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The article deals with the specifics of the socio-political image of the Kyiv philosophical school of the second half of the 20th century as an innovative academic project of directors of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, Academicians P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk. Their democratic vision of the foundations of educational and scientific processes in the Ukrainian SSR during the Khrushchev thaw was fruitfully embodied by the illustrious generation of the creators of this school or philosophers of the sixties. The study of a significant part of their memories, mainly realized in T. Chaika’s project “The Philosophers’ Oral Histories” a series of autobiographical reconstructions by Academicians S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, M. Popovych, as well as the ones of their colleagues S. Proleev and Y. Stratii, carried out thanks to the Student Society of Oral History of Philosophy, organized at the Department of the History of Philosophy of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, testifies to the manifestation of a wide range of their civic stands from apolitical non-conformism to nationally oriented dissidence. An analysis of the memories of these members of the two most non-conforming departments of the said institute, namely of the History of philosophy in Ukraine and of the Logic and methodology of science, as well as the memoirs of their colleagues, primarily V. Lisovyi, allows us to recognize the Kyiv philosophical school as a domestic academic micromodel-prototype of an open society with its apparent: democracy, opposition to xenophobia, primarily to anti-Semitism and Ukrainophobia, resistance to official dogmatization of state ideology, openness to international experience in the context of direct dialogue and, which is fundamentally important, awareness of their role in the study and preservation of the spiritual, primarily philosophical, experience of the Ukrainian people and all ethnic groups in Ukraine.
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Introduction

The innovative academic project of academicians P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk, carried out in the 1950s-1980s from the era of the Khrushchev thaw to Gorbachev’s perestroika, and now widely known under the name of the Kyiv philosophical school, became the main evidence of the revival in the Ukrainian SSR of interrupted by the repressive policy of the Stalinist regime the tragic and contradictory Soviet period of the institutionalization of modern domestic national philosophy. This project arose on a material and personnel basis of renewed in the mid-1940-s the Faculty of Philosophy of Kyiv State University and the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, as two leading institutions of Ukrainian philosophical education, science, and culture of that time, became one of the active scientific and public participants of Ukrainian cultural, national and state-building from the times of the Iron Curtain and the Cold War to its end. The Kyiv philosophical school has witnessed and participated in the activation of the world post-war human rights movement from the adoption of The Universal Declaration of Human Rights at the third session of the UN General Assembly in 1948 to the singing of the Helsinki Accords or the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in 1975. This period of development of the neo-anti-colonial movement in Asia, Africa, and on other continents, and of the protest movements in Western, Central and Eastern Europe, embodied in the Ukrainian SSR in the human rights movement and, in general, in the phenomenon of the sixties or of the Sixties, continuing the national liberation movement in a peaceful way. An important, but the little-studied source of the reconstruction of the role of the Ukrainian philosophers of the sixties in it is the array of their autobiographical reconstructions, realized by them in many hours of interviews in the T. Chaika’s project “The Philosophers’ Oral Histories,” as the actual approach in the branch of history of the recent Ukrainian philosophy (Chaika, 2009), and, partially, in the project of Student Society of Oral History of Philosophy, organized at the Department of the History of Philosophy of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Khelufi, 2019). Thus, the purpose of our research is to determine the general specifics of the social and political image of the Kyiv philosophical school, as well as the diverse spectrum of civic stands of its leaders M. Popovych, S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, and a group of their colleagues, primarily V. Lisovyly and Y. Stratiy, in the context of studying their final autobiographical researches as unique samples of intersubjective analysis.

The Kyiv Philosophical School as an Innovative Project of P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk: a Micromodel-Prototype of an Open Society

Over the past three decades in Ukrainian and, in part, foreign historical and philosophical thought, there is a process of studying the Kyiv philosophical school as a unique phenomenon in the history of national philosophy, namely as the leading ideological and organizational academic-institute capital’s center-school of institutionalization of the Ukrainian philosophic tradition as a national one in the second half of the twentieth — the first decades of this century. An increasingly active and large-scale study of it in the last decade in Ukraine still faces a number of very problematic questions of the prehistory and process of the emergence of this school and its name, the determination of the founders and the personal composition of generations of its members, as well as the classification of branches and directions of its professional and other activities. Fundamental answers to them are impossible without an
analysis of the Kyiv philosophical school not only as a scientific but also, more broadly, a socio-cultural phenomenon. Such a reassessment of it, only partially begun by its creators and their colleagues in the first modern textbooks on the history of philosophy of Ukraine, for example (Horskyi, 1997; Ohorodnyk & Rysun, 1997), and in their memoir essays, in particular (Shynkaruk, 1998; Horskyi, 1998; Krymskyi, 1998), found its large-scale, already to a certain extent generalizing, continuation in the series of scientific publications of both of them and their students and followers from the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Konverskyi et al., 2005; Gyberskyi et al., 2010). The first highly professional systematic analysis of the outlined range of problems in the history of the Kyiv philosophical school in these two works was carried out in the light of panoramic coverage of the social and political life of the Ukrainian SSR in the second half of the 20th century and is constantly supplemented and refined in a growing representative list of publications in special periodicals and other issues. They pay more and more attention not only to references to the influence of the social and political life of the Khrushchev thaw and stagnation-neo-Stalinism on the work of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, in particular (Hrabovskiy, 2009; Yolon, 2015), but also to the specifics of its reflection in the worldview attitudes of the creators of the Kyiv philosophical school, the directors of mentioned institute P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk (Kozlovskiy, 2016; Yolon, 2016; Yolon, 2017; Andros, 2017), and there, first of all, famous students and colleagues (Horskyi, 2000; Popovych, 2010; Krymskyi, 2010).

Only recently began a study, on a broad archival basis, of the political and scientific collisions of the 1970s, both in the development of research on the history of Ukrainian philosophy in this institute and in its work as a whole (Sheremeta, 2013; Yolon, 2015). Starting approximately from the same years, primarily abroad thanks to the scholars of the Ukrainian diaspora (Zakydalsky, 1976), and later, already in independent Ukraine, the ideological and organizational connection with the human rights movement of arrested in 1972 scientists of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR V. Lisovyi and Y. Pronyuk, as well as the group of their employees who were dismissed from the same place, is being increasingly covered both in their memoirs, mainly (Lisovyi, 2014), and of their colleagues (Hrabovskiy, 2009; Yermolenko, 2016). At the same time, in the first significant, interesting and very polemical, attempts at a scientific and memoir analysis of the origin of the Kyiv philosophical school at the Kyiv State University (Horak, 2009) and its design at the mentioned institute (Tabachkovskiy, 2002), the author’s reconstructions of its history as a scientific and socio-cultural phenomenon are presented, both in the context of Soviet social and political life from the end of the era of Stalinism to Gorbachev’s perestroika, and in independent Ukraine. T. Chaika’s project “The Philosophers’ Oral Histories,” as the actual approach in the branch of history of the recent Ukrainian philosophy and his continuing initiative of Student Society of Oral History of Philosophy, organized at the Department of the History of Philosophy of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, became qualitatively new, highly informative steps in this study. The result of the first of them was a series of final interviews with her for more than forty years teachers and colleagues S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, M. Popovych, P. Yolon, conducted and partially published by a Kyiv State University former graduate and an employee of the Institute of Philosophy of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine T. Chaika in the journal “Philosophical Thought” and editions (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012; Horskyi & Chaika, 2014). They are complemented by two interviews (Stratii, 2018; Proleev et al., 2018; Proleev et al., 2019) conducted and published by X. Zborovska and her colleagues from the said society. They were held in the form of a general rethinking in a
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frank talk with a specialist teacher of his life and scientific experience, in particular, detailed assessments of his and his colleagues’ civic stands.

All these autobiographical reconstructions of the creators of the Kyiv philosophical school of different generations, carried out in the genre of “oral history,” as well as a number of interviews complementing them, like the M. Boichenko’s one (Popovych, 2015), and the memoirs of their colleagues, first of all (Shynkaruk, 1998; Tabachkovskyi, 2002; Horak, 2009; Lisovy, 2014), allow us to proceed to clarify the social and political image of this school as an inflorescence of personal autobiographical visions of this, in their common opinion, an innovative project of P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk. The main aspects of this common image, in our opinion, is a high evaluation by all of them not only of the great scientific abilities and achievements of the two ideologists and leaders of this project, but also of their common civic stand as initiators of the emergence in the 1960-s at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR albeit embryonic, but a very illustrative micromodel-prototype of an open society. Notable examples of participation in the aforementioned neo-anti-colonial movement of the countries of the Socialist Bloc, for example, the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 and the Prague Spring of 1968, as well as the experience of the Ukrainian national liberation movement, catalyzed the beginning in Ukraine in the 1950s of the dissident individual-group socio-political human rights activities, or the movement of the sixties, in all spheres of the socio-cultural life of the Ukrainian SSR and, first of all, in the sections of the nationally conscious creative and scientific intelligentsia of Kyiv and Lviv. Then a broad non-conformal movement arose in the Ukrainian SSR and other republics of the USSR, designated both as a movement of loyal Soviet citizens, often active members of the CPSU, as a movement of intellectuals, a socio-political protest of the intelligentsia against the system and as national liberation currents among the peoples of the USSR. It is traditionally personified in the definition by A. Gladilin of the post-war generation of the scientific and creative intelligentsia in the USSR as the children of the XX Congress of the CPSU and in its general laconic name of the sixties or Sixtiers by S. Rassadin. It is significant that in the aforementioned memoirs, already in independent Ukraine, the creators of the Kyiv philosophical school and their colleagues declared a firm definition of its creators as philosophers of the sixties or Sixtiers: a generation of students — the core staff of the sixties (Horak, 2009: 24), a new generation of philosophers, which replaced those who formed during the Stalinist period (Stratii, 2018: 186), or the generation of philosophers of the sixties, formed during the Khrushchev thaw (Horskyi, 2000: 5), and precisely as a cohort of the most famous philosophers of the sixties in Ukraine and beyond (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 2).

V. Shynkaruk recognized the appearance of a “humanistic turn” in the policy of the CPSU of that era as one of its initiators in the philosophical thought of the Ukrainian SSR. He clearly stated that behind the official ideological “facade” of the Khrushchev thaw remained the bureaucratic technocratic stand of the command-administrative system as a reactionary utopian ideology focused on achieving social progress through the development of technology with a stupid underestimation and a relative decrease in investment in a person (Shynkaruk, 1998: 7). V. Shynkaruk and his aforementioned colleagues, most detailed (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 383-384), described the complicated staff morale of constantly arising intrigues at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR under the leadership of D. Ostryanin (1952 — 1962). He was repressed under Stalinism, to a certain extent an unhappy and broken man of the early Soviet era (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 117), who, like the group he headed, looked at philosophy as an addition to CPSU ideology, and looked at this institute
as an ideological one (Yolon, 2016: 59). The heading of the said institute by P. Kopnin in 1962 and the reforms carried out by him after the dismissal of D. Ostryanin and his supporters for quarrelsomeness and scientific inconsistency (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 77), became the beginning of a change of totalitarian discourse and its images of the chieftain, the people and his enemies in the institute to a democratized Soviet one with pro-European images of the leader as well as an informal leader who is in a constructive dialogue with his staff as a community of ideological like-minded persons. All of them paid special attention in their memoirs to P. Kopnin as a scientist of a new type, who played a significant role at a turning point in the institute’s activity (Yolon, 2016: 54), who not only revolutionized it enough (Horak, 2009: 270) but also turned it into a “lacuna of freethinking” as the second in the 20th century but not shot Ukrainian philosophical revival (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 12). It was he, the initiator of the scientific direction, focused on the liberal rationalist tradition (Popovych, 2010: 6), who became the founder of the legendary Kopnin’s brotherhood (Krymskyi, 2010: 5) and the Kyiv philosophical school. It was he who not only revived the institute with new ideas, personnel, structural reorganizations but also turned it into a generator of ideas, an essential component of the spirituality of society of that time, which was deeply opposed to the existing system and its specific bearers, despite its apparent loyalty (Horak, 2009: 269). P. Kopnin, like a real manager (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 119), with his insight into personnel intuitions (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 42), sociability and loyalty (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 387), guessed correctly, according to M. Popovych, promising lines of development of our philosophy and was tragically lost for the country a figure of a state scale (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 386).

The memoirists jointly emphasized that thanks to P. Kopnin, the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR immediately set the tone for a very tolerant, benevolently disposed towards all members of a single-family (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 79), a philosophical family (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 39), with a positive scientific standard of P. Kopnin (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 52), and his “cult” for the benefit of him and the institute (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 129). They noted together his humanity and wonderful sense of humor, aptly captured in the thought that under P. Kopnin, the institute first smiled openly (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 141). According to the authors of these memoirs, one of the most important aspects of P. Kopnin’s organizational and scientific activity, revisionist in relation to the Soviet ideological officialdom, was that it was he who directed great energy and broke through the wall (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 41) in the reconstruction of the history of Ukrainian philosophy from the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy to the philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR, who were repressed in the 1930s during the Shoted or Red Renaissance. The solidarity of different generations of the Kyiv philosophical school in recognition of it and the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR as a “different world” and, in fact, an antipode to the everyday Soviet existence (Proleev et al., 2019: 179), found their confirmation and development in numerous studies on the history of this school, both of its founders (Shynkaruk, 1998), and a wide range of their colleagues and students, for example (Hrabovskyi, 2009; Kozlovskyi, 2015; Yolon, 2017). These and other scientists recognized the indisputable contribution of this school to the divergence with the traditional interpretation of Marxism in the USSR (Tabachkovskyi, 2002), in particular in the form of the phenomenon of Ukrainian neo-Marxism of the 1970s — first half of the 1980s, as a legal neo-Marxist philosophy within the framework of the Kyiv philosophical school (with accompanying manifestations in psychology and sociology) (Hrabovskyi, 2009: 96). The removal of the Marxist methodology by the members of this school beyond the boundaries of the ideological...
doctrine, and sometimes beyond the ones of the philosophy of Marxism itself (Yermolenko, 2015: 63), witnessed the recoding of Soviet dogmatic Marxism-Leninism (Kozlovskyi, 2015: 24), and its transition to post-Marxism. These researchers, like (Konverskyi et al., 2005; Andros, 2017), like the creators of the Kyiv philosophical school, first of all (Shynkaruk, 1998), and, in fact, all of his colleagues in this school, for example (Tabachkovskyi, 2002; Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012; Horskyi & Chaika, 2014), identified two conditional periods of its history — the first is named after P. Kopnin, and the second one is named after V. Shynkaruk, and, accordingly, the presence of their two scientific teams of the same name and, in fact, schools of philosophy.

Noting certain differences in their civic stands and scientific positions as directors and scientists, they more than once compared P. Kopnin as the founder of a powerful school of the logic of scientific knowledge (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 62), and, at the same time, a “charming gentleman,” intellectual and secular person without aplomb (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 75), pragmatist and talented politician with a typical Moscow face (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 134), to V. Shynkaruk as his heir under P. Kopnin’s wing (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 96), but is both a different person and a different philosopher (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 94). Memories brightly illuminate his “living image”: from the personally extravagant with the idea that there were only two philosophers at the Kyiv State University in the 1950s — 1960s, namely Hegel and Shynkaruk, and at the same time, ridicule of his fear of Department of logic and more restrained than P. Kopnin’s sense of humor (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012), to the most epic one (Andros, 2017). General recognition of his moderation and penchant for ideological compromise is combined in these living voices of memory with a high evaluation of his scientific achievements and gratitude for the fact that the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR was not disbanded in the 1970s at all (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 153). Directly admitting that V. Shynkaruk was neither a radical intellectual, much less a dissident (Kozlovskyi, 2016: 71), researchers have repeatedly noted vivid manifestations of the scientist’s civic stand as a deeply Ukrainian person who is not indifferent to the fate of his native people (Andros, 2017: 72), in particular, his contribution to the development of civil society in Ukraine, as the authorship of the Law “About Languages in the Ukrainian SSR” (1989) and many years of fruitful work in the Society “Knowledge” of Ukraine as its chairman (Andros, 2017: 72). The reformatory role of P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk in the philosophical life of the Ukrainian SSR, defined as the “revisionist line of Kopnin — Shynkaruk” (Shynkaruk, 1998: 19) in the denunciation of them to the Central Committee of the CPU during the stormy wave of struggle against caused by the Prague Spring in the USSR “philosophical revisionism”, consisted precisely in the revival by them of interrupted by repressions since the mid-1930s institutional philosophizing in the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (Horskyi, 1998: 27), as, in fact, a full-fledged foundation for the development of modern Ukrainian both humanities and, at the same time, civil society.

The experience of the “oral history” of the Ukrainian philosophers of the sixties: the inflorescence of personal visions of their civic stands

The phenomenon of the philosophers of the sixties of the Ukrainian SSR, as a socio-communicative problem, witnessed the simultaneous manifestation of a wide range of civic
stands by this generation: from apolitical non-conformism through different variations of dissent to nationally oriented dissidence as the inheritance of a number of national-patriotic and national-communist ideas and teachings of the period of the Ukrainian national liberation movement of the first half of the 20th century. One of the indicative manifestations of this in the academic environment of the Ukrainian SSR in the 1960s was the striking distinction between the official and unofficial atmospheres in the institutes of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. Their wide range included both the non-conformal public humorous project of the virtual parallel world “The Country of Cybertonia,” initiated in the Institute of Cybernetics of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR under the leadership of V. Glushkov, with its Constitution, the governing “Council of Robots,” passports and institutions, and the clearly Ukrainian national-patriotic atmosphere in a number of humanitarian institutes of the said Academy, primarily in the Institute of Art History, Folklore and Ethnography under the leadership of M. Rylskyi. This ideologically diverse spectrum of these domestic academic subcultures of the 1950s — 1970s, which arose in the fifteen-year interval between the XX (1956) and XXIV (1971) Congresses of the CPSU, as markers of the conviction of cult of J. Stalin’s personality, and, in fact, its return, has absorbed the contradictory experience. This is both the experience of the rehabilitation of victims of political repressions in the USSR and, at the same time, the pompous anniversaries of the centenary of the birth of V. Lenin (1970) and the fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the USSR (1971), and the arrests of dissidents in the Ukrainian SSR in 1965 and in 1972. This is also both the experience of the mass destruction of archival library funds of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, and, at the same time, numerous academic and official events, significant scientific projects for the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of T. Shevchenko and the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of G. Skovoroda. The background of the socio-cultural life of the USSR of this era, in addition to turbulent international events, namely the mediated confrontation between the USSR and the US from the Arab-Israeli conflict and the October Crisis of 1962 to the Vietnam War, became outlined by the poet B. Slutsky and started in 1959 in the newspaper “Komsomolskaya Pravda” by I. Erenburg and I. Poletayev discussion of physicists and lyricists and the flight in 1956 of Y. Gagarin into open space. All this found indicative manifestations in the activities of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR during this period of crisis of the ideology of Stalinism with its transition from the cult of Stalin to the cult of Lenin with filling the second of them with a new ideological content — Lenin’s “consecration” of N. Khrushchev’s reforms (Shynkaruk, 1998: 6).

Summarizing in his memoirs the Kyiv philosophical school’s experience, a well-known member of P. Kopnin’s circle at the said institute P. Yolon defined two tactics for a scientist’s civic stand in the USSR. The first of them is the forced tactics of the conformism of the initiators of innovative, creative undertakings with an imitation of devotion to Marxism-Leninism’s dogma. The second one is separate protest actions, like the practice of “samizdat” by V. Lisovyi and Y. Pronyuk, with its enormous socio-political significance without any constructive scientific perspectives (Yolon, 2017: 55). Previously re-examined by us in the light of autobiographical reconstructions of a number of leading members of this school, this thesis is corrected taking into account the first and second plans of their memoir narratives: 1. self-analysis of personal formation until adulthood with family and friends, 2. detailed consideration of the educational process and scientific life of the Ukrainian SSR and the places in them of them and their colleagues. Natives of different regions of Ukraine during the Stalin era before and during the World War II, witnesses of repression, collectivization, industrialization, and military events.
both in their rural (V. Lisovyi in Tarasivka, Stari Bezradychi) and, mainly, urban (S. Krymskyi in Artemivsk/Bakhmut, M. Popovych in Zhytomyr and Izyaslav, V. Horskyi in Kharkiv, Y. Stratii in Dnipropetrovsk/Dnipro and Lviv) dimensions, they, besides the last of them, had the experience of post-war student life in Kyiv, namely studying at Kyiv State University. It is indicative that their direct and indirect involvement in childhood and adolescence in the domestic and foreign scientific and cultural heritage led to a clear manifestation already in their student years of their original scientific persons and remarkable non-conformity of their civic stands. Vivid examples of this involvement were: love of music, astronomy, physics and philosophy, book mania, in particular reading the collected works of G. Hegel (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012), interest in German and philosophy, for example, the teaching of I. Kant (Stratii, 2018), passion for music, theater and the history of world literature, in particular the works of W. Shakespeare (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014).

Disclosing in their interviews the multifaceted specifics of institutional changes in education and scientific life of the Ukrainian SSR during the Khrushchev thaw, in particular, distinguishing and describing the official and unofficial atmospheres in universities and academic institutions, they and a number of their contemporaries, for example (Horak, 2009), together with recognized low and, in general, an unsatisfactory level of teaching at the said university. This range of critical assessments, reaching the extreme emotional recognition of the level of teaching philosophy as almost entirely ignored and absurd (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 47), contrasts sharply with Y. Stratii’s high evaluation of the traditions of learning classical philology at the Lviv State University. It is noteworthy that it was thanks to the inspired professional contribution of the students-philologists of this university, as a general manifestation of their expressive nationally conscious civic stands, that the rather non-conformal project of the Kyiv philosophical school for the study of old Ukrainian philosophy, initiated by P. Kopnin and V. Nichik, was largely implemented. Describing in detail the difficult conditions of their studies at the university, for example, numerous conflicts based on infringements for scientific views, civic stand and ethnicity (anti-Semitism), S. Krymskyi and a number of his colleagues testified that they developed personal practices to counteract this, such as, for example, developed by him, M. Popovych and V. Mazepa, a certain subculture as a form of defense against “Marxist absurdity” (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 49). Paying exceptional attention to the reproduction of the original images of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR and the Kyiv philosophical school as the central objects of the second plan of their recollections-interviews, the memoirists actualized them in the context of the third plan as evaluate the impact of socio-cultural contexts on their lives, in particular, the socio-political situation of the mid-20th century — early 21st century in the USSR and in the Ukrainian SSR and then in independent Ukraine and in the world. Together with highlighting these institutes and schools’ activities mainly in the socio-cultural contexts of the Khrushchev’s thaw and, to a lesser extent, neo-Stalinist-stagnation eras, they described the formation and demonstrations of their civic stands and the ones of their colleagues in a differently emphasized manner.

Y. Stratii and V. Horskyi together focused their views on the twists and turns of the work of the Department of the History of Philosophy in Ukraine in the 1960s — 1980s, and the first of them opposed its creative atmosphere to an intolerable moral climate — a terrible atmosphere, at the Institute of Social Sciences in Lviv early 1970s (Stratii, 2018: 201-202). Comparing the certain level of freethinking that was allowed in Moscow at that time with the powerful ideological pressure already perceptible in Kyiv, up to and
including repression and an even worse situation in Lviv, Y. Stratii noted, that dissidents non-violently resisted the criminal political regime, and many of the repressed were simply engaged in scientific work, had authority in their industry and were Ukrainians, not Soviet people (Stratii, 2018: 203). In their own words, not dissidents, for example, it is difficult to make a hero-dissident out of me (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 103), even with the experience of Stalinist repressions from childhood and acquaintance with V. Lisovy, Y. Pronyuk and I. Svitlychnyi from institute years (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014:111), with knowledge of the Holodomor, Bolshevik terror and critical attitude from youth to the Soviet political regime (Stratii, 2018: 184-185), they assessed the actions of the authorities against the human rights movement in the Ukrainian SSR as persecution of nationalists (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 98) and as repression against the Ukrainian intelligentsia (Stratii, 2018: 202). V. Horskyi noted the indicative solidarity and sympathy at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR of decent people, mainly young people, and, above all, P. Kopnin, to Y. Pronyuk and V. Lisovy. In particular, V. Horskyi spoke about the secret storage at his place, at the request of Y. Pronyuk, of photocopies of D. Chyzhevskyi’s “Essays on the History of Philosophy in Ukraine” and their joint attempt with V. Nichik to stand up for V. Lisovy and Y. Pronyuk before the secretary for ideology of the Pechersk District in Kyiv Committee of the CPU (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 99-100). Y. Stratii went deep in her interview into a philosophical analysis of the heritage of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and the history of its study, and V. Horskyi highlighted the tragic fate of the “philosophical front” of the Ukrainian SSR during the Shooted Renaissance period. Representatives of different regions of Ukraine and various ethnocultural traditions, Y. Stratii and V. Horskyi described their common contribution to the revival of Ukrainian philosophy in accordance with the principle of the family brought up in P. Kopnin’s community (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 152) both at the H. S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy and at the revived in independent Ukraine with the active participation of V. Horskyi innovative educational project National University of “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.”

Systematically assessing in the article (Sheremeta, 2013) the work of the said Department in the 1960s — 1970s and thepressive measures of the authorities directed mainly against it in 1972, namely the arrests and exile of V. Lisovy and Y. Pronyuk and expulsion from the institute and persecution of a number of employees (V. Byshovets, M. Bondar, V. Zhmyr, F. Kanak, S. Kudra, M. Rozhenko and V. Tsymbal), O. Sheremeta indicated, that all this was due to a change in the leadership of the CPU, and along with this and the change in the ideological and administrative climate (Sheremeta, 2013: 99). V. Lisovy thoroughly comprehended in his memoirs these changes and their socio-political consequences in the context of an autobiographical and philosophical consideration of his arrest, conviction, imprisonment and exile in 1972 — 1983 and recognized the repressions of the second half of the 1960s — early 1970s in the Ukrainian SSR a decisive attempt by the party elite to strangle in the bud the direction of thinking towards the establishment of national identity in the republics of the USSR, especially in Ukraine (Lisovyi, 2014: 230). An activist of the Ukrainian human rights movement, admirer and distributor of “samizdat” materials of I. Dziuba, Y. Sverstiuk, V. Chornovil, M. Osadchy and V. Moroz, as well as A. Sakharov, O. Solzhenitsyn, A. Avtorkhanov, V. Lisovy according to S. Hrabovskyi, was one of the few Ukrainian post-Marxists of the 1960s (Lisovyi, 2014: 10), not only a scientist, but also a publicist, essayist, poet and an outstanding public figure of historical scale (Yermolenko, 2016). Speaking in his “Open Letter to the deputies of the Supreme
Soviet of the USSR” (1969) in defense of the councils of people’s deputies as bodies of representative democracy against the usurpation of their power by a centralized party-state apparatus and recognizing the need to return to a multiparty system (Lisovyi, 2014: 272), he developed these theses already in “Open Letter to the members of the CPSU and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine” (1972). Condemning the new period of political repressions in the Ukrainian SSR as a neo-Stalinist bacchanalia of Ukrainian-hating forces directly violates The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and denies the principle of national self-determination, he vividly highlighted the crisis state of the USSR as a whole. The most famous representative of the nationally oriented dissidence from the Department of the History of Philosophy in Ukraine, as, in fact, its center at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, V. Lisovyi outlined in his memoirs the common and the different in his civic stand and the one of his colleague and friend M. Popovych.

M. Popovych was then the head of one more non-conformal Department — logic and methodology of science, in this institute, the subject of which was outside the controlled field of official ideology (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 144), recognized by M. Popovych himself as created by P. Kopnin a rather successful, but, at the same time, openly opportunistic research group (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 388). Recalling their discussions with M. Popovych on intellectual and political topics both in those years and later, already in independent Ukraine, with the participation of the employees of this Department P. Yolon, S. Krymskyi and S. Vasiliev, (Lisovyi, 2014: 194-197), V. Lisovyi witnessed a high level of M. Popovych’s openness, his knowledge of many European languages and his dissident moods. V. Lisovyi recognized his ideological orientation as a general democratic one, with the clause that M. Popovych, unlike many Russian democrats, had a negative attitude to the stereotypes of Russian chauvinism and in the 1960s solidified himself with the dissidents, whom the authorities blamed as “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists” (Lisovyi, 2014: 195). Pointed out that their discussions in the 1990s revealed differences in their understanding of the defining features of Ukrainian national-cultural identity and the role of the Ukrainian language in it, V. Lisovyi noted that he was trying to shift M. Popovych’s position to the right, towards rejecting the too liberal version of multiculturalism, and also noted his tolerant attitude to various ideological positions of the democratic type even as the director (2001 — 2018) of the H. S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy (Lisovyi, 2014: 197). Clarifying in their memoirs the civil position of M. Popovych, his colleagues admitted that in Soviet times he was not a dissident in the established sense of this word, but, of course, was a free-thinker (Popovych, 2010: 9), in particular, back in the terrible 1970s expressed a “fundamental thought” that humanity is condemned if it cannot overcome communism (Andros, 2015: 90), and occupied a leading place in the opposition to an inhuman and unlearned officious philosophy (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 152). One of the initiators of the People’s Movement of Ukraine and the head of its Kyiv branch in 1989, co-chairman of the Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine, and then a member of the Initiative Group “December 1,” a supporter of European social democracy M. Popovych was the most famous representative of the Kyiv philosophical school in the social and political life of Ukraine.

His name, as a thinker and author of landmark studies on the history of culture and socio-political life of Ukraine and the world, is often recalled by his fellow memoirists next to the name of S. Krymskyi as his long-term colleague in the said Department and institute, just like he is a laureate of the Taras Shevchenko National Prize, his close friend and, more than
once, his passionate opponent. The co-authors, together with I. Drach, of the book “Hryhorii Skovoroda: A Biographical Tale” (1984) with its clearly dissident fate, M. Popovych and S. Krymskyi more than once received remarkable assessments from colleagues: old university friends who have always been as an informal structure at the top of the pyramid at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (Horak, 2009: 271-272), the leading Kopninists (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 160), and M. Popovych himself recognized himself a student of S. Krymskyi in many respects, for example, in the “worlds” of music and Kyiv (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 395). Pointing out that from his students day he did not become an enemy of Marxism and a dissident (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 50), and repeatedly reminding T. Chaika that he is an apolitical person (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 393), S. Krymskyi, however, played, in our opinion, an important role in the implementation of P. Kopnin’s opportunistic and “revisionist” innovative scientific project. Reproducing in his interview to T. Chaika, which was extremely interesting and extravagant in terms of the range of assessments and characteristics, in more detail than all his colleagues almost all the juicy events from the history of this institute, he, in fact, very quickly recalled the arrest of V. Lisovyi and Y. Pronyuk. At the same time, S. Krymskyi widely considered the influence of Kyiv and Moscow scientific and socio-cultural, mainly non-conforming, environment of those years on the worldview of both his own and his colleagues. An active participant and attentive chronicler of the history of this institute during the time of its directors D. Ostryanin, P Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk, he described in detail its transition from the “atmosphere of ideological pogroms” and denunciations to the Central Committee of the CPU (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 381), when, thanks to his recommendations, the main staff of both the institute (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 112) and the Kyiv philosophical school was formed, to the emergence of a real philosophical environment at the institute and in Ukraine as a whole. An essential aspect of this description is S. Krymskyi’s consideration of the connections of both his own and other participants of this school with, as he said, their “brothers in mind,” namely non-conforming leaders of Georgian (M. Mamardashvili) and Russian (A. Zinoviev, H. Batishchev and others) academic philosophy.

According to M. Popovych, S. Krymskyi was “our man”: of course, with a democratic and humanistic orientation, a liberal in the political sense of a word, who always felt the abomination of the bureaucratic system in which we live, always resisted everything to the best of his ability, which in one way or another humiliated human dignity (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 394). S. Krymskyi highlighted his spiritual evolution from orthodox Hegelianism to Christian values and paid special attention to the influence on it of the civic stand of his friend, the writer Victor Nekrasov, with its patriotism, alternative to the Soviet way of life (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 201). The general democratic position of the Kyiv philosophical school is attested in the recognition by M. Popovych that the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR then brought up the phenomenon of a philosophical community, which had to be reckoned with (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 43), and already A. Horak recognized it for the forge of spiritual opposition to the regime, carried out in the form inherent in philosophy (Horak, 2009: 273). The diversity of personal visions of the socio-political image of this institute and school by their members is wide in all their differences: from enthusiastic to the limit, for example, an exceptional and desirable phenomenon, an island of happiness (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 79), a blinking light that shone in the darkest periods of obscurantism (Horak, 2009: 273), to exclusively civilly accented, like a lacuna of free thought (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 11) and an outpost of spirituality (Horak, 2009: 273). This vide positive range of assessments is summarized in the
recognition that the search team of the mentioned institute has played and is playing a significant role in our socio-political life, which contributed and contributed to democratic development, the national revival of Ukrainian society, and the establishment of the state independence of Ukraine (Yolon, 2017: 55). In the 1960s, this institute became one of the few prototypes of modern civil society in the Ukrainian SSR with its: democracy, opposition to xenophobia, primarily to anti-Semitism and Ukrainophobia, resistance to official dogmatization of state ideology, openness to international experience in the context of direct dialogue and, which is fundamentally important, awareness of their role in the study and preservation of the spiritual, primarily philosophical, experience of the Ukrainian people and all ethnic groups in Ukraine.

Conclusions

The results of our research are as follows:

1. Comprehension of the history of the Kyiv philosophical school in the context of the memoir and scientific research of its creators, in particular the domestic projects of the oral history of philosophy implemented in their final interviews, brought its professional analysis, including the clarification of the socio-political image of this school, to a qualitatively new, intersubjective-autobiographical, level of its consideration.

2. The autobiographical reconstruction by colleagues of directors of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, Academicians P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk, both theirs and their own civic stands, attested to the democratic character of the Kyiv philosophical school as a micromodel-prototype of an open society, embodied by the philosophers of the sixties in the Ukrainian SSR as their innovative academic project under the influence of the activation of the human rights movement.

3. Considered on the basis of their own memories, the civic stands of members of the Department of the History of Philosophy in Ukraine in this institute V. Horskyi, Y. Stratii, V. Lisovyi confirmed its socio-political image as the leading center of nationally-oriented dissidence in this institution and, accordingly, the main object of political repression in it by the authorities of the Ukrainian SSR.

4. Considered on the basis of their own memories, the civic stands of members of the Department of Logic and methodology of science in this institute M. Popovych and S. Krymskyi revealed its socio-political image as a leading non-conformal center of an expressively democratic direction in this institute, closely connected with the Department of the History of Philosophy in Ukraine.
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