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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 UPA. 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.
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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 public 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 Lebed, 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 UPA. The indisputable merit of both authors was their open-
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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, Yurii Tys-Krokhmaliuk, Volodymyr Kosyk, Taras Hunczak, and Petro Sodol. 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 monograph 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 research.

**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
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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
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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 examination\textsuperscript{10}.

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 Ivanyszyn, Andriy Duda, Volodymyr Staryk, Petro Duzhyi, Hryhoriy Demyan\textsuperscript{11}, which were effectively a compilation of works by Petro Mirchuk, Mykola Lebed, Yaroslav Stetsko,

\textsuperscript{10} See more: Kulchytskyi 2004, 102; Tarasov 2007; Kaskanov 2002; Myshchak 2010, 34–35.

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 science. The most apt description of the works created by Ukrainian historians of that period was given by Yuriy 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.”

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 archaeographical 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 century. During the mentioned period, interesting works based on new archival sources were written by Volodymyr Serhiychuk, Mykhailo Koval, Ivan Bilas, Petro Brytskyi, Ivan Mukovskyi, Oleksandr Lysenko, Volodymyr Trofymovych, and others.

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 publications, 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...
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.

19 Kulchytskyi 2005.
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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 Kasyanov, Yaroslav Dashkevych, Ihor Iliushyn, Dmytro Vedeneev, Volodymyr Dziobak, Oleksandr Vovk, Andriy Rukkas, Vasyly Derevinskyi, 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 Denyshchuk, Igor Iliushyn, Mykola Posivnych, Oleksandr Pahiria, Oleksandr Ishchuk, Valeriy Ogorodnik, Andriy Rukkas, Yuri Soroka, Vasyly Ukhach, Oleksandra Stasyuk, Yaroslav Antonyuk, Ihor Marchuk, Vasyly 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 shown.

An important contribution to the development of the discussion on Polish–Ukrainian relations in 1942–1947 made by Volodymyr Vyatrovych, 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 Ukraine and beyond.

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 state. 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 nationalists. 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

---

22 Vyatrovych 2011; Vyatrovych 2011; Vyatrovych 2016.
not take into account the further evolution of the OUN itself and its relations with Germany. In general, Zaitsev’s concept of “ustashaism” caused an active discussion in the scientific circles in Ukraine and abroad.

In 2012, a comprehensive monograph by Ivan Patrilyak 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 topic. In 2020, the author prepared its second, updated edition.

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

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.
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**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. Szczęśniak and Wiesław Z. Szota, *The Road to Nowhere*, published in 1973. 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,
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 Czeslaw Partach, Krzysztof Łada, Władysław Filar, Bogumił Grott, Aleksander Korman, Leon Popek, Jerzy Dębski, Lucyna Kulińska, Zdzisław Konieczny, Władysław Ważniewski, Józef Turowski, Jan Wilczur, Andrzej Źupański, Henryk Komański, Szczepan Siekierka, Zbigniew Małyszczycki, Jan Niewiński, Tadeusz Piotrowski, Władysław and Eva Semaszki, etc. The named authors have published their works in special collections, 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 voivodeship administrations), they publish monographic series, which in certain cases can hardly be called even as pseudo-scientific works.

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.
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 Wieczorkiewicz, Damian Markowsky, Grzegorz Mazur, Grzegorz Hryciuk, Roman Wysocki, Rafal Wnuk, Henryk Piskunowicz, Andrzej Ajnenkiel, Zbigniew Palski, 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 parties.

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

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 Zajączkowski have the greatest scientific value for an objective study of the history of the OUN and the UPA.

Grzegorz Motyka’s *Ukrainian Guerilla Warfare* 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 problem.

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 Misioł, 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
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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 War\textsuperscript{44}. 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 1939–1944\textsuperscript{45} 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.

\textbf{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.

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

\textsuperscript{45} Hałagida, Ivanyk 2021.
In 1955, the first edition of John Armstrong’s work *Ukrainian Nationalism* was published\(^{46}\). The book, which was subsequently republished several times with corrections and additions\(^{47}\), 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 20\(^{th}\) 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 others\(^{48}\). 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 topic\(^{49}\).

At the same time, some Western scholars (John-Paul Himka\(^{50}\), Grzegorz Rossoliński-Libe\(^{51}\), Frank Golczewski\(^{52}\), Per Anders Rudling\(^{53}\), Timoty Snyder\(^{54}\), 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 West\(^{55}\). As part of this approach, the concept of generic fascism is singled out\(^{56}\), 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.
54 Snyder 2012, 189–218; Snyder 2010, 8.
55 Umland 2008, 12–16.
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-discipline\(^57\). 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-Libe\(^58\).

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 Statiev\(^59\). 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.
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Kopsavilkums
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 zinātniskā aprakstu, faltiskās teorijas, metodoloģijas un konceptuālās pieejas prizmu, kā arī ņemot vērā attiecīgo darbu tapšanas sociāli politisko kontekstu.


Pēdējos gados Ukrainas un citu valstu zinātnieki arvien vairāk pievēršas ukraiņu nacionālistiskās kustības mikrovēsturei, pētot tās regionālās dimensijas. Šī tendence, no vienas puses, veicina konkrētām tēmām veltītas pētniecības padziļināšanos, bet, no otras puses, noveida pie tā, ka šaurajā problēmā veltītos darbos bieži pazūd tās sarežģītība un tās daudzskautūtainais raksturs. Turklāt likz latīšu problēma lielā mērā joprojām ir “kaut kas pats par sevi pastāvošs”. Neskatoties uz dažu pētnieku centieniem izvērst ukraiņu nacionālistiskās kustības analizi Eiropas un pasaules kontekstā,
nesašaurinot tās nozīmi tikai Ukrainas vai pat tikai tās rietumu daļas limeni, vēsturiski salīdzinošu pētijumu par šo tēmu ir ārkārtīgi maz.