

Kyiv Philosophical School and Human Rights. National-Cultural Movement in the Ukrainian SSR: Scientific and Public Dialogue and Interaction

Heorhii Vdovychenko

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Senior Researcher,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: georgyvovychenko@knu.ua
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8532-7672>

Vdovychenko, Heorhii (2021) Kyiv Philosophical School and Human Rights. National-Cultural Movement in the Ukrainian SSR: Scientific and Public Dialogue and Interaction. *Ukrainian Policymaker*, Volume 8, 127-143. <https://doi.org/10.29202/up/8/14>

This article deals with defining and analyzing the experience of dialogue and interaction of the founders of the Kyiv philosophical school, as a leading participant in the philosophical life of the Ukrainian SSR from the Khrushchev's "thaw" to the Gorbachev's "perestroika," with the human rights and national-cultural movement of the 1950s and 1980s, also represented, in particular, by its figures V. Lisovyi and Y. Pronyuk. Academicians S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi, founders both of this school and, at the same time, its main academic center, namely the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, were long-term employees of its two most nonconforming Departments – Logic and Methodology of Science and History of Philosophy of Ukraine, and left a lot of evidence on this topic. In their final autobiographical reconstructions of the past two decades, they left a number of recollections of their long-term friendly relations with the known ideologists of the Ukrainian human rights movement I. Svitlychny, I. Dziuba, E. Sverstiuk, L. Plyushch, including their colleagues, prisoners of conscience V. Lisovyi and Y. Pronyuk. At the same time, they provided much evidence of similar relations with well-known in the USSR and the world Russian Soviet dissidents: the philosophers A. Zinoviev and A. Esenin-Volpin, and the writer V. Nekrasov. Other no less important sources of the topic of the article, apart from the memoirs of the mentioned and other figures of the Kyiv philosophical school, as significant achievements of the first domestic projects on the oral history of philosophy of T. Chaika and Student Society of Oral History of Philosophy of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, are used below. These are scientific works, memoirs, and correspondence of the said well-known academic human rights scholars: dissident philosopher V. Lisovyi and his colleague from the Institute of Cybernetics of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, also dissident philosopher L. Plyushch. They reflected the formation of a new type of Ukrainian intelligentsia of the post-Stalin era of the generation of the sixties as postmodern thinkers-visionaries of democratic Ukraine.

Keywords: Ukrainian philosophy, Kyiv philosophical school, Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, sixties, human rights movement, V. Horskyi, S. Krymskyi, V. Lisovyi, L. Plyushch, J. Kolasky, P. Kravchuk.

Received: 8 April 2021 / Accepted: 3 May 2021 / Published: 29 May 2021

Introduction

There are so many very interesting, albeit little-studied pages of the history of the Kyiv philosophical school, as, according to our articles (Vdovychenko, 2020; Vdovychenko, 2020), an academic center for the institutionalization of the Ukrainian national philosophic tradition, formed during Khrushchev's "thaw" at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. They are both its active participation in the international scientific life of the Cold war era and its reflection in scientific and all other discourses of the sides in this global geopolitical confrontation, primarily the USSR and the USA. Almost thirty years of secret and public dialogue and interaction between the founders of this school, in particular V. Lisovyi and Y. Pronyuk, and a number of their colleagues from the constellation of Ukrainian philosophers of the sixties, with the Ukrainian human rights and national-cultural movement becoming one of the now-forgotten scientific and social factors in overcoming this conflict and, as a consequence, the collapse of the USSR and dawn of Ukraine's independence. In the 1960s, the USSR intensified official international relations with the democratic world, especially with the most developed countries of Western Europe and North America. These relations, in which both the directors of the said institute P. Kopnin (1962 – 1968) and V. Shynkaruk (1968 – 2001), and the deputy of the first of them, M. Honcharenko, and some of their colleagues, such as S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi, took part, had their own no less effective, but censored and persecuted by the Soviet authorities continuation in the form of self-publishing (samizdat) and information exchange and cooperation of dissidents of the Ukrainian SSR and the human rights movement in the world. It is significant that the memoirs of two well-known members of the Communist Party of Canada J. Kolasky and P. Kravchuk vividly reflected the crisis of the Khrushchev's "thaw" in the socio-cultural, including political and scientific-educational, the life of Soviet Ukraine in the 1960s, and the growth of the Resistance Movement in Kyiv, which they visited in those years. The same subject matter found its professional philosophical comprehension in the oral recollections, memoirs, correspondence of their contemporaries-Kyivans, namely both well-known human rights activists-philosophers L. Plyushch and V. Lisovyi, and co-founders of the Kyiv philosophical school, famous Kyivan non-conformist thinkers S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi. *The purpose* of our research is to determine the circumstances and content of the dialogue and interaction of this school with the human rights and national-cultural movement in the Ukrainian SSR, in particular the emergence of the type of domestic philosopher-human rights activist, based on evidence of the illustrative examples, V. Lisovyi and L. Plyushch, and their Ukrainian and foreign colleagues, especially S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi.

Socio-cultural life of the Ukrainian SSR in the 1960s – 1970s through the eyes of neo-Marxists and post-Marxists from the diaspora and Ukraine: philosophers-human rights activists in the memoirs of both them and their contemporaries

The theme of origin in the Ukrainian SSR, a dissident philosopher as a post-Stalinist type of Ukrainian scientist and, at the same time, a public figure and his entry into the political and

scientific arena of the USSR and the world, is topical to domestic humanities. It is especially actual for studies of Ukrainian philosophy and socio-political thought and related to the study of the Kyiv philosophical school in the above-mentioned projects on the oral history of philosophy. The memoirs of the creators of this school, obtained in these projects and already covered by us in the articles (Vdovychenko, 2020; Vdovychenko, 2020), are one of the main sources of our research. These are the final autobiographical reconstructions of academicians S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, M. Popovych and a number of their colleagues, who jointly represented the scientific staff of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR in the second half of the 20th – 21st century. In the center of our attention in this part of the article are taken, deciphered and completely published by T. Chaika interviews with the first two of them (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012; Horskyi & Chaika, 2014). Both of these interviews, in our view, form the basis of defined by us the first, namely the Central Ukrainian with its center in Kyiv, regional-urban circle of spatial conditionality of all now known oral histories of philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR. It is almost entirely represented by the memories of graduates of Kyiv State University, who became employees of the said institute, and is a system-forming for the Kyiv philosophical school. This circle also includes two partially published interviews of T. Chaika with M. Popovych and P. Yolon and two fully published interviews of the mentioned Student Society with E. Golovakha and S. Prolev. We also outlined two more similar circles, such as the Western Ukrainian one with the center in Lviv and the South Ukrainian with the center in Odesa. Their materials, in particular interviews with O. Rogero (Rogero, 2017) and S. Sekundant, conducted by I. Golybovych with a group of her colleagues from Ilya Mechnikov National University of Odessa in their project on the oral history of philosophers, are partially used in this article. At the same time, we used a whole range of domestic and foreign publications on the history of the Ukrainian and, in general, the Soviet human rights movement: from the memoirs of its well-known participants and some materials of domestic samizdat to the works of Sovietologists dedicated to them. Our special attention was drawn to the texts of four Ukrainian Sixties thinkers, such as L. Plyushch (Plushch, 2002), a member both of the Initiative Group for the Protection of Human Rights in the USSR and the Foreign Representation of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, V. Lisovyi (Lisovyi, 2014) and two known public Ukrainian figures abroad, neo-Marxists and Communists J. Kolasky (Kolasky, 1968; Kolasky, 1970; Kolasky, 1979) and P. Kravchuk (Kravchuk, 1993).

It is these works of the last two of them, scholars of the Ukrainian diaspora in Canada and active members of the Communist Party of Canada, became a blatant testimony to the totalitarian backstage, for all the specifics of this definition, of “democratic changes” in the Ukrainian SSR in the mid-1950s – 1960s, and at the same time, of their ephemerality and official completion for the broad circles of the Ukrainian diaspora, especially in North America and, in fact, the entire Western bloc in the midst of the Cold War era. Many of their colleagues Sovietologists, such as the US historian K. Farmer, author of the monograph (Farmer, 1980), and former director of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies B. Krawchenko, compiler of collections of materials and author of works on the recent history of Ukraine, such as the monograph (Krawchenko, 1985), carried out their sophisticated analysis of the development of Ukrainian national consciousness and its social expression in the Ukrainian SSR from anti-Marxist positions. Unlike both of them, P. Kravchuk and, mainly, J. Kolasky systematically assessed the crisis of socio-cultural life of Soviet Ukraine on neo-Marxist principles on the basis of personal experience of their stay in the Ukrainian SSR back in the 1960s. It is significant that the second of them, a graduate of the Universities of Saskatchewan and Toronto, a historian,

studied for about two years (1963 – 1964) at the Higher Party School at the Central Committee of the CPU in Kyiv. P. Kravchuk, a public figure, historian of Ukrainian literature and publicist, who was the head of the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians from 1978 to 1991, managed to publish two openly pro-Soviet propaganda essays on the Ukrainian diaspora in the Kyiv Publishing house “Soviet Writer”: “Bad great-grandchildren. Ukrainian nationalists in Canada” (1960) and “Nationalist Scorpions” (1963). They both witnessed many contradictions in the socio-cultural life of the Ukrainian SSR at the very end of the Khrushchev’s “thaw” and the beginning of the neo-Stalinist “stagnation” in 1963 – 1967, namely between the very end of the Cuban Missile Crisis and the eve of the Prague Spring. It is noteworthy that they jointly stated the crisis of Ukrainian educational and scientific, cultural and socio-political life in their memoirs, which, in fact, became one of its most eloquent testimonies in the Western bloc and in the world as a whole. It is significant that in parallel with their writing, the head of the Union of Writers of the Ukrainian SSR and a Member of the Central Committee of the CPU, O. Honchar, created during the same 1963 – 1967 his novel “Cathedral” (1968), as, in fact, Ukrainian art herald of the Prague Spring. In this, in the words of H. Tiutiunnyk, the “novel-alarm” (Koval, 1989: 33), which had been silenced in the USSR for almost twenty years, more veiledly, but much more artistically and symbolically, witnessed the anti-Marxist and, in general, criminally punitive practice of Soviet totalitarianism in the Ukrainian SSR.

These “cautionary works” were published at the beginning of the era of neo-Stalinist “stagnation”, outlined by its extremes-political markers, such as the anti-Khrushchev October Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee (1964) and the XXVII Congress of the CPSU (1986). This era gained new momentum after the removal of P. Shelest in 1972 from the post of First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPU and provocation by the KGB of the Ukrainian SSR in the same year “Dobosh case.” This led, among other things, to new repressions against the Ukrainian sixties, in particular dissident philosophers V. Lisovyi, Y. Pronyuk and a group of their colleagues from the Department of History of Philosophy of Ukraine of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (Sheremeta, 2013). The military confrontation between the leading countries of the Eastern and Western blocs, the USSR and the USA, in the 1960s – 1980s in Latin America, Southeast and Central Asia, and Africa was accompanied by their active ideological struggle in the form of a Cold War. Its very important component was the propaganda information campaigns initiated and carried out through state and other institutions, including in the territory of the enemy state, such as KGB agents within the said Association of United Ukrainian Canadians. At the same time, a lot of public institutions of the Ukrainian diaspora emerged in North America and Western Europe in the 1960s and 1970s, as the World Congress of Free Ukrainians (World Congress of Ukrainians) (1967), which played then an important role in opposing Soviet totalitarianism and support of its opponents. The attention of these institutions was attracted not so much by a number of underground organizations in the Ukrainian SSR in the late 1950s and 1960s, in particular the Ukrainian National Front (1964 – 1967), as by well-known centers of the Ukrainian human rights movement, such as the Ukrainian Helsinki Group (1976), and ideologists of this movement, for example, I. Dziuba, V. Chornovil, Y. Sverstiuk and others. An important role in popularizing their names and ideas in the world was played by Ukrainian diaspora publishing houses, such as the Ukrainian Publishers Limited (1949, Manchester and London), which cooperated with the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain (1945) and published a number of philosophical and socio-political works of dissident philosophers, including O. Berdnyk and I. Gel. In our opinion, the Suchasnist Publishers (1961, Munich) and V. Symonenko

Smoloskyp Publishers (1967, Baltimore) played rather effective role in acquainting the world community with these and many other thinkers-activists of the human rights and national-cultural movement in the Ukrainian SSR. The title of the second of them, as well as its very first edition “From the Generation of Innovators: Svitlychny and Dziuba” (1968), and devoted to the action of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group thorough editions of the 1970s – 1980s, testified to its considerable attention to history, scientific and creative achievements of this movement.

In both of these publishers, many works of dissident philosophers, such as I. Dziuba, O. Berdnyk, Y. Sverstiuk, V. Moroz, were published. They republished in collections of materials, for example, in the final volume of the Suchasnist Publishers big project “Ukrainian Socio-Political Thought in the 20th century: Documents and Materials. Vol. 3” (1983), also devoted to the “Ukrainian Resistance Movement.” In various series of these publishers, such as the “Socio-Political Library. Documents” of the Suchasnist Publishers and the “Documents of the Ukrainian samizdat” of the V. Symonenko Smoloskyp Publishers, a lot of self-published testimonies of Soviet totalitarianism in the Ukrainian SSR were printed. Among them were also published some collections of materials on “prisoners of conscience” in the Ukrainian SSR L. Plyushch (Medical Case History, 1976) and V. Lisovyi and his fellow philosophers Y. Pronyuk and V. Bondar (Zakydalsky, 1976). It was in the Suchasnist Publishers that the first abbreviated Ukrainian-language edition of the philosophical autobiography-confession “In History’s Carnival” (1980, 1982) by L. Plyushch was published in translation by M. Carynnyk from Russian. This book was published more than once from 1977 to 1982 in the original Russian language and in translations in French, Italian, English and twice in Ukrainian. These memoirs of L. Plyushch, in his words, are “not a confession and not a biographical story,” but “a story about another path to freedom” (Plyushch, 1982: 16). It is really a very worthy successor to vivid examples of documentary and documentary-artistic descriptions of communist atrocities in the Ukrainian SSR and debunking the foundations of both Soviet pre-Stalin and Stalinist totalitarianism from V. Vynnychenko’s “Diary” to V. Kravchenko’s “I Chose Freedom” (1946) and trimming I. Bahriany’s novel “Garden of Gethsemane (1950). This, according to L. Plyushch, his “description of the Soviet Union through the eyes of a man who passed from a fanatical belief in the Soviet government to the fight against its lies and terror” (Plyushch, 1982: 16), as well as published in the journal “Suchasnist” yet in independent Ukraine and republished (Lisovyi, 2014) Lisovyi’s “Memoirs,” are both illustrative examples of philosophical memoirs of Ukrainian philosophers-human rights activists. They are commensurate in their meaning and influence, in particular with the expressive irony, sarcasm and scale of philosophical insights, with a series of famous novels by their colleague and familiar, the Soviet Russian dissident philosopher A. Zinoviev, and both are, like them, attempts at philosophical autobiographies and chronicles. It is noteworthy that J. Kolasky and P. Kravchuk reflected in their memoirs the experience of temporary contact with Soviet totalitarianism in almost all its socio-cultural manifestations, largely in the educational and scientific and also day-by-day life spheres, which both have undergone horrible Russification and dehumanization. In contrast, V. Lisovyi and L. Plyushch, as Ukrainian dissident philosophers, namely academic philosopher and cybernetic philosopher, revealed from within the experience of constant personal opposition to the system of state security of the Ukrainian SSR and the entire Soviet system from a post-Marxist (V. Lisovyi) and neo-Marxist (L. Plyushch) positions.

Like L. Plyushch, born in 1939 (the city of Naryn, Kyrgyz SSR), his slightly older peer from a peasant family in the Kyiv region (Tarasivka hamlet in the village of Stari Bezradychi), V. Lisovyi was also a “child of war” and a witness to its horrors and postwar reconstruction

and just as strikingly as L. Plyushch covered them in his “Memoirs.” Like L. Plyushch, with whom he was acquainted before their arrests in 1972 and conducted philosophical dialogues at the time, V. Lisovyi highlighted his worldview evolution from the years of study at school and Kyiv State University and also paid special attention to his participation in the human rights movement. Like his colleague, who was a graduate of the said one and Odessa State University, V. Lisovyi described his experience of imprisonment and exile, which, however, was twice as great as that of L. Plyushch, namely ten years. He was one of the most active figures in the creation and distribution of samizdat in the Ukrainian SSR, in particular the author of the “Open Letter to the Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR” (1969) and the “Open Letter to Members of the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine” (1972), in which he criticized the destruction of representative democracy in the USSR by the party-state apparatus and stated the crisis in it and the Ukrainian SSR. It is significant that V. Lisovyi became the most famous Ukrainian philosopher – human rights activist, and spokesman for nationally oriented dissent in the Kyiv philosophical school. He analyzed in detail in the “Memoirs,” mainly in the sections “Investigation” and “Camps and Exiles”, his experience as a Soviet “prisoner of conscience” gained by him in the Perm and Mordovian camps and exile in Buryatia from 1972 to 1983, which was no less unique than obtained by L. Plyushch at the Dnipropetrovsk Special Psychiatric Hospital from 1973 to 1976. Substantially and extensively analyzing, like him, the ideology and ethics of Ukrainian dissidents and repressive technologies of the KGB, V. Lisovyi recognized as an essential difference between this ideology and the “ideology of the national liberation war of the UIA” (Ukrainian Insurgent Army – *H.V.*) that the goal of the first was a peaceful “radical transformation of the mass consciousness and psychology in the process of transition from a totalitarian and imperial state to a democratic and national one” (Lisovyi, 2014: 289). It was from this position that he considered the essence of the “Brezhnev period” with its repressions of the second half of the 1960s and early 1970s as a policy of the Soviet government aimed at “suffocating in its infancy” “direction of thinking on the establishment of national identity in the republics” of the USSR, especially in the Ukrainian SSR. Like, in fact, L. Plyushch, V. Lisovyi recognized as the central theme of his philosophical interests the search for a theory of “directing the efforts of people against the destructive onslaught of chaos and absurdity,” under the conditions of degeneration of the “cultural formlessness of Ukrainian,” alienated from his “traditional rural culture” in the 20th century, in the “chimerical mentality” (Lisovyi, 2014: 160-162).

Beginning his memoirs with a deep intersubjective analysis of his tuberculous childhood and adolescence, which coincided with the last two decades of the Stalin era, L. Plyushch devoted most of them to describing his dissident activities in the 1960s. He noted that his “first contact with Ukrainian patriots deepened and spread” during the Sinyavsky-Daniel show trial (1965 – 1966) and cited such an interesting philosophical and literary sketch of the atmosphere of “alienation” in the USSR at the beginning of “stagnation” era in the way of its “seeing” through the artistic ideas of iconic artists of modern and postmodern: “The feeling of the Kafkaesque grew. At that time, Kafka became very popular among young people ... It was amazing how deeply Kafka reflected the absurdity of our world, so familiar – the Soviet, in the Kafkaesque delusion. It was ridiculous to read our critics about the singer of “alienation” in “rotting feudal-capitalist Austria-Hungary”: if we know ourselves in this alienation, then what kind of world do we have under “socialism”? ... The theory of alienation was increasingly associated with modern Western fiction. Ionesco’s “Rhinoceros” was published, followed by

Beckett's "Waiting for Godot." All my friends and I, too, were fascinated by the theater of the absurd. This is real realism. The absurdity of the twentieth century cannot be conveyed through critical realism. Sartre's "Plays" appeared. My friends didn't like them very much, but some of them seemed wonderful to me. Sartre's "Words" and several of Camus' works were published before the "Plays." He influenced us more" (Plyushch, 2002: 150). He mentioned the interest of the Sixties philosophers in the "philosophical scaffolding" of Marx's "Capital" and in "authentic Marxism," which "was not only not accepted by official doctrine, but was also actively rejected" (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 166). Plyushch also highlighted the experience of his appeal to the Soviet philosophy of the 1920s in the light of the description of his acquaintances with O. Bogdanov's son "geneticist Malinovski" and V. Asmus. Analyzing the acute crisis of Soviet ideology against the background of comparing the scientific and cultural gains and losses of the 1920s and 1930s – 1940-s in the USSR, in particular noting the first of them ("works of Vygotsky and Uznadze on psychology," studies of V. Propp and M. Bakhtin, and the "theater of the absurd (Vvedensky, Harms)," he contrasted them with the worldview foundations of Stalinism: "The final victory of "dialectical materialism" led to Lysenko's mechanistic and voluntarist neo-Lamarckism, to Stalin's mechanistic and voluntarist "dialectics," to the flat-rationalist theory of socialism. No fresh ideas in philosophy (I'm not talking about those philosophers who only cover themselves with Marxist phraseology, or about the Young Marxists who appeared after the XX Congress)" (Plyushch, 2002: 155).

Well-known creators of the Kyiv philosophical school, long-term employees of the two most nonconforming Departments of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, of Logic and Methodology of Science and History of Philosophy of Ukraine, S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi repeatedly mentioned in their memoirs V. Lisovyi and L. Plyushch. They recalled both of them as famous domestic dissidents and, at the same time, emphasized in their interviews with T. Chaika that they themselves didn't become dissidents (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 319; Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 103). V. Horskyi, for example, mentioned in this interview and an interview with Y. Zavorodnyi (Vilen Horskyi, 2011: 259-279) his friendly relations with well-known figures of the Ukrainian human rights movement. He briefly noted in the first one that he knew I. Svitlychnyi well, though not as closely as his fellow friends at the institute V. Lisovyi and Y. Pronyuk (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 111). Recalling both of them in the same interview in view of the recollection of actively started, in his words, "persecution of nationalists" in the Ukrainian SSR in 1967, V. Horskyi noted the participation of Y. Pronyuk in "this movement." He spoke separately on hiding at the request of the soon-to-be arrested Y. Pronyuk, a photocopy of D. Chyzhevskyi's "Essays on the History of Philosophy in Ukraine." Speaking about the arrest in 1972 of V. Lisovyi, he evaluated in such a way the said: "Open Letter to Members of the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine" (1972): "He did nothing, he just wrote an official protest letter to the Central Committee of the party and sent it. He very politely tried to convince party leaders that it was a mistake to persecute and arrest intelligent people, intellectuals in general, and so on" (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 100). V. Horskyi noted the sympathy for both of them by their colleagues from the institute, but, in general, passive and without any action, and told about the visit together with V. Nychyk, given their joint personal decision, immediately after these events, to the Pechersk District Committee of the CPU. They had a conversation with the secretary for the ideology of this Committee with the never achieved goal of "proving that the party was wrong in arresting our colleagues" (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 100). Considering these arrests as a "misunderstanding, a mistake"

that can be corrected, he agreed with the thesis of his contemporary and colleague T Chaika that then “there was a global feeling that you were sitting under a hood” with a reservation. However, that this feeling was and oppressed, but “it was not personal, but somehow in general, across the country” (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 103). Frankly admitting to her that “it is difficult to make a dissident hero out of me,” Horskyi noted that after these events in 1972, the arrests at the institute stopped. Still, almost all employees of the Department of the History of Philosophy of Ukraine received party fines then. The department itself was threatened with closure for some time, while “clouds hung over us for about ten more years” (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 110).

S. Krymskyi in much more detail than V. Horskyi and other their colleagues covered his long-term ties with leading figures of the human rights movement in the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, as a result of which, according to him, he “was on a note in the KGB.” In his interview with T. Chaika, he revealed little-known details of friendly relations with V. Nekrasov, A. Zinoviev and A. Esenin-Volpin, as well as with I. Svitlychny, L. Plyushch and Y. Pronyuk (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012). Krymskyi recalled, in particular, the “whole movement,” as T. Chaika put it, of the “galaxy of intellectuals” of the 1970s and 1980s who “wanted to live outside society.” Then he dwelled on the problem of “inhuman experience” of “the world of suffering and losses of the 20th century” in view of the description of the concentration camp practice of Stalinist Gulag in the works of A. Solzhenitsyn and V. Shalamov already known to him: “In general, the answer to the question of how well we can be humanized or dehumanized by camps and prisons is very important and very serious. Not only in Soviet times but also now. The answers to it are ambiguous. Even the ones of Solzhenitsyn and Shalamov are, to some extent, alternative. Shalamov has clearly shown that the experience of camps and of prisons is an inhuman world, and it has no instructive meaning for people, including us ... The world of suffering and loss the 20th century gives us a completely inhuman experience. People survived in this world by inhuman rules that had nothing to do with the rules and experiences of our daily lives. Shalamov showed it directly, and Solzhenitsyn showed it indirectly, and I understand that” (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 316). He pointed out, given that “people with a somewhat affected psychics” are just as often capable of reckless protest, in which such a person is not stopped even by a premonition of its consequences, and explained his attitude to dissidents as “very strange people” who seem to him “as strange as all religious fanatics”. S. Krymskyi illustrated this thesis on the examples of his old acquaintances L. Plyushch and one of the leaders of the Soviet dissident movement, mathematician and philosopher A. Esenin-Volpin and noted that in their behavior there is so-called social psychopathology. Evaluating it as changes that are quite commensurate with clinical changes, he recognized this as a deviation from the norm and “not in the conventional sense”: “I knew Leonid Plyushch well, he is a strange man. Prior to his dissent, he was so fascinated by Soviet power that we all considered him a little out of his mind. It was known that every morning he started playing a record with the International and saluted to him... And then he became a dissident...” (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 316-317).

S. Krymskyi, at the same time, briefly considered the prison experience of his friend, a patient in a psychiatric hospital and a political exile during the Stalinist regime, organizer of the “Publicity Rally” in Moscow in 1965 and illegitimate son of the poet S. Esenin, A. Esenin-Volpin: “I knew Alik Esenin-Volpin quite closely, he was the even stranger man who did such experiments on himself (of course, he was a dissident and was in prison) ... So, when he was touched to be beaten, he read poems ... he told me later that he was stopped being beaten, I call it the elven power of poetry. It was a confrontation of beauty and brute physical strength.

Alik said that when he read the poems, the prison guards simply could not do it” (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 317). Telling T. Chaika about his ability to remain a person outside the dissident destiny, he also mentioned his friendship with other figures of the human rights and national-cultural movement in the Ukrainian SSR. Krymskyi emphasized that in the 1970s, he was still “close enough to the Kyiv dissident circle,” in particular to his real inspirer I. Svitlychny: “I celebrated the New Year with Svitlychny, and in the morning he was arrested. And this home celebration was constantly watched from the street by some people, they controlled us ... he found an opportunity to send me letters from prison, we communicated very closely” (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 319). One of V. Nekrasov’s closest friends in Kyiv, he mentioned his reaction to I. Dziuba’s arrest in March 1973: “Nekrasov was the second person in Ukraine in the 1960s, to react immediately to Dziuba’s arrest, and the first was M. Lukash ... Usually restrained Nekrasov, who was not prone to any demonstrations, emotional outbursts, because everything he did was usually well thought out, wrote a correct and reasoned letter of protest to the Central Committee and the Writers’ Union. He was immediately expelled from the Writers’ Union and from the party. But it didn’t change the way he behaved” (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 201-202). Another illustrative page of S. Krymsky’s involvement in the movement of the sixties was his long-term acquaintance with A. Zinoviev, whom he stayed at his apartment for a long time when he and his wife and child came to “hide” to him in Kyiv (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 319). We noticed noted by the figures of the Kyiv philosophical school their conditional division into groups of dissident philosophers (V. Lisovyi, Y. Pronyuk) and sympathetic non-conformist thinkers (V. Horskyi, S. Krymskyi, M. Popovych and others). This division, in our opinion, requires a more detailed consideration of the philosophical and human rights self-determination of the first group together with the brilliantly presented by L. Plyushch constellations of dissident philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR, which are different from the academic research of the second of these two groups.

Philosophical and human rights confrontation of totalitarianism: the experience of Freudianism, structuralism and linguistic analysis in counteraction to the Soviet psychiatric and prison practices

An acquaintance with the history of the Ukrainian diaspora in North America in the 1960s and 1970s, including information-rich publications (Woycenko, 1986; Woycenko, 1992), showed that the testimonies of its activists from various political camps of the current situation in the Ukrainian SSR were within its eyeshot. Among the most notable of them was the report of the delegation of the Communist Party of Canada on its official visit to Soviet Ukraine in 1967 in the Ukrainian weekly “Life and Word” and a “documentary book on the Russification of education and schooling in Ukraine by former communist Ivan Kolyaska” (Woycenko, 1986: 415). They were published in 1968 as, in general, the International Year of Human Rights and the so-called year of the “world revolution,” in particular: the year of the Prague Spring and of the 1968 Red Square demonstration against the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the USSR and its Warsaw Pact allies, and, also, the year of leftist student revolt in France and mass protests both in Western Germany and the United States. Testimonies of both the delegates of this party, in particular the editor of the mentioned weekly and a functionary of Association of United Ukrainian Canadians as a “communist organization in Canada” P. Kravchuk, and, especially, the author of published that year (Kolasky, 1968) and later (Kolasky, 1970) “works-expositions” of the “Russification course in Ukraine” (Woycenko, 1986: 462), caused an essential resonance

in the Ukrainian diaspora in North America and in the English-speaking world. J. Kolasky's open speeches to students and faculty at universities in Toronto, Manitoba, and Winnipeg from 1968 to 1969, as well as his participation in television and radio programs in Canada at the same time, won many reviews, responses, and the "loud reaction of the Communists" in diaspora (Woycenko, 1986: 462). It is significant that these events continued during the active public-legal competitions of Ukrainians in Canada for the state status of the Ukrainian language and opposition to the "linguocide" against it both in the Ukrainian SSR and in the world. J. Kolasky, as "a well-known author of several books in English about life in modern Ukraine" (Woycenko, 1992: 118), conducted a very deep scientific study of both anti-Soviet urban folklore and the decline of the educational system in the Ukrainian SSR and the crisis of socio-cultural life of Soviet Ukraine in the 1960s in general. This led to his clearly manifested in his works (Kolasky, 1970; Kolasky, 1979) frustration both in the communist construction in the USSR and in the activities of the Canadian pro-Soviet communist organizations and parties. The same conclusions were reached at the same time by neo-Marxist L. Plyushch and post-Marxist V. Lisovyi, who jointly reevaluated the official version of Marxism-Leninism and, in general, the theory and practice of socialist construction in the Ukrainian SSR. It is largely based on a critical analysis of domestic education, academic life and their strict administration by the Central Committee of the CPSU and the state security of the USSR.

Memoirs of L. Plyushch and V. Lisovyi continue and deepen the experience of communication with the species "Homo soveticus" described by J. Kolasky in his works, in particular, cover its dominance in leading Soviet Ukraine's institutions of higher education and academic science of the 1960s: from the mentions of the first of them about the professor of philosophy, Stalinist F. Yenevich from Kyiv State University to the described by the second party functionaries from the Institute of Cybernetics of the Ukrainian SSR. L. Plyushch vividly illustrated their ideological degradation on the examples of his two confidential conversations with "one of the party figures" of this institute and with "another party boss," who was even more interesting," in the 1960s. The first of them remarked that the "October Revolution was a revolution of boors," acknowledged the correctness of D. Merezhkovsky's vision of the invasion of the "coming boor," and stressed that instead of "idiots" and "cook's children," the "technical intelligentsia should come to power in the USSR." The second or the "party nationalist-technocrat," who organized "interesting cultural and political arrangements" at this institute and, indicatively, acknowledged, that L. Plyushch, I. Dziuba, I. Svitlychny are "needed by Ukraine," sharply criticized, in his words, "Marxist illusions" from a clear totalitarian pro-Nazi position: "I am leading three hundred communists. And they are sheep. They need a whip, a strong hand. Mathematicians, physicists, and technicians must be in power. Only in this way will Ukraine become independent". I commented on the whip and the strong hand as A. Hitler's idea. "Was A. Hitler a fool? Not everything he said was stupid" (Plyushch, 2002: 166). L. Plyushch is well-known as the author of notable for their scale and depth of analysis of philosophical, linguistic and literary studies of the life and work of iconic figures of Ukrainian national culture T. Shevchenko and M. Khyvlovyyi. And, at the same time, he was one of the very few thinkers of the Ukrainian SSR, who combined in his scientific research the ideas of Marxism, Freudianism, structuralism and anthroposophy in the context of a comprehensive understanding of Ukrainian history and culture of the 19th – 20th centuries, including their mystical dimension. Bringing in his central autobiographical work (Plyushch, 2002) on the imaginary podium of their tragic progress or the "history's carnival," a numerous number of its creators, he paid special attention to its ideologists in the USSR:

from the mentioned party figures and their predecessors, the founders of the CPSU V. Lenin, L. Trotsky, J. Stalin and others, to the figures of the Kyiv philosophical school M. Popovych, V. Lisovyi and Y. Pronyuk, who was personally acquainted with him. L. Plyushch highlighted one of discussions with these colleagues from the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR in the context of recollection of the plan he conceived after passing the candidate exam at Kyiv State University “to develop the problem of the meaning of life, starting from the development theory, the theory of reflection and some cybernetic ideas.”

Briefly reproducing the said interesting controversy with these, in his words, “young Kyiv logical positivists,” he critically assessed S. Freud as a “lightweight scientist” and recognized L. Wittgenstein as a thinker whose scientific problems and approach to philosophy are not interesting to him. L. Plyushch, in particular, argued with them about their idea that Marxism was “one of the mystical teachings” and ironically remarked that he “laughed in his heart” at the fact that he, as samizdat participant, was proving then this “official Soviet philosophers” reasonableness of Marxism (Plyushch, 2002: 157). He compared this discussion to his later dialogue with the French philosopher Asulter, a member of the Communist Party of France in 1976, who denied that L. Plyushch was a Marxist, while L. Plyushch recognized him as a “logical positivist” (Plyushch, 2002: 157). L. Plyushch highlighted in memoirs another “interesting conversation” with a “Kyiv positivist,” probably some activist of the Kyiv philosophical school, after 1968. Pointing out that there were “the most numerous logical positivists” in philosophy in the USSR at that time, because they were “supported by scientists and the very process of growing the role of science, in particular mathematics,” he recounted his interlocutor’s vision of “modern Soviet philosophy”: “Now we have all directions of philosophy – from religious to Marxist. Among them, there is a small part of party philosophers, that is, not philosophers, but quoters who only follow the latest instructions. Everyone despises them, but they are almost not afraid: they do not understand anything. Only young Marxists are beaten. That’s what you need, and maybe you’ll understand something now. And you are being beaten because this is the only philosophy that is revolutionary in its content. The rest can all rebel, but rebellion does not follow from their philosophy.” I thanked him for pleasant words for us, young- and neo-Marxists. During Khrushchev’s “thaw,” this acquaintance of mine had access to Lenin’s archives. As he said, there are many unpublished works of Lenin, including philosophical (“ignorant, of course”, – he added)” (Plyushch, 2002: 158-159). Clearly acknowledging the crisis of Marxism-Leninism in the USSR, L. Plyushch illustrated this with a rather interesting example of his conversation with V. Asmus as, in his opinion, “the most prominent Soviet philosopher” who expressed his surprise at the fact that in the USSR “Marxists still remain among the youth”: “It turned out that Asmus had always considered himself a neo-Kantian ... The smartest of party philosophers suspected him of heresy, but could not prove it: “They are not interested in the content. If only there were quotes from Marx, Engels and Lenin” (Plyushch, 2002: 158).

Analyzing various tactics of censored existence of neo-Marxist and post-Marxist philosophers in the Ukrainian SSR, L. Plyushch also mentioned the Soviet “Marxist-Sartrists” and briefly described their “method of philosophical “Aesopian” language”: “Sartrists” hide very simply. If I want to develop this or that Sartre’s idea, I have to bow to the founders (of Marxism-Leninism – *H. V.*) (just one quote) and start smashing Sartre. And it is not necessary to be hypocritical – any intelligent follower of Sartre disagrees with him in something. He writes about this, developing in parallel other Sartre’s ideas. From the outside, this development

looks like a denial of these ideas” (Plyushch, 2002: 159). More than 20 letters by L. Plyushch to relatives and acquaintances, written and sent by him from the said Dnipropetrovsk special mental hospital, are vivid examples of the philosophical and human rights confrontation of L. Plyushch himself to the anti-human psychiatric practice of the Soviet regime in the first half of the 1970s. They were published by the Alexander Herzen Foundation (Khodorovych, 1974), republished by the Suchasnist Publishers in Ukrainian (Medical Case History, 1976), and widely opened to the readership a laboratory of his worldview and philosophical search. These letters testified to the close connection of it with L. Plyushch’s parallel analysis both of the history of Ukrainian and world literature, in particular French and Russian, from their folklore origins to masterpieces of modern and postmodern, and the large-scale range of Soviet and foreign humanities of the 19th and 20th centuries. He showed interest in the poetry of T. Shevchenko “with his inner nobility and aristocracy of the spirit,” which he soon comprehended as “ecstatic poetry” of “shaman and prophet” in monograph “Taras Shevchenko’s Exodus. Apropos “The Soldiers Well.” Twelve Essays” (1986). He combined it with no less in-depth analysis of the works of F. Dostoevsky, in particular through the prism of the ideas of M. Bakhtin’s monograph “Problems of Dostoevsky’s poetics” (1972). Carefully studying the life experience of these two geniuses imprisoned and exiled by Russian tzarism, L. Plyushch no less carefully considered the works of M. Prishvin, F. Schiller, A. de Saint-Exupery and O. Green as “figurative material” for developed at the same time own conceptions about myth as a life-giving force, transforming reality, and “appropriation and taming” as a way of cultural creation in dialogue with others. It is noteworthy that in the twenty-second letter, which is, in fact, the most important for understanding the cultural anthropological guidelines for the search of Plyushch, he stressed that “the whole culture is the cultivating of man from the Darwinian-Freudian monster” in the way of “going beyond man, to the Other and to Nature” (Khodorovych, 1974: 84). And already in his memoirs, Plyushch noted that “there are no pure ideologies” at all, because “they are all psycho-ideologies,” which are “an intertwining of complexes of inferiority, guilt, fear, shame, conscience, hysteria and sexual and social pathology” (Plyushch, 2002: 403).

In his correspondence, he went from detailed professional reflections on Greek sophistry to the studies of A. Losev and G. Batishev, as well as the works of V. Propp and “everything from structural analysis,” including “structuralist articles” and L. Vygotsky’s monograph “Thought and Language” (1934). L. Plyushch paid considerable attention to the variety of topics in the Soviet journals “Questions of Philosophy,” “Questions of Literature,” “Questions of Psychology” and reread the legacy of S. Freud, to whom he treated “with restraint,” but was interested in all the works he had not yet read, such as an article about L. da Vinci. He was interested in classical psychoanalysis and its successors in the light of the categorical imperative of “Vynnychenko’s “honesty with oneself,” or, in fact, “the urge to look the truth in the eye and solve one’s tasks consciously.” Critical of L. Tolstoy and the “religious-ethical position” as such, L. Plyushch outlined the grounds for this belief: “Both Tolstoy and even Nietzsche cannot stand the truth about themselves, about near and far, and form a myth that helps to hide from reality. Personally, this has led to the fact that they themselves have become toys in the hands of their own subconscious. In Nietzsche, this was clearly manifested in the nature of his illness, which revealed that behind his anti-Christianity, God-fighting was hidden the search for God, the search for Christ. It seems that you need to be aware of your subconscious motives and desire to be the master of yourself. For the same reason, you need to see clearly the situation in which the person is “thrown.” Otherwise, it will become a toy of the environment.

Freud's mistake (one of his mistakes) is in ignoring the role of conditions. Fromm and other neo-Freudians try to make a social adjustment to psychoanalysis, but I am only familiar with their studies by rumors" (Khodorovych, 1974: 84). L. Plyushch traced in memoirs the path of his own philosophical growth from the rethinking of Marxism in the light of Freudianism and neo-Freudianism, especially the ideas of S. Freud, E. Fromm and K.-G. Jung, to the transition to structuralism under the influence, in particular, the ideas of V. Propp, L. Vygotsky, K. Levi-Strauss and "works on structural analysis of the University of Tartu." Conducting in it a critical analysis of the "psychoideology of our state," namely the USSR, through these memoirs, he embodied it in the "worlds-myths" of the odious conservative Soviet writers V. Kochetov and I. Shevtsov. It is significant that he condemned them, with their expressive xenophobia, anti-Semitism and many other manifestations, in his words, of the "boorish psyche," and contrasted them with the "phenomenon of national genius – Shevchenko."

V. Lisovyi, like L. Plyushch, also was the victim of a new wave of arrests of Ukrainian nationally-conscious intellectuals that began in Kyiv in 1972. In his final autobiographical reconstruction (Lisovyi, 2014), V. Lisovyi offered his own attempt at a philosophical analysis of his way of life and worldview evolution before, during and after the experience of prison, camps and exile, equal in scale and depth to the memoirs of L. Plyushch and S. Krymskyi (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012). One of the very few connoisseurs banned in the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR at that time samizdat journalism, namely the works of I. Dziuba, V. Moroz, M. Osadchy, Y. Sverstyuk, V. Chornovil, and A. Avtorkhanov, A. Sakharov and A. Solzhenitsyn, as ideological sources of the formation of his civic stand, he revealed it in detail, along with its own philosophical foundations. V. Lisovyi described his ideological transition from Marxism to logical positivism, and later to linguistic philosophy, under the influence of the ideas of G. Ryle, W. Quine, and the "late" L. Wittgenstein, and recognized it as his own "intellectual evolution", corresponding, albeit belatedly, to the "crisis of logical positivism in the West" in the 1940s and 1950s (Lisovyi, 2014: 179). One of the few domestic specialists in the history of world philosophy, then acquainted in the Ukrainian SSR with the works of M. Heidegger and K. Jaspers from their film copies, he had in his home library many other such copies. Among them also were: "almost everything" by E. Husserl in German, S. Freud's "small things" in Russian translations, and monographs in English and German on social philosophy, ethics and philosophy of culture (H. Marcuse, G. Le Bon, J. Dewey, J. Ortega y Gasset, T. Parsons and others), including the works of N. Berdyaev, L. Shestov, V. Rozanov. Noting that the philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR were late with their "entry" into the "western space of intellectual communication" (Lisovyi, 2014: 245), V. Lisovyi explained his direction in his students years from "fragmentary acquaintance with logical positivism" to the adoption of the position of analytical philosophy as, in particular, an effective means of critique of the rhetoric of dialectical materialism (Lisovyi, 2014: 135). He stressed his sharp disapproval than of its official version, which he described as a continuation of the sophistic dialectic with its relativism and as, in fact, a means of justifying the cynical policy of the Soviet government. Also recognized as important for himself, first of all, about twenty books on analytical philosophy in German and English (G. Frege, R. Carnap, A. Ayer, G. Moore, G. Ryle, P. Strawson, W. Sellars, W. Quine and some others), V. Lisovyi identified D. Gauthier's work "Practical Reasoning: The Structure and Foundations of Prudential and Moral Arguments and Their Exemplification in Discourse" (1963) for a "happy discovery" on the way to his transition to the problems of practical philosophy. An important result of this interest was the article "Critique of Scientific Concepts of Scientific and Technological

Progress” (1971) as a prophetic warning of V. Lisovyi about the possible transformation of not only Soviet communist totalitarianism into the technocratic one.

V. Lisovyi highlighted his spiritual growth in the graduate school of Kyiv State University under the non-conformist influence of the original Ukrainian thinkers V. Skurativskiy and O. Pogorilyi. If the first of them interested him in M. Foucault’s work “Words and Things” (1966) and Russian philosophy and literature of the modern era (S. Bulgakov, D. Merezhkovsky, V. Rozanov, L. Shestov and etc.), O. Pogorilyi acquainted him with the teachings of M. Heidegger and K. Jaspers and introduced to the “worlds” of both postmodern Russian Soviet philosophy and the Ukrainian literary process. V. Lisovyi also highlighted in his “Memoirs” his acquaintance with A. Zinoviev and A. Uyomov and their opposition to him while defending his thesis for a candidate’s degree, as well as his “episodic conversations” in the early 1970s, on the very eve of his own arrest, with the ideologists of the Ukrainian human rights movement I. Svitlychny, Y. Sverstiuk and its other well-known figures, such as V. Ovsienko. He recalled his “occasional communication” with the first of them, for example, the detailed I. Svitlychny’s response to written in 1971 and published only two decades later V. Lisovyi’s article “Worldview Horizons of B.-I. Antonych’s Poetry” (1994). He mentioned the cooperation with V. Ovsienko on the distribution of samizdat from 1968 to 1972 and their criminal proceedings. Recalling his friendship with Y. Sverstiuk broadly, V. Lisovyi explored the specifics of his philosophical essays, especially the Christian utopia “Cathedral in scaffolding” (1970) with its concept of moral and religious philosophy, the “reference centers” of which are “Value – Person – Social Environment” (Lisovyi, 2014: 212). Communicating later in exile with him and V. Stus, V. Lisovyi, like L. Plyushch, also realized a large-scale philosophical comprehension of a world cultural heritage from the “Odyssey” and “Iliad” to the works of J. Joyce, R. M. Rilke and A. Camus, as well as, at the same time, conceived in his own poem “Shevchenko” image of Kobzar, in the stream of defined for himself the “broad topic – man and the world in literary works” (Lisovyi, 2014: 318). V. Lisovyi’s person as a Ukrainian post-Marxist of the 1960s and a long-term “prisoner of conscience” in the USSR, as well as his scientific and public activities, attracted the attention of well-known scholars of the Ukrainian diaspora in Canada and the United States, namely philosophers T. Zakydalsky and B. Vitvitsky. The first of them, as a translator and compiler of a collection of samizdat materials (Zakydalsky, 1976), which covered the fate of Soviet political prisoners-philosophers, namely V. Lisovyi, Y. Pronyuk, M. Bondar, such as letters from V. Lisovyi’s wife Vira to Amnesty International, called on the democratic world to actively support them. Recognizing V. Lisovyi as one of the brightest and most original voices in the philosophy of the Ukrainian SSR at that time, B. Vitvitsky regarded his “philosophical silence” as a great loss for Ukrainian philosophy as a whole: “What is truly tragic is the fact, that, for reasons that had nothing to do with Lisovyi’s professional work in the philosophical field, his career was ruined for a decade by arrest (in June 1972) and imprisonment for participating in a protest action against the arrests of other Ukraine’s cultural figures ” (Vitvitsky, 1984: 101).

This is a quote from the first foreign professional Ukrainian-language review of the Ukrainian academic journal “Philosophical Thought” for 1970 – 1979, namely the first decade of its history, published in monthly “Suchasnist” on the very eve of the Gorbachev’s “perestroika.” Critically examining the achievements of the Kyiv philosophical school, Doctor of Philosophy at Columbia University B. Vitvitsky paid special attention in a special section “Vasyl Lisovyi” to this very figure of it as an “extremely gifted thinker” from, remarkably, the “Soviet school of philosophy.” He noted the figure of V. Lisovyi among all participants

of the V. Nychyk's project on studying the scholar heritage of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy for his really "broad knowledge" of the history of philosophy and also "excellent interpretive abilities." B. Vitvitsky praised the above-mentioned article by V. Lisovyi and acknowledged the "deep impression" of another of his articles, "On Methods of Analysis of Texts of Everyday Language" (1970), as a clear manifestation of its author's "ability to good synthesis, subtle analysis and method of philosophical expression," which is "both available and free from the superfluous" (Vitvitsky, 1984: 98). He emphasized that it reflected V. Lisovyi's wide awareness of works on the philosophy of language and philosophy of logic of all important modern Eastern and Western thinkers, which were published in Western Europe, Great Britain and the United States (G. Frege, A. Church, G. Ryle, P. F. Strawson, and others). At the same time, B. Vitvitsky revealed his vision of the first of V. Lisovyi's articles mentioned by us as a critique of "the ideology of scientism and technical materialism," which, in his words, clearly goes beyond bourgeois society and is aimed at condemning what V. Lisovyi considers for "the most terrible product of this ideology," namely "moral nihilism and spiritual emptiness" (Vitvitsky, 1984: 100). L. Plyushch and V. Lisovyi have witnessed both their own and their colleagues, dissident philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, as well as the philosophical and human rights opposition to the repressive policy of the Soviet government both in national and cultural and political and social issues. This confrontation revealed their use of a significant array of world scientific and cultural experience both for the critical reevaluating of official Soviet ideology and for the development of original, in particular philosophical and Ukrainian, ideas and teachings. For the first time after the terrible repressions of the Stalinist regime on the "philosophical front" of the Ukrainian SSR in the 1930s, Ukrainian academic philosophers, figures of Kyiv philosophical school and their colleagues from the institutes of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, especially V. Lisovyi and L. Plyushch, rose to the level of fruitful dialogue and interaction with the Ukrainian human rights and national-cultural movement, as well as the foreign scientific and public community, during their full entry into the world arena in the 1960s.

Conclusions

The results of our research are as follows.

1. An important group of sources for the alternative study of the history of dialogue and interaction of the Kyiv philosophical school with the Ukrainian human rights and national-cultural movement of the second half of the 20th century are both autobiographical reconstructions of the founders of this school, academicians of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi, initiated in T. Chaika's project "The Philosopher's Oral Histories" and memoirs of their fellows-colleagues, philosophers-human rights activists V. Lisovyi and L. Plyushch.
2. Both political and social and national-cultural changes in the Ukrainian SSR during Khrushchev's "thaw" and the early "stagnation", which were quite critically assessed in the memoirs of their witnesses, communists from the Ukrainian diaspora in Canada, scholars and public figures J. Kolasky and P. Kravchuk, gave rise first of all in the said school of new post-Stalinist types of Soviet academic philosophers, non-conformist and dissident, united by a critical reevaluation of Marxism-Leninism in the context of their analysis of the world scientific and cultural heritage.
3. Famous non-conformist philosophers S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi actively

supported both dissident philosophers and activists of the Ukrainian human rights movement. Still, they themselves remained, as a rule, in the field of censored/covert study and development of non/neo/post-Marxist ideas. Dissident philosophers, such as V. Lisovyi and L. Plyushch, creatively developed all these ideas during their public participation in this movement, namely ideological opposition to the Soviet government from a national-patriotic and democratic standpoint.

4. L. Plyushch's ideological path from Marxism to structuralism, as well as W. Lisovyi's progress to linguistic philosophy, revealed their essential conditionality in the world and Ukrainian scientific and cultural heritage, in particular, forbidden in the USSR, such as the achievements of the Shotged Renaissance and their comrades in the sixties. The fruitful and creative antitotalitarian synthesis in their scientific and autobiographical narratives of Ukrainian and academic-philosophical themes led to the development of world-famous philosophical visions of the history of national/cultural building in Ukraine.

References

- Farmer, Kenneth C. (1980) *Ukrainian Nationalism in the Post-Stalin Era. Myth, Symbols and Ideology in Soviet Nationalities Policy*. Hague – Boston – London, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Horskyi, Vilen, and Tatiana Chaika (2014) *I Lived a Happy Life (T. A. Chayka Interview Cycle)*. Kyiv, Izdatelskiy dom D. Burago.
- Khodorovych, Tatiana (1974). *Medical Case History of Leonid Plyushch*. Amsterdam, The Alexander Herzen Foundation.
- Kolasky, John (1968) *Education in Soviet Ukraine: A Study in Discrimination and Russification*. Toronto, Peter Martin Associates.
- Kolasky, John (1979) *The Shattered Illusion. The History of Ukrainian Pro-Communist Organizations in Canada*. Toronto, Peter Martin Associates.
- Kolasky, John (1970) *Two Years in Soviet Ukraine. A Canadian's Personal Account of Russian Oppression and Growing Opposition*. Toronto, Peter Martin Associates.
- Koval, Vitaliy (1989) *"Cathedral" and Around the Cathedral*. Kyiv, Molod.
- Kravchuk, Petro (1993) *From Peter I to Suslov*. Kyiv, Ros'.
- Krawchenko, Bohdan (1985) *Social Change and National Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine*. London, The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Krymskyi, Serhii, and Tatiana Chaika (2012) *Our Life-Long Conversation (T. A. Chayka Interview Cycle)*. Kyiv, Izdatelskiy dom D. Burago.
- Lisovyi, Vasyl (2014) *Memories. Poems*. Ed. by Natalia Velbovets, Vira Lisova, Larysa Turovets-Lisova. – Kyiv: Smoloskyp.
- Medical Case History of Leonid Plyushch / Compiled and annotated by T. Khodorovych* (1976). Suchasnist.
- Plyushch, Leonid (1982) *History's Carnival / Ed., translated, and with introd. by M. Carynnyk*. Suchasnist, 1982.
- Plyushch, Leonid (2002) *In History's Carnival: Testimony*. Kyiv, Fact.
- Rogero, Alexei (2017) *From the History of Soviet Philosophy of the 1960s – 1970s (Part 2)*. *Doxa*, No. 2 (28).
- Sheremeta, Oksana (2013) *Soviet investigations of the philosophic thought of Ukraine: the*

- ideological and administrative context of research strategies. *Philosophical Thought*, No. 1.
- Vdovychenko, Heorhii (2020). Personal Dimensions of the Kyiv Philosophical School and its Images through the Voices of Memory. *Future Human Image*, Volume 14. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/14/11>
- Vdovychenko, Heorhii (2020). Socio-Political Image of the Kyiv Philosophical School: from Internal Resistance to Open Attitude. *Ukrainian Policymaker*, Volume 7. <https://doi.org/10.29202/up/7/10>
- Vilen Horskyi: Touches, Meanings, Contemplations: Collection of Scientific Papers* (2011) Ed. by Maryna Tkachuk. Kyiv, Agrar Media Group.
- Vitvitsky, Bohdan (1984) Philosophy, Politics and Politics in Philosophy (Review of “Philosophical Thought” for 1970 – 1979). *Sucasnist*, № 7-8 (279-280), № 9 (281).
- Woycenko, Ol’ha (1986) *The Annals of Ukrainian Life in Canada. Vol. 7.: Period of Continued Organizational Consolidation and First Steps to Obtain Constitutional Recognition (1960 – 1969)*. Edmonton, CIUS Press.
- Woycenko, Ol’ha (1992) *The Annals of Ukrainian Life in Canada. Vol. 8.: Striving for a new Canada: Official Bilingualism and Multiculturalism (1970 – 1979)*. Edmonton, CIUS Press.
- Zakydalsky, Taras (1976) *Three Philosophers – Political Prisoners in the Soviet Union*. Smoloskyp Publishers, Documents of Ukrainian Samvydav, Smoloskyp Samvydav Series, No.4.