

УДК 94(477.8):323.12/.13

**ARRESTS OF UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUALS IN 1965
IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK REGION****Богдан ПАСКА**

*Державний вищий навчальний заклад
“Прикарпатський національний університет імені Василя Стефаника”,
кафедра історії України і методики викладання історії,
вул. Шевченка, 57, 76018, Івано-Франківськ, Україна
e-mail: paskabogdan@i.ua
DOI: 10.15330/gal.34.68-76
ORCID: 0000-0002-5452-5254*

Метою статті є комплексне дослідження арештів української інтелігенції в 1965 р. на території Івано-Франківської області. У контексті цієї мети виділені такі завдання: встановлення кількісних масштабів арештів на території Івано-Франківщини, аналіз висунутих представникам інтелігенції обвинувачень, методів ведення слідства, поведінки заарештованих, дослідження судових процесів над івано-франківськими дисидентами. Основу джерельної бази становлять документи Галузевого державного архіву Служби безпеки України у м. Київ та матеріали самвидаву. Методологічною основою дослідження є концепція Я. Секо про співіснування в українському русі спротиву 1950–80-х рр. двох парадигм – національно-визвольної (підпільні організації) та націоналізаційної (легальна діяльність інтелігенції із середовища “шістдесятників”). Автор статті приходить до висновку, що у ході хвилі репресій проти українського шістдесятницького правозахисту у серпні-вересні 1965 р. було затримано п’ятьох представників інтелігенції Івано-Франківщини, із яких чотирьох осіб (В. Мороз, О. Заливаха, М. Озерного, В. Іванишина) було заарештовано. Основними пунктами обвинувачення були розповсюдження забороненої літератури та бесіди про необхідність виходу України з СРСР, що було трактовано як “антирадянська агітація і пропаганда”. Суворість покарання інакодумців значною мірою залежала від проявлення ними у ході слідства необхідних емоцій, які свідчили б про їх “розкаяння” і “перевиховання”. У ході “першої хвилі арештів” Івано-Франківська область опинилась на третьому місці за кількістю репресованих осіб після Львівщини та Київщини. Репресії завдали значного удару по осередках шістдесятницького правозахисту на Прикарпатті та місцевій мережі поширення самвидавної літератури.

Ключові слова: український дисидентський рух, радянський режим, “перша хвиля арештів”, самвидав, Комітет державної безпеки (КДБ), Валентин Мороз, Опанас Заливаха, Михайло Озерний.

The wave of repressions against the Ukrainian creative intelligentsia, organized by the Committee of State Security (KGB) under the Council of Ministers (RM) of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (Ukrainian SSR) in August-September 1965, was called by researchers “the first mowing” or “the first wave of arrests”. It was the beginning of the open attack of the Soviet regime on the environment of the Ukrainian Sixtiers intelligentsia. Although the number of arrests in 1965 was not significant, on the one hand they dealt a severe blow to the most active members of the Ukrainian national movement and the samizdat distribution network, and on the other accelerated the movement and facilitated the transition of some dissidents to more active resistance to the system. Despite the coverage of the events of the “first wave of arrests” in the Ukrainian SSR in the works of researchers Heorhii Kasianov¹, Anatolii Rusnachenko², Yurii Danyliuk and Oleh Bazhan³, Borys Zakharov⁴, Yaroslav Seko⁵, the issue of arrests in 1965 in Ivano-Frankivsk region has not received comprehensive

¹ Касьянов Г. Незгодні: українська інтелігенція в русі опору 1960–80-х років. Київ : Либідь, 1995. 224 с.

² Русначенко А. Національно-визвольний рух в Україні. Середина 1950-х – початок 1990-х років. Київ : Вид-во ім. Олени Теліги, 1998. 720 с.

³ Данилюк Ю., Бажан О. Опозиція в Україні (друга половина 50-х – 80-ті рр. ХХ століття). Київ : Рідний край, 2000. 616 с.

⁴ Захаров Б. Нарис історії дисидентського руху в Україні (1956–1987). Харків : Фоліо, 2003. 144 с.

⁵ Секо Я. Арешти 1965 р. в УРСР як засіб боротьби комуністичної партії з інакодумством. Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка. Серія :



research in modern Ukrainian historiography. The objectives of the article are to establish the quantitative scale of arrests in the Ivano-Frankivsk region, to analyze the accusations made against intellectuals, the methods of investigation, the behavior of detainees, and the investigation of trials against Ivano-Frankivsk dissidents. The source base is based on the documents of the Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine (HDA SBU) in Kyiv and samizdat materials. The methodological basis of the study is Y. Seko's concept of the coexistence in the Ukrainian resistance movement of the 1950s and 1980s of two paradigms – national liberation (underground organizations) and nationalization (legal activity of the intelligentsia from among the Sixtiers). Within the framework of the nationalization paradigm, scholars have identified two forms – revisionism and human rights protection, within the latter – two stages: the Sixtiers (1960s – early 1970s) and Helsinki (1976–1988)⁶.

In the first half of the 1960s, the scale of the Ukrainian dissident movement within the nationalization paradigm gradually increased (the stage of the Sixtiers human rights protection). The spread of illegal self-published literature, which was the most common form of struggle, was growing in the Kyiv and Lviv Sixtiers environments. Along with Kyiv and Lviv, key centers of the Sixtiers human rights protection, quite significant centers existed in Volyn, Ternopil, and Ivano-Frankivsk regions. The leaders of the Kyiv Sixtiers were Ivan Svitlychnyi, Alla Horska, Yevhen Sverstiuk, Ivan Dziuba, and the Lviv leaders were brothers Mykhailo and Bohdan Horyn, Ivan Hel, Mykhailo Osadchyi, and Mykhailo Kosiv.

Two informal samizdat distribution centers were formed in Ivano-Frankivsk – a group of teachers led by Ivano-Frankivsk Pedagogical Institute employee, historian Valentyn Moroz, with the participation of Petro Arsenych, Ivan Kosteniuk, Andrii Zahoruiko, Yaroslav Melnychuk, Mykhailo Fihol, Ivan Kozovych⁷, and a group of employees of the local art fund, which included Opanas Zalyvakha, Vasyl Turetskyi, Mykhailo Fihol, Oleksandr Korovai⁸. Despite the fact that both groups included the artist M. Fihol, no active contacts and exchange of literature between them in 1964–1965 were recorded. At the same time, V. Moroz maintained active ties with Lviv (M. and B. Horyn) and Lutsk (Dmytro Ivashchenko) dissident circles, from where self-published literature came to Ivano-Frankivsk. He also tried to establish permanent relations with Kyiv dissidents⁹. Opanas Zalyvakha was in contact primarily with Kyiv residents I. Svitlychnyi and A. Horska, from whom he received illegal literature, and Lviv resident B. Horyn¹⁰. A separate center of the Sixties human rights protection was formed on the territory of Rozhniativ district. It included the German language teacher from the village of Ripne Mykhailo Ozernyi and the teacher of Russian language and literature from the village of Duba Volodymyr Ivanyshyn. Mykhailo Ozernyi, whose family lived in Ternopil, maintained active contacts and exchanges of literature with the leaders of the local dissident cell, Ihor Gereta and Mefodii Chubatyi¹¹. According to I. Hel, Volodymyr Ivanyshyn, in turn, had certain contacts with V. Moroz¹².

Історія. 2015. Вип. 2. Ч. 4. URL: http://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Seko_Yaroslav/Areshty_1965_r_v_URSR_iak_zasib_borotby_komunistychnoi_partii_z_inakodumstvom (дата звернення: 05.01.2021).

⁶ Секо Я. Концептуальні проблеми розвитку українського національного руху в середині 1950-х – середині 1980-х рр. Україна – Європа – Світ. *Міжнародний збірник наукових праць. Серія : Історія, міжнародні відносини*. 2015. Вип. 15. URL: http://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Seko_Yaroslav/Kontseptualni_problemy_rozvytku_ukrainskoho_natsionalnoho_rukhu_v_seredyni_1950-kh_seredyni_1980-kh (дата звернення: 05.01.2021).

⁷ Паска Б. Валентин Мороз: прапор українського дисидентства. Івано-Франківськ : Фоліант, 2018. С. 55–57.

⁸ Паска Б. Дисидентська діяльність Опанаса Заливахи (1960–1970-ті рр.). *Галичина. Науковий і культурно-просвітний краєзнавчий часопис*. Івано-Франківськ, 2020. Ч. 33. С. 138. Doi: 10.15330/gal.33.136-145.

⁹ Паска Б. Валентин Мороз: прапор українського дисидентства... С. 50–52.

¹⁰ Галузевий державний архів Служби безпеки України (далі – ГДА СБУ). Ф. 16 : Секретаріат ГПУ-КГБ УРСР. Оп. 3. Спр. 952 : Документи (повідомлення, листи, доповідні) КДБ при РМ УРСР до ЦК КПУ про: результати оперативно-слідчої роботи; поточну оперативну обстановку, антирадянські прояви на місцях та надзвичайні події; розшук авторів та розповсюджувачів антирадянських листів та листівок; протестні акції представників творчої інтелігенції; рух кримськотатарських автономістів; реагування громадськості на події суспільно-політичного життя; роботу пунктів “ПК”; діяльність українських емігрантських організацій (ТОУК) тощо (а/с “Блок”). Арк. 169, 174–175.

¹¹ Тас само. Арк. 182–183.

The KGB actively monitored the activities of the Ukrainian creative intelligentsia. In the early 1960s, a group case called “88” was opened against key leaders of the Sixtiers human rights protection movement. It was decided to “implement” it in August–September 1965 by arresting the most active members of the dissident movement and taking preventive measures against less proactive persons. In a report by Vitalii Nikitchenko, head of the KGB under the RM of the Ukrainian SSR, to the Central Committee (CC) of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) in late August 1965, the key reasons for the wave of arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals were an increase in numerical scale of the resistance movement, as well as a significant increase in the spread of illegal literature¹³.

Finally, in August–September 1965, the KGB in Kyiv, Lviv, as well as Ivano-Frankivsk, Ternopil, and Volyn regions detained 34 individuals involved in distributing illegal self-published literature, of whom 24 were arrested. Subsequently, the cases of 18 people were considered during the trials, and 6 people were subjected to prevention. According to operative materials of the KGB, information was obtained about 350 contacts of arrested intellectuals and young people who were involved in the “anti-Soviet” activities of the defendants. About 90 of them were called as witnesses in all criminal cases¹⁴.

During the all-Ukrainian wave of repressions in late August and early September 1965, five representatives of the local intelligentsia were detained in Ivano-Frankivsk region, who were active members of the dissident movement (15% of the total number of detainees). In particular, on August 25, M. Ozernyi was taken into custody while returning from vacation to the village of Ripne¹⁵; August 28 – V. Ivanyshyn in the village of Duba¹⁶, as well as O. Zalyvakha and V. Turetskyi¹⁷; September 1 – V. Moroz¹⁸. However, V. Turetskyi was released a few days later for his loyal position on the investigation and giving the necessary evidence to KGB officers. All other dissidents were arrested; criminal cases were opened against them and charges were brought under Art. 62, Part I of the Criminal Code (CC) of the Ukrainian SSR (“anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda”), and against M. Ozernyi and V. Moroz – also under Art. 64 of the CC Ukrainian SSR (“organizational activities aimed at committing particularly dangerous state crimes”). All the detainees were held in the Ivano-Frankivsk KGB detention center, and the investigation was conducted by local KGB officers.

Prisoners of the intelligentsia were accused primarily of storing, reproducing and distributing “nationalist” literature, “ideologically harmful” documents, as well as “anti-Soviet” conversations with

¹² Гель І. Виклик системі: український визвольний рух другої половини ХХ століття / ред. та упор. І. В. Єзерська; Центр досліджень визвольного руху. Львів : Часопис, 2013. С. 241.

¹³ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 944: Документи (повідомлення, доповідні) КДБ при РМ УРСР до ЦК КПУ про: оперативну обстановку, антирадянські прояви та надзвичайні події в Україні; провокаційні дії Коляски І. В.; протести представників творчої інтелігенції; спостереження за діяльністю церковних організацій та сектантських груп; виступи кримськотатарських автономістів; ситуацію в середовищі іноземних студентів; реагування громадськості на події суспільно-політичного життя тощо (а/с “Блок”). Арк. 1–2.

¹⁴ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 948: Документи (повідомлення, доповідні) КДБ при РМ УРСР до ЦК КПУ про: поточну оперативну обстановку, антирадянські прояви на місцях та надзвичайні події; протестні акції представників творчої інтелігенції; оперативне спостереження за діяльністю adeptів сектантських організацій та груп; рух кримськотатарських автономістів; оперативний супровід Міжнародного конгресу з питань птахівництва; діяльність закордонних антирадянських організацій (ЗП УГВР, ЗЧ ОУН); ситуацію в середовищі іноземних студентів; реагування громадськості на події суспільно-політичного життя; розслідування злочинів, скоєних окупаційною владою на території України у роки Другої світової війни тощо (а/с “Блок”), 22.06.1966–22.09.1966. Арк. 186–187.

¹⁵ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 952. Арк. 189.

¹⁶ Секо Я. Арешти 1965 р. в УРСР як засіб боротьби комуністичної партії з інакодумством... С. 1.

¹⁷ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 946 Документи (повідомлення) КДБ при РМ УРСР до ЦК КПУ про: поточну оперативну обстановку, антирадянські прояви на місцях та надзвичайні події; протестні акції представників творчої інтелігенції; оперативне спостереження за діяльністю adeptів сектантських організацій та груп; рух кримськотатарських автономістів; ситуацію в середовищі іноземних студентів; реагування громадськості на події суспільно-політичного життя; розслідування злочинів скоєних окупаційною владою на території України у роки Другої світової війни тощо (а/с “Блок”). Арк. 315.

¹⁸ Паска Б. Валентин Мороз: прапор українського дисидентства... С. 63.



friends and acquaintances. During searches in the homes of detainees and their acquaintances, quite large arrays of illegal literature were seized, which can be divided into three groups:

- diaspora publications (so-called “tamvydav”), which came to the territory of Ivano-Frankivsk region primarily from Kyiv (7 titles);
- samizdat documents, the source of which was Lviv, to a lesser extent Kyiv dissident circles (7 items);
- materials of the Ukrainian national liberation movement during the struggle of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which were of local origin.

The investigation established specific facts of production and distribution of illegal literature by arrested dissidents. The most “dangerous” in the eyes of the KGB was the published literature published by Ukrainian diaspora organizations abroad and illegally transported to the territory of the Ukrainian SSR. In particular, V. Moroz distributed the book “Vyvid prav Ukrainy” (“Collection of the Rights of Ukraine”) (Munich, 1964) received from M. Horyn, which he handed over to D. Ivashchenko in Lutsk for making copies, as well as for acquaintance to Ivano-Frankivsk teachers P. Arsenych and I. Kosteniuk¹⁹. The most active in the distribution of tamvydav was O. Zalyvakha, who, having received from the Kiev student Pavlo Movchan in April 1965 the book “Selection of articles from “The Information Bulletin” of UHVR”, gave it to read to Ivano-Frankivsk artists O. Korovai and V. Turetskyi, and in May 1965 he handed it over to H. Nedashkivska, an employee of the Lviv Historical Museum²⁰. In early May 1965, O. Zalyvakha received from the Kyiv artist A. Horska a photocopy of I. Koshelivets book “Modern Literature in the Ukrainian SSR” (Munich, 1964), which he passed on to O. Korovai and V. Turetskyi for review²¹. In the summer of the same year, the artist, having received from friends an article by R. Rakhmannyi “Letter to the writer I. Wilde and her countrymen who are not afraid of the truth” (Montreal, 1964), introduced her to V. Turetskyi and a resident of Ivano-Frankivsk I. Zatyshnyi²². M. Ozernyi was somewhat less active in the distribution of diasporic literature. Having received the document “Pope’s Speech to Ukrainian Pilgrims” from Lviv acquaintances, he handed it over to I. Gereta, an employee of the Ternopil Museum of Local History²³. During 1964 and 1965, M. Ozernyi received from A. Matvienko, a lecturer at Kyiv State University, the documents “Response to Cultural Figures of the USSR from Cultural Figures in America and Canada” and “The Speech by D. Eisenhower – the 34th President of the USA at the Unveiling of the Monument to Taras Shevchenko in Washington on Saturday, June 27, 1964”, which he kept at home until the day of his arrest²⁴.

Ivano-Frankivsk dissidents also kept and distributed many materials of the Ukrainian samizdat. The most common self-published document in the Ivano-Frankivsk region in the mid-1960s was an anonymous article (by I. Svitlychnyi and Ye. Sverstiuk) “On the Trial of Pogruzhal’sky”, devoted to the arson of the Kyiv library in 1964. In February–March 1965, V. Moroz received it from the brothers M. and B. Horyn in Lviv, and later passed it on to D. Ivashchenko, P. Arsenych, and the writer from the city of Kosiv Maria Vlad (Hantsyak)²⁵. Shortly afterwards, H. Nedashkivska brought the same article to Ivano-Frankivsk from B. Horyn from Lviv and acquainted O. Zalyvakha and V. Turetskyi with it; O. Zalyvakha later told M. Fihol about its content²⁶. As for other materials of the samizdat, V. Moroz also had articles “Response to Vasyl Symonenko’s mother – H. F. Shcherban” and “Ukrainian Education in a Chauvinistic Blindfold” (received from the same M. and B. Horyn)²⁷, and O. Zalyvakha in August 1965 in Kiev received a document “12 questions for independent thinking

¹⁹ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 952. Арк. 215.

²⁰ Там само. Арк. 174.

²¹ Там само. Арк. 175.

²² Там само. Арк. 176.

²³ Там само. Арк. 183.

²⁴ Там само. Арк. 182.

²⁵ Там само. Арк. 216.

²⁶ Там само. Арк. 177.

²⁷ Там само. Арк. 217.

of students.”²⁸ In June 1965, V. Ivanyshyn handed over to M. Ozernyi the article “On the Trial of Pohruzhal’skyi”, “Response to Vasyl Symonenko’s mother – H. F. Shcherban” and “Ukrainian Education in a Chauvinistic Blindfold”, which in fact did not spread further. According to V. Ivanyshyn, he received this literature from his acquaintance graduate student M. Kosiv²⁹, who lived in Lviv and was the head of the local Sixtiers center – the club of creative youth “Snowdrop”. In addition, M. Ozernyi was the author of two self-published articles “Discovery of Kyiv” (directed against Russification) and “Brought Margarine” (described the social ills of Soviet reality)³⁰, and O. Zalyvakha wrote an essay “As they speak in Kiev”³¹ (apparently in defense Ukrainian language). However, these documents were not distributed by the illegal self-published network.

At the same time, much less documents of OUN underground literature were found during the investigation. In particular, M. Ozernyi in 1961 while working in the village Dorohiv (now Halych district) obtained the following OUN materials: “10 Commandments of a Ukrainian Nationalist (Decalogue)”, “Prayers”, “12 Signs of the Character of a Ukrainian Nationalist”, “44 Rules of Life”³². The day before his arrest, O. Zalyvakha handed over to the school teacher the village Nadiiv (now Kalush district) B. Shliakhtych 4 coils with poems and songs of Ukrainian underground movement³³. During the search in V. Moroz’s apartment, investigators found and confiscated a notebook with insurgent songs³⁴.

During the investigation, it was established that the arrested Ivano-Frankivsk dissidents at various times had expressed their views on the need to separate Ukraine from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and create an independent Ukrainian state. In conversations with P. Arsenych, I. Kostyniuk, M. Fihol, M. Vlad and members of the Lutsk dissident group, V. Moroz repeatedly spoke about the possibility of separating Ukraine from the USSR with the help of Western countries, introducing a democratic political system like Great Britain in Ukraine. He praised the OUN’s activities and at the same time condemned the repeated Soviet occupation of Ukraine at the end of World War II, openly calling the Red Army an “invader” and a “enslaver.”³⁵ O. Zalyvakha also during meetings with V. Turetskyi, M. Fihol and others approved of the struggle OUN and UPA, saying that “they proved to the whole world about the existence of the Ukrainian nation.” He painted the Ukrainian national emblem Trident on a wedding gift to his friend Maria Kukhtiak³⁶. At the beginning of 1965, during an educational lesson in the 11th form of the school of Ripne, M. Ozernyi dictated to pupils 20 rules from the “44 Rules of Life” of Ukrainian nationalists under the guise of winged expressions of famous people. In March 1965, during the meeting at I. Gereta’s apartment in Ternopil, he expressed his views on the need to create an independent Ukrainian state, Ukraine’s withdrawal from the USSR, and also recited the “March of Ukrainian Nationalists”³⁷.

The presence of OUN underground materials in the arrested dissidents, their positive assessment of OUN and UPA struggle for Ukraine’s independence, views on Ukraine’s withdrawal from the USSR and the creation of an independent Ukraine indicate that the Sixtiers human rights activists in Ivano-Frankivsk region had a strong component of the national liberation paradigm of the Ukrainian national movement. Under strong pressure from the Soviet regime, Ivano-Frankivsk dissidents were apparently forced to fight for tactical reasons within the nationalization paradigm, as indicated by the lack of an established organization, the distribution of self-published literature from Lviv and Kyiv, and contacts with Sixtiers from other cities. In fact, according to their internal views and worldview, Ivano-Frankivsk dissidents belonged to the national liberation, and according to

²⁸ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 952. Арк. 177.

²⁹ Там само. Арк. 182–183.

³⁰ Там само. Арк. 182.

³¹ Там само. Арк. 179.

³² Там само. Арк. 181.

³³ Там само. Арк. 178.

³⁴ Паска Б. Валентин Мороз: прапор українського дисидентства... С. 63.

³⁵ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 952. Арк. 219.

³⁶ Там само. Арк. 178.

³⁷ Там само. Арк. 182–184.



external forms of struggle – to the nationalization part of the Ukrainian movement. Interestingly, the dissidents themselves were aware of the role and importance of their activities. For example, V. Moroz in a conversation with one of the members of the Lutsk dissident group Olesia Kovalchuk said that “there is a national movement in Ukraine... and this movement exists in other cities, in particular in Kyiv, Lviv, and we... are like one link in this movement...” At the same time, the historian was quite optimistic about the national movement, believing that the future was behind it³⁸. In a conversation with I. Svitlychnyi in December 1963, O. Zalyvakhа called the latter the ideological father and leader of the “national revival movement in Ukraine”³⁹.

The main task of the KGB investigators was to obtain the personal confession of the arrested dissidents in carrying out “anti-Soviet activities.” Various methods of moral pressure were used for this purpose. During September–November 1965, protracted daily interrogations continued. In particular, V. Moroz was interrogated 17 times⁴⁰, and M. Ozernyi – as many as 46 times. Investigators specifically made the interrogations as long as possible to exhaust the detainees. In particular, M. Ozernyi, answering a clarifying question from a judge at his trial, stated the following: “I was interrogated for 6 hours and 46 minutes. My shows here are true. I told this to the investigator. He tired me so I said, “Write as you want.” Signed”⁴¹. A witness in the case of M. Ozernyi, a lecturer at Kyiv State University, A. Matvienko, was interrogated for 4 days from 9 o’clock a. m. until 7 o’clock p. m. The captain named Rudyi, who conducted the interrogations, used obscene words in order to intensify the moral terror against A. Matvienko, and threatened to rape the teacher⁴². V. Nikitchenko, the head of the KGB of the Ukrainian SSR, came to Ivano-Frankivsk to put additional pressure on the detainees. On November 30, 1965, he met with M. Ozernyi⁴³.

The detainees were under the full control of the KGB and could not effectively resist the investigative actions. M. Ozernyi tried unsuccessfully to establish contact with V. Ivanyshyn in the KGB detention center in order to coordinate actions during the investigation. He wrote several notes with recommendations on how to behave during interrogations and in court, and attempted to pass them secretly to V. Ivanyshyn. However, the notes were intercepted by KGB officers and later used during the trial of M. Ozernyi⁴⁴.

A family factor was repeatedly used to increase the pressure. The investigator in M. Ozernyi’s case repeatedly interrogated the detainee’s young children, showed them to his father, and a few minutes later threatened that the children would grow up without his care after a long prison term, trying to break his will to resist⁴⁵. KGB officers tried to break up V. Moroz’s family and put pressure on his wife, Raisa Moroz. At the same time, they closed their eyes to the prisoner’s secret meetings with his wife and son through the cell window. As R. Moroz later wrote in her memoirs, “Valentyn said that it was what he saw us that irritated his soul the most”⁴⁶. Eventually, dissidents unprepared for open confrontation with the regime were forced to admit their “guilt” during interrogations.

Analyzing the everyday life of the Stalinist period, the researcher S. Yekelchuk noted that the authorities demanded that the citizens of the USSR must confirm their loyalty with appropriate emotional reactions⁴⁷. In his opinion, the Soviet project in general was characterized by the belief that political education transforms human consciousness⁴⁸. The regime’s leadership believed that dissidents could be “re-educated” and eventually turned into “exemplary Soviet citizens.” But in order to do so,

³⁸ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 946. Арк. 268.

³⁹ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 944. Арк. 266.

⁴⁰ Паска Б. Валентин Мороз: прапор українського дисидентства... С. 65.

⁴¹ Чорновіл В. Твори : у 10 т. Т. 2 : “Правосуддя чи рецидиви терору?”. “Лихо з розуму”. Матеріали та документи 1966–1969 рр. / упоряд. Валентина Чорновіл; передм. Лесь Танюк. Київ : Смолоскип, 2003. С. 264.

⁴² Там само. С. 269–270.

⁴³ Там само. С. 272.

⁴⁴ Там само. С. 272–273.

⁴⁵ Гель І. Виклик системі: український визвольний рух другої половини ХХ століття... С. 240–241.

⁴⁶ Паска Б. Валентин Мороз: прапор українського дисидентства... С. 66–67.

⁴⁷ Скељчик С. Повсякденний сталінізм: Київ та кияни після Великої війни. Київ : Laurus, 2018. С. 47.

⁴⁸ Там само. С. 82.

the detainees had to not only admit their “guilt” and testify against other suspects, but also show appropriate emotions that would show loyalty to the Soviet state.

Obviously, V. Ivanyshyn coped best with this task. After the active work of the KGB officers on his “ideological disarmament”, the teacher, according to the reports, “truthfully told about his hostile activities and condemned it.” It was decided not to prosecute him, but instead to organize a demonstration prevention event with the participation of the public. On January 28, 1966, in the village of Duba, the authorities prepared and held a general meeting of the villagers, at which V. Ivanyshyn was forced “to tell the truth about his anti-Soviet activities... to sincerely admit guilt before the people and the state.” In the end, the staged meeting condemned Ivanyshyn’s activities and, taking into account his “remorse,” appealed to the state security authorities not to prosecute the teacher and hand him over to the village community for “re-education.” The KGB leadership considered the preventive measure against V. Ivanyshyn a successful action, which had a “positive educational impact” on the residents of the village of Duba. With this in mind, the next day, on January 29, the teacher was released from custody, and the criminal case against him was terminated⁴⁹.

Trials of other dissidents arrested in the Ivano-Frankivsk region took place during January–March 1966. As the criminal case of V. Moroz on November 25, 1965 was merged with the case of the teacher of the Lutsk Pedagogical Institute D. Ivashchenko, the massacre of the historian took place in Lutsk on January 17–20, 1966⁵⁰. The trials of M. Ozernyi and O. Zalyvakha took place in Ivano-Frankivsk on February 4–7 and March 1966, respectively⁵¹. If the Lutsk trial over V. Moroz and D. Ivashchenko was open, then only people with special invitations and witnesses were admitted to the trial over M. Ozernyi, and the trial over O. Zalyvakha was completely closed. In coordination with the Ivano-Frankivsk Regional Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, the trial over M. Ozernyi was attended by heads of district propaganda and agitation departments, staff propagandists of party district committees, social science teachers of higher educational institutions, some school principals of Rozhniativ district, and press workers. The purpose of the KGB in this case was to show the audience a clear example of “the activities of Ukrainian nationalists” in the region to strengthen the fight against any manifestations of the Ukrainian national movement⁵².

The behavior and strategy of the defendants themselves were somewhat different, although they were all forced to admit their “guilt” and “repent.” V. Moroz, taking advantage of the openness of the trial, tried to turn his speeches into propaganda of his own ideas. In particular, he stated that he considers the goal of his activity creating an independent Ukraine with a democratic form of government, and spoke of his outrage at people who are indifferent to their native language and culture. The historian’s words that there are remnants of Russian chauvinism in the Soviet Union, and the existence of the Ukrainian nation and Ukrainian patriotism can be defended only in an underground, illegal way, were quite bold. In his last words, V. Moroz condemned his previous activities, but did not “repent”, but tried to make rational arguments in his favor, saying that in the last months before his arrest he stopped distributing samizdat, and during interrogations fully revealed the facts of his own “anti-Soviet activities.” Instead, the speech of D. Ivashchenko, another defendant at the Lutsk trial was full of emotions: “I deeply understand my grave crime and sincerely repent. I understand that by my shameful act I despised myself in front of people and despised myself in front of my homeland... I will always be tormented by remorse, I will be ashamed”⁵³. As a result, V. Moroz was sentenced to 4 years, and D. Ivashchenko – to 2 years in a strict regime colony. “Right” emotions were valued by Soviet justice more than rational evidence.

During the trial, Mykhailo Ozernyi sought to mitigate the sentence through remorse, arguing that his participation in the Ukrainian national movement was caused by material difficulties, separation from his wife and children, and the impossibility of finding work in Ternopil, where his family lived. However, on the eve of the trial, KGB officers received information that the teacher had

⁴⁹ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 946. Арк. 248–255.

⁵⁰ Паска Б. Валентин Мороз: прапор українського дисидентства... С. 63, 71.

⁵¹ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 946. Арк. 275.

⁵² Там само. Арк. 276.

⁵³ Там само. Арк. 271–272.



specifically chosen such tactics of behavior and was not “sincere” in his words⁵⁴. Moreover, during the trial M. Ozernyi tried to resist the prosecution by prosecutor V. Paraskevych and judge I. Bachylenko, who also actually acted as a prosecutor. In the end, the teacher was sentenced to 6 years in a strict regime colony⁵⁵. Later, the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR reduced M. Ozernyi’s sentence to 3 years in prison. He was also deprived of the right to engage in pedagogical activities for 3 years after serving his term⁵⁶.

As for O. Zalyvakha, he admitted all the facts of the accusation against him during the court hearing. At the same time, he said that he was distributing the “anti-Soviet” literature and views not intentionally, which was regarded by the judicial board as “an attempt to evade responsibility for the crime.” The text of the sentence to the artist states that he “did not realize the public danger” of his actions. Apparently, O. Zalyvakha did not show the necessary emotions of “repentance”, so the sentence was one of the harshest during the “first wave” of repressions – 5 years in a strict regime colony⁵⁷.

Thus, during the wave of repressions against the Ukrainian Sixtiers human rights activists in August–September 1965, five representatives of the intelligentsia of Ivano-Frankivsk region were detained, four of whom (V. Moroz, O. Zalyvakha, M. Ozernyi, V. Ivanyshyn) were arrested. The main charges were distribution of banned literature (samizdat, tamvydav, materials related to the OUN and UPA struggle) and conversations about the need for Ukraine to leave the USSR, which was interpreted as “anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda.” As a result of the use of moral pressure by KGB officers, as well as the psychological unpreparedness of dissidents to confront the system, all prisoners were forced to cooperate with the investigation. The severity of the punishment of dissenters largely depended on the manifestation of the necessary emotions during the investigation, which would indicate their “repentance” and “re-education.” During the January–March 1966 trials, V. Moroz, M. Ozernyi, and O. Zalyvakha were sentenced to four, three, and five years in a strict regime colony, respectively. A preventive measure with public participation was used to punish V. Ivanyshyn. During the “first mowing” Ivano-Frankivsk region was in third place in the number of repressed people after Lviv and Kyiv. The repression dealt a significant blow to the Sixtiers human rights centers in Prykarpattia and the local network for the distribution of self-published literature.

АРЕШТИ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ІНТЕЛІГЕНЦІЇ В 1965 р. НА ІВАНО-ФРАНКІВЩИНІ

Bohdan PASKA

*State Higher Educational Institution
“Vasyl’ Stefanyk Precarpathian National University”,
Department of History of Ukraine and methods of teaching history,
Shevchenko St., 57, 76018, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine
e-mail: paskabogdan@i.ua*

Summary

The purpose of the article is a complex study of the arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals in 1965 in the Ivano-Frankivsk region. In the context of this goal, the following tasks were identified: establishing the quantitative scale of arrests in Ivano-Frankivsk region, analysis of accusations against intellectuals, methods of investigation, behavior of detainees, studying of trials of Ivano-Frankivsk dissidents. The source base is based on the documents of the Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine (HDA SBU) in Kyiv and samizdat materials. The methodological basis of the study is J. Seko’s concept of the coexistence of two paradigms in the Ukrainian resistance movement of the 1950s and 1980s – national liberation (underground organizations) and nationalization (legal activity of the intelligentsia among the Sixties). The author of the article concludes that during the wave of repressions against the Ukrainian Sixties human rights activists in August-September 1965, five representatives of the intelligentsia of Ivano-Frankivsk region were detained, four of whom (V. Moroz,

⁵⁴ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 946. Арк. 276.

⁵⁵ Чорновіл В. Твори: у 10 т. Т. 2... С. 236–282.

⁵⁶ ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Оп. 3. Спр. 952. Арк. 189.

⁵⁷ Там само. Арк. 179–180.

O. Zalyvakha, M. Ozernyi, V. Ivanyshyn) were arrested. The main charges were distributing banned literature and talking about the need for Ukraine to leave the USSR, which was interpreted as “anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda”. As a result of the use of moral pressure by KGB officers, as well as the psychological unpreparedness of dissidents to confront the system, all prisoners were forced to cooperate with the investigation. The severity of the punishment of dissenters largely depended on the manifestation of the necessary emotions during the investigation, which would have indicated their “repentance” and “re-education”. During the January–March 1966 trials, V. Moroz, M. Ozernyi, and O. Zalyvakha were sentenced to four, three, and five years in a maximum security prison colonies, respectively. A preventive measure with public participation was used to punish V. Ivanyshyn. During the “first wave of arrests” Ivano-Frankivsk region was in third place in the number of repressed people after Lviv and Kyiv. The repression dealt a significant blow to the Sixties human rights centers in Prykarpattia and the local network for the distribution of self-published literature.

Keywords: Ukrainian dissident movement, Soviet regime, “first wave of arrests”, samizdat, State Security Committee (KGB), Valentyn Moroz, Opanas Zalyvakha, Mykhailo Ozernyi.

REFERENCES

- Chornovil, V. (2003). *Tvory: u 10 t. T. 2: “Pravosuddia chy retsydyvy teroru?”*. “Lykho z rozumu”. *Materialy ta dokumenty 1966–1969 rr.* [Writings. In 10 vols. Vol. 2: “Justice or recurrence of terror?” “Disaster of the mind.” Materials and documents of 1966–1969]. V. Chornovil Comps.. Kyiv: Smoloskyp (in Ukrainian).
- Danyliuk, Yu., & Bazhan, O. (2000). *Opozytsiia v Ukraini (druha polovyna 50-kh – 80-ti rr. XX stolittia)* [Opposition in Ukraine (second half of the 50s – 80s of the XX century)]. Kyiv: Ridnyi kraj (in Ukrainian).
- Hel, I. (2013). *Vyklyk systemi: ukraïnskyi vyzvolnyi rukh druhoi polovyny XX stolittia* [Challenge to the System: the Ukrainian Liberation Movement of the second half of the XXth century]. I. V. Yezerska (Ed.). Lviv: Chasopys (in Ukrainian).
- Kasianov, H. (1995). *Nezghodni: ukraïnska intelihentsiia v rusi oporu 1960–80-kh rokiv* [Dissenting Voices: the Ukrainian Intelligentsia in the Resistance Movement of 1960–80s years]. Kyiv: Lybid (in Ukrainian).
- Paska, B. (2018). *Valentyn Moroz: prapor ukraïnskoho dysydentstva* [Valentyn Moroz: Flag of Ukrainian Dissent]. Ivano-Frankivsk: Foliant (in Ukrainian).
- Paska, B. (2020). Dysyidentska diialnist Opanasa Zalyvakhy (1960–1970-ti rr.) [Dissident Activity of Opanas Zalyvakha (1960–1970s)]. *Halychyna. Naukovi i kulturno-prosvitni kraieznavchyi chasopys*. Ivano-Frankivsk, part 33, pp. 36–145. Doi: 10.15330/gal.33.136-145 (in Ukrainian).
- Rusnachenko, A. (1998). *Natsionalno-vyzvolnyi rukh v Ukraini. Seredyna 1950-kh – pochatok 1990-kh rokiv* [National Liberation Movement in Ukraine. Mid 1950s – early 1990s]. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo im. Oleny Telihy (in Ukrainian).
- Seko, Ya. (2015). Areshty 1965 r. v URSS yak zasib borotby komunistychnoi partii z inakodumstvom. *Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka. Serii: Istoriiia*, iss. 2 (4), pp. 1–10. Retrieved from: http://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Seko_Yaroslav/Areshty_1965_r_v_URSS_iak_zasib_borotby_komunistychnoi_partii_z_inakodumstvom (in Ukrainian).
- Seko, Ya. (2015). Kontseptualni problemy rozvytku ukraïnskoho natsionalnoho rukhu v seredyni 1950-kh – seredyni 1980-kh rr. *Ukraina – Yevropa – Svit. Mizhnarodnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Serii: Istoriiia, mizhnarodni vidnosyny*, iss. 15, pp. 1–13. Retrieved from: http://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Seko_Yaroslav/Kontseptualni_problemy_rozvytku_ukraïnskoho_natsionalnoho_rukhu_v_seredyni_1950-kh_seredyni_1980-kh (in Ukrainian).
- Yekelchuk, S. (2018). *Povsiakdennyi stalinizm: Kyiv ta kyiany pislia Velykoi viiny* [Stalin’s Citizens. Everyday Politics in the Wake of Total War]. Kyiv: Laurus (in Ukrainian).
- Zakharov, B. (2003). *Narys istorii dysyidentskoho rukhu v Ukraini (1956–1987)* [An Essay on the History of the Dissident Movement in Ukraine (1956–1987)]. Kharkiv: Folio (in Ukrainian).