MODERN UKRAINIAN NATIONALISM: NATIONALIST POLITICAL PARTIES IN UKRAINE, 1988-1992.

by Andrew Wilson

Thesis submitted for the partial fulfilment of the requirements for a PhD degree at the University of London, autumn 1993.

UMI Number: U056278

UMI

Dissertation Publishing

ProQuest

CONTENTS

PREFACE

This work studies the nature of nationalism in a country whose stability is of vital concern to Western Europe. Apart from Russia herself, Ukraine is the largest country to emerge from the break-up of the USSR, and its size, population, economic potential and military power mean that the stability, or even survival, of most other states in the region is dependent on what happens in Ukraine. Moreover, relations between Ukraine and Russia are the key to the politics of the whole region. Ukraine's attitude to Russia is complicated, however. On the one hand, many Ukrainian nationalists are deeply hostile to Russia as their traditional imperial enemy, but on the other hand they are in a minority within their own country. Many ethnic Russians or Russian-speaking Ukrainians in Eastern and Southern Ukraine would prefer to see the maintenance of close links with Russia. The Ukrainian nationalist movement has therefore historically been weak, unable to command a natural majority in its own country. In response to this weakness, some Ukrainian nationalists have in the past sought to build bridges with Eastern and Southern Ukraine by constructing a broad-based civic nationalism, whilst others have reacted in frustration and embraced an authoritarian ethnic nationalism of the type which has caused so much trouble elsewhere in Europe after the collapse of communism.

This work therefore examines the nature of the modern Ukrainian nationalist movement since its emergence in 1988. It demonstrates that the movement was unable to fully overcome its historical weaknesses, and that Ukrainian independence was only achieved in August 1991 with the help of the former imperial elite in Ukraine, that is with those 'national communists' who embraced the national cause in 1990-1. After independence, in 1991-2, the nationalists were able to push their agenda

on the national communists, but were unable to expand their overall appeal. The nationalists were therefore not in a strong position to prevent the national communists backsliding on their agenda, as leftist and regional lobbies began to grow in Eastern and Southern Ukraine from the summer of 1992 onwards. The work also demonstrates that, although most Ukrainian nationalists emphasised civic nationalism in 1988-90, most had moved to the right by the end of 1992. Ethnic nationalism, only a minority concern in 1988, was growing strongly in popularity by the end of the period.

The work is based on original sources collected in Ukraine during a series of visits in 1991-2, including party press and publications, party archives, interviews with leading figures, and the Ukrainian press, both central and local. The limited range of secondary literature available was also consulted.

Chapter 1 uses the ideal-type distinction between ethnic and civic nationalism to examine the development of the Ukrainian nationalist movement in the twentieth century. Chapter 2 surveys the development of political parties in Ukraine, and then Chapters 3-7 look at the main nationalist parties individually. Chapter 8 then looks at the key split in the nationalist movement in early 1992, and at various attempts to bind the nationalist camp back together.

Transliteration is based on the Library of Congress system. However, in a common modification of the system, words beginning with 'iu' or 'ia' begin with a 'y' (therefore 'Yurii' instead of 'Iurii'). A soft sign is transliterated as an apostrophe (*Nezalezhnist'*), and a Ukrainian apostrophe as a speech mark (*Luk"ianenko*). Ukrainian and Russian words are in italics, except those which have passed into common usage such as perestroika and glasnost (no apostrophe), as excessive italicisation is ugly. Ukrainian place names are used throughout,

therefore 'Odesa' is used instead of 'Odessa', the 'Donbas' instead of the 'Donbass', and so on. 'Kiev', rather than 'Kyïv' is retained as a common Anglicism.

I have innumerable people to thank, but the following are most worthy of mention. Jonathon Aves, Dominique Arel and Brendan O'Leary contributed invaluable comments on the text; and my secretaries Jenny and Marion help in practical matters. My supervisor Dominic Lieven provided patient and constructive guidance, and was always around when I needed advice. Taras Kuzio has helped me with contacts in Ukraine. In Ukraine itself, I would like to thank Valentyn Yakushik; Ihor Ostash, Yurii Petrus and all the staff at the International Association/School of Ukrainian Studies. I am grateful to Natalka Petrus for her hospitality. Above all, I would like to thank Helen Skillicorn in London for her love and support.

List of abbreviations:

ACAIF	Anti-Communist Anti-Imperial Front
CDFU	Congress of Democratic Forces of Ukraine
CNDF	Congress of National-Democratic Forces
CPU	Communist Party of Ukraine
DPU	Democratic Party of Ukraine
DSU	(Organisation for) Ukrainian Statehood and Independence
GPU	Green Party of Ukraine
KUN	Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists
LPU	Labour Party of Ukraine
OUN	Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists
OUN-r	OUN-revolutionary (radical Banderites)
OUN-s	OUN-solidarity (more moderate Melnykites)
OUN-z	OUN-'abroad' (social democrats)
PDRU	Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine
RUP	Revolutionary Ukrainian Party
SDPU	Social Democratic Party of Ukraine
SNUM	Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth
SPU	Socialist Party of Ukraine
SRs	Socialist Revolutionaries
UCDF/P	Ukrainian Christian Democratic Front/Party
UCRP	Ukrainian Conservative Republican Party
UDRP	Ukrainian Democratic-Radical Party
UHG	Ukrainian Helsinki Group
UHU	Ukrainian Helsinki Union
UIA	Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly
ULS	(Taras Shevchenko) Ukrainian Language Society

UNA	Ukrainian National Assembly
UNCP	Ukrainian National-Conservative Party
UNDO	Ukrainian National-Democratic Organisation
UNF	Ukrainian National Front
UNR	Ukrainian People's Republic
UNS	Ukrainian Nationalist Union
UNSO	Ukrainian National Self-Defence Forces
UOU	Union of Officers of Ukraine
UPA	Ukrainian Insurgent Army
UPDL/P	Ukrainian People's Democratic League/Party
UPDP	Ukrainian Peasant Democratic Party
UPSF	Ukrainian Party of Socialists-Federalists
UPSR	Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries
URP	Ukrainian Republican Party
USDPU	United Social Democratic Party of Ukraine
USDWP	Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party
UWPU	Ukrainian Workers'-Peasants' Union
VOST	All-Ukrainian Organisation of Workers' Solidarity
WUU	Writers' Union of Ukraine

1. Civic and Ethnic Nationalism in Ukraine: Political Parties, the Intelligentsia and the State.

Introduction

The years 1987-91 witnessed the spectacular growth and ultimate success of a powerful movement for national revival and independence in Ukraine. The formal declaration of Ukrainian independence on 24 August 1991, its ratification by popular referendum on 1 December 1991, and the subsequent struggle to underpin the declaration by building a viable nation-state have had profound consequences for the balance of power in Eastern Europe. Ukrainian independence was the single most decisive factor leading to the dissolution of the USSR, and Ukrainian nationalism has been a key factor in regional politics ever since. After Russia, Ukraine is the largest state in the region, and the fortunes of its smaller neighbours are inextricably bound up with those of the new Ukrainian state. Moreover, the interplay between Ukrainian and Russian nationalism will be the key determinant of the prospects for regional stability into the next century and beyond.

Ukrainian nationalism was a relatively weak force in the pre-Soviet period, and even in the Gorbachev era developed late. Hence Ukraine's declaration of independence caught many observers by surprise. Many were also surprised by the degree to which Ukrainian nationalism had apparently changed since the last serious attempt to gain Ukrainian independence, led in the 1940s by the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN). The OUN's uprising in 1941 followed in the wake of the German invasion, and the OUN gained a reputation as a neo-fascist and ethnic nationalist organisation. However, the modern Ukrainian national movement has from the beginning stressed its commitment to civic nationalism, thereby initially at least confounding the

thesis that Eastern European nationalism is somehow always 'ethnic', exclusivist and uncivilised, and Western European nationalism 'civic' and universal.[1] However, despite the rhetoric, Ukraine's new civic nationalism has yet to be tested under crisis conditions. The mainstream nationalist movement has pursued what is in effect an ethnic agenda, and openly ethnicist groups have emerged on the far right. This thesis will therefore examine whether Ukrainian nationalism has in fact yet fully transcended the legacy of the past, and the extent to which civic nationalism has put down deep roots in contemporary Ukraine.

Ukraine provides an excellent test-case for the study of the differences between the two ideal-types of ethnic and civic nationalism; both geographically, as ethnic nationalism is supposedly more common in Eastern Europe; and historically, as Ukrainian nationalists in the 1990s claim to have left behind the ethnic nationalism of their counterparts in the 1930s and 1940s. The stability of this commitment, along with the course of events in Russia, will determine whether inter-ethnic relations in the region remain peaceful, or follow the Yugoslav route. As both Russia and Ukraine inherited nuclear weapons after the collapse of the USSR, inter-ethnic peace in the region is obviously highly desirable.

This opening chapter will firstly examine the notion of 'Eastern exceptionalism' propounded by Hans Kohn and others, who argued that Eastern Europe nationalism always tended to be of a more intolerant, ethnicist type. Then it will consider the extent to which the Ukrainian national movement before the Gorbachev era could in fact be validly described as ethnicist. Subsequent changes to the Ukrainian social and political system (in particular the role of the intelligentsia, the state and national communism) will then be examined, with a view to considering whether civic nationalism is now likely to be more firmly rooted in Ukraine, or whether a reversion to ethnic nationalism is likely.

Eastern and Western Europe: Ethnic versus civic nationalism

Hans Kohn first proposed the idea of a separate and distinct Eastern European brand of nationalism. According to Kohn, nationalism was an ideology imported into Eastern Europe by local intelligentsias in the nineteenth century but, 'while the new nationalism in Western Europe corresponded to changing social, economic and political realities, it spread to Central and Eastern Europe long before a corresponding social and economic transformation'[2] had taken place.

According to Kohn, the classic Western European nation-states formed in such countries as England, France and Holland were based on civic concepts of universal citizenship for all classes and social groups in the nation (although in all three there were in fact religious criteria for citizenship). This idea was first popularised by the rising middle classes and then gradually extended to the lower orders, so that by the late nineteenth century most social classes were relatively well-integrated into the social order. Moreover Western European nationalism could be fairly secure and self-confident because the nation-state was more or less congruent to a well-defined territorial homeland, whose core *ethnie* had established state control over periphery areas largely in the pre-industrial era, when peripheral communities were easier to assimilate or simply to dominate politically, although of course this process was in fact long and bloody, particularly in Britain and France.

To this analysis could be added a geographical divide based on Eastern Europe's relative isolation from Roman civilisation, the Reformation and Enlightenment, plus the 'refeudalisation' of many parts of Eastern Europe from the sixteenth century onwards.

In Eastern Europe therefore, in contrast to the West, 'nationalism arose not only later, but also generally at a more backward stage of social and political

development; the frontiers of an existing state and of a rising nationality rarely coincided; nationalism there grew in protest against and in conflict with the existing state pattern - not primarily to transform it into a people's state, but to redraw the political boundaries in conformity with ethnographic demands'.[3]

The group most susceptible to nationalist ideas was the intelligentsia, but the Eastern European intelligentsia did not occupy the same social position as the Western European middle classes. If the latter were substantial property owners, whose social preeminence was underpinned by the control either of business or the professions, the Eastern European intelligentsia, according to Kohn, was doubly isolated, both from an imperial and cosmopolitan upper class, and from a parochial and illiterate peasantry. A civic order in which all social classes could feel they had some stake was also largely absent. Hence the intelligentsia tended to ground their nationalism in abstract notions of 'the people', derived from Rousseau and Herder, and blood-based notions of genealogical descent. Even if the intelligentsia's rhetorical appeal to 'the people' did not actually result in the political participation of the lower orders, it was still epistemologically necessary for defining the 'nation'.[4]

Local intelligentsias, having first imported the ideology of nationalism from the West, tended either to seek to use nationalism as a modernising ideology to compete with, and possibly overtake the West on its own terms, or as a form of prestige nationalism to prove that local traditions were equal to, or superior to those of the West, whose example could therefore be rejected. Either way, a sense of urgency and insecurity was imparted into nationalism that tended to mutate it in the direction of authoritarianism.

This tendency was also promoted by the practical geographical conditions of ethnic intermingling in Eastern Europe. Various *ethnie* overlapped and interpenetrated. They tended to be internally divided into a multitude of local peasant loyalties, and were all subsumed in caste-based empires. This led, at least among the intelligentsia, to a 'borderland consciousness',[5] a sense of

intense competition with neighbouring *ethnie* , and to the belief that any given group faced a stark choice between intensely promoted national revival or death. The state configuration of Eastern Europe, always involving either empire or states with substantial ethnic minorities, added to these fears, promoting intense competition between neighbouring groups over disputed regions.

Therefore, Kohn argued, Eastern European nationalism tended to veer between periods of insecurity and aggression. Eastern European nationalists felt that they could not afford to follow Western European civic concepts of voluntary or territorial citizenship, but felt compelled to make exclusive claim to their brethren on inalienable ethnic or blood lineage grounds.[6] That is, nationality can be neither chosen at random nor opted out of. Rather, ideas of 'authenticity', derived from Herder, meant that a person's true individuality lay in his inalienable nationality. The practical divorce of many sections of the population from the national idea, however, led Eastern European intelligentsias to advocate programmes of national revival or popular 'mobilisation', (led of course by themselves) that would restore individuals' true selves, whether they sought such a transformation or not. According to Kohn's thesis therefore, Eastern European nationalism was always less likely to be at peace with its surroundings, both because of its need for external enemies, and because of its restless compulsion towards a forced pace of 'nation-building' at home.

Kohn's analysis is useful for the two ideal-types that it contrasts, but it is often in practice difficult to distinguish between cases of ethnic and civic nationalism. Of the paradigmatic civic cases listed by Kohn, only the northern Scandinavian countries fit his model exactly, but they are ethnically homogeneous in any case (apart from Finland). Few other states have ethnically neutral citizenship requirements, — France for example. Even the USA and other colonial democracies, which as societies of largely

voluntary immigration, have come closest to the ideals of civic nationhood, have in practice discriminated against their own native and black populations. However, the ideal-types can be applied to the Ukrainian case as a test-case for the conditions that might favour one type of nationalism over the other.

In summary then, the argument of Kohn and his supporters can be broken down into a geographical premise (ethnic intermingling and the perception of territorial insecurity produce a 'borderland consciousness' and consequent ethnic tension), and a social premise (middle classes underpin civic nationalism). This opening chapter will first examine the geographical issue, before moving on to the social question.

Ukraine and its regions

Ukraine, both in 1943 and today, certainly met Kohn's first condition for the emergence of ethnic nationalism. Modern Ukraine is a multi-ethnic state with extreme patterns of regional diversity. Neither Ukraine, nor its predecessor the Ukrainian SSR, is a well-established state formation. Its borders were only established in the post-war period, when they were accorded only administrative significance, and Ukraine contains sizeable regions and minorities whose long-term loyalty to the state may well be in question. Modern Ukrainian nationalists have good reason to feel insecure about their control over Eastern and Southern Ukraine (and to a lesser extent of some of Ukraine's western borderlands). The following section will explain these differences, which will also help the reader later on in the text. Kohn's social conditions for the emergence of ethnic nationalism will be examined later in this chapter.

In the modern era a Ukrainian state has only existed briefly in the late seventeenth century and in 1917-20, but in neither period was it a secure entity, with firm control over all the territory in present-day Ukraine. Ethnically

Ukrainian lands have therefore tended to be subsumed in empires, or dispersed amongst several states. The present-day borders of Ukraine, inherited from the Ukrainian SSR, fit more closely to Ukrainian ethno-linguistic territory than at any other time in the modern era, but the fit is still not exact, and significant patterns of diversity still exist within its boundaries (see Map 1.1). Moreover, Ukraine's territory is not all integrated economically, both because it was a peripheral region in an imperial economic system, and because the inheritance of the hyper-centralised command economy has to date prevented the development of localised markets which would help foster integrative forces.

Ukraine is more accurately a bi-ethnic state (or at least a bi-lingual state), with substantial peripheral minorities. It has a huge ethnic Russian minority (11.4 million, or 22% of the total population in 1989), while the indigenous population has also been subject to centuries of Russification, whose impact has been particularly intense in the post-war period. From 1970 to 1989 alone the number of Ukrainians with a working knowledge of Russian increased from 44% to 72%.[7] From 1959 to 1989 the number of Ukrainians speaking Russian as their native tongue rose from 2 to 4.6 million, while the Ukrainian-speaking population of the republic fell from 73% to under 65%. By 1989, 50.6% of the republic's children studied in Russian language schools, and only 48.6% in Ukrainian.[8] Moreover, many Ukrainians speak the Ukrainian/Russian mixture known as *surzhyk* . The existence of a massive Russophone population, heavily concentrated in Eastern and Southern Ukraine, is a key factor weakening the Ukrainian national movement. Ukraine also has problems on its western borders with substantial Moldovan/Romanian, Hungarian and Rusyn minorities.

This pattern of regional diversity, described in detail below, has meant that Ukrainian political parties find it difficult to appeal across the whole territory of modern Ukraine, whilst the pattern of their support can be used as a key

indicator of their political profile and social base. Nationalist parties tend to be concentrated in Western Ukraine, especially in Galicia, leftist parties (in the traditional Western sense of the term) in urban Central and Eastern Ukraine, and Russophone groups in Eastern and Southern Ukraine.

For the present study Ukraine will be divided into the following eight regions, listed in Table 1.1, along with the present-day oblasts that they contain. These regions are shown in Map 1.1.

Table 1.1: Ukraine's Regions

Region	Oblasts
Galicia	L'viv, Ternopil', Ivano-Frankivs'k
Volyn'-Polissia	Rivne, Volyn'
Other West	Transcarpathia, Chernivtsi
Right Bank	Khmel'nyts'kyi, Vinnytsia, Zhytomyr, Cherkasy, Kivovohrad
Kiev*	city and oblast
Left Bank	Poltava, Sumy, Chernihiv
East	Kharkiv**, Dnipropetrovs'k, Donets'k, Luhans'k, Zaporizhzhia
South	Kherson, Mykolaïv, Odesa, Crimea

* Kiev is treated separately. See below.

** There is strong historical case for considering Kharkiv as the historical centre of Left Bank Ukraine, but its economic, demographic and socio-linguistic profile is more similar to that of the other four eastern oblasts, so it is here considered as part of Eastern Ukraine.

Map 1.1.

Ukraine and its Regions

International Boundary

---- Region

·············· *Oblast'*

0   miles   200

0   kms   200

BELARUS'

POLAND

RUSSIA

Chemihiv

Sumy

(B)

Volyn'

Rivne

Kiev

L'viv

Zhytomyr

Kharkiv

(F)

SLOVAKIA

(A)

Ternopil'

Kmel'nyts'kyi

(G)

Poltava

Ivano-Frankivs'k

Vinnytsia

Cherkasy

U K R A I N E

Uzhhorod

(C)

Chernivtsi

(D)

(E)

Kirovohrad

Dnipropetrovs'k

(H)

Luhans'k

HUNGARY

Donets'k

MOLDOVA

Zaporizhzhia

(I)

Mykolaïv

Region - (A) - Galicia

ROMANIA

        B - Volyn'-Polissia

        C - Transcarpathia

        D - Chernivtsi

        E - Left Bank

        F - Kiev, city and *oblast'*

        G - Right Bank

        H - Eastern Ukraine

        I - Southern Ukraine (including Crimea)

Odesa

Kherson

Simferopol'

B l a c k   S e a

Galicia

Galicia, or to be precise Eastern Galicia, the three Ukrainian oblasts of L'viv, Ternopil' and Ivano-Frankivs'k, has for the last century and a half been the foremost centre of Ukrainian nationalism.[9] The area was part of the medieval proto-Ukrainian princedom of Kievan *Rus'* , whose traditions lingered longer in Galicia thanks to the establishment of the kingdom of Galicia-Volyn' that flourished after the sack of Kiev by the Mongols in 1240 until the fourteenth century. Galicia was then under the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from 1387 to 1772, apart from a brief period after the Cossack revolt led by Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi in 1648.

With the First Partition of Poland in 1772, Galicia came under Habsburg rule, where it remained until the empire's collapse in 1918. The relatively liberal Habsburgs allowed Ukrainian civil society to revive in the nineteenth century, and also encouraged the flowering of Ukrainian (then called 'Ruthenian') national identity, and its main institutional bulwark, the Uniate Catholic Church, as a counterweight against the traditional Polish dominance of the region. This Galician national revival resulted in the formation of the West Ukrainian People's Republic after the collapse of the Habsburg empire in 1918, which united with the larger Ukrainian People's Republic based in Kiev in 1919.

As a result of the collapse of would-be Ukrainian state and the Polish-Ukrainian war of 1919-20 some seven million Ukrainians fell under Polish control, although this was only internationally recognised in 1923 after Poland promised to grant Galicia autonomy. Poland however failed to deliver on such promises, and the Ukrainians embarked on a long struggle against Polish rule, in which the OUN (see above) was prominent. Galicia was seized by Stalin as a result of the Nazi-Soviet pact in September 1939. The OUN (now split into two factions) now struggled against Soviet rule and returned with the invading German armies in 1941, issuing a symbolic declaration of Ukrainian

independence in L'viv on 30 June 1941. The OUN fought on against the Red Army until the early 1950s.

Despite the defeat of the OUN and widespread post-war purges, Galicia has continued to function as the main stronghold of Ukrainian nationalism. In fact, its population became even more solidly Ukrainian as a result of the wartime (and post-war) death, departure and expulsion of the local Jewish and Polish population. Apart from a one-off in-migration of Russian officials in the late 1940s, Galicia has never been subject to Russification in the same manner as Eastern Ukraine. According to the 1989 census the ethnic Ukrainian percentage of the population of the three Galician oblasts was 93%.[10] Linguistic Russification in the area is minimal, and if anything has been in decline. In the 1989 Soviet census, 87% of the L'viv population gave Ukrainian as their native language, 97% in Ternopil', and 96% in Ivano-Frankivs'k.[11] Apart from L'viv oblast, the area contains little industry and few large urban centres. It is therefore the one rural area in modern Ukraine with a strong nationalist tradition.

Galicia likes to think of itself as the true upholder of the Ukrainian language, culture and traditions, and has historically sought to perform a proselytising role (as the 'Ukrainian Piedmont'), spreading the true national faith to the rest of Ukraine. However, Galicia is atypical, both because of its fervent commitment to nationalism, and because of its Uniate faith (the rest of Ukraine is Orthodox), and its nationalist messianism is not always well-received in the rest of Ukraine.

Volyn'-Polissia

Volyn'-Polissia, in north-western Ukraine, again has a strong nationalist tradition, but its different historical experience justifies its separate treatment. The region belonged to Kievan *Rus'* and became one of its successor principalities after 1240. It was then subject to Polish-Lithuanian rule from the

fourteenth century, and that of the Tsars after the third Partition of Poland in 1795. The strong local Uniate tradition was then eradicated in favour of Orthodoxy. The region reverted to Poland in 1920, and was then incorporated into the Ukrainian SSR at the same time as Galicia - temporarily in 1939 and permanently in 1945. The northern forests of Volyn'-Polissia were however a stronghold of OUN resistance in the 1940s (where the nationalist guerrilla leader Borovets' declared the 'Olevs'k republic' in 1941). The region was 94% Ukrainian in 1989, and remained strongly rural. The Ukrainian language was still dominant, with 93% of the population in Rivne using it as their native language, and 95% in Volyn'.

Other West

1) Transcarpathia

Transcarpathia (the region separated by the Carpathian mountains from the rest of Ukraine) was a part of Hungary for centuries, before becoming part of the new Czechoslovak state (with a degree of autonomy) after the treaties of Saint-Germain and Trianon in 1919 and 1920. In the second half of the nineteenth century, however, a strong local national revival took place under Oleksandr Dukhnovych. This national revival however was split between competing pro-Russian, pro-Ukrainian and pro-Rusyn tendencies until 1938 (Rusynism is the idea that the local population form a separate *ethnie* as Rusyns).[12] Even Dukhnovych himself typified the split personality of the region, as he condemned the Rusyn dialect as not suitable for the formation of a literary language.

By 1938 the Ukrainiophiles seemed victorious, with the formation of the short-lived Carpatho-Ukrainian republic under the Uniate priest Afgustyn Voloshyn after Hitler's dismemberment of Czechoslovakia (although the republic was crushed by Hungarian invasion in 1939) and the addition of the

area to Ukraine in 1945, but an autonomist or even separatist Rusyn movement has revived strongly in the early 1990s.[13]

The local population in 1989 was officially 78% Ukrainian, 13% Hungarian and 9% Others, but as respondents to the census were not allowed to class themselves as Rusyns, the local Rusyn movement now claims that up to two thirds of the (977,000) local 'Ukrainians' are in fact Rusyns.[14] Similarly, 74% of the oblast population was reported by the census as Ukrainianophone, but this would include all those speaking the Rusyn dialect. Revanchists in both Slovakia and Hungary have made claims against Transcarpathia, but unlike Chernivtsi, this has not been on an official level.

2) Chernivtsi

The territory of Northern Bukovyna, the core of what is now Chernivtsi oblast, was also part of Kievan *Rus'* , but later fell under Ottoman rule before passing to the Habsburgs from 1776 to 1918. The area has always had a mixed Ukrainian and Romanian (and German and Jewish) population, but the former appeared dominant in November 1918 when a local Ukrainian *viche* (people's assembly) voted to add Northern Bukovyna to the newly-formed Ukrainian People's Republic.[15] The *viche's* ambitions were crushed by Romanian invasion however, and by the award of the area to Romania by the treaty of Saint-Germain in 1919 as a reward for entering the Great War on the side of the *Entente* in 1916. Romania attempted to forcibly Romanianise the area after 1924, but it returned to Ukraine in 1940, if now somewhat swollen by Stalin's addition of the traditionally Romanian Bessarabian counties of Hertsa and Khotyn to the Ukrainian heartland of Northern Bukovyna. The population of the resulting Chernivtsi oblast in 1989 therefore was 71% Ukrainian, 20% Romanian/ Moldovan and 10% Other. Unlike Transcarpathia therefore, Ukrainian ethnic domination of the region is secure (the Ukrainian language population was 68% in 1989), although the period of Romanian rule

has resulted in a lower level of national consciousness than in Galicia (local Ukrainian civil society was much weaker than in neighbouring Galicia, and the local population mainly Orthodox). Romania however continues to press its territorial claim to the area, and to Southern Bessarabia in what is now Odesa oblast.

Right Bank

The region on the Right (Western) bank of the river Dnipro contains the five modern oblasts of Khmel'nyts'kyi, Vinnytsia, Zhytomyr, Cherkasy, and Kirovohrad. The first two represent the historical Ukrainian region (and Tsarist *guberniia*) of Podillia, and the latter three the Right Bank proper. Most of what is now Kiev oblast was also historically part of the Right Bank, but Kiev will be treated separately, for reasons explained below.

Both regions are traditional heartlands of Ukrainian culture. Originally part of Kievan *Rus'* , they fell under the dominion of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the fourteenth century, although they joined in Khmel'nyts'ky's rebellion in 1648. The local Ukrainians were mainly peasants who were often parochial in outlook, but they maintained their national consciousness in opposition to their Polish (and Jewish) overlords. The two regions did not fall under Tsarist rule until the second partition of Poland in 1793.

The area is basically still rural, although Kirovohrad oblast, the closest of the five to Eastern Ukraine, contains much industry. In 1989 the local population was 89% Ukrainian. Russian language assimilation is also at a comparatively low level. In Khmel'nyts'kyi the Ukrainian language population in 1989 was 91%, in Vinnytsia 90%, in Zhytomyr 87%, in Cherkasy 89%, and in Kirovohrad 83%.

Left Bank

The Ukrainian territories to the East of the river Dnipro, (the three modern oblasts of Poltava, Sumy and Chernihiv), also part of the original Kievan *Rus'* , were incorporated into Tsarist Russia at a much earlier stage, and therefore have exhibited a much higher degree of Russification to this day. Chernihiv fell under Muscovite control in 1522, and the rest of the area was acquired by the Tsars as the result of the Pereiaslav agreement in 1654, along with Kiev city and what is now Kharkiv oblast. The area initially received a degree of autonomy as 'the Hetmanate', but this was extinguished by Catherine II. The Russian influence has therefore been greater than on the Right Bank, although Kharkiv, or Sloboda Ukraine, was the first centre of the Ukrainian national revival in the early nineteenth century.

Kharkiv has however been placed in Eastern Ukraine, as over the last 150 years it has experienced patterns of industrialisation and further Russian in-migration similar to those occurring in Eastern Ukraine. The Left Bank's population in 1989 was 88% Ukrainian, similar to that of the Right Bank (the area's traditionally close links to Russia are offset by its high rural population: villages tend to be more ethnically Ukrainian), but levels of national consciousness tend to be lower. The Ukrainian language population was 86% in Poltava oblast, 78% in Sumy and 86% in Chernihiv.

Kiev

Kiev could be included in either the Right or Left Bank. The 1654 Pereiaslav agreement also gave the Tsars control of the city, but most of what is now Kiev oblast was part of the Right Bank. In order to avoid this dilemma, but also because of Kiev city's special status as the capital of the republic since 1934, Kiev will be treated separately. The dynamics of national revival in the capital have had a specific character of their own in any case, because of the concentration of the cultural intelligentsia and mass media in the city. Kiev oblast in 1989 was 89% Ukrainian, but Kiev city only 73% (plus 21% Russians and 4% Jews). The

Ukrainian population of Kiev has steadily increased in the post-war period (from 66% in 1959),[16] however, as Ukrainian peasants from Central Ukraine have been sucked into the capital. Although the Russian language was traditionally dominant in the city, the Ukrainian-speaking population has also risen from 44% in 1959 to 58% in 1989 (88% in Kiev oblast).

Eastern Ukraine

Eastern Ukraine is here taken to comprise the five modern-day oblasts of Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovs'k, Donets'k, Luhans'k, and Zaporizhzhia. Donets'k and Luhans'k together form the coal-mining region of the Donbas. The reasons for Kharkiv's inclusion have already been discussed. Zaporizhzhia is also included as part of Eastern Ukraine as it exhibits patterns of industrialisation and Russification similar to the other four oblasts, although its southern littoral has more in common with the rest of Southern Ukraine. Both Kharkiv and Zaporizhzhia have substantial rural hinterlands around their oblast capitals, and are therefore more ethnically Ukrainian than the rest of Eastern Ukraine.

Most of the area was part of Kievan *Rus'* (when it was entirely rural), whilst Zaporizhzhia was the site of the headquarters of the Ukrainian Cossacks in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. Kharkiv came under the Tsars' control in 1654, and the rest of the area in the colonisation drive to the south and east from 1752 to 1775, when Catherine II destroyed the Cossack's headquarters, the *sich* . However, the character of the area was totally transformed by the industrialisation drive of the late nineteenth century onwards. Unlike in Central Ukraine, the mining and metallurgical industries of the area mainly attracted Russian in-migrants, especially in the pre-1930s era. By 1989, the Ukrainian population of Kharkiv oblast was only 63%, that of Dnipropetrovs'k 72%, Donets'k 51%, Luhans'k 52%, and Zaporizhzhia 63%. Moreover, the Russian population in the area's main urban centres was always

proportionately higher, and as up to a quarter of local Ukrainians tend to be sufficiently assimilated to use Russian as their native language,[17] the proportion of native language Ukrainian population in the area is even lower, and often in fact a <u>minority</u>. In Kharkiv oblast in 1989 it was only 51%, in Dnipropetrovs'k 61%, in Donets'k 31%, in Luhans'k 35%, and in Zaporizhzhia only 49%. Moreover, the area is so highly urbanised that, apart from Kharkiv, the Russophone urban centres dominate the region. Hence the area has always been among the least receptive to the Ukrainian national idea. The authority of the various nationalist governments of 1917-20 was always precarious in Eastern Ukraine, which was a centre of Bolshevik support and the site of the rival Donets'k-Kryvyi Rih republic.

<u>South</u>

<u>1) The Black Sea Coast</u>

Southern Ukraine is here taken to comprise the three coastal oblasts of Kherson, Mykolaïv, and Odesa, plus the Crimean peninsula. The northern Black Sea littoral has always been characterised by a complex pattern of multi-ethnic settlement, including penetration by Ukrainians in the Kievan *Rus'* and Cossack eras, but it fell under a long period of Ottoman and Tatar domination until the conquest of the area by Russia's Tsars in the eighteenth century. Most of the area was annexed in 1774, and the Crimea in 1783.

The Tsars' nineteenth century immigration policy further encouraged the influx of a multi-ethnic settler population, including Greeks, Bulgarians and Gagauz (Christian Turks). Odesa in particular became famous as a cosmopolitan city.[18] Land hunger in Central Ukraine however meant that the Ukrainian peasantry spread into the southern rural hinterland at the same time. However, although the countryside is mainly Ukrainian, patterns of industrialisation and urbanisation under the Soviet regime created urban

settlements similar in character to those in Eastern Ukraine, highly Russified and lacking in institutional support for Ukrainian language and culture.

In 1989 the population of Kherson was 76% Ukrainian, and that of Mykolaïv 76%. Odesa oblast remains more multi-ethnic. Only 55% of the population was Ukrainian (49.9% in the city of Odesa), 27% Russian, 6.3% Bulgarian, 5.5% Moldovan, 2.6% Jewish, 1.1% Gagauz, and 2.5% Other. As in Eastern Ukraine, however, a high percentage of local Ukrainians were assimilated to the Russian language. The Ukrainian speaking population in 1989 was only 68% in Kherson, 64% in Mykolaïv and 41% in Odesa.

2) The Crimea

The Crimean peninsula has always had a multi-ethnic population. Although Ukraine had some links with the peninsula in the early medieval period, from the 1420s until Tsarist conquest in 1783 it was dominated by the Crimean Khanate (and by the Ottoman Turks on its southern shores). Tsarist rule resulted in the emigration of much of the local Tatar population, and after the building of a railway link in 1876, their gradual displacement by (mainly Russian) settlers. Although the Treaty of Brest Litovs'k awarded the Crimea to Ukraine, in 1921 the Crimean Autonomous SSR was established as part of the Russian SSR, with considerable autonomy for the Crimean Tatars. The Tatars were however deported *en masse* in May 1944 for alleged wartime collaboration with the Germans, and the Crimean ASSR was abolished in 1946. The peninsula then became an integral part of the RSFSR until it was transfered to Ukraine in 1954 as a gift from Khrushchev to mark the 300th anniversary of the Pereiaslav agreement.

Considerable further post-war in-migration resulted in a population only 26% Ukrainian, but 67% Russian in 1989 (before the Crimean Tatars were able to return in large numbers). It should however be borne in mind that the Crimea's northern flatlands have much in common geographically and

ethnically with Ukraine's southern Black Sea coast, and that the Ukrainian share of the population there is correspondingly higher. In the rest of the peninsula, however, particularly in the all-important southern ports, the almost complete absence of Ukrainian media, schools and other cultural infrastructure means that the local population is the most highly Russified in Ukraine (the local Ukrainian speaking population was a mere 14% in 1989), and the least receptive to the national idea.

The information concerning the ethnic population breakdown in each oblast and the more significant figures for the Ukrainian speaking population is summarised in Table 1.2 below.

Table 1.2

The Relative Dominance of Ethnic Ukrainians and the Ukrainian Language Population in Ukraine in 1989, by oblast.

Oblast	Ethnic Uk	Ethnic R	Other	Uk Lg
Galicia				
L'viv	90.4	7.2	2.4	87.0
Ternopil'	96.8	2.3	0.9	97.0
Ivano-Frankivs'k	95.0	4.0	1.0	95.0
Volyn'-Polissia				
Rivne	93.3	4.6	2.1	93.0
Volyn'	94.6	4.4	1.0	94.5
Other West				
Transcarpathia	78.4	12.5	9.1	74.0
C hernivtsi	70.8	6.7	22.5	68.0
Right Bank				
Khmel'nyts'kyi	90.4	5.8	3.8	91.0
Vinnytsia	91.5	5.9	2.6	90.0

Zhytmoyr	84.9	7.9	7.2	87.0
Cherkasy	90.5	8.0	1.5	89.0
Kirovohrad	85.3	11.7	3.0	83.0

Kiev

city	72.5	20.9	6.6	58.0
oblast	89.4	8.7	1.9	88.0

Left Bank

Poltava	87.9	10.2	1.9	86.0
Sumy	85.5	13.3	1.2	78.0
Chernihiv	90.5	8.0	1.5	89.0

East

Kharkiv	62.8	33.2	4.0	51.0
Dnipropetrovs'k	71.6	24.2	4.2	61.0
Donets'k	50.7	43.6	5.7	31.0
Luhans'k	51.9	44.8	3.3	35.0
Zaporizhzhia	63.1	32.0	4.9	49.0

South

Kherson	75.7	20.2	4.1	68.0
Mykolaïv	75.6	19.4	5.0	64.0
Odesa	54.6	27.4	18.0	41.0
Crimea	25.6	67.0	7.3	14.0

Lastly, some idea of the relative importance of Ukraine's various regions is provided by Table 1.3, which lists each region's share of national territory, population, and contribution to national income.

Table 1.3: The Relative Importance of Ukraine's Regions[19]

Region	% of Uk territory	% of Population	% of national income
Galicia	8.2	10.3	10.2

Volyn'-Polissia	6.6	4.5	3.1
Other West	3.4	4.2	3.3
Right Bank	20.4	15.1	13.6
Kiev city and oblast	4.8	8.8	9.5
Left Bank	14.0	8.9	8.7
East	23.8	33.5	37.6
South	18.8	14.8	14.0

In conclusion, Ukraine has inherited considerable problems of regional diversity which means both that the potential appeal of the nationalist message is likely to be highly variegated, and that problems of 'borderland consciousness' exist in modern Ukraine.

Inter-ethnic relations in Ukraine are considerably complicated by the existence of a large Russophone Ukrainian community. On the one hand, the Ukrainian, Russian and Russophone communities are culturally close, and the existence of a substantial middle group of Russified Ukrainians prevents the easy polarisation of ethnic relations into 'us' and 'them'. Inter-ethnic politics in other states are often dominated by zero-sum conflicts between sharply differentiated communities, where the main party battle is *within* each community rather than across ethnic divides, as ethnic 'flanking' parties force more moderate parties to the extreme.[20] The fact that both the Ukrainianophone and ethnic Russian groups have to compete for the loyalty of the Russified Ukrainian group somewhat reduce this tendency in Ukraine. On the other hand, recent experience in Yugoslavia and elsewhere have shown how quickly and sharply ethnic relations can become polarised in crisis situations. Moreover, although it is beyond the scope of this study, it is possible that Russian-speaking Ukrainians may side with ethnic Russians, if they decide that their language of everyday use is more important to their sense of identity

than their passport ethnicity, thus sharply curtailing the potential support base for Ukrainian nationalism.

The analysis of nationalist parties and movements in Chapters 3-7 will draw heavily on information concerning the party's regional profiles as a key indicator of their commitment to civic or ethnic nationalism. Civic nationalist groups should be more accommodating towards Ukraine's regional differences, and would be expected to seek support throughout Ukraine, whereas ethnic nationalism would probably be confined to Western Ukraine, and Galicia in particular.

The Ukrainian Nationalist Tradition

It must now be asked how true Kohn's caricature of Eastern European ethnic nationalism was of the Ukrainian nationalist movement in and before 1943. Its subsequent development can then be better traced.

The nationalist groups that appeared in Ukraine from 1988 onwards represented the fourth generation of the Ukrainian national movement in the twentieth century. The first wave was the liberal and socialist groups that appeared in Tsarist and Habsburg Ukraine at the turn of the century (Ukrainian lands were then divided between the two empires, see below), but which failed to achieve a Ukrainian nation-state when both empires collapsed in 1917-21.

1900-1921

Political parties began to appear in Tsarist Ukraine from 1900 onwards, but, although they were able to expand their influence after the 1905 revolution, they could never mobilise the population in significant numbers, proved highly fractious in 1917-20 and were crushed by the final and decisive imposition of Soviet rule in 1920.[21] Moreover, ethnically Ukrainian parties were led either by liberal populists such as Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi or by

socialists like Volodymyr Vynnychenko. Even the former tended to share the general commitment to socialism almost universal amongst the intelligentsia of the Tsarist empire at the time, and in any case their nationalism was moderated by the need to compete with larger socialist and all-Russian parties, which at the time were dominant in most Ukrainian cities.[22]

In such circumstances, the Ukrainian parties were unable to adopt maximalist strategies. Most supported various schemes for a federal accommodation with Russia, and only began to push for independence after the Bolsheviks' seizure of power in October 1917. The Ukrainian People's Republic (in Ukrainian, UNR) they then established was, on paper at least, a model democratic and civic state,[23] although it soon collapsed as Ukraine became the battleground for numerous armies and the site of anti-Jewish pogroms in 1919-20.[24] If, however, the period leading up to the brief attempt to establish Ukrainian independence in 1917-21 was certainly dominated by the liberal and/or socialist Ukrainian intelligentsia, the failure of that attempt, and the considerable inter-ethnic violence in the wars of 1918-21 contributed to a sharpening of Ukrainian national identity and the radicalisation of the national movement in the post-war yeas.[25]

The largest party in this period, which claimed at least 75,000 members,[26] was the Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries (UPSR). It was in many ways the local Ukrainian equivalent of the all-Russian Socialist Revolutionary party (SRs), which embraced most of the ethnic Ukrainian village and city intelligentsia. Its programme was a mixture of Ukrainian nationalism and nineteenth century Populism. The UPSR's origins could be traced back to the split in the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (see below) during the 1906 revolution, and to local defections from the SRs, but its existence as a mass party began with its first congress in April 1917. Its leader Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi was the first President of the UNR. Although it had virtually no influence in the cities, one source estimates that the UPSR received over 60%

of the votes cast in Ukraine at the November 1917 all-Russian Constituent Assembly elections,[27] although peasant support soon fell away in 1918 as the party failed to deliver on the all-important question of land reform. The UPSR was later to be reviled by nationalists like Dmytro Dontsov for its liberalism, and the party proved ineffective and fractious in government, splitting in March 1919 when its left wing formed the national communist *Borotbisti* party. The party was totally purged from Ukrainian life by 1921.

The first major political party established in Tsarist Ukraine was the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (RUP), set up in 1900. Its major ideologist Mykola Mikhnovs'kyi, who wrote the party's programme *Samostiina Ukraïna* ('Independent Ukraine'),[28] left the RUP in 1902 to form the first avowedly nationalist Ukrainian party, the Ukrainian People's Party, (his slogan was 'Ukraine for the Ukrainians!'), but its influence remained minimal. After a further split in 1904, when the Ukrainian Social Democratic Union left the RUP to join the all-Russian Mensheviks, the RUP renamed itself the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party (USDWP) at its second congress in 1905. The USDWP, which claimed 5,000 members,[29] had similar socio-economic policies to the all-Russian Mensheviks, but during the Great War effectively split in two. The majority of party members supported the journal *Ukraïns'ke zhyttia* ('Ukrainian life') run by the future revolutionary leaders Volodymyr Vynnychenko and Symon Petliura, and were broadly socialist in their sympathies. A minority of radicals supported the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (one of whose leaders was Dmytro Dontsov, who was to become the main ideologist of Ukrainian nationalism in the 1920s), which favoured an independent Ukraine under German-Austrian protection. Vynnychenko and Petliura's branch of the USDWP was prominent in the governments of both the UNR (where it provided 4 out of 8 members of the first cabinet) and the later 'Directorate'. After 1920 its members were forced into exile in Prague.

The second party of broadly socialist orientation was the Ukrainian Democratic-Radical Party (UDRP) formed in late 1905. It almost disappeared in the period of Stolypin's reaction after 1906-7, but after absorbing the centrist-liberal Ukrainian Democratic Party, the Ukrainian Radical Party, and the underground Society of Ukrainian Progressives, founded in 1908, it reemerged in June 1917 as the Ukrainian Party of Socialist-Federalists (UPSF). The UPSF was a prominent participant in all the Ukrainian governments of 1917-20. The party's leadership in exile renounced socialism in 1923 and renamed the party the UDRP, but by then the party's influence was minimal.

As a point of comparison, all of the major all-Russian parties were active in Ukraine at the time; 50,000 of the Mensheviks' national strength of 200,000 was concentrated in Ukraine (30,000 in the Donbas alone), 9 out of 64 of the Kadets' *gubernii* organisations were in Ukraine, one sixth of the *Trudovyky's* strength was in Ukraine, and the SRs could claim a Ukrainian membership of 300,000.[30] The Bolsheviks claimed 60,000 supporters in Ukraine in Spring 1917.[31] The key weakness of the Ukrainian parties was their failure to cooperate with the imperial, more accurately all-Russian, parties, which tended to be stronger in the dominant urban areas. This was to be an important lesson for the nationalist movement in the early 1990s. A similar argument was replayed about whether to cooperate with 'national communists'.

1921-1950s

Political parties lasted longer in Western Ukraine (especially in Galicia and Volyn'-Polissia, under Polish rule from 1920), including the moderate nationalist Ukrainian National-Democratic Organisation (UNDO), the Ukrainian Social-Democratic Party and (popular in the 1920s at least) the West Ukrainian Communist Party. Although Ukrainianisation and the cultural renaissance of the 1920s in Soviet Ukraine initially attracted many Western Ukrainians, most Ukrainian parties in Galicia, and in exile further afield,

swung sharply to the right in reaction to the failures of 1917-21, and any lingering pro-Soviet sentiment was destroyed by the Great Famine in Soviet Ukraine in 1932-3. Hence, the major Ukrainian political organisation of the period, and the one with the most durable legacy, was in fact the ultra-right Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) set up in 1929, and which soon outflanked more moderate Galician parties.[32]

The OUN originally had a militant 'integral nationalist' ideology, based on the ideas of Dmytro Dontsov, (although he was never formally a member of the OUN).[33] Dontsov's political philosophy was the result of eclectic borrowing from the likes of Nietzsche, Maurras, Fichte, Pareto and Sorel. Its basis was firstly a violent critique of the socialist 'provincialism' and inferiority complex of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, which he deemed responsible for the failure to create an independent Ukrainian state in 1917-21. He advocated instead a militant form of elite leadership that he termed 'the nationalism of the strong' (*Chynnyi natsionalizm*).[34] A Ukrainian nation-state could only be achieved through the 'initiative of the minority', in other words the embodiment by a minority elite of a true and pure 'national idea', a clear and simple programme around which the popular masses could consolidate. Dontsov understood this 'national idea' not as the product of rational thought, or the agglomeration of social interests, but (in his interpretation of Hegel) as an abstraction to which all other values should be subordinated (his favourite slogan was 'The Nation Above All!'). A pure and inspiring 'national idea' could only exist as the representation of the spirit of a homogeneous ethnic nation, free from all internal disunity. Dontsov was an open opponent of democratic and liberal values. He admired the fascist corporate state, and believed that the nationalist political party should provide the nucleus for the 'ruling caste' in an ethnically pure future 'hierarchical society'.

The OUN of the 1930s in many respects conformed to Dontsov's ideal. His philosophical ruminations easily translated into a simplistic programme of

national liberation, the glory of individual struggle and sacrifice, and ethnic exclusion that appealed strongly to the OUN's social base amongst radical youth and the Galician peasantry.[35]

The OUN organised a terrorist campaign first against Polish and then Soviet rule, and in 1943 was the main force behind the creation of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (known by its Ukrainian acronym, UPA), which fought a long and arduous struggle in Western Ukraine against Soviet (and on occasion, German) troops until as late as the mid-1950s.[36] Estimates as to the number of men it had under arms vary from 10,000 to 200,000.[37] The years of the UPA insurrection certainly left a bitter legacy of ethnic strife, with many in Western Ukraine seeing little or no difference between an anti-Soviet and an anti-Russian war.

The OUN, however, split in two in 1940 after the death in 1938 of its charismatic leader, Yevhen Konovalets'. The OUN's radicals (mainly younger supporters of Konovalets'' would-be successor, the firebrand Stepan Bandera) had parted company with the more moderate leadership of Andrii Mel'nyk, with the former calling themselves OUN-b for 'Banderite' (later OUN-r for revolutionary), and the latter OUN-m for 'Mel'nykite', (later OUN-s for 'solidarity'). Both wings of the organisation, however, soon found (like the Vlasovites) that they had to adopt a mutated form of social democratic populism as they attempted to spread their appeal to Soviet Ukraine in 1941-4.[38] Bandera's supporters were less prepared to compromise their ideology, but Bandera and the OUN-b's other main leader Yaroslav Stets'ko were arrested by the Germans in 1941 for having the temerity to proclaim a revived Ukrainian republic in L'viv after the German invasion of the USSR.

By 1943 the OUN had adopted democratic nationalism as its official ideology. With Bandera in prison, the OUN was now under the more moderate leadership of Mykola Lebed' and the UPA commander Roman Shukhevych. Moreover, in July 1944 Shukhevych and the OUN sponsored the

creation of an underground coalition (the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council) with less radical parties like the UNDO.

After the early 1950s, the OUN only existed in exile. Many remained loyal to Dontsovite authoritarianism, including Bandera himself who had never had to make the compromises thought necessary to spread the organisation's influence in central and Eastern Ukraine, and a substantial body of UPA veterans, radicalised by their long struggle. Their dominance lead to a further split between the more moderate OUN-z (for *zakordonnyi* , or OUN-abroad) and the OUN-r in 1955. The OUN-r, however, remained loyal to the political philosophy of Bandera and Dontsov, and was the most active organisation amongst the émigré communities in Western Europe and North America.

Although the OUN largely disappeared from political life in the Ukrainian SSR after the early 1950s (some small underground groups continued the tradition, see Chapter 3), it left a powerful myth behind. Fifty years of Soviet propaganda depicting the OUN-UPA as fascists and traitorous collaborators with the Nazis and celebrating the alternative myth of the Red Army's liberating role have left deep roots,[39] particularly in Eastern and Southern Ukraine. On the other hand, in Western Ukraine (where the OUN-UPA's struggle was largely confined) the counter-myth of the UPA as an army of national liberation has remained equally strong. Many in contemporary Ukraine, however, remain ignorant of the complex history of the OUN-UPA, especially after 1943, and are ironically prepared to accept the myth propagated by both the Soviet authorities and the OUN-r that all members of the OUN-UPA were in fact ultra-nationalists.

Most nationalist groups in post-war Ukraine have developed independently with no formal connection to the OUN, but their attitude to the OUN-UPA myth can be used as a key criterion for the degree of their commitment to civic rather than ethnic nationalism (in addition to the extent to which they are able to expand their influence outside of Western Ukraine), both on an ideological

level and in terms of their sensitivity to the historical differences between Western and Greater Ukraine.

Furthermore, the various émigré branches of the OUN, particularly the most powerful and best-funded the OUN-r, have attempted to revive their influence in Ukraine from the late 1980s onwards. After a series of attempts to create a nationalist party in its own image, the OUN-r created a front organisation in 1992, the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists, to restore its presence in modern Ukrainian politics. Its role is considered in Chapter 7.

1950s-1980s

The defeat of the OUN in the 1940s and the incorporation of most ethnically Ukrainian lands into the Ukrainian SSR meant that modern Ukrainian nationalism came to be dominated by its third, or 'Soviet' variant, which, while owing much to previous manifestations of Ukrainian nationalism, has nevertheless developed since the 1960s under profoundly different social and political conditions.

The new dissident national movement that emerged in Ukraine in the 1960s (the *shestydesiatnyky* , or 'generation of the 1960s') was part of the broader Soviet movement of legalistic dissent, which, by placing as much stress on individual as on national rights, laid the foundations for the development of the largely civic conceptions of nationalism espoused by the successor groups that emerged in the late 1980s as the fourth 'wave' (the history of the *shestydesiatnyky* is described in more detail in Chapter 3). The *shestydesiatnyky* movement was suppressed in 1972-3, but when Mikhail Gorbachev's political reforms allowed opposition politics to revive throughout the former USSR in the late 1980s, the new nationalist parties that appeared in Ukraine largely returned to the agenda of the *shestydesiatnyky* . In many cases, former *shestydesiatnyky* provided the leadership of the new parties.

Furthermore, this new civic nationalism was supposedly underpinned by the social transformations of the Soviet period in Ukraine, which had resulted in the partial transcendence of the conditions identified by Kohn and others as likely to foster the growth of ethnic nationalism. In particular the period of Soviet rule in Ukraine had fostered the development of a new Ukrainian intelligentsia that, after the 1960s, provided the leadership for the new national movement.

The New Environment

Since Kohn published his original thesis in 1943, it could be argued that Eastern European societies have changed out of all recognition. Modernisation and urbanisation have worked to transcend many of the conditions identified by Kohn as the breeding-ground for ethnic nationalism. Modern Ukrainian society is better educated, and now possesses substantial 'middle strata', whom Kohn argued provided the bedrock for civic nationalist movements, and which were largely absent in 1917. Therefore, although intolerant ethnic nationalism certainly revived in Ukraine in the late 1980s amongst those organisations whose social base was amongst youth, students and unskilled workers, the most influential organisations were dominated by the civic nationalism of the new intelligentsia. Certainly, it has at least been commonplace for the intelligentsia leadership of Ukrainian nationalist groups in the modern period to argue that they have left the integral nationalism of the original OUN far behind.

However, this thesis will argue that this is only partially true. It could also be argued that Soviet rule has both effectively frozen the distinction between Western and Eastern European nationalism, which has reemerged with the collapse of communism, and has bequeathed peculiar problems of its own. Post-communist societies, although vastly different to their nineteenth century

Eastern European counterparts, nevertheless share some of the problems of the latter as discussed above. Their new 'intelligentsias' are not the same as Western European 'middle classes' (in the sense of property-owning and/or professional groups), and the new states lack a well-defined, stable social structure and the stable civil societies which in Kohn's view underpin civic conceptions of nationalism.[40] Most importantly, however, in Ukraine at least, the 'new intelligentsia' is still relatively small. Moreover, the 'new Soviet intelligentsia' consists of both a cultural elite and a technical intelligentsia. The latter are largely Russian-speaking, and often live in Eastern and Southern Ukraine. The former is thin on the ground, and is also geographically concentrated , living mainly in Kiev, Galicia and in the university towns of Central Ukraine. The cultural intelligentsia has undoubtedly provided the leadership for the Ukrainian nationalist movement in the 1990s, but its small size and limited social influence has been a key factor in limiting support for the nationalists. Lastly, it will be argued below that if a nationalist movement is dominated by the cultural intelligentsia, it will tend to emphasise the importance of language, and cultural myths and symbols, which tend to be ethnically specific.

Therefore key elements of Kohn's thesis that Eastern European national movements tend to be based on concepts of ethnicity and common blood descent, rather than broader and more inclusive civic concepts of citizenship for all inhabitants of the state may still be valid under modern conditions, or in other words the new intelligentsia's commitment to civic nationalism may be only skin-deep.

Nationalism and the intelligentsia

The predominance of the intelligentsia in many nationalist movements, particularly in 'renewal nationalisms' has often been noted. Myroslav Hroch

pointed out in his comparative study of nineteenth century nationalist movements, 'no class or social group had a stable place in the structure of the patriotic communities, sufficient to indicate that such a group had a fixed or necessary share in the national movement',[41] (the Ukrainian revival movement in nineteenth century Galicia, for example, where the local intelligentsia was tiny, was led by Uniate priests). Nevertheless, the relative preponderance of the intelligentsia has been a common factor to many 'renewal nationalisms',[42] especially in Eastern Europe, where alternative elites have been thin on the ground.

In the nineteenth century the intelligentsia was a class that was alienated from the peasant masses by the simple fact of its own education, but which saw itself as 'a "class" held together only by the bonds of "consciousness", "critical thought" or moral passion',[43] and therefore somehow separate from the rest of educated society. That is the intelligentsia was distinguished as much by its radicalism and culture of protest, as by its formal socio-economic position. In Eastern Europe the intelligentsia was able to develop its own powerful critical counter-culture because of the relative weakness of alternative middle strata to whom such an intelligentsia might have been subordinated in the West. The industrial bourgeoisie was always thin on the ground, and in the Orthodox world at least, if not in Catholic Poland or Slovakia, a strong and independent church was absent. Furthermore, in Ukraine, as in many other areas on the imperial periphery, leadership of whatever nationally-conscious elements existed in society fell to the intelligentsia by default, in the absence of an indigenous local aristocracy and state bureaucracy.

The contemporary Ukrainian intelligentsia does not of course exist in the same social milieu as its pre-1917 Tsarist counterpart, but some comparisons can nevertheless be made. The Ukrainian population in 1990 was 51.8 million, 34.8 million of whom (67%) were urban dwellers.[44] The workforce of 23.3 million was made up, according to Soviet Ukrainian classification, of 3.5

million collective farmers (15%), 13.7 million workers (*robitnyky*), or 59% of the total, and 6.1 million employees (*sluzhbovtsi*), or 26% of the workforce.[45] The latter in Soviet parlance are the 'intelligentsia'. The number of 'specialists with secondary or higher education', also used as a definition of the intelligentsia, was 7 million (30% of the workforce) in 1990.[46] In other words, superficially at least, Soviet rule has helped to create a large intelligentsia in modern Ukrainian society.

In practice, however, this new intelligentsia is something of a will-o'-the-wisp. Modern Soviet usage of the term 'intelligentsia' is more equivalent to the Western notion of white collar workers, than to the nineteenth century notion of a critical sub-culture. It would therefore include large numbers of semi-skilled employees in areas such as engineering, mechanics and medicine little different from the skilled working class as a whole. In Richard Pipes' words, 'mass education, implicit in industrialisation, has considerably blurred the sharp distinction which in pre-1890 Russia had separated the educated minority from the rest of the population, and given it its sense of cultural cohesion. Side by side, there has now emerged a considerable body of technical and administrative semi-intelligentsia dispersed through many levels of society.'[47] The Soviet Ukrainian conception of the intelligentsia therefore is obviously broader than for example Anthony Smith's definition of the intelligentsia as those 'who possess some form of further or higher education and use their educational diplomas to gain a livelihood through vocational activity, thereby disseminating and applying the paradigms created by the intellectuals'.[48]

The modern Ukrainian intelligentsia is both broader and less homogeneous than its Tsarist predecessor.[49] For the purpose of the analysis below, it will be divided into two sub-groups; the cultural and the technical intelligentsia.

The cultural intelligentsia may be defined as those whose vocational activity involves the formation, propagation and renewal of culture. Hence it

would include academics in the humanities, writers, actors and others in the arts, teachers, mass media workers in appropriate areas and in certain circumstances the clergy.[50] The distinguishing feature of such groups is that their vocation is dependent on language use (usually, but not necessarily, the indigenous language), or on national culture in the broader sense of a nationally specific myth-symbol complex. In Ukraine such group are concentrated in university towns and in Kiev, given its function as the capital city since 1934. It is they who have tended to provide the leadership for the modern nationalist movement, but their numbers are a small proportion of the 7 million quoted above. This fact should be borne in mind when later chapters demonstrate such low membership figures for the nationalist parties. Most of the nationalist parties' rank and file activists, on the other hand (except perhaps the DPU, see Chapter 5), are drawn from the ranks of the semi-skilled intelligentsia and the working class.

The technical intelligentsia, on the other hand, tends to be more prominent in the industrial centres and technical institutes of Left Bank and Eastern Ukraine. Such groups were educated in a basically Russian environment, and their vocations require the use of universal discourse. Particularly for the higher echelons of the technical intelligentsia, such as physicians, logicians and mathematicians, Ukrainian language and culture cannot function, at least not yet, as the gateway to international contacts, as Russian, or even English, has done in the past. Hence, members of the technical intelligentsia have not been prominent in the Ukrainian nationalist movement. Instead, many have supported Russophile groups (see Chapter 2).

There are many theories concerning the reasons for the intelligentsia's frequent predominance in nationalist movements. Not all of them make the above distinctions, but those which do tend to predict that the cultural rather than technical intelligentsia will occupy a leading role in such movements, by

focusing either on modernisation theory, the group interests of the intelligentsia, or on their centrality in the processes of cultural communication that are vital to the maintenance or creation of a sense of national identity.

Modernisation Theory

The process of modernisation supposedly creates rational industrial societies which require a universal conceptual currency. This in turn presupposes a state-sponsored 'monopoly of legitimate education' in order to create a homogeneous and literate society, all of whose members can communicate with each other. Whereas traditional societies were divided between an elite 'high' (and anational) culture and heterogeneous and isolated peasant sub-cultures, the making of a 'modernised' society requires the creation of an indigenous intelligentsia to assist in the development of the new mass culture.[51] The intelligentsia and the nation-state therefore become mutually dependent and supportive. Ironically, the modernisation of Ukrainian society has largely taken place under Soviet rule, which had a profoundly ambiguous effect. The universal conceptual currency in the USSR was not simply Russian. Rather, the federal structure of the state from the 1920s onwards meant that there were hundreds of such languages, even if open pressure towards Russification did become increasingly prominent.

Group Interests

An almost opposite view is that the intelligentsia's support for nationalism is due to the 'over-production' of the mass education institutions of modernisation.[52] A disappointed unemployed or underemployed intelligentsia in a modernised nation-state turns to separatist or renewal nationalisms as a path to employment in reformed state structures,[53] or simply to let off steam. A sub-type of such arguments refers specifically to colonial societies, where the metropole trains local indigenous elites for the purpose of

indirect administration of the localities, but then blocks their further upward social mobility into the heart of the metropole itself. Again this is likely to result in instrumental separatist movements.[54]

One specific form of such arguments, combining both modernisation theory and the group interest approach, has already been partially applied to Ukraine.[55] On this analysis, 1917 came too early for the nascent Ukrainian national movement, which was fatally handicapped by its lack of a modernised social structure. Ukrainians were underrepresented in the crucial urban areas, and in all the leading strata of society, which tended to be the preserve of imperially minded Russians, or Jews and Poles, whilst Ukrainian society remained rural, parochial and largely illiterate.[56]

Ironically however the industrialisation and urbanisation drives of the Soviet regime were to transform the situation. Large numbers of Ukrainians were drawn off the land and into the cities, creating indigenous majorities in all the leading sectors in society (often as early as the late 1920s, although this process was then reversed by Stalin's reactive purges of Ukrainian elites in 1929-30, 1933 and 1937-8).[57] Consequently, Ukraine developed a national intelligentsia to refine and propagate the national message (see below), plus the means for them to do so (schools, modern mass communication), as well as an appropriate audience (concentrated and increasingly literate urban populations), hence making the long-term growth of nationalism an inevitable process.

Moreover, it has been argued that the process of mobilisation did not take place in a vacuum. According to Karl Deutsch, the urbanisation of traditional agricultural societies was first expected to lead to assimilation into the dominant urban culture, but even he allowed for the possibility that the rate of influx into urban areas might swamp the system's assimilative capacity, thus having the opposite effect as the newcomers captured the urban centres for their own (modified) culture.[58]

A further reason for the failure of the new elites to assimilate, on this perspective, would be that urbanisation takes place within the confines of a 'hierarchical cultural [i.e. ethnic] division of labour'.[59] That is, the traditionally dominant urban elites, in this case Russians, maintain more than their proportionate share of high status positions, and the resulting social blockage and competition with the incomers sharpens the ethnic consciousness of the latter, and eventually produces a reactive nationalism. Furthermore, the relationship was further politicised by the central Soviet state's support for Russian language and culture. Although Ukrainian communist leaders were at times able to protect, and even promote, Ukrainian language and culture, as in the 1920s and in 1963-72 under CPU First Secretary Petro Shelest, at other times pressure towards Russification was considerable, as in the 1930s and 1940s, and under Shelest's successor, Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi in 1972-89. Large-scale Russian in-migration (there were 7.1 million Russians in the Ukrainian SSR in 1959, and 11.4 million by 1989),[60] also raised Ukrainian fears that their culture was being swamped.

As Paul Brass has pointed out, 'it is not inequality as such or relative deprivation or status discrepancies that are the critical precipitants of nationalism in ethnic groups, but the relative distribution of ethnic groups in the competition for valued resources and opportunities in the division of labour in societies'.[61] In this broader sense, Ukrainian nationalist dissent in the 1960s and 1970s was arguably fuelled by grievances (real or imagined) over employment opportunities, access to schooling and higher education, capital investment and housing.[62] Although the Soviet state's extensive control over society gave it considerable power to suppress ethnic and national conflicts, it also had the effect of politicising the distribution of such resources.

Culture and the Intelligentsia

According to Anthony Smith, 'more than a style and doctrine of politics, nationalism is a form of culture - an ideology, a language, mythology, symbolism and consciousness'.[63] Nationalism is neither specifically modern, nor uniquely primordial, rather it is rooted in the sense of cultural identity of a given *ethnie* , with a more or less continuous existence through both the pre-modern and modern eras. 'Collective cultural identity refers not to a uniformity of elements over generations, but to a sense of continuity on the part of successive generations',[64] and this sense of continuity depends on the collective historical memory nurtured through the creation a national myth-symbol complex. 'The core of ethnicity....resides in [the] quartet of myths, memories, values and symbols and in the characteristic forms or styles and genres of certain historical configurations of populations'.[65]

Hence it is the very nature of nationalism, its requirement to produce or reproduce the above-mentioned myth-symbol complex, that leads to the involvement of the intelligentsia, particularly of the cultural intelligentsia. Their job is to lead 'the process of intensifying the subjective meanings of a multiplicity of symbols and of striving to achieve multi-symbol congruence among a group of people defined initially by one or more central symbols, whether these symbols are ethnic attributes or loyalty to a particular state'.[66]

If the imperial system fails to provide the cultural intelligentsia with such a role, then it has a vested occupational interest in obtaining an indigenous nation-state. It may rise to prominence at the head of a renewal nationalism challenging the existing order, or it may be called upon by state elites to help legitimise and solidify their power through the process of building a nation upon the raw material of ethnic identities (the creation of 'multi-symbol congruence') described above.

According to the proponents of the notion of Eastern Exceptionalism, the cultural intelligentsia was always comparatively prominent in the paradigmatic Eastern European nationalist movement. Without a state

bureaucracy and civic tradition of their own (most Eastern European nations were ruled over by imperial states based on non-national principles), the cultural intelligentsia was naturally centrally involved in the more demotic 'vernacular mobilisation' route to nation-building common in the East. That is, the attempt to 'form a vertical community using cultural resources (ethno-history, language, ethnic religion, customs, etc) to mobilise other strata into an active political "nation"'.[67] This type of vernacular mobilisation would be the function of the intelligentsia either when it sought power on its own in a renewal nationalism, or when it acted as the servant of a state which lacked the resources to copy the alternative Western model of nation-building, namely 'bureaucratic incorporation'.

Any of the above analyses could be used to predict that in post-communist societies the intelligentsia is again likely to take the leading role in national movements. Moreover, an additional factor encouraging the predominance of the cultural intelligentsia in the nationalist movements of the perestroika era, not present in the nineteenth century, was the bifurcation of the Soviet state, highly centralised in political affairs, but more genuinely federal in the cultural sphere.[68] In other words, each of the *non-Russian* Republics of the USSR was blessed with its own significant cultural institutions, such as Writers' Unions and Academies of Sciences, which not surprisingly often provided the leading figures for the nationalist movements of the late 1980s. The Soviet expectation that cultural diversity would ultimately be absorbed into the homogeneous political sphere proved a serious underestimation of the importance of autonomous centres of culture formation in leading the development of national assertiveness. It was the republican cultural intelligentsias who therefore everywhere took the lead in forming nationalist opposition movements, and repeating the process of 'vernacular mobilisation' begun in the nineteenth century.

Ethnic or Civic Nationalism?

Ernest Gellner's brand of modernisation theory would predict the likelihood of civic nationalism, as modern states wish to draw the whole of their populations into the ambit of their 'universal conceptual currency'. Although Gellner predicts that this process can be sabotaged if sharp 'boundary markers' mark off one ethnic group within a given state from another,[69] such boundary markers are not particularly sharp between Ukrainians and Russians, given their close histories, languages and cultures, although the potential for them to become more salient in crisis situations must always be considered.

On Smith's analysis, however, it could be predicted that a modern intelligentsia-led nationalist movement would be as committed to some form of ethnic nationalism as its nineteenth-century counterpart, unless it could devise national myths and symbols that were specifically civic in character, although the specific circumstances of each nation's history and the nature of its own myths and symbols would also have to be taken into account. In Ukraine's case, both inclusive 'civic' myths (such as the idea of the multi-national, freedom-loving Cossacks), and exclusive 'ethnic' myths (such as that of the OUN-UPA) are available. It is therefore of profound significance that the Ukrainian intelligentsia, whilst on paper committed to civic nationalism, is so fearful for the very survival of Ukrainian language and culture after centuries of Russification, that it has chosen to promote specifically Ukrainian myths and symbols.

It would also be expected that the intelligentsia would be inclined towards ethnic nationalism if their primary motivation was to overcome a 'cultural [i.e. ethnic] division of labour'. The politicisation of ethnic differences would be the best way to displace members of a rival ethnic group from desired positions.

The State

The above analysis will not be complete without considering the other main group in modern Ukrainian society, namely national communists or former *apparatchiki* . If the social and political influence of the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia is limited, this is because most of Ukrainian society continues to be dominated by the servants of the *ancien regime* . In order to understand the clear constraints to the appeal of nationalism in Ukraine it is necessary to examine the role of this group.

As argued at the start of this section, 'on their own...opposition [i.e. here intelligentsia] elites were largely powerless: they lacked concrete resources and their demands, mostly regarding language, culture and the environment, would have remained only symbolic without the active backing of resource-endowed actors' (i.e. state elites).[70] Moreover, the communist (and even post-communist) state was vastly more powerful than its nineteenth century counterpart, and much less tolerant of rival centres of power, making anti-state collective action extremely difficult.[71]

One key component of the thesis of 'Eastern exceptionalism' was the idea that in Western Europe nations tended to form the state from below, whereas in Eastern Europe the reverse situation, with the state (in the post-imperial phase) forming the nation from above, tended to be more prevalent. This is of course only an ideal-type distinction. It was the French Third Republican state which turned 'peasants into Frenchmen'. According to Kohn, this was the result of the relative social vacuum in Eastern Europe, and the lack of strong intermediary groups between the individual and the state. In this respect, little has changed in post-communist Eastern Europe, which is once again characterised by comparatively weak civil societies.[72] Moreover, in Ukraine, inherited regional differences make the formation of a nationalist movement from below highly problematical. In August 1992, for example, the leading Ukrainian nationalist leader Mykhailo Horyn' could admit the existence of 'a

paradoxical situation in Ukraine, when it is not the nation that is building the state, but the state which, having been established on ethnic territory during the time of the nation's emergence, is [now] assisting her consolidation'.[73]

Therefore, the intelligentsia may be perfectly conscious of its weakness, and explicit about seeking an alliance with state elites. Moreover, many Ukrainian nationalists are anxious to avoid repeating the errors of 1917-20 when no attempt was made to win over local imperial elites to the national cause. In August 1992, another leading nationalist, Larysa Skoryk, quoted the leading Ukrainian conservative philosopher, V"iacheslav Lypyns'kyi, to assert that Ukrainian independence could only be achieved by 'the creation of a new unified Ukrainian ruling elite composed of...the separatist part of the old local ruling elite [i.e. national communists]...and the new active leaders who emerged from the popular mass' [i.e. the cultural intelligentsia].[74]

One crucial difference between the late 1980s and 1917, however, was that the modern Ukrainian intelligentsia now had a potential ally in the state elites of the Ukrainian SSR (Ukrainian state institutions had simply not existed in 1917, and the dominant social elites, as argued above, were imperially-minded). Therefore, the Ukrainian nationalist movement began in 1987-90 as a typical 'renewal nationalism'. Such movements 'usually start outside the main centres of power, and if allied to social discontent, are directed against the incumbent ruler or regime',[75] because their 'policies of concessions and privileges for foreigners have brought a paralysis of the collective will and a loss of communal purpose and integrity.'...that 'can only be remedied by the infusion of a new spirit and moral purpose into the "body politic" and the society, involving its modernisation and reintegration through sweeping changes.'[76] The nationalist movement was then able to expand its influence significantly in 1990-91 as the result of an alliance with Ukrainian state elites.

Fortunately for Ukrainian nationalists, the Soviet federal state had a built-in tendency towards generating nationalism amongst such elites. In the USSR

before perestroika, the central state always found it difficult to exercise control over peripheral regions, to which it would periodically have to grant more autonomy (as in the 1920s, or under Khrushchev). Although such a devolution of power was never permanent (once local communist elites or opposition dissidents in the periphery overplayed their hand, the centre would complete the cycle by reasserting control), the fact that it was a recurrent phenomenon indicated that it was a long-term effect of the manner in which the Soviet state was constructed (see below) and the practical difficulties of exercising highly centralised control in such a vast empire.

The crucial aspect of the perestroika period therefore was the extent to which Gorbachev's reforms and his struggle to assert his own power, the decline of the communist party, and economic collapse had weakened the centre so that the normal recentralisation phase was no longer possible when it was attempted in August 1991. It was the effective implosion of central imperial authority in 1990-91, a process ironically completed by the failure of the attempted coup, that allowed effective nationalist movements to organise in the periphery, and ultimately to triumph in late 1991 by allowing (or even compelling) local state elites to make common cause with them.

National Communism

As well as having the power to block or facilitate the emergence of nationalist opposition movements then, the Soviet state also tended to foster a kind of nationalism <u>within</u> official federal structures. Moreover, in many republics, especially Ukraine, the alliance between 'national communists' in the state and opposition groups was the crucial factor in the eventual triumph of the national movement.

The origins of the term 'national communism' lie in the Austro-Marxism of Karl Renner and Otto Bauer, whose arguments were first utilised by

Ukrainian communist leaders of the 1920s, such as Mykola Skrypnyk and Mykola Khvyl'ovyi.[77] They argued that it was not only possible, but desirable to build communism within a national framework. For them a future communist utopia would not be premised on the 'withering away' of national differences as in official Soviet doctrine, but rather would be enriched by diverse national cultures and peculiarities. National communism for them also meant the Ukrainianisation (*korenisatsiia*)[78] of the Ukrainian SSR, and their empowerment as a specifically national communist elite.

As belief in the 'higher stage of communism' has itself long since withered away, the term 'national communism' is here used to denote members of the communist party who primarily seek to achieve their goals, whatever they may be, within the confines of a given nation-state. 'National' is here adjectival: such men may or may not be nationalists, in the sense of their primary political value being that of the nation and its interests. However, a nation-state has to exist, be defended, or created for them to pursue their goals. That is, in the nation-building period they objectively function as nationalists as they must support the creation of state structures as the vehicle for their ambitions. This required that, in addition to the disappearance of communism as an ideology, that the myths and symbols of the imperial state also should lose their attraction. Once Gorbachev had completed this process by 1990-91, national communism was in many ways the only option for local elites.

The federal structure of the Soviet state certainly promoted the Ukrainianisation of the state elite in Ukraine, dramatically transforming the situation in 1917, when the Ukrainian national movement had had few leaders and virtually no influence in Ukrainian urban centres or in the local imperial administration. The process was begun first in the 1920s, and then, after the wholesale purges under Stalin, renewed after the first post-Stalin (the 18th) Congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU)[79] in 1954. After the appointment of Oleksii Kyrychenko as First Secretary of the CPU in June 1953,

the First Secretary would always be a Ukrainian, as would a majority of leading figures in the party and the state apparatus (the Second Secretary of the CPU, responsible for cadre appointments, was also an ethnic Ukrainian until 1976, unlike many other republics, where this sensitive post was always reserved for Russians). The percentage of Ukrainians in the CPU, only 23% in 1922, rose and stabilised to around two thirds by the 1960s (although still less than the Ukrainian share of the population of the republic, - 73% in 1989), as shown in Table 1.3 below.

Table 1.3: Percentage of Ukrainians in the CPU.[80]

1920	23%
1922	23%
1927	52%
1933	60%
1937	57%
1940	63%
1950	59%
1960	62%
1971	65%
1980	66%
1988	67%
1990	67%

Table 1.4 shows the rate of growth of the Ukrainian party over the same period. In the 1920s and in the post-Stalin period, this was faster than that of the CPSU as a whole, reflecting the same desire to attract Ukrainians into the party.

Table 1.4: Growth of the CPU.[81]

1918	4,301
1922	73,804
1933	555,433
1936	241,330
1940	505,706
1945	164,743
1954	795,559
1959	1,159,207
1966	1,961,408
1971	2.378,789
1976	2,625,808
1981	2,933,564
1986	3,188,854
1989	3,302,221
1990	3,294,038
1991	2,500,000[82]

According to Bohdan Krawchenko; 'The [1954] congress marked a turning point in the history of Ukraine. It saw the emergence of a new Ukrainian political elite.'[83] The national communism of the early 1990s therefore did not appear from nowhere. It was the product of a long incubation period during which the post-1917 modernisation of the Ukrainian social structure had resulted in the local state structures being captured for national communism from within.

Whereas Krawchenko argues that the emergence of national communism was the product of socio-economic change, the Director of the Soviet Institute

of Ethnography, Valerii Tishkov, argues that it was the result of the institutional structure of the Soviet state. The fatal flaw in the Soviet state was the system of federal institutions established in the 1920s, which gave free rein to the ambitions of such Union-Republican elites, and, by promoting their national communism, proved to be the key factor leading to the dissolution of the USSR.[84] Tishkov interprets nationalism entirely subjectively as an alien doctrine imported from Western Europe, and then manipulated by local elites to secure their path to power, quoting Ernest Gellner in support of the notion that all nations are more or less 'invented', and that all nationalisms therefore subjectively politicise otherwise neutral social relations.[85]

However, although it is possible to accept Tishkov's point that the Soviet federal state was a natural breeding ground for national communism,[86] short-term political and economic factors must also be considered. National communism was as much a product of the crisis of the late 1980s as it was of political institutions or of long term socio-economic change. The circumstances of the late 1980s were radically different from previous national communist eras. The federal system in itself was not enough to produce secessionist sentiment amongst local elites. That also required the unique circumstances of the Gorbachev period, and the way in which imperial myths and symbols were so totally discredited.

The leaders of the Soviet Union's constituent republics were in the same invidious position as all satrap elites in an empire. Required to administer the locality on behalf of the centre, they were nevertheless trapped in an ambiguous role, as a two-way channel for the influence of the centre on the locality and vice-versa. Hence, all too frequently, the original design of the state is often reversed, and the proconsuls come to represent the interests of the periphery against the centre rather than the opposite.[87]

The Soviet federal system established in the 1920s attempted to overcome this traditional problem with local elites through the highly centralised nature

of the state structure as a whole and the communist party that inhabited it at every level, and by attempting to construct a viable imperial ideology.[88] Some analysts have stressed the near-total powerlessness of republican elites in such a situation.[89] They would point out that although in theory the federal system ceded impressive powers to the localities, in practice sovereignty was not granted to the nationalities themselves, but to the 'national working classes' whose unitary interests were represented by the highly centralised communist party, thus preventing the exercise of republican autonomy in any manner which conflicted with the interests of the centre. Moreover the imperial centre's apparent monopoly control over the distribution of material and political resources, ensured that republican elites simply lacked the capacity for independent political action.

However, except under the high Stalinist period, republican leaderships were never simply 'transmission belts' for the passive implementation of the *diktat* of a totalitarian centre. They possessed substantial political resources of their own in terms of their control over local populations. As a mobilisational state, the Soviet Union needed assistance in mobilisation.[90] Despite the state's totalitarian reputation, its capacity to reach into every nook and cranny of social life ('penetration') and to secure the active rather than passive support of the population ('participation') was always limited, if admittedly extensive in comparison with other states. [91]

Republican elites were key intermediaries in both these respects. Hence they were never pure vassals, but political actors with significant control over resources. If anything, such control was strengthened by Brezhnev's policy of maintaining 'stability of cadres', which led to significant economic and political fiefdoms slipping out of the centre's control, and the creation of dense local networks for corruption and the exchange of favours. Moreover, the federal system and the *korenisatsiia* principle tended to over-represent Union-Republican elites at the expense of other local minorities.[92]

The Gorbachev reforms, and the declining powers of the imperial centre in the late 1980s both increased the resources at the disposal of local elites and tilted the balance towards deploying such resources with the interests of the locality rather than the centre in mind. The early perestroika period (1985-89), admittedly, had much in common with earlier periods of partial decentralisation. The balance of costs and benefits facing republican leaders in 1985-9 still inclined them towards loyalty to the centre. It was still conceivable that Moscow would recentralise at any moment, as it had done in the past.

However, in 1990-91 local elites were more or less compelled to cut loose in the direction of national communism by the surprising, but nevertheless total, failure of the centre in all areas where local elites might be expected to feel the tug of attraction towards the imperial state (see Chapter 2). Most important of all in this respect, was Moscow's repeated failure to deliver either significant economic improvement or reform. The combination of this implosion of the imperial centre with the republican elections of March 1990, which forced local elites to pay more attention to cultivating their links with their local constituencies than with the centre, strongly encouraged the development of national communism.

Satrap elites, however, cannot 'invent' local nationalisms. They must have some prior material on which to build. In other words, national communists are dependent on national intelligentsias to furnish the cultural foundation on which their state-building project might rest. Therefore, when national communists began to break away from Moscow in 1990-91, they were more or less forced to make common cause with their local cultural intelligentsia, and its nationalist agenda.

In Ukraine, once the national communists joined forces with the intelligentsia-led opposition in mid-1991, the situation was transformed. The national communists controlled vast areas of Ukrainian economic and social life that the opposition was unable to reach, particularly in small towns and in

the countryside. Together with a mass media blitz in favour of Ukrainian independence, the national communists secured a level of support in the 1 December 1991 referendum that the former opposition alone could never have achieved. The March 1990 elections, and the March 1991 referendum on the future of the USSR, when the opposition called for a vote against Gorbachev's question (see Chapter 2) had shown that the opposition was unable to increase its support from around the level of 25-33% of the electorate.[93] Once the national communists also began to promote the national message, however, opinion polls in Autumn 1991 showed a steadily rising response to the authorities' propaganda campaign,[94] before a final 'Yes' vote to Ukrainian independence of 90.3% on 1 December.

As the leader of the main nationalist party, the Ukrainian Republican Party, Levko Luk"ianenko, was prepared to admit at the party's third Congress in May 1992, 'the glittering victory of 92% [sic] of the votes [in the December 1991 referendum] became possible only because both nationalists and communists agitated for independence'.[95]

The most important conclusion of the above analysis, however, is that the national communists committed themselves to the nationalist cause for their own reasons. They remained former satraps. If any of the past attractions of the imperial centre were to be revived, then their support for local nationalism would start to waver. Unlike the Baltic states or Transcaucasia, the Ukrainian nationalists were too weak to take power on their own, and would not therefore be well-placed to prevent the national communists backsliding.

Conclusion

Once they were securely in power in Ukraine after August 1991, the national communists had an agenda, but not an ideology of their own. They wished to take power over their own society, but had to clothe such self-interest in the

language of nationalism. Hence although the nationalist political parties were not yet formally in power, the national communists were parasitic on their ideology and their programme. This was increasingly true as President Leonid Kravchuk and his government began to take aggressive state-building measures from September 1991 onwards.[96] The nationalist parties tended both to prepare the programmes for such measures, and then to maintain pressure on the authorities to ensure their implementation. Moreover, although the national communists to a certain extent enjoyed the benefits of submerging themselves in an amorphous and anonymous 'party of power', it became increasingly clear that they had a vested interest in supporting the nationalist parties as a potential future power base.

In 1991-92 then, Ukrainian politics was dominated by the tactical alliance between the nationalists proper and the national communists. Superficially, both remained committed to civic nationalism, which helped to maintain internal stability and external peace. The nationalists were not yet in power themselves. Ukraine remained a bi-ethnic state, and Ukraine's national communist leaders remained cautious about committing themselves wholeheartedly to the nationalist cause, fearing that this could jeopardise inter-ethnic harmony.

However, the logic of the state-building process means that national communists tend to be parasitic on the ideology of 'renewal nationalism', and there is nothing to stop them making demagogic appeals to their ethnic brethren if they come to think that this would provide them with a stronger basis of support. In other words, as with the intelligentsia, the civic nationalism of Ukraine's national communists has yet to be tested in crisis conditions.

The rest of this work will seek to develop further the main issues raised in this introductory Chapter, in particular the nature of modern Ukrainian nationalism, and the manner of its influence on the state (this is not a work about national communism). Chapter 2 will trace the development of Ukrainian political parties in the period 1987-92, and examine their general characteristics, before later chapters move on to a discussion of the nationalist parties.

2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARTY POLITICS IN UKRAINE, 1988-92

Introduction

Although Gorbachev came to power in 1985, the beginnings of independent political activity in Ukraine were delayed until 1987-88, as the First Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) since 1972, Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi, largely succeeded in maintaining a Brezhnevite autocracy until his departure in September 1989. Thereafter, although the CPU progressively ceded ground, it always enjoyed a comparative advantage over any potential rivals because of its control of material and institutional resources. A period of more open party competition was ushered in by the banning of the CPU in the aftermath of the failure of the August 1991 coup (on 30 August), but it would be a mistake to assume that a fully fledged civil society was also created in this period. Rather, Ukrainian political parties remained in many respects underdeveloped and loosely organised.

Therefore, the five years from 1987-92 will be divided into the following four periods (all of which overlap to a degree);

1) Communist party monopoly, 1987-89. The communist party largely retained its monopoly over public political activity. As in the 1960s, opposition activists were able to form discussion circles and propaganda groups, but not political parties.

2) Dominant or 'Hegemonic' party system, late 1989 -August 1991. The CPU surrendered its constitutional monopoly; opposition groups were allowed to contest the March 1990 republican elections under clear constraints and subsequently gain a foothold in state political institutions; and from summer 1990 onwards it was finally possible to

form non-communist parties. However, the CPU remained 'first among equals'.

3) Atomised pluralism, 1991-2. It was clear even before the attempted coup in August 1991 that party formation in Ukraine was hindered by the underdevelopment of civil society and the difficulty of building national parties to bridge the gap between Ukraine's diverse regions. The parties' weaknesses were then given sharper focus in the vacuum following the banning of the CPU, as the new political parties struggled to influence the political process.

4) Political realignment and polarised pluralism, 1992. Party blocks were created, giving clearer focus to the party struggle, and enmeshing the parties more closely into the political system. *Rukh* itself sought to turn itself into a political party in December 1992.

Communist party monopoly, 1987-89

The Soviet Union up to 1989 has often been described as a 'one party system'. However, as Sartori points out, a 'party' is normally also some part, and only a part, of a broader whole, whereas in a 'one party system' the 'single party can be said to be a duplication of the state'.[1] Although the duplication is never exact, the 'party' is no longer only a part of the system, but displays characteristics of 'wholism', that is it seeks to substitute itself for the system as a whole. What results is not so much a ruling party as the 'party-as-a-system' or a ruling 'party-state nexus'.[2]

In such circumstances, the party-state's relations with other would-be parties can be of two types. Firstly, they can be 'destructive', that is the party-state uses maximum levels of coercion to prevent groups associating together even at the very margins of political life. This Sartori (rather strangely reintroducing the term 'party') classifies as

'totalitarian unipartism'. Secondly, the party-state may be 'exclusionary', that is small groups may be allowed to form at the margin, but the party-state vigorously polices a sharply delineated boundary totally excluding such groups from participation in public political life. For Sartori, this is 'authoritarian unipartism'.[3] In practice, it is possible for the party-state to swing from one mode to the other.

The post-war Ukrainian party-state was a clear example of totalitarian unipartism. That is, the CPU's attitude towards actual and potential rivals was nearly always 'destructive' rather than 'exclusionary'.[4]

Nevertheless, underground or semi-public groups, even if they all met the same fate, were a recurrent feature of the post-war period. In the late 1940s and early 1950s the CPU had to face a long drawn-out struggle to suppress the insurrection of the nationalist OUN-UPA in Western Ukraine (see Chapter 1). After a lull in the mid-1950s, smaller dissident groups began to reappear. Some, such as the Ukrainian National Front (UNF) in the 1960s were consciously descended from the UPA, others such as the Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union (UWPU), led by Levko Luk"ianenko and Ivan Kandyba, active in Galicia in 1958-61, were committed to constitutional and peaceful methods of activity (all of the groups mentioned here are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3).[5] Although both the UNF and UWPU were suppressed, the 1960s also produced a new generation of dissidents, known as the *shestydesiatnyky* ('generation of the 60s'). Although never an organised movement as such, they represented a much broader climate of opinion than the activists of the UNF and UWPU. Most of the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia sympathised with the movement to promote national cultural and linguistic revival, more or less tolerated by the CPU leader from 1963 to 1972, Petro Shelest, but the movement petered out after Shelest's replacement by Shcherbyts'kyi and the mass arrests of 1972-3.[6]

The most important dissident group of the pre-perestroika era was the Ukrainian Helsinki Group (UHG), established in November 1976 (see Chapter 3). Like the other Helsinki watch groups elsewhere in the USSR it acted openly, although more as an organisation to publicise the regime's violations of the rule of law than as a political party.

Despite a period of relative tolerance under Shelest, however, the party-state remained committed to the defence of 'totalitarian unipartism'. All the above groups were coerced out of existence. The UWPU's leaders were arrested in 1961, the UNF's in the late 1960s. The *shestydesiatnyky* were eventually silenced by two arrest waves in 1965-6 and a much larger round-up in 1972-3. The UHG was effectively out of action by 1980-1 (23 of its 37 declared members were eventually imprisoned, and 6 forced into exile. See Chapter 3). In other words, the party-state not only zealously defended its monopoly of public political life, but was prepared to use sufficient levels of coercion to prevent the formation of groups capable of collective action against the state, or at least to quickly strangle them at birth.[7]

In many respects the 1987-9 period had much in common with the 1960s. After the lull of the early 1980s, the first signs of dissent began to reemerge in Ukraine towards the end of 1987 (rather later than in the rest of the Soviet Union given the extreme conservatism of Shcherbyts'kyi's period in office). The first opposition organisation proper to be formed was the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), a conscious revival of the UHG, in spring 1988. Although the UHU's members were continually harassed and prevented from assembling (see Chapter 3), the CPU, mainly in deference to the new climate in Moscow, had moved from 'totalitarian unipartism' to 'authoritarian unipartism', as it now sought only to 'exclude' groups such as the UHU, that is

prevent them from engaging in open political activity, rather than to destroy them, so long as they avoided labelling themselves as political parties and did not challenge the party-state's constitutional monopoly right to rule. However, the UHU always *de facto* saw itself as a political party in embryo, and constantly strove to escape from the limitations placed on it by the CPU. Moreover, as the proponents of *perestroika* (in Moscow at least) began to place more emphasis on developing a rule of law, it became progressively more difficult for the CPU to coerce the UHU and similar groups, and the UHU gradually evolved into a proto-party.

Other similar, but more radical groups, such as the Ukrainian People's Democratic League, set up in Kiev in June 1989, the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Front established in November 1988, and the underground Ukrainian National Party that held its first congress in secret in L'viv in October 1989, were also in practice functioning as opposition parties by 1989 (see Chapter 6 for the UPDL and UNP, and Chapter 7 for the UCDF).

A second type of proto-party that appeared in this period were the many 'informal' groups that were established in 1987-8. They could function as safe havens for the opposition-minded so long as they followed self-limiting precepts confining them to 'apolitical' areas. Examples included cultural 'discussion groups' such as the Ukrainian Culturological (or Culture and Ecology) Club set up in Kiev in August 1987,[8] and the *Tovarystvo leva* ('The Lion society', after the city's symbol) in L'viv in October 1987.[9] A Ukrainian Association of Independent Creative Intelligentsia, including V"iacheslav Chornovil and Mykola Rudenko of the UHG, was formed in October 1987.[10] A student group *Hromada* (named after the nineteenth century Ukrainian patriotic groups) appeared in Kiev in the spring of 1988.[11] A Committee

in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church emerged in Galicia in early 1988 under Ivan Hel', whose roots went back to a similar group set up in 1982.[12] All such groups had miniscule memberships, but they served to incubate a new generation of opposition activists, alongside the elder generation which reemerged from the camps in 1987-8.

A third form of proto-party that began to emerge generally at a later stage in 1987-9 were much larger 'front' organisations, which tended to be hybrid organisations uneasily straddling the official and growing unofficial worlds, although they tended increasingly to adopt the latter's values, as the authorities' ability to direct their activities slowly weakened. Their initial leadership tended to come from the establishment intelligentsia, which was for the authorities a more acceptable alternative to the ex-political prisoners prominent in the UHU, but, as even the official intelligentsia was beginning to feel the pull of nationalism from late 1988 onwards, the 'fronts' soon became bulwarks of nationalism.

The first such 'front' was the *Zelenyi svit* (Green World) ecological association, set up under the auspices of the CPU controlled Ukrainian Peace Committee in December 1987, but soon slipping out of its control.[13] In January 1988 the radical writer Serhii Plachynda (later the leader of the Ukrainian Peasants' Democratic Party - see Chapter 7) was elected the first President of *Zelenyi svit* , and the association held its first conference in March 1988 in Kiev. Another writer Yurii Shcherbak had replaced Plachynda by the time of *Zelenyi svit's* first national conference in October 1989. By then the association had grown rapidly, mainly because the 1985 Chornobyl' disaster had sparked off a genuinely popular mass movement of ecological protest that the authorities could not contain, but also because *Zelenyi svit* functioned as a flag of convenience, providing an unnatural political home for activists such as

Anatolii Lupynis, later a member of the ultra-nationalist Ukrainian National Assembly.

The second main 'front' organisation in this period was the Taras Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society (ULS), allowed to hold its first congress more or less with official blessing in February 1989. The ULS had grown out of the unofficial *Ridna mova* (native language) society that had grown up in Galicia in 1988-9,[14] but its inaugural congress was also supported by the Institutes of Philology and Literature.[15] Its first head was therefore the poet Dmytro Pavlychko, at the time still an establishment CPU figure capable of commanding the confidence of the authorities. However, the ULS's rank-and-file membership, estimated at 70,000 in mid-1989,[16] was more radical and would form the activist core for later organisations such as *Rukh* and the Republican and Democratic parties.[17]

Finally there was also the Ukrainian branch of the all-Union *Memorial* society set up in March 1989. It gained official support from the Ukrainian Cultural Fund as part of the official campaign to uncover the 'blank spots' in Ukrainian history, but its main sponsors were the Kiev cultural intelligentsia, including groups from the Cinematographers', Theatre Workers', and Architects' Unions.[18] The head of the Theatre Workers' Union and future people's deputy, Les' Taniuk, became the first leader of the Ukrainian *Memorial* .

The CPU however prevented the above groups from combining their forces. It was as yet impossible to form a 'Popular Front' similar to those in existence by the summer of 1988 in the Baltic Republics. A campaign of mass meetings reportedly attended by 20,000 to 50,000 people in L'viv in June and July 1988 attempted to force the authorities to concede the creation of a Popular Front, while a similar demonstration in Kiev attracted some 500 people.[19] However, the authorities, although initially

hesitant in L'viv, cracked down with the OMON militia and demonstrations largely ceased with the onset of winter.

Hence, although at the beginning of the 1987-9 period, the CPU was capable of 'destroying' its political opponents, it increasingly had to be content with only 'exclusion' as its powers began to wane, and as the unfolding *perestroika* programme narrowed the limits of permissible coercion (little is yet known about the relationship between CPSU and CPU elites in this period). At the end of the period, although fully fledged political parties had not yet developed, the CPU was attempting to defend its monopoly control of the public political arena against increasingly assertive opposition groups growing in both size and number. 'Exclusion' was becoming more and more difficult. The next period would be marked by both the transformation of opposition proto-parties into political parties proper, and by their break-out from the artificial 'apolitical' area in which the CPU had attempted to confine them.

Hegemonic party system, late 1989 -August 1991

The period from late 1989 until the failed coup attempt in Moscow in August 1991 can best be described as a 'hegemonic party system'. The CPU was no longer capable of maintaining either 'totalitarian unipartism' or 'authoritarian unipartism'. However it remained first among equals. To return to Sartori's typology, a 'hegemonic party system' is a two-tier system, where there is one set of rules for the governing party and another for those in opposition.[20] The governing party still enjoyed a comparative political advantage because of its control over the economic, coercive and communicative resources of the

state, whereas its potential competitor parties remained starved of resources. Moreover, although Ukraine rapidly developed a formal multi-party system from spring 1990 onwards, opposition political parties remained in many respects underdeveloped, and not only because of their lack of material and communicative resources. Parties were weakly 'institutionalised', in terms of factors such as the degree of development of the parties' bureaucratic structures, the degree of cohesion within and amongst the various branches of the party, and so on.[21]

This period begins with the first congress of the Ukrainian Popular Movement (originally, the Ukrainian Popular Movement for *Perestroika*) or just *Rukh* (the Ukrainian for 'movement') in September 1989, and the CPU's surrender of its constitutional monopoly to rule (although the Ukrainian 'Article 6' was not formally removed from the Soviet Ukrainian constitution until October 1990, *after* the March 1990 elections). Although *Rukh* and other political associations were able to work behind the scenes in the campaign, they were not able to participate directly (although *Rukh* was the main force behind the Democratic Bloc set up to contest the elections in November 1989). The process of party formation did not therefore receive the boost that could have been expected from participation in a fully free and open election campaign, and this also reduced the influence that the new parties could exercise in the Ukrainian Parliament (the Supreme Council, or *Verkhovna rada*) .

The history of *Rukh* is described in Chapter 4. Originally it was deliberately conceived as a non-party organisation, an umbrella movement that would unite three main groups; communist reformers, 'general democrats' and nationalists. In its formative period, in the run-

up to its first congress in September 1989, *Rukh* remained subject to a strong element of control from above and many of its members came from the CPU. In this period, *Rukh* saw its role as a ginger group to maintain the pressure for reform, but increasingly it assumed the role of a counterweight to the CPU in the absence of genuine political pluralism. *Rukh* was therefore the main organising force behind the Democratic Bloc that opposed the CPU at the March 1990 republican elections in Ukraine, winning approximately 25% of the 450 seats. This Bloc in turn then became the basis of the opposition faction in the Ukrainian parliament, the *Narodna rada* (People's Council) that, including the old Democratic Platform of the CPU, claimed the support of 125 people's deputies by June 1990.[22]

Between September 1989 and the movement's second congress in October 1990, however, *Rukh* increasingly fell under the control of the third, that is nationalist, element. Hence *Rukh* found it increasingly difficult to perform its new role as a coordinating body for the new political parties that had emerged in the inter-congress period. Non-nationalist parties shunned it, and even with the nationalist parties the putative relationship was reversed. Instead of *Rukh* directing the nationalist parties, the parties came to impose their priorities and their squabbles on *Rukh* , resulting in a debilitating factionalism.

While *Rukh* sought to act as an umbrella movement, political parties proper also began to develop from mid-1990 onwards.[23] This, again, was relatively late, as the CPU had continued to obstruct the process of formal party formation before the March 1990 republican elections. Despite a promise made by the then Ideology Secretary of the CPU Leonid Kravchuk to the first congress of *Rukh* in September 1989, *Rukh* and other organisations such as *Zelenyi svit* were prevented

from putting forward candidates to the elections.[24] Hence it was only once the elections were over that the process of party formation began in earnest, once the CPU could no longer hold back the tide. The simultaneous moves emanating from Moscow to abandon Article 6 of the USSR constitution (which enshrined the communist party's formal monopoly on power) only gave formal recognition to this process.

In other words, the CPU remained a hegemonic party. It conceded an arena to Ukraine's many proto-parties to formally organise themselves, but it continued to try to exclude them from the centre of political life. The party-state continued to obstruct the process of party formation by insisting until September 1991, in the aftermath of the failed coup, that a would-be party required 3,000 members spread throughout a majority of Ukraine's 25 oblasts in order to receive official registration (in September the requirement was lowered to 300, by which time only five parties had met the targets). Although coercion was now used more sparingly against the CPU's opponents (though they were still harassed where necessary, see the arrest of Stepan Khmara in Chapter 3, and that of UIA activists in Chapter 6), the CPU continued to enjoy monopoly access to the means of communication and the economic resources of the party-state.

The party spectrum - right and centre parties

Nevertheless, most of Ukraine's proto-parties formalised their existence as political parties proper in this period. It is of course difficult to classify post-communist political parties along a traditional left-right spectrum, as 'rightists' may well be radical reformers, and 'leftists' conservatives, nostalgics or even reactionaries. With such a proviso,

however, nationalists will regarded as being on the right, and neo-communists on the left.

The Right

The main new parties were, on the nationalist right, the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP), which was formed on the basis of the UHU at an inaugural congress in April 1990 (see Chapter 3). The URP was led by many of Ukraine's numerous ex-political prisoners, and throughout the period of study remained the best organised and best resourced nationalist party.

The other main nationalist party was the Democratic Party of Ukraine (DPU), which held its founding congress in December 1990 (see Chapter 5). This was the party of the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia. Initially it posed as a party of the centre, but by the time the party held its inaugural congress the centre-ground was already crowded, and the DPU soon found its natural home on the right. By 1992, it was contemplating merger with the URP. Both the URP and DPU drew their main strength from Western Ukraine, but also had strong centres of support in the urban centres of Central (Right and Left Bank) Ukraine (for Ukraine's regions, see Chapter 1). The URP has 11 deputies in the Supreme Council, and the DPU 23 (plus 17 'supporters').

The URP and DPU had many satellite parties with similar political programmes. Two nationalist parties that failed to live up to their early promise were the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Party (UCDP) formed on the basis of the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Front in April 1990, and the Ukrainian Peasants' Democratic Party (UPDP) established in June 1990 to campaign for the rebirth of the Ukrainian village. Both are discussed, along with a splinter group from the URP, the Ukrainian Conservative Republican Party (UCRP) set up by Stepan Khmara in June

1992, in Chapter 7. The UPDP has one deputy (Dmytro Chobit), and the UCRP one (Khmara).

Although the DPU and URP remained the two strongest nationalist parties throughout this period, they were always challenged by a variety of extreme nationalist parties to their right. Ukraine's many ultra-right groups tended to be quarrelsome and fissiparous, but helped to pull the URP and DPU (and the political system in general) to the right as the orthodox nationalist parties could not risk being outflanked on the right. The main characteristic of the Ukrainian ultra-right before August 1991 was their refusal to accept the institutions of the Ukrainian SSR as legitimate, and their consequent advocacy of boycott tactics. After August 1991, they swung to the other extreme, and advocated the building of a strong corporate state and/or a more ethnically exclusive nationalism. The main such group was the Ukrainian Inter-party Assembly (UIA), formed in June 1990 as a coalition of radical groups, and transformed in September 1991 into the Ukrainian National Assembly (UNA) - see Chapter 6. The UNA's goal was the building of a mighty nation-state, in alliance with national communists if necessary, whereas the other main far right group, the Union for Ukrainian Statehood and Independence (in Ukrainian DSU), based itself on the traditional ethnic nationalism and anti-communism of the OUN. It is discussed in Chapter 7, along with some smaller right wing groups and the main émigré nationalist group, the OUN-r, which has operated in Ukraine through the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists (KUN) since March 1992. The UNA has no deputies, as it was only formed in 1991, but the DSU has one (its leader after December 1992, Volodymyr Shlemko).

The Centre

Although non-nationalist groups lie outside of this study, a short explanation of their history is necessary in order to fully understand the limitations on the influence of the nationalist camp.

The political centre in Ukraine is occupied by the Green Party of Ukraine (GPU) founded by members of *Zelenyi svit* in September 1990;[25] two Social Democratic parties, the Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (SDPU) and the United Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (USDPU), formed as a result of a split at the social democrats' founding congress in May 1990;[26] and by the Party of Democratic Revival of the Ukraine (PDRU). A Liberal Party of Ukraine, claiming to represent the new business class, was formed in August 1991.[27]

The early history of *Zelenyi svit* was described above. The GPU has no deputies of its own in the Supreme Council (as it was prevented from putting forward candidates in March 1990), although the second congress of *Zelenyi svit* in March 1991 was attended by three sympathetic deputies; - Mykhailo Holubets' from Ivano-Frankivs'k, Taras Nahulko from Khmel'nyts'kyi and Yurii Kostenko from Kiev[28] (Kostenko, supported by the GPU and *Rukh* , became Minister for the Environment in October 1992). Thanks to its Chornobyl' campaigns, however, it has consistently enjoyed high levels of public support. As a party, however, it has suffered from its decentralised structure, and there were signs that it was slipping out of public view in 1992.

The two social democratic parties are small. Their membership consists mainly of centrist and leftist intellectuals, while their links with organised labour are undeveloped. The SDPU is more centrist. It bases it s conception of social democracy on the ideas of social partnership developed by the post-Bad Godesberg German SPD, and the party supports the idea of a Ukrainian nation-state. The leftist USDPU on the

other hand took its brand of social democracy from the Second International, and sees itself as more 'int ernationalist'. It is consequently less willing to repudiate all aspects of the Soviet past. The USDPU has one deputy, Volodymyr Moskovska from Kharkiv, and the SDPU two, Yurii Zbitnev from Kiev and Oleksandr Suhoniako from Zhytomyr. The SDPU proposed reunification to the USDPU, after Zbitnev replaced Suhoniako as leader in mid-1992.

The most important centrist party, however, was the PDRU, formed in December 1990 on the basis of the old Democratic Platform of the CPU. The PDRU was supported by both the Ukrainian liberal intelligentsia and the Eastern Ukrainian Russophone technical intelligentsia. In 1990-92 the PDRU was the only party with a mass base in the urban centres of Eastern Ukraine, where it was better able to represent generalised urban discontent, than *Rukh* or the nationalist parties.[29] In 1992, however, other parties began to emerge in Donets'k (see below), and the PDRU's main power base is now in Kharkiv, which has a more modern industrial base than the Donbas, which is dominated by heavy industry and a cruder form of left wing populism.[30]

The PDRU tends to take a radical line on questions of decommunisation or economic reform, but is also a strong supporter of the rights of Ukraine's Russophone population. The PDRU controls a faction of 36 in the Supreme Council, including 20 members of the party and sixteen supporters, (18 of the 36 were from Eastern Ukraine),[31] and is a party of considerable intellectual and organisational potential. If the DPU tended to monopolise the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia, the PDRU has attracted logicians, scientists and engineers, such as the philosopher Myroslav Popovych and the Russian Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Council, Vladimir Griniov.[32]

The Liberal Party of Ukraine, led by local businessman Ihor Markulov, emerged from Donets'k, and has strong links with the business structures set up by former CPU and Komsomol members.

The party spectrum - left wing and regional parties

The second phase in party formation in Ukraine took place after the banning of the CPU and achievement of Ukrainian independence in August 1991. On the left, successor parties to the CPU emerged; slowly at first, then with the pace quickening after the autumn of 1992. Regional groups also began to develop as Ukraine's ethnic minorities began to digest the full implications of Ukrainian independence for their future.

The Left

Apart from small anarchist groups who are difficult to classify in any case, only the CPU was to the left of the USDPU before August 1991. However, after the CPU was banned by the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet on 30 August 1991, two successor parties, the Socialist Party of Ukraine (SPU) led by Oleksandr Moroz, and the Peasants' Party of Ukraine (PPU) led by Serhii Dovhan were founded in October 1991 and January 1992 respectively.[33] Both were partial successors to the banned CPU, but in the climate of the times were careful to maintain their distance from the discredited ruling party. Both parties hoped to emulate the success of Polish or Lithuanian communists by renaming themselves and adopting a strongly populist programme to take advantage of growing opposition to economic reform. In Ukraine, however, unlike Poland or Lithuania, the party could also afford to be strongly anti-nationalist and hope to gather support in Eastern and Southern Ukraine.

The SPU claimed the support of 60,000 members, and 38 deputies in the Supreme Council, although the latter were not strictly organised as a faction.[34] The PPU drew considerable support from the 'agrarian faction' in the Supreme Council. The latter has claimed the support of 103 deputies,[35] but a more realistic figure would be the 44 collective farm chairmen and heads of agro-industry elected in March 1990.[36] The PPU claimed a membership of 1.6 million in 1992,[37] which in fact represented the fact that the PPU was simply the old Soviet era Peasants' Union in different guise.

Eastern Ukraine

From 1991 to mid 1992 the nationalist parties from Western and Central Ukraine dominated the political agenda in Ukraine, particularly after the ban on the CPU left Eastern Ukrainian elites disorientated. However, despite a period of relative quiescence in 1991-92, Eastern and Southern Ukrainians began to find their feet again in the summer of 1992, as economic collapse accelerated, traditional links with the rest of the USSR were ruptured and ethnic nationalism began to gather support in Western Ukraine.

First of all Eastern Ukraine, in particular Donets'k, was the centre for the appearance of a variety of other leftist parties in 1992-93, with the rate of their formation quickening significantly after the decision by the Russian Supreme Court to partly annul the ban on the CPSU in November 1992. An 'Initiative Committee for the Annulment of the Anti-Constitutional Decision to Ban the CPU',[38] largely the work of the SPU, was established in Ukraine in June 1992. After 243 deputies signed a motion to reconsider the Ukrainian ban in January 1993,[39] the Presidium of the Ukrainian parliament issued a decree in May 1993 allowing Ukrainian citizens to form communist organisations.

If the SPU's brand of socialism was analogous to that of Brazuaskas in Lithuania or Roy Medvedev's reform communists in Russia, many of the new Ukrainian groups were more openly reactionary, as with Nina Andreeva's group in Russia. These included the League of Crimean Communists, which claimed 10,000 members in August 1992;[40] the Party of Workers and Industrialists of Ukraine, formed in Odesa in June 1992;[41] the Congress of Working People of Ukraine, founded in Dnipropetrovs'k in August 1992;[42] the Ukrainian Party of Justice, set up in December 1992 with support from the (ex-communist) Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine;[43] the Union of Communists of Ukraine established in January 1993;[44] and the Party of Communists-Bolsheviks, established in Donets'k in February 1993.[45] A Ukrainian branch of the all-Union (i.e. all USSR) Party of Communists met in Luhans'k in June 1992.[46] The largest new leftist party, however, was the Labour Party of Ukraine, based in the Donbas, which held its first congress on 25 December 1992. It was backed by conservative industrialists,[47] earning it the nickname of 'the party of red directors'.

The sheer length of the above list deserves comment. Clearly there was a growing constituency for such groups, especially in Eastern Ukraine, as the economic situation in Ukraine deteriorated sharply from early 1992 onwards. There were divisions within the left wing camp, however. The smaller leftist groups only tended to represent a small number of war veterans and nostalgics. The SPU was formed as a party of leftist economic populism, but, as demonstrated by the speed of its formation after August 1991, the party's leaders were on the whole prepared to work within the new regime. On the other hand, those who openly regretted the passing of the old order were hostile to Moroz, whom they viewed as an *arriviste* . They preferred such figures as Borys Oliinyk who was elected to the Supreme Council in a by-election in

November 1992, (Stanislav Hurenko, the last First Secretary of the CPU, announced his intention to retire from the 'nationalist' Supreme Council in January 1993).[48] If Moroz was reconciled to the fact of Ukrainian independence, many of the rival groups on the left were openly nostalgic for the CPU and the USSR. Open moves to restore the CPU were beginning in early 1993, but lie outside the scope of this study (an 'all-Ukrainian Conference of Communists' was held in Makiïvka in Donets'k in March 1993, and was attended by 300 delegates, including eight people's deputies, who discussed the possibility of formally reviving the CPU.[49] The Ukrainian *Komsomol* meanwhile held a revivalist (28th) congress in Donets'k in January 1993).[50]

Regional and/or Ethnic Parties

A conventional left-right spectrum far from exhausts the range of political parties to appear in Ukraine in the early 1990s. Because of Ukraine's ethnic and regional diversity, a number of ethnic and/or regional parties also appeared in the 1990s, especially in periphery regions and above all in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine, where regional groups were closely tied to the new left wing parties. In other words, parties are as likely to form in Ukraine along regional and/or ethno-linguistic cleavages, as along socio-economic cleavages, especially as the latter are comparatively underdeveloped.[51] In particular, it is impossible to understand the situation in Eastern Ukraine, without analysing the mix of welfare populism and Russophone sentiment which unites both the neo-communist and regional organisations of the area.

a) Periphery regions

In Transcarpathia, a Hungarian Cultural Association of Subcarpathia was established in February 1989, which was in turn the foundation for the more overtly political Hungarian Democratic Alliance set up in

October 1991.[52] The local Ruthenians formed the Society of Carpathian Ruthenians in January 1989, and the Subcarpathian [*Pidkarpats'ka*] Republican Party in Mukachev in March 1992, led by Vasyl' Zaiets'.[53] A Congress of Romanians in Bukovyna (Chernivtsi) was held in June 1992.[54]

The Crimean Tatars also have their own organisations, the most significant of which is the Organisation of the Crimean Tatar National Movement (OCNM), led by Mustafa Jemilev, which elected a *Majlis* , or Supreme Tatar Assembly, at its first congress in June 1991, which declared that 'Crimea is the national territory of the Crimean Tatar people, on which they alone possess the right to self-determination'.[55] In July 1992 the OCNM announced its intention of forming a political party to represent the interests of the Crimean Tatars, around 155,000 of whom were estimated to have returned to the Crimea by mid-1992 (they were deported *en masse* by Stalin in 1944 for alleged collaboration with the Germans).[56] Jews and Germans in Ukraine also have their own organisations.[57]

b) Russophone Groups

Most important, however, were the numerous organisations that emerged in 1991-3 to defend the interests of the Russophone population in the Crimea and Eastern (and Southern) Ukraine. The main Crimean organisation, which has openly pro-Russian sympathies, is the Republican Movement of the Crimea, led by local deputy Yurii Meshkov. At its third conference in September 1992, it created the Republican Party of the Crimea / Party of the Republican Movement of Crimea, also led by Meshkov.[58] A Party of the Economic Revival of Crimea was set up in November 1992 to represent Crimean business interests, which remain strongly opposed to Ukrainian independence.[59]

In Southern and Eastern Ukraine, a variety of organisations defending the interests of the Russophone population have sprung up since the Declaration on Ukrainian Independence on 24 August 1991. The main Southern organisation is the Congress of Democratic Forces of the Odesa Region, which held its first congress in March 1993.[60] It is backed by former local leaders of the CPU, and some of its members have openly declared that Southern Ukraine is no more than *Novorossiia* (that is, an addition to Russia as a result of Catherine II's defeat of the Ottoman Turks and Tatars in the late eighteenth century, rather than an integral part of Ukrainian territory).

Eastern Ukraine is more populous, strategically important, and its Russophone population more dominant, however. The main two Russophone organisations are the Democratic Movement of the Donbas, formed in October 1991 in Luhans'k; and the Public Congress of Democratic Forces of Ukraine formed at two congresses in Donets'k in June and October 1992.[61] The Public Congress' title deliberately echoes that of the Russian *Grazhdanskii soiuz* , with which the organisation has close links. Both Ukrainian organisations make similar demands; - for a federalised Ukraine with Russian as the local state language in Eastern Ukraine, strengthened ties with the CIS, and dual citizenship of Ukraine and Russia.

The growing strength of such regional groups from the summer of 1992 onwards is the flip-side of the limitations of the nationalist movement. The nationalist movement has little political appeal in Eastern and Southern Ukraine. The nationalist camp was able to dominate the political agenda in 1991-2 because nationalist parties were organised relatively soon (in 1990-91), and because the tide was flowing in their direction with the winning of independence in August 1991, but their victory was always illusory. Eastern and Southern Ukraine are not

natural nationalist territory. Although both regions supported Ukrainian independence in the December 1991 referendum, they did so largely for pragmatic economic reasons, soon to be disappointed (that is they accepted state and nationalist propaganda that the standard of living would be higher in an independent Ukraine). Once both regions began to create their own parties from the summer of 1992 on, the nationalist lobby found its influence waning, as national communists such as President Kravchuk now had to balance two roughly equal political forces, the nationalist and the Russophone.

The list of the main all-Ukrainian political parties to emerge in the early 1990s is summarised in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1. Main Ukrainian Political Parties at the end of 1992.

Ultra-right

Inter-party Assembly (UIA) / Ukrainian National Assembly (UNA)

Union for Ukrainian Statehood and Independence (DSU)

Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists (KUN)

Right

Ukrainian Peasants' Democratic Party (UPDP)

Ukrainian Christian Democratic Party (UCDP)

Ukrainian Republican Party (URP)

Democratic Party of Ukraine (DPU)

Centre-left

Green Party of Ukraine (GPU)

Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (SDPU)

Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine (PDRU)

United Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (USDPU)

Liberal Party of Ukraine (LPU)

Left

Socialist Party of Ukraine (SPU)

Peasants' Party of Ukraine (PPU)

Labour Party of Ukraine (LPU)

Regional

Subcarpathian Republican Party (SCR)

Republican Movement of Crimea (RMC)

Tatar *Majlis*

Public Congress (Donbas)

This study will focus on the nationalist parties: - the DPU, URP, UIA, DSU and smaller parties of the right, along with the Ukrainian Popular Front (*Rukh*). A nationalist party is here defined as one for whom the primary political value is the nation.[62] This excludes the parties of the Centre-left, even though by November 1991 many were in favour of Ukrainian independence. The left wing parties such as the SPU, PPU and USDPU are primarily economic populists whose long term commitment to Ukrainian independence is largely tactical; the PDRU and SDPU are more interested in economic reform, individual rights and a rule of law; and the GPU in ecology.[63]

The length of the above list demonstrates that the nationalist parties face plenty of competition in Ukraine, as predicted by the analysis of the historical weaknesses of the Ukrainian national movement in Chapter 1.

The CPU Splits

No description of the Ukrainian party system can be complete without examining the reasons for the demise of the CPU and its legacy.

By spring 1991 Ukraine had at least the appearance of a multi-party system, but free and equal competition remained impossible, so long as the CPU remained more of a party-state than a normal political party. Spring 1991, however, also marked the emergence of serious divisions within the CPU, as the attractions of national communism finally began to make themselves felt (although at this stage the national communists were still a minority within the CPU), and national communist leaders such as Leonid Kravchuk began to build bridges with the opposition.

The *perestroika* reforms, if inadvertently, were shifting control over political resources and the locus of political legitimacy from the centre to the periphery, causing local communist parties to split in two. The 1990 elections in the republics forced local communists in the state and the Soviets to adapt themselves to the exigencies of electoral politics by reorientating their policies towards the defence of their constituents' interests, and by adopting the myths and symbols of nationalism as the best, in many ways the only, means of relegitimating their rule (it is important here that the 1989 all-Union elections were much less democratic). As mentioned above, the opposition 'Democratic Bloc' had won approximately 25% of the seats in the March 1990 Ukrainian elections, and the CPU therefore 75% (84% of deputies were originally members of the CPU, but many defected in the aftermath of the elections).[64] Despite considerable electoral malpractice, this was broadly a fair reflection of patterns of support at the time.[65] Much of Ukraine was still politically inert. However, even at this stage the CPU had been compelled to steal the opposition's clothes by adopting a programme defending republican rights,[66] in which the CPU called for 'the affirmation of sovereign Ukrainian statehood'.[67]

However, although the March 1990 Ukrainian elections had forced at least the CPU's parliamentary wing into a limited accommodation with

public opinion, the party *apparat* was still rigidly pro-Moscow. Its influence ensured that the CPU could never turn itself into a normal electoral party. The CPU's 1990 programme also restated its commitment 'to defend the ideas of the October revolution and of socialism', and stressed that the party continued 'to organise itself on the principle of democratic centralism'.[68] Moreover the commitment to defend the rights of the republic was qualified by the statement that 'the CPU, considering historical experience, does not consider that all [problems] can be solved on the basis of the state sovereignty of Ukraine' and aims for 'a new Union....of equal, sovereign, socialist states, united on the basis of common values and interests'.[69] The CPU *apparat* from July 1990 was controlled by the rigidly orthodox Stanislav Hurenko,[70] and he and his fellow conservatives continued to coordinate their activity with that of Moscow hardliners, supporting the January 1991 Baltic measures and finally discrediting themselves through their role in the August 1991 attempted coup.

However, the ground was being cut from under the conservatives' feet by the extraordinary process of the imperial centre's collapse, undermining all the traditional reasons for loyalty to the centre one by one, so that even those who were relatively reluctant to cut ties with the centre were forced to strike out on their own.

First and foremost, economic dependency was traditionally a vital centripetal factor, given that as late as 1990, 96% of (official) economic activity in Ukraine was still controlled by Moscow ministries. As Ukraine was but one part of a highly centralised and integrated command economy, few if any branches of its 'national economy' were truly self-sufficient.[71] However, Gorbachev's repeated failure to address the question of economic reform, allied to the spiralling collapse in production from 1990, the enfeeblement of the central economic

ministries and the desire of the republics to isolate themselves from Moscow's inflationary monetary policy, all loosened the centre's control over the periphery. The Soviet political economy was transformed from a centralised dependency system to a zero-sum war of all against all for a diminishing quantity of economic resources and political legitimacy. The centre could no longer provide for the periphery in the way it had done in the past. In such circumstances the optimal policy for republican elites was to try and recentralise control at their own local level, and the necessary means to establishing such a local hegemony was the national communist strategy of using nationalism to mobilise local populations.

Other traditional factors mitigating against the appearance of national communism also declined or disappeared in 1990-91. Many Ukrainians had traditionally benefited from all-Union career paths, like Scots in the British Empire, often becoming more Catholic than the Pope as they served alongside Russians as fellow East Slavs in the wider empire. For example, Shcherbyts'kyi's successor as First Secretary, Volodymyr Ivashko, notoriously showed his contempt for the republic by accepting the post of Second Secretary to Gorbachev in the all-Union CPSU in July 1990, turning his back on a position he had only held since September 1989.[72] This had the vital effect of exposing the CPU's centrist loyalties, and leading to the division of the top CPU and state posts, previously combined by both Shcherbyts'kyi and Ivashko, between Stanislav Hurenko and Leonid Kravchuk. This created the fault-line around which the CPU was eventually to split.

In Ukraine the rising tide of national communism reached a critical mass in spring 1991, when it became increasingly clear that the conservative counter-attack launched in Moscow the previous autumn (and supported by Hurenko in Kiev) had no real chance of success. In the Supreme Council, the national communists began to vote with the

opposition. The stand-off between the CPU majority and the opposition was therefore replaced by a new majority consisting of the national communists and the former opposition, if not the national communists on their own.[73] Most of the former opposition in turn were happy to escape from their own former minority status by cooperating with the national communists. The centre parties were mainly in favour (although some distrusted the communists), as were the DPU, although the far right continued to refuse to 'collaborate' with any institutions or representatives of the Ukrainian SSR. The URP was split, with the party leadership seeking to cooperate with the national communists, but with a substantial body of the party's rank-and-file sympathising with the far right.

In the spring and summer of 1991 this new alliance began to bear fruit, as Ukraine passed a series of measures to give effect to its July 1990 Declaration of Sovereignty, and opted out of the Union Treaty negotiations until September 1991. It is important therefore to bear in mind that the process of national communist cooperation with the former opposition began long before August 1991, and that nationalism had already deeply penetrated the CPU even before the Declaration of Independence on 24 August 1991. Although during the August coup attempt, it appeared for a time that many in the CPU were prepared to revert to type, especially those in the CPU *apparat* , and in local administration, Kravchuk was only criticised for wavering; -things had gone too far for any of the national communists to actually back the plotters, until it was clear that they would be forced to do so.[74]

Thereafter almost the entire CPU sought to save themselves by joining the national communist camp after the party was banned by the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Council on 30 August, although a minority joined the revivalist Socialist Party of Ukraine set up by the

former leader of the CPU majority in the Supreme Council Oleksandr Moroz in Kiev on 26 October 1991.[75]

The party-state did not disappear, however. Most members of the former CPU were now reluctant to associate themselves with any political party, but it it is impossible to explain the operation of the formal party system without reference to the informal 'party of power'. The fact that most of the levers of political power are still controlled by national communists is a key reason for the relative weakness of the (rest of) the party system.

Atomised pluralism, 1991-2

The banning of the CPU on 30 August 1991 only served to indicate how weak most of Ukraine's fledgling political parties actually were. Although the CPU had formally departed from the scene, most of the resources of the party-state were now inherited by the national communists. Hence the legacy of the 'two-tier system' of 1990-1 persisted, although the strongest element in the political system was no longer a party as such (the party-state simply became the state), and the new political parties struggled to make their impact felt.

A first glance at the Ukrainian party system after August 1991 confirms the impression of an 'atomised party system', seemingly characteristic of all post-communist states.[76] If anything in fact, Ukrainian party politics had weaker foundations than in other post-communist states. In Poland by contrast, Solidarity had already put down deep roots as an anti-communist front at the time of political liberalisation in 1989. Hungary had had a long tradition of semi-official tolerance of opposition groups since the 1960s, while the Baltic

opposition movements reached the stage of mass mobilisation almost two years before Ukraine.

In late 1991 there were already more than twenty parties in Ukraine (the proliferation of political parties was facilitated after September 1991, when the number of members required for official registration was lowered from 3,000 to 300. At that time, only five parties had met the target). Party membership figures were low, even for the best organised parties. The largest nationalist party, the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP), had only 12,000 members in 1992 for example and the Socialist Party of Ukraine (SPU) probably only around 10,000 (it claims 30,000 but has yet to formally register its members). Moreover, for most parties membership after the initial enthusiasm of 1990-1 was either stagnant or falling. The disappearance of the CPU as the opposition's main opponent, poor economic performance, and for many nationalists, the achievement of their main goal, an independent nation-state, led to disorientation and growing apathy amongst many former activists. Many Ukrainians are in any case suspicious of any political party.

Even amongst those parties claiming to have an all-Ukrainian structure, membership tended to remain regionally concentrated. Of the two main nationalist parties, 55% of the URP's membership in 1992, and 34% of the DPU's was from the radical but unrepresentative Galician region.[77] Almost a third of the Green Party's membership was in one oblast - Ternopil'.[78] On the other hand, the membership of centre-left parties such as the Social Democrats or the PDRU was concentrated in urban Eastern and Central Ukraine (The PDRU had 320 members in Luhans'k oblast, 250 in Kharkiv, 250 in Donets'k out of a total of 3,500 in spring 1992).[79] Party organisations moreover rarely existed outside of the local oblast centres, except in Galicia.

Parties were also handicapped by minimal resource bases and limited access to the mass media. In 1992, only the URP, DPU and the ultra-radical UNA had proper offices in Kiev. All had miniscule budgets. In autumn 1992 the DPU had only 10,000 coupons (then $30) in the kitty. Parties such as the URP, which received up to 65% of its budget from supporters abroad, were only slightly better off.[80] Unlike the Russian Federation Parliament, the Ukrainian Supreme Council did not materially support party factions. It did not even provide them with offices. Only the URP, DSU, and UNA had a regular party press, but its quality was poor.[81] The mass media remained the preserve of the supporters of President Kravchuk, although this now included some elements of the former opposition (see below). An appeal for the creation of a new independent TV channel was therefore launched by disgruntled members of the former opposition in July 1992, but with little immediate chance of success.[82]

The interconnections between political parties and other elements of the social and political system remained weak and ill-formed. The parties' ability to mobilise collective action amongst the public declined spectacularly after the great wave of strikes and public demonstrations that culminated in the student hunger strikes of October 1990. The predominant public mood was by 1992 either hostile or indifferent to political parties. *Rukh* for example had a minus 32% rating (17% in favour, 49% hostile) in May-June 1992, and the rival centrist coalition *New Ukraine* (see below) minus 19% (12% support, 31% against).[83] The number of individuals in Kiev classifying themselves as non-party or anti-party rose from 17% to 42% from mid-1990 to May 1992.[84]

No party could claim more than 10% in opinion polls. A typical poll in April 1992 gave the URP 7.7%, the GPU 5.4%, the DPU 4.3%, the PDRU 2.6%, the SPU 2.2%, the UPDP 1.2%, and the UCDP 1.1%.[85]

In many cases, Ukrainian public opinion was simply ignorant of the activities of political parties, given their limited means of publicising themselves. In September 1991, only 18% of Ukrainians considered themselves 'well-informed' about the activities of the DPU; 17% well-informed about the URP, and 7% about the PDRU.[86] One indication of declining public support for political parties was the repeated failure for by-elections to elect a candidate with the required 50% participation of the local electorate. Consequently, in September 1992, thirty seats in the Supreme Council lay vacant.[87]

Party factions in parliament remained small and ill-disciplined. Central party leaderships lacked the means to enforce a party programme on their deputies' group. Even when the latter had some collective identity as a caucus, there was no whipping system. Caucus decisions only had recommendatory character. In a survey of Supreme Council deputies in September 1992 only 38 (out of 421) were prepared to confess a party affiliation.[88] As in the eighteenth century British parliament, personalities and informal ties (as well as 'the king's men', or in the modern Ukrainian context, the amorphous national communist 'party of power') were usually more important than party.

Analysis of voting patterns in the Supreme Council throws up abundant evidence of the lack of party discipline. On 7 July 1992 for example various opposition groups tabled a motion for the resignation of the government of Vitol'd Fokin. The URP's leader Mykhailo Horyn' abstained, but four of his colleagues voted in favour of resignation. Ten members of the DPU voted for, but the leader of the party's parliamentary faction Dmytro Pavlychko abstained. Thirty of the *New Ukraine* faction (see below) voted for, six against, and six abstained.[89] However, parties often issue public declarations on particular issues, and are increasingly responsible for concrete legislative initiatives.

Moreover, the parties failed to show much discipline during the autumn 1991 Presidential election campaigns (see Chapter 4). The PDRU had two rival candidates (Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi and Vladimir Griniov), and the DPU supported the non-party Volodymyr Pylypchuk instead of their own Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi. Even the URP, despite its reputation for internal party discipline, had problems with its maverick Deputy Leader Stepan Khmara supporting Leopol'd Taburians'kyi instead of the URP's then leader Levko Luk"ianenko.

Lastly, Ukrainian parties (and movements) have suffered from frequent splits, such as those at the congress of *Rukh* in February-March 1992, and the URP in May 1992, testifying to the failure to create 'broad church' parties, or parties united by a common commitment to a clear platform. The Ukrainian Christian Democrats split into *three* factions in 1992; whilst the Social Democrats managed to split at their *founding* congress in 1990, and again after attempts to reunify the party in the summer of 1992. The radicals who split from the URP to form the Ukrainian Conservative Republican Party (UCRP) themselves split at their founding conference in June 1992. On the other hand those parties who have a loose and open structure, such as the GPU, have been debilitated by internal anarchy.[90]

Three possible theoretical perspectives could be applied to examine the reasons for the weakness of Ukrainian political parties.

From a structuralist perspective, where primary causality is attributed to socio-economic forces, and political parties are only dependent variables, the patterning of any party system supposedly reflects the pattern of strategic 'structural cleavages' in society.[91] The UK's traditional two-party system for example could be interpreted as reflecting the still all-important (if declining) central class cleavage in

society, the four main camps in Belgian politics the crosscutting socio-economic and linguistic cleavages, and so on.

As throughout the former Soviet Union, however, a post-communist society with well-defined 'structural cleavages' has yet to crystallise in Ukraine. Ethnic and regional cleavages also exist, but are also ill-defined until politicised by elites. The Soviet state prevented social groups from organising themselves, or even from communicating with one another and developing a sense of identity. Consequently, it is common to argue that the only significant social division in contemporary Ukraine is between a priviligentsia *apparat* and an amorphous 'society as a whole'.[92] Although parties may claim to speak for the interests of given social groups, as yet they represent only activist networks or circles of friends (Max Weber's 'political clubs'). Hence there is as yet no real pressure from social self-organisation welling up from below to channel the creation of political parties into more well-defined blocs.

Parties therefore remain weakly connected to social groups as a whole. They function horizontally by providing systems of communication and mutual support for groups of activists, but do not provide vertical linkage between social groups and the state.[93] Instead, parties' projected social bases are determined ideologically. It is unfashionable to directly invoke narrow working class interests, and few are prepared to openly speak out for the interests of the *nomenklatura* upper strata. Hence nearly all parties are either forced into the crowded middle ranks of society, speaking for a farmer or entrepreneurial class that has yet to come into existence, or resort to a vague and general populism.

In addition to the bottom-up structuralist perspective, a top-down analysis stressing the importance of political institutions and the relative

autonomy of political parties as organisations can also be invoked to explain the relative weakness of Ukrainian political parties.[94] Here the key institution is the Ukrainian Supreme Council, and its key feature is the fact that political parties were largely created *after* the elections held in March 1990. As stated above, the CPU used its then near monopoly on public political activity to prevent many of the various 'fronts' and opposition movements of the time from putting forward candidates and establishing a presence in parliament. Hence Ukrainian deputies were not elected on a party label. Although factions were organised subsequently in the Supreme Council, Ukrainian deputies do not owe their careers to a party machine. Moreover, although the CPU was not allocated the reserved places it had enjoyed in the all-Union elections of 1989, many candidates were selected through the old Soviet system of workplace nomination, rather than through a Western European-style system of open nomination in which all social groups can participate.

Since March 1990 the Supreme Council has done little to stimulate the formation and consolidation of political parties from above. As stated earlier, factions have little organisational or ideological cohesion. Deputies may in fact belong to two factions. (That said, two seemingly more purposeful factions were created in September 1992, a *Rukh* faction of 49, and the 42 belonging to the Congress of National Democratic Forces. *New Ukraine* had a faction of 52 in the summer of 1992.[95] For an explanation of these groupings, see below).

Election campaigns have yet to play their traditional role in stimulating party formation. The 1989 and 1990 elections came too early, whereas the referenda and Presidential campaigns of March and December 1991 had a mixed effect. The independence referendum of 1 December 1991 did little to sharpen individual party identities, as every significant political force campaigned for independence, whereas the

Union Treaty referendum of 17 March 1991 and the Presidential vote on 1 December 1991 produced as many divisions within as between the political parties. The URP was admittedly perhaps an exception, as it strengthened its organisation and public profile in the Presidential campaign (and also earned the enmity of its rivals for splitting the opposition vote). New parliamentary elections, due in 1995, but probable in 1994 would of course be different.

A third theoretical perspective might focus on Ukrainian political culture, or rather the lack of it. Post-communist Ukraine is in effect attempting to create a political culture from scratch. Unlike the Baltic or Eastern European states with their, albeit limited, memories of independent political parties and civil society in the inter-war period, Ukraine cannot draw on a rich historical political tradition. The fundamentals of a civil society did develop in Galicia under Habsburg rule before 1918 and Polish rule until 1939, but Galicia only contains 10% of the contemporary Ukrainian population.

The political parties of 1917-20 that were described in Chapter 1 were always weak and fractious, and failed to leave much of a historical tradition behind them. The OUN left a more durable legacy, but, as a terrorist group with, in the 1930s at least, a militant ethnically-exclusive ideology, did not display many of the virtues of a civic culture. The only other domestic political traditions available as opposition activity began to flourish in the *glasnost'* era, were those of the tiny dissident circles of the 1960s and 1970s. Such groups had left the militant ideology of the original OUN behind, but by definition had no experience in forming mass political parties.

Nor in general have Ukrainian parties been able to organise around ready-made indigenous ideologies bequeathed from the past. Liberals may quote Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841-95),[96] the URP the

conservative philosopher V"iacheslav Lypyns'kyi (1882-1931),[97] and the ultra-right Dmytro Dontsov (1883-1973),[98] but their works are not well-known. Even amongst the highly ideologised ultra-right, which tends to revere Dontsov, its more important groups, such as the Ukrainian National Assembly, are clear that they would prefer to formulate their own ideology more in tune with contemporary political conditions.[99] Poets tend to get more space in party publications.

Post-Soviet political culture in general is not free of its birth-marks under the *ancien régime* . The Soviet regime did little to foster the principles of open dialogue, tolerance, and acceptance of mutual dependence and compromise on which the creation of broad-based political parties depends. Most Ukrainian parties have extremely low tolerance levels for internal dissent, and tend to be characterised instead by crude slander and bullying tactics. Mykhailo Horyn', leader of the URP, has for example complained of 'extreme Bolshevik intolerance towards our political opponents, especially when we are trying to work out a common strategy'.[100] However, the URP itself has been one of the most ruthless parties when it comes to purging internal dissent (see Chapter 3). Open political activity has only been possible in Ukraine since 1990. It will take many years to develop the habits of collective action, accommodation and compromise that are the cement of an effective party system.

Despite the impressive list of weaknesses above, parties have nevertheless had a major impact on the political system. As argued in Chapter 1, the national communists who still dominate the Ukrainian political system, do not have a real ideology, unlike their predecessors in the 1920s. They are parasitic on other political parties. Ukrainian parties may be weak in structural terms, but their ideological impact on the state

has been great. In 1991-2 the national communists were particularly subject to nationalist pressure, as they had committed themselves to the goal of building a Ukrainian nation-state, there was a political vacuum on the left where the CPU used to be, and regional counter-lobbies had yet to organise themselves. A clear pattern emerged in 1991-2 whereby a given issue, such as the retention of Ukrainian nuclear weapons, or the protection of Ukrainians living in the Russian Federation would first be raised by the far right, and then be taken up by the conservative right, before finally emerging in government circles some several months hence.

After the summer of 1992, however, the national communists were also subject to pressure from the new left-wing and Russophone groups. The 'party of power' now had to conduct a more delicate balancing act between two roughly equal political forces, largely resulting in political stalemate. If anything this was the more natural situation. As was described in Chapter 1, the Ukrainian national movement does not has a natural majority within the current boundaries of the Ukrainian state. It could exercise enormous influence in 1991-2 after the startling collapse of pro-Moscow and leftist forces, and with Eastern Ukraine quiescent, as in 1917, but there were strong signs that all three of the latter were beginning to revive in late 1992.

Political realignment and polarised pluralism, 1991-3

Because of the weaknesses in the party system as listed above, and because of the desire to convert parties of opposition into parties of government, Ukraine's political parties have since early 1992 attempted to consolidate their position through the formation of political blocs or coalitions, five of which are likely to contest parliamentary elections in

1994 or 1995, alongside whatever regional groupings may emerge. These may be classified as follows:

- Ultra-nationalist;

- Nationalist;

- Centrist;

- State-bureaucratic;

- Socialist;

- Regional;

The Ultra-nationalist camp is represented by the UNA, DSU, KUN, and UCRP, plus radical youth groups such as the Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth (see Chapter 6), and some smaller fringe groups (see Chapter 7). The UCDP and UPDP are difficult to classify, with a foot in both the ultra-nationalist and national-democratic camps (see Chapter 7).

The ultra-right's influence is considerable, but the likelihood of its achieving unity is poor. The most prominent individual on the ultra-right is the maverick people's deputy and ex-Deputy Leader of the URP Stepan Khmara, but his party, the UCRP is weak. On the other hand, the best organised party of the ultra-right, the UNA, lacks charismatic leaders. Khmara and the UNA are not close, because the latter do not share Khmara's strident anti-communism. The prospects for unifying the ultra-right under the banner of the well-funded émigré OUN-r and its front organisation the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists are also poor, as the OUN-r has consistently alienated indigenous Ukrainian parties by its manipulative tactics.

The ultra-right should not be dismissed as mere rabble-rousers, however. The UNA and its paramilitary wing, the Ukrainian National Self-Defence Forces, have gained notoriety for participating in the

fighting in the breakaway 'Dnister republic' and other controversial acts, such as issuing a notorious condemnation of separatism in the Crimea, namely that it should be 'either Ukrainian or depopulated'.[101] However, often in ethnic politics competition tends to be between the competing claims of extreme and moderate nationalists to best defend the ethnic constituency, rather than between moderate nationalists and moderate centrists. Hence the ultra right has good prospects for a significant political breakthrough if the economic and/or security situation in Ukraine continues to worsen, and support within the core nationalist camp shifts to the right. In such circumstances, poorly qualified Ukrainian white-collar workers and sections of the Ukrainian working class threatened by unemployment could easily be attracted by their populist, neo-socialist economic rhetoric,[102] and their clear identification of the national 'enemy'.

Until such a time, the main nationalist parties (*Rukh* , the URP, DPU and smaller satellite parties) are likely to inherit most of the 25-33% of the national vote that *Rukh* could command at the peak of its popularity in 1990-91 (see Chapter 4), with probably less than 10% of that vote going to the ultra-right However, sharp disagreements exist between the URP and the remnants of *Rukh* , now led by V"iacheslav Chornovil. Since 1991 the URP has tried to transform itself into a 'party of respectable conservatism',[103] becoming an ardent supporter of the new state and its national communist leaders, and has even talked of becoming 'the natural party of government'.[104] Consequently the URP has actively supported the strengthening of Presidential rule since August 1991, and has sought to 'participate in, rather than to criticise' government (see Chapter 3).

At the other extreme is Chornovil's *Rukh* , which is less attracted by the nationalist principle of 'my country, right or wrong', and still sees itself as a party of opposition. Chornovil's anti-communist populism, in many ways reminiscent of Lech Walesa's in Poland, strikes a strong chord with *Rukh's* remaining rank and file, especially while other leaders of the former opposition are receiving cosy government jobs from President Kravchuk.

Opinion polls indicate that the nationalists could expect up to 25-30% in new elections, but the animosities between Chornovil and the pro-Kravchuk wing make it extremely unlikely that a cohesive pre-election bloc could be formed,[105] although in an atmosphere of national crisis the two camps are more likely to close ranks, as in January 1993, when the short-lived Anti-Communist Anti-Imperial Front was formed (see Chapter 8).

In summer 1992 the nationalists created two rival blocs. On 31 July Chornovil formed the Congress of Democratic Forces on the basis of 'struggle with the authoritarian tendencies of the pro-communist structures of power',[106] along with the committee 'A New Parliament for a New Ukraine' to campaign for the collection of the three million signatures necessary to force early parliamentary elections (see Chapter 8). At *Rukh's* fourth congress in December 1992, Chornovil formally transformed *Rukh* into a political party.

Chornovil's *Rukh* hopes to emulate the anti-communist success of the Civic Forum movement in Czechoslovakia or Lech Walesa's Presidential campaign in Poland, if necessary through cooperation with the liberal centrists, whom the URP abhors. Ukraine is, however, much less of a homogeneous nation-state than Poland or even the Czech republic, and commitment to many aspects of Soviet egalitarianism and welfarism goes much deeper in Ukraine, particularly in the East. It is

therefore unlikely that an anti-communist tide that Chornovil seeks to ride to power will sweep across the whole country, as it did for Walesa. Moreover, Chornovil's *Rukh* is not the organisation it was in 1990, having been weakened by a series of splits in 1992, and the time for an anti-communist crusade may well have past. Personal popularity often counts for much in Ukrainian politics, however, and Chornovil's is second only to Kravchuk's.[107]

The most serious of these splits led to the 'Presidential', or more nationalist wing of *Rukh* , forming the rival Congress of National Democratic Forces (CNDF) on 2 August 1992 along with the URP, DPU, Union of Ukrainian Students and other smaller organisations. The CNDF stood for 'unitary statehood, departure from the CIS, support for national industry and the building of [strong] Armed Forces'.[108] The CNDF's priority, in other words, was the building of a Ukrainian nation rather than a civic state. In Chornovil's words, they favoured building 'statehood first and then democracy', whereas he viewed the two processes as inseparable.[109]

All the nationalist parties, like their counterparts in Western Europe, are on the political right and claim to support free enterprise (and therefore low taxes), and court the emergent new business class as their future bedrock of support.[110] At the same time they support strong national defence, and even 'social protection of the population'. The social dynamics of post-communist societies are completely different to those of relatively stable Western European states, however, and it will be difficult for Ukraine's national-democrats to achieve all of the above aims at once. The nationalists' commitment to free enterprise is largely the legacy of their past anti-communism, and the idea popular in the 1980s that a free enterprise economy was the best foundation for a strong state. In the harsh economic climate of the 1990s, a majority of the

Ukrainian working population will be short-term losers from the processes of economic adjustment, and the new middle classes are likely to remain thin on the ground. The nationalists therefore are more likely to be attracted by policies of state support for industry and economic populism. Such policies, after all, also have a strong pedigree for conservatives.

As regards government, the CNDF has cultivated good links mainly with security ministers, especially the head of the Security Service of Ukraine, Yevhen Marchuk and Defence Minister Konstantin Morozov. *Rukh* , on the other hand, having been violently opposed to the 1990-92 government of Vitol'd Fokin, was prepared to cooperate with his successor, Leonid Kuchma, appointed in October 1992, and several of its members joined the new Cabinet of Ministers. These included the First Deputy Prime Minister until March 1993 (when he was forced out of office by left-wing criticism) Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Economic Reform Viktor Pynzenyk, the Deputy Prime Minister with responsibility for Humanitarian Issues Mykola Zhulyns'kyi (a *Rukh* sympathiser), the Minister for the Environment Yurii Kostenko, and the Minister for Foreign Economic Relations, Ivan Herts.

The <u>Centrist</u> bloc is represented primarily by the *Nova Ukraïna* (New Ukraine) organisation, formed in January 1992,[111] but whose origins can be dated back to the formation by the PDRU of a coalition for 'Democratic Reform in Ukraine', in the aftermath of the failed August 1991 coup.[112]

New Ukraine is a union of centrist political parties, such as the PDRU, SDPU, USDPU, and some sections of the Green Party; and those business lobbies which favour economic reform, such as the Ukrainian League of Businesses with Foreign Capital, the Confederation of

Industrialists of Ukraine (later the Ukrainian Union of Industrialists and Managers, or UUIM) and the Union of Cooperative Workers (the original name intended for New Ukraine was in fact the 'Union of Politicians and Industrialists'). In summer 1992 New Ukraine controlled a Parliamentary faction of 58 deputies.[113]

The main aim of New Ukraine is 'the creation of [both] appropriate social conditions, and a coalition between politicians, state bureaucrats, businessmen and skilled workers [to support] the introduction of radical reforms and the building of a socially-oriented market economy and a well-developed civil society in Ukraine'.[114] At its founding congress in June 1992, it declared itself in favour of 'capitalism with a human face'.[115] Unlike the URP, *Rukh* , and the other national-democrats, New Ukraine does not call for Ukraine's departure from the CIS, and pragmatically supports the maintenance of good neighbourly relations with Russia. Although New Ukraine supports the Ukrainian nation-state, it is not a nationalist party.

Arguments within the PDRU between supporters of liberal and social democracy, between more or less fervent supporters of President Kravchuk, and between the Kiev liberal intelligentsia and the Russophone technical intelligentsia in Kharkiv have however carried over into New Ukraine.[116] New Ukraine's second congress in March 1993 seemed to mark the ascendency of the Russophone element, when Vladimir Griniov replaced Volydymyr Filenko as Chairman.[117]

Moreover, New Ukraine only represents a minority of industrial managers, most of whom are lukewarm about market-oriented reforms at best. The UUIM is not the only industrial lobby, as Ukrainian industrialists have proved just as fractious as the leaders of Ukraine's political parties. The UUIM, led by New Ukraine stalwart and from October 1992 Deputy Prime Minister of Ukraine Vasyl' Yevtukhov,[118]

supports market reforms in principle, but Yevtukhov has used his influence in government to change the privatisation laws to give more rights to enterprise managers. The UUIM is analogous to, and has close links with, Arkadi Volsky's managers' group in Russia, and Yevtukhov's group represents those managers who favour the restoration of close economic links with Russia.

Managers in Eastern Ukraine are much more conservative. They set up the Interregional Association of Industrialists in November 1992,[119] which supports Russophone and left of centre groups in Eastern Ukraine, such as the Public Congress and the Labour Party of Ukraine.

The Union of Independent Industrialists, set up in February 1993, on the other hand, is more national-protectionist. Its first chairman was Oleksandr Yemel'ianov, President Kravchuk's conservative economics adviser.[120]

A final business group is the National Association of Businessmen of Ukraine, which was set up on 29 March 1993 in response to alleged 'backsliding' by the Kuchma government on economic reform. It has strong links with the Congress of Business Circles of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Financial Group.[121]

The centre ground in Ukraine is very precarious. New Ukraine has found itself squeezed between the national-democrats and the national communists, attacked for its anti-patriotic 'pro-Russian' stance and for its forthright opposition to the government for its foot-dragging on questions on economic reform. Its main standard-bearer in government, the pro-Western Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Privatisation and Economic Reform, Volodymyr Lanovyi, was unceremoniously sacked by Kravchuk in July 1992.[122] Several ministers in the new Kuchma government had good links with New Ukraine, however, including Yevtukhov, Viktor Pynzenyk and Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi.

Early opinion polls suggested that New Ukraine was supported by 20-24% of the electorate. More people had a negative opinion of *Rukh* (49%) than of New Ukraine (31%), reflecting the unpopularity of *Rukh's* nationalism in the industrial regions of Eastern and Southern Ukraine, and New Ukraine's relative novelty.[123] More electors were indifferent or as yet undecided towards New Ukraine (57% compared to *Rukh's* 34%), indicating some potential for growth. New Ukraine's key weakness, however, is that it looks to long-term processes of privatisation and demonopolisation to create appropriate social bases of support. Moreover, as a centrist bloc it would be squeezed if the situation in Ukraine polarised. Already in late 1992 it was loosing support to its left, and the formation of new parties in Donets'k meant that its influence in Eastern Ukraine was increasingly confined to the Kharkiv area.

The prospects of the <u>state-bureaucratic</u> bloc are the most difficult to analyse. The so-called 'party of power', the national communists led by President Kravchuk into support of the national cause, has no real formal party structure. This is natural enough, as it is not in the interests of either the President, the leaders of the military-industrial complex, the heads of the collective farms, or those who work in the government executive to associate themselves with any party. The banning of the CPU has given them a useful anonymity with which to deflect public criticism, compared with both the opposition parties and with their communist past. Interestingly, the rating of President Kravchuk, compared with that of the government (down 18%) and that of the Supreme Council (down 32%), rose by 10% from January - June 1992 to stand at +14%. A relatively high 44% of the population supported his policies, in the expectation of social peace and relative stability of life,

and because public opinion places more faith in leading individuals such as Kravchuk and Chornovil, than in unfamiliar or discredited institutions, such as parties or parliament.

Kravchuk at least still commands considerable support amongst a public worried that an 'atomised party system' is too reminiscent of Russia in 1917, Germany in 1933 or Georgia in 1991. The notion of a strong 'apolitical' President has strong appeal to at least half of the population. However, Kravchuk's increasing inability to act decisively after the summer of 1992 was bound to cost him some support.

At a local level, former members of the *nomenklatura* , as in other ex-communist countries, are likely to pose as 'non-party' candidates, whilst using their control over local economic resources and mass media to secure election.[124] Therefore it is unlikely that the 'party of power', will seek to fully institutionalise itself, although the proposed election law (see below) may force them either to cooperate with existing party structures, or even to form new parties of their own.

The socialist bloc is represented by the Socialist Party of Ukraine and its rural counterpart, the Peasants' Party of Ukraine, plus numerous small neo-communist groups. Both the SPU and PPU stand accused of 'social demagogy', and are treated as pariahs by the rest of the political spectrum. However, the two parties' simple slogans against price liberalisation, in favour of restored state control, and for 'socially just privatisation' strike a chord amongst those elements of the population who see market reforms wholly in terms of higher prices. The socialist bloc might expect 10-15% at the forthcoming elections (as in the 1991 elections to the Polish *Sejm*) but its prospects should not be exaggerated. The majority of the former party-economic nomenklatura have not joined its ranks, but have found it more convenient to remain in the

non-party 'party of power'. Moreover, there are internal divisions within the left wing camp between the SPU and those who would like to revive the CPU.[125]

In Eastern Ukraine, however, it is likely that the SPU and other leftist groups may make common cause with Russophone groups to create a powerful regional lobby. Although the formation of regional organisations lagged behind that of mainstream political parties, the events of January 1993, when 150 Eastern Ukrainian people's deputies attempted (unsuccessfully) to force the Supreme Council to open in emergency session to consider their demands that economic reform be slowed, the ban on the CPU reconsidered and the CIS Statute signed by Ukraine, vividly demonstrated the potential strength of such a bloc (see Chapter 8).

Ukraine's 'atomised party system' is developing towards the pattern of party configuration described by Sartori as 'polarised pluralism', as in the French Fourth Republic of 1946-58 (although the respective geo-political, ethnic and economic situations are completely different, as are the histories of the political parties themselves).[126] That is, a party system with five main blocs has a 'destructive opposition' on both the extreme left and extreme right (the socialists and the ultra-right, as with the PCF and the Gaullists under the Fourth Republic), with the national-democrats, liberal-democrats and the 'party of power' in the centre. The prospects for political stability will therefore depend on the stability of coalitions in the centre. This in turn will depend on how much of the centre is prepared to work together, and on the centre's power to resist encroachment from the flanks.

Of most relevance to this work, however, is the fact that the two nationalists blocs do not represent a political majority. Although Ukraine was basically governed from 1991-92 through an alliance of the nationalist and national communist camps, it remained possible that an alternative majority could be constructed if the national communists were to construct a new alliance with the fast-growing leftist-regional bloc.

A leg-up for the parties?

The Ukrainian Supreme Council has passed certain measures to try to strengthen the party system. The first, in June 1992, was a Law on citizens' associations (*Obiednannia hromadian*).[127] The Law divided such associations into two categories; political parties which will have the right to directly nominate candidates in Parliamentary elections and the right of legislative initiative, but will not be allowed to participate in commercial economic activities; and civil organisations (*Hromads'ki orhanizatsii*) such as unions, movements and societies (*Tovarystva*), which, on the contrary, will be able to engage in commercial activity, but not to directly nominate candidates for election.

Secondly, the draft law on parliamentary elections envisaged a mixed, majoritarian-proportional electoral system.[128] One part of the deputy corpus will be elected from single mandate electoral districts, and the rest from party lists, where electors will not vote for concrete individuals, but for a party or coalition of parties (parties may add non-party candidates to their lists). The number of mandates received would then be proportional to the number of votes received on the lists (as in Germany).

Given the small size and lack of influence of existing parties, it is envisaged that parties or coalitions must not only be registered, but also must collect 100,000 signatures of support before they can be added to the general list. This is likely to be an extremely tough obstacle. A similar provision existed for the 1 December 1991 Presidential elections in Ukraine, when only the six candidates backed by the strongest organisations managed to collect the necessary 100,000 signatures. The *apparat* successfully collected for Kravchuk, *Rukh* for Chornovil, the URP for Luk"ianenko, the PDRU for Yukhnovs'kyi and Griniov, and the (obscure) Peoples' Party for Taburians'kyi. The candidates of the Greens, the UNA and the DPU all fell short.[129] Candidates for individual districts will require the signatures of 500 electors.

Moreover only those parties receiving more than 3% of effective votes will be allowed representation. Lastly, the requirement that 50% of electors participate in any given election for it to be effective will be abolished.

Taken together, these measures will clearly favour the larger parties, and may go some way towards assisting the emergence of a stronger party system with more cohesive Parliamentary factions, loyal to the party platform. However, it is far from certain that all the above measures will be passed. They are of course in the interests of the parties themselves, but, as demonstrated above, their influence in the Supreme Soviet is limited. Moreover, the majority of deputies from the state-bureaucratic bloc would prefer to be elected as non-party individuals. Their chances of future success are considerable if they are able to manipulate their local influence, whereas few would be prepared to gamble on association with the SPU or other neo-communist groups (as shown by the fact that only 38 deputies of the former hardline CPU

'group of 239' have joined the SPU). They therefore have little incentive to support the proposed measures.

Conclusion

After a long and difficult birth, Ukraine's political party system was entering a consolidation phase in 1992-3. This Chapter has made clear the manifold difficulties facing political parties in Ukraine, as in many other post-communist societies. Politics remains highly individualised and volatile. But in a situation where all political structures are as yet weakly institutionalised, the influence of political parties is a key element in the political process.

The nationalist and ultra-right blocs represent only two out of a total of six significant political groupings in Ukraine, but, as predicted in Chapter 1, the nationalist parties were able to exercise considerable influence in 1991-92 through their alliance with the national communists. This alliance was not necessarily permanent, however, as the national communists had other possible allies.

3. THE PRISONERS' PARTY:

FROM THE UKRAINIAN HELSINKI UNION,

1988-90, TO THE UKRAINIAN REPUBLICAN

PARTY, 1990-2

Introduction

The Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), which became the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) in April 1990, was the best organised, and often the most influential, nationalist party throughout the period of study. It came closer than any other nationalist group to functioning as an effective political party. As argued in Chapter 1, however, the social and geographical base for a mass nationalist party in Ukraine remained inherently limited. Moreover, the new Ukrainian intelligentsia initially kept their distance from radical nationalism by forming their own party, the Democratic Party of Ukraine (see Chapter 5). Therefore the UHU-URP's rank-and-file membership largely consisted of working class or unskilled white collar workers, while its leadership was provided by former political prisoners. The leader of the UHU-URP from 1988 until May 1992, Levko Luk"ianenko, spent a total of 27 years in the camps, and his successor, Mykhailo Horyn', twelve.[1]

The ideological background of such former prisoners was in the civic ideals of the dissident movements of the 1960s and 1970s. However, in practice, given the semi-underground conditions in which the party had to operate before it became (as the URP) the first non-communist party to be officially registered in Ukraine in November 1990, the URP evolved into a highly disciplined party, whose style and structure was in many ways reminiscent of its communist opponents, and whose ideology was distinctly ethnicist. This trend was also encouraged by the

unsophisticated nature of the party's mass membership, and the cult of deference within the party towards Luk''ianenko as the patriarch of the national movement.

The party had no enemies on its right until 1990 when small ultra-nationalist groups began to form, and even in 1990-91 it remained distinctly radical. Whilst more moderate groups were firmly committed to civic nationalism, parliamentary politics and cooperation with national communists, the URP continued to flirt with ethnic nationalism and the extra-parliamentary tactics of the far right.

As fervent nationalists, however, the URP swung from one extreme to the other after the Declaration of Ukrainian independence in August 1991. If before August 1991, the URP had remained deeply suspicious of the institutions of the 'colonial' Ukrainian SSR and its communist leaders, the party now considered that the situation had changed utterly. A truly Ukrainian state worth defending had now come into being, and the URP became a strong supporter of the the national communists who had played the key role in securing independence. The party now sought to actively participate in 'nation-building', and sought to transform itself into a 'party of respectable conservatism' and 'a school for the preparation of state cadres', by becoming a party of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, and the pre-eminent defender of national statehood.[2]

This chapter will firstly examine the party's roots in the nationalist groups of the 1960s and 1970s, and then provide a basic chronological survey of the party's history, before looking at key themes such as the party's structure, ideology and tactics.

The OUN and UWPU

The roots of the UHU-URP go back to January 1961, when Levko Luk"ianenko,[3] the party's elder statesman, was first arrested for his part in the formation of a underground nationalist party, the Ukrainian Workers'-Peasants' Union (UWPU), whose dozen or so members had held various secret meetings in L'viv oblast in 1958-61.

As described in Chapter 1, from 1941 until 1953 Ukrainian nationalism had been dominated by the OUN-UPA. After the early 1950s, however, it only survived in exile, and new nationalist organisations began to take its place in Ukraine. The most prominent of these was the UWPU, which, according to Luk"ianenko, represented a crucial transitional phase in the Ukrainian nationalist movement. The UWPU's radical call for outright independence echoed the OUN, but Luk"ianenko's group also foreshadowed the legalistic themes of 1960s and 1970s dissidents by basing this demand on Article 17 of the then USSR constitution, which formally guarantied all Soviet republics the right of succession. Moreover, the UWPU proposed that such secession would only be possible after a referendum,[4] and specifically renounced the use of force.[5] It soft-pedalled on the OUN's traditional anti-communism, and called for 'an independent Ukraine with a highly developed socialist political system'.[6] Its membership was also more typical of the 1960s than the 1940s. The UWPU itself was 'a group of intelligentsia, three lawyers [one being Luk"ianenko himself], an agronomist, a militiaman, party workers....until then the national liberation movement had a military character and was made up of simple peasants'.[7]

Nevertheless, the UWPU's leading members were all arrested in 1961. Luk"ianenko was initially sentenced to death, but this was later commuted to 15 years' in the camps. Also arrested with Luk"ianenko was Ivan Kandyba, who founded his own nationalist organisation, the DSU, in 1989 (see Chapter 7).

The UWPU was, however, somewhat ahead of its time. The majority of other arrests in the early 1960s were still of conspiratorial Galician groups committed to the goals of the OUN, and often run by OUN veterans. Examples of such groups were the conspirators arrested in Ivano-Frankivs'k in 1958, the *Ob"ednannia* ('Union') group uncovered in 1960, the Khodorovs'ka group arrested in 1962, and the 20 members of the 'Ukrainian National Committee' imprisoned in L'viv in 1962.[8]

Most of the Ukrainian prisoners, including Luk"ianenko and the rest of the UWPU, were sent to the Mordovian prison camps, where, ironically, a whole generation of Ukrainian political leaders was formed, later to be released *en masse* in 1987-8. In the early 1960s the camps were still dominated by OUN veterans,[9] who formed a radical Galician clique. They cooperated easily with other non-Russian prisoners, but found even the professed democrats among the Russians to be profound chauvinists. Moreover, they felt a considerable distance from Ukrainian prisoners from Central and Eastern Ukraine, who seemed less fervent in their commitment to the national idea.[10] Older prisoners such as Luk"ianenko and Kandyba still had much in common with the OUN generation, but after 1966 the Banderites' domination of the camps' intellectual life, such as it was, began to decline with the influx of a new generation of political prisoners from Central and Eastern Ukraine after the mass arrests of 1965-6. In other words, even those in the camps were to absorb many of the changes of the 1960s.

The *shestydesiatnyky*

The new prisoners came from the *shestydesiatnyky* , (generation of the 1960s), whose roots lay in the Khrushchev thaw rather than in the wartime struggles of the OUN. Once Khrushchev loosened the political reins after 1956, a new generation of dissenters began to appear throughout the USSR. The Ukrainian *shestydesiatnyky* were mainly *intelligenty* , who worked in 'the linguistic-cultural sphere', and 'limited their demands to national enlightenment'[11] [*prosvitianstvo*], rather than seeking outright national independence, at least in public. The first secretary of the CPU from 1963 to 1972, Petro Shelest, was relatively tolerant of their activity, allowing the *shestydesiatnyky* to produce a national literary and poetic revival, and campaign for the rehabilitation of national myths and symbols. Such dissidents also strongly criticised the pressure to Russify Ukrainian schools and culture that had become more intense after Khrushchev's education reforms of 1959. Like other dissidents elsewhere in the USSR at this time, however, the *shestydesiatnyky* emphasised individual rights and a rule of law as much as national rights. Unlike the UWPU, which, although legalistic and peaceful, had operated underground, they consciously sought to work openly and within the Soviet constitution, in the attempt to force the authorities to live up to their own formal standards.

The most famous dissident publication of the period was Ivan Dziuba's *Internationalism or Russification?* published in samizdat in 1966.[12] Dziuba was far from being a radical. His book called for a return to 'Leninist nationalities policy' (that is, removing the 'distortions' of the Stalin and Khrushchev eras, and restoring the respect for national rights supposedly prevalent in the early 1920s).

The main dissident organ of the period was the *Ukraïns'kyi visnyk* (Ukrainian Herald),[13] edited by the journalist V"iacheslav Chornovil.[14] Six issues were circulated in Ukraine in 1970-2. Issue 7-8 appeared in Spring 1974, having been edited by Stepan Khmara[15] after Chornovil's arrest in 1972. Chornovil maintained a dry legalistic tone, reporting human rights violations without editorial comment in a style reminiscent of the *Chronicle of Current Events* in Russia, but Khmara's issue, which referred to the 1972 wave of arrests in Ukraine as a 'pogrom', was noticeably more radical - a foretaste of future arguments between the two.

Chornovil was more typical of the new generation of Ukrainian dissidents, however. He believed that the tactics of underground struggle appropriate to the 1930s and 1940s had now outlived their usefulness. Each successive conspiratorial group failed to learn from the mistakes of its predecessor and soon fell into the hands of the police, and once in the camps could only 'fantasise about a future struggle for Ukraine's freedom'.[16] The *shestydesiatnyky* therefore sought to work within the framework of the USSR's constitution and within international law. Such tactics did not guarantee them immunity from arrest, but they helped to attract a larger circle of sympathisers, whom it was more difficult for the authorities, fitfully mindful to a degree of international opinion, to arrest *en masse* .

This semi-tolerance ended with Shelest's removal in in 1972 and the mass arrests that followed (smaller numbers had been arrested in 1966). Under Shelest, the cultural intelligentsia's agenda had overlapped at least partially with that of local national communists who sought to defend Ukrainian language schooling and capital investment for Ukrainian industry. However, his successor Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi

(1972-89) collaborated enthusiastically with Moscow. After Shelest's removal, not only dissidents, but also national communists in the CPU, were purged. Party leaders with a background in cultural work and from nationally conscious areas in Central and Western Ukraine were replaced by CPU generalists, ideologists and 'administrative cadres', and above all politically safe careerists from Russified Eastern Ukraine.[17]

The arrest of many of the *shestydesiatnyky* , however, had the paradoxical effect of introducing new political ideas into the camps. Although traditional OUN-style radicals were still arrested, such as the Ukrainian National Front group in 1967,[18] intellectual discussion in the camps 'was turned upside-down' by the arrival of the new generation.[19] Therefore, the former prisoners who emerged from the camps in the late 1980s to lead the UHU were transitional figures. They were more radical than those *shestydesiatnyky* who had escaped arrest. Many prisoners, such as Stepan Khmara, were embittered by their experience, and all had more contact in the camps with the traditions of the OUN than the population at large. Nevertheless, even in the camps the prisoners felt the effects of generational change and adapted to the new political ideas produced by the demands of post-war reality. They thus stood half-way between the radical ethnic nationalism of the OUN and the civic nationalism that supposedly replaced it in the late 1980s.

The Ukrainian Helsinki Group

The most prominent group to espouse the new 'civic' dissent in Ukraine was the Ukrainian Group for the Promotion of the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, or Ukrainian Helsinki Group (UHG) for short, active from November 1976 to 1981 (although it never

formally disbanded). Like the Helsinki Groups elsewhere in the USSR, the UHG was not an overtly nationalist group, even though leading figures, such as Luk"ianenko (who had resumed political activity after his release in 1976 and become one of the leaders of the UHG), and the UHG's first leader Mykola Rudenko were professed nationalists.[20] According to Luk"ianenko, 'in the first year of its existence, the group occupied itself 70% in the defence of individual rights, and only 30% - in the defence of national rights'.[21] The UHG's main demand in its founding Declaration was that the Helsinki Accords 'became the basis of relations between the individual and the state'. Its only mention of specifically national demands was that 'Ukraine, as a sovereign European state and member of the UN, should be represented by its own delegation at all international conferences at which the implementation of the Helsinki Accords will be discussed'.[22] In fact, the UHG would later be strongly attacked by radical nationalists for their alleged 'neglect' of the national issue.[23] The documents of the UHG, like the Ukrainian Herald when edited by V"iacheslav Chornovil, concentrated instead on cultural and linguistic issues.

The UHG worked to publicise abuses of the Helsinki Accords, producing a dozen statements and twice as many bulletins, many of which reached the West. It only ever had 37 declared members, however, (plus an outer circle of sympathisers of unknown size), and its ranks were soon decimated by arrest. Twenty three were imprisoned and 6 forced to emigrate to the West.[24] Four members; Oleksa Tykhyi, Vasyl' Stus, Valerii Marchenko and Yurii Lytvyn; died in the camps, and were later to be mythologised by reburial in Kiev in November 1989.[25] Luk"ianenko later claimed that, given the high risks associated with dissent at the time 'we did not attempt to expand our circle of association

and did not demonstrate the associations we had so as not to bring misfortune on innocent people'.[26]

The UHG drew its membership mainly from the cultural intelligentsia. They were 'predominantly the literati': 52% of its members came from the arts and humanities, 22% from the scientific intelligentsia (the reverse of the proportions in the Moscow group, indicating the centrality of cultural concerns), and 15% from other professions.[27]

Krawchenko and Carter's broader study of 942 Ukrainian dissidents active in 1960-72 draws similar conclusions. Eighty nine percent were urban dwellers, and 86% 'white collar staff' (including, out of a sample of 659, 227 creative intelligentsia, 151 scientific and technical intelligentsia, 98 teachers and 66 students). Dissent was no longer confined to Galicia. Thirty eight percent of dissidents now came from the city of Kiev, and 25% from L'viv.[28] In other words, as argued in Chapter 1, the new Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia provided most of the activists for the new movement, but it was unable to provide them in any great numbers.

The UHG did not survive long under Shcherbyts'kyi's regime, and repression easily isolated it from the general population. However, when the Ukrainian national movement reemerged in 1987-8, the prior existence of the UHG as a organisational and moral example proved invaluable, even if at the time they appeared to be fighting a losing battle.

The release of prisoners and the establishment of
the Ukrainian Helsinki Union

The issues raised by the UHG were returned to in 1987-8, when limited dissent again became possible. By then the additional damage that Ukrainian language and culture was perceived to have suffered in the intervening period added extra urgency to the cause.

Dissent had in fact never entirely disappeared in the early 1980s, although its level was certainly sharply reduced. In 1982, for example, Yosyf Terelia had established the Initiative Committee for the Defence of the Rights of Believers of the Church [in Ukraine], which sought to relegalise the Uniate Church. However, dissent only really began to return to the levels of the early 1970s with the mass release of political prisoners and their return to Ukraine in 1987 (those released included V"iacheslav Chornovil, Mykhailo Horyn', Oles' Shevchenko[29] and Stepan Khmara. The older prisoners, whom the authorities feared more, were only released in 1988. Luk"ianenko only returned to Ukraine in January 1989). At this time the penalties for public dissent were severe enough to deter all but former prisoners, who felt that they had nothing to loose. The establishment cultural intelligentsia was still quiescent, and therefore leadership of the dissident movement fell to the UHU by default (until rumblings of disquiet in the cultural establishment began to be heard in late 1988).

The first dissident publications of the new era were Chornovil's 'Open letter to Gorbachev' in August 1987, and the simultaneous appeal by 206 Uniates to Pope John Paul II.[30] Chornovil's letter announced the relaunch of the Ukrainian Herald, starting with issue 7, that is, ignoring

Khmara's number. Chornovil declared, in the fashion of the time (if only for tactical reasons), that 'this journal conforms to the spirit of glasnost',[31] and by appealing to Gorbachev to restore 'Leninist orthodoxy' in nationalities policy, effectively took Ukrainian dissent back to the positions set out by Ivan Dziuba's *Internationalism or Russification?* in 1966. Ukrainian dissent mainly took the form of 'loyal appeals' to Gorbachev until 1989-90, when separatist sentiment could be openly expressed for the first time.

Issue 7 announced that the Herald would be an independent organ, but in March 1988 it effectively became the house journal of the revived UHG (later the Ukrainian Helsinki Union). A press release issued on 18 March was signed by the 13 founder members of the revived UHG, plus the six coopted editors of the Herald.[32] As the only available channel for opposition activity, 'the Ukrainian Herald in L'viv [and the Ukrainian Culturological Club in Kiev] became centres to unite [all] the active national-cultural and social-political forces in Ukraine'.[33] A steering committee for reviving the UHG was established, consisting of Chornovil, Mykhailo Horyn', Mykola Horbal', Yevhen Proniuk, Khmara and, nominally, Levko Luk"ianenko (Luk"ianenko had been asked by Chornovil to assume leadership of the group while Luk"ianenko was still in exile in March 1988).[34]

A Declaration of Principles for a Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), written by Chornovil, Mykhailo and Bohdan Horyn',[35] was issued on 7 July 1988, and circulated in *samizdat* . After heated discussion, however, the Declaration failed to demand outright Ukrainian independence, and called instead for a confederal USSR, although individual members were allowed to campaign for independence. The Declaration stated that 'we imagine the possible future coexistence of the peoples of the USSR in a

confederation of independent states'. 'The new... constitution of the union must only guarantee....general principles of federal ties between the republics, but without unifying and regulating the organisation of economic, political and cultural life in the republic'[36] (the use in the same breath of the terms 'confederal' and 'federal' indicates a confusion typical of the times, and also the degree of the UHU's dissimulation).

Moreover, the rest of the Declaration confined itself to general demands that would command maximum support. It called for Ukrainian citizenship and state status for the Ukrainian language. It supported state provision of 'minimal material welfare' but did 'not see the revival of social justice in egalitarianism'. The 'threat of ecological genocide' was also condemned. The Declaration also called for a rule of law, general civil rights, freedom of religious worship and individual movement, and the dismantling of the old repressive criminal code. Lastly, 'military service should take place on the territory of the republic in republican military formations'.[37]

These compromises were not without cost, as the UHU began to lose some of its more radical members. By 1989, the UHU would also lose its monopoly status as the only opposition group, as leading radicals such as Vasyl' Sichko and Luk"ianenko's colleague from the UWPU, Ivan Kandyba, left to form their own organisations (see Chapter 7).[38]

In December 1988 and January 1989 Luk"ianenko wrote a programmatical essay *Shcho dali?* (What Next?)[39] in order to further explain the UHU's position.[40] It still expressed faith in the progressive nature of Gorbachev's reforms, but was more open in its forthright condemnation of Bolshevism and Russian imperialism. 'At the heart of the Russian national spirit is the conception of Russia as a country whose core is known, but whose periphery has no permanent limits', he

argued. 'The temperament of an individual is a subjective phenomenon, whereas the temperament of a large number of people becomes an objective force', and this 'objective force' consists of 'the traditional stability of the vast Russian masses' imperialist attitudes'.[41]

Luk"ianenko's references to the 'exploited masses', his deterministic belief that 'the progress of national maturation is irresistible'[42] and his statement that 'to be a leading organisation, the UHU must be in the forefront of other Ukrainian patriotic currents just enough, so as not to break the sense of common, strategic direction of those who are with us'[43] showed how much he remained under the influence of Bolshevik ideology and political tactics. He argued explicitly that the UHU should function as a vanguard party. The popular masses were still 'not guided by aspirations for justice, but by an aspiration to avoid prison',[44] and the cultural intelligentsia, 'the writers and other patriotic persons of the official system' were still conformist, although Luk"ianenko concluded his work with a call to them to struggle alongside the UHU.[45] Therefore only former prisoners could provide the necessary leadership to the national movement.

In order to function as a vanguard party, however, the UHU needed to influence mass public opinion. In 1988-90 this remained very difficult. The L'viv UHU began to publish two *samizdat* information bulletins; *Informator* from late 1988, and *L'vivs'ki novyny* (L'viv news) in January 1989, and the Kiev UHU published the journal *Holos vidrodzhennia* (Voice of Rebirth) from March 1989, but their circulation remained limited. *Holos vidrodzhennia* , for example, only had a print-run of 10,000-15,000 which had to be organised in the Baltic republics.[46] However, in late 1988 the UHU established two press centres, one in Moscow and one in L'viv under Chornovil, which made skilful use of

foreign contacts to spread information about the organisation and its aims more widely (Radio Liberty in Munich and others could be relied on to relay such information back into Ukraine).

The UHU also sought to organise mass collective action. First and foremost it returned to its traditional tasks of campaigning against human rights abuses. To this end, an Initiative Group for the Freeing of Ukrainian Political Prisoners had been set up by Mykhailo Horyn' as early as October 1987. When one of the group's members, Ivan Makar (later to become a Ukrainian deputy), was arrested in summer 1988 the successful campaign for his release became 'the foundation, on which the structural edifice of the L'viv oblast organisation of the UHU began to arise'.[47] The UHU organised petitions, leafleting and publicity in the West for the persecuted. In autumn 1988, the L'viv UHU set up a social committee for the families of the persecuted, and in October was strong enough to organise a strike committee under Stepan Khmara to protest against the violent dispersal of demonstrators in L'viv on 1 October. Forty factories in L'viv struck for two hours on 3 October, as a result of which Colonel Martynov of the local OMON, and General Popov of the local militia were replaced for failing to contain the protest.[48]

In June and July 1988 a series of public demonstrations numbering some 1,000 to 7,000 people were held in L'viv to demand the formation of a 'Democratic Front in Support of Perestroika', in imitation of similar moves in the Baltic republics. The failure of the 19th CPSU Party conference in Moscow to condemn the Baltic Popular Fronts emboldened the Ukrainians and encouraged them to believe that a similar organisation could be formed in Ukraine. However, they came too early to be effectively led by the UHU, and the authorities had little compunction in quickly crushing them.[49] Despite formulating their

demands in terms of a loyal petition to Gorbachev, the demonstrations were soon broken up by the OMON, as was a further meeting on 1 October. The UHU continued to organise meetings, however, although people were less willing to demonstrate in the winter. On international Human Rights Day, 10 December 1988. a few hundred gathered in L'viv, but no demonstration was possible in Kiev. The same pattern was repeated on 22 January 1989, when a large demonstration was held outside Sts. Yuriis' Church in L'viv to commemorate the 1919 reunion of Western and Central-Eastern Ukraine, but a demonstration planned for St. Sophia square in Kiev had to be held in a private apartment.[50] The tempo of demonstrations would, however, begin to rise again in mid-1989, as the Ukrainian cultural establishment began to join the protests.

The UHU organises itself

The set-backs of summer 1988 convinced the UHU that it must quickly organise itself more effectively. The UHU also benefited from the growing radicalisation of public opinion in Galicia and in Kiev in reaction to the failure of the Ukrainian authorities to live up to the promises of perestroika (the political atmosphere in Ukraine was always distinctly more conservative than that in Moscow until Shcherbyts'kyi's removal in September 1989). A founding 'congress' for the UHU was held in secret in a private apartment in L'viv on 29 October 1988, attended by 60 people.[51] Oblast branches were formed in early 1989.[52] By the beginning of 1990 the UHU was active in every Ukrainian oblast save Kirovohrad and Cherkasy.

The first URP congress

An all-Ukrainian conference of the UHU attended by 134 delegates on 17-18 March 1990 finally decided to call the Union's first national congress, and also endorsed Luk"ianenko's desire to turn the UHU formally into a political party, and *de facto* to create the first mass opposition party in Ukraine[53] (the UHU's campaign in the March 1990 Ukrainian elections is described below). The decision was made possible by Gorbachev's decision in February 1990 to abolish Article 6 of the USSR constitution that had guaranteed the communist party's legal monopoly on public political activity.

The congress met in Kiev on 29-30 April 1990,[54] and was attended by 495 delegates, representing the UHU's 2,300 members (the UHU now had organisations in all of Ukraine's oblasts, and even branches in Moscow and Lithuania). The name 'Ukrainian Republican Party' was chosen by 251 of the delegates, although 39 voted for 'Ukrainian Democratic Party', 14 for 'Ukrainian Christian-democratic Party', 11 for 'Ukrainian National-democratic Party', and two for 'Party of Ukrainian Independence'.[55]

The delegates' speeches showed that the UHU, despite the departure of many radicals in 1989, remained a broad church, embracing both moderates such as V"iacheslav Chornovil, and radicals such as Roman Koval' and Dmytro Korchyns'kyi who were later to provide the leadership for parties of the far right. Chornovil attacked both the excessive radicalism of the proposed programme and the party's authoritarian structure and, together with 11 other delegates, signed a declaration disassociating himself from the new party.[56] The exiled 1970s

dissident Leonid Pliushch also complained that the new party was too preoccupied with the national question, and had failed to pay sufficient attention to socio-economic questions, which would limit its appeal in Eastern Ukraine.[57]

The UHU's radicals, mainly somewhat younger, also had their say. Volodymyr Yavors'kyi, Oles' Serhiienko, Dmytro Korchyns'kyi and Roman Koval' (all of whom would ultimately depart the URP for parties further to the right) called for the URP to be a tightly disciplined, vanguard party, with limited tolerance for internal dissent and with radical nationalism as its ideology.[58] Koval', one of the URP's seven leadership Secretaries, even proposed a radical alternative programme for the party, which asserted that 'the rebirth of Ukrainian statehood is impossible without the rebirth of the Ukrainian nation', and demanded that 'the government of a Ukrainian republic should carry out a protectionist national policy which will secure the fundamental rights of the indigenous nation' as opposed to the 'denationalised' and the 'millions of Russians whose numbers in Ukraine are steadily growing'. Koval' also called for the CPU to be banned, and for all 'armed [forces] on Ukrainian territory, including nuclear, to be nationalised. This will be the guarantee of our independence'[59] (it is significant that leading radicals such as Koval' were prepared to contemplate a nuclear-armed Ukraine as early as 1990).

Koval''s proposals received little support, however, not least because they openly challenged Luk''ianenko's leadership. However, the final party programme that was thrashed out in a committee dominated by Luk''ianenko's supporters owed more to Koval''s radical nationalist ideas than to Chornovil's civic liberalism.[60] The programme was short on specifics, but strongly emphasised the party's central goals of

independence and the rehabilitation of ethnic myths and symbols. The economic section was particularly sparse.

Moreover, the new leadership elected at the congress contained several ultra-radical supporters of ethnic nationalism, and Luk"ianenko had to fight a long-running battle throughout 1990-92 to prevent their influence from growing. Luk"ianenko was elected by acclaim, and proposed as his Deputies Stepan Khmara from L'viv and Hryhorii Hrebeniuk from Donets'k in a misguided attempt to balance Western and Eastern Ukraine. Both, however, were ultra-radicals, who along with three other members of the URP leadership; Roman Koval' (now head of the party's Ideological Department, and editor of the URP's *samizdat* paper *Prapor antykomunizmu* ,[61] which in February 1991 was renamed *Vyzvolennia '91*), Serhii Zhyzhko and Oles' Serhiienko[62] formed a powerful radical faction pushing the party to the right. They dominated the party Secretariat because many of the URP's leading moderates had just been elected to the Ukrainian parliament, where their activities were now concentrated (see below).

Internal arguments, 1990-91

Throughout 1990-1, the party was divided on three key issues that also split other nationalist parties; whether to recognise the political institutions of the Ukrainian SSR as legitimate and participate in parliamentary politics, whether to embrace ethnic 'integral' nationalism as the party's official ideology, and whether to cooperate with national communists in the CPU. These arguments will be considered thematically in greater detail below. Here it will only be remarked that the URP's leadership found it increasingly difficult to hold the line as

the party's younger members grew increasingly frustrated with the slow pace of political change and with the leadership's conservative accommodation of non-nationalist opinion in Eastern and Southern Ukraine. As a result, there was considerable cooperation between the URP's radicals and other ultra-right groups (see Chapters 6 and 7), especially at a local level. The Cherkasy branch of the URP defected *en masse* to the Ukrainian National Party in late 1990.[63] Roman Koval' went so far as to called for formal merger with other ultra-right groups in March 1991,[64] and the URP leadership felt compelled to ban joint membership of the URP and the main ultra-right group the UIA (see Chapter 6) in April 1991.[65] An 'Initiative Committee for the Formation of a Radical Group in the URP' appeared in L'viv in December 1990, which criticised Luk"ianenko and other leaders of the URP and *Rukh* for their 'irresolution', lack 'of preparedness for active struggle', and fascination with the parliamentary game. The Group argued that 'having grown in numbers, the party has decisively weakened in terms of quality', for which the only remedy was 'the study of the experience of the ideological-political struggle of the OUN'.[66]

The desire by the party's radicals such as Roman Koval' and Stepan Khmara for a policy of sharp confrontation with the authorities gathered support in the winter of 1990-91 as Gorbachev's reforms began to falter and conservative communists counter-attacked throughout the USSR. In Ukraine, Stepan Khmara was entrapped by KGB *provocateurs* on 7 November 1990 (he was accused of an assault). Two hundred and forty deputies from the CPU majority voted to strip him of his parliamentary immunity on 17 November and he was promptly arrested in the Supreme Council building itself.[67] When the URP's Grand Council met

on 17-18 November, the atmosphere was near-hysterical.[68] Roman Koval' called for the URP to form secret underground structures and prepare for an all-Ukrainian strike in protest at Khmara's arrest and the general communist *revanche* , and received widespread support[69] until he was put in his place by Luk"ianenko, who asserted that 'the situation is not that extreme. The worsening of the situation is natural, and we expected it'. 'Our strength lies in open struggle' and semi-public discussion of the party going underground was absurd in any case.[70]

Arguments over strategy continued to split the party right up to the very top, however. Koval', for example, attacked moderate deputies such as Oles' Shevchenko for compromising with the imperial enemy, while Shevchenko replied by accusing Koval' of 'carrying out the work of the KGB' by splitting the party from within.[71] The radicals' personal feud with leading figures in the URP led to a widespread purge in the run-up to the URP's second congress in June 1991. The first to go was Volodymyr Yavors'kyi, thrown out of the L'viv URP in December 1990 (he went on to edit the radical nationalist L'viv journal *Napriam* , and joined Ivan Kandyba's ultra-nationalist splinter group, the DSU, in 1992 - see Chapter 7). After long discussion, Koval' was suspended from his work as a URP Secretary in April 1991.[72] Koval', along with most of the others purged before the congress (Zhyzkho, Anatolii Shcherbatiuk) also ended up in the DSU (the parties of the far right were often led by those expelled from the UHU-URP, - see Chapters 6 and 7). The URP's deputy leader, Hrebeniuk, would also be removed at the congress. The radicals therefore were largely decapitated of leadership.

Khmara, however, because of his spell in prison, was too much of a popular hero for the leadership to touch. The Ukrainian authorities in fact deliberately released him in time to make mischief at the party's second congress. Moreover, many of the party's younger and more

nationalist members continued to support the radicals' programme, and there was much resentment against the party being run by a clique of former political prisoners at the top (Luk"ianenko, Shevchenko and the Horyn' brothers).[73]

Khmara and the second congress

The second URP congress was held on 1-2 June 1991.[74] The party now claimed 8,881 members (1,653 of whom were probationary 'candidate members'), as opposed to 2,300 a year earlier.

Khmara now carried the standard for the party's radicals. He had already gained notoriety for his extreme anti-Russian and anti-communist views, and had been further embittered by what he saw as lack of support from other opposition deputies while he was in prison, and frustrated at their general lack of activity.[75] From prison, Khmara had even drawn up a draft constitution for a 'Sovereign Hetmanate Republic', in other words a Ukraine purged of all communist influence and Soviet institutions.[76] Khmara therefore was always arguing with Luk"ianenko, Shevchenko and the Horyn' brothers. For them, national independence was the primary political goal, to be achieved through cooperation with national communists if necessary.

In his speech to the congress, Khmara declared that 'Marxism is the embodiment of Satanism', and that 'in the whole of world experience there is not a single example where cooperation between democrats and communists has had positive consequences'. He dismissed talk of a split between orthodox and national communists in the CPU as 'demagogic and perfidious propaganda, designed to maintain the people's delusions'. In fact 'the Supreme Soviet under the leadership of Kravchuk has turned itself into [little more than] a branch of the Central

Committee of the CPU', which was full of 'wafflers' unwilling or incapable of taking practical steps to defend Ukraine's sovereignty.[77] He therefore repeated his call for the URP to remain a purist and elite vanguard party, with a more openly nationalist ideology, based on the principle that 'abstract love for Ukraine without hatred for those who crucify her, that is for her enemies [a reference to Luk"ianenko's normal position that nationalism meant love for one's own, rather than hatred of others], will render the defence of our people impossible; nor with such an (amoral) approach will an independent Ukraine ever be built'.[78] The URP, according to Khmara, should seek to come to power only with the aid of similarly pure political forces. Far from cooperating with the CPU, the URP should exclude even ordinary former communists from its ranks for a period of five years after their departure from the CPSU-CPU.

Khmara's platform was clearly popular with many of the delegates, but his support was never openly tested as he withdrew his candidacy for the leadership in exchange for the position of deputy leader[79] (a proxy candidate, an obscure local party member Ivan Ternovyi, received 33 votes against Luk"ianenko's 368 in the ballot for the leadership).[80] Luk"ianenko (rather a biased source) estimated Khmara's support at no more than 5-10% of the party, and only 5 delegates (from Rivne) actually quit the party at the congress,[81] but events at the party's third congress in 1992 indicated much higher levels of support for ultra-radical positions (25-33% of the party, see below), which only Luk"ianenko's personal prestige managed to stifle in 1991.

Luk"ianenko's speech on the other hand directly attacked the 'ultra-radicals', arguing that the URP's participation in the Supreme Council had produced clear and positive results. By raising the issue of independence before a mass audience, it had helped to expand the limits

of the popular political imagination, whilst pressure on the national communists had produced the July 1990 Declaration of Ukrainian Sovereignty and the legalisation of opposition political activity. Luk"ianenko also claimed credit for devising the wording of the second ballot in the March 1991 referendum, taken up with enthusiasm by Kravchuk. Moreover, the ultra-radicals were unrealistic to think that independence could be achieved without the cooperation of the hundreds of thousands of bureaucrats and enterprise managers in the CPU. Ukrainian society, dominated by parochial self-sufficient peasant economies in 1917, was now a complex industrial organism, whose disentanglement from imperial structures would be a long and complex process. Luk"ianenko again stressed his personal opposition to narrow ethnic nationalism, and argued that the self-limiting radicalism of more extreme groups to the party's right was not for the URP. The URP had to accept that for the first time since the formation of the UHG in 1976, it now had more radical rivals to its right, but experience had shown that such groups would remain tiny, and their influence confined to Galicia.[82]

That said, Luk"ianenko clearly had to make concessions to the party's right wing to prevent Khmara splitting the party. Despite Oles' Shevchenko's stated desire to provoke a showdown with Khmara's supporters, Luk"ianenko preferred to avoid a split at all costs. The party's amended programme once again committed the party to the defence of individual rights, but also declared that 'the development of Ukraine should be based on the union of the [ethnic] nation and statehood, without which the decisive material and spiritual progress of Ukrainian society is impossible', and that the CPU was a 'criminal' organisation, whose 'property must be returned to the people of Ukraine'.[83] The party would maintain its 'twin-track' strategy of simultaneous parliamentary

and extra-parliamentary action until Ukrainian independence was unexpectedly achieved in August/December 1991. The URP was not finally rid of Khmara and his supporters until the party's next congress in May 1992.

The August coup, independence and Presidential elections

During the attempted coup in Moscow in August 1991, the URP was prepared to resume its underground existence.[84] The party immediately condemned the coup as 'an attempt to smash the national-democratic movement [in Ukraine] and start a civil war in the republic', and called on 'all party organisations to organise open party meetings in the streets, squares and factories',[85] and prepare for mass civil disobedience and an all-Ukrainian strike if necessary. Luk"ianenko meanwhile joined other representatives of the political parties in attempting to persuade Kravchuk to take a firm stand against the plotters (see Chapter 8).[86] The URP's deputies were also prominent at the meeting of the *Narodna rada* on 23 August that decided, after the collapse of both the coup attempt and Moscow's authority, to press the demand for independence at the special session of the Supreme Council due to open the next day. The party's deputies also successfully argued that the demand for Ukrainian independence should come before any witch-hunt against the CPU.

Events on the 24th (Luk"ianenko's birthday) duly unfolded in this fashion. The achievement of independence then had a profound effect on the whole psychology and politics of the URP. Khmara's continued anti-communist obsession was no longer shared by the majority of the party's leaders, who instead swung to the other extreme and embraced the national communists for having delivered the party's main political goal. Luk"ianenko and Mykhailo Horyn' now sought to transform the

URP from a semi-underground party into the main defenders of Ukraine's newly-acquired statehood. Khmara meanwhile began to alienate other nationalists by arguing against 'premature' Presidential elections, and even against the referendum on Ukrainian independence as a majority then seemed far from certain.[87]

The party of course campaigned strongly for a 'yes' vote in the referendum, and also put forward Luk"ianenko as the party's candidate for President (see below). Luk"ianenko tacitly supported Kravchuk, but opposed *Rukh's* official candidate, the 'excessively liberal' Chornovil.

The URP changes to a 'party of government'

The URP's campaign caused much bad blood, especially as it had split the opposition vote; and was the key factor leading to Chornovil's 'anti-party' campaign within *Rukh* (see Chapter 4). The URP nevertheless considered itself vindicated. It called on 'all Ukrainian citizens and all civic and political organisations to unite around President Kravchuk in the defence of Ukrainian independence, and as one set about the building of our state, confirmation of our rights and freedoms, spiritual revival of the Ukrainian people and all peoples and ethnic groups for whom Ukraine has become their one single homeland'. The URP now declared itself to be in 'constructive opposition' to Kravchuk, that is they would support him in so far as he lived up to the tasks outlined above.[88]

The fact should be borne in mind, as the URP was accused throughout 1992-3 of excessively slavish support for the authorities. In fact, the party was only prepared to back them in so far as they were implementing the party's nationalist programme. The URP called for the resignation of Premier Vitol'd Fokin's government as early as December 1991.[89] The URP's position, as clarified in August 1992, 'is,

and has always been [to support the process of] state-building. In Ukraine, as in the rest of the world, the institution of the Presidency is the source of stability. Given this, the URP does not orient itself towards the actual individuals who occupy the post of President, but towards Presidential power itself as the guarantee of stability in the state and in society'.[90] Kravchuk, meanwhile, was happy to accept the URP's support. He needed to broaden his power-base, whilst the URP's emphasis on state-building and relative lack of interest in economic reform did not threaten his policy of domestic 'stability'.

The ground for these changes was first of all prepared at a theoretical conference held in Kiev in Khmara's absence on 25-6 January 1992,[91] which endorsed the new party line. The party leadership also moved quickly to isolate the supporters of Khmara. In the manner of the communist party of old, the URP leaders circulated a 'closed letter' condemning Khmara to its oblast organisations, which not surprisingly surfaced in *Vechirnii Kyïv* on 28 April. This listed his increasingly idiosyncratic behaviour, and concluded that 'it is obvious that the quicker the personality and image of Mr. Khmara ceases to be associated with the URP, then the quicker we will attract engineers, scientists' and the like into the party.[92] Khmara had alienated many of his supporters since 1991. The URP leadership was no longer so afraid of his public popularity, and prepared the ground for his expulsion well.

The URP campaign to build bridges with Kravchuk suffered a setback in March 1992. The party had tried to push *Rukh* into open support for Kravchuk, but at the movement's third congress V"iacheslav Chornovil and his supporters, who wished to emphasise anti-communism as much as nationalism and remain in opposition to Kravchuk, were victorious (see Chapter 4). Ironically, however, this left pro-Kravchuk elements in *Rukh* even more dependent on the URP, as the only political force

capable of creating a 'national democratic' coalition that would support the national communists (see Chapter 8). The proposal to create such a movement was also supported by the Democratic Party of Ukraine, the Union of Ukrainian Students, and the *Prosvita* Ukrainian Language Society. The pro-Kravchuk elements in *Rukh* therefore began to come over to the URP, which withdrew formally from *Rukh* once Chornovil's victory became irreversible. Forty deputies in the Supreme Council (mainly URP and DPU), formerly members of the opposition, but now keen supporters of Kravchuk, who had first organised themselves as a 'national democrat' *Rukh* faction in February 1992, under Mykhailo Horyn' (see Chapter 4), now disassociated themselves from Chornovil and formed a pro-Kravchuk 'Independence and Democracy' faction, also led by Horyn'.[93] More formal steps towards union within what the URP termed the 'national democratic' camp were clearly possible once the URP had forced Khmara out of the party.

The URP's third congress

The URP's third congress met on 1-2 May 1992.[94] Since the second congress in June 1991, membership had grown from 8,881 to around 12,000 members (6,033 or 50.3% were from Galicia),[95] maintaining the URP's status as the largest (in terms of membership) and best organised Ukrainian party, the Socialists excepted. The URP's Council had denied Khmara the right to speak the previous day, and an attempt by his supporters to overturn this received only 142 votes. Khmara also failed to be elected to the Congress Presidium, receiving only 216 votes (after a stormy recount).[96] Khmara's claim to represent the voice of radicalism within the party was finally squashed by Luk"ianenko forcing through a reaffirmation of the party's ban on factions, which received 296 votes.

Khmara promptly announced his departure from the party, initially taking 11 delegates with him to form a rival 'Party of Radical Action', although ultimately perhaps 5-10% of the URP's membership was to join the rival Ukrainian Conservative Republican Party founded by Khmara in June 1992 (see Chapter 7).[97] The URP leadership conducted a post-congress purge of Khmara's supporters in any case, just to make sure that they were rid of his influence.[98]

Thereafter the leadership prevailed. The statute was liberalised to attract more members of the intelligentsia. Luk"ianenko, who had agreed to become Ukrainian ambassador to Canada, became honorary chairman of the party, and Mykhailo Horyn' replaced him as the party's new leader, receiving 389 votes with 9 against. The Congress then confirmed Horyn"s proposals of Oleh Pavlyshyn as deputy leader in charge of party organisation, and Levko Horokhivs'kyi as deputy leader in charge of the parliamentary party.

The Congress's resolutions and amendments to the party programme confirmed the supremacy of the 'national democrats', urging support for Kravchuk from a position of pushing him into ever more radical policies. The Congress demanded complete and immediate withdrawal from the CIS; protection of national enterprises against 'unfair foreign competition'; strengthened national defence and retention of remaining nuclear weapons should Russia keep a nuclear capacity; tough action against 'separatist fifth columns' within Ukraine; and support for Ukrainians living in the other states of the former Soviet Union.[99] As regards the last point, even Luk"ianenko, a relative moderate, called for the disintegration of the Russian Federation (in February 1992, the party had organised a series of meetings with Ukrainians from the Kuban'

region of Russia to encourage a potential separatist movement in the region).[100]

The party demanded quicker and more decisive Ukrainianisation of the state, and of the new Ukrainian Armed Forces in particular. The URP argued that too many servicemen had taken the Ukrainian shilling for economic reasons, and their loyalty could not be guaranteed in any future conflict with Russia. The party's commitment to ethnic nationalism was made clear by its slogan supporting 'the Ukrainian character of national statehood', that is priority treatment for Ukrainian language, culture and economic interests. The URP's economic policy was becoming increasingly national-protectionist. The party argued that the guiding principle of economic policy should be 'the priority of national industry' and condemned liberal centrists such as the then Economics Minister Volodymyr Lanovyi for granting excessive privileges to foreign investors.[101] The party supported a complete economic break with Russia as the only way of guaranteeing Ukrainian independence.

The URP's transformation into a 'party of respectable conservatism' was now complete, and its efforts to consolidate nationalist forces to support the young Ukrainian state are described in Chapter 8.

The rest of this Chapter now concentrates on a thematic overview of the main policy and political issues surrounding the URP.

The URP's social and regional strength

The party's social base

The UHU-URP was the main nationalist party throughout this period, but it proved unable to transcend the geographical and social

limits to Ukrainian nationalism's appeal that were described in Chapter 1. Its appeal was largely confined to Kiev and Galicia.

The UHU-URP was a populist nationalist party, composed almost exclusively of ethnic Ukrainians, more than half of whom came from Galicia. Its rank-and-file membership was largely composed of workers and radical teachers. The UHU-URP was unable to make much impact on other social groups. Of the 381 delegates to the first URP congress in 1990 who answered the mandate commission's questionnaire, an overwhelming 359 (94%) were ethnic Ukrainians (although several ethnic Ukrainian delegates from Eastern Ukraine spoke in Russian), 14 were Russian, and four were from other nationalities. Sixty three were workers, and 94 were engineering-technical operatives (41% of the total). 17 were pensioners, 17 were unemployed, 2 worked in agriculture, and one was a housewife. Of those who might be classed as intelligentsia (27% of the total), 60 were teachers, 12 were doctors, 8 students, 7 journalists or editors, 7 artists, 5 scientific workers, 3 workers 'in state and civil organisations', plus one writer and one architect. Two hundred and nine had higher education, 75 middle-specialised education, and 76 only middle or incomplete education. Only 33 were women.[102]

Unlike the Democratic Party of Ukraine, whose first congress was held in December 1990 (see Chapter 5), the UHU-URP had few supporters amongst the Ukrainian intelligentsia. On the other hand, the dominance of ex-dissidents was made clear when the Ukrainian National Party's Hryhorii Prykhod'ko began his address to the congress with the phrase 'Dear fellow political prisoners!' [spivkamernyky] to loud applause.[103]

This pattern was confirmed at later gatherings. At the 1991 congress, 96% of the delegates were Ukrainian (433 of the 450 who answered a questionnaire), and 4% Russian. Although 70% of delegates were now classed as 'intelligentsia' (297), most of these were teachers. The other

delegates were workers (27%), with a handful of pensioners (nine), students (two) and peasants (two). More than 61% of the delegates were over the age of 35.[104]

At the 1992 congress, 97% of delegates were Ukrainian. Only 48% were now classed as 'intelligentsia', 22% were workers, 19% peasants, and 7% pensioners.[105]

As regards the party's mass membership, 46% were working class [robitnykiv], and 28% white-collar [sluzhbovtsiv]. Only 24% had higher education.[106] Only 5% were women.[107]

Regional support

The most detailed information concerning the party's regional support was made available at the time of the party's second congress in May 1991 when the party had 8,881 members. As shown in table 4.1 below, the URP's membership was strongly concentrated in Galicia. Of the party's 8,765 members based in Ukraine, 55% were from Galicia, and 12% from elsewhere in Western Ukraine. Central Ukraine accounted for 20% (6% in the Right Bank, 10% in Kiev city and oblast, 4% in the Left Bank), but only 9% were from Eastern Ukraine, and a mere 4% from the South. The party's membership therefore was not as geographically widespread as that of the DPU (see Chapter 5). On the other hand, the size of the URP meant that they still had more members outside Galicia (3,933, and 2,894 outside of Western Ukraine as a whole) than any other party.

Table 4.1: The URP's membership as of June 1991.[108]

Oblast	Membership
i) Galicia	
L'viv	2,630
Ternopil'	1,152
Ivano-Frankivs'k	1,050
ii) Volyn'-Polissia	
Rivne	257
Volyn'	286
iii) Other West	
Transcarpathia	340
Chernivtsi	156
iv) Right Bank	
Kirovohrad	104
Cherkasy	163
Vinnytsia	83
Zhytomyr	77
Khmel'nyts'kyi	111
v) Kiev (city & oblast)	891
vi) Left Bank	
Poltava	124
Sumy	59
Chernihiv	152
vii) East	
Kharkiv	166
Donets'k	209

Luhans'k	82
Zaporizhzhia	142
Dnipropetrovs'k	214

viii) South

Mykolaïv	63
Kherson	135
Odesa	77
Crimea	42

Other (North, Leningrad, Moscow) 116

Total: <u>8,881</u>

A similar pattern was apparent in 1990, when 790 (34%) of the UHU's 2,300 members were from L'viv oblast alone,[109] and a further 270 (12%) were from Ternopil').[110]

By 1991, the URP was well organised throughout Ukraine. The party had 258 regional organisations (154 in November 1990) throughout Ukraine's 27 oblasts (55 of these were in Galicia).[111] This meant that the URP's reach, uniquely among Ukrainian political parties, extended beyond oblast centres. The party had an organisation in almost every raion in Galicia, and in more than half of Ukraine's central raions, although its coverage of Eastern and Southern Ukraine was more patchy.

At the local level the URP (then the UHU) claimed the support of 427 deputies in June 1991.[112] Most (362) were elected in Galicia in March 1990 where the opposition all but swept the board; 19 elsewhere in Western Ukraine; 37 in Central Ukraine, including 21 in Kiev city and oblast; but only 9 in the East and 9 in the South[113] (it should be borne in

mind that these figures refer to URP deputies. Most, but not all those who were elected as members of the UHU in 1990 transferred to the URP).

The UHU-URP's largest body of deputies was elected in L'viv oblast, where it had 23 deputies on the oblast council (out of 200), 20-22 on the town council (out of 150), and 210 in the oblast as a whole.[114]

The URP helped form the 'Democratic Platform' faction in the Transcarpathian oblast council,[115] and it exercised considerable influence on the Ternopil', Ivano-Frankivs'k and Rivne councils (all in Western Ukraine). In L'viv, on the other hand, the URP was in opposition to Chornovil, who was leader of the council from 1990-92. However, the URP had few deputies outside of Western Ukraine (except for Kiev city) and its deputies were rarely capable of disciplined action as a faction,[116] despite the provision in the party's statute that they should always act as a group and coordinate their actions with the appropriate local branch of the URP.[117]

Local party organisations produced a total of 29 papers (mainly *samizdat*) with a total circulation of 259,700. Again, however, these were concentrated in Galicia. Eight of the URP's key papers were printed in Galicia, and no URP paper outside of Galicia and Kiev had a circulation of more than 10,000.[118] The dominance of the party's press by Galician radicals can be seen from the fact that they were always full of material on the OUN-UPA. Unlike the Democratic Party of Ukraine, the URP had no compunction about eulogising the UPA.[119]

The preeminent role played by radical Galicians inside the party was also indicated by the fact that many of the URP's members outside Galicia were actually born in Galicia.[120] The three Galician oblast parties often held common sittings (although eventually the URP leadership ended this practice and condemned the Galician Assembly, the regular

joint assembly of the three Galician councils, arguing that this set an unhealthy precedent for regional separatism elsewhere in Ukraine).[121] Members of the URP's Galician branches frequently travelled elsewhere in Ukraine to take part in public demonstrations, petition campaigns and the like.[122] In the 1989-91 period the CPU was able to attack the idea of Galician 'flying pickets' descending on Kiev or the Donbas to considerable propaganda effect. The Galician branches of the URP were often twinned with weaker organisations in Eastern Ukraine to provide practical help and assistance. In 1991 the party helped to organise a series of exchanges of schoolchildren between Eastern Ukraine and Galicia to try and help overcome misconceptions concerning 'Galician extremism'.[123]

The effectiveness of the party's organisations elsewhere in Ukraine varied considerably. The Rivne party was prone to infiltration by extremists,[124] as were the URP's organisations in Vinnytsia, Kherson, Mykolaïv and Odesa.[125] Paradoxically, many of the URP's smaller branches in Eastern and Southern Ukraine were more easily dominated by a handful of ultra-radicals, resentful at the high local levels of Russification.[126] The URP's Kharkiv branch, on the other hand, was larger and was led by one of the party's leading moderates Ihor Kravtsiv. It therefore had relatively good relations even with Russophone groups such as the PDRU.[127] In more remote areas, it was difficult even for a centralised party like the URP to control local party organisations, which often went their own way or fell under the control of particular individuals.[128] The Transcarpathian URP broke away from the rest of the party in April 1993.[129] Even the URP's largest organisation in L'viv faced problems after 1991, as it was increasingly outflanked by more radical parties on its right.

Party organisation; neo-Bolshevik discipline

<u>The URP as a nationalist 'vanguard'</u>

The URP soon obtained a reputation as a well-organised, but disciplinarian party, which ironically followed many of Lenin's precepts on how to organise a political party. Although the irony of a nationalist party copying the methods of its communist opponents is obvious, the URP was able to develop a party organisation that was much more efficient than that of its rivals and consequently to exercise an influence out of proportion to its membership, much as the Bolsheviks themselves had done in 1917.

The original UHU had fallen between two stools. On the one hand, the UHU's Declaration of Principles had stated that the Union, 'not being a political party and not setting itself the aim of taking power' saw itself more as a proto-Popular Front, hoping to 'become the basis for uniting all democratic forces in the struggle for restructuring society, and for human and national rights'.[130] It therefore functioned as a loose-knit broad church, describing itself as 'a federative union of self-governing human rights groups and organisations', with the right of internal disagreement.

On the other hand, leading figures in the UHU already saw the Union as a vanguard organisation whose purpose was to radicalise other political organisations in a nationalist direction. To all intents and purposes the UHU was already attempting to function as an opposition political party, despite its public protestations to the contrary. Luk"ianenko in 1990 accepted that, 'the UHU has through the last two years played the role of a political party',[131] and even Chornovil

admitted that, 'the name "Helsinki" we considered from the very start to be temporary'...'a clearly tactical measure' to attract broad support to the UHU and allow it to function as a proto-Popular Front, particularly in order to combat the all-Union political parties that were beginning to spread outwards from Moscow to Ukraine. However, 'in practice, the authorities understood our true nature well and...began to call us an organis[ed] political alternative to the CPSU, and even a party'.[132]

Luk"ianenko later explained his thinking as follows;

The authority of a political party manifests itself not in ultra-radical political slogans, but in those slogans that the people consider realistic.

What people, on what basis?

It's clear that a party cannot orientate itself towards the backward part of the people. In order to be the leading force in society, the party should orientate itself towards the active part of the population, that part which is more quickly freeing itself from fear and regaining consciousness after the imperial and communist mist. The UHU is a dynamic organisation which has continually accelerated the development of the renewal of national consciousness and the civil activity of the people, whilst at the same time never getting ahead of them. The UHU's merit lies not in the fact that it well understands the inevitability of the disintegration of the empire and the arrival of an independent Ukrainian state, but in so far as it can contain itself and prepare others to [support] it s idea.[133]

In other words, Luk"ianenko conceived of the UHU as a vanguard party, leading public opinion, but never wholly out of step with it. The Ukrainian public was not ready to swallow the idea of independence in 1988. Luk"ianenko later admitted that 'if the UHU had gone to the people with its plans for independence in 1988, it would have remained

a tiny groupuscle like the UPDL'[134] (the UPDL was the Ukrainian People's-Democratic League, another radical splinter group formed by defectors from the UHU in June 1989 that quickly disappeared almost without trace. See Chapter 6). The UHU did not begin openly to call for Ukraine's independence until after the formation of *Rukh* in September 1989 (see Chapter 4).[135]

In the winter of 1989-90, as the Ukrainian elections of March 1990 approached, the UHU's began to consider the possibility of openly organising themselves as a political party, but there were bitter arguments at the all-Ukrainian council of the UHU on 5 and 13 November 1989 over what form the new party should take.[136]

Luk"ianenko's position was that the UHU should 'abandon the form of human rights defence (the word "Helsinki") and change the federal principle of organisational construction [of the UHU] for a unitary one'.[137] That is, the UHU should be reorganised into a disciplined political party. At the same time, however, Luk"ianenko argued that the Ukrainian elections must come before narrow party interests. He was opposed by Chornovil, who saw no need for neo-communist discipline within the future party, and preferred to concentrate on building the UHU's internal strength.[138] The dispute was further embittered by personal animosities resulting from Chornovil's hijacking of the UHU press-service to form his own Ukrainian Independent Publishing-Information Union in January 1990, and from the other UHU leaders' mistrust of Chornovil's 'liberalism'. Chornovil, however, was increasingly isolated amongst the UHU leadership. As early as 16 March 1989, he had declared that he no longer considered himself to be a member of the UHU executive committee, and had called on UHU members to rally to his banner.[139]

Chornovil was therefore squeezed out of the UHU leadership and Luk"ianenko's line prevailed (after the March 1990 elections Chornovil formed his own independent power base as head of the new L'viv oblast council). Nevertheless, Chornovil was able to make a sharply critical speech to the first URP congress in 1990, accusing the party leadership of 'creating a deeply centralised organisation of the Bolshevik-Fascist type'.[140]

The new party statute was certainly highly centralised. It gave the URP leadership a large amount of autonomy,[141] which was further strengthened (in 1990-92 at least) by a culture of deference amongst the party's largely working class activists. The party leadership was able to reorganise, dissolve and reestablish local cells at will, and frequently intervened to change local leaderships when it deemed necessary.[142] A member of the central party leadership would always attend the AGMs of oblast party meetings to exercise general 'oversight' over the proceedings.[143] Those who disagreed with the leadership line, such as Koval"s supporters in 1991, or Khmara's in 1992, were simply expelled (after 1991, via an 'Ethics Commission' of the party). Internal party factions were formally banned. Whenever sympathy for another organisation's political line became widespread amongst the party's membership, the leadership would simply forbid joint membership, as with the UNA in 1990 and KUN in 1993 (see Chapters 6 and 7).[144]

Entry into the party was rigidly controlled, with the URP even adopting the Bolshevik system of 'candidate membership' as the first step towards entrance into full party membership. There was, however, considerable disagreement between Luk"ianenko and Khmara as to what size the party should be. For Luk"ianenko, a mass-based party was the only practical way to oppose the social power of the CPU, which had a cell in every village and every workplace.[145] Khmara, on the other

hand, favoured a much smaller party with tighter control over the admission of former communists into the party. The dispute, however, remained largely academic, as the URP's membership stagnated at a maximum level of around 12,000 after 1992.

Party office and press

The URP was the best financed non-communist party in Ukraine. In 1991-2 its party budget was 962,000 roubles, 306,000 roubles of which was financed by membership contributions and the rest from voluntary contributions, many from abroad.[146] The URP was therefore unique among non-communist parties in having a large and well-equipped central office in Kiev.

The party always had a strong central press which, although often journalistically weak, appeared regularly and in wide circulation. The party's first two attempts at publishing a national newspaper in 1990-91 (*Prapor antykomunizmu* and *Vyzvolennia '91*) were short-lived. From February 1991, however, the party regularly published *Samostiina Ukraïna* , ('Independent Ukraine', the same title as the nationalist pamphlet written by Mykola Mikhnovs'kyi in 1900).

The URP in parliament

Despite its reputation as a disciplined and centralised party, the URP had as many problems with controlling its parliamentary faction as other parties.[147] Relations between the party bureaucracy and the party faction in the Supreme Council were often poor. The party's 11-man faction in the Supreme Council was dominated by ex-political prisoners, who were extremely reluctant to heed the advice of younger party members.[148]

Although they often met as a faction before crucial votes, they failed to exercise voting discipline. During the vote on the resignation of the Fokin government in July 1992, for example, URP leader Mykhailo Horyn' abstained, Oles' Shevchenko voted against, and Levko Horokhivs'kyi, Ihor Derkach, Bohdan Rebryk, Bohdan Horyn', and Yaroslav Kendz'ior voted in favour.[149] In any case, the URP deputies were not really a true parliamentary faction. Rather, they represented a radical pole of attraction, around which up to two dozen (out of 450) nationalist, but independent-minded deputies gathered on occasion (URP 'sympathisers' included Ivan Makar, Larysa Skoryk and Hendrikh Altunian). After the party's third congress in 1992, however, Horokhivs'kyi, the party's leader in the Supreme Council, was made deputy leader of the party, and this helped to achieve a better degree of coordination between the two wings of the party.

Links with other organisations

The party made two attempts to establish a youth wing. In 1990 it sponsored the creation of a nationalist youth organisation, SNUM, but this quickly fell under the control of extreme nationalists, split away from the URP, and had to be disowned by the party's leadership (see Chapter 6). In 1991 the URP set up the Organisation of Young Republicans of Ukraine, led by Taras Batenko. It sought to be a 'youth organisation of a new type, cleansed of pro-communist ideology and ultra-radicalism, with the aim of appealing to [the type of people who will provide] the most effective foundation for the affirmation of independence'.[150] Although it was not a paramilitary group like UNSO (see Chapter 6), it nevertheless organised its own sports section and youth 'emergency volunteer corps'.[151]

On the whole, however, the URP was wary about establishing sister organisations, and preferred the classic Trotskyist tactics of 'entryism'. That is, the URP sought to exercise indirect influence through positioning its members in strategic positions in other nationalist groups and attempting to radicalise them from within. Bohdan Horyn' described 'the UHU's task' as 'displacing the liberalism of certain informal organisations, and giving them a radical direction'.[152] UHU members were active in *Memorial* , the Ukrainian Language Society and eventually *Rukh* (see Chapters 2 and 4).[153] When *Rukh* eventually held its founding congress in September 1989, the UHU's secretary Mykhailo Horyn' was elected to head the *Rukh* Secretariat (i.e. its bureaucracy), and seven UHU members became *Rukh* secretaries.[154] The leadership of the UHU felt that a voice in such organisations was particularly vital after the leadership of such groups was effectively conceded to the establishment cultural intelligentsia in the winter of 1988-9.

This strategy was often successful, but tended to cause resentment when the UHU was seen to be pushing its narrow party interests.

The UHU-URP also played a key role in establishing other nationalist organisations, such as the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers in 1990 and the Union of Officers of Ukraine in 1991 (see the section on Defence below). In 1991, when Ukrainian independence had not yet been achieved and when the URP was seeking to exert maximum pressure on national communists like Leonid Kravchuk to commit themselves to the national cause, the party was one of the main co-sponsors of the breakaway independent trade union organisation VOST (All-Ukrainian Organisation of Workers' Solidarity) along with more radical groups such as the UIA (see Chapter 6). The URP originally hoped that this

would function as an alliance between political activists and trade unionists akin to Solidarity in Poland. The party therefore seconded several of its leading members to VOST's Consultative Council of political advisers (analogous to Jacek Kuron's Workers' Defence Committee in Poland), including deputy leader Stepan Khmara; Mariia Oliinyk, the leader of the URP in Donets'k; and two key URP sympathisers, the deputies Larysa Skoryk and Bohdan Ternopil'skyi (the latter joined the URP in 1992).[155] However, VOST fell under the influence of the UIA, and became more of a vehicle for noisy public demonstration than a mass trade union. The URP therefore sought to distance itself from VOST after Ukrainian independence, as it came increasingly to argue that strikes were unpatriotic.

The URP also sought to broaden its influence through its regular practice of convening conferences of politicians and academics on key nationalist themes. These were often responsible for elaborating ideas that then became public policy. A path-breaking conference on the formation of Ukrainian Armed Forces was held in January 1991 (see below). A follow-up (on 'The Principles of National Security in an Independent State') was organised in October 1991, whilst on 22-3 December 1990 the party organised a conference on 'Problems of Overcoming Economic Colonialism in Ukraine'.[156]

After independence: the URP liberalises its statute

In December 1991, however, the URP's ruling Grand Council decided that the party would have to change profoundly if it was to successfully transform itself into a 'party of respectable conservatism'.[157] Before August 1991 the URP had had to function as a centralised and disciplined

organisation dedicated to the pursuit of independence, but now Luk"ianenko argued that this threatened to trap the URP in a 'bunker psychology'. The party's main task now was to assist the young Ukrainian state. Its statute should therefore become more liberal, and the party should attempt to recruit the intelligentsia who could help 'construct rather than destroy', instead of the working class activists who had formed the party's backbone in the past, but who were only capable of flag-waiving and noisy public demonstration. The URP also hoped that its admittance to the Christian Democratic International in November 1991 would set the seal on the party's new-found respectability.[158]

Deputy leader Oleh Pavlyshyn therefore proposed to replace the old territorial and workplace 'cell-based structure' of the party, which he admitted was copied from 'the experience of the Bolsheviks in organisational structures', with a more fluid system. The intelligentsia would be encouraged to act as party advisers or to become associate members of the party, and entry into the party was made easier by abolishing the need to secure two recommendations from existing party members.[159] After the statute was duly liberalised at the party's third congress in 1992, there were some signs that the changes were having the desired effect. Leading intellectuals such as the deputy Bohdan Ternopil'skyi and the journalist Viktor Teren' joined the party, and in June 1992 the party founded, with assistance from the Melnykite OUN in the diaspora, the theoretical journal *Rozbudova derzhavy* , ('Building the State'), to which many of the leading figures of the Kiev intelligentsia began to contribute.

A revolutionary or a parliamentary party?

<u>Parliamentary politics</u>

From the very beginning of its existence as the UHU, the URP's primarily goal was the desire to achieve Ukrainian independence. Although the party's more moderate leadership continued to believe that this could be achieved through parliamentary methods (as Luk"ianenko himself had believed since as far back as 1958), many of the party's younger and more radical members were attracted by the extra-parliamentary 'National Congress' route to independence, popular in the Baltic States and in the Caucasus in the early 1990s, and amongst Ukraine's ultra-right groups before August 1991 (see Chapter 6). This approach rejected the legitimacy of all forms of Soviet rule and sought to restore the forms of national statehood that had existed in the non-Russian republics in 1917-21. In Ukraine this took the form of the campaign to restore the Ukrainian People's Republic of 1918.

Although the URP's leadership was prone to making ambiguous statements concerning the basic legitimacy of the Ukrainian SSR,[160] on the whole they remained committed to parliamentary politics in 1990-91, if only to provide a tribune for the party's views. After winning deputies' seats in the 1990 elections, Luk"ianenko, Mykhailo Horyn', and V"iacheslav Chornovil (by then no longer a member of the URP) put themselves forward as symbolic candidates for the post of Chairman of the Supreme Council in May 1990 in order to make the maximum use of this unprecedented new opportunity to spread the national message (their speeches were carried on live TV).[161] Luk"ianenko was quick to stress the achievements of parliamentary politics; - the URP was

officially registered on 5 November 1990, making it the first legal modern non-communist party in Ukraine,[162] formal freedom of the press had been established and Article 6 of the constitution of the Ukrainian SSR (guaranteeing the CPSU/CPU's monopoly right to rule) had been abolished.[163] At the same time, however, although most of the party were prepared to follow Luk"ianenko when the parliamentary approach was seen to be bringing such results, the URP was also prepared to resort to extra-parliamentary methods, particularly during the general communist reaction throughout the USSR in the winter of 1990-91. In particular, any hint that the CPU leadership was prepared to contemplate signing a new Union Treaty with Moscow brought about URP-sponsored demonstrations (such as the mass rallies in Kiev to coincide with the opening of the second session of the Supreme Council on 30 September and 1 October 1990) and calls for an all-Ukrainian political strike.[164] In the freer political atmosphere after the Ukrainian elections in March 1990, the URP's mobilisational ability was at its height. The party could regularly organise demonstrations in the thousands in both Kiev and L'viv. The party's statute defined its 'main methods of activity' extremely broadly, from participation in elections to sponsoring strikes and campaigns of civil disobedience.[165]

This instrumental attitude was typified by Bohdan Horyn', leader of the L'viv URP, who stated in February 1991 that 'the URP views the Supreme Council as an arena of struggle, and not for collaboration with the imperial forces.....the party should not be afraid to declare that it is a reactionary organ'.[166] Basically the URP occupied the middle-ground between the far-right, who wanted to boycott all 'Soviet' elections and institutions, and the centre and centre-left, which was prepared to participate in both Ukrainian and all-Union institutions. The URP condemned the latter, but sought to work within the former. It was only

after the August 1991 declaration of independence that the URP dropped its ambivalent attitude towards Ukrainian state institutions. Now it swung to the other extreme, condemning extra-parliamentary action as 'destabilising' and disloyal to the new regime, and dropping its previous association with VOST and other groups.

Cooperation with national communists

A related question concerned whether it was worthwhile trying to work with national communists within state institutions. All of the URP's leading deputies, Luk"ianenko, the Horyn' brothers and Oles' Shevchenko, stood for cooperation with moderate elements in the CPU. Although the first URP programme had called for parties 'whose leading structures lay outside Ukraine' to be banned, in practice the URP leadership knew that their party was too weak to obtain power on its own, and that the achievement of independence required cooperation with national communists. According to Bohdan Horyn', the slogan of radical groups (see Chapter 6) for the 1990 elections, 'Councils without communists!' was a mistake, as many CPU members in the Supreme Council were already showing signs of embracing national communism. The URP must therefore work with them, and seek to broaden their split with their more reactionary colleagues.[167] Luk"ianenko, in reply to a question in April 1991 as to whether he would prefer 'an independent Ukraine with a despotic [i.e. communist] order, or a Ukraine with a democratic order but within the USSR', replied 'without a doubt, only an independent' [Ukraine].[168] In March 1991, Luk"ianenko simply declared that "I am a colleague of Kravchuk".[169] Like the Democratic Party of Ukraine, the URP leaders believed that nationalists could achieve their aims through proxy figures such as Kravchuk. However,

the leadership came under increasing challenge in 1990-1 as radical nationalists, including many in the URP, became increasingly disillusioned with the slow pace of constitutional change.[170]

As far back as the first meeting of the URP's new Grand Council (the party's leading organ between congresses, which met quarterly) on 3 June 1990,[171] Stepan Khmara had expressed his doubts concerning the commitment in the URP's statute to act in accordance with the constitution of the USSR (a necessary condition for the party's registration). Excessive legalism could only hamper the URP's struggle, he argued. Khmara and Koval', who had links with the radical right, preferred the latter's strategy of treating all institutions of the Ukrainian SSR as part of a colonial administration, boycotting them and forming an alternative Citizens' Assembly based on the 1917-21 Ukrainian People's Republic (see Chapter 6). Moreover, they insisted that the CPSU/CPU should be treated as a criminal organisation, and that the URP should support mass strikes, civil disobedience and the creation of a rival 'Government of National Salvation' to achieve the resignation of the government and new elections to the Supreme Council (which rather contradicted the idea of total boycott).[172] In August 1990, Khmara attacked the opposition *Narodna rada* in the Supreme Council for its ineffective struggle against the CPU majority, and called instead for a policy 'of massive popular pressure on the apparat', and for the URP to agitate amongst the armed services and militia to undermine their loyalty to the state.[173] When the Supreme Council reassembled in October, Khmara tabled a bill, radical before its time, to nationalise the property of the CPSU and komsomol, (which was nevertheless only defeated by 192 votes to 130).

Koval', meanwhile, announced that 'the beginning of the second session of the Supreme Council [in October 1990] has already shown that

"parliamentary" methods of struggle are obviously not enough'....'the fate of Ukraine will not be decided in the communist Supreme Council, but in the streets and the squares'....'the URP sees a positive perspective in paths to destabilisation, in paths to awakening the thirst for struggle amongst new sections of the population'.[174] Koval' was roundly censured for making similar calls at public rallies during the student hunger strikes of October 1990, which Luk"ianenko, considered to be dangerous demagogy at a time of a real risk of bloody confrontation with the authorities.[175]

As explained above, despite the pressure from their right, Luk"ianenko, Mykhailo Horyn' and Oles' Shevchenko cooperated actively in the Ukrainian parliament with Kravchuk, encouraged by the success of the second referendum question in March 1991 and by Kravchuk's reluctance to sign Gorbachev's proposed new Union Treaty. They therefore considered themselves vindicated by the successful outcome to the attempted coup in August 1991, and by the CPU's wholesale (if belated) subsequent conversion to the national cause. Luk"ianenko now argued that the period between the Declaration of Independence on 24 August and its confirmation on 1 December had marked a decisive turning point in Ukrainian history. 'Since 24 August we have no [longer] had an occupation administration, but a Ukrainian state. If before the 24th we were prepared to attack it [the occupying administration] from out of the bunker, now we must raise ourselves onto the same level as the state, cooperate with her and defend her against external enemies and fifth columns'.[176]

Therefore Luk"ianenko argued that the party must support the building of 'our state', changing from a 'party of destruction' to a 'party of construction' by active participation in the new structures of power. The party must become 'a school for the preparation of state cadres'.[177]

Hence, the URP supported Kravchuk's moves towards strengthening the institutions of Presidential rule in Spring 1992, including the system of local Presidential 'prefects' [*predstavnyky*] introduced in March 1992, hoping that many of its members would be appointed to such posts.[178]

Khmara's anti-communist radicalism, on the other hand, now seemed illogical to the majority of URP members, and his hostility to the institutions of 'the Ukrainian SSR' absurd now that the Ukrainian SSR had supposedly been transformed into an independent Ukrainian state.

Ukrainian elections

In March 1989, the UHU had to face the question of whether to become an electoral party and participate in the all-Union elections called by Gorbachev. On 18 December 1988 the all-Ukrainian UHU council had called for the elections to be boycotted because of their all-Union nature and because they were based on an undemocratic franchise and nomination procedure.[179] On 19-24 February 1989, the UHU organised pre-election rallies in Kiev under the slogans 'Down with Shcherbyts'kyi!' and 'State status for the Ukrainian language!', eventually broken up by the militia. However, under pressure both from the UHU's Eastern branches where the boycott call was having little effect and from the Western branches which felt confident that some seats in Galicia could be won, the UHU council reversed itself on 2 April and allowed local UHU branches to campaign for particular candidates, as they saw fit.

In L'viv for example the UHU supported Rostyslav Bratun, who was eventually elected in district No. 487 with 60% of the vote, whereas in the three okrugs where the UHU called for a boycott (Nos. 488 and 492, plus the L'viv national-territorial okrug) no candidate was elected on the

first round, with 60-94% of the vote being cast against the official candidates (a reasonable result in the conditions of the time).[180] Nevertheless, although some 50 or so of the 262 deputies elected from Ukraine to the all-Union Supreme Soviet were held to be sympathetic to the opposition, the elections demonstrated that the ability of the UHU and similar groups to reach and influence public opinion outside of Galicia was still fairly minimal, given continued CPU control of the mass media (see Chapter 2).

The March 1990 Ukrainian republican elections were less problematical for the UHU. Although the UHU conducted an internal debate over the winter of 1989-90 as to whether its first priority should be calling a congress to transform itself into a fully fledged political party, or devoting all its energies to the elections, few were prepared to argue that the UHU should not participate in what were after all Ukrainian elections. Ivan Makar and a handful of others continued to support the 'National Congress' line and argue that such elections were essentially 'imperial' and illegitimate, and that to participate in them would imply the *de facto* recognition of the occupying power, but they were in a distinct minority. Makar himself eventually ran for office and was elected as a deputy in L'viv oblast.

For rather different reasons, Chornovil was also highly critical of the UHU's campaign, which he regarded as amateurish. No common party manifesto was issued, and candidates were allowed to run their own individual campaigns.[181] Luk"ianenko for example did not mention Ukrainian independence, but Khmara did.[182] The UHU's Mykhailo Horyn', on the other hand, was the initiator of the Democratic Bloc coalition formed on 18 November 1989,[183] that eventually won 28% of the seats in the elections (125 out of 450). Twelve of these were members of the UHU,[184] eleven of whom were elected in the three Galician

oblasts. Seven were former political prisoners, with almost 100 years of sentence between them.[185] Several scored impressive victories; - Luk"ianenko was elected on the first round with 54% of the vote, Mykhailo Horyn' with 70%, his brother Bohdan with 77%, Khmara with 64%, Chornovil with 69%, Bohdan Rebryk with 71%, and Levko Horokhivs'kyi with 71%.[186] The UHU formed the core of the 22 strong radical *Nezalezhnist'* (Independence) faction within the opposition group in the Supreme Council.[187] The faction's platform issued on 12 June 1990 called for Ukrainian independence 'on the basis of the Helsinki final act' and 'the organisation of the [Ukrainian] state, socio-political, economic and cultural life in accordance with the national spirit and traditions of our people'.[188]

As mentioned above, the UHU-URP also elected 427 deputies at a local level.

However, the dispute as to whether elections held under the auspices of the Ukrainian SSR were legitimate resurfaced in March 1991, when the URP had to decide its attitude towards the referendum called by Gorbachev on the future of the USSR. Radicals within the URP leadership, in particular Roman Koval', were determined that the URP should follow the example of the rest of the ultra-right and boycott the referendum completely as the illegitimate act of an occupying power (see Chapters 6 and 7).[189] Several of the URP's deputies, on the other hand, in particular Oles' Shevchenko, argued that the URP should not only participate, but also support the second question placed on the ballot by Kravchuk.[190] On 30 January the URP Secretariat voted 5 to 2 against a boycott, whilst simultaneously arguing that the URP's propaganda should stress the illegitimacy of the exercise,[191] and in March even supported (by 7 votes to 3) the idea (which came to nothing) of Luk"ianenko joining the Supreme Council's committee to negotiate the

new Union Treaty.[192] Under pressure from the URP's largest branch in L'viv, however,[193] the URP Secretariat eventually decided on 1 March to call not for a boycott, but for a 'no' to both all-Ukrainian ballots, and a 'yes' to the separate question on outright independence organised by the three Galician councils.[194]

The URP decided on Luk"ianenko's candidature in the Presidential elections due in December 1991 as far back as July 1991 of that year.[195] The rationale for doing so was firstly to raise the URP's profile, and secondly to oppose Chornovil, who seemed likely to be *Rukh's* official candidate. The URP's leadership considered Chornovil to be too stridently anti-communist and distrusted his commitment to a federalised Ukraine. In contrast to Chornovil, Luk"ianenko's campaign stressed the importance of maintaining the alliance with Kravchuk and the national communists that had brought about the Declaration of Independence and other subsequent state-building measures.[196] For the URP, the continuation of such measures was more important than either economic reform or de-communisation.

Luk"ianenko was supported by the Union of Ukrainian Students,[197] the all-Ukrainian Society of the Repressed,[198] the Ukrainian Language Society *Prosvita* , the Ukrainian Youth Association, and prominent individuals such as Ivan Drach, Mykola Rudenko, Pavlo Movchan and Mykola Porovs'kyi, plus the Political Council of *Rukh* , and the Kiev branches of the Writers' Union of Ukraine and the UCDP. Together they formed an electoral coalition on 6 November entitled 'Ukraine, Luk"ianenko, Democracy', and chaired by Mykhailo Horyn'.[199] Table 3.2 shows the vote obtained by Luk"ianenko on 1 December 1991. Not surprisingly, Luk"ianenko scored most strongly in Western Ukraine, except in L'viv where Chornovil still had special prestige as head of the local oblast council (the URP's strength in Western Ukraine was also

shown by the fact that 35,000 of the original 107,964 signatures in support of Luk"ianenko's candidature were collected in L'viv oblast alone).[200] In strongly nationalist Western Ukrainian towns such as Dubno in Rivne, he scored as high as 27.6%.[201] He also scored 6.4% in Kiev city, and 6.7% in his native Chernihiv.

Table 3.2: Support for Levko Luk"ianenko in the Presidential Elections of 1 December 1991.[202]

Oblast	Support (%)
i) Galicia	
L'viv	4.7
Ternopil'	19.6
Ivano-Frankivs'k	11.8
ii) Volyn'-Polissia	
Rivne	13.4
Volyn'	8.9
iii) Other West	
Transcarpathia	5.0
Chernivtsi	4.4
iv) Right Bank	
Kirovohrad	3.5
Cherkasy	2.0
Vinnytsia	3.3
Zhytomyr	3.3
Khmel'nyts'kyi	3.2
v) Kiev city	6.4
Kiev oblast	5.6

vi) Left Bank

Poltava	4.2
Sumy	3.9
Chernihiv	6.7

vii) East

Kharkiv	2.1
Donets'k	3.1
Luhans'k	2.8
Zaporizhzhia	3.1
Dnipropetrovs'k	2.5

viii) South

Mykolaïv	2.3
Kherson	2.2
Odesa	2.8
Crimea	1.9

Total: 4.5%

Nevertheless, the results showed the limits of the party's nationalist appeal. Luk"ianenko admitted that his radical 'programme was a little before its time' and that the election of Kravchuk was natural in a post-communist society.[203] The URP was now well aware of the need to form a coalition of nationalist forces, and its efforts to do so are described in Chapter 8.

Ideology: an ethnic or a civic state?

Whilst Luk"ianenko remained leader, the party remained at least formally committed to the civic conceptions of nationalism that it had inherited from the UHG and UHU.[204] Moreover, the party repeatedly purged radical 'integral nationalists' such as Roman Koval' from its ranks. A close reading of the URP's documents, however, and the observation of its practical political activity shows that the party was always statist, and bordered on the ethnicist. For example Luk"ianenko stated in 1990 that, 'the social philosophy of the UHU was that the fate of [every] separate citizen depends in large measure upon the fate of his nation'.[205] By the end of the period of study the URP had adopted a basically ethnicist programme emphasising 'the national character of Ukrainian statehood'.

The Declaration of Principles published by the founders of the UHU in 1988, despite stating that the UHU was the direct successor of the UHG, had already marked a shift of emphasis by concentrating on the struggle for national, rather than individual, rights. The Preamble of the Declaration stated that 'the UHU considers it vital to define as the principal aim of its activity the defence of national rights, first and foremost the right of a nation to self-determination'.[206] Oleh Pavlyshyn, a founder member of the UHU and later deputy leader of the URP, admitted in January 1992 that 'the URP, and formerly the UHU, was always a party which stood for the liberation of Ukraine and against the totalitarian system, - though the latter always came second if we speak frankly'.[207]

The Declaration stated that 'the reestablishment of Ukrainian statehood, which exists today only on paper, would be the principal

lasting guarantee of the safeguarding of the economic, social, cultural, civic and political rights of the Ukrainian people as well as those national minorities living on the territory of Ukraine'.[208] However, the Declaration's proposals for new Ukrainian citizenship laws were not so generous, arguing against 'the artificial intermixing of the population of the Union' [i.e. the USSR] and deriding the concept of 'Soviet Man'. Its criteria for citizenship were in essence ethnicist, stating that 'anyone can be a citizen of Ukraine with compulsory and adequate knowledge of the state language of the republic [i.e. Ukrainian] and who lived on this or on other Ukrainian territory before its inclusion into the USSR...Ukrainian emigrants...and all other persons, who always lived on the territory of the republic for no less than ten years and who recognise the state language and constitution of the republic'.[209]

The party programme adopted by the URP in 1990 firmly declared itself in favour of complete Ukrainian independence, but avoided any reference to Dontsovite ideas of ethnic nationalism, choosing again to defer to the civic traditions of the UHG-UHU. The new party declared that its basic guiding principles were taken from the UN's Declaration of Human Rights.[210] However, in a carefully-worded phrase, the URP defined as its basic principle 'the absolute value of the life, freedom and specificity [*samobutnist'*] of the individual and every nation', but nowhere defined which should take priority. The programme promised equality for every citizen of Ukraine, regardless of national origin, and 'national-cultural autonomy' for all, but also spoke of the need for 'the cultivation of the aristocratic spirit, and the tutelage of self-respect and national pride'. There was also a call to ban those 'political organisations, whose leadership centres lie outside Ukraine' (i.e. the CPU).[211]

The official commitment to civic nationalism was best represented by Yevhen Boltarovych, head of the party's theoretical department in L'viv,

transferred to Kiev in 1992, who declared that 'the most effective integrating factor [for a future Ukrainian state] will be "territorial patriotism", that is the awakening of the sense of solidarity between all inhabitants of Ukrainian lands regardless of social status, religious affiliation, ethnic origin and even national-cultural consciousness'.[212]

This position was strongly opposed by the party's younger radicals, who in 1990-91 began openly to argue in favour of the URP adopting Mikhnovs'kyi's slogan of 'Ukraine for the Ukrainians!' and basing the party's ideology on the ideas of Dontsov. The radicals' influence reached its peak at the special theoretical conference held by the party in February 1991 to settle the question of whether the URP should adopt 'democratic' or 'integral' nationalism as its official ideology.[213] Valentyna Paryzhak from L'viv, for example, stated that 'for all my respect for democracy and individual rights, we must give priority to the rights of the nation'. The URP 'should not be afraid....of taking the best elements' of the OUN's ideology. In fact, it was surprising 'how relevant to our time and our struggle are the thoughts and words of Stepan Bandera'.[214] Serhii Aibabin from Zaporizhzhia stressed that the URP should stress above all that they were 'UKRAINIAN nationalists' who struggled 'for the interests of the Ukrainian nation above all', and called for a reversal of the tide of Russification in Eastern Ukraine.[215] Adam Kardash declared that 'only nationalism can lead us to independence'.[216] Yurii Hureïv from Kiev argued that the URP should abandon parliamentary politics, and Koval' called for the complete rejection of 'Soviets' (i.e. parliamentary politics) as an alien Russian import into Ukrainian political life.[217] The conference also warmly greeted ultra-radicals from integral nationalist parties, such as Dmytro Korchyns'kyi and Zenovii Krasivs'kyi (see Chapters 6 and 7).[218]

The speeches of other URP leaders showed that they were wary of dismissing the radicals' arguments out of hand. Nevertheless, after Luk"ianenko set the tone in his address, the 'integral nationalists' were largely defeated. Luk"ianenko attacked the 'Dontsovite integral nationalism....of some of our young men and members of SNUM' (the radical nationalist youth organisation, see Chapter 6), 'which is undemocratic in its content and revolutionary in its method'. Although he admitted that 'the ideology of national liberation cannot exist without hatred of the occupier and the regime established by them', Luk"ianenko stated that the URP's ideology should be based on 'the three elements of striving for national liberation, opposition to rightlessness and the creation of democracy', and called unequivocally for the URP to uphold the UHG-UHU's traditions of democratic nationalism and commitment to civic rights.[219] He was ably supported by others, who attacked the radicals' notion that '[integral] nationalism was simply the natural reaction of a people to its slavery'. It was an idea whose time had passed, and whose adoption by the URP would simply prevent it gathering support in Eastern Ukraine.[220] Vasyl' Lisovyi, the journalist and head of the committee 'Helsinki-90'[221] (the organisation that had taken over the UHU's responsibility for the defence of human rights in Ukraine after the UHU became the URP in 1990), proposed that the URP should look not to Dontsov for its ideological inspiration, but to the Ukrainian conservative philosopher of the 1920s (and sometime monarchist) V"iacheslav Lypyns'kyi.[222] The conference's official resolution stressed that 'democratic nationalism' was the official ideology of the URP, but left open the possibility of further discussion at the party's forthcoming second congress.[223]

The integral nationalists' voice continued to be heard within the party, however, especially as Roman Koval' was then both head of the

URP's theoretical department, and editor of the party papers *Prapor antykomunizmu* and *Vyzvolennia '91* . A typical Koval remark was that Ukrainians had no grievances against those of its national minorities 'who did not declare their supremacy over Ukrainians', but this was unlikely to include the Russians, who are unable 'to consider themselves a minority beyond their ethnic lands, and moreover consider themselves the historical (and only) masters of these lands' [i.e. Ukraine].[224] The party's deputy leader Hrebeniuk meanwhile argued that the proposed Gorbachev referendum in March 1991 was analogous to the Germans, had they been victorious in World War Two, offering to decide Ukraine's fate by referendum forty years later.[225]

Although Koval' and Hrebeniuk were eventually removed from the party (on Koval''s later career, see Chapter 7), their arguments represented an important part of the party's mainstream. The URP's desire for an ethnically Ukrainian state was given added prominence after the declaration of independence in August 1991. During the long discussion that ran from September 1991 to February 1992 about which official symbols the new state should adopt (more moderate voices were wary of alienating Ukraine's Russophone population),[226] the URP insisted (with ultimate success) on the adoption of narrowly ethnic symbols; the blue and yellow flag, trident symbol (supposedly dating back to the era of Kievan *Rus'*) and national hymn 'Ukraine has not yet died' popular in 1917-21. The party's press even published the names of those 'Russian chauvinist' Deputies who had voted against their adoption.[227] In June 1992 the party opposed the official proposal that Ukrainian citizens should not have to mention their ethnic origin in the new Ukrainian passports.[228] The URP continued to violently oppose a federal system of government for Ukraine, or any concessions to regional or separatist sentiment, especially in Crimea.[229] The party

consistently pressed for a more rapid Ukrainianisation of the new state, for a more vigorous imposition of the 1989 Language Law, and for the new Ukrainian constitution to recognise the supremacy of the rights of ethnic Ukrainians on their own national territory.[230] Lastly, the party was enthusiastically involved in the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the UPA in Summer 1992, whom it viewed, as always, simply as 'national heroes'.[231]

Defence and foreign policy

The URP tended to regard defence and foreign policy as its special preserve, and was able to exercise considerable influence in this area throughout 1991-2. It was the main proponent of the idea of building up Ukraine's Armed Forces even before the task began with the appointment of Defence Minister Konstantin Morozov in September 1991. The URP believed strongly in the nationalist axiom that Ukraine had lost her independence in 1917-21 'because her then leaders (Vynnychenko, Hrushevs'kyi), blinded by socialist ideals, did not defend the Ukrainian nation' militarily,[232] and that therefore only sufficient military strength would guarantee Ukrainian independence in the face of inevitable Russian hostility. More generally, Luk"ianenko declared that 'a people which does not want to provide for its own army, will [have to] provide for a foreign one'.[233]

The UHU's Declaration of Principles in 1988 had included a demand for 'republican military formations', but had envisaged that these would still be a constituent part of the Soviet Armed Forces.[234] However, once radical groups such as the Ukrainian National Party (see Chapter 6) began to raise the issue of independent Ukrainian Armed Forces as early as Autumn 1989, the UHU soon followed suit, and the first URP

programme in April 1990 declared that the party supported 'the restoration of Ukrainian Armed Forces, as one of the main guarantees of the independence of the Ukrainian people'.[235] As a result of campaigning by the URP and others the Declaration of Sovereignty issued by the Supreme Council in July 1990 included the claim that Ukraine 'had the right to' form its own Armed Forces.[236] In order to give substance to the Declaration, the URP then supported the campaign for Ukrainian conscripts to serve only on Ukrainian territory, and to this end assisted the formation of the Ukrainian Committee of Soldiers' Mothers in September 1990.[237] The URP also played a key role in establishing the Union of Officers of Ukraine (UOU) at two congresses in July and November 1991, and later nudging it towards a nationalist platform.[238]

The URP, along with *Rukh* , organised a conference on 'The External and Internal Security of Ukraine' on 2-3 February 1991,[239] at which Luk"ianenko proposed that, instead of trying to create her own Armed Forces from scratch, as Armenia and Moldova had done, Ukraine should instead seek to take over the Soviet forces already stationed on her territory, and gradually Ukrainianise them by 'returning foreign officers to their homeland' and encouraging ethnic Ukrainian officers to return home from their stations in other Soviet republics and further abroad.[240] Luk"ianenko also qualified Ukraine's commitment to future non-nuclear status by stating that 'she could not give them up earlier than the rest of the world achieved nuclear disarmament'. Luk"ianenko's programme proved highly prescient, and was to be largely followed as Ukraine rushed to create her own Armed Forces after august 1991.

Once that campaign was underway, the URP exercised constant pressure on President Kravchuk and Konstantin Morozov to ensure that

Ukraine built up what it saw as adequate defences and reject all Russian attempts to frustrate the process. The party proposed that the country's military doctrine should be based on a much clearer assessment of Ukraine's potential enemies, and that therefore the troop configuration inherited from the USSR, namely a concentration of men and equipment on Ukraine's Western borders, should be changed to meet the requirements of 'all-round defence'. In particular, troops should be redeployed towards Ukraine's borders with Russia. This would require a total Armed Force of 500,000-520,000 men, as opposed to the 225,000-250,000 then planned by the Ukrainian government.[241] After the success of the campaign to persuade Soviet troops stationed on Ukrainian territory to take an oath of loyalty to Ukraine in early 1992, the URP then exerted further pressure to create an ethnically Ukrainian officer corps, and to weed out those who had only signed out of basically economic motives.[242] Too many officers were 'reactionaries', 'more or less oriented to Moscow', who had brought too many of the habits of the old Soviet Armed Forces with them. To combat this, the URP proposed and then supported the creation of a 'Social-Psychological Service' within the military, whose job would be to teach officers and men about the best 'traditions of the Ukrainian people and Armed Forces', and an enhanced role for the UOU, even its veto over appointments.[243]

As regards the division of Forces between Ukraine and Russia/The CIS, the URP's position was simple; - 'everything that is situated on Ukrainian territory [at the time of the dissolution of the USSR] belongs to the Ukrainian people'.[244] The URP called for the complete seizure of the Black Sea fleet, and denounced the August 1992 Yalta agreement establishing joint control over the fleet as 'Ukraine's Munich', and a Trojan Horse leading to the establishment of foreign military bases on Ukrainian territory.[245] Luk"ianenko in fact calculated that Ukraine was

entitled to a proportionate share of 30.2% of the naval forces of the USSR (given her contribution to their construction, etc), and that therefore her demand for the Black Sea Fleet was a relatively modest claim.[246]

As with the rest of the Ukrainian right, the URP's position on nuclear arms progressively radicalised from 1990-93. As stated above, radicals such as Koval' had raised the issue of a nuclear Ukraine as early as 1990. Luk"ianenko's early doubts about nuclear disarmament soon grew into bitter criticism of the decision to transfer tactical nuclear weapons to Russia in 1992. Thereafter, the URP's position was that in order for Ukraine 'to sign any agreement on nuclear disarmament, it should be accompanied by the following conditions: firstly Ukraine must have effective guarantees from the nuclear states of the world, the UN Security Council and NATO concerning her national security and non-interference in her internal affairs; secondly the developed countries must give Ukraine financial and technical help for the dismantling of nuclear warheads and their carriers. Such dismantling must take place on the territory of Ukraine. Thirdly, Ukrainian disarmament is possible only in parallel with the disarmament of other nuclear states'.[247] Given that the fulfilment of even one of these conditions was highly problematical, the URP's position amounted to a refusal to disarm. The new URP leader Mykhailo Horyn' was quite explicit that, in the face of 'political and economic pressure on the part of our neighbours' particularly from Russia, the non-nuclear commitments of 1990 were now outdated and Ukraine 'should conduct a [more] flexible policy to defend [her] independence and territorial integrity'.[248]

The URP called for Ukraine's departure from the CIS as early as January 1992,[249] and in its place proposed a Baltic-Black Sea zone of cooperation.[250] Such an alliance with other former non-Russian

republics of the USSR and with the states of the Visegrad Triangle/Quadrangle would serve both to cut Russia off from Europe and better serve to facilitate the development of long-term links with the EC. The CIS agreement was not worth the paper it was printed on, because 'it is impossible to believe in any agreement with Russia, because from the beginning of her existence to today she had been and remains an Empire, the basis of which is contempt for Ukrainian rights and interests, and intolerance of her freedom'.[251] Russian imperialists from the very beginning conceived of the CIS as some form of revived confederation or union, and the West was falling into the trap of seeing it in the same way. Only a sharp and decisive breakaway from Russia would serve to establish Ukraine as a truly independent national actor. The party therefore maintained a steady stream of attacks on the CIS, and on Russian imperialism in general.

Conclusion

The URP was the best organised nationalist party throughout this period. It exercised powerful influence through its ideological dominance of the right, although, unlike the DPU, it had only a handful of influential figures in the Supreme Council. The URP also played a key role in the early development of *Rukh* , was midwife to the birth of many nationalist organisations such as *Prosvita* and the Union of Officers of Ukraine, and was the main driving-force behind the creation of the Congress of National-Democratic Forces in August 1992, and the Anti-Communist Anti-Imperial Front in January 1993 (see Chapter 8). The party's rating in public opinion polls rose from 2% in January 1991 to 4% in November 1991, and 7.7% in April 1992.[252] The URP was the third largest party in Kiev in May 1992, with 7% support, behind the

Greens' 10% and the SPU's 13%.[253] Although the momentum of the party's growth began to sag somewhat in late 1992, as the public as a whole became disillusioned with party politics and there were signs of a swing to the left, the URP had by then created the most effective structure of all the nationalist parties, and was well placed to be the leading party on the right in parliamentary elections due in 1994 or 1995.

4. *RUKH* - UKRAINE'S POPULAR FRONT

Introduction

The first uncoordinated and unsuccessful attempts to form a Ukrainian Popular Front similar to those already operating in the Baltic republics were made by the UHU and others in the summer of 1988 (see Chapter 3). A 'Popular Front', it was felt, would help to coordinate the actions of Ukraine's fledgling opposition groups, and, by claiming to support Gorbachev's programme of perestroika, would be much more difficult for the conservative authorities in Kiev to suppress. The initiative failed, however, because Ukrainian society was not yet prepared to follow the initiative of radical groups like the UHU. Moreover, in Ukraine it was not yet possible to form a Baltic-style alliance between opposition activists and national communists, few of whom were yet visible in the CPU, which therefore forcibly crushed the attempts.

After the failure of the UHU's efforts, the initiative passed in the winter of 1988-89 to semi-official bodies, in particular to the ecological and Ukrainian language movement, and above all to the Kiev branch of the Writers' Union of Ukraine (WUU).[1] Although the CPU remained far from enthusiastic about the prospect of a Ukrainian Popular Front and would place a succession of obstacles in its path, the authorities found it easier to tolerate the efforts of such semi-official groups than it did those of the UHU, which, although it helped in the background, was at this stage anxious not to alienate potential moderate supporters by adopting too high a profile.[2] The WUU was also willing, initially at least, to accept a degree of party tutelage.

The Ukrainian Popular Movement for Perestroika, or *Rukh* , that was finally established in September 1989 was therefore originally an extremely broad church, uniting reform communists, 'general democrats' and nationalists. However, as the general political climate in the USSR rapidly liberalised in 1989-90, *Rukh* was able to escape the CPU's control, and by the time of of its second congress in October 1990, *Rukh* had fallen under the domination of its nationalist wing. This limited its growth and influence, especially after further arguments within the nationalist camp led to a formal split in the movement in 1992. Consequently, even at the peak of its support in mid-1990, *Rukh* found it difficult to expand its appeal beyond the nationalist heartlands in Western and Central Ukraine, and as it began to slide in 1992, its implosion and the rise of extreme nationalism within its ranks demonstrated the fragility of the Ukrainian commitment to civic nationalism.

First steps

The first, stillborn, attempts to establish a Ukrainian Popular Front were made in the Summer of 1988, when separate initiative groups appeared in L'viv, Kiev, Vinnytsia, Khmel'nyts'kyi and elsewhere.[3] The largest group was the L'viv based 'Democratic Front in Support of Perestroika', formed after mass demonstrations in L'viv in June and July 1988 (the first mass unofficial rallies of the modern period).[4] Although reportedly up to 10,000 to 20,000 attended,[5] the demonstrators were unable to challenge the communist party's monopoly on power in the manner of the Baltic Popular Fronts. Firstly, national communists who might have made common cause with the opposition were still thin on the ground, despite the sympathy of some, such as Bohdan Kotyk, head

of the L'viv city CPU.[6] Potential national communists in Galicia were still subject to Kiev's orders in any case. Secondly, the various informal groups which organised the demonstrations, such as the UHU, *Tovarystvo leva* , the Ukrainian Language Society and *Memorial* , were still too small, amorphous and lacking in influence. They were still perceived as too radical by the majority of the population (and certainly by the authorities). Coercion was therefore the logical outcome of the demonstrations, which had subsided by the autumn.

A similar fate befell the other groups, attempting to organise on less favourable territory. In Kiev a meeting in June 1988 had called for the creation of a 'Popular Union in Support of *Perestroika* '.[7] The initiative was supported by Kiev's tiny informal dissident groups, such as the Ukrainian Culturological Club and the student group *Hromada* , but without official protection such groups were even less able to make contact with mass public opinion than in L'viv.

Therefore an alternative approach began to be canvassed. The idea of intelligentsia leadership for a would-be Popular Front was first raised at a meeting of 150 or so writers in the Kiev Writers' Union building on 30 October 1988,[8] chaired by Pavlo Movchan and Viktor Teren.[9] An initiative group was then formed under the poet Ivan Drach,[10] and later enlarged by the addition of representatives from similar groups set up at the Institute of Literature (such as Mykola Zhulyns'kyi and Vitalii Donchyk),[11] and the Institute of Philosophy (headed by Myroslav Popovych).[12] Several of the key figures in the initiative group, such as the poet Dmytro Pavlychko,[13] then hijacked a 10,000 strong demonstration ostensibly concerning ecological issues in Kiev on 13 November, and went public with their demands for the creation of a Popular Front.[14]

However, right from the very start there were arguments concerning the extent of party tutelage over the embryo Popular Front, and in particular over whether the leading role in the initiative group should be played by the party groups in the various institutes, or should encompass most of the leading figures in the Kiev intelligentsia.

The CPU, however, particularly the Ideology Secretaries Yurii Yel'chenko and Leonid Kravchuk, was in two minds. Its first instinct may have been to attempt to strangle the Popular Front at birth (Shcherbyts'kyi of course was still First Secretary of the CPU). Kravchuk issued a warning at the 31 January 1989 plenum of the WUU against party members joining the initiative group, and many members of the intelligentsia were successfully warned off, such as the writer Borys Oliinyk (later a leading Ukrainian socialist).[15] On the other hand, more realistic voices recognised that something had to be done to release the pressure building up from below, and that it would be preferable if any Popular Front was formed on the party's own terms. The publication of the Popular Front's draft programme was therefore delayed until February 1989, while the party attempted to make its impact felt.[16]

The version finally published in the main intelligentsia paper *Literaturna Ukraïna* on 16 February 1989 conformed to most of the party's demands. The Popular Front was to be called 'The Popular Movement [*Rukh*] of Ukraine for Perestroika'; and it explicitly recognised both the CPU's constitutional leading role, and the socialist character of Ukrainian society. *Rukh* , as the organisation was soon known, would not seek to usurp the role of the party, but would act as a 'unifying link between the programme of perestroika [in Ukrainian, *perebudova*] proposed by the Party and the initiative of the broad mass of the people'.[17] *Rukh* would campaign for 'humanity, peace and progress', for a rule of law and for individual rights. In the crucial area of

the national question, the programme confined itself to some safe remarks concerning the desirability of republican sovereignty.

Rukh's cautious approach was not only dictated by the heavy hand of the CPU. *Rukh's* founders were also aware of the need to create as broadly based a coalition as possible to counterbalance the influence of party conservatives. Ukrainian nationalists were always likely to provide the bedrock of the movement's membership, but *Rukh* also hoped to attract into its ranks CPU moderates, 'general democrats' (that is liberals and centrists) and if possible Russian-speaking Ukrainians or Russian radicals from Eastern and Southern Ukraine.

Moreover, the CPU-controlled mass media had in any case launched a campaign of defamation against *Rukh* before it was barely even off the ground, led by party papers such as *Pravda Ukrainy* and *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , but also including the TV and radio.[18] *Rukh's* leaders, mindful of the historical weaknesses of the Ukrainian national movement (see Chapter 1), were extremely concerned at the effect of such propaganda on the population of Eastern and Southern Ukraine. The dominant figures in *Rukh's* original leadership were also overwhelmingly from the *shestydesiatnyky* generation, and hoped that civic or territorial nationalism would help bridge the gap with Eastern Ukraine. Hence, they were prepared to tread carefully, and to downplay the national message.

However, there were still several paths that *Rukh* could take. In its early stages, it was still entirely possible that *Rukh* would be little more than a talking-shop under the direct supervision of the CPU. In March 1989, a round-table meeting was organised between CPU leaders and *Rukh* representatives, at which *Rukh* came under immense pressure to submit to the party's direction and confine itself largely to a cultural programme. That it did not do so was largely due to the resistance of

Ivan Drach.[19] Instead, Drach and others deliberately sought to broaden the base of *Rukh* , and head off the danger of its being swallowed by the CPU, by the creation of an independent Coordinating Council at the end of March 1989. In order to maximise *Rukh's* outreach to all sections of Ukrainian society, the Council was headed by the moderate and urbane philosopher, Myroslav Popovych. It was Popovych who presented *Rukh's* case in a series of TV debates with Leonid Kravchuk in the summer of 1989. The other members of the Coordinating Council were mostly leading *literati* : - Drach, Pavlychko, Donchyk, Les' Taniuk, V"iacheslav Briukhovets'kyi, Serhii Hrechaniuk, Leonid Shulman and Anatolii Shevchenko.[20]

A series of regional conferences was organised, at which *Rukh* , whilst remaining in general loyal to the party, was able to express its differences, and gradually edge away from the party's tutelage. The regional branches of *Rukh* also began to support a thriving samizdat press (such as *Vil'ne slovo* , or 'The Free Word' in Kiev, and *Viche* , an old Ukrainian term for 'People's Assembly' in L'viv), which could usually take more risks than the movement's official spokesmen. At the conference of the Kiev branch of *Rukh* on 1 July 1989, for example, Pavlychko spoke of

> two conceptions of perestroika. One ...allows [different] peoples to be reborn, to raise from under the boot their sovereignty, language and culture, and to go over to a republican economy and real popular self-rule. The other conception is Pharisiacal, our official-republican conception, which by various means tries to preserve the command-administrative system, to nourish dissatisfaction with the changes brought about by perestroika, to frighten people with invented rumours of nationalism amongst the .. intelligentsia, and paint the leaders of *Rukh* , without doubt honest and brave citizens of the republic, as adventurists bent on the seizure of power.[21]

Ivan Drach meanwhile bemoaned the absence of 'a Ukrainian Brazauskas', prepared to forge an alliance between reform communists and *Rukh* .[22] At the same time however Pavlychko was calling only for 'an economically, politically and culturally sovereign Ukraine within the ranks of the USSR',[23] whilst Popovych insisted that *Rukh* concentrate on building a general 'democratic movement, that includes all possible political trends' rather than a narrowly nationalist movement.[24] *Rukh* , he argued, should seek to build a Ukrainian national revival on the basis of prior democratisation, not the other way round.

This approach initially helped to promote the growth of *Rukh* in regions other than Western Ukraine, but so long as Shcherbyts'kyi remained in power as head of the CPU, it was still harassed at every turn. Apart from the set-piece TV confrontations in the summer, it was still denied access to the mass media. Its programme and opinions circulated mainly in samizdat (although here the intelligentsia weekly *Literaturna Ukraïna* , and increasingly the Kiev daily *Vechirnii Kyïv* under reformist editor Vitalii Karpenko were notable exceptions).[25] The right to public demonstration was also strictly curtailed, and there was little prospect of *Rukh* being allowed to participate in the upcoming republican elections in March 1990.

The movement's prospects only began to improve after September 1989, when *Rukh's* founding congress was finally held, and Shcherbyts'kyi at last resigned. On the other hand, with its new found freedom of action *Rukh* would increasingly become a more narrowly nationalist, rather than 'general democratic' movement.

The first *Rukh* congress, September 1989

On 8-10 September 1989, the founding congress of *Rukh* was finally held in the Hall of Culture at Kiev's Polytechnic Institute. An official building had been secured, but many were still discouraged from attending, the authorities prevented large-scale demonstrations, and the proceedings were not broadcast on TV.[26]

By then the organisation claimed around 280,000 members, represented by 1,109 delegates. Some idea of the sociological and political profile of *Rukh* can be gained from the following information supplied by the congress' mandate commission.[27] Nine hundred and forty four (89% of those who replied to the commission's questionnaire) of the delegates were Ukrainian, and 77 (7%, as opposed to 22% of the population of Ukraine as a whole) were Russian. The largest number of delegates was from Galicia -318 or 29%. 133 (12%) were from Volyn'-Polissia, 39 (4%) were from Transcarpathia and Chernivtsi, 133 (12%) were from Right Bank Ukraine, 199 (18%) from Kiev city and *oblast'* , 68 (6%) from the Left Bank, 132 (12%) from Eastern Ukraine, and 79 (7%) from the South (8 delegates from the Baltic republics are excluded from the calculations).

This was a much broader geographical spread than would be the case in later years. *Rukh's* then broad church was also indicated by the fact that 252 (23%) of the delegates were still members of the CPU or the Komsomol.

The congress was dominated by the cultural intelligentsia. Eight hundred (72%) delegates had some form of completed higher education. 28 had doctoral degrees, and 96 had graduate degrees. One hundred and thirty of the delegates were described as educational workers (i.e. mainly teachers), 104 were cultural workers, 42 were journalists, 48 were medical practitioners, 25 were lawyers, 5 were actors, 5 were students, 3 were bookkeepers and 2 were architects (a total of 38% of those who indicated

a profession). A further 329 (34%) were 'engineers' (the most common Soviet technical or managerial qualification). Only 109 were labourers (11%), and a mere 16 (2%) were agricultural workers. Few of these were from the workers' movement in Eastern Ukraine, whose representatives attended only as observers.

The congress was also dominated by the *shestydesiatnyky* . The average age of the delegates was 42. There was, however, also a substantial youth element, as 167 of the delegates were under the age of 30. The fact that even opposition politics in Ukraine was largely a male preserve was indicated by the fact that only 98 women attended the congress.

The congress formalised *Rukh's* existence as a 'general democratic' movement, but the preoccupation of many delegates with the national question was evident.[28] Formally the movement remained under the tutelage of the CPU. The new programme adopted at the congress stated that *Rukh* 'conducts its activity according to the principles of humanism, democracy, glasnost, pluralism, social justice and internationalism [emphasis added], proceeding from the interests of all citizens of the republic, regardless of nationality'.[29] The programme also pledged to follow the course laid down at all recent gatherings of the CPSU. The importance of national revival was heavily emphasised, but *Rukh* defined its main goal as the rather less controversial 'construction of a humane and democratic society in Ukraine'. No mention was made of Ukrainian independence. Rather it was declared that *Rukh* supported 'the transformation of the Ukrainian SSR into a democratic state under the rule of law', although the sections on the economy and culture strongly emphasised the importance of creating true republican sovereignty.

The programme was, above all, predicated on the need to defend individual rights and to construct a civil society in Ukraine, while the section on 'The National Question' stressed territorial rather than ethnic concepts of citizenship. Moreover, the programme stated that 'while advocating respect for national dignity and rejecting national nihilism, Rukh · considers the propaganda of racial and national exclusivity and chauvinistic and nationalistic views to be incompatible with its principles'.

Some speakers of course sounded a more radical note, especially Levko Luk"ianenko, leader of the UHU. His speech, which was the only main speech not to be published in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , called on *Rukh* to help 'abolish the empire as the greatest evil of life today'.[30]

The dominant moderate tone, however, was due to centrists such as Popovych and the economist and USSR deputy Volodymyr Cherniak, who had a key say in drawing up the programme.[31] They supported such a general line as necessary in itself, while others, such as the chairman of the preparation committee for the congress, Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi,[32] and Ivan Drach, elected at the congress as *Rukh's* first leader, had only deemphasised the national question because of massive pressure from the CPU. Once the hegemony of the CPU began to decline, they would come increasingly to the fore.

The priorities of *Rukh's* rank and file could be seen from a poll of delegates' priorities which showed that 73% thought that *Rukh* 'should support the development of the Ukrainian culture and language', while 49% thought that *Rukh* should promote 'economic sovereignty within the framework of the USSR'. Only 46% mentioned the 'solving of pressing economic problems'.[33] A simultaneous poll of the general population, however, showed that economic problems were most often mentioned (by 44%), compared to only 12% mentioning language and

culture. The potential long term conflict between *Rukh's* priorities and public opinion was not yet fully apparent, however, and more (37%) evaluated *Rukh* positively, than negatively (25%).[34]

A key organisational problem for *Rukh* was the absurdly cumbersome leadership structure created at the congress. Ivan Drach was elected leader, but he was to share power with a bicameral Grand Council, consisting of a 81 strong Council of Representatives under Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi and a 93 strong Council of Collegia under Volodymyr Cherniak (the 'Collegia' were basically four sub-committees on Politics, Society and Economics, Culture and Ecology); an administrative Secretariat under the UHU's Mykhailo Horyn'; a Council of Deputies and a Council of Nationalities under the ethnic Armenian army colonel Vilen Martyrosian. As might be expected, the above structures were to prove slow, unwieldy and a recipe for factional conflict, while real power tended to pass to the Secretariat.

Between congresses, 1989-90

The first congress and the subsequent, and (hardly coincidental) final demise of Shcherbyts'kyi gave a considerable boost to *Rukh* and its organisational and communication abilities. *Rukh's* view of the limits of the politically possible was also rapidly radicalised by the collapse of communism in East-Central Europe in late 1989. *Rukh's* front organisation, the Democratic Bloc, succeeded in winning 25% of the seats in the March 1990 Ukrainian elections. However, the aftermath of the elections, and the growth of political pluralism in Ukraine presented *Rukh* with problems that it was less able to manage.

Kravchuk had failed to deliver on his promise to allow *Rukh* to be officially registered in time to participate in the March 1990 elections

(*Rukh* was officially registered in February, after the deadline for candidate registration had already passed). Hence *Rukh* and the other small opposition organisations formed the Democratic Bloc in Kiev on 18 November 1989 instead.[35] The Bloc was a useful way of circumventing the refusal to register *Rukh* , and a necessary device to promote non-communist candidates, but, despite publishing a largely negative common platform,[36] it was too amorphous to exercise any real collective authority over the candidates it endorsed, most of whom campaigned on their own individual programmes. Some candidates even ran against one another. For example in the Pechers'k region of Kiev, Popovych was opposed by the UHU's Oles' Serhiienko, resulting in the loss of the seat to the CPU.

Nevertheless *Rukh* /the Democratic Bloc demonstrated considerable mobilisational ability during the election campaign, the high spot of which was the giant human chain organised from Kiev to L'viv to celebrate the 71st anniversary of the temporary reunification of Western and East-Central Ukraine in 1919 on 21 January 1990.[37] The event was designed to celebrate *Rukh's* commitment to civic nationalism, by symbolically linking Galicia with Central Ukraine. At this point, *Rukh* was still well aware of the dangers of associating itself too closely with the self-limiting myths and symbols of Galician nationalism. *Rukh* therefore also invested considerable effort in the celebrations of the 500th anniversary of the first Ukrainian Cossack settlements throughout 1990, culminating in the 'Days of Cossack Glory' festival in August 1990. Whereas the appeal of the OUN-UPA myth was confined to Western Ukraine, the historical centres of Ukrainian Cossackdom had been in Central and Eastern Ukraine. The late seventeenth century 'Hetmanate' state had been based on Left Bank Ukraine (Chernihiv, Poltava and Sumy), and the Cossacks' *Sich* headquarters at Zaporizhzhia. Therefore,

Rukh's purpose in emphasising the Cossack heritage was twofold; it hopefully provided a historical myth that Eastern Ukrainians could share with Western Ukrainians, and moreover, 'the celebration of the Cossack past contradicted the Russian imperial vision of the area [Eastern and Southern Ukraine] as primarily the creation of Catherine II and Prince Grigorii Potemkin.....the restoration of the memory of the Cossack past had in effect claimed these southern lands for the emerging Ukrainian polity'.[38] By 1991 Ukraine's national communists had realised the effectiveness of this approach, and were making similar use of the Cossack myth. By then, however, *Rukh* was more firmly under the control of the nationalists, and its choice of political symbols less sensitive.

Although the elections had many faults, not least the continuing CPU monopoly of the mass media, the 25% or so the vote won by the Democratic Bloc was probably a fair reflection of *Rukh's* strength at the time.[39] The Bloc won 43 out of 46 seats in Galicia, 11 out of 19 in Volyn'-Polissia, a surprisingly low 1 out of 17 in Transcarpathia and Chernivtsi, 12 out of 85 in the largely rural Right Bank; 17 out of 21 in Kiev city and 2 out of 17 in Kiev *oblast'* , 6 out of 42 on the Left Bank, 28 out of 150 in Eastern Ukraine (11 of these were in Kharkiv), and 2 out of 64 in the South (a further 36 non-communist deputies were elected in Eastern Ukraine, but preferred to keep their distance from *Rukh* and remain non-party).[40]

The Democratic Bloc claimed 115-33 members, the uncertainty being a result of continued defections from the CPU and the amorphous nature of political loyalties in general.[41] The Bloc's deputies named themselves the *Narodna rada* (People's Council), adopted a formal statute,[42] and elected Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi as leader. His deputies were Luk"ianenko of the UHU/URP; Dmytro Pavlychko, eventually of the DPU; Oleksandr

Yemets' of the Democratic Platform /PDRU; and Les' Taniuk was Secretary.[43] The *Narodna rada* , however, did not constitute a *Rukh* faction as such. It often held common sittings, but the decisions of such meetings were only recommendatory. In practice, the *Narodna rada* soon subdivided into four more or less formalised mini-factions (the radicals led by the URP, the DPU, the PDRU and the non-party), and a variety of other cross-cutting loyalties.[44]

The broader problem for *Rukh* was the question of how it was to cope with the political pluralism that was rapidly beginning to develop. A first option, that of turning *Rukh* into a formal political party, was rejected at the Grand Council meeting in Khust, Transcarpathia in March 1990 (see Chapter 5). A majority on the Grand Council felt that this would narrow *Rukh's* political base unnecessarily, and were also aware of the public distrust of political parties that was already apparent.[45] This decision speeded up the formation of both the URP and DPU (see Chapters 3 and 5).

The second option was to restructure *Rukh* as an umbrella or coordinating movement to which all political parties would be responsible. Two problems arose with this strategy, which was the one adopted. Firstly, now that *Rukh* was increasingly free of the oversight of the CPU, as the latter's formal hegemony began to dissolve in 1990 (see Chapter 2), it became an increasingly openly nationalist organisation, alienating the new parties of the centre-left. Secondly the main parties of the nationalist right, the URP and DPU were also unwilling to submit to the authority of *Rukh* , and preferred to further their own narrow party interests.

Particularly at a local level, and in Galicia above all, *Rukh* underwent rapid radicalisation in 1989-90.[46] This was the result of the growing influence of the UHU/URP (see Chapter 3), and of the higher

rate of political mobilisation in Galicia and to a lesser extent Kiev. The publicity given to nationalist deputies in the Supreme Council, and the achievement of passing the Declaration of Ukrainian Sovereignty in July 1990 served to radicalise that minority of the population which had supported the Democratic Bloc in March 1990. Leaders such as Drach began openly to talk of their desire for full independence,[47] and *Rukh* expressed outright opposition to proposals for a renegotiated Union Treaty between Moscow and the republics that Gorbachev began to float in mid-1990. *Rukh* now openly embraced narrowly ethnic myths and symbols, such as the blue and yellow flag from 1917-21,[48] and its press began to fill up with articles eulogising the OUN-UPA.

Rukh now had a very active press. At a central level, it published *Visnyk Rukhu* ('Rukh News'), *Ohliadach* ('The Observer'), and *Ekspres-novyny* ('Express News'), but the all-important planned daily paper *Narodna hazeta* ('The People's Paper') had yet to get off the ground. At a local level, *Rukh* organisations produced approximately 50 publications of variable quality,[49] often little more than samizdat. Nearly all devoted a high proportion of their pages to reviving ethnic myths and symbols, and to filling in the 'blank spots' in Ukrainian history. In Galicia especially, increasing attention was paid to reviving the memory of the OUN-UPA. A festival to commemorate the UPA was held in Volyn' in September 1990.

The increasing predominance of Galician radicalism led to increasing tensions with Eastern and Southern Ukraine, however. The Kharkiv *Rukh* organisation for example effectively split in two as Russian speakers led by elements in the PDRU such as Vladimir Griniov[50] sought to disassociate themselves from *Rukh's* growing nationalism.[51] At the same time centrist liberals, such as Popovych, began to drift away from *Rukh* as the nationalist influence grew.[52]

Centre-left parties such as the SDPU and PDRU therefore rejected *Rukh's* overtures. The SDPU condemned *Rukh's* 'anti-democratic ideology and political practice, that is national ultra-radicalism'[53] at its party conference on 24-5 November 1990. The PDRU meanwhile stressed the 'priority of general human values over class or national values', and kept their distance from *Rukh* .[54] Ironically however both the URP and the DPU also failed to become associate members of *Rukh* , despite the changes made to *Rukh's* structure at its second congress that were designed to encourage them to do so, and sought to promote their narrow party interests instead (see Chapters 3 and 5).

Second congress

The second congress of *Rukh* , held in Kiev on 25-8 October 1990, showed how far the movement had been radicalised by the events since its first congress.[55] The congress' radical mood also reflected a reaction against the turn to the right that had been manifest in official circles in both Moscow and Kiev since the late summer of 1990.

The movement now claimed the support of 630,000 members (a considerable increase on the 280,000 at the time of the first congress), 2,125 of whom were present as delegates to the congress.[56] The composition of the delegates reflected the growing dominance in *Rukh* of more nationalist elements. Almost 95% of delegates were now Ukrainian, and only 4% Russian,[57] compared to 89% and 7% respectively a year earlier. More than half (57%) the delegates were now from the nationalist strongholds of Galicia and Kiev city, compared to 47% in 1989.[58] Only 1.5% of delegates still belonged to the CPU or Komsomol (compared to 23% in 1989), whereas 13% now belonged to the URP, 6% to the DPU, and 25% to the Ukrainian Language Society. Even

ultra-radical groups such as the DSU (4 representatives, or 0.2%) and the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Party (9 representatives) were present (see Chapter 7).[59] Fifteen veterans of the UPA were also in attendance.[60]

The congress was once again dominated by middle-aged male members of the intelligentsia. 72% had higher education or above. In terms of profession, 30% of delegates were from the cultural intelligentsia,[61] and 53% from the technical intelligentsia.[62] Pensioners represented 6%, 3% were workers, 3% were from the village intelligentsia, 1.4% were unemployed, and 0.6% were in the Armed Forces.[63] The average age of delegates was again 42. The foothold on power gained by *Rukh* / the Democratic Bloc in the March 1990 elections was demonstrated by the fact that 418 of the delegates were now people's deputies at one level or another (5 USSR deputies, 18 Ukrainian, 117 oblast, and 323 raion or city deputies).[64]

Ivan Drach's keynote speech to the congress was uncompromisingly radical in tone, reflecting the fact that the URP's Mykhailo Horyn' was under pressure to challenge him for the leadership. Drach claimed that the CPU was preparing a 'Peking variant' against the Ukrainian people (i.e. the use of force as in Tianamen square), which *Rukh* should resist through 'extra-parliamentary action', civil disobedience and the like.[65] The only long-term defence against the CPU was 'the full sovereignty of the Ukrainian people, and a completely independent Ukrainian state'. Drach used his usual colourful language to full effect. The after-effects of Chornobyl' were like a 'Mengelian' experiment on Ukraine's future generations. The Ukrainians, he argued, were the true inheritors of the traditions of Kievan *Rus'* , and were the real 'elder brothers' to the 'Great Russians'.[66] However, Drach still went to some length to formally reject ethnic nationalism, stressing that all Ukrainian citizens

should share in a future Ukrainian state, and emphasising his solidarity with Russian patriots.

While many delegates, such as people's deputy Serhii Holovatyi,[67] echoed Drach's sentiment that *Rukh* should emulate the methods of Gandhi and Martin Luther King and use only peaceful and democratic means of struggle, the URP's Mykhailo Horyn' placed more emphasis on the achievements of extra-parliamentary methods, such as the 1989 miners' strikes, the October 1990 student hunger strikes and mass demonstrations such as the one which concluded the students' strikes on 17 October. By themselves he declared 'parliamentary methods for achieving democratic laws are not enough'.[68] Extra-parliamentary action, he declared, was necessary both to bolster the position of the *Narodna rada* minority in the Supreme Council and to 'raise the consciousness' of the people.

The prevailing radical mood resulted in several key changes to *Rukh's* programme and statute. The words 'for *perestroika* ' were dropped from the movement's title. Moreover, the programme stated that 'today *Rukh* has naturally transformed itself [*pereris z*] from a movement for perestroika into a movement for the state independence of Ukraine, and become a real force in opposition to the CPSU and to the totalitarian state-party system'.[69] The main aim of *Rukh* was now explicitly 'attaining Ukrainian sovereignty in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Ukrainian State Sovereignty on 16 July 1990', and the full 'state independence of Ukraine'.[70] Furthermore, membership in *Rukh* was now banned to those who belonged to organisations whose 'leading organs were located outside the Ukrainian SSR' (obviously such a move was directed against members of the CPSU, but it left the door open for possible future reconciliation with a truly independent CPU). The congress in fact called on communist party

members to chose between 'Ukraine or the CPSU!' and desert the party.[71]

Post-congress activity

Rukh also changed its statute to encourage the newly formed Ukrainian political parties to become collective members of the movement. A new Political Council was created under the URP's Mykhailo Horyn', on which the leaders of all parties and organisations who became associate members of *Rukh* would have a seat as of right (and also on the Grand Council).[72] The congress also passed an appeal to all political parties in Ukraine to join a political coalition entitled 'Democratic Ukraine'.[73]

In the siege mentality created by Gorbachev's embrace of CPSU conservatives in the winter of 1990-1 and the Baltic killings in January, the Political Council was able to announce the formation of just such a broad-based coalition on 30 January 1991.[74] Only the extreme right (the UIA) and the CPU did not sign. Crucially the Political Council was able to persuade centrist groups like the PDRU, both Social Democratic parties and the Greens to join up.[75] However, the crisis atmosphere, and the unity it produced, did not last long. New divisions were exposed in the run-up to the referendum called by Gorbachev on the future of the Union on 17 March 1991. *Rukh* established a committee entitled 'Referendum - [for a] Sovereign Ukraine', but a common front of all the opposition parties was now impossible to hold. Nationalists argued with centrists who still favoured some kind of Union, and extreme and moderate nationalists argued over whether to boycott the referendum.

The argument within *Rukh* was now mainly between nationalists. Many *Rukh* radicals sympathised with call from the ultra-right (and

many in the URP) to boycott the referendum altogether, but they were defeated at a special session of *Rukh's* Coordinating Council on 2-3 February, by 117 votes to 84.[76]*Rukh* therefore campaigned against Gorbachev's question ('Do you consider it necessary to preserve the USSR as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics, in which human rights and the freedoms of all nationalities will be fully guarantied?'), but in favour of the second republican question added by Leonid Kravchuk ('Do you agree that Ukraine should be part of a Union of Soviet Sovereign States on the basis of the Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine?').[77] Mykhailo Horyn' however supported the URP's position (two 'nos'), and was increasingly accused of abusing his position to promote the narrow party interests of the URP, which saw even the second ballot as a betrayal of their demand for full independence.[78]

On 17 March, the Ukrainian electorate gave 70.5% support to Gorbachev's question, but 80.2% supported the Ukrainian question. Analysis of the voting shows that *Rukh's* influence on the electorate had not advanced much on the position obtained in March 1990. Table 4.1 seeks to show the level of support for *Rukh* in two ways. Column 2 shows the vote against the Gorbachev question, and Column 3 shows the common vote for both questions as a measure of the vote for the status quo (that is, in opposition to Rukh's call for a 'no' and a 'yes').

Table 4.1. The Referendum of 17 March 1991.[79]

Oblast	Rukh support (%)	Status quo (%)
i) Galicia		
L'viv	71	10
Ternopil'	77	13
Ivano-Frankivs'k	78	12

ii) Volyn'-Polissia

Rivne	43	47
Volyn'	43	47

iii) Other West

Transcarpathia	36	54
Chernivtsi	36	54

iv) Right Bank

Kirovohrad	16	73
Cherkasy	21	67
Vinnytsia	18	72
Zhytomyr	17	72
Khmel'nyts'kyi	21	67
v) Kiev city	53	37
Kiev oblast	31	59

vi) Left Bank

Poltava	20	69
Sumy	20	68
Chernihiv	15	75

vii) East

Kharkiv	22	62
Donets'k	14	72
Luhans'k	17	76
Zaporizhzhia	19	68
Dnipropetrovs'k	21	64

viii) South

Mykolaïv	14	73
Kherson	18	70
Odesa	16	68
Crimea	12	*

* Figures for Crimea were unavailable.

In the aftermath of the referendum, *Rukh* found it increasingly difficult to persuade all political parties to campaign under its umbrella. Centrist parties such as the PDRU now favoured a loose Confederation of Independent States to replace the USSR (as in fact occurred in December 1991), and had been amongst the prime movers behind the 'Democratic Congress', formed with like-minded parties from other republics in Kharkiv on 26-7 January 1991 to promote such a goal.[80] They therefore increasingly kept their distance from nationalist leaders such as Ivan Drach and Mykhailo Horyn'. The nationalist camp also had its problems in relation to *Rukh* . The relative weight of delegates from Eastern Ukraine at the original congress of the DPU in December 1990 (see Chapter 5), and the desire of the DPU's leaders to maintain a broader church than the URP had prevented the DPU becoming an associate member of *Rukh* at an all-Ukrainian level (although cooperation at the *oblast'* level was considerable). The URP on the other hand still considered *Rukh* too moderate, and at the time was internally divided over whether to cooperate with national communists like Kravchuk (see Chapter 3), or to adopt the UIA's tactics of boycotting all the institutions of the Ukrainian SSR. Formally therefore, the URP too maintained its independence from *Rukh* , but in practice continued its entryist tactics of trying to radicalise *Rukh* from within. However, the URP's very success in this regard (243 out of the 2,125 delegates [11%] to *Rukh's* second congress had been members of the URP),[81] only served to alienate more moderate elements from *Rukh* .

Independence and the December 1991 polls

A degree of unity was restored by the attempted coup in August 1991. Nationalist forces closed ranks in the face of the threat to their achievements to date, and then made use of the communists' disarray in the wake of the coup's collapse to force the national communists into supporting a historic declaration of Ukrainian independence on 24 August.

After a meeting with Kravchuk at 11 a.m. on Monday 19 August (the first day of the coup) the main non-communist parties unanimously condemned the coup, and on 20 August formed a coalition entitled 'Independent Democratic Ukraine' to resist the junta.[82] There were already, however, important differences of emphasis between the parties. The PDRU for example confined itself to general appeals for calm.[83] *Rukh's* call for a general strike was published in *Vechirnii Kyiv* on the 20th,[84] and by the 22nd *Rukh* was calling for the special Supreme Council session on the 24th to declare Ukraine's secession from the USSR.[85] The unity showed by *Rukh* was then instrumental in forcing the CPU's national communists to cut their ties with Moscow, vote for independence (the vote was 346 to 1) and the declaration to establish Ukrainian Armed Forces on the 24th, and accept the decision to ban the CPU on the 30th. However the unity briefly reestablished in August was the product of extreme circumstances, and was rapidly lost as political attention turned to the two simultaneous election campaigns in the Autumn of 1991.

The Declaration of Independence had to be ratified by referendum on 1 December 1991, and elections for the first Ukrainian executive President (already planned before the attempted coup) were to be held on the same day. Although *Rukh* could unanimously campaign for the

former goal, it could not reach agreement on whom to support for President, either internally or with other political parties. When *Rukh's* Grand Council met to discuss the issue on 1 September 1991, it split between those such as Drach and Yevhen Proniuk (leader of the all-Ukrainian Society for the Repressed, i.e. ex-political prisoners) who supported the URP's Luk"ianenko because of his impeccable nationalist credentials, and lower-ranking leaders and the younger generation, such as the leader of the October 1990 student hunger strikes Oles' Donii, who preferred V"iacheslav Chornovil because of his populist appeal and his more outspoken anti-communism.[86] Luk"ianenko argued that the building of a strong nation-state must take precedence over de-communisation and economic reform, Chornovil the opposite.

The Grand Council eventually supported Chornovil as *Rukh's* official candidate, swayed most by the argument that the younger and more energetic Chornovil would garner more votes, but Luk"ianenko and a third *Rukh* candidate Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi refused to stand down in his favour (Luk"ianenko was supported by *Rukh's* smaller Political Council). The best promise the three could make was to withdraw in favour of the best placed *Rukh* candidate in any second round (necessary if no candidate received received more than 50% of the votes on the first round). This promise, however, did nothing to prevent the three campaigning against each other before 1 December. The Grand Council also endorsed a disastrous decision allowing local branches of *Rukh* to campaign for any candidate of their choosing.[87] The Donets'k branch of *Rukh* ended up supporting Kravchuk.[88] Not surprisingly therefore *Rukh's* campaign was wracked by disunity, and produced much bad blood.

The final number of candidates was six. Leonid Kravchuk[89] was the only national communist candidate (Agriculture Minister Oleksandr

Tkachenko withdrew in Kravchuk's favour).[90] Leopol'd Taburians'kyi was the candidate of the centrist People's Party of Ukraine.[91] The Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Council, Vladimir Griniov put himself forward as the candidate of Ukraine's Russophone population.[92] He was supported by elements in the PDRU, including in his native Kharkiv, the leftist United Social Democratic Party, the Ukrainian *Kadets* , and several of the Donbas strike committees.

Of *Rukh's* three candidates, Chornovil was also supported by the Social Democratic Party of Ukraine and the Association of Democratic Councils;[93] Luk"ianenko by *Prosvita* , the Union of Ukrainian Students, the all-Ukrainian Society of the Repressed, and the Kiev branch of the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Party (the Christian and Peasant Democratic Parties were divided between supporters of Chornovil and Luk"ianenko);[94] and Yukhnovs'kyi by the PDRU and the Kiev DPU.[95]

As the urbane Yukhnovs'kyi found it difficult to promote his message beyond the ranks of the big city intelligentsia, the *Rukh* vote was basically divided between Chornovil and Luk"ianenko (with arguably Griniov siphoning off some liberal-minded Russophone voters). The total vote for the *Rukh* troika is shown in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2. Support for the three *Rukh* candidates in the Ukrainian Presidential election on 1 December 1991.[96]

Oblast	Chornovil	Luk"ianenko	Yukhnovs'kyi	Total
i) Galicia				
L'viv	75.9	4.8	4.4	85.1
Ternopil'	57.4	19.6	3.2	80.2
Ivano-Frankivs'k	67.1	11.6	3.3	82.0
ii) Volyn'-Polissia				
Rivne	25.5	13.4	3.6	42.5

Volyn'	31.4	8.9	3.2	43.5
iii) Other West				
Transcarpathia	27.6	5.0	2.8	35.4
Chernivtsi	42.7	4.4	2.0	49.1
iv) Right Bank				
Kirovohrad	13.5	3.5	1.1	18.1
Cherkasy	25.0	2.0	1.0	28.0
Vinnytsia	18.2	3.2	1.6	23.0
Zhytomyr	14.0	3.3	1.0	18.3
Khmel'nyts'kyi	15.4	3.2	1.6	20.2
v) Kiev city	26.7	6.4	3.5	36.6
Kiev oblast	21.2	5.6	1.5	28.3
vi) Left Bank				
Poltava	13.6	4.2	1.3	19.1
Sumy	14.7	3.9	1.8	20.4
Chernihiv	12.3	6.7	0.9	19.9
vii) East				
Kharkiv	19.7	2.1	1.0	22.8
Donets'k	9.7	3.1	0.9	13.7
Luhans'k	9.9	2.0	0.7	12.6
Zaporizhzhia	13.0	3.0	1.3	17.3
Dnipropetrovs'k	18.1	2.5	1.2	21.8
viii) South				
Mykolaïv	15.1	2.3	0.7	18.1
Kherson	18.1	2.2	1.0	21.3
Odesa	12.8	2.8	1.1	16.7
Crimea	5.0	1.9	0.9	7.8
Sevastopol'	10.9	1.8	0.9	13.6

Total   23.3 4.5 1.7 29.5

In total, the *Rukh* trio received 9,393,654 votes, or 29.5% of the total (turnout was 84.2%). The centrist Taburians'kyi received a mere 0.6%, while the maverick Griniov polled 4.2%, performing even better in Russophone areas such as his native Kharkiv (10.9%) and Donets'k (11.0%). Kravchuk, however, was a strong winner, receiving 61.6% of the total vote. The results largely confirmed the pattern of *Rukh* support established in March 1990 and March 1991, and the likely level of maximum support for the nationalist parties in any future parliamentary elections. The *Rukh* trio swept the board in Galicia and received strong support elsewhere in Western Ukraine. They scored better than average in Kiev and other Central Ukrainian cities (for example 30.7% in Sumy city as against 20.4% for the oblast as a whole, and elsewhere 47.9% in Rivne city as opposed to 42.5%, and 24.3% in Dnipropetrovs'k city as opposed to 21.8%),[97] and improved sharply in Chernivtsi, but otherwise remained weak in Eastern and Southern Ukraine, especially in the Donbas and in Crimea. *Rukh* could make little impact on the countryside outside of Western Ukraine. Opinion poll evidence showed that support for the *Rukh* trio, as for independence as a whole, was most pronounced among the intelligentsia and students (those with higher education were 39% more likely to support Chornovil than those with incomplete or only middle education),[98] ethnic Ukrainians (in one poll Ukrainians split 35%, 10% and 2% between Kravchuk, Chornovil, and Griniov; but Russians 25%, 3% and 6%)[99] and amongst Uniate Catholic and Autocephalous Orthodox believers.

Table 4.3 shows that support for independence in the simultaneous referendum on 1 December 1991 was relatively high and uniform

throughout Ukraine on the basic 'Yes' figures shown in Column 2, but if allowance is made for differential turnout by calculating the percentage voting 'Yes' as a percentage of the total electorate (Column 3) rather than as a percentage of those who voted, a similar pattern of differential support to that in the March 1990 and March 1991 votes is more clearly exposed.

Table 4.3. Results of the referendum on Ukrainian independence on 1 December 1991.[100]

Oblast	'Yes' as % of turnout'	'Yes' as % of electorate
i) Galicia		
L'viv	97.4	92.8
Ternopil'	98.7	95.8
Ivano-Frankivs'k	98.4	94.2
ii) Volyn'-Polissia		
Rivne	96.8	89.2
Volyn'	96.3	89.8
iii) Other West		
Transcarpathia	92.6	76.8
Chernivtsi	92.8	81.3
iv) Right Bank		
Kirovohrad	93.9	82.7
Cherkasy	96.0	86.6
Vinnytsia	95.4	87.2
Zhytomyr	95.1	86.1
Khmel'nyts'kyi	96.3	90.0
v) Kiev city	92.9	74.6

Kiev oblast	95.5	84.0
vi) Left Bank		
Poltava	94.9	87.2
Sumy	92.6	81.9
Chernihiv	93.7	85.1
vii) East		
Kharkiv	86.3	65.3
Donets'k	83.9	64.4
Luhans'k	83.9	67.6
Zaporizhzhia	90.7	73.1
Dnipropetrovs'k	90.4	73.9
viii) South		
Mykolaïv	89.4	75.1
Kherson	90.1	75.1
Odesa	85.4	64.0
Crimea	54.2	36.6
Sevastopol'	57.0	36.4
Total	90.3	76.0

The generally high levels of support for independence were due to the fact that both *Rukh* and the national communists were campaigning for independence. No significant force, not even the Socialist Party of Ukraine, opposed independence. Again, however, the regional pattern was clear, with support for independence dropping significantly in Eastern and Southern Ukraine. Rural areas everywhere showed higher turnouts, indicating the continuing social power of collective farm chairmen, whilst urban apathy reduced turnouts in Eastern Ukraine and even in Kiev.

After independence: Government or Opposition?

Rukh was profoundly affected by the internal tensions generated by the campaign, and by the fact that they and the national communists had campaigned on the same side in the referendum. Two opposing camps quickly developed within the movement, and began a struggle for *Rukh's* soul in the run-up to the movement's third congress scheduled for 28 February-1 March 1992.

For a majority of *Rukh's* leadership, particularly the nationalist URP and DPU, the outcome of the campaign was clear enough. The national communists were to be praised for having adopted their agenda. Independence had been secured, and all patriotic forces should now unite around the new President, particularly given residual dangers of Russian revanchism and separatism within Ukraine. The real opposition in Ukraine was now the Socialist Party. The ardent nationalist and Deputy Leader of *Rukh* , Mykola Porovs'kyi,[101] for example, argued that Rukh must now 'go over to constructive work, and assist the state-building activity of the President, Supreme Council and government' and promote *Rukh's* nationalist ideology as the new ideology of the state.[102] *Rukh's* leader, Ivan Drach, declared even more bluntly that 'he who supports Ukrainian statehood must support the President'.[103]

As Drach was now taking something of a back-seat in politics, however, the nationalist argument was put most forcefully by the URP's Mykhailo Horyn', head of the *Rukh* Secretariat, as he campaigned to succeed Drach as leader. He strongly urged *Rukh* to support the President, and sought to protect the interests of the nationalist parties by reviving the plan for collective membership in *Rukh* .[104] Now that

Rukh itself was more nationalist, he hoped that both the URP and DPU would be happier to join it as associate members. Moreover, a pro-Presidential *Rukh* could be the vehicle through which the URP and DPU could achieve their new-found ambition of becoming 'parties of the state' and entering government (see Chapters 3 and 5). *Rukh's* support would also be a more attractive proposition to President Kravchuk, than that of the URP alone. This position was endorsed by other leading figures in *Rukh* , such as the DPU's Dmytro Pavlychko.[105]

On 5 February 1992 the URP's Grand Council endorsed the idea of collective membership in *Rukh* in principle,[106] followed by the DPU's Kiev organisation on 1 February and the party's National Council on 8 February (which recommended *oblast'* organisations to become collective members of *Rukh*).[107]

These developments were encouraged by Kravchuk. In February he expressed the hope that *Rukh* 'can become the organisation that unites around itself all progressive democratic forces',[108] and on 21 February organised a round-table with *Rukh* and all the political parties, which led to the creation of a permanent consultative council between the President and the parties.[109] Immediately after the meeting, Kravchuk announced the creation of a *Duma* , or Presidential advisory council, on which *Rukh* members were prominent. Of the *Duma's* four committees, one (on 'humanitarian politics') was headed by the literary critic and *Rukh* sympathiser Mykola Zhulyns'kyi, and another (on 'scientific-technical politics') by one of *Rukh's* Presidential candidates, Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi. Other leading *Rukh* members included Ivan Drach, Oleksandr Lavrynovych and the economist Volodymyr Cherniak.[110] After Kravchuk announced the formation of a system of regional Presidential Prefects in March 1992, *Rukh* , URP and DPU leaders also hoped that many of their members would gain such positions.

Not surprisingly therefore most of the *Rukh* leadership responded to Kravchuk's bait by endorsing Horyn"s proposals, despite heated argument, at a meeting of the *Rukh* Grand Council on 25 January,[111] and at a special meeting with leaders of the URP, DPU, Union of Ukrainian Students and *Prosvita* at the Kiev Writers' Union building on 1 February.[112] Finally, after the *de facto* dissolution of the *Narodna rada* faction in the Supreme Council after the December 1991 elections, Mykhailo Horyn' announced the formation of a *Rukh* (nationalist) faction of 41 Deputies in February 1992 under his leadership.[113]

Whilst a majority of *Rukh's* leaders' were prepared to ally with Kravchuk, V"iacheslav Chornovil continued to campaign for a completely different set of priorities. He was furious with *Rukh's* fractious campaign, which had prevented him from running Kravchuk closer. He was especially angry with the URP and DPU for not submitting to *Rukh's* collective discipline. Moreover, he did not regard 1 December as a complete victory for *Rukh's* programme, as he argued that true Ukrainian independence could not be achieved until the national communists had been dislodged from power. For Chornovil, the national revolution and the anti-communist revolution were inextricably bound together. He therefore argued both that *Rukh* had to remain in opposition, and that it must become a more effective and professional organisation in order to better challenge the national communists in the future.[114]

According to Chornovil, it was premature and dangerous for the nationalists to disable the forces of opposition by allying with the national communists. Without an opposition, Ukraine would simply relapse into authoritarian rule. Moreover, if *Rukh* supported the President, only a handful of small and fractious parties would be left in

ineffective opposition. According to Chornovil, 'without basing itself on *Rukh* , any new political opposition.in the republic is impossible'.[115] The political parties were too weak themselves to perform such a role, and were likely to remain so as Ukrainian society remained undifferentiated (see Chapter 2). Only *Rukh* could function as a broad civic movement capable of mobilising Ukrainians on a mass scale. In order to do so, however, it had to become a US-style mass campaigning party, with a streamlined and professionalised internal structure, free of the debilitating influence of the fractious parties. Mykhailo Horyn"s proposal for *Rukh* to function as an umbrella movement for the existing parties would simply institutionalise previous patterns of anarchic internal dissent.[116] Therefore Chornovil demanded that all political parties (i.e. the URP and DPU) should be purged from *Rukh's* ranks, although by February he had reduced this demand to a call simply for the removal of representatives of the political parties from *Rukh's* leadership positions.

Chornovil received strong support for his line from the grass-roots membership of *Rukh* , in what he described as a 'revolt from below'.[117] *Rukh's* leaders might benefit from Kravchuk's patronage, but to most members of *Rukh* in the regions, the same old regime remained in charge at their level, and *Rukh* was in danger of selling its soul to the national communists (a sarcastic banner at the third *Rukh* congress read 'Greetings to the [*Rukh*] nomenklatura from the lower ranks!').[118] The oblast conferences held in the run-up to the third *Rukh* congress showed that this position was gaining ground.[119]

The near total incompatibility of Chornovil and Horyn"s views, and the simultaneous struggle between the two men to succeed Ivan Drach as *Rukh* leader, seemed to indicate that *Rukh* was facing the same fate as Poland's Solidarity or Czechoslovakia's Civic Union as it approached

its third congress. That is, its early history as a common front for all opposition forces was giving way to strong internal centrifugal forces. An indication of the passions aroused was Drach's intemperate attack on Chornovil at *Rukh's* Grand Council meeting on 25 January 1992, when he accused him of trying to usurp the position of Ukraine's democratically elected President. Chornovil, according to Drach, 'could not wait [another] five years, and is trying to force new elections. In my opinion this is intolerable. Ukraine is being threatened by the position of Russia, and war between Ukraine and Russia would [bring] a contemporary apocalypse'.[120]

The third congress: *Rukh* splits in all but name

The third *Rukh* congress, having been delayed by the Autumn election campaign, was finally held in Kiev on 28 February - 1 March 1992.[121] The information provided concerning the 864 delegates in attendance largely confirmed the social and political profile of *Rukh* established at the second congress in October 1990. Over half the delegates were from Galicia. 74% were urban dwellers; but only 14% were classified as workers, and a mere 4% 'peasants' [*selianyn*]. The rest were, as before, mainly representatives of the cultural intelligentsia, such as teachers, doctors and academics (34%), and the 'scientific-technical intelligentsia' (20%). Students and serving members of the Armed Forces accounted for 1% each. *Rukh's* foothold in the corridors of power was demonstrated by the fact that 5% now classed themselves as workers in state administration (and 25 People's Deputies were in attendance). The rest were 'various'. The average age of the delegates was 35. Although over 500 delegates classed themselves as 'non-party', 91 were

members of the URP and 108 of the DPU (the PDRU, UCDP, UPDP and Greens all had less than ten delegates).[122]

The first day of the congress was carefully stage-managed by, and reserved for, the official leadership. Mykhailo Horyn"s pro-Presidential line therefore predominated. President Kravchuk himself attended and, having flattered *Rukh* for 'having done most' to achieve Ukrainian independence, made an explicit appeal to *Rukh* to define its central future task as assisting him 'in building Ukrainian statehood'. He finished by declaring that 'the idea of national consolidation can be the idea that unites the President and *Rukh* !'[123] He was followed by Mykhailo Horyn', who declared that Kravchuk had adopted *Rukh's* programme, to which therefore it was impossible to remain in opposition.

However, the extent of the leadership's lack of communication with the movement's grass-roots was revealed on the second day (Saturday 29 February) when the regional heads had their say (16 out of 25 leaders of *Rukh's oblast'* organisations had reportedly consulted with Chornovil at his hotel on the Friday night).[124] Almost to a man they supported Chornovil, and expressed a groundswell of popular discontent against the fractious activity of the parties, and their leaders' perceived pursuit of privilege. Chornovil was also supported by People's Deputies Les' Taniuk, Ivan Zaiets' and Serhii Holovatyi.

As defeat stared them in the face, the '1 February group' circulated a petition stating that they, 'the best representatives of the working and scientific-technical intelligentsia....could not take part in the election of [*Rukh's*] leading organs, when the further activity of *Rukh* at a time most critical for the independence of Ukraine will be in the role of an opposition, which will narrow her social base and make it more complicated for democratic political organisations to take part [in her

activity]', and calling for a rival assembly at the Kiev Writers' Union building the next morning.[125] When Ivan Drach read out this statement, his supporters having conveniently disconnected the TV cameras, the congress threatened to collapse in mayhem.

After pressure from diaspora representatives (*Rukh's* main paymasters), however, a compromise emerged from backstage negotiations, and, after a two hour break, a new leadership troika of Drach, Chornovil and Horyn' was presented to the largely relieved delegates. Chornovil, who would have been elected undisputed leader in an open election, accepted a certain dilution of his preeminence as the price of keeping the rebels in the fold, but he was clearly first among equals. His demand that *Rukh's* leading organs should be departicised was accepted, the congress' main declaration stated that '*Rukh* will be in opposition to the executive power and the President, if their actions contradict the programme of *Rukh* ',[126] and two-thirds of *Rukh's* new leadership was appointed by Chornovil, as opposed to only one third for Drach and Horyn' together.[127] Moreover, *Rukh's* Political Council, hitherto Mykhailo Horyn''s power-base, was disbanded.

The congress' resolutions confirmed *Rukh's* increasingly radical position on the national question, while still paying lip-service to civic nationalism. The congress stressed that 'the independence of Ukraine, nothwithstanding its formal recognition by the states of the world, to date remains more declarative than real', and called for Ukraine's departure from the CIS.[128] It also demanded the dissolution of the Crimean Supreme Soviet and the imposition of direct Presidential rule on the peninsula,[129] and strongly condemned separatism in general.

Rukh remained divided on the question of the OUN-UPA. Larysa Skoryk provoked uproar by accusing Chornovil of an insufficiently reverent attitude towards the OUN-UPA, claiming that he had referred

to them as 'historical tatters [*motlokh*]', - a claim vehemently denied by Chornovil.[130] At the other end of the spectrum Oleksandr Burakovs'kyi, head of *Rukh's* Council of Nationalities, in his speech attacked not only extreme right groups such as the UNA, but also the DPU, accusing it of becoming 'a mono-national party' which had abandoned its original commitment to democracy as a primary value to become a 'national-democratic' party instead.[131]

Chornovil's *Rukh*

In the aftermath of the congress, however, *Rukh* came increasingly under the sole control of Chornovil, especially after he resigned from his position as leader of L'viv council in March to take full-time control of the central *Rukh* bureaucracy in Kiev.[132] Drach took little part in the *Rukh* leadership after the congress, and Horyn' was forced out after his election as leader of the URP in May 1992. However, Chornovil's ambitions to turn *Rukh* into an efficient campaigning organisation remained largely on paper, and *Rukh* continued to experience problems with internal divisions and the growth of extreme nationalism within its ranks.

Chornovil's dominance of the movement was strengthened by the formal withdrawal of the URP and DPU from its ranks, although this deprived the organisation of many of its hardest-working and most prestigious members. The URP condemned Chornovil's plans to turn *Rukh* into yet 'another political party', and called on those who were still committed to the idea of *Rukh* as an umbrella organisation for all political parties to rally around the URP.[133] The DPU meanwhile disassociated itself from Chornovil's so-called 'constructive opposition' which it claimed would simply lead to confrontation with President

Kravchuk and internal destabilisation at a time when the need for national unity was paramount.[134] The departure of the URP and DPU to organise the rival Congress of National-Democratic Forces, however, allowed Chornovil to exercise complete control over the *Rukh* bureaucracy by the summer of 1992. By then, many of Horyn' and Drach's nominees to the leadership, such as Mykola Porovs'kyi, had ceased to take an active part in the movement's leadership, in any case. The bureaucracy was now run by Oleksandr Lavrynovych, an ally of Chornovil's.

Chornovil used his new-found preeminence to attempt to reactivate *Rukh* as a campaigning organisation. His attempts to force the resignation of the government and the Supreme Council, and organise a public 'trial' of the CPSU/CPU for its crimes are described in Chapter 8. Chornovil was increasingly critical of President Kravchuk's 'constitutional monarchism', and attacked the draft Ukrainian constitution published in July as potentially authoritarian (Chornovil was a member of the committee on the constitution).[135] Moreover, *Rukh* now argued that only a special Constitutional Assembly would have the authority to pass a new constitution, instead of the discredited Supreme Council.

Therefore *Rukh* was far from enthusiastic about the formation of the pro-Presidential Congress of National-Democratic Forces (CNDF), whom it accused of trying 'to create an alternative *Rukh* or a party of power, which will become a political support for the authoritarian system of power'.[136] *Rukh* sent Lavrynovych to the CNDF's first meeting on 2 August 1992, but only as an observer.[137] In the summer of 1992, *Rukh* and the CNDF drifted further and further apart, as Chornovil could not comprehend its support for Kravchuk at a time when the President was failing to seize a golden opportunity to make real radical reforms.

Consequently, when the Supreme Council reassembled in September 1992, the two groups formed separate factions. The *'Rukh'* faction established by Mykhailo Horyn' and Mykola Porovs'kyi in February 1992 became the CNDF faction, which claimed 40-50 members, whilst a new Chornovil-led *Rukh* faction also claimed the support of 50 Deputies.[138]

Rukh was, however, subject to the same radicalisation process as the rest of the Ukrainian political spectrum in 1992. *Rukh's* Council of Nationalities continued to meet, and called for a strengthened law protecting ethnic minorities' rights, and for state support for minority national-cultural societies, but it tended to work very much on its own.[139] Chornovil did not dissent from the CNDF's insistence on the need for rapid Ukrainianisation of the new state, and in particular its Armed Forces. He also stressed 'the necessity of strengthening propaganda and enlightenment work, especially in the Southern and Eastern oblasts of Ukraine' and also 'amongst the Ukrainian population of the states of the former USSR, especially in ethnically Ukrainian lands'.[140] He had also dropped his support for a federal Ukraine since the election campaign.[141] In June Chornovil visited the Kuban' in South-West Russia (the region to which the Zaporizhzhian Cossacks were expelled after the destruction of their headquarters by Catherine II),[142] and the *Rukh* leadership issued an appeal to support Ukrainians in *Prydnistrov"ia* (the rebel Dnister republic in Moldova).[143]

Radicalisation was most evident in L'viv, however, which still had the largest share of *Rukh's* total membership (of 50,000 reregistered members in November 1992, 20,000-30,000 were in L'viv).[144] In the early summer of 1992, L'viv's fringe nationalist groups (see Chapter 7) and supporters of the former 1970s dissident, and radical nationalist Valentyn Moroz,[145] organised a 'Nationalist Bloc' against the more moderate leadership of Yurii Kliuchkovs'kyi, *Rukh* chairman in

L'viv.[146] In May 1992 the L'viv radicals organised a conference attended by other nationalists such as Stepan Khmara and members of the UNA, which openly called on *Rukh* to reorient itself towards 'the nationalist conception and moral bases of the OUN' and even to declare itself the 'spiritual successor and continuation of the OUN'.[147]

On 27 September 1992, a meeting of the regional heads of L'viv *Rukh* passed a motion of no-confidence in Kliuchkovs'kyi,[148] and expressed support for Moroz, who was openly calling for a 'noble reinvigoration of *Rukh* ' [*shliakhetno ozdorovyty Rukh*] through a return to the integral nationalism of the 1930s OUN. He claimed that the 'democratic resources of the Ukrainian revival are [now] depleted. Thus ends the first, general-democratic, stage. The next stage must be nationalist', as he argued that a historical progression through the 'formula; communist-democrat-nationalist' was inevitable. Moroz urged Ukraine to throw off the colonial burden of both Russia and the 'pro-Russian' West, and assert its national interests at home and on the world stage. Ukrainians were threatened with becoming a 'national minority' in their own land. 'In the draft constitution' claimed Moroz, 'all rights [are granted] to them [i.e. the national minorities], and not for us - the ruling nation. Power is not [yet] in our own hands'.[149] His supporters claimed that Ukraine was becoming 'a banana republic', rejected the 'penetration into the national economic structure of foreign elements', and called for the spiritual cleansing of the irredeemably compromised and corrupt local and national administration, claiming that 'the conclusion from the parallel with Weimar is that only nationalism can save Ukraine from communist-fascist dictatorship'.[150]

The conflict between Kliuchkovs'kyi and Moroz's radical nationalists came to a head at the L'viv *oblast'* conference of *Rukh* on 24 October 1992, from which Moroz had prudently absented himself.[151] His

supporters were unsure of obtaining a majority, and therefore recruited 50 or so thugs from the neo-fascist Social-National Party of Ukraine (see Chapter 7), who stormed the building, breaking doors and windows and taking over the platform. After several minutes of chaos, the visiting Chornovil suspended the conference. Moroz's supporters, however, who numbered around half the delegates (but who controlled a minority of the L'viv regions) remained, declaring themselves the legal representatives of *Rukh* in L'viv, and electing Moroz as one of three co-leaders, along with Ihor Baranovs'kyi and Iziaslav Kokodyniako.[152] The radicals also gained control of the L'viv *Rukh* newspaper *Viche*.[153] Rival assemblies were then held by Kliuchkovs'kyi on 7 November,[154] and by the Moroz group on 28 November. The latter issued a manifesto, calling for 'the equality of Ukraine amongst all the nations of the world', 'mighty armed forces' and 'the education of nationally conscious individuals boundlessly dedicated to Ukraine, for whom the nation is above all'. Despite recognising 'the rights of national minorities', the manifesto argued that 'the [ethnic] Ukrainian nation is the primary state-building agent on its own ethnic territory'.[155]

Not surprisingly, Chornovil was ultimately compelled to deny the Moroz group entry to the fourth national *Rukh* congress in December 1992, but the affair had wider ramifications. Firstly, with a membership of 20,000-30,000, the L'viv branch of *Rukh* was not only the backbone of *Rukh* itself, but was also one of the largest political organisations in the country. Nothwithstanding *Rukh's* split in L'viv, Moroz's supporters had therefore secured the first mass base for an extreme ethnic nationalist movement. Secondly, the events were given wide publicity throughout Ukraine, and could not but help provoke an anti-nationalist backlash in Eastern and Southern Ukraine, especially at a time of growing economic collapse and disillusion with the new state. Thirdly,

Moroz had helped to demonstrate that Chornovil's optimistic expectation that he would inherit a *Rukh* as powerful as at its peak in 1990-91 was misguided. Moroz's supporters would make common cause with the other anti-Chornovil elements in *Rukh* (see below).

Fourth congress

The fourth *Rukh* congress was held in Kiev on 4-6 December 1992.[156] *Rukh's* statute stipulated that congresses should be held yearly, but the fourth congress was brought forward both to confirm Chornovil's ascendancy, and to turn *Rukh* into a political party before the June 1992 Law on Citizens' Associations (see Chapter 2) came into affect on 1 January 1993. *Rukh* had to become a political party if it was to participate in future legislative elections, and the move was given extra logic as *Rukh* was now a smaller, but more homogeneous movement under Chornovil's leadership (L'viv notwithstanding).

The decision to turn *Rukh* into a political party (*Rukh* received its registration on 2 February),[157] however, caused a further split at the congress. On the 6th a rival assembly was organised by 116 of the 474 delegates, mainly those from Galicia, Chernivtsi, Kharkiv, Poltava, Mykolaïv and the Crimea.[158] The splitters appeared to be supporters of the CNDF and a more nationalistic line for *Rukh* . The proposition that 'the realisation of the principles of Ukrainian nationalism' should be 'the ideological basis' of the new ersatz *Rukh* , was greeted with loud applause. The splitters later organised a rival 'All Ukrainian Popular Movement of Ukraine' led by the CNDF stalwarts Mykola Porovs'kyi and Larysa Skoryk as a spoiling tactic at a congress in Kharkiv on 20 February 1993,[159] possibly to form a future alliance with Moroz's L'viv *'Rukh'* . In order to spike Chornovil's guns, and spread confusion

amongst the general public, the new *Rukh* rapidly received official registration on 26 February 1993.[160]

Chornovil meanwhile had slimmed down the organisation of *Rukh* proper, and re-registered a membership of 60,000 (which made *Rukh* in practice the largest political party in Ukraine). In addition to 60,000 card-carrying members, *Rukh* now claimed amongst one million 'sympathisers' (who were required to do no more than sign a statement of sympathy with *Rukh's* aims and values) and 100,000 collective associate members, belonging to the Union of Ukrainian Women,[161] *Memorial*,[162] the Association of Farmers and others.[163]

The new *Rukh* programme approved at the congress, drawn up by Cherniak, Holovatyi, Kostenko, Oleksandr Savchenko, Taniuk, Zaiets' and others was entitled 'A Conception of State-building in Ukraine', and largely confirmed *Rukh's* differences with the CNDF. Both were clearly nationalist programmes, but *Rukh* continued to give greater priority to individual and civic rights, and was more openly hostile towards the residual influence of the national communists. *Rukh's* programme stressed the primacy of fundamental individual rights, arguing that 'the state can only receive its legitimacy from civil society. The state cannot stand above civil society, or even on the same level. The state must serve society.' Furthermore, the new programme stated that '*Rukh* views Ukraine as a national state [formed] from the multi-national nature of Ukrainian society', because 'for historical, ethnic, economic, political and social-pyschological reasons Ukrainian society is not homogeneous'.[164] Therefore the programme was surprisingly mild on the question of Ukrainianisation of language and culture, and also advocated inter-confessional tolerance.

On the other hand, the congress' slogan had been 'Ukraine in Danger!', and the programme was more uncompromising in its sections

on internal and external security. Despite the fact that Chornovil had flirted with the idea of a federalised Ukraine before beginning his election campaign in Autumn 1991, *Rukh* now strongly emphasised the importance of maintaining a unitary system to prevent the growth of separatist forces, particularly in the Crimea. In terms of external security, *Rukh* supported President Kravchuk's rapid build-up of military strength, although the nuclear question was largely sidestepped (Chornovil himself was strongly against 'one-sided disarmament').[165] Although the importance of maintaining 'mutually beneficial economic ties' with Russia was stressed, the new programme declared that 'Russia still has not finally made her choice between a democratic or imperialistic course of future development. Russia has not once and for all given up territorial pretensions on Ukraine. Moreover, internal processes in Russia are threatening her with dissolution, and she is embroiled in conflicts on her borders in the Caucasus and in Central Asia. Because of this Russia is in practice a continual source of instability and possible external threat'.[166]

Therefore, *Rukh* proposed immediate Ukrainian withdrawal from the CIS, and supported instead the idea of a Baltic-Black Sea alliance first proposed by the URP and UNA.

In January 1993, the attempt by Eastern Ukrainian deputies to force Kravchuk to sign the CIS charter, and to lift the ban on the CPU, plus their attempt to impeach Defence Minister Morozov, at the same time as a growing threat of a revanchist nationalist movement replacing Yel'tsin in Moscow, caused *Rukh* to revive its slogan of 'Ukraine in Danger!' and bury its differences with the CNDF and others by joining a common 'Anti-Imperial, Anti-Communist Front' (see Chapter 8), but the fundamental differences between Chornovil and the CNDF that surfaced

in 1992 meant that the alliance was unlikely to be anything other than tactical and short-term.

Conclusion

From 1989-91 *Rukh* was the main nationalist umbrella organisation in Ukraine. However, the historical weaknesses of the Ukrainian nationalist movement prevented it from becoming a hegemonic political force, and also debilitated it from within, through a succession of internal splits. *Rukh's* commitment to civic nationalism was a vital factor in moderating the nationalist movement throughout 1989-92, but by 1992 *Rukh* was unable to keep all leading nationalists to such moderate positions, resulting in the formation of the CNDF in August 1992. Nor was *Rukh* able to contain the growth of ethnic nationalist groups on its right flank.

In 1988-90, *Rukh's* original leaders had kept it to moderate positions in order to try and expand its appeal in Eastern and Southern Ukraine, but in 1990-92 the movement fell under the control of more nationalist leaders, such as Ivan Drach and Mykhailo Horyn'. V"iacheslav Chornovil took over the *Rukh* leadership in March 1992 with a slightly less nationalist programme, and attempted to reforge links with centrist parties (see Chapter 8). However, his victory came by appealing to the *Rukh* rank and file, most of whom were Ukrainians from Galicia and Central Ukraine. *Rukh* has therefore had to continue to compete with the parties to its right, leading to further radicalisation in *Rukh's* programme in 1992. *Rukh* in 1993 remained a large and significant political force, but it was now only one nationalist group amongst many.

5. THE PARTY OF THE INTELLIGENTSIA:

THE DEMOCRATS

Introduction

The second main nationalist party to emerge in Ukraine in the early 1990s was the Democratic Party of Ukraine (DPU), which held its founding congress in December 1990. It was always poorly organised in comparison with the URP, but its importance lay in its position as the preeminent party of the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia. It included in its ranks many cultural figures who had been prominent leaders of the broader national movement in 1988-90, and who therefore gave the party high public visibility and a sense of intellectual gravitas. One of the DPU's founders, the poet Dmytro Pavlychko, even went so far as to describe the party as 'the brain of our nation' in June 1991.[1]

The programme of the DPU was largely therefore the typical programme of a revival nationalism led by a local intelligentsia, concentrating initially on issues of national cultural and linguistic rebirth, and after August 1991 on aiding and abetting the process of building a Ukrainian nation-state. The party therefore helped to chart the course for the new ship of state, and to develop an ideology of Ukrainian national interest, as well as reviving ethnic myths and symbols from the past to help promote national revival in the present.

The DPU was therefore the main political representative of the new Ukrainian intelligentsia, whose development was described in Chapter 1. The new intelligentsia was less socially marginalised (and therefore radicalised) than its nineteenth century counterpart, and had been strongly influenced by the legalistic and humanistic traditions of 1960s dissent. Initially at least (in 1990) the DPU therefore tended to support

civic rather than ethnic conceptions of nationalism. The DPU, like *Rukh* and to a lesser extent the URP, deliberately sought to overcome the legacy of 'Eastern exceptionalism' by emphasising its adherence to general European and international standards of human rights, and by explicitly rejecting Dmytro Dontsov's Ukrainian version of integral nationalism. However, the Ukrainian intelligentsia's commitment to civic nationalism was always likely to be qualified in the long run by its desire to improve the dismal status of Ukrainian language and culture, and its own status as a social group. The DPU therefore moved to the right in 1990-2 to espouse positions little different from those of the URP, and by the time of its second congress in December 1992 was committed to the principle of 'the Ukrainian character of the state'.

The party's roots

The roots of the DPU were in the 1960s *shestydesiatnyky* movement for Ukrainian cultural and national rebirth, rather than in the camps (see Chapter 3). The DPU's first leader from 1990-2, Yurii Badz'o, had been a high-profile dissident, but was also a typical representative of the *shestydesiatnyky* generation. He worked in the Institute of Literature from 1961 until 1964, when his sympathy for the more radical elements in the *shestydesiatnyky* cost him his job.[2] His main dissident publication, the 1,400-page *Prava zhyty* ('The Right to Live') written in the late 1970s, concentrated on issues of linguistic and educational Russification,[3] although at the time he described himself as a 'Eurocommunist'. His successor, Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi, was a writer.

The party therefore drew its strength from the Ukrainian cultural establishment, restive in the 1960s, and again beginning to stir in 1988-90

after the enforced slumbers of the 1970s and early 1980s. 65% of the delegates to the inaugural DPU congress in December 1990 had at least higher education,[4] as did 80% of the delegates to the first all-Ukrainian conference of the DPU in April 1992.[5] The party was characterised as a 'party of philologists' whose 'so-called party cell number one'[6] was to be found in the building of the Kiev Writers' Union. Its higher ranks were indeed dominated by Ukrainian *literati* , such as the poets Ivan Drach and Dmytro Pavlychko, academics such as the historian Voleslav Heichenko and artists such as Halyna Yablons'ka and Diana Petrynenko; while the party's lower levels consisted 'preponderantly of engineering technical workers and the scientific intelligentsia',[7] teachers and the like. Its strongest local organisations tended to be in university towns (see below).

Such people had provided both the leadership and the rank and file for the various 'informal' movements that sprang up in 1988-90 in Ukraine and which were the direct antecedents of the DPU. According to Badz'o, 'the procedure was simple: the leader of the [local] organisation of *Rukh* or the [Ukrainian] Language Society would simply sign the [DPU's] Manifesto, therefore automatically becoming the organiser for the creation of party cells in the oblast, and later, also almost automatically, becoming the leader of the oblast council of the party'.[8]

Chapter 4 described how the cultural intelligentsia provided the initial leadership for such organisations. After the failure of the first attempt to form a Ukrainian Popular Front in the summer of 1989 under the leadership of the UHU and other 'informal' organisations, the initiative passed to leading members of the Kiev branch of the Writers' Union of Ukraine (WUU), such as Ivan Drach, Viktor Teren and Pavlo Movchan.[9] Members of the WUU predominated on the organising committee for *Rukh* and amongst the *Rukh* leadership elected at the

movement's first congress in September 1989. Drach became leader. Another writer, Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi, headed the Kiev *Rukh* organisation.

The cultural intelligentsia also dominated the Taras Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society (ULS) which held its founding congress in February 1989. The first leader of the ULS was Dmytro Pavlychko. Yurii Badz'o also worked for the ULS from November 1989. By the summer of 1989 Pavlychko claimed 70,000 members for the Society.[10] Together with local cells of *Rukh* the ULS was the main organisational outlet for the frustrations of the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia in this period (for the moment confined to the campaign for national cultural and linguistic renaissance).

From *Rukh* to the Democratic Party

The first successful *Rukh* congress in September 1989 marked the end of the first stage of the organisation's existence, when it had functioned as a necessary umbrella under whose protection the first shoots of political pluralism had begun to develop. Thereafter there were a number of possible directions in which *Rukh* could have evolved. Drach and Pavlychko wanted *Rukh* to become a political party, to which *Rukh's* still high levels of popularity could simply be transferred. *Rukh* /The Democratic Bloc had won 25% of the seats in the March 1990 elections, and with the imminent abolition of Article 6 of the USSR constitution, they argued that the time was right to create a broad-based party capable of challenging the communist party's continuing hegemony.

On 8 March 1990, between the two rounds of the republican elections, Drach's group published a declaration 'To the members of *Rukh* and to all citizens of Ukraine', signed by Drach, Pavlychko, Yavorivs'kyi, Pavlo Kyslyi, Vitalii Donchyk and others.[11] It called for an 'immediate extraordinary congress of *Rukh* , at which to elaborate a [new] conception of *Rukh* and its activity as a political party'.[12] Drach and Pavlychko, supported by Levko Luk"ianenko and Mykhailo Horyn' from the UHU, who had also signed the declaration, then pushed this line at the fourth session of the Grand Council of *Rukh* , held in Khust in Transcarpathia in late March 1990. They were however defeated by those who preferred to see *Rukh* develop as a coordinating organisation for all political parties that might emerge in Ukraine, and by those who did not yet wish to challenge the power of the CPU outright.

Drach and Pavlychko therefore published a 'Declaration of Conscience' announcing their intention to leave the communist party and to go it alone in forming a new political party. An initiative group was founded on 14 May, headed by Pavlychko, with Badz'o and Vitalii Donchyk as his deputies. The draft Manifesto for the new party was published in *Literaturna Ukraïna* on 31 May 1990.[13]

The May manifesto was based on a project for a 'Ukrainian Party of Democratic Socialism and State Independence' that Badz'o had been working on since as long ago as March-April 1989.[14] Badz'o's 1989 draft had sought to rehabilitate the ideals of Ukrainian Social Democrats such as Vynnychenko, before their corruption by the Bolsheviks and 'real existing socialism', whilst stressing the Ukrainian people's 'historical will to life and to freedom'.[15] Badz'o's draft was therefore strongly reminiscent of Ivan Dziuba's 'loyal petitions' in the 1960s (see Chapter 3), and was far removed from the strident anti-Marxism of the OUN or

UHU. Many of the DPU's leaders were too close to the existing political establishment to be sharply critical of it.

The May 1990 manifesto was notable for its long intellectual critique of Marxism-Leninism, but again the criticism was phrased from within the general socialist tradition. The manifesto attacked the CPSU as 'a ruling class' overseeing a form of 'feudal socialism', but its signatories nevertheless proclaimed that the new party 'adheres to the world social-democratic movement and continues the traditions of Ukrainian social democracy'. Moreover, it would 'strive to ensure that Ukrainian society, on its path to economic and political freedom, does not repeat the experience of primary capitalist accumulation with its acute social antagonisms and unchecked private-ownership egoism' (although the manifesto also declared earlier that 'the categories of "capitalism" and "socialism" are outdated and have lost their historical content').[16] The manifesto called for full Ukrainian state independence, as 'a nation's liberty, like that of an individual, is an absolute value and does not require explanation or justification'. There would be a transitional period to full independence, but there was no possibility of 'any middle-road in this conflict. Half-freedom is an unstable condition'.[17] Moreover, 'the idea of a "new union agreement" on federal principles is speculation and highly dangerous for the national freedom of the USSR's peoples'.

The draft manifesto was signed by 86 leading members of Ukrainian society, representing a broad cross-section of support, on which the DPU had the opportunity to establish itself as the preeminent opposition party. The long delay to December 1990 in holding the party's first congress, however, meant that many initial supporters drifted away, such as Oleksandr Lavrynovych, later in charge of the *Rukh*

bureaucracy; Serhii Holovatyi, a leading non-party opposition deputy; and Leopol'd Taburians'kyi, founder of the tiny People's Party of Ukraine, and Presidential candidate in December 1991 (he received 0.6% of the votes).

Through the summer of 1990 the debate about the DPU's ideology and programme continued to progress in the context of rapidly radicalising public opinion, particularly in *Literaturna Ukraïna* and in the samizdat journal *Holos* ('Voice'). The editor of *Holos* , for example, Volodymyr Solopenko, in describing 'our tasks', called for 'privatisation and a decisive crossover to market economic relations'.[18] By September 1990 *Holos* announced that the DPU's basic aim should be 'the creation of a sovereign Ukrainian state with a market economy (on the basis of neo-conservative economic theories)'.[19] As Ukrainian public opinion became increasingly anti-communist in the aftermath of the disappointments surrounding the 27th CPSU and CPU congresses, the growing liberal faction in the would-be party was increasingly reluctant to contemplate any mention of 'socialism' or even 'social democracy' in the party's programme.[20] However, the party's leadership, dominated by ex-Eurocommunists such as Badz'o and long-time CPU stalwarts like Pavlychko, resisted such demands.

In June three organising committees were set up. The first, to draw up the party's programme, was chaired by the self-styled neo-conservative, Oleksandr Lavrynovych. The second, empowered to draw up the party's statute, was led by the historian and (after November 1990) head of the Kiev DPU, Voleslav Heichenko. The third, to organise the congress itself, was led firstly by Vitalii Donchyk, and then Badz'o from November.[21]

The DPU's leaders assembled in the town of Terebovlia in Ternopil' oblast on 22 September 1990 to formally declare the party's existence (the local council had been dominated by the party's supporters since the March 1990 elections and had printed the DPU's paper *Volia* since July 1990). Thereafter a series of oblast congresses were held in the run up to the party's inaugural national congress. In Ivano-Frankivs'k for example the congress was held on 17 November, with the local party already claiming 300 members.[22] In Kiev the congress on 24 November was reportedly a virtual who's who of the capital's cultural intelligentsia.[23] In Kharkiv on 8 December Volodymyr Shcherbyna, people's deputy of Ukraine and Professor of physics and mathematics at Kharkiv university was elected as head of the local DPU. In Kirovohrad on 2 December the editor of the local evening paper, Serhii Zaporozhana, was elected leader.[24] The L'viv DPU held its congress on 8 December, attended by 92 delegates representing 212 members.[25]

Still, the DPU's founding congress did not take place until 15-16 December 1990 in Kiev, a full nine months after the original intention to form the party had been announced. This was an extraordinary delay and one that severely undermined the party's 'launch effect'. Although its leaders remained well-known and popular, in the interim crucial momentum had been lost, and the political ground that the party wanted to occupy was already partly occupied by the centrist Social Democratic Party of Ukraine that held its founding congress in May 1990, and the Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine whose first congress had been on 1-2 December 1990 (see Chapter 2). The URP had already established itself as the main nationalist party (the DPU was in fact the twelfth new political party to be formed in Ukraine in 1990). Moreover, the drawn-out process was characteristic of the DPU's leaders' general lack of enthusiasm for basic organisational work. In Vitalii Donchyk's

words, 'the party was not created in [people's] heads, or on paper, rather it emerged of its own accord'.[26]

Inaugural congress

The first DPU congress was eventually attended by 523 delegates representing 2,753 members of the party. The delegates included 188 'experts in economy', 152 workers in science, culture and education, 66 industrial workers, and 6 unemployed.[27] One delegate openly boasted that 'the main support for the DPU to date has been the scientific and working [*tvorcha*] intelligentsia'.[28]

The party had by then also established a faction of 23 deputies in the Supreme Council,[29] led by Dmytro Pavlychko, who claimed an additional 19 'sympathisers'[30] (in practice Pavlychko's deputy, Stepan Volkovets'kyi, did much of the organisational work, as Pavlychko was so often preoccupied with his duties as chairman of the Supreme Council's committee on Foreign Affairs). Unlike the 11 deputies who were elected as members of the UHU in March 1990, however, the DPU faction was formed long *after* the elections by previously independent deputies who transferred their allegiance to the DPU. Pavlychko and Volkovets'kyi therefore had to give their colleagues a relatively long leash.

Despite its long gestation period, the party was still unsure about several crucial aspects of its identity. The dispute between liberals and social democrats continued to simmer away. At the congress, the economist and USSR deputy Volodymyr Cherniak called on the DPU to help create a 'class of businessmen'[31], while the *Holos* editor Volodymyr Solopenko criticised the new party for paying insufficient

attention to socio-economic problems and for underemphasising individual as opposed to national rights.[32] Badz'o in his speech admitted that 'we must assert and defend economic freedom - more concretely, the interests of business. But we [must] not absolutise and idealise private property interests, or identify it with private property egoism!'[33]

Although the congress supported a nationalist platform of outright state independence, there were doubts both amongst the intelligentsia and amongst delegates from Eastern and Southern Ukraine concerning the wisdom of reviving the right wing traditions of Ukrainian integral nationalism. Pavlychko declared that the DPU should struggle against not only 'the dictatorship of one-party Bolshevism' and the USSR as 'the combination of an Asiatic feudal monarchy with a European fascist regime', but also against 'nationalism based on the Nietzscheanism of Dontsov'. Extremist parties such as the UIA and SNUM (and the CPU) were deliberately not invited to the Congress. However, Pavlychko also declared that 'Democracy - is above all the self-determination of the nation', and 'there is no conflict between the rights of individuals and the rights of a people [narod]'.[34] Badz'o moreover declared that 'the centre [of the Soviet empire] - is not some mythical supranational bureaucracy, as some try to picture it. In its origins, national-cultural basis and orientations, [in terms of] its physical superiority - it is a Russian centre, a second tier of Russian statehood (above the RSFSR)'.[35]

However delegates from Eastern and Southern Ukraine opposed attempts to rehabilitate the wartime OUN-UPA, resulting in a compromise suggestion by Ivan Drach to hold a special academic conference on the subject.[36] Although the DPU was a nationalist party, it sought to act as a bridge between Eastern and Western Ukraine and

avoid confinement in a Galician ghetto, and was therefore concerned to tread more cautiously on these issues than the URP.

Paradoxically, most difficulty was experienced over the new party's attitude to *Rukh* . *Rukh* had by then (in October 1990) held its second congress, which had been perceived by many as marking a decisive shift away from its original 'general democratic' direction towards more exclusively nationalist concerns. Although Badz'o himself was in favour of the party becoming a collective member of *Rukh* ,[37] he had warned the second *Rukh* congress about the dangers of 'ideological intolerance and the psychology of hatred' and simplistic opposition politics.[38] The party decided to keep its distance from *Rukh* at this stage, and declined Badz'o's proposal.

The DPU programme passed at the congress gave a clearer commitment to the supremacy of liberal and humanist values than many of the speeches at the congress. It declared that 'our system of priorities is: the individual - the family - the nation - the state'.[39] It placed heavy emphasis on the importance of a rule of law and exclusively parliamentary methods of struggle, and stated that the 'state's power is not a mechanism for the political rule of one class over another'.[40] No mention was made of the political rule of one ethnic group over another, but the programme promised that all would be equal citizens of a future independent Ukrainian state. Such a state should have its own Armed Forces, although without nuclear weapons.[41]

The influence of the party's intelligentsia constituency was obvious in many areas of the programme. The party stressed the importance of the revival of education and the arts, with the former to 'operate on the

basis of the harmonious unity of general human and national values',[42] and increased state support for academia, research and culture.

The economic section of the programme was again somewhat cautious, calling for the 'state's role in regulating economic processes to gradually [*postupovo*] decline' and for equality between all forms of property. There should be 'a guarantee of the social defence of the population', with indexation of incomes.[43]

The party's statute was more liberal than that of the URP.[44] Entry into the party was made relatively easy, and Article 2.4 of the statute declared that only primary organisations could expel members, who in any case had the right to protest to an appeal committee, whereas the leadership of the more rigidly centralised URP had the (frequently used) right to expel members (see Chapter 3). According to Article 3.1 (again unlike the URP which banned factions within the party), the DPU guarantied minorities, defined as 1/5th of any assembly, the right to be heard and publish their opinion. The DPU's hostility to the idea of a centralised and disciplined party, however, also meant that party congresses were to be held only every two years (Article 7.1) - an obvious encumbrance for a new party trying to establish its position and profile. The party also burdened itself with an unwieldy National Council of 83 members, necessitating the later creation of an Inner Council of seven, plus six regional representatives.

Badz'o was elected leader, receiving 413 votes for and 74 against. His only opponent was Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi, who received 63 for and 424 against, after Dmytro Pavlychko withdrew his candidature claiming the pressures of parliamentary business.[45]

Party membership

The DPU was officially registered as a political party at the Ukrainian Ministry of Justice on 28 June 1991, having passed the membership threshold of 3,000 to do so (it actually had 3,015 members). The party was proud that its membership profile was broader than that of both the URP (concentrated in Western Ukraine) and the PDRU (concentrated in Eastern Ukraine). It therefore claimed, somewhat disingenuously, to be the most 'all-Ukrainian' of the parties. 34% of the DPU's members were from Galicia, 5% from Volyn'-Polissia, 6% from Transcarpathia and Chernivtsi, 30% from Central Ukraine (17% from the Right Bank, 8% from Kiev city and *oblast'* , and 5% from the Left Bank), 18% from Eastern Ukraine, and 7% from Southern Ukraine and Crimea (see Table 5.1 below). Such percentages should not disguise the fact that the DPU's overall membership remained disappointingly low. The DPU's most active local organisations were in Galicia, Kiev and Chernivtsi, but the party also had strong organisations in Donets'k, Dnipropetrovs'k and Cherkasy.[46]

Table 5.1. Membership of the DPU at the time of the party's registration on 28 June 1991.[47]

Oblast	Membership
i) Galicia	
L'viv	254
Ternopil'	356

Ivano-Frankivs'k	403
ii) Volyn'-Polissia	
Rivne	74
Volyn'	72
iii) Other West	
Transcarpathia	106
Chernivtsi	84
iv) Right Bank	
Kirovohrad	59
Cherkasy	212
Vinnytsia	115
Zhytomyr	37
Khmel'nyts'kyi	73
v) Kiev (city & oblast)	250
vi) Left Bank	
Poltava	94
Sumy	28
Chernihiv	24
vii) East	
Kharkiv	181
Donets'k	137
Luhans'k	25
Zaporizhzhia	68
Dnipropetrovs'k	145
viii) South	
Mykolaïv	50
Kherson	85
Odesa	61

Crimea	12

Total: (& 10 People's Deputies)   3,015

Some idea of the party's social profile can be gleaned from the analysis of the 203 delegates who attended the DPU's first all-Ukrainian party conference on 12 April 1992. One hundred and eighty six were Ukrainians (91.6%), plus 11 Russians and 6 others.[48] Fifteen were below 30, 106 aged 30-50, 59 from 50-60, and 23 over 60. One hundred and sixty two had at least higher education. As regards occupation, nearly all were from the intelligentsia; 32 were engineers or technicians, 29 were teachers, 24 were scientists or researchers (*naukovtsi*), 22 were university lecturers, 12 were doctors, 9 were white-collar workers (*sluzhbovtsi*), 6 were journalists, 5 were artists, 4 were factory directors, 2 each were lawyers, writers, and actors, while there was also one architect, farmer and vet. The rest were made up of 16 workers, 3 pensioners and 2 peasants (not all the delegates declared their occupation).

Party organisation

The party could not be described as well-organised. It suffered from several major problems: the weakness of the resource base at its disposal; the lack of communication and coordination between the party leadership and both the local oblast organisations and the party's faction in the Supreme Council: certain defects in the party's statute; and consequent to all the above, the party's problems in organising collective action.

The party's resource base was weak. Although the party had a small head office in Kiev, its only patron was the WUU and it lacked significant diaspora support (unlike the URP), although Badz'o tried to cultivate contacts with the OUN-z.[49] The DPU's main source of funds was from membership dues, but the central party leadership was constantly complaining about the oblast organisations' poor record in forwarding dues to the centre, and as the Ukrainian economy succumbed to serious inflation in 1992, the flow almost dried up. In summer 1992, the central office had a mere 10,000 coupons in the kitty (then around $30).[50] Despite Badz'o's repeated attempts to found a central party paper, the party's only organ in 1990-92 remained *Volia* , printed in Ternopil' through its supporters on the local council in Terebovlians'kyi raion. *Volia's* circulation, however, fell from an original 50,000 to 5,000 by summer 1991. It appeared only irregularly, and not at all after autumn 1991. It was not until December 1992 that the first issue of the long-planned national party paper *Demokrat* appeared, with a circulation of 25,000.

The party's capacity to print and distribute its various appeals and declarations was limited by its lack of resources. Before the March 1991 referendum, for example, it was able to print 4 appeals, but only in runs of 10,000 copies each, and this was counted a success![51] The party's appeals and statements, however, regularly appeared in the press. In this respect, the DPU was blessed by its intelligentsia leadership, many of whom had independent access to the mass media, although as Badz'o constantly complained, many of the party's representatives and deputies '"forget" to mention their party allegiance when speaking at sessions, meetings, on TV, or printing articles in the press'.[52]

In general the party's central leadership found it difficult to exercise control over the other branches of the party. At a local level, many branches led only a formal existence, or operated as independent fiefdoms that rarely communicated with the centre (unlike the highly centralised URP). According to Badz'o again, 'some of the local leaders of the regional councils of the DPU simply "forget" about the party'.[53] Too often, local party organisations 'confine their work to the oblast centre, or at best, a few regional centres'.[54] Unlike local branches of the URP, too little effort was made to broaden the party's influence at a local level by expanding contacts with local youth groups, strike committees, etc.[55] The attempt by the party leadership in May 1991 to encourage the creation of local 'information-enlightenment groups' to promote the party's message, was largely stillborn.[56]

At its worst, many local branches did not even 'act like separate political subjects'.[57] Badz'o cited the Zhytomyr, Khmel'nyts'kyi, Chernihiv and Sumy organisations as areas where the party's existence was purely formal (in 1991), with local leaders such as Sviatoslav Vasyl'chuk in Zhytomyr effectively spending all their time in other political organisations such as *Rukh* .[58] Despite constant campaigns to expand the party's membership, by the time of the party's second congress in December 1992, the leadership had to settle for congratulating themselves that they had actually managed to maintain the party's membership constant at around 3,000.[59]

As stated above, 23 deputies in the Ukrainian parliament belonged to the DPU (plus a further 16 'sympathisers'), but relations between the deputies' faction and the rest of the party were often problematical. As Badz'o complained, 'our deputies are not people who were elected from political parties on a multi-party basis, but deputies who became members of parties, after the elections. They don't necessarily work in

the party's mechanisms.'[60] Therefore their sense of responsibility to the party was too often subordinated to their individual interests as deputies. Moreover Badz'o was not himself a deputy, the leader of the DPU's faction in the Supreme Council, Dmytro Pavlychko, was too often busy on other business, and his deputy Stepan Volkovets'kyi was unable to organise any effective whipping system.

Nevertheless, powerful figures from the DPU were a significant force on many Supreme Council committees, particularly on the Foreign Affairs Committee (chaired by Pavlychko); the Chornobyl' Committee (chaired by Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi, with Volodymyr Shovkoshtnyi, a DPU 'sympathiser', as his deputy); and the Science and Education Committee (chaired by Pavlo Kyslyi after Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi became Deputy Prime Minister in October 1992, with the DPU's Stepan Pavliuk also a member). The DPU's Mykhailo Svaika was also deputy head of the Economic Reform Committee, headed by another DPU 'sympathiser', and the party's unsuccessful Presidential candidate in 1991, Volodymyr Pylypchuk; while Dmytro Zakharuk was Secretary to the Committee on Planning, the State Budget, Finance and Prices. Three out of 27 members of the Supreme Council Presidium therefore belonged to the DPU (four if Pylypchuk is included).

The DPU also had its representatives in local and national government. Stepan Volkovets'kyi, for example, was head of Ivano-Frankivs'k oblast council; Anatolyi Pohribnyi,[61] a member of the party's National Council, was deputy minister of Education in the national government. Pohribnyi, also a leading figure in the ULS, was regarded by many as the power behind the throne in the department (the minister was Petro Talanchuk), and the driving force behind plans to Ukrainianise education. Many DPU figures were appointed as provincial prefects (*predstavnyky*) by President Kravchuk after the system was

established in March 1992, such as Professor Roman Hrom"iak, former local head of the DPU, in Ternopil'; Vitalii Donchyk, former head of the Kiev DPU, as deputy prefect in Kiev; and Anatolii Zdorovyi as deputy prefect in Kharkiv.

The party often claimed (after the elections in March 1990) to have more deputies at all levels than all other parties, including the URP, especially in Galicia.[62] However, estimates of 500 deputies or more could not be substantiated because of poor communication with local party cells.[63]

The party's leading figures, such as Pavlychko and Drach, were very much a law unto themselves, as were the DPU's representatives in parliament or government as a whole. For example, only 13 of the DPU's 23 deputies joined the *Rukh* faction formed by Mykhailo Horyn' in February 1992 (later the Congress of National-Democratic Forces faction).[64]

The DPU also suffered from certain weaknesses in its party statute. The decision to hold congresses only every two years was clearly a mistake, depriving the party of vital opportunities for publicity in the crucial 1990-2 period of party formation and consolidation. It also led to a lack of communication and coordination between the party's national leadership and the party rank-and-file, demonstrated by the disputes over the OUN issue at the 1990 congress, and over merger with the URP at the 1992 congress. On the other hand, the license given to local party organisations and the DPU faction in parliament simply reflected the party's political culture, and the impossibility of imposing discipline on its leading figures. Most of the DPU's members were happier arguing about abstract issues than in mundane organisation. The party statute stated clearly that every 'deputy group coordinates its activity with the

party council of the equivalent level',[65] but in practice the principle was impossible to implement.

Hence, although the DPU found itself gradually placing more emphasis on central authority, its leading structures were always uncoordinated and inefficient in comparison to those of the URP. The meetings of the party's National Council tended to lack discipline and focus, and therefore increasing responsibility tended to devolve to the party Presidium and Inner Council (*Mala rada*) of 13.[66] But even the Inner Council was never possessed of sufficient leadership or material resources to impose itself on the rest of the party in the manner of the URP's Secretariat. Dissatisfaction with the party's performance in this respect, and Badz'o's increasing sense of frustration, was one key reason for the election of Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi as party leader to replace Badz'o at the party's second congress in December 1992.

These factors were reflected in the party's opinion poll performance. It tended to outscore all other parties (apart from the Green Party), because of the high public profile of its leaders, but its rating began to slide in 1992, and the party found it difficult to translate vague feelings of public sympathy into more tangible forms of support for the party.

In September 1991, for example, a more than respectable 18% considered themselves 'well-informed' about the DPU, second only in public recognition to the Greens.[67] In December 1991 33% of the population rated the DPU positively, 14% negatively (plus 19% net), and 52% offered no opinion, a rating above that of the URP (plus 13% net), and in line with that of the PDRU (plus 22% net), but behind that of the GPU (plus 30% net).[68] The percentage intending to vote for the DPU in multi-party elections rose from 6% in January 1991 to 9% in November 1991, before slipping back to 4.3% in April 1992.[69] The DPU's leaders

were therefore aware that this was by Ukrainian standards an impressive but fragile level of support, and by 1992 were increasingly susceptible to the argument that the DPU needed to ally with the organisational solidity of the URP to make the best of its ratings.

Post-congress activity: the DPU moves to the right

Although the DPU was clearly a nationalist party, at its first congress in December 1990, Badz'o had defined the DPU's 'vocation as performing the role of a [political] centre, the role of balancing the turbulent political primitives to the right and left'.[70] In 1990 and early 1991 therefore, there were calls, particularly from the Kiev DPU, to cooperate with, and even eventually unite with, the centrist Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine (PDRU) which saw itself in a similar fashion. The PDRU had made overtures at the DPU congress, and Pavlychko had urged for 'union within a year at the most' to create 'a mass party of opposition to the CPU' as early as December 1990.[71]

The DPU's Presidium discussed the issue on 27 March 1991, and the full National Council on 13 April and 14 May 1991. Some representatives stressed the logic of a merger with the PDRU, given the importance of 'attracting the technical intelligentsia' who 'were afraid of the Banderites'.[72] Pavlychko in particular pressed the issue. The predominant feeling however was against the PDRU, as the party contained 'as many chauvinists as democrats', and too many 'general democrats - without nationality'.[73] According to Badz'o, the PDRU (and the Social Democrats) were dominated by 'people of a cosmopolitan direction, that is either indifferent or even alien (*chuzhy*) to the idea of a Ukrainian national revival and Ukrainian statehood. Such people are very common in the PDRU, there is even an openly anti-Ukrainian

mood amongst some. -Therefore.....unity with such people was impossible'.[74] Moreover, the PDRU's liberals 'favour the idea of the complete bargain basement sale of the main part of Ukrainian industry to foreign capital'. According to Badz'o, 'the Kharkiv PDRU' [led by Vladimir Griniov] supports 'the sovereignty of the individual over the sovereignty of any collective. That is, once again the right of the individual against the right of the nation. Our position is different: the right of a nation is an organic part of the rights of an individual....because there is no [such thing as a] individual without or transcending nationality'.[75]

At the meeting of the National Council on 18 May 1991 Vitalii Donchyk proposed a compromise whereby the decision would be devolved to the DPU's local organisations, and this was accepted with only four votes against.[76] Thereafter the DPU and PDRU continued to cooperate in certain areas, where both parties were dominated by the liberal intelligentsia, particularly in Kiev where many members of the DPU campaigned for the PDRU's candidate, Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi, in the 1991 presidential elections. In some areas of Eastern Ukrainian, the DPU had some Russian-speaking members who preferred to cooperate with the PDRU, as in Donets'k where the DPU had some cells in mining towns, Dnipropetrovs'k and Zaporizhzhia.[77] The L'viv DPU and PDRU even created a common coordinating council for their work.[78] But on the whole, the DPU's increasing preoccupation with the national question in 1991-2 inevitably brought the party's mainstream closer to the URP. The DPU therefore kept its distance from the centrist *New Ukraine* coalition founded by the PDRU and others in January 1992. Although the then head of the Kiev DPU, the historian Voleslav Heichenko, attended as an observer, Badz'o immediately made clear that

the DPU had not joined as collective member,[79] a line endorsed by the National Council on 8 February 1992.[80]

Instead, the DPU converged towards the URP in 1991-2 by adopting a much more clearly nationalist line. In the run up to the March 1991 referendum on the future of the Union, the DPU strongly opposed Gorbachev's question, but supported both the republican and Galician ballots, whereas most members of the URP opposed the second question as it stopped short of full independence.[81] Although the DPU had doubts about the wording of the republican question the majority on the party's Presidium supported it on pragmatic grounds, as it encouraged the convergence of Kravchuk's national communists with the nationalists, and its defeat would have meant a significant step backwards away from sovereignty.[82] The DPU's Ivan Yushchuk was deputised to organise the coalition 'Referendum for a Sovereign Ukraine',[83] which included the DPU and Ukrainian Peasant Democratic Party, but also the centrist PDRU, Social Democrats, and Liberal Democrats. Its declaration, issued in January 1991,[84] indicated the parties' preference for a 'Commonwealth of Independent States' along the lines of the project drawn up by Ukrainian academics.[85] In the aftermath of the referendum the DPU denounced the confused results, but argued that they could not be used to justify any new Union Treaty.[86]

By April 1991 the DPU was sounding a more radical note. It called for the 1990 Declaration of Ukrainian Sovereignty to be given constitutional status, for Ukraine to refuse to recognise the validity of the USSR constitution on Ukrainian territory, for the banning of parties with 'a extra-republican structure' (i.e. the communist party), and for an all-Ukrainian political strike in the event of the Ukrainian government signing Gorbachev's proposed new Union Treaty.[87] In August 1991, the DPU paper *Volia* published sharp criticisms of the proposed Treaty.[88]

The DPU's leaders increasingly believed that full independence was achievable, but were wary of running too far ahead of public opinion, particularly in Eastern Ukraine.[89] In private however Badz'o was insisting that 'we must always emphasise that a Commonwealth is only a form for the transition to full independence'.[90] On the Monday morning of the attempted August 1991 coup (the 19th), the DPU was the first party to seize the moment and called for the Supreme Council to 'denounce the Union Treaty of 1922, and announce the full state independence of Ukraine'.[91]

The DPU, however, was aware that the opposition was still too weak to achieve this goal on its own and therefore keenly supported Leonid Kravchuk's national communist group, both before and after the attempted August coup. According to Badz'o in April 1991, the opposition 'must not lump together Kravchuk and the Kravchukites with Hurenko [the hard-line First Secretary of the CPU], but search for a split between them and widen it'.[92] Whereas the radical wing of the URP at this time doubted Kravchuk's motives, the DPU enthusiastically greeted the emergence of national communism as the best way of breaking the deadlock with Moscow, and securing independence, or at least full sovereignty, for Ukraine. In April 1991, Badz'o was prepared to admit that 'for the tasks that now stand before Ukraine, Kravchuk is best suited. Although of course the [necessary] basis for this - is his departure from the CPU'.[93]

Ironically, the DPU found it more difficult to cooperate with the rest of the opposition. Various attempts to organise the opposition in a common front before August 1991 floundered (see Chapter 8). Similar difficulties were experienced in the run-up to Ukraine's first ever presidential elections on 1 December 1991. The DPU, despite issuing a call for a common opposition candidate in September 1991,[94] was unable

to coordinate its activities with the other opposition parties. In August 1991, the DPU's National Council discussed the issue of whom the party should support.[95] Unlike the URP, which remained determined to nominate Luk"ianenko for President, the DPU was not confident enough of its own organisational capacity to nominate a candidate from their own ranks. Nevertheless, the party felt obliged to raise its profile by supporting a candidate. It was too early to openly declare for Kravchuk, especially after his equivocation during the attempted coup. On the other hand many DPU members were more or less openly supportive of his state-building efforts, and it was difficult to raise their enthusiasm for a campaign against him.

As regards the opposition candidates, the DPU National Council denounced the L'viv oblast DPU for prematurely supporting V"iacheslav Chornovil, whom the DPU's leaders had long condemned for his support for a federal Ukraine. Badz'o argued in favour of supporting the liberal academic Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi, the head of the opposition *Narodna rada* faction in the Supreme Council, but a majority on the National Council supported the formally non-party economist Volodymyr Pylypchuk, a decision confirmed on 1 September. Pylypchuk however failed to excite the party's intelligentsia supporters, and ran a lacklustre campaign. The DPU only managed to collect 79,710 of the 100,000 signatures necessary to place his name on the final ballot.[96] The Kiev DPU simply supported Yukhnovs'kyi.[97] The campaign therefore ably demonstrated the weakness of the DPU as an organisation, and encouraged the DPU's leaders to seek closer ties with the more disciplined URP.

Nationalism and ideology

As discussed in Chapter 1, one way of judging any Ukrainian party's attitude to ethnic nationalism is by its attitude towards the OUN-UPA. In this respect the DPU has been an excellent weather-vane for the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia as a whole, mirroring the gradual radicalisation of its attitudes over the early 1990s.

The issue had been a thorny one at the December 1990 congress, but on the whole the DPU was careful to avoid the unreserved endorsement of the UPA that was characteristic of the URP. Badz'o in his congress speech had accepted that 'the activity of the OUN and UPA, - [represented] a social and national liberation movement, that wrote an important page in the history of the Ukrainian people. But we would be poor readers of our experience if we did not also observe in its activity an undemocratic ideology and political practice'.[98] In other words, Badz'o supported a carefully constructed compromise between those emphasising the importance of reviving the myth of the OUN-UPA to help consolidate the incipient national revival, and those delegates, primarily from Eastern and Southern Ukraine, who considered that associating the new national movement with such a controversial historical tradition would only serve to help confine its appeal to Galicia.

Such sensitivity did not last long, however. By August 1991, however, the DPU's newspaper *Volia* was devoting half of its pages to favourable portrayal of the OUN-UPA, and blaming their poor historical image in Eastern Ukraine on 'lying Soviet propaganda aimed at dulling the consciousness of the peoples of the USSR and coarse defamation of fighters for freedom',[99] although the party's revised programme in 1992 still avoided making any direct statement on the issue.[100]

In sharp contrast to the party's founding congress, the DPU's second congress in December 1992 demanded that 'the UPA be recognised as a military organisation, and its members given all the rights of veterans of the second world war'.[101] Dmytro Pavlychko, who had skilfully swum with the times, described the 1940s as an era, 'when the UPA, the military organisation of the Ukrainian people, which appeared as [the result of the latter's] protest against Hitler's occupation, conducted a just struggle both against Stalinist enslavement and once again for national freedom'.[102]

The DPU, however, continued to formally reject Dontsovite nationalism. In Badz'o's words in September 1991, 'the DPU was born in and is based on three ideas: the state independence of Ukraine, a democratic Ukraine and a democratic path to an independent democratic Ukraine'.[103] The bases of the party's ideology were 'humanism, democracy, patriotism and rationalism'.[104] The party believed in 'Ukrainian patriotism' but 'we understand by Ukrainian patriotism not only patriotism for Ukrainians, but also for Ukrainian citizens of any other nationality'.[105] Moreover, the DPU supported the creation of a 'civil society....whose characteristics are the sovereignty of the people with respect to power, the inalienability of rights and the inviolability of the individual'.[106] In this respect, the DPU remained true to its origins in the legalistic and humanistic traditions of the *shestydesiatnyky* generation. The party's programme emphasised the importance of general human rights, and the harmonious balance of the rights of the individual and the nation or state. The draft programme for the party's December 1992 congress emphasised that the DPU's guiding principle was the idea 'of UKRAINIAN NATIONAL-STATE PATRIOTISM, which is based on the common interests of all citizens of our state, regardless of their ethnic origin'.[107]

However, the party was also prone to making such statements as 'the secure freedom of the individual is not possible without the freedom of national independence and the self-development of the people'.[108] The draft programme for the December 1992 congress stated that 'Ukraine is the ethnic territory of the Ukrainian people [*narod*], and the declaration of the state independence of Ukraine on 24 August 1991 was an act of the self-realisation of the Ukrainian people. Therefore we are against any attempt to interpret the Ukrainian state as the anational [*ponadnatsional'ne*] territorial creation of those peoples who live in it.[109] The party was of course overwhelmingly Ukrainian in its composition (see above). As with the URP, the DPU in day to day politics supported many of the principles of an ethnically Ukrainian state. The party talked a great deal about the rights of Eastern Ukrainians, but was reluctant to give them what they wanted.

The DPU took an uncompromising line against minority separatism within Ukraine and against proposals for a federal constitution. As separatist sentiment began to grow in the aftermath of Ukraine's Declaration of Independence in August 1991, the DPU issued an appeal to the Presidium of the Supreme Council and the General Procurator of Ukraine, condemning 'separatists...who play on the low levels of political consciousness of a section of the population. Their activity is *de facto* a continuation of the putsch', and calling for the use of forceful 'legal sanctions against those who threaten the territorial unity of our fatherland'.[110] The DPU was particularly eager to condemn separatist movements in Transcarpathia and in the Crimea (Badz'o was from Transcarpathia). It considered that demands for Transcarpathian autonomy had 'no historical, ethnic or political grounds'. The local population was simply part of the Ukrainian *ethnie* . Any contrary

sentiment was simply the result of 'inter-state anti-Ukrainian intrigue'. Similarly, demands for a Crimean republic were solely the result of the 'pretensions of Russian politicians' and 'the games of the [local] administrative power'.[111] To combat the rising separatist movement in Eastern Ukraine, the DPU, along with *Prosvita* (the renamed Ukrainian Language Society), founded a nationalist Ukrainian-language paper entitled *Nashe slovo* in Donets'k in July 1992.[112]

Foreign and defence policy

The DPU also took a strongly nationalist line in questions of foreign policy, a stance that could not but have helped to alienate Ukraine's substantial Russian-language population. Although necessarily circumspect before August 1991, when the party had in any case tended to concentrate on the single issue of independence, in 1991-2 the DPU, like the URP, became an increasingly forceful advocate of an aggressive pursuit of Ukrainian national interests as it saw them. Although the DPU was now a strong supporter of President Kravchuk, it constantly chided him whenever he failed to oppose Russian pretensions.

The DPU almost immediately condemned the December 1991 Minsk agreement setting up the CIS. The party's National Council declared that 'the formation of a so-called Commonwealth...will only support and even strengthen the inertia of the imperial attitude towards Ukraine on the part of certain leadership circles in Russia, and will leave the Ukrainian people at the mercy of their age-old encroachment on our freedom'.[113] According to Badz'o the agreement was a 'trap', perhaps a necessary 'transitional form' towards the full destruction of the Empire, but one that risked perpetuating Ukraine's longstanding 'slave psychology' towards its larger neighbour, and distracting the West's

attention from Ukraine's drive towards full independence.[114] As early as January 1992, in the aftermath of growing confrontation between Ukraine and Russia over the issue of the Black Sea fleet, the DPU declared that 'the history of the CIS is short, but it already gives sufficient grounds to conclude that in Russia the tendency to view the Commonwealth as the road towards a unitary state is already victorious. If Ukraine remains in such a union, it will threaten her sovereignty and independence'.[115] Consequently the National Council called for Ukraine's departure from the CIS.

The DPU supported all moves towards the creation of national Armed Forces, and towards military disentanglement from the CIS. Although the party's draft programme in early 1992 (drawn up by Badz'o) still insisted that the DPU stood 'for the non-nuclear and non-block status of Ukraine',[116] by the time of its second congress in December 1992 the draft party programme declared that 'in the present circumstances we consider Ukrainian neutrality to be mistaken. Instead we propose a system of collective security with [other] Central and East European nations'.[117]

.The perceived threat from Russia also led the DPU to rethink its position on nuclear weapons. It had been radical groups such as the UNA who had first questioned Ukraine's non-nuclear status in autumn 1991, but the adoption of similar positions by the more respectable URP and DPU by the summer of 1992 considerably aided the permeation of such thoughts into official circles. Many state officials were openly calling for Ukraine to retain a nuclear capacity in some respect by the end of 1992.

The DPU's original 1990 programme had echoed Ukraine's July 1990 Declaration of Sovereignty by declaring that the party supported 'the

creation in Ukraine of a non-nuclear zone, and also the banning of the manufacture, preservation and transport of weapons of mass destruction on her territory'.[118] At the time it was thought impossible to reconcile Moscow to the idea of Ukrainian independence without such a declaration. This position was still maintained when the party's National Council discussed a new draft programme on 8 February 1992.[119] However, doubts concerning the wisdom of transferring tactical nuclear weapons to Russia at a time of growing tension with Ukraine's powerful neighbour, and over the neglect of *realpolitik* in giving up such valuable assets for no tangible return, led the April 1992 DPU conference[120] to demand that 'the question of Ukraine's nuclear disarmament should depend on effective control over such disarmament and on international guarantees of the inviolability of Ukraine's sovereignty, [and that] in the interests of the independence of Ukraine [she should] temporarily suspend her transformation into non-nuclear status'.[121] The documents prepared for the party's December 1992 congress called for 'the destruction of atomic weapons throughout the world and the acquisition by Ukraine of non-nuclear status only as part of the process of general European and global nuclear disarmament',[122] and insisted that Ukraine's 'signing of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty should depend on guarantees for the security of Ukraine from the nuclear states of the West'.[123] The above statements contained several mutually incompatible positions, but demonstrated the depth of the party's unease.

The party's leaders also maintained a steady stream of anti-Russian rhetoric, constantly condemning Russian interference in Ukrainian affairs, and her supposed desire to resurrect some form of imperial dominion over Ukraine. Badz'o for example criticised nineteenth century Ukrainian thinkers such as Mykhailo Drahomanov, who

saw Ukraine's future in some kind of union with Russia. They hoped that Ukrainian traditions, Ukrainian society would influence Russia, lesson the authoritarianism in the Russian tradition and harmonise the relations between us as neighbours. History has shown that this is impossible. The inertia of Russia's imperialistic attitude towards Ukraine is still powerful. The formation of Ukrainian statehood, and the assertion of independence from Russia in all spheres of life is therefore our only guarantee of democracy.[124]

The DPU's first all-Ukrainian conference on 12 April 1992 declared that under cover of the CIS, 'tendencies to revive the empire are not only preserved but are actually strengthening themselves. Russia is imposing constant economic, political and propaganda pressure on Ukraine, complicating for us the process of creating a democratic order and independent state'.[125] Although the DPU rarely used the more virulent anti-Russian language of the URP or of more extreme groups, it shared their thesis of innate Russian imperialism and authoritarianism in a milder form.

By December 1992, the DPU considered that a key priority for the 'foreign policy of Ukraine should be the defence of the rights of Ukrainians who live in other states, support for their national revival, and securing their close links with Ukraine'.[126]

Second congress

The build-up to the DPU's second congress in December 1992 was marked by the DPU leadership placing increasing stress on the importance of joint action with the URP in defence of the state-building process in Ukraine. The meeting of the DPU's National Council on 13

September 1992 called on all political parties to participate more actively in this process,[127] and declared its support for President Kravchuk and, with some qualifications, for the proposed new constitution, about which others had serious reservations.[128] Moreover, the Council 'welcome[d] the formation of the coalition between the DPU and URP and the Congress of National-Democratic Forces, which opposes the politics of destructive radicalism with the position of positive participation in the building of an independent democratic state and civil society'.[129]

The congress was finally held in Kiev on 12-13 December 1992.[130] The National Council had twice postponed the congress, in February and September 1992, and the April 1992 party conference had been held in its place, and such a long delay had serious consequences both for the party's public visibility and organisational cohesion. The party's membership had stagnated at around 3,000, and many more moderate DPU party cells had dissolved themselves into Chornovil's *Rukh* as a result of the decision to departicise *Rukh* taken at the third *Rukh* congress in February-March 1992 (see Chapter 4).[131]

The congress confirmed the DPU's development in a more nationalist direction over the period 1990-92 (although at the same time formally reaffirming the party's commitment to civic nationalism). Dmytro Pavlychko's remarks on the UPA were referred to above. Pavlychko spoke of how the Ukrainian people were no longer like 'a paralytic at the crossroads', but were now 'masters in their own house'.[132] The new government of Leonid Kuchma and President Kravchuk, and especially Defence Minister Morozov should receive every Ukrainian's support for their efforts in building a Ukrainian nation-state.[133] Badz'o went further, asserting that 'amongst our

political leaders in Ukraine today, [Kravchuk] is the one individual who can live up to the demands of history in every respect'.[134]

The DPU nevertheless asserted that state-building should only proceed on the basis of the 'priority of the rights of the individual. The rights of the family, nation and state follow on from this one basic right'.[135] Badz'o, by contrast, attempted to balance the rights of individuals and nations as follows; -

> as Ukrainian patriots, we resolutely support and will continue to support the
> complete state independence of Ukraine, the all-round rebirth and development
> of the Ukrainian nation, and oppose cosmopolitan speculation on the idea of
> individual rights. As democrats, we insist not only upon equality of civil rights
> for all the nationalities of Ukraine, but also reject Ukrainian chauvinism, and
> view critically the non-democratic strains in the Ukrainian national-liberation
> movement of both the past and present. As patriots, we strive for the
> consolidation of the nation in the name of her state independence. However, as
> democrats we clearly state that the consolidation of the nation is possible only on
> the basis of democracy and in the name of a humanistic order.....At the same time
> the Ukrainian state is both a supra-national territorial creation, and the logical
> consequence of the historical self-determination of the Ukrainian ethnos.[136]

The sub-text behind this balancing act was the attempt by the DPU's leadership to force an early merger with the URP. In order to do so, the DPU had committed itself in the summer of 1992 to the Congress of National-Democratic Forces' (CNDF) programme which stressed 'the national character of Ukrainian statehood' (see Chapter 8). The congress now 'declared its intent [to seek] an organisational union of the URP and DPU on the basis of a common programme and statute'.[137] Badz'o,

having stated that 'the URP and DPU are not identical, but in the present circumstances it would be an extravagance to make [serious] differences out of our distinctions', called for a union on the basis of 'national-democratic principles', to create a 'National-Democratic Party of Ukraine', which he hoped would attract like-minded elements from 'Rukh ,... the UPDP, Christian Democrats, Greens and [even] the PDRU and social democrats' to its ranks.[138]

However, it was apparent that not all the DPU's membership shared the leadership's enthusiasm for moving to the right and seeking union with the URP. The Kiev DPU, which contained many of the party's best-known moderates, declared before the congress that 'in the event of the immediate union of the two parties, the Kiev organisation of the DPU will remain as part of the [original] DPU'.[139] At the congress Badz'o publicly attacked the Kiev DPU for their 'opposition to the national-democratic direction of our party', their preference for general liberalism, and willingness to entertain notions of a federalised Ukraine.[140] He also criticised local branches of the DPU, who 'without an appropriate decision from higher party organs, were prepared to enter coalitions with any other party organisation, instead of entering into a coalition with the CNDF'.[141]

In other words, it was doubtful whether the DPU could deliver its organisation and membership base, which were of limited extent in any case, into any deal with the URP. What it could offer, however, was the prestige of its leading members, and the party's strength in the Supreme Council.

Badz'o was replaced as leader by Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi, another writer and Badz'o's unsuccessful opponent in 1990. Although Ivan Drach expressed his doubts at the departure of the hard-working Badz'o, the congress supported Yavorivs'kyi 'almost unanimously',[142] in the

hope that he would raise the party's profile in the Supreme Council and the country at large, and forge stronger links between the party organisation and the party in Parliament. Yavorivs'kyi was a strong-willed individual, however, who was unlikely to accept second place to the URP's Mykhailo Horyn' in any union between the two parties.

Conclusion

The proposed alliance between the URP and DPU was in theory ideally suited to both. The URP had a well-organised party machine outside of parliament, while the DPU had a prestigious leadership and a higher profile in the Supreme Council. However, mergers between two parties do not always conserve the strengths of both. The main impetus towards union was the recognition by the DPU's leadership of their own organisational effectiveness, but its grandees would undoubtedly seek to preserve their freedom of action in any new party in the same way as they had done in the DPU, and this was likely to clash with the more centralised traditions of the URP. Nevertheless, the DPU continued to hope that the prestige of its leaders would bring it public support, and prevent the party being smothered by the URP.

The fortunes of the DPU were emblematic of those of the Ukrainian intelligentsia as a whole, whose crucial importance in the Ukrainian national movement as a whole was described in Chapter 1. The party rode its popularity in 1990, but was unable to significantly expand its influence outside of Galicia and Central Ukraine in 1990-2. In terms of organisation and membership, the party trod water between its two congresses in December 1990 and December 1992. Many of the party's leading individuals were able to exercise powerful influence in official circles in 1991-92. Many DPU figures, such as Drach and Pavlychko, had

close and friendly relations with Kravchuk. However, the DPU was unable to institutionalise such influence, and it was in a poor position to oppose any back-sliding by the national communists in their commitment to the national cause.

Most significantly perhaps, the DPU, even more than the UHU, was nominally committed to the ideas of civic nationalism, but the above analysis has demonstrated how its actual political practice was based on the idea of an ethnically Ukrainian state, and how the party moved sharply to the right in 1990-92.

6. THE STREET PARTY:

THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Introduction

Over the period 1988-92 public opinion amongst the nationalist core constituency in Galicia and Kiev grew increasingly more radical and impatient (although, as has repeatedly been stressed, this was far from representative of Ukraine as a whole). This had two effects. One, as described in the last three chapters, was to pull *Rukh* and the mainstream nationalist parties in a more radical direction. The other was to open up a political space to their right. The existence of the Ukrainian National Assembly (UNA), an openly authoritarian group and the most successful organisation on the extreme right, was therefore testimony to the impatience of many Ukrainian nationalists with the civic nationalism originally espoused by *Rukh*, the URP and DPU. A host of other, smaller, ethnicist parties were also formed in this period, and are described in Chapter 7.

The UNA was formed on 8 September 1991 as the result of a name-change by the Ukrainian Interparty Assembly (UIA) established in Kiev on 1 July 1990 as a coalition of various small ultra-right parties. Throughout 1990-92 the UIA-UNA was the most significant political force to the right of the URP, and also tended to be the most prominent (or most noisy) in public demonstrations. Although the ultra-right as a whole in Ukraine has proved extremely quarrelsome and fissiparous, the UIA-UNA has remained its best organised, most durable and most influential component. It has strongly opposed the democratic and civic version of nationalism originally propagated by *Rukh*, but has also rejected the 'romantic nationalism' of the 1930s OUN as obsessed with

history, irrelevant to modern conditions, and likely to appeal only to Galicia. Instead the UIA-UNA has attempted to forge an ideology based on a mixture of ethnic nationalism and statist-corporatist concepts, with a strong paramilitary emphasis to attract its main target group, disaffected youth throughout Ukraine.

The history of the UIA-UNA can be divided into three phases. The original rationale for the creation of the UIA was to coordinate the efforts of all those ultra-radical groups to the right of the UHU. Most had split from the UHU-URP over firstly, the UHU's refusal to campaign for full Ukrainian independence until September 1989, and secondly the UHU's decision to participate in the Ukrainian republican elections of March 1990. The UIA therefore represented those who considered that 'the Ukrainian SSR is not a Ukrainian state. It was created by the communist party of a country hostile to the Ukrainian People's Republic [the short-lived independent Ukrainian state of 1918], - the RSFSR'.[1] Its members sought to copy the tactics of the radical citizens' committees in Estonia and boycott the structures of the official state, whilst at the same time recreating the old legitimate government of the Ukrainian People's Republic to replace the Soviet 'occupying power'.

Following the election of Yurii Shukhevych (the son of the wartime Ukrainian Insurgent Army commander Roman Shukhevych) as leader of the UIA in December 1990, the UIA entered a second phase after it openly embraced the integral nationalist ideology of Dmytro Dontsov,[2] and began to cooperate with the émigré OUN-r. However, the UIA eventually turned its back on the émigrés, whom it regarded as manipulative and out of touch, and entered a third phase in its existence after September 1991 as it began to develop a brand of Ukrainian nationalism that it deemed more appropriate to modern conditions.

The founder members of the UIA

The first session of the UIA, held on 1 July 1990 to coincide with the anniversary of the 1941 declaration of Ukrainian independence by OUN leaders in L'viv, was attended by most of the ultra-right groups then in existence. The most significant were the Ukrainian National Party, the Ukrainian People's Democratic Party, the Ukrainian Peasants' Democratic Party, and the nationalist faction of the Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth (SNUM)[3] (the Ukrainian Peasants' Democratic Party will be considered in Chapter 7, as its L'viv branch only participated in the UIA's opening session out of curiosity). All of these were ultimately to fall by the wayside except SNUM. The UIA-UNA therefore came to be dominated by the representatives of radical youth who ran SNUM. The history of the other parties is worth describing, however, in order to give the flavour of the times. Even in 1988-89, many radicals were impatient with the civic nationalism then espoused by the UHU and others.

<u>Ukrainian National Party</u>

The Ukrainian National Party (UNP), led by the former political prisoner Hryhorii Prykhod'ko, was in fact the first non-communist political party to be established in Ukraine in the modern era. Prykhod'ko, an electrician by trade, had been held in the camps for 15 years. Upon his release in July 1988 he joined the UHU in L'viv, but found it too cautious on the basic issue of Ukrainian independence, and left in May 1989 along with like-minded radicals such as Ivan Makar and Vasyl' Sichko (Makar later became a radical deputy and Sichko founded the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Front - see Chapter 7).[4]

The UNP's founding congress was held in L'viv on 21 October 1989. As the party still had to operate underground, the meeting had to be held in a private apartment. The UNP's original programme argued that

> in so far as the Ukrainian SSR [UkSSR] and its government were created by the decision of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party and because of the exile of the legal government of the Ukrainian People's Republic, the laws and agreements of the government of the UkSSR with the governments of other nations are legally void. Therefore the UNP does not recognise it and considers the UkSSR not a republican, but a colonial administration in Ukraine.[5]

The UNP were therefore the first to suggest copying the tactics of the Citizens' Congress committees in Estonia and elsewhere and organise a campaign for the rebirth of the Ukrainian People's Republic (in Ukrainian, UNR). It proposed the organisation of committees to register 'citizens of the UNR', which would then create a system of 'dual power' in the republic to challenge and usurp the existing authorities.

The UNP's programme also called for 'the rebirth of the UNR within her ethnic borders', and, most controversially, argued that 'the best defence [of democracy] is private arms'.[6] Prykhod'ko later defended the latter statement by saying that he did not envisage armed revolutionary struggle. Rather, as with the US Second Amendment, the right to bear arms was a means of strengthening civil society against the state.[7]

Prykhod'ko also explicitly rejected the civic concept of Ukraine as a multi-national society, and denounced the use of the term 'the peoples of Ukraine'.[8] There was only one Russian people, and only one Ukrainian; and each had its own homeland where the other should neither live nor interfere.

The party saw itself as an elite group rather than a parliamentary party, for whom 'large numbers were not necessary'.[9] Members were expected to engage constantly in 'patriotic activity', and leading former

communists were theoretically excluded from membership. The party's statute was much criticised for the authoritarian powers given to Prykhod'ko.[10]

The UNP published a party newsletter (*Visnyk UNP*), and two journals (*Klych natsiï* , and *Ukraïns'kyi chas*). The radical L'viv historian Yaroslav Dashkevych wrote frequently for *Ukraïns'kyi chas* . As the most radical party in late 1989 to early 1990, the UNP was instrumental in organising a theoretical conference on how to obtain Ukrainian statehood in January 1990 along with the UHU and UPDL (see below). In the climate of the time, the conference had to be held in Iurmala in Latvia. It was also one of the prime movers behind the creation of the Committee for the Creation of Ukrainian Armed Forces in L'viv in February 1990 (which did much to popularise the idea of independent Ukrainian Armed Forces), the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers in April 1990, and ultimately of the UIA in July 1990. It also set up a youth wing called *Sich* (named after the headquarters of the seventeenth century Ukrainian Cossack state).[11]

Although the UNP was in many respects a path-breaking ultra-right party, which led to initial material support from the émigré OUN-r, its membership remained low (never more than 100-150) and it was soon overtaken by other groups in importance. Prykhod'ko's idiosyncratic behaviour soon led to the withdrawal of OUN-r support.[12] It also alienated itself from moderate nationalists by its harsh criticism of their involvement in the parliamentary process.[13]

The UNP lost its leading position in the UIA in December 1990 (see below), and its radical wing, led by Levko Franchuk of the L'viv UNP, defected to form the Ukrainian National Patriotic Liberation Front in April 1991.[14] At their first meeting (*zbir*) on 26-7 October 1991, Franchuk's tiny group refused even to recognise the legitimacy of

Kravchuk as Ukraine's 'so-called President'.[15] Franchuk's group also had links with the ultra-right Nationalist Bloc set up in L'viv in 1992 (see Chapter 7).

Prykhod'ko meanwhile partially revived the fortunes of the UNP by keeping intact the small group of L'viv intelligentsia around *Ukraïns'kyi chas* , and by issuing a new manifesto in September 1991, declaring that, after the 24 August 1991 Declaration of Ukrainian Independence, the UNP could emerge from the underground, 'legalise its activity' and campaign for a 'Yes' vote in the 1 December referendum.[16] As regards the Presidential election, it advised a vote against the allegedly pro-Russian Griniov, but did not make any positive recommendations.

The UNP remained fiercely nationalist, and against the Ukrainian government's 'Robin Hood style of social politics'.[17] In the face of an 'economic war by Russia against Ukraine' and the threat of Ukraine's exploitation by foreign multinationals 'like a third world country', Ukraine faced 'a stark choice: either to legalise 'shadow' capital or [face a] revolution of the lumpen, or the economic and financial dependence of Ukraine either on Russia or the West'.[18] In other words, Ukraine must build its national self-defence through the creation of its own capitalist class. Prykhod'ko attempted to define the UNP as a national-Thatcherite party, arguing against the paternalistic approach of all other parties that the only guarantee of a strong state is strong and self-reliant individuals.[19]

This programme had much in common with that of the Kiev intelligentsia-based UPDP (see below), and the two parties merged to form the Ukrainian National-Conservative Party (UNCP) in Summer 1992,[20] which then participated as an observer at the Congress of National Democratic Forces in August 1992 (see Chapter 8). The UNCP

was registered as a legal party in October 1992, under the leadership of Viktor Rodionov, and retained a modicum of influence as an intellectual pressure group.[21]

Ukrainian People's Democratic Party (UPDP)

The UPDP's roots were in the tiny informal 'cultural discussion' groups that sprang up amongst the Kiev intelligentsia and in student circles in 1987-88. At the time, it was impossible to engage in open public dissent. Therefore the groups that began to form in this period, such as in Kiev the Ukrainian Culturological Club,[22] and the student *Hromada* (meaning 'Community' or 'Society', and named after the intelligentsia groups of the nineteenth century);[23] and in L'viv *Tovarystvo leva* (the 'Lion Society', named after the symbol of the city),[24] confined themselves in theory to cultural affairs, although behind closed doors heated discussion would take place.

Other small groups active at this time were Ukrainian branches of all-Union political organisations, notably the Democratic Union established in May 1988 in Moscow. Its Ukrainian offshoot, the Ukrainian Democratic Union, was set up in Autumn 1988, but renamed itself the Ukrainian People's Democratic League (UPDL) in February 1989 to make clear it was not an artificial import from Russia.[25] Its activists were a peculiar mixture of nationalists and liberals, who joined the UHU as collective members (with pretensions to be its 'Christian Democratic' intellectual vanguard) until the congress that turned the UHU into a political party (the URP) in April 1990.[26] The UPDL fortnightly journal *Nezalezhnist'* (Independence) that began publication in September 1989 was the first regular opposition publication in Ukraine.

The UPDL emphasised anti-communism as much as Ukrainian nationalism, and quarrelled with the UHU in the run-up to the 1990 Ukrainian elections, when they campaigned under the slogan 'Councils without communists!' After the 'league' left the UHU, it transformed itself into the Ukrainian People's Democratic Party (UPDP) at a congress on 16-17 June 1990, attended by 36 delegates supposedly representing 347 members.[27] The UPDP's twin slogans: 'A free individual in a free land and a free state' and the 'four Ds' *derzhavnist'* , *demokratiia* , *dobrobut* , *dukhovnist'* ,[28] (statehood, democracy, prosperity and spirituality) demonstrated the new party's attempt to balance individual and national rights.

The party's extremely long programme was also marked by a peculiar mixture of liberalism and radicalism.[29] On the one hand, the party, like the UHU, claimed to base its philosophy on the UN Declaration of Human Rights, and laid out a detailed plan, advanced for its time, for the creation of a market economy. On the other hand, it argued, like the UNP, that the Soviet Ukrainian government was illegitimate, and should be replaced by a revived Ukrainian People's Republic elected by citizens' committees. In fact it claimed to have been the originator of the idea.[30] To this end, both 'parliamentary and extraparliamentary means' were permissible.[31]

The UPDP was therefore the other key founder member of the UIA in July 1990. However, it soon found itself disillusioned with the UIA's narrow social and ideological base and was outflanked by the UIA's younger ultra-radicals. After dissociating itself from a motion concerning the possible use of force at the UIA's first session,[32] the UPDP formally walked out at the fourth session in March 1991.[33] More precisely, the UPDP split, as its more radical members chose to stay within the ranks of the UIA.

Consequently, at the UPDP's second congress in Kiev on 29-30 June 1991, the party appeared a spent force, with only 600 members, down from its peak of 1,811 members in December 1990.[34] *Nezalezhnist'* no longer appeared regularly, and the party had little organisational discipline over its membership.

In retrospect, it seems that the ranks of the party were artificially swollen in 1988-90, when it was one of the few available fora for dissent, but by 1991 it had reverted to its original status as a discussion club for a handful of intellectuals. In that status, however, in had reasonable prospects of survival in its new union with the UNP (see above).

Youth Groups[35]

In effect then, despite the initial prominence of the UNP and UPDP in the UIA, the latter soon fell under the control of the extremist youth group SNUM, and then its offshoot the Ukrainian Nationalist Union. The latter were then in turn the main driving force behind the UIA's radicalisation as the Ukrainian National Assembly in 1991-2.

As early as July 1988, certain members of the UHU, such as Ivan Makar, had proposed the idea of creating a youth affiliate, along the lines of the inter-war Union of Ukrainian Youth, which still survived amongst the Ukrainian diaspora. However, although UHU activists, such as Ihor Derkach, were prominent in making the initial steps towards the creation of a youth organisation to rival the Komsomol, the organisation that was eventually established at an all-Ukrainian congress in Ivano-Frankivs'k on 26-7 May 1990 called itself the Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth (in Ukrainian, SNUM) to emphasise its distance both from the organisations of the diaspora and from domestic party politics.[36]

The first SNUM congress gathered 220 delegates from 19 oblasts in the republic, representing 1,200 members.[37] Thirty eight of the delegates were students, 53 from middle schools; 190 were Ukrainian, only two were Russian. Even at this stage, SNUM was beset by arguments between Derkach's leading group, who were supporters of democratic nationalism, and radical supporters of Dontsovite 'integral nationalism' such as Oleh Vitovych and the leader of the Kiev group Dmytro Korchyns'kyi. However, SNUM's ideology as a whole was already quite radical, due to the influx of extremist youths over whom the organisation's would-be patron, the UHU, had little control.[38] SNUM's programme stated that 'the highest and strongest human community is the nation'. The nation is distinguished by its 'spirit', which is 'the conscious feeling of belonging to past, present and future generations'. Moreover, SNUM declared that 'the attitude of the individual to his nation is the main test of his morality and ethics'.[39] SNUM's rather authoritarian statute also demanded members' full-time commitment to the organisation. 'Through constant explanation the leadership must maintain the members of SNUM in conscious obedience, discipline and execution of [their] tasks'.[40] SNUM issued the journal *Napriam* in L'viv, edited by Volodymyr Yavors'kyi, who had been expelled from the L'viv URP (see Chapter 3) for his support for ethnic nationalism.

By May 1990 Vitovych, Korchyns'kyi and Viktor Mel'nyk had organised a nationalist faction in SNUM, which formally split from Derkach's moderates, and changed its name to the Ukrainian Nationalist Union (UNU) at its founding congress on 3-4 November 1990 (it should be pointed out that in the Ukrainian context, the word 'nationalist' has long been synonymous with chauvinist. Hence the open use of the word is designed to shock).

According to Korchyns'kyi, 'our aim is not [just] independence (which is only a little thing), our aim - is building a great nation , which will not adapt itself to circumstance, but will dictate its own terms to the world'.[41] The only route to national survival 'is by abandoning [mere] restoration, and beginning intensive nation-building, abandoning the position of defence and going onto the attack'.[42] As Kievan *Rus'* , 'Ukraine was the centre for the birth of European civilisation ....a historical base for the long-lasting and protracted creation of European culture',[43] and Ukraine must be restored again to a position of dominance over Europe. This aim would best be secured by the creation of 'a nuclear Ukraine within. her ethnic borders', that is including ethnically Ukrainian territories in the RSFSR and elsewhere.[44] The UNU adopted a party symbol deliberately evocative of the Nazi swastika and its members took to wearing paramilitary uniforms.

Although the UNU only had a hard-core of 100 or so members in 1990-2, they were extremely well-organised and active, as is so often the case with ultra-radical youth groups. The UNU had two regular and well-produced publications (initially funded by the émigré OUN-r); *Zamkova hora* in Kiev (its masthead slogan is '[we want] everything and immediately!') and *Natsionalist'* in L'viv (published by the Club of Supporters of Dmytro Dontsov, set up in December 1990, and basically also an UNU group. Its slogan is 'Ukraine above all!'). As will be shown below, the UNU were in effective control of the UIA by the summer of 1991, - hence the dropping of the word 'interparty' when the UIA changed its name to the Ukrainian National Assembly in September 1991.

SNUM, meanwhile, remained under the control of Derkach, now a deputy in the Ukrainian parliament. After the August 1991 Declaration of Ukrainian Independence, the organisation renamed itself the Union

of Ukrainian Youth, which claimed 800 members, and published the journal *Nash klych* .[45]

The first two sessions of the UIA

The first meeting of the UIA was held in Kiev on 30 June-1 July 1990. In its political declaration, the UIA argued that 'the control over the Supreme Council of the Ukrainian SSR by colonial forces and the impossibility of achieving a Declaration of the Independence of Ukraine through our deputy patriots [i.e. the moderate nationalists in the People's Council] leads [to the conclusion that] the parliamentary method of struggle is insufficient'.[46] Therefore, the UIA adopted the UNP/UPDP's idea of promoting the revival of the 1918 Ukrainian People's Republic through a network of local committees that would register its would-be citizens. When 50% of the adult population was signed up, a National Congress of these committees would be held, and Ukrainian independence declared. By the time of the Assembly's second session on 6-7 October 1990, the head of the UIA's Executive Committee, Anatolii Lupynis, was claiming that the committees were 'already a real alternative to the organs of power, the prototype models for a future state'.[47] The second session also passed a resolution declaring that such committees could become the basis of a 'committee of national emergency' if necessary.[48]

Such statements were of course sheer hyperbole. The success of the signature collection campaign on the other hand is hard to gauge, as the UIA's figures were obviously inflated for propaganda purposes. Nevertheless, the Kiev political scientist Oleksa Haran' accepted a figure of 729,000 by 27 September 1990. More than half of these, however, were collected in L'viv oblast alone (450,000). In Kiev city and oblast 140,000

signed, and in Ternopil' 40,000. No other oblast managed more than 2,000.[49] Later claims were as high as 2.5 million,[50] or 2.2 million in January-February 1991,[51] and 2.8 million by April 1991.[52] Clearly the idea was attractive to many in Galicia and to some in Kiev, but had no impact elsewhere in Ukraine. Only 28 people from only nine oblasts attended the regular council for the committees in Kiev on 2 March 1991.[53] Moreover, even Korchyns'kyi admitted that many who signed did not understand the implications of what was involved.[54] The leader of the URP, Levko Luk''ianenko, did however praise the propaganda value of the campaign.[55]

The UIA was also able to find common ground with the URP on issues such as the creation of Ukrainian Armed Forces. Both were active in the Committee for the Revival of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, which held a conference in Kiev in February 1991 on 'ways towards the creation of the Armed Forces of Ukraine'.[56] The UIA's radical 'extra-parliamentary and non-parliamentary'[57] methods, however, alienated potential support on the moderate right, as did the fact that the UIA seemed more concerned with abusing the URP and other nationalist parties than the communists. By trying to win over the URP's radicals to its side, the UIA was bound to attract the hostility of the URP.

The UIA flirts with the émigré OUN-r

At the third session of the UIA on 22-3 December 1990, Prykhod'ko made a series of idiosyncratic demands; to devolve all the UIA's work onto the citizens' committees and devote all of the organisation's energies to their activities, and to exclude all former communists from leading positions in the UIA. The UIA was already evolving into a *de facto* party of the ultra-right, however, and most of its members wished

to adopt a more flexible strategy.[58] Prykhod'ko was consequently replaced as head by Yurii Shukhevych. Because his father had been one of the wartime leaders of the UPA, Yurii had suffered two long spells as a political prisoner from 1945-68 and 1973-89. During his second imprisonment, he lost his sight. He was consequently a man of radical, and old-fashioned, views, who was arguably out of touch with events in post-war Ukraine[59] (even in 1968-72 he had not been allowed back to Ukraine, but had been forced to work as an electrician in the North Caucasus).

Shukhevych wished to build the UIA in the image of the wartime OUN, at least in its mythologised variant. Shukhevych accepted the myth nurtured by the post-war OUN-r in exile that the OUN had always been a Dontsovite party since its foundation in 1929, and that it had kept the faith uninterrupted into the modern era. In fact, the true history of the OUN is rather more complex, as outlined in Chapter 1. Dontsov was never formally a member, and the party had split in both 1940 and 1953, creating three rivals to its inheritance (the militant OUN-r, the more moderate OUN-s, and the openly social democratic OUN-z).

Nevertheless, all émigré Ukrainian parties were now keen to rebuild their influence inside Ukraine, particularly the OUN-r, now under the leadership of Slava Stets'ko, widow of Yaroslav Stets'ko, one of the wartime leaders of the OUN. The OUN-r had first attempted to work through the idiosyncratic Prykhod'ko, but his UNP had failed to live up to its early promise. Then the OUN-r had attempted to radicalise the URP, but the latter had formerly repudiated 'integral nationalism' at its theoretical conference in Kiev in February 1991 (see Chapter 3).[60] Now the OUN-r targetted the UIA.

Slava Stes'ko attended the fifth UIA session in L'viv on 29 June 1991, when the UIA adopted OUN-r slogans such as 'a united Ukraine under a

black and red flag [the colours of the OUN] from the Sian (a river in Poland) to the Caucasus'.[61] Stets'ko was also president of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations formed under OUN-r influence in the 1940s, and which reconstituted itself on 'occupied territory' at a conference in Kiev on 1 June 1991. Korchyns'kyi, Shukhevych and Mel'nyk attended for the UIA, along with like-minded radicals from the Baltic and the Caucasus, and the UIA maintained strong links with the organisation.[62]

Korchynsk'yi's speech singled out Russian imperialism rather then communism per se as the main enemy of the Ukrainian people. Russian imperialism 'may change its form, it may go under the red flag or under the tricolour, it may use the ideology of Marxism or stand under the White Guard ideology of Orthodoxy. But its essence, and therefore its name, does not change'. The RSFSR itself was an empire, and therefore 'the activity of our organisation must be transferred onto the territory of the opponent'. 'Real independence' for the suppressed nations of the USSR was impossible he declared, 'until Russia has returned to her borders at the time of Ivan III'.[63]

The UIA also copied traditional OUN-r tactics of trying to expand its influence in trade unions, and through youth organisations like *Sich* .[64] The UIA was one of the guiding forces behind the creation of The All-Ukrainian Organisation of Workers' Solidarity (in Ukrainian, VOST) on 21-3 June 1991 (see also Chapter 3). VOST even shared the UIA's offices in Kiev, and the conference's proceedings were published by the UIA.[65] The UIA's Anatolii Lupynis was a member of VOST's consultative council, along with other radicals such as Larysa Skoryk and Stepan Khmara. VOST, claiming to represent 1-3 million workers, attacked the official trade unions as 'schools of amorality, impudence, the suffocation and degradation of the individual' and passed a resolution prepared by Lupynis condemning the activity of the current Ukrainian Supreme

Council as 'dangerous for Ukraine'.[66] VOST remained officially non-party, 'not subordinate to any civic organisation, political party or state institution'[67] but always tended to support ultra-radical positions. As VOST always found it difficult to displace the old official trade unions, with their established organisations and monopoly control of welfare functions, it tended to remain a semi-political organisation, always prominent in public demonstrations. The UIA and (VOST) repeatedly called for strikes in 1990 and 1991; such as on the opening of the second phase of the 28th congress of the CPU on 13 December 1990, and against the March 1991 referendum, but it had little opportunity to mobilise a now largely apathetic general public. The miners' strikes in March 1991 were not of its doing, although the UIA tried to propagandise amongst the participants. The working class as a whole still remained immune to far right propaganda. The UIA's manipulative attitude towards the radical trade unions was revealed after the August 1991 declaration of independence, when the UIA sharply reversed itself, and began to condemn 'unnecessary and disruptive' strike action. In September 1992, the UNSO occupied the offices of the Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and demanded that its leaders be prosecuted for actions injurious to Ukrainian independence.

Throughout 1991, the UIA maintained its uncompromising stance against the institutions of the Ukrainian SSR as an 'occupying power'. It called for a boycott of all the questions in the March 1991 referendum on the future of the Union. It s executive committee declared that it was immoral to pose such a question and for 'one generation in a state of subjugation to pledge the destiny of the coming generation'.[68] The UIA condemned Gorbachev's proposed Union Treaty and 'any other

agreements between the imperial centre and the organs of colonial administration' in Ukraine.[69]

This ultra-radical stance meant frequent arrests for both leaders and members of the UIA. On 26 March 1991 Petro Kahui, the head of the UIA executive committee, was arrested, as was Lupynis on 6 July 1991.[70] The UIA also had poor relations with other nationalist groups, quarrelling frequently with the URP and *Rukh* , particularly after the prospects for an UIA-URP alliance declined after the defeat of Stepan Khmara's radicals at the second URP congress in June 1991 (see Chapter 3). According to the UIA's Oleh Vitovych, the 'moderate democrats' in the Ukrainian parliament disgraced themselves not only by participating in the structures of the Ukrainian SSR, but also by ignoring Bandera's dictum that 'with the Muscovites [*moskaly*] there can be no common language' and by seeking to build bridges with 'Moscow-democrats'. 'We shall throw these people in the litter. They are not [true] Ukrainians'. Vitovych also quoted Nietzsche's Zarathustra. ' "I call you not to peace, but to war". We also are calling for war, but only because for us it is sacred. The war started by our ancestors has not finished for us even today. It will continue in every possible form and method, as long as one of us is living'.[71]

Such ultra-radicalism was above all due to the increasing dominance within the UIA of the UNU, especially after the restraining influence of the UPDP, most of whose members were moderate members of the Kiev intelligentsia, was lost when most of its members walked out of the UIA's fourth session in March 1991. Shukhevych largely left organisation up to the UNU activists. Unlike *Rukh* , which 'cared about mass [membership], but didn't care about quality', Shukhevych praised the UNU as a tightly knit elite, around whom the people 'would group in the near future'.[72] According to Mel'nyk, leadership of the UIA fell to

the UNU by default, as none of the other member organisations were sufficiently active or sufficiently numerous.[73]

For Mel'nyk, 'the [UIA] is not a party. It is an anti-party organisation. Parties must base themselves on concrete social layers and represent their interests. But these simply don't exist'. It was therefore logical for both the UIA and UNU to remain elite organisations (the UNU's membership was 'in the 100s'). The difference between the UNU and the UIA was that the UNU 'pushes things forward,... attempts to overcome inertia. The UNU performs the work that others are afraid to do. There are some things which the state should do... but where they limit themselves. The UNU is the catalyst for events. [Whereas] the UIA is wider'.[74] The UNU in other words was a vanguard group leading the UIA. But the UIA was worth preserving for its potentially broader appeal.

After the coup: The Ukrainian Interparty Assembly becomes the Ukrainian National Assembly

The declaration of Ukrainian independence by the Supreme Council on 24 August 1991 rendered the UIA's strategy of campaigning for the revival of the Ukrainian People's Republic redundant. It was also apparent that the organisation's leaders were already rethinking their relationship with the OUN-r, as they were unwilling to function as their puppets in Ukraine.

Shukhevych, speaking at the sixth session of the UIA in Kiev on 8 September 1991 said that 'on 24 August this year the Supreme Soviet [sic] of the Ukrainian SSR pronounced the Act on independence. It is possible to have different attitudes to this, but in essence there is just this - the Act is passed and is the juridicial basis for our statehood. This may please

some, and displease others, but we are facing an accomplished fact, and we shall proceed from its basis......'[75] The September session of the UIA therefore resolved to turn itself into a better structured organisation, renamed itself the Ukrainian National Assembly (UNA), resolved to take part in the forthcoming presidential elections, and nominated Shukhevych as its candidate.

The session's political resolution, which was to be the basis of the UNA's election programme, stated that 'the cardinal question of today is not the conflict of democracy and communism, but the struggle [*borotba*] between nations - the struggle of Russia for domination, and of the non-Russians for liberation'.[76] Moreover, according to Korchyns'kyi, 'we, the UNA, [as] Ukrainian nationalists have already said that the real enemy is not some mythical imperial centre, not the command-administrative system, but Russia, and Russian chauvinism'.[77]

The Ukrainian people, however, were not well-placed to resist the inevitable revival of Russian imperialism. After centuries of Russian rule the Ukrainians were just 'a mass...without any sense of general national priorities, without national feeling, without even general national culture'. The UNA therefore looked to the new Ukrainian state. Whether it was run by national communists or not, it was now a Ukrainian state, and 'the state is an instrument for forming the nation'. Moreover, given the weakness of civil society, it was the only effective instrument available.[78] According to the UNA, Ukraine stood at a crossroads. It could either become 'a market, a raw material appendix, an object of exploitation and a field for the activity of external economic and political influences' or 'be the central state of the region, that is to hold in its hands Euro-Asian communications, to be the guarantor of stability in the region and determine the directions of its own development'. This would require nothing less than a strong army, a great leap forward

towards the technological level of the West, and 'the defence of the internal economic and state structure from outside influence'. At the same time, there must be a powerful system of social defence to ensure that 'the Ukrainian people live better than [all other] peoples of the region'. The UNA's slogan was to be 'Order, Strength, Prosperity'.[79]

The new party programme stressed that 'as Ukraine enters the world's economic infrastructure and the international division of labour, there is a danger that her economy may be subordinated totally to the interests of [other] strong states'. It is therefore necessary to 'support and defend the Ukrainian businessman [*pidpryemets'*] until the time when he can overcome foreign business in competitive struggle'. In general, 'there must be the formation of a force that is capable of containing class contradictions and party ambitions...that will represent the interests of all the Ukrainian nation, that can defend the worker from excessive exploitation, and also the businessman from the worker and secure him victory in the struggle with foreign capital. Such a force can only be Ukrainian nationalism', which must be represented by a hierarchical organisation, such as the UNA, as the 'matrix for the future national hierarchy itself'.[80]

To this end, the UNA's statute envisaged a powerful leader 'who carries out the general leadership of the Assembly, creates temporary structures of the UNA and dissolves them, takes political decisions and summons sessions of the UNA'. He also appoints the Executive Committee. The leadership was relatively unconstrained by the congress (*zbir*) of the UNA, which need only assemble every two years, or the sessions of the UNA, held only every six months.[81] In practice, however, given Shukhevych's disability, real power in the UNA rested with Mel'nyk and Korchyns'kyi.

The UNA therefore was developing an ideology of statism or fascist corporatism. This tended to take it a long way from the traditional anti-communism and 'Galician romanticism' of the OUN-r. In fact, it was pushing the UNA into a position of support for Kravchuk's national communists and their efforts to build the young Ukrainian state. According to Mel'nyk, 'the choice of independence made by the population of Ukraine was not the result of the so-called 'democratic forces'...but was the result of the turn towards independence of the higher [levels] of power'. 'The state must be led only by those who are capable of doing so'.[82] In other words, the democrats were self-seeking, verbose and inexperienced, only the national communists were capable of building a strong state. According to the UNA's official military programme,'the communist party was *de facto* the only political force in the country, which still cemented the administrative and economic structures and created the possibility of governing through them. Whether for good or for evil [*zhubu*] -that is already another affair.' Therefore, 'the maintenance in power of the national communists in the person of Kravchuk and co., with their experience in the state may be the "lesser evil" for Ukraine'.[83] Only Kravchuk, the UNA believed, could provide the smack of firm government. The UNA therefore instructed its members to vote for Kravchuk on 1 December 1991, after Shukhevych had failed to obtain the 100,000 signatures necessary to support his candidacy.

The UNA's support for the national communists meant a final break between the UNA and the OUN-r, which cut off support and shifted its attention to the DSU (see Chapter 7). The UNA continued to be well-organised and well-funded, however, leading to persistent rumours of covert support from the newly established Ukrainian Ministry of Defence. In 1992 the UNA-UNU was unique amongst nationalist parties

in having three newspapers which appeared regularly; - *Zamkova hora* ('Fortified Heights') with a circulation of 10,000; *Natsionalist* also with 10,000; and *Ukraïns'ki obriï* ('Ukrainian Horizons') with 999. A further publication, *Holos natsiï* ('The Voice of the Nation') began to appear in late 1992.

The UNA now accused the OUN-r of being trapped in the ideology of a different era, and of failing to take account of the changes in Ukraine since the 1940s.[84] The OUN-r was 'mechanically transferring onto Ukrainian soil Western rules of political life'. Consequently, the UNA refused to attend the Conference of Ukrainian Nationalists organised by the OUN-r in Kiev in March 1992 (see Chapter 7).

Nationalism and the corporate state

The basic premise in the UNA's political philosophy was the need to restore order and national might. In the UNA's standard formulation of the question, 'Ukraine's problem lies in whether a social force can be created capable of standing against social chaos, uniting all links of the state mechanism and getting the motor of the economy in motion. The question for the future is this: who will bring such order? This will either be one of [our] internal forces, or the function of restoring order will be left to some external cause. [But] this would be their order, and order for their benefit'.[85]

The UNA of course represented such an internal force and was capable of leading Ukraine to greatness through her own efforts, whereas 'the majority of our so-called political parties are subordinate to, and aim to serve foreign states and transnational institutions'[86] and interests (an obvious swipe at the OUN-r). Other parties, such as the PDRU would sell out Ukraine to Western or Russian interests, whereas Ukraine must

defend her own security in opposition to both. In Mel'nyk's words, 'Military, physical expansion [of Russia] -that's the worst variant. But we also have to face economic expansion from the likes of Japan. There is also spiritual expansion from America'.[87]

In order to resist external domination, a strong and united nation had to be reborn. 'In Ukraine a nation is intensively forming itself', but there are many potential 'centres of national "crystallisation". There will be competition between them for the right to form, and determine the future face of, the nation'.[88] In order to overcome the potential anarchy of such competition, there must be an authoritarian and statist domestic order. 'Freedom is a wonderful thing. But no freedom can exist...when it is not supported by some kind of order. Today in the world only strength is respected. All questions, problems, contradictions can only be resolved from a position of strength'.[89] For the UNA, true freedom was the unconstrained might of the strong nation, not that of individuals using their license to undermine national cohesion and strength.

Such a nation could only be created by a national elite, forming a powerful nation-state in its own image. Given that the Ukrainian ethnos was now weakened and disunited by centuries of Russification, and decades of totalitarian rule, it was impossible 'for the Ukrainian ethnos to become a strong political nation in the near future without her general organisation from above'.[90] In a time of economic and social chaos, Ukraine was facing 'the ruination of old views of the world, morals, and the old store of understanding. There is a search for new values and new orientations'.[91] In other words, the time was right for a Nietzschean 'revaluation of values', to be led by the new national elite. The twenty first century would then be the century of nationalism, and above all of Ukrainian nationalism. As stated above, the UNA was increasingly prepared to accept that the elite of what they termed the new

Natsiokratiia would, apart eventually from themselves, in practice have to be the national communists, and the UNA's support for them grew more steadfast through 1992.

Most of the above could have been lifted straight from the work of Dontsov, and the UNU/ UNA's literature was full of reprints of his works. The UNA echoed his attack on the weak-mindedness of the Ukrainian elite, and its 'provincial' mentality, and the need for national salvation through the Nietzschean transformation of the individual into the embodiment of the national 'spirit' or 'will', and the leadership of the nation to redemption by an elite of such men (whereas the URP preferred the traditional conservative nationalist philosopher, V"iacheslav Lypyns'kyi. See Chapter 3).

The UNU liked to argue that 'the Ukrainian revolution has two phases: the first is national-democratic (the establishment of the Ukrainian Weimar republic, the sale and dispersal of everything into small pieces), and the second - is the decisive entry of nationalism onto the scene in organised forms (the rapid formation of the nation and preparing the possibility for its spiritual take-off). We are people of the second wave'. The second phase would be characterised by the emergence of hierarchy out of chaos. In order to lead this process, he who 'calls himself a nationalist, must be he best in every respect: in educating others, in a fight, in his profession, in his action', and 'must stand out from the crowd through his dignity, nobility, and intellect wherever he may find himself, at work, at home, on the barricades or in prison. Above all, he must never be similar to the common herd'. Such an individual moreover must devote himself wholesale to the nationalist movement. The individual 'realises himself through the organisation. The organisation will defend you. Your state - is the organisation'.[92]

Ethnic politics

However the UNA's ideology was closer to fascism than Nazism, and placed little overt emphasis on racial theory. Unlike the DSU, the UNA (and the UNSO paramilitaries, see below) was open to non-ethnic Ukrainians. Indeed UNSO had fought beside Russian Cossacks in Moldova in 1992. Both organisations were prepared to accept anybody for whom the building of a strong state was the first priority, although of course in practice the UNA's membership was overwhelmingly Ukrainian. However, although the UNA claimed not to be as preocuppied with traditional ethnic politics as the DSU or OUN-r (see Chapter 7), the UNA's definition of the national interests of the new Ukrainian state was clearly ethnicist.

The UNA believed that one of the key duties of a strong state was the defence of the interest of Ukrainians living beyond Ukraine. 'He who does not pursue an active politics beyond the boundaries of the state, will become subject to the active politics of his neighbours'.[93] Accordingly, the UNA's press was full of news concerning the interests of Ukrainians abroad (under the heading *Sobornist'* , meaning 'unity' or 'ingathering'), and condemning the 'separatism' of non-Ukrainian minorities at home (a section simply called 'Fifth Column' in *Zamkova hora*). In Spring 1992, the UNA set up a *Kuban'* fund to help the many largely denationalised Ukrainians who still lived there.[94] They were also one of the prime movers behind the formation of the Union of Officers of the Ukrainian Diaspora, called 'Return to the Motherland' (*"Za povernennia na bat'kivshchynu"*) in Kiev on 19 July 1992.[95] (At the time the campaign to persuade ex-Soviet servicemen left on Ukrainian territory to take the oath of loyalty to the new Ukrainian Army had

proved remarkably successful, and nationalists were beginning to argue that many non-Ukrainians had only signed up for economic reasons, and should be replaced with ethnic Ukrainians officers stranded elsewhere in the former Soviet Union).

The UNSO was active in the Crimea, and in the 'Dnister republic' (see below). The UNA regarded Kravchuk's comments in June 1992 that hinted at possible future Ukrainian support for the Dnistran rebels as a victory for their months of campaigning on behalf of 'fellow Ukrainians' in the breakaway region (28% of the area's population was Ukrainian in 1989, but highly Russified).[96] The UNA took a characteristically extreme attitude towards Crimean separatism, issuing a terse official statement after Bagrov's short-lived declaration of Crimean independence in May 1992 to the effect that 'The Crimea will either be Ukrainian or depopulated' (*bezliudnym*).[97] The UNA regarded the test of Ukrainian will in the Crimea as 'Ukraine's Thermopylae.'[98]

Foreign and defence policy

The UNA put much of its energies into developing a military and defence doctrine, which it came to regard as its special province. It was often the first to express a developing philosophy of *realpolitik* and an aggressive defence of national interests, when others were still afraid to do so. The UNA was fond of declaring that liberals and others 'do not understand that the enemy is not interested whether the people of a given country conduct themselves well or badly. He simply follows his own interests',[99] as Ukraine must follow hers. The UNA criticised the Ukrainian government for having been seduced by doctrines of 'minimum sufficiency', and for remaining hamstrung by the unrealistic commitments made in the July 1990 Declaration of Sovereignty

concerning Ukraine's neutral and non-nuclear status.[100] Ukraine's national communist leaders had also not fully overcome the habit of servility to Russia, and an obsessive concern with Moscow affairs.

The UNA, on the other hand (the UNA was even more outspoken than the URP), saw itself as expressing the inner thoughts of many in the state apparatus who remained constrained by the above commitments from developing a clear philosophy of the Ukrainian national interest.

According to Shukhevych at the press conference in autumn 1991 that launched his campaign for the presidency, 'the question of borders, and the question of atomic weapons, must be decided by Ukraine. No encroachment by Moscow on the territory of Ukraine should force us to renounce nuclear arms. The democrats, who today express the concept of a nuclear-free Ukraine, are acting against her interests, against her security'.[101] In other words, 'given the territorial pretensions of Russia', 'we need a guarantee that Ukraine will be strong...and for this, she must have an army with nuclear arms'.[102]

According to the UNA's 'military doctrine' 'every one of Ukraine's neighbours has territorial pretensions (historical or political) against her'. Russia of course was the most serious threat, but because 'Ukraine was not in the condition to raise similar forces [to Russia], the basis of her Armed Forces therefore must be nuclear weapons. They are the only guarantee of the defense preparedness of Ukraine'. According to the UNA, nuclear weapons would provide the necessary short-term defence until Ukraine successfully developed its own self-sufficient military-industrial complex.[103]

Ukraine should also develop her defence against Russia by 'the creation of a buffer zone between Ukraine and Russia in terms of autonomous or state structures in the Kuban' and the Don'; 'by supporting national liberation movements on the territory of the

present-day Russian Federation'; and through 'the creation of an anti-Russian defensive alliance, above all of the countries of the Baltic, Caucasus and Central Asia'.[104]

All of these subjects were taboo when first raised by the UNA, but all came under official consideration in 1992. The UNA therefore had a significant influence on Ukrainian defence and foreign policy thinking, contributing to the radicalisation of Ukrainian positions in 1991-2 and to the attempt to construct an anti-Russian *realpolitik* .

Domestic politics

In internal affairs, the UNA supported the creation of other aspects of national statehood, especially the formation of a national Orthodox Church. The UNA and UNSO were strong supporters of Metropolitan Filaret's defection to join the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, and form a united national Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Kiev Patriarchy) in June 1992 (see below). UNA and UNSO paramilitaries often appeared at official Church functions, and were allegedly responsible for a series of attacks on those priests who remained loyal to Moscow.

The UNA's economic policy combined both populism and a corporatist emphasis on the need for state support in the creation of an effective national economy. The political resolution of the eighth session of the UNA in June 1992 condemned 'unconsidered privatisation' and an open door for foreign investment.[105] The UNA's rhetoric concerning 'socially just privatisation' and condemning price increases had much in common with that of the Socialist Party of Ukraine. At the same time, however, the UNA clearly hoped that economic hardship would provide it with a pool of recruits. The UNA's leadership constantly

refered to a 'Weimar scenario', hoping that Ukraine would pass through a similar period of declining order and prosperity, so that the UNA benefited from the consequent radicalisation of public opinion.

Support

The UNA was officially registered in May 1992, and announced its intention of participating in all future elections. It expected to gain 5-7% of the vote.[106] Opinion polls in 1991 showed that the majority of the public was simply ignorant of its activities. In September 1991, only 2% of the public considered themselves 'well-informed' concerning the UNA, whereas 15% 'knew something' about them.[107] However, its controversial antics, especially those of the UNSO, rapidly gained it a higher profile in 1991-2, and a notorious reputation, helping to polarise opinion about them. In December 1991, 11.6% evaluated them positively, 12.4% negatively, whilst 76% offered no opinion or found it difficult to reply.[108]

The UNA claimed a membership of 16,000 when it was registered, and 14,000 in February 1993.[109] Such claims were likely to be based on the nominal membership figures of all of the UNA's supposed constituent parties, however, many of whom had fallen by the wayside. Five thousand of the UNA's claimed membership in February 1993 were in Western Ukraine, and 950 in L'viv alone. However, the UNA's membership was less geographically concentrated than that of other nationalist parties, and the UNA had local organisations in 14 of Ukraine's oblasts.[110] The UNA's leaders claimed more success in attracting members outside of Western Ukraine than the more traditionalist DSU, and in building a modern nationalist movement capable of expanding its appeal beyond OUN veterans and Galician

extremists to disaffected and radical youth in the rest of urban Ukraine (particularly through its paramilitary branch, the UNSO - see below). The UNA's key leaders, such as Oleh Vitovych and Dmytro Korchyns'kyi, had after all begun their political careers in the youth group SNUM.

The Ukrainian Peoples' Self-Defence Forces (UNSO)

The UNA attracted most notoriety through the creation of its paramilitary wing, the Ukrainian Peoples' Self-Defence Forces (in Ukrainian UNSO). According to Mel'nyk, 'UNSO is a completely anti-party organisation. It is an organisation of social order, created because peoples saw the need for self-defence, because in Ukraine everything is falling apart, everything, - state and military structures'.[111] Its main purpose was to undertake the actions that the nationalists felt that the state was too cautious to perform itself (dealing with separatists, mafiosi of pro-Moscow priests) or to provide the state with additional manpower when it did take its responsibilities seriously.

The initiative to form UNSO came after August 1991, when it was felt that the young Ukrainian state lacked the means to defend itself (Ukraine had yet to create her own Armed Forces), given that Yel'tsin's press spokesman had already caused a storm by announcing the possibility of Russian territorial pretensions on Ukraine, and separatist movements in the Crimea, Donbas and Transcarpathia were strengthening in response to Ukrainian independence.[112] Moreover, it was feared that the authorities would not yet be able to control the internal security and economic situation. Posters circulated by the UNA in Kiev in autumn 1991 stated that recruits who were 'physically healthy individuals, without needless psychological complexes, who wish to take part in acts directed towards the defence of national interests in

Prydnistrov'iia, the Crimea and other regions can realise their dreams in the ranks of UNSO'.[113] By May 1992, the UNA was claiming a total membership for UNSO of 5,000, more than half of whom were non-party individuals. Most were youths, but the UNSO also included some ex-officers and policeman in its ranks.[114] The L'viv branch of UNSO even issued an appeal to women aged 17-30 'with nationalistic views' to join their ranks in January 1993.[115]

UNSO based itself on the traditions of the Free Cossack movement active in Ukraine during 1917-21, and the UNS (Ukrainian Peoples' Self-Defence) militia active in Western Ukraine in 1941-4.[116] Its uniform and insignia were similarly evocative of the UNS and the UPA. UNSO's programme stated that its main tasks were to 'the defence of military and state objects; the struggle with sabotage and diversions; the direction of reconnaissance and the organisation of a partisan movement of an aggressive type; the support of law and order, assistance of the police; and helping the population in extraordinary circumstances, in times of industrial catastrophes and natural disasters'.[117] UNSO attempted to function legitimately. It even demanded 'the political and financial support of the leadership of the state in connection with securing formal neutrality',[118] but the organisation was refused official registration by the Ministry of Justice in May 1992.[119]

UNSO's practical activities were various. Most notoriously, it claimed to have sent 200 of its members to join the fighting in the 'Dnister republic' in Spring 1992. Ukraine's stated policy at the time was one of neutrality, if not *de facto* support for the Moldovan authorities, and Kiev had closed the border with Moldova in March 1992 to prevent the transit of volunteers to the fighting. There were therefore calls to prosecute UNSO for taking part in the hostilities.[120] UNSO also made several trips to the Crimea, including one in Spring 1992 with then URP

deputy leader Stepan Khmara, where UNSO members 'confronted' activists of the separatist Republican Movement of the Crimea.

Perhaps most surprisingly, UNSO paramilitaries (in uniform) provided a guard for Metropolitan Filaret during his public appearances, especially after he agreed to break ranks with the Russian Orthodox hierarchy and form the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Kievan Patriarchy) in alliance with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in June 1992. UNSO members attempted to storm the Kiev Pechers'k monastery, the stronghold of those bishops who refused to go along with Filaret's union, in the same month.[121]

UNSO has also tried to perform a 'Guardian Angel' function by patrolling areas of high crime. Its members have assisted Ukraine's hard-pressed customs officials in attempting to ensure that Ukraine's best produce was not spirited away over its borders, and in combating local 'mafiosi' and 'speculators'.

It is difficult to assess the popularity of all the above actions, but it can be said that UNSO enjoyed a measure of tacit support beyond ultra-nationalist circles. The fact that the organisation was not suppressed in 1991-2 shows remarkable official toleration. In 1992 Ukraine was far from disintegrating into the open chaos and warlordism characteristic of the former Yugoslavia, but the appearance of an open paramilitary organisation was obviously deeply worrying, indicating the potential for inter-ethnic conflict if the economic and/or security situation were to dramatically worsen.

Conclusion

The 'Weimar scenario' so often cited by the leaders of the UNA and UNSO remained in early 1993 a distinct possibility (the UNA's leaders

also liked to compare themselves with Le Pen's National Front in France, and even with the Klu Klux Klan).[122] It would be rash to predict which of Ukraine's many ultra-nationalist political groups would benefit from a radicalisation of nationalist public opinion, but as of autumn 1992, the UNA was best placed to do so.

In 1990-92, however, the UNA's main practical importance was to break the taboo on key subjects, such as the retention by Ukraine of the nuclear weapons left on her territory by the collapse of the former Union, or the protection of the interests of Ukrainians living in the Russian federation. Such issues then slowly percolated into official circles, if necessary via more respectable parties like the URP. The UNA, because of its controversial public image, did not have the same personal contacts with government circles as the DPU or URP, but its importance lay in the ideas that it raised.. Moreover, the UNA chose its issues carefully, campaigning as the nationalist conscience of Ukraine, rather than being diverted into marginal issues like many of the smaller nationalist groups, or speaking the language of the past, like the OUN. The UNA was 'against *ukase* [decrees] that cannot be put into action'.[123] and was cautious of discrediting itself by running too far ahead of the current climate of nationalist opinion.

According to Korchyns'kyi in May 1992, 'Kravchuk is a mirror. He simply reflects the existing situation. In a year [when we have gathered] sufficient strength, Kravchuk will be a nationalist'.[124] In 1990-92, Kravchuk did indeed swing to the right, as nationalist forces made the running. On the other hand, the UNA's extreme political message was never likely to have much appeal to Russian-speaking groups in Eastern and Southern Ukraine, despite the UNA's care to avoid an openly ethnicist programme. Rather, the UNA's antics, and especially those of the paramilitary UNSO, only served to help confirm the propagandist

stereotype in Eastern and Southern Ukraine that all Ukrainian nationalists were Nazis, and were a factor in encouraging the rise of Russophone political groups in Eastern Ukraine from the summer of 1992.

7. SMALLER GROUPS:

ETHNIC NATIONALISTS AND OTHERS

Introduction

Chapter 1 explained both how radical ethnic nationalism enjoyed considerable popular support in Galicia in the inter-war period, and how difficult it had been to transplant Galician nationalism to the rest of Ukraine in the 1940s after Galicia was absorbed into the Soviet Union. Although after 1945 Galicia shared in many of the post-war social changes that affected the rest of Ukraine, it remained a largely agricultural region, whose radical traditions marked it off from the rest of Ukraine. It was therefore only to be expected that ethnic nationalism was bound to revive to an extent in Galicia, as national traditions were 'rediscovered' from the late 1980s onwards, after initial expectations concerning Ukrainian statehood were disappointed, and after the economic situation sharply worsened in the early 1990s. After an initial period of euphoria in 1988-90, many Galicians became frustrated with the slow pace of constitutional change and with Kiev's cautious approach to Ukrainianising the new state, and consequently shifted their support to organisations of the far right. As was to be expected, however, such groups found little support elsewhere in Ukraine.

The first organisation to embrace the far-right nationalism of the 1930s OUN was the tiny Ukrainian National Party founded in 1989 (see Chapter 6). It was then followed by the (Organisation for) Ukrainian Statehood and Independence (known by its Ukrainian acronym of DSU) founded by radical members of the UHU in 1990, and a variety of openly neo-nazi groups such as the Social-National Party of Ukraine and the Ukrainian National-Radical Party. Other parties, notably the Ukrainian

Conservative Republican Party (formed as the result of a split from the URP in 1992); the Ukrainian Peasants' Democratic Party; and the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Party although in theory much closer to the political mainstream, also upheld many of the traditions of the OUN. Although political satellites of the URP, they also had one foot in the ultra-nationalist camp. Finally, the various émigré branches of the OUN itself began to revive their activity in Ukraine in the early 1990s, with the most radical and most active, the OUN-r, forming the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists (KUN) as a front organisation for its activities in 1992.

All such parties tended to remain small, and largely confined to Galicia, but they exercised considerable influence in dragging more moderate nationalists to the right. Moreover, by confirming Eastern Ukrainians' traditional preconceptions of radical Galician nationalism, they helped to widen the split between Western and Eastern Ukraine.

The DSU

The DSU was established by former members of the UHU in April 1990, who had become disillusioned by the latter's failure to declare itself in favour of outright Ukrainian independence in 1988-9, and was later periodically reinforced by radical nationalists defecting from the URP (such as Roman Koval', Serhii Zhyzhko, Volodymyr Yavors'kyi and the DSU's first leader Ivan Kandyba, who had all been leading figures in the UHU-URP). The UHU's leaders had argued in 1988-89 that Ukrainian public opinion was not yet prepared to accept the demand for full independence, and that the UHU had to preserve its influence on the public by not rushing too far ahead of them.[1] By rejecting such an approach, the DSU demonstrated its preference for ideological purity

over political pragmatism. Moreover, the potential size of the organisation was deliberately limited by denying membership to non-Ukrainians or those in any way connected with the CPSU.[2] Also, whereas the UHU-URP based itself (at least on paper) on the civic traditions of the *shestydesiatnyky* and the UHG (see Chapter 3), the DSU harked back to the ethnic nationalist traditions of the OUN and the underground Ukrainian National Front of the 1960s. The DSU was therefore largely confined to Galicia and its membership middle-aged, unlike the UNA which was more successful in building a more modern ultra-nationalist movement with more appeal to radical youth throughout Ukraine.

The DSU's founding congress in L'viv on 7-8 April 1990 was attended by 180 delegates representing 300 members.[3] Significantly, 75% of the delegates were from L'viv oblast.[4] The DSU has never grown significantly in size since. At the time of its second congress (*zbir*) in December 1991, the organisation still only claimed 650 members,[5] although by then it claimed to be active in 22 of 25 Ukraine's oblasts.[6] The DSU's first leader Ivan Kandyba admitted, however, that the DSU's main organisations were in Western Ukraine (L'viv, Ivano-Frankivs'k and Rivne), although it also had strongholds in Zaporizhzhia and in the Donbas.[7] At the DSU's third congress in December 1992 the DSU's main ideologist and new deputy leader Roman Koval' admitted that membership was stagnant,[8] (in fact it had fallen to 530) whilst the congress was attended by delegates from only 16 oblasts (plus delegates from the historically ethnically Ukrainian lands of the Kuban' and Voronezh in Russia).[9] According to Kandyba, the DSU's membership did not include 'many intelligentsia. Our main membership consists of relatively unskilled white-collar workers [*sluzhbovtsi*] of a middle intellectual level, no more'.[10] The DSU's membership was also mainly

middle-aged, but the organisation made a conscious, if unsuccessful, attempt to attract radical youth by lowering its membership age from 18 to 16 in January 1992.[11]

The DSU elected as its first leader Ivan Kandyba. Kandyba was a long-standing nationalist dissident who had been sentenced to 15 years with Levko Luk"ianenko as one of the original members of the UWPU in 1961 (see Chapter 3), and had also been one of the founder members of the UHG in 1976 before being imprisoned again in 1981-88.[12] However, Kandyba, although accorded respect for his 22 years in the camps, was not a dynamic leader, and at the DSU's third congress in December 1992 he was replaced by Volodymyr Shlemko, one of a dozen or so ultra-radical, but independent-minded, members of the Ukrainian Supreme Council.[13]

The DSU's main publications were *Neskorena Natsiia* ('The Nation Unsubdued'), edited in Kiev by Roman Koval' with a circulation of 11,000, and from 1992 the former journal of the radical youth movement SNUM in L'viv, *Napriam* ('Direction') edited by Volodymyr Yavors'kyi with a circulation of 3,000.

Before August 1991 the DSU was in effect an underground party that, like the UNP and UIA, refused to participate in what it saw as the 'illegitimate' institutions of the Ukrainian SSR. It was even somewhat reluctant to participate in Ukraine's first presidential elections in Autumn 1991, although Koval"s paper *Neskorena Natsiia* (not formally the organ of the DSU until December 1991) endorsed the UNA's candidate Yurii Shukhevych.[14] Like other ultra-nationalist organisations, however, it soon became a strong supporter of 'our' state. The DSU applied for, and received, official registration in March 1993.[15]

In theory therefore, the DSU should have shared much common ground with its stablemates of the ultra-right. However, proposals to

establish a common front of all ultra-right parties always seemed to flounder on minor policy differences and personality clashes. The DSU distrusted its main rival, the UIA-UNA, because of the latter's 'adventurism', its insufficiently reverent attitude towards the OUN, its willingness to cooperate with former communists, and its failure to restrict membership to Ukrainians only. The former deputy leader of the URP, Stepan Khmara, proposed cooperation with his Ukrainian Conservative Republican Party (see below), at the third congress of the DSU in December 1992,[16] but personal differences again made this an unlikely prospect. For a time the DSU was linked with the émigré OUN-r, but even this relationship soon collapsed. This failure to cooperate and consolidate was symptomatic of the ultra-right as a whole, which remained fractious and ill-disciplined.

An ethnic super-state

The DSU's programme called for 'the building by democratic means of a Ukrainian state within [her] ethnographic borders'.[17] Ivan Kandyba later clarified this as meaning that ethnic Ukrainian territory in Poland and Slovakia (Lemko Ukraine), Belarus' (Brest) and Russia (the Kuban', Strarodub, Vorenezh and Taganrog) should be permitted to peacefully reunite with Ukraine,[18] probably by referendum.[19] The DSU usually stressed that this is a long-term ambition that the young Ukrainian state was in practice still too weak to achieve. In the short-term therefore, the organisation has confined itself to sending literature and 'cultural agitators' to such regions, but it hopes to take advantage of what is sees as the inevitable development of centrifugal tendencies within the Russian Federation to eventually add such territory to a Ukrainian super-state, united 'from the Carpathians to the Caucasus'.[20]

The DSU has also called for ethnic Ukrainians to receive priority treatment within the Ukrainian state. At its first congress in 1990, the DSU demanded that 'only Russians study the Russian language in Ukraine, and that for other citizens it should be one of [many] foreign languages'[21] (a position later supported by the ULS). According to the DSU's official statement of its political philosophy in 1991, 'we understand the nation as an ethnos....an ethnos which has power over...national minorities. The meaning of "nation" and the state are for us indivisible'.[22] Most bluntly, 'nationalism as we understand it is about the defence of the Ukrainian ethnos'.[23] The DSU in fact frequently attacked the civic nationalism of those such as the DPU's Dmytro Pavlychko, 'who want to build in Ukraine not a Ukrainian state, but a "state of [all] the peoples of Ukraine"'.[24] Instead the DSU sought to revive Mikhnovs'kyi's slogan of 'Ukraine for the Ukrainians!'[25] (see Chapter 1). The DSU castigated the *shestydesiatnyky* for having abandoned what they saw as the ideology of the OUN. According to Koval', 'the level of national consciousness amongst the dissidents/ human rights activists of the 1960s to 1980s was not high. A large proportion of them was more [concerned with] defending the rights of Soviet individuals than with defending the rights of the Ukrainian people'.[26] Hence they were now ill-equiped to lead a national revival. Koval' agreed with Mikhnovsk'yi and Dontsov's diagnosis that the biggest obstacle to Ukrainian independence was always the feeble-mindedness and 'cosmopolitan' preference for 'universal' over national values amongst the native Ukrainian intelligentsia.[27]

Their biggest mistake was to try to incorporate the 11.4 million Russian minority, a massive potential fifth column, into a civic Ukrainian state, by promising that Russians would live better in Ukraine than in Russia itself. Instead, 'active Ukrainianisation and

discrimination in favour of Ukrainians [*protektsionists'ka stosovno Ukraïntsiv*] will create a political climate not only favourable towards a Ukrainian renaissance, but will also create an atmosphere of social discomfort for Russians, which will contribute to their gradual removal to beyond the borders of Ukraine',[28] (a line similar to that of radical Estonian nationalists). Anatol' Shcherbatiuk provoked calls for his prosecution at the third DSU congress in December 1992 be declaring that the only thing to do with 'our internal enemies' was 'to get a gun and start shooting'.[29]

Moreover, the Russians were the natural enemies of Ukrainian statehood, because of their imperial mentality. According to Koval', 'the history of Russia - is the history of raiding, wars, plunder, *Anschluss*, occupation, intervention, blockade, and unceremonial interference in the affairs of other nations and peoples'.[30] The Russian people could not blame imperialism on the Tsars or on communism, rather it was in their blood; - 'the Russian people themselves are the creators of the Russian empire'.[31] 'It is not worthwhile to talk about the differences between the national politics of Russian democrats, monarchists and communists. They have one single policy - imperial and chauvinistic [*velukoderzhavna*]'.[32] Not only should Russians be opposed *per se* as natural imperialists, but an explicitly anti-Russian Ukrainian orientation would provide the 'image of an enemy' around which to consolidate an otherwise weak nation. About this, the DSU was quite explicit; - 'a nation needs the image of an enemy, an object to beat upon. A people is used to having someone to blame for its misfortunes'.[33] According to Koval', speaking in 1992, 'only that politics which has a clear image of the enemy is effective. When the CPSU existed it was easier to organise people against it, but now nobody says to the people that our enemy is Russia'.[34]

Anti-semitism also often bubbled fairly close to the surface in the DSU's publications and actions. Even if it remained something of a taboo subject as late as 1992, the DSU knew how to speak in the right code, sparking a discussion concerning the need to rehabilitate the word 'yid' in 1992,[35] and often leading protests against the supposed victimisation of Ivan Demjanjuk by Israel.[36]

The only way to build a true Ukrainian nation-state was to consolidate it around a 'national idea', a simple ethnic conception of citizenship which all could comprehend. Only an undifferentiated *ethnie* could build a strong nation-state. It should make no concessions to national minorities. According to Koval' again, 'it's absurd for national minorities to dictate to us what our national flag and national symbols should be. Russians like Charadeev, Griniov and Rugoslav [Russian deputies in the Ukrainian Supreme Council] are trying to ban us from having our own national symbols, like Arabs getting up in the French parliament and saying that the Tricolour should have only two colours!'[37]

As in Dontsov's conception of nationalism and that of the original OUN (see Chapter 1), all other values should be subordinated to that of the nation. 'A nation is always built by force',[38] and 'an organisation, which bases itself on democracy will never lead a nation to freedom'.[39] Democracy divides the people during the crucial period of nation-building, when there should instead be order, hierarchy and discipline. Whereas 'modern Ukraine in both politics and the state - is a classic example of the rule of the weak,'[40] the DSU proposed instead a vulgar Nietzschean mixture of a hierarchically ordered society, a cult of heroism, and an ideology of national might, in which 'the rights of the state took priority over the rights of the individual'.[41] In January 1992 therefore Koval' summarised the DSU's values as 'traditionalism,

idealism, national interests, the unity of all Ukrainian lands, militarism, hierarchy, order, the supremacy of the state, responsibility before the nation, anti-communism and anti-liberalism'.[42]

National defence

To this end, the DSU placed great emphasis on the importance of building up national defence, and was one of the first groups to call for the retention of nuclear weapons by Ukraine. Koval' had argued in the build-up to the first URP congress in 1990 that Ukraine should become a nuclear state, only to be overruled by Oles' Shevchenko.[43] Kandyba, addressing the third *Rukh* congress on 28 February 1992, had caused a stir by calling for a halt to Ukraine's 'unilateral disarmament'.[44] The DSU's Anatol' Shcherbatiuk argued in March 1992 that 'only atomic weapons will allow the proud and unobstructed development of Ukraine in the future', and 'allow Ukraine to live amongst the world hierarchy of aggressive nations'.[45] For Koval', disarmament while Russia, 'our historical and actual enemy', remains a nuclear power, would simply ensure that 'Ukraine remains a colony'.[46]

If the DSU had not existed, a similar organisation would have taken its place. There was always a political space for an ethnicist Galician party following in the footsteps of the OUN, However, the DSU's influence seemed likely to diminish once the real OUN returned to active Ukrainian political life in 1992.

The OUN and Ukrainian Politics

From 1989 at least, the various factions of the OUN in exile (see Chapter 1) began to try to exercise a degree of more direct influence back

in Ukraine. The more moderate OUN-m largely preferred to work with the URP, while the better-funded and better organised OUN-r sought out more radical partners. To assist its rehabilitation in Ukraine the OUN-r sought to present itself as a reformed organisation with a new-found commitment to democracy, but its tactics remained manipulative and its declarations dissimulative.

Its initial approach was to work through front organisations, and to attempt to radicalise existing nationalist organisations in the direction of Banderite nationalism (see Chapter 1). The first tactic brought disappointing results, as the OUN-r's chosen targets (the UNP and UIA) were happy to receive material assistance, but unwilling to become the puppets of the émigrés, whilst the URP, the main target of the second tactic, had largely checked the rising tide of radicalism within its ranks by the time of its second congress in June 1991 (see Chapter 3). Therefore the OUN-r's leaders, by then permanently resident again in Ukraine, changed tack in 1992 and sponsored the formation of the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists (KUN) as a front organisation for the revival of the OUN-r in Ukraine.

The OUN-r was also the leading force behind the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations formed in 1943, and renamed the Assembly of the Bloc of European and Asian Nations for Independence and Freedom at a conference in Toronto in November 1992,[47] which was also active in Ukraine.

The OUN-r's early partners

The OUN-r had first looked to the Ukrainian National Party as the organisation closest to its own heart, but the idiosyncratic behaviour of its leader Hryhorii Prykhod'ko soon ruptured ties (see Chapter 6). Similarly, the UIA-UNA was unwilling to be manipulated by the OUN-

r, and increasingly saw its nationalism as old-fashioned in any case (see Chapter 6). The all-Ukrainian Brotherhood of Veterans of the OUN-UPA, established in L'viv in April 1991 and led by Mykhailo Zelenchuk,[48] not surprisingly took a more reverent attitude towards the émigrés, but the OUN-r still sought a more overtly political organisation through which to exercise influence. Its next target was therefore the DSU.

The DSU's literature had always reprinted much OUN material, and sought to portray the nationalists of the 1940s in an idealised heroic light.[49] Moreover, the DSU's leaders stressed both their ideological closeness to the OUN-r, and their opposition to the moderation and democratisation of its ideology after the splits of 1943 and 1954.[50] The original leadership of the DSU included several veterans of the OUN-UPA, such as Petro Duzhyi, editor of the journal *Ideia i chyn* , ('Idea and Action') and Zenovii Krasivs'kyi (reportedly the leading representatives of the OUN-r in Ukraine in the absence of its leader Slava Stets'ko).[51] The DSU and its supporters were also prone to criticise the civic ideas of 'democratic nationalists' such as Dmytro Pavlyckho of the DPU, and Mykhailo Horyn' of the URP, preferring instead an idealised version of a truly 'Dontsovite' OUN.[52] Hence they seemed natural allies for the OUN-r.

The links were more or less formalised around the time of the DSU's second congress in December 1991, when both sides spoke warmly of the prospects for future cooperation. There was even talk of possible union between the two organisations.[53] However, the OUN-r became disillusioned with the DSU's low intellectual level, and the leadership of the aged Kandyba; whilst the DSU mistrusted the OUN-r's attempt to paint itself in more moderate colours in order to facilitate its return to mainstream Ukrainian politics, and its basically instrumental attitude to

the DSU. Therefore, the Conference of Ukrainian Nationalists that was held in Kiev in March 1992 under OUN-r sponsorship, which seemed at the time to mark a high-point in the development of cooperation between the DSU and OUN-r, in fact was used the first stage of the OUN-r's rebirth in Ukraine as a more or less independent organisation. By the time of the DSU's third congress in December 1992, the DSU was attacking the OUN-r for 'causing splits in the nationalist movement', and for 'looking on us like younger brothers'.[54]

Conference of Ukrainian Nationalists

The March 1992 Conference then marked a key change of tactics by the OUN-r. In the light of Ukrainian independence and the referendum of December 1991, the organisation had to rethink its traditional abstentionist and anti-communist tactics. The OUN-r therefore sought to attract more mainstream nationalists, such as the radical deputies Stepan Khmara, Larysa Skoryk and Les' Taniuk, to its March 1992 Conference in order to legitimise its rebirth amongst more moderate opinion. All in all, 600 delegates attended.[55] Although the conference used the still largely taboo word 'nationalist', it nevertheless called for 'all healthy national forces in Ukraine to unite in one nationalist block on the basis of a common platform'.[56] Moreover, the conference declared that 'democracy and multi-party [politics] are the basis of the Ukrainian state order', and stated that 'we shall always support the [state] power in Ukraine, if that power acts in the spirit of the interests of Ukraine'.[57] Slava Stets'ko, attempting to dissociate the OUN-r from narrow ethnic nationalism in her speech, declared that 'the OUN struggles against Russian imperialism and not against the state of the Russian people on their own ethnic territory', stressed the OUN's 'anti-racism', and called

for 'a common front' of all Ukraine's ethnic minorities in the building of a Ukrainian state.[58]

At the same time, however, she declared that 'the liberal-democratic state is not the last word in history', and called for a 'new elite of the spirit', and called for a nationalism of national unity to transcend the egoism of the individual, and the selfishness of social classes.[59] The influence of the OUN-r's radicalism was also clear in the call for 'Ukrainian nationalism [to become] the official ideology of the Ukrainian Armed Forces', for the Union of Officers of Ukraine to become 'the nucleus of nationalism within the Armed Forces', and for a sober consideration of national interests to replace Ukraine's ill-considered rush to non-nuclear status.[60] Despite the attempt to present a respectable front, many delegates, such as Yevhen Smyrnov, made comments such as our 'internal enemy number one is those supporters of human rights and liberal democracy who are oriented towards Washington and Tel-Aviv'.[61] Many of the OUN-r's former supporters were in any case critical of the decision to emerge, albeit partially, from the underground, as they were convinced that the traditional method of organisation would soon prove necessary again in the event of what they regarded as the inevitable coming conflict with Russia.

The conference announced the formation of a permanent Secretariat, whose task would be to coordinate the revival of nationalist forces in Ukraine. Therefore, throughout 1992, a series of rolling regional 'Conferences of Ukrainian Nationalists' were held, mainly in Western Ukraine,[62] leading to a founding congress of the Conference of Ukrainian Nationalists (KUN) in Kiev on 17-18 October 1992, attended by delegates from 23 of Ukraine's oblasts.[63] KUN was officially registered as an all-Ukrainian organisation in January 1993, with Slava Stets'ko as its Chairwoman.[64] On 30-31 January 1993 the split between the DSU and

OUN-r was formalised, when Kandyba and others organised a Congress for the 'Relegalisation of the OUN' in L'viv, which was formally disowned by Stets'ko.[65]

There were good reasons for expecting KUN to become perhaps the largest single organisation of the ultra-right, and main rival to the UNA. It was well-funded in the diaspora, and from 1992 was able to distribute its newspaper *Shliakh peremohy* ('The Road to Victory') in Ukraine. As other ultra-right organisations fractured or declined in influence, KUN hoped to mop up their supporters and use its organisational strength to become the hegemonic party on the far right. Only the UNA seemed to have put down strong enough roots to survive as a significant independent force outside the orbit of KUN.

Peasant Democrats

The Ukrainian Peasant-Democratic Party (UPDP) was formed in June 1990, but is more difficult to classify than other right wing parties. It has sought, without conspicuous success, to build a social base in the Ukrainian countryside, but it has also been active in wider politics, where, under the influence of the party's radical leader the writer Serhii Plachynda,[66] it has adopted a position somewhat to the right of the URP.

The UPDP, however, failed to live up to its early promise. Ukrainian nationalism has traditionally looked to the village, and much of its support in the early part of the twentieth century had come from the smallholder farmers (*kurkuly*), prominent in both West Ukraine (until the 1940s) and Central Ukraine (until collectivisation and the Great Famine in 1932/3). The UPDP in fact sought to project a traditionalist image by naming its paper *Zemlia i volia* ('Land and Liberty') after the nineteenth populist organisation. In 1991, 32% of the Ukrainian

population was still classified as rural.[67] Therefore there were good grounds to expect good prospects for a rural nationalist party in Ukraine. Moreover, the movement to revive the Ukrainian village had quite broad backing in 1990. The 'Appeal to the Peasants, Workers and Intelligentsia of Ukraine', published in March 1990 by the initiative group to form a 'Peasants' Party', was signed by 21 prominent individuals, 19 of whom were still members of the communist party.[68] The party's draft statute committed it to the principles of 'democratic socialism'.[69]

However, on 4 April 1990 the group split, as the radicals who wished to restore 'traditional Ukrainian village life' were opposed by the representatives of the all-powerful collective farm chairmen and heads of agro-industry who wished to defend their social and economic domination of the countryside by building an organisation based on the existing rural communist structures. The majority therefore formed the Peasants' Union of Ukraine in September 1990.[70] This in turn was the basis of the Peasants' Party of Ukraine, established in January 1992 under the sponsorship of establishment individuals such as the then Minister of Agriculture Oleksandr Tkachenko.[71] The Peasants' Party claimed a nominal membership of 1.6 million, and cells in 340 raions in Ukraine, (largely a hangover from the official rural organisations of the pre-perestroika era).[72] Not surprisingly, its programme tended to stress continued state support for agriculture and the maintenance of the collective farm system.

The radical minority, meanwhile, called in early 1990 on 'all honest individuals, dedicated to the national rebirth of town and village, workers in education and culture' to join their ranks.[73] The founding conference of the UPDP was then held on 9 June 1990 in Kiev.[74] The party declared its aims to be 'ending the plunder of the Ukrainian

village', 'the rebirth of the culture and ethnos of the Ukrainian village', and a reversal of its long-term spiritual, national and demographic decline.[75] The party declared that it was 'above all a party of farmers', but admitted that the collective farm system, although 'the product of totalitarian socialism' which 'had brought enormous material and spiritual ruin on the village', had nevertheless 'become convenient for the majority of Ukrainian peasants' and the party therefore stopped short of calling for its dissolution.[76]

Herein lay the party's problem. As one of its leading members admitted, the Ukrainian peasantry was like 'an internal colony' of the Soviet system, politically passive and difficult to mobilise.[77] Apart from radical peasants in Galicia therefore, the party's social base was limited to nationally conscious collective farm chairmen or members of the village intelligentsia, plus radical students at agricultural academies and first generation urban dwellers who retained their rural roots. These, however, were few and far between, and the party could never rival the Peasant's Party in size. The UPDP remained geographically confined to Galicia. At the party's founding conference, 32 of the delegates were from L'viv, 48 from Kiev, and 7 from Ivano-Frankivs'k. No other *oblast'* provided more than two delegates.[78] Initially optimistic claims for the party's membership; - 10,000 in June 1990,[79] and 30,000 in August 1990;[80] were scaled down to 3,256 at the time of the party's official registration in January 1991. Of these, 73% were from Galicia (1,307 were from L'viv *oblast'* , 831 from Ivano-Frankivs'k, and 237 from Ternopil').[81] In February 1992, Plachynda claimed that the party had increased its membership to 5,000, but accepted that it remained confined to Galicia, Kiev and a few central oblasts such as Cherkasy and Kirovohrad.[82] The party had little or no presence in Eastern and Southern Ukraine. The

special deputy leader posts created to represent the two regions remained empty after the party's first congress in 1990.

Even the above figures might be treated with some scepticism, as at the time of the conference of the L'viv branch of the UPDP in March 1992, the local party only claimed 502 members, not 1,307.[83] The same conference provided some information confirming the social base of the UPDP. Of the 151 delegates, 51 were heads of collective farms, 18 worked in local agricultural administration, and 27 were members of the agricultural firm *Provesin'* , in whose premises the conference was held.[84] The UPDP was often derided therefore, even in Galicia, for being a 'party of collective farm chairmen'.

The UPDP initially supported the founding of the Association of Ukrainian Farmers in February 1991,[85] although the Association in turn formed a rival Farmers' Party in February 1993.[86] Although this was unlikely to help expand the party's social base in the short-term (there were reportedly only 78 registered farmers' businesses in Ukraine at the time,[87] and still only 14,600 in February 1993),[88] the UPDP had great hopes that land privatisation in Ukraine would eventually create a class of supporters. It lobbied strongly in the Supreme Council to radicalise the Land Law passed in January 1992 (which stopped short of wholeheartedly embracing the principle of the private ownership of land), and its pressure was a key factor leading to the more radical decree of January 1993 transferring the ownership of small land plots to their current users[89] (the UPDP has one deputy in the Ukrainian parliament, Dmytro Chobit from L'viv).

The political significance of the UPDP's failure to build political support for nationalism in the Ukrainian countryside outside Galicia was immense. It demonstrated yet again the relatively narrow social and regional base of the Ukrainian national movement. It was unable to

make much headway in Eastern and Southern Ukraine for ethnic and historical reasons. Moreover, the countryside, still home to 32% of the Ukrainian population, was also largely impervious to the nationalist message because of the continued social dominance of the collective farm system. Unlike many Central European states, Ukraine was unable to build a strong agrarian nationalist party. In Hungary and Romania such parties had dominated the inter-war period and in many cases been revived after 1989, but the collective farm system had much deeper roots in Ukraine, having been established a generation earlier (apart, as always, from in Galicia).

Ideology

Without a firm social base in the countryside, the political autonomy of the UPDP's leaders was increased, and their growing radicalisation was apparent throughout 1990-93. Plachynda himself, after early moderation, was something of a loose cannon in the Ukrainian national movement as a whole, often being the first to express previously taboo thoughts.

Two of Plachynda's deputies, Hryhorii Kryvoruchko and M. Starushko, caused a storm by attending the first session of the ultra-radical UIA in Summer 1990 (see Chapter 6) and declaring that the UPDP were 'not a parliamentary party'. Although their views were repudiated, and the UPDP still contained a countervailing moderate faction led by Volodymyr Shcherbyna, the original head of the party in L'viv, that favoured cooperation with the CPU, the party swung rapidly to the right after its founding congress. The party in July 1990 called for the nationalisation of all Soviet property in Ukraine and for the USSR to be replaced by a 'confederation of 100 states'.[90] In December 1990 Dmytro Chobit introduced, without success, a bill before the Ukrainian

parliament to nationalise all Soviet enterprises on Ukrainian territory. At the UPDP's second congress on 2 February 1991, the party resolutely opposed Gorbachev's proposed Union Treaty, and could not even agree to support the project for a Confederative Union of Free States published by leading Ukrainian academics in *Literaturna Ukraïna* on 24 January 1991. Instead, many delegates supported the proposed Galician referendum on outright independence for Ukraine.[91] During the autumn 1991 presidential campaign, the UPDP was similarly split between moderate and radical nationalists, dividing its support between Levko Luk"ianenko and V"iacheslav Chornovil.[92]

Plachynda himself grew progressively more radical. In 1990, he declared that 'democratic nationalism is the ideology of the UPDP'.[93] By democratic nationalism, however, Plachynda understood 'the opposition to Great-power chauvinism', as demonstrated by the OUN and UPA. Therefore, 'the time of Bandera was [in fact] a national-liberation struggle, and Stepan Bandera was a national hero of Ukraine'.[94] According to Plachynda in June 1992, Ukraine needed 'an element of aristocratic rule, because, unless we stabilise our internal situation by aristocratic methods, we shall again become a colony, not only of Russia, but also of world capital'.[95] By 1992 Plachynda was prepared to state openly that only radical nationalism was capable of defending Ukraine against Great Russian chauvinism, 'the most powerful enemy of the Ukrainian nation'. Although Plachynda stated that, 'Democracy, Autocracy and Nationalism are the three foundations [*kyty*] of statehood', he went on to argue that 'without autocracy there cannot be democracy. Because democracy without autocracy means anarchy, chaos, the destruction of society, or at least its degradation....At the same time, democracy without nationalism is Pharisaism, political intrigue, demagogy'.[96] In other words, Plachynda believed that

democracy was a disposable luxury during the critical early stages of building a a nation-state.

At a round-table of political leaders (also broadcast on Ukrainian TV) with President Kravchuk in February 1992 largely devoted to the exchange of pleasantries, Plachynda stood out by declaring that 'we must scrap the Alma-Ata decision [by which control of 'strategic' nuclear weapons was a matter for the newly-created CIS] and end the transfer of nuclear arms to Russia. We must not delude ourselves here by playing with [the ideas of] internationalism and a non-nuclear state. It's impossible to believe in Russia. In Russia, as is obvious, there are chauvinistic black forces prepared for anything, including a nuclear attack on Ukraine. We must have a deterrent, which to them is tactical nuclear weapons'.[97]

At the founding assembly of the Congress of National-Democratic Forces in August 1992, Plachynda declared to huge applause that 'we should not support trans-national [*pozanatsional'nu* , that is civic] democracy, that can become the hidden agent of chauvinism'. In other words, talk of minority rights was simply a means to prevent ethnic Ukrainians from obtaining their rights. In Plachynda's words, the majority of 'Russians support chauvinism, even fascism. Therefore Russians will only rid themselves of this chauvinistic complex, as the Germans freed themselves from fascism, - through war, suffering and blood'.[98] Most controversially, at the fourth congress of *Rukh* in December 1992, he called for Ukraine to sell its nuclear weapons to Saddam Hussein and Colonel Gaddafi. Such controversial statements have nevertheless served to maintain Plachynda's high political profile.

The UPDP's third congress in March 1993 confirmed the general pattern described above. Although the party tried to remain a broad church, it was dominated by Plachynda, and continued to find it difficult

to expand beyond Galicia (the party now claimed a total membership of over 4,000).[99]

Christian Democrats

The Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party (UCDP), first established as the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front (UCDF) in November 1988, played an important role in 1988-90 by acting as the radical conscience of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), and through mobilising Greek Catholic opinion in the 1987-89 relegalisation campaign. However, internal disagreements resulted in the party's split into three factions in 1992, with the Kiev faction in effect dominated by Russian Orthodox believers. The better organised URP joined the Christian Democratic International in 1991 as the main representative of Ukrainian Christian conservatism, and the UCDP's influence therefore went into sharp decline. The history of the UCDP's unfulfilled promise is however instructive, and provides further evidence of the limited appeal of Ukrainian nationalism. In Central and Eastern Europe the backbone of many nationalist movements has been a strong peasants' party, such as the Smallholders' Party in Hungary or Rural Solidarity in Poland, or a Christian nationalist party such as the Christian Democrats in Lithuania; but Ukrainian nationalists were unable to build either as a significant political force.

The UCDF was formed on 1 November 1988, (the anniversary of the creation of the West Ukrainian People's Republic in 1918) by father and son Petro and Vasyl' Sichko,[100] both former dissidents and founder members of the UHU.[101] Vasyl' Sichko claimed in 1991 that the UCDF had had 365 members at the time, but this seems exaggerated.[102] Like the UPDL and DSU, the UCDF was formed as a result of the impatience of

the UHU's more radical members with the cautious line taken by the UHU on the national question in 1988-89.[103] As Vasyl' Sichko later explained; from the beginning 'we stood on truly principled anti-communist positions. Because politics must be principled, if it is to be respected'.[104] As well as stressing the incompatibility of Christian and communist values, the UCDF moved more quickly than the UHU to support full Ukrainian independence.[105] The Front also stressed the importance of reviving ethnically Ukrainian myths and symbols, and emphasised the specifically national aspects of religious revival. It was one of the main supporters for the campaign to revive the two traditional national Ukrainian churches (the Greek Catholic and Autocephalous Orthodox) 'which were a moral and spiritual defence for millions of Ukrainians'.[106] The early period of the UCDF's existence was therefore basically clandestine. The Front's first conference on 13 January 1989 had to be held in a private apartment in L'viv.

In practice the UCDF was an almost exclusively Galician organisation, and its membership almost exclusively Greek Catholics, as admitted by Mykola Boika in October 1990.[107] Moreover, according to Vasyl' Sichko, 'only Christians can be members of our party. We can admit former communists into the party, but only of course through their confession of Christ'.[108] As the main political expression of Galician Greek Catholicism, however, the UCDF rose to public prominence during the massive campaigns to relegalise the Greek Catholic church in 1987-89.[109] By 21-22 April 1990, when the UCDF held its first public congress, and formally turned itself into the UCDP, the party's profile was well-established. The largest group amongst the 188 delegates came from Ivano-Frankivs'k, followed by L'viv, Ternopil' and Kiev (although there were also representatives from Odesa and Vinnytsia).[110]

The UCDF/P also sought to embed itself in Galician life by sponsoring a range of sister organisations, including the Scout organisation *Plast* (for ages 7 to 16, *Plast* had existed in Galicia until 1940, and was revived in 1989); the Christian Union of Ukrainian Youth (for ages 16 to 30) set up in September 1989; and the Ukrainian Christian Party of Women, established in November 1991 and led by Ol'ha Horyn', wife of the URP leader Mykhailo Horyn'.[111] The UCDP was officially registered on 14 November 1991, and claimed 7,000 members.[112]

In the long-term, however, the UCDP's mono-confessional nature and the ultra-radicalism of its leaders placed a cap on its potential growth. The party's nationalist agenda concerning the rehabilitation of the OUN and UPA prevented it from gaining much support amongst Orthodox believers in Ukraine outside of Galicia.[113] The party boycotted both the 1989 and 1990 elections (although one People's Deputy, Zinovii Duma from Ivano-Frankivs'k, was a supporter of the party). At the UCDP's second congress in April 1992, Sichko sponsored a new programme and a series of resolutions highly critical of Ukraine's national communist leadership, and opposing presidential rule, at a time when most Ukrainian nationalists were strongly supportive of President Kravchuk.[114] Sichko also alienated the party's potential supporters amongst the Ukrainian intelligentsia, by adopting Dontsov's argument that they were irredeemably corrupted by social democratic ideas[115] (the party's membership, however, consisted predominantly of the intelligentsia or the Galician peasantry. Of the 900 members of the Kiev branch of the UCDP in 1992, only three were classed as workers).[116] Sichko in any case largely wrote off Eastern Ukrainians as potential Christian democrats, as they were too 'materialist'.[117]

Most damaging of all to the UCDP, however, was the unpredictable and autocratic behaviour of Vasyl' Sichko. In Autumn 1991, he

quarrelled with the L'viv branch of the UCDP, and expelled its leaders. However, this meant that many of the party's leading branches (those from L'viv oblast, Ivano-Frankivs'k city, Ternopil' raion, and Kiev oblast and city) refused to attend the second party congress called by Sichko in his stronghold of Ivano-Frankivs'k in April 1992.[118] Sichko's congress was attended by 488 delegates supposedly representing 5,500 of the party's members, but his opponents claimed this was simply because the congress' mandate commission was prepared to admit almost anybody.[119]

Sichko's opponents were not a unified force, however. The Western Ukrainian rebels opposed him from a nationalist position, whereas those from Kiev and elsewhere had strong links with with the Orthodox Church and Russian Christian democrats. Two 'alternative' Christian democrat congresses were therefore held in June 1992. The first, in L'viv on the 19th June, was supported by the Galician rebels, and by the UCDP's one deputy, Zinovii Duma, and elected the former OUN member and political prisoner, Mykhailo Viter as its head. It was attended almost entirely by Greek Catholic ethnic Ukrainians.[120] The Viter group adopted a similarly nationalist programme to that of Sichko's UCDP, and left the door open to possible future reunion, presumably once Sichko had departed from the stage.

On the 20th June 117 delegates from 11 oblasts in Central and Eastern Ukraine claiming to represent 6,000 members met in Kiev,[121] elected Viktor Zhuravs'kyi, a candidate of philosophical science, leader, and renamed themselves the Christian Democratic Party of Ukraine (thereby emphasising their multi-ethnic nature).[122] The Kiev congress was dominated by Russophone and Orthodox Christian democrats, nearly all of whom were representatives of the intelligentsia (85% had higher education, and only 8% were workers and a mere 2% peasants),[123] and

was attended by Russian Christian democrat activists from Russia and Moldova, including V. Savitskiy, co-leader of the Christian Democratic Party of Russia.

In the long-term, it seemed that the split between the two Western Ukrainian groups and Zhuravs'kyi's Kiev group would prove more serious, as it reflected the ongoing conflict amongst Ukraine's warring faiths. Zhurakivs'kyi's Kiev party was basically Russophone and anti-nationalist. The split in Western Ukraine seemed to be mainly a matter of personality. Support from the Greek Catholic hierarchy in Galicia for the idea of a party of Christian values remained strong, but the split was likely to be prolonged in the short-term as Sichko's group was officially recognised by the state, whilst Viter's group had more grass roots support in Galicia.

Only Sichko's UCDP joined the Congress of National-Democratic Forces in August 1992, where Sichko ironically admitted that the nationalist movement was plagued by a plethora of small parties, 'whose basic programmatical principles are almost identical', and whose 'differences lie more or less in individual personalities'.[124]

Stepan Khmara's Conservative Republican Party

The events leading up to the departure of the URP's charismatic populist deputy leader, Stepan Khmara, from the party in May 1992 were described in Chapter 3. He then founded his own party in June 1992, the Ukrainian Conservative Republican Party (UCRP). On the one hand this new split was further evidence for the extreme fissiparousness of the Ukrainian far right, but on the other hand the UCRP did represent a genuine right-radical tradition that had been part of the UHU since its inception in 1988, and Khmara remained a popular figure well-skilled in

the art of self-publicity. Moreover, the UCRP represented those ultra-nationalists who were also anti-communist. His party therefore appeared to have better prospects than most.

The founding 'conference' of Khmara's party was held in Kiev on 6-7 June 1992, attended by 243 delegates from 22 oblasts.[125] No direct information was provided about the new party's membership, but it had been estimated (see Chapter 3) that about 5-10% of the URP's then 12,000 members were supporters of Khmara. Khmara's supporters in fact claimed that the third URP congress had been unconstitutional, and that they were the true keepers of the faith as established at the founding URP congress in 1990. Therefore the congress declared that 'with the aim of distancing ourselves from the revisionists, we add to the name of our party the term "conservative", [and] confirm our new name - Ukrainian Conservative Republican Party. We consider henceforth that the UCRP is the rightful successor to the URP in all matters of legal, political and property inheritance',[126] a claim of course rejected by the URP, and without any juridicial force whatsoever.[127]

Not surprisingly, given Khmara's past record, the UCRP sought to distinguish itself from the URP in three main areas: its attitude to President Kravchuk and the existing authorities, questions of economic reform, and over relations with Russia.

As regards the first, Khmara remained virulently anti-communist. In April 1992 he had stated that 'I identify the Marxist philosophy and ideology with the philosophy of Satan'. Since independence, communist 'bureaucrats have only changed from one seat to the other, but always remained in power'.[128] In his speech to the UCRP conference, he attacked 'old communist cadres who [remained] at all levels of state power - like a huge state mafia, which is the main internal threat to the Ukrainian state'.[129] This mafia was corrupting the privatisation process

and had proved itself incapable of defending Ukraine's state interests. Therefore, unlike the URP, which had become 'a marionette of the state-mafia communist *nomenklatura* ',[130] the UCRP would remain in resolute opposition to President Kravchuk and his national communists, who were 'supported by the most reactionary communist forces'.[131] So long as they remained in power, 'a truly independent state cannot exist'.[132] The conference's resolutions even threatened to organise a campaign for Kravchuk's impeachment. The new party's statute forbade even former rank-and-file communist party members from joining the party.

The UCRP strongly condemned the 'predatory privatisation of the communist party-state mafia',[133] and called instead for state property to be distributed free to workforces, and for all Ukrainian citizens to have an 'equal start' in the privatisation process. The new party also called for key avenues of *nomenklatura* self-enrichment to be blocked off, including the establishment of parallel private businesses to state enterprises and so-called 'spontaneous privatisation'. Deputies should be banned from engaging in commercial activity (several of these populist themes were taken up by the new government of Leonid Kuchma after October 1992). Khmara's slogans condemning price rises, the impoverishment of the people and the growth of crime often echoed that of the populist Socialist Party of Ukraine.

Khmara's anti-Russian rhetoric at the conference was sufficiently extreme to cause a walkout by approximately 40 of the delegates. Khmara's proposed programme contained the following passage:

> The politics of Ukraine should be steadfastly directed towards the disintegration of the empire - the Russian Federation. Only after its disintegration will such a mortal danger to Ukraine disappear. The field of

struggle should be taken onto Russian territory; - the most favourable moment for this has arrived and it should not be wasted. Then Russia will no longer [be able to make] imperialist encroachments against Ukraine - and such a policy will weaken to a maximum extent the 'fifth column' within Ukraine...

The opportune moment has [also] arrived to cut off Russia at last from the
. Black Sea. Here our interests coincide with those of our neighbours, first of all with Turkey.

Ukraine should become the organiser of an anti-Russian anti-Imperialist front of the former republics of the USSR.[134]

Such an aggressively anti-Russian position, with its implied support for Ukrainian separatism in the South-West of the Russian Federation (in the Kuban', Voronezh and Taganrog) was opposed by Mariia Oliinyk, former head of the Donets'k URP. Although a majority of delegates agreed with her, Khmara made the issue one of confidence in his leadership. The passage therefore remained, and 40 or so of Oliinyk's Eastern Ukrainian supporters left the hall.[135] Oliinyk later formed a rival organisation in Donets'k, entitled *Soborna Ukraïna* ('Unified Ukraine'), which eventually became the local branch of KUN.[136] Such a split, however, at the founding conference of a party which had itself only split from the URP in May 1992, was hardly an auspicious start for the UCRP.

The conference's declarations committed the new party to much that was by now part of the standard nationalist programme. The UCRP called for departure from the CIS, the Ukrainianisation of the Armed Forces, and Ukrainian control over the nuclear weapons on its territory. Organisations which engaged in 'anti-Ukrainian, anti-state activity' should be banned.[137] First of all, this meant separatist organisations. The UCRP called for the 'so-called Supreme Soviet of the Crimea' to be

dissolved, and its leader Nikolai Bagrov to be arrested, and it made repeated similar appeals through the winter of 1992-93 as more and more Russophone organisations began to appear in Eastern Ukraine.[138] Unlike those nationalists who were prepared to work with the national communists, however, the UCRP called for all 'former heads of the leading structures of the CPSU-CPU and *komsomol* to be deprived of their deputies' mandates, and to leave the structures of executive power, leading positions in the economy and in political and social organisations'.[139]

The national communists could not be trusted because of their criminal past, and because of their tendency to compromise on the ethnic character of the Ukrainian state. On this issue, Khmara remained as explicit as always. Myths and symbols, particularly those of the OUN-UPA, 'should not be celebrated only in Western Ukraine, [but should have] an all-Ukrainian character'.[140] The desire to compromise with Eastern Ukrainians would simply perpetuate the low level of national consciousness in Ukraine, according to Khmara.

A final indication of the UCRP's radicalism could be seen in the fact that the conference reserved for itself the right to use all methods, 'not excluding armed struggle' in the event of a Russian revanchist threat against Ukraine, with only 17 delegates voting against.[141] Moreover, in the first issue of the UCRP paper *Klych* , ('The Call'), published in February 1993, Khmara declared that 'in general I am a supporter of republicanism, of a parliamentary form for the state. However, in a transition period a positive role could be played by an authoritarian regime.....in such circumstances we must rely on strong individuals'.[142]

Khmara's uncompromising stand won him few friends, even on the right. He had burnt his bridges with the URP, and therefore the UCRP took no part in the establishment of the Congress of National

Democratic Forces in August 1992. Khmara often spoke warmly of the OUN-r, and his overtures to the DSU at their third congress in December 1992 have already been mentioned above. However, the increasing estrangement between the OUN-r and the DSU was also likely to make the prospect of close ties less attractive from the UCRP's point of view. Khmara continued to use his position as a deputy to act as a radical tribune (he was parliamentary spokesman / adviser for both the radical trade union organisation VOST and the Union of Officers of Ukraine), and he could still pull big crowds, but his political isolation seemed complete when he refused to join the Anti-Communist Anti-Imperial Front of Ukraine (ACAIF) set up in January 1993 (see Chapter 8), even though groups such as the UNA and UNSO attended its first session.[143] Khmara's argument that there was just as much danger to Ukrainian statehood from the traitorous acts of President Kravchuk, as from Russophone deputies in the Supreme Council or from separatist organisations in the Donbas, gathered little support at a time when all nationalist political forces, even Chornovil's *Rukh* , wished to close ranks in support of the President.

Minor parties

As well as the parties listed above, a number of smaller ultra-right groups existed in Ukraine (mainly in Galicia), often with barely a hundred members. None appeared to be important in themselves, but their existence did shed some light on the nature of nationalist politics in Ukraine in the period. In Galicia, especially in L'viv, the radicalisation of public opinion over the period 1988-93, the growing economic crisis after 1990, and the general disillusion with Ukraine's seemingly atomised and ineffective political parties after August 1991, meant that it

proved extremely difficult for the mainstream parties to hang on to their more radical and impatient members. They tended to create a string of ultra-radical parties with maximalist political programmes, explicitly renouncing civic nationalism as the 'ideology of the weak', and wholeheartedly embracing a mythologised version of Dontsovite extremism. Although none was ever capable of an organisational challenge to the established parties, they certainly contributed to the radicalisation of the ideological atmosphere in L'viv in the Summer of 1992. Many were founder members of the Valentyn Moroz's Nationalist Bloc that took over the L'viv branch of *Rukh* in the run-up to the fourth *Rukh* congress in December 1992 (see Chapter 4).

One such party was the Social-National Party of Ukraine (SNPU), founded in December 1991. Its name was deliberately evocative of the NSDAP, as was its party symbol, a Ukrainian trident, reminiscent of a Nazi swastika. The party's programme was explicitly ethnicist, declaring that

> the democrats and partocrats are building a Ukraine where Russians can live better than in Russia, whilst Ukrainians remain second class citizens. They are continuing to deceive us with the ideas of human rights. We [however] will not pay any attention to fashionable cosmopolitan breezes from across the ocean. The nation is the basis on which all European states are formed. This principle is the root of all their achievements. The nation - is the root of the state! On this there can be no compromise![144]

The SNPU called for a complete purge of the corrupt state, and its replacement by a new order that was both 'forbidding and omnipotent'. Most of the SNPU's claimed 300 members were radical youths, previously active in organisations such as *Plast* and SNUM, such as the party's leader Yaroslav Andrushkiv. Members of the SNPU were

reportedly prominent amongst the nationalist thugs who disrupted the L'viv *Rukh* congress on 24 October 1992 (see Chapter 4).[145]

The <u>Ukrainian National-Radical Party</u> (UNRP), founded in late 1990 by Mykhailo Stosiuk, (it was originally called the All-World Ukrainian Radical Party) occupied very similar ground.[146] Its slogan was 'Independence or death', and its programme called for the unity 'of all the world's nationally conscious Ukrainians in one monolithic party', and for an 'independent Ukraine from the Carpathians to the Caucasus'. It also favoured a hierarchically ordered society after the Japanese model, led by Nietzschean 'new men'. The party did not rule out revolutionary struggle to achieve such ends.[147] The UNRP modelled its statute after what it saw as the military discipline of the OUN. Its supposed 500 members were required to wear uniform and unquestioningly carry out the orders of the party leadership. Little was heard of the UNRP after 1992, but Stosiuk continued to edit the nationalist journal *Derzhavnist'* ('Statehood') that he founded in 1991, and which provided a mouthpiece for various extreme right groupings, as well as reprinting the works of Dontsov, Mikhnovs'kyi and others.

In March 1992, a <u>Union of Monarchists of Ukraine</u> appeared in L'viv,[148] and on May 27-8 1993 an All-Ukrainian Forum of Monarchists was held, also in L'viv,[149] but the patent absurdity of their cause confined the union to the fringe of Ukrainian politics. A <u>National-Socialist Party of Ukraine,</u> apparently separate from the SNPU was reportedly created in Poltava in October 1992. Its platform called for strengthening Ukrainian statehood and resolute support for an emergent business class on the basis of a nationalist dictatorship.[150]

Conclusion

None of the above-mentioned parties was, in 1990-2, as powerful as the mainstream nationalist parties or the UNA. The ultra-right, although gradually growing in importance throughout the period, remained organisationally weak and fractious, and its influence was largely confined to Kiev and Galicia. However, the early appearance and large number of such parties indicated that not all Ukrainian nationalists were happy with the moderate civic nationalism espoused by the likes of *Rukh* and the DPU. The fact that they existed as competitors to the right also helped to pull the more mainstream parties in a more radical direction.

Finally, as with the UNA, the ultra-right believed with much justification that there was a strong possibility of public opinion swinging strongly in their direction in the event of serious confrontation with Russia and/or further deterioration in the internal economic and security situation, if only in Galicia and Kiev. No single group had yet managed to combine the strong organisation, charismatic leadership and populist ideology characteristic of successful parties of the far right, but the potential for such a group clearly existed. However, it is noteworthy that there was little evidence of any of the above groups successfully expanding their appeal even to ethnically Ukrainian industrial workers, despite the immense economic problems faced by Ukraine in the early 1990s. Large-scale unemployment, however, yet to appear in 1992, might provide a potential pool of recruits.

8. NATIONALIST SPLITS AND COALITIONS

Introduction

As argued in Chapter 2, all Ukraine's political parties (not just the nationalists) faced many major handicaps after the unexpectedly sudden achievement of independence in August 1991. Therefore the period 1992-3 was marked by a process of political consolidation and coalition formation as the political parties attempted to overcome their weaknesses by combining together. In the nationalist camp two separate coalitions were formed, after the serious split amongst nationalists in early 1992.

This final chapter seeks to describe the processes by which the two groups were formed. One, the *Rukh* -led Congress of Democratic Forces of Ukraine (CDFU) was established by V"iacheslav Chornovil in late July 1992, while the more nationalist Congress of National-Democratic Forces (CNDF) was set up by the URP and DPU in August 1992. The CDFU also organised the 'New Parliament for a New Ukraine' campaign in the autumn of 1992. In January 1993, the two coalitions attempted to resolve their differences through the creation of the Anti-Communist Anti-Imperial Front (ACAIF), but the attempt seemed unlikely to have lasting success.[1]

Of the two coalitions, the CNDF was more cohesive. Chapters 3, 5 and 7 described the process by which the main nationalist parties, the DPU, URP and their satellites, were radicalised in 1990-92 and ended up occupying much the same political positions in mid-1992. Chornovil's CDFU attempted less successfully to build bridges with the main centrist parties. Although both exercised considerable influence on the government and President,[2] the division of the nationalist camp into

two in fact came at a most inopportune time. In early and mid-1992 leftist and regional lobbies had yet to organise themselves, and the nationalists had a golden opportunity to press their agenda on Kravchuk. They were able to pull him a long way in their direction, but not as far as would have been possible if unity had been maintained. As leftist and regional groups began to organise in late 1992, there was a growing realisation that crucial momentum had been lost, but by the time the attempt was made to restore unity in January 1993 too much bad blood had been split, and it seemed likely that the nationalists would be less well placed to stop Kravchuk backsliding from his commitment to their agenda.

The Congress of National-Democratic Forces (CNDF)

Convergence between the URP and DPU

The roots of the CNDF went back a long way. As described in Chapters 3 and 5, the two main nationalist parties, the URP and DPU, had moved progressively closer together in 1990-92. The original rationale for differentiating the DPU from the URP (formed before the DPU in April 1990) had concerned the parties' different social bases, tactics and ideologies. Although many of the URP's leadership were from the intelligentsia, its rank and file membership was largely working class (see Chapter 3). For many in the DPU this fact was connected with the URP's rabble-rousing style, and its repeated flirtation (before August 1991) with extra-parliamentary action. In particular, cooperation with the URP was difficult so long as Stepan Khmara remained deputy leader of the URP. His ultra-radicalism, including his repeated calls to boycott the Supreme Council and his cooperation with far right groups, was unacceptable to the DPU.[3] A final factor was the

URP's commitment to a neo-conservative economic policy, whereas the DPU remained broadly social-democratic.

By the time of the URP's third congress in May 1992, however, all of these problems had disappeared, whilst other factors were encouraging closer cooperation between the two parties. After August 1991 the URP had declared its intention to become a 'party of Ukrainian statehood' and of 'respectable conservatism'. The URP's Ideological Conference in February 1992 had supported the leadership's intention to attract more *intelligenty* into the party, and Khmara and his supporters had been forced out of the URP at the May congress. Moreover, the URP had begun to adopt a more protectionist and corporatist economic policy, moving some, but not all, of the way towards bridging the gap with the DPU on economic policy (see Chapter 3).

The DPU meanwhile attempted to pay greater attention to economic issues, as the economic crisis worsened still further in 1992, and shake off its reputation as the 'party of philologists'. One of the party's Deputies, the economist Mykhailo Shviaka, was commissioned to draw up a new party programme in January 1992,[4] that reflected the party's cautious approach to privatisation, stress on the need to protect the national economy from foreign competition, and desire to cushion the blow of reform with maximum social protection. As the economic crisis deepened in 1992, it became increasingly clear that such policies reflected more closely the instincts of the two parties' nationalist constituency (and those of the public as a whole),[5] than the URP's theoretical commitment to liberal capitalism, that owed as much to anti-communism as to positive desire. The URP itself realised as much in 1992, leading to a dilution of its neo-conservatism. Despite the leadership's expressed desire to attract more *intelligenty* into the party, the backbone of its membership remained working class nationalists,

who were more likely to be animated by criticism of the then government's price reform, than by the uncertain long-term prospect of their enrichment under capitalism.[6]

The DPU also moved closer to the URP in 1991-2 by abandoning the idea of union with the PDRU and adopting a much more clearly nationalist line, as described in Chapter 5. Union between the two was also encouraged by both parties' perceptions of their own relative weakness. The referendum campaign in March 1991, according to the DPU's assessment, 'demonstrated that the democratic forces in Ukraine are not yet sufficiently well-grounded and [tactically] mobile',[7] while Luk"ianenko would later admit that 'we are not prepared for elections. The URP has not got sufficient candidates in all [450] constituencies'.[8]

Moreover, support even for the united opposition had stagnated at around 25-33% of the electorate in 1990-91 (see Chapters 1 and 2). Therefore the leadership of both parties realised that they had to cooperate not only with each other, but also with Leonid Kravchuk's national communist group. The DPU, and URP leaders such as Luk"ianenko, Shevchenko and the Horyn' brothers, enthusiastically greeted the emergence of national communism as the best way of breaking the deadlock with Moscow, and securing independence (or at least full sovereignty) for Ukraine.

Badz'o, Pavlychko and others therefore tried to organise the opposition in a common front in order better to support Kravchuk, but the attempt proved premature. At two meetings on 2 April and 10 June 1991 the DPU had supported the idea of a coalition entitled 'Independent Democratic Ukraine' to be formed on the basis of the Ukrainian section of the all-party and all-Union Democratic Congress formed in Kharkiv in January 1991.[9] The proposal however eventually floundered on Luk"ianenko's insistence (supported by Ivan Drach, who feared a

possible rival to *Rukh*) on preserving the URP's distinctive face, and on his worry that such a move would precipitate a split with Stepan Khmara and the radical wing of the URP.[10] The latter still distrusted Kravchuk's motives, and preferred the ultra-right's tactics of underground struggle and the boycott of the institutions of the Ukrainian SSR. Luk"ianenko also declared that he 'saw no need to create yet another supra-party organisation. We are in favour of cooperation, but against the creation of [unnecessary] structures'.[11]

Similar difficulties were experienced during Ukraine's first ever presidential elections on 1 December 1991. The URP and DPU, despite the latter issuing a call for a common opposition candidate in September 1991,[12] were unable to coordinate their activities. Moreover, the DPU's lack of discipline over its own members was clearly demonstrated by the manner in which the party divided its support between different candidates, and failed even to collect the 100,000 signatures necessary for its candidate to proceed to the final ballot. The URP ran a stronger campaign, but Luk"ianenko still only received a disappointing 4.5% of the vote. The campaign therefore ably demonstrated the weakness of both parties (especially the DPU) when they acted separately, whilst at the same time creating a strong desire amongst them to support, and indeed participate in, the process of building the new Ukrainian nation-state.

The third *Rukh* congress and after

Such cooperation was evident in the run-up to the third *Rukh* congress in February-March 1992. The two parties formed a joint faction of 40 Deputies in the Supreme Council, originally entitled 'Independence and Democracy',[13] and negotiated on joint tactics for the congress (see Chapter 4).[14] The two aimed, by becoming collective members of *Rukh* at last and securing the election of the URP's

Mykhailo Horyn' as *Rukh's* leader, to take over control of *Rukh* and then align it more clearly in support of President Kravchuk. In return, the parties' leaders expected to be drawn into the embrace of government.

Chapter 4 has described how the attempt failed, and V''iacheslav Chornovil came to dominate *Rukh* instead. If the URP and DPU were at first inclined to remain in *Rukh* and fight their corner against Chornovil, it quickly became clear that Chornovil was more dominant than they expected, and consequently both parties withdrew from *Rukh* and began organising another vehicle for their ambitions.[15]

Badz'o had called for ever closer cooperation between the DPU and the URP at the latter's third congress in May 1992, and later in the same month the leading nationalist deputy Mykola Porovs'kyi called for the formation of a 'Ukrainian National Democratic Party' to be based on the URP, DPU and like-minded elements within *Rukh* Porovs'kyi proposed that its programme would include the defence of Kravchuk, 'strong Presidential power' and the post-August 1991 state, whilst emphasising state-building and 'the strengthening of people's social conscience' over the establishment of a market economy.[16]

On 1 July 1992 the URP and DPU announced the formation of a coalition between the two parties.[17] Their joint declaration called for; departure from the CIS, a unitary, anti-separatist state, 'the priority of national industry', and the 'national character of Ukrainian statehood' (although at the DPU's insistence a phrase was added defining 'Ukrainian patriotism as the ideology and feeling of people regardless of their ethnic origin'). The joint declaration's definition of 'social justice as the possibility for the self-realisation of the individual in society, and the effective defence of those groups of the population who cannot fend for themselves' [*nepratsezdatni*] was closer to the economic thinking of

the URP than to that of the still broadly social-democratic DPU. The possibility of eventual union between the two parties was discussed at the DPU's second congress in December 1992 (see Chapter 5), and in the run-up to the URP's fourth congress in May 1993.[18]

On 8 July a broader meeting of like-minded parties and organisations was held; including the URP, DPU, UPDP, all-Ukrainian Society for the Repressed, Union of Ukrainian Students, Union of Ukrainian Youth and Union of Officers of Ukraine, plus Ivan Drach and Viktor Burlakov from *Rukh* . It resulted in a common programme calling for the creation of a 'law-based democratic state and civil society', 'the national character of Ukrainian statehood and the national self-determination of Ukraine with the wide participation of all national minorities', 'a unitary state structure for Ukraine', and 'the creation of a "society of property owners" by the means of just privatisation and destatification, dynamic economic reform and the priority of national industry'.[19] Those present also called for a series of regional conferences of a 'Congress of National-Democratic Forces' to be held,[20] followed by an all-Ukrainian congress on 2 August 1992. On 16 July Pavlo Movchan overruled the pro-Chornovil forces in *Prosvita* (the renamed Ukrainian Language Society), and added his signature to the declaration.[21] Initially, there was some hope that Chornovil's *Rukh* would join the proposed CNDF,[22] but Chornovil had no desire to repeat the arguments of the third *Rukh* congress, and on the eve of the 2 August meeting accused the CNDF of attempting 'to form an alternative *Rukh* or "party of power", which could become the political support for an authoritarian system.'[23] Chornovil sent *Rukh's* deputy leader, Oleksandr Lavrynovych, to attend the CNDF congress as an observer, but he declined to formally join its structures.

The divergence between the two groups was clearly exposed on 7 July, when the URP leader, Mykhailo Horyn', formally abstained in the

Supreme Council in the vote of censure against the government organised by Chornovil and his supporters (see below), which Horyn' described as 'premature'.[24] The URP and DPU instead supported an alternative motion requiring Kravchuk to 'reexamine' the composition of the government before parliament reassembled in September. At a press conference on 8 July, Horyn' then presented the URP-DPU proposals for a 'government of technocrats' to be led by Academician Pavlovs'kyi or by the rector of Vinnytsia polytechnic and national deputy Borys Mokin.[25] Leading members of the CNDF had already received state posts. Luk"ianenko, for example, was appointed ambassador to Canada, the DPU's Vitalii Donchyk the President's deputy prefect in Kiev,[26] and leading members of the CNDF such as Larysa Skoryk were appointed to the President's advisory *Duma* ('Council'), established in February 1992[27] (although abolished that October when Kravchuk was forced to cede many of his powers to the new Kuchma government).

The CNDF congress

On 2 August, the CNDF Congress was held in Kiev,[28] attended by 60 deputies of the Supreme Council and 500 delegates representing 18 political parties and organisations, plus others who attended as observers. The 18 included all the main groups of the moderate right, apart from *Rukh* . The political parties present were the URP and DPU, Plachynda's UPDP, Sichko's UCDP, and the Ukrainian National-Conservative Party (see Chapter 6); and the main civic organisations were the All-Ukrainian Society of the Repressed led by Yevhen Proniuk, Pavlo Movchan's *Prosvita* , the Union of Ukrainian Students, Mykola Porovs'kyi's 'Crimea with Ukraine' organisation, the Committee for the Defence of Ukrainian Orthodoxy (led by Vasyl' Chervonyi and the URP's

Oles' Shevchenko) the 'Independence' Union of Ukrainian Journalists, the Andrii Sheptyts'kyi Ukrainian Greek Catholic Union, the Ukrainian Association for the Defence of Historical Heritage, the Organisation of Soldiers' Mothers,[29] the *Rukh* Women's Organisation (represented by Larysa Skoryk), the 'OUN-*Rukh* 'organisation from Moscow, the Kharkiv CNDF, and the Ukrainian Youth Association.[30] The URP's Mykhailo Horyn', acting Chairman of the Congress, compared the gathering to the formation of the broad-based coalition by the OUN in 1944 (the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council).[31]

Like *Rukh* , *Memorial* and the Ukrainian Greens attended only as observers, as did the Union of Officers of Ukraine. The ultra-right were not invited. The Organisation of the Crimean Tatar National Movement promised to join at a later date. A permanent Council of the CNDF was elected, consisting of three representatives from each of the Congress' constituent groups (all of whom had an equal voice). In practice, however, the URP was the dominant force in the CNDF as the party's representatives and allies dominated the delegations from *Prosvita* (Pavlo Movchan), 'Crimea with Ukraine' (Mykola Porovs'kyi), the all-Ukrainian Society for the Repressed (Yevhen Proniuk) the *Rukh* Women's Organisation (Larysa Skoryk), and the Committee in Defence of Ukrainian Orthodoxy (the URP deputy Oles' Shevchenko); and Mykhailo Horyn' was the CNDF's chairman. Many of the CNDF's constituent organisations had supported Luk"ianenko's election campaign in Autumn 1991 (see Chapter 3), and the agenda for the Congress was set at the meeting of the URP's Grand Council the day before.[32]

The Congress adopted as its slogan 'Ukraine in Danger!' The programme adopted echoed the main themes of the 1 July declaration, whilst the organisation's statute described the CNDF as 'a union of

political parties and civil organisations of national-democratic orientation, formed for the purpose of taking strong measures for the building and strengthening of a Ukrainian state, securing national independence and democracy'.[33] The Congress' main declaration attacked 'anarchic radicalism', and declared instead that during the period 'of building [our] own independent state' it was necessary 'to strengthen presidential power'.[34] In Mykhailo Horyn''s words, 'as regards the President, neither the URP nor I wish to place him above criticism. But to fear the loss of the glory of opposition, and not to support the President when he deserves and needs it, just because he is the President, would in such times be [dangerously] frivolous'. 'Despite all his imperfections and errors, the President remains the guarantee of stability in the country.[35]

The Congress' declarations also called for 'the securing of the principle of unitary Ukrainian statehood and the strengthening of the Ukrainian nation on her ethnic territory; support for Ukrainians who live in the [other] states of the CIS in their striving for national revival; and the satisfaction of the cultural needs of all national minorities'.[36] In foreign and defence policy, the Congress called for an immediate and total severance of links with the CIS, the creation of powerful national Armed Forces, and the removal of all 'foreign forces and foreign bases from her territory' (i.e. the CNDF was opposed to the Yalta agreement of August 1992 which established joint Ukrainian-Russian control over the Black Sea Fleet for three years). Surprisingly however, little was said directly on the nuclear weapons issue.

In the economic sphere, the Congress called for 'the removal of any discrimination against national industry in comparison with foreign industry', and 'the reexamination of the 1992 privatisation programme' which was supposedly too favourable to foreign investors, and the

creation of 'equal starting possibilities', in other words a populist programme whereby shares would be given away free to the general public or workforces, rather than falling into the hands of the *nomenklatura* .[37] The Congress still, however, professed that it saw this as the best route to achieving a 'society of property-owners'. In other words, the programme owed most to the URP's mixture of neo-liberalism and protectionism.

Many at the Congress were sharply critical of Chornovil and *Rukh's* activity after the *de facto* split at the third *Rukh* congress in February-March 1992. Badz'o, for example accused him of practising 'yesterday's politics - the position of frontal assault on power', which could only 'lead in the end to the political destabilisation of society, which will complicate the process of reform and state creation'.[38] Larysa Skoryk's attack on Chornovil and his ally Serhii Holovatyi was even more intemperate. Skoryk was also explicit in asserting that the CNDF should abandon their former allies in *Rukh* to make common cause with the national communists, quoting V"iacheslav Lypyns'kyi to the effect that the Ukrainian intelligentsia alone would always be too weak to build a Ukrainian state with its own strength, and should therefore enthusiastically embrace the contribution of the national communist defectors from the old order (see Chapter 1).[39]

The most radical note was sounded, as was by now traditional, by Serhii Plachynda, leader of the Ukrainian Peasant Democratic Party. His demand that 'Ukrainian nationalism [i.e. ethnic nationalism] should become the ideology of the state' was met by loud applause, but was for the time being ignored by the Congress' leadership.[40]

The CNDF continued to press the Ukrainian leadership to take decisive state-building measures, particularly through its Supreme Council faction of 43 led by Mykola Porovs'kyi and Mykhailo

Holubets'.[41] During the governmental crisis of September-October 1992 it directed most of its effort towards support for Defence Minister Konstantin Morozov and Security Services Minister Yevhen Marchuk. According to the CNDF, 'success in [other] spheres does not compensate for losses from the insufficient tempo and quality in the formation of state structures (an army, security service, forces of law and order, customs, a financial-monetary and banking system)'.[42] The organisation praised Morozov, Kravchuk and Marchuk for their efforts to date, but urged them on to greater efforts.

The CNDF continued to rail against Ukraine's enemies at both home and abroad, calling for separatists within Ukraine to be prosecuted and for a special commission 'to take effective measures' against the danger of 'the activation of chauvinistic pro-Imperial forces'.[43] Abroad, Yel'tsin was to be supported because of the dark forces that lay in wait to succeed him.[44] In February 1993, the CNDF grasped the nuclear nettle, and declared that 'taking into account the fact that our neighbours, Russia in particular, continually make territorial claims on Ukraine, we have to regard nuclear weapons as a means of strategic deterrence and demand that Ukraine exercise full control over these weapons'. In other words the CNDF rejected 'the unilateral disarmament of Ukraine that will leave the country hostage to the aggressive policy of other states'.[45] By the time Ukraine's draft Military Doctrine was debated for a second time in April 1993, 162 Deputies were prepared to sign a declaration supporting such a position.[46]

Rukh , the Congress of Democratic Forces of Ukraine (CDFU) and a 'New Parliament for a New Ukraine'

Chapter 4 described how V"iacheslav Chornovil had emerged victorious from the third *Rukh* congress in February-March 1992, on a platform of combining nationalism and anti-communism. Unlike the CNDF therefore, he was unwilling to support Kravchuk's national communists. In particular, he used his new-found preeminence within *Rukh* to adopt a much more aggressive line against the government of then Prime Minister Vitol'd Fokin and against the national communists in general. Fokin was taking many of the aggressive state-building and security measures demanded by the CNDF, but was not promoting domestic or economic reforms.

Rukh's campaign against Fokin[47] culminated in a formal vote of no-confidence in the Supreme Council on 7 July 1992, the last day of the summer parliamentary session. Fokin survived by 139 votes to 135,[48] but a second vote instructing President Kravchuk to 'reexamine the government's composition' by the time parliament began its next sitting in September was carried by 238 votes to 81.

Chornovil therefore began a dual-track campaign. On 31 July he organised a loose coordinating council of sympathetic political parties and organisations under the label Congress of Democratic Forces of Ukraine (CDFU). The CDFU consisted mainly of centrist and centre-right political parties, hence the choice of the term 'Democratic Forces', rather than 'National-Democratic Forces'[49] (although many parties were members of both the CNDF and CDFU). The CDFU remained a much looser body than the CNDF. Although a Coordinating Council was created with 2/3 delegates from each member organisation, the latter insisted that it should remain a campaigning organisation only and should not usurp the parties' 'executive functions'.[50] The main purpose of the CDFU therefore was the creation of a committee entitled 'A New Parliament for a New Ukraine', whose sole aim was to campaign for the

collection of the three million signatures necessary under Ukrainian law to force the pre-term dissolution of the Supreme Council. As *Rukh* had lost many leaders and members to the CNDF, who now refused to cooperate with the campaign (as did the ultra-right, which was now emphasising the importance of stability and strong national communist government) Chornovil was forced to bring the centrist *New Ukraine* movement onto his committee. The Committee's founding statement asked rhetorically, 'Can the legislative body of one state wield power in another? Strangely enough it can. Our parliament today represents a non-existent state, the Ukrainian SSR'.[51]

At the same time, *Rukh* made its own proposals, either for a new government (two of the ministerial candidates put forward by *Rukh* in July, Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi and Viktor Pynzenyk,[52] duly became Vice-Premiers in the new Kuchma government of October 1992), or for President Kravchuk himself to head a 'government of national accord' (a proposal Kravchuk was extremely unlikely to embrace so long as the Ukrainian economy remained plagued by severe stagflation). When the Supreme Council reassembled in September 1992, *Rukh* and the CDFU pressed successfully for Fokin's resignation,[53] and claimed much of the credit for forcing the creation of the Kuchma government in October 1992, in which the influence of the national communists was at least somewhat diluted.

In the new government, apart from the above-mentioned Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi (First Deputy Premier) and Viktor Pynzenyk (Deputy Premier and Minister for Economic Reform); *Rukh* was also represented by Mykola Zhulyns'kyi (Deputy Premier with responsibility for Social Issues, a literary critic and long-standing *Rukh* sympathiser), Ivan Herts (Minister for Foreign Economic Relations and a member of *Rukh's*

Parliamentary faction), and Yurii Kostenko (Minister for the Environment).

The formation of the new government took the wind out of the sails of the *Rukh-New Ukraine* petition campaign, although in the end it managed to collect 1,175,068 signatures (3% of the available electorate). As might be expected, a majority of these (702,000 or 60% of the total) of these were collected in Galicia (238,000 in Ternopil', 209,000 in Ivano-Frankivs'k, and 255,000 in L'viv), compared to a paltry 1,600 (0.1% of the total) in Crimea and 3,600 (0.3%) in Mykolaïv.[54] Proposals for a second attempt were soon abandoned, as they were unlikely to be successful much before new elections were due in March 1995 in any case.[55]

Rukh also began to call for a 'Nuremberg-2'; in other words a grand public trial of the communist party and all its misdeeds. Chornovil would have preferred a state sponsored trial along the lines of the investigation of the CPSU then being undertaken by the Russian Supreme Court, but, as the former was impossible to organise, a civil process was a useful second resort, as the main intention was simply to nip any potential neo-communist revival in the bud by publicising the party's past crimes.[56] In practice, however, the initiative meant little more than the publication of anti-communist material in *Rukh's* press (in this area, it has to be said that despite the generally pro-Kravchuk line of the CNDF, the ex-political prisoners of the URP were more prepared to take part in *Rukh's* anti-communist campaign than the former CPU stalwarts who dominated the DPU's leadership).[57]

Anti-Communist Anti-Imperial Front (ACAIF)

Despite the divergences between *Rukh* and the CNDF in 1992, the political crisis of January 1993 revealed that both were in the last analysis

nationalist groupings to whom the interests of the Ukrainian state were paramount. The crisis was the result of the confluence of three forces: growing calls to rehabilitate the CPU in Ukraine, following the decision by the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation in November 1992 to partially lift Yel'tsin's ban on the communist party (by January, 243 Deputies had signed a petition to the Chairman of the Supreme Council, Ivan Pliushch, calling on him to permit a debate on the banning of the CPU);[58] the attempt by 150 Eastern Ukrainian Deputies to force the opening of a special session of the Supreme Council before the Minsk CIS summit on 22 January 1993, and commit President Kravchuk to sign the proposed CIS Charter;[59] and growing opposition to the economic reforms of the Kuchma government. For many nationalists, this simultaneous pressure on three fronts amounted to the creation of a powerful fifth column within Ukraine, and produced a strong desire to close ranks behind President Kravchuk. The political tension was further exacerbated by the crisis in Moscow, uncertainty over the future of President Yel'tsin, and concern over who might succeed him; and by the violent arguments concerning elections to the new Ukrainian Supreme Court. Those nominated were mainly former CPU stalwarts, including Al'bert Korneev, the only man to vote against Ukrainian independence in August 1991, and hence the ACAIF feared that the Supreme Court was being packed in preparation for a ruling on the restoration of the CPU and to ensure that the new constitution represented the interests of the former *nomenklatura* .[60]

This new-found solidarity was first apparent at a round-table of political parties and organisations called by Kravchuk in the run-up to the Minsk summit. The nationalists closed ranks and demanded that Kravchuk should 'not sign the Statute and should withdraw from the CIS'. This line was supported by Chornovil for *Rukh* , Mykhailo Horyn'

for the CNDF, Ivan Drach representing the *Ukraïna* society, Pavlo Movchan representing *Prosvita* (the Ukrainian Language Society), Stepan Khmara for the UCRP and others.[61] Centrist groups on the other hand (Volodymyr Filenko for *New Ukraine*, Valerii Khmel'ko for the PDRU, Oleksandr Stoian for the Federation of Ukrainian Trade Unions, and Volodymyr Pylypchuk, Chairman of the Supreme Council Committee on Economic Reform) proposed that 'Ukraine should use certain advantages of its participation in the CIS'; while the Left (Oleksandr Moroz for the SPU, Serhii Dovhan for the PPU, and M. Petrun for the Ukrainian Society of War Veterans) declared that Ukraine should 'sign the Statute and stay in the CIS by all means'.

In the tense build-up to the summit, the URP was the first to announce the creation of 16 regional branches of an 'Anti-Imperial Anti-Communist Front' on 16 January 1993, an initiative also supported by Mykola Porovs'kyi, now Deputy Chairman of the CNDF.[62] After a spectacular *volte-face* by Chornovil, who declared that in such a situation of crisis *Rukh* would now support President Kravchuk and participate in the new coalition,[63] a common front of all Ukrainian nationalist parties from the UNA to *Rukh* was established at the 'Forum' of the 'Anti-Communist Anti-Imperial Front (ACAIF) in Kiev on 21 February 1993, attended by 4,000 delegates from 30 political parties and organisations.[64] Ivan Drach was persuaded out of his semi-retirement to head the ACAIF's Coordinating Council.

The limits to such a common front, however, were immediately apparent. *New Ukraine*, the PDRU and other centrist groups, however, kept their distance from the ACAIF, arguing that the threat of a communist *revanche* in Ukraine was exaggerated, and that the creation of the ACAIF would only serve to widen the gap between Western and Eastern Ukraine (although the *New Ukraine* organisations in Odesa,

Chernihiv, Donets'k and Kiev joined their local ACAIF).[65] Stepan Khmara's UCRP, rather more idiosyncratically, also refused to join, arguing that nationalists should not be uniting behind the President, when Kravchuk himself was in fact the main threat to Ukraine's independence.[66] Chornovil, meanwhile, objected to the presence of the UNA and UNSO.[67]

However, so long as the atmosphere of political crisis continued, *Rukh* and the CNDF at least were forced to work more closely together. A joint meeting of the two in March 1993 resulted in pledges to cooperate together in the face of the mounting danger from Russia, and evidence of growing public disillusion with all political forces,[68] and both supported a declaration by the Coordinating Council of the ACAIF in March calling on President Kravchuk to 'prevent the destabilisation of the situation in the whole Russian Federation....from spreading to Ukraine' by taking 'urgent measures to strengthen the state borders of Ukraine', and after 'suspending the plenary sessions [of the Supreme Council], considering the growing confrontation in Parliament', 'set up an Anti-crisis Committee under the President involving representatives of state administrations, deputies' factions, political parties and associations'.[69] Interestingly, *Rukh* had now persuaded the CNDF to support its call, however unrealistic, for the dissolution of the Supreme Council. The CNDF's opposition to new elections had previously been predicated on the national communists' loyalty to the new state, and it was therefore prepared to signal to the national communists the conditionality of their support, in so far as many former CPU Deputies now appeared to be backsliding on several crucial issues.

Conclusion

The ACAIF was unlikely to prove a permanent organisation, but it did demonstrate the potential for the consolidation of Ukraine's nationalist forces, especially under the threat of serious conflict with Russia. In the absence of such conflict, however, it seemed that the split between the CNDF and Chornovil's *Rukh* was likely to prove permanent. The split seriously weakened the nationalist camp at an inopportune moment. Chapters 2 and 4 demonstrated the cap on the level of public support reached for the nationalists in 1990-91 (around 25-33% of the population, mainly in Western and Central Ukraine), hence the split was extremely ill-timed at a time when leftist and Eastern Ukrainian groups were beginning to gain in strength.

9. CONCLUSION

The achievements of *Rukh* and the nationalist political parties in 1988-92 were considerable. They helped to push the national communists into a declaration of independence and to separate from the USSR without bloodshed. Thereafter considerable progress was made towards the consolidation of a nation-state with its own political institutions and Armed Forces.

However, these successes were not obtained by transcending the historical and regional weaknesses of the Ukrainian national movement outlined in Chapter 1, or the organisational problems of the political parties described in Chapter 2. As in other post-communist states, Ukrainian political parties continued to struggle to influence the political process. In many respects, moreover, parties were relatively weaker in Ukraine than elsewhere in Eastern Europe.

Although nationalist parties had by 1990-91 created a strong base in Western Ukraine (especially in Galicia), and amongst the intelligentsia in Kiev and other main urban centres in Central Ukraine, Chapters 1 and 2 described the geographical and social limits of the nationalists' influence. The detailed analysis of individual parties in Chapters 3-7 then confirmed this picture. Nationalism had little or no appeal in Eastern and Southern Ukraine (the most populous areas of Ukraine), and outside oblast centres and university towns in Central Ukraine (Right and Left Bank). As argued in Chapter 1, this reflected the sharp regional differences in Ukraine bequeathed by history, and the fact that the main support group for Ukrainian nationalism, the new cultural intelligentsia, was both small in numbers and geographically concentrated.

Outside of Galicia, where an entire nationalist civil society existed, Kiev and a handful of large Central Ukrainian towns, the mainstay of the nationalist movement tended to be teachers and white collar workers, who were not capable of challenging the social dominance of local ex-communist elites in the same manner as the Kiev intelligentsia. Throughout this broad swathe of Ukrainian territory, the old guard remained in place.

Apart from in Galicia, and to a lesser extent in Volyn'-Polissia, the nationalist parties had virtually no impact on the countryside. Chapter 7 described the difficulties of forming a rural nationalist party in Ukraine (the UPDP). Unlike many Central European countries, where the experience of collectivisation was much shorter, there is only a limited base for rural nationalism in Ukraine. Chapter 7 also discussed the difficulties faced by nationalists in trying to establish a Christian nationalist party in Ukraine. Unlike Catholic Lithuania or Poland, deep inter-confessional differences exist within Ukraine, and the most religious region of the country, Galicia, is strongly atypical and of a different faith, Uniate Catholicism, to the country's Orthodox majority.

Chapter 4 demonstrated that *Rukh* and the nationalist parties could not command more than 25-33% of the national vote even at the peak of their popularity in the elections and referenda of 1990-1. Moreover, Chapters 3-7 demonstrated how all nationalist parties, even the URP and DPU, remained small, even after independence, and failed to expand their support significantly in 1991-2. Most suffered from stagnant or falling membership. The work as a whole has shown how frequent squabbles and splits within this nationalist bloc were throughout this period. Chapter 6 described how even the UNA, which sought to transcend the traditionally limited appeal of Galician nationalism by organising amongst radical youth and adopting a populist programme to

attract unskilled workers disoriented by growing economic chaos, had only partial success, unlike similar xenophobic populists elsewhere in Europe (such as Meciar in Slovakia or Milosevic in Serbia). Finally, Chapter 8 described how attempts to reestablish unity within the nationalist camp in 1992 had only partial success.

It has to be pointed out therefore, that independence was due as much to the extraordinary process of imperial collapse in Gorbachev's USSR and to the role played by Kravchuk's national communist group as to the internal strengths of the national movement.[1] In this respect, Ukraine occupied the middle ground between the Baltic republics where the nationalist opposition was sufficiently powerful to take power on its own, and the Central Asian republics where local national communists easily dominated relatively weak oppositions.

From early 1991 Ukrainian politics was dominated by the interplay between three roughly equal groups: traditional communists, national communists and the nationalists. The centre group - Kravchuk's national communists - governed by maintaining alliances with one or both of the other groups. Kravchuk had one foot in both camps, that of the nationalists and the former *apparatchiki* . After independence and the formal dissolution of the CPU, the nationalists attempted to persuade Kravchuk to forge a closer alliance with them and cut his ties with the old guard, but Kravchuk was too aware of the nationalists' limited strength, and their lack of progress in 1991-2 in extending their support, especially after the implosion of *Rukh* in March 1992. Therefore, although he moved sharply to the right in 1992, Kravchuk never fully embraced the nationalists' cause. The creation of the CNDF in August 1992 represented the second attempt by pro-Presidential nationalists to persuade Kravchuk to jump ship, but it remained too

amorphous a structure to rival the resources of the ex-communist 'party of power'.

Therefore, because of the self-limiting nature of the nationalists' support, the defence of Ukrainian statehood continued to depend on the national communist group. In fact, Kravchuk's delicate balancing act between nationalists and the old guard, Russophone groups in Eastern Ukraine and a revivalist left wing became even more difficult after the summer of 1992, as the latter grew in strength; reducing the likelihood that the national communists would risk an alliance with the nationalists alone. This left the nationalists dangerously dependent on the national communists, whose commitment to the national cause had yet to be tested in a serious confrontation with Russia, or amidst a make-or-break economic crisis at home and/or the head-on collision between Western and Eastern Ukraine that economic collapse made increasingly likely. In a comparative perspective, the Soviet Union's imperial economy was centralised to an extraordinarily high degree, which made the economic costs of escape that much higher than in other cases of de-colonisation, thus making the Ukrainian nationalists' task even harder.

The work has also demonstrated how the nationalist parties were unable significantly to expand the appeal of nationalism into Eastern and Southern Ukraine in 1990-92. Most Eastern and Southern Ukrainians voted for independence for pragmatic economic reasons in 1991, and therefore Ukraine's subsequent economic collapse risked placing severe strain on their relatively tenuous loyalty to the state.

Nevertheless, the nationalist parties took their chances well in the political vacuum that developed in 1990-91, and were instrumental in forcing the CPU to split and give birth to the national communist group which led Ukraine to independence. From August 1991 until mid-1992 the conditions remained favourable for nationalist parties to set the

political agenda, as Ukraine's new leaders concentrated on building the institutions of a nation-state and charting an independent foreign and defence policy.

Thereafter Russophone and neo-socialist groups began to catch up on their late start and become politically organised. After a period of relative political quiescence in 1990-92, growing economic difficulties, the severance of ties with Russia and the rise of ethnic nationalism in Western Ukraine prompted Eastern and Southern Ukrainians to find their feet again and create their own political organisations (see Chapter 2).[2] The nationalists' failure to achieve a hegemonic position in 1990-92 bade ill for the prospects of future stability if relations with Ukraine's near 40% Russophone population were to become a serious problem, especially as the radicalisation of the nationalist camp in 1990-92 had further increased the distance between the two groups.

Because the Ukrainian national movement was well-aware of its minority position at the time it was first organising itself in 1988-9, it was widely realised that a commitment to civic nationalism was necessary to broaden its appeal outside of Western Ukraine. This lesson had in fact been learned at an earlier period, by some sections of the OUN in 1943, by the *shestydesiatnyky* movement of the 1960s, and the Helsinki movement of the 1970s. Therefore the discontinuity between the late 1980s and the militant Ukrainian nationalism of the 1930s and early 1940s was partly an illusion. Moreover, if the OUN and UPA had been largely peasant organisations confined to Western Ukraine, the national-dissident movement of the 1960s and 1970s was more broadly-based geographically, spreading to Kiev and other urban centres in Central Ukraine, whilst its leadership mainly came from the new intelligentsia that, paradoxically, was a product of Soviet socio-economic

development. The same was true of *Rukh* and the nationalist parties that began to appear in 1988-90. This early phase of the modern Ukrainian nationalist movement therefore was characterised by moderation, and a surprising degree of success in uniting Ukraine's disparate regions and ethnic groups.

However, the intelligentsia's commitment to civic nationalism began to fray at the edges with the general radicalisation of the nationalist mood in 1990-92. Many nationalists became frustrated with their failure to win outright control of the state, and with the slow pace of Ukrainianisation. Many felt that so much damage had been done to the Ukrainian language and culture in the Soviet period, that only accelerated and forcible Ukrainianisation would ensure the survival of the Ukrainians as an ethnic group.

Chapter 4 described how *Rukh* , which began its life as a 'general democratic' movement in 1989, adopted a specifically nationalist programme in 1990. Even though the fourth *Rukh* congress in December 1992 reaffirmed the movement's commitment to civic nationalism, it's programme was noticeably more radical, and *Rukh's* relatively moderate leaders were loosing ground to Valentyn Moroz's radical 'Nationalist Bloc' in the nationalist stronghold of L'viv. Moreover, *Rukh* lost many of its leading members in the summer of 1992 to the CNDF. The CNDF continued to pay lip-service to the civic principles inherited from the 1960s, but its guiding principle was 'the national character of Ukrainian statehood', and a growing sense of frustration with the national communists' failure to Ukrainianise the state.

The same sense of frustration animated both the main parties on the right, the URP and DPU. Chapters 3 and 5 described the progressive radicalisation of both parties over 1990-92. When the two parties were

founded in 1990, the URP's roots in the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, and the DPU's intelligentsia leadership and desire to function as an all-Ukrainian party were powerful forces for moderation. However, by 1992 both parties stood on a common platform of a strong, unitary national state, with a foreign and defence policy committed to the aggressive defence of national interests. The two parties were still prepared to accommodate ethnic minorities in the Ukrainian state, but were equally clear that the interests of the indigenous ethnic Ukrainian population should always be the first priority of the state. The DPU was always less of an ethnicist party than the URP, but its organisational weaknesses tended to force it to accept the URP's lead. The URP consequently tended to dominate the CNDF.

Moreover, the Ukrainian intelligentsia and the mainstream nationalist parties were unable to prevent the growth of ultra-radical parties in 1990-92 as disillusion with the established parties grew. The main such ultra-nationalist organisation was the UNA, described in Chapter 6, while its smaller rivals were covered in Chapter 7. Such groups contributed little to expanding overall levels of nationalist support, largely in fact having the opposite effect, but were able to slowly expand their influence within the nationalist camp at the expense of the more moderate parties.

As argued in Chapter 1, a key reason why civic nationalism failed to take root throughout Ukraine was that the new Ukrainian intelligentsia remained both relatively thin on the ground and unevenly distributed throughout Ukraine. The new intelligentsia was not a Western style middle-class, socially dominant because of property ownership and the control of business and the professions. Its control over its own constituency was limited to the force of moral example and cultural

prestige. Moreover, this constituency was relatively small, as in most of Eastern and Southern Ukraine, and throughout rural society (Galicia excepted) traditional ex-communist elites continued to dominate. Moreover, the conditions identified in Chapter 1 as encouraging the development of ethnic nationalism in Eastern Europe had not been fully transcended by the process of socio-economic change in Soviet Ukraine. It remained distinctly possible that inter-ethnic tension within Ukraine could dramatically increase as the economic situation deteriorated, in the event of a serious conflict between Ukraine and Russia, or if the national communists began to backtrack on their commitment to the national cause.

Footnotes to Chapter 1.

1 Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism* ,(New York: Macmillan, second edition, 1967), especially Chapters 1, 7 and 8. See also John Plamenatz, 'Two types of nationalism', in E. Kamenka (ed.), *Nationalism* , (1973); Carleton B. Hayes, *Essays on Nationalism* (New York: Macmillan, 1933); Jósef Chlebowczyk, *On Small and Young Nations in Europe: Nation-Forming Processes in Ethnic Borderlands in East-Central Europe* , (Warsaw ·: Polish Historical Library No. 1, 1980); and James G. Kellas, *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity* , (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), pp. 51-4. Anthony D. Smith also discusses the difference between "Western civic nationalism' and 'Eastern ethnic nationalism' in his *National Identity,* (London: Penguin, 1991), Chapters 1, 4 and 6.

2 Kohn (1967, op cit), p. 457.

3 Ibid, p. 329.

4 Anthony D. Smith (1991, op cit), p. 12.

5 Chlebowczyk (1980, op cit), p. 27.

6 See also Slavoj Zizek, 'Eastern Europe's Republics of Gilead', *New Left Review,* No. 183, (September/October 1990).

7 T. M. Rudnyts'ka, 'Natsional'ni hrupy i movni protsesy v Ukraïni', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , No. 5, 1991, pp. 145-55. Table 2.

8 Serhii Tsapok, 'Enhvo-linhvistychna sytuatsiia v Ukraïni', *Slovo* , No. 22 (December) 1991.

9 See Paul Robert Magocsi, *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographical Guide* , (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983) and his 'A Subordinate Or Submerged People: The Ukrainians of Galicia Under Habsburg and Soviet Rule', in Richard L. Rudolph and David F. Good (eds.), *Nationalism and Empire: The Habsburg Empire and the Soviet Union* , (New York: St Martin's Press / Centre for Austrian Studies, 1992), pp. 95-108; Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 'The Ukrainians in Galicia Under Austrian Rule', in his *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), pp. 315-52; Christine D. Worobec, ' "Galicians into Ukrainians": Ukrainian Nationalism Penetrates Nineteenth Century Rural Austrian Galicia', *Peasant Studies* , Vol. 16, No. 3 (Spring 1989), pp. 200-9; and John-Paul Himka, *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century* , (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988). Worobec's article is a review of Himka's book. Andrei S. Markovits and Frank E. Sysyn (eds.), *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia* , (Harvard: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982) collects many of the above essays amongst other contributions.

10 Unpublished information from *Natsional'nyi sostav naseleniia SSSR, po dannykh vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1989 g* . In author's possession. As with all subsequent calculations from the census.

11 Serhii Tsapok, 'Enhvo-linhvistychna sytuatsiia v Ukraïni', *Slovo* , No. 22 (December) 1991. All other linguistic data are from this source.

12 On Transcarpathia and the Ukrainian / Rusyn controversy, see Paul Robert Magosci, *The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus' 1848-1948* , (London: Harvard University Press, 1978) for the Rusyns' point of view, and Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 'Carpatho-Ukraine: A People in Search of Their History', in his *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), pp. 353-73 for the Ukrainian point of view. For recent developments, see Alfred A. Reisch, 'Transcarpathia's Hungarians and the Autonomy Issue', and "Transcarpathia and its Neighbours', in *RFE/RL Research Report* , 7 & 14 February 1992 respectively.

13 See Ivan Banat, 'Politychnyi rusynizm: korinnia i parostky', *Trybuna* No. 1, 1992, pp. 21-2, and Yurii Baleha, 'Rusynstvo: ideolohy i pokrovyteli', *Dzvin* , No. 5 (May) 1991, pp. 96-102. For a Ukrainian nationalist point of view, see Fedir Myshanych, 'Zakhystyty Zakarpattia', *Respublikanets'* , (Journal of the L'viv URP) No. 2 (November-December), 1991, pp. 41-4.

[14] Alfred A . Reisch, "Transcarpathia and its Neighbours', *RFE/RL Research Report* , 7 February 1992, p. 18. Cf the claim by the Hungarian consulate in Kiev that Transcarpathia's population in fact consists of 200,000 Hungarians, 800,000 Rusyns, 40,000-50,000 Romanians, and 125,000 Ukrainians, *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 11 October 1991.

[15] See I. M. Nowosiwsky, *Bukovinan Ukrainians: A Historical Background. Their Self-Determination in 1918* , (New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1970), and Vladmir Socor, 'Moldovian Lands Between Romania and Ukraine: The Historical and Political Geography', *Report on the USSR* , RL 473/90, 16 November 1990.

[16] See Roman Szporluk, 'Urbanisation in Ukraine Since the Second World War', in Ivan L. Rudnytsky (ed.) *Rethinking Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1981).

[17] It is here assumed that assimilation can occur at many levels. Use of Russian as one's native language may well, but not necessarily, also lead to assimilation to Russian culture. It will be difficult, but not impossible, for the assimilated at whatever level to identify with a Ukrainian state. See Dmytro Vydrin, 'Rosiiany v Ukraïni: pid chas referendumu, do i pisliia', *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 1, 1992, pp. 237-249.

[18] On the history of Odesa and Southern Ukraine in general, see Patricia Herlihy, *Odessa: A History 1794-1914* , (Harvard: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1986).

[19] Source: V. Popovkin, 'Rehional'na polityka suverennoï Ukraïny', *Ekonomika Radians'koï Ukraïny* , No. 8 (August), 1991, pp. 34-43. From Table 1 on p. 41.

[20] See John McGarry and Brendan O'Leary, 'The Political Regulation of National and Ethnic Conflict', in their *The Politics of Ethnic Conflict Regulation* , (London: Routledge, 1993).

[21] On Ukrainian political parties in the early twentieth century see Oleksandr Fed'kov (ed.), *Samostiina Ukraïna: Zbirnik prohram Ukraïns'kykh politychnykh partii pochatku XX stolittia* , (Ternopil': Redaktsiino-vydavnychnyi viddil upravlinnia po presi, 1991); V. S. Zhuravs'kyi (ed.), *Bahatopartiina Ukraïns'ka derzhava na pochatku XX st. Prohramni dokumenty pershykh Ukraïns'kykh politychnykh partii* , (Kiev: Poshuk, 1992); V. A. Potul'nyts'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïns'koï politolohiï* , (Kiev: Lybid', 1992); Taras Hunchak and Roman Sol'chanyk (eds.), *Ukraïns'ka suspil'no politychna dumka v 20 stolitti: Dokumenty i materialy* , (Munich: Suchasnist', 1983), esp Vol. 1: and V. F. Zhmyr, D. B. Yanevs'kyi, D. Tabachnyk and V. Rybchuk, 'Problema bahatopartiinosti', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , Nos. 9 & 10, 1990, pp. 3-17 & 17-36 respectively.

[22] In Kiev, for example, the Ukrainian parties only received 21.4% of the vote in the Summer 1917 City Duma elections, and only 26% in the November 1917 Constituent Assembly elections. See George Liber, 'Ukrainian Nationalism and the 1918 Law on National-Personal Autonomy', *Nationalities Papers* , Vol. 15, No. 1, (Spring 1987), pp. 22-42. On the divisions between and within the political parties, see Rudolf A. Mark, 'Social Questions and National Revolution: The Ukrainian National Republic in 1919-20', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 14, Nos, 1/2 (June 1990), pp. 113-31.

[23] George Liber, 'Ukrainian Nationalism...', (1987, op cit).

[24] On the Jewish question in Ukraine, see Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster (eds.), *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988); and *Jewish-Ukrainian Relations: Two Solitudes* , (Oakville: Mosaic Press, 1983); and T. Hunczak, *Symon Petliura and the Jews: A Reappraisal* , (Toronto: Ukrainian Historical Association, 1985).

[25] On the history of the 1917-21 period in Ukraine, see Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History* , (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), Chapters 18 and 19; J. Borys, *The Sovietisation of Ukraine 1917-1923* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980); Geoff Ely, 'Remapping the Nation: War, Revolutionary Upheaval and State Formation in Eastern Europe, 1914-1923', Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster (eds.), *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988); Richard Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and Nationalism 1917-1923* , (Cambridge, Mass: HUP 1954); J. Reshetar, *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917-1920: A Study in Nationalism* , (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953);

, T. Hunczak (ed.), *The Ukraine, 1917-21: A Study in Revolution* , (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard, Ukrainian Research Institute, 1977).

26 V. S. Zhuravs'kyi (ed.), *Bahatopartiina Ukraïns'ka derzhava na pochatku XX st.* (Kiev: 1992, op cit), p. 13. Zhmyr and Yanevs'kyi in *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , No. 9, 1990, (op cit) estimate 75,000 - 350,000.

27 George O. Liber, (1992, op cit), p. 17.

28 Taras Hunchak and Roman Sol'chanyk (eds.), *Ukraïns'ka suspil'no politychna dumka v 20 stolitti: Dokumenty i materialy* , Vol. 1, (Munich: 1983, op cit), pp. 61-72.

29 *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , No. 9, 1990 (op cit), p.4. On the RUP-USDWP, see Georgii Kas'ianov, 'Ukraïns'kyi sotsializm: liudy, partiï, ideï (pochatok XX storichchia)', *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 2, 1992, pp. 101-114.

30 *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , No. 10, 1990, (op cit), pp. 17, 18, 28 & 29.

31 Ibid, p. 17. Orest Subtelny cites a much lower figure of 4,364 Bolsheviks in Ukraine as of July 1918, *Ukraïna - istoriia* , (Kiev: Lybid', 1991), p. 318.

32 On the intellectual origins of the OUN see Alexander J. Motyl, *The Turn to the Right: The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism 1919-1929*, (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1980).

33 Dontsov's two main works are *Natsionalizm* , written in 1926 (London: Ukraïns'ka vydavnycha spilka, third edition, 1966); and *Dukh nashoï davnyny* , written in 1944 (Munich: Vidrodzhennia, second edition, 1951). For commentaries on his work, see M. Sosnovs'kyi, *Dmytro Dontsov: politychnyi portret* , (New York: Trident International, 1974); V. S. Lisovyi, 'Drahomanov i Dontsov', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiologichna dumka* , No. 9, 1991, pp. 83-101; and Mykola Tomenko, 'Politychni pohliady Mykhaila Drahomanova ta Dmytra Dontsova', *Slovo* , No. 21 (December) 1991. For the general intellectual climate of the time, see Taras Hunchak, 'Ukraïns'ka politychna dumka 1920-ykh rokiv: monarkhizm, natsionalizm, natsional-komunizm', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 20 June 1991, and Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 'Trends in Ukrainian Political Thought', in his *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), pp. 91-122.

34 M. Sosnovs'kyi, *Dmytro Dontsov: Politychnyi portret* , (1974, op cit), pp. 232-38.

35 See P. Potichnyj and Y. Shtendera, *Political Thought of the Ukrainian Underground 1943-51* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986).

36 See the following works on the OUN-UPA; John A. Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism* , (Englewood, Colarado: Ukrainian Academic Press, second edition, 1990); and his 'The Chronicle of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 14, No. 1/12 (June 1990), pp. 171-75; Yaroslav Bilinsky, *The Second Soviet Republic: The Ukraine After World War II* , (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1964), and *Bol'shevizm i vyzvol'na borot'ba* , (London: Zakordonna chastyna OUN, 1957); Yurii Boshyk (ed.), *Ukraine During World War Two: History and its Aftermath* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986), pp. 61-104; Stepan Horak, *Poland and her National Minorities* , (New York: Vantage, 1961); Yurii Krokhmaliuk, *UPA Warfare in Ukraine* , (New York: Society of Veterans of Ukrainian Insurgent Army, 1972); Volodymyr Kubiovyc, *Western Ukraine Within Poland, 1920-1939* , (Chicago: Ukrainian Research and Information Institute, 1963); Mykola Lebed', *Ukraïns'ka Povstans'ka Armiia* , (Munich: Vydavnytstvo UHVR, 1946); David R. Marples, *Stalinism in Ukraine in the 1940s* , (London: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 72-9; Petro Mirchuk, *Ukraïns'ka Povstans'ka Armiia, 1942-1952* , (Munich: Cicero, 1953, reprinted in the *Rukh* paper *Narodna hazeta* , No. 20-21, December 1991) and *Narys istoriï OUN 1920-1939* , (Munich: Ukraïns'ke vydavnytstvo, 1968); Andrii Mykulyn, *OUN v svitli postanov velykykh zboriv, konferenstiv ta inshykh dokumentiv z borot'by 1929-1955 r* , (London: Zakordonna chastyna OUN, 1955); the debate in *Pravda Ukrainy* , 9-18 August 1989; Petro Poltava, *Zbirnik pidpil'nykh pysan'* , (Munich: Ukraïns'kyi samostiinyk, 1959); B.F. Sabrin, *Alliance for Murder: The Nazi-Ukrainian Nationalist Patrnership in Genocide* , (New York: Sarpedon/ Shapolsky, 1991); and Y. T. Tsokh, *The Ukrainian Insurgent Army in Fight for Freedom* , (New York: United Committee of Ukrainian American Associations, 1954). As much of the above is polemical, Armstong's book is still the best study.

[37] David R. Marples, *Stalinism in Ukraine in the 1940s*, (London: Macmillan, 1992), p. 58.

[38] Taras Kuzio, 'OUN v Ukraïni. Dmytro Dontsov i zakordonna chastyna OUN', *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu*, Nos. 59 & 60, 1991; and 'Panorama politychnykh partii ta orhanizatsii Ukraïns'koï emihratsii' *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu*, 3 October 1991. See also John A. Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism*, (1990, op cit).

[39] On the struggle between different conceptions of the Ukrainian past, see Kenneth C. Farmer, *Ukrainian Nationalism in the Post-Stalin Era: Myths, Symbols and Ideology in Soviet Nationality Policy*, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980); and his 'Politics and Culture in the Ukraine in the Post-Stalin Era', in *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US*, Vol. XIV, No. 37-8 (1978-80), pp. 180-208, which makes many of the same points; Frank Sysyn, 'The Reemergence of the Ukrainian Nation and Cossack Mythology', *Social Research*, Vol. 58, No. 4 (Winter 1991), pp. 845-64; and Bohdan Krawchenko, 'National Memory in Ukraine: The Role of the Blue and Yellow Flag', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Summer 1990), pp. 1-21.

[40] The view that, (in the early 1990s) Ukrainian society remains amorphous and ill-defined, and the structures of civil society rudimentary, is fairly commonplace, although the implications of this for supporting a truly civic nationalism are not often drawn. See for example, Valerii Bebyk, 'Nasha politychna kul'tura', *Politolohichni chytannia*, No. 1, 1992, pp. 6-23; Volodymyr Shynkaruk, 'Hromadians'ke suspil'stvo i hromadians'ka pozytsiia', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka*, No. 5 (May) 1991, pp. 3-10; and the round-table discussion 'Nova Ukraïna - kudy ity?', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka*, Nos. 3 and 4 (March and April) 1992, pp. 3-25 and 24-44.

[41] Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of a National Revival in Europe*, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 129.

[42] For the concept of 'renewal nationalism', see Anthony D. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism*, (London: Duckworth, 1971), p. 224.

[43] Martin Malia, 'What is the intelligentsia?', Richard Pipes (ed.), *The Russian Intelligentsia*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), pp. 1-18. The quote is from p. 5.

[44] *Ukraïns'ka RSR u tsyfrakh u 1990 rotsi - derzhavnyi komitet Ukraïns'koï RSR po statystytsi*, (Kiev: Tekhinika, 1991), p. 22.

[45] Ibid, p. 33.

[46] Ibid, p. 36. Y. A. Kurnusov, 'The Ukrainian Intelligentsia: The Process of Formation and Development', *East European Quarterly*, Vol. XXIV, No. 2, (Summer 1990) uses the same definition.

[47] Richard Pipes, 'The Historical Evolution of the Russian Intelligentsia', in his (ed.) *The Russian Intelligentsia*, (1961, op cit), pp. 47-62. The quote is from p. 51.

[48] Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Revival*, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 108 & 109.

[49] Richard Pipes (ed.), *The Russian Intelligentsia*, (1961, op cit), p???

[50] Compare L. M. Drobizheva's classification in 'The role of the intelligentsia in developing national consciousness among the peoples of the USSR under *perestroika*', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Special Issue: National identity in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union Vol. 14, No. 1 (January 1991), pp. 87-99.

[51] Ernest Gellner, *Thought and Change*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1964), Chapter 7; *Nations and Nationalism*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 'Nationalism in the Vacuum', in Alexander J. Motyl (ed.), *Thinking Theoretically About Soviet Nationalities: History and Comparison in the Study of the USSR*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), pp. 243-54.

[52] J. Hutchinson, *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism*, (London: Allen and Unwin, 1987).

[53] See the views of V. A. Tishkov in notes 83 and 84 below.

[54] E. Kedourie (ed.), *Nationalism in Asia and Africa*, (London: Wiedenfeld and Nicholson, 1971), especially his introduction. John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982), also argues that nationalist movements are instrumentally

manipulated by outsider elites for the purpose of capturing state power and employment, but he does not argue that such elites are always from the intelligentsia. Kedourie also suggests that such elites are unlikely to believe their own rhetoric.

55 Bohdan Krawchenko is the most famous exponent of such an approach. See his *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth Century Ukraine* , (Oxford: St. Anthony's/ Macmillan, 1985); 'The Impact of Industrialisation on the Social Structure of Ukraine', *Canadian Slavonic Papers* , Vol. XXII, No. 2 (September 1980), pp. 338-57; 'Changes in the National and Social Composition of the Communist Party of Ukraine from the Revolution to 1976', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 9, No. 1 (Summer 1984), pp. 33-54. A similar approach is taken by Wsevolod Isajiw's 'Urban Migration and Social Change in Contemporary Soviet Ukraine', *Canadian Slavonic Papers* , Vol. XXII, No. 1 (March 1980), pp. 58-86.

56 Bohdan Krawchenko, 'The Social Structure of Ukraine at the Turn of the Twentieth Century', *East European Quarterly* , Vol. XVI, No. 2 (June 1982), pp. 171-81; 'The Social Structure of Ukraine in 1917', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. XIV, No. 1/2 (June 1990), pp. 97-112. Cf Steven Guthier, 'The Popular Basis of Ukrainian Nationalism in 1917', *Slavic Review* , Vol. 38, No. 1 (March 1979); and George O. Liber, (1992, op cit), pp. 11-25.

57 H. V. Kas'ianov and V. M. Danylenko, *Stalinizm i Ukraïns'ka inteligentsiia (20-30-i roky)* , (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1991); George O. Liber, (1992, op cit); and the serialised article by Yu. Shapovyl, 'Stalinizm i Ukraïna', *Ukraïns'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* , 1990 and 1991, *passim* .

58 Karl Deutsch, *Nationalism and Social Communication* , (New York: MIT Press, second edition, 1966), Chapter 6.

59 For a criticism of the 'cultural division of labour' argument, see Alexander Motyl,*Will the Non-Russians Rebel?* ,(1987, op cit), pp. 103-4; and *Sovietology, Rationality, Nationality* , (1990, op cit), Chapter 10.

60 *Natsional'nyi sostav naseleniia SSSR, po dannykh vsesoiuznoi perepisi naseleniia 1959 i 1989 g.*,(Moscow: Finansy i statistika).

61 Paul R. Brass, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparison* , (London: Sage Publications Inc, 1991), p. 47.

62 See for example Ivan Dziuba's plea for a return to 'Leninist nationalities policy' in his *Internationalism or Russification?* , (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1968); Viacheslav Chornovil's dissident profiles in *The Chornovil Papers* , (New York: McGraw Hill, 1968); and Osyp Zinkewych (ed.), *Ukraïns'ka hel'sins'ka hrupa, 1978-1982: Dokumenty i materiialy* , (Toronto: Smoloskyp Inc, 1983).

63 Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* , (London: Penguin, 1991), p. 91.

64 Ibid, p. 25.

65 Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* , (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), p. 15. See also John A. Armstrong, *Nations Before Nationalism* , (North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).

66 Paul R. Brass, 'Ethnic Groups and Nationalities: The Formation, Persistence and Transformation of Ethnic Identities', in P. F. Sugar (ed.), *Ethnic Diversity and Conflict in Eastern Europe* , (Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio, 1980), p. 5. See also Brass's *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparison* , (1991, op cit).

67 Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* , (London: Penguin, 1991), p. 123.

68 Anthony D. Smith, 'Ethnic Identity and Territorial Nationalism in Comparative Perspective', in Alexander J. Motyl, *Thinking Theoretically About Soviet Nationalities* , (1992, op cit), pp. 45-65.

69 See also Fredrick Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organisation of Cultural Difference* , (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1969).

70 Alexander J. Motyl, *Sovietology, Rationality, Nationality* , (1990, op cit), p. 178.

71 See Alexander J. Motyl, *Will the Non-Russians Rebel? State, Ethnicity and Stability in the USSR* , (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987) for the impossibility of 'renewal nationalism' under neo-totalitarian regimes; and his *Sovietology, Rationality, Nationality: Coming to Grips*

with Nationalism in the USSR , (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990) for its growing feasibility as the central Soviet state collapsed.

[72] Compare Antonio Gramsci's famous remark that 'In Russia the state was everything, civil society was primordial and gelatinous; in the West, there was a proper relation between State and civil society, and when the State trembled a sturdy structure of civil society was revealed.' Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith (eds.), *Selections From The Prison Notebooks Of Antonio Gramsci* , (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), p. 238.

[73] Mykhailo Horyn"s speech at the Congress of National Democratic Forces, 2 August 1992, in *Samostiina Ukraïna* , (or 'Independent Ukraine', the main Ukrainian Republican Party newspaper), No. 31, (August) 1992, p. 2.

[74] Larysa Skoryk, speech to the first congress of the Congress of National-Democratic Forces, 2 August 1992, *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, p. 5.

[75] Anthony D. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism* , (London: Duckworth, 1971), p. 224.

[76] Ibid, pp. 224-5.

[77] James E. Mace, *Communism and the Dilemmas of National Liberation: National Communism in Soviet Ukraine, 1918-1933* , (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983); and George O. Liber, *Soviet nationality policy, urban growth and identity change in the Ukrainian SSR, 1923-1934* , (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992). See also Ephraim Nimni, *Marxism and Nationalism: Theoretical Origins of a Political Crisis* , (London: Pluto Press, 1991), Chapters 6 and 7, on Bauer's philosophy.

[78] Literally, *korenisatsiia* means 'the putting down of roots', and was the term used by the Soviet leadership in the 1920s to describe their strategy for increasing the legitimacy of communist party leadership in the non-Russian republics through indigenisation.

[79] The CPU (from 1918 to 1952, the Communist party [Bolshevik] of Ukraine) was always a constituent part of the broader CPSU, even after the CPU adopted its own programme in 1990. The term 'CPU' only really referred to those members of the CPSU who were resident in the Ukrainian SSR, but as the CPU always had its own congresses and leadership it is referred to as if it were a separate entity. On the history of the CPU, see S. O. Vasyl'chenko (ed.), *Storinky istoriï Kompartiï Ukraïny: zapytannia i vidpovidi* , (Kiev: Lybid', 1990); and Ivan Maistrenko, *Istoriia komunistychnoï partiï Ukraïny* , (Munich: Suchasnist', 1979).

[80] Source: S. O. Vasyl'chenko (ed.), *Storinky istoriï Kompartiï Ukraïny...*, (1990, op cit), pp. 484-5, and Bohdan Krawchenko, 'Changes in the National and Social Composition of the Communist Party of Ukraine From the Revolution to 1976', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 9, No.1 (Summer 1984), pp. 33-54.

[81] Source: *Storinky*..... op cit, pp. 482-3. As of January 1st each year, save 1918 (July). The figures include both full and candidate members. Krawchenko, 1984, op cit, gives marginally different figures for 1918 (5,000 in October; p. 36), 1922 (56,000; p. 36), and 1940 (680,000; p. 45). However, the 1940 figure and others are not necessarily from January 1st.

[82] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 17 June 1991 cited a decline in CPU membership to 2.5 million on the eve of the August 1991 coup attempt.

[83] Krawchenko, 1984, op cit, p. 49.

[84] V. A. Tishkov, 'O novykh podkhodakh v teorii i praktike mezhnatsional'nykh otnoshenii', *Sovietskaia etnografiia* , 1989, No. 5 (September-October), pp. 3-14. See also his 'Inventions and Manifestations of Ethno-Nationalism in and After the Soviet Union', in Kumar Rupesinghe et al (eds.) *Ethnicity and Conflict in a Post-Communist World: The Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China* , (London: Macmillan & New York: St Martin's Press, 1992), pp. 41-65; and 'Ethnicity and Power in the Republics of the USSR', *Journal of Soviet Nationalities* , Vol. 1, No. 3 (Fall 1990), pp. 33-66.

[85] Tishkov, (1989), op cit, p. 10. His reference is to Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* , (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983). Compare Eric Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* , (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality* , (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990); and Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* , (London: Verso, 1983).

[86] On the tendency of the Soviet federal state to generate national communism, see Motyl (1990), op cit, Chapters 5 & 6; Steven L. Burg, 'Nationality Elites and Political Change in the Soviet Union', in L. Hajda and M. Beissinger (eds), *The Nationalities Factor in Soviet Politics and Society* , (Boulder: Westview Press, 1990); and M. Beissinger, 'Ethnicity, the Personnel Weapon, and Neo-Imperial Integration: Ukrainian and RSFSR Provincial Party Officials Compared', *Studies in Comparative Communism* , Vol. XXI, No. 1 (Spring 1988), pp. 71-85.

[87] On the problems that an empire faces with such local elites, see Alexander J. Motyl, 'From Imperial Decay to Imperial Collapse: The Fall of the Soviet Empire in Comparative Perspective', in Richard L. Rudolph and David F. Good (eds.), *Nationalism and Empire: The Habsburg Empire and the Soviet Union* , (New York: St Martin's Press / Centre for Austrian Studies, 1992), pp. 15-43. See also Gregory Gleason, 'On the Bureaucratic Reinforcement of Nationalism in the USSR', *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* , Vol. 19, No. 1-2 (1992), pp. 43-58.

[88] For a general study of Soviet federalism, see Gregory Gleason, *Federalism and Nationalism: The Struggle for Republican Rights in the USSR* , (Boulder: Westview Press, 1990).

[89] See for example Bohdan Nahaylo and Victor Swoboda, *Soviet Disunion: A History of the Nationalities Problem in the USSR* , (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1990).

[90] On mobilisation and modernisation, see .
C. Black et al (eds.), *The Modernisation of Japan and Russia: A Comparative Study* ('New York: The Free Press 1975).

[91] On the concept of 'penetration' and 'participation' crises, see Leonard Binder (ed.), *Crises and Sequences in Political Development* , (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971).

[92] See V. A. Tishkov, 'Et nichnost' i vlast' v SSSR (etnopoliticheskiĭ analiz respublikanskikh organov vlasti)', *Sovietskaia etnografiia* , 1991, No. 3 (May-June), pp.3-18.

[93] Oleksii Redchenko, 'Hotuimo sany vlitku (rozdumy nad tsyframy)' *Narodna hazeta* , No. 12 (April) 1992, p. 2. See also V. V. Popovych, 'Referendum SRSR i politychni oriientatsiï naselennia Ukraïny', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , No. 9 (September) 1991, pp. 10-21.

[94] During fieldwork carried out on 5-13 September 63%, and in early October 71% said they would support independence, *Holos Ukraïny* , 1 November 1991. On 18-24 October, 84.3%, *Holos Ukraïny* , 13 November 1991; and on 10-15 November 87.6%, *Holos Ukraïny* , 23 November 1991.

[95] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 20, (May) 1992.

[96] On the developing views of Leonid Kravchuk, see the collection of his speeches and interviews from 1991-2, edited as Leonid Kravchuk, *Ie taka derzhava - Ukraïna! Materialy z vystupiv, interv"iu, pres-konferentsii, bryfingiv, vidpovidei na zapytannia* , (Kiev: Globus, 1992).

Notes to Chapter 2.

[1] Giovanni Sartori, *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis, Vol. 1*, (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 47.

[2] Ibid, pp. 39 & 44.

[3] Ibid, Section 7.2.

[4] For the history of the CPU, see *Storinky istoriï Kompartiï Ukraïny: zapytannia i vidpovidi*, (Kiev: Lybid / Instytut politychnykh doslidzhen', 1990); and Ivan Maistrenko, *Istoriia komunistychnoï partiï Ukraïny*, (Munich: Suchasnist', 1979).

[5] On opposition groups in the late 1950s and 1960s, see Julian Birch, *The Ukrainian Nationalist Movement in the USSR Since 1956*, (London: Ukrainian Information Service, 1971). On the Ukrainian National Front in particular, see Nina Strokata, 'Ukraïns'kyi natsional'nyi front, 1962?-1967', *Suchasnist'*, (June 1985), pp. 67-75.

[6] On Shelest and his successor Shcherbyts'kyi, see Taras Kuzio and Andrew Wilson, *Ukraine: Perestroika to Independence*, (London: Macmillan, 1993), Chapter 3. V. P. Salel'iev's 'Chy buv P. Yu. Shelest vyraznykom Ukraïns'koho avtonomizmu?', *Ukraïns'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, No. 4 (April) 1991, pp. 94-105 provides an interesting reappraisal of Shelest.

[7] For a theoretical discussion of the possibilities for oppositional collective action against the state, see Alexander J. Motyl, *Will the Non-Russians Rebel? State, Ethnicity and Stability in the USSR*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987); and *Sovietology, Rationality, Nationality: Coming to Grips with Nationalism in the USSR*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991).

[8] See Bohdan Nahaylo, 'Informal Ukrainian Culturological Club Helps to Break New Ground for *Glasnost'* '; and ' "Informal" Ukrainian Culturological Club Under Attack', *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 57/88, 8 February 1988 & RL 477/87, 23 November 1987 respectively. Oles Shevchenko, later a Ukrainian Republican Party People's Deputy, was a leading figure in the Club.

[9] See M. Drohobychy, 'The Lion Society: Profile of a Ukrainian Patriotic "Informal" Group', *Radio Liberty Reserach*, RL 325/88, 18 July 1988.

[10] Bohdan Nahaylo, 'Ukrainian Association of Independent Creative Intelligentsia Formed', *Radio Liberty Research*, RL 489/87, 25 November 1987.

[11] See the article 'Kyïvs'ki neformaly: khto vony?', *Vechirnii Kyïv*, 2 September 1989.

[12] On Hel"s group, see Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, 'The Ukrainian Catholic Church in the USSR Under Gorbachev', *Problems of Communism*, Vol. 39, No. 6 (November-December) 1990, pp. 1-19.

[13] On the early years of *Zelenyi svit*, see David R. Marples, 'The Greening of Ukraine: Ecology and the Emergence of *Zelenyi svit*, 1986-90', in Judith B. Sedaitis and Jim Butterfield (eds.) *Perestroika from Below: Social Movements in the Soviet Union*, (Boulder: Westview Press, 1992), pp. 133-44; and his *Ukraine Under Perestroika: Ecology, Economics and the Workers' Revolt*, (London: Macmillan, 1991), Chapter 5. See also V. Lytvyn, 'Acotsiatsiia "zelenyi svit" i partiia zelenykh Ukraïny', *Polityka i chas*, No.9 (June) 1991, pp. 53-7.

[14] *Lenins'ka molod'*, 31 December 1988.

[15] *Pravda Ukrainy*, 12 February 1989. See also Bohdan Nahaylo, 'Inaugural Congress of Ukrainian Language Society Turns Into Major Political Demonstration', *Report on the USSR*, RL 103/89, 13 February 1989.

[16] David Marples, 'The Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society: An Interview with Dmytro Pavlychko', *Report on the USSR*, RL 340/89, 29 June 1989.

[17] As illustrated by the nationalist People's Deputy Mykola Porovs'kyi's comment at the Republian Party's founding congress that 'the majority of you were [also] present in this very hall at the founding congress of the Ukrainian Language Society',

Ustanovchyi z'ïzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï , (Kiev: RUKHinform, 1990), p. 34.

[18] *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 5 March 1989.

[19] See Roman Solchanyk, 'Democratic Front to Promote Perestroika Formed in Ukraine', *Radio Liberty Research* , RL 324/88, 17 July 1988, and Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina: prohramni dokumenty novykh partii* , (Kiev: Pam'iatky Ukraïny, 1991), pp. 6-7.

[20] Sartori, 1976, op cit, Section 7.3, pp. 230-8.

[21] Angelo Panebianco, *Political Parties: Organisation and Power* , (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988), Part II, Chapter 4.

[22] See 'Narodna rada v parlamenti Ukraïny', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 14 June 1990, and ibid, 28 June 1990.

[23] On the development of a multi-party system in Ukraine, see Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (1991, op cit), especially the introductory essay on pp. 5-28, and *Vid stvorennia Rukhu do bahatopartiinosti* , (Kiev: Znannia, seriia 1 "chas", No. 1, 1992); A. H. Sliusarenko & M. V. Tomenko, *Novi politychni partiï Ukraïny* , (Kiev: Znannia, seriia 1 "chas i suspil'stvo", No. 12, 1990) and their 'Sproba klasyfikatsiï politychnukh partii Ukraïny', in *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 1, 1992, pp. 102-9; Volydymyr Lytvyn, 'Pro suchasni Ukraïns'ki partiï, ïkhnikh prykhyl'nykiv ta lideriv', also in *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 1, 1992, pp. 62-101; *Suchasni politychni partiï ta rukhy na Ukraïni* , (Kiev: Instytut politychnykh doslidzhen', 1991); V. Lytvyn, 'Novi orientyry novykh partiï', *Polityka i chas* , No. 12 (August), 1991, pp. 47-55; and, in English, Peter J. Potichnyi, *The Multi-Party System in Ukraine* , (Cologne: Berichte des Bundesinstituts für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studien, No.3, 1992).

[24] See David Marples, 'The Ukrainian Election Campaign: The Opposition', *Report on the USSR* , RL 115/90, 9 March 1990; and *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 22 February 1990.

[25] With all the main political parties, their staute and programme can be found in Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (1991, op cit). On the GPU see V. Lytvyn, 'Asotsiatsiia "Zelenyi svit" i partiia zelenykh Ukraïny', *Polityka i chas* , No. 9 (June) 1991, pp. 53-7; and the party's paper *Zelenyi svit , passim.* On the GPU's first congress see *Molod' Ukraïny* , 30 September 1990, *Sils'ki visti* , 3 October 1990 and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 20 September 1990. On the GPU's second congress in June 1991 in Ternopil' see *Zelenyi svit* , No. 9 (July) 1991. Mykola Sappa, Nataliia Pakhomova, and Tetiana Lykholit's article '"Zelenyi rukh" Ukraïny ochyma uchasnykiv i sotsioloha', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , No. 10 (October) 1991, pp. 18-24 provides a sociological analysis of the Ukrainian Green movement.

[26] On the SDPU and USDPU in general, see V. Lytvyn, 'Suchasni sotsial-demokratychni partiï Ukraïny', *Polityka i chas* , No. 8 (June) 1991, pp. 44-9. On the first congress, see *Molod' Ukraïny* , 28 August 1990; *Moloda Halychyna* , 12 July 1990; and *Zelenyi svit* , No. 4, 1990. On the SDPU alone see *Osvita* , 15 February 1991, and on the USDPU see *Moloda Halychyna* , 12 March 1991. The SDPU published (irregularly) *Sotsial-demokrat Ukraïny* and *Kyïvs'kyi sotsial-demokrat* . The latter desribes the SDPU's second congress in October 1991 in Donets'k in issue No. 2 (December) 1991, p. 6. Moves towards reunion began at the third congress of the SDPU in May 1992, and at the fourth congress in November 1992, - see *Moloda Halychyna* , 30 May 1992, and *Kreshchatyk* , 2 December 1992.

[27] *Pravda Ukrainy* , 14 September 1991.

[28] *Zelenyi svit* , No. 5 (April) 1991, p. 1.

[29] On the Democratic Platform (DP) in Ukraine, see the article by Oleksa Haran', 'Vid marksystiv do anarkhistiv...', *Moloda hvardiia* , 29 July 1990; *Halychyna* , 1 June 1990; *Moloda Halychyna* , 10 July 1990; and the group's informational

bulletin published from 1990-1, *Demokratychnyi vybir* , *passim*. For the DP's programme before the 28th party congress and for its declarations after, see *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 3 June 1990, and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 3 July 1990. See also the interviews with Volodymyr Filenko in *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 1 December 1990, and with Valerii Khmel'ko in *Molod' Ukraïny* , 1 November 1990.

[30] Kharkiv contains a higher proportion of relatively modern military industry than the Donbas, and is also home to a large number of technical colleges (23, as opposed to 18 in Kiev and 5 in Donets'k).

[31] *Demokratychnyl vybir* , No. 11, 1991, p. 1. Fourteen out of 20 of the PDRU's members were from East Ukraine; 5 from Kharkiv oblast, - Ivan Balenia, Vladimir Griniov, Valerii Meshcheriakov, Volodymyr Usatenko, and Volodymyr Filenko; 4 from Dnipropetrovs'k, - Mykhailo Bairaka, Yurii Serebianikov, Volodymyr Smetanin, and Oleksandr Shekhovtsov; 3 from Zaporizhzhia, - Leonid Bilyi, Serhii Sobolev, and Volodymyr Shevchenko; and 2 from Donets'k, - Viktor Husev and Gennadii Masliuk (names are Ukrainianised where national origin is uncertain). The other 6 were Volodymyr Panchenko and Viktor Shishkin from Kirovohrad; Oleksandr Yemets' from Kiev; Oleksandr Borobiov from Sumy; Taras Stets'kiv from L'viv; and Volodymyr Yasyns'kyi, unknown. The 16 sympathisers more evenly represented Ukraine, although 5 were from Kiev; - Mykola Dziuba, Ivan Kapshtyk, Vitalii Karpenko, Volodymyr Kryzhanivs'kyi, and Oleksandr Nechyporenko. Four were from South Ukraine; - Borys Zadorozhnyi from Mariupol', Anatolii Kinakh from Mykolaïv, Anatolii Pulinets' from Kherson, and Yurii Mazur from Odesa. Three more were from Donets'k; - Vasyl' Vasyl'ev, Oleksandr Spas'kyi, and Oleksandr Charodeiev. Yevhen Kushnar'ov was from Kharkiv; Mykola Mel'nyk and Anatolii Savchuk from Vinnytsia; and Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi from L'viv.

[32] On the PDRU's first congress, see *Partiia demokraticheskogo vozrodzhdeniia Ukrainy - materialy uchreditel'nogo s"ezda* , (Kiev: UkrNIINTI, 1991); *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 13 December 1990; *Molod' Ukraïny* , 4 December 1990; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 11 December 1990. On the PDRU in general, see V. Lytvyn, 'Partiia demokraticheskogo vozrozhdeniia Ukrainy', *Politika i vremia* , No. 1 (January) 1991, pp. 84-6.

[33] On the founding congress of the SPU see *Holos Ukraïny* , 30 October 1992, and *Materialy ustanovchoho z"izdu SPU* , (Kiev: Myronivs'ka drukarnia, 1991); and for the PPU *Holos Ukraïny* , 29 January & 14 February 1992. On the SPU as a whole, see V. Lytvyn, 'Sotsialistychna partiia Ukraïny', *Polityka i chas* , No. 17-18 (December), 1991, pp. 80-92; various editions of the party's paper *Tovarysh* , founded in 1992; and Yevhen Boltarovych, 'Sotsialistychna partiia Ukraïny: ideolohiia, polityka, perspektyva', *Rosbudova derzhavy* , No. 4 (September), 1992, pp. 5-9.

[34] Information supplied by the SPU Secretariat. By the time of the SPU's second congress in November 1992, this claim had been reduced to 30,000 members. See *Kreshchatyk* , 2 December 1992.

[35] *Moloda Halychyna* , 3 April 1992.

[36] Dominique Arel, "The Parliamentary Blocs in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet: Who and What do They Represent?', *Journal of Soviet Nationalities* , Vol. 1, No. 4 (Winter 1990-91), p. 134.

[37] *Uriadovyi kur"ier* , No. 31 (July), 1992.

[38] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 14 July 1992; and *Tovarysh* , No. 4 (June) 1992.

[39] Interview with V"iacheslav Chornovil, 22 March 1993.

[40] *Demokratychna Ukraïna* , 11 August 1992; *Molod' Ukraïny* , 10 November 1992.

[41] *Holos Ukraïny* , 17 June 1992.

[42] *Robitnycha hazeta* , 18 August 1992.

[43] *Molod' Ukraïny* , 22 December 1992.

[44] *Sil's'ki visti* , 6 January 1993. The Union, led by Yurii Solomatin, was officially registered on 12 March 1993, and claimed 2,000 members in 13 *oblasti* , *Holos Ukraïny* , 13 March 1993.

[45] *Holos Ukraïny* , 16 and 17 February 1993.

[46] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 16 June 1992.

[47] The new Ukrainian Premier Leonid Kuchma visited the factory run by the Party of Labour's leader, Vlamimir Ladnyk, in February 1992, *Holos Ukraïny* , 2 February 1993.

[48] *Molod' Ukraïny* , 12 January 1993.

[49] *Pravda Ukrainy* , 6 February 1993 reported the prepartions for the congress; and *Holos Ukraïny* , 10 March 1993 the conference itself.

[50] *Pravda Ukrainy* , 11 January 1993.

[51] See Andrew Wilson and Valentyn Yakushyk, 'Politychni orhanizatsiï v Ukraïni (Deiaki problemy stanovlennia i rozvytku)', *Suchasnist'* , No. 5 (May) 1992, pp. 160-5.

[52] Alfred A. Reisch, 'Transcarpathia's Hungarian Minority and the Autonomy Issue', *RFE/RL Research Report* , 7 February 1992.

[53] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 30 March 1992; *Moloda Halychyna* , 28 March 1992. See also *Zakarpats'ka pravda* , 21 April 1990.

[54] *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 10, 1992.

[55] *Advet - vozvrashchenie* , (the main Tatar paper) No. 15-16, 11 July 1991. The most comphrehensive survey on the Crimean Tatars is M. N. Guboglo and S. M. Chervonnaia, *Krymskotatarskoe natsional'noe dvizhenie* , (Moscow: TsIMO, 1992), two volumnes. The article 'Yak rozihruiet'sia Kryms'ka karta', in *Holos Ukraïny* , 4 October 1991 surveys the development of the various Crimean Tatar organisations.

[56] *Holos Ukraïny* , 29 July 1992. Other reports on the OCNM are in *Holos Ukraïny* , 18 February, 12 May, and 7-10 October 1992 (when conflict between the Crimean Supreme Soviet resulted in an attempt to ban the OCNM and to Tatars storming the Soviet building); and 2 February 1993.

[57] On the Jewish Shalom Aleichem Cultural and Educational Society, see'Ukrainian-Jewish Relations: An Interview with Oleksandr Burakovs'kyï', Roman Solchanyk (ed.), *Ukraine: From Chernobyl' to Sovereignty* , (London: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 160-9; *Holos Ukraïny* , 21 April 1992; and the Kiev Jewish paper, *Yevreiskie vesti* , *passim* . The third all-union (sic) Congress of Jewish Organisations was held in Odesa in May 1992, *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 12 May 1992. On the Germans, see *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 6 February 1992; and *Demokratychna Ukraïna* , 13 August 1992.

[58] *Holos Ukraïny* , 29 September 1992. See also *Holos Ukraïny* , 30 May 1992; and *Moloda Halychyna* , 7 May 1992. A Congress of the Crimean Nation was held in July 1992, see *Holos Ukraïny* , 18 July 1992 and 30 April 1992.

[59] *Holos Ukraïny* , 5 November 1992.

[60] *Robitnycha hazeta* , 3 March 1993.

[61] *Holos Ukraïny* , 16 June 1992.

[62] Cf Anthony Smith's definition of a nationalist movement as 'an ideological movement for the attainment and maintenance of autonomy, cohesion and individuality for a social group deemed by some of its members to constitiute an actual or potential nation', Anthony D. Smith (ed.) *Nationalist Movements* , (London: Macmillan, 1976), p. 1.

[63] See for example the interview with GPU leader Vitalii Kononov in *Holos Ukraïny* , 6 March 1993.

[64] 373 out of the 442 Deputies elected in March 1990 were originally members of the CPSU/CPU, but their numbers were soon reduced by the departure of the Democratic Platform from the CPU.

[65] P. J. Potichnyj, 'Elections in Ukraine', *Berichte des Bundesinstituts für ostwissenshafliche und internationale studien* , No. 36, 1990; and D. Arel, 'The Parliamentary Blocs in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet: Who and What Do They Represent?', *Journal of Soviet Nationalities* , Vol. 1, No. 4 (Winter 1990-91), pp. 108-54. The opposition *Narodna rada* (People's Council) claimed 115-133 deputies out of 450 in the Summer of 1990, having been bolstered by the defection of 28 Ukrainian members of the Democratic Platform of the CPSU after the disappointments of the 28th Party Congress (lated joined by others). See *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 14 & 28 June 1990.

[66] The CPU election programme was published in *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 3 December 1989. The party's general programme and other documents adopted at the 28th congress of the CPU in June and December 1990 can be found in *Suchasni politychni partiï ta rukhy na Ukraïni: Informatsiino-dovidkovi materialy* ,(Kiev: Instytut politychnykh doslidzhen', 1991), pp. 8-55; and in *Materialy XXVIII z'ïzdu komunistychnoï partiï Ukraïny* , (Kiev: Vydavnytstvo "Ukraïna", 1991). On the 28th congress, see also *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 27-9 June 1990, and 16-18 December 1990.

[67] *Suchasni politychni partiï....*(1991), op cit, p. 15.

[68] Ibid, pp. 13 & 39.

[69] Ibid, p. 26.

[70] For Hurenko's views, see *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 15 March 1991; *Pravda Ukrainy* , 6 March 1991; *Ukraïna* , No. 2, 1991, pp. 2-4; and *Pravda* , 4 February 1991.

[71] On the Ukrainian economy, see David Marples, *Ukraine Under Perestroika: Ecology, Economics and the Workers' Revolt* , (London: Macmillan, 1991); and the following works by I. S. Koropechyj - (ed.) *The Ukraine Within the USSR: An Economic Balance Sheet* , (London: Praeger, 1977), 'A Century of Moscow-Ukraine Economic Relations: An Interpretation', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 4, No. 4 (December 1981), pp. 467-90, *Development in the Shadow: Studues in Ukrainian Economics* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1990), and (ed.) *Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretative Essays* , (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1991).
  See also Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi, 'Yaki zh mu - bidni chy bahati?', *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 20 May 1992. .

[72] See Kathleen Mihalisko, 'Volodymyr Ivashko and Ukraine', *Report on the USSR* , RL 315/90, 12 June 1990.

[73] See Roman Solchanyk, 'Ukraine Considers a New Republican Constitution', 'The Changing Political Landscape in Ukraine', 'Ukraine and the Union Treaty', *Report on the USSR* , RL 215/91, RL 222/91, and RL 263/91 respectively; 7 and 14 June, and 26 July 1991.

[74] Many in the CPU hierarchy did of course support the plotters, as did many more middle-ranking and local officials. See H. P. Krymchuk and L. S. Taniuk, *Khronika oporu: dokumenty, inshi ofitsiini materialy, svidchennia presy pro sprobu derzhavnoho perevotoyu, vchynenu tak zvanym HKChP u serpni 1991 roku* ,(Kiev: Vik-dnipro, 1991). For the allegations of collaboration made in the Supreme Council during the emergency debates on 24 August 1991, see *Pozacherhova sesiia Verkhovnoï Rady Ukraïns'koï RSR dvanadtsiatoho sklylannia. Biuleten' No. 1* , 24 August 1991 (Kiev: Vydannia Verkhovnoï Rady URSR, 1991), especially pp. 37, 40 & 93. The Ukrainian Republican Party's local organisations also provided the central party with more detailed allegations. See *URP-inform* , (the weekly URP press bulletin) throughout Autumn 1991.

[75] *Holos Ukraïny* , 30 October 1991.

[76] Giovanni Sartori, 'Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis', Vol. 1. (Cambridge, UK: CUP, 1976), pp.125-28.

[77] Taras Kuzio and Andrew Wilson, *Ukraine: Perestroika to Independence* (London: Macmillan, 1993), Chapter 7.

[78] Interview with Serhii Kurykin of the GPU, 2 February 1992.

[79] Information supplied by the PDRU's Volodymyr Filenko in February 1992.

[80] M.Paskov and L. Tupchienko, *Polityka i biznes: Ukraïns'kyi variant* , Paper supplied by Tupchienko to the author in October 1992.

[81] The URP publishes *Samostiina Ukraïna* with a circulation of 50,000 (the name being taken from the first avowedly nationalist political programme to appear in twentieth century Ukraine, written by Mykola Mikhnovs'kyi. See note 52 below). The UNA's (technically the Ukrainian Nationalist Union) *Zamkova hora* has 10,000 and *Ukraïns'ki obrii* 1,000.

[82] *Narodna hazeta* , No. 28, (July) 1992.

[83] Khmel'ko, Valerii (one of the co-leaders of the PDRU), 'Komu my doviriamo?', *Ukraïns'kyi ohliadach* , No. 7, 1992. The research was carried out amongst 1900 electors over the age of 18 in May-June 1992 by the Scientific-practical centre of the Sociological association of Ukraine together with the research institute of Radio Liberty and the International Research Institute in Social Changes, Nion, Sweden. Margin of error, +/- 2.6%.

[84] *Respublika* , No. 2, 19-25 June 1992. The article by Yevhen Holovakha, 'Politychna zaluchenist' naselennia: poinformavanist', aktyvnist', kompetentnist'', *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 2, 1992, pp. 18-27 discusses the low level of political activism in Ukraine.

[85] *Holos Ukraïny* , 21 October 1992.

[86] *Ukraïns'kyi nezalezhnyi tsentr sotsiolohichnykh doslidzhen'* , 20-24 September 1991. Figures rounded off to nearest whole percentage.

[87] On the attempt to fill the vacant seats through by-elections in Autumn 1992, see *Holos Ukraïny* , 28 November and 11 December 1992; and *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 1 December 1992.

[88] *Holos Ukraïny* , 25 September 1992.

[89] The voting list is in *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 9 July 1992.

[90] In October 1992 the GPU's third congress sreamlined the party's organisation, and elected a single leader for the first time, namely Vitalii Kononov. See *Kyïvs'ki visti* , 16 October 1992, and 4 December 1992.

[91] Sein Rokkan, 'Party Systems and Voter Alignment', (New York: The Free Press, 1967).⁺ˢ·ᴹ·ᴸᵉᵖᵘᵉᵗ(ᵉᵈˢ.),

[92] See for example V"iacheslav Chornovil, 'Shcho dali?', *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 24 January 1992.

[93] Kay Lawson, *Political Parties and Linkage* , (NY: Yale University Press, 1980).

[94] See Angelo Panebianco, *Political Parties: Organisation and Power* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988) for political parties as *organisations* .

[95] *Ukraïns'ki novyny* , No. 35, 21 September 1992.

[96] On Drahomanov, see Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 'Drahomanov as a Political Theorist', *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), pp. 203-53; the collected articles on Drahomanov in, *Filosofs'ka i sotsiologichna dumka* , No. 9, 1991; and Mykola Tomenko, 'Politychni pohliady Mykhaila Drahomanova ta Dmytra Dontsova', *Slovo* , No. 21 (December) 1991.

[97] See Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 'Lypynsky's Political Ideas from the Perspective of Our Time', *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), pp. 447-61; and Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi, 'Viacheslav Lypyns'kyi yak filosof istorii', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , No. 10 (October) 1991, pp. 51-62.

[98] See Chapter 1, note 18.

[99] Viktor Mel'nyk, 'OUN: sproba povernennia', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 6, 1992.

[100] Speech at the CNDF congress on 2 August 1992, *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31, (August) 1992.

[101] *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 8, 1992.

[102] 'Partiia Khmara - partiia radykaliv?', *Molod' Ukraïny* , No. 88, 1992.

[103] URP leader Myhailo Horyn' at the press conference after the URP's third congress, 2 May 1992.

[104] Levko Luk"ianenko, 'URP na suchasnomu etapi', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 5, (January) 1992.

[105] See note 83 above.

[106] 'Komitet "Referendum" utvoreno', *Vechirnii Kyïv* , No. 166, 1992.

[107] For example, in an October 1992 poll Chornovil and Kravchuk were jointly rated the most popular politician in Ukraine, with ratings of 2.9 out of 5, *Holos Ukraïny* , 24 October 1992. In the Presidential elections on 1 December 1991, Kravchuk had won 61.6%, and Chornovil 23.3%.

[108] The main speeches at the congress, its documents and declarations can be found in *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31, (August) 1992.

[109] *Vechimii Kyïv* , 3 September 1992.

[110] 'Natsional'ni demokraty maiut' obiednatysia', *Khreshchatyk* , No. 65, 1992.

[111] On the founding of *New Ukraine* , see *Nesalezhnist'*, (itself a Kiev paper close to the PDRU) 17 January 1992 for the movement's founding statement; *Holos Ukraïny* , 5 February 1992: *Demokratychna Ukraïna* , 11 January 1992; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 31 January 1992.

[112] *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 6 September 1991.

[113] *Moloda Halychyna* , 3 April 1992.

[114] 'Nova Ukraïna - shliakh u maibutnie?', *Molod' Ukraïny* , No. 95, 1992.

[115] Material on the first congress can be found in *Pershyi z'ïzd ob'iednannia "Nova Ukraïna": prohramni dokumenty i statut* , (in author's files); *Holos Ukraïny* , 1 July 1992; and *Post-postup* , No. 23, 1992. *New Ukraine's* economic programme, 'Kontseptsiia rynkovoï reformy v Ukraïni', is in *Business dilo* , 8-10 July 1992.

[116] See *Moloda Halychyna* , 21 May and 23 June 1992; and *Post-postup* , Nos. 19 and 23, 1992.

[117] *Holos Ukraïny* , 16 March 1993; *Kievskie vedomosti* , 16 April 1993.

[118] See *Molod' Ukraïny* , 2 March 1993; *Holos Ukraïny* , 21 April and 6 August 1992; and the interview with Yevtukhov in *Zakon i biznes* , No. 16 (April) 1992. The Union's second congress in March 1993 is described in *Holos Ukraïny* , 10 March 1993. See also *Molod' Ukraïny* , 29 January, 2 March and 20 April 1993.

[119] *Post-postup* , No. 43 (November) 1992, p. 5.

[120] On Yemelianov's Union, see *Holos Ukraïny* , 3 February and 30 March 1993.

[121] On the National Association of Businessmen of Ukraine, see *Robitnycha hazeta* , 2 April 1993; *Narodnaia armiia* , 23 March 1993; and *Molod' Ukraïny* , 2 March 1993. On the Congress of Business Circles of Ukraine, see *Holos Ukraïny* , 19 October and 17 December 1991.

[122] See *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 6 and 7 July 1992; and *Nezavisimost'* , 15 July 1992.

[123] See note 83 above. 17% expressed support for *Rukh* , 49% hostility, and 34% indifference. 12% expressed support for *New Ukraine*, 31% hostility, and 57% indifference.

[124] In the by-elections on 22 November 1992, only 4 out of 27 constituencies (okrug) produced a clear winner. All were 'non-party', *Holos Ukraïny* , 28 November 1992. At the second attempt on 5-6 December, a further 9 were elected. At least 7 were 'non-party', *Holos Ukraïny* , 11 December 1992. Most seemed

typical national communists, including four heads of local administration, four managers, one collective farm chairman, and the left wing writer Borys Oliinyk.

[125] For a discussion of divisions within the left wing camp, see Serhii Pravdenko and Oleksandr Kotsiuba, 'Komunizm: Real'nist' chy utopiia?', *Holos Ukraïny* , 30 April 1993.

[126] See note 83 above.

[127] Passed on 16 June, published in *Holos Ukraïny* , 18 July 1992.

[128] Artur Bilous, 'Bahatopartiini vybory: Iakym buty zakony pro nykh?', *Holos Ukraïny* , No. 45, 1992; and 'Vyborcha systema Ukraïny: problemy i perspektyvy vyboru', *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 2, 1992, pp. 46-51.

[129] An indication of the mobilising ability of the respective forces involved can be taken from the fact that of the candidates who successfully collected 100.000 signatures, Leonid Kravchuk obtained 428,134, V"iacheslav Chornovil 278,720, Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi 151,387, Levko Luk"ianenko 150,920, Oleksandr Tkachenko 143,632, Vladimir Griniov 121,218, and Leopol'd Taburians'kyi 114,270. *Holos Ukraïny* , 2 November 1991.

Notes to Chapter 3

[1] Of the URP leadership in December 1991, the following had been political prisoners; Levko Luk"ianenko, Mykhailo and Bohdan Horyn', Stepan Khmara, Levko Horokhivs'kyi, Oles' Shevchenko, Petro Rozumnyi, Vasyl' Ovsienko and Volodymyr Andrushko, *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 19 (December) 1991.

[2] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 5 (January), 1992.

[3] Levko Luk"ianenko was born into a peasant family in Chenihiv in 1927. From 1944-53 he served in the Soviet Army, firstly in Austria, where he was impressed by the rapid recovery of its capitalist mixed economy, and then in Azerbaijan. He then studied law at Moscow university, and after graduation in 1958 worked as a lawyer in L'viv *oblast'* . On the history of Luk"ianenko's various trials and incarcerations, and letters to and from him in prison, see Stepan Sydovs'kyi (ed.), *Zashyty Ukraïns'koho samvydavy, vypusk 11. Zupynit' kryvosuddia! Sprava Levka Luk"ianenka* , (Munich: Suchasnist', 1980).

[4] As Luk"ianenko stressed in his autobiographical address to the Ukrainian Supreme Council on 29 May 1990, when putting himself forward for the post of Chairman of the Supreme Council, *Persha sesiia Verkhovnoï Rady Ukraïns'koï RSR dvanadtsiatoho sklykannia.* Biuleten' No. 22, p. 7.

[5] Levko Luk"ianenko, 'Do istoriï Ukraïns'koho pravozakhysnoho rukhu', *Vyzvolennia '91* (a short-lived URP broadsheet of 1991), Nos. 1-3 (February-March). 1991.

[6] Volodymyr Kubijovyc (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ukraine: Vol. 1, A-F* , (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1984), p. 678.

[7] Interviewed in *Ukraïna* , No. 39, 1990.

[8] Luk"ianenko in *Vyzvolennia '91* , op cit, No.1, p. 1.

[9] Levko Luk"ianenko, 'Zhyttepys', *Spovid' u kameri smertnykiv* , (Kiev: Vitchyzna, 1991), p. 25. His 'Zhytttepys' [biography] can also be found in *Viruiu v boga i v Ukraïnu* , (Kiev: Pam"iatky Ukraïny, 1991), pp. 8- 32. On p. 23 he estimates that almost a half of the camps' 1800 inmates were Ukrainian.

[10] Luk"ianenko, *Zhyttepys* , (1991, op cit), p. 25.

[11] Levko Luk"ianenko, *Vyzvolennia '91* , (February 1991, op cit), p. 1. For the *shestydesiatnyky* , see the entry on 'Dissident movements', in Volodymyr Kubijovic (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Ukraine* , Vol. 1 (A-F), pp. 677-80; Michael Brown (ed.), *Ferment in the Ukraine* , (London: Macmillan, 1971); Julian Birch, 'The Nature and Sources of Dissidence in Ukraine' in Potichnyi (ed.), *Ukraine in the 1970s* , (Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press, 1975) and *The Ukrainian Nationalist Movement in the USSR Since 1956* , (London: Ukrainian Information Service, 1971); Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 'The Political Thought of Soviet Ukrainian Dissidents', in his *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), pp. 477-89; Jaroslaw Bilocerkowycz, *Soviet Ukrainian Dissent: A Study of Political Alienation* , (Boulder: Westview Press, 1988); George S. N. Luckyj, 'Polarity in Ukrainian Intellectual Dissent', *Canadian Slavonic Papers* , Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 269-79; and V"iacheslav Chornovil, *The Chornovil Papers* , (New York: McGraw Hill, 1968).

[12] Published in the West as Ivan Dziuba, *Internationalism or Russification?* , (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968)

[13] Published in the West as *The Ukrainian Herald* , (London: Ukrainian Publishers, 1987).

[14] Chornovil was born in Cherkasy oblast in 1938. After graduating in journalism from Kiev university in 1960, he worked in TV in L'viv and on various papers in Kiev. His account of the 1965-6 trials, *The Chornovil Papers* , (1968, op cit) led to his imprisonment from 1967-70. See also V"iacheslav Chornovil and Borys Penson, *Khronika taborobykh budniv,* (Kiev: Taki spravy, 1991 and Munich: Suchasnist', 1976).

[15] Khmara was born into a peasant family in what is now L'viv oblast, but was then part of Eastern Poland, in 1937. He worked as a doctor, but was an active dissident from an early age. He was imprisoned from 1980-7.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Mark Beissinger, 'Ethnicity, the Personnel Weapon and Neo-Imperial Integration: Ukrainian and RSFSR Provincial Party Officials Compared', *Studies in Comparative Communism*, Vol. XXI, No. 1 (Spring 1988), pp. 71-85.

[18] On the Ukrainian National Front, see Nina Strokata, 'Ukraïns'kyi natsional'nyi front, 1962?-1967', *Suchasnist'*, June 1985, pp. 67-75.

[19] Luk"ianenko, *Vyzvolennia '91*, (February 1991, op cit), p.1.

[20] Interview with Rudenko, *Literaturna Ukraïna*, 30 April, 1992.

[21] Luk"ianenko, *Vyzvolennia '91*, (No. 3, March 1991, op cit), p. 2.

[22] Lesya Verba and Bohdan Yasen (eds.), *The Human Rights Movement in the Ukraine: Documents of the UHG, 1976-80*, (Toronto: Smoloskyp publishers, 1980), p. 20. On the UHG see also Osyp Zinkevych (ed.), *Ukraïns'ka hel'sins'ka hrupa 1978-82: Dokumenty i materialy*, (Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1983); the review article by Victor Haynes, 'The Ukrainian Helsinki Group: A Postmortem', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Winter 1983), pp. 102-13, which surveys the literature on the UHG; and for an autobiography of one of the UHG's leading members, Oksana Meshko, *Mizh smertiu i zhyttiam*, (Kiev: Iava, 1991).

[23] For example, Roman Koval', *Chy mozhlyve Ukraïno-Rosiis'ke zamyrennia?*, (L'viv: Stryi, 1991), especially 'Ukraïns'ki demokraty i demokraty Ukraïny', pp. 57-66.

[24] Haynes (1983, op cit), p. 105.

[25] See *Holos vidrodzhennia* (a UHU-URP paper from 1989-90), special issue, December 1989.

[26] Levko Luk"ianenko, *Shcho dali?* (Translated as *What Next?*), (London: Ukrainian Central Information Service, Ukrainian version 1989, English version 1990), p. 37 (English version).

[27] Bilocerkowycz, (1988, op cit), p. 81.

[28] Bohdan Krawchenko and Jim A. Carter, 'Dissidents in Ukraine Before 1972: A Summary Statistical Profile', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Winter 1983), pp. 85-8.

[29] Oles' Shevchenko was another 1970s dissident, sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment and 3 years' exile in March 1980.

[30] Taras Kuzio (ed.), *Dissent in Ukraine Under Gorbachev: A Collection of Samizdat Documents*, (London: Ukrainian Press Agency, 1989).

[31] Ibid, p. 6.

[32] Press release of the UHG, dated L'viv 11 March 1988, and issued on 18 March. Author's files.

[33] Bohdan Horyn', 'Nash shliakh do URP', *Respublikanets'*, (the theoretical/ discussion journal of the L'viv URP), No. 1, October 1990, p. 1.

[34] Yurii Kyrychuk, 'Narys istoriï UHS-URP', *Respublikanets'*, No. 2, (November-December) 1991, p. 86.

[35] The Horyn' brothers were born (Mykhailo in 1930, Bohdan in 1936) in Zhydachivs'kyi region in what is now L'viv oblast, but was then Eastern Poland. Their father was a Ukrainian nationalist activist, arrested by both the Poles and Soviets. Both studied at L'viv university, but their careers as teachers were soon interrupted by sentences for political activity. Mykhailo was imprisoned from 1965-71 and 1981-7, Bohdan in 1965-8. Both were founder members of the UHU.

[36] As note 30, Articles 2 & 4.

[37] Ibid, Articles 5-20.

[38] See Kandyba's speech to the URP's first congress, *Ustanovchyi z'ïzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï* , (Kiev: RUKHinform, 1990), pp. 15-16.

[39] See note 26 above.

[40] Luk"ianenko, *Viruiu v boha i v Ukraïnu* , (1991, op cit), p. 281.

[41] Levko Luk"ianenko, *What Next?* , (1990, op cit), pp. 8 & 11.

[42] Ibid, p. 24.

[43] Ibid, p. 41.

[44] Ibid, p. 3.

[45] Ibid, p. 42.

[46] Luk"ianenko's speech at the URP's first congress,*Ustanovchyi z'ïzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï* , (1990, op cit.), p. 12.

[47] Bohdan Horyn', 'Nash shliak do URP', *Respublikanets'* , No. 1 (October 1990), p. 2.

[48] *L'vivs'ki novyny* , No. 12, 1988.

[49] Yurii Kyrychuk, 'Narys istoriï UHS-URP', *Respublikanets'* , No. 2 (November-December) 1991, p. 86. See also Roman Solchanyk, 'Democrtic Front to Promote Perestroika Formed in Ukraine', *Radio Liberty Research* , 17 July 1988; and 'Lviv Authorities Begin Criminal Proceedings Against Ukrainian Activists', *Radio Liberty Research* , 26 July 1988.

[50] Anatol' Kamins'kyi, *Na perekhidnomy etapi: "Hlasnist' ", "peredudova" i "demokratyzatsiia" na Ukraïni* , (Munich: Ukrainian Free University, 1990), p. 346. Chapter 10, 'Vid Ukraïns'koï Hel'sins'koï Spilky do Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï', pp. 315-378, covers this period in general.

[51] Bohdan Horyn', 'Nash shliak do URP', *Respublikanets'* , No. 1 (October 1990), p. 2.

[52] Such as the branches established in Ternopil' on 26 January 1989; in Chernivtsi on 11 March; in Donets'k on 22 April; in Chernihiv on 10 May; in Kharkiv on 22 June; in Zhytomyr on 16 July; in Khmel'nyts'kyi on 22 July; in Kherson on 27 July; and in Uzhhorod on 28 October. Yurii Kyrychuk, 'Narys istoriï UHS-URP', *Respublikanets'* , No. 2 (November-December) 1991, p. 87.

[53] Yurii Kyrychuk, 'Narys istoriï UHS-URP', (1991, op cit), p. 92; and Anatol' Kamins'kyi, (1990, op cit), p. 372.

[54] The congress' proceedings are recorded in*Ustanovchyi z'ïzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï* , (Kiev: RUKHinform, 1990); and were reported in *Tsentral'na rada* , (a UHU *samizdat* paper), No. 5 (June) 1990; *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 16 May 1990; *Halychyna* , 2 June 1990; and *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 17 July 1990.

[55] Ibid, p. 53. Kyrychuk (1990, op cit), p. 93 has 21 voting for the name 'Party of Ukrainian Independence'. One of the two versions is a misprint. Interestingly, the most popular names at the March 1990 conference had been The Ukrainian Democratic Christian Union, the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Union and the Organisation for the Liberation of Ukraine, Anatol' Kamins'kyi, (1990, op cit), p. 372.

[56] Kyrychuk (1990, op cit), p. 95.

[57] *Ustanovchyi z'ïzd URP* , (1990, op cit), pp. 92-3. Pliushch was expelled from Ukraine to France in the 1970s, but became an external member of the UHG. He claimed at the time to be as much a Eurocommunist as a nationalist. See Leonid Plyushch (sic), *History's Carnival: A Dissident's Autobiography* , (London: Collins and Harvill, 1977); and Marite Sapiets, Peter Reddaway and Caryl Emerson (Trans. and eds.), *The Case of Leonid Plyushch* , (London: C. Hurst, 1976).

[58] *Ustanovchyi z'ïzd URP* , (1990, op cit), pp. 88-9, 50-1, 90-1, and 38-41.

[59] Ibid, pp. 39-40.

[60] See Yevhen Proniuk's report from the committee, which consisted of himself, Luk"ianenko, Mykhailo and Bohdan Horyn', Vitalii and Oles' Shevchenko (who vetoed Koval"s nuclear proposal), Stepan Hura, Stanislav Ishchenko, Komir Kryzhanivs'kyi, Illia Chupeda and two URP advisors, Volodymyr Zhtyr' from the Institute of Sociology and Ivan Rozputenko. Ibid, pp. 27-34. See also Kyrychuk (1990, op cit), p. 93-5.

[61] *Prapor antykomunizmu* ('Flag of Anti-communism') was a play on the title of the Kiev CPU paper *Prapor komunizmu* . *Vyzvolennia* means 'liberation'.

[62] Interview with Petro Rozumnyi (one of seven URP Secretaries), 26 January 1992.

[63] *Visti* , (a *samizdat* journal), No. 1 (June) 1990.

[64] *Protokol zasidannia sekratariatu URP* , 18 and 20 March 1991.

[65] *L'vivs'ki novyny* , No. 16, 1991.

[66] *Zvernennia do chleniv URP. Initsiiatyvnyi komitet po stvorenniu radykal'noi hrupy Ukrains'koi Respublikans'koi Partii* , dated 15 December, L'viv.

[67] The Khmara affair was to drag on until August 1991. On Khmara's arrest, see *Holos* , No. 20, 1990; *Vyzvolennia '91* , No. 1 (February) 1991; and *Za vil'nu Ukrainu* , 1-2 January 1991. Khmara's hunger strikes in prison, and his various statements are in *Za vil'nu Ukrainu* , 21 December 1990, 1-2 January, 3 and 24 April, 18 and 22 May, and 8 and 15 June 1991. The latter are collected as Stepan Khmara, *Lysty z-za grat* , (Kiev: Ukrains'ka mizhpartiina asambleia, 1991). Khmara's short-term release, abortive trip to Donets'k and rearrest in April 1991, are in *Za vil'nu Ukrainu* , 6 and 11-14 April 1991. Khmara was released again in time for the URP congress in June 1991, and then rearrested for a third time on 18 July, *Za vil'nu Ukrainu* , 20 July 1991. Khmara was only exonerated in the aftermath of the failed August 1991 coup.

[68] *URP-Zasidannia Rady partii. Protokol N2-R* . 17-18 November 1990, in author's possession.

[69] Roman Koval', *Rezolutsii u zv"iazku z zahostrenniam politychnoi sytuatsii* , 17 November 1990.

[70] As note 68 above.

[71] As note 64 above.

[72] *Postanova Sekratariatu URP vid 22 kvitnia 1991 r* . The argument over Koval' had raged for several months, Protokoly zasidannia Sekretariatu URP , 20 March and 3, 5, 10, 12 and 22 April 1991.

[73] Interview with Roman Koval', 5 May 1992.

[74] The following contained reports on the second congress; - *Vechirnii Kyiv* , 6 June 1991; *Za vil'nu Ukrainu* , 7 and 11 June 1991; *Ratusha* , (an interview with Khmara) 17-18 June 1991; *Moloda Halychyna* , 4 June 1991; and *Ukrains'ke slovo* , 16 June 1991. The congress' proceedings were published as B. Proniuk (ed.),*II z"izd Ukrains'koi Respublikans'koi Partii* , (Kiev: URP, 1991); and in *Holos Halychyny: Rozdumy pro doliu Ukrainy na 2-mu z"izdi URP* , No. 1, 1991. The Proniuk version is a much fuller transcript. Long extracts were published in the URP papers *Samostiina Ukraina* , Nos. 6, 7 and 9 (June-July) 1991; and *Nezalezhnist'* , No. 9 (June) 1991. See also Yurii Kyrychuk, 'Narys istorii URP', *Respublikanets'* , No. 3 (January-March) 1992, pp. 62-3.

[75] See note 67 above.

[76] Stepan Khmara, 'Proekt pobudovy Suverennoi Het'mans'koi Respubliky (kazka pro Suverennoho Bychka)', *Lysty z-za grat* , (1991, op cit). pp. 10-16.

[77] Stepan Khmara, 'Pro naivazhlyvshi momenty ideolohii, politychnoi taktyky i partiinoho budivnytstva na suchasnomu etapi',*Holos Halychyny: Rozdumy pro doliu Ukrainy na 2-mu z"izdi URP* , (1991, op cit), pp. 14 and 17.

[78] Ibid, p. 20.

[79] Interview with Petro Rozumnyi, 26 January 1992. For some speeches in support of Khmara, see Mykola Rudenko (the original leader of the UHG) and Oleksandr Novak, head of the URP in Rivne, B. Proniuk (ed.),*II z"Tzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï PartiÏ* , (Kiev, 1991, op cit), pp. 57-61.

[80] Ibid, p. 161.

[81] Ibid, pp. 191 and 185.

[82] Levko Luk"ianenko, speech to the second congress, 'Demokratychna Samostiina Ukraïna - nash ideal', *Holos Halychyny: Rozdumy pro doliu Ukraïny na 2-mu z"Tzdi URP* , (1991, op cit), pp. 3-13; or in *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 6 (June) 1991. Cf Bohdan Horyn"s speech 'Try nebezpeky dlia Ukraïny' ('Three Dangers for Ukraine'; - namely Moscow, imperialists in the CPU, and the ultraradicals themselves), *Holos Halychyny* , op cit , pp. 30-2.

[83] 'Prohrama Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï PartiÏ', *II z"Tzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï PartiÏ* , (Kiev, 1991, op cit), pp. 126 and 127.

[84] The author was present in Kiev at the time. See also the instructions issued by URP deputy leader Oleh Pavlyshyn, reprinted in Les' Taniuk's collection of documents concerning the putsch attempt, *Khronika oporu* , (Kiev, 1991, op cit), pp. 203-4.

[85] *Khronika oporu* , (1991, op cit), p. 188. Other appeals by the URP are on p. 186 and in the author's possession.

[86] At 11 a.m. on Monday 19 August, the coup's first day, Kravchuk met with the nationalists Luk"ianenko, Badz'o from the DPU, Drach from *Rukh* , Taniuk and Skoryk; plus Griniov, Yemets' and Filenko from the centrist PDRU and others (although Kravchuk chose to keep his cards close to his chest).*Khronika oporu* , p. 11. On the 19-20th a coalition of democratic political parties was formed to resist the coup.

[87] At a meeting in L'viv on 6 October 1991, Khmara condemned the idea of holding elections, *L'vivs'ki novyny* , No. 41, 10 October 1991. See also the interviews with Khmara in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 14 November 1991; and in *Nezalezhnyi ohliadach* , August-September 1991.

[88] 'Zaiava providu URP', dated 11 December 1991, *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 20, (December) 1991.

[89] 'Zaiava provodu URP', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 1 (January) 1992.

[90] 'Zaiava provodu URP', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992.

[91] 'Chas miniaty taktyku', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 7 (February) 1992; *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 8 (February) 1992; and *Sil's'ki visti* , 27 February 1992. The author was present at the conference. See also the round-table discussion 'Shukaemo odnodumtsiv' organised by the party in the intelligentsia paper *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 27 February 1992.

[92] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 28 April 1992. See also *Sil's'ki visti* , 18 February and 18 April 1992; and the article by Viktor Teren making exactly the same point against Khmara, 'Shchob ob"iednuvaty, treba ob"iednuvatytysia samym', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 16 (April) 1992. The URP leadership's patience with Khmara seems finally to have snapped after his provocative visit to Crimea with paramilitaries from UNSO in February 1992; - see *Nezavisimost'* , 6 March 1992 and Chapter 6 below.

[93] Interview with Yurii Badz'o, 29 April 1992.

[94] The congress' proceedings were published in detail in *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 29 (May) 1992; and in *Ternystyi shliak* , No. 19, 9 May 1992; and were reported in *Holos Ukraïny* , 7 May 1992; *Poklyk sumlinnia* , No. 17 (May) 1992; *Moloda Halychyna* , 2 and 5 May 1992; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 22 April, 1 and 4 May 1992; *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 7 May 1992; and *Post-postup* , Nos. 15 and 19, 1992

[95] 'Zvitna dopovid' holovy URP Levka Luk"ianenka III z"Tzdovi URP', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 20 (May) 1992, p. 5.

[96] Author's own notes from the congress.

[97] Interview with the URP's Yevhen Boltarovych, 6 August 1992. On the departure of Khmara's supporters at the local level after the congress, see 'Kasha, zavarena Khmaroiu, prodovzhuie kypity, dekhto vzhe s'orbnuv', *Post-postup* , No. 19, 1992. At the URP's Grand Council meeting on 1 August 1992, regional heads reported that up to 10% of their members had joined Khmara, for example 50 out of (a surpisingly low) had 600 in Kiev, and 15 out of 120 in Poltava. The party's Khmel'nyts'kyi branch split in two and effectively ceased to operate. From the author's notes at the meeting.

[98] *URP-inform* , No. 21, 26 May 1992.

[99] See *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 20 (May) 1992; and *URP-inform* , No. 18, 5 May 1992.

[100] From the discussion at the meeting of the URP's Grand Council on 30 April 1992, at which the author was present.

[101] Remarks by Oleh Pavlyshyn at URP press-conference on 8 July 1992 at which the author was present. See also *URP-inform* , No. 28, 14 July 1992.

[102] All the information on delegates is from *Ustanovchyi z'Tzd URP* , (1990, op cit), p. 52.

[103] *Ustanovchyi z'Tzd URP* , (1990, op cit), p. 85.

[104] 'Zvit mandatnoï komisiï druhomu z"ïzdovi URP',*II z"ïzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï* , (Kiev, 1991, op cit), p. 83. Unlike 1990, no more detailed breakdown of the figures was provided, nor any explanation of the term 'intelligentsia', which was much higher than at other URP congresses, and therefore presumably included all of those who were not manual workers.

[105] Information suplied by Petro Borsuk, head of the congress' mandate commission.

[106] Information supplied by URP Secretariat, survey of the party's membership, dated 12 May 1991.

[107] Information also supplied by URP Secretariat, but from an earlier survey of party membership, dated 1 November 1990. The two surveys are cited interchangeably because the same information does not appear in each.

[108] Source: information supplied by the URP Secretariat.

[109] *Respublikanets'* , (at that time the L'viv URP's newsletter) No. 21 (July) 1990. To be precise, the conference of the L'viv URP on 23-24 June 1990 announced that 600 of the UHU's 790 members in L'viv had reregistered as members of the URP. It is impossible to determine whether the 190 who declined to reregister were mainly disillusioned ultra-radicals or moderates.

[110] Speech of Levko Horokhivs'kyi, People's Deputy and head of the Ternopil' URP, *Ustanovchyi z'Tzd URP* , (1990, op cit), p. 55. At the URP's fourth congress in May 1993, the party had 3,000 members in L'viv *oblast'* , 1,800 in Ternopil', and 1,700 in Ivano-Frankivs'k. The next largest organisations were in Kiev (1,000), Transcarpathia (600), and Donets'k (300), *Ukraïns'ke slovo* , 11 May 1993. In other words, 54% were from Galicia.

[111] As of 12 May 1991, see note 106 above.

[112] Information provided by the congress mandate commission at the second URP congress in June 1991. Cf the estimate of 305 deputies at all levels made by V. Litvin, 'Ukrainskaia Respublikanskaia Partiia', *Politika i vremia* , (Kiev CPU journal), No. 7 (May), 1991, p. 78.

[113] In Galicia, the URP had 210 deputies in L'viv, 81 in Ivano-Frankivs'k, and 71 in Ternopil'. Elsewhere in West Ukraine, the URP had 5 deputies in Volyn', 4 in Chernivtsi, and 1 in Transcarpathia. In Central Ukraine, most of the URP's deputies were in Kiev oblast -21, plus 4 in Kirovohrad, 3 in Chernihiv, 3 in Poltava, 3 in Zhytomyr, 2 in Khmel'nyts'kyi, and 1 in Sumy. In Eastern Ukraine the URP only had 4 in Kharkiv and 5 in Donets'k; and in Southern Ukraine 4 in Mykolaïv, 3 in

Kherson, 1 in Odesa, and 1 in Crimea. Source: Vasyl' Ovsienko, (URP secretary) information on the state of the URP as of 12 May 1991, prepared for second URP congress.

[114] Information supplied by Yevhen Boltarovych, theoretical secretary in the L'viv URP until 1992, and then theoretical secretary in the URP Secretariat.

[115] *Informatsiinui zvit pro politychne stanovyshche na Zakarpatti* , (from URP files), dated April-May 1991.

[116] This impression is derived from the series of regional reports delivered by local URP heads to the party leadership in Kiev in 1991, some of which have already been cited above.

[117] 'Deputats'ki hrupy URP', in 'Derzhava, natsiia, svoboda: kontseptsiia diial'nosty URP v novykh umovakh', *Samostiina Ukraina* , No, 21 (May) 1992. The party's statute, on the other hand, contained no such provision.

[118] Ibid. The URP's main Galician papers were *Za nezalezhnist'* (Ivano-Frankivs'k), founded in August 1990, - its circulation fell to 5,000 by 1991; *Ternovyi shliakh* (Ternopil') founded in Spring 1990 with a circulation of 8,200; and *Nezalezhnist'* (L'viv), founded in November 1990 with a circulation of 15,000.

[119] The following local URP papers in the author's possession all contained regular material on the OUN-UPA (listed from West to East); *Karpats'ka Ukraina* (Transcarpathia), No. 1, 1990;*Nezalezhnist'* (L'viv), Nos. 1-11, 1991, No. 5, 1992; *Sobornist'* (Galicia), Nos. 1 and 5-10, 1990, Nos. 1-5 and 17-20, 1991; *Ternystyi shliakh* (Ternopil'), 1990-92 *passim* ; *Za nezalezhnist'* (Ivano-Frankivs'k), Nos. 10-11, 1990, Nos. 6-10, 17-18, 21 and 40, 1991; *Na perelomi* (Ivano-Frankivs'k), No. 2, 1991; *Krytsia* (Volyn'), No. 6, 1991; *Tryzub* (Uman'), Nos 1-4, 1990;*Prozrinnia* (Vinnytsia), No. 3, 1990; *Tsentral'na rada* (Kiev *oblast'*), No. 1, 1990; *Ukrains'ka volia* (Kiev *oblast'*), *Volia* (Chernihiv), No. 1, 1990; *Skhid* (Zaporizhzhia), No. 1, 1990; *Na strorozhi* (Mykolaiv), Nos. 1, 3 and 4, 1991.

[120] Interviews with selected heads of the URP's *oblast'* organisations at the party's third congress on 1-2 May 1992. The author has no quantifiable information on this topic.

[121] 'Zaiava pro stavlennia do "Halyts'koi Asamblei"', *Samostiina Ukraina* , No. 13 (March) 1992.

[122] See, *inter alia* , *L'vivs'ki novyny* , Nos. 27 and 40, 2 July and 2 October 1991.

[123] *URP-inform* , No. 1, 25 January 1991.

[124] Roman Koval', *Zvit pro vidriadzhennia do Rivnens'koi orhanizatsii URP* , from URP files, dated 22 April 1991; 'URP proty NRU', *Dialog* , (the then local CPU paper) No. 17 (April) 1991.

[125] Levko Luk"ianenko, 'URP na suchasnomu etapi', *Samostiina Ukraina* , No. 5 (January) 1992; interviews with Oleh Pavlyshyn, 27 January 1992, and Petro Rozumnyi, 26 January 1992.

[126] As indicated by the report *Pro politychnu situatsiiu v Luhans'kii oblasti* , URP files, dated Spring 1991.

[127] *Informatsiinyi biuleten' Kharkivs'koi kraiovoi orhanizatsii URP* , No. 4, 1991. For a biography of Kravtsiv, see *Samostiina Ukraina* , No. 1 (January) 1992.

[128] Such as the party organisations in Odesa, Sumy and Poltava. *Pro politychnu sytuatsiiu v Odes'kii oblasti za stanom na 1 kvitnia 1991* (from URP files); *URP-inform* , No. 27, 29 October 1991; interview with Petro Rozumnyi, 26 January 1992.

[129] *Sil's'ki visti* , 20 April 1993.

[130] Ibid, Preamble.

[131] Luk"ianenko, *Viruiu v boha i v Ukrainu* , (1991, op cit), p. 285.

132 V"iacheslav Chornovil, *Komentar do proiektu "decliaratsiï pryntsypiv"*, 21
October 1989. UHU Executive Committee document, author's files.

133 Levko Luk"ianenko, 'Speech to the UHU congress: 29 April 1990', *Viruiu v boha
i v Ukraïnu* , (1991, op cit), p. 282.

134 Ibid, p. 283.

135 See for example the speech by Oles' Serhiienko at the URP's first congress; as
note 42 above, pp. 50-1.

136 Levko Luk"ianenko, 'Speech to the UHU congress: 29 April 1990', *Viruiu v boha
i v Ukraïnu* , (1991, op cit), pp. 285-6.

137 Ibid, p. 285.

138 Ibid, p. 286.

139 V"iacheslav Chornovil, 'Do vykonavchoho komitetu UHS - zaiava', *Moloda
Ukraïna* , (an independent *samizdat* journal in L'viv), No. 8, 1990, p. 5. The author
is also has a letter from Chornovil to the UHU entitled *Shanovni chleny VKRI* dated
24 January 1990, which details his disagreements with the UHU leadership.

140 *Ustanovchyi z'ïzd URP* , (1990, op cit), p. 82.

141 The URP's original statute is in Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (1991,
op cit), pp. 67-71. The 1991 version can be found in *II z"ïzd Ukraïns'koï
Respublikans'koï Partiï* , (1991, op cit), pp. 85-93; and the 1992 version in
Samostiina Ukraïna , No. 21 (May) 1992.

142 For example in Zaporizhzhia in July 1991, *L'vivs'ki novyny* , No. 30, 24 July
1991; Vinnytsia in December 1991, *URP-inform* , No. 33, 10 December 1991; and
in Donets'k in July 1992 (after local leader Mariia Oliinyk sided with Stepan
Khmara), *URP-inform* , Nos. 27 and 30, 7 and 20 July 1992.

143 Interview with Petro Rozumnyi, 26 January 1992.

144 See note 63 above, and *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 2 (January) 1993.

145 Levko Luk"ianenko, 'Analiz politychnoï sytuatsiï i taktyky URP na suchasnomu
etapi', *Zasidannia Sekretariatu URP; Protokol N. 30* , 19 December 1990. See also
the interviews with Luk"ianenko in *Trybuna lektora* , No. 8, 1990; *Molod' Ukraïny* ,
6 March 1991; *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 5 April 1991; *Sil's'ki visti* , 9 April 1991; and
Moloda hvardiia , 26 March 1991.

146 Information supplied at the URP Grand Council meeting on 30 April 1992 at
which the author was present.

147 See, for example, the complaints made by ordinary party delegates at the party's
Grand Council meeting in December 1991, *URP-inform* , No. 35, 24 December
1991. Stepan Khmara tried to introduce a motion condemning the party's deputies
for ignoring party policy at the second URP congress in June 1991, 'Pro diial'nist'
deputativ vid URP v Sovetakh', *II z"ïzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï* , (1991,
op cit), pp. 179-80.

148 Interview with Roman Koval', 5 May 1992.

149 *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 9 July 1992. *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 28 (July) 1992 has
Horokhivs'kyi voting against, and Shevchenko in favour.

150 'Zvernennia do Ukraïns'koï molodi', *L'vivs'ki novyny* , No. 40, 2 October 1991.

151 *L'vivs'ki novyny* , No. 43, 23 October 1991; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 15 May 1992.

152 Bohdan Horyn', 'Nash shliak do URP', *Respublikanets'* , No. 1 (October 1990),
p. 6.

153 See Chapter 2, note 17.

154 Yurii Kyrychuk, 'Narys istoriï UHS-URP', *Respublikanets'* , No. 2 (November-
December) 1991, p. 91.

155 *URP-inform* , No. 12, 18 July 1991.

156 Yurii Kyrychuk, 'Narys istoriï UHS-URP', *Respublikanets'* , No. 3 (January-
March) 1993, p. 60.

[157] *Holos Ukraïny* , 25 December 1991; *URP-inform* , No. 35, 24 December 1991.

[158] *URP-inform* , No. 30, 19 November 1991.

[159] Interview with Oleh Pavlyshyn, 27 January 1992. Cf Pavlyshyn's article 'Vybir shliakhu', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 19 (April) 1992.

[160] See for example, Luk"ianenko's interview in *Sil's'ki visti* , 9 April 1991.

[161] *Persha sesiia Verkhovnoï Rady Ukraïns'koï RSR dvanatsiatoho sklykannia* , Bulletins Nos. 22 and 23 (Kiev: Vydannia Verkhovnoï Rady URSR, 29 May 1990).

[162] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 20 November 1990.

[163] See the two articles by Luk"ianenko, 'Nash zasiv dobryi i dobrom proroste', *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 1 January 1991; and 'Shchodo kontrnastupu partokratiï', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 3 (April) 1991.

[164] See the URP's appeal 'Nezalezhnist' chy novyi soiuznyi dohovir?', dated 12 August 1990, *Prapor antykomunizmu* , No. 2, 1990.

[165] 'Statut URP', Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (1991, op cit), esp. clauses 3.1 and 3.2, p. 70.

[166] Bohdan Horyn', *Stratehiia i taktyka URP* , speech delivered at the conference held by the L'viv URP on party strategy, 2 February 1991. Also reported in *Za vil'nu Ukrainu* , 5 February 1991; and *Nezalezhnist'* , No. 5 (February) 1991. Cf the more moderate tone in Horyn"s article, 'Meta - u nazvi', *Nezalezhnist'* , No. 1 (November) 1990.

[167] Bohdan Horyn', *Stratehiia i taktyka URP* , speech delivered at the conference held by the L'viv URP on party strategy, 2 February 1991.

[168] *Sil's'ki visti* , 9 April 1991.

[169] V. Chepurnyi, 'Levko Luk"ianenko: "Ya ye kolehiiu Kravchuka"', *Molod' Ukraïny* , 6 March 1991.

[170] On the rise of the ultra-right in general, see David Marples, 'Radicalisation of the Political Spectrum in Ukraine', *Report on the USSR* , RL 306/91, 30 August 1991.

[171] *Informatsiinyi biuleten' No. 2; - zasidannia Rady URP* , 3 June 1990. From URP files, in author's possession.

[172] For the views of the radicals, see 'Pozytsiia; teoretychnyi viddil URP', *Prapor antykomunizmu* , No. 3, 1990; Roman Koval', 'URP na novomu etapi', *Prapor antykomunizmu* , No. 4, 1990; Roman Koval', 'Komunistychna Verkhovna Rada nediiezdatna', and Volodymyr Yavors'kyi, 'Davaite hovoryty po suti', *Prapor antykomunizmu* , No. 5, 1990; and Serhii Zhyzhko, 'My vyzvolymos", *Vyzvolennia '91* , No. 1 (February) 1991.

[173] Stepan Khmara, *Pro politychnu sytuatsiiu v Ukraïni i zavdannia URP* , speech to the National Council of the URP on 11 August 1990.

[174] Roman Koval', 'URP na novomu etapi', *Prapor antykomunizmu* , No. 4, 1990, op cit.

[175] 'Rozkol v URP?', *Holos* , Nos. 8 and 9, 1991.

[176] Levko Luk"ianenko, 'URP na suchasnomu etapi', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 5 (January) 1992.

[177] Ibid.

[178] Although the party was soon disappointed that 'in the majority of oblasts [appointees] are from the former communist nomenklatura, who discredit the idea of a Ukrainian state', 'Zaiava provodu URP', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 19 (April) 1992.

[179] Yurii Kyrychuk, 'Narys istoriï UHS-URP', *Respublikanets'* , No. 2, (November-December) 1991, p. 88.

[180] Ibid, p. 89-90.

181 V"iacheslav Chornovil, 'Do vykonavchoho komitetu UHS - zaiava', (1990, op cit).

182 In author's files. Luk"ianenko's programme can be found in *Viruiu v boha i v Ukraïnu* , (1991, op cit), pp. 274-7.

183 *Slovo* , (the samizdat broadsheet of Kiev's liberal intelligentsia), No. 3 (November-December), 1989.

184 Six from L'viv oblast, V"iacheslav Chornovil, Mykhailo and Bohdan Horyn', Yaroslav Kendz'or, Stepan Khmara and Ihor Derkach; two from Ivano-Frankivs'k, Levko Luk"ianenko and Bohdan Rebryk; three from Ternopil', Bohdan Boiko, Levko Horokhivs'kyi, and Volodymyr Kolinets'; and Oles' Shevchenko from the city of Kiev, who was the UHU's only non-Galician deputy. Information supplied by URP Secretariat.

185 The seven were the two Horyn' brothers, Chornovil, Khmara, Luk"ianenko, Rebryk and Horokhivs'kyi.

186 Dominique Arel, 'The Parliamentary Blocs in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet: Who and What Do They Represent?', *Journal of Soviet Nationalities* , Vol. 1, No. 4 (Winter 1990-91), p. 114.

187 Its platform was drawn up by Luk"ianenko and Larysa Skoryk. The initiative group consisted of deputies Skoryk, V"iacheslav Chornovil, Volodymyr Kolinets', Ivan Makar, Yarosalv Kendz'or, Levko Horokhivs'kyi, Oles' Shevchenko, Bohdan Boiko, Stepan Khmara, Iryna Kalynets', Vasyl' Chervonii, Mykola Porovs'kyi and Andrii Sukhorukov. *Ternystyi shliak* , (journal of the Ternopil' UHU-URP), No. 6 (June), 1990, p. 2.

188 Ibid, p. 2.

189 *Protokol Sekretariatu URP* , Nos. 7 and 8, 21 and 23 January 1991.

190 On the arguments between Oles' Shevchenko and Roman Koval' in this period, see 'Rozkol v URP?', *Holos* , Nos. 8 and 9 (and 11), 1991; and for the radicals' side of the argument, Hryhorii Hrebeniuk, 'Rozdumy nad mynulym i maibutnim', and Roman Koval', 'Try pohliady na nashi zavdannia', *Napriam* , (the L'viv SNUM journal), No. 7 (August) 1991, pp. 2-7, and 7-12.

191 *Protokol Sekretariatu URP* , No. 11, 30 January 1991.

192 *Protokol zasidannia Sekretariatu URP* , no number, 20 March 1991. The 7 in favour were Luk"ianenko, Shevchenko, Bohdan Horyn', Bidochko, Mykolyshyn, Borsuk and Ovsienko. Koval', Hrebeniuk and Zhyzhko voted against; and Oleh Pavlyshyn abstained.

193 *Ratusha* , 13-14 March 1991.

194 *URP-inform* , No. 3, 28 February 1991.

195 *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 19 July 1991.

196 Luk"ianenko's campaign was extensivley covered in the Ukrainian press. See *Trybuna* , No. 11, 1991; *Kul'tura i zhyttia* , No. 41, 1991; *Komsomol'skaia pravda* , 1 November 1991; *Holos hromadianyna* , No. 44-5, 1991; and *Holos Ukraïny* , 30 October, 24 and 27 November 1991. Luk"ianenko's programme 'P"iat' rokiv dostatno, shchob Ukraïna stala rozvynenoiu Yevropeis'koiu derzhavoiu. Ya znaiu, yak tsoho dosiahty!', is in *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 13 November 1991.

197 The Union of Ukrainian Students, founded in March 1990 and led by Volodymyr Chemerys, was the main nationalist student organisation in 1990-92. It was more moderate than SNUM (see Chapter 6), but violently opposed to the Komsomol. It claimed some 2,000 members, and was the main organising force behind the hunger strikes in Kiev in October 1990 that brought about the resignation of Prime Minister Vitalii Masol. It joined the CNDF in August 1992. See V. A. Holoven'ko and M. Yu. Pashkov, *Zbirnyk materialiv pro molodizhni ob"iednannia Ukraïny* , (Kiev: Ukraïns'kyi naukovo-doslidnyi instytut problem molodi, 1991), pp. 24-33.

[198] On 22-3 June 1991, the Society had held the first All-World congress of Ukrainian Political Prisoners in Kiev, see *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 7 (June) 1991. On the Society's first congress, see *Robitnycha hazeta* , 13 August 1992.

[199] *URP-inform* , Nos. 21 and 29, 17 September and 13 November 1991.

[200] *L'vivs'ki novyny* , No. 42, 17 October 1991.

[201] The author obtained the results for Rivne oblast by raion.

[202] Source: official election results. Figures rounded to nearest decimal place.

[203] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 19 (December) 1991.

[204] See, for example, the statement made at the founding congress of the L'viv URP on 24 June 1990, *Zvernennia do neukraïns'koho naselennia* , or the appeal by the central URP in Kiev, dated June 1990, *Do Rosiian - hromadian Ukraïny* .

[205] Luk"ianenko, *Viruiu v boha i v Ukraïnu* , (1991, op cit), p. 285.

[206] All quotations from the Declaration of Principles refer to Taras Kuzio, (1989, op cit), pp. 24-34. Preamble.

[207] Interview with Oleh Pavlyshyn, 27 January 1992.

[208] As note 206, Article 1.

[209] Ibid, Articles 6 and 5.

[210] The original URP party statute and programme are in *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 17 July 1990; and a slightly different version in Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (1991, op cit) pp. 62-71. The author has three earlier versions of the party programme in his possession. Not surprisingly, the programme finally adopted owed much to Luk"ianenko's *Komentar nashoï korotkoï partiinoï prohramy* , dated September 1989; and Volodymyr Zhtyr"s *Prohrama spilky* , undated. A more radical version from Volodymyr Yavors'kyi entitiled *Tezu do prohramy Partiï Ukraïns'koï Derzhavnosty* , dated 11 March 1990, called for 'the ideology of Ukrainian nationalism [i.e. that of Dontsov and the early OUN] in its full reformulation to be recognised as the basic ideology of the Party of Ukrainian Statehood' [his proposed name for the new party].

[211] *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 17 July 1990.

[212] Yevhen Boltarovych, 'URP: aspekty ideolohiï i polityky', *Nezalezhnist'* , No. 2 (December) 1990. See also the article by Boltarovych, 'Problemy stanovlennia URP yak partiï parlaments'koho typu, ïï mistse v politychnomu spektri Ukraïny ta na mizhnarodnii areni', *Respublikanets'* , No. 2 (November-December) 1991, pp. 99-103.

[213] The conference's proceedings were published as *Ideolohiia i taktyka URP: Materiialy teoretychnoï konferentsiï* , (Kiev: URP, 1991); and were reported in *Vyzvolennia '91* , No. 4 (March) 1991; *Sil's'ki visti* , 27 February 1991. See also *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 5 February 1991; and the press conference given by the URP's leaders in *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 14 March 1991.

[214] Valentyna Paryzhak, 'Chy povynna URP maty natsionalistychnyi kharakter?',*Ideolohiia i taktyka URP: Materiialy teoretychnoï konferentsiï* , (Kiev, 1991, op cit), pp. 15 and 16; also reprinted in *Vyzvolennia '91* , No. 4 (March) 1991. The author also has an article by Paryzhak entitled *Chomu vony nenavydiat' Ukraïns'kyi natsionalizm?* dated March 1991.

[215] Serhii Aibabin, 'Natsionalizm chy sovietyzatsiia?', *Ideolohiia i taktyka URP: Materiialy teoretychnoï konferentsiï* , (Kiev: URP, 1991), pp. 68-71 (emphasis in original). Aibabin confirmed his ethnicist views and nostalgia for the OUN in an interview with the author on 11 August 1991.

[216] Ibid, p. 41.

[217] Yurii Hureïv, 'Chy ie URP parlaments'koiu partiieiu?', and Roman Koval', 'Desovietyzatsiia Ukraïny - neobkhidna umova nezalezhnosty', as note 124 above, pp. 58-61, and 48-9.

[218] Ibid, pp. 57-8, and p. 25.

[219] Levko Luk"ianenko, 'Yakoiu ya bachu ideolohiiu URP', Ibid, pp. 1-9 (the quotes are on pp. 8 and 3); also reprinted in *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 4 (May) 1991.

[220] See the speeches by the URP Secretaries Vasyl' Ovsienko and Oleksa Mykolyshyn, the URP leader in L'viv Bohdan Horyn', the youth leader and Deputy Ihor Derkach, the head of the L'viv URP's theoretical department Yevhen Boltarovych, and, surprisingly, Serhii Zhyzhko. Ibid. Derkach's speech is also in *Vyzvolennia '91* , No. 4 (March) 1991.

[221] On 'Helsinki-90' see *Informatsiinyi biuleten' Ukraïns'koho komitetu 'Hel'sinki-90'* , No. 1 (August) 1990.

[222] Vasyl' Lisovyi, 'Deiaki pytannia ideinoho samovyznachennia URP', Ibid, pp. 9-14. For a study of Lypyns'kyi's philosophy, see Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 'Lypynsky's Political Views from the Persepective of our Time', *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), pp. 447-61; and Taras Hunchak, 'Ukraïns'ka politychna dumka 1920-ykh rokiv: monarkhizm, natsionalizm, natsional-komunizm', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 20 June 1991.

[223] As note 215 above, p. 79; and *Vyzvolennia '91* , No. 4 (March) 1991, p. 2.

[224] Roman Koval', *Protyvnykam idei natsional'noho vyzvolennia* , 14 March 1991.

[225] Hryhorii Hrebeniuk, *Politychna sytuatsiia v Ukraïni i URP* , speech to the URP's National Council on 16 February 1991.

[226] A new national hymn, flag and trident symbol were finally adopted in January and February 1992, see *Holos Ukraïny* , 18 January; 15, 20 and 21 February 1992; and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 20 February 1992.

[227] The names of the 39 who voted against the flag, plus the 45 who abstained or did not vote, were published in *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 7 (February) 1992; and the 72 who voted against the trident in *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 10 (March) 1992. The URP also called on all its members to assist in the task of the destruction of all the old symbols of the Ukrainian SSR at a local level, as decreed (with almost no effect) by President Kravchuk in Spring 1992, 'Dopomozhimo Prezydentovi!', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 27 (July) 1992.

[228] 'Zaiava URP shchodo vvedennia pasportiv hromadianyna Ukraïny', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 25 (June) 1992.

[229] On the URP's opposition to federalism, see Vasyl' Ovsiienko, 'Chomu my proty "federalizatsiï"', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 15 (October) 1991. The party's calls for 'decisive action' against separatist groups can be found in ibid, and No. 19 (May) 1992. In March 1992, the URP even condemned the 'Galician Assembly' (regular joint meetings of the opposition-controlled councils of L'viv, Ivano-Frankivs'k and Ternopil' organised by V"iacheslav Chornovil since 1990), because it encouraged the formation of similar regional groups in Eastern Ukraine, 'Zaiava pro stavlennia do "Halyts'koï Asambleï"', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 13 (March) 1992. The party press regularly attacked separatist forces in Crimea, see *Samostiina Ukraïna*, Nos. 7 (February), 22-4 (June), and 28 (July) 1992.

[230] See, for example, the comments on the proposed new constitution in *Rozbudova derzhavy* , No. 5 (October), 1992.

[231] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 25 (June) 1992.

[232] Levko Luk"ianeko, 'Ukraïns'ka armiia: yak ïï stvoryty?', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 5 (June) 1991.

[233] 'Zvitna dopovid' holovy URP Levka Luk"ianenko III z"ïzdovi URP, *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 20 (May) 1992.

[234] Taras Kuzio (ed.), *Dissent in Ukraine Under Gorbachev* , (1989, op cit), pp. 24-34, Article 17.

[235] 'Prohrama URP', *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 17 July 1990.

[236] See K. Mihalisko, 'Ukraine's Declaration of Sovereignty', *Report on the USSR* , RL 329/90, 27 July 1990.

237 See *Novyi chas* , 13 September 1990. On the Committees' second congress in November 1991, see *Molod' Ukraïny* , 26 November 1991.

238 On the founding congress of the UOU, see *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 24 and 27 July 1991; *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 25 July 1991; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 30 July 1991; and on the November congress, *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 6 and 7 November 1991; and *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 31 October and 7 November 1991. See also Taras Kuzio, 'Ukraine's Young Turks - The Union of Ukrainian Officers [sic]', *Jane's Intelligence Review* , Vol. 5, No. 1 (January 1993), pp. 23-6.

239 *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 7 February 1991; and *Holos* , No. 3, 1991.

240 As note 232 above.

241 See especially 'Pozytsiia URP shchodo rozbudovy Zbroinykh Syl Ukraïny', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 25 (June) 1992: and the declarations by the party leadership in *URP-inform* , No. 2, 13 January 1992; No. 15, 14 April 1992.

242 *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 6 (February) 1992. See also the remarks by Luk"ianenko in *Rozbudova derzhavy* , No. 1 (June) 1992, p. 17.

243 As note 241 above.

244 'Zaiava provodu URP', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992.

245 *Samostiina Ukraïna* , Nos. 3 (January), and 31, (August) 1992

246 *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 3 (January), 1992.

247 'Ukhvala provodu URP', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 2 (January) 1993. Cf 'Ukhvala III z"izdu URP z viis'kovykh pytan", *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 20 (May) 1992.

248 Interview with Mykhailo Horyn', *Ukrainian News* , No. 7, 15 February 1993.

249 'Zaiava provodu URP', *URP-inform* , No. 2, 15 January 1992. The party leadership, meeting on 11 December 1991, had initially reserved judgement, as at least the CIS had provided a means of dissolving the old Empire, *URP-inform* , No. 34, 17 December 1991.

250 'Zaiava pro mozhlyvist' stvorennia Baltiis'ko-Chornomors'koï zony intensyvnoï ekonomichnoï spivpratsi', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 13 (March) 1992.

251 'Zaiava provodu URP', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 18 (April) 1992.

252 All-Ukrainian polls carried out by the Institute of Sociology in the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, *Holos Ukraïny* , 21 October 1992. These figures are in line with the 3.4% recorded for the URP bt the Ukrainian Independent Institute for Sociological Research in 20-24 September 1991, *Informatsiina zapyska pro rezul'taty sotsiolohichnoho doslidzhennia hromads'koï dumky z pytan' referendumu shchodo Aktu proholoshennia nezalezhnosti Ukraïny ta vyboriv prezydenta* . In a poll by *Vechirnii Kyïv* on 3 December 1991 25% evaluated the URP positively, 12% negatively, and 63% could not or would not reply.

253 *Respublika* , No. 2, 19-25 June 1992. The URP's rating was 2% in January 1990 (when it was still the UHU), 1% in November 1990, and 7% in May 1992.

Notes to Chapter 4.

[1] See 'The Beginnings of "Rukh": An Interview with Pavlo Movchan', in Roman Solchanyk (ed.), *Ukraine: Chernobyl' to Sovereignty* , (London: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 7-18; the article by Viktor Teren, 'Musymo pochynaty spochatku', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 13 (March) 1992; and Bohdan Nahaylo, 'Kiev's "Popular Movement for the Support of Restructuring" Allowed to Meet - Behind Closed Doors', *Report on the USSR* , RL 468/88, 2 November 1988. A comparison of *Rukh* with the Estonian Popular Front from the perspective of Rational Choice Theory can be found in Charles F. Furtado, Jr and Michael Hechter, 'The Emergence of Nationalist Politics in the USSR: A Comparison of Estonia and the Ukraine', in Alexander J. Motyl (ed.), *Thinking Theoretically About Soviet Nationalities: History and Comparison in the Study of the USSR* , (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), pp. 169-204.

[2] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 1 December 1988.

[3] Oleksa Haran, *Vid stvorennia Rukhu do bahatopartiinosti* , (Kiev: Znannia, 1992), p. 5.

[4] See Roman Solchanyk, 'Democratic Front to Promote Perestroika Formed in Ukraine'; and 'Lvov Authorities Begin Criminal Proceedings Against Ukrainian Activists', *Radio Liberty Research* , RL 324/88, 17 July 1988; and RL 327/88, 26 July 1988 respectively.

[5] Ibid. See also Yurii Kyrychuk, 'Narys istoriï URP', *Respublikanets'* , No. 2 (November-December) 1991, p. 86; and Taras Kuzio, 'Nationalist Ferment In Western Ukraine', *Soviet Analyst* , 3 August 1988.

[6] Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (Kiev: Pam"iatky Ukraïny, 1991), p. 7. See also the advert for the Popular Front in the Ukrainian *Komsomol* paper *Lenins'ka molod'* , 28 July 1988.

[7] *Robitnycha hazeta* , 4 October 1988; and *Radians'ka osvita* , 30 September 1988.

[8] *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 7 November 1988. See also the article by Viktor Teren, 'Musymo pochynaty spochatku', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 13 (March) 1992

[9] Pavlo Movchan, a poet, became a People's Deputy for Kiev city in March 1990, and headed the Ukrainian Language Society (renamed *Prosvita* in 1991) after Dmytro Pavlychko. Viktor Teren, a writer, remained close to the UHU / URP.

[10] *Moloda hvardiia* , 25 November 1988.

[11] Mykola Zhulyns'kyi, a literary critic, remained close to *Rukh* , before being appointed the head of the humanitarian section of President Kravchuk's advisory *Duma* in March 1992, and a Vice Premier in the new Kuchma government in October 1992. Vitalii Donchyk, also a literary critic and writer (he was the editor of the journal *Slovo i chas*) joined the DPU, and headed its Kiev organisation from February 1992. In 1992 he joined the staff of the President's administration in Kiev city.

[12] Myroslav Popovych was a logician, who headed the Kiev organising committee of *Rukh* in 1989, but became alienated by the growing influence of the nationalists within *Rukh* in 1990-1, and therefore left to become one of the original co-leaders of the centrist PDRU.

[13] Dmytro Pavlychko, a famous writer and poet, was elected to head the Ukrainian Language Society at its first congress in February 1989. In March 1990 he was elected to the Ukrainian Supreme Council, and heads its Committee on Foreign Affairs. Since December 1990 he has been a leading figure in the DPU.

[14] David Marples, 'Mass Demonstration in Kiev Focuses on Ecological Issues and Political Situation in Ukraine', *Report on the USSR* , RL 525/88, 7 December 1988.

[15] Oliinyk, a writer and head of the Ukrainian Cultural Fund, had been one of the original sponsors of the initiative, but eventually dissociated himself. See his letter in *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 8 March 1989. In November 1992 Oliinyk was elected to the Supreme Council as the standard-bearer of the Ukrainian left.

[16] *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 15 & 22 December 1988.

[17] *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 16 Febraury 1989. The programme was drawn up by Drach, Donchyk, Oliinyk, Yurii Mushketyk, V"iacheslav Briukhovets'kyi and others, - Ivan Drach, 'Rukh ne vycherpav sebe i maie maibutnie', RUKH-PRESS interview February 1992, supplied by the mandate commission to the third *Rukh* congress.

[18] See, for example, *Pravda Ukrainy* , 18 February & 19 March 1989; and *Radians'ka Ukraïny* , 7 February 1989. For a commentary, see Roman Solchanyk, 'Party and Writers at Loggerheads over Popular Front'; and 'Shcherbitsky Assails Popular Front and Helsinki Union', *Report on the USSR* , RL 237/89, 22 May 1989 & RL 256/89, 9 June 1989 respectively.

[19] Roman Solchanyk (ed.), *Ukraine: Chernobyl' to Sovereignty* , (London: Macmillan, 1992, op cit), p. 14. See also *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 6 April 1989.

[20] See the translation of the September 1989 *Rukh* programme,*The Popular Movement of Ukraine for Restructuring - Rukh : Programme and Charter* , (Ellicott City, USA: Smoloskyp Publishers, 1989), p. 3.

[21] Dmytro Pavlychko, 'Nas tut zibrala istoriia', *Vil'ne slovo* , No. 2, (July) 1989, p. 2. See also Roman Solchanyk, 'Constituent Congress of Kiev Regional Popular Front', *Report on the USSR* , RL 365/89, 27 July 1989.

[22] Ivan Drach, 'Za ednist' usikh dobrykh i chesnykh liudei', *Vil'ne slovo* , No. 2, (July) 1989, p. 1.

[23] As note 21.

[24] Interview with Myroslav Popovych, 23 January 1992.

[25] Karpenko was a supporter of first the Democratic Platform in the CPU, and then of the centrist PDRU. He was elected to the Ukrainian Supreme Council in March 1990 from Kiev city. See '*Vechirnii Kyiv* , the Voice of *Perestroika* in Ukraine: An Interview with Vitalii Karpenko', Roman Solchanyk (ed.), *Ukraine: Chernobyl' to Sovereignty* , (London: Macmillan, 1992, op cit), pp. 1-7.

[26] *Rozmova z Mykoloiu Horbalom pro ustanovchyi z"ïzd Narodnoho Rukhu v Kyevi* , 11 September 1989; supplied by Ukrainian Central Information Service, London.

[27] All of the information in this section is from *The Popular Movement of Ukraine for Restructuring - Rukh : Programme and Charter* , (Ellicott City, USA: Smoloskyp Publishers, 1989), p. 4. The same information is the basis of the article by Vladimir Paniotto, 'The Ukrainian Movement for Perestroika - 'Rukh': A Sociological Survey', *Soviet Studies* , Vol. 43, No. 1 (1991), pp. 177-81, although some of the original information is grouped together. All figures are rounded to the nearest whole number.

[28] The congress' proceedings were covered in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 21 & 28 September, and 5 October 1989. The 28 September issue contained *Rukh's* new programme and statute, also translated as *The Popular Movement of Ukraine for Restructuring - Rukh : Programme and Charter* , (1989, op cit). Further background information is from *Prohrama ustanovchoho z"ïzdu Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny za Perebodovu* , in author's possession.

[29] *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 28 September 1989, p. 4 (as with all other references to the programme, which is on pp. 4-5).

[30] See *Suchasnist'* , December 1989.

[31] Interview with Myroslav Popovych, 23 January 1992.

[32] Volodymyr Yavoriv'skyi, a writer, was elected from Kirovohrad oblast to the Ukrainian Supreme Council in March 1990, where he became famous as Chairman of the Committee on Chornobyl'. A leading nationalist, he became the second head of the DPU in December 1992.

[33] Vladimir Paniotto, 'The Ukrainian Movement for *Perestroika* - 'Rukh': A Sociological Survey', *Soviet Studies* , Vol. 43, No. 1 (1991, op cit), p. 178.

[34] Ibid, p. 179.

[35] *Vil'ne slovo* , No. 8, 1989.

[36] Ibid, and *Slovo* , No. 3 (November-December 1989).

[37] See Bohdan Nahaylo, 'Human Chain Demonstration in Ukraine: A Triumph for "Rukh"', *Report on the USSR* , RL 57/90, 2 February 1990. See also David Marples, 'The Ukrainian Election Campaign: The Opposition', *Report on the USSR* , RL 115/90, 9 March 1990.

[38] Frank Sysyn, 'The Reemergence of the Ukrainian Nation and Cossack Mythology', *Social Research* , Vol. 58, No. 4 (Winter 1991), pp. 845-64. The quote is on p. 861.

[39] On the March 1990 election results, see Dominique Arel, 'The Parliamentary Blocs in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet: Who and What do They Represent?', *Journal of Soviet Nationalities* , Vol. 1, No. 4 (Winter 1990-91), pp. 108-54; and P. J. Potichnyj, 'Elections in Ukraine', *Berichte des Bundesinstituts für ostwissenshafliche und internationale studien* , No. 36, 1990; and J. V. Koshiw, 'The March 1990 Elections in Ukraine', *Ukraine Today* , August 1990, pp. 5-8. For a comparison with the referenda of 1991, see Oleksii Redchenko, 'Hotuimo sany vlitku', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 12 (April) 1992.

[40] Arel, (1990-91, op cit), pp. 113-4. Arel's article lists 122 deputies as belonging to the *Narodna rada* . The author was supplied with a list of 108 as belonging to the *Narodna rada* faction by the *Rukh* office. Their figures broke down as 43 in Galicia, 9 in Volyn'-Polissia, 3 in Transcarpathia, 9 in the Right Bank, 17 in Kiev city, 2 in Kiev oblast, 7 in the Right Bank, 20 in Eastern Ukraine, and 3 in the South. The greatest discrepancy is in Eastern Ukraine, becuase of its large number of uncommitted deputies.

[41] *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 14 & 28 June 1990.

[42] *Orhanizatsiini pryntsypy parlaments'koï fraktsiï "Narodna rada"* , in author's possession, as is the broader *Statut klub deputativ Rukhu* .

[43] Yukhnovs'kyi was a physicist by trade. He stood in the December 1991 Presidential elections, receiving 1.74% of the vote. In October 1992 he was appointed First Deputy Premier in the new Kuchma government. Yemets' worked in Kiev's higher military school, before becoming involved in the Democratic Platform of the CPU. One of the co-leaders of the PDRU, he chaired the Supreme Council's Human Rights committee, then became the head of the legal section of President Kravchuk's advisory *Duma* in March 1992. Despite the dissolution of the *Duma* in October 1992, he was retained as a Presidential advisor. Taniuk is head of the Ukrainian theatre workers' union, and chairs the Supreme Council committee on Culture and Spiritual Revival.

[44] See the following 3 *samizdat* articles 'Narodna rada: 4 fraktsiï', *Holos* , No. 10, (May) 1991; Rostyslav Hotyn, 'Verkhovna rada Ukraïny: p"iatyrichku za pivroku?', *Nezalezhnyi ohliadach* , No. 1 (November) 1990; and 'Dovidka

Demokratychnoï Bloku', *Demokratychnyi vybir* , (a PDRU paper from 1990) No. 11, 1990.

45 See Oleksa Haran', *Vid stvorennia Rukhu do bahatopartiinosti* , (Kiev: Znannia, 1992), esp. pp. 12-15.

46 For example, for the activities of *Rukh* in radical Galicia, see the interview with Bohdan Boiko, *Rukh's* local head in Ternopil', in *Vil'ne zhyttia* , 27 March 1990; for L'viv, see the interview with local head Orest' Blokh in *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 19 May 1990; and for Ivano-Frankivs'k, see *Prykarpats'ka pravda* , 3 April 1990.

47 Ivan Drach, 'Pro nezalezhnist', yakoï shche nemae', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 30 August 1990.

48 See Bohdan Krawchenko, 'National Memory in Ukraine: The Role of the Blue and Yellow Flag', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 15, No. 1 (Summer 1990), pp. 1-21.

49 Mykhailo Horyn's' report to the second *Rukh* congress on the organisational status of *Rukh* and the activities sponsored by *Rukh's* Secretariat, 'Pro robotu Sekretariatu Rukhu',*Visnyk Rukhu* , No. 7 (November) 1990, p. 45.

50 Vladimir Griniov was a lecturer in engineering at Kkarkiv polytechnical institute. A leading member of the Democratic Platform/PDRU he was elected to the Supreme Council in March 1990, and became its Deputy Chairman. In the December 1991 Presidential elections he ran as the candidate of the Russian-speaking population in Ukraine, receiving 4.2% of the vote overall, but 10.9% in Kharkiv and 11% in Donets'k.

51 Interview with Volodymyr Filenko, co-leader of the PDRU, 10 February, 1992.

52 Interview with Myroslav Popovych, 23 January 1992. See also the article by Popovych, 'Filosofiia hromads'kykh rukhiv: (Pro Narodnyi Rukh Ukraïny za perebudovu', *Nauka i suspil'stvo* , No. 2, 1990, pp. 18-24.

53 Declaration of the first all-Ukrainian conference of the SDPU, 24-5 November 1990, *Pro stavlennia do Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny* .

54 Valerii Khmel'ko, 'Yaka partiia nam potribna?' *Trykotazhnytsia* , 31 August 1990. See also *Partiia demokraticheskogo vozrozhdeniia Ukrainy: Materialy uchreditel'nogo s"ezda* ,(Kiev: UkrNIINTI, 1991); the interview with Filenko in *Komsomol'skoe znamia* , 15 June 1991; and the PDRU's condemnation of (national) extremism in *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 24 February 1992.

55 The main speeches at the congress, and the figures concerning the composition of the delegates are in*Visnyk Rukhu* , No. 7 (November) 1990, and the new *Rukh* programme, statute, and the resolutions passed at the congress are in *Druhi vseukraïns'ki zbory Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny - dokumenty* , (Kiev: Sekretariat Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny, 1991). Press reports are in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 8 November 1990; *Moloda hvardiia* , 31 October 1990; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 26 October 1990; *Molod' Ukraïny* , 30 October 1990; *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 11 & 13 November 1990; and *Kul'tura i zhyttia* , 28 October 1990.

56 *Visnyk Rukhu* , No. 7 (November, op cit) 1990, p. 33.

57 Ibid. Six Jews were also present (0.3%), 4 Poles (0.2%) and 15 others (0.8%).

58 *Suchasni poltychni partiï ta rukhy na Ukraïni* , (Kiev: Institut politychnykh doslidzhen', 1991), p. 230. The difference is underestimated, as the 1990 figures do not include Kiev oblast, whereas the difference between oblast and city was not recorded in the 1989 figures.

59 *Visnyk Rukhu* , No. 7 (November, op cit) 1990, p. 7. 445 out of 2,125 (or 21%) had been delegates to the first congress.

60 *Suchasni poltychni partiï ta rukhy na Ukraïni* , (Kiev: Institut politychnykh doslidzhen', 1991, op cit), p. 230.

61 10.7% were higher white collar [*sluzhbovtsi iz spetsial'noiu osvitoiu*], 10.2% were lecturers [*vykladachi*], 5.9% were 'working intelligentsia', 2.3% were unqulified white collar, and 1% students. *Visnyk Rukhu* , No. 7 (November, op cit) 1990, p. 14.

62 Ibid. 19.6% were engineers, 17.0% were 'qualified workers', 10.2% factory administrators [*kerivnyky pidrozdiliv, ustanov, pidpryemstv*], and 6.72% were scientific workers.

63 Ibid. 'Workers' included 2.2% of cooperative workers, and 1.2% 'poorly qualified workers'. The 'village intelligentsia' was made up of 1.5% 'qualified practitioners of agricultural work' and 1.2% 'specialists in the sphere of agricultural economy'. 43.1% of delegates lived in *oblast'* capitals (mainly large cities), 34.8% in other towns, and 22.1% in villages. Ibid, p. 49.

64 *Suchasni poltychni partiï ta rukhy na Ukraïni* , (Kiev: Institut politychnykh doslidzhen', 1991, op cit), p. 230.

65 Ivan Drach's speech at the second congress; 'Politychna sytuatsiia na Ukraïni i zavdannia Rukhu',*Visnyk Rukhu* , No. 7 (November, op cit) 1990, p. 14 & 13. The speech can also be found in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 8 November 1990.

66 Ibid, p. 8 & 9.

67 Holovatyi is a young lawyer whose early career was in the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences Institute for the Study of Foreign Countries. He was elected in Kiev city in March 1990, and has proved himself one of the most articulate of opposition deputies. He is also Chairman of the Association of Ukrainian lawyers.

68 Mykhailo Horyn''s speech at the second congress, 'Pro robotu Sekretariatu Rukhu',*Visnyk Rukhu* , No. 7 (November, op cit) 1990, p. 44.

69 'Ukhvala druhykh vseukraïns'kykh zboriv Harodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny', *Druhi vseukraïns'ki zbory Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny - dokumenty* , (Kiev, 1991, op cit), p. 41. Emphasis added.

70 *Prohrama Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny* , Ibid, p. 4.

71 'Do hromadian' Ukraïny - chleniv KPSS', *Druhi vseukraïns'ki zbory Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny - dokumenty* , (Kiev, 1991, op cit), p. 61.

72 *Deklaratsiia pryntsypiv diial'nosti politychnoï rady Rukhu* , 2 November 1990.

73 'Pro utvorennia politychnoho bloku "Demokratychnoho Rukhu"', *Druhi vseukraïns'ki zbory Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny - dokumenty* , (Kiev, 1991, op cit), p. 49.

74 *Protokol No. 6. Zasidannia Politychnoï Rady Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny* , 30 January 1991. On 4 February a draft agreement for the group, now entitled 'Sovereign Democratic Ukraine' was drawn up. The main aim of the colaition was 'the creation of a sovereign, democratic, unbounded [*pravovoï*] Ukrainian sate, and the liquidation of the communist party's monopoly on power'. *Protokol No. 7. Zasidannia Politychnoï Rady Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny* , 4 February 1991; and *Uhoda mizh politychnymy partiiamy ta hromads'kymy orhanizatsiiamy pro politychnu koalitsiiu (blok) Suverenna Demokratychna Ukraïna* , 4 February 1991.

75 The full list of signatories was *Rukh* itself; plus on the right: - the URP, DPU, UCDP (Christian Democrats), UPDP (People's Democratic Party, plus the

remnants of the Kiev branch of the Democratic Union), UPDP (Peasant Democrats), SNUM (the radical student group), USS (Ukrainian Student's Union); and representing the centre-left; - the DPRU, the Greens and their parent organisation *Zelenyi svit* , PPU (People's Party), SDPU & USDPU (the two social democratic parties), ULDP (the tiny Ukrainian Liberal-Democratic Party, and its splinter Liberal Democratic 'Union'), the Confederation of Anarchists, *Memorial* ; plus the Union of Ukrainian Women, Ukrainian Youth Association, the Czecho-Slovak Cultural Society, and the 'Independence' Union of Ukrainian Journalists. *Protokol No. 6. Zasidannia Politychnoï Rady Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny* , 30 January 1991.

[76] Mykola Porovs'kyi, 'Zvitna dopovid' na tretikh zborakh Rukhu', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 9 (March) 1992, p. 4.

[77] *Protokol No. 7. Zasidannia Politychnoï Rady Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny* , 4 February 1991.

[78] *Protokol No. 9. Zasidannia Politychnoï Rady Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny* , 10 March 1991.

[79] Source: Oleksii Redchenko, 'Hotuimo sany vlitku', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 12 (April), 1992, p. 2. The second column is simply the 'no' votes to Gorbachev's question. The 'status quo' vote (the CPU had called for a 'yes' to both questions) was obtained by subtracting the 'nos' to Gorbachev's question from the 'yes' result for the Ukrainian question, thereby obtaining a measure of those who voted for both questions.

[80] The Democratic Congress' documents can be found in the PDRU *samizdat* paper *Al'ternatyva* , No. 2, 1991, and in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 7 February 1991. See also *Holos Ukraïny* , 20 February 1991; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 31 January & 20 February 1991; and *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 19 February 1991.

[81] *Visnyk Rukhu* , No. 7 (November, op cit) 1990, p. 7. As a percentage of those who answered the mandate committee's questionaire, 12.7% were members of the URP.

[82] Les' Taniuk (ed.), *Khronika oporu: Dokumenty, inshi ofitsiini materialy, svidchennia presy pro sprobu derzhavnoho perevorotu, vchynenu tak zvanym HKChP u serpni 1991 roku* , (Kiev: Vik/Dnipro, 1991), p. 11. The coalition's declarations are on pp. 182 & 198.

[83] Ibid, pp. 185-6.

[84] For *Rukh's* various appeals, at a national and local level, see Ibid, pp. 182-248.

[85] Ibid, p. 248.

[86] *URP-inform* , No. 19, 3 September 1991, p. 4 cites M. Yakovyna, Serhii Odarych, Oles' Donii, Yurii Aibazian, and N. Hnativ as supporting Chornovil; and Mykhailo Horyn', Yevhen Proniuk, Pacichnyk, Mykola Porovs'kyi, Bohdan Ternopil's'kyi, and Ivan Drach as supporting Luk"ianenko. People's deputy Vasyl' Chervonii supported the candidature of Ihor Yukhnovs'kyi.

[87] Ibid.

[88] *L'vivs'ki novyny* , No. 39, 1991.

[89] Kravchuk's campaign was of course widely covered in the official press. See *Holos Ukraïny passim* , especially the issues on 15, 19, and 31 October 1991; and 1, 12, 19, 21, 26, 28, and 29 October 1991. Kravchuk's official programme 'Nova Ukraïna', based on the '5 "Ds", derzhavnist', demokratiia, dostatok, dukhovnist', dovir"ia ('statehood, democracy, prosperity, spirituality, trust')' was published in *Holos Ukraïny* , 31 October 1991.

[90] Tkachenko's programme, and an interview entitled 'Ia spoviduiu Marksyzm' ('I believe in Marxism') appeared in *Holos Ukraïny* , 6 November 1991.

[91] See *Holos Ukraïny* , 23 November 1991.

[92] See *Rabochaia gazeta* , 11 October 1991 and 6 November 1991; and *Holos Ukraïny* , 4 November 1991.

[93] On Chornovil's campaign, see *Holos Ukraïny* , 23 October and 23 November 1991; *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 26 September 1991; *Vil'ne slovo* , No. 42, 2 November 1991; and *Pravda Ukrainy* , 4 September 1991. A collection of his interviews and articles from the campaign was published in *Holos* , No. 21, 17-23 October 1991. Chornovil's official programme 'Ukraïna: shliakh do svobodu: osnovni pryntsypy prohramy', can be found in *Holos Ukraïny* , 23 October 1991.

[94] Luk"ianenko's campaign is covered in Chapter 3.

[95] For Yukhnovs'kyi's campaign, see his programme and interview in *Trybuna* , No. 11, 1991; plus his interviews in *Holos Ukraïny* , 16 October 1991; and *Moloda hazeta* , No. 1 (October) 1991.

[96] Source: official election results. The results are shown to one decimal place because support for Luk"ianenko and Yukhnovs'kyi was often in low single figures.

[97] The author obtained the results by raion for half a dozen oblasts.

[98] *Obshchestvennoe mnenie naseleniia Ukrainy o predstoiashchikh vyborakh Prezidenta Ukrainy i respublikanskom referendume o podtverzhdenii akta provozglasheniia nezavisimosti Ukrainy* , (Kiev: Institut sotsiologii AN Ukrainy, September 1991), p. 6.

[99] *Holos Ukraïny* , 1 November 1991. For the most detailed analysis of the election results, see Valerii Khmel'ko, 'Referendum: khto buv "za" i khto "proty"', *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 1, 1992, pp. 40-52.

[100] Source: official election results.

[101] Mykola Porovs'kyi, born in 1956, is a Supreme Council People's Deputy from Rivne. At the second *Rukh* congress in 1990 he was elected head of the movement's Coordinating Council, and therefore worked as its most preeminent bureaucrat. He was also the leading orgainser of the *Rukh* faction in the Supreme Council established in February 1992, and head of the 'Crimea with Ukraine' organisation set up in 1992. In 1993 he joined the URP, becoming one of four deputy heads of the party at its fourth congress in May 1993.

[102] Mykola Porovs'kyi, 'Rukh zaimet'sia ideolohiieiu derzhavy', *Holos Ukraïny* , 25 January 1992. See also the same author's 'Rukh i perspektyva ', *Holos Ukraïny* , 12 February 1992; and *Nashe slovo* , 1 March 1992.

[103] *Narodna hazeta* , No. 7 (February) 1992.

[104] Mykhailo Horyn', 'Ob"iednatysia, shchob peremohty', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 20-21 (december) 1991. See also Horyn"s speech to the L'viv *Rukh* assembly in February 1992, *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 18 February 1992.

[105] Dmytro Pavlychko, 'Budemo hornutysia do Yevropy', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 26 December 1991.

[106] *URP-inform* , No. 6, 11 February 1992.

[107] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 5 February 1992; *Kyïvs'ka pravda* , 11 February 1992. The author was present at both meetings.

[108] *Holos Ukraïny* , 19 February 1992, p. 6.

[109] *Holos Ukraïny* , 25 February 1992. The proceedings were broadcast on Ukrainian TV.

[110] *Moloda Halychyna* , 27 February 1992. A list of the *Duma's* members can be found in *Holos Ukraïny* , 10 April 1992.

[111] *Narodna hazeta* , No. 4 (January) 1992; *Holos Ukraïny* , 4 February 1992; *Moloda Halychyna* , 30 January 1992. See also the 'Zaiava politychnoï rady

Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïnu', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 1 (January) 1992, which also supported Horyn''s line.

[112] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 8 (February) 1992; and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 6 February 1992. The meeting was attended by Ivan Drach, Mykhailo Horyn', Oleksandr Lavrynovych, Bohdan Ternopils'kyi, Serhii Odarych and Viktor Teren from *Rukh* ; Levko Luk''ianenko, Oleh Pavlyshyn, Serhii Ovsienko, Mykola Horbal', Petro Rozumnyi, Bohdan Rebryk and Yurii Didenko for the URP; Dmytro Pavlychko, Vitalii Donchyk, Pavlo Kyslyi, V. Fesenko, Mykhailo Holubets', and A. Pohribnyi for the DPU; Pavlo Movchan, A. Buriachok, M. Nesterchuk, and Yurii Orobets' from *Prosvita* ; Volodymyr Chemerys, P. Sherevera and K. Barantseva from the Union of Ukrainian Students. The group overlaps to a considerable extent with those who signed the petition to split *Rukh* at its third congress.

[113] The faction's membership as listed in *Narodna hazeta* , No. 7 (February) 1992, was as follows. Not surprisingly, at least 21 of the 41 were from Galicia; - ten from L'viv, namely Mykhailo Horyn', Orest Blokh, Vitalii Romaniuk, Roman Ivanychuk, Mykhailo Batih, Yaroslav Kendz'or, Bohdan Koziars'kyi, Mykhailo Kosiv, Iryna Kalynets' and Ivan Drach; eight from Ivano-Frankivs'k, that is Zinovii Duma, Markiian Chuchuk, Liubomyr Pyrih, Petro Osadchuk, Mykhailo Holubets', Dmytro Zakharuk, Stepan Volkovets'kyi and Bohdan Rebryk; and three from Ternopil'; - Lev Krupa, Dmytro Pavlychko and Kateryna Zavads'ka. A further five were from elsewhere in Western Ukraine; Fedir Sviders'kyi and Oleksandr Hudyma were from Volyn'; and Mykola Porovs'kyi, Vasyl' Chervonii and Volodymyr Pylypchuk were from Rivne. Five were from Kiev; - Pavlo Movchan, Pavlo Kyslyi, Ivan Zaiets', Larysa Skoryk and Yurii Kostenko. Most of the rest were from Central Ukraine; - Taras Nahulko from Khmel'nyts'kyi, Oleksandr Piskun from Sumy, Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi from Kirovohrad and Tatiana Yakheieva from Cherkasy. Only one was from Southern Ukraine; - Boris Markov from Kherson. Only two were from Eastern Ukraine; - Andrii Sukhorukov and Hendrikh Altunian, both from Kharkiv. M. Korobko, V. Batalov and S. Semenets also signed.

The above includes 13 of the DPU's 23 deputies, but only three of the URP's (Mykhailo Horyn', Rebryk and Kendz'or).

In an interview with the author on 1 May 1992, Mykola Porovs'kyi claimed that the faction had grown to 70 members.

[114] V''iacheslav Chornovil's views were set out in two major articles, 'Rukh mozhe staty masovishoiu i vplyvovishoiu politychnoiu syloiu', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 19 (December) 1991; and 'Shcho dali?', *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 24 January 1992.

[115] V''iacheslav Chornovil, 'Shcho dali?', *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 24 January 1992.

[116] Chornovil's argument was supported by *Rukh* Deputy Leader Oleksandr Lavrynovych in his article 'Musymo vyznachytycia', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 1 (January) 1992.

[117] *Nezavisimost'* , 7 February 1992.

[118] *Nezavisimost'* , 6 March 1992.

[119] On the position of local *Rukh* leaders, such as Yurii Kliuchkovs'kyi in L'viv and Viktor Bed' in Transcarpathia, see *Molod' Ukraïny* , 19 February 1992. On the all-important L'viv congress on 15-16 February, see *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 18 February 1992; and also ibid, 4 January, and 13 and 19 February. For a similar pro-Chornovil view from the opposite end of Ukraine, see Olena Bondarenko, head of *Rukh* in Luhans'k in *Viche* , No. 5, 1992.

[120] *URP-inform* , No. 4, 28 January 1992.

121 For general reports on the congress, see *Narodna hazeta* , Nos. 9 and 10 (March) 1992;*Vechirnii Kyïv* , 4 March 1992; *Holos Ukraïny* ,3 March 1992; *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 3 and 7 March 1992; *Moloda Halychyna* , 3 March 1992; *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 5 March 1992; *Nezavisimost'* , 6 March 1992; *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 12 (March) 1992; and *Nezavisimaia gazeta* , 3 March 1992.

122 All information supplied by the congress' mandate commission.

123 *Holos Ukraïny* , 3 March 1992, and from the notes of the author in attendence.

124 Press conference after the congress, 1 March 1992.

125 This document circulated throughout the afternoon, after the URP and DPU delegations had met at lunchtime. As it was in continual circulation, the number of signatures was never fixed, but the version seen by the author was signed by Ivan Drach, Dmytro Pavlychko, Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi, Voleslav Heichenko, Pavlo Kyslyi and Vitalii Donchyk of the DPU; Mykhailo Horyn' and Levko Luk"ianenko for the URP; Mykola Porovs'kyi, Larysa Skoryk, Pavlo Movchan, Viktor Burlakov, Vasyl' Chervonii, Bohdan Ternopil's'kyi, Petro Osadchuk, Leonid Shul'man and others. Not surprisingly, many of the above subsequently denied signing.

126 *Ukhvala III vseukraïns'kykh zboriv Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny* , in author's possesion.

127 *Rukh's* new 23-strong leadership consisted of two Deputy Heads belonging to neither faction, - Oleksandr Lavrynovych and Oleksandr Burakovs'kyi; Chornovil's quota of 14, consisting of himself, Olena Bondarenko, Yurii Kliuchkovs'kyi, Les' Taniuk, Bohdan Boichuk, Bohdan Chornomaz, Volodymyr Cherniak, Ivan Zaiets', Ivan Shovkovyi, Levko Viriuk, Viktor Tsymbaliuk, Serhii Odarych, Henrikh Altunian, and Mykhailo Boichyshyn; and Drach and Horyn"s quota of seven (who had all signed the call for a split, apart from Kostenko), consisting of themselves, Mykola Porovs'kyi, Vasyl' Chervonii, Vitalii Donchyk, Yurii Kostenko and Viktor Burlakov. Burlakov and Boichyshyn were also made Deputy Heads of *Rukh* . Source: congress mandate commission.

128 *Ukhvala III vseukraïns'kykh zboriv Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny* , in author's possesion.

129 *Zaiava III vseukraïns'kykh zboriv Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny pro stanovyshche v Krymu* , in author's possesion.

130 *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 4 March 1992.

131 Oleksandr Burakhovs'kyi, 'Zvitna dopovid' na tretikh zborakh Rukhu', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 9 (March) 1992, p. 6.

132 *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 19 March 1992.

133 'Zaiava pro politychni naslidky tretikh zboriv Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 13 (March) 1992; - dated 7 March 1992.

134 *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 26 March 1992.

135 V"iacheslav Chornovil, 'Ya ne holosuvav za tsei proekt', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 26 (July) 1992. Cf Chornovil's interviews in *Holos Ukraïny* , 30 June 1992; and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 3 September 1992.

136 *Zaiava Maloï rady NRU* , 1 August 1992, in author's posession.

137 *Ukhvala Maloï rady NRU pro koordynatsiiu dii demokratychnykh syl Ukraïny* , dated 1 August 1992. On the first meeting of the CNDF, see *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992.

138 *Holos Ukraïny* , 30 September 1992. The 50 members of the *Rukh* faction mainly consisted of previously 'non-party' members of the *Narodna rada* faction. At least 32 were from Western Ukraine. The fluidity of

factional boundaries in the Supreme Council could be seen from the fact that 21 of the 50 had belonged to the Horyn' group listed in Note 112 above. Thirteen of the 50 were from L'viv; namely Chornovil, Yaroslav Kendz'or, Mykhailo Batih, Bohdan Koziars'kyi, Iryna Kalynets', Valerii Ivasiuk, Yurii Kostenko, Mykhailo Kosiv, Yevhen Hryniv, Dmytro Chobit, Vitalii Romaniuk, Stepan Pavliuk, Ihor Derkach and Viktor Pynzenyk; 7 from Ivano-Frankivs'k, - Bohdan Rebryk, Markiian Chuchuk, Zinovii Duma, Stepan Volkovets'kyi, Dmytro Zakharuk, Petro Osadchuk and Liubomyr Pyrih; 5 from Ternopil', - Bohdan Boiko, Kateryna Zavads'ka, Lev Krupa, Volodymyr Kolinets' and Myroslav Motiuk; 4 from Volyn', - Fedir Sviders'kyi, Oleksandr Hudyma, Yaroslav Dmytryshyn and Andrii Bondarchuk; 3 from Transcarpathia, - Viktor Bed', Vasyl' Shepa and Ivan Herts; 4 from Kiev, - Les' Taniuk, Ivan Zaiets', Oleksandr Nechyporenko and Serhii Holovatyi; Oleksandr Vorobiov and Oleksandr Piskun from Sumy; Taras Hahulko from Khmel'nyts'kyi; Tatiana Yakheieva from Chernihiv; and Andrii Sukhorukov and Henrikh Altunian from Kharkiv. S, Semenets', O. Nesterenko, M. Korobko, P. Markov, M. Humeniuk, Y. Zaiko, and V. Melnychuk also signed. The full list is in *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 1 October, 1992. Zaiets' took over the formal leadership of the largely defunct *Narodna rada* in December 1992.

The author has no information on the exact composition of the CNDF faction, but it can be assumed to consist of the remnants of the Horyn' group, plus the URP and DPU factions, as listed in Chapters 3 and 5.

[139] *Narodna hazeta* , No. 13 (April) 1992.

[140] 'Ukhvala Velykoï rady Rukhu pro sotsial'no-politychnu sytuatsiiu v Ukraïni ta zavdannia Rukhu', dated 18 April 1992, *Narodna hazeta* , No. 15 (April) 1992.

[141] Interview with V"iacheslav Chornovil, 22 March 1993.

[142] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 30 July 1992.

[143] 'Ukhvala tsentral'noho provodu NRU z pryvodu zvernennia Vseukraïns'koho vicha Prydnistrov"ia', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 21 (June) 1992.

[144] *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 17 October 1992 gave the figure of 20,000 for *Rukh's* membership in L'viv oblast; while *Molod' Ukraïny* , 13 November 1992 gave the figure of 30,000.

[145] Moroz's dissident writings in the 1970s had taken up many of Dontsov's themes, including the weak-mindedness of the Ukrainian intelligentsia (he attacked Ivan Dziuba for his public recantation in the ealy 1970s). Moroz himself was forced to emigrate in 1979, and settled in Canada, before returning to Ukraine in the early 1990s to work as a Professor in the Ukrainian Polygraphic Institute (his opponents questioned his right to Ukrainian citizenship). See Yaroslav Bihun (ed.), *Boomerang: The Works of Valentyn Moroz* , (Baltimore: Smoloskyp Publishers, 1974); and Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 'The Political Thought of Soviet Ukrainian Dissidents', *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1987), pp. 477-89. For Moroz's modern-day views, see his 'Adieu, meine Herren', *Derzhavnist'* , No. 1 (January-March) 1992, pp. 22-29.

[146] *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 13 June 1992.

[147] *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 14 May 1992.

[148] *Molod' Ukraïny* , 29 September 1992; *Ukraïns'ke slovo* , 29 November 1992.

[149] Interview with Valentyn Moroz, *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 26 September 1992.

[150] *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 10 November 1992.

[151] See Moroz's declaration in *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 17 October 1992.

152 On the events surrounding the conference, see *Holos Ukraïny* , 31 October 1992; *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 27 October, 7 November, and 3 December 1992; *Visti z Ukraïnu* , 22 November 1992; *Ukraïns'ki visti* , 29 November 1992; and *Ukraïns'ke slovo* , 29 November 1992.

153 *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 7 November 1992.

154 *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 10 November 1992

155 *Derzhavnist'* , No. 4 (October-December) 1992, p. 2.

156 For reports on the Congress, see *Holos Ukraïny* , 4 and 8 December 1992; *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 17 December 1992; *Pravda Ukrainy* , 5 and 10 December 1992; *Uriadovyi kur"ier* , 9 December 1992; *Nezavisimost'* , 9 december 1992; and *The Ukrainian Weekly* , Nos. 48 and 50, 29 November and 13 December 1992.

157 *Holos Ukraïny* , 3 February 1993.

158 *Post-postup* , No. 49, 1992; *The Ukrainian Weekly* , No. 50, 13 December 1992.

159 *The Ukrainian Weekly* , No. 11, 14 March 1993; *Narodnaia armiia* , 18 March 1993.

160 *Pravda Ukrainy* , 2 March 1993.

161 The Union of Ukrainian Women was led by Chornovil's wife, the poetess Atena Pashko, and was registered as an official organisation on 27 February 1992, *Narodniaia armiia* , 6 March 1992.

162 *Memorial* was led by Chornovil's ally, Les' Taniuk. See Chapter 2.

163 Interview with V"iacheslav Chornovil, 22 March 1993.

164 *Kontseptsiia derzhavotvorennia v Ukraïni* , (Kiev: *Rukh* , December 1992), pp. 3, 4 and 5.

165 Interview with V"iacheslav Chornovil, 22 March 1993.

166 As note 164, p. 13.

Notes to Chapter 5.

[1] *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 27 June 1991.

[2] See the biographies of Badz'o in *Volia* , No. 5 (April 1991), and *Trybuna* , No. 4, 1991, pp. 33-5.

[3] See also his 'Open Letter to the Soviet Leaders', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 9, Nos. 1 & 2 (1984), pp. 74-94 & 47-70.

[4] That is, 340 out of 523 (though only 460 delegates registered). *Volia* , (DPU paper printed in Ternopil'), No. 5, December 1990, p. 1.

[5] That is, 162 out of 203. *Analiz anketnykh danykh uchasnykiv 1-ï Vseukraïnskoï partiinoï konferentsiï DemPU* . Supplied by DPU Secretary Hryhorii Kutsenko.

[6] Badz'o at the meeting of the Kiev oblast DPU, 1 February, 1992 (the author was present at the meeting).

[7] Interview with Badz'o, *Visti z Ukraïny* , No. 22, May 1991, p. 6.

[8] Yurii Badz'o, *Pro suspil'no-politychnu sytuatsiiu v kraïni, pro proekt prohramy, orhanizatsiinyi stan i cherhovi zavdannia Demokratychnoï Partiï: Dopovid' na pershii vseukraïns'kii konferentsiï DemPU* , 11-12 April 1992, p. 3.

[9] See the interview with Movchan in Roman Solchanyk (ed.) *Ukraine: From Chernobyl' to Sovereignty* (London: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 7-18.

[10] David Marples, 'The Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society: An Interview with Dmytro Pavlychko', *Report on the USSR* , RL 340/89, 29 June 1989.

[11] *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 8 March 1990.

[12] Ibid.

[13] An English transalation of the manifesto, and the full list of the 86 signatories, can be found in *The Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 15, No. 2 (Winter) 1990, pp. 85-111. See also *Pravda Ukrainy* , 27 July 1990.

[14] Copy in author's possession, entitled *Sproba politychnoï initsiatyvy: proekt prohramy Ukraïns'koï Partiï Demokratychnoho Sotsializmu i Derzhavnoï Nezalezhnosti* , and dated end March- 7 April 1989.

[15] Ibid, p. 15.

[16] 'Manifest Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 31 May 1990, pp. 4-5.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Volodymyr Solopenko, 'Nashi zavdannia', *Holos* , No. 8, (6 May 1990), p. 1.

[19] 'Partiini novyny', *Holos* , No. 15, 9 September 1990, p. 1.

[20] See, for example, Oleksandr Lavrynovych, 'Do ustanovchoho z"ïzdu DemPU', *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 12 September 1990.

[21] *Holos* , No. 11, 17 June 1990.

[22] *Zakhidnyi kur"ier* , 22 November 1990.

[23] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 27 November 1990; and *Kul'tura i zhyttia* , 2 December 1990.

[24] *Visnyk: Informatsiinyi b'iuleten' natsional'noï rady Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny* , No. 2, July-August 1991, p. 6.

[25] *Moloda Halychyna* , 11 December 1990.

[26] Vitalii Donchyk, quoted in V. Lytvyn, 'Demokratychna Partiia Ukraïny', *Polityka i chas* , No. 2 (January) 1991, p. 56.

[27] Oleksa Haran', 'Democrats Form Democratic Party', *News From Ukraine* , No. 1 (January), 1991.

[28] *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 20 December 1990.

[29] The DPU office supplied the author with a list of 23 as follows; eight from L'viv oblast - Orest Blokh, Ihor Hriniv, Ivan Drach, Roman Ivanchuk, Roman Lubkivs'kyi, Stepan Pavliuk, Vitalii Romaniuk and Mykhailo Shvaika; four from Ivano-Fankivs'k - Stepan Volkovets'kyi, Dmytro Zakharuk, Markiian Chuchuk, and Mykhailo Holubets'; four from Ternopil' - Roman Hrom'iak, Levko Krupa, Dmytro Pavlychko and Heorhii Petruk-Popyk; three from Volyn' - Oleksandr Hudyma, Yaroslav Dmytryshyn, and Andrii Mostys'kyi; one from Kirovohrad - Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi; one from Kharkiv - Volodymyr Shcherbyna; one from Kherson - Boris Markov; and Pavlo Kyslyi from Kiev city.

[30] As note 26, p. 58. Yevhen Hriniv, People's Deputy, leader of *Memorial* in L'viv oblast, and one of the DPU's 'sympathisers', confirmed to the author that the total DPU faction was 'up to 40' strong. Interview with Hriniv, 10 May 1992.

[31] As note 27.

[32] Oleksa Haran', 'Demokraty vyznachaiut'sia', *Zelenyi svit* , No. 1 (January), 1991.

[33] Yurii Badz'o, 'Politychna sytuatsiia v Ukraïni i rol' u suspil'nomu protsesi Domkratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny', *Ideini zasady Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny: z materialiv uctanovchoho z"izdu* , (Kiev: Prosvita, 1990), p. 25.

[34] Dmytro Pavlychko, 'Za nezalezhnu demokratychnu Ukraïnu vstupne slovo', Ibid, pp. 15, 14, 13, & 14.

[35] As note 33, p. 21.

[36] Ukrainian reports on the congress, apart from those already mentioned, can be found in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 20 & 27 December 1990; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 17 and 24 December 1990, *Molod' Ukraïny* , 16 & 23 December 1990; *Ukraïna* , No. 4, 1991; *Pravda Ukrainy* , 19 December 1990; *Kyïvs'ka Pravda* , 20 December 1990; *Ukraïna* , No. 4, 1991; and *Komsomol'skoe znamia* , 21 December 1990. On the early history of the DPU, see V. Lytvyn, 'Demokratychna partiia Ukraïny', *Polityka i chas* , No. 2 (January), 1991, pp. 56-8.

[37] Interview with Badz'o, *Trybuna* , No. 4, 1991, p. 35.

[38] Yurii Badz'o, *Rukhovi - demokratychnyi rukh do demokratiï ta berzhavnoï nezalezhnosti Ukraïny* (speech to second *Rukh* congress, 25-8 October 1990, in author's possession).

[39] *Demokratychna Partiia Ukraïny: Prohramovi pryntsypy i statut* , (Kiev: *Rukh* , 1991) p. 3 (The programme can also be found in *Ideini zasady...* , 1991, as note 33 above).

[40] Ibid, p. 5.

[41] Ibid, p. 9.

[42] Ibid, p. 6.

[43] Ibid, p. 8.

[44] See Voleslav Heichenko, 'Demokratychnii partiï - demokratychnyi statut', *Volia* , No. 2 (November) 1990, p. 3.

[45] *Protokoly Demokratychnoï Patiï Ukraïny* , 15-16 December, 1990.

[46] Interview with Badz'o, 29 April 1992. The party's Donets'k organisation appeared to be moribund when the author visited the Donbas in July 1993. For the activity of the DPU at a local level, see *Khersons'kyi visnyk* , 19

January 1991; *Nash gorod* (Zaporizhzhia), 13 February 1991; the article by the head of the Chernivtsi DPU, Professor Taras Kyiak in *Bukovyns'ke viche* , 28 February 1991; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 27 December 1990 & 13 March 1991; for Transcarpathia *Zakarpats'ka pravda* , 7 May 1991 & *Novyna Mukacheva* , 24 January 1991; *Chernihivs'ki vidomosti* , 12-18 April 1991; and *Znamia shakhtara* (Donets'k), 14 December 1990.

[47] Supplied by DPU office in Kiev. The breakdown of Ukraine into regions follows the pattern laid out in Chapter 1.

[48] All figures are from *Analiz anketnykh danykh uchasnykiv 1-ï Vseukraïnskoï partiinoï konferentsiï DemPU* . Supplied by DPU Secretary Hryhorii Kutsenko.

[49] Yurii Badz'o, *Pro suspil'no-politychnu sytuatsiiu v kraïni, pro proekt prohramy, orhanizatsiinyi stan i cherhovi zavdannia Demokratychnoï Partiï: Dopovid' na pershii vseukraïns'kii konferentsiï DemPU* , 11-12 April 1992, p. 9.

[50] M. Pashkov and L. Tupchienko, *Polityka i biznes: Ukraïns'kyi variant* , paper given to the author in October 1992, p. 2.

[51] Circular letter by Badz'o to the heads of the DPU's *oblast'* organisations on the occasion of the party's registration, summarising the party's record to date, *Z peremohoiu, dorohi druzi* , 4 July 1991, p. 6.

[52] Ibid, p. 6-7.

[53] Ibid, p. 5.

[54] Circular from the DPU's Inner Council, *Mala rada DemPU. Pytannia pryiomu do partiï* , 13 April 1991, p. 5.

[55] Ibid, p. 6.

[56] *DemPU natsional'na rada: Postanova pro stvorennia informatsiino-prosvitnyts'kykh hrup* , dated 18 May 1991.

[57] Yurii Badz'o, *Pro suspil'no-politychnu sytuatsiiu v kraïni, pro proekt prohramy, orhanizatsiinyi stan i cherhovi zavdannia Demokratychnoï Partiï: Dopovid' na pershii vseukraïns'kii konferentsiï DemPU* , 11-12 April 1992, p. 5.

[58] Ibid, p. 6.

[59] Kostiantyn Paryshkura, "Demokraty "rozmorozylysia"", *Holos Ukraïny* , 15 December 1992.

[60] Interview with Badz'o, 29 April 1992. Emphasis in original.

[61] Pohribnyi provoked controversy in March 1993 by attending a meeting of the OUN-r's front organisation, the Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists, in Kiev. *Shliakh peremohy* , 4 April 1993.

[62] See, for example, Badz'o's speech to the second DPU congress in December 1992, *Na shliaku stanovlennia ta samousvidomlennia: zvitna dopovid' holovy National'noï Rady DemPU druhomu z"ïzdovi partiï 12-13 hrudnia 1992 r* , p. 4.

[63] Interview with DPU Secretary Hryhorii Kutsenko, 28 April 1992.

[64] For the full list of members of the *Rukh* faction, given in the *Rukh* newspaper, *Narodna hazeta* , No. 7 (February) 1992, see Chapter 4, note 111. The DPU's 13 (out of 41) were -from L'viv oblast, Ivan Drach, Roman Ivanchuk, and Vitalii Romaniuk; from Ivano-Fankivs'k - Stepan Volkovets'kyi, Dmytro Zakharuk, Markiian Chuchuk, and Mykhailo Holubets'; from Ternopil' - Levko Krupa, and Dmytro Pavlychko; from Volyn' - Oleksandr Hudyma; from Kirovohrad - Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi; from Kherson - Boris Markov; and Pavlo Kyslyi from Kiev city.

[65] 'Statut DemPU', Clause 8.3. See Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (1991, op cit), p. 183.

[66] The position of the *Mala rada* was clarified by the National Council on 18 May 1991. It consisted of the 7 Presidium members; -party leader, Yurii Badz'o; the head of the DPU's Supreme Council faction, Dmytro Pavlychko; the head of the Kiev DPU, Voleslav Heichenko; Vitalii Donchyk, Yurii Tsekov, Mykhailo Shvaika and H. Iushchuk; plus 6 regional representatives; B. Iakymovych (West Ukraine); S. Hubar (Central); M. Starunov (East); V. Iukhno (South); V. Su'iarko (Donbas); and V. Zaremba (Dnipro). *DemPU natsional'na rada: postanova. Pro zatverdzhennia "tymchasovoho polozhannia pro malu radu, prezydiiu i holovu natsional'noï rady DemPU"* , 18 May 1991.

[67] *Ukraïns'kyi nezalezhnyi tsentr sotsiolohichnykh doslidzhen': Informatsina zapyska pro rezul'taty sotsiolohichnoho doslidzhennia hromads'koï dumky z pytan' referendumu shchodo Aktu proholshennia nezalezhnosti Ukraïny ta vyboriv prezydenta* , fieldwork dated 20-4 September 1991, p. 6.

[68] Artur Bilous, 'Tse mahichne slovo - demokratiia', *Verchirnii Kyïv* , 3 December 1991.

[69] 'Sotsiolohichne doslidzhennia provedeno hrupoiu naukovtsiv Institutu sotsiolohiï AN Ukraïny', *Holos Ukraïny* , 21 October 1992, p. 12-13.

[70] *Ideini zasady...* , 1991, (as note 31 above), p. 23.

[71] *Protokoly DemPU, No. 2* , (sitting of the temporary presidium of the national council), dated 27 December 1990.

[72] *Protokoly DemPU: rehional'ni zviti* 13 April 1991 (report from Dnipropetrovs'k).

[73] *Protokoly DemPU. No. 17: druha sesiia national'noï rady* , 18 May 1991.

[74] Interview with Badz'o, 29 April 1992.

[75] Yurii Badz'o, *Z peremohoiu, dorohi druzi!* , (speech circulated to all DPU members, 4 July 1991), p. 4.

[76] As note 44. See also *Volia* , No. 9-10 (June) 1991, p. 1,

[77] Interview with Badz'o, 29 April 1992.

[78] Yevhen Boltarovych, 'L'vivshchyna: politychni syly i politychnyi spektr', *Respublikanets'* , No. 2 (November-December) 1991, p. 29.

[79] Yurii Badz'o, 'A my za staru?', letter to *Holos Ukraïny* , 8 February 1992.

[80] Minutes taken by the author at the meeting.

[81] For the position of the L'viv DPU see *Poklyk sumlinnia* , No. 9. 1991. For the national DPU see *Holos Ukraïny* , 19 February 1991. See also 'Demokratychna partiia Ukraïny proty novoho "soiuznoho dohovoru"', *Volia* , No. 4 (February), 1992, p. 3.

[82] *Protokoly DemPU, ch. 10: zasidannia prezydiï Natsional'noï Rady* , 5 March 1991.

[83] *Holos Ukraïny* , 19 February 1991.

[84] Leaflet copy in author's possession.

[85] Published in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 27 September 1990; and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 25 December 1990.

[86] *Zaiava DemPU pro resul'taty referendumu ta opytuvannia 17 Bereznia 1991 roku i novyi proekt soiuznoho dohovoru* , 13 April 1991.

[87] *Vidozva DemPU do robitnykiv, trudovykh kolektyviv, do vs'oho narodu Ukraïny* , dated 13 April 1991.

[88] 'Zakliuchennia na proekt dohovoru soiuznu suverennykh derzhav', *Volia* , No. 13-14, (August), 1991, p.1.

[89] *Protokoly prezydiï DemPU* , No. 10 (5 March 1991), & No. 22 (2 July 1991).

90 Yurii Badz'o to the Presidium of the DPU, 23 April 1991, *Protokoly DemPU* , No. 15, 1991.

91 'Prezydiia natsional'noï rady DPU do prezudiï verkhovnoï rady Ukraïny', 19 August 1991, reprinted in *Volia* , No. 15-16, (September), 1991, p. 2.

92 'Hei, vy....otamany!', *Zakarpats'ka pravda* , 30 April 1991.

93 *Protokoly prezydiï DemPU* , No. 15, 23 April 1991.

94 Appeal of the DPU, *Do hromadian Ukraïny* , dated 20 September 1991, which called for all other opposition candidates to give way to the candidate with the highest opinion poll rating, and the best chance of defeating Kravchuk.

95 Letter of Yurii Badz'o to all heads of oblast DPU organisations, 9 August 1991.

96 *Holos Ukraïny* , 2 November 1991.

97 Voleslav Heichenko, the head of the Kiev DPU from 1990-2, report to the conference of the Kiev DPU, 1 February 1992. Author was present.

98 *Ideini zasady...* , (1991, as note 33 above), p. 22.

99 *Volia* , No. 13-14 (August) 1991, p. 1.

100 *Prohrama DemPU - proekt* , adopted by the National Conference of the party on April 12 1992, in author's possession.

101 'Resoliutsiia II z"ïzdu DemPU', *Demokrat: No. 1. Informatsiino-metodychnyi biuleten' Natsional'noï Rady Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny* , February 1993, p. 3.

102 Dmytro Pavlychko, 'Za derzhavu i demokratiiu, za yednist' narodu', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 17 December 1992, p. 3.

103 Yurii Badz'o, 'Chomu nam potribna bahatopartiinist'?', *Volia* , No. 15-16 (September) 1991, p. 4.

104 *Nasha pozytsiia: Prohramova deklaratsiia DemPU* , (a draft discussion document approved by the DPU National Council on 8 February 1992), p. 1.

105 Yurii Badz'o, 'Chomu nam potribna bahatopartiinist'?', *Volia* , No. 15-16 (September) 1991, p. 4.

106 *Prohrama DemPU - proekt* , adopted by the National Conference of the party on 12 April 1992, in author's possession, p. 1.

107 *Prohramova deklaratsiia druhoho z"ïzdu DemPU* , p. 1. In author's possession, emphasis in the original. The author was Vitalii Lisnychyi, head of the Odesa oblast DPU.

108 Draft version of the revised DPU programme, as discused at the party's National Council meeting on 8 February 1992, p. 2.

109 In the draft programme submitted to the December 1992 congress; *Prohrama DemPU (korotka redaktsiia)* , p. 3.

110 *Zverennia do presidiï Verkhovnoï Rady, do uriadu ta heneral'noho prokuratura Ukraïny* , 2 October 1991, in author's possession.

111 *Nasha pozytsiia: Prohramova deklaratsiia DemPU* , (a draft discussion document approved by the DPU National Council on 8 February 1992), p. 6. See also *Ukhvala pershoï konferentsiï DemPU: pro zahrozu suverenitetovi i terytorial'nii tsilisnosti Ukraïny* , 12 April 1992.

112 Issue 1 in author's possession.

113 *He spivdruzhnist', a spivrobitnytstvo!* , Zaiva prezidiï DemPU, 12 December 1991.

114 Yurii Badz'o, *Nova pastka* , 16 December 1991. Declaration in author's possession.

[115] *Zvil'nytysia vid zahrozu novoho HKChP!* Zaiava Prezidiï DemPU, 18 January 1992. See also Mykola Tsivirko, 'Zahroza suverenitetovi', *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 21 January 1992.

[116] *Prohrama DemPU - proekt* , adopted by the National Conference of the party on 12 April 1992, in author's possession, p. 5.

[117] *Prohramova deklaratsiia druhoho z"ïzdu DemPU, (proekt)* ,p. 3. In author's possession, emphasis in the original. The author was Vitalii Lisnychyi, head of the Odesa oblast DPU.

[118] 'DemPU prohramovi pryntsypy', in Oleksa Haran' (ed.), *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (1991, op cit), p. 178.

[119] *Prohrama DemPU - proekt* , p. 5, and notes taken by the author at the meeting.

[120] The conference was reported in *Kyïvs'ka pravda* , 14 April 1992.

[121] *Ukhvala pershoï konferentsiï DemPU: pro zahrozu suverenitetovi i terytorial'nii tsilisnosti Ukraïny* , 12 April 1992.

[122] *Prohrama DemPU (korotka redaktsiia)* , p. 4.

[123] *Prohramova deklaratsiia druhoho z"ïzdu DemPU, (proekt)* , p. 3.

[124] Interview with Badz'o, 29 April 1992.

[125] *Ukhvala pershoï konferentsiï DemPU, pro stavlennia do SND* , 12 April 1992. Cf the open letter by the L'viv DPU attacking Russian imperial pretensions at the level of 'the highest officers of state, President B. Yeltsin and Vice President O. Rutskoi', 'Boiazh moskovs'koho "strateha". Vidkrytyi lyst L'vivs'koï DemPU do Prezydenta Ukraïny Leonida Kravchuka z pryvodu hruboho vtruchannia Rosiï u vnutrishni spravy Ukraïns'koï derzhavy', *Holos Ukraïny* , 7 April 1992.

[126] In the draft programme submitted to the December 1992 congress; *Prohrama DemPU (korotka redaktsiia)* , p. 4.

[127] *Ukhvala Natsional'noï Rady DemPU vid 13 veresnia 1992 roku pro stavlennia do orhaniv derzhavnoï vlady* . Also reported in *Robitnycha hazeta* , 16 September 1992.

[128] *Ukhvala Natsional'noï Rady DemPU vid 13 veresnia 1992 roku pro proiekt konstytutsiï Ukraïny* . Cf the criticisms of the new constitution made in the URP-backed journal *Rozbudova derzhavy* , No. 5 (October) 1992.

[129] *Ukhvala Natsional'noï Rady DemPU vid 13 veresnia 1992 roku pro stan natsional'no-demokratychnoho rukhu i perspektyvy rozbudovy partiï.*

[130] For reports on the congress, see *Holos Ukraïny* , 15 December 1992; *Pravda Ukrainy* , 15 December 1992; and the interviews with the DPU's new leader, Volodymyr Yavorivs'kyi, in *Holos Ukraïny* , 18 December 1992, and an earlier one in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 22 October 1992. Dmytro Pavlychko's speech to the congress, 'Za derzhavu i demokratiiu, za iednist' narodu', was published in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 17 December 1992; while the congress' proceedings, resolutions, etc are in *Demokrat: No. 1. Informatsiino-metodychnyi biuleten' Natsional'noï Rady Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny* , dated February 1993.

[131] Badz'o's speech to the second congress, *Na shliaku stanovlennia ta samousvidomlennia: zvitna dopovid' holovy National'noï Rady DemPU druhomu z"ïzdovi partiï 12-13 hrudnia 1992 r* , p. 1.

[132] As note 102 above.

[133] 'Zaiava DemPU', *Demokrat: No. 1. Informatsiino-metodychnyi biuleten' Natsional'noï Rady Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny* , February 1993, p. 11.

[134] Ibid, p. 7.

[135] The quote is from the DPU's definition of its own basic tasks as a party in the new party statute adopted at the congress. Clause 1.2, *Demokrat: No. 1.*

Informatsiino-metodychnyi biuleten' Natsional'noï Rady Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny , February 1993, p. 5.

[136] As note 133 above, pp. 5-6.

[137] 'Zaiava DemPU', ibid, p. 4.

[138] As note 133 above, p. 9.

[139] 'Zasidannia Kyïvs'koï oblasnoï rady DemPU; - Pro ob"iednannia DemPU i URP', dated 10 December 1992, as note 135, p. 14.

[140] As note 133 above, p. 8.

[141] Report of the sitting of the Presidium of the National Council of the DPU on 11 January 1993, as note 135, p. 10.

[142] *Pravda Ukrainy* , 15 December 1992.

Notes to Chapter 6.

[1] Speech by the leader of the Ukrainian National Party, Hryhorii Prykhod'ko at the first session of the UIA, 'Politychna Ukraïna: vybir shliakhu', *Zoloti vorota* , (UIA bulletin), No. 5, 1990, p. 5.

[2] See Chapter 1, Note 33 for Dontsov's works.

[3] *Visnyk Kyïvs'koho komitetu UMA* , (UIA newsletter), No. 1, (June), 1991, p. 4. Also present were the tiny Republican Party of Ukraine (not to be confused with the URP); various independent trade union committees; the Committee for the Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church; the Committee of Ukrainian Catholic Youth; the Ukrainian Committee for the Creation of Armed Forces; the All-Ukrainian Society of the Repressed; the *Ekolohiia* society; the *Sich* youth organisation; the citizens' front of Zhytomyr and others.

[4] Anatol' Kamins'kyi, *Na perekhidnomu etapi: "hlasnist' ", "perebudova" i "demokratyzatsiia" na Ukraïni* , (Munich: Ukrainian Free University, 1990), p. 366.

[5] The UNP's programme and statute are in Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (Kiev: Pam'iatky Ukraïny, 1991), pp. 29-32.

[6] Ibid, pp. 29 & 30.

[7] *Vyzvol'nyi shliakh* , No. 4, 1990.

[8] Speech by Prykhod'ko at the first congress of the URP in April 1990: *Ustanovchyi z'ïzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï* , (Kiev: RUKHinform, 1990), pp. 85-6.

[9] *Visnyk UNP*, No. 1 (June), 1990.

[10] A. H. Sliusarenko and M. V. Tomenko, *Novi politychni partiï Ukraïny* , (Kiev: Znannia, 1990), pp. 29-30.

[11] V. Mikhailiv, 'Ukrainskaia natsional'naia partiia', *Politika i vremia* , No. 2, (February) 1992, pp. 64-8.

[12] Information supplied by Yevhen Boltarovych of the L'viv URP.

[13] See the 'Zaiava UNP shchodo deklaratsiï pro derzhavnyi suverenitet Ukraïny' and Prykhod'ko's article 'Problema dnia', in *Visnyk UNP* , No. 3 (September), 1990.

[14] *Holos Ukraïny* , 21 May 1991.

[15] Yevhen Boltarovych, 'L'vivshchyna: Politychni syly i politychnti spektr', *Respublikanets'* , No. 2 (November-December), 1991, p. 35.

[16] V. Mikhailiv, 1992, op cit, p. 68.

[17] Hryhorii Prykhod'ko, 'Ukraïns'ka sotsial'na revoliutsiia: Uriadova polityka i reaktsiia suspil'stva', *Ukraïns'kyi chas* , No. 1(January) 1992, p. 2.

[18] Ibid, pp. 8 & 11.

[19] Hryhorii Prykhod'ko, 'Sotsial'no-ekonomichna kontseptsiia Ukraïns'koï Natsional'noï Partiï', *Ukraïns'kyi chas* , No. 1(8), (December) 1991, pp. 23-8.

[20] *Post-postup*, (A centrist L'viv weekly, originally founded by the *Tovarystvo leva*), No. 19, 1992; *Nash chas* , 23 July 1992.

[21] *Robitnycha hazeta* , 6 November 1992. See also *Post-postup* , No. 1, 1993.

[22] On the Ukrainian Culturological Club, see Bohdan Nahaylo, ' "Informal" Ukrainian Culturological Club Under Attack'; and 'Informal Ukrainian Culturological Club Helps to Break New Ground for Glasnost' ', *Radio Liberty Research* , RL 477/87, 23 November 1987 and RL 57/88, 8 February 1988.

[23] On *Hromada* , see *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 2 September 1989.

24 On the *Tovarystvo leva* , see *Molod' Ukraïny* , 6 March 1988; *Ukraïna* , July 1988, pp. 20-2; and M. Drohobycky, 'The Lion Society: Profile of a Ukrainian Patriotic "Informal" Group', *Radio Liberty Research* , RL 325-88, 18 July 1988.

25 See 'Korotko pro Ukraïns'ku Narodno-demokratychnu Partiiu', *Moloda gvardiia* , 19 October 1990.

26 See the declaration made at the UHU-URP congress by the UPDL's A. Kyreev, *Ustanovchyi z'izd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï* , (Kiev: RUKHinform, 1990), pp. 103-4.

27 *Nezalezhnist'* (the UPDL-UPDP paper), No. 5, 1990. See also the interview with Kyreev in *Trybuna* No. 10, 1990, pp. 42-3.

28 *Deklaratsiia pershoho z'izdu UNDP* , in author's files. Interestingly Leonid Kravchuk's Autumn 1991 Presidential campaign used a virtually identical slogan of the 'five Ds', adding only *dovir'ia* (trust), and changing *dobrobut* for its synonym *doctatok* (prosperity); *Holos Ukraïny* , 31 October 1991.

29 For the UPDP's programme and statute, see Haran' (1991, op cit), pp. 110-135.

30 *Moloda hvardiia* , 8 July 1990.

31 UPDP programme, in Haran', ibid, p. 112.

32 The UPDP's formal declaration of protest can be found in *Zoloti vorota* , No. 5, 1990, p. 4.

33 V. Lytvyn, 'Ukraïns'ka Narodno-demokratychna Partiia', *Polityka i chas* , No. 15 (November), 1991, pp. 54-9.

34 Ibid, p. 59.

35 On Ukraine's many youth organisations, see V. A. Holoven'ko and M. Yu. Pashkov, *Zbirnyk materialiv pro molodizhni ob"iednannia Ukraïny* , (Kiev: Ukraïns'kyi naukovo-doslidnyi instytut problem molodi, 1991).

36 See the explanation given by Ihor Derkach in *Novyi shliakh* , 20 January 1990.

37 Holoven'ko and Pashkov, (1991, op cit), p. 47.

38 See S. Yanovs'kyi, 'SNUM: z kym i proty koho?', *Radians'ka osvita* , 24 April 1990; and 'SNUM: alternatyva Komsomolu?', *Osvita* , 15 February 1991.

39 'Ideolohichni zasady SNUM' in Holoven'ko and Pashkov (1991, op cit), p. 48.

40 *Ustrii SNUM* , Article 6, Ibid, p. 55.

41 Dmytro Korchyns'kyi, 'Vse i nehaino', *Biblioteka Ukraïns'koï Natsionalistychnoï Spilky: zbirka stattei "chastyna 1"* (Kiev: *samizdat* , 1991), pp. 3-4.

42 *Ideolohichna pliatforma Ukraïns'koï Natsionalistychnoï Spilky* , Article 4. In author's files.

43 Oles' Babii, 'Ukraïna i Moskva - protystoiannia kul'tury ta varvastva', *Biblioteka Ukraïns'koï Natsionalistychnoï Spilky: zbirka stattei "chastyna 1"* (Kiev: Samizdat, no publisher, 1991), p. 23.

44 Dmytro Korchyns'kyi, 'Yakoiu maie buty natsionalistychna orhanizatsiia?' *Napriam* , No. 4, 1992, p. 33.

45 *Moloda halychyna* , 21 January 1992.

46 'Politychna zaiava mizhpatiinoï asambleï', *Zoloti vorota* , No. 5, 1990, p. 3.

47 'Politychna dopovid' holovy vykonavchoho komitetu Ukraïns'koï Mizhpartiinoï Asambleï Anatoliia Lupynoca', *Documents of Second Session of the UIA* ; in author's files.

48 *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 10 October 1990; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 9 October 1990.

[49] Oleksa Haran', 'Do voli -cherez natsional'nyi konhres', *Moloda hvardiia* , 12 October 1990.

[50] *Kyïvs'ka pravda* , 31 January 1991.

[51] Interview with Lupynis, *Visti z Ukraïny* , No. 8, February 1991.

[52] Lupynis in*Vinnyts'ki visti* , No. 7. (April), 1991.

[53] *Molod' Ukraïny* , 10 April 1991.

[54] *Moloda hvardiia* , 12 October 1990.

[55] Ibid. Many grass-roots URP members took part in the committees.

[56] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 5, (June) 1991.

[57] Anatolii Lupynis, as note 47 above.

[58] *Ratusha* , 27 December 1990.

[59] See, for example, the interviews with Shukhevych in *Zapovit* , No. 11, 3 October 1991; and in*Ukraïna* , No. 10, (May), 1991.

[60] The conference's proceedings are recorded in *Ideologiia i taktyka URP: Materiialy teoretychnoï konferentsiï* (Kiev: Vydannia URP, 1991).

[61] *Visti prestsentru UMA* , (UIA news-release), No. 8 (July), 1991.

[62] *Visti prestsentru UMA* , No. 6 (June), 1991. The conference was also attended by representatives from the National Party 'Musovat', and the Peoples' Party of Freedom from Azerbaijan; The League of Citizens, the Society of Ilia Pravednyi, and the independent information centre from Georgia; and the Union of Independent Youth from Lithuania.

[63] 'Vystup p. Dymtra Korchyns'koho na konferentsiï ABN OT', *Visti prestsentru UMA* , No. 6 (June), 1991, p.2.

[64] Interview with Shukhevych, *Ukraïna* , No. 10, (May), 1991, pp. 16-18.

[65] Published as *Materialy z'ïzdu VOST* (Kiev: Prestsentr UMA, 1991).

[66] V. Lytvyn, 'Novitni politychni partiï i robitnychnyi rukh', *Polityka i chas* No. 13 (September), 1991, pp. 41-6. See also *Moloda Halychyna* 25 June 1991; and *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* 27 June 1991.

[67] VOST statute, *Materialy z'ïzdu VOST* (Kiev: Prestsentr UMA, 1991), p. 3.

[68] 'Zaiava vykonavchoï rady Ukraïns'koï Mizhpartiinoï Asaambleï', *Viln'e slovo* , 19 March 1991.

[69] 'Rezoliutsiia p'iatoï sesiï Ukraïns'koï Mizhpartiinoï Asaambleï pro soiuznyi dohovir', *Visti prestsentru UMA* , No. 8 (July), 1991, p. 2.

[70] See*Visti prestsentru UMA* , No. 9 (July), 1991.

[71] Oleh Vitovych, 'Bo my - natsionalisty', *Visti prestsentru UMA* , No. 8 (July), 1991, p. 3.

[72] Shukhevych in*Ukraïna* , No. 10, (May), 1991, p. 17.

[73] Interview with Viktor Mel'nyk, 7 May 1992.

[74] Ibid.

[75] Yurii Shukhevych, speech at the sixth session of the UIA, *Natsionalist* (journal of the L'viv-based Club of the Supporters of Dmytro Dontsov), No. 2, 1991, p. 21.

[76] 'Politychna rezoliutsiia VI sesiï Ukraïns'koï Natsional'noï Asembleï', *Zamkova hora* (the UIA-UNA periodical), No. 19, 1991, p. 5.

[77] *Natsionalist* , No. 2, 1991, p. 21.

[78] Interview with Dmytro Korchyns'kyi, 12 May 1992.

[79] 'Osnovy politychnoï prohramy Ukraïns'koï Natsional'noï Asembleï', *Zamkova hora* , No. 19, 1991, p. 6.

[80] 'Politychna prohrama UNA', *Natsionalist* , No. 2, 1992, pp. 25-6.

[81] 'Statut Ukraïns'koï Natsional'noï Asembleï'. Articles 1.5, 1.7, 1.3, and 1.4; *Natsionalist* , No. 2, 1992, pp. 24-5.

82 Viktor Mel'nyk, 'Het' usikh, a todi het' tykh, khto zalyshyt'cia', *Natsionalist* , No. 1, 1992, p. 3.

83 'Viis'kova doktryna Ukraïns'koï Natsional'noï Asambleï', *Zamkova hora* , No. 1, 1992, p. 4.

84 Viktor Mel'nyk, ' OUN: sproba povernennia', (the OUN: an attempt to return) *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 6, 1992, p. 4.

85 Dmytro Korchyns'kyi, 'Nostal'giia -dukh revoliutsiï', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 6, 1992, p. 1.

86 Ibid.

87 Interview with Viktor Mel'nyk, 7 May 1992.

88 As note 85, p. 1. Also in *Zamkova hora* , No. 1, 1991, p. 2.

89 Viktor Mel'nyk, 'Orientyr -zmina svitohliadu', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 8, 1992, p. 2.

90 Oles' Babiii, ' Svoboda i natsional'nyi ideal', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 8, 1992, p. 5.

91 Ibid.

92 'Ideol'ohichna pliatforma Ukkraïns'koï Natsionalistychnoï Spilky', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 6, 1992, p. 2.

93 Oleh Kubakh, 'Rol' "tavriï" v stratehichnykh planakh Kyieva', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 8, 1992, p. 3.

94 See for example the appeal in *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 5, 1992, p. 3.

95 *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 10, 1992, p. 2.

96 'Zaiava Ukraïns'koï Natsional'noï Asambleï z pryvodu zminy pozytsiï Ukraïns'koho uriadu shchodo Prydnistrov'ia', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 10, 1992, p. 1.

97 'Zaiava Ukraïns'koï Natsional'noï Asambleï z pryvodu sproby separatsiï Krymu', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 8, 1992, p. 1.

98 Oles' Babii, 'Ukraïna naperedodni hariachoho lita 1992-ho', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 8, 1992, p. 3.

99 Volodymyr Yavors'kyi, 'Bozhe, syly nam podai!', *Zamkova hora* , No. 6, 1992, p. 5.

100 'Viis'kova doktryna Ukraïns'koho uriadu', *Zamkova hora* , No. 3, 1992, pp. 4-6.

101 *Natsionalist* , No. 2, 1991, p. 24.

102 Interview with Shukhevych in *Neskorena natsiia* ('The Nation Unsubdued', a journal founded by ex-URP secratary Roman Koval' in Autumn 1991, eventually becoming the organ of the DSU. See Chapter 7), No. 3 (October), 1991.

103 'Viis'kova doktryna Ukraïns'koï Natsional'noï Asambleï', *Zamkova hora* , No. 1, 1992, pp. 4-6.

104 Ibid.

105 'Politychna resoliutsiia VIII sesiï UNA', *Zamkova hora* , No. 8, 1992, p. 2.

106 Oleh Vitovych, *Respublika* , No. 5, 1-7 August 1992, p. 8.

107 *Sekratariat Verkovnoï Rady Ukraïny: grupa sotsiolohichnykh doslidzhen'. Anketa provedenoho 20-24 veresnia 1991 roku* , p. 10. In author's files. By comparison, 50.9% considered themselves well-informed about *Rukh* , 21.5% concerning the Green Party of Ukraine.

108 Artur Bilous, 'Tse mahichne slovo -demokratiia', *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 3 December 1991, p. 1.

109 *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 14 May 1992; and *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 16 February 1993.

110 *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 16 February 1993 (which carries a report on the first UNA conference in L'viv in February 1993). On the founding conference of the Crimean UNA see *Molod' Ukraïny* , 18 September 1992.

111 Interview with Viktor Mel'nyk, 7 May 1992.

112 The initiative grew out of a Congress in Support of Nationalism held in the Writers' Union of Ukraine building in Kiev on 30 August 1991. *Holos* , No. 17, 1991.

113 Poster in author's possession.

114 Information supplied by Dmytro Korchyns'kyi, 12 May 1992.

115 *Narodnaia armiia* , 12 January 1993.

116 Oles' Babii, 'UNSO i natsional'na perspektyva', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 5, 1992, p. 3.

117 'Mistse UNSO v doktryni natsional'noï bezpeky Ukraïny', *Zamkova hora* , No. 9, 1992, Article V, p. 5. See also Serhii Hrinchuk, 'Mizhpartiini ambitsiï ta intryhy UNSO zalyshae svoïm konkurentam', *Ukraïns'ki obriï* , No. 9, 1992, pp. 1-2..

118 Ibid, 'Mistse UNSO...'.

119 'Zaiava komandy UNSO z pryvodu vidmovy u reiestratsiï ministerstvom yustytsiï Ukraïny', *Zamkova hora* , No. 4, 1992, p. 2.

120 *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 16 April & 8 July 1992; *Holos Ukraïny* , 24 & 25 April 1992.

121 *Holos Ukraïny* , 3 July 1992.

122 For the former, see the interview with Oleh Vitovych in *Respublika* , No. 5, 1-7 August, 1992, p. 5. For the latter, see Slavko Artemenko, 'Ku Kluks Klian', *Zamkova hora* , No. 19, 1991, pp. 6-7.

123 Interview with Dmytro Korchyns'kyi, 12 May 1992.

124 Ibid.

Notes to Chapter 7.

[1] See the speeches by Ivan Kandyba at the first URP congress in April 1990, *Ustanovchyi z"izd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï* , (Kiev: RUKHinform, 1990), pp. 15-16, and by Levko Luk"ianenko at the second URP congress in June 1991, *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 6 (June) 1991.

[2] 'Statut DSU', in Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina: prohramni dokumenty novykh partii* , (Kiev: Pam"iatky Ukraïny, 1991), pp. 37-41. According to Article III. 5 (ibid, p. 40), the members of the DSU are banned from 'fraternising (*solidaryzuvatysia*) with organisations, which profess a communist or pro-communist (anti-popular and amoral) ideology and violent [means of] action'. The ban on non-ethnic Ukrainians was confirmed to the author by the then DSU leader Ivan Kandyba in an interview on 2 May 1992.

[3] *Moloda Halychyna* , 10 April 1990.

[4] V. Mikhailiv, 'Politicheskoe ob"edinenie "gosudarstvennaia samostoiatel'nost' Ukrainy" (GSU)', *Politika i vremia* , No. 3 (March) 1991, pp. 72-5. The percentage for delegates is on p. 72.

[5] *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 26 December 1991.

[6] 'Druhyi zbir DSU', *Neskorena Natsiia* , (or 'The Nation Unsubdued', the DSU's paper, -both capital Ns are in the original. The paper's masthead shows a map of 'ethnic Ukrainian territory' far beyond her present borders), No. 1 (January), 1992, p. 1.

[7] Interview with Ivan Kandyba, 2 May 1992.

[8] Roman Koval"s speech at the congress, 'Ksenofil'na demokratiia chy natsionalizm?', *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 1 (January), 1993, p. 3. On the DSU's third congress, see also *Holos Ukraïny* , 23 December 1992.

[9] *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 1 (January), 1993, p. 1.

[10] Interview with Ivan Kandyba, 2 May 1992.

[11] *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 1 (January), 1992, p. 2.

[12] Ivan Kandyba was born into a peasants' family in what was then Ukrainian Eastern Poland in 1930. From 1953-61 he worked as a lawyer in L'viv *oblast'* , where he met Luk"iananko and joined the UWPU. After their arrest in 1961, he was in the Mordovian camps till 1977, but upon his return to L'viv he immediately joined the UHG, which earned him a further 10 year sentence in 1981. He was released under Gorbachev's general amnesty in September 1988. For a more detailed biography, see *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 1 (January), 1992, p. 6.

[13] Volodymyr Teofilovych Shlemko was elected to district No. 201 in Ivano-Frankivs'k *oblast'* in March 1990. A former worker, he then worked as an actor in the main theatre in Ivano-Fankivs'k. He was one of the founders of *Rukh* and the Ukrainian Language Society in the *oblast'* , which then helped to secure him the position of head of the cultural department in the *oblast'* council in 1990. See *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 1 (January) 1993, p. 7.

[14] 'Nash kandydat v prezydenty Ukraïny - Yurii Shukhevych', *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 3 (October) 1991, p. 1.

[15] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 30 March 1993.

[16] *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 1 (January) 1993, p. 7. See also Ivan Kandyba's speech to the first congress of Khmara's party in June 1992, 'Razom stavaimo do borot'by za USSD!', *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 11 (June) 1992, p. 1.

[17] 'Napriamky diial'nosti DSU pislia vidrodzhennia derzhavnosti', Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (Kiev, 1991, op cit), p. 37.

[18] Interview with Kandyba in *Moloda Halychyna* , 18 September 1990. Compare his interview in *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 16 May 1991.

[19] As indicated by Kandyba in an interview with the author on 2 May 1992.

[20] Interview with Roman Koval', 5 May 1992.

[21] V. Mikhailiv, 'Politicheskoe ob"edinenie "gosudarstvennaia samostoiatel'nost' Ukrainy" (GSU)', *Politika i vremia* , No. 3 (March) 1991, p. 73.

[22] *Politychna filosofiia DSU* , p. 1. Written by Roman Koval', and dated 3 May 1991.

[23] Interview with Roman Koval', 5 May 1992.

[24] Roman Koval', 'V borot'bi za demokratychnu malorosiiu', *Chy mozhlyve Ukraïno-Rosiis'ke zamyrennia?* , ('Is Ukrainian-Russian Reconciliation Possible?') (Stryi, L'viv *oblast'* : Myron Tarnavs'kyi, 1991), p. 50.

[25] The DSU's publications often reprinted Mikhnovs'kyi's works. See, for example, *Neskorena Natsiia* , Nos. 8 and 9 (May-June), 1992.

[26] Roman Koval', 'Ukraïns'ki demokraty i demokraty Ukraïny', *Chy mozhlyve Ukraïno-Rosiis'ke zamyrennia?* , (1991, op cit), p. 57.

[27] Ibid, p. 65.

[28] Roman Koval', 'Chy povynni Ukraïntsi dbaty pro dobrobut Rosiian?', *Rivne* , (the paper of the Rivne town council) 27 July 1991. The article caused a storm of protest in later issues. See *Rivne* , 3 and 10 September 1991.

[29] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 3 March 1993.

[30] Roman Koval', 'My i vony', *Chy mozhlyve Ukraïno-Rosiis'ke zamyrennia?* , (1991, op cit), p. 21.

[31] Roman Koval', 'Ukraïns'ki demokraty i demokraty Ukraïny', *Chy mozhlyve Ukraïno-Rosiis'ke zamyrennia?* , (1991, op cit), p. 61.

[32] Roman Koval', 'Rosiis'ki demokraty i problemy imperiï', *Chy mozhlyve Ukraïno-Rosiis'ke zamyrennia?* , (1991, op cit), p. 69.

[33] P. Lastivka, 'Narodu potribnyi obraz voroha', *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 9 (May), 1992, p. 7.

[34] Interview with Roman Koval', 5 May 1992.

[35] Petro Sokolov, 'Zhydy chy ievreï?', *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 13 (August) 1992, p. 7.

[36] Before President Leonid Kravchuk's visit to Israel in January 1993, the DSU urged him to ask for Demianiuk's release, *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 5 January 1993.

[37] Interview with Roman Koval', 5 May 1992.

[38] 'Shcho take natsiokratychna derzhava?', Ideolohichna referentura DSU, *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 11 (June) 1992, p.2.

[39] Roman Koval', 'Vyzvolennia natsiï', *Chy mozhlyve Ukraïno-Rosiis'ke zamyrennia?* , (1991, op cit), p. 81.

[40] Oles' Babii, 'Natsiia syl'nykh chy natsiia slabkykh?', *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 4 (November) 1991, p. 2.

[41] Roman Koval', 'Yakoï Ukraïny my khochemo', *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 1 (January) 1992, p. 1.

[42] Ibid, p. 2. Cf Volodymyr Yavors'kyi, 'Natsiia ponad use', *Neskorena Natsiia'*, No. 13 (August) 1992, p. 3.

[43] Interview with Roman Koval', 5 May 1992.

[44] Ivan Kandyba, 'Prypynyty vyvezennia yadernoï zbroï z Ukraïny', *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 4 (March) 1992, p. 2.

[45] Anatol' Shcherbatiuk, 'Dukh krovi', *Slovo* , No. 4 (March) 1992, p. 7. This article and the virulent nationalism it expressed led to calls for Shcherbatiuk's prosecution from Oleksandr Burakovs'kyi, the Jewish Chairman of *Rukh's* Council of Nationalities. See Burakovs'kyi's speech at the third *Rukh* congress, 'Zvitna dopovid' na tretikh zborakh Rukhu', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 9 (March) 1992, p. 6.

[46] Interview with Roman Koval', 5 May 1992.

[47] *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 19 December 1992.

[48] *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 1 May 1991.

[49] See, for example, the material on the 50th anniversary of the UPA in *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 14 (August) 1992.

[50] See the interview with Ivan Kandyba in *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 16 May 1991; *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 2 (January) 1992.

[51] Information supplied by Yevhen Boltarovych of the URP Secretariat.

[52] See Stanislav Ishenko, 'Natsionalizm spravzhnii i "demokratychnyi"', *Napriam* , (a DSU journal by 1992), No, 5 (May) 1991, pp. 15-18.

[53] *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 1 (January) 1992.

[54] Speeches of Ivan Kandyba and V"iacheslav Rohoziv at the third DSU congress, *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 1 (January) 1993, pp. 1 and 6.

[55] The Conference's proceedings were reprinted as *Konferentsiia Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv: vybrani materiialy* , (Kiev: UIS, 1992). The conference was reported in the 31 March 1992 editions of *Holos Ukraïny* , *Moloda Halychyna* , and *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* ; and its Manifesto, 'Volia narodam - volia liudyni', was published in *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 2 April 1992. See also *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 6 (April) 1992, and the interview with Slava Stets'ko in *Holos Ukraïny* , 9 April 1992.

[56] 'Manifest konferentsiï Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv', *Konferentsiia Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv: vybrani materiialy* , (Kiev, 1992, op cit), p. 25.

[57] Ibid, pp. 25 and 27.

[58] Slava Stets'ko, 'Ukraïns'kyi natsionalizm i yoho rolia v zakriplenni ta rozbudovi Ukraïns'koï Samostiinoï Sobornoï Derzhavy', *Konferentsiia Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv: vybrani materiialy* , (Kiev, 1992, op cit), pp. 7, 10 and 12.

[59] Ibid, p. 8.

[60] 'Postanova viis'kovoï hrupy Konferentsiï Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv', *Konferentsiia Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv: vybrani materiialy* , (Kiev, 1992, op cit), pp. 18 and 16.

[61] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 16 (April) 1992.

[62] For example, such conferences were held in Transcarpathia on 23 May 1992, *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 10 (June) 1992; Rivne on 20 June 1992, *Neskorena Natsiia* , No. 13 (August) 1992; and in Ternopil' in November 1992, *Kyïvs'ka pravda* , 4 December 1992. Ivan Kandyba travelled to Chernivtsi in December 1992 to help organise a revival of the OUN in Bukovyna, *Holos Ukraïny* , 17 December 1992.

[63] *Ukrainian Radio* , 19 October 1992; *The Ukrainian Weekly* , 8 November 1992; and *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 3 December 1992. The conference's resolutions can be found in *Vyzvol'nyi shliakh* , No. 1 (January) 1993, pp. 13-16.

[64] *Kyïv'ska pravda* , 29 January 1993.

[65] *Zakhidnia Ukraïna* , 7-13 February 1993; *Ukraïns'ka dumka* , 6 May 1993.

[66] Serhii Plachynda was born into a Ukrainian smallholder peasant family in a tiny village in Poltava, Central Ukraine, in 1928. His father was arrested in the thirties, and many of his relatives perished in the Great Famine of 1932/3. Nevertheless, he secured a place to study philology at Kiev University after the war, graduating in 1953. Thereafter, he worked as one of Ukraine's most prolific writers, becoming a leading figure in the Writers' Union of Ukraine. He was a member of its communist party cell for 22 years until 1990.

[67] *Ukraïns'ka RSR u tsyfrakh u 1990 rotsi* , (Kiev: Tekhnika, 1991), p. 22.

[68] *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 8 March 1990.

[69] Ibid.

[70] For the programme and statute of the Peasants' Union, see *Sil's'ki visti* , 8 June 1990. On the Union's founding congress, see *Sil's'ki visti* , 2 October 1990; *Kyïvs'ka pravda* , 28 September 1990; *Molod' Ukraïny* , 20 September 1990; and *Radians'ka Ukraïna* , 28 September 1990.

[71] *Holos Ukraïny* , 29 January and 14 February 1992.

[72] *Uriadovyi kur"ier* , No. 31 (July) 1992.

[73] 'Zvernennia initsiatyvnoho komitetu po stvorenniu Ukraïns'koï Selians'ko-demokratychnoï Partiï do vsikh hromadian Ukraïny', *Moloda Halychyna* , 7 April 1990.

[74] On the UPDP's founding congress, see *Moloda hvardiia* , 26 September 1990; *Zemlia i volia* , No. 1 (August) 1990; *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 18 June 1990; and *Komsomolskaia znamia* , 15 June 1990.

[75] 'Deklaratsiia osnovnykh pryntsypiv Ukraïns'koï Selians'ko-demokratychnoï Partiï', *Moloda hvardiia* , 26 September 1990, p. 2.

[76] Ibid. See also Plachynda's laments on the destruction of the Ukrainian village in *Vil'na zemlia* , Nos. 2 and 3 (May) 1990; and 'Chy nastane kinets' tryvoham nashym?', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 31 January 1991.

[77] P. M. Serhin, 'Partiia chy spilka?', *Zemlia i volia* , No. 2 (October) 1990, p. 2.

[78] See note 74 above. See also V. Litvin, 'Ukrainskaia Krest'ians'ko-demokraticheskaia Partiia', *Politika i vremia* , No. 6 (April) 1991, pp. 57-61.

[79] *Moloda Halychyna* , 12 June 1990.

[80] *Molod' Ukrainy* , 20 August 1990.

[81] Volodymyr Lytvyn, 'Pro suchasni Ukraïns'ki partiï, ïkhnikh prykhyl'nykiv ta lideriv', *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 1, 1992, p. 82.

[82] Interview with Serhii Plachynda, 11 February 1992.

[83] *Moloda hvardiia* , 24 March 1992.

[84] Ibid.

[85] On the Association, see *Moloda hvardiia* , 11 March 1991; and *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 7 March 1991.

[86] *Holos Ukraïny* , 24 February 1993.

[87] *Molod' Ukraïny* , 15 February 1991.

[88] *Holos Ukraïny* , 24 February 1993.

[89] The draft 1992 Land Law was published in *Holos Ukraïny* , 14 January 1992, and Plachynda criticisms were published as 'Nas poriatuie zemlia', in *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 13 February 1992.

[90] 'Zvernennia Velykoï Rady USDP' (dated 14 July 1990), *Moloda hvardiia* , 8 August 1990.

[91] On the UPDP's second congress, see *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 28 February 1991; *Osvita* , 5 February 1991; *Visti z Ukraïny* , No. 8, 1991. See also the

party's declaration '"Ni!" - soiuznomu dohovoru', *Zemlia i volia* , No. 1 (January) 1991.

[92] *Pravda Ukrainy* , 12 October 1991.

[93] *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 8 November 1990.

[94] Interview with Serhii Plachynda, *Sil's'ki visti* , 1 February 1991.

[95] *Holos Ukraïny* , 24 June 1992. The radicalisation of Plachynda's views can be seen by comparing the following series of interviews and articles; - *Sil's'ki visti* , 1 February 1991; *Moloda hvardiia* , 13 March 1991; *Holos Ukraïny* , 24 June 1991; *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 23 July 1991; 'Shcho bude?', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 31 October 1991; and *Holos Ukraïny* , 4 February 1992.

[96] Serhii Plachynda, 'Suchasnyi Ukraïns'kyi natsionalizm yak ideolohiia', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 23 July 1992.

[97] *Holos Ukraïny* , 25 February 1992.

[98] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, p. 6. The author was present at the congress.

[99] *Holos Ukraïny* , 13 March 1993; *Robitnycha hazeta* , 17 March 1993.

[100] The elder Petro had been deported to Siberia as a member of both the OUN and UPA, where his son Vasyl' was born in 1957. After completing their sentence, both returned to Ukraine. Vasyl' studied journalism at Kiev university, but was expelled for publishing samizdat. In 1979 he was arrested for organising a nationalist meeting in L'viv, and was imprisoned until 1985. He joined the UHU in 1988. *Moloda Halychyna* , 24 April 1990.

[101] For the early history of the UCDF/UCDP, see V. Lytvyn, 'Ukraïns'ka Khrystyians'ko-demokratychna Partiia', *Polityka i chas* , No. 5 (April) 1991, pp. 62-5.

[102] Vasyl' Sichko, 'Khrystyians'ka demokratiia - maibutne Ukraïny', *Za Viru i Voliu* , No. 2 (1991).

[103] In May 1989, Vasyl' Sichko wrote a programmatical essay *Yak ity dali?* ('How to proceed?') in which he attacked the views the UHU's leader Levko Luk"ianenko had put forward in the similarly entitled *Shcho dali?* (see Chapter 3). In particular, Sichko attacked the UHU's faith in Gorbachev and his reforms, providing a more root-and-branch criticism of the irredemably rotten USSR. In author's possession, dated 1 May 1989.

[104] Interview with Vasyl' Sichko, *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 8 December 1990.

[105] The UCDF's draft programme of February 1989 stressed the 'independence of Ukraine as a state', although it also rather confusingly talked of a possible confederation to replace the USSR, *Ukrainian Central Information Service* , (London), U - 13/67/89, pp. 6 and 15. The programme is dated 16 February 1989.

[106] Ibid, p. 3.

[107] *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 13 October 1990.

[108] *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 22 October 1990.

[109] On this period, see Bohdan R. Bociurkiw, 'The Ukrainian Catholic Church in the USSR Under Gorbachev', *Problems of Communism* , Vol. 39, No. 6 (November-December) 1990, pp. 1-19.

[110] 'Vid frontu - do partiï', *Moloda Halychyna* , 24 April 1990. On the 1990 congress, see also *Ukraïns'ka dumka* , 24 May 1990; and *Moloda hvardiia* , 26 March 1991. On the conference of the Ivano-Frankivs'k branch of the party on 1 July 1990, see *Halychyna* , 6 July 1990.

[111] Yevhen Boltarovych, 'L'vivshchyna: politychni syly i politychnyi spektr', *Respublikanets'* , No. 2 (November-December) 1991, p. 30.

[112] Volodymyr Lytvyn, 'Pro suchasni Ukraïns'ki partiï, ïkhnikh prykhyl'nykiv ta lideriv', *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 1, 1992, p. 66.

113 The party's press, such as *Voskresinnia* ('Resurrection'), and *Za Viru i Voliu* ('For Faith and Freedom') was often full of material glorifying the OUN and UPA. See for example the special issue of *Za Viru i Voliu* , No. 9, 1991, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence by the OUN in L'viv in 1941.

114 *Moloda Halychyna* , 23 April 1992.

115 Vasyl' Sichko, 'Khrystyians'ka demokratiia - maibutne Ukraïny', *Za Viru i Voliu* , No. 2 (1991).

116 *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 1 July 1992.

117 See note 115 above. Compare the interview with Mykola Boiko in *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 13 October 1990.

118 On the congress, see *Moloda Halychyna* , 23 April 1992; *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 14 April 1992; and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 16 April 1992.

119 *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 16 April 1992.

120 On the L'viv congress, see *Post-postup* , No. 23, 1992.

121 *URP-Inform* , No. 25, 23 June 1992, p. 7.

122 For the Kiev congress, see *Post-postup* , No. 23, 1992, and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 1 July 1992. See also the CDPU's press conference in *Holos Ukraïny* , 26 February 1993. The CDPU received a boost in November 1992, when 1,500 former members of the UCDP in Ternopil' joined its ranks, *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 11 November 1992.

123 *URP-Inform* , No. 25, 23 June 1992, p. 7.

124 Speech of Vasyl' Sichko to the CNDF, 2 August 1992, *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, p. 8.

125 *URP-Inform* , No. 23, 9 June 1992, p. 7; and *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 24 (June) 1992.

126 'Ukhvala UKRP', *Materialy nadzvychainoï konferentsiï UKRP* , (Kiev: Brochure, no publisher, 1992).

127 See *URP-Inform* , Nos. 23 and 24, 9 and 16 June 1992.

128 Interview with Stepan Khmara in *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 2 April 1992. See also the interview with Khmara in *Narodna hazeta* , No. 22 (June) 1992.

129 Speech of Stepan Khmara at the UCRP conference, 'Pro suspil'no-politychnu sytuatsiiu v Ukraïni i stanovyshche v Ukraïns'kii Respublikans'kii Partiï',*Materialy nadzvychainoï konferentsiï UKRP* , (Kiev: 1992, op cit). Also reported in *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 19 June 1992.

130 Ibid.

131 Interview with Khmara, *Post-postup* , No. 15, 1992.

132 As note 129 above.

133 'Rezoliutsiia nadzvychainoï konferentsiï UKRP', 7 June 1992, as note 126 above.

134 Cited in *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 19 June 1992. See also *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 24 (June) 1992, p. 1.

135 The split was reported in *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 11 and 19 June 1992.

136 'Donets'k proshchavsia z URP bez zaivoho halasu', *Post-postup* , No. 25, 1992. Oliinyk's organisation included elements from the local URP, DPU, *Prosvita* , Union of Ukrainian Youth and non-party individuals, including several local People's Deputies.

137 'Rezoliutsiia nadzvychainoï konferentsiï UKRP', 7 June 1992, as note 126 above.

138 See, for example, the UCRP's appeal for the constituent congress of the Party of Labour in Kharkiv on 26 December 1992 to be banned, *Kyïvs'ka pravda* , 25 December 1992.

139 'Rezoliutsiia nadzvychainoï konferentsiï UKRP', 7 June 1992, as note 126 above.

140 Interview with Khmara in the paper of the Ivano-Frankivs'k URP in *Za nezalezhnist'* , No. 22-23, 25 April 1992.

141 *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 19 June 1992.

142 Interview with Khmara, *Klych* , No. 1 (February) 1993, p. 2.

143 See *Holos Ukraïny* , 23 February 1993; and Liudmila Vasil'eva, 'Na antikommunisticheskom fronte bez peremen', *Kievskie vedomosti* , 24 February 1993.

144 *Vidozva Sotsial-natsional'noï partiï Ukraïny* , distributed in L'viv in the Summer of 1992.

145 *Holos Ukraïny* , 31 October 1992; and *Ukrainian Radio* , 25 October 1992.

146 See Yevhen Boltarovych, 'L'vivshchyna: politychni syly i politychnyi spektr', *Respublikanets'* , No. 2 (November-December) 1991, p. 35.

147 Oleksa Haran', *Ukraïna bahatopartiina* , (1991, op cit,), pp. 13-14.

148 'Zaiava Spilky Monarkhistiv Ukraïny', *Post-postup* , No. 12, 1992, p.4.

149 *Sil's'ki visti* , 29 May 1993. The four pretenders to the Ukrainian 'crown', all claiming descent from Cossack Hetmen (leaders), were Oleksii-Olelko II, resident in Spain; two dukes living in Paris, Mykhailo Karachevs'kyi-Vovk and Serhii Volkons'kyi; and duke Anatol' Massals'kyi of Lublin.

150 *Kyïvs'ka pravda* , 16 October 1992.

Notes to Chapter 8.

---

1 See Roman Solchanyk and Taras Kuzio, 'Democratic Political Blocs in Ukraine', *RFE/RL Research Report* , 16 April 1993.

2 Chornovil, for example, met with Kravchuk once a month. Interview with V"iacheslav Chornovil, 22 March 1993.

3 Interview with Yurii Badz'o, 29 April 1992. He explicitly stated that (speaking just before the third URP congress) cooperation with the URP was conditional on the departure of Khmara and his supporters at the congress, as in fact occurred.

4 See Mykhailo Shviaka, 'Chy znae prava, shcho robyt' liva?' *Holos Ukraïny* , 22 January 1992. The DPU's economic programme was published in January 1992, as *Nezalezhnii Ukraïni - nezalezhnu ekonomiku, hromadianam - vlasnist' i svobodu hospodariuvannia. Pohliad DemPU na nynishniu ekonomichnu sytuatsiiu* , 24 January 1992, also published in *Probudzhennia* , No. 4-5 (March) 1992, p.3. A different version was published as 'Pravova baza na zadvirakh', *Holos Ukraïny* , 8 December 1992. See also 'DemPU protestue: hrabuiut' narod!', *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 29 January 1992; and *Ukhvala pershoï konferentsiï DemPU pro ekonomichnu polityku kerivnytstva Ukraïny* , 12 April 1992.

5 See for example, 'Kyiany pro pryvatyzatsiiu', *Holos Ukraïny* , 4 December 1991.

6 Interview with the URP's Deputy Leader, Oleh Pavlyshyn, after the party's 1992 theoretical conference, 27 January 1992.

7 *Mala rada DemPU. Zaiava pro resul'taty referendumu ta opytuvannia 17 bereznia 1991 roku i novyi proekt soiuznoho dohovoru* , 13 April 1991.

8 *Kyïvs'kyi visnyk* , 5 March 1992.

9 On the Democratic Congress, which united 46 opposition groups from 10 republics, and which called for a 'Commonweath of Independent States' to replace the USSR, see *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 7 February 1991; *Holos Ukraïny* , 20 February 1991; and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 31 January & 20 February 1991.

10 *Visnyk: Informatsiinyi b'iuleten' natsional'noï rady Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny* , No. 1, 28 June - 19 July 1991, p. 8.

11 *Zasidannia sekretaraitu URP: Protokol N. 11* , 30 January 1991.

12 Appeal of the DPU, *Do hromadian Ukraïny* , dated 20 September 1991, which called for all other opposition candidates to give way to the candidate with the highest opinion poll rating, and the best chance of defeating Kravchuk.

13 Interview with Yurii Badz'o, 29 April 1992.

14 On the meeting of URP, DPU and other leaders on 1 February 1992, see Chapter 4, note 111.

15 For the URP's response to the third *Rukh* congress, see 'Zaiava pro politychni naslidky tretikh zboriv Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 13 (March), 1992, p. 2; and for the DPU's reaction 'Zaiava Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny pro stanovyshche v Rusi', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 14 (March), 1992, p. 2.

16 *Holos Ukraïny* , 16 May 1992. Cf Porovs'kyi's article 'Pro z"ïzd, perspektyvy Rukhu ta "novu heneratsiiu"', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 18 (May) 1992.

17 'Zaiava kerivnytstva URP ta DemPU', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 27, (July) 1992; and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 6 July 1992.

[18] *Molod' Ukraïny* , 20 April 1993.

[19] 'Ukhvala narady predstavnykiv politychnykh partii ta hromads'kykh orhanizatsii Ukraïny', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 28 (July) 1992. The meeting was attended by Yevhen Proniuk for the All-Ukrainian Society for the Repressed, Dmytro Pavlychko and Yurii Tsekov for the DPU, Ivan Drach and Viktor Burlakov for *Rukh* , Volodymyr Chemerys and Karina Barantseva for the Union of Ukrainian Students, Roman Kostiuk for the Union of Officers of Ukraine, Ihor Derkach and Oleksandr Zadorozhnyi for the Union of Ukrainian Youth, Mykhailo Horyn' and Oleh Pavlyshyn for the URP, and Serhii Plachynda for the UPDP. See also *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 16 July 1992.

[20] The Kiev conference, for example, was held on 26 July 1992, and attracted a somewhat broader spectrum of political opinion than the latter all-Ukrainian congres, including delegates from *Zelenyi svit* , and the Liberal Democratic Party of Ukarine ,*URP-inform* , No. 30, 28 July 1992. A conference in Kharkiv on 16 July grouped local nationalist organisations into a local CNDF, which called itself *Derzhavnist'* ('statehood'), *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 29 (July) 1992; and *Ternystyi shliakh* , No. 31 (August) 1992. The near identical wording of the resolutions of these conferences seems to have reflected instructions sent out by the central leadership of the URP. A similar Coordinating Council of moderate nationalist parties in L'viv (the URP, DPU, *Prosvita* , and UPDP), plus, surprisingly, the Greens and SDPU, was set up in June 1992, *Moloda Halychyna* , 27 June 1992.

[21] *URP-inform* , No. 31, 4 July 1992.

[22] See 'Ukhvala Maloï rady Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny pro koordinatsiiu dii demokratychnykh syl Ukraïny', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 28 (July) 1992.

[23] Declaration of Inner Council of *Rukh* , 1 August 1992. In author's files.

[24] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 8 July 1992.

[25] *Post-postup* , No. 26, 1992.

[26] On Donchyk, see *Narodna hazeta* , No. 13 (April) 1992; and *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 2 April 1992.

[27] For the composition of the *Duma* , see *Holos Ukraïny* , 10 April 1992.

[28] The congress was reported in *Holos Ukraïny* , 4 August 1992; *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 6 August 1992; *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992; and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 3 August 1992.

[29] The Organisation of Soldiers' Mothers was set up with strong URP support in September 1990 to campaign against the all-Union draft, and for Ukrainian soldiers only to serve on Ukrainian soil.

[30] *URP-inform* , No. 31, 4 August 1992; and *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992.

[31] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, pp. 1-2.

[32] The author was present at the meeting.

[33] 'Statut kongresu natsional'no-demokratychnykh syl', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, p. 3.

[34] 'Zaiava KNDS', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, p. 3. The sentence 'the relatively painless addition of the *apparat* of the former Ukrainian SSR, the army, security organs and other organisations and structures to the state-building process should be considered a positive success for the President' was left out of the final version. From the author's notes at the Congress. Dmytro Pavlychko and Larysa Skoryk reportedly worked behind the scenes to ensure that the Congress' final documents were as pro-Presidential as possible.

[35] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, p. 3.

[36] 'Zaiava KNDS', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, p. 3.

[37] 'Zaiava kongresu natsional'no-demokratychnykh syl shchodo ekonomichnoï polityky', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, p. 3.

[38] Yurii Badz'o, 'Vid konsolidatsiï natsional'no-demokratychnykh syl do konsolidatsiï natsiï', *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, p. 4.

[39] *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 31 (August) 1992, p. 5.

[40] Ibid, p. 6.

[41] The CNDF faction held its constituent meeting in the Supreme Council building at the start of the new Parliamentary session on 17 September 1992. Twenty three deputies were present, but the total strength of the faction was estimated at 43-45. On the other hand, at the press-conference held by the CNDF on 30 December 1992 a figure of 40 Deputies was given, *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 1 (January) 1993.
Chornovil's *Rukh* faction attracted 50 deputies to its meeting earlier the same day. See 'Fraktsiia Rukhu', *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 1 October 1993; and *Ukraïns'ki novyny* , No. 35, 21 September 1992.

[42] *Ukhvala Rady KNDS pro politychnu sytuatsiiu v Ukraïni i zavdannia natsional'no-demokratychnykh syl* , dated 27 September 1992.

[43] *Kyïvs'ka pravda* , 24 December 1992.

[44] *Robitnycha hazeta* , 26 March 1993.

[45] *Ukraïns'i novyny* , Nos. 7 and 10, 15 February and 8 March 1993.

[46] 'Statement of Ukrainian Parliamentarians Concerning the Nuclear Status of Ukraine', *Ukraïns'ki novyny* , No. 17, 26 April 1993.

[47] See the report on the meeting of *Rukh's* Grand Council in *Holos Ukraïny* , 23 April 1992; 'Ukhvala Velykoï Rady Rukhu pro sotsial'no-politychnu sytuatsiiu v Ukraïni ta zavdannia Rukhu', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 15 (April) 1992; and the appeal 'Hromadiany Ukraïny!', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 20 (May), 1992.

[48] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 8 and 9 July 1992; *Post-postup* , No. 27, 1992.

[49] The 31 July meeting organised by *Rukh* , was also attended by representatives from i) centrist parties and organisations - *New Ukraine* , the PDRU, Liberal Democratic Party of Ukraine, SDPU, USDPU, Christian Democratic Party of Ukraine, GPU and *Zelenyi svit* ; ii) nationalists - the UPDP, Ukrainian National-Conservative Party, *Prosvita* , and *Memorial* ; iii) youth groups - the Union of Ukrainian Youth, Ukrainian Student Union and Union of Ukrainian Students; iv) civil associations - the *Rukh* Women's Organisation, Union of Ukrainian Women, VOST and the Union of Officers of Ukraine. The DPU sent a low-ranking 'observer'. From the author's notes at the meeting.

[50] Ibid. Notes taken at the meeting.

[51] Declaration by the Committee 'A New Parliament for a New Ukraine', dated August 1992, in author's possession. For the list of participating parties, see *Nezavisimost'* , 2 September 1992.

[52] For the full list of *Rukh's* propositions, see 'Propozytsiï pro stvorennia Uriadu natsional'noï zhodu, zetverdzheni ukhvaloiu Maloï rady NPU', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 24 (June) 1992.

[53] *Holos Ukraïny* , 18 September 1992.

[54] The figures are given in *Samostiina Ukraïna* , No. 2, (January) 1993. See also *Sil's'ki visti* , 18 December 1992; and *Kyïvs'kyi visnyk* , 24 December 1992.

[55] *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 16 April 1993.

[56] See 'KPSS-KPU - do sudu! Zvernennia tsentral'noho provodu NRU do Prezydenta ta Verkhovnoï Rady Ukraïny', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 21 (June) 1992; and 'Zaiava konferentsiï holiv kraiovykh ta raionnykh orhanizatsii

NRU pro pidhotovku do hromads'koho sudu nad KPSS-KPU', *Narodna hazeta* , No. 27 (July) 1992.

[57] See, for example, the special issue of the L'viv URP paper *Nezalezhnist'* , No. 5, (December) 1992, devoted entirely to the alleged crimes of the CPU.

[58] Interview with V"iacheslav Chornovil, 22 March 1993. See also *Holos Ukraïny* , 24 April 1993 on further moves to overturn the ban on the CPU.

[59] See Roman Solchanyk, 'Ukraine and the CIS: A Troubled Relationship', *RFE/RL Research Report* , 1 February 1993; *Holos Ukraïny* , 20-24 January 1993; and *Demokratychna Ukraïna* , 20 January 1993, which listed the deputies' demands.

[60] On the Supreme Court contoversy, see *Holos Ukraïny* , 18-20 February 1993.

[61] *Holos Ukraïny* , 6 January 1993.

[62] *Holos Ukraïny* , 19 January 1993.

[63] *Sil's'ki visti* , 28 January 1993; and *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 29 January 1993. See also the appeal by the Kiev branch of *Rukh* , urging President Kravchuk to protect Ukrainian independence if 'the communist-*nomenklatura* majority attempts to conduct a "quiet" coup in Parliament', *Sil's'ki visti* , 20 January 1993; and Chornovil's remarks in *Molod' Ukraïny* , 16 March 1993.

[64] *Holos Ukraïny* , 23 February 1993; *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 25 February 1993; *Kievskie vedomosti* , 24 February 1993; and *Narodnaia armiia* , 23 February 1993. The Front's name was not fixed in its early stages, as argument raged over whether the greater threat to Ukraine's security came from communist or Imperial forces. 'Anti-Communist Anti-Imperial Front' was the final variant.

[65] Ibid, and *Kievskie vedomosti* , 3 March 1993.

[66] See note 64 above, and Khmara's attack on Kravchuk reported in *Vechirnii Kyïv* , 16 April 1993.

[67] *Kievskie vedomosti* , 24 February 1993.

[68] *Sil's'ki visti* , 23 March 1993.

[69] 'Statement by the Coordinating Council of the ACAIF Concerning the Aggravation of the Political Situation in Moscow', *Ukrainian News* , No. 7, 29 March 1993.

Notes to Chapter 9.

---

[1] See also Alexander J. Motyl, *Dilemmas of Independence: Ukraine After Totalitarianism* , (New York: Council of Foreign Relations Press, 1993), especially Chapter 6.

[2] On the rise of Eastern Ukrainian parties, see Andrew Wilson, 'The Growing Challenge to Kiev From the Donbas Challenges Kiev', *RFE/RL Research Report* , Vol. 2, No. 33, 20 August 1993.

ABSTRACT for the PhD submission

Modern Ukrainian Nationalism:

Nationalist Political Parties in Ukraine 1988-1992

by Andrew Wilson

1. Civic and Ethnic Nationalism, Political Parties, the Intelligentsia and the State.
The opening chapter considers the theoretical distinction between the ideal-types of civic and ethnic nationalism, and the argument that the latter is more common in Eastern Europe. The history of the Ukrainian nationalist movement in the twentieth century is then analyzed. Social and political changes in Ukraine since the 1940s are then examined with a view to considering whether the conditions that fostered ethnic nationalism in the 1940s have been transcended. This was found to be only partially the case. Therefore, the oft-stated commitment of modern Ukrainian nationalists to civic nationalism is likely to prove precarious. The historical factors limiting the appeal of Ukrainian nationalism throughout the twentieth century are found still to exist.

2. The Development of Party Politics in Ukraine, 1988-1992. Different stages in the development of political pluralism in Ukraine are distinguished. The nationalist movement is therefore placed in a broader context. The difficulties in establishing strong political parties and a civil society in post-communist Ukraine are examined.

3. The Prisoners' Party. From the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, 1988-1990 to the Ukrainian Republican Party, 1990-1992. The main nationalist party. Its roots in

the dissident movements of the 1960s and 1970s are examined, then a brief history of the period 1988-92 is provided, demonstrating how the party became in practice an ethnicist party. Key themes in the party's history are examined, such as commitment to parliamentary politics, attitude to ethnic minorities, defence and foreign policy. The same themes are then picked up in later chapters.

4. *Rukh* - Ukraine's Popular Front. When first formed in 1989, *Rukh* was a broad-based movement, uniting nationalists, liberals, 'general democrats', and reform communists; but over 1990-1 it gradually fell under the control of the nationalist element. In 1992 *Rukh* was weakened by repeated splits and by the rise of extreme nationalism within its ranks.

5. The Party of the Intelligentsia. The Democrats. If the Republican party was led by former dissidents and political prisoners, the Democratic Party was led by prominent members of the Ukrainian cultural intelligentsia. They, more than any other group, were nominally commited to civic nationalism. However, Chapter 5 demonstrates how they swung sharply to the right in 1990-2 to adopt political positions little different to those of the Republicans. By 1992, the two parties were contemplating merger.

6. The Street Party. The Ukrainian National Assembly. The revival of open ethnic nationalism was also demonstrated by the formation of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly in 1990 (which became the UNA in 1991) encompassing all political parties to the right of the Republicans. The UNA's ideology and tactics are examined, as is the paramilitary movement it founded in 1991. The prospects for a radicalisation of public opinion leading to a sharp rise in the fortunes of the UNA are analyzed.

7. Smaller Groups, Ethnic Nationalists and Others. Further evidence for the rise of ethnic nationalism is provided by the study of ultra-right fringe parties. Most such parties remain small and their influence is mainly confined to Western Ukraine. However, their existence demonstrates the impatience of many nationalists with the politics of compromise, and their creation provided more mainstream parties with competition, helping to shift the latter to the right.

8. Nationalist Splits and Coalitions. Given the weaknesses described in Chapter 2, the nationalist parties have made various attempts to combine their strength. However, the nationalist camp split in 1992 and two rival coalitions were formed.

9. Conclusions. The main findings of the thesis are firstly, that, despite a strong revival in the late 1980s, the Ukrainian nationalist movement was unable to win majority support in Ukraine. Secondly, partly in response to this failure, and because many of the conditions identified by Kohn and others as likely to foster the development of ethnic nationalism still hold true, most nationalist political parties swung sharply to the right in 1990-2. This bade ill for the future, as it promised to encourage sharp polarisation in Ukrainian society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Monographs

Khmara, Stepan,*Lysty z-za grat* , (Kiev: Ukraïns'ka mizhpartiina asambleia, 1991)

Koval', Roman, *Chy mozhlyve Ukraïno-Rosiis'ke zamyrennia?* , (L'viv: Stryi, 1991)

Krymchuk, H. P. and Taniuk, L. S., *Khronika oporu: Dokumenty, inshi ofitsiini materialy, svidchennia presy pro sprobu derzhavnoho perevotoyu, vchynenu tak zvanym HKChP u serpni 1991 roku* , (Kiev: Vik-dnipro, 1991)

Kuras, I. F. et al (eds.), *Suchasni politychni partiï ta rukhy na Ukraïni* , (Kiev: Instytut politychnykh doslidzhen', 1991)

Haran', Oleksa, *Vid stvorennia Rukhu do bahatopartiinosti* , (Kiev: Znannia, seriia 1 "chas", No. 1, 1992)

Ukraïna bahatopartiina: prohramni dokumenty novykh partii , (Kiev: Pam'iatky Ukraïny, 1991)

Institute of Sociology opinion polls, 1991

Luk"ianenko, Levko,*Shcho dali?* (Translated as *What Next?*), (London: Ukrainian Central Information Service. Ukrainian version 1989, English version 1990)

Spovid' u kameri smertnykiv , (Kiev: Vitchyzna, 1991)

Viruiu v boga i v Ukraïnu , (Kiev: Pam"iatky Ukraïny, 1991)

Meshko, Oksana,*Mizh smertiu i zhyttiam* , (Kiev: Yava, 1991)

Persha sesiia Verkhovnoï Rady Ukraïns'koï RSR dvanadtsiatoho sklykannia. Biuleten' No. 22

Pozacherhova sesiia Verkhovnoï Rady Ukraïns'koï RSR dvanadtsiatoho sklylannia. Biuleten' No. 1 , 24 August 1991 (Kiev: Vydannia Verkhovnoï Rady URSR, 1991)

Proniuk, B., (ed.),*II z"ïzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï* , (Kiev: URP, 1991)

Sichko, Vasyl',*Yak ity dali?* (L'viv: Samizdat, 1990)

<u>Ukrainian Newspapers and Journals</u>

Demokratychna Ukraïna

Derzhavnist'

Halychyna

Holos Ukraïny

Kievskie vedomosti

Kreshchatyk

Kul'tura i zhyttia

Kyïvs'ka pravda

Kyïvs'ki visti

Lenins'ka molod'

Literaturna Ukraïna

Molod' Ukraïny

Moloda Halychyna

Moloda hvardiia

Narodnaia armiia

Nesalezhnist'

Poklyk sumlinnia

Politolohichni chytannia

Post-postup

Pravda Ukrainy

Radians'ka Ukraïna

Ratusha

Respublika

Robitnycha hazeta

Shliakh peremohy

Sil's'ki visti

Slovo

Slovo i chas

Trybuna

Ukraïna

The Ukrainian Weekly

Ukraïns'ka dumka

Ukraïns'ke slovo

Ukraïns'ki novyny

Ukraïns'ki visti

Ukraïns'kyi ohliadach

Uriadovyi kur"ier

Vechirnii Kyïv

Visti z Ukraïnu

Vyzvol'nyi shliakh

Yevreiskie vesti

Zakarpats'ka pravda

Zakhidnyi kur"ier

Zakon i biznes

Za vil'nu Ukraïnu

<u>Russian/ Soviet newspapers</u>

Izvestiia

Komsomol'skaia pravda

Komsomol'skoe znamia

Nezavisimaia gazeta

Pravda

<u>Party Publications and Materials</u>

Crimean Tatars:

Avdet - vozvrashchenie

Democratic Party of Ukraine:

Analiz anketnykh danykh uchasnykiv 1-ï Vseukraïnskoï partiinoï konferentsiï DemPU

Demokrat (party paper)

Demokrat: No. 1. Informatsiino-metodychnyi biuleten' Natsional'noï Rady Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny , February 1993

Demokratychna Partiia Ukraïny: Prohramovi pryntsypy i statut , (Kiev: *Rukh* , 1991)

DemPU natsional'na rada: postanovy i protokoly

Documents and speeches of February 1992 DPU Natioanl Council, April 1992 DPU party conference, December 1992 party congress

Holos

Ideini zasady Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny: z materialiv ustanovchoho z"ïzdu (Kiev: Prosvita, 1990)

Internal circulars

Party declarations and appeals

Sproba politychnoï initsiatyvy: proekt prohramy Ukraïns'koï Partiï Demokratychnoho Sotsializmu i Derzhavnoï Nezalezhnosti , and dated end March- 7 April 1989

Ukhvaly Natsional'noï Rady DemPU

Visnyk: Informatsiinyi b'iuleten' natsional'noï rady Demokratychnoï Partiï Ukraïny

Volia

DSU (Ukrainian Statehood and Independence):

Napriam

Neskorena Natsiia

Green Party of Ukraine:

Zelenyi svit

KUN (Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists):

Konferentsiia Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv: vybrani materiialy , (Kiev: UIS, 1992)

Na novomy etapi. Vybrani materiialy z pershoho zboru Kongresu Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv , (Kiev: Vydannia KUN, 1993)

PDRU (Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine) / New Ukraine:

Al'ternatyva

Demokratychnyi vybir

Partiia demokraticheskogo vozrodzhdeniia Ukrainy - materialy uchreditel'nogo s"ezda , (Kiev: UkrNIINTI, 1991)

Pershyi z'ïzd ob'iednannia "Nova Ukraïna": prohramni dokumenty i statut

Social Democrats:

Sotsial-demokrat Ukraïny

Kyïvs'kyi sotsial-demokrat

Socialists:

Materialy ustanovchoho z″ïzdu SPU , (Kiev: Myronivs'ka drukarnia, 1991)

Tovarysh

Rukh :

Declarations and Documents of third congress, March 1992

Declarations of *Rukh* Inner Council

Druhi vseukraïns'ki zbory Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny - dokumenty , (Kiev: Sekretariat Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny, 1991)

Kontseptsiia derzhavotvorennia v Ukraïni , (Kiev: *Rukh* , December 1992)

Narodna hazeta

Orhanizatsiini pryntsypy parlaments'koï fraktsiï "Narodna rada"

The Popular Movement of Ukraine for Restructuring - Rukh : Programme and Charter , (Ellicott City, USA: Smoloskyp, 1989)

Prohrama ustanovchoho z″ïzdu Narodnoho Rukhu Ukraïny za Perebodovu

Protocols of Rukh Political Council

Statut klub deputativ Rukhu

Vil'ne slovo

Visnyk Rukhu

Visti

Social-National Party of Ukraine:

Vidozva Sotsial-natsional'noï partiï Ukraïny

UCDP (Ukrainian Christian Democratic Party):

Voskresinnia

Za Viru i Voliu

UCRP (Ukrainian Conservative Republican Party):

Klych

Materialy nadzvychainoï konferentsiï UKRP , (Kiev: Brochure,1992)

UPDP (Ukrainian Peasants' Democratic Party):

Zemlia i volia

UNA (Ukrainian National Assembly):

Biblioteka Ukraïns'koï Natsionalistychnoï Spilky: zbirka stattei "chastyna 1" (Kiev, 1991)

Documents of Second Session of the UIA

Ideolohichna pliatforma Ukraïns'koï natsionalistychnoï spilky

Materialy z'ïzdu VOCT (Kiev: Prestsentr UMA, 1991)

Natsionalist

Ustrii SNUM

Ukraïns'ki obriï

Visnyk Kyïvs'koho komitetu UMA

Visti prestsentru UMA

Zamkova hora

Zoloti vorota

UNP (Ukrainian National Party):

Visnyk UNP

Ukraïns'kyi chas

URP (Ukrainian Republican Party):

Draft party programmes

Holos Halychyny: Rozdumy pro doliu Ukraïny na 2-mu z"ïzdi URP

Holos vidrodzhennia

Ideolohiia i taktyka URP: Materiialy teoretychnoï konferentsiï , (Kiev: URP, 1991)

Internal discussion papers

Karpats'ka Ukraïna

Krytsia

L'vivs'ki novyny

Na perelomi

Na strorozhi

Nezalezhnist'

Party declarations and appeals

Prapor antykomunizmu

Press releases of the UHG and URP

Protocols of URP Secretariat

Prozrinnia

Reports of regional organisations

Respublikanets'

Rozbudova derzhavy

Samostiina Ukraïna

Skhid

Sobornist'

Ternystyi shliak

Tryzub

Tsentral'na rada

Ukraïns'ka volia

URP-inform

Ustanovchyi z'ïzd Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï , (Kiev: RUKHinform, 1990)

Volia

Vyzvolennia '91

Za nezalezhnist'

Zvernennia do chleniv URP. Initsiiatyvnyi komitet po stvorenniu radykal'noï hrupy Ukraïns'koï Respublikans'koï Partiï , (L'viv: December, 1990)

Secondary Sources

i) On Ukraine:

a) Historical

Armstrong, John, A., *Ukrainian Nationalism* , (Englewood, Colorado: Ukrainian Academic Press, second edition, 1990)

Badz'o, Yurii, 'Open Letter to the Soviet Leaders', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 9, Nos. 1 & 2 (1984), pp. 74-94 & 47-70

Beissinger, Mark, 'Ethnicity, the Personnel Weapon and Neo-Imperial Integration: Ukrainian and RSFSR Provincial Party Officials Compared', *Studies in Comparative Communism* , Vol. XXI, No. 1 (Spring 1988), pp. 71-85

Bihun, Yaroslav, (ed.), *Boomerang: The Works of Valentyn Moroz* , (Baltimore: Smoloskyp, 1974)

Bilinsky, Yaroslav, *The Second Soviet Republic: The Ukraine after World War II* , (New Jersey: Rutgers, 1964)

Bilocerkowycz, Jaroslaw, *Soviet Ukrainian Dissent: A Study of Political Alienation* , (Boulder: Westview Press, 1988)

Birch, Julian,*The Ukrainian Nationalist Movement in the USSR Since 1956* , (London: Ukrainian Information Service, 1971)

Borys, J., *The Sovietisation of Ukraine, 1917-1923* , (Edmonton: CIUS, 1980)

Boshyk, Yurii (ed.), *Ukraine during World War Two: History and its Aftermath* , (Edmonton: CIUS, 1986)

Brown, Michael, (ed.), *Ferment in the Ukraine* , (London: Macmillan, 1971)

Chornovil, V"iacheslav,*The Chornovil Papers* , (New York: McGraw Hill, 1968)

Khronika taborobykh budniv, (Kiev: Taki spravy, 1991 and Munich: Suchasnist', 1976)

Dontsov, Dmytro, *Natsionalizm* , (London: Ukraïns'ka vydavnycha spilka, third edition, 1966)

Dukh nashoï davyny , (Munich: Vidrodzhennia, second edition, 1951)

Dziuba, Ivan,*Internationalism or Russification?* , (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968)

Ely, Geoff, 'Remapping the Nation: War, Revolutionary Upheaval and State Formation in Eastern Europe, 1914-1923,' in Potichnyj, Peter J. and Aster, Howard (eds.),*Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective* , (Edmonton: CIUS, 1988), pp. 205-46

Fed'kov, Oleksandr (ed.), *Samostiina Ukraïna: Zbirnik prohram Ukraïns'kykh politychnykh partii pochatku XX stolittia* , (Ternopil, 1991)

Friedgut, Theodore H., *Iuzovka and Revolution. Vol 1: Life and Works in russia's Donbass, 1869-1924* , (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989)

Guthier, Steven, 'The popular Basis of Ukrainian Nationalism in 1917,' *Slavic Review* , Vol. 38, No. 1   (March 1979)

Haynes, Victor, 'The Ukrainian Helsinki Group: A Postmortem', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 8, No. 2 (Winter 1983), pp. 102-13

Herlihy, Patricia, *Odessa: A History, 1790-1914* , (Harvard: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1986)

Himka, John-Paul, *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century* , (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988)

Isajiw, Wsevolod, 'Urban Migration and Social Change in Contemporary Soviet Ukraine,' *Canadian Slavonic Papers* , Vol. XXII, No. 1 (March 1980), pp. 58-86

Kas'ianov, Georhii, *Ukraïns'ka inteligentsiia 1920-x--1930-x rokiv: Sotsial'nyi portret ta istorychna dolia* , (Kiev: Globus, 1992)

   (with Danylenko, V. M.), *Stalinizm i Ukraïns'ka inteligentsiia (20-30-i roky)* , (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1991)

Koropechyj, I. S. (ed.), 'A Century of Moscow-Ukraine Economic Relations: An Interpretation', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 4, No. 4 (December 1981), pp. 467-90

   Development in the Shadow: Studues in Ukrainian Economics , (Edmonton: CIUS, 1990)

   (ed.) *Ukrainian Economic History: Interpretative Essays* , (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1991)

   The Ukraine Within the USSR: An Economic Balance Sheet , (London: Praeger, 1977)

Krawchenko, Bohdan, and Carter, Jim A., 'Dissidents in Ukraine Before 1972: A Summary Statistical Profile', *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 8, No. 2 (Winter 1983), pp. 85-8

Krawchenko, Bohdan, 'Changes in the National and Social Composition of the Communist Party of Ukraine From the Revolution to 1976,' *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 9, No.1 (Summer 1984), pp. 33-54

'The Impact of Industrialisation on the Social Structure of Ukraine,' *Canadian Slavonic Papers* , Vol. XXII, No.3 (September 1980), pp. 338-5

'National Memory in Ukraine: The Role of the Blue and Yellow Flag,' *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 15, No. 1 (Summer 1990), pp. 1-21

Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth Century Ukraine , (Oxford: Macmillan, 1985)

'The Social Structure of Ukraine at the Turn of the Twentieth Century,' *East European Quarterly* , Vol. XVI, No.2 (June 1982), pp. 171-81

'The Social Structure of the Ukraine in 1917,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. XIV, No. 1/2 (June 1990), pp. 97-112

(ed.), *Ukraine After Shelest* , (Edmonton: CIUS, 1983)

Kubijovyc, Volodymyr, (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ukraine: Vol. 1, A-F* , (Toronto: CIUS, 1984)

Kurnusov, Y. A., 'The Ukrainian Intelligentsia: The Process of Formation and Development', *East European Quarterly* , Vol. XXIV, No. 2 (Summer 1990)

Liber, George O., *Soviet nationality policy, urban growth, and identity change in the Ukrainian SSR 1934-1934* , (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

Luckyj, George S. N., 'Polarity in Ukrainian Intellectual Dissent', *Canadian Slavonic Papers* , Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 269-79

Mace, James E., *Communism and the Dilemmas of National Liberation: National Communism in Soviet Ukraine, 1918-1933* , (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1983)

Magocsi, Paul Robert, *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographical Guide* , (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983)

The Shaping of a National Identity: Subcarpathian Rus' 1848-1948 , (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1978)

'A Subordinate or Submerged People; The Ukrainians of Galicia Under Habsburg and Soviet Rule', in Richard L. Rudolph and David F. Good (eds.), *Nationalism and Empire: The Habsburg Empire and the Soviet Union* , (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992)

'The Ukrainian National Revival: A New Analytical Framework,' *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* , Vol. XVI, No. 1-2, (1989), pp. 45-62

Maistrenko, Ivan, *Istoriia komunistychnoï partiï Ukraïny* , (Munich: Suchasnist', 1979)

Markovits, Andrei S. and Sysyn, Frank E. (eds.), *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia* , (Harvard: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982)

Mark, Rudolf A., 'Social Questions and National Revolution: The Ukrainian National Republic in 1919-20,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. XIV, No.1/2 (June 1990), pp. 113-31

Marples, David, *Stalinism in Ukraine in the 1940s* , (London: Macmillan, 1992)

Materialy XXVIII z'izdu Komunistychnoï partiï Ukraïny , (Kiev: Ukraïna, 1991)

Motyl, Alexander J., *The Turn to the Right: The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism 1919-1929* , (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1980)

Nowosiwsky, I. M., *Bukovinan Ukrainians: A Historical Background. Their Self-Determination in 1918* , (New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1970)

Pipes, Richard (ed.), *The Formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and Nationalism 1917-1923* , (Cambridge, Mass: , 1954)

The Russian Intelligentsia , (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961)

Plyushch, Leonid, *History's Carnival: A Dissident's Autobiography* , (London: Collins and Harvill, 1977)

Potichnyj, Peter, (ed.),*Ukraine in the 1970s* , (Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press, 1975)

(with Shtendera, Y.), *Political Thought of the Ukrainian Underground 1943-51* , (Edmonton: CIUS, 1986)

Potul'nyts'kyi, V. A., *Istoriia Ukraïns'koï politolohiï* , (Kiev: Lybid, 1992)

Rudnytsky, Ivan L., *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: CIUS, 1987)

(ed.) *Rethinking Ukrainian History* , (Edmonton: CIUS, 1981)

Salel'iev', V. P., 'Chy buv P. Yu. Shelest vyraznykom Ukraïns'koho avtonomizmu?', *Ukraïns'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* , No. 4 (April) 1991, pp. 94-105

Sapiets, Marite; Reddaway, Peter; and Emerson, Caryl, (Trans. and eds.), *The Case of Leonid Plyushch* , (London: C. Hurst, 1976)

Saunders, David, 'Modern Ukrainian History (II),' *European History Quarterly* , Vol. 21 (1991), pp. 81-95

Sosnovs'kyi, M., *Dmytro Dontsov: Politychnyi portret* , (New York: Trident, 1974)

Strokata, Nina, 'Ukraïns'kyi natsional'nyi front, 1962?-1967', *Suchasnist'* , (June 1985), pp. 67-75

Subtelny, Orest, *Ukraine: A History* , (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1988)

Sydovs'kyi, Stepan, (ed.), *Zashyty Ukraïns'koho samvydavy, vypusk 11. Zupynit' kryvosuddia! sprava Levka Luk"ianenka* , (Munich: Suchasnist', 1980)

Sysyn, Frank, 'The Reemergence of the Ukrainian Nation and Cossack Mythology', *Social Research* , Vol. 58, No. 4 (Winter 1991), pp. 845-64

The Ukrainian Herald , (London: Ukrainian Publishers, 1987)

Vasyl'chenko, S. O., *Storinky istoriï Kompartiï Ukraïny: zapytannia i vidpovidi* , (Kiev: Lybid / Instytut politychnykh doslidzhen', 1990)

Verba, Lesya and Yasen, Bohdan, (eds.), *The Human Rights Movement in the Ukraine: Documents of the UHG, 1976-80* , (Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1980)

Worobec, Christine D., '"Galicians into Ukrainians": Ukrainian Nationalism Penetrates Nineteenth Century Rural Austrian Galicia', *Peasant Studies* , Vol. 16, No. 3 (Spring 1989), pp. 200-209

Zhuravs'kyi, V. S., *Bahatopartiina Ukraïns'ka derzhava na pochatku XX stolittiï* , (Kiev: Poshuk, 1992)

Zinkevych, Osyp (ed.), *Ukraïns'ka hel'sins'ka hrupa 1978-82: Dokumenty i materialy* , (Toronto: Smoloskyp, 1983)

b) Contemporary

Arel, Dominique, "The Parliamentary Blocs in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet: Who and What do They Represent?', *Journal of Soviet Nationalities* , Vol. 1, No. 4 (Winter 1990-91), pp. 108-54

Bilous, Artur, *Politychni ob"iednannia Ukraïny* , (Kiev: Ukraïna, 1993)

'Vyborcha systema Ukraïny: problemy i perspektyvy vyboru', *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 2, 1992, pp. 46-51

Bociurkiw, Bohdan R., 'The Ukrainian Catholic Church in the USSR Under Gorbachev', *Problems of Communism* , Vol. 39, No. 6 (November-December) 1990, pp. 1-19

V"iacheslav Chornovil, 'Shcho dali?', *Za vil'nu Ukraïnu* , 24 January 1992

Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi, 'V"iacheslav Lypyns'kyi yak filosof istoriï', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , No. 10 (October) 1991, pp. 51-62

Farmer, Kenneth C.,*Ukrainian Nationalism in the Post-Stalin Era: Myths, Symbols and Ideology in Soviet Nationality Policy* , (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980)

Guboglo, M. N. and Chernonnaia, S. M., *Krymskotatarskoe natsional'noe dvizhenie* , (Moscow: TsIMTO, two volumes, 1992)

Holoven'ko, V. A., and Pashkov, M. Yu,*Zbirnyk materialiv pro molodizhni ob"iednannia Ukraïny* , (Kiev: Ukraïns'kyi naukovo-doslidnyi instytut problem molodi, 1991)

Hunchak, Taras, 'Ukraïns'ka politychna dumka 1920-ykh rokiv: monarkhizm, natsionalizm, natsional-komunizm', *Literaturna Ukraïna* , 20 June 1991

Kamins'kyi, Anatol', *Na perekhidnomy etapi: "Hlasnist' ",
"peredudova" i "demokratyzatsiia" na Ukraïni* , (Munich: Ukrainian
Free University, 1990)

Kravchuk, Leonid, *Ye taka derzhava - Ukraïna!* , (Kiev: Globus, 1992)

Kuzio, Taras, (ed.), *Dissent in Ukraine Under Gorbachev: A
Collection of Samizdat Documents* , (London: Ukrainian Press Agency,
1989)

Lytvyn, Volodymyr, 'Asotsiatsiia "Zelenyi svit" i partiia zelenykh
Ukraïny', *Polityka i chas* , No.9 (June) 1991, pp. 53-7

'Demokratychna partiia Ukraïny', *Polityka i chas* ,
No. 2 (January), 1991, pp. 56-8

'Ukraïns'ka Khrystyians'ko-demokratychna Partiia',
Polityka i chas , No. 5 (April) 1991, pp. 62-5

'Ukrainskaia Krest'ians'ko-demokraticheskaia
Partiia', *Politika i vremia* , No. 6 (April) 1991, pp. 57-61

'Novi orientyry novykh partiï', *Polityka i chas* , No.
12 (August), 1991

Novitni politychni partiï i robitnychnyi rukh',
Polityka i chas , No. 13 (September), 1991, pp. 41-6

'Partiia demokraticheskogo vozrozhdeniia Ukrainy',
Politika i vremia , No. 1 (January) 1991, pp. 84-6

'Pro suchasni Ukraïns'ki partiï, ïkhnikh
prykhyl'nykiv ta lideriv', *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 1, 1992, pp. 62-
101

'Sotsialistychna partiia Ukraïny', *Polityka i chas* ,
No. 17-18 (December), 1991, pp. 80-92

'Suchasni sotsial-demokratychni partiï Ukraïny',
Polityka i chas , No. 8 (June) 1991, pp. 44-9

'Ukraïns'ka Narodno-demokratychna Partiia',
Polityka i chas , No. 15 (November), 1991, pp. 54-9

'Manifesto of the Democratic Party of Ukraine', *The Journal of Ukrainian Studies* , Vol. 15, No. 2 (Winter) 1990, pp. 85-111

Marples, David R., 'The Greening of Ukraine: Ecology and the Emergence of *Zelenyi svit* , 1986-90', in Judith B. Sedaitis and Jim Butterfield (eds.) *Perestroika from Below: Social Movements in the Soviet Union* , (Boulder: Westview Press, 1992), pp. 133-44

Ukraine Under Perestroika: Ecology, Economics and the Workers' Revolt , (London: Macmillan, 1991)

Motyl, Alexander J.,*Will the Non-Russians Rebel? State, Ethnicity and Stability in the USSR* , (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987)

Sovietology, Rationality, Nationality: Coming to Grips with Nationalism in the USSR , (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991)

Thinking Theoretically About Soviet Nationalities: History and Comparison in the Study of the USSR , (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992)

Mykhailiv, V., 'Politicheskoe ob"edinenie "Gosudarstvennaia samostoiatel'nost' Ukrainy" (GSU)', *Politika i vremia* , No. 3 (March) 1991, pp. 72-5

'Ukrainskaia natsional'naia partiia', *Politika i vremia* , No. 2 (February) 1992, pp. 64-8

Pakhomova, Nataliia, and Lykholit, Tetiana, '"Zelenyi rukh" Ukraïny ochyma uchasnykiv i sotsioloha', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , No. 10 (October) 1991, pp. 18-24

Paniotto, Vladimir, 'The Ukrainian Movement for *Perestroika* - 'Rukh': A Sociological Survey', *Soviet Studies* , Vol. 43, No. 1 (1991), pp. 177-81

Potichnyi, Peter J.,*The Multi-Party System in Ukraine* , (Cologne: Berichte des Bundesinstituts für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studien, No.3, 1992)

Rudnyts'ka, T. M., 'Natsional'ni hrupy i movni protsesy v Ukraïni', *Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka* , No. 5, 1991, pp. 145-55

Solchanyk, Roman, (ed.), *Ukraine: From Chernobyl' to Sovereignty* , (London: Macmillan, 1992)

Tomenko, M. V. and Sliusarenko, A. H., *Novi politychni partiï Ukraïny* , (Kiev: Znannia, seriia 1 "chas i suspil'stvo", No. 12, 1990)

'Politychni pohliady Mykhaila Drahomanova ta Dmytra Dontsova', *Slovo* , No. 21 (December) 1991

'Sproba klasyfikatsiï politychnykh partii Ukraïny', in *Politolohichni chytannia* , No. 1, 1992, pp. 102-9 , pp. 47-55

Tsapok, Serhii, 'Enhvo-linkvistychna sytuatsiia v Ukraïni', *Slovo* , No. 22 (December), 1991

Ukraïns'ka RSR u tsyfrakh u 1990 rotsi , (Kiev: Tekhnika, 1991)

Wilson, Andrew and Yakushyk, Valentyn, 'Politychni orhanizatsiï v Ukraïni (Deiaki problemy stanovlennia i rozvytku)', *Suchasnist'* , No. 5 (May) 1992, pp. 160-5

Extensive use was made of articles from RFE/RL, too numerous to mention.

ii) On the Soviet Context

Armstrong, John A., 'The Ethnic Scene in the Soviet Union: The View of the Dictatorship,' Erich Goldhagen (ed.), *Ethnic Minorities in the Soviet Union* New York: Praeger, 1986, pp. 3-49

'The Soviet Ethnic Scene: A Quarter Century Later,' *Journal of Soviet Nationalities* , Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 1990), pp. 66-75

Arutiunian, Yu. V., and Bromlei, Yurii, (eds.), *Sotsial'no-kul'turnyi oblik sovetskikh natsii: Po rezul'tatam etnosotsiologicheskogo issledovaniia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1986)

Connor, Walker, *The National Question in Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy* , (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984)

Conquest, Robert, (ed.), *The Last Empire: Nationality and the Soviet Future* , (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1986)

Drobizheva, C. M., 'The Role of the Intelligentsia in Developing National Consciousness Among the Peoples of the USSR Under Perestroika,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* , Vol. 14, No. 1 (Jan.1991), pp. 87-99

Ekiert, Grzegorz, 'Democratic Processes in East Central Europe: A Theoretical Reconsideration,' *British Journal of Political Science* , Vol. 21, Part 3 (July 1991)

Gleason, Gregory, *Federalism And Nationalism: The Struggle For Republican Rights in the USSR* , (Boulder: Westview Press, 1990)

Guboglo, Mikhail, 'Demography and Language in the Capitals of the Union,' *Journal of Soviet Nationalities* , Vol. 1, No. 4 (Winter 1990-91), pp. 1-11

Hajda, Lubomyr and Beissinger, Mark, (eds.), *The Nationalities Factor in Soviet Politics and Society* , (Boulder: Westview Press, 1990)

Nahaylo, Bohdan, and Swoboda, Victor, *Soviet Disunion: A History of the Nationalities Problem in the USSR* , (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1990)

Rakowska-Harmstone, Teresa, 'The Dialectics of Nationalism in the USSR', *Problems of Communism* , Vol. 23 (May-June,1974), pp. 1-22

'The Study of Ethnic Politics in the USSR,' in G. Simmonds (ed.), *Nationalism in the Soviet Union and East Europe* , (Detroit: University of Detroit Press, 1975), pp. 20-36

'Integration and Ethnic Nationalism in the Soviet Union; Aspects,Trends and Problems,' in Carl A. Linden and Dimitri K. Simes (eds.), *Nationalities and Nationalism in the USSR: A Soviet Dilemma* , (Washington: Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, 1977), pp. 31-39

Schöpflin, George, 'National Identity in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* , Special issue on 'National Identity in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union,' Vol.14, No.1 (Jan. 1991)

Sugar, P. F. (ed.), *Ethnic Diversity and Conflict in Eastern Europe* , (Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio, 1980)

Tishkov, Valerii, A., 'Ethnicity and Power in the Republics of the USSR', *Journal of Soviet Nationalities* , Vol. 1, No. 3 (Fall 1990), pp. 33-66

'Ethnichnost' i vlast' v SSSR (etnopoliticheskii analiz respublikanskikh organov vlasti)', *Sovietskaia etnografiia* , 1991, No. 3 (May-June), pp. 3-18

'Inventions and Manifestations of Ethno-nationalism in and after the Soviet Union', in Kumar, Rupesinghe et al (eds.), *Ethnicity and Conflict in a Post-Communist World* , (London: Macmillan, 1992)

'O novykh podkhodakh v teorii i praktike mezhnatsional'nykh otnoshenii', *Sovietskaia etnografiia* , 1989, No. 5 (September-October), pp. 3-14

iii) On Nationalism:

Anderson, Benedict,*Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* , (London: Verso, 1983)

Armstrong, John A., *Nations Before Nationalism* , (North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1982)

Barth, Fredrick, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organisation of Cultural Differences* , (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1969)

Brass, Paul, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparison* , (London: Sage, 1991)

'Ethnicity and Nationality Formation,' *Ethnicity* , No.3 (Sept. 1976), pp. 225-41

Breuilly, John, *Nationalism and the State* , (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1982)

Chlebowczyk, Jósef, *On Small and Young Nations in Europe: Nation-Forming Processes in Ethnic Borderlands in East-Central Europe* , (Warsaw: Polish Historical Library, 1980)

Deutsch, Karl W., 'Social Mobility and Political Development,' *American Political Science Review* , Vol. LV, No. 3 (Sept. 1961), pp. 493-514

Nationalism and Social Communication , (Cambridge, Mass: MIT. Second edition, 1966)

Gellner, Ernest,*Nations and Nationalism* , (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983)

Hayes, Carleton B., *Essays on Nationalism* , (New York: Macmillan, 1933)

Hechter, Michael, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966* , (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul,1975)

Hroch, Mryslav,*Social Preconditions of a National Revival in Europe* , (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985)

Hutchinson, J., *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism* , (London: Allen and Unwin, 1987)

Kamenka, E. (ed.), *Nationalism* , (1973)

Kedourie, E. (ed.), *Nationalism in Asia and Africa* , (London: Wiedenfeld and Nicholson, 1971)

Kellas, James G., *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity* , (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991)

Kohn, Hans, *The Idea of Nationalism* , (New York: Macmillan, second edition, 1967)

McGarry, John, and O'Leary, Brendan, *The Politics of Ethnic Conflict Regulation* , (London: Routledge, 1993)

Meadwell, Hudson, 'Ethnic Mobilisation and Collective Choice Theory', *Comparative Political Studies* , Vol. 22, No.2 (July 1989), pp. 139-54

Olzak, Susan, 'Contemporary Ethnic Mobilisation,' *Annual Review of Sociology* , Vol. 9 (1983), pp. 355-74

Rogowski, Ronald, 'Causes and Varieties of Nationalism: A Rationalist Account,' in Tiryakan and Rogowski (eds.), *New Nationalisms of the Developed West* , (London: Allen and Unwin, 1985), pp. 87-108

Smith, Anthony D., *The Ethnic Origin Of Nations* , (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986)

'The Myth of the "Modern Nation" and the Myths of Nations', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* , Vol. 11, No.1, (January 1988)

National Identity , (London: Penguin, 1991)

ed.), *Nationalist Movements* , (London: Macmillan, 1976)

Theories of Nationalism , (London: Holmes and Meier, 1983)

iv) On Political Parties

LaPalombara, Joseph and Weiner, Myron (eds.), *Political Parties and Political Development* , (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972)

Lawson, Kay,*Political Parties and Linkage* , (Yale: Yale University Press, 1980)

Olson, Mancur, *The Logic Of Collective Action* , (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1965)

'The Logic of Collective Action in Soviet-type Societies,' *Journal of Soviet Nationalities* , Vol. 1, No. 2 (Summer 1990), pp. 8-27

Panebianco, Angelo,*Political Parties: Organisation and Power* , (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988)

Rokkan, Sein, *Party Systems and Voter Alignment* , (New York: The Free Press, 1967)

Sartori, Giovanni,*Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis, Vol. 1* , (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 1976)