

AN UNFINISHED WAR: THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE ORGANISATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS AND THE UKRAINIAN INSURGENT ARMY PROBLEMS

Ivan Patryliak

DSc, professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

 0000-0002-4534-4654

Research interests: the history of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA); monograph in preparation: “The Liberation Struggle of the OUN and the UPA”

Oleksandr Pahiria

PhD, postdoctoral student, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

 0000-0003-2481-9769

Research interests: the history of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement of the mid-20th century; monograph in preparation: “Carpatho-Ukraine in the Documents of the Second Polish Republic (1938–1939)”

The article analyses the historiographical process related to the history of Ukrainian nationalism, namely the activities of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army in the 1930s–1950s. Drawing on the chronological-territorial and conceptual-methodological principles, the authors divide the secondary sources into five main groups: writings by authors of the Ukrainian diaspora, works of Soviet scientists and publicists, post-independence Ukrainian historiography, communist and contemporary Polish historiography, Western history writing. Within each group, key publications are examined through the prism of documentary sources, methodologies, and conceptual approaches, as well as the socio-political context in which they were created.

Key words: Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists, Ukrainian Insurgent Army, liberation movement, nation-state, historiography

Introduction

The history of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) for more than 75 years has been triggering a strong interest among researchers from various countries and academic schools, provoking intricate scientific and public discussions and generating a massive volume of scientific literature. Back at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, Ukrainian scientists, while summarising the bibliography of the named problem, indicated the existence of more than four thousand studies on the history of the OUN and the UPA¹. It can be assumed with a high degree of likelihood that over the past two decades, given the colossal surge of interest in the topic in Ukraine and abroad provoked by both internal and external political developments in Ukraine (the Maidan Revolution and the Russia–Ukraine war) coupled with the declassification of large documentary collections in Ukrainian and foreign archives (“archival revolution”), these indicators have tripled, reaching to date more than 20,000 publications.

Systematising, analysing, and comprehending such enormous historiographical data is extremely difficult. For this purpose, we based our analysis on a set of principles – chronological-territorial and conceptual-methodological which allowed us to outline main streams and trends of the historiographical process related to the problem under study.

Drawing on the chronological-territorial principle, we identified five main groups of the historiography of the OUN and the UPA activities in the 1930s–1950s:

- 1) research of the Ukrainian diaspora;
- 2) works of Soviet scientists and publicists;
- 3) post-independence Ukrainian historiography;
- 4) communist and contemporary Polish historiography;
- 5) Western history writing.

With the help of conceptual and methodological approaches to the classification of the historiography, in the middle of each large group, subgroups, and directions are distinguished based on the use of different methodologies, conceptual approaches, the reflection of the authors’ political preferences, etc.

1 Zdiouruk, Hrynevych, Zdiouruk 1999; Lysenko, Marushchenko 2002; Vovk 1994, 90–95; Patryliak 2006, 257–268; Marushchenko 2002, 54–61.

Research of the Ukrainian diaspora

While analysing the works on the history of the OUN and the UPA written by Ukrainian scholars in the diaspora, it is necessary to underline that the vast majority of this research was created by direct participants or witnesses of the Ukrainian nationalist movement, who were often bearers of the ideology of Ukrainian nationalism and suffered throughout their lives because of their political convictions. Therefore, their works are marked by the idea of national martyrdom, significant complementarity about the actions of the Ukrainian nationalist underground and the Insurgent Army, exaggeration of the scale of the movement, apologetics, silence on certain facts, blending historical research with one's memories and impressions, etc. Despite several indisputable merits, the works produced in the Ukrainian diaspora are characterised by two important drawbacks. The first is an almost mandatory reflection of the author's party views (a Banderite, a Melnikite, a Dvoikar, a communist, etc.) in the research, and the second is, as a rule, insufficient use of archival materials.

To a large extent, Ukrainian historians of the diaspora, due to the existing social and political realities in the West after the Second World War, were compelled to take a “defensive” position, fending off accusations against Ukrainian nationalism and proving the “normality” of this phenomenon as a struggle of Ukrainians for their state independence. As the contemporary Ukrainian researcher Yana Prymachenko rightly points out, such a situation forced diaspora scientists to significantly limit the use in their works of the latest conceptual approaches that were formed by Western liberal intellectuals in the second half of the 20th century. This, in turn, made the scientific output of the diaspora of little interest to the non-Ukrainian public² and contributed to the fact that those minor works by authors of non-Ukrainian origin published in the West were largely based on the Polish or Soviet vision of the Ukrainian nationalist movement.

Among the first studies on the history of the OUN and the UPA during the Second World War, written by Ukrainian diaspora researchers, one should mention publications by Mykola Lebed³, who initiated the “Banderite” direction in the emigration historiography. It was fruitfully continued by Petro Mirchuk, who authored more than ten monographs and brochures on the history of the OUN and the UPA⁴. The indisputable merit of both authors was their open-

2 Prymachenko 2010, 244.

3 Lebed 1993; Lebed 1953; Lebed 1960, 4–5.

4 Mirchuk 1968; Mirchuk 1985; Mirchuk 1952; Mirchuk 1970; Mirchuk 1953; Mirchuk 1961.

ing of a scientific discussion around the mentioned problem and the introduction into academic circulation of a whole variety of documents generated by those structures, which these authors brought with them to the West.

However, the most objective and science-based approach to the study of certain aspects of the underground activities of the OUN and the UPA among Ukrainian scientists abroad was applied in the publications by Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, Yuriy Tys-Krokhmaliuk, Volodymyr Kosyk, Taras Hunczak, and Petro Sodol⁵. Their works are characterised by a representative source base, the use of a wide range of scientific literature, original methodological approaches, and conceptual integrity.

In general, the emigration Ukrainian historiography of the history of the OUN and the UPA was based, for the most part, on national-patriotic and party positions, which often led to various myths. At the same time, diaspora scientists managed to accumulate and introduce into scientific circulation a huge factual material, which, to a large extent, served as the foundation for the academic examination of the history of the OUN and the UPA in post-Soviet Ukraine, in the early 1990s.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the diaspora historiography continued the study of the history of the Ukrainian nationalist movement on a new methodological and source base. Its qualitative transformation can be showcased by Myroslav Shkandrij's monograph⁶ analysing ideological, political, and cultural dimensions of Ukrainian nationalism(s). The work combines the strengths of both synthesis and close empirical investigation through a thorough survey of previous works, well-known sources, and a significant amount of new material and original research⁷.

Soviet historiography

Soviet history science had been under strict ideological pressure throughout the existence of the USSR, and under physical pressure during the Stalin-era. The methodological foundations of Soviet publications were based exclusively on the works of the so-called classics of Marxism-Leninism, prominent figures

5 Lysiak-Rudnytskyi 2003, 237–259; Tys-Krokhmaliuk 1972; Hunczak 1994, 138–153; Hunczak 1993; Kosyk 1992; Kosyk 2003, 57–86; Kosyk 2003, 94–107; Kosyk 2002; Sodol 1994; Sodol 1995.

6 Shkandrij 2015.

7 Horbyk 2019, 181–184.

of the world left movement, who considered all national liberation and anti-colonial movements of enslaved peoples, which took place outside the influence of Marxist ideology, as a bourgeois, anti-democratic, anti-people, reactionary phenomenon. Given such initial positions of Soviet historiography, it is quite obvious that the Ukrainian national liberation movements of the 1930s–1950s fell under the mentioned classification. An important feature of the Soviet historiography of the history of the OUN and the UPA was also that it tried not only to examine and understand this phenomenon but to prove (basing on the Marxist ideology) its anti-national, harmful bourgeois nature for the sake of utilitarian “educational” and propaganda purposes.

Within the torrent of Soviet-era publications, it is worth singling out the work of Volodymyr Belyaev and Mykhailo Rudnytskyi, *Under Foreign Flags*, published in 1956. Written in a brilliant journalistic style by an employee of the Soviet state security, Belyaev, with the surname of Lviv University professor, and literary critic Rudnytskyi added to increase the effect, the work, from a scientific point of view, does not constitute particularly valuable material. It is marked by a re-arrangement of facts, tendentious interpretation of events, and preparation of documents, which corresponds to its pamphlet genre⁸.

Soviet assessments of the history of the OUN and the UPA did not alter much throughout the Soviet era. They became a kind of ideological stamp, one of the many “infallible” axioms of Soviet history science. Works on the history of the OUN written by Soviet publicists played a particularly important propagandistic and disinformation role. Sharp pamphlets, historical stories, and narratives, created in an almost impeccable literary form, were designed to form an a priori negative image of the OUN and the UPA in the mass Ukrainian readership⁹.

Among the Soviet anti-nationalist pasquils, the works of the already mentioned Belyaev, Serhii Danylenko (aka Serhiy Karin), Klym Dmytruk (aka Klym Galskyi), and Boris Steklyar are particularly uncompromising. All the above-mentioned “scientists” were high-ranking employees of the Soviet special services, while their professional activities in the 1940s–1960s were closely related to the liquidation of the Ukrainian nationalist underground, the Greek Catholic Church, persecution of dissidents, etc.

In general, within the existing ideological coordinates of the Soviet Union, the study of the Ukrainian nationalist movement could not but turn into

8 Bieliaiev, Rudnytskyi 1956.

9 Bieliaiev 1980; Dmytruk 1972; Dmytruk 1982; Ivanchenko 1984; Malanchuk 1974; Melnychuk 1960; Melnychuk 1967; Melnychuk 1963; Rymarenko 1983; Bieliaiev 1952, 18–23.

an incomprehensible mixture of history science with propaganda, designed to form among the population of the Soviet Ukraine and representatives of the Ukrainian emigration, showing several persistent negative stereotypes on the ideological enemies of the Soviet government – “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists”. Nevertheless, studying the Soviet historiographic heritage is not a complete waste of time. Discarding the ideological layering, and cleaning the research from falsifications and distortions, one can see a lot of interesting factual material there, catch some little-known nuances, and look behind the scenes of the espionage struggle or the “propaganda inner workings” of the times.

Post-independence Ukrainian historiography

The most fundamental historiographic layer of the history of the OUN and the UPA has been created in Ukraine after the declaration of its independence in August 1991. Released from the state ideological pressure, Ukraine’s contemporary history science has been granted an opportunity to develop on a new methodological base, with access to an enormous array of archival sources and interaction with the global science community. On the other hand, as noted by modern Ukrainian historiographers, while faced with a colossal mass of factual material and trying to cover the “white spots” in history as quickly as possible, Ukrainian history science, in the early 1990s, often physically could not cope with the challenges of the time. It appeared to be neither methodologically nor technically prepared to work under the new conditions, which led to the creation of often low-quality studies that did not even formally undergo scientific examination¹⁰.

A peculiar reaction by the historical public to the fact that for about fifty years it was possible to portray Ukrainian nationalists only in a negative light was a certain idealisation of their activities, focusing attention, as a rule, on the facts of the two-front struggle of the OUN led by Stepan Bandera against the Nazi and the Soviet regimes. Bluntly apologetic pro-OUN books began to appear in Ukraine by the authorship of Oleh Bahan, Vasyl Ivanyshyn, Andriy Duda, Volodymyr Staryk, Petro Duzhyi, Hryhoriy Demyan¹¹, which were effectively a compilation of works by Petro Mirchuk, Mykola Lebed, Yaroslav Stetsko,

10 See more: Kulchytskyi 2004, 102; Tarasov 2007; Kasianov 2002; Myshchak 2010, 34–35.

11 Bahan 1994; Ivanyshyn 1992; Duda, Staryk 1995; Demian 1993, 102–107; Duzhyi 1996–1997; Duzhyi 1998; Butko, Demchenko 1992; Holovko 1992, 12–14.

Stepan Bandera, Oleh Shtul', Zynoviy Knysh, Lev Rebet, Dmytro Dontsov, and other emigre scientists and publicists. Academic conferences held in honour of the 50th anniversary of the UPA, which reflected the spirit of the historiographical era, its searches, miscalculations, and trends, became typical illustrations of the rather deplorable state of Ukrainian history science¹².

The most apt description of the works created by Ukrainian historians of that period was given by Yurii Kyrychuk. He emphasised that “they seem to have fulfilled their mission – to familiarise the public with the Ukrainian liberation movement. But at the same time, they showed the harmfulness of cavalry attacks on history. These works were relevant when they were written. Now these “hot cakes” have petrified and are interesting only to bibliographers”¹³.

Starting from 1993–1995, Ukrainian scientists began to approach the history of the OUN and the UPA more objectively, gradually moving away from emotional assessments and ideological views. The new stage of research was characterised by an upsurge in the archaeological and historiographical source base, the formation of a democratic and pluralistic way of history writing, and the creation of real opportunities for shaping an objective view of the history of the Ukrainian national liberation movement of the mid-20th century¹⁴. During the mentioned period, interesting works based on new archival sources were written by Volodymyr Serhiychuk, Mykhailo Koval, Ivan Bilas, Petro Brytskyi, Ivan Mukovskiy, Oleksandr Lysenko, Volodymyr Trofymovych, and others¹⁵.

At this stage, the first conceptual generalisations of the role of the OUN and the UPA during the Second World War were also made, based on new research and documentary publications¹⁶, summarising the achievements of the historiography in the first 5–6 years of Ukraine's independence.

At the turn of the 1990s and 2000s, four new trends emerged in Ukrainian history writing on the named problem. Firstly, initial attempts to apply a comprehensive approach to the history of the Ukrainian nationalist movement were made, to feature the latter not only as a separate current of the anti-fascist resistance movement but as a distinct, self-sufficient phenomenon. Secondly, the expansion of the source base facilitated the appearance of numerous special studies

12 Kulchytskyi S. ta in. 1992; Dychkovskiy O. ta in. 1993.

13 Kyrychuk 2002, 97.

14 Ivantsev, Marushchenko 2003, 21.

15 Serhiichuk 1994, 15–20; Serhiichuk 1995, 193–196; Koval 1994; Koval 1995; Koval 1994, 94–102; Ivanchenko 1993, 296–271; Bilas 1994; Brytskyi 1995; Mukovskiy, Lysenko 1995, 14–17; Ozymchuk 1995; Trofymovych 1994.

16 Mukovskiy, Lysenko 1996; Reient, Mukovskiy, Lysenko 1997, 114–129; Kucher 1997; Kucher, Cherneha 1995; Bondarenko 1997.

dedicated to certain aspects of the activities of the Ukrainian nationalist underground and the Insurgent Army, their struggle in regional dimensions, everyday life history, etc. Thirdly, separate streams, based on different methodological and worldview approaches to the studied topic, are gradually beginning to crystallise. Fourthly, the history of the OUN and the UPA receives a stable “registration” in the general works on the history of Ukraine of the 20th century, the history of the Second World War, and the histories of social groups or specific regions.

Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma's mandate to the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, dated 28 May 1997, to establish a governmental commission to conduct an in-depth study of the OUN and the UPA problem and to develop the state's official position regarding their activities, contributed to significant intensification of historical research in the field. On 12 September 1997, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine created a Governmental Commission that set up a relevant working group at the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, to prepare, under the leadership of Prof. Stanislav Kulchytskyi, a historical report on the activities of the OUN and the UPA. As part of the work of the commission that functioned until 2005, more than 30 monographs were published, a report¹⁷, and a professional opinion¹⁸ were prepared, as well as a summarising collective essay on the history of the OUN and the UPA was promulgated¹⁹. It is worth mentioning that within the working group there was a complete pluralism of opinions, which contributed to the crystallisation of various directions of the modern Ukrainian historiography of the problem.

Speaking about generalising works on the history of the Ukrainian nationalist movement during the Second World War and the post-war decade, which appeared at the turn of the millennium, it is important to highlight the research by Anatoly Kentiy, Yuriy Kyrychuk, and Anatoliy Rusnachenko. In particular, the latter, for the first time in Ukrainian history science, attempted to introduce the Ukrainian liberation movement of the 1930s–1950s into a broader Eastern European comparative context, presenting its development against the background of similar movements in Belarus and the Baltic states²⁰.

17 *Problema OUN-UPA*. (2004). Zvit robochoi hrupy istorykiv pry Uriadovii komisii z vyvchennia diialnosti OUN i UPA. Osnovni tezy z problemy OUN-UPA (istorychnyi vysnovok). Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy.

18 *Orhanizatsiia ukrainskykh natsionalistiv i Ukrainska povstanska armii: Fakhovyi vysnovok robochoi hrupy istorykiv pry Uriadovii komisii z vyvchennia diialnosti OUN i UPA* (2005). NAN Ukrainy. In-t istorii Ukrainy. 3-tie vyd. ster. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

19 Kulchytskyi 2005.

20 Rusnachenko 2002.

In parallel with the creation of the first general studies in Ukraine at the turn of the millennium, the development of specific aspects of the Ukrainian liberation movement of the mid-20th century was actively continued. Such problems as the OUN's activity in September 1939, the formation of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, the OUN's military actions against the Nazi and Soviet regimes, the formation and functioning of the OUN's Security Service, the development of the UPA's rear, the circulation of nationalist and insurgent press, and propaganda, ethno-national concepts of the Ukrainian liberation movement, complex Ukrainian–Polish relations, regional aspects in the activities of the nationalist underground and the Insurgent Army and others have been studied. Over 1997–2004, the world saw the works of such scientists as Oleksandr Lysenko, Stanislav Kulchytskyi, Volodymyr Lytvyn, Volodymyr Trofymovych, Yuriy Shapoval, Halyna Starodubets, Georgiy Kasianov, Yaroslav Dashkevych, Ihor Iliushyn, Dmytro Vedeneev, Volodymyr Dziobak, Oleksandr Vovk, Andriy Rukkas, Vasyl Derevynskyi, Volodymyr Viatrovych, Serhii Demidov, Maria Mandryk, Volodymyr Moroz, Oleksandra Stasiuk, Nestor Myzak, Oksana Dmyterko, Taras Hryvul, Ihor Marchuk.

In the early 2000s, a group of young historians-enthusiasts established the Centre for the Study of the Liberation Movement at Ivan Krypiakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies in Lviv, which in 2003 started a regular publication of a collection of scientific works entitled *The Ukrainian Liberation Movement*. By 2017, 22 volumes appeared, in which dozens of interesting and informative articles, documentary publications, and reviews prepared by young talented researchers were published. In the collection, special attention was focused on the research of everyday life structures, microhistory, and gender aspects of the Ukrainian liberation movement.

A strong public and political interest in the history of the OUN and the UPA, which prevailed in Ukraine after the Orange Revolution (2004) until 2010, generated a substantial reinvigoration in the scientific study of this problem and its popularisation with the help of popular science publications, exhibitions, and documentaries. During this time, thorough monographs, brochures, and articles were published by such researchers as Dmytro Vedeneev, Hennadiy Bystrukhin, Volodymyr Kovalchuk, Volodymyr Dziobak, Oleksandr Denyschuk, Igor Iliushyn, Mykola Posivnych, Oleksandr Pahiria, Oleksandr Ishchuk, Valeriy Ogorodnik, Andriy Rukkas, Yuri Soroka, Vasyl Ukhach, Oleksandra Stasyuk, Yaroslav Antonyuk, Ihor Marchuk, Vasyl Manzurenko, and dozens of others, covering various aspects of the activities of the Ukrainian nationalist underground movement and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army on the eve, during and after the Second World War.

During this period, the Ukrainian historiography evolved from the systematic accumulation of source materials to presenting the struggle of the Ukrainian underground within a conceptual framework. The thematic spectrum of the research was expanded, in particular, the functioning of the Soviet repressive system in Ukraine was revealed, a historical and legal interpretation of events was given, the ideological and practical component of the Ukrainian independence movement was clarified, the functioning of nationalist associations and groups and their struggle with the Soviet repressive system was shown²¹.

An important contribution to the development of the discussion on Polish–Ukrainian relations in 1942–1947 made by Volodymyr Vyatrovych²², who proposed to consider the Ukrainian–Polish conflict within the framework of the “second Polish–Ukrainian war” concept. The historian claimed that the second Polish–Ukrainian war was “a war within a war”, which determined its features and the behaviour of main participants. The proposed thesis triggered vigorous public and historiographical debates in Ukraine²³ and beyond²⁴.

The Ukrainian historian Oleksandr Zaitsev, under the influence of comparative fascist studies, made an attempt to introduce the new generic concept of Ukrainian “ustashism”, or proto-fascism about the ideology and praxis of Ukrainian integral nationalism. The scholar defined “ustashism” as revolutionary integral nationalism developing under conditions of perceived foreign oppression and involving the use of violence for national liberation and the creation of an independent authoritarian state²⁵. He suggested that the history of the Croatian Ustaša best illustrates how under certain conditions “ustashism” can take the form of proto-fascism and establish a fascist-type regime once a nation-state is built. Employing this theoretical model, the author underlined special features of the OUN as a proto-fascist movement which, had it gone on to acquire state power, could have tapped its full “fascist potential”. However, according to the scholar, the conflict between the OUN and the German occupation authorities in 1941–1943 prevented the crystallisation of Ukrainian fascism and prompted a fundamental revision of the ideology of the Ukrainian revolutionary nationalists²⁶. As Vasyl Futala rightly points out, the formulation of the problem and its solution in the field of intellectual history is worthy of attention, but it does

21 Lysenko 2011, 194; Viedienieiev, Lysenko 2010, 29; Lysenko, Hrytsak 2009, 245.

22 Viatrovych 2011; Viatrovych 2011; Viatrovych 2016.

23 Iliushyn 2012, 382–385; Portnov 2012, 324–334.

24 Motyka 2013, 97–101; Zemba (2012), 403–421; Rudling 2012, 356–381; Sowa 2012, 450–460; Hryciuk 2012, 460–471.

25 Zaitsev 2011, 24.

26 Zaitsev 2013; Zaitsev 2012, 89–101; Zaitsev 2015, 183–193; Zaitsev 2016, 125–149.

not take into account the further evolution of the OUN itself and its relations with Germany²⁷. In general, Zaitsev's concept of "ustashatism" caused an active discussion in the scientific circles in Ukraine and abroad²⁸.

In 2012, a comprehensive monograph by Ivan Patryliak was published, dedicated to the history of the Ukrainian nationalist underground and the UPA, which was based on a wide range of primary and secondary sources and summarised the achievements of the Ukrainian post-independence historiography in the investigation of the named topic²⁹. In 2020, the author prepared its second, updated edition³⁰.

In recent years, Ukrainian historiography has been enriched with works devoted to the regional dimension of the Ukrainian nationalist underground and the UPA³¹, biographies of prominent UPA commanders and OUN leaders³², gender aspects³³, everyday life history, and military-historical anthropology of the Ukrainian liberation movement³⁴.

The development of the contemporary Ukrainian historiography of the OUN and the UPA problem has been taking place in the conditions of a sharp social controversy surrounding worldview, moral, and philosophical problems. Consequently, three main streams have crystallised in Ukrainian history science, which form their evaluative approaches to the history of the OUN and the UPA, based on their inherent worldview values: national-statist, national-liberal, and pro-Russian–Marxist. Despite certain political colouring of the national historiography, over the last three decades, Ukrainian scientists have made a grand breakthrough in the scientific investigation of the history of the Ukrainian nationalist movement.

27 Futala 2014, 126–127.

28 See, for example: *Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society*, 7 (1) (2021); *Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society*, 7 (2) (2021); *Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society*, 9 (1) (2023).

29 Patryliak 2012.

30 Patryliak 2020.

31 Trush, Khobot, Shchur 2019.

32 Ponymaliak 2021; Posivnych 2023; Isaiuk 2023.

33 Havryshko 2015, 199–213; Havryshko 2016, 89–107; Havryshko 2008, 35–67.

34 Prokopov 2019.

Polish historiography

The most powerful historiography of the OUN and the UPA problem abroad has been created in Poland. Polish researchers have written thousands of works on the history of Ukrainian nationalism, most of which, quite obviously, are devoted to the problem of the Polish–Ukrainian conflict during the Second World War and after its end. Polish literature on the topic can be divided into two chronological periods – the one created in the Polish People's Republic (PPR) and as part of contemporary Polish historiography.

Polish history writing during the PPR period itself can be brought down to several stages: the second half of the 1950s–1960s (at this time, the scientific study of the history of the OUN and the UPA in Poland began, the main goal of the research was to legitimise the Polish ruling regime as the one that protected the people and the state from the “Banderites’ threat”); the first half of the 1970s (at this time, due to some liberalisation of the political regime in Poland, several interesting and more or less specialised studies on the history of the Ukrainian nationalist movement appeared); the late 1970s–1980s (the period of complete fictionalisation of the Polish historiography of the OUN and the UPA).

It should be noted that in the communist Polish state, in contrast to the USSR, there were attempts to write truly scientific research along with propaganda pamphlets. The most valuable work about the OUN and the UPA was written by Antoni B. Szcześniak and Wiesław Z. Szota, *The Road to Nowhere*, published in 1973³⁵. In terms of information processing, inclusion of new sources, and history analysis, the work had no equals at the time, neither in the territory of the USSR nor in Poland.

Despite all its flaws, the Polish historiography of the PPR period laid at least some substantial foundation for further studies of the OUN and the UPA problem in the democratic Poland after 1989. This fact played a decisive role in the situation that the modern Polish historiography had a much stronger starting position than the post-independence Ukrainian historiography. However, along with the positive aspects, the PPR-era historians passed on to their successors distinctly negative features – an almost exclusively intolerant approach to the object of their research, a view of the “Ukrainian problem” as an artificially created anti-Polish diversion, a distrustful attitude towards Ukrainian sources (as compared to Polish or Soviet ones), etc.

The post-communist Polish historiography has been revolving largely around the painful aspects of Ukrainian–Polish relations in 1939–1947. In today's Poland,

35 Szcześniak, Szota 1973.

the history of the OUN and the UPA is an extremely sensitive political problem, with different domestic forces often trying to “score points” on the past of Ukrainian–Polish relations. Therefore, socio-political discussions in Poland about the OUN and the UPA usually reactivate at the time of tragic anniversaries (the 1943 Volyn massacre, the 1947 Operation Vistula, the September 1939 campaign, etc.). Thereby, Polish historians, like their Ukrainian colleagues, often become drawn into socio-political confrontations. Consequently, the interpretation of the Ukrainian liberation movement of the 1930s–1950s by Polish scholars depends, as a rule, on the political views and worldview positions of the researchers. Given this situation, three main streams in the post-communist Polish historiography of the problem should be distinguished: the radical nationalist (related to the milieu of “Kresowiaks”, veterans of the Polish Home Army; the national-liberal (represented by the younger generation of scientists from the academic and university environment); and the pro-Ukrainian (represented by scientists of Ukrainian origin).

A characteristic feature of the first stream of modern Polish historiography is its focus on proving several theses – Ukrainian nationalism is a product of German intrigues; a kind of fascism; and a criminal movement responsible for the genocide of Poles and Jews. The most prominent representatives of this trend are Czesław Partacz, Krzysztof Łada, Władysław Filar, Bogumił Grott, Aleksander Korman, Leon Popek, Jerzy Dębski, Lucyna Kulińska, Zdzisław Konieczny, Władysław Ważniewski, Józef Turowski, Jan Wilczur, Andrzej Żupański, Henryk Komański, Szczepan Siekierka, Zbigniew Małyszczycycki, Jan Niewiński, Tadeusz Piotrowski, Władysław and Eva Semaszki, etc. The named authors have published their works in special collections³⁶, or, often with the support of the highest authorities of Poland (including the administration of the President of the Republic of Poland, the Senate, ministries, and voivodship administrations), they publish monographic series³⁷, which in certain cases³⁸ can hardly be called even as pseudo-scientific works³⁹.

Close to the radical nationalist stream, in terms of the number of published works, is the national-liberal direction. It is more moderate in its assessment of the Ukrainian nationalist movement and admits mistakes and miscalculations

36 Grott 2004; Niewiński 2005; Grott 2010.

37 Turowski, Siemaszko 1990; Dębski, Popek 1997; Karłowicz, Popek 1998; Filar 2003; Filar 2008; Piotrowski 2002; Piotrowski 2004; Partacz, Łada 2004; Korman 2002; Konieczny 2006; Komański, Siekierka 2005; Kulińska 2001–2002; Siekierka, Komański, Bulzacki 2006; Żupański 2007; Kulińska 2009.

38 Semaszko, Semaszko 2000.

39 Marchuk 2003, 171–180.

on the part of interwar Polish authorities in their policies towards the Ukrainian minority, but, despite everything, largely adheres to the theory of the genocide of the Polish population carried out by UPA units and the OUN underground in the Volyn and Galicia regions. Representatives of this stream are marked by a rather critical approach to the historiographic legacy of the Soviet era, the use of a large volume of documentary sources, and the application of the latest methodological approaches in their publications. The most famous scientists of this direction are Ryszard Torzecki, Grzegorz Motyka, Waldemar Rezmer, Paweł Wiczorkiewicz, Damian Markowski, Grzegorz Mazur, Grzegorz Hryciuk, Roman Wysocki, Rafał Wnuk, Henryk Piskunowicz, Andrzej Ajnenkiel, Zbigniew Pałski, Michał Klimiecki, Zbigniew Karpus, and others. Most of the above-mentioned scholars took an active part in the meetings of the International Workshop of Historians “Ukraine – Poland: Difficult Questions”, as a result of which 11 volumes of materials have been published with the final protocols of agreement and disagreements in the positions of the parties⁴⁰.

Despite the positive experience in communication with Polish scientists during the mentioned international workshop, the joint work did not result in the development of a common denominator in the approach to the history of Ukrainian–Polish relations in the 1930s–1940s, as the Polish side had hoped for, being an organiser of these meetings. The lack of synchronised views on the complex issues was caused by a completely different understanding of the fundamental questions: while Ukrainian scientists viewed Western Ukraine as Ukrainian historical and ethnic territories, Polish scholars saw them foremost as Polish historical territories with an ethnically mixed population; Ukrainian scientists considered the activities of the OUN and the UPA as a national liberation struggle directed against all forces hostile to Ukrainian statehood, whereas Polish historians saw them, first of all, as the anti-Polish right-wing radical and totalitarian movement; while Ukrainian historians viewed the Polish–Ukrainian conflict primarily as a struggle for post-war possession of territories with the use of terror against the civilian population by both sides, Polish scientists regarded it as an asymmetric extermination of innocent Polish people by Ukrainian armed formations and characterised these actions as an act of genocide, etc.

Moreover, in recent years, dozens of monographic studies and hundreds of articles have appeared by the representatives of the national-liberal camp covering

40 *Ukraina – Polshcha: vazhki pytannia. (1997–2006). T. 1–10. Varshava; Polska–Ukraina: trudne pytania: materiały XII międzynarodowego seminarium historycznego “Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie w latach II wojny światowej” (2009). Toruń, 11–12 października 2006, t. 11. Warszawa.*

the activities of the OUN and the UPA during the Second World War in the context of Polish–Ukrainian conflict or against the background of the activities of the Polish nationalist underground in the territory of Western Ukraine in 1939–1945. The works of Ryszard Torzecki, Grzegorz Motyka, Grzegorz Hryciuk, Roman Wysocki, Jan Pisuliński, and Mariusz Zajączkowski⁴¹ have the greatest scientific value for an objective study of the history of the OUN and the UPA.

Grzegorz Motyka's *Ukrainian Guerilla Warfare*⁴² represents a certain generalisation of the achievements of the national-liberal trend in Polish historiography. The work covers the entire period of the activity of the OUN and the UPA in the territory of Ukraine (from 1929 to 1960). The author attempted to show the Ukrainian nationalist movement as an original, powerful, and independent phenomenon, thereby moving away from the concepts that considered Ukrainian nationalism as a marginal movement. To some extent, efforts to cover all aspects of the activities of the OUN and the UPA resulted in certain schematic and superficial presentation of the material, but this does not spoil the overall positive impression of the book. The most problematic, in our view, in Motyka's monograph is the sixth chapter dedicated to the Ukrainian–Polish conflict. There the author practically did not take into account the achievements of Ukrainian historiography, relying mainly on the research of Polish authors and on the documents of the Polish underground, which shaped, to some extent, a one-sided view of the problem⁴³.

The last and the weakest stream of the modern Polish historiography, which tentatively can be called “pro-Ukrainian”, is represented, for the most part, by representatives of the Ukrainian community in Poland and individual Polish researchers who actively oppose the right-wing radical tendencies that are firmly established in Polish history science. The most fruitful representatives of the “pro-Ukrainian” trend in Polish historiography are Roman Drozd, Eugeniusz Miśiło, and Mikołaj Siwicki. The former two scholars largely focus on the study of Operation Vistula and its consequences for the Ukrainian community in Poland. They consider this operation an act of genocide against the Ukrainian minority. At the same time, Mikołaj Siwicki focuses on the entire spectrum of Ukrainian–Polish conflicts in the 20th century. In the context of their research, all three

41 Torzecki 1989; Torzecki 1993; Hryciuk 2005; Motyka, Wnuk 1997; Motyka 1999; Motyka 2006; Motyka 2009; Motyka 2011; Wysocki 2003; Wysocki 2019; Pisuliński 2017; Zajączkowski 2015.

42 Motyka 2006.

43 Hrytskiv 2003, 148–170.

mentioned scientists, to a greater or lesser extent, cover certain aspects related to the activities of the OUN and the UPA during and after the Second World War⁴⁴.

Recently, the “pro-Ukrainian” stream has been reinforced by an academic programme under the general supervision of Prof. Igor Hałagida at the Ukrainian Catholic University of Lviv aimed at counting the Ukrainian victims of the Polish–Ukrainian confrontation in 1939–1947. The first volume within the project covering the Chełm Land and southern Podlachia in 1939–1944⁴⁵ showed the huge scientific potential of the critically and empirically-based scientific approach to the study of the Polish–Ukrainian conflict and for correcting some of the fundamental conclusions made by the Polish historiography on the root causes, nature, scale, and consequences of the conflict.

Summarising the analysis of Polish historiography, it is worth pointing out that a more hostile discourse towards the Ukrainian liberation movement prevails in modern Polish history science. A large group of Polish researchers is in favour of preserving the views established during the Polish People's Republic which presented Ukrainian nationalism as a fascist, pro-German, anti-Polish, genocidal movement. A slightly smaller group of scientists is more restrained in their assessment of Ukrainian nationalism. They generally recognise the right of Ukrainians to fight for their statehood but agree with the thesis about an asymmetry of the Ukrainian–Polish confrontation and a genocide of the Polish people in the Volhynia and Galicia regions (disagreements between the representatives of the first and the second streams of the Polish historiography are rather technical and relate to the numbers of losses, rather than the core of the issue). Only a small, marginal group of modern Polish scholars constitutes an almost unnoticeable trend in the Polish historiography, which in its evaluation of the activities of the OUN and the UPA gravitates more towards modern Ukrainian history science than towards the Polish one.

Western historiography

The works of Western European and North American scholars can be divided into the studies specifically dedicated to the history of Ukrainian nationalism as a phenomenon, and publications in which certain aspects of the praxis of the OUN and the UPA are highlighted in a broader context.

44 Misyło 1997, 7–36; Misyło 2006, 5–54; Drozd 2001; Drozd 2003, 64–81; Drozd 2005; Drozd 2003, 336–351; Syvitskyi 2005.

45 Hałagida, Ivanyk 2021.

In 1955, the first edition of John Armstrong's work *Ukrainian Nationalism* was published⁴⁶. The book, which was subsequently republished several times with corrections and additions⁴⁷, became a classic Western study of the history of Ukrainian nationalism. For a long time, it was the de facto "legislator of fashion" in the matter of studying the history of the OUN and the UPA in Europe and North America. The book, to a large extent, revealed to Western readers not only Ukrainian nationalism but also Ukraine as such, the "Ukrainian problem" as one of the most complex and perplexed geopolitical problems of the 20th century.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of independent Ukraine on the political map of the world somewhat intensified the study of the OUN and the UPA problem in the West. Separate special studies, mostly in the form of articles and scientific reports, dedicated to Ukrainian nationalism came out of the scientific works of such scholars as Marko Carynnyk, Karl Berkhoff, Franz Grelka, Timoty Snyder, Franziska Bruder, Wilfried Jilge, and others⁴⁸. However, the majority of Western researchers are familiar with the history of the OUN and the UPA through Polish and Russian historiography, which forms a distorted image of the topic⁴⁹.

At the same time, some Western scholars (John-Paul Himka⁵⁰, Grzegorz Rossoliński-Libe⁵¹, Frank Golczewski⁵², Per Anders Rudling⁵³, Timoty Snyder⁵⁴, and others) contextualise the OUN and the UPA's activities in the light of comparative fascist studies, which is actively being developed by certain academic schools in the West⁵⁵. As part of this approach, the concept of generic fascism is singled out⁵⁶, which, in particular, offers a theoretical model for making scientific extrapolations and generalisations, attributing a fascist nature to the right-wing radical movements and political systems of the 1930s and 1940s, synchronous with the regimes of Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler.

46 Armstrong 1955.

47 Armstrong 1963; Armstrong 1980; Armstrong 1990; Armstrong 2008.

48 Berkhoff, Carynnyk 1999, 149–184; Berkhof 2011; Grelka 2005; Snyder 1999, 86–120; Snyder 2003, 198–204; Snyder 2003, 49–54; Snyder 2011; Yilhe 2006, 29–31; Bruder 2007.

49 Patryliak 2011, 295–321; Kosyk 2003, 176–189; Hunchak 2005, 253–263.

50 Himka 2010, 353–358; Himka 2021.

51 Rossoliński-Libe 2011, 83–114; Rossoliński-Libe 2010, 1–16.

52 Golczewski 2010, 571–591.

53 Rudling 2006, 163–189; Rudling 2010, 237–309; Rudling 2011, 1–71; Rudling 2014, 214–286.

54 Snyder 2012, 189–218; Snyder 2010, 8.

55 Umland 2008, 12–16.

56 Umland 2009, 298–309.

In particular, the Canadian historian John-Paul Himka outlines specific features characteristic of Eastern European fascism (to which he includes the OUN): anti-Semitism, anti-communism, and self-discipline⁵⁷. The most extensive argumentation about the fascist nature of the OUN is presented in the biographical book dedicated to the OUN leader Stepan Bandera by the German historian Grzegorz Rossoliński-Libe⁵⁸.

Researchers of this direction pay considerable attention to the search for manifestations of totalitarianism, xenophobia, and anti-Semitism in the ideological and programmatic documents and practical activities of the OUN and the UPA, the influence of fascism and Nazism on their praxis, investigate the facts of the involvement of its members in war crimes and ethnic cleansing, leaving other essential aspects and features of the Ukrainian liberation movement of the 1930s–1950s on the periphery. The attempts to “integrate” the history of the Ukrainian national liberation movement into the familiar formula of “fascism” quite often lead to schematic, one-sided, and superficial presentation of the topic.

Among Western synthetic writings dedicated to anti-Soviet nationalist insurgencies in the Western Borderlands one should mention the comparative study by Russia-born historian Alexander Statiev⁵⁹. Drawing mainly on Soviet sources from Moscow archives, the author outlines the goals, strategies, composition, strengths and weaknesses of the synchronised anti-communist nationalist movements in Ukraine, Eastern Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and conceptualises the Soviet pacification doctrine and the means used by the state against the insurgents. However, Statiev’s perspective on the national resistance movement in Ukraine and the wider Western Borderland area has been largely shaped by Soviet sources and conceptual approaches that led to some disputable conclusions. In particular, the author stated that UPA’s major focus was not the fight against the Soviets, even less against the Germans, but the ethnic cleansing of Poles. He exaggerated the level of collaboration between the UPA and Germany and the former’s violence against the civilian population, which served as part of the research strategy to justify Soviet anti-insurgency and pacification operations in Western Ukraine after 1944.

57 Himka 2010, 108.

58 Rossoliński-Libe 2014.

59 Statiev 2010.

Conclusions

Concluding the historiographical analysis, we would like to point out that after the end of the Second World War, Ukrainian and foreign scholars created a rich selection of scientific literature dedicated to the most diverse aspects of the history of the OUN and the UPA in the 1930s–1950s. Most of the respective works have been produced by scientists of the Ukrainian diaspora, Polish researchers, and contemporary Ukrainian historians. The most original, multifaceted, and methodologically pluralistic are the achievements of Ukrainian scientists in recent decades. Due to the wide public interest in the problem, the topic of the OUN and the UPA activities always remains at the epicentre of public and scientific attention, which provokes heated debates and contributes to the crystallisation of certain schools and directions in Ukrainian history writing.

Ukrainian historians have investigated the most varied aspects of the history of the Ukrainian independence movement of the 1930s–1950s, worked out a colossal volume of documentary sources and introduced a huge layer of factual and empirical data into scientific circulation. However, the development and application of modern theoretical and methodological principles are significantly inferior to the empirical level of research. In particular, one of the fundamental questions regarding the nature and typology of the Ukrainian nationalist movement against the background of similar movements of European and world nations remains poorly articulated in the scientific discourse.

In recent years, Ukrainian and foreign scholars have increasingly focused on the “human dimension” of the Ukrainian nationalist movement and its regional specificity. This trend, on the one hand, contributed to the deepening of special research, and, on the other hand, led to a situation where the sense of the complexity of the topic, and its multifaceted nature is often lost behind in narrowly focused works. Besides, to this day, the OUN and the UPA problem remains to a certain extent a “thing-in-itself”. Despite the attempts by some scientists to expand the analysis of the Ukrainian nationalist movement in the European and global contexts, without narrowing its significance exclusively to the level of Ukraine, let alone its Western part, historical comparative studies on this topic are extremely few.

BIBLIOGRAPHY / BIBLIOGRĀFIJA

- Armstrong, John (1955). *Ukrainian Nationalism 1939–1945*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Armstrong, John (1963). *Ukrainian Nationalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Armstrong, John (1980). *Ukrainian Nationalism*. Colorado: Ukrainian Academic Press.

- Armstrong, John (1990). *Ukrainian Nationalism*. Englewood – Colorado.
- Armstrong, John (2008). *Ukrainskiy natsyonalizm*. Fakty i issledovania. Per. s anhl. P. V. Bekhtyna. Moskva: Tsentrpolymhraf.
- Bahan, Oleh (1994). *Natsionalizm i natsionalistychnyi rukh. Istoriiia ta idei*. Drohobych.
- Berkhof, Karl (2011). *Zhnyva rozpachu. Zhyttia i smert v Ukraini pid natsyystskoiu vladoiu*. Z anhl. Pereklav T. Tsymbal. Kyiv: Krytyka.
- Berkhoff, Karl, Carynnyk, Marko (1999). The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and its Attitude Towards Germans and Jews: Iaroslav Stetsko's Zhyttiepys. In: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, XIII (3/4), pp. 149–184.
- Bieliaiev, Volodymyr (1952). Vbyvti lvivskykh uchenykh na utrymanni Vashynhtona. (Ukrainski burzhuazni natsionalisty). In: *Suchasne i maibutnie*, № 7, pp. 18–23.
- Bieliaiev, Volodymyr, Rudnytskyi, Mykhailo (1956). *Pid chuzhymy praporamy. Pamflety*. Kyiv: Radianskyi pysmennyk.
- Bieliaiev, Volodymyr (1980). *Ya zvyuvachuiu! Narysy y pamflety*. Kyiv: Polityvdav Ukrainy.
- Bilas, Ivan (1994). Represyvno-karalna systema v Ukraini 1917–1953. In: *Suspilno-politychnyi ta istoryko-pravovyi analiz*. U dvokh knykhakh. Kn. 1. Kyiv: Lybid.
- Bondarenko, Kost' (1997). *Diialnist orhanizatsii ukrainskykh natsionalistiv naperedodni i pid chas Druhoi svitovoi viiny (1939–1945): politychni ta viiskovi aspekty*. Avtoref. dys. kand. ist. nauk: 07.02.01. Derzh. un-t "Lvivska politekhnikha". Lviv.
- Bruder, Franziska (2007). *“Den Ukrainischen Staat erkämpfen oder sterben!”*. Die Organisation Ukrainischer Nationalisten (OUN), 1929–1948. Berlin: Metropol.
- Brytskyi, Petro (1995). *Ukraina u Druhii svitovii viini (1939–1945)*. Chernivtsi: Chernivetskyi un-t.
- Butko, Serhii, Demchenko, Tamara (1992). *Za Ukrainu, za yii voliu. Korotkyi narys borotby OUN-UPA za nezalezhnist Ukrainy (druhyi etap natsionalno-vyzvolnoho rukhu na Ukraini 30-kh – pochatku 50-kh rr.)*. Chernihiv.
- Dębski, Jerzy, Poppek, Leon (1997). *Okrutna przestroga*. Lublin.
- Demian, Hryhoriy (1993). Protty natsyystskykh okupantiv. In: *Viisko Ukrainy*, № 10, pp. 102–107.
- Drozd, Roman (2001). *Polityka władz wobec ludności ukraińskiej w Polsce w latach 1944–1989*. Warszawa.
- Drozd, Roman (2003). Polsko-ukrainski vidnosyny na Kholmshchyni, Nadsiani ta Lemkivshchyni v 1944–1947 rr. In: Isaievych, Ya. (red.). *Volyn i Kholmshchyna 1938–1947 rr.: polsko-ukrainske protystoiannia ta yoho vidlunnia. Doslidzhennia, dokumenty, spohady*. Lviv, pp. 336–351.
- Drozd, Roman (2003). Ukraińcy w Polsce 1944–1947 – losy, postawy, nastroi. In: Pisuliński, Jan (pod. red.). *Akcja “Wisła”*. Warszawa: IPN, pp. 64–81.
- Drozd, Roman (pod. red.) (2005). *Ukraińcy w najnowszych dziejach Polski (1918–1989)*. T. II. Akcja “Wisła”. Warszawa.
- Duda, Andriy, Staryk, Volodymyr (1995). *Bukovynskyi kurin v boiakh za ukrainsku derzhavnist*. Chernivtsi.

- Duzhyi, Petro (1996–1997). *Stepan Bandera – symbol natsii. Eskiznyi narys pro zhyttia i diialnist providnyka OUN. U 2-kh chastynakh.*
- Duzhyi, Petro (1998). *Roman Shukhevych – polityk, vojn.* Lviv: Halytska vydavnycha spilka.
- Dychkovskiy, Oleh (1993). *Materialy naukovoi konferentsii Vseukrainskoho bratstva voiakiv UPA “Orhanizatsiia Ukrainskykh Natsionalistiv i Ukrainska Povstanska Armiia (istoriia, uroky, suchasnist). 16–17 sichnia 1993 r., m. Ivano-Frankivsk. Stryi: TOV “UVIS”.*
- Filar, Władysław (2003). *Wołyń 1939–1944: Eksterminacja czy walki polsko-ukraińskie.* Studium historyczno-wojskowe zmagania na Wołyniu w obronie polskości, wiary i godności ludzkiej. Toruń: Adam Marszałek.
- Filar, Władysław (2008). *Wydarzenia wołyńskie 1939–1944: W poszukiwaniu odpowiedzi na trudne pytania.* Toruń: Adam Marszałek.
- Futala, Vasył (2014). Vidobrazhennia istorii OUN 1929–1939 rr. v suchasnomu ukrainskomu naratyvi. In: *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh.* Lviv. Zb. 19, pp. 126–127.
- Golczewski, Frank (2010). *Deutsche und Ukrainer. 1914–1939.* Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Grelka, Frank (2005). *Die ukrainische Nationalbewegung unter deutscher Desatzungsherrschaft 1918 und 1941–1942.* Weisbaden.
- Grott, Bogumił (red.) (2004). *Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie w latach 1939–2004.* Warszawa: Museum Historii Polskiego Ruchu Ludowego w Warszawie.
- Grott, Bogumił (red.) (2010). *Działalność nacjonalistów ukraińskich na Kresach Wschodnich II Rzeczypospolitej.* Warszawa: Museum Historii Polskiego Ruchu Ludowego w Warszawie.
- Hałagida, Ihor, Ivanyk, Myroslav (upor.) (2021). *Ukrainski zhertvy Kholmshchyny ta pivdennoho Pidliashshia u 1939–1944 rr.* Lviv: Ukrainkyi Katolytskyi Universytet.
- Havryshko, Marta (2008). Love and Sex in Wartime. Controlling Women’s Sexuality in the Ukrainian Nationalist Underground. In: *Aspasia: The International Yearbook of Central, Eastern, and Southeastern European Women’s and Gender History.* Vol. 12, pp. 35–67.
- Havryshko, Marta (2015). Henderni aspekty seksualnoi morali v OUN i UPA u 1940–1950-kh rokakh. In: *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh.* Lviv, Zb. 2, pp. 199–213.
- Havryshko, Marta (2016). Choloviky, zhinky y nasylystvo v OUN ta UPA v 1940–1950-kh rr. In: *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal,* № 4, pp. 89–107.
- Himka, John-Paul (2010). O znachenyy situatsionnoho elementa v vostochno-tsentralnoevropeiskom fashyzme. In: *Ab imperio,* 4, p. 108.
- Himka, John-Paul (2021). *Ukrainian Nationalists and the Holocaust. OUN and UPA’s Participation in the Destruction of Ukrainian Jewry, 1941–1944.* Stuttgart: Ukrainian Voices, Vol. 12.
- Himka, John-Paul (2010). The Importance of the Situational Element in East Central European Fascism. In: *East Central Europe,* 37 (2–3), pp. 353–358.
- Holovko, Taras (1992). OUN-UPA – smolokyp natsii. In: *Trybuna,* № 1, pp. 12–14.

- Horbyk, Roman (2019). Myroslav Shkandrij. Ukrainian Nationalism: Politics, Ideology, and Literature, 1929–1956. Yale UP, 2015. xii, 332 pp. In: *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, VI (1), pp. 181–184.
- Hryciuk, Grzegorz (2005). *Przemiany narodowościowe i ludnościowe w Galicji Wschodniej i na Wołyniu w latach 1931–1948*. Toruń.
- Hryciuk, Grzegorz (2012). Recenzja książki: Wołodymyr Wiatrowycz, Druha polsko-ukrajńska wijna 1942–1947. In: *Pamięć i Sprawiedliwość*, № 21, pp. 460–471.
- Hrytskiy, Roman (2003). Polska istoriohrafia ukrainsko-polskoho zbroinoho konfliktu chasiv Druhoi svitovoi viiny. In: *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh*. Zb. 2, pp. 148–170.
- Hunchak, Taras (1993). *Ukraina: persha polovyna XX stolittia: Narysy politychnoi istorii*. Kyiv: Lybid.
- Hunchak, Taras (2005). Problema istoriohrafii: istoriia ta yii dzherela In: *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh*. Zb. 4, pp. 253–263.
- Hunczak, Taras (1994). OUN–German Relations 1941–1945. In: *German–Ukrainian Relations in Historical Perspective*. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton, pp. 138–153.
- Iliushyn, Ihor (2012). Plokho zabytoe staroe: o novoi knyhe Vladymyra Viatrovycha. In: *Ab Imperio*, 1, pp. 382–385.
- Isaiuk, Olesia (2023). *Roman Shukhevych*. Zhyttia lehendy. Kyiv: Nash format.
- Ivanchenko, Ivan (1984). *Ideolohichna dyversiiia v natsionalistychnii upakovtsi*. Kyiv.
- Ivanchenko, Mykhailo (1993). Pochute i pobachene. Zvenyhorodskyi teren OUN na Cherkashchyni. In: *Natsionalno-vyzvolna borotba 20–30-kh rokiv KhKh stolittia v Ukraini*. Kyiv – Lviv, pp. 296–271.
- Ivantsev, Ivan, Marushchenko, Oleksandr (2003). Ukrainska povstanska armia v suchasni vitchyzniani istoriohrafii. In: *Ukrainska povstanska armia – fenomen istorii: Materialy Vseukrainskoi naukovo konferentsii*. Ivano-Frankivsk: Plai.
- Ivanyshyn, Vasyl (1992). *Natsiia. Derzhavnist. Natsionalizm*. Drohobych: Vidrozhennia.
- Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society*. Vol. 7, No. 2 (2021).
- Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society*. Vol. 7, No. 1 (2021).
- Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society*. Vol. 9, No. 1 (2023).
- Karłowicz Leon, Popek Leon (1998). *Śladami ludobójstwa*. Lublin.
- Kasianov, Georgiy (2002). Shche ne vmerla ukrainska istoriohrafia. In: *Krytyka*, Ch. 4.
- Komański, Henryk, Siekirka, Szczepan (2005). *Ludobójstwo dokonane przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich w wojewodstwie tarnopolskim 1939–1946*. Wrocław.
- Konieczny, Zdzisław (2006). *Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie na ziemiach obecnej Polski w latach 1918–1947*. Wrocław.
- Korman, Aleksandr (2002). *Stosunek UPA do Polaków na ziemiach południowo-wschodnich II Rzeczypospolitej*. Wrocław.
- Kosyk, Volodymyr (1992). *Ukraina pid chas druhoi svitovoi viiny (1939–1945)*. Kyiv – Paryzh – Niu-York – Toronto: Lybid.
- Kosyk, Volodymyr (2002). *Rozkol OUN u svitli dokumentiv*. Kyiv.

- Kosyk, Volodymyr (2003). Harvard patronuie nenaukovi metody doslidzhennia. In: *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh*. Zb. 1, pp. 176–189.
- Kosyk, Volodymyr (2003). Polsko-ukrainska trahediia pid chas Druhoi svitovoi viiny (1942–1944). In: *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh*. Zb. 2. Lviv: Ms. pp. 94–107.
- Kosyk, Volodymyr (2003). UPA v nimetskykh dokumentakh. In: *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh*. Zb. 1. Lviv: Ms. pp. 57–86.
- Koval, Mykhailo (1994). OUN-UPA mizh “tretim reikhom” i stalinskym totalitaryzmozom. In: *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, № 2–3, pp. 94–102.
- Koval, Mykhailo (1994). *U kraina u Druhii svitovii i Velykii Vitchyznianiі viinakh (1939–1945 rr.): Sproba suchasnoho kontseptualnoho bachennia*. Kyiv.
- Koval, Mykhailo (1995). *Ukraina 1941–1945. Malovidomi i neprochytani storinky istorii*. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola.
- Kucher, Volodymyr (1997). *OUN-UPA v borotbi za nezalezhnu Ukrainu*. Kyiv: Biblioteka ukrainsia.
- Kucher, Volodymyr, Cherneha, Petro (1995). *50-richchia peremohy nad fashyzmozom: Ukraina i Druha svitova viina*. Kyiv.
- Kulchytskyi, Stanislav (2004). Ukrainska istoriia yak znariaddia lehitymizatsii postradianskoho politychnoho ustroiu naprykintsi 80-kh rokiv. In: *Istoriia ta istoriohrafia v Yevropi*. Vyp. 3.
- Kulchytskyi, Stanislav (1992). *Ukrainska povstanska armiia i natsionalno-vyzvolna borotba v Ukraini 1940–1950-kh rr. Materialy Vseukrainskoi naukovoī konferentsii*. Kyiv.
- Kulchytskyi, Stanislav (vidp. red.) (2005). *Orhanizatsiia ukrainskykh natsionalistiv ta Ukrainska povstanska armiia. Istorychni narysy*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Kulińska, Lucyna (2001–2002). *Dzieje Komitetu Ziemi Wschodnich na tle losów ludności polskich Kresów w latach 1943–1947*. T. 1–2. Kraków.
- Kulińska, Lucyna (2009). *Działalność terrorystyczna i sabotażowa nacjonalistycznych organizacji ukraińskich w Polsce w latach 1922–1939*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Kyrychuk, Yuriy (2002). Istoriohrafia Ukrainskoi povstanskoi armii. In: *Drohobyskyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk*. Spetsvypusk do 60-richchia UPA. Drohobych, 2002.
- Lebed, Mykola (1953). *Druhyni Ukrainskykh Natsionalistiv u rokakh 1941–42*. Miunkhen: Nasha knyhozbirnia.
- Lebed, Mykola (1960). Do zviazkiv OUN–Bandery z nimetskyim viiskom. In: *Svoboda*. Dzherzi Siti. ch. 3. 10. 6. pp. 4–5.
- Lebed, Mykola (1993). *Ukrainska Povstanska Armiiia. Yii geneza, rist i dii u vyzvolnii borotbi ukrainskoho narodu za Ukrainku Samostiinu Sobornu Derzhavu*. Chastyna I. Nimetska okupatsiia. Repryntne vydannia. Drohobych: Vidrodzhennia.
- Lysenko, Oleksandr (2011). Doslidzhennia istorii Druhoi svitovoi viiny v suchasniī Ukraini: osnovni tendentsii ta perspektyvy. In: *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, № 4, p. 194.

- Lysenko, Oleksandr, Hrytsiuk, Valeriy (2009). Problematyka Druhoi svitovoi viiny u suchasnykh vitchyznianskykh viiskovo-istorychnykh doslidzhenniakh. In: *Ukraina XX st.: kultura, ideolohiia, polityka*. Kyiv: In-t istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, № 15, p. 245.
- Lysenko, Oleksandr, Marushchenko, Oleksandr (2002). *Orhanizatsiia ukrainskykh natsionalistiv ta Ukrainska povstanska armii. Bibliohrafichni pokazhchyk publikatsii 1998–2002 rokiv*. Kyiv.
- Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, Ivan (2003). *Istorychni ese*. U 2-kh t. T. 2. Kyiv: Osnovy.
- Malanchuk, Fedir (1974). *Yikh remeslo – zrada: publitsystrychni narysy, pamflety y feiletony*. Lviv: Kameniar.
- Marchuk, Ihor (2003). Rez. na: Semaszko W., Semaszko E. Ludobójstwo dokonane przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich na ludności polskiej Wołynia 1939–1945. Warszawa, 2000. T. 1, S. 1–1000; T. 2, S. 1001–1440. In: *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh*. Zb. 2, pp. 171–180.
- Marushchenko, Oleksandr (2002). Suchasna vitchyzniana istoriohrafiiia uchasti ukrainsiv u zbroinykh formuvanniakh voiuichykh storin u roky Druhoi svitovoi viiny. In: *Storinky voiennoi istorii Ukrainy: Zb. nauk. statei*. Kyiv. Vyp. 6, pp. 54–61.
- Melnychuk, Yuriy (1967). *Prodai-dushi*. Lviv: Kameniar.
- Melnychuk, Yuriy (1960). *Koly krov kholone v zhylakh. Narysy, pamflety*. Kyiv: Radianskyi pysmennyk.
- Melnychuk, Yuriy (1963). *Plemia upyriv. Narysy. Pamflety. Felietony*. Kyiv: Radianskyi pysmennyk.
- Mirchuk, Petro (1952). *Akt vidnovlennia Ukrainskoi derzhavnosti 30 chervnia 1941 roku. Yoho heneza ta politychne y istorychne znachennia*. Niu-York: Vydannia holovnoi upravy Orhanizatsii oborony chotyrok svobod Ukrainy.
- Mirchuk, Petro (1953). *Ukrainska Povstanska Armii, 1942–1952*. Miunkhen: Tsytseron.
- Mirchuk, Petro (1961). *Stepan Bandera symvol revoliutsiinoi bezkompromisovosti*. Niu-York–Toronto.
- Mirchuk, Petro (1968). *Narys istorii Orhanizatsii Ukrainskykh Natsionalistiv*. T. I. 1920–1939. Miunkhen: Ukrainske vydavnytstvo.
- Mirchuk, Petro (1970). *Roman Shukhevych (Hen. Taras Chuprynka) komandyr Armii bezsmertnykh*. Niu-York: Tovarystvo kolyshnykh voiakiv UPA.
- Mirchuk, Petro (1985). *Revoliutsiinyi zmah za USSD. (Khto taki “banderivtsi”, “melnykivtsi”, “dviikari”)*. T. 1. New York; Toronto; London.
- Misyło, Eugeniusz (2006). Pawłokoma. 3.III.1945 r. In: *Pawłokoma. 3.III.1945 r. Dokumenty*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo “UKAR”, pp. 5–54.
- Misyło, Eugeniusz (1997). Peredmova. In: *Aktsiia “Visla”. Dokumenty*. Lviv – Niu-York, pp. 7–36.
- Motyka, Grzegorz (1999). *Tak było w Bieszczadach. Walki polsko-ukraińskie 1943–1948*. Warszawa.
- Motyka, Grzegorz (2006). *Ukrainska partyzantka 1942–1960. Działalność Organizacji Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów i Ukraińskiej Powstanskiej Armii*. Warszawa: Rytm.

- Motyka, Grzegorz (2009). *W kręgu "Łun w Bieszczadach"*. Warszawa: Rytm.
- Motyka Grzegorz (2011). *Od rzezi wołyńskiej do akcji "Wisła". Konflikt polsko-ukraiński 1943–1947*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2011.
- Motyka, Grzegorz, Wnuk, Rafał (1997). "Pany" i "rezuny". *Współpraca AK-WiN i UPA 1945–1947*. Warszawa.
- Motyka, Grzegorz (2013). W krainie uproszczen. In: *Nowa Europa Wschodnia*, 1, pp. 97–101.
- Mukovskiy, Ivan, Lysenko, Oleksandr (1995). Ukrainci v zbroinykh formuvanniakh krain-uchasnyts II svitovoi viiny. In: *Rozbudova derzhavy*, № 5–6, pp. 14–17.
- Mukovskiy, Ivan, Lysenko, Oleksandr (1996). *Zvytiaha i zhertovnist: ukrainci na frontakh Druhoi svitovoi viiny*. Kyiv: Vydavnyche ahentstvo "Knyha pamiaty Ukrainy".
- Myshchak, Ivan (2010). *Inkorporatsiia ta radianizatsiia zakhidnoukrainskykh zemel (1939 – pochatok 1950-kh rr.): istoriografii*. Monohrafiia. Kyiv: In-t zakonodavstva VR Ukrainy.
- Niewiński, Jan (wybor i opracowanie) (2005). *Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie "Głos kresowian"*. Warszawa: Museum Historii Polskiego Ruchu Ludowego w Warszawie.
- Orhanizatsiia ukrainskykh natsionalistiv i Ukrainska povstanska armii: Fakhovyi vysnovok robochoi hrupy istorykiv pry Uriadovii komisii z vyvchennia diialnosti OUN i UPA* (2005). NAN Ukrainy. In-t istorii Ukrainy. 3-tie vyd. ster. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Ozymchuk, Oleh (1995). *Antyfasystska borotba OUN–UPA v roky Druhoi svitovoi viiny (period 1941–1944 rr.) na materialakh Volyni: Avtoreferat dys. kand. ist. nauk*. Rivnenskiy ped. Instytut. Rivne.
- Partacz, Czesław, Łada, Krzysztof (2004). *Polska wobec ukraińskich dążeń niepodległościowych w czasie II wojny światowej*. Toruń: Centrum Edukacji Europejskiej.
- Patryliak, Ivan (2006). OUN i UPA u vysvitlenni suchasnoi ukrainskoi istorychnoi nauky. In: Redkol.: Boriak, H. V. (holova), Matiash, I. B. (zast. holovy) ta in. *Arkhivoznavstvo. Arkheohrafiia. Dzhereloznavstvo: Mizhvid. zb. nauk. prats*. Vyp. 8, pp. 257–268.
- Patryliak, Ivan (2011). Sproba vmistyty velyku istoriiu u malii formuli. Rets. na Franziska Bruder "Den Ukrainischen Staat erkämpfen oder sterben!". Die Organisation Ukrainischer Nationalisten (OUN). 1929–1948. Berlin: Metropol, 2007. 299 s. In: *Ukrainskiy vyzvolnyi rukh*. Zb. 15, pp. 295–321.
- Patryliak, Ivan (2012). "Vstan i borys! Slukhai i vir...": *ukrainske natsionalistychne pidpillia ta povstanskiy rukh (1939–1960 rr.): Monohrafiia*. Tsentr doslidzhen vyzvolnoho rukhu. Lviv: Chasopys.
- Patryliak, Ivan (2020). *Vyzvolna borotba OUN y UPA (1939–1960): monohrafiia*. Kyiv: VD ADEF Ukraina.
- Piotrowski, Czesław (2002). *Zniszczone i zapomniane osiedla polskie oraz kościoły na Wołyniu*. Warszawa.

- Piotrowski, Czesław (2004). *Krwawe żniwa za Styrem, Horyniem i Słuczą*. Toruń: Adam Marszałek.
- Pisuliński, Jan (2017). *Przesiedlenie ludności ukraińskiej z Polski do USRR w latach 1944–1947*. Rzeszów: Libra Pl.
- Polska–Ukraina: trudne pytania: materiały XII międzynarodowego seminarium historycznego “Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie w latach II wojny światowej”* (2009). Toruń, 11–12 października 2006, t. 11. Warszawa.
- Ponypaliak, Alina (2021). *Ostannii komandyr UPA. Zhyttia i borotba Vasylia Kuka*. Kyiv: Nash format.
- Portnov, Andriy (2012). “Istorii dlia domashnoho vzhytku”. In: *Ab Imperio*, 3, pp. 324–334.
- Posivnych, Mykola (2023). *Providnyk ukraińskiej idei*. Kyiv: Nash format.
- Problema OUN-UPA* (2004). Zvit robochoi hrupy istorykiv pry Uriadovii komisii z vvychennia diialnosti OUN i UPA. Osnovni tezy z problemy OUN-UPA (istorychnyi vysnovok). Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy.
- Prokopov, Vasyl (2019). *Povsiakdenne zhyttia chleniv OUN ta voiakiv UPA na Zakerzonni (1943–1947 rr.)*. Dysertatsiia na zdobuttia naukovooho stupenia kandydata istorychnykh nauk. Spetsialnist: 07.00.01. Istoriiia Ukrainy (Istorychni nauky). Dnipro.
- Prymachenko, Yana (2010). Stanovlennia novoho pivnichnoamerykanskoho istorychnoho dyskursu z problemy OUN-UPA u druhii polovyni XX st. In: *Problemy istorii Ukrainy: fakty, sudzhennia, poshuky. Mizhvidomchyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats*. Vyp. 19: V, Ch. 2. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy, p. 244.
- Reient, Oleksandr, Mukovskiy, Ivan, Lysenko, Oleksandr (1997). UPA ta zbroini formuvannia OUN yak chynnyk Druhoi svitovoi viiny. In: *Viche*, № 10, pp. 114–129.
- Rossoliński-Libe, Grzegorz (2011). The “Ukrainian National Revolution” of 1941. Discourse and Practice of a Fascist Movement In: *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 12 (1), pp. 83–114.
- Rossoliński-Libe, Grzegorz (2014). *Stepan Bandera: The Life and Afterlife of a Ukrainian Nationalist: Fascism, Genocide, and Cult*. Stuttgart.
- Rossoliński-Libe, Grzegorz (2010). Celebrating fascism and war criminality in Edmonton. The Political Myth and Cult of Stepan Bandera in Multicultural Canada. In: *Kakanien Revisited*, 12, pp. 1–16.
- Rudling, Per Anders (2006). Theory and Practice: Historical Representation of the War Time Activities of the OUN-UPA (the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists – the Ukrainian Insurgent Army In: *East European Jewish Affairs*, 36 (2), pp. 163–189.
- Rudling, Per Anders (2010). Yushchenkiv fashyst: kult Bandery v Ukraini ta Kanadi. In: *Strasti za Banderouiu: statti ta ese*. Kyiv: Hranit-T, pp. 237–309.
- Rudling, Per Anders (2011). The OUN, the UPA and the Holocaust: A Study in the Manufacturing of Historical Myths. In: *The Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies*. Pittsburgh: University Center for Russian and East European Studies, pp. 1–71.

- Rudling, Per Anders (2012). Warfare or War Criminality? Volodymyr Viatrovych, Druha polsko-ukainska viina, 1942–1947 (Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim “Kyevo-Mohylianska akademiia, 2011). 228 pp. In: *Ab Imperio*, 1, pp. 356–381.
- Rudling, Per Anders (2014). OUN, UPA i Holokaust: Tworzenia mitów historycznych – badanie problem In: Tokarczuk, W. (red.). *OUN, UPA, i zagłada ludności żydowskiej na Wołyniu i w Galicji*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, pp. 214–286.
- Rusnachenko, Anatoliy (2002). *Narod zburenyi. Natsionalno-vyzvolnyi rukh v Ukraini y natsionalni rukhy oporu v Bilorusii, Lytvi, Latvii, Estonii u 1940–50-kh rokakh*. Kyiv: Pulsary.
- Rymarenko, Yuriy (1983). *Z kym i proty koho: dokumentalno-publitsystychni narysy y statii*. Kyiv: Dnipro.
- Semaszko, Władysław, Semaszko, Ewa (2000). *Ludobójstwo dokonane przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich na ludności polskiej Wołynia 1939–1945*. Warszawa, T. 1–2.
- Serhiichuk, Volodymyr (1994). Radianski partyzany pro OUN-UPA. In: *Samostiina Ukraini*, pp. 15–20.
- Serhiichuk, Volodymyr (1995). Diialnist ounivskoho pidpillia na Skhodi Ukrainy. In: *Ukraina u Druhii svitovii viini.*: Zb. nauk. prats. Kyiv, pp. 193–196.
- Shkandrij, Myroslav (2015). *Ukrainian Nationalism: Politics, Ideology, and Literature, 1929–1956*. Yale UP.
- Siekierka, Szczepan, Komański, Henryk., Bulzacki, Krzysztof (2006). *Ludobójstwo dokonane przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich w wojewodstwie lwowskim 1939–1947*. Wrocław.
- Snyder, Timothy (1999). To Resolve the Ukrainian Problem Once and For All: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ukrainians in Poland 1943–1947. In: *Journal of Cold War Studies*, No. 2, pp. 86–120.
- Snyder, Timothy (2003). Akcja “Wasa” a homogeniczność społeczeństwa polskiego. In: *Jan Pisuliński* (pod red.). *Akcja “Wisła”*. Warszawa: IPN, pp. 49–54.
- Snyder, Timothy (2003). The Causes of Ukrainian–Polish Ethnic Cleansing. In: *Past and Present*, No. 179, pp. 198–204.
- Snyder, Timothy (2010). Fashystskyi heroi u demokratychnomu Kyievi. In: *Krytyka*, № 3–4, p. 8.
- Snyder, Timothy (2011). *Kryvavi zemli: Yevropa mizh Hitlerom i Stalynym*. Kyiv: Hrani-T.
- Snyder, Timothy (2012). Peretvorennia natsii. *Polshcha, Ukraina, Lytva, Bilorus. 1569–1999*. Per. z anhl. Kyiv: Dukh i litera, pp. 189–218.
- Sodol, Petro (1994). *Ukrainska Povstancha armiia 1943–1949*. Dovidnyk. Niu-York: Proloh.
- Sodol, Petro (1995). *Ukrainska Povstancha armiia 1943–1949*. Dovidnyk druhyi. Niu-York: Proloh.
- Sowa, Andrzej Leon (2012). Recenzja ksiazek: Polsko-ukrajinski stosunki w 1942–1947 rokach u dokumentach OUN ta UPA, red. Wolodymyr Wiatrowycz oraz


- Wolodymyr Wiatrowycz, Druha polsko-ukrajinska wijna 1942–1947. In: *Pamięć i Sprawiedliwość*, nr. 21, pp. 450–460.
- Statiev, Alexander (2010). *The Soviet Counterinsurgency in the Western Borderlands*. Cambridge University Press.
- Syvitskyi, Mykola (2005). *Istoriia polsko-ukrainskykh konfliktiv*. U 3-kh t. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo imeni Oleny Telihy.
- Szcześniak, Antoni, Szota, Wiesław (1973). *Droga do nikąd. Działalność Organizacji Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów i jej likwidacja w Polsce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Ministerstwa Obrony Narodowej.
- Tarasov, Volodymyr (2007). “Bili pliamy” vitchyznianoï istorii na storinkakh publitsystyky 1989–1991 rr.: istoriohrafichnyi ta metodolohichni aspekty. Kharkiv: Kursor.
- Torzecki, Ryszard (1989). *Kwestia ukraińska w Polsce w latach 1923–1929*. Kraków.
- Torzecki, Ryszard (1993). *Polacy i Ukraińcy. Sprawa ukraińska w czasie II wojny światowej na terenie II Rzeczypospolitej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo naukowe PWN.
- Trofymovych, Volodymyr (1994). *Istoriia viiskovykh formuvan OUN (1939–1942 rr.)*. Lviv.
- Trush, Viacheslav, Khobot, Pavlo, Shchur, Yuriy (upor.) (2019). *Diiálnist Orhanizatsii Ukrainskykh Natsionalistiv na Skhodi Ukrainy*. Zbirnyk statei, № 2. Dnipro, Skhidnoukraiński doslidnytskyi tsentr “Spadshchyna”.
- Turowski, Józef., Siemaszko, Władysław (oprac.) (1990). *Zbrodnie nacjonalistów ukraińskich dokonane na ludności polskiej na Wołyniu 1939–1945*. Warszawa.
- Tys-Krokhmaluk, Yuriy (1972). *UPA warfare in Ukraine. Strategical, Tactical and Organizational Problems of Ukrainian Resistance in World War II*. New York.
- Ukraina – Polishcha: vazhki pytannia. (1997–2006)*. T. 1–10. Varshava.
- Umland, Andreas (2009). Refining the Concept of Generic Fascism In: *European History Quarterly*, 39 (2), pp. 298–309.
- Umland, Andreas (2008). Porivnialne fashyznavstvo. In: *Krytyka*, 12 (7–8) (129–130), pp. 12–16.
- Vedenev, Dmytri, Lysenko, Oleksandr (2010). Ukraina u Druhii svitovii viini: deiaki pytannia teorii, metodolohii y suspilnykh refleksii. In: *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, № 3, p. 29.
- Viatrovych, Volodymyr (2011). *Druha polsko-ukrainska viina 1942–1947*. Kyiv: Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia.
- Viatrovych, Volodymyr (2016). *Za lashtunkamy “Volyni-43”. Nevidoma polsko-ukrainska viina*. Kharkiv: Klub simeinoho dozvillia.
- Viatrovych, Volodymyr (vidp. red. ta uporiad.) (2011). *Polsko-ukrainski stosunki v 1942–1947 rokakh u dokumentakh OUN ta UPA*: u 2 t. Lviv: Tsentr doslidzhen vyzvolnoho rukhu.
- Vovk, Oleksandr (1994). Vysvitlennia tematychno OUN i UPA v zhurnali “Ukrainskyi istoryk”. In: *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, № 31, pp. 90–95.
- Wysocki, Roman (2003). *Organizacja Ukraińskich Naconalistow w Polsce w latach 1929–1939*. Lublin.

- Wysocki Roman (2019). *Patsyfikatsiia Halychyny 1930 roku. Dokumenty*. Tom I. Lviv: Vydavnytstvo UKU.
- Yilhe, Wilfried (2006). Zmahannia zhertv. In: *Krytyka*, Ch. 5, pp. 29–31.
- Zaitsev, Oleksandr (2011). “Intehralnyi natsionalizm” yak teoretychna model doslidzhennia ukrainskoho natsionalistychnoho rukhu. In: *Ukrainskyi vyzvolnyi rukh*. Lviv. Zb. 15, p. 24.
- Zaitsev, Oleksandr (2012). OUN i avtorytarno-natsionalistychni rukhy mizhvoiennoi Yevropy. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, № 1, pp. 89–101.
- Zaitsev, Oleksandr (2013). *Ukrainskyi intehralnyi natsionalizm (1920–1930-ti roky). Narysy intelektualnoi istorii*. Kyiv: Krytyka.
- Zaitsev, Oleksandr (2015). Fascism or Ustashism? Ukrainian Integral Nationalism in Comparative Perspective, 1920s–1930s. In: *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 48 (2–3), pp. 183–193.
- Zaitsev, Oleksandr (2016). Ydeolohyia y polytycheskaia stratehia OUN do 1939 hoda: vznokhneniye y evoliutsyia ukrainskoho intehralnogo natsyonalizma v mezhvoennoe vremia. In: *Forum noveishei vostochnoevropeskoj istorii i kultury*. Russkoe izdanye, № 2, pp. 125–149.
- Zajączkowski, Mariusz (2015). *Ukraińskie podziemie na Lubelszczyźnie w okresie okupacji niemieckiej 1939–1944*. Lublin–Warszawa: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej Oddział w Lublinie, Instytut Studiów Politycznych PAN.
- Zdioruk, Serhii, Hrynevych, Lydmyła, Zdioruk, Olena (1999). *Pokazhchyk publikatsii pro diialnist OUN ta UPA (1945–1998)*. Kyiv.
- Zemba, Andrzej (2012). Mifologizirovannaia “voina”. In: *Ab Imperio*, 1, pp. 403–421.
- Żupański, Andrzej (2007). *Tragiczne wydarzenia za Bugiem i Sanem przed ponad sześćdziesięciu laty*. Warszawa: Rytm.

NEPABEIGTAIS KARŠ: UKRAIŅU NACIONĀLISTU ORGANIZĀCIJAS UN UKRAINAS SACELŠANĀS ARMIJAS PROBLEMĀTIKA HISTORIOGRĀFIJĀ

Ivans Patriljaks

DSc, profesors, Kijivas Tarasa Ševčenko Nacionālā universitāte

 0000-0002-4534-4654

Zinātniskās intereses: Ukrainu nacionālistu organizācijas un Ukrainas Sacelšanās armijas vēsture; sagatavošanā monogrāfija “OUN un UPA cīņa par Ukrainas atbrīvošanu”

Oleksandrs Pahiria

PhD, pēcdoktorants, Kijivas Tarasa Ševčenko Nacionālā universitāte

 0000-0003-2481-9769

Zinātniskās intereses: 20. gadsimta vidus ukraiņu atbrīvošanās kustības vēsture; sagatavošanā monogrāfija “Ukrainas Karpatu reģions Polijas Otrās republikas dokumentos (1938–1939)”

Rakstā analizēts historiogrāfiskais process, kas saistīts ar Ukrainas nacionālisma – konkrētāk, ar 20. gadsimta 30.–50. gados notikušo Ukrainu nacionālistu organizācijas un Ukrainas Sacelšanās armijas aktivitāšu – vēsturi. Balstoties uz hronoloģiski teritoriālo un konceptuāli metodoloģisko principu, autori iedala vēstures literatūru piecās galvenajās grupās: ukraiņu diasporas autoru rakstītais, padomju zinātnieku un publicistu darbi, neatkarīgajā Ukrainā tapusi historiogrāfija, komunistu un poļu mūsdienu historiogrāfija, Rietumu vēstures literatūra. Katras grupas ietvaros tiek aplūkotas galvenās publikācijas, raugoties caur dokumentāro avotu, metodoloģijas un konceptuālās pieejas prizmu, kā arī ņemot vērā attiecīgo darbu tapšanas sociāli politisko kontekstu.

Atslēgas vārdi: Ukrainu nacionālistu organizācija, Ukrainas Sacelšanās armija, atbrīvošanās kustība, nacionāla valsts, historiogrāfija

Kopsavilkums

Rakstā analizēts historiogrāfiskais process, kas saistīts ar Ukrainas nacionālisma – konkrētāk, ar Ukrainu nacionālistu organizācijas (OUN) un Ukrainas Sacelšanās armijas (UPA) aktivitāšu 20. gadsimta 30.–50. gados – vēsturi. Balstoties uz hronoloģiski teritoriālo un konceptuāli metodoloģisko principu, autori iedala vēstures literatūru piecās galvenajās grupās: Ukrainas diasporas autoru rakstītais, padomju zinātnieku un publicistu darbi, neatkarīgajā Ukrainā tapusi historiogrāfija, komunistu un poļu mūsdienu historiogrāfija, Rietumu vēstures literatūra. Katras grupas ietvaros tiek aplūkotas galvenās

publikācijas, raugoties caur dokumentāro avotu, metodoloģijas un konceptuālās pieejas prizmu, kā arī ņemot vērā attiecīgo darbu tapšanas sociāli politisko kontekstu.

Lai arī ukraiņu emigrācijas historiogrāfija par OUN un UPA vēsturi lielā mērā balstījās nacionāli patriotiskā un partejiskā nostājā, tā ieviesa zinātniskajā aprītē lielu faktoloģiskā materiāla apjomu, kas veidoja pamatu šīs problēmas zinātniskai izpētei 20. gadsimta 90. gadu sākumā. Neskatoties uz ideoloģisko uzslāņojumu, falsifikācijām un izkropļojumiem, padomju vēstures literatūra par OUN un UPA sniedz interesantu faktoloģisko materiālu, ļauj notvert dažas maz zināmas nianšes un ielūkojas tā laika spiegu cīņās aizkulisēs.

Neatkarīgās Ukrainas historiogrāfija par OUN un UPA problēmu ir attīstījusies no uz nāciju centrētām un apoloģētiskām publikācijām līdz objektīvākiem pētījumiem, kuros izmantotas sarežģītas metodes un ņemts vērā plašāks konteksts. 20. gadsimta 90. gados piedzīvotā “arhīvu revolūcija” un pakāpeniska Ukrainas vēstures zinātnes iekļaušanās Rietumu akadēmiskajā pasaulē ir ļāvusi Ukrainas zinātniekiem pēdējos trīs gadu desmitos īstenot apjomīgu izrāvienu ukraiņu nacionālistiskās kustības vēstures zinātniskā izpratnē. Ukrainas vēsturnieki ir izpētījuši visdažādākos 20. gadsimta 30.–50. gadu Ukrainas neatkarības kustības vēstures aspektus, apstrādājuši kolosālu dokumentāro avotu apjomu un ieviesuši zinātniskajā aprītē milzīgu faktoloģisko un empīrisku datu slāni. Tomēr modernu teorētisko un metodoloģisko principu attīstība un pielietojums ievērojami atpaliek no izpētes empīriskā līmeņa. Zinātniskajā diskusijā joprojām īpaši maz ir aplūkots viens no pamatjautājumiem attiecībā uz Ukrainas nacionālistiskās kustības raksturu un tipoloģiju uz citu Eiropas un pasaules nāciju līdzīgu kustību fona.

Kopš Polijas Tautas Republikas dibināšanas poļu vēstures literatūrā lielā mērā dominē tendencioza pieeja ukraiņu nacionālisma tēmai, ko Polijas historiogrāfijas galvenais virziens uzlūko kā fašistisku, labvēlīgu Vācijai un pret Poliju vērstu genocīdisku kustību. Lai arī mazliet mazāka Polijas vēsturnieku daļa kopumā atzīst ukraiņu tiesības cīnīties par savu valstiskumu, tā tomēr atbalsta tēzi par Ukrainas–Polijas konflikta asimetriju un pret Volīnijas un Galīcijas reģionā mītošajiem poļiem izvērsto genocīdu. Tikai neliela margināla mūsdienu Polijas pētnieku grupa savos vērtējumos par OUN un UPA darbību nosliecas vairāk mūsdienu Ukrainas vēstures zinātnes virzienā. Rietumu vēsturnieku uzmanības centrā kopumā ir totalitārisma, ksenofobijas un antisemitisma izpausmes OUN un UPA ideoloģiskajos un programmatiskajos dokumentos un praktiskajā darbībā, maz uzmanības pievēršot citiem būtiskiem ukraiņu 20. gadsimta 30.–50. gadu atbrīvošanās kustības aspektiem un iezīmēm.

Pēdējos gados Ukrainas un citu valstu zinātnieki arvien vairāk pievēršas ukraiņu nacionālistiskās kustības mikrovēsturei, pētot tās reģionālās dimensijas. Šī tendence, no vienas puses, veicina konkrētām tēmām veltītas pētniecības padziļināšanos, bet, no otras puses, noved pie tā, ka šaurai problēmai veltītos darbos bieži pazūd tēmas sarežģītība un tās daudzšķautņainais raksturs. Turklāt līdz pat šai dienai OUN un UPA problēma lielā mērā joprojām ir “ kaut kas pats par sevi pastāvošs”. Neskatoties uz dažu pētnieku centieniem izvērst ukraiņu nacionālistiskās kustības analīzi Eiropas un pasaules kontekstā,

nesašaurinot tās nozīmi tikai Ukrainas vai pat tikai tās rietumu daļas līmenī, vēsturiski salīdzinošu pētījumu par šo tēmu ir ārkārtīgi maz.

Saņemts / Submitted 30.09.2023.

© 2023 Ivan Patryliak, Oleksandr Pahiria, Latvijas Universitāte

Raksts publicēts brīvpieejā saskaņā ar Creative Commons

Attiecinājuma-Nekomerciāls 4.0 Starptautisko licenci (CC BY-NC 4.0)

This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).