, have the form of a ritual procedure. However, as one Ukrainian demagogue said, "We have what we have." We have dozens of official statistical sources: hundreds of archival files with the data of departmental statistics; materials of the All-Union Censuses of the population (1926, 1937, 1939); archival criminal case records of the repressed demographers and statisticians of those years; periodicals that were not censored by the Soviets; analytical works of Ukrainian demographers of the 1930s; and eyewitness accounts. In other words, we have an appropriate base. One cannot hope for more.

There will be no heuristic miracle, because there is no "secret" statistical register of people who died because of the Genocide-

Holodomor. Statistical protocols of the totalitarian regime, except for the occasional, local-situational accounting of the dead (in ledgers in the registry offices recording relevant diagnoses; contemporaneous reports of the GPU; information from the People's Commissariat of Health; *nomenklatura*-service correspondence; testimonies of eyewitnesses and district employees; regional statistical offices; and the central apparatus of the UGSU of the Ukrainian SSR). The system was a trusted servant – sometimes insolent, but generally loyal.

The statistics of the Genocide-Holodomor victims of 1932–1933 in Ukraine, as a universal sacral and spiritual value of people, are at the forefront of historical, demographic, intellectual, and ideological discourses; as well as memorial, and institutional actions.

Spanning several generations of Ukrainian and foreign researchers since 1933, a kind of historic-demographic auction is under way. Participants offer real and hypothetical stakes, as if they seek to buy the eternal blessings of the dead souls, whose bodies lie in the Ukrainian black earth, in the Soviet Union, elsewhere in foreign lands, or under the waters of the Dniester or the Zbruch [Rivers]. In almost 15,000 works of different kinds, authors have expressed their own and "objective scientific" assessments. A certain amount of this authorial production is difficult to explain only by the ideological confrontation of political systems; attempts to establish the facts of the Genocide-Holodomor and its denial; the identification of the Genocide-Holodomor; and acknowledging it as a national tragedy of Ukrainians in the twentieth century. Obviously, there are other motivational incentives inspiring the colossal intellectual energy of several generations of historians, writers, artists, spiritual asceticism of public figures in and outside Ukraine.

Why is there such an unbelievable attraction to the truth? Whether one is a scientist or an average citizen, everyone possesses his or her own truth. It is in vain to deny the emotional component, since the truth about the Genocide-Holodomor lived on in the memories of the older generations, transformed into dozens of collections of memoirs of eyewitnesses and victims acquired a memorial status – an individual, collective, associative, corporate national memory. This is a historical fact that, after the political-legal assessment of the Genocide-Holodomor in 2006, a legal act came into force.

The combination of these components and their institutional design in the functioning National Museum "Holodomor victims Memorial," as well as in the annual memorial events, testifies to the

systematic nature of commemorative phenomenon. These events cause irritation among the ideologically dependent and the Communist's social groups in Ukraine, frank chauvinistic forces, and supporters of mythical "worlds," various representatives of intellectual and ritual shamanism. The brutal denial of the Genocide-Holodomor as a fact does not work. Therein, we see their search for ways and means of destructive revision of its causes and consequences.

Revisionism in historical science, but as a method of critical revision of theories and concepts, is a normal phenomenon. In the early 1990s, Ukrainian historiography was embraced by the element of a systematic attempt to create a truthful revision of the Soviet past. Science lost its ideological schemes and dogmas, and was institutionalized and conceptually purified, and intellectually enriched. However, in the people's history, there are phenomena, symbols, and significant events that distinguish them from among the general, and give signs and features to national identity. These include language, customs, traditions, ethnographic and anthropological types of people.

The Genocide-Holodomor with millions of victims testifies to the destruction of the identifiable and systemic foundations of the people's identity. Therefore, a logical question arises regarding sacrificial symbolism, and the statement of the crime against humanity arises by itself. Most significant for the perception of this tragedy was the statistical symbolism; that is, the total number of the genocidal victims. A ritual historiographical and demographic discourse is taking place around it, especially during the civilizational choice made by Ukraine.

A part of the researchers, observing the memorial component of the Genocide-Holodomor tragedy, seeks to ascertain the maximum number of deaths, as well as the victims. This approach does not ignore the academic study, that is, the classical scientific interpretation of statistical and demographic materials. They are interconnected, since the total number of losses means the return from oblivion of the dead in the form of a functional-memorial Symbol, that is, the impersonal fixation of victims. A depreciation of number of the Genocide-Holodomor victims, as well as an unjustified increase in them, is contrary to the principles of Christian morals. It is cynical that the phrase, "Is 3.5–4 million Genocide-Holodomor victims insufficient" exists, especially in the context of the numerous proofs of the "apocalyptic tragedy." If the nation does not reach a consensus on the actual number of the Genocide-Holodomor victims, it will continue to be a "fake electorate" and its

“pseudo-prophets” in “sheep's clothing” will use this indifferent conceptualization. They will continue to fill out electronic declarations with six-digit numbers of dubious statements, sarcastically responding to efforts of historians and demographers who want to revive the multi-million code of the Ukrainian national sacrifice. A strange competition exists about this among the citizens of the same country. Some care about determining the real number of victims, while others fixate on the accounting of this issue. Meanwhile, the memorial figure of the number of Genocide-Holodomor victims wanders between 3.5–7.5 million people.

The organizers of the international scientific conference, which was held on October 4, 2016, in Kyiv, hoped for the consolidation of intellectual forces in Ukraine – professional historians, demographers, ethnographers, all of whom studying the consequences of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933. The purpose of the forum was to arrive at, by means of a scientific method, the total number of the victims of the Genocide-Holodomor. Leading scientists from these fields of knowledge were invited to participate, but not all responded. Some, with contempt, did not attend. The leaders of the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance were cautiously opposed to the idea of holding this conference. Intellectually, and with their presence, the Conference was supported by Ukrainian historians, international jurists, lawyers, literary critics, and ethnographers from leading Ukrainian universities and academic institutions, researchers from Kazakhstan studying “the Great Kazakh Jute,” and colleagues from the United States. Approximately thirty people participated in the discussion of the controversial and hotly debated issues.

Presented in the Proceedings of the Conference are the reports of its participants – authors’ intellectual-ideological and scientific-theoretical interpretations of events and phenomena that took place in Ukraine and in certain regions of the RSFSR. Thematically, they relate to: the statistical and demographic estimation of population losses during the Genocide-Holodomor; the territory of its distribution; local and national differences; historiography of coverage; political and legal qualification of the Genocide-Holodomor and the role and place of the evidence-based statistical basis; its reflection by literary means; and comparative analysis of genocides of the twentieth century. By highlighting the experience of establishing the total number of Jews in the 1933–1945 Holocaust (about 6 million people) – the consensus approach of the participants in the statistical and demographic discourse highlights

the first mention of this figure by the journalist, I. Ehrenburg, in 1944. Having been a part of the Nuremberg Trials materials, it has acquired legal process status. Before the trial, after it, and even now, various quantitative assessments were expressed, but no decent people denied the very fact of the crime. This figure for the fallen victims of the Holocaust has lasted for decades; has not decreased below 5 million; and was recognized as a statistical limit.

Some Ukrainian and Russian historians, who consider themselves the modern moral authority in the historiography of the Genocide-Holodomor and political repressions, perceive the "emulation" of the number of its victims as a "crime against the fallen." This is a very biased attitude, and absolutely false; and, from the memorial side of the case, immoral. That is correct, because speculative figures that are not documented are amorphous and impersonal. Looking at them, we, in absentia, return to their proper place in historic memory the forgotten victims of genocide – hundreds or thousands, which previously had not been taken into account.

The guilty of the Holocaust have been persecuted for years, found and publicly tried, since there is no statute of limitation period for a crime against humanity. The statistics of the Genocide-Holodomor victims, which have been accepted by Ukrainian legislation, are injured by the obfuscation that tries to conceal the issue within the hypothetical labyrinths of modern demographic assessments.

The political and legal assessment of the Genocide-Holodomor was difficult for Ukrainian society. In accordance with the articles of international lawyers (V. Vasylenko, M. Antonovych), a report by V. Udovychenko (practitioner in criminal case No. 475), materials of various parliamentary hearings, so-called legislative initiatives were promulgated regarding the revision of the Law of Ukraine of November 28, 2006, on the recognition of the Genocide-Holodomor. Disputes between scientists testify to a kind of intellectual confrontation, which has no signs of a rigid confrontation, but also a corporate consensus.

Historians and demographers, especially regarding the research of the victims' number of the Genocide-Holodomor, are moving along parallel courses without crossing the latitude of the theoretical and methodological preference. However, parallels, despite disappointing geometric theories, have the prospect of combining, even the combination of applied discourse. A historic-demographic study of district mortality rates in the years of the Genocide-Holodomor may be an important research area. If it is a permanent and scientifically accepted statistical and demographic value, then it

is important to determine the existing population that was physically present in villages at the time of the Genocide-Holodomor; and to distinguish its socio-occupational structure, and gender-age composition. Similar analytical methods are presented in the Conference materials. They are not universal, because universality does not exist at all, but, rather, applied.

However, the average area mortality that can be established hypothetically (demographers have already achieved some successes) and by direct reconstruction (a certain territorial-administrative segment is recreated), should be multiplied by the total number of rural population and as close as possible to the "agricultural population" – the collective farmers, independent farmers, and separate socio-occupational groups of the village. There are other approaches, but all together, they bring us to the awareness of the most complete number of deaths from the Genocide-Holodomor.

Its victims were not only the deceased, but also those affected. The Conference raised the issue of separating two social groups among the victims of the Genocide-Holodomor for the first time: the dead, as well as those who suffered from moral and psychological effects, and physical injuries. Applied psychiatry has special formulas for statistical measurement of the intensity of the impact of extreme conditions on the human psyche. The effect of prolonged hunger on the morphological changes of the internal organs of man, its psyche, the general physical condition and social behavior has been proved by sociologists and anthropologists in the 1920s. Therefore, there are theoretical and applied grounds for the justification of category of the Genocide-Holodomor victims. This is a subject of joint study by psychologists, anthropologists, and historians.

The Conference, having discussed scientific papers and reports, recognized the scientific basis of the total number of the Genocide-Holodomor victims – more than 7 million people. There were expected hopes for the cooperation of historians and demographers who directly study the statistical and demographic effects of the 1932–1933 Genocide-Holodomor in Ukraine. It is important to systematically and consistently investigate real mortality in each district by combining the different techniques (hypothetical prediction, restoration project, etc.) in order to achieve an optimal scientific conclusion.

Vasyl Marochko,
Doctor of Historical Sciences, Chief Scientist at the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

GREETINGS

Mykola Kotcherha,
President of the Ukraine Genocide-famine foundation – USA

Dear Pro-Rector Viktor Martyniuk, Co-Chair of the Commemorative Commission of Ukraine, Ivan Vasyniuk, sponsors, organizers, and colleagues of the Conference, and respected friends, The Ukrainian community long awaited for such a stellar scientific gathering to address the issue of the loss suffered by our nation during the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, not only in Ukraine, but also beyond its borders, wherever Ukrainians resettled or were exiled in great numbers. The legislation that recognizes the tragedy as a genocide was promulgated by the Verkovna Rada of Ukraine, in 2006. The Kyiv Court of Appeal reaffirmed the legality of the legislation, and named the main perpetrators of the genocide. We must fully determine as near as possible the true number of the Genocide-Holodomor victims. After all, every dead person is a loss for all mankind. Because of premature death, he or she could not serve the needs of our native land, nor contribute in his or her own way to the betterment of the broader community of mankind itself.

We must bring an awareness of the horrors of this tragedy to others. The success of our Conference is a serious and valuable contribution to the study of this genocide against Ukrainians within the context of Ukrainian society as a whole.

First, I want to thank Leonid Huberskyi, the Rector of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, who graciously invited us to hold our Conference within these walls. President Olesia Stasiuk and staff of the National Museum "Holodomor Victims Memorial" undertook the key mission of conference organization. I extend our special thanks to Professor Volodymyr Serhiychuk, who not only responded to our appeal to study the Genocide-Holodomor as a genocide, not only of the Ukrainian nation, but of Ukrainians everywhere in the Soviet Union, and to establish a realistic number of its victims. He also gave a powerful impetus to this venerable and successful scientific gathering.

For our part, I assure you all that the Ukrainian Genocide Famine Foundation – USA will continue to support your scientific researches in the quest for historical Truth. Every soul matters and should be accounted for.

GREETINGS

Ivan Vasiunyk,
Co-chairman at the Public committee for the commemoration of the victims of Holodomor-genocide 1932-1933 in Ukraine

Dear Colleagues!

Following the victory of the Revolution of Dignity, two negative trends are affecting the development of a humanitarian sphere in Ukraine. On the one hand, we continue to observe the lack of government attention to creating a humanitarian policy, which is not a surprise for anyone. Due to the fact that, in the past 25 years, we have had only brief periods when the government defined humanitarian policy as a whole; thereby placing information policy or the policy of national memory, in particular, as the first priority. On the other hand, we feel the efforts of our European neighbors to impose their vision of Ukrainian history, especially certain individual pages of the national struggle for Ukrainian Independence during the twentieth century. Sometimes, we are inclined to accept such a pact: "We, Europe, guarantee international support for your European integration; and solidarity in Ukraine's struggle for sovereignty and territorial integrity. In turn, you, Ukraine, should support our interpretation of certain historical events and eras."

I emphasize this for only one purpose. We must take into account the fact that institutions of state power, after 2013, are extremely weak, and some of them are incapacitated. We must also keep in mind the fact that the authorities have a great responsibility for the protection of territorial integrity, implementation of reforms, and elimination of corruption. Nevertheless, it does not have sufficient political will to bring to fruition the ideal changes that were naturally expected resulting from the Maidan, even if it desired to do so.

Can this justify treating humanitarian policy in such a secondary fashion? Not at all! Does such treatment relieve responsibility from the intellectual elite, scientists, and the general public? Again, not at all!

It is not sufficient to remind authorities about omissions by those engaged in public intellectual discourse. We are equally responsible for the humanitarian aspirations and spiritual potential of our nation.

That is why the topic of today's conference is extremely important, as is the very fact of its occurrence. Let me remind you that, at the beginning of the Yanukovych presidency in 2010, he denied the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 as genocide committed against the Ukrainian people. At first, under pressure from, and in order to please Putin, he betrayed national memory. Three years later, he betrayed the nation's future by refusing to sign the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the European Union.

Does Ukraine and the world need scientific discussions about the Genocide-Holodomor? Yes, of course! Is the Ukrainian Genocide-Holodomor Law of the Ukrainian people discussed? That is a rhetorical question. This is the Law of Ukraine. As such, it must be upheld by the authorities, the elites, and all citizens. Is it politically correct to question the legal assessments of the genocides of other nations and national groups; to develop discussions on issues that have become an integral part of the national memory of many peoples, whose members have been exterminated by totalitarian regimes? No! Do we have the right to remain silent when representatives of other countries incorrectly politicize and impose upon our own interpretations of history?

As a Co-Chairman of the Public Committee of Commemoration of the Victims of the Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933, in Ukraine, I appreciate the many reasons for today's conference.

In recent years, the study of the Ukrainian losses during the Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933, intensified due to the initiative of individual researchers or scientists. It is not difficult to observe a certain bias in the formation of public opinion regarding the scale of the crime, and the number of Genocide-Holodomor victims killed by the Stalinists. However, the problem is not limited to that point alone. In the academic environment, it is believed that the conclusions made by one group of academicians regarding the number of the Genocide-Holodomor victims are final; and all other facts, analyses, and researches carried out over the decades must simply be ignored, not considered, or forgotten. This is their claim to the "monopoly of truth."

In conclusion, I once more sincerely thank the initiators of today's scientific conference. Furthermore, with a great pleasure, allow me to say a few good and fair words about our government. After several years of appeals from the Public Committee of Commemoration of the Victims of the Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933 in Ukraine, President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko made a political decision. The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine led by Prime Minister Volodymyr Groysman completed the practical preparation of the CMU Resolution, "Preparatory Questions Regarding the Second Phase of 'Genocide-Holodomor Victims Memorial' in Kyiv."

I am convinced that this decision will enable all of us – the authorities, the public, and the world Ukrainian community – to fulfill our sacred duty to the innocent people killed. Additionally, in the near future, we must build a modern and worthy Museum that will present the truth about one of the greatest human tragedies of the twentieth century, to Ukrainians, and to the entire world.

ARTICLES

Volodymyr Serhiychuk

AN OBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT BASED ON OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS FROM UKRAINIAN ARCHIVES OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC LOSSES IN THE UKRAINIAN SSR CAUSED BY THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR IN 1932–1933

For decades, our diaspora was convinced that Ukraine has lost 7–10 million human lives due to the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933. German diplomats immediately wrote about their observations. On 11 December 1933, diplomats at the Consulate General of Germany in Kharkiv reported, "From reliable sources, it is known, that, according to official estimates, seven million victims do not constitute great losses; but this means that the fourth part of the peasantry was destroyed. Even in comparison to the victims of the World War [World War I, 1914–1918] this is a frightful number" [1].

Ukrainian researchers of emigration made relevant conclusions. For example, the Ukrainian economist, S. Sosnovyi, who worked in the State Planning Committee of the Ukrainian SSR in the 1930s, and remained a well-informed individual, published his conclusions in post-war time in emigration, claiming that the losses from the Genocide-Holodomor in 1932–1933 were 7,465,000 victims [2]. Consequently, starting in 1953, whenever our Diaspora held mass commemorative events regarding this tragedy, they used the above-mentioned figures.

For example, on 2 August 1953, in Manchester, Great Britain, a commemorative memorial march was held under the slogan, "We Blame Moscow for the Death of Seven Million Ukrainians Who Were Killed by the Famine in 1933" [3].

With the proclamation of independence, this assertion came to be accepted in Ukraine, and for almost a quarter of a century, this figure was accepted in the minds of the people. However, Professor Stanislav Kulchytskyi, the first Ukrainian historian allowed into the Kremlin's secret archives, did not accept this figure, and remained convinced that the losses of the Ukrainian SSR amounted to only 3.5 million people [4].

A few weeks before the unveiling of the Genocide-Holodomor Victims' Memorial in Washington, D. C. (7 November 2015), the leaders of five Ukrainian scientific institutions of North America:

the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute; the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies; the Shevchenko Scientific Society of America, Inc.; the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences; and the American Association of Ukrainian Studies appealed to the Chairman of the Organizing Committee, Michael Sawkiw, Jr., that he not use the generally accepted number of losses of 7–10 million people. Rather, he was to limit the number to that derived from the research of Professors Andrea Graziosi, Timothy Snyder, and Stanislav Kulchytskyi, who claim that this tragedy took the lives of less than half the accepted total number of victims. Otherwise, they said this would provoke protests in certain anti-Ukrainian circles that Kremlin propagandists could use to label Ukrainian science "incompetent" and so on. With this request in mind, the Organizing Committee decided to acquiesce. Hence, at the opening ceremony, they spoke only about millions of victims, without specifying a figure [5].

In my opinion, in the situation that was formed with an incomplete source base on migration processes in the Ukrainian SSR in 1929–1931, it is necessary to take the current population record from 1 January 1932, as the basis, because for this date, we have indicators of the residents of both villages and the cities. In general, the population of the Ukrainian SSR at that time, according to the record, was 32,680,700 people: urban – 7,127,700; rural – 25,553,000 [6].

If, to the official number of the population of the Ukrainian SSR of 32,600,700, as of 1 January 1932, we add at least 921,200 for the natural increase for the indicated two years (we take at least 460,600, which is the 1931 figure, for a year when there was no mass starvation), then we have a total of 33,521,900. The estimated figure of known population during that time, according to the Ukrainian demographer, A. Khomenko, for 1 January 1934, is 33,464,000 [7].

To define the population loss of the Ukrainian SSR during the two starvation years from the official figure of the All-Union Census in 1937 (28.2 million) [8], we deduct the natural increase of the population in 1934, in the number of 88,200 people. In 1935 – 417,200; 1936 – 533,700 – in total, 1,391,000, as well as the difference derived from the comparison with the regional results of the above-mentioned Census. The result is 532,000 less than the figure submitted to Moscow [9].

Thus, as of 1 January 1934, we have only 26,628,100 inhabitants. This mathematical process demonstrates a decrease in the

population of the Ukrainian SSR in 1932–1933 to 6,993,800 people. If about a million of these people died from natural causes, then all the others – almost 6 million people, defines the losses from the Genocide-Holodomor.

A demographic picture looks quite different in the Ukrainian village, if for the basis of the calculation of losses, we take data from 1 January 1932, rather than the results of the All-Union Census of 1926 [10], as this chart demonstrates:

Regions	1926 year, thousands	1932 year, thousands	1937 year, thousands	1937 year, in % to 1926	1937 year, in % to 1932
Kyiv	4,748,237	52578	3,786,939	79,7	72,0
Chernihiv	2,444,022	25814	2,194,462	89,7	85,0
Vinnytsia	3,829,831	4233,8	3,456,669	90,2	81,6
Kharkiv	4,747,282	5035,9	3,469,456	73,0	68,8
Dnipro-petrovsk	2,916,426	3116,9	2,152,859	73,8	69,0
Odesa	2,455,291	2637,4	1,899,485	77,3	72,0
Donetsk	2,032,386	2157,6	1,392,845	68,6	64,5
Moldavian ASRR	489,638	5362	473,127	96,6	88,2
Ukrainian SRR	23,663,113	255,503	18,825,842	79,5	73,6

According to these data, the loss of the village population is 6,724,500 people. However, if we include 2/3 of general population in the Census of 1937 [11], of 532,000, then 351,100 people were villagers. Therefore, the rural population decreased by 7,075,000 people. Again, when we add the typical growth of the rural population until 1937, in the amount of 771,600 (2/3 of which belonged to the village, from the total increase, numbering 1,169,200, in 1932 and 1934–1936), then losses amount to 7,846,200 people.

If we subtract the natural losses that could have amounted up to one million deaths in 1932–1933, in my opinion, it would be justifiable today to claim a minimum loss of 7 million before establishing a specific figure by checking thoroughly all the circumstances of this tragedy.

Meanwhile, it is necessary to continue the purposeful search, which will add to this approximately defined number of victims – many of those, who are still not taken into account. This effort is not simply about people who died from hunger on Ukraine's black soil;

it is about discovering the true death toll of the Genocide-Holodomor.

In particular, it is necessary to investigate the migration flow in 1932–1933 to the west, when thousands of hungry Ukrainian peasants tried to reach Poland or Romania through swamps in Polissia, Zbruch and Dniester, but were shot by the Soviet border guards, and did not reach foreign shores, where they hoped to find desperately needed food [12]. We need to total those who perished due to the death sentences issued in accordance with the Law of Five Spikelets [13]. We need to count those bodies found in mass burial sites near railway stations, into which the bodies of the starved people were thrown. What is the total number of those wanderers, who died while seeking food, and whose bodies were thrown naked into common burial pits without any proper registration to mark their deaths? How many perished from cannibalism? How many workers from Russia and other Soviet Republics were brought into Ukrainian cities, and who, in the Census of 1937, took the place of those victims lost to Ukraine, as a result of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933?

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Голодомор в Україні 1932–1933 років. За документами політичного архіву Міністерства закордонних справ Федеративної Республіки Німеччини. – К.: Національний інститут стратегічних досліджень, 2008. – С. 161. A. I. Kudriachenko, ed. *Holodomor in Ukraine 1932-1933, According to Documents of the Political Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany* (Kyiv: Natsional'nyi instytut stratehichnykh doslidzhen', 2008): 161.
2. Сосновий С. Правда про голод в Україні 1932–1933 рр. // Українські вісті (Новий Ульм, Західна Німеччина). – Ч. 10–11. – 1950. *Ukrainian News* (New Ulm, Bavaria, Germany, 1950): Part 11.
3. Сосновий С. Правда про голод в Україні 1932–1933 рр. // Українські вісті (Новий Ульм, Західна Німеччина). – Ч. 10–11. – 1950. *Ukrainian News* (New Ulm, Bavaria, Germany, 22 October 1953).
4. Кульчицький С. Демографічні наслідки Голодомору 1933 р. в Україні. – К. 2003. – С. 62. S. Kulchytsky "Holodomor 1932-1933, As Genocide: Difficulties of Realization," *Nash Chas* (2008): C. 48.
5. Serhij Plokhii plokhii@fas.harvard.edu,"Holodomor Memorial" email to Michael Sawkiw, Jr., Chairman U.S. Holodomor Commission unis@ucca.org cc: George Grabowicz, Albert Kipa, Volodymyr Kravchenko, Serhij Plokhii, Vitaly A. Chernetsky (Tuesday 1 September 2015, 9:44:53 a.m.) group email (Accessed: 12 September 2017).
6. Довідник з основних статистично-економічних показників господарства районів Київської области. – Харків, 1933. – С. 8 Arsen Khomenko, "Population of the USSR in Prospective Calculation," *Profilaktychna Medycyna* 11:12 (1932): 4.
7. Ibid.

8. С. Демографічні наслідки Голодомору 1933 р. в Україні. – К. 2003. – С. 62. *All-Union Population Census 1937: Brief Outcome* (Moscow: Institute of History of the USSR 1991): 58.
9. CzDAVOVU: F.2; Op.12, Spr. 70. Ark. 5:7.
10. All-Union Census of 1926 at: http://www.brill.com/sites/default/files-/ftp/downloads/31708_Titlelist.pdf (Accessed: 30 December 2017). Сосновий С. Правда про голод в Україні 1932–1933 рр. // Українські вісті (Новий Ульм, Західна Німеччина). – Ч. 10–11. – 1950.
11. *The All-Union Population Census, 1937 and 1939*: Vsesoluzmaia perepis' naseleniia 1937 goda (Woodbridge, Connecticut" Research Publications, an imprint of Primary Source Media: Moscow: Federal Archival Service of Russia, 2000).
12. "Dniester is Red from Blood," *Svoboda* (newspaper) (L'viv, 1933).
13. Decree of the Central Government of the USSR: "On the Protection of the Property of State Enterprises, Collective Farms, and Cooperatives, and on the Consolidation of Pubic (Socialist) Property (7 August 1932) at: *http://www.faminegenocide.com/kuryliw/corn*_law.htm (Accessed: 25 April 2017). From: Sobranie zakonov (Collection of Laws) 1932, No. 62, in *Tragediia sovetskoi derevni, Vol. 3* (Moscow, 2001): 453-454.
14. Українські вісті. – Новий Ульм, Західна Німеччина. – 1953. – 22 жовтня.

Vasyl Marochko

HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOURCE EVIDENCE OF DEMOGRAPHIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE FAMINE IN THE UKRAINAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC, IN 1932–1933

Researchers of the Genocide-Holodomor are studying primarily the total number of tube deceased. However, the concept of the phenomenon of "Genocide-Holodomor victims" also applies to those who survived and experienced physical, mental, and psychological trauma. The definition "hunger victim" appeared in the Western press in the 1930s, and was disseminated by intellectuals of the Ukrainian Diaspora, in the 1940s–1980s. It received legal interpretation at the meetings of The International Commission of Inquiry into the 1932–1933 Famine in Ukraine, which operated through 1988–1989 [5]. The legal and political definition of "Genocide-Holodomor victims" was legislatively established by the Ukraine in the Law No. 376-V, "On the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 in Ukraine," on 28 November 2006. This law gave legal status to the terms, such as: "victims of the Genocide-Holodomor in 1932–1933 in Ukraine;" "victims of the Genocide-Holodomor;" and "victims and survivors of the Genocide-Holodomor." The category of "survivors" included those deemed conditionally "alive," yet who suffered bodily injuries due to prolonged starvation and physical exhaustion: those swollen from starvation edema; sufferers of long-term consequences of chronic diseases, such as typhoid, malaria, dystrophy, dysentery; as well as those enduring mental disorders. Additionally, we must count suicides as a result of hunger; deaths from cannibalism; sickness and death from eating dead animals, including cats and dogs; and the "silent insanity" of PTSD or an inherited sense of fear, etc.

During the first half of the 1920s, anthropologists studied the destructive effect of "hunger as a factor" on the physical and moral state of human beings. They conducted research on the socio-anthropological type of the victims of the 1921–1923 Famine [4]. Their works show scientifically proven the anthropological manifestations identified in the victims of hunger, including pathological changes in the internal organs of a person resulting from the quantitative (duration of hunger) and qualitative (lack of proteins, fats, carbohydrates in the food substitutes) aspects of the starvation of a living human organism.

Anthropological and statistical-demographic features of the victims of the Genocide-Holodomor are documented in the books of death records of village councils, registry offices, documents of the Soviet government bodies in Ukraine (reports of the State Political Directorate, People's Commissariat for Health of the Ukrainian SSR, and official correspondence of party structures).

The definitions: "mass swelling from hunger;" "exhaustion;" "acute exhaustion from hunger;" "mass malnutrition;" "swelling of the body;" "dystrophy;" "epidemics of typhoid;" and "malaria" documented in those years, testify to the presence of the many physical damages afflicting the starving people.

According to archival documents, those swollen with starvation edema constituted 50% of the still-"living" victims of the Genocide-Holodomor, and mortality reached 29% of this socio-anthropological group [2, p. 519]. From tropical malaria alone, we see that more than 2 million people were afflicted in the southeastern regions of the Ukrainian SSR [12, sheet. 11].

The statistical-demographic aspects involve the establishment of the total number of Genocide-Holodomor victims, the identification of the deceased, and the establishment of the number of those who survived. The demography considers the "present" population (by the place of permanent residence), and the legal (registered at a specific address). Official statistics recorded from 31.9 to 32.5 million people of the Ukrainian SSR in 1932–1933, of which the urban population ranged from 6.7 to 7.1 million. Rural residents were counted from 24.7 to 25.5 million people. Simultaneously, they were the witnesses and victims of the Genocide-Holodomor. The departmental statistics preserved in the archival fonds of various institutions of the Ukrainian SSR in the 1930s, specifies the socio-demographic group of the "present" rural population. The Ukrainian Research Institute of MTS (Machine Tractor Stations) and collective-farm construction (established in December 1932) found 24,049,309 people, not 25.1 million, according to the People's Commissariat of Labor, as 4.2% of the rural population were not engaged in agricultural works [13, sheet 5]. The Authority of the All-Ukrainian Cooperative Union operated in 1932–1935, and identified two groups of social and labor types within the rural population: "agricultural" and "non-agricultural." The 17.6 million collective farm workers attributed to the first category, along with 5.8 million individual peasants together accounted for 23.4 million of the "present" population. Statistician K. Voblyi counted 23.7 million farmers in 1932 [7, sheet 1]. They are "direct" victims of the

Genocide-Holodomor. Waves of migrating starving peasants, and homeless children from rural areas sought shelter and food. Despite the temporary nature of their departure from home, they constituted a part of that portion of the hungry peasant population doomed to death.

The current official statistics show the causes and circumstances of the Genocide-Holodomor. In 1933, 45% of Ukrainian collective farms paid for earned workdays 6-12 poods of grain (14 poods per person per year). That is an amount less than the minimum intake required for health. In 1932, this number of collective farms was 51%. During the first year of the Genocide-Holodomor, 40% of the collective farmers did not work. Therefore, they did not accumulate any workdays (form of payment by money and/or in kind, for the amount of work done. Note that workdays were not chronological days, but based on a certain amount of work completed, regardless of how many calendar days were actually required.), and thus, they had no means of garnering subsistence. In the spring of 1933, 48% of the collective farms in the Ukrainian SSR did not pay the collective farmers. That means the Soviet government did not give grain crops and money for their labor earnings [3, p. 446].

The non-agricultural population (100,000 teachers; about 100,000 craftsmen; 39,000 employees; and 400,000 "dependents" – children, the elderly, the disabled, including war-wounded), were not engaged in professional agriculture, yet also lived in the countryside, as a part of the "present" population. The workers of the state farms, although distinguished by the form of wages and social status, did not escape terror by hunger. Therefore, together with teachers, craftsmen, and "dependents" made up 1.4 million people. We can consider these people victims of the Genocide-Holodomor, because they lost their relatives, suffered physical injuries, or died.

Students from rural areas comprised a special social group. In the first semester in 1932, there was 3.6 million pupils, but the so-called "hot breakfast" (100 grams of surrogate bread and tea) was received by only 73,000 of these children. Cooperative public catering was able to cover from 15 to 20% of the students and 40% of the teachers. This food was given only to the "physically weak," "exhausted," and children with symptoms of anemia. Such symptoms, in 1932, affected 10% of the population of the children of Ukraine. An additional 5% suffered from tuberculosis [15, sheet 84]. They are "direct" victims of the Genocide-Holodomor.

Modern demographic science uses the notion of "direct" (over-mortality) and "indirect" (deficiency of births), while talking about

the losses of the famine in 1932–1934. Demographers estimate the total loss figure of 4.5 million, 3.9 million of which are due to death and 586,000 unborn; and "direct losses" of the rural population – 3.6 million people [6, p. 100]. This is a very "direct" and categorical conclusion. "Direct" losses are considered to be "... the difference between the real number of deaths and their hypothetical amount that could have existed in the absence of hunger." If there is a "real number of deaths" (apparently, registration books did not record one-third of the dead, and in some areas, officials completely stopped creating mortality records), why use this hypothetical prognosis? "Non-crisis years of 1932–1934" were chosen as the model of stable demographical process, but the scientific calculations of the Ukrainian demographer, a co-worker of the Central Statistical Directorate of the Ukrainian SSR, A. Khomenko, proved the opposite. In this period, there was a decline in the birth rate, so mortality increased. In May 1932, the Director of the Central Statistical Directorate of the Soviet Union, V. Osynskyi, informed the government about the birth rate decline in cities by 15% and in the countryside by 24% [8, p. 3].

Statistics and demographics of the Ukrainian SSR, in the 1920s and 1930s, worked on the hypothetical forecasts regarding the natural movement of the population. Thus, in 1927, A. Khomenko applied an "empirical concrete coefficient" and a "hypothetical" one concerning a natural movement of the population. These two coefficients had to cross in 1932, and therefore, Ukraine in 1940, would have reached 35.4 million people [10, p. 198]. In 1932, the scientist expressed confidence that in 1937, the population of the Ukrainian SSR would be 35.6 million people [11, p. 48]. The prognosis of demographer M. Puchta concerning reaching the figure of 34.6 million by 1 January 1938, as well as Khomenko's prediction, did not raise the objections of their senior colleague, J. Korchak-Chepurkivskyi. All three were repressed. In 1939, A. Khomenko was shot. Many of the statisticians and census-takers were liquidated [murdered through unjust execution], when the 1937 Census revealed the extent of the demographic disaster.

The All-Union Census, which took place on 6 January 1937, revealed the "real population" in Ukraine. On 15 January, the Director of the Central Statistical Directorate of the Ukrainian SSR, O. Asatkin, reported the outcome of the Census. According to the documents of the regional departments of statistics, the population of the Ukrainian SSR amounted to 27.9 million "present" people. According to preliminary estimates (without counting the army, or

those persons held in imprisonment by the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs), the population totaled 28.2 million people [16, sheet 14–20]. He recalled that the catastrophic decline of the natural population movement in 1932–1933, did not conceal the decline of the population in comparison to 1926. Asatkin was arrested on 4 July 1937, accused of falsifying the materials of the Census, especially in regards to the missing justification for the figure of 35 million people that Stalin expected. On 2 September, Asatkin was shot. This mysterious 35 million figure appeared in the archives and criminal cases of the repressed demographers and statisticians.

Thus, comparing the expected population in the Ukrainian SSR, in January 1937 (35.6 million, according to the hypothetical prognosis by A. Khomenko), with the real numbers (according to the Census: 27.9 and 28.2 million people), the number of "dead souls" totals 7.7 million people (35.6 million minus 27.9 million) or 7.4 million (35.6 million minus 28.2 million). Conditionally, we can name the statistical and demographic calculations "Khomenko's Formula." The figure of 35 million found in O. Asatkin's criminal case records [1, sheet 9], in relation to the results of the population census, proved fatal to him. This number shows another losses rate: from 6.8 to 7.1 million people. Therefore, at least 23.4 million people of the total Ukrainian SSR population became victims of the Genocide-Holodomor, and of these, there were more than 7 million Ukrainian peasants, who perished.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. ГДА СБУ. – Ф. 6. – Спр. 43187. – фп. Т. 1.
2. Голод 1932–1933 років в Україні: очима істориків, мовою документів. – К., 1990. – 603 с.
3. Голод 1932-1933 років в Україні: причини і наслідки. – К., 2003. – С. 446.
4. Ивановский А.А. Изменение физических признаков населения России под влиянием голодания // Наука на Украине. – 1922. – №4. – С. 90–97; Вайсенберг С.А. Влияние недоедания и болезней на физическое развитие детей // Русский антропологический журнал. – 1924. – №3–4. – С. 103–110; Бунак В.В. К антропологической характеристике влияния голодного времени на физическое развитие // Русский антропологический журнал. – 1926. – №1/2. – С. 211–212; Николаев Л.П. Влияние голодания на строение и вес внутренних органов у детей // Дети украинцы школьного возраста. Материалы по антропологии Украины. Сборник первый / Под ред. д-ра Л.П. Николаева. – Харьков, 1926. – С. 182–218.
5. Международная комиссия по расследованию голода на Украине 1932–1933 годов. Итоговый отчет 1990 года / Ответ. за выпуск В.Б. Евтух. – К., 1992. – 191 с.
6. Левчук Н.М. Втрати міського й сільського населення України внаслідок Голодомору в 1932–1934 рр.: нові оцінки / Н.М. Левчук, Т.Г. Боряк,

О. Воловина, О.П. Рудницький, А.Б. Ковбасюк // Український історичний журнал. – 2015. – №4. – С. 100.
7. Національна бібліотека України імені В.І. Вернадського. Інститут рукопису. – Ф. XXXVIII. – № 411. – Арк. 1.
8. РДАСПІ. – Ф. 82. – Оп. 2. – Спр. 538. – Арк. 3
9. Українське слово. – 2006. – 6–12 грудня.
10. Хоменко А. До питання про майбутній темп росту населення України (За матеріалами демографічного відділу ЦСУ УСРР) // Червоний шлях. – 1927. – № 7. – С.198.
11. Хоменко А. Людність УСРР у перспективному обчисленні // Профілактична медицина. – 1932. – № 11–12. – С. 48.
12. ЦДАВО України. – Ф. 342. – Оп.14. – Спр. 198. – Арк. 11.
13. ЦДАВО України. – Ф. 3470. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 69. – Арк. 5.
14. ЦДАВО України. – Ф. 3470. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 72. – Арк. 9.
15. ЦДАВО України. – Ф. 4134. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 291. – Арк. 84.
16. ЦДАГО України. – Ф.1. – Оп.20. – Спр.7163. – Арк.14 – 20.

Volodymyr Vasylenko

EMPIRICAL AND CLASSICAL ATTEMPTS OF COUNTING DEMOGRAPHIC LOSSES FROM THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR IN UKRAINE IN 1932–1933

The exact victims' number of the Genocide-Holodomor does not exist, and it is hardly possible to establish it. In an effort to conceal the scale of crime and its disastrous consequences, the Kremlin leadership banned the authorities of civil status records, the authorities of natural population movement, and medical institutions to record true causes of deaths. When the famine peaked in 1933, the dead were buried in the peasant's yards, and in mass graves without any registration. According to S. Kulchytskiy, at that time, the work of state authorities in the countryside had been violated, and sometimes, it was completely paralyzed. In 1934, the bodies of population registration and related archival services were subordinated to the NKVD of the USSR. Free access to demographic information ended.

Difficulties in counting the total number of people starved to death are used sometimes to to cast doubt on the Ukrainian national tragedy and to deny its genocidal character. According to international law, the key to qualifying the crime of genocide is not a number of killed people, but intention to destroy a particular group through the total or partial elimination of its members. The number of victims is not a legal feature of genocide, but only one of the crime's circumstances. The clarification of this circumstance is only an auxiliary means that prove an intention of partial or complete destruction of a particular group. Moreover, it helps to resolve the issue of the crime's gravity, and to impose appropriate punishment. In the presence of directing crime against a group as such, the murder of any number of its members is a crime of genocide.

Even if, during the Genocide-Holodomor, not a few million Ukrainians died, but many less, it would not change the genocidal nature of this crime. Numerous calculations, particularly those whose results indicate a minimum number of the Genocide-Holodomor victims, indicate that millions were killed. The exact number of millions – 3, 5, 7 or 10 – from the legal point of view, is not of fundamental importance. Therefore, in terms of qualifying the Genocide-Holodomor as a crime of genocide, any political manipulation of quantity related to number of victims, both in their

direction and in increase, is pointless; and in moral terms, such actions are speculative, and blasphemous.

Despite the objections to the fact of famine made by the Communist authorities, and the concealment of demographic information, the scale of demographic catastrophe in Ukraine has attracted an attention of foreign journalists, diplomats, and specialists, who worked in the USSR at that time.

The first empirical estimates of the Genocide-Holodomor victims' number began to appear in the western press at its height. Unlike journalists' reports, diplomat assessments were closed, and became known only much later. An analysis of correspondence and diplomatic reports at that time indicates that there are large differences in the numbers of the victims' of the crime. They ranged between 1 million and 15 million. The only logical conclusions based on these estimates are that: the victims of the Genocide-Holodomor organized by the Communist regime joined in death by millions of people in Ukraine and abroad; and that the Ukrainian nation suffered the greatest number of losses.

Thus, in the analytical report, "Famine and the Ukrainian Question," prepared in May 1933, by the Royal Consul of Italy in Kharkiv, S. Gradenigo, said that the policy of the Moscow government "is aimed at liquidating the Ukrainian problem in a few months, amounting to 10 or 15 million souls. This figure should not seem exaggerated. I think that it has been reached already, and probably will be exceeded... From this, I conclude: the present catastrophe will cause the colonization of Ukraine mainly by the Russian people. This policy will change its ethnographic nature. Perhaps in the very near future it will not be necessary even to talk about Ukraine or the Ukrainian people, and, therefore, there will be no Ukrainian problem, as Ukraine will actually become a part of Russia."

In a political report of the German Consulate in Kiev, dated 15 January 1934, it was noted: "The Ukrainian question stated this year can be estimated only in the context of mass starvation. Because of this catastrophe that people consider Moscow's politics responsible for, the gap between Ukrainians as advocates of self-sufficiency and Moscow's centralism, of course, has deepened. A remarkable attitude in the mood of the population is a common belief that the Soviet government deliberately intensified the hunger to force Ukrainians fall on their knees." It is also worthwhile to cite the document, "Is Ukraine Ukrainian?" written in May 1936, by an anonymous author after a week-long trip to Ukraine. In this

document, now is stored in archives of the German Foreign Ministry, states: “Ukrainian Ukraine was destroyed. Of more than 30 million of its population, according to rough estimates, one fifth, that is 6 million people, died of starvation.”

Along with the empirical estimates of the Genocide-Holodomor victims' number, there are many expert assessments made through use of various methods by numerous researchers in the 1940s–1950s. The sources of these assessments were the all-encompassing Censuses of 1926, and 1939. They recognized the fact that the stunning results of the All-Union Census in 1937 were deemed defective by the Soviet leadership, which prohibited its publication. According to expert estimates made upon the declassification of Soviet demographic statistics, the upper limit of the loss decreased from 15 million to 7.5 million, and the minimum limit increased from 1 million to 2.5 million.

Following the discovery made in the late 1980s during access to previously closed Soviet archives, a further narrowing of the total number of the Genocide-Holodomor victims in Ukraine was possible. Estimates of researchers began to fluctuate in the range from 5.2 million to 2.6 million victims stricken by the hunger death.

However, the issue of determining the number of the Genocide-Holodomor victims remains controversial. As before, researchers get ambiguous results, even within the framework of same project.

Evidence of this was presented in 2008, in “Demographic Catastrophe in Ukraine as a Result of the 1932–1933 Genocide-Holodomor: Constituents, Scale and Effects,” by the scientific-analytical Report of the Institute of Demography and Social Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. The Report reveals the rather contradictory estimates of the quantitative parameters of human losses in Ukraine. Thus, on page 76 of the Report, it indicates that total demographic losses are from 5.5 to 5.6 million people, while the magnitude of human losses from morality varies within a range of no more than 3.4–3.5 million. On report page 78, total losses are estimated at 5.4 million, with allocation of losses in rural areas of 5.1 million people. On report page 82, total losses of Ukraine in 1932 are defined as 795,000, and in 1933 – 3.5 million; that is, in total, 4,295,000. On page 84, the Report summarizes that demographic losses of Ukraine resulting from the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, estimate the number of losses due to increased mortality at 4.5 million to 3.4 million people. Additionally, 1.1 million people were lost because of declining

fertility. At the same time, it states there that cumulative demographic losses are about 6 million people.

The ambiguity in the estimates of human losses from the Genocide-Holodomor is explained not as researchers' application of different methods of calculating demographic statistics, but due to the known unreliability of their basic data. Even if calculations are made according to all the rules of demographic science, and yet are based on Censuses statistics of 1937 and 1939, their results can hardly be considered reliable. As is well known, the quality of both Censuses is questionable.

The statistics of the Census of 1937 are particularly dubious. According to S. Kulchytskiy, there was from one-third to one-half deaths recorded in Ukraine, but death from starvation was not noted; and from March to August 1933, the real mortality (including natural) was in the range of 2–3 times exceeded from that specified in the documents of statistical accounting. Beginning in November, officials removed registration books of deaths, for 1933 and 1932, from the village council, and transferred them to secret departments of the district executive committees. In the SBU investigation materials of the criminal case No.475 On the Fact of Ukrainian Genocide in 1932–1933, only 3,186 such books were documented in the archives. During World War II, most of these books were destroyed or lost.

The records of censuses did not properly show the current population movement. The absurdity of statistics recorded in both censuses evidenced by fact that, according to their data, the population of Ukraine, from 1926 to 1937, decreased by only 538,639 people, and from 1926 to 1939, more than 3 million.

During the SBU investigation of the criminal case, No.475 On the Fact of Ukrainian Genocide in 1932–1933, the Institute of Demography and Social Research conducted a judicial-research experiment, which gave the following results: direct losses of the Ukrainian population at the territory of the Ukrainian SSR as result of the Genocide-Holodomor amounted to 3,941,000 people (in villages – 3,666,000 (93%), in cities – 275,000 (7%), and indirect losses (deficit of births) equal to 1,122,000 people (in villages – 762,000), in cities – 360,000). Among the famine killed 3,597,000 (91.2%) were Ukrainians, 345,000 (8.8%) were representatives of national minorities.

In this regard, it should be mentioned that, in the official letter of the State Economic Register of the State Planning Committee of the Ukrainian SSR dated on 22 April 1935, addressed to S. Kosior and

P. Postishev, it was noted that, in the beginning of 1934, the republic had not found present an estimated 4,179,000 rural people.

Under these circumstances, modern expert assessments cannot unconditionally be a non-alternative substitute, for professional evaluations carried out in the past as thoroughly as some of the first empirical assessments of the Genocide-Holodomor conducted by contemporaries especially, those who lived for years in Ukraine, visited the rural regions, and gained confidential access to the primary sources of the necessary information.

Given the extraordinary situation, it is necessary to develop new approaches to correcting rigged demographic statistics, and to use previously made expert and empirical assessments. Homogeneity of such approaches will help obtain results that are more reliable.

In order to restore historical truth; officially establish the truth; pay due attention to the victims' memory; and reveal the Genocide-Holodomor's disastrous consequences for development of the Ukrainian nation, it is necessary to continue to work to establish the number of the Genocide-Holodomor victims.

The Security Service of Ukraine, in May 2009, validated Case No 475, investigating the fact of committing the Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933 in Ukraine. The findings obtained in its investigation and their confirmation in the Resolution of the Court of Appeal in Kyiv of 13 January 2010, relates only to the Genocide-Holodomor organizers. Consequently, the crimes committed by the actual perpetrators were not investigated. Accordingly, the whole picture of all the circumstances and consequences of the Genocide-Holodomor, including those relating to the number of Ukrainians killed by famine, remain without clarification.

Therefore, the present author proposes that the Conference address the SBU of Ukraine, with a proposal to investigate the crime of the Ukrainian Genocide-Holodomor in 1932–1933; and to initiate a new case to identify its perpetrators. Such an investigation will allow us more fully grasp the consequences of the Genocide-Holodomor, including clarifying the number of the Ukrainian people killed by famine. Clearly, a new investigation should be completed by court order that will officially confirm its conclusions and validate the number of the victims.

Andriy Kozytskyi

UKRAINE'S DEMOGRAPHIC LOSSES DURING THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR OF 1932–1933, IN THE CONTEXT OF 20TH CENTURY CALCULATIONS OF GENOCIDAL VICTIMS

During the twentieth century, approximately a dozen cases of mass extermination of civil population that had signs of genocide occurred. For example, six cases have gained international recognition, including: the Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War; the Ukrainian Genocide during the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933; the Genocides of Jews and Gypsies during the Second World War; the Khmer Rouge Genocide of Cambodians; and the Genocide of Tutsi in Rwanda, in 1994. Also, one of the episodes of the Bosnian War of 1992–1995: namely, the murder by Serbs of about eight thousand Bosnian Muslim men near Srebrenica, in July 1995, we recognize internationally, as an act of genocide. The case of the genocide of Kazakhs during the Great Famine in Kazakhstan in 1931–1933, is a special case. Undoubtedly, this has all the signs of a genocidal action, but because of certain specifics in the course of foreign policy of modern Kazakhstan, the event has not received international recognition. Other 20th century cases of mass extermination of civil populations: Kurds in Iraq; Chinese Communists in Indonesia; the indigenous people of East Timor; the Igbo nationality in Nigeria; the black population of Darfur, etc., still have not received widespread, international recognition as acts of genocide, although they all feature certain aspects of genocidal action [9, p. 17–24].

Despite long and scrupulous researches, scientists have not been able to establish the exact number of victims of any of the genocides of the twentieth century. Usually, researchers operate only with approximate, and sometimes, simply estimated numbers (see Table 1). Scientists usually resort to comparing population before and after the mass extermination, in an attempt to calculate demographic losses in specific cases of genocide. Such a method raises complex tasks, because it is necessary to reconstruct dynamics of the demographic changes, both on the eve of and after the genocide, and often over relatively long timespans. Another difficult problem is the calculation of the numbers of persons involved in a mechanical population movement: those who escaped from persecution or those whose “dissolution” from the persecuted among

the surrounding population occurred by them changing their national or religious identity.

Particularly difficult are attempts to determine the number of victims of genocide in cases where genocide was combined with an external armed conflict or civil war that resulted in a "natural" increase in mortality, both due to direct military losses, and to the sharp deterioration of the socio-economic conditions in the lives of formerly peaceful people. Other traditional companions of military conflict are the emergence of refugees, and the fact that during a military crisis or action, no one troubles to count refugees.

Meanwhile, the prevailing majority of recognized cases of mass extermination or genocide of civilians in the 20th century occurred precisely during large-scale military conflicts. The Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire during the World War I; the Genocide of Jews and Gypsies during the Second World War; the Genocide of the Tutsi during the Civil War in Rwanda all occurred in such circumstances. The Genocide in Cambodia took place immediately after the end of a long-running partisan war carried out by the Khmer Rouge during a permanent armed conflict of the Pol Pot regime with Vietnam.

The Genocides of Ukrainians and Kazakhs are unique cases of mass extermination of civilians in the twentieth century. These tragedies took place, not only during peacetime, but during a long period of peace. As such, they are distinguished from the general landscape of genocidal actions committed against a targeted population.

The main demographic feature of the Genocide-Holodomor is that Ukrainians are the largest group of people exterminated by means of genocide during the twentieth century. Where the Genocide-Holodomor occurred, 25.5 million Ukrainians lived in the affected territories. Other peoples, who also became victims of genocidal activities, were numerically smaller (see Table 2).

The second unique feature of the Genocide-Holodomor of Ukrainians is that it was one of two cases of genocide in the twentieth century that took place on the territory where victims were the majority of the population – more than 75% of the total population in the case of the Ukrainian SSR. Mass extermination of Kazakhs and Armenians took place on the territories where these people were only a relative majority: Kazakhs accounted for 59% of the population of Kazakhstan in 1926; and Armenians 39% of the population of Western Armenia (six eastern villages of the Ottoman Empire), in 1912. Jews, Gypsies, and Tutsi were the national

minorities in those countries, in which their mass extermination took place. They did not exceed the figure of 10% of total population, although they could amount to from 30 to 40% of the inhabitants of individual regions.

Another nationality, named Khmer, was in a similar situation as Ukrainians during the Genocide. The Khmer also formed the overwhelming majority in the territory of their mass extermination – about 90% of the inhabitants of Cambodia. There is a fundamental difference between the genocides of Ukrainians and Khmers. As results of the Genocide-Holodomor, demographic losses of the Ukrainian population were significantly higher than the loss of national minorities in Ukraine (Russians, Jews, Poles, etc.): Ukrainians accounted more than 81% of the dead from starvation in Ukraine in 1932–1933 [12, p. 517–518]. In contrast, during the Genocide in Cambodia, the losses of Khmers were proportionally less than twice as low (from 21 to 24%) as the percentage of victims among the national minorities in their country (Chinese, Vietnamese, Thais, etc.), reaching from 37 to 40% of these national groups [17, p. 536–537]. A large number of publications devoted to the Genocide of 1975–1978 in Cambodia do not divide the demographic losses of the inhabitants of Cambodia by national groups. Thus, they provide a total number of victims of the inhabitants, called "Cambodians" (collectively, these losses can reach 29% population of the country before the Genocide).

The third demographic feature of the Genocide-Holodomor combines it with the mass extermination of Jews and Gypsies. Like members of these two groups in 1941–1945, Ukrainian peasants during 1932–1933 also lacked or were forbidden opportunities to flee abroad, as did populations of the Great Famine in Kazakhstan (over 1.3 million refugees). Partly, this inability to flee occurred also during genocidal crimes in the Ottoman Empire (about 300,000 refugees); in Cambodia (over 300,000 refugees); and in Rwanda (more than 250,000 refugees) [8, p. 42; 23, p. 120–126]. Similarly, the Ukrainian peasants, who had very limited opportunities to avoid persecution, were "dissolving" among the local (first, the urban) population, as happened with part of the Armenian inhabitants in the Ottoman Empire, of which 240,000–300,000 people were saved.

It should be noted separately, that the most expressive and unequivocal long-term negative trends in demographic development are manifested in Ukrainians and Jews, among the other nationalities, which survived a genocide in the twentieth century (see Table 2).

Table 1. Demographic Losses as a Result of the Genocides of the Twentieth Century.

Group	Minimum number of victims of genocide	Maximum number of victims of genocide	Extremely minimal estimate of the number of victims of genocide	Extremely maximal estimate of the number of victims of genocide	Percentage of demographic losses relative to the total number of people in the world	Percentage of demographic losses of the population relative to the size of the genocide territory
Armenians	0.6–0.8 mln	1.25-1.50 mln	0.05–0.06 mln	2.1 mln	15–50%	0–88%
Kazakhs	1–1.5 mln	1.75–1.84 mln	0.86 mln	2–2.2 mln	17–33%	25–46%
Ukrainians	3.4–3.9 mln	6.5–7.5 mln	1.5–2.6 mln	10 mln	9–20%	13-29
Jews	4.5–5 mln	5.72–5.95 mln	4.2 mln	6.3 mln	28–38%	50–66%
Gypsy	0.22 mln	0.27 mln	0.2 mln	0.4–0.5 mln	4–5%	22–31%
Cambodians	0.74–1.20mln	1.67–2,16 mln	0.3 mln	3.1–3.3 mln	9–27%	10–29%
Tutis	0.72–0.80 mln	0.94 mln	0.5 mln	1 mln	40–59%	89–146%

The calculation based on: [1, p. 60–72; 2, p. 27–40; 3, p. 17; 4, p. 7–29; 5, p. 97; 6, p. 422; 7, 76; 10, p. 9–26; 11, p. 407; 13, p. 37–54;14, p. 137–141; 15, p. 3–72; 16, p. 3–10; 18, p. 763–796; 19, p. 65–110; 20, p. 52, p. 61; 21, p. 24–36; 22, p. 2–25; 24, p. 17; 25, p. 3; 26, p. 259–260; 27, p. 103–115; 28, p. 1797; 29, p. 25–27; 30, p. 207; 31, p. 9–36; 32, p. 109–142; 33, p. 1320–1321; 34, p. 31–50; 35, p. 184; 36, p. 535; 37, p. 585–597; 38, p. 21; 39, p. 137–192; 40, p. 264–265; 41, p. 108; 42, p. 79; 43, p. 200; 44, p. 85–86; 45, p. 85–106].

Table 2. Demographic Consequences of the Genocides of the Twentieth Century.

Groups	Population before genocide	Population on genocidal territory before the mass extermination	Population in 2017 in the world	Population in 2017, in the area in which the genocide was committed	Time passed since the end of the genocide (years)	Increase in the number of population after genocide in the world	Increase in the number of population after genocide at the territory of mass extermination
Armenians	3–4.16 mln	1.67–2 mln	8–10 mln	0.06–0.25 mln	99	+195–334%	–85–97%
Kazakhs	5.5–6 mln	4.1 mln	15 mln	11.5 mln	84	+250–273%	+280%
Ukrainians	37.2 mln	25.5 mln	46 mln	29.5–30 mln	84	+124%	+115%
Jews	15.7 mln	8.94 mln	14.3–17.5 mln	1.20–1.25 mln	72	–9%+111%	–86%
Gypsy	5–6 mln	0.88–1.02 mln	10–20 mln	10–12 mln	72	+167–333%	+1136–1364%
Cambodians	8 mln	7.09–7.34mln	18–19 mln	15.9 mln	38	+225%	+214–227%
Tutis	1.6–1.8mln	0.64–0.81mln	2.8 mln	1.9 mln	23	+155-175%	+235–297%

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Абылхожин Ж.Б., Козыбаев М.К., Татимов М.Б. Казахстанская трагедия.Вопросы истории. – М., 1989. – №. 7. – С. 60–72.
2. Алексеенко А.Н. Население Казахстана в 1926–1939 годах // Компьютер и историческая демография / Ред. В.Н. Владимиров. – Барнаул, 2000. – С. 27–40.
3. Асылбеков М.Х., Козина В.В. Народонаселение Республики Казахстан в условиях суверенитета. – Алматы, 2009. – 114 с.
4. Валлін Я., Месле Ф., Адамець, С. Пирожков. Нова оцінка втрат населення України протягом криз 1930-х та 1940-х років // Демографія та соціальна економіка. – К., 2005. – № 2. – С. 7–29.
5. Всесоюзная перепись населения 1937 г. Краткие итоги. – М., 1991. – 239 с.
6. Девис Р., Виткрофт С. Годы голода. Сельское хозяйство СССР 1931–1933 / Пер. с англ. О.Ю. Вздорик, под ред. О.Ю. Пантиной. – М., 2011. – 543 с.
7. Демографічна катастрофа в Україні внаслідок Голодомору 1932–1933 років: складові, масштаби, наслідки. [Науково-аналітична доповідь] / Кер. кол. А. Лібанова. – К.: Інститут демографії та соціальних досліджень НАН України, 2008. – 96 с.
8. Козина В.В. Демографическая история Казахстана. – Караганда, 2007. – 145 с.

9. Козицький А. Геноцид та політика масового винищення цивільного населення у ХХ ст. (причини, особливості, наслідки). – Львів, 2012. – 608 с.
10. Кубійович В. Зміни в стані населення совєтської України в рр. 1927–1958 // Інститут для вивчення СРСР. Український збірник. – Кн. 16. – Мюнхен, 1959. – С. 9–26.
11. Кульчицький С. Голодомор 1932–1933 рр. як геноцид: труднощі усвідомлення. – К., 2008. – 424 с.
12. Кульчицький С. Червоний виклик. Історія комунізму в Україні від його народження до загибелі. – Книга 2. – К., 2013. – 628 с.
13. Кульчицький С. Український Голодомор: оцінка втрат // Краєзнавство. – К., 2013 – № 4.– С. 37–54.
14. Кульчицький С. Ще раз до питання про демографічні наслідки голоду 1932–1933 рр. в Україні // Український історичний журнал. – К., 1995. – № 5. – С. 137–141.
15. Кульчицький С., Єфіменко Г. Демографічні наслідки Голодомору 1933 р. в Україні. Всесоюзний перепис 1937 р. в Україні: документи та матеріали. – К., 2003. – 192 с.
16. Кульчицький С., Максудов С. Втрати населення України від голоду 1933 р. // Український історичний журнал. – К., 1991. – № 2. С. 3–10.
17. Куртуа С., Верт Н., Панне Ж.-Л., Пачовський А., Бартошек К., Марголен Ж.-Л. Чорна книга комунізму. Злочини, терор і репресії / Пер. з фр. Я. Кравець. – Львів, 2008. – 712 с.
18. Максудов С. Миграции в СССР в 1926–1939 // Cahiers du monde Russe: Russie, Empire russe, Union sovietique, états Independants. – Vol. 40. – № 4. – 1999. – P. 763–796.
19. Максудов С. Потери населения в годы коллективизации // Звенья. Исторический альманах. – М., 1991. – С. 65–110.
20. Месле Ф., Валлен Ж.; за участі В. Школьникова, С. Пирожкова, А. Адамця. Смертність та причини смертності в Україні у ХХ ст. / Пер. з фр. Є. Марічєва, за ред. С. Пирожкова. – К., 2008. – 416 с.
21. Перковський А.П., Пирожков С.І. Демографічні втрати Української РСР у 30-ті роки // Український історичний журнал. – К., 1989. – № 8. – С. 24–36.
22. Поляков Ю.А., Жиромская В.Б., Киселев И.Н. Полвека молчания (Весоюзная перепись населения 1937 г.) // Социологические исследования. – М., 1990. – № 6. – С. 2–25.
23. Татимов М.Б. Социальная обусловленность демографических процессов. – Алма-Аты, 1989. – 125 с.
24. Benz W. Dimension des Völkermords. Die Zahl der jüdischen Opfer des Nationalsozialismus. – Munich, 1991. – 584 s.
25. Cambodia, 1975–1978: Rendezvous with Death / Ed. K.D. Jackson. Princeton, 1989. – 360 p.
26. Dalrymple D. The Soviet Famine 1932–1934 // Soviet Studies. – Oxford, 1964. – Vol. XV. – № 3. – P. 250–284.
27. Dolabjain V. The Armenian Genocide as portrayed in the Encyclopaedia Brittanica // Journal of Genocide Research. – 2003. – Vol. 5. – № 1. – P. 103–115.
28. Estimated Jewish Losses in the Holocaust // Encyclopedia of the Holocaust / Ed. by I. Guttman I., R. Rozett. Vol. IV. – New York, 1990. – P. 1797–1990.
29. Etcheson C. «The Number» – Quantifying Crimes Against Humanity in Cambodia // Searching for the Truth. Magazine of Documentation Center of Cambodia. – 2001. – № 15 (March). – P. 25–27.
30. Fleming G. Hitler und die Endlösung. – Wiesbaden–Munich, 1982. – 218 s.

31. Gilbert M. The Twentieth-century Genociedes // America and the Armenian Genocide of 1915 / Ed. by J. Winter. – Cambrige, 2003. – P. 9–36.
32. Halaçoğlu Y. Realities Behind Relocation // Armenians in the Late Ottoman Period / Ed. Türkkaya Ataöv. – Ankara, 2001. – P. 109–142.
33. Hilberg R. The Destruction of the European Jews. [College student edition]. New Haven, 2003. – 1388 p.
34. Huttenbach H. B. The Romani Porajmos: The Nazi Genocide of Gypsies in Germany and Eastern Europe // The Gypsies of Eastern Europe / Ed. by D. Crowe, J. Kolsti. – New York–London, 1991. – P. 31–50.
35. Kenrick D., Puxon G. The Destiny of Europe's Gypsies. – New York, 1972. – 256 p.
36. Kevorkian's R. The Armenian Genocide: A Complete History. – London–New York, 2011. – 1008 p.
37. Kiernan B. The Demography of Genocide in Southeast Asia. The Death Tolls in Cambodia, 1975–1979, and East Timor, 1975–1980 // Critical Asian Studies. – Vol. 35 – № 4. – P. 585–597.
38. Le Denombrement des victimes du genocide. – Kigali, 2004. – 38 p.
39. Pianciola N. Famine in the Steppe. The Collectivization of Agriculture and the Kazakh Herdsmen 1928–1934 // Cahiers du monde Russe: Russie, Empire russe, Union sovietique, etats Independants. – Vol. 45 – № 1–2. – 2004. – P. 137–192.
40. Prunier G. The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide. – London, 1998. – 389 p.
41. Rummel R.J. Statistics of Democide: Genocide and Mass Murder Since 1900. – New Brunswick, 1998. – 544 p.
42. Śliwiński M. Le Genocide Khmer Rouge: Une Analyse Démographique. – Paris, 1995. – 174 p.
43. Vickery M. Cambodia 1975–1982. – Boston–Sydney, 1984. – 369 p.
44. Vossen R. Zigeuner: Roma, Sinti, Gitanos, Gypsies; zwischen Verfolgung und Romantisierung; Katalog zur Ausstellung "Zigeuner zwischen Romantisierung und Verfolgung – Roma, Sinti, Manusch, Calé in Europa" des Hamburgischen Museums für Völkerkunde. – Frankfurt am Main, 1983. – 351 s.
45. Zamir M. Population Statistics of the Ottoman Empire in 1914 and 1919 // Middle Eastern Studies. 1981. – Vol. 17. – № 1. – P. 85–106.

Volodymyr Petrenko

DEMOGRAPHIC LOSSES IN THE POPULATION OF PODILLYA DURING THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR OF 1932–1933

It is difficult to establish the final number of victims of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, especially based on official statistics. This is due to the following reasons: the situation with registration of civil status acts of demographic events became restricted as top secret at the end of 1933, in connection with the imposition of responsibility for the record of births and deaths on the NKVD of the USSR. Not all rural councils managed to transfer registration documents to the district RACS in a timely manner, and so these were destroyed during the Nazi occupation of 1941–1944. A part of the documents of the RACS was lost during their evacuation to the Eastern areas of the USSR, due to the war that began in 1941. The migration of an insignificant number of the population occurred during this tragic period. The population censuses of the regions that were conducted from 1937 to 1939, included families of the military, the number of which had increased significantly in the border regions before the Second World War. The exact number of immigrants to Ukraine from other Soviet republics during the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, and after remains unestablished. There was no accurate record of the deaths by famine, and often the record about the causes of death is absent from the appropriate column of the records. In many villages, mortality from hunger was deliberately lessened; and in some, starvation was not recorded as the cause of death. Permanent administrative-territorial changes also complicate the study of the number of victims of the Genocide-Holodomor [13, p. 125].

The results of demographic changes in the USSR should have been determined by the Second All-Union Census, which was planned to be held in December 1933. However, in connection with the demographic catastrophe, are associated: mass repression; the forced collectivization of agriculture, which led to the displacement and physical destruction of a huge number of people; spontaneous migration from villages to cities; and, finally, the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933. Accordingly, the Soviet government postponed the Census several times.

The first results of the 1937 Census were not published until today (data stored in the Russian Federation), and deeply impressed

those who read it. Instead of the "predictable" 180 million inhabitants in the country, there were counted only 162 million [15, p. 46].

The Soviet government accused the census organizers of anti-Soviet bias and arrested them. I. Kraval, the Chief of the Central Administration of National Economy of the State Planning Committee of the USSR, responsible for overseeing the Census, was shot.

The nationwide Census took place only in 1939, and this later statistical data largely satisfied the Stalinist regime.

Compared with the latest census of 1926, the population of the USSR has grown from 147,028,000 people to 170,557,000 people. The number of Russians increased from 77,791,000 people to 99,591,000 people. Belarusians increased from 4,739,000 to 5,275,000 people. The number of the Ukrainian population had decreased from 31,195,000 people to 28,111,000 people. The difference is 3,084,000 people) [15, p. 49].

Most of the scientists report about falsification of the 1939 Population Census and argue that the number of victims of the 1932–1933 Genocide-Holodomor in Ukraine is between 7–10 million. These data were announced at the United Nations, in 2003 [16, p. 2].

In Podillya (Vinnytsia Region, in the years of 1932–1933, united 71 Districts of Vinnytsya, Khmelnytskiy, Zhytomyr, and Kyiv Regions) [2, sheets 1–4], from 781,574 people [3, sheets 1–104] to 1,127,761 people died from the Genocide-Holodomor. [4, sheet 135]. Archival sources contain different information.

The population of the Vinnytsia Region, at the time of its foundation, was 5, 272,939 people [2, sheets 1–4]. After separation in October 1932, and joining to the Kyiv Region of seven districts, such as Babanskyi, Monastyryshchenskyi, Orativskyi, Plyskivskyi, Pogrebyshchenskyi, Umanskyi, Khrystynivskyi [11, sheet 170], with a population of 546,842 people [2, sheets 1–4], in the Vinnytsia Region had lived 4,726,097 people. The same number of people (before the Genocide-Holodomor) is included in the Directory of the main statistical and economic indicators of the farms of Vinnytsia Region Districts for 1932 – 4,726,400 people [10, p. 8].

By July 1934, according to data of "special" sector of the Vinnitsa Regional Committee of the KP(b)U, the population of the region decreased to 3,598,336 people [4, sheet 135]. The difference is 1,127,761 people.

Therefore, it is most probable that, during the 1932–1933, the Podilskyi Region lost 1,127,761 people. Of course, it cannot be

argued that all the people missing from Podillya were victims of the Genocide-Holodomor. Some of them were able to escape to different areas; some of the rest managed to escape abroad), but the overwhelming majority died of starvation.

In September 1937, the Monastyryshchenskyi, Orativskyi, Plyskivskyi and Pogrebyshchenskyi Regions became a part of the Vinnytsia Region once again [5, sheet 74]. As regards only the districts of the modern Vinnytsia Region (35 of 71), documents of the State Archives of the Vinnytsia Region confirm that the population of Vinnytsya decreased, during the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, by 531,025 people [6; 7, sheets 1–246].

In February 1932, at the time of formation the modern Vinnytsia Region, 2,580,732 people lived in its regions; then, in 1934, after the Genocide-Holodomor, there lived only 2,049,707 people. Due to the fact that, at the end of 1932, the Bolshevik authorities in Ukraine introduced a passport regime that forbade peasants from leaving the dying villages, 531,025 people might be considered victims of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933; in percentage terms, 20.5%, every fifth inhabitant of the Vinnytsia Region [6; 7, sheets 1–246].

The released archival documents objectively confirm the number of victims of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, in the Vinnytsia Region, and most of these numerical data are supported by several sources.

Approximately the same number of victims of the 1932–1933 Genocide-Holodomor in the Vinnytsia Region (568,000 people) was published by the well-known English scientist, Vitcroft. These figures are based on research of archival records that are stored in the Russian State Archive of Economics, and are determined by the 5–6-fold increase in the death rate of the population during this tragic period [1, p. 162].

Unfortunately, the permanent administrative and territorial changes in the Podillya territory (for example, already in 1935, began the inclusion of 14 more districts) [8, sheet 2] complicate the absolute accuracy of the demographic statistics, but table, included below, shows a number of deaths from the Genocide-Holodomor that the people of Vinnytsia find most reliable.

The Population in the Districts of the Vinnytsia Region in February 1932 and May-December 1934 (Data on the Districts the Territory of which Constitutes the Modern Vinnytsia Region) [6; 7, sheets 1–246]

№	Districts	January 1932	May–December 1934	The Difference
1	Barskyi	84,321	73,338	10,983
2	Bershadskyi	116,834	98,614	18,220
3	Bratslavskiyi (together with Shpykivskyi □ 1933)	83,002	63,826	19,176
4	Vinnytsia (except for the Vinnytsia population)	74,868	65,292	9,576
5	Voronovitskyi	43,145	34,883	8,262
6	Haysinskyi	109,961	86,646	23,315
7	Julinskyi	54,511	39,633	14,878
8	Zhmerinskyi	78,931	73.846	5,085
9	Illinetskyi	84,009	57,059	26,950
10	Kalynivskyi	79,039	59,419	19,620
11	Koziatynskyi	89,855	61,494	28,361
12	Kopaygorodskyi	73,770	58,260	15,510
13	Kryzhopilskyi	81,340	72,629	8,711
14	Lypovetskyi	102,750	74,965	27,785
15	Litynskyi	72,742	54,501	18,241
16	Makhnivskyi	51,922	34,719	17,203
17	Mohyliv-Podilskyi	94,989	81,924	13,065
18	Murovankurylovetskyi	38,439	28.936	9.503
19	Nemyrivskyi (together with Sytkovets'kyi, 1933)	94,050	67,854	26,196
20	Orativskyi	50,751	39,224	11,527
21	Pishchanskyi	58,552	50,697	7,855
22	Plyskivskyi	56,272	44,248	12,024
23	Pogrebyshchenskyi	70,382	57,731	12,651
24	Stanislavchytskyi	32,459	25,160	7,299
25	Teplitsckyi	79,524	57,023	22,501
26	Tyvrivskyi	60,709	48,486	12,223
27	Tomashpilskyi	87,073	62,610	24,463
28	Trostyanetskyi	67,106	50,267	16,839
29	Tulchinskyi	55,461	43,093	12,368
30	Ulanivskyi	60,057	45,670	14,387
31	Khmelnitskyi	84,396	71,162	13,234
32	Chernivetskyi	73,587	65,882	7,705
33	Chechelnitskyi	75,748	63,773	11,975
34	Shargorodskyi	91,142	72,500	18,642
35	Yampilskyi	69,035	64,343	4,692
Total:	Vinnytsia Region	2,580,732	2,049,707	531,025

During the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932-1933, demographic losses in the population of Khmelnytskyi Region (27 Districts) are smaller – 229,407 people – that is, 12%. The territory of the Districts of this Region, at that time, was mostly along the border – a fact which was crucial for the peasants' ability to save some food from the confiscation brigades. The Bolshevik authorities did not force these local activists as hard. Additionally, the Red Army's collective farms were more densely located in these areas. Concealing of the genocidal crime by the Bolsheviks required at least the appearance of prosperity at the border. Food aid also came first to the population of these border areas.

The same percentage (12%) of the Genocide-Holodomor victims in Khmelnytskyi was mentioned in S. Markova's monograph [12, p. 97]

The Difference in the Number of the Population in the Khmelnytskyi Districts, in February 1932, and May - December 1934 [6; 7, sheets 1–246]

№	Districts	February 1932	May–December 1934	Difference
1	Antoninskyi	103 105	95 617	7, 488
2	Volochyskyi	79 257	69 531	9,726
3	Gorodotskyi	92 542	81 936	10,606
4	Grytsivskyi	49 945	42 827	7,118
5	Derazhnyanskyi	73 351	62 952	10,399
6	Dunaevetskyi	50 517	47 190	3,327
7	Zaslavskyi	100 340	91 089	9,251
8	Zatonskyi	68 798	66 457	2,341
9	Kamyanets-Podilskyi (except the population of Kamyanets-Podilskyi city)	95 759	83 389	12,370
10	Letychivskyi	78 325	64 261	14,064
11	Liakhovetskyi	45 221	42 140	3,081
12	Medzhybizskyi	45 499	32 126	13,373
13	Mychalpilskyi	30 449	27 614	2,835
14	Novoushytskyi	89 294	80 029	9,265
15	Orynynskyi	44 677	41 170	3,507
16	Polonskyi	76 666	55 021	21,645
17	Proskurivskyi	121 469	109 921	11,548
18	Slavutskyi	100 381	93 882	6,499
19	Smotrytskyi	70 971	66 027	4,944
20	Solobkovetskyi	39 704	38 065	1,639
21	Starokostyantynivskyi	91 427	78 042	13,385
22	Staroushytskyi	66 073	39 538	26,535

23	Theophipilskyi	83 590	80 766	2,824
24	Chemyrovetskyi	50 082	47 547	2,535
25	Shepetivskyi	64 211	51 843	12,368
26	Yurynetskyi (Satanivskyi)	45 816	41 903	3,913
27	Yarmolynetskyi	40 694	37 873	2,821
	Total: Kamianetz Region (actually Khmelnytskyi Region)	1 ,898,163	1,668,756	229,407

In the structure of the Vinnytsia Region, during the Ukrainian tragedy, there were included five districts of the modern Zhytomyr Region. Statistics on the reduction of population in these areas during the Genocide-Holodomor is much higher – 99,012 people – that is, 26.6% [6; 7, sheets on the Zhytomyr Region. Reduced Statistics, 1–246].

№	Districts	February 1932	May-December 1934	Difference
1	Berdychivskyi	127 684	99,506	28,178
2	Dzerzhynskyi	47 125	35,471	11,654
3	Lyubarskyi	81 761	57,349	24,412
4	Chudnivskyi	66 640	48,753	17,887
5	Yanushpilskyi	47 997	31,116	16,881
Total: Zhytomyr Region		371 207	272,195	99,012

However, the highest death rate from starvation was in four districts of the modern Cherkassy Region that, during the Genocide-Holodomor period (until October 1932), were part of the Vinnytsia Region. The population in these areas decreased by 139,464 people, which is 37.7% [6, 7, p. 1–246; 14, p. 1–152].

№	Districts	February 1932	May-December 1934	Difference
1	Babanskyi	95 880	47,640	48,240
2	Monastyryshchenskyi	72 389	58,917	13,472
3	Umanskyi	143 983	81,600	62,383
4	Khrystynivskyi	57 185	41,816	15,369
Total: Cherkasy Region (at that time - Kyiv Region)		369,437	229,973	139,464

Summing up the tragic statistics of the 1932–1933 Genocide-Holodomor victims in the territory of Podillya (in terms of the administrative-territorial division of the 1930s, 71 Districts of the Vinnytsia Region), it can be seen that that population decreased from February 1932 to May–December 1934, from 5,219,539 people (excluding the population of Vinnytsia and Kamyanets-Podilskyi, that were mainly sold food rations, as well as the

population of the centers of Podillya almost did not decrease, due to the timely arrival and location of the Red Army border units during this period) to 4,220,631 people. The difference is 998,908 people, that is, almost one million lives taken by the artificial Genocide-Holodomor. This represents 20% of the population – every fifth resident of Podillya. Among them, more than a half were children, who were least protected from starvation [9, sheets 12–25, 176, 177].

The population suffered the most in those areas, which led a desperate and fierce struggle against Bolshevism, for a sovereign Ukraine during the 1920s and 1930s. The Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, was the Stalinist totalitarian regime's a means of suppressing the heroic resistance of the Podillya farmers against the criminal policy of Bolshevism.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Голод та голодомор на Поділлі 1920 – 1940 рр. Збірник документів та матеріалів / автори-упорядники: Р.Ю. Подкур, В.Ю. Васильєв, П.М. Кравченко та ін. – Вінниця: ДП "ДКФ", 2007. – 704 с.
2. Державний архів Вінницької області (далі – ДАВО). – Ф. П-136. – Оп. 4. – Спр. 2. – Арк. 4.
3. ДАВО. – Ф. П-136. – Оп. 4. – Спр. 448. – Арк. 104.
4. ДАВО. – Ф. П-136. – Оп. 3. – Спр. 219. – Арк. 135.
5. ДАВО. – Ф. Р-2700. – Оп.1. – Спр. 34. – Арк. 275.
6. ДАВО. – Ф. П-136. – Оп. 4. – Спр. 2. – Арк. 4; – Спр. 448. – Арк. 104; – Оп. 6. – Спр. 198. – Арк. 19; – Спр. 561. – Арк. 47; – Оп. 9. – Спр. 117. – Арк. 159.
7. ДАВО. – Ф. Р-2355. – Оп. 2. – Спр. 3. – Арк. 262.
8. ДАВО. – Ф. П-136. – Оп. 9. – Спр. 79. – Арк. 9.
9. ДАВО. – Ф. П-136. – Оп. 3. – Спр. 69. – Арк. 195.
10. Довідник з основних статистично-економічних показників господарства районів Вінницької області. – Харків, 1933. – 436 с.
11. Збірник законів та розпоряджень Робітничо-Селянського Уряду УСРР. – Харків, 1932. – 762 с.
12. Маркова С. Голодомор 1932 – 1933 років на Поділлі. – К: МАУП, 2003 – 116 с.
13. Петренко В.І. Трагедія українського селянства / Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету ім. М. Коцюбинського. – Вип. 5. Серія: Історія: Збірник наукових праць / За заг. ред. П.С. Григорчука – Вінниця: ДП "ДКФ", 2003. – 276 с.
14. Райони УСРР. Статистичний довідник. – К., 1936. – 544 с.
15. Смертю смерть подолали: Голодомор в Україні 1932 – 1933 рр. / Авт. колектив: П.П. Панченко (керівник), М.М. Вівчарик, А.І. Голуб та ін. – К.: Україна, 2003. – 352 с.
16. "Урядовий кур'єр" – видання центральних органів виконавчої влади України. – К., 2003. – № 180.

Oleksiy Kurinnyi

THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR OF 1932–1933, IN THE NORTHERN CAUCASUS AS THE GENOCIDE AGAINST UKRAINIANS

The problem of the Ukrainian population genocide in North Caucasus region is considered in the article as a crime against humanity [6], which constitutes a cruel but, at the same time, the most effective means of eliminating ethnic groups. Elimination or disorganization of such a group as the carriers of collective human rights is necessary for leveling the right to self-determination, and, therefore, to preserve the territorial integrity of the metropolis-empire. The main attention is paid to the Holodomor in the North Caucasus as a genocide of the Ukrainian national minority of Soviet Russia, the forced deportation of Ukrainians in the Kuban – as a crime against humanity, as well as accompanying illegal repression actions that carried the character of ethnocide and linguocide and caused the language and ethnic assimilation of Ukrainians. In the article for the first time within the framework of Ukrainian legal science (history of the state and the rights and protection of the national minorities' rights) the question of responsibility for committing crimes against humanity concerning the Ukrainian national minority of Russia is raised and possible forms and mechanisms of such responsibility are offered.

A well-known Russian explorer of the principle of self-determination O. Tarasov calls only four models of possible reaction of the metropolis (empire) to aspiration of enslaved ethnic groups to self-determination in the event of their international will to have their own statehood and (or) separate from the metropolis in case when it is clearly demonstrated at the international level [19]. The only legitimate reaction is the recognition of the right to freedom by ethnic group, for example nationalities of Austria-Hungary (Italians, Poles, Romanians, Ukrainians). Other three ways to resolve the national issue mentioned by the author are illegal. However, if the assimilation of community or its deportation (eviction from historical places of residence) is in general a flagrant violation of individual and collective human rights, however, depending on the circumstances, they may either have signs of a crime against humanity or genocide, and do not have these signs, then the elimination and the disorganization of community as a plurality of people by genocide is unambiguous.

Such a liquidation of community is not necessarily accompanied by the complete destruction of all persons that belong to it. The Bolshevik regime had no intention (and could not have an intention for a number of reasons) physically destroy all Ukrainians in the Kuban – but it hung out and deported, by other words, removed the most active part of Ukrainians, that allowed to russify a rest of population extremely quickly. The disintegration and assimilation of the multimillion Ukrainian minority of the North Caucasus were necessary conditions for preservation of the Russia borders, disputed during the intensive national-cultural revival of Ukrainians in the North Caucasus.

A particular threat to the integrity of Russia were Ukrainians of the North Caucasus for two reasons: taking into account all the previous ethno-demographic history of the Kuban Ukrainian community and its socio-political activity, as well as taking into account the rapid processes of national-cultural revival of the North Caucasus Ukrainians, as in 1917, and in the future – under the influence of the coronation policy.

According to all statistics and researchers' assessments, Kuban region was predominantly Ukrainian in terms of population and language from the second half of the nineteenth century to the 30's of the twentieth century. In particular, according to information from the Caucasian calendar of 1886, among the inhabitants of Kuban region of 1882, Ukrainians were 503 235 people or 46.8%, while Russians – 41%, Highlanders – 9.73% [5, p. 192]. According to the first all-Russian census of 1897, persons with a native Ukrainian language comprised 47.36% in Kuban region, with a native Russian (Russian and Russified people) – 42.56% , and 10.08% in the other. [13, p. V, 60]. At that time, Russian imperial researchers point out that 859,122 people were considered to be Ukrainian, or 49.1%; as Russian only the 41.8% [14; 10, p. 569, 570].

The Kuban has shown political activity significantly higher than ordinary Russian provinces or regions. Already in the ultimatum to the Bolsheviks of December 4, 1917, the Central Rada actually recognized the right to self-determination for the Kuban [11, p. 43], which was implemented in the autumn of 1917 with creation of the Kuban People's Republic, proclaimed independent in January 1918. During the period of the liberation struggles in Kuban, which turned to the Kuban People's Republic (The Kuban Territory) in 1918–1920, three atamans, five heads of government were changed in power. The composition of government changed even more often – 9 times in total. These changes were the result of contradictions

between the Ukrainian-speaking Black Sea and Russian-speaking linear Cossacks in the Kuban. The first Cossacks, were economically and politically more active, stood on federalist (and often on pro-Ukrainian independent) positions [8, p. 7]. In order to humble Ukrainians, the Soviet authorities used the Holodomor as a method.

Numerous sources not only confirm the artificial nature of famine as a deliberately planned the Holodomor-genocide, but also testify to the anti-Ukrainian orientation of this unprecedented, yet punitive action. Thus, according to the research, conducted by D. Biliy, since all the repressive circumstances – the Holodomor, repressions, and deportations – touched primarily Ukrainian regions, where Ukrainians ranged from 30% (Tikhoretskiy district) to 87% (Temriutskiy), and in general in rural areas of Kuban region, which was the largest in Holodomor, Ukrainians accounted for 66.6%, and the percentage of Ukrainians among the victims reached about 70%. D. Bilyi, on the basis of his own calculations and with reference to the data of Hoover's archive materials at Stanford University of the United States, proclamates: in North Caucasus region from 1929 to 1933, during the Holodomor, deportations, punitive actions killed about 2 million 250 thousand man, calls the number of victims among Ukrainians in the region – 1 million 575 thousand people [1]. According to the research of S. Chorniy, about half of local Ukrainians died from the Holodomor in the Kuban [9, p. 326]. According to R. Medvedev, the Kuban population was deported from 16 villages, a total number was 200 thousand people, besides, M.V. Palibin notes that collective farmers – middle peasants and poor people were evicted. In view of this, it becomes clear that the influx of immigrants from the central regions of Russia to these territories was much larger than in Ukraine. In 1933, 329 echelons of the 21,856 Russian collective farms with a total number of 117,149 people were delivered to Ukraine, then more than 500 thousand immigrants from the central Russia came to the Kuban during 1931–1932, a significant part of them were the demobilized Red Army soldiers [15, p. 78]. According to the V. M. Rakachov data, by the middle of December 1933, 105 echelons in amount of 38,504 displaced persons from the Urals, from the central regions of Russia, from the southern Russian and Ukrainian regions came to the North-Western Caucasus (to the territory of the former Kuban region – primarily to the affected areas of the Black Sea and the northeastern Kuban). The responsible for resettlement persons acknowledged that over October–December 1933, more than a

thousand people fled from places of settlement [7]. It means that 37 thousand people remained in the region [16, p. 63].

The genocide was accompanied by the lingvocide: the curtailment of Ukrainization, the complete destruction of the system of Ukrainian-language education, the press, and a book publishing. The release of twenty Ukrainian newspapers and magazines was banned, radio broadcasting was stopped in Ukrainian, all Ukrainian schools and universities were closed, staff and students' departments of the pedagogical institute and the Ukrainian branch of the labor faculty were also repressed. In the spring and summer of 1933, the mass burning of Ukrainian-language literature was recorded on the margins of the village and city libraries of the Kuban [17, p. 214]. At the same time, the destruction of the Ukrainian toponymic – the renaming of the evicted villages – was proving: the Poltavske village became Chervonoarmiyske, Umanske became Leningradske [20]. For the Caucasian Ukrainians, the consequences of unprecedented for the twentieth century genocide, accompanied by the ethnocide and lingvocide became predictably catastrophic. In particular, the historian I.M. Skybitska, clearly summarizes: “In 1932, the “Ukrainization” was suddenly halted, with a change of rigid Russification. Stalin's policy surpassed ethno-cultural assimilation of royal power. As a result, the Ukrainian ethnic group has changed its ethnic identity into Russian” [18].

The perception of the surviving community or its remnants of the very fact and nature of the repressive actions towards itself, their proper political and legal assessment as a crime against humanity, as well as the adequate recognition and proclamation by such a community of the perpetrators of these actions is important not only for the actual establishment of the perpetrators and the degree of their guilt, but also to understand the post-genocidal nature of the social group: the level of preservation or loss of its features (and, consequently, the status) of the collective subject of the right to self-determination, as well as the right to adequate compensation for genocidal acts, even to restore the previous (pre-genocidal) position.

It should be emphasized, that the recognition and specific perception of the perpetrators of genocide are characteristic of all, without exception, its victims. We all know the position of the Armenians and Greeks towards Turkey, which does not require any unnecessary commentary. Similarly, for the Jews, the undisputed awareness of guilt of the German state apparatus in the commission of the Holocaust, as well as the involvement of (or at least criminal inaction) the entire German people.

The assimilated Ukrainian population of the Kuban, as well as the inhabitants of more conscious in the national sense Central Ukraine, fully acknowledges the Holodomor and very categorically defines its hidden causes and, in one way or another, those involved in the genocide, subjects, including the collective ones. Thus, according to many eyewitnesses, if the non-Ukrainian populations dominated in the Black Sea regional settlements of the Kuban western districts, the punishment of starvation would not be so terrible. It was also recognized that the Red Army troops closed access primarily to Ukrainian-speaking Cossack villages [12].

It is noteworthy that the planned nature of the Holodomor as a genocide, first of all, of the Ukrainian community of the Kuban, is recognized by representatives of the Russian people who witnessed those events themselves. Thus, according to the memoirs of A. Dolgaliov's mother, out of population of 20,000 inhabitants of the Shkyrinske village in 1932–1933, six thousand ethnic Ukrainians (Cossacks) died of starvation, while ethnic Russians remained alive, because they received rations and some food [2] .

Soviet scientists, authorities, and artists for a long time have been concealing the Holodomor as a fact, wholly ignoring it with attention, now deny the genocide of Ukrainians by appealing to ... the Holodomor facts in the Kuban, Northern Caucasus, and Northern Slobozhanshchyna. Similarly, Russian state politicians deny the Holodomor as a genocide of Ukrainians, emphasizing its all-union character, while their most radical representatives generally refuse Ukrainians to recognize as individual people, proclaiming the Holodomor as an ideological basis for the creation of Ukrainian nation. This position is easy to explain in the context of responsibility for genocide: as long as there is an independent state Ukraine and an independent Ukrainian nation, as long as the world community maintains information about the autochthonous Ukrainian population, was living in the North Caucasus in the past, sufficiently organized to protect its rights and political demands – until the prospect of Russia's political responsibility for the Ukrainian in general and the Kuban and the whole North Caucasus will potentially be preserved.

Political responsibility in practice is realized by changing of state borders whose leadership has been found guilty of genocide or by using negative sanctions against social groups (ethnic minorities, irredentists' ethnic groups of people etc.) that supported the state leadership. Population exchange between the Ukrainian SSR and Poland aimed at ending armed confrontation and hadn’t the

features of sanctions against one side of the conflict. In the contrary, the expulsion of up to 5 million Austrian Germans from the Czech Republic as well as the indigenous population from the German territories of Silesia, Pomerania and Prussia for further transmission the territories of Poland can only be very arbitrarily explained (but can not be justified) by the need to ensure social peace, the historical rights of Poland on these lands. Thus, such actions against Germany and German-speaking groups (in particular, the Austrians) may be legitimate only if it is recognized as an extraordinary political responsibility of ethnic Germans for crimes against humanity. In another case, it is evident of the brutal violation of the doctrinal principles of international law concerning the sovereignty, inviolability of the state territory and the realization of the right of nations of self-determination fixed at that time (1944–1946). Without the justification of the responsibility of Germany and the Germans, the unprecedented decisions of the Versailles, Yalta and Potsdam conferences automatically were illegal, and, according to the consequences (the decline of German culture, the many thousands of victims of deportation), this actions were criminal.

The experience of developing the state-territorial structure of postwar Iraq during the period of 2003–2008 is a precedent for restoring the legal status and the full extent of the rights of the community that has suffered from crimes against humanity (restoring the status quo). It is close to the relevant Ukrainian situation regarding the expression of will by the long-time assimilated population. In particular, to the final version of the new Iraqi constitution, approved by the referendum on 15th October, 2005, on demand of the victims of perennial repressions and ethnocide of the Kurdish community was added a special article №140. According to this article, the Iraqi executive power is obliged to take the necessary measures to comply with the provisions of Article №58 of the Transitional Administrative Law approved by the Council of Representatives of Iraq on 8th March, 2004. In particular, it was about measures of normalization the situation, the conducting a census of the population and a referendum about the granting the legal status (territorial independence) of the region, suffered from the crimes against humanity [22]. In addition, the requirements of the article are "unique", because demographic and territorial manipulation that violated human rights, in particular, political rights and the collective rights of nationalities and ethnic minorities was legally recognized in the Article №58 at the highest levels of power in modern Iraq. For this reason, the legal requirements

stipulated in Article №58 and Article №140 of the Constitution envisaged measures for the rapid and uncompromising removal of offenses of the regime of Saddam Hussein. Thus, it was envisaged "to take measures to overcome the injustice caused by the activity of the previous regime regarding the demographic change of certain regions, including in the Kirkuk Province, deportation, expulsion of persons from their places of residence, forcing migration to and beyond the region, settlement of persons hostile to the region, as well as the deprivation of the work for the inhabitants and adjustment of their nationality" [21]. Consequently, the aftermath of the criminal actions of the Sunni Arab regime of Saddam Hussein against Kurds had all the features of a crime against humanity. It was recognized as the illegal actions and such that make impossible the objective results of the referendum. A completely analogous concept should be applied in the case of a referendum on the preservation of the USSR. It is a unique precedent that Ukrainians should use for overcoming the consequences of a violent change in the national composition of the North Caucasus, disruption and destruction of the Ukrainian community in the region as a result of the Holodomor-Genocide and deportation.

Taking into consideration the above-mentioned precedents of responsibility and social situation at the time of solving such problems, it is impossible to consider the issue of Holodomor as inseparable from politics question. It would mean an artificial and unacceptable attempt to separate from the consequences of genocide and other crimes, from their impact on contemporary socio-political and international processes, as well as from public opinion in Ukraine, Russia, and the world in relation to the Holodomor, from contemporary Russian politics as a successor of the USSR, etc.

The experience of states, peoples and certain social groups testifies to their desire to obtain compensation, in particular at the state-political level, as well as the readiness of the world community to provide them with such reimbursement. The decisive role, in this case, is played by the factor of preservation of the community. It is clear that, at the international level, nobody will be able to provide for the restoration of a physically destroyed social group and to return the territories or material compensation to the assimilated population that has lost the traits of an ethnic group. It is apparent that can be no such political responsibility for China for the destruction of millions of its citizens or Cambodia for the criminal actions of the Pol Pot regime. We can only speak about the crime of

a regime against own people (with the punishment of persons) or one nation against one another.

Therefore, the representatives of the social-political “elite” of Russia disseminate the information about the genocide of the “Cossacks” and the destruction of the “Russian Vendée” in order to the final assimilation the population of the Kuban [3, p. 106]. They emphasize on the fact of the assimilation of Ukrainians in the Kuban as a subject of self-determination and to extrapolate this statement for the period of the colonization of the Kuban by removing from the research and journalistic (mostly, chauvinistic) works the mention about the Ukrainians. Soviet scholars, authorities hid the Holodomor as a fact and ignored its features. They deny the genocide of Ukrainians by appealing to ... the facts of the Holodomor in the Kuban, Northern Caucasus, and Northern Slobozhanshchyna!

At the same time, Russia's “scholars” categorically deny the Ukrainian character of the population of the western Kuban and the historical affiliation of the Black Sea Cossacks with the Ukrainian ethnic group. During more than 150 years, the Russian “researchers” don’t recognize the fact that the population of Chernomoriya is the Ukrainian community. For them, that population was “an ethnographic, social, cultural and linguistic group with the identity of the Kuban Cossacks” [4]. This statement is fundamentally wrong. Accordingly, they don’t mention about the ethnographic maps and statistical data of the linguistic composition of the population, about the crimes of the Holodomor and ethnocide, the curtailment of Ukrainization or the burning of Ukrainian-language books.

Similarly, Russian state politicians deny the Holodomor as the genocide of Ukrainians, emphasizing its all-union character. Their most radical representatives deny recognition of Ukrainians as a single nation, declaring the Holodomor an ideological basis for the creation of a Ukrainian nation. This position is easy to explain in the context of responsibility for genocide. The independent Ukrainian nation and the world community keep the memory of the autochthonous Ukrainian population of the North Caucasus, who could protect their rights and political demands. For this reason, the possibility of Russia's political responsibility for the genocide of the Ukrainian people in the Kuban and the North Caucasus is reminded as the responsibility of Turkey, Germany, and the Serbian states.

After an in-depth study, the author came to the following conclusions:

1. The well-stated and intensely advocated national desire to realize the right of self-determination can not be ignored. It can either be recognized as a metropolis or lose its relevance to the liquidation of its carrier, which can be achieved both by the physical extermination of people or the national minority and by their disorganization, assimilation as a collective entity of certain rights. The purpose of the USSR was to destroy, assimilate the Ukrainians of the Kuban as an organized national minority and a potential bearer of the right to self-determination.

2. Given the above statistics and estimates, the Holodomor of 1932–1933 in the Kuban and throughout the North Caucasus, despite numerous casualties among other peoples, is the genocide of the Ukrainian majority of the region, accompanied by of the Ukrainian ethnocide and the destruction of the Ukrainian language (the linguicide) and culture. That is why it should be considered inseparable from the Holodomor as genocide in Ukraine in 1932–1933, which necessitates the introduction of appropriate amendments to the Law of Ukraine "On the Holodomor of 1932–1933 in Ukraine".

3. The surviving assimilated Ukrainian population of the Kuban retained a sense of isolation from the Russian state titular nation, which authorized genocide and ethnocide, as well as a clear awareness of the perpetrators of this crime.

4. The last circumstance points to the possibility of future responsibility of the Russian Federation, as a successor of the USSR and the RSFSR for the crime of genocide through its official recognition, as well as the implementation of active positive actions to eliminate the negative effects of genocide, the revival of the Ukrainian community in the Kuban and the North Caucasus and recognition, accorded to it, in the full extent of relevant collective human rights: the rights of national minorities and the indigenous people, including the right of self-determination.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Білий Д. Зміни у складі українського населення Кубані в 1932–1933 рр. // Донецький вісник Наукового товариства ім. Шевченка. – Т. 2 – Донецьк: Український культурологічний центр, Східний видавничий дім. – 2002. – 220 с. – Режим доступу: www.ruthenia.info/txt/donvisn/t2/index.html

2. Долгальов А. Голодомор – свідчення кубанського росіянина. – Режим доступу: http:// memorial.kiev.ua/content/view/536/149/

3. Экскурс в литературу Кубани (Из опыта работы учителя русского языка и литературы МОУСОШ №68 г. Краснодара С.Н. Фатейчева). – Режим доступу: http://school68.kubannet.ru/index.files/Page2838.htm.

4. Захарченко В.Г. Народные песни Кубани. – Вып. 2. Песни черноморских казаков / Центр нар. культуры Кубани; Сост., примеч. ст. В.Г.Захарченко. – Краснодар, 1997. – 586 с.
5. Кавказский календарь на 1886 год. Издан по распоряжению Главноначальствующего гражданскою частью на Кавказе / Под ред. Е Кондратенко. – Тифлис: типография Канц. Главноначальств. гражданск. частью на Кавказе, 1885. – VI, 3. – 206 с.
6. Конвенція про незастосування строку давності до воєнних злочинів і злочинів проти людства (1968) // http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?nreg=995_168
7. Краснов П.Н. Всевеликое войско Донское // Белое дело: Избранные произведения в 16 книгах. Дон и Добровольческая армия. – М.: Голос, 1992. – 416 с.
8. Кубанское краевое правительство в годы революции и Гражданской войны на Кубани в 1917–1920 // Протоколы заседаний Кубанского краевого правительства: 1917–1920 / Сборник документов в 4-х томах / под ред. А.А. Зайцева. – Проект "Библиотека Кубанского края". – Краснодар, 2008. – 342 с.
9. Лавер О. Динаміка кількості східної української діаспори в XX столітті та її роль в майбутньому України // Проблеми історії України: Факти, судження, пошуки. – К., 2004. – Вип. 12. – С. 326. – Режим доступу: http://www.history.org.ua/ JournALL/pro/12/14.pdf
10. Население Кубанской области по данным вторых экземпляров листов переписи 1897 г. / Под ред. Л.В. Македонова. – Екатеринодар: Типография Кубанского Областного правления, 1906. – С. 569, 570.
11. Нота Генерального Секретаріату Раді Народних Комісарів від 4.12.1917 // Україна в XX столітті (1900–2000): Зб. документів і матеріалів / Упоряд.: А.Г. Слюсаренко, В.І. Гусєв та ін. – К.: Вища школа, 2000. – 351 с.
12. Палий О. Украинский взгляд из России // Новый мост. – 26.08.2008. – Режим доступу: http:// www.new-most.info/stories/interview/5895.htm
13. Первая Всеобщая перепись населения Российской империи, 1897 г. LXV. Кубанская область / Под ред. Н.А. Тройницкого. – СПБ: Центральный Статистический комитет МВД, 1905. – 284 с.
14. Петренко Є. Звідки і чому з'явилися українці на Кубані // Польовий Р. Кубанська Україна. – К.: Діокор, 2004. – 304 с.
15. Полян П. Не по своей воле… История и география принудительных миграций в СССР. – М.: О.Г.И – Мемориал, 2001. – 351 с. – Режим доступу: http://memo.ru/history/deport/polyan1.htm
16. Ракачев В.Н. Компенсационные миграции 1930-х гг. на Кубани и Ставрополье // Историческая и социально-образовательная мысль. – 2012. – № 2 // http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ kompensatsionnye-migratsii-1930-h-gg-na-kubani-i- stavropolie#ixzz4S61pgDAn
17. Савка Я. Російщення Кубані – південно-східного бастіону України // Російщення України: Науково-популярний збірник / Гол. ред. Л. Полтава. – К.: Видання українського конгресового комітету Америки ради оборони і допомоги Україні, 1992. – 408 с. – Режим доступу: historyso.narod.ru/
18. Скибицкая И.М. "Кубань с Украиной"?: или кто раскачивает политическую лодку сегодня / И.М. Скибицкая // Кубань-Украина. Вопросы историко-культурного взаимодействия. – Краснодар, 2007. – Вып. 2. – С. 169–177.

19. Фролов Б.Е. Национальный состав Черноморского казачьего войска (1787–1860 гг.) // Культурная жизнь Юга России. – Краснодар, 2002.
20. Широпаев А.А. Тюрьма народа – русский взгляд на Россию. – М.: ФЭРИ-В, 2001. – 144 с.
21. O'Leary B. Article 140: Iraq's Constitution, Kirkuk and the Disputed Territories. – 07.05.2008. // http://www.kurd.org/doc/OLeary_Paper.pdf
22. The Constitution of Iraq, adopted on 15 October 2005. – Режим доступу: http://www.uniraq.org/documents/iraqi_constitution.pdf .

Serhiy Vaculyshyn

HUMAN LOSSES IN THE VILLAGES NEAR KYIV

The fact of the terrible consequence of the hunger starvation of 1932–1933, near Kyiv (deaths of a half of the villagers in the Boryspil Region) was noted by American scientists in the 80th year anniversary works [1]. Nonetheless, the Ukrainian tragedy was known in the Western world in summer of 1933: "In villages, the death level often reaches 80%, never comes down to 50%. The greatest losses occurred in Kyiv, Poltava, and Sumy Regions, which became a depopulated territory," as reported by the Italian Consul S. Gradenigo [2]. In 1986, one of most well-known Western researchers of Soviet history, Robert Conquest, published the opposite conclusion, maintaining that the death level in Kyiv Region was 15–20% [10].

In 1930, "collective farms" were formed: "Voroshylov" (Hrushky), "Kahanovych" (Bilychi), "Komunist" (Mykilska Borshchahivka), "Lenin" (Zhuliany), "Nezamozhnyk" (Zhuliany), "Novyj Svit" (Pyrohiw), "Peremoha" (Vita-Lytovska and Bilychi), "1 Travnia" (Sofiyivska Borshchahivka), "Petrovskyj" (Mostyshchi), "Voroshylov" (Troieshchyna), "Druzhba" (Troieshchyna), "Kirov" (Troieshchyna), "Nove Zhyttia" (Bortnychi), "Tretii Rik Piatyrichky" (Pozniaky), "Trynadtziatyrichchia Zhovtnia" (Troieshchyna), "Chervonyi Zhovten" (Vyguriwshchyna), "Chervony Molochar" (Vyguriwshchyna), "Shevchenko' (Osokorky).

During the 20th century, nearly all these villages became parts of Kyiv. At the time mentioned, these territories were parts of the "Kyiv outskirt zone," administered by the Kyiv City Rada. In 1937, this entity was closed, and two administrative units were made to oversee these territories: Sviatoshyn, and Brovary Districts of the Kyiv Oblast.

At the time of the starvation in 1933, in the middle of these official boundaries, a compact "cleaned" territory was formed that included the so-called historic center of Kyiv, where important Communist institutions were located. Recollections about militia boundaries helped reconstruct its perimeter. According to Roman Krutcyk, the natural boundary of the broad Dnipro River made it easier for the actions of the barrier squads, whose task it was to prevent the starving peasants from reaching Kyiv [14, p. 390]. An

eye-witness states that hundreds of corpses lined the bank. So many people died, and nobody bothered to take the bodies away [6].

Hanna Kochubey, an eye-witnesses, explains: “I saw masses of hungry peasants, who were coming to Kyiv, their strength leaving them... later barriers were built, and then not so many hungry people were seen in the streets, although, some people were coming all the time...” [13, p. 102]. Andrii Opanasenko saw in Kyiv, “...dying peasants from nearby villages. They were not like human beings. They bothered nothing, they could only sit or lie under the walls of buildings at Verhnii and Nyzhnii Val at Podil. Corpses were buried at Babyn Yar. Those still half-alive were also buried there” [3].

Can it be stated what percentage of those victims came from nearby villages or from elsewhere?

According to the report of the Regional Department of the GPU to Central Committee CP (b) U about the Kyiv Suburban Region (February, 1933): “In the v. [village] Zhulyany, some cases of hunger are marked because of undernourishment and the eating of something rotten – uneatable. Those who are starving are mainly widows, big families, very old people, and, rarely, poor farmers and members of Kolhozes” [7, p. 326]. Eye-witness Andrij Shport details: “Now that winter ended, the grounds around our Institute near Feofania became visible [due to the snow melting]. We first saw what we had heard about: corpses in ditches. Women, children, old people...” [5].

The Kyiv Regional Rural Questionnaire, “About the Difficult Conditions of the Population and Aid to the Starving” (April, 1933), used as source data by Prof. P. Vakulyuk, relates horrible details: “Bortnychi – 795 families are in a hard state; Troyeshchina – 16 adults are swelled, also 18 children, in a very hard state. 29 adults and 5 children are dying, and one person already died of starvation” [4]. An anonymous woman living in Bortnychi, born in 1923, was sure that in 1933, half of this village's population died [12].

The examples I myself noted, in the early 1990s, from interviewing local elderly people, were published several times in **Vita-Lytovska**. In the family of 12 persons, only one person recovered. **Zhuliany**. In the village, all dogs were eaten. Some people lived on pancakes made from acorn flour. **Korchuvate**. The workers of the brick-yard were rescued with their work-related rations, and they also fed on a soup from grass. **Mysholowka**. “Special workers” were moving about in the woods: they tied corpses by the feet, dragged them to the edge of the Golosiyiv forest and dropped them there…

At that same time, I became interested in the total quantity of human losses in the Kyiv outskirts. Basic sources of the calculations were: statistic tables containing the 1931–1934 years; documents in the Kyiv State Archive [8]; the local demographic records of those years [9]; primary source statements given by elderly people: Ivan Bondarenko (Vita-Lytovska), Omelian Semenenko (Mykhaylivska Borshchahivka), Varvara Kuzmenko (Vyguriwshchyna), and others. The comparison of dates in different documents made it possible to calculate the total human losses. Meetings with native citizens of those settlements enabled making previous calculations more exact, and most importantly, to affirm the conclusion: those losses were the results of the hunger starvation.

The dependence of human losses from the collectivization level: Mykilska Borshchahivka – 94% households were collectivized, the hunger starvation victims was 32% of the villagers; Bilychi – 76/18; Pyrohiw – 72/24; Vyguriwshchyna – 65/13; Zhuliany – 57/13; Bortnychi – 47/44; Troieshchyna – 47/16; and Vita-Lytovska – 32/19.

However, the problem arose in the fact of there being different statuses of these inhabited units. The archival documentation describes separate villages, as well as holding the documents of special units – "rural Radas." I had to "split" the rural Radas; keeping constant the habitation ratio of villages, farmsteads, and former out-of-town resorts. For example, from autumn 1931 to summer 1932, in the rural Rada of Mykilska Borshchahivka, 74 persons died every month, 19 persons died every week (compiled from autumn 1931 to summer 1932 – 9 and 2 persons, respectively). Half of the victims were children; by quantity: in Bratska Borshchahivka – 100; in Mykilska and Mykhailivska Borshchahivkas – 135 each.

The information collected by myself refers to 18 villages and 4 farmsteads. The average diligently checked loss indicator in the villages, that are now parts of Kyiv, is 23%. This may be compared with the resulting conclusion of the Demography Institute (on the average 200 victims by 1000 inhabitants of Kyiv region [11]). The statistics of these settlements divide them into two groups:

1. Mortality lower then 20% – 5 settlements: Bilychi, Vyguriwshchyna, Zhuliany, Troieshchyna, Mryhy.

2. Mortality higher then 20% – 17 settlements: Bortnychi, Bratska Borshchahivka, Vita-Lytovska, Voskresenska Slobidka, Krasny Khutir, Mykilska Borshchahivka, Mykhailivska

Borshchahivka, Mysholovka, Osokorky, Pyrohiw, Pozniaky, Sovky, Dehtiari, Kytayiw, Konyk, Korchuvate, Samburky.

The hunger-starvation of 1932–1933, is the most tragic page of local history. Death by hunger took nearly 8,000 inhabitants of 22 villages and farmsteads in the suburban belt.

Therefore, I declare once again: It is necessary to place a set of memorial signs or markers dedicated to the victims of the Genocide-Holodomor, in the actual places of the tragedy – in the streets of modern Kyivian outskirts, the settlements of Zhuliany, Mysholovka, Pyrohiw, and the residential areas built on the ground of the villages Voskresenka, "Troieshchyna," and so on. Preferably, these memorials will be made from durable materials, and be indicated in future official cartographic editions.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Великий голод в Україні 1932–1933 років: у IV т. – Т. II. Свідчення очевидців для Комісії Конгресу США / Викон. дир. Комісії Дж. Мейс. – К.: Вид. дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", 2008. – 326 с.
2. Великий голод в Україні 1932–1933 років: у IV т. – Т. IV. Звіт Конгресово-президентської Комісії США з дослідження Великого голоду 1932–33 рр. в Україні. – К.: Вид. дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", 2008. – 516 с.
3. Вечірній Київ. – 1998. – 26 листопада.
4. Вечірній Київ. – 1999. – Червень.
5. Воля Олесь. Мор: Книга буття України. – К.: Кобза, 2002. –1152 с.
6. Голод-геноцид 1933 року в Україні: істор.-політологічний аналіз соц.-демогр. та морально-психол. наслідків: Міжнар. наук.-теорет. конференція: Київ, 28 листопада 1998 р.: Мат-ли. – К., Нью-Йорк, 2000. – 439 с.
7. Голодомор 1932–1933 рр. в Україні: злочин влади – трагедія народу: Документи і матеріали / Кол. упорядн.: О.А. Удод, В. Лозицький та ін. – К.: Генеза, 2008. – 504 с.
8. Державний архів міста Києва. – Ф. Р-1. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 1806. – Арк. 207, 208; Ф. Р-1. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 7173. – Арк. 166; Ф. Р-1. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 1908. – Арк. 19, 20; Ф. Р-11. – Оп. 3. – Спр. 178. – Арк 1.
9. Київ та його приміська смуга: Стат.-екон. довідник 1932 року / Київська міська державна плянова комісія. – С. 1–9.
10. Конквест Р. Жнива скорботи: Радянська колективізація і голодомор / Пер. з англ. – Київ: Либідь, 1993. – 281 с.
11. Радіо "Голос Києва". – 2015. – Листопад.
12. Радіо "Культура", прямоефірна передача Івана Драча. – 2006. – листопад.
13. Український голокост 1932–1933: Свідчення тих, хто вижив: У 3-х т. / За ред. Ю. Мицика. – Т. 2. – К.: Вид. дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", 2004. – 296 с.
14. Український хліб на експорт: 1932–1933 / Упоряд. В. Сергійчук. – К.: ПП Сергійчук М.І. , 2006. – 432 с.

Yuriy Bryazhunov

LOSSES OF UKRAINIAN PEOPLE FROM THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR DURING 1932–1933, IN THE VORONEZH REGION

Proof of genocide of the Ukrainian community in the USSR outside of Ukraine proper during the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, is found in a comparison of the characteristics of the population censuses conducted in 1926 and 1937, across the territory of the RSFSR. The results of Census of 1926, which was not questioned regarding its scientific process [4, p. 5], showed that Ukrainians numbered 6,948,381 – almost 7.5% of the total number of inhabitants of Russia (93,107,746). According to the Census of 1937, Ukrainians in Russia were less by 2.2 times – 3,087,022. It must be noted that the specialists, who participated in Census of 1926, also were involved in the Census of 1937 [4, p. 11]. The Kremlin discredited the results of this later Census; declared it "defective" and repressed its organizers as "enemies of people" to hide the colossal losses of population in the key earlier years of the 1930s [4, p. 9]. According to the results of the 1926 Census, in the Central Chornozem Region that included Voronezh Oblast, there were 1,651,853 Ukrainians (more than 15% of population in this region). In Voronezh Oblast, there were 1,078,552 Ukrainians (32.6%) among the 3,307,548 inhabitants of the region [3, pp. 12, 13, 16-17]. In 1925–1926, the birth rate was increasing, and the mortality rate in the European part of the RSFSR was decreasing. Nonetheless, after 1928, mortality increased; and since 1929, the birth rate had been decreasing [7, pp. 10, 12, 21]. Concentrated groups of Ukrainians lived in 6 district counties of the region: in 42 of 91 counties, and in four cities, they constituted from 23% to 91% of population [14, sheet 5]. However, terror and repression led to depopulation, and provoked armed resistance – in particular, in the Korshiv Rebellion, in 1930 [7, p. 46]. In the autumn of 1928, almost 200 rebellions against the authorities occurred in the Central Black Earth Oblast. Repressions conducted in response, led to the fact that just during the 1930–1931 timeframe, 25,979 families (128,393 persons) were sent to Siberia, the Far North, and other remote regions of the USSR [19, p. 27–29]. Famine occurred not only because the people were deprived of their properties, but because they also were denied food, and forbidden to migrate or relocate to acquire food elsewhere.

During the time between these two censuses, the population of Voronezh, in 1937, did not reach the level of 1926, but only reached 97.9% (6,216,357 and 6,086,834 – thereby, a loss of 129,523) [7, p. 38]. Nevertheless, on the background of a decrease in the absolute number of inhabitants in the region by 2.1%, the number of Ukrainians during the same period in Eastern Podon decreased by more than half: out of 1,073,552 Ukrainians, only 482,774 persons, [4, p. 92] or 44.96%, survived. At the same time, the number of Belarusians, Jews, and other minorities in these years did not decrease. In the province, there were 2,514 Belarusians in 1926, and in 1937 – 3,109. The number of Jews increased – 6,026 to 10,630, in accordance with these dates [3, pp. 16; 4, p. 92].

The main cause of mortality was the total withdrawal of bread and other food products. In the Rososhanskyi District, in 1932, the plan for surrendering grain was increased in 1.8 times in contradistinction to 1931 [9, p. 34]. Olkhovatskyi District was ordered to give bread – 3,000 tons more than it actually could produce [9, p. 35]. The state did not pay for the annual work of the peasants, and banned the free sale of grain until the end of the grain harvesting [8, pp. 8; 22, p. 14]. In the telegram of Stalin and Molotov, the Party leadership of the Province was ordered to remove all grain from the peasants [9, pp. 38–39, 110]. In September 1932, the annual plan was implemented by only 28.6% [13, p. 1]; at the end of 1932 by 65% (1,306,000 tons). In the first quarter of the following year, 641,000 tons of grain was expropriated from the peasants; and in the second quarter, for another 68,000 tons [9, pp. 35–36].

Archives reveal that in 1926, Ukrainians in Voronezh wanted to unite with the Ukrainian SSR, because they recognized that Ukraine had helped them survive in 1921, and so, it would be better to stay as a single family [15, p. 8]. However, in the winter of 1933, the Ukrainians of Starobilsk, Svatovsky and other border regions of the Ukrainian SSR, who were starving of famine, went to the Olkhovtsyi District of Voronezh in search of food, but only saw the same hungry children and adults there [5]. The peasants of the Shaposhnikivka village died when they ate sown grain treated with poisonous chemicals [6]. In this situation, even activists of the Communist Party and the district leaders stood against the Stalin and Molotov line taken against the village. They were punished for this courageous protest, particularly in Olhovatka [12, p. 64–65]. Repressions were carried out by special forensic investigating

brigades. In January–February, they condemned 4,562 people, and sentenced 14 of them to death [9, p. 17].

In the spring and summer of 1933, people started to die while at work. Additionally, the scale of cannibalism was rising. Nevertheless, in March 1933, Voronezh celebrated the complete victory of the authority in the province, at the Congress of Collective Farmers [9, p. 50]. In 1934, famine returned to Voronezh. The authorities, in order to save their victory over agricultural problems, gave the people the waste production [18, sheet 136]. A total lack of food was recorded in three regions of the province [9, p. 51].

Educational institutions recorded "excessive" student dropouts. At the end of 1934, the occupancy rate at elementary school was only 92.5%, and as low as 71.1% in elementary secondary schools. Instead of 1,247,000 pupils, only 94,000 transferred to complete secondary school. School graduation from the fourth grade was only 72.5% of the students enrolled in the first grade; for the seventh grade, this number was 73.3% According to the standards, the drop-out rate in primary school was at 5%; in the incomplete secondary years – 7%; and in the full secondary school – to 3%. In fact, in all categories of students, the drop-out rate was 21–23% [2, p. 133].

In the 1927/1928 academic year, there were 413 Ukrainian schools of the first degree in the region, of which 42,516 children studied in the Ukrainian language, in 766 groups. In total, 98,637 pupils studied at schools of the first degree, in 5 Ukrainian districts.

Out of 12 secondary schools of the second level in the region, 5 of them had 5 Ukrainianized groups; 6 had an unspecified number of Ukrainian groups; and, in three pedagogical schools, the Ukrainian language was taught [18, pp. 7]. Ukrainian schoolchildren predominated in the Olkhovatsky District: 53 schools out of 97 were Ukrainian [12, p. 18]. Even in 44 Russian schools, Ukrainians prevailed, because in Olhovatka, as well as in 6 counties of the Rossoshansky Region, the Ukrainian population was 100% [17, pp. 70, 71, 72]. In Olkhovatsky district, there were 7,345 school-age children, before the Genocide-Holodomor, out of the total number of 70,715.

In Rososhanskyi Region, at the beginning of 1931, there were 55 Ukrainian schools, 2 Ukrainianized pedagogical schools, and 1 Ukrainianized medical school. In general, 5 pedagogical schools, with 388 students, were Ukrainianized, in the Voronezh Region. In Boguchar, and Kalach, there were 2 Ukrainian agricultural technical schools for 80 students. Moreover, in Suianska, and Valuiwska pedagogical schools, Ukrainian was obligatory. In Rososhanskyi

District, a labor faculty opened for 157 students at the Voronezh University.

Five districts of Bogucharsk County had a 100% Ukrainian population; three, more than 80%; one, more than 73%. In Ostrogozsky Oblast, one district was 100% Ukrainian, two districts had more than 80% Ukrainian population. In total, in Voronezh, in 13 counties, Ukrainians were 100% of the population; 2 counties – 90%; 5 counties – 80%; 2 counties – 70%; and 3 counties – 60%. Within the total population, Ukrainians comprised more than 60% in 25 counties of Voronezh [17, sheets 70, 71, 72; 14, sheets 5, 7]. At the same time, the infant mortality amounted to one-third of all deaths in the 1930's [11, pp. 210, 211].

Officials acknowledged that in the Voronezh Region, the birth rate of 1933 had a negative indicator of more than 25,000 people (excluding those stillborn). This means that there were 1,802,000 newborns and 2,055,000 dead. However, these data are incomplete: in the areas of famine, nobody had time to record mortality, because of the number of employees' deaths among the accounting authority [7, pp. 11, 12].

It was found that there were many deaths in Ukraine, Azov-Black Sea Region, Saratov, Stalingrad, Kursk, and Voronezh Regions that were not recorded in the Registry Office; that totaling 1 million deaths. In general, the average annual mortality was close to 2.6 million. Even Russian researchers consider too low the difference in losses of 4.1 million dead in 1933 [7, pp. 40–41, 46, 68; 4, pp. 92, 96, 101].

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Брук С.И., Кобузан В.М. Численность и расселение украинского этноса в XIII – начале XX в. // Советская этнография. – № 5.
2. Брязгунов Ю. Голод 1930-х у Центральному Чорнозем'ї та на Кубані: антиукраїнське спрямування // Три Голодомори в Україні в XX ст.: погляд із сьогодення. – К.: Українська Видавнича Спілка, 2003. – 312 с.
3. Всесоюзная перепись населения 1926 года. – Т. III. – Москва: Издание ЦСУ Союза ССР, 1928.
4. Всесоюзная перепись населения 1937 года: общие итоги. Сборник документов и материалов. – М.: "Российская политическая академия" (РОССПЭН), 2007. – 320 с.
5. Двірник Ф.Г. Голодомор на Воронежчині // Голос. Незалежний інформаційний бюллетень. – № 25. – Київ, 1991.
6. Двірник Ф.Г. Голодомор 1932–1933 рр. на Воронежчині // Східна Слобожанщина. Пресовий бюллетень за перше півріччя. – Воронеж, 1994.
7. Жиромская В.Б. Демографическая история России в 1930-е годы. Взгляд в неизвестное. – М.: РОССПЭН, 2001. – 280 с.

8. Забродский. На передовые позиции борьбы за хлеб // В помощь районной печати. Журнал сектора печати обкома ВКП(б) ЦЧО. – Воронеж, 1932. – №26.
9. Загоровский П.В. Социально-экономические последствия голода в Центральном Черноземье в первой половине 1930-х годов. – Воронеж: Воронежский государственный педагогический университет, 1998. – 132 с.
10. Зонин Ю. Украинизация и перевыборы в Россошанском районе ЦЧО // Революция и национальности. – 1931. – № 2-3.
11. Население России в XX веке. В 3-х т. – Т. 1. – М.: РОССПЭН, 2000. – 463 с.
12. Ольховатка – край Воронежский. Краткий исторический очерк, природа, люди, их дела и судьбы. – Ольховатка, 2000. – 176 с.
13. Повысить темпы хлебоздачи! // В помощь районной печати. Журнал сектора печати обкома ВКП(Б) ЦЧО. – 1932. – № 27-28.
14. Центр документации новейшей истории Воронежской области (далі – ЦДНИВО). – Ф. 1. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 2213.
15. ЦДНИВО. – Ф. 1. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 961.
16. ЦДНИВО. – Ф. 1. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 947.
17. ЦДНИВО. – Ф. 1. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 1644.
18. ЦДНИВО. – Ф. 2. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 2834.
19. Чвикалов И.М. К вопросу о причинах коллективизации (по материалах Центрального Черноземья) // Материалы для изучения сельских поселений России. Доклады и сообщения 3-й научно-практической конференции “Центрально-Черноземная деревня: История и современность”. Воронеж, декабрь 1994. – М.: РА СХН, 1995.
20. Шевченко С. Зверніть увагу, кому слід // В помощь районной печати. Ежемесячный журнал сектора печати обкома ВКП(б) ЦЧО. – Воронеж, 1932. – №29.

Dmytro Hryn'

RESULTS OF THE CENSUSES OF THE 1920–30S, AS A HISTORICAL SOURCE REGARDING THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR

In the historical memory of the Ukrainian nation, these decades are associated with the most tragic pages of our history of the XX century: namely, the artificial mass starvation of 1921–1922, and the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933. This article focuses on an analysis of the Censuses of the 1920–1930s, studying the effects of the criminal policy of Stalin and the Bolshevik regime and its impact on population dynamics, as well as the national and social structure of the population. It is proved that, in the study of social processes and demographic structures, the decisive role belongs to the data of statistics, which emphasizes the continuous and selective census of the population [4; 5; 6]. Thus, the problem is stated that due to the fact of the construction of the dynamic series, which should be based on the same type of data, leads to the necessity of finding, through a comparative analysis, similarity (or discrepancy) of concepts, categories and methodological keys of the programmatic principles of the censuses.

During this period, the general population censuses were carried out in 1920, 1926, 1937, 1939; the Urban Census in 1923; and the "Accounting of the Urban Population of the Ukrainian SSR," in 1931. However, the volume of publications of the results of these surveys is significantly different. Materials of no other Soviet censuses have been published in such a volume, as the results of the All-Union Census of Population in 1926 [2]. The results of the Urban Population Survey of the Ukrainian SSR in 1931, are supplemented and continued with the addition of the previous publications [7]. For a long time, the materials of the 1937 Census were believed destroyed, which proved untrue, because some of the results of this Census began to be published in the early 1990s [1]. At the same time, some data of the Census of 1939 was also published [3]. An appeal to archival materials allows filling the existing gaps in publications [8; 10].

The basis of the programmatic provisions of the demographic censuses is the definition of the categories of the population as the object of statistical examination: available (actual), permanent (settled), and reserved (legal). Changes in the approaches to the definition of categories of people subject to the census, depended

not only on academic standards, but also had a political connotation, when the maximum approximation to support Stalin's projected population was required. Therefore, using the results of the Censuses of the 1920-1930s, it is more appropriate to operate the number of the existing population, since such an approach makes it possible to capture the "reflection," and "imprint" of the quantity and composition of the population of Ukraine, at the time of the Census.

During the 1920–1930s, the national composition of the population experienced significant changes, which can be analyzed in relation to the ten most numerous nationalities, whose number of representatives was not less than 20,000 people. Since the total proportion of these nationalities among the general population varied, from 99.65% in 1926 to 99.4% in 1939, the data on their numbers and territorial concentration should provide us with an optimal answer to the question.

In the Censuses of the 1920–1930s, the largest complexity of issues concerned the employment of the population. The indication of the presence or absence of their own livelihoods was the basis of the division of the population into a self-employed and non-self-employed, which, in turn, makes it possible to reveal the relationship between the economically "active" or "passive," in the society.

In the Censuses of the 1920–1930s, the problem of determining the "socio-class" structure was solved by raising the question of the position of the individual in the activity. The fundamental difference between the social categories was the way of considering workers as representatives regarding the representation of their own work – that is, whether they were employed – or not. On this basis, we distinguish two main groups, among which the first, namely workers, servants, and employees hired for work; and the rest – the owners of all levels, and family members, who helped with this activity, or worked within their own household. Persons of free occupations, who had a private practice, were also included in the last group.

By the mid-1930s, the social structure of society had undergone significant changes, and therefore the term, "a single farmer," had disappeared. Cooperated artisans were considered as one group. Priests were assigned to unemployed elements, as opposed to their status in the 1920s, when they were allocated to liberal professions, i.e. intellectuals.

An adequate reflection of the social structure of the population is impossible without analyzing the data by means of its distribution as branches of the national economy. Following this purpose, special

classification schemes were created in the programs of each census, [9, v. XX, p. 4, preface, v. XXIIII, p. 6; 7, p. XVII–XVIII; 8, op. 336, case 1048, sheet 38], the analysis of which testifies to the possibility of comparing statistical indicators.

Consequently, a comparative analysis of the publications of the censuses results of archival sources convinces one that, if there is a sufficient volume of publications, the preference should be given to them, rather than to archival materials. The use of these archival documents, especially in the 1930s, complicated the almost complete absence of such documents in the archives of Ukraine; and, these are not primary-source materials. Analysis of the methodological principles of censuses in the 1920–1930s testify to the possibility of comparing their statistical results, which corresponds to the purpose of constructing dynamic lines according to social and demographic characteristics.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Вестник статистики. – 1990. – № 7, 8.; Всесоюзная перепись населения 1937 года. Краткие итоги. – М.: И-т истории СССР АН СССР, 1991. – 239 с.
2. Всесоюзная перепись населения 17 декабря 1926 года. Окончательные итоги. В семи отделах, 56 томах. – Отдел I. Народность, родной язык, возраст, грамотность. В 17 томах. – Т. XI. Украинская Социалистическая Советская Республика. Итоги по республике. Полесский подрайон. – М., 1929.; Т. XII. То же. Правобережный подрайон. Левобережный подрайон. – М., 1928.; Т. XIII. То же. Степной подрайон. Днепропетровский подрайон. Горнопромышленный подрайон. – М., 1929.; Отдел II. Занятия. В 17 томах. – Т. XXVIII. Украинская Социалистическая Советская Республика. Итоги по республике. Полесский подрайон. – М., 1930.; Т. XXIX. То же. Правобережный подрайон. Левобережный подрайон. – М., 1930.; Т. XXX. То же. Степной подрайон. Днепропетровский подрайон. Горнопромышленный подрайон. – М., 1930.; Отдел 4. Безработные. – Т. LII. – М.–Л., 1931.
3. Всесоюзная перепись населения 1939 г. Основные итоги. – М., 1992.
4. Жиромская В.Б. После революционных бурь: Население России в середине 20-х годов / В.Б. Жиромская. – М.; Наука, 1996. – 158 с.
5. Ковальченко И.Д. О применении математико-статистических методов в исторических исследованиях / И.Д. Ковальченко // Источниковедение: Теоретические и методические проблемы. – М., 1969. – С. 115-133.
6. Корчак-Чепурківський Ю.О. Відтворення населення Української РСР до початку першої п'ятирічки / Ю.О. Корчак-Чепурківський // Демографічні дослідження. – Вип. 3. – К., 1975. – С.78-114.
7. Підсумки обліку міської людності УСРР 1931 р. – Харків, Народне господарство та облік, 1933. – 211 с.
8. Російський державний архів економіки. – Ф.1562.
9. Труды Центрального статистического управления СССР. Т. I-LII – М.: Издательство ЦСУ СССР, 1921–1931.
10. Центральний державний архів вищих органів влади та управління України. – Ф. 582.

Nina Lapchynska

THE HOMELESS: A SEPARATE CATEGORY OF VICTIMS OF THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR BASED ON KHARKIV DOCUMENTS

A bitter fate of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, did not bypass Kharkiv, the largest city of Ukraine and the capital of the Republic at that time. The vital statistics of more than 33,000 people in the city, who died during this period, were archived in the registration documents that noted, as the causes of death, diseases directly related to prolonged starvation. How could this happen, since the working urban population and their dependents were given rations; which, although too inadequate to allow any to be wasted, should have preserved the population from death by hunger? Who were the victims of the famine; and can we consider the documented number as the final total?

No special research has been dedicated to answer these questions. Questions remain open, despite the fact that the archival documents were introduced into scientific circulation [1], and testify to some distinct facts regarding the Kremlin's intention to destroy the Ukrainian people in the Kharkiv Region by famine. These are fixed in the records of the Bureau and the Secretariat of the Kharkiv Regional Committee of the CP (b) U, the City Committee of the CP (b) U, the fonds of the Kharkiv City Council, City Health Department, sections of socialist reorganization of life, and other subdivisions of the City Council. Important, although incomplete, sources for calculating the number of victims are the books for registering deaths in the city of Kharkiv and in the suburban area [2].

A new unique source, which to some extent sheds light on the scale of the losses and the social affiliation of the Genocide-Holodomor victims, was discovered at the Kharkiv Regional Office of Forensic Medical Examination. These were the death records of the Kharkiv morgue for the years 1928–1933, that fortunately had not been destroyed. Currently, they are stored in open access in the State Archives of the Kharkiv Region [3]. Also, documents of the internal affairs of the Kharkiv Morgue during the late 1920s–the first half of the 1930s, were studied by the author. These documents are still stored at the Kharkiv Regional Office of Forensic Medical Examination: annual reports, orders for cadres, and special circulars from governmental authorities addressed to the institution.

A systematic study of these sources has revealed the following important points. On the background of industrialization, only in 1931, the population of Kharkiv increased by 258,000 people [4]. These people were devastated by the collectivization and dekulakization of the peasantry; they took the lowest paid jobs; and they lived in primitive dormitories or barracks. Their survival depended entirely on state norms of supply, which sometimes did not exceed 1/4 of the physiological needs of an adult engaged in heavy physical labour [5]. The workers could not stand long hours in queues for "commercial bread," the sale of which started in Kharkiv on 15 March 1933. So, for the inhabitants of such barracks, the dining rooms of companies were the only source of any kind of food. The strength of people's bodies, which were healthy before, became exhausted too quickly. Due to the high mortality of unskilled workers in the workers' barracks, separate facilities were created to temporarily conceal the corpses.

However, the main category of the Genocide-Holodomor victims in Kharkiv remained the street inhabitants – beggars and petty thieves. The communist government put the dekulakized into this state of poverty by ejecting them from their homes and businesses to survive as best they were able on the streets. Soviet law forbade them to be employed, because they were marked as socially alien subjects.

With the onset of the Genocide-Holodomor, a significant number of hungry Ukrainian peasants, including collective farmers, migrated to the cities in search of relief. The flow of the hungry people was not stopped, even by the official introduction during the first months of 1933 of the required certification of the population of Kharkiv and workers from Kharkiv enterprises living in the suburban area. Restriction of the free movement of peasants through the territory of Ukraine, and the ban on entry to Kharkiv without relevant certificates, and the placement of blocking posts around the city, and the ban on overnight stays in residential buildings, etc. thwarted the people's hopes of finding a means of survival.

In the report on the work of the headquarters with specially authorized Extraordinary Commissioner Professor V. Kogan-Yasnyi, for the period from 10 April to 10 May 1933, it is specified that just during this brief time, "11,014 homeless people (children and adults) were picked up and brought to isolated checkpoints in the city" [6]. However, the flow of new hungry beggars to Kharkiv did not stop.

Among the thousands of homeless people, the most vulnerable were children, including babies. In June 1933, there were 19

children's homes in the city of Kharkiv and the Kharkiv suburban area [7], and 18,000 children gathered there, as of 4 July 1933 [8]. In addition, a significant number of selected children were stationed in railway cars, and a tent camp for 3,000 children was deployed near Kharkiv [9]. However, there were still not enough places for all of them.

Not only did the conditions in orphanages not ensure their normal development, but these conditions also did not guarantee their survival. This also applies to homeless adults "taken" from the streets. In March 1933, 300 grams of bread per day was assigned for one adult [10]. As evidenced by the notes of an employee of the Health Department of the Kharkiv City Council, regarding the contingents (adults and children) of the Saltivskyi and TSIPivskyi barracks, the diagnosis of diseases and the planned figures of the food supply on 14 May 1933, the anticipated scanty funds for food had not arrived [11]. The inability to acquire anything eatable while under protection meant survive was impossible. Association of the majority of those killed by hunger with the category of homelessness is also proven by the death records in the journals of the Kharkiv City Forensic Morgue. Given the high number of corpses brought to the city morgue, from April 1933 onwards, the process of autopsy was ended. According to the visible external features recorded in the death journal, the forensic diagnosis of "BBO" (from the Russian phrase meaning protein-free edema) the determination was made of death caused by hunger.

The police immediately directed that the majority of corpses picked up from the streets were to be taken to the cemeteries or special burial grounds. Usually, there were no documents with these corpses, so they were recorded as "unknown," or "unknown child," and their approximate age was indicated [12]. Also, from the spring of 1933, the head of the Korsykovske Cemetery received an order to accept corpses for burial without documentation, even in the preliminary registration at the registry office [13]. This not only demonstrates the falsity of Soviet statistics, but also shows the deliberate distortion of data by the authorities.

In addition to Korsykovske, all the other cemeteries of the city were involved in the burial of the Genocide-Holodomor victims. These naked bodies were buried every night in common burial pits.

To assist the police in picking up bodies from the city streets and burying the corpses of the homeless, from June 1933, special workers were assigned [14]. These workers immediately took the

selected bodies to the pre-determined places, usually in ravines on the outskirts of the city.

The analysis of documentary sources stored in the fonds of the State Archives of the Kharkiv Region, and in the collection of documents of the Kharkiv Regional Office of Forensic Medical Examination enables the formulation of the following conclusions, regarding the Genocide-Holodomor victims in Kharkiv:

- the main category of victims was homeless adults and children, Ukrainian peasants who arrived in the capital of the Ukrainian SSR by various ways, hoping to find rescue from starvation;
- a certain proportion of those who died by hunger were the workers from the barracks, "the workers of the fulfillment of Five-Year-Plan," and former villagers, who received food rations set below the physiological norms of consumption, who were deprived of the opportunity to improve their situation;
- the Genocide-Holodomor victims were a significant part of the prisoners of BUPR-1, BUPR-2 (institutions of forced labour), the GPU concentration camps, numerous forced hard labor colonies, as well as Ukrainian arrested for their opposition to the authorities;
- the real goal of creating orphanages by the Communist regime was not the intention to save Ukrainian peasants and their children from starvation, but to conceal the scale of the deliberate crime.

In addition, archival documents provide incentives for arguing that the mortality rate records in Kharkiv are significantly underestimated. This is also confirmed by the conclusion of the Forensic Medical Examination for the trial of a criminal case, No. 475: "The real number of deaths registered on April 19, 1933 – 22,463. The figure is approximately seven times higher than the one that reflects the mortality rate in Kharkiv on April 19, 1933, according to the deaths records of Kharkiv city registration offices. Data on the corpses registration from the journals of the Kharkiv City Forensic Medical Morgue correctly (quantitatively) reproduces the mortality rate in morgues only during the first half of 1933. According to forensic medical data, the minimum mortality rate in Kharkiv in 1933, is 100,000 dead. ... the number of childrens' deaths only in 1933 in Kharkiv was no less than 36–56,000. The figure only of the infant mortality rate is twice larger than the total mortality rate in Kharkiv, which is reflected in the official records of the registration offices in 1933" [15]. Most of the Genocide-

Holodomor victims were buried without any death registration, and this is not less than 75,000 people just in 1933.

Kharkiv, as the capital of the Ukrainian SSR, was in the midst of events, and like a sponge, it sucked into its stone slums and digested the lives of peasants and their children from all over Ukraine. The archival documents testify that, at the micro level of one administrative-territorial unit, the communist regime carefully concealed the results of one of the most serious crimes in recent history, the crime of genocide. Further archaeological searches should lead to the identification of direct, irrefutable evidence of the scope of the crime.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Голодомор 1932–1933 рр. у м. Харкові, столиці УСРР / Упор. О.С. Гнезділо, Н.В. Лапчинська, І.В. Шуйський, О.В. Сафонова. – Х.: Оригінал, 2009. – 319 с., іл.
2. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-6532. – Оп. 3. – Спр. 1 – 181, у тому числі під літерними номерами 29 а, 29 б, 53 а, 53 б, 104 а, 155 а, 155 б, 174 а.
3. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-6537. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 1 – 11.
4. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-1962. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 120. – Арк. 73; Довідник основних статистично-економічних показників господарства районів Харківської області УРСР. – Х.: Видання Управління справами РНК УСРР, 1933. – С. 8.
5. ДАХО. – Ф. П-69. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 90. – Арк. 168 – 171.
6. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-1962. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 281. – Арк. 198.
7. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-1962. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 973. – Арк. 9, 9 зв., 10, 14, 17, 42, 56.
8. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-408. – Оп. 8. – Спр. 1806. – Арк. 237 – 257.
9. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-1962. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 981. – Арк. 38.
10. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-408. – Оп. 8. – Спр. 170. – Арк. 104, 105.
11. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-1962. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 281. – Арк. 223.
12. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-6537. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 6 – 11.
13. Харківське обласне бюро судово-медичних експертиз. – Колекція документів.
14. ДАХО. – Ф. Р-1962. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 981. – Арк. 38 зв.
15. Геноцид в Україні 1932–1933 рр. за матеріалами кримінальної справи № 475 // Упор. М. Герасименко, В. Удовиченко. – К., 2014. – С. 367 – 368.

Fedir Turchenko and Inna Shugalyova

CHILD MORTALITY IN ZAPORIZHZHIA DURING THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR OF 1932–1933

In the following study, we will discuss the tragedy of the Children Orphanage located at 7 Rosa Luxemburg Street (actually, Oleksandrivska) in the center of the city of Zaporizhzhia. A real conveyor of death functioned here in 1932–1933, in this building intended to house approximately 60–70 children. About 800 children from ages 7 days to 8 years old were killed at this facility from May 1932 to November 1933. However, as archival documents indicate, such special state homes for children existed throughout the territory of the Ukrainian SSR. [1, p. 64].

At the beginning of the mass death from starvation, peasants brought their children to the big cities and abandoned them in crowded places with the hope that someone would transfer their child to the shelter. The main administrative, law enforcement, and party institutions of the city were located on the same street as the Children's Orphanage mentioned above.

Researchers succeeded in recording a unique testimony of the event's eye-witness – Maria Tykhonivna Sydorenko, (born in 1928) [1]. The story of Maria Tykhonivna's existence in the Children's Orphanage in Zaporizhzhia was provided by her niece – A.O. Nuzhna. In particular, she recalled that her father was imprisoned. Her mother, in order to save the children, handed them over to her brother. The brother brought the small girls to the marketplace in Zaporizhzhia and left, because he was himself in a difficult financial situation. A woman nearby saw them, and took girls to the orphanage. Maria Sydorenko remembered that children were kept in poverty.

Children slept on naked dirty boards, without any linens, blankets or pillows. It was a catastrophic problem due to the lack of clothing [1]. Unsanitary and dirty conditions caused the children to have the appearance of rats. Different infections constantly occurred among all the children. Every child walked about in a state of undress, their bodies were discolored from dermatologic infections that were widespread. Dead children were taken and thrown into a ditch near the house, and then their bodies were covered with earth, while other children watched these proceedings through the windows of the orphanage [1].

The archival Civil Registration Books document the mortality in the Stalino Region. These documents help us to understand some of the events that took place in the Children's Orphanage, in 1932–1933. These contain small forms that contain information about the parents of these children. As such, these are invaluable. For example, the mother of Nunka Mykola, who died at the same house at the age of 1 month, was a 23-year-old Ukrainian peasant, who worked as a "breastfeeder." However, her own child died from exhaustion [2, sheet 10]. Similarly, the other "breastfeeder's" son, Evgeny Khorolsky, also died of exhaustion at the age of 2 months, in February 1933 [3, sheet 19].

Analyzing the data of the Book of Registration," for the years 1932–1933, researchers discovered a number of irregularities. First, the age of the deceased ranged from 7 days to 8 years, and the date of death. At a specified period of time, at least two deaths per day were recorded. In June 1932, 26 child deaths were registered. The next surge in mortality was in December 1932, and January 1933, when, according to the documentation, 25 and 26 persons died, respectively. From the spring of 1933, the number of deaths in the Children's Orphanage had been steadily increasing. The average number of deaths was 5 per day. In March 1933, 74 child deaths were registered. The peak of the mass death fell at the end of the spring into the summer of 1933. In May 1933, 124 children died (nearly 8 per daily); in June – 116; and in July – 119 children. From August 1933, a mortality decline was traced. All deaths were attested to by Doctor Falko, or sometimes Doctors Perezetsky [2, sheets 249, 263] or Cholodna [4, sheets 123–161].

They indicated the causes of death for the statistics. In these registry books, you can find such causes as: "exhaustion"; "intoxication"; "congenital weakness"; and "catarrh of the intestine and stomach." These documents do not reveal the main cause of death was famine. This was because doctors had received official instructions not to publish the real cause of death. However, these diseases are the consequences of prolonged starvation.

Another aspect that attracts attention is the names of the children. Usually, foundlings were named by the shelter workers. Very often, analogies (possibly unconscious) were used in choosing a name, which shed light on the history of the child arriving at the shelter. You can find such names as Yaselna Roza (meaning "Nursery Rose"); Nevidoma Mania (Unknown Mary"); Mayskaya Sima ("May Sima"), etc. In other examples, the surnames attract special attention: Mitya (Dmitriy) Donskoy; Gritsko Nevsky; Dnieprostoy

Yurchik; Akhmatova Anna; Maxim Gorky; Demyan Bednyy; Karl Liebkhnecht; and George Bernard Shaw. There is one question, what motivated the employees of the Orphanage, when giving such surnames to the children? George Bernard Shaw visited the USSR, in July 1933, and wrote in the preface to his play, *On the Rocks*: "... I did not see the people who had not enough to eat there; and the children were surprisingly round ..." [5]. The name of this "Stalinist tourist" was given to a child, who died of hunger in Ukraine one week after his visit.

Events that took place in the Children's Orphanage at 7 Rosa Luxemburg Street in Zaporizhzhia, in 1932–1933, are unique testimonies to the Genocide-Holodomor's overwhelming scale. There is no doubt that similar institutions existed in all areas affected by famine. Therefore, the disclosure and analysis of the relevant statistics and evidence should take place in all regions of Ukraine, and the results published.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Свідчення Марії Тихонівни Сидоренко, 1928 р.н., записано зі слів її родички Нужної А.О. – Запис З.В. Партико.
2. Державний архів Запорізької області (ДАЗО). – Ф. Р-5593. – Оп.13. – Спр. 317.
3. ДАЗО. – Ф. Р-5593. – Оп.13. – Спр. 316.
4. ДАЗО. – Ф. Р-5593. – Оп.13. – Спр. 318.
5. Партико З. "Бернард Шоу, добро пожаловать в ад!" / З. Партико // День. – 2015, 31 июля.

Jaroslav Kalakura

HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOURCE EVIDENCE OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE FAMINE IN THE UKRAINIAN SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLIC IN 1932–1933

A study of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 in Ukraine, in addition to its concrete historical significance, embodies historiographical and source-related dimensions. It requires a dedicated study of the research materials, and formation and analysis of these sources. The purpose of this article is to continue the analysis of the historiography of the issue [6] and its supporting sources [2]. According to bibliographic indices and the present author's calculations, in the period from the mid-1930s–2016, almost 15,000 documentary collections, collective and individual monographs, scientific and journalistic articles were published in Ukraine and abroad. This fact gives grounds for arguing that no event in world history, except the Second World War, caused such an inexhaustible interest of researchers as the Genocide-Holodomor in Ukraine.

In the chronology of accumulating sources and knowledge about the greatest crime against humanity, we can trace at least four periods: a) from the middle of the 1930s to the middle of the 1950s, represented mainly by foreign historiography; b) the second half of the 1950s–1980s, when Soviet historiography continued to deny hunger, while foreign historians, including the Diaspora, exposed mass starvation involving millions of victims; c) the 1990s and the first decade of 21st century, when historians and demographers of mainland Ukraine, along with foreign researchers, on the basis of published documents, convincingly proved the criminal nature of the Genocide-Holodomor planned by the Communist regime. An adoption by the Verkhovna Rada of "The Genocide-Holodomor Law," that recognized it as a genocide of the Ukrainian people, the Euromaidan, and the Revolution of Dignity laid the foundation for a qualitatively new, fourth period of the historiography of the Genocide-Holodomor as a genocide.

In the process of analysis of the latest scientific and scientific-documentary literature devoted to the Genocide-Holodomor, it has been established that, along with founders of this direction of study such as S. Kulchytskyi, V. Marochko, V. Serhiychuk, a significant contribution to the development of knowledge belongs to

S. Bilokon, V. Vasylenko, V. Vasyliev, O. Veselova, L. Hrynevych, V. Danylenko, G. Yefymenko, N. Lapchynska, O. Movchan, R. Pyrih, O. Stasiuk, F. Turchenko, J. Shapoval, P. Chernega, as well as works of young authors such as M. Bulda, V. Viatrovych, M. Doroshko, N. Ivanytskyi, G. Kapustian, P. Kardash, A. Kozytskyi, Y. Kotsur, N. Levchuk, K. Nazarova, V. Nikolskyi, V. Petrenko, B. Petryliak, A. Serputko, V. Tilischak, V. Udovychenko, E. Yatsenko, and others. As discoveries and the introduction of new sources come into scientific circulation, evaluative views have undergone a certain evolution – from hunger to genocide [5].

At present, researchers have a huge array of published all-Ukrainian and regional documentary collections devoted to the Genocide-Holodomor [4]. Unique memories of the survivors were published in 10 issues of the collection of memoirs gathered by the staff and students of the Institute of Hrushevskyi Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies, and the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, where the project leader is Prof. Y. Mytsyk. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of enriching the body of sources of the Genocide-Holodomor, and granting access to its digitized bibliography of documentary publications about all three Genocide-Holodomors that occurred in 20th Century Ukraine [Famines in the 1920s, 1930s, 1940s]. This should include documentary and scientific-documentary editions on the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, as experienced in Kyiv, Kirovohrad, Luhansk, Odesa, Poltava, Sumy, Kharkiv, Chernihiv, and other regions.

The creation, in the context of the laws of Ukraine about the de-communization and the expansion of access to the electronic archive of the repressive organs dedicated to the Genocide-Holodomor, under the title, "The Genocide of the Ukrainian People," which includes, "The Description of the Collection of Documents of the State Security Service of Ukraine," deserve our attention and support. Already published are more than 50 volumes of the National Book of Memory, about victims of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 (about the Kirovograd Region, there are 16 volumes; about Zaporizhzhia Region – 6; Kyiv – 3 volumes; and about Donetsk, Sumy, Khmelnytskyi – 2 volumes, and for the rest of the regions – 1 each). Unfortunately, this work recently has slowed down; it not funded properly; and, in a number of regions, the work is unsatisfactory.

What are the most fundamental conclusions derived from the latest achievements of historiography of this problem and from the source studies? First, it has been scientifically proven that the Genocide of 1932–1933, was intentional, artificial, pre-planned, and organized by the Communist regime. It was seen as a key link in the chain of mass terror and repression, in order to build a "state-commune;" the final approval of the regime of one-man authority; the physical extermination of all the forces of resistance; total denationalization; and a forced change of the genetic pool of Ukraine. A much wider chronological range of the hunger has been established. It began in 1929, and lasted until the summer of 1934. Its geography is precisely outlined: it covered lands that were densely populated by ethnic Ukrainians.

Secondly, by analyzing documentary and other sources, including statistical and demographic information, the involvement of quantitative methods of processing the population censuses, historical, legal, and demographic science researchers came close to establishing the real scale of Ukraine's loss from the genocide. V. Marochko has been working on a huge array of archival documents and statistical materials. He came to the conclusion that at least 7 million people died of the Genocide-Holodomor [10]. V. Serhiychuk, in solidarity with Marochko, estimates that the minimum number of Ukrainian victims of the Genocide-Holodomor amounts to 7 million people [11]. Moreover, the authoritative researcher of the Genocide-Holodomor, J. Mace set the number at 7.5 million, warning that this number might prove to be even higher.

Thirdly, the newest historiography based on the analysis of the ethnic composition of the Genocide-Holodomor victims unambiguously asserts that the Ukrainians, especially the Ukrainian peasantry, suffered the greatest losses, which gives grounds to speak about the ethnic coloration of the genocide [8]. S. Bilokin convincingly proved that the authorities, under the guise of eliminating the shortage of labor, organized a massive resettlement of Russians and other non-Ukrainian ethnic groups to the depopulated territory of Ukraine after the Genocide-Holodomor.

In addition, the Genocide-Holodomor led to the elimination of the "second Ukraine" in Kuban. In 1939, residents, who remained, were ordered to register as Russians [1]. Investigating the ethnic identity of the Genocide-Holodomor, the authors convincingly prove that it became not only a genocide, but also an ethnocide of the Ukrainian people, and an instrument for the elimination of "Ukrainian nationalism" [7].

It is possible to predict several areas of further work, including in-depth analysis of correlation between the international legal interpretation of genocide and Ukrainian realities during 1932–1933. It is very important to combine efforts of various specialists – historians, lawyers, demographers, ethno-political scientists, sociologists, psychologists, philologists, philosophers, and representatives of other branches of knowledge; and to involve foreign specialists. It is very important to trace the connections of the Genocide-Holodomor with the communization of the Ukrainian public and the planting of a "Soviet consciousness." The genocide became one of the methods of implementing Leninist-Stalinist projects and experiments, and became the embodiment and result of an unpardonable experiment conducted on living people, and Ukraine served as the landfill to dispose of the dead bodies.

Consequently, Ukrainian researchers, along with foreign colleagues, advanced to a new stage in the study of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, as a genocide of the Ukrainian people. This process allows enrichment of the knowledge about all segments of this world scale tragedy that includes analysis of the human losses, moral, and psychological traumas.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Білокінь С. Нові студії з історії большевизму. – К.: ІПУ НАН Украни, 2007. – С. 66–68.
2. Боряк Г., Папакін Г. Голодомор в Україні 1932–1933: реєстр архівних документів, опублікованих в 1990–2007 рр. // Національна книга памяті жертв Голодомору 1932–1933 рр. в Україні. – К.: Вид-во ім. О. Теліги, 2008. – С.421–532 та ін.
3. Голод 1932–1933 років в Україні: причини та наслідки (під ред. В. Литвина). – К.: Наукова думка, 2003. – 936 с.; Голодомор 1932–1933 років: основні дійові особи і механізми здійснення. – К.: МАУП, 2004. – 320 с.; Голодомор 1932–1933 років в Україні: каральні органи більшовицького режиму. – К.: МАУП, 2007. – 211 с. та ін.
4. Голод 1932–1933 років на Україні: очима істориків, мовою документів. – К., 1990. – 606 с.; Упокорення голодом. Зб. документів (упорядник М. Мухіна). – К., 1993. – 311 с.; Командири великого голоду. Поїздка В. Молотова і Л. Кагановича в Україну та на Північний Кавказ.1932–1933 рр. (За ред. В. Васильєва, Ю. Шаповала). – К.: Генеза, 2001. – 399 с.; Голодомор 1932–1933 років в Україні: документи і матеріали / Упорядн. Р.Я. Пиріг. – К.: ВД "Києво-Могилянська академія", 2007. – 1128 с.; Розсекречена пам'ять. Голодомор 1932–1933 років в Україні в документах ГПУ–НКВД. – К.: ВД "КМА", 2008. – 604 с. та ін.
5. Гудзь В.Еволюція поглядів Станіслава Кульчицького на голод в Україні 1932–1933 рр. та їх вплив на вітчизняний науковий дискурс // Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького національного університету, 2013. – вип. XXXV. – С. 297–302.

6. Калініченко В., Яценко Є. Історіографія голодомору 1932–1933 років в Україні // Голод-геноцид 1933 року в Україні: історико-політологічний аналіз соціально-демографічних та морально-психологічних наслідків. – К. – Нью-Йорк, 2000. – С. 15–26; Ящук П. Маловивчені аспекти геноциду-голодомору в Україні // Там само. – С. 217–234; Васильєв В.Ю. Голод 1932–1933 років в Україні: нові інтерпретації та тенденції у вітчизняній історіографії // Історія України: маловідомі імена, події, факти. – 2004. – Вип.27. – С. 271–302; Марочко В.І. Сучасна зарубіжна історіографія голоду 1932–1933 рр. в Україні: нова чи стара інтерпретація? // Укр. істор. журн, 2006. – №3. – С.186–199; Чернявська К.В. Сучасні історіографічні дослідження проблеми голодомору 1932–1933 рр. в Україні: тенденції та напрямки // Наук. вісн. Микол. НУ ім. В.О.Сухомлинського. – Серія Істор. науки. – Вип. 3.35. – 2013. – С. 262–268 та ін.
7. Зімон Г. Чи був голодомор 1932–1933 рр. інструментом "ліквідації" українського націоналізму? // Україн. істор. журн. – 2005. – №2. – С. 118–131.
8. Куліш А. Генетичний голодомор 1932–1933. – Полтава, 2000. – 84 с.; *Його ж.* Геноцид: голодомор 1932–1933: причини, жертви, злочинці. – Вид. 3-є, доп. – Х.: Просвіта, 2001. – 97 с.
9. Кульчицький С. Голод 1932–1933 рр. в Україні як геноцид. – К., 2005. – 230 с.
10. Марочко В. Голодомор1932–1933 рр. – К.: Б.в., 2007. – 64 с.; Його ж. Територія Голодомору 1932–1933 рр. – К.: Б.в., 2014. – 64 с. ; Марочко В.І., Мовчан О.М. Голодомор в Україні: Хроніка. – К.: ВД КМА, 2008. – 294 с. та ін.
11. Сергійчук В. Голодомор 1932–1933 років як геноцид українства. – Вишгород: ПП СЕРГІЙЧУК М.І., 2015. – 168 с.

Petro Chernega

THE GENOCIDE OF THE UKRAINIAN NATION IN THE USSR, 1932–1933

Today, when Ukrainian people once again are waging a just war with the Russian occupiers and collaborators and separatists of Donbas, we repeatedly return to the analysis of the consequences of "fratricidal friendship," imposed on Ukrainians first by Muscovy; later by Imperial Russia; Soviet Russia; and now, present day Russia, under the rule of V.V. Putin. We forget the warning of I. Franko, the ingenious son of Ukraine: "Moskofiliya, as any meanness, any demoralization – is an international phenomenon worthy of general condemnation and struggle with it" [8, p. 145]. The main content of it was the implementation of the idea, "Ukraine without Ukrainians." This policy became most active during the Russian Communist dictatorship, set on the ruins of the Russian Empire in the XX century, which aspired to build communism in the new Soviet empire and throughout the world.

For the "replacement of ethnographic material," the government of Lenin, and later the Stalinist regime, resorted to mass repressions, executions, barbaric and cynical methods of extermination of Ukrainians by famine in 1921–1923, and by Genocide-Holodomor in 1932–1933. "We need Ukraine itself, declared communist leaders, – people are not needed" [6, p. 33].

Genocide-Holodomor in Ukraine was a planned act of robbery of the peasants to seize funds for industrialization; however, not only that. The fertile Ukrainian land and the hard-working multimillion peasantry were extremely advantageous for creation of a new militaristic Soviet empire. The geopolitical and strategic position of Ukraine were, for Stalin, a prime prerequisite and a real proof, in the event of of its successful taming, of the victory of his version of socialism. Exploitation of its powerful base of material and human resources for the creation of the Soviet empire should result in the realization of a world proletarian revolution. Instead, the Ukrainian peasant nation did not support the policy of the Moscow authorities.

The communist government brutally suppressed the resistance of the rebel peasants of Ukraine by taking the course towards extermination of the Ukrainian nation. In 1929, and during the years of collectivization, the Stalinist regime repressed and deported from Ukraine 1.2 million of the so-called kulaks. To the cities and villages, in 1932, the Soviet government brought more than 200,000

communists, Komsomol members, workers of the Soviet organs of control and their families from central and western regions of Russia [9, p. 217]. The All-Union Resettlement Committee of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, by the end of 1933, sent into the areas desolated by Genocide-Holodomor 329 train echelons of property, cattle from 21,856 farmsteads and 117,149 family members of the re-settlers from Gorkovsky, Ivanovsky, and other regions [3, p. 642]. The anti-Ukrainian policy of the Bolsheviks weakened the productive forces of Ukrainian agriculture. The authorities have reduced to minimum the private gardening areas of collective farmers in order to make them to look for means of survival exclusively in work on the collective farms, and at the same time the same authorities has taken away all the food. The Ukrainian village was left without bread. During 1932–1933 the USSR exported to the Western Europe over 2.8 million tons of grain, mainly from Ukrainian peasants [1, p. 94].

Collectivization and grain procurements accompanied mass repression and murder of peasants and their children by the Soviet punitive bodies, representatives of local authorities, and Communist activists. To prevent the people from escaping to the cities; to control their movements; and to create detailed personal records of the entire population of the USSR, in 1932, the Bolsheviks introduced the internal passport regime. The process of creating these documents required the registration of one's comprehensive demographic information. The peasants were not issued these internal passports. Leaving their village to go to the city to find work [and, thereby, a source of life-sustaining rations] and to establish residence there was banned. The Soviet State, by way of a number of cruel anti-Ukrainian laws, established total control over the entire society. For the farmers, this meant succumbing to the newest form of serfdom [7] [Village elders possibly remembered Alexander II, the "Tsar Liberator," who freed Imperial Russian serfs, in 1861].

The people of Ukraine fell victim to the government's policies. Soviet military forces imposed and enforced the blockade of marked Ukrainian peasant settlements. The outright robbery of their farms, livestock, and the means of production completed the Bolsheviks' plan to organize the Genocide-Holodomor against Ukrainians on their native land, in the Kuban, the North Caucasus, the Volga Region, and Kazakhstan. The mass starvation of the peasants affected all 55,000 Ukrainian villages since spring of 1931, and lasted until the winter of 1934. Mass murders of adults and children, cannibalism, and suicides accompanied the forced starvation.

Cannibalism acquired a mass and terrible character. Children, more than 38% of the rural population, suffered the most. In each village, hundreds of children died from hunger; they were killed by the authorities for collecting ears of grain in the fields; and they became the victims of cannibals. In the Uman region, Alexandra Rabenko ate 7 of his children; her brother – his own son. In village Masynyakivtsi, Kirovograd region, where the well-known Ukrainian writer S. Plachinda was born, more than 911 children were killed. Only two survived – he and a neighbor girl. If we recognized the number of Genocide-Holodomor victims as 10 million people, then the children among them would count more than a half that number. During three years of hunger, the number of pupils and teachers in many rural schools amounted to 2–4% of the total number of previous years [1, p.126–139].

During 1932–1933, several times more Ukrainian children and women died than during the Second World War. According to a former employee of Ukrderzhplanu (Ukrstateplan), S. Sosnovyi, in Ukraine during the first half of 1933, every minute 17 died; every hour more than 1,000; and daily 25,000 people [4, p. 159–160].

An integral part of the Stalinist plan of the genocide against the Ukrainian nation was curtailment of Ukrainization; intensification of repressions against the intelligentsia; deportation of millions of Ukrainians; and the resettlement of Russians on their lands. The state terror and the Genocide-Holodomor had one more aim: to stop and then to destroy Ukrainian culture by dissolving it into Russian culture. Ukrainian culture experienced a great flowering and increase in the years 1917–1930, as well as an increase in the population number of Ukrainians. In 1929, the birth rate and natural population growth in Ukraine were the highest in Europe, and amounted 13.3% per 100 women. In Germany and England were only 5.6% [2, p. 134–144].

Among the approximately 10 million victims of the Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933, Ukrainians accounted for 91.2%. They died at rates varying from 50 to 80%, in most villages; and, in some others, up to 90%. All other nationalities, whose populations lived in the USSR, comprised 8.8% of the deceased. Russians and Jews were the least among them, although according to the 1926 Census, Russians were 12.1% of the population of Ukraine [4, p. 151, 156, 163].

Why? Representatives of these two nations in Ukraine lived in an absolute majority of cities, and were leaders of the Communist Party's policy. In 1922, there were 27,490 Russians; 11,920 Ukrainians; and 6,981 Jews in the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of

Ukraine. The ethnic composition of the state apparatus of the Republic, in the 1920s and 1930s, was mostly non-Ukrainian. The Ukrainian portion did not reach even 35%. In the governing bodies of the party, state and economic organs, Ukrainians were in an absolute minority. In College of the People's Commissariat worked 47% Russians; 26% Jews; and only 12% Ukrainians. Among the employees of the Commissariats, Jews were 40%; Russians 37%; and Ukrainians 14% [5].

The genocide of Ukrainians suppressed our internal "reflex of freedom" as well as the greater part of our moral and legal reflexes, and in this sense transformed us into legal and moral nihilists. This conserves the process of civil society the national elite is creating. Only the Revolution of Dignity and Russian aggression returned Ukrainians to the struggle for their statehood and national culture.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Веселова О.М. , Марочко В.І. , Мовчан О.М. Голодомори в Україні з 1921–1923, 1932–1933, 1946–1947 рр. : злочини проти народу. Вид. 2-е , допов. – Київ–Нью-Йорк, 2000. – 270 с.
2. Енциклопедія українознавства. Загальна частина. – Ч. 1. Перевид. в Україні. – К., 1994. – 880 с.
3. Колективізація і голод на Україні 1929–1933. – К., 1992. – 736 с.
4. Козицький А. Геноцид та політика масового винищення цивільного населення у XX ст. (причини, особливості, наслідки): Навч. посіб. для студентів вузів. – Львів, 2012. – 608 с.
5. Лизанчук В. "Ніхто нам не збудує держави, коли ми самі її не збудуємо…" // Народна газета. – 1999. – № 10(393). – Березень.
6. Сергійчук В.І. Голодомор 1932–1933 років як геноцид українства. – Вишгород, 2015. – 168 с.
7. Трагедия советской деревни. Сб. док. – Т.3. Конец 1930–1933 / Под ред. В. Данилова, Р. Манина, Л. Виолы. – М., 2000.
8. Франко І.Я. Дещо про польсько-українські відносини. Відповідь П.Т. Романовичу на статтю "Хатні справи українців" // Будівничий української державності. Хрестоматія політологічних статей І. Франка. Упоряд. Д. Павличко.– К., 2006. – С. 142-163.
9. Штепа П. Московство, його походження, зміст, форми й історична тяглість. – Вид. шосте. – Дрогобич, 2007. – 409 с.

Myroslava Antonovych

VICTIMS OF GENOCIDES IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE XX CENTURY: COMPARATIVE AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

The Armenian Genocide, the Genocide-Holodomor of the Ukrainian nation, and the Holocaust of Jews were the most significant genocides of the first half of the XX century, and the most massive from the perspective of the number of victims. Although the motives of those genocides were different, they had a lot in common. This article analyzes the subjective aspect of the genocides, in particular: who were the victims of the genocides; the time issue that influences the number of victims; and the measurements of the number of victims.

The Armenian nation was an indigenous civilization "torn asunder by a nation that had secured possession of these territories through invasion and conquest," and Jews "were destroyed as an immigrant population by the rulers of the host country" [2, p. 36]. In this victimological perspective, the Genocide-Holodomor case is similar to the Armenian case, because Soviets exterminated Ukrainians in their native land, mostly in villages where vast majority of the Ukrainians lived.

Throughout history, all three groups – Armenians, Jews, and Ukrainians were vulnerable and subject to persecution: the massacres of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, in 1894–1896, and 1909; anti-Jewish pogroms of 1881–1882, and the 1903 Kishinev Massacre in Tsarist Russia; suppression of Ukrainian (language, culture) throughout the XVIII–XX centuries in Tsarist Russia and later in the Soviet Union.

Often, it is difficult to determine the timeframe of a crime of genocide. As Scott Straus explains, "The idea of intent is central to the legal definition of genocide. Yet, ascertaining and substantiating in real-time the intent to destroy groups is quite difficult. Moreover, often by the time such intent is clear, the process of violence is significantly advanced, and the time to act preventively has passed." On the example of the well-known case of the Holocaust, Scott Straus demonstrates that the intent of the German SS and police was clear, when they began to establish killing centers in the late autumn of 1941. However, in the early years of the war (1939–summer 1941), in Poland, the Soviet Union, and other occupied territories, their intent was less clear [9, p. 34]. In fact, the persecution of the Jews that started when Hitler came to power, "mounted further with

the Kristallnacht (Night of Broken Glass) on November 9–10, 1938," when "a proto-genocidal assault" targeted Jewish properties, residences, and persons. Several dozen Jews were killed outright, billions of deutschmarks in damage done, and some 30,000 male Jews were rounded up and imprisoned in concentration camps" [4].

Dadrian uses the term "rudimentary stages of genocide" for the period when "the leadership of the Armenian nation throughout the length and breadth of the Ottoman Empire was subjected to an array of tortures…" [2, p. 50]. Similarly, at the rudimentary stages of the Soviet genocide in Ukraine, Ukrainians were exterminated selectively – first, the intelligentsia; then, the clergy; and later, the peasantry. The culmination of Stalin's genocide against the Ukrainians was "the fateful year of 1933," when "physically exhausted after several years of struggle and privation, the farmers of the Ukrainian SSR and the ethnically Ukrainian regions of the RSFSR were most vulnerable to the new onslaught of the communist regime's destructive actions. During the winter, spring, and into the summer of 1933, uncounted millions died of hunger, cold, and the maladies that accompanied them. Previous repressions were intensified. "Dekulakization" (no real kulaks were left) and deportations continued, although on a smaller scale and for mostly political reasons. Arrests, beatings, and all sorts of cruelties occurred as before, but the victims were weaker and less capable of resistance" [7].

Not less complicated and disputable is the issue of *measurements* of genocides. As Scott Straus fairly asks, "how much partial destruction must occur for genocide o be in evidence?" In a landmark but complex ruling *Prosecutor v. Radislav Krstić*, the Appeal chamber of the International Criminal Court for the former Yugoslavia sustained a claim that genocide meant that a "substantial" part of a group is destroyed [5]. Scott Straus considers it to be a useful criterion; nonetheless, significant disparity remains regarding how to conceptualize the degree of destruction sufficient to constitute genocide [8, p. 34]. On the other hand, in 1995, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) found, in the *Jelisi´c* Case, that the "genocidal intent can take two forms." On the one hand, the intent to exterminate a very large number of members of the group; and, on the other, the intent to pursue a more selective destruction targeting only certain members of the group, "because of the impact their disappearance would have on the survival of the group as such" [6]. In 2004, the ICTY ruled that "if a specific part of the group is emblematic of the overall

group, or is essential to its survival, that may support a finding that the part qualifies as substantial" [1, p. 35]. Moreover, the Elements of Crimes of the International Criminal Court state that even one person would suffice for a crime of genocide, if he/she was killed as a representative of a national, ethnical, religious, or racial group [3].

Regarding the point of substantiveness, the Armenia genocide took the lives of 1.5 million people. The Genocide-Holodomor victim count is 4–10 million men, women and children. Resulting from the Holocaust, up to 6 million people were killed. Even under the strictest definition of genocide, this makes these the three most significant genocides in the first half of the XX century [1, p. 138].

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Bartrop P.R., Totten S. The History of Genocide: An Overview // The Genocide Studies Reader, ed. Samuel Totten and Paul R. Bartrop. – New York and London: Routledge, 2009. – P. 138.
2. Dadrian V. N. Patterns of Twentieth Century Genocides: The Armenian, Jewish, and Rwandan Cases // Genocide and Mass Violence in the 20th and 21st Centuries: An Introduction. Criteria, Common Elements, and Patterns. Comparative Genocide Studies 1, ed. Christian P. Scherrer. -Moers: IFEK-IRECOR, 2005). – P. 35-64.
3. Elements of Crimes // The Official Journal of the ICC [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://www.icc-cpi.int/Menus/ICC/Legal+Texts+and+Tools/. – P. 7.
4. Jones A. The Jewish Holocaust. Introduction // Adam Jones. Genocide. A Comprehensive Introduction. – Routletge, 2007. – P. 237.
5. Prosecutor v. Radislav Krstić, International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia Since 1991, IT-98-33-A, 4 (2004).
6. Prosecutor *v.* Jelisi'c, Case No. IT-95-10, at para. 82.
7. Serbyn R. Genocide-Holodomor: The Ukrainian Genocide // Central and Eastern European Online Library PISMИ Series (PISM Series) – 2010. – V. 1. – P. 224.
8. Straus S. Fundamentals of Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention. – United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2016.

Valeriy Udovychenko

VARIOUS ASPECTS OF FORENSIC INVESTIGATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONAL LOSSES FROM THE GENOCIDE IN UKRAINE, 1932–1933

Eighty years later, the Main Investigation Department of the Security Service of Ukraine investigated the events of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, in the territory of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic. Criminal Case № 475 was initiated on 22 May 2009, based on the fact of the Ukrainian Genocide in 1932–1933 – on the grounds of a crime envisaged by the first part of Article 442, "Genocide," of the Criminal Code of Ukraine. The media covered well the results of the investigation and trial of the criminal case [11]. However, there are certain aspects of the activity due to forensic features of the investigation of this crime that, in the absence of forensic methodology for investigating genocide in Ukraine, was developed by the author of this article directly during the work of the investigative and operational group of the Security Service of Ukraine in this criminal case.

For this purpose, the author has researched some of the works by V.A. Vasylenko [2,3], S.V. Kulchytskyi [6; 7], V.I. Marochko [9], R.Y. Pyrih [10], V.I. Serhiychuk [12]. Moreover, he perused and selected a large number of the most suitable materials from the Nuremberg Tribunal for the preparation of a separate forensic methodology for investigating the Genocide in Ukraine in 1932–1933. The materials of The Hague Tribunal for Bosnia, and the International Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda, and Cambodia were taken into consideration, because of the specifics of the circumstances of the crimes against humanity committed in those countries. One of the specific tasks of this publication is the consideration of some features and the use of certain types of technical expertise while conducting the investigation of the crime of genocide.

In the USSR, the criminal communist totalitarian regime concealed from the public the crime of genocide against the Ukrainian nation, the number of victims, and the true causes of the mass deaths in Ukraine during 1932–1933. Thereby, years of obfuscation and deception made investigators' work more difficult and complicated. The current legislation of Ukraine provided for the mandatory appointment of forensic-medical examiners to determine the causes of death at the stage of the pre-trial investigation. In order

to collect materials needed to conduct such forensic examinations, experts identified and inspected 857 sites of mass graves of victims of the Genocide-Holodomor on Ukrainian territory. Furthermore, they collected testimony about and some documents regarding these graves. As a result of consultations with experts in the field of forensic-medical examination and bioarheology [scientific study of human remains found in or at archaeological sites], the necessity for large-scale exhumation of the remains of Genocide-Holodomor victims has not been addressed. The main reason for this is the non-existence of bio-archaeological measurements of the bones of people who died of famine in the 1930s to determine the causes of their death. Under such circumstances, before the appointment of forensic-medical examinations, instead data from various sciences, in particular, certain criminal investigative methods were used in the absence of corpses. These methods were developed by O.Y. Bylykov [1], V.Y. Shepitko [13, 14]; and on the causes of starvation, the most informative are V.I. Viter, A.A. Khalikov [4], and E. Knoblokh [8]. During the investigation, the scientists collected documentary data on the Genocide-Holodomor victims in Ukraine.

In addition to these facts, in the Kharkiv Bureau of Forensic-Medical Examination they found unique documents showing the real causes of death. While investigating the state archives, they found books for the registration of death certificates for 1932–1933. These books contained information about the nationality of the victims, and the diagnoses that were the official causes of death, and other factors. Among the available archival documents, the most important were those in which the diagnoses of death confirmed the cause – famine.

The investigators have managed to analyze and generalize the diagnoses of mortality, collect quantitative characteristics, as well as identify the facts of the falsification of documents. The results of the analysis of the archival medical records conducted by investigators provided an opportunity to conduct 24 forensic-medical expert examinations based on materials collected in the criminal case. These were the main documentary sources of information on the mortality in Ukraine. According to the conclusions of the experts, a basic reason for the mass death rate of Ukrainians was a famine, as well as diseases directly and indirectly related to starvation.

The next feature of the method during the investigation was the appointment of judicial research and demographic expertise. The basis for the appointment of such an examination was information

about concealing for many decades the demographic consequences of the Genocide-Holodomor in Ukraine from the Soviet society. During such an examination by the scientists of the Institute for Demography and Social Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, they determined that the number of direct and indirect losses among Ukrainians resulted from the Genocide-Holodomor in 1932–1933. This conclusion based on the materials of the criminal case, and on the results of the latest research conducted on the medical and demographic consequences of the famine [5].

The results of the court examination are indisputable evidence of the crime of genocide against the Ukrainian nation. The article describes the specifics of the purpose and the conduct of forensic examinations in a criminal proceeding on genocide. In depth researches on other elements of forensic methodology for investigating the crime of genocide are possible in the future.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Булулуков О.Ю. Методика розслідування вбивств при відсутності трупа / О.Ю. Булулуков: автореф. дис. канд. юрид. наук. – Харків, 1999. – 19 с.
2. Bululukov O. Y. Method of investigation of murders in the absence of a corpse / O.Y. Bululukov: author's abstract. dis. cand.of lawyer sciences - Kharkiv, 1999. – 19 p.
3. Василенко В.А. Голодомор 1932–1933 років в Україні як злочин геноциду: правова оцінка / В.А. Василенко. – К., 2009. – 48 с.
4. Василенко В. Кваліфікація Голодомору 1932–1933 рр. в Україні як злочин Геноциду і постанова Апеляційного суду м. Києва від 13 січня 2010 р.
5. Витер В.И., Халиков А.А. Судебная медицина в лекциях / В.И. Витер, А.А. Халиков. – Ижевск–Уфа, 2007. – 343 с.
6. Геноцид в Україні 1932–1933 рр. за матеріалами кримінальної справи №475 / Нац. акад. наук України, Ін-т укр. археографії та джерелознавства ім. М.С. Грушевського, Ін-т Нац. Пам'яті, Служба безпеки України; упоряд. В. Удовиченко, М. Герасименко. – К.: Ін-т укр. археографії та джерелознавства ім. М. Грушевського, 2014. – 557 с.
7. Кульчицький С.В. Украинский Голодомор 1932–1933 гг.: интерпретация фактов / С.В. Кульчицький. – К., 2008. – 103 с.
8. Кульчицький С.В. Голодомор 1932–1933 рр. як геноцид: труднощі усвідомлення / С.В. Кульчицький. – К., 2008. – 424 с.
9. Кноблох Э. Медицинская криминалистика / Э. Кноблох. – Прага, 1960. – 420 с.
10. Проблеми історії України: Факти, судження, пошуки: Міжвідомчий збірник наукових праць. – Випуск 18. Спеціальний: "Голод 1932–1933 років – геноцид українського народу" / Упорядник О. Веселова. – К., 2008. – 470 с.
11. Пиріг Р.Я. Голодомор 1932–1933 років в Україні: документи і матеріали / Р.Я. Пиріг . – К., 2007. – 1125 с.
12. Постанова апеляційного суду м. Києва у кримінальній справі за фактом вчинення геноциду в Україні в 1932–1933 роках. 01 лютого 2010 р. Електронний ресурс [режим доступу]: http://memorial.4uth.gov.ua/famine-of-

1932-33/investigation-Security-Service-of-Ukraine-on-the-genocide-in-Ukraine-in-1932-1933
13. Сергійчук В.І. Український хліб на експорт: 1932–1933 / В.І. Сергійчук. – К., 2006. – 432 с.
14. Шепітько В.Ю. Проблемні лекції з криміналістики: навчальний посібник / В.Ю. Шепітько. – Харків, 2012. – 152 с.
15. Шепітько В.Ю. Керівництво розслідування злочинів: науково-практичний посібник / В.Ю. Шепітько. – Харків, 2009. – 960 с.

Svitlana Zubchenko

SOVIET GENOCIDE IN UKRAINE IN 1932–1933

The Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 in Ukraine is acknowledged as a genocide at the international level, and the actions of the Soviet leadership concerning Ukrainian people are condemned by the world community.

The policy of forced industrialization and collectivization of agriculture coincided with the actual trade ban, and the introduction of the practice of centralized planning and quotas established for the collection of bread and other agricultural products, as demanded by the state. A plan was set for each village, collective, or individual farm.

Since the summer of 1930, the practice of unalterable assignments for the collecting of all surpluses spread. Deliveries of commodity products to the state were decreed a priority task for collective farms; but due to inflation, the price of products decreased, and the volume of products available left undefined [1]. For the general public, the methods of the military-communist assault were called "the New Stage of the NEP" (New Economic Policy), and the concept of "*prodrazvyorstka*" was replaced by the common term, "Plan," thus masking the true meaning of the implemented policy [7, p. 6–10].

To simplify the management system, the XVI Party Congress decided to eliminate the canton branch; this led to confusion with the administrative division and led to the emergence of a two-level management system: the centre, and the area under its control. As a result of these reforms, rural areas appeared to be without sufficient governance at the most responsible moment of the collective farm system formation, and direct links with hundreds of areas actually ceased [9, p. 15].

The state leadership in Kharkiv and Moscow assessed the situation, and even recognised mistakes made during the grain procurement campaigns that led to the disastrous state of agriculture in Ukraine: the delay of the seeding campaign; fields where crop rotation was used were neglected; and partial crop due to the lack of proper farming practices.

In 1931, the terrible consequences of *prodrazvyorstka* for the Ukrainian peasantry fully manifested. A threat of hunger hung over the collective farmers, and in many rural areas, food, primarily bread, was out of stock.

At the end of October 1932 (in pursuance of the decision of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) of 22 October 1932), an "Extraordinary Commission" led by V. Molotov started working in Ukraine. The "correction of the situation" in Ukraine began: in particular, the repression against the collective farm activists, members of the party, and Soviet workers for not carrying out the grain procurement plan [5, sheet 144].

On 20 November 1932, the People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR adopted decisions that led to an increase in the number of victims of the Genocide-Holodomor, in particular the imposition of fines; and on 6 December 1932, the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in Ukraine and the People's Commissariat of the Ukrainian SSR adopted a decree, "On Placing on the 'Black Boards' Villages that Sabotaged Grain Procurement Plans" (The use of fines was to confiscate all food products – meat, eggs, potatoes, etc.).

Large-scale extraction of the seed fund through the implementation of the procurement plan led to a new problem. It was necessary to prepare for sowing, and the Donetsk Region had only 21% of the required amount of seeds; Odesa – 14%; Dnipropetrovsk – 10%. In the northern regions, the situation reached a critical level [2, p. 300].

There were no hopes for state assistance, according to the Resolution of the SNK of the USSR and the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) of 23 September 1932. All proposals for the issuance of seed loans that year to state farms and collective farms were rejected and prohibited [6, p. 11].

Difficult in the moral sense was a problem of the protection of the harvest from the hungry people. In the courts and in the press, people who consumed wheat spikelets during the primary stage of maturation were called, "kulak hairdressers" ["кулацькі перукарі" цей термін зустрічається в архівних документах. 5, sheet 162–163].

At the level of Soviet party leadership, the information about the situation in the countryside was deliberately concealed, and even cynically distorted. A confirmation of this is a speech given by Stalin in January 1933, from the rostrum of the Joint Plenum of the CC and CCC, CPSU (b), "We have certainly achieved such results that the financial situation of workers and peasants is improving year by year. Only the cursed enemies of Soviet power may doubt it" [2, p. 295]. The result of these statements was the absence of the

term “hunger” in the archival documents of Soviet institutions. The real situation in Ukraine became a non-existent phenomenon.

Thus, the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 became a tragedy of Ukraine. In addition to the obvious human losses and huge moral blow, the famine caused irreparable damage to Ukrainian national life. Collectivization blunted the feeling of individualism fundamental to the identity of Ukrainian peasants/farmers. For several generations, the Genocide-Holodomor instilled social fear, political apathy, and passivity into the consciousness of the peasantry. The Genocide-Holodomor interrupted the continuity of generations in the development of the Ukrainian national elite; suspended the “Ukrainization” of the cities of the East and South of Ukraine; and after these events, the primary replenishment of the urban population consisted of immigrants from Russia.

The sharp change in the party's internal politics, which essentially meant a return to the methods of “war communism,” and mass revolutionary terror led to the final strengthening and consolidation of the Bolshevik totalitarian regime. This meant the overall totalitarianizing of Soviet society – that is, the assumption of governmental control over all spheres of public life by the *nomenklatura* of the ruling party.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Вісті ВУЦВК. – 1932. – 14 липня.
2. Голод 1932 –1933 років на Україні: Очима істориків, мовою документів / Під ред. Ф.М. Рудича; Упоряд. Р.Я. Пиріг. – К. : Видавництво політичної літератури України, 1990. – 605 с.
3. Жнива скорботи радянська колективізація і голодомор / Роберт Конквест. – К.: Либідь, 1993. – 383 с.; Мейс Д. Штучний голод 1933 року в Радянській Україні: що сталося й чому? / Д. Мейс // Україна молода. – 2007. – 20 лютого. – № 32.
4. Кульчицький С.В. Міжнародна комісія з розслідування Голоду в Україні 1932–1933 років // Енциклопедія історії України: у 10 т. / редкол.: В.А. Смолій (голова) та ін.; Інститут історії України НАН України. – К.: Наук. думка, 2009. – Т. 6 : Ла – Мі.– 704с.
5. Російський Центр Збереження і Використання Документації Новітньої Історії (далі – РЦЗВДНІ). – Ф. 82. – Оп. 2. – Спр. 139.
6. РЦЗВДНІ. – 81. – Оп. 3. – Спр. 215.
7. Третя конференція КП(б)У. 6-9 липня 1932 р. Стенографічний звіт. – Харків, 1932.
8. Указ Президента України № 635/2015 “Про заходи у зв’язку з Днем пам’яті жертв голодоморів”. / Електронний ресурс / Офіційне інтернет-представництво президента України П. Порошенко / Режим доступу: http://www.president.gov.ua/documents/6352015-19555.
9. XVI з’їзд ВКП (б). Стенографічний звіт. – 2 изд. – Ч. 1-2. – М., 1931.

Askold Lozynskyi

UKRAINIAN GENOCIDE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION OF 1948

Discussions about the number of victims of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 are ongoing. The number of deceased from the Genocide-Holodomor includes those who died directly from starvation; those who were shot at this time for the breaking laws and directives of grain procurement; those whose nameless corpses torn by wolves; or became victims of cannibalism. As Professor Volodymyr Serhiychuk recently stated based on the document published in Kharkiv [capital of the Ukrainian SSR at that time], "Information about the Territory and Population on January 1, 1932, According to the Conclusions of the Central Administrative Territorial Commission of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee," the original figure from January 1932 was much more important than the Census of 1926 [7, p. 11–41].

By including those figures in what we know today, this paradigm will take into account the following information:

Total population of the Ukrainian SSR:

Census 1926	January 1932	October1932	Census1937
28,925,900	32,680,700	31,909,000	28,213,800

The total population difference between January 1932 and 1937 is 4,466,900 direct losses [7, p. 16].

If we take into account the growth rates that were foreseen between 1926 and January 1932, in the amount of 12.98% (2.16% per year in this area, however, this figure could selectively include not only Ukrainians) and this applies only until 1934–1936, when the hunger ended. The smallest number of the general population, according to Census of 1937, the same growth should have been 1,828,254 people. Therefore, the total reduction in population in the Ukrainian SSR – direct and indirect – since January 1932, when the famine came into full force, until December 1936, before the "cleansings" of Stalin and Yezhov, was 6,295,154 people. If we to include here a certain number of Russians, who settled during that time in the cities of the Ukrainian SSR, then the decline of the Ukrainian population was even more severe. It should be taken into account that this statistic does not include the birth rate in 1932–1933, although children were born and died even then. These children usually were not recorded in the official registries.

Even more severe decline was found among the rural population of the Ukrainian SSR:

Census 1926	January 1932	October 1932	Census 1937
23,663,113	25,553,000	24,674,000	18,825,842

The total difference in the rural population in period from January 1932 until 1937, was 6,727,158 people.

If we take into account the growth rates between 1926 and January 1932, in the amount of 7.99% (1.33% per year, which is accurate, because Russians and other nationalities rarely lived in the countryside), and apply them only from 1934–1936, when there was no longer any hunger, to the smallest number of rural population, according to the Census of 1937, the same increase had to be 753,034. Thus, the total reduction in the number of the rural population in the Ukrainian SSR – direct and indirect – since January 1932, when the famine only began to come into force, until January 1937, was 7,480,192 people.

Perhaps, in this calculation, we should separately mention the Ukrainians who died as a result of the famine of 1932–1933, while in Russia, and in particular, those in the Kuban Region that was so densely populated by Ukrainians. Without the use of Soviet sources, the world-famous historian, Robert Conquest, presented a figure of 1 million in the North Caucasus, and 1 million in other parts of the Soviet Empire. He also suggested the number of 5 million victims in the Ukrainian SSR. However, he did not have a significant number of secret Soviet sources that were still highly classified at the time of his research.

The discussion about the number of victims of the Ukrainian Genocide, from the rise of Soviet power in Ukraine until the first half of the twentieth century, does not include the earlier victims of widespread genocide, such as those killed or arrested among the members of the intelligentsia of 1920–1930; those murdered because of the Soviet elimination of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church; those murdered in 1937–1939; people tortured by the Bolsheviks, particularly in Western Ukraine; the victims killed during the elimination of the UGCC (Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church); those who were exiled to the concentration camps after the Second World War, and died there. Nowadays, there are opportunities to make the appropriate calculations of the number of victims. For example, several months ago, a mass grave was excavated on the grounds of the memorial Museum "Prison at Lonskoho Street," in Lviv, and those victims need to be counted in the overall losses, as well.

The Convention about the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted and proposed for signature, ratification or accession by resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1948. That date was after the above-mentioned acts of genocide. It had no reverse effect; however, it provides an exact formulation for the crime of genocide. Genocide is not actually determined by the number of victims. All of these above-mentioned events constitute acts of genocide.

The Convention defines genocide, as follows: "The following actions committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, any national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such:

a) killing members of such a group;

b) causing serious bodily injuries or mental disorder to the members of such a group;

c) the deliberate creation for any group of such living conditions that designed for its complete or partial physical destruction;

d) measures aimed at preventing childbirth in the environment of such a group;

d) transferring children forcibly from one human group to another."

The author, who coined the term, "genocide" deriving from the Greek and Latin languages, and means, "kill the genus," was the Jewish Polish-American attorney, Rafael Lemkin. He graduated from the University of Lviv with a doctoral degree in Law, and was one of the authors of the text of the UN Convention.

Lemkin considered the events in Ukraine as a genocide, as he stated in 1953, to Ukrainians at the Town Hall in New York City on the occasion of the 20th Anniversary of the Genocide-Holodomor. The Soviet genocide of the Ukrainians was the Kremlin's attempt to exterminate the Ukrainian nation, and for that it was necessary to destroy the intelligentsia, clergy, and peasantry, and then to settle Russians in their place: "What I want to say is that this is probably the classic example of Soviet genocide, its longest and the widest experiment of Russification – the extermination of the Ukrainian nation ... The first blow was directed at the intelligentsia – the nation's brain – to paralyze the rest of the body. In 1920, 1926, and again in 1930–1933, teachers, writers, artists, thinkers, and politicians were killed, imprisoned or deported ... Along with that attack on the intelligentsia, there was an offensive against the Church, the priests, and higher clergy – the "soul" of Ukraine. Between 1926 and 1932, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, its Metropolitan (Lypkivskiy) and 10,000 priests were liquidated. In 1945, when

Soviet power was established in Western Ukraine, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church suffered a similar fate ... The third edge of the Soviet attack was directed at the agriculturists – a great number of peasant single-holders, keepers of traditions, folklore and music, national language and literature, the national spirit of Ukraine. The weapon used against them was, perhaps, the most terrible thing – starvation ... The fourth step in that process was the fragmentation of the Ukrainian people by settling foreigners in Ukraine ..."

A well-known English historian, Norman Davies, responding to the Soviet propaganda and analyzing Soviet sacrifices during the Second World War, affirmed that the Soviet authorities in time of Khrushchev spoke to the world about 20 million Russians who died defending the world from German fascism. He explained that the greater part of those victims were Ukrainians, and not only those who perished in the ranks of the Red Army, but also a much bigger portion of the civilian population. Davies calculated that 5.5 million civilian Ukrainians died during the war, and another 5 million were exiled to areas beyond the Urals, when the Soviet Army troops and Special Services troops were escaping from the Germans. Later, many of those settlers died from various causes, in particular in concentration camps. All those events were the part of the Soviet genocide of Ukrainians. As for the Famine of 1932–1933, Davies mentioned the figure of 7 million victims [1, p. 965].

I leave to historians and demographers the task of counting the number of Ukrainian victims as a result of the Soviet genocide of Ukrainians since 1920s until the 1950s, including the Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933. You can say with certainty that this figure far exceeds 7 million.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Дейвіс Норман. Європа. – Oxford University Press, 1966.
2. Дейвіс Норман. Не двадцять мільйонів, не росіян, не вбитих на війні. – The Independent. – 29 грудня 1987.
3. Конквест Роберт. Жнива смутку. – Oxford University Press, 1986.
4. Лемкін Рафаель. – Рафаель Лемкін. Радянський Геноцид в Україні. – К.: "Майстерня книги", 2009.
5. Лозинський Аскольд. Світовий Конгрес Українців та ООН: заради справедливості. – К.: Видавничий Дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", 2013.
6. Сербин Р. Концепція злочину Геноциду Рафаеля Лемкіна та його аналіз Українського Геноциду. – Рафаель Лемкін. Радянський Геноцид в Україні. – К.: "Майстерня книги", 2009.
7. Сергійчук В. Документи переконують: Втрати українства від Голодомору 1932–1933 років – щонайменше сім мільйонів // Народна творчість та етнологія, 2016. – Ч. 3. – С. 11–41.

Arsen Zinchenko

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BOLSHEVIK OCCUPATION OF UKRAINE

The preparation of this speech has a certain history, primarily related to the study of the sources from the history of Ukrainian liberation movement and the Ukrainian peasantry of 1920s and early 1930s. The Communist regime classified documents regarding the Holodomor era. When it first became possible to access these archival documents, the author was shocked to read about the brutally violent, repressive nature of the agrarian policy of the Bolshevik regime. The violent methods employed in the formation of the collective farms, and in the dispossession of the peasantry were alarming. A number of mass protests against the actions of that regime occurred, not only in the first half of 1920s, but in the early 1930s, as well. It should be emphasized that the generalized characteristics of that policy were not formed on a priori "exposure" to and theorizing about its nature, but based on mass sources generated in the depths of the system of that time. Every researcher reading the operational summaries of the Cheka-GPU or declassified Party correspondence, in which vivid factual material was presented regarding certain generalizations subordinated to the general ideology of the regime, inevitably peers into the depths of the macabre world of total violence and disregard for human life and basic human rights. Nowadays, there are thousands of articles and hundreds of books written about this based, I repeat, on the massive source material.

Our conviction that the Bolshevik regime operated as a force of occupation against Ukrainians is *based on the study of numerous sources of a mass character*. The violent nature of the establishment of the Bolshevik regime; the conduct of the policy which, firstly, contradicted the interests of the vast majority of Ukrainians; and secondly, was implemented by repressive means and caused enormous human and socio-psychological losses, gives us reason to characterize the Bolsheviks as a regime of occupation in Ukraine.

Now, we will try to describe the notion of the *occupation* regime in its main, defining features. Consequently, in relation to the political regime of domination over a particular country, the notion of *occupation* should be applied on the following features:

- the occupation regime is established through the military intervention, the elimination of national sovereignty, suppression

of national liberation resistance, violation of interstate treaties on mutual recognition;
- the representative bodies, national political parties, institutions of self-government and public initiatives are being destroyed in the captive country;
- the national media are liquidated, and a censorship regime by the invaders is established;
- the rule of law, based on the principles of legality is being eliminated; instead, there are introduced emergency bodies, field courts, tribunals, revolutionary tribunals, and etc.;
- the fundamental rights of the subjugated population, first of all the right to life, as well as the right to inviolability of property, housing, the right to dispose of products of their own work, are roughly violated;
- the national political leaders are physically exterminated or forced into involuntary emigration;
- authorities and its power structures, and command ranks of the army are filled by the people of the ruling national groups representing the occupation regime;
- defining models of public administration are guided by ideologues; and personnel decisions are made outside the conquered country and brought to its management personnel for prompt compliant execution;
- the practice of exile on a political basis, and the organization of concentration camps is widely used; the institution of hostage-taking is implemented;
- the practice of food requisition and confiscation of property by military force becomes widespread;
- taxation of rural landholders is introduced, the amount of which is incommensurable with the productivity of farms;
- the policy of suppressing by hunger is developed and implemented; by the means of the Genocide-Holodomor, the task of changing the ethnographic composition of the population is solved;
- massive relocation of the ruling nation's groups is carried out on the conquered territories and in cities;
- natural and human resources are used in the interests of ruling groups; the national interests of the conquered country are subordinate to the demands of the occupation center;
- massive imposition of the ideology of the ruling regime is carried out; education, culture and art are subjected to this ideology;

- the system of ideological humiliation of traditions, culture, ideological achievements of the conquered people is created; the culture is treated as outdated, limited, unfit for the future;
- systematic measures are implemented to split the conquered people by political, regional, linguistic, cultural, social features; such models of behavior as national apostasy, renegade, assimilation, and cultural indifference are encouraged.

All of these named signs are formulated on the basis of the analysis of the realities of Russian Communist rule in Ukraine, and therefore, with full reason, that regime should be characterized as an *occupation*. The occupier's urge toward cooperation and collaboration with a certain part of the population in the conquered country, thereby involving it in participation in the occupational ideological and repressive structures under the conditions of total domination of alien national groups, is not a reason for denying the occupational character of the system forced by the conquerors. Consider, first, that its ideology, political goals and objectives and repression actions were developed by the center, and implemented by the colonial administration, in which not only the key figures, but also the overwhelming majority, belonged to that foreign group.

Note: As this piece is the author's proprietary analysis, reference notes are not provided.

Georgiy Papakin

GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR'S "BLACK BOARD"AND HUMAN LOSSES IN 1932–1933

Among the repressive measures introduced during the Genocide-Holodomor in Ukraine in 1932–1933, there was a collective punishment of the Ukrainian village, which became known as the regime of the "black board." It differed in complexity from the number of other repressive measures introduced at the same time, and created unbearable living conditions for the Ukrainian peasant.

The first act that promulgated its tragic content at the all-Ukrainian level was the Resolution of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (b) of 18 November 1932. V.M. Molotov, the Secretary and Commissar of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b), and Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, spent two days in his second visit to Kharkiv on November 17, "Working out, in accordance with instructions received from Stalin, party and government decrees of the Kharkiv center on the strengthening of grain supplies. He sent texts of documents to the Kremlin for approval." Some of the recommendations were called "black boards," the effects of which had already been tested in the Kuban. The general list of repressive actions under this regime included:

1. Immediate suspension of the import of any goods, complete cessation of state and cooperative trade, export of all available goods from cooperative stores;
2. Complete prohibition of collective farm trade for collective farms, collective and single farmers;
3. Termination of lending in any form and prepayment of previously issued loans and other financial obligations;
4. Carrying out a thorough check and "cleansing" of "counter-revolutionary elements" from collective farms and local executive branches."

The official state act that introduced such a regime was a decision of the SNK of the Ukrainian SSR, "On the Fight Against Kulaks' Influence on Collective Farms," of 20 November 1932, with its instructions. In particular, the instructions stipulated that "to overcome the kulak resistance to grain procurements, to establish the placement on the 'black board' of collective farms that maliciously sabotage the surrender (sale) of grain on the state plan."

Immediately there is a question of correlation of such officially approved components of the "black board" regime, with similar events in the Kuban two weeks earlier, where another one of Stalin's envoys, L. Kaganovich, acted. They were introduced by decision of the North Caucasus Region Committee of the CPSU (b), "On the Bread and the Progress of the Sowing [of grain] in the Districts of the Kuban," of 4 November 1932. Stalin personally edited a resolution on the North Caucasian repressions. Therefore, we may quite rightly assume that these five components of the "black board" regime were formulated with his direct participation.

However, the five already mentioned components far from exhaust the list of specific repressions. Those represent only a certain mandatory and even minimal set supplemented in every case by other measures of pressure exerted against the peasants.

The Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) P. Postyshev, immediately after his stay in the Volga Region, was sent to the Dnipropetrovsk Region in January 1933. He reported to the Kremlin: "In some collective farms placed on "black board", we had to resort in the least – to evict a number of collective farmers beyond the regional boundaries. ... In a number of cases, it was necessary to resort to the confiscation of livestock. Thus, in the Kamensky village council of Apostolovsky District, where pits were found fill of [hidden] grain, 27 cows and 12 horses were taken from collective farmers and stock-breeders."

The Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of Ukraine and RNK of the Ukrainian SSR issued a joint decree (6 December 1932), named "On bringing to the 'black board' villages that are maliciously sabotaging the grain procurement." It cited six settlements in Dnipropetrovsk, Odesa, and Kharkiv regions, "for apparent disruption of a grain procurement plan and malicious sabotage". By placement on the all-Ukrainian "black board" these villages were completely limited in supply of industrial goods, trade, lending [in other words, when whatever stocks of goods then present were consumed, there would be no more available by any means]. State and cooperative activists, and all collective farmers of the above-mentioned villages were subjected to political-ideological "cleansing". The Resolution also contained a new list of repressive measures regarding villages – those very five paragraphs in the editorial so close to the wording of the Kuban decree. The last two paragraphs, as in the first document, are devoted to personnel "cleansing" and "eviction of counter-revolutionary elements."

This party-state Act contradicted the previous one of 18 November. The Act was created to determine the locality and characteristics of all the village inhabitants: collective farmers, single farmers, handicraftsmen, workers, teachers, etc., with the purpose of placing their names on the black boards, as a form of terrorizing and shaming these people. This Bolshevik policy was not to implement the grain procurement. Rather, the grain procurement served as a pretext to create conditions incompatible to life. Further, the Machine Tractor Stations [MTS], collectives, forestry enterprises, separate employees of the various district institutions (even those engaged in the legal profession), and collective farmers for the fact that they did not work. The names of these individuals were written on the "black board". The "black board" turned into a universal weapon directed against all the inhabitants of the village.

These "black boards" bolstered the ability of the central and local authorities to impose additional sanctions. Otherwise, it is difficult to explain why three days after entering two villages of the Kharkiv region to the all-Ukrainian "black board", the secretariat of the regional committee of the CP (b) made a special decision on the matter. Obviously, each government body, depending on its competence and level, added factors to make living conditions more impossible to survive.

It should be noted that repressions of the "blackboard" regime were used, as well as other officially allowed punishments not included in the written Act itself. Novotroitsky RC of the CP (b) in the Odesa Region, on the initiative of S. Kosior, who was present at the meeting of the district committee, decided to implement the Act against the Novotroitske village by placing the collective farm "Progress" on the black board. They imposed the same measures that they applied to other collective farmers and farms that were placed on the "black board". In addition, a specially selected group of peasants (from 15 farms) was punished with a double meat fine; 5 people were scheduled to be arrested and expelled; 4–5 men were sentenced to the application of "the most stringent judicial sentence [executed]." In the Mykolayiv Region, even the official reporting (on "Form 8") of the special category of the punished, records: "collective farms not placed on the "black board", but repression has been applied".

At the local level, repressive measure were even more horrifying. The peasants' struggle to survive was witnessed by their relatives, who worked in industry and transport. There was a forced reduction in the size of individual land plots within the collective farms that

prevented the farmers from growing their own food supply. There was the assignment of "towing brigades" and "agents" assigned the task of policing the movement and transport of confiscated grain, and the removal of domestic animals, etc. The very placement of specific targeted areas named on the "black board" turned out to be an illegal act, and did not conform to actual regulatory measures. At the end of 1932, the Bureau of the Dnipropetrovsk Regional Committee of the CP (b) approved the following list of oblast sanctions against the "black board" collective farms:

- "Stop the import of goods, and withdraw all cash goods from the cooperative stores;
- Completely prohibit all trade by collective farmers;
- Demand the early recovery of loans and all payments (agricultural tax, government debts, insurance);
- Assess the monetary collective farm debt based on every yard of the collective farm, and collect this debt;
- Issue pre-harvest collection plans for collective farms and kolkhozes;
- Impose a fine in the form of meat to the collective farmers of these collective farms in the amount of a 15-month norm;
- Prohibit the grinding of grain products."

In Kharkiv region, on November 18, 1932, a special decree of the Bureau of the Regional Committee "On Repressions" also provided selection of household plots from "those, who did not give up their bread."

Another sign of the "black board" regime's repressions of was the activity of the "towing brigades" in the search for and seizure of all edible supplies. Village correspondent Ivan wrote to the newspaper the *Soviet Village* about the activities of such a brigade in the Krasnopilka village of the Odesa Region: "Since the time, we have been placed on the "black board", the towing brigade walks around collective farms looking for bread. And, if they find bread, the brigade drags the farmers to court as thieves. ...The activities of the towing brigade for grain procurement is illegal. A brigade goes into the huts, and takes everything it wants, and where it leaves the confiscated goods is unknown." Activities of such brigades were not a secret to the authorities.

The most eloquent in this context are the memories of those who survived these repressions. For example, Y. Buzoveria, a resident of Verbky village of Dnipropetrovsk Region from the all-Ukrainian "black board" recalled: "A commission came in the evening and

began to look for bread everywhere. They smashed the oven, and pierced the floor with a crowbar, while Mother was sewing and sewing at that time. Suddenly, one man of the commission approached her and pulled the sewing machine out of its place, and found a loaf of bread hidden behind it. Mother began to beg the man not to take away the last little bit of their "happiness." He hit her and pushed her away. Then, Father interceded for her. That is why he was taken away, and a month later put in prison for four years."

The memoirs of eyewitnesses also record the fact of military sieges of villages listed on the "black board". Residents of the Lutenky village, named on the all-Ukrainian "black board," testified about the patrol activities of the OGPU, "who did not let anyone out from the village". Such measures proved to be very effective in creating conditions incompatible with life in those villages entered on the "black board". The events of 1933 showed that they were the most affected by famine.

Eyewitness Y. Buzoveria, a resident of Verbky village, testified: "In the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, many people in our village died, only the one third of its population was left. People, who were able to work, survived." About the great mortality in another village, Gavrylivka in the Dnipropetrovsk Region, on the all-Ukrainian "black board", Yavdokha Pyshna says: "There was a terrible famine in the village. There were told among people that a "black board" had been laid on the village. A cow and a piglet were taken from our family. My mother, two sisters, and younger brother died."

A similar picture was observed in the Kamyani Potoky village in Poltava Region from the same all-Ukrainian "black board": "...entire streets were deserted. Houses were empty and destroyed. Half of the village died of starvation."

Even in 1990, the village has not reached the population size it had before the famine – 5,000 inhabitants. The Soviet authorities created terrible conditions for the inhabitants of villages and collective farms listed on the "black board". These conditions caused resistance. Frequently, inhabitants of the settlements listed on the "black board" resorted to a traditional peasant strategy to save themselves from death – they tried to escape from the terrible scourge. The Velykolepetynskiy District Committee indicates that livestock breeders and collective farmers took down the "black boards". This occurred in Zelena, Mala Lepetykha, Mykolaivka, Nyzhnii Rohachyk, Rubanivka, Ushkalka.

In conclusion, the Soviet "terror by hunger" aimed at the physical extermination of the Ukrainian agrarian population and the deprivation of their capability for resistance to the authorities by the use of such elements as the "black board" regime. Depriving the people of all food supplies, property, houses, and individual household plots of land, increased taxation, and the evictions of the active part of the population created conditions incompatible with life. High mortality was achieved by such measures, which inevitably resulted in the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 in Ukraine.

Note: As this piece is the author's proprietary analysis, reference notes are not provided.

Hryhorii Serhiychuk

CASUALTIES AMONG THE UKRAINIAN AGRARIAN POPULATION ATTEMPTNG TO FLEE ABROAD, IN 1932-1933

Excessive grain collecting from the harvest of 1931 left the Ukrainian agrarian population without livelihoods in the spring of 1932. The starving fled hoping to find bread in the neighboring regions of the Russian SSR, where it still was possible to buy, exchange, or beg for food.

Not all of these beggars were able to return to their families with even a small amount of corn. A letter from the Secretary of the Kantemyrivskyi District Committee of the CPSU (b) Zhurylov to the Secretary of the Central Chornozem Region Committee Varekis, on 1 April 1932, testifies that in Kantemyrivtsi, "only in recent days, 12 people were buried, who came for bread from neighboring Ukrainian regions" [5, sheet 16].

At the same time, the Secretary of the Central Chornozem Region Committee, who sent this message to the Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b) of Ukraine S. Kosior, demanded from the authority of the Ukrainian SSR to establish control over its citizens, because they dug up beetroots and ate them while still frozen [4].

It is possible that this signal from Voronezh has led to the fact that the bodies of the State Political Directorate had already received unspoken instructions to prevent the departure of hungry Ukrainian peasants seeking bread in Russia. This is evidenced by the letter dated 26 May 1932, by a group of these starving people from Hlobynskyi, Semenivskyi, Pototskyi, Kremenchutskyi, Olexandriyskyi Districts.

In their despair, these people wrote: "This statement we sign with our blood, but we are uncertain of its reception. We sincerely inform you that before the ripening of fruits and vegetables, we survive only by eating such scum as is not even needed for fodder to feed the chickens, pigs, and dogs of the inhabitants of Leningrad, Minsk, Gomel, and the suburbs of Moscow. There, we, like locusts, pounce on a garden. There are those who suggest that they would prefer to eat the meat of those people who eat good bread, rather than dead horses dug out from the ground. We should not be surprised at our return to savagery. Artificially-induced famine forces us to do so.

Such a famine was unheard of in the history and tradition of humanity" [5, sheet 29].

Therefore, given the restrictions on travel to Russia and Belarus, a large part of the Ukrainian peasantry, primarily from the right-bank areas of Ukraine, tried to cross the western border of the Soviet Union in order to escape to Poland or Romania. At that time, it was possible to observe daily at the Soviet-Polish and Soviet-Romanian borders, tens and hundreds of fugitives trying to make their way across the border, in hope of escaping starvation.

Thus, among the problems to solve in the calculation of the number of victims of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, we must define the number of Ukrainian peasants who tried to escape abroad. This question poses an avenue of further inquiry, but it has not yet received any special consideration [3]. Archival sources about this aspect of inquiry have not been located yet in the central archival collections of Ukraine, but we do have news reports found in Ukrainian periodicals published at the time in Lviv, Lutsk, Chernivtsi, as well as later documented testimonies of eyewitnesses. A small array of relevant documents were found in the State Archives of the Ternopil Region by Professor Volodymyr Serhijchuk, who provided them for this article.

The specified documents testify that in the spring of 1932, the number of hungry peasants from the Ukrainian SSR crossing the Zbruch River increased. Thus, on 22 April 1932, there was a message from Skalat to the Ternopil Governor about the detention of Stefan Venhlovskyi, his wife and two daughters, and Alfonse Vinohradskyi and his wife at the border [1, sheet 13].

It is clear that the Governor of Ternopil reported to Warsaw about all these cases. In response to his appeals, on 15 December 1932, he received a letter from the Chief of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Poland, H. Suhenek-Suhetskyi, on the issue of guardianship of the fugitives from the USSR. The letter states that the increasingly cold winter weather led to an increase in the wave of hungry fugitives to Poland. Therefore, the ministry initiated the creation of a special Assistance Committee for the Fugitives, which should have included delegates from the International Red Cross, the Department of Public Guardianship, the Episcopacy, and the League of Nations Refugee Affairs Department [1, sheet 1].

For his part, the governor gave an order to the county officials to provide assistance to the fugitives in case of necessity, and to inform about the scope of the problem in Ternopil. Such a message was

issued on 20 December 1932 to the county leader of Borshchiv [1, sheet 3].

According to archival documents, in the spring 1933, the problem of illegal crossing of the Soviet-Polish border by hungry peasants of the Ukrainian SSR was further aggravated, and more and more of them were detained by Polish border guards. Thus, on 16 May 1933, the Governor of Ternopil wrote to Warsaw about the need to supply 27 fugitives from Soviet Ukraine, who, at that time, were in Borshchiv. The Ministry of Internal Affairs of Poland replied that, in addition to the assistance in the amount of 1,350 zlotys, the Red Cross additionally provides another 200 zlotys [1, sheet 5].

Today, it remains difficult to say how many hungry fugitives from the Bolshevik "paradise" were killed by a bullet in their head as they tried to cross the border. How many of them drowned because of an inability to swim while crossing the river, especially in the waves of the fast-moving Dniester? How many died because of the freezing temperatures once on the territory of Poland or Romania? The Genocide-Holodomor researcher Ivan Chyhyryn cites data that during 1932, the border guards of the State Political Directorate shot 5.450 people [6].

How many unfortunate people drowned in the waters of the Dniester or Zbruch Rivers is unknown. In the same way, we do not know about those who died of pneumonia or exposure. In 1933, no one counted these losses at the border.

We must also remember the words of the Secretary-General of the European Congress of Nationalities Ewald Ammende, "Powerless, swollen, with a terrible expression in their eyes, they went quietly, without protesting, from that world. Nothing disturbed the terrible silence. The hunger covered Ukraine, but did not go beyond the border, and peace was not disturbed by any sinister rumor. Exhausted beyond recognizing, children and adults perished. Everywhere, there is the same image of horror – the terrible death by hunger" [2].

It also should not be forgotten that those hungry Ukrainian farmers who managed to escape to the West in 1932–1933, were not taken into account in the 1937 Census. It is likely they were replaced by new settlers relocated by the Soviet government, from regions outside of Ukraine.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Державний архів Тернопільської області. – Ф. 231. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 1770. – Арк. 13
2. Діло. – 1933. – 28 липня.
3. Сергійчук В. Чи варто було поспішати із самоприниженням, або Кому вигідно забути про всі жертви українців під час Голодомору // Літературна Україна. – 2016. – 17 березня.
4. Сергійчук В. Щоб не поїли сусідські буряки… Як українським голодуючим селянам забороняли виїжджати у північному напрямку // Голос України. – 1995. – 15 квітня.
5. Центральний державний архів громадських об'єднань України. – Ф. 1. – Оп. 20. – Спр. 5255.
6. http://you-books.com/book/I-Chigirin/Mif-i-pravda-o-Stalinskomgolodomore-Ob-ukrainskoj.

Vadym Zadunayskiy

THE TRAGEDY OF THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR OF 1932–1933, IN KUBAN STANYTSIA: THROUGH EYEWITNESS REPORTS

The Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 was a great tragedy for millions of our countrymen and their descendants. The calamity did not bypass the farmers from Kuban, gathering its terrible "harvest" in hospitable Cossack villages. From the mid-1980s, XX–early XXI century domestic and foreign scholars started researching this tragedy in the Ukrainian SSR, but there are still controversial issues left regarding the number of victims and regional specifics [4; 5; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 14]. Concerning the Kuban, there is still a lack of even general works on the history of the region, and the Cossacks, in modern Ukrainian historiography [1; 2; 3; 6; 7].

Under such conditions, the study of the circumstances of the tragedy in the Kuban villages, and the manifestation of it upon the personal perceptions of the witnesses' and their memories of those events is appropriate and relevant. That is why attention in this article will be focused upon the manifestations of its features in two Kuban villages – Konelivskyi and Nezamayivskyi, based on the memoirs of F. Skubak and V. Pushko, who lived there at the time. It should be noted that both witnesses, whose memories are being analyzed, used the term "Hunger," not the "Genocide-Holodomor" to identify the tragedy of 1932–1933, in their native villages.

I emphasize that both villages belong to the most ancient Cossack settlements in the Kuban, which are the direct descendants of the Zaporizkyi and later the Chornomorskyi hosts of Konelivskyi and Nezamayivskyi, that together with the Chornomorskyi Army moved to the Kuban during the years 1792–1794 [1, p. 366–367]. They are located in the north of the Krasnodar Region of the Russian Federation. Due to the colonization of this region by the settlers from the Dnieper Ukraine, the Ukrainian population dominated there. According to the Census of 1897, the percentage of the Ukrainian-speaking population in this region reached 74% [3, p. 308].

I stress that both witnesses (Fedir Skubak, born in 1918, and Valentyn Pushko, born in 1924) belonged to the family of Cossacks, who preserved the memory of their Ukrainian roots and spoke Ukrainian fluently (Kuban dialect). Despite the considerable distance of those events, both witnesses have shown clarity of

content and transferring of information. At the same time, they talked about a hungry calamity only after specific questions, opposed to stories about other aspects of the Cossack life in the Kuban. Probably, for them, this tragedy remained the one that was hard to remember, because they had to experience a sense of regret and the sorrow for their dead relatives. It was especially hard for F. Skubak to tell the story, because he lost his entire family.

As this old Cossack says, "People swelled like drums from the famine. The body was like a glass [holding water], and when you pressed your finger, a hole remained for a long time, like when pressing a finger into dough" [8, p. 21]. These two sentences clearly depict the perception of physical exhaustion and its external features. Moreover, to determine the level of exhaustion, he used vocabulary typical for farmers: reporting about the mass extinction of his compatriots, F. Skubak said, "Dead people were lying around the village. They were green. Then, they were lifted with a pitchfork, and thrown onto carts" [8, p. 21]. It is in these sentences that the quintessential dimension of the horrors and hopelessness are established: mass mortality became the "norm" for the Konelivskyi village.

According to the testimonies of witnesses, there were few survivors. "I was fortunate because I put out nets to capture rodents to eat, and also I gathered the waste of grain production. This is how I survived, when the majority of villagers died" [8, p. 21]. Recalling those horrors, he noted, "People died horrifically, 2-3 times more than during the Great Patriotic War" [World War II, 1939-1945] [8, p. 21]. Thus, in the opinion of this witness, the villagers of Konelivskyi remember the highest number of the victims occurred not in the years of the most terrible war of the twentieth century, in which he participated as a member of the Red Cossack formations (including the VI Kuban Corps), but during peacetime. Obviously, the personal experience of survival and the loss of people closest to him had to have intensified the sensation of this tragedy forever fixed in the memory of the old Cossack. Simultaneously, no other evaluative judgments about those events were expressed during the interview, as related by F. Skubak.

Turning to the memoirs of V. Pushko on the relevant events in the village of Nezamayevsky, I want to draw your attention to the fact that he began his story with an overview of the preconditions of this tragedy – Cossack rejection of collectivization and other measures of Soviet authority. He also noted that such repressions took place in the neighbouring villages of Krylovskyi and

Pavlovskyi, the consequences of which he saw with his own eyes. On the basis of these impressions and further considerations, he noted the following, "It was so all over Ukraine and the Kuban. But probably most of the people died in Nezamayevsky, because they did not like collective farms here, and did not want to give up their bread for nothing" [8, p. 21].

Speaking about the situation in his native village, the witness emphasized that there were preliminary arrests and the mass exile of combatant men, "…at the end of the summer, all healthy men were arrested, and the authorities shut down in stores at the market. After 2 days, all Cossacks, including 5 uncles of mine, were sent to Tychoretzk, and from there to Siberia by train… Not more than a hundred Cossacks returned out of exile in the late '30s. One of my uncles, Phylyp, was among survivors, and the rest died out there or they were shot." [8, p. 21]. Obviously, such measures were preventive, in order to avoid resistance by the male population of the village. After that, as it was mentioned by V. Pushko, "They began to withdraw bread, and the people hid it. Because of such resistance, workers from Leningrad arrived in the village with the army (one settled in our house). They went through the village with sticks looking for food. They took away everything, even beetroots and pumpkins seeds" [8, p. 21–22]. The fact that not only grain was taken (according to the grain procurement plans), but also pumpkin seeds and vegetables, demonstrates attempts to deprive the villagers of any means of survival.

The consequences of such actions by the Stalinist regime was the mass deaths of the population from the hunger; and because military units blockaded the villages and did not allow anyone to go beyond the village boundaries. As V. Pushko reminisced, "A terrible plague began in winter of 1933. We barely survived due to having a half bag of wheat. People were dying by whole families in their houses. When you looked in the window of a certain house, there were corpses laid in rows. A lot of people died in the streets. A person could be walking along – then sat down, and died [8, p. 22]. Corpses of the dead people on the streets and in the houses became a "normal phenomenon" for the Nezamayevsky village.

According to V. Pushko, "Before this calamity, there were more than 15,000 people in the village, but no more than a third survived" [8, p. 22]. It is clear that he suggested quite relative numbers, but the very fact of such an assumption made by the eyewitness of those events is quite an ostensive evaluative judgment concerning the consequences of "decossackization and sovietisation of the Kuban.

I emphasize that V. Pushko, after long reflection and analysis of the events of that time, concluded that it was a conscious realization of repressions by the Stalinist regime. As a consequence, his native village lost such a large number of its inhabitants, the likes of which it had never known, even during the later event of World War II. He fought in the Red Army and was seriously wounded. That is why he summed up his story with these words, "This is the way the Soviet authority ruined the Cossacks" [8, p. 22].

On the basis of the above mentioned, it can be concluded that during 1932–1933, in the Kuban villages of Konelivskyi and Nezamayivskyi, according to the witnesses' testimonies, it was due to the Genocide-Holodomor that the local population suffered such significant losses. Additionally, V. Pushko drew a parallel with the Ukrainian SSR, assuming that they were the links of one chain of events. The probable cause of such considerations was his residence in the territory of Ukraine. After the war, he settled in the Donetsk Region and worked as a doctor all his life. Since independence, he has been informing the public about the circumstances and consequences of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933. The upbringing of his family, who were members of the village intelligentsia, and the experience of scientific activity (he defended his doctoral dissertation) also played their roles, and stimulated his attempts to analyse the tragedy of his family and native village in a wider historical context. In contrast, F. Skubak is an ordinary peasant still living in his native village, and he did not make such generalizations.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Авраменко А.М. Козацьке військо на Кубані / А.М. Авраменко, Б.Є. Фролов, В.К. Чумаченко // Історія Українського Козацтва. Історія Українського Козацтва. Нариси: У 2 т. / Редкол.: В.А. Смолій (відп. ред.) та ін. – К.: Вид. дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", 2007. – Т. ІІ. – С. 364–414.
2. Білий Д. Малиновий Клин. Нариси історії українців Кубані / Д. Білий. – К.: Товариство "Україна", 1994. – 117 с.
3. Білий Д.Д. Українці Кубані в 1792–1921 роках. Еволюція соціальних ідентичностей / Д.Д. Білий. – Львів-Донецьк: Східний видавничий дім, 2009. – 543 с.
4. Борисенко В.К. Свіча памяті: усна усторія про геноцид українців у 1932–1933 роках / В.К. Борисенко. – К.: ВД "Стилос", 2007. – 288 с.
5. Голодомор 1932–1933 років в Україні: документи і матеріали / Упоряд. Р. Пиріг. НАН України. Ін-т історії України. – К.: Вид. дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", 2007. – 1128 с.
6. Задунайський В. Бойове мистецтво та військова спадщина українських козаків в кінці XIX – на початку XX ст. / В. Задунайський. – Донецьк: Норд-Прес – ДонНУ, 2006. – 335 с.

7. Задунайський В. Шашка у бойовій підготовці козаків у полках І черги Кубанського козацтва на початку ХХ ст. / В. Задунайський // Історія зброї. Альманах / Гол. ред. В.Г. Шлайфер. – Запоріжжя, 2012 – № 5-6/2012. – С. 82–94.
8. "Із козацької минувшини" (спогади українських кубанських козаків) / Упоряд. В.В. Задунайський. – Донецьк: ООО "Норд Компьютер", 2006. – 33 с.
9. Конквест Р. Жнива скорботи. Радянська колективізація і Голодомор / Р. Конквест. – Луцьк: ВМА "Терен", 2007. – 456 с.
10. Кульчицький С.В. Голодомор 1932–1933 рр. як геноцид: труднощі усвідомлення / С.В. Кульчицький. – К.: Наш час, 2007. – 424 с.
11. Марочко В. Голодомор 1932–1933 років в Україні: Хроніка / В. Марочко, О. Мовчан. – К.: Вид. дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", 2008. – 294 с.
12. Сергійчук В. Як нас морили голодом / В. Сергійчук. – Київ: ПП Сергійчук М.І., 2006. – 392 с.
13. Сергійчук В. Голодомор 1932–1933 років як геноцид українства / В. Сергійчук. – Вишгород: ПП Сергійчук М.І., 2015. – 168 с.
14. Український голокост. 1932–1933: Свідчення тих, хто вижив / Упоряд. Ю. Мицик. – К.: Вид. дім "КМ Академія", 2003. – 296 с.

Olesia Stasiuk

CALUMNIATIONS, THEFTS, AND LYNCHINGS DURING THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR, AS THE RESULT OF THE REPRESSIVE POLICIES OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT TOWARD UKRAINIAN FARMERS

In the late 1920s and early 1930s, the Ukrainian peasantry suffered the greatest upheavals that influenced traditional Ukrainian culture. These tragic years witnessed the worst of the consequences that created the process of active destruction of the traditional peasant way of life.

The Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 produced and continually fueled a number of social phenomena that negatively impacted the spiritual life of the Ukrainian people for a long time. One such phenomenon was denunciation. People were frightened. They were afraid of each other, because everyone was a potential informer. Thus, while grinding grain on millstones peasants encouraged their children to announce the appearance of any other person. Others, tried to slaughter their livestock or other domestic animals secretly in their cellars at night when nobody could see them, to use for their own consumption. In such cases, informers blackmailed these peasants. In the village Vunyshche in Zhytomyr Oblast, one of informers persuaded his neighbor to kill his calf and split it in half, promising to keep it all secret. After picking up his half, the informer immediately told the local authorities [4].

Fear and an oppressive atmosphere of denunciation forced peasants to be the first to report. People were so frightened that even in separate villages near collective farms and in the fields, the authorities did not offer any protection. They intimidated people by repression, thereby forcing them to remain silent. Detection of any discontent was dangerous. Any word spoken contrary to the Bolshevik policy of village ruin and destruction was punished extremely cruelly. Any negative statement about Stalin became a verdict of death for the peasants [12, p. 9].

The sense of fear caused by the Genocide-Holodomor, dispossession, collectivization, and repressions, forced the peasant to denounce others. After all, not only those who expressed something "anti-Soviet," but also those who witnessed these talks and did not denounce to the relevant authorities were imprisoned [11, p. 183]. Another factor was that the denunciations were generally groundless. People were afraid of denunciations against themselves,

and so they denounced others first. However, sometimes, such denunciations ended badly for them [7, Stock 1 – Inventory 14. – Case 77. – Sheet 2]. The mass frequency of denunciation affected the psychological senses of the peasantry, resulting in such negative feelings as depression, despondency, anger, irritability, and forebodings of doom.

Fear was so absorbed into the peoples' souls, that, sometimes, peasants died of hunger, having a store of buried grain, but not digging up their stocks in case of denunciation. A strong sense of fear forced peasants to violate the most sacred family ties – even to perpetrate a denunciation of their family: parents, husband, wife, children.

An immoral measure of the Soviet power was giving a reward for denunciation. Everyone, who pointed out where a neighbor had hid grain, received from 10 to 15% of the detected products – as a prize [2]. Evidence of eyewitnesses also confirms the fact of cash payments for denunciation. For example, N. E. Rukomeda, from Mizhlissia village in Vinnytsia Region, named a sum of 16 rubles that given him as payment for denunciations [5]. Such awards were given secretly [1, Stock 6. – Case 20. Sheet 2]. The policemen, for every report of his cases sent to court, received 75 rubles in surcharges added to their salaries [7, Stock 5. – Inventory 18. – Case 1. – Sheet 10].

During the Genocide-Holodomor, mass demoralization of the people occurred. They no longer considered denunciation as something shameful. On the contrary, the authorities promoted denunciation as a patriotic act. As a result, people began to treat each other suspiciously. Some of them used denunciations to resolve personal disputes. Quite often, there were cases that local authorities used peasant children for predatory purposes, in order to advance themselves by pleasing senior management. Official documents provide a number of materials indicating that teachers inquired of children to learn about hidden stores of grain at home, using the form of questions during testing [6, Stock 30. – Storage Unit 124. – Sheet 1. Sh. Roll – 5]. Moreover, teachers asked peasant children who among them still had food in their families, or how their parents were eating food. If they uncovered such information from the unsuspecting pupils, they were given 10% of the seized goods, as a reward for their treachery [1, Stock 18 – Inventory 2. – Case 35. – Sheet 172].

Before collectivization, the Ukrainian village did not know theft, because in the minds of peasants, a dominant theme was always

respect for someone else's work. This is confirmed by the large number of Genocide-Holodomor witnesses who claim that even during the brutal famine, peasant huts and “sheds were not locked, because people did not rob, they simply went and asked for what they needed” [3]. Looking for different ways to survive, people rarely resorted to begging. Those who in childhood survived the Genocide-Holodomor say that ‘they were afraid to steal, to ask for help, and could not do it” [8, p. 117]. Hopelessness forced peasants to resort to petty thefts. As G. Horyn correctly noted, an unconventional attitude towards property began to emerge from these times. To the new Soviet generations, the slogans of “state property” and “public goods” came to mean that everything was “nobody's things.” Therefore, according to Soviet morals, illicit appropriation was not really theft [8, p. 117]. Starving farmers often foraged beets, rotten potatoes, carrot remnants, etc., hiding them in the tops of their boots. Over the years, people came to think of theft at the collective farm as a “compensation” for underpaid working days. So accustomed to people became of this practice that a new term appeared: the “one who carries.” As noted by a well-known researcher L. Kovalenko, “In the minds of the peasant, there was a terrible shift: thefts were no longer considered a sin, a shame, everyone ceased to condemn it” [14, p. 556].

The Soviet authorities deliberately created conditions under which social and legal norms lost any meaning. Deformation of these norms was evidenced by the massive proliferation of hunger during the Genocide-Holodomor years. As a result, people tried to obtain food for themselves and their families in various ways. There arose a kind of mass hatred, and indifference brought on by so many dying, which caused a social reaction marked by unbelievable cruelty. Thus, historian I. Shulga noted that people in conditions of brutal famine lost mercy, and punished, crippled, or killed “thieves” [13, p. 152–153].

In many cases, the authorities did not send people to prison for crimes, but killed them on the spot without trial and investigation. According to S. Drovoziuk, such actions led to the Bolsheviks' deformation of human consciousness [10, p. 300]. One of the characteristic features of this consciousness was the certainty of the lawfulness and impunity of actions against that part of peasantry that the authorities declared as a class enemy [9, p. 203].

The spiritual enslavement of Ukrainians took place during the Genocide-Holodomor. The immoral, uncivilized, criminal acts of the Soviet power at all levels became a rule, a norm of behavior

negatively affecting the peasantry's moral consciousness. The original moral principles were rejected as "kulak's" and hostile. Such immoral acts as robbery, arbitrariness and bullying, murder, suicide, bribery, intimidation, and denouncement were encouraged, because these served the dictatorship of party. Therefore, such immorality became behaviors officially approved of as "moral."

Collectivization and the Genocide-Holodomor led to deformation of moral norms of the Ukrainian peasant. Ethical and moral norms, such as respect for the elders, humanity, and benevolence disappeared. Honor and dignity underwent condemnation. Denunciation was considered an expression of patriotism; and kindness, mercy, dignity, integrity and diligence were replaced by "class vigilance" [12, p. 106]. The demoralization of the Ukrainian people was part of the Stalinist program of action in Ukraine. Thus, the widespread phenomenon was firstly a moral and then physical intimidation and bullying of the peasants. Massive widespread tyranny, robbery, and violence by Soviet activists existed, headed by authorized OGPU. The rural activists mostly consisted of the poor, who wanted to please the authorities or take revenge on wealthy families. Some actually believed in the Stalinist ambition, but did not have a chance to retreat back to a previous normally-moral way of life, because then they could be marked as "the enemy of people" [8, p. 113–114]. All were victims brutally used and destroyed, but they additionally would become despised by their descendants.

During the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, the social and legal norms in the Ukrainian village were also deformed. This fact is evidenced by mass executions and murder of peasants. The largest number of murders and murderous judgments were committed by the authorities, among which there was an atmosphere of unfathomable anger, cruelty, indifference, and mass stupidity. There resulted from the panicked fear of and displeasure by the authorities for an unfulfilled quota. After all, the authorities paid attention, even more than to the peasantry, to their own units that often without enthusiasm and inspiration, carried out the planned campaigns.

The moral and psychological atmosphere in the Ukrainian village in 1929–1934, was extremely oppressive. Collectivization and the Genocide-Holodomor caused a devastating impact on all aspects of spiritual life of Ukrainians. As a result of hunger, profound changes in the mass psyche of the peasantry have happened. For many years, that most singular fear passed to the following generations. Distrust and anxiety took root and endured for a long time. In physically

exhausted people, various changes in the psyche occurred ranging from fear to complete destruction of psyche and to suicide.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Архів Національного музею "Меморіал жертв Голодомору" (далі АНМ).
2. АНМ. – Свідчення Березного Ю.Ф., 1933 р. н., с. Бровки Перші, Андрушівський р-н, Житомирська обл.
3. АНМ. – Свідчення Буряк М. А., 1910 р. н., с. В'юнище, Малинський р-н, Житомирська обл.
4. АНМ. – Свідчення Пагер О.О., 1926 р. н., с. В'юнище, Малинський р-н, Житомирська обл.
5. АНМ. – Свідчення Рукомели Н. Є., 1923 р. н., с. Міжлісся, Барський р-н Вінницька обл.
6. Архівні наукові фонди рукописів та фонозаписів Інституту мистецтвознавства, фольклористики та етнології Національної академії наук України. – Ф. 30.
7. Рукописний фонд Народознавчого центру Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені М. Коцюбинського (Далі РФ НЦ ВДПУ).
8. Горинь Г. Голодомор 1932–1933 років – нищівний удар по фундаментальних устроях традиційного укладу життя українського села // Відлуння голодомору – геноциду 1932–1933. Етнокультурні наслідки голодомору в Україні. – Львів, 2005.
9. Дровозюк С.І. Духовне життя подільського селянина у 20–ті роки XX ст. (схема конкретно–історичного дослідження) // Подільська старовина: Зб. наук. праць / Від. Ред. В. А. Косаківський. – Вінниця, 1993. – С. 200-205.
10. Дровозюк С.І. Висвітлення духовних аспектів геноциду 1932–1933 рр. в українській історіографії // Геноцид українського народу: історична пам'ять та політико-правова оцінка: Міжнар. наук.– теорет. конф., Київ, 25 листопада, 2002 р. – К.; Нью-Йорк, 2003. – С. 295-305.
11. Капустян Г. Голод і селянська ментальність // Голод-геноцид 1933 р. в Україні: історико–політологічний аналіз соціально-демографічних та морально-психологічних наслідків: Міжн. наук.–теор. конф., Київ, 28 лист. 1998 р. – С. 179-190.
12. Ткаченко Б.І. Терор голодом // Голодомор на Сумщині 1932–1933. – Суми, 1993. – С. 9
13. Шульга І.Г. Голод на Поділлі: До 60–річчя голодомору 1933 р. – Вінниця, 1993. – 224 с.; Людомор на Поділлі. – К., 1993. – 253 с.
14. 33–й: голод: Народна Книга-Меморіал / Упоряд.: Л.Б Коваленко, В.А. Маняк. – К.: Радянський письменник, 1991. – 584 с.

Yuliya Kotsur

LOSS OF ELEMENTS OF UKRAINIAN FAMILY RITUALS IN THE ROMNY REGION, AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR 1932–1933

The 1920s and 1930s are associated in the historical memory of Ukrainians with the most tragic pages of national history in the twentieth century: namely, the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933. The Genocide-Holodomor took not only millions of human lives, but also caused irreparable damage to traditional ethno-culture, including family rituals.

The initial stage in family ritual is the birth ritual. It relates to the birth of a child and rites of the first years of life. In the early 1930s, fertility dropped sharply. This is especially true of the Genocide-Holodomor period of 1932–1933. Eyewitnesses point out that during this period, little children were born and many of them died immediately [6, sheet 41]. During the Genocide-Holodomor, children under 1 year of age were not registered in official records, because they were the most vulnerable and so often the first to die of hunger [2, sheet 16]. Regarding the second stage of maternity ceremony, parents lost the opportunity to celebrate the birth of a baby into their families, because during the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, they had no food [4, sheet 55]. A visit to a pregnant woman also lost it place in family ritual, because traditionally such visits by certain customs required funds to present as gifts. Families lost their function and ceased to exist in full form, even during the second half of the 1930s. Soviet authorities forbade certain family traditions related to the church, such as the sacraments of church weddings, and baptism. These transformed not only because of the ideological propaganda of Soviet power, but additionally due the material plight of the peasantry. The sacrament of church baptism was strictly forbidden by the Soviet authorities. Nonetheless, peasants tried to baptize their children, even though they knew only too well what negative consequences could result due to the violation of this ban. However, the feast in honor of the baptized during this period ceased [2, sheet 22]. People's rites – part of the third stage of maternal rituals, namely the ritual of “ingots,” and the ecclesiastical “introductory” rite, also lost their semantic importance, and ceased to occur, especially due to the mass closure of churches and the widespread persecution of priests [1, sheet 6]. A large part of the rites disappeared because of the Genocide-

Holodomor in 1932–1933. In subsequent years, some ceremonies partially revived in a transformed mode, because of the continued prohibition by Soviet power to perform the traditional ordinances.

Another part of the family ritual ceremony is the wedding ceremony. People preserved the traditional wedding ceremony in all its integrity in the Romny District until the beginning of the 1930s. The decline of the village in the process of collectivization led to the reduction and even the disappearance of some wedding rituals. The first of these concerned the pre-wedding stage. During this period, traditional requests, acquiescence, engagement, and insights lost their original purpose, and continued to exist only as a certain formal tradition. During the 1930s, some of the components of this cycle disappeared altogether. This applies to surveys and queries. The ritual of worship combined with engagements [2, sheet 10]. The agreement that accompanied this ceremony had a symbolic sense, but its legal function weakened considerably.

Traditionally, the wedding in the Ukrainian village lasted almost a week. Already by the early 1930s, and in subsequent years, the duration of the wedding process in the Romny District decreased from 3 days to 1 day [1, sheet 5]. Because of the wedding prohibition and atheistic propaganda, in the late 1930s – early 1940s, a new type of marriage arose called, "converge." In different regions of Ukraine, there were other options, such as "putting together people" [13, p. 113]. The beginning of this alteration of the ritual process began during the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933.

Wedding ceremonies and the customs of Ukrainians give a broad idea of the ethical and aesthetic views of the people about different aspects of their life. However, the events of the 1930s led not only to reduction of duration the wedding celebrations, the loss of certain structural elements, but also to changes in holiday foods and clothing.

Funerals form another part of family ritual and tradition. The anti-peasant policy of the Soviet power led to abnormal mortality rates. The death count became massive during the 1932–1933. Most people died from prolonged starvation [11, sheet 136]. Especially severe for the Romny inhabitants were spring months of 1933, when the entire families died. The testimony of the respondents provides the evidence: "The whole family Baranchik consisted of seven-persons became extinct near the house of the old woman Maryna ..." [8, p. 56].

The Genocide-Holodomor led to complete deformation of the funeral ritual of the Romny inhabitants. Christians have always had

a respectful attitude to the deceased. In the conditions of mass mortality, respect to the deceased was not shown, but reactions were quite to the contrary. “I remember every day, when I was going to school, I witnessed a terrible sight. On the corner of the street, there was a wagon harnessed to two pairs of oxen, and accompanied by two men with hay forks clearing the way of collected corpses ...” [8, sheet 57]. Due to the numerous peasant deaths and the exhaustion of hunger, the traditional funeral ritual was not carried out. “The dead were not buried, only slipped into the ditches” [10, p. 18]. Hungry dogs dug up bodies of the dead. In the spring, when the snow melted and it rained heavily, corpses floated on the streets [12, p. 26]. To prevent this, the authorities also condemned peasants who could not bury their relatives [9, p. 73]. Not all inhabitants of Romny could afford to bury their relatives in coffins [8, sheet 57]. The majority buried the dead in boxes and [7, sheet 50] or even in bedspreads or veils. Very often the deceased not only lacked individual coffins, but even a separate place of burial. Their final resting place was in one of these common graves, roadside ditches, or ravines.

In conditions of the anti-religious policy, the priests avoided the implementation of religious rituals, including burial [5, sheet 11]. Some people still tried to adhere to the traditional rite, so they read a prayer over the deceased themselves [3, sheet 47]. Moreover, nobody wept over the deceased, because death became such a common occurrence. The hungry peasants roamed from village to village in search for food, and so might die far from their native village.

Regarding the memorial ceremonies, it should be noted that in the conditions of the Genocide-Holodomor, almost no one adhered to them. Nonetheless, the deepest respect for the dead still stimulated the peasants to commemorate the deceased in some way, at least on the day of burial. Therefore, the peasants with their last strength tried to prepare something like a memorial meal [3, sheet 47]. Of course, in the conditions of the Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933, nobody could prepare the traditional ritual dishes. There were some cases when after the funeral, the people made a memorial meal, but the traditioanl “nine days” and “forty days” meals were not served.

Thus, during the 1930s, in the conditions of the Genocide-Holodomor, and due to repression and atheistic propaganda, a number of individual elements of burial ceremonies were lost. Certain rituals still existed in a transformed form, but the authorities tried to ban these from implementation, as well. Furthermore, the

Party and Komsomol authorities closely monitored peasants who followed their own customs. To replace missing aspects of burial rituals, the Soviet authorities introduced "new" ones, such as public funeral services.

The Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 was one of the main factors of the deformation of traditional ethno-culture. Because of the Genocide-Holodomor, the Soviet government sought to eradicate traditional culture from the Ukrainian village, depriving it of its identity. The nation dies when it exists without its language and culture, when the connections between generations break. National and cultural values are passed on to children and grandchildren from their ancestors. Thus national identity is formed and preserved. The Soviet leadership destroyed two generations of Ukrainians who were the carriers of traditional Ukrainian culture.

Family ritualism, as one of the main components of traditional ethno-culture, underwent significant changes. The Genocide-Holodomor destroyed the original family values, which contributed to the loss of a sense of family affiliation. A number of family traditions and rituals ceased to exist under the extreme in conditions of collectivization and the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933. These traditions began to recover in the second half of the 1930s, but suffered the constant influence and transformation due to Soviet propaganda.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Архів кафедри етнології та краєзнавства Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка (далі КЕК). – Ф. 26. – П. 1. – № 1.
2. Архів КЕК. – Ф. 26. – П. 1. – № 8.
3. Архів КЕК. – Ф. 26. – П. 1. – № 9.
4. Архів КЕК. – Ф. 26. – П. 1. – № 11.
5. Архів КЕК. – Ф. 26. – П. 1. – № 16.
6. Архів КЕК. – Ф. 26. – П. 1. – № 19.
7. Архів КЕК. – Ф. 26. – П. 1. – № 20.
8. Архів КЕК. – Ф. 26. – П. 1. – № 21.
9. Голодомор на Сумщині 1932 – 1933 / [упоряд. О.П. Столбін]. – Суми: Ред.-вид. відділ облуправління по пресі, 1993. – 158 с.
10. Голодомор 1932 – 1933 років на Сумщині / [упоряд. Л.А. Покидченко]. – [1-е вид.]. – Суми: Вид-во "Ярославна", 2006. – 356 с.
11. Державний архів Сумської області (далі ДАСО). – Ф. П-37. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 33.
12. Іванущенко Г. Голодомор 1932 – 1933 років: очима свідків, мовою документів / Геннадій Іванущенко. – К.: Укр. вид. Спілка, 2003. – 59 с.
13. Стасюк О. Геноцид українців: деформація народної культури / Олеся Олександрівна Стасюк. – К.: Стилос, 2008. – 224 с.

Tetiana Kononchuk

PRESENTATION IN UKRAINIAN FICTION OF THE GENOCIDE-HOLODOMOR OF 1932–1933

The tragedy of the Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933 found wide reflection in Ukrainian literature of different genres. All artists react to social processes and artistically reflect them. Through the artistic word, they report causes and consequences of tragedy of the Genocide-Holodomor. The millions of fatalities comprise the worst result. Therefore, seeking a motive of death dominates in these texts that reveal mass deaths in all regions of Soviet Ukraine. As a rule in these texts, the authors maintain the names of geographical places, out of the intention to bring story closer to reality. Therefore, the documentary component in these works plays an extremely important role. In telling about the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933, writers become artistic chroniclers. They create an artistic picture of reality following historical truth, which is the main motivation to write essays about one of the most difficult periods of the Ukrainian history. A. Lozynsky notes, "The Genocide-Holodomor is one of the biggest examples of tragedy, genocide, and crimes against humanity in history" [11, p. 147].

The implementation of the theme of the Genocide-Holodomor 1932–1933 in literature became a part of overall Ukrainian history, in which the question of historical truth in Soviet times was under the control of state, acquired a subjective color, and, instead of reflecting real events, a myth of Soviet reality resulted. The departure of writers from the Soviet canon of Socialist Realism led to repressions, and their physical extermination. Nonetheless, did Ukrainian artists, who survived the loss of their relatives, passed through the hunger hell themselves, and knew the terrible scale of the nationwide tragedy always adhere to the Soviet canon? From the array of literature we have about the 1930s, we state that during the years after the Genocide-Holodomor, many artists looked for a chance to lift at least slightly the veil concealing these events, and somehow record their experiences in artistic memory for the sake of posterity. Significantly, these events presented in the very first artistic effort. Evidence provided in a small pamphlet written by Dmytro Chuba (Nytchenko), who during the tragedy lived in Kharkiv and worked at the publishing house demonstrates this. On the occasion of the 50th anniversary commemoration of the victims of the Genocide-Holodomor held in Toronto, Canada, his brochure,

"Echoes of the Great Famine in the Memoirs of Eyewitnesses and in Ukrainian Literature," received its first introduction to the world. He emphasized: "It is clear that this famine, organized by Moscow, could not fail to appear in our literature. Many of courageous writings devoted to the famine were burned by writers during the period of mass arrests. Not without reason, in those winter days around the House of Writers, named 'Word,' the snow was black from paper soot that flew from many chimneys" [17, p. 11]. Unfortunately, those works, will not be read. Instead, at that time, other works began to appear to convince those overseas that in the USSR everything was allright and there is no hunger. Thus, the testimony of D. Chub is very important for us, because of his claim that some works created by the contemporaries of the events honestly described the tragic events of the 1930s. We know about the tragedy of the Genocide-Holodomor and the Ukrainian experience of 1932–1933, from eyewitness testimony, poetic folklore, and different genres of fiction – poetry, prose, and drama.

We can generalize the periods of creation the fiction on the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933:

1) during the events of the Genocide-Holodomor, when the literature adequately reflects current reality;

2) in the Soviet days in censorship, when difficulties were expressed symbolically, in a comic, laconic manner;

3) in emigration, in accordance with a desire to reflect accurately the occurrence and the obscene experience of hunger, in order to expose the policy of the Bolshevik authorities against Ukraine;

4) in the post-Soviet era when conditions of taboo surrender to historical truth: pictures of the entrance of grain confiscators into the hunger-afflicted areas appear in multifaceted works: pictures of terrible hunger; paintings of cannibalism; mass deaths and burials depict the behavior of people in extreme circumstances.

The works of the Soviet era about villages that survived millions of human losses before war, and so went into the Second World War devastated, were carefully scrutinized by censors, before a release to the world. However, writers could not bypass the years of hunger in their texts, especially in stories or novels. The artists transmitted their creative ideas based on the past fate of their characters. When it was impossible to write adequately about the Genocide-Holodomor, the information on certain difficulties now deciphered as a kind of encoded authentication of the truth was laconic. Now, when so much information is disclosed in historical documents, commentaries of contemporary historians, political scientists, and the testimony of

eyewitnesses, – the short, artistic information in these works appears to be panoramic.

Such symbolism is perceived in the novel, *"The Peace"* (Living Water) by Y. Yanovsky [18] about rural shelters for orphans that arose in the early 1930s. The author could not explain what caused these orphans; where were parents of these children; why were there so many orphans, and so many empty huts. The fact of the existence of such children and circumstances is artistically certified. Such conciseness, for example, is also seen in the story of *"Guys of Major Ken"* by V. Darda [6].

Today, this information is clear. Collectivization and repression led to destruction of: spirituality; the farming communities; family structures and continuity; led to forced famine; caused countless children to become orphans; and cost millions of lives.

In the Soviet literature of the post-war era, writers tried to show the difficulties experienced by Ukrainian farmers in the '30s of the 20th century. They paid attention to the human problem of malnutrition and hunger. M. Stelmakh, in his work, *"The Duma about You"*, revealed such problems [15, p. 77]. In other words, one of the characters of the novel, *"Man and Weapon"*, written by O. Honchar, tells us about mass deaths and rape, caused when the child, "for some reason," was too scared to walk on the streets or to be in the house alone [4, p. 98].

In works written in emigration, writers sincerely described the fact of the Genocide-Holodomor without hinting about, using powerful and revealing words, as in the novel, *"Maria"*, by U. Samchuk [14] or *"The Yellow Prince"*, by V. Barka [2]. Furthermore, T. Osmachka truthfully writes about the tragedy of the Genocide-Holodomor, showing how, in front of disobedient peasants who did not want to join the collective farms, the authorities threatened to deploy a "plan to the court" [13]. The writer shows that execution of such a "plan to the court" could not lead to anything but starvation. "It was an attack on the master of the household, little different from his sudden death" [13, p. 48]. All property and all food supplies were taken away; he was evicted from his house, and brought to forced labor camps in Solovki, Siberia, and so on. We see detailed reflections of the Genocide-Holodomor and denial of the authorities' policy in the novel, *"Milky Way"*, written by D. Humenna [5], and in the novel, *"Stones under the Scythe"* by O. Mac [12], and so on.

Among the poetic writings created in exile about the Genocide-Holodomor, are the poems of Y. Klen (O. Bourgardt) [8],

I. Bagryanyi [1], I. Kachurovskyi [7], etc. In these poems, we learn about the half-dead villages, and people languishing on the verge of death.

Texts that began to appear in Ukraine before and since the proclamation of Ukrainian Independence, were some works from drafts originally published in periodicals. These provided the evidence of eyewitnesses about mass deaths that occurred as the direct result of government policies that imposed the terrible hunger. All these books are majestic monuments to human suffering, and to the endurance of human memory [16; 3]. The books of testimony issued in all regions of Ukraine also contain unique examples of folk-stories about the tragedy of the Genocide-Holodomor. In 1996, the author of this article defended the first philological dissertation, *The Tragedy of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 in Ukrainian Folklore: The Problem of Artistic Transformation of Historical Truth."* The research has been reported to reader in monographs [9; 10].

Today, we have many works based on the problem of the Genocide-Holodomor written and published in independent Ukraine. The prose-writers paid homage to the victims of the Genocide-Holodomor: Borys Antonenko-Davydovych, Eugene Gutsalo, Ivan Kiyri, Panas Zaparenko, Yuri Mushketyk, Anatolii Dimarov, Andriy Miastkovskyi, Ivan Tsiupa, Andrii Gudyma, Mykhailo Potupeiko, Kateryna Motrych, Vasyl Zakharchenko, and others; the dramatists – Ivan Rachada, Oleksa Kolomiyets, Oleksii Chuhui and others; the poets – Mykola Rudenko, Lina Kostenko, Dmytro Golovko, Mykola Tkach, Vasyl Goloborodko, Oleksandr Matiiko, Dmytro Pavlychko, Mykhailo Shevchenko, Volodymyr Bazylevskyi, Anatolii Kryvorotko, Hryhoriy Sahaidak, Valentyna Kovalenko, Natalia Kharasailo, and others. All these works are as a requiem for the dead of the Genocide-Holodomor of 1932–1933 in Ukraine and embody memory, pain, and important lessons for future.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Багряний І. Під знаком скорпіона: З творчої спадщини письменника: Поезія, проза, публіцистика / Упоряд. та автор передм. О. Шугай / Іван Багряний. — К.: Смолоскип, 1994. – 240 с.
2. Барка В. Жовтий князь / передм. М. Жулинського / Василь Барка. – К.: Дніпро, 1991. — 266 с.
3. Воля О. (Міщенко) Мор: книга буття України / Олесь Воля. – К.: Кобза, 2002. – 1152 с.

4. Гончар О. Людина і зброя / Олесь Гончар. – К.: Український письменник, 1994. – 287 с.
5. Гуменна Д. Діти Чумацького Шляху: роман: у 4 кн. / Передм. А. Погрібного / Докія Гуменна. – К.: Укр. Центр духовної культури, 1998. – 576 с.
6. Дарда В. Хлопці майора Кена: повість // Дарда В. Коли гриміли гармати: повісті / Володимир Дарда. – Вид. 2-ге. – К.: Веселка, 1985. – С. 55–188.
7. Качуровський І. Село в безодні: поема / передм. І. Дзюби. – Вид. 4, доп. / Ігор Качуровський. – К.: Вид. дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", 2006. – 85 с.
8. Клен Ю. (Освальд Бургардт). Вибране / упоряд., автор передмови та прим. Ю. Ковалів / Юрій Клен. – К.: Дніпро, 1991. – 464 с.
9. Конончук Т. Затемнення українського сонця, або Трагедія Голодомору 1932–1933 років у фольклорі України: монографія / Тетяна Конончук. – К.: Твім інтер, 1998. – 216 с.
10. Конончук Т. На вічну пам'ять: українська культура про 1932–1933 роки в Україні / Тетяна Конончук. – Київ: Твім інтер, 2004. – 52 с.
11. Лозинський А. Близька Україна: із нью-йоркського зошита / Аскольд Лозинський. – Харків: Березіль, 2017. – 320 с.
12. Мак О. Каміння під косою: повість / передм. Г. Кирпи / Ольга Мак. – К.: Лелека, 2004. – 144 с.
13. Осьмачка Т. План до двору / Тодось Осьмачка. – Торонто, 1951. – 184 с.
14. Самчук У. Марія: роман / післямова С. Пінчука / Улас Самчук. – К.: Український письменник, 1991. – 190 с.
15. Стельмах М. Дума про тебе // Стельмах М. Твори: У 7 т. – Т. 2 / Михайло Стельмах. – К.: Дніпро, 1982. – 383 с.
16. 33-й: голод: Народна Книга-Меморіал / упоряд. Л.Б. Коваленко, В.А. Маняк. – К.: Радянський письменник, 1991. – 584 с.
17. Чуб (Нитченко) Д. Відлуння великого голоду в спогадах очевидців і в українській літературі Дмитро Чуб (Нитченко). – Торонто, 1984. – 16 с.
18. Яновський Ю. Мир: роман // Яновський Ю. Твори: в 5 т. – Т. 3. – К.: Дніпро, 1983. – С. 6–190.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

Antonovych, Myroslava – Doctor of Law, Head of the Center for International Human Rights Protection, Associate Professor of the Department of International Law, Faculty of Law, National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy"

Bryazhunov, Yuriy – Honored Journalist of Ukraine

Chernega, Petro – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Head of the Department of Ethnology and Local History of the Faculty of Historical Education at the Dragomanov National Pedagogical University

Hryn', Dmytro – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of World History, Faculty of History and Philosophy, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University.

Kalakura, Yaroslav – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor-Consultant of the Department of Archival Studies and Special branches of Historical Science of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Kononchuk, Tetiana – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Ukrainian Philology and Social Sciences, Professor of the Academy of Advocacy of Ukraine

Kotsur, Yuliya – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Head of the Research Department of the National Museum "Holodomor Victims Memorial"

Kozytskyi, Andriy – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of a New and Modern History of Foreign Countries at the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

Kurinnyi, Olexiy – Senior Lecturer of the Department of International Law and Special Legal Sciences of the Faculty of Law at the National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy," Expert of the Center for International Human Rights at the National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy," Expert of the Center of Policy and Legal Reforms in Administrative Law

Lapchynska, Nina – Senior Collections Specialist of the National Museum "Holodomor Victims Memorial"

Lozynskyi, Askold – Doctor of Law (New York), President of the Foundation of the Ukrainian Free University (New York)

Marochko, Vasyl – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Chief Scientist at the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Papakin, Georgiy – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Director of the M. S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archaeography and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Petrenko, Volodymyr – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Humanities and Information Technologies at the Vinnytsia Cooperative Institute

Serhiychuk, Hryhorii – Junior Researcher at the M. T. Rylsky Institute of Art, Folklore Studies and Ethnology Institute of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Serhijchuk, Volodymyr – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Shugalyova, Inna – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of the Ukrainian History at the Zaporizhzhia National University. During 2006–2008, she worked in the editorial team of the National Book of Memory of Victims of 1932–1933 Famine, specifically on the Zaporizhzhia regional volume.

Stasiuk, Olesia – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Director General of the National Museum "Holodomor Victims Memorial"

Turchenko, Fedir – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Honored Science and Technology Worker of Ukraine, Head of the Department of Modern History of Ukraine at the Zaporizhzhya National University. Head of the Scientific and Editorial Team for preparation of the National Memory Book of Famine's Victims of 1932–1933, in Zaporizhzhia Region.

Udovychenko, Valeriy – Honored Lawyer of Ukraine, Head of Investigative and Operational Group of the Security Service of Ukraine for Investigation of Criminal Case № 475 on the fact of genocide in Ukraine during 1932–1933.

Vakulyshyn, Serhiy – Methodologist at the Center of extracurricular activities in Svyatoshinskiy District of Kyiv

Vasylenko, Volodymyr – Doctor of Law, Professor at the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

Zadunayskiy, Vadym – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of the Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv

Zinchenko, Arsen – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Deputy Director of the Institute of Ukrainian Studies of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

Zubchenko, Svitlana – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Ethnology and Local History of the Dragomanov National Pedagogical University

Підписано до друку 25.10.2018 р.
Формат 60x84/16. Папір офсетний. Гарнітура Times New Roman
Наклад 1000 прим.

Національний музей «Меморіал жертв Голодомору»
вул. Лаврська, 3, м. Київ, Україна

Видруковано у книжковій друкарні “Коло”.
вул. Бориславська, 8, м. Дрогобич, Львівська область, 82100
С в і д о ц т в о
про внесення суб’єкта видавничої справи
до Державного реєстру видавців, виготівників
і розповсюджувачів видавничої продукції:
Серія ДК №498 від 20.06.2001 р.