

**Representation of Symon Petliura in Ukrainian  
Nationalist Discourse and Politics of Memory**

by  
Havva Gurbanova

2024  
Nationalism Studies  
Central European University  
Vienna, Austria

Supervisors:  
Prof. Ostap Sereda  
Prof. Andras Pap

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of  
Arts

## **Table of Contents**

Acknowledgement.....	3
Abstract.....	4
Methodology .....	5
Introduction.....	7
I. The Image of Petliura in the Soviet Propaganda .....	16
II. Representation of Symon Petliura in the Ukrainian historiography after the World War II.....	25
2.1 Diaspora/Emigre books.....	25
2.2 Historiographic Representation of Petliura in Contemporary Ukraine (after 1991) .....	36
III. The Contested Place of Symon Petliura in the Collective Memory in Independent Ukraine .....	52
Conclusion .....	95
Bibliography .....	100
1. Primary Sources .....	100
2. Secondary Sources.....	101
a. Books.....	101
b. Articles .....	102
c. Survey .....	103
d. Internet Sources .....	103

## **Acknowledgement**

My deepest and eternal thanks for this work to Professor Ostap Sereda. He patiently imparted knowledge, expanded the work and offered great solutions. Without Professor Ostap Sereda, this study would not have been possible. I express my gratitude and appreciation to him.

I would also like to thank Professor Andras Pap for his patient support throughout this long period. Endless thanks to Professor Liliya Berezhnaya, who always supported me from the very beginning of the study.

I am grateful to my mother Muxliset Gurbanova, whose love I have always felt, for always believing in me and supporting me. I would like to thank my dear husband Cem Patrick Sili for his contribution to my work and always being there for me.

## **Abstract**

This study examines Symon Petliura's influence on Ukrainian society and historiography throughout history. While several aspects of Symon Petliura's life and legacy have been the subject of numerous studies, there hasn't been a thorough synthesis of these viewpoints. Despite continuous initiatives to restore Petliura's reputation in the country today, there are still disagreements about his place in Ukrainian history. To undertake this study, we first look into the Soviet authorities' portrayal of Petliura, paying particular attention to the negative propaganda and the tools to disseminate it. Then, we examine the writings about Petliura that Ukrainian emigre wrote after World War II. This includes analyzing the narratives that have been put together and the portrayals of Petliura. Furthermore, we assess contemporary Ukrainian sources to understand current perspectives on Petliura. This section includes an examination of the significant academic studies, highlighting how Petliura is represented in present-day Ukraine and his position within historical memory. We examined the memory politics of the presidents of Ukraine and several surveys in order to conduct this analysis. The hermeneutic research method was employed throughout the study to interpret and contextualize these findings. The study comes to the conclusion that attempts to rehabilitate and reintegrate Symon Petliura into Ukrainian history are succeeding, and that the public's positive opinion of him has grown. Given the context of the ongoing Russia-Ukraine conflict, Petliura's popularity is probably going to rise.

## **Methodology**

This study explores the place of Symon Petliura in the Ukrainian historiography and public discourse after the World War II, and especially after 1991, and it focuses on the transformation of the perception of Petliura.

Following research questions were addressed in the thesis:

1. How the historical studies and narrative image of Petliura were included into the politics of memory of the Ukrainian emigre community after the World War II?
2. What role the historiographical and public discussions on Petliura played in the transformation of national identity in Ukraine after the collapse of the USSR?
4. How has Petliura's image been drawn and reconstructed in various works?
5. How the image of Petliura is changing in the context of the policy of decommunization and derussification in Ukraine after February 2022?

First chapter of the thesis analyzes Soviet propaganda, the formation of the negative perception of Petliura in Soviet narratives. Such propaganda tools as films, books, and other media used to disseminate Soviet views on Petliura were examined.

The second chapter deals with the image of Symon Petliura in the changing historical context after the Second World War. The literature under survey is divided in two parts: Diaspora and Contemporary. In the first part the mythologization of Petliura in the Ukrainian diaspora historiography were analyzed. In the second part, the more balanced and critical approaches in the contemporary Ukrainian historiography were studied. Here hermeneutic research

method was used to interpret how different authors evaluate Petliura across the time.

The third chapter, Symon Petliura in Modern Ukraine, is a main part of the thesis. Modern Representations such as films, and public opinion surveys (results from various regions of Ukraine, reflecting current perceptions) were used as tools for analysis. Presidential initiatives in memory politics are the main part of the chapter. The actions of Ukrainian presidents to rehabilitate and honor Petliura are analyzed. The chapter is also based on the pilot survey conducted among Ukrainian students of humanities and social sciences in order to gauge expert opinions on Petliura circulating in Ukrainian society today.

## **Introduction**

For a long time, perception of Ukrainian history remained under strict ideological control. The past was approached in two ways: glorification and victimization. Academic studies on Ukrainian history were possible outside Ukraine, in a few academic centers in North America. However, what was called emigre or diaspora history or various interpretations in history books written during the Soviet period also presented distorted ideas about Ukrainian history. The dominant role of nationalist political groups in the intellectual and social life of Ukrainian emigre community before 1991 resulted in the glorification and victimization of Ukrainian national history by the diaspora authors. Glorification was taken from the Soviets, and only the glorified objects were radically altered. Victimization led to the presentation of Ukraine as the victim and pawn of the Soviets, that is, the Moscow administration. This situation makes it impossible to evaluate history and historical persons objectively.

Things began to change, albeit slowly, in independent Ukraine. As the Canadian scholar of Ukrainian historical discourses David Marples commented, “a key factor for Ukraine has been the maintenance of certain perceptions of the past outside the country by a large and politically active Diaspora that arrived in its new homes during or immediately after the Second World War and whose life experience and outlook were conditioned by their experience of the 1920s–1940s. For the most part these new arrivals emanated from the Galicia, region of Western Ukraine, a population with no experience of Soviet rule prior to 1939, but with very firm views on the events that had affected their compatriots in Eastern Ukraine. The result has been

the elaboration of a national history (and other disciplines) outside Ukraine that could be taken up as part of the contemporary state and its official past following the collapse of the Soviet regime and its own version of history, with Russia as the benevolent elder brother and friend of Ukraine. The new histories issued in Ukraine virtually all take up these émigré themes and interpretations to a greater or lesser degree. For a time, after independence, Ukrainian schools relied completely on textbooks by Western academics such as Orest Subtelny, whose book, *Ukraine: a History*, published originally in 1988, became an international best seller”<sup>1</sup>.

Of course, while Ukraine was trying to rewrite its history, the nationalization of history began. Georgiy Kasianov divides this process into two and explains it as follows:

“The first began in the mid-nineteenth century and reached its height in the creation of a grand narrative, Mykhailo Hrushevsky’s *History of Ukraine-Rus’*. The tradition of historical writing that emerged at this stage persisted in Ukrainian Marxist historiography until the end of the Second World War (when it was destroyed as a result of deliberate actions on the part of the authorities); in diaspora historiography it turned into a canon, a true credo. The second stage began in the late 1980s and is still continuing. It differs from the preceding one in that it is taking place under state sponsorship and is an integral part of the nationalization of that state. Secondly, unlike the previous stage, which coincided with the general European phenomenon of the “invention of tradition” and the development of nations, the present stage is unfolding in an era of globalization, the fading of cultural boundaries, and the

---

<sup>1</sup> David R. Marples, *Heroes and Villains, Creating National History in Contemporary Ukraine*, Budapest, CEU PRESS, 2007, pp. 11-12.



large-scale aggression of international forms of mass culture. At the same time, it bears all the characteristics of intellectual déjà` vu, since it is an obvious reprise of an “unfinished modernization project” and a means of carrying out intellectual and ideological tasks of the nineteenth century; hence its rather obvious association with an ideological and political agenda”<sup>2</sup>.

The problem that arises from nationalization of history is again about suffering. Here Kasianov gives an example from Mark von Hagen's “lacrimogenesis”. Fetishizing the “long-suffering people”; emphasizing its losses (and consciously or unconsciously exaggerating them); intensifying the emotional stress associated with certain terrible facts and events; attempting to explain present-day failures by invoking large-scale “genetic losses,” “elite betrayals,” and “perfidious enemies”; the frequent use of invective and adjectives such as “terrible,” “frightful,” “murderous,” “hostile,” and “mortal”; as well as nouns like “terror,” “losses,” “treason,” “perdition,” and so on—all these are the first and most obvious characteristics of the classic canon of nationalized history. Kasianov adds: “In this discourse Ukraine “wishes,” “is able,” “suffers,” “strives,” “struggles,” “aspires,” “wins”; it is “oppressed,” “plundered,” and “exploited.” It is a living being with its own emotions, diseases and conflicts—and in this regard it is highly tempting to draw parallels with the basic outlook of organic nationalism, for which the nation is also a living entity. Nationalized history is a perfectly legitimate intellectual product both from the viewpoint of public demand and because of the

---

<sup>2</sup>Georgiy Kasianov, Laboratory of Transnational history, Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography, Budapest, CEU Press, 2009, p.20; *Memory Clash, The Politics of History in and around Ukraine 1980s-2010s*, Budapest, CEU Press, 2022, pp. 193-194.

need to “catch up” or “fill in a gap”<sup>3</sup>. The other important problem of nationalization of history says Kasianov, is to create a national pantheon. Commenting on the attempt to create such an “All Ukrainian” pantheon in the highly regionalized society of Ukraine before 2022, Kasianov noticed that while Taras Shevchenko is included in this pantheon, it was impossible to include nationalistic icons such as Ivan Mazepa, Symon Petliura, and Stepan Bandera<sup>4</sup>.

After Revolution of Dignity, in Ukrainian historiography was a clear tendency to prioritize heroic history. In this case too, Ukraine was not alone in writing its own history. Although it was not possible to make a clear distinction between Western and Eastern Ukraine on the map, there were differences of opinion in Ukraine. Russia, using the large number of Russian population living in Ukraine, continued to influence Ukrainian history. Russia instrumentally was using Ukraine’s complex situation to strengthen its own domination in the region and to keep Ukraine in its sphere of influence. Russia was considering Ukraine an inevitable part of its imperial past and struggles to force Ukraine to remain a part of its imperial future. The annexation of Crimea, the war in Donbass backed by Russia played a key role in turning back to nationalized history. There was no need to produce anything new for this. It was enough to return to how modern Ukrainian history was perceived by the emigre scholars. Its legitimacy was unquestionable since it was banned during the Soviet years, and some of its founders were eliminated both from history and memory<sup>5</sup>. Revival of the classical narrative brought back into circulation names and dates that had been partially forgotten or taboo. And now the situation is changing.

---

<sup>3</sup>Kasianov, *Laboratory of Transnational History*, pp. 21-23.

<sup>4</sup>Kasianov, *Laboratory of Transnational History*, p.20

<sup>5</sup>Kasianov, *Memory Clash*, p.197.

With the beginning of the war, probably many new names will be added to this national pantheon.

Symon Petliura, one of the most controversial figures of the twentieth-century Ukrainian history, the Chief Ataman and the head of the Directory of Ukrainian National Republic in 1919-1920, is one of the people whose name are added to this pantheon. Today, debates continue about Symon Petliura, who cannot be decided whether he is a nationalist, hero or a traitor, a *pogromshik*. There are two important debates about Petliura that continue to this day. The first is on the Petliura's Warsaw treaty with Jozef Pilsudski and the second is on the Jewish pogroms in the Ukrainian territory during the revolutionary period.

The figure of Symon Petliura is still being rehabilitated in Ukrainian public discourse today and his place in Ukrainian historiography is still unclear, although the predominant representation of him today is increasingly idealized. The study on Petliura in Ukrainian historiography can be divided into two periods: Diaspora/Emigration and contemporary Ukraine. Ukrainian diaspora historiography is mainly dominated by apologetic tendencies and excessive glorification of the personality of Petliura. These studies lack balance and objective analysis. When it comes to contemporary Ukraine, as Sergiy Lytvyn says, modern post-communist historiography is characterized by the inertia of narrow mind, conservatism, and political and ideological caution. Representations of the role of Petliura in the history of Ukraine are predominantly one-sided and come down mainly to consideration of the internal situation, interpersonal relations

of the leaders of the UPR, to the “atamanshchina” and to the odious Jewish pogroms.<sup>6</sup> However, studies conducted in the last ten years vary.

We can explain the process of Petliura becoming an important part of Ukrainian history again in independent Ukraine as follows. As Serhy Yekelchuk mentions in his article “In Ukraine as well as in other Soviet republics the disintegration of party ideological controls in the late 1980s brought to prominence new symbolic markers of collective identity. These symbols usually came from the rich depository of the national past and were presented to the public as the restoration of the nation’s historical memory. Patriotic activists, who served as the promoters of the new canon, depicted it rhetorically as the opposite of Soviet dogma and a revival of the organic, anthropomorphized nation, which needed to shed the imposed Soviet memory in order to recover its true national self”<sup>7</sup>.

Petliura's exoneration began in modern-day Ukraine in 2005 with a public campaign of collective respect initiated by the Ukrainian President Viktor Yushenko. Yushchenko, a proponent of Ukraine's Orange Revolution, sought to counter the legacy of Soviet narratives about Ukraine's past by granting “Hero of Ukraine” status to Stepan Bandera, the highly controversial leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), in 2010.

Works on the rehabilitation of Petliura in Ukraine were going on even before Yushchenko’s victory in the elections. On May 23, 2004, an All-Ukrainian Commission was organized to prepare for the celebration of the 125th anniversary of Petliura’s birth. Together with

---

<sup>6</sup>Sergiy Lytvyn, *Sud Istorii: Symon Petlura i Petluriana*, Kyiv, Vydavnytstvo Imeni Oleny Telegi, 2001, p. 20.

<sup>7</sup>Serhy Yekelchuk, National Heroes for a New Ukraine: Merging the Vocabularies of the Diaspora, Revolution, and Mass Culture, *Ab Imperio*, N:3, 2015, 97-123.

Ukrainian historians and librarians, the last president of the Ukrainian People's Republic in exile, Mykola Plaviuk, and the representative of the Petliura Foundation in Great Britain, Roland Franko held a press conference at which he announced the creation of a virtual museum of Symon Petliura on the internet. The main task of the committee was to erect a monument to Petliura in Kyiv. The project relied primarily on funds from the British Symon Petliura Foundation; its organizers could not even open a bank account in Ukraine due to lack of government permission. (The decree authorizing official recognition of the anniversary stalled in the *Verkhovna Rada*, Ukraine's parliament, as the Communist Party of Ukraine opposed it politically.) However, the committee independently proceeded with plans to honor Petliura. The exhibition "Symon Petliura: Knight of the Ukrainian Revolution" was opened at the National Historical Museum, at the Kyiv City House of Teachers – the place of the proclamation of the UPR – and at the Museum of Local Lore in Poltava, the city of Petliura's birth held a meeting on the occasion of the remembrance. On May 22, the committee planned a ceremonial laying of flowers on Independence Square and a memorial service for Petliura in the St. Volodymyr's Cathedral. By May 2005, was announced a new turn for Petliura, publishing a decree that provided for a number of official measures to honor the leaders of the UPR. In accordance with the decree, an organizing committee was created to achieve the goal of honoring the leaders of the UPR by installing monuments (including Petliura) in cities throughout Ukraine, publishing scholarships, museum exhibitions, and issuing commemorative coins. In May 2006, a number of scientific

and commemorative events were held especially in honor of Petliura, including a ceremony at the National Opera in Kyiv<sup>8</sup>.

In April 2015 the Ukrainian parliament passed a series of so-called decommunization laws, which forcefully asserted the nationalizing version of the country's history. In addition to designating Soviet rule as criminal and banning the use of Soviet symbols, the legislation established an authoritative list of "twentieth-century fighters for Ukraine's freedom and independence."<sup>9</sup>

The process of exonerating Symon Petliura continues and work is still continuing. Of course, one of the important points is not only how Petliura is discussed in the books, but also how he is evaluated and seen among the Ukrainian people. Today, who Symon Petliura is for the Ukrainian people is a subject that needs to be investigated. In November 2018, the sociological group "Reyting" conducted a survey about attitudes towards Simon Petliura. 13% were completely positive about Simon Petliura, 17% were rather positive, 10% did not know about him, 29% of respondents found it difficult to answer the question asked, 9% were rather negative, and 21% were completely negative. At the same time, in the ranking of the positive attitude of Ukrainians towards historical figures, Symon Petliura was on the 7th place after Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Ivan Mazepa, Leonid Brezhnev, Peter I and Stepan Bandera. In the anti-rating, Petliura was fifth after

---

<sup>8</sup>*The Burden of the Past. History, memory and Identity in Contemporary Ukraine*, edited by Anna Wylegala, Malgorzata Glowacka Grajper, Indiana University Press, 2020, p. 121-122.

<sup>9</sup>Serhy Yekelchuk, National Heroes for a New Ukraine: Merging the Vocabularies of the Diaspora, Revolution, and Mass Culture, *Ab Imperio*, N:3, 2015, 97-123. p.98.

Stalin, Gorbachev, Lenin and Stepan Bandera<sup>10</sup>. Of course, Petliura's image and perception has been changing every year.

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.istpravda.com.ua/articles/2021/05/21/159546/>

## I. The Image of Petliura in the Soviet Propaganda

Symon Petliura is one of the most vilified figures in Soviet history. If we look at how the Soviets portrayed Ukraine's war of independence, which started in 1917, the government of the Ukrainian People's Republic is called nothing less than "an agency of interventionists in Ukraine, traitors who at the beginning of 1918 called on the German occupiers". The name of S. Petliura was mentioned only with humiliating, crushing assessments. The Soviet authors introduced Petliura as a pogromist, without any references or confirmation, imposing the opinion that "during 1919, the Petliuraites carried out 800 pogroms, torturing and killing about 100 thousand Jews". Manifestations of any national consciousness are mercilessly stigmatized<sup>11</sup>. In the Soviet Union, Petliura's supporters were called *Petlurovtsy*. Soviet Ukrainian identity had a different "other" in the figure of a Petliurovtsy, an anti-Soviet Ukrainian from the revolutionary period. The term "Petliurite" in both positive and negative sense became widespread already during the Ukrainian Revolution. In everyday usage, "Petliurites" replaced the earlier tsarist labeling of all patriotic Ukrainians as "Mazepists". Only after the war would these connotations be transferred to the term "Banderites." Stalin continued referring to anti-Soviet Ukrainians as "Petliurites" long after Petliura's assassination and the emergence of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) as the new, leading militant force among

---

<sup>11</sup>Sergiy Lytvyn, *Sud Istorii: Symon Petlura i Petluriana*, Kyiv, Vydavnytstvo Imeni Oleny Telegi, 2001. p. 13-14.



Ukrainians abroad. Any person suspected of disloyalty to the official version of Soviet Ukrainian identity—which after the 1930s was increasingly defined as pro-Russian—could be branded a “Petliurite” or “Banderite”<sup>12</sup>.

Eradicating the traces of Soviet historicism has been a long process and is still ongoing. This hostility of the Soviets and their ban on Petliura can also be seen in today's Russia-Ukraine war. In March 2022, after one month after Russia's full scale invasion, there were published reports in Ukrainian media about the purge of schools and libraries in the Russian occupied territories. Russian military police and administrators were culling books, any academic publications devoted to Ukrainian resistance to the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. To the list of anti-Russian Ukrainian historical figures was included Symon Petliura too. Some books were even taken to Moscow where some fifty Russian historians and educators analyzed them for the presence of anti-Russian interpretations<sup>13</sup>.

In general, the Russian media note that S. Petliura was supported by a minority of the Ukrainian population, and the majority fought in the ranks of the Red Army. In addition, Russian sources claim that all political forces of the UPR condemned Petliura's signing of the Warsaw Pact and considered him a traitor. For decades, Soviet propaganda formed a negative image of Petliura, which has not yet received proper critical assessment. The propaganda of the Russian Federation takes advantage of the incompleteness of the process of formation of national

---

<sup>12</sup> Serhy Yekelchuk, “Good Ukrainians vs Petliurites: The Ukrainian Revolution as a Soviet, Young-Adult Tale”, *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, volume III, No. 1, 2016, 111-136.

<sup>13</sup> Serhy Yekelchuk, *Writing the Nation, The Ukrainian Historical Profession in Independent Ukraine and the Diaspora*, ibidem-Verlag, Stuttgart, 2023. p. 13-14.

memory in Ukraine, in particular the search for national heroes. Petliura is also accused of Jewish pogroms and Russophobia. Thus, the Russian Federation, continuing the traditions of Soviet propaganda, is trying to discredit the entire Ukrainian national liberation movement and completely shift the blame for the Jewish pogroms of 1917–1921. to Ukraine, whitewashing the Russian anti-Semitism of the troops of General Denikin and the Red Army<sup>14</sup>.

In Russian materials, Petliura is portrayed as a subordinate of Pilsudski, who had neither his own army, nor territory, nor political followers. Russian media and academic sources constantly exaggerate, claiming that the Warsaw Pact was not an equal union, but rather a protectorate of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth over Ukraine. They created the image of Petliura as a so-called bourgeois nationalist and anti-Semite.

Going back to Soviet propaganda, the Soviet Union made great efforts to spread propaganda against Petliura. For this purpose, films were made, new Ukrainian heroes were produced to replace Petliura, and studies were published. Among them, one of the most popular works is the memoirs of general Yurko Tyutyunnyk. Yuri Osypovych Tyutyunnyk was a wartime officer of the Russian Imperial Army, then a Ukrainian officer, general-cornet of the army of the Ukrainian People's Republic. In 1923, he was summoned to Ukraine with a lie and arrested. It is written that he did not agree to cooperate with the Soviets for a long time, but was last brought together with his wife and daughter and forced to cooperate with Soviets. On August 15, Tyutyunnyk publishes an appeal “To all Ukrainian soldiers in exile”. It was reported

---

<sup>14</sup>*Spadshina Pilsudskogo ta Petlury*, ed. Valentyna Balyuka, Yuriya Makar, Mykola Doroshka, Kyiv, UMKS, 2021. pp. 263-267.

to the general public that he went over to the side of the Soviet government voluntarily. Starred in the propaganda art-documentary film “P.K.P.” (Pilsudsky Kupil Petluru) (“Pilsudsky Bought Petliura”), where he played himself<sup>15</sup>. And he wrote the memoirs reviewed above, which is named “Z Poljakamy Protvy Vkrainy” (“With Poles Against Ukraine”)<sup>16</sup>. It is clear that the entire 105 pages were written solely to disparage Symon Petliura.

Tyutyunnyk starts his words with these words: “Through bitter and difficult experience,”. Tyutyunik wrote in his statement to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, “I had to become convinced that social counter-revolution is at the same time a national counter-revolution. Gradually and unnoticed by myself, I, like the entire Ukrainian emigration, turned in the hands of Ukraine’s enemies into a weapon against it. And my last attack on Ukraine in the autumn of 1921 showed me clearly that I played the role of an executor of the dark intrigues of the Polish imperialists. One more step - and I would have to go to the bottom - to play the role of a conscious traitor to my nation, to fight against what was and is most dear to me, and to defend what I hate. Emigration plays such a role, wanting to please its bread-givers...”<sup>17</sup>

In fact, it was written as “Petliura's army” to show that it was not written by force and the words were not changed, and it was even stated here that “of course, we could have called it a gang, but since the author called it an army, the army remained”<sup>18</sup>. Tyutyunnyk emphasizes

---

<sup>15</sup><https://uinp.gov.ua/istorychnyy-kalendar/kviten/20/1891-narodyvsya-yuriy-tyutyunnyk-general-horunzhyy-armiyi-unr> (23.01.2024).

<sup>16</sup>Yuri Tyutyunnyk, *Z Poljakamy Protvy Vkrainy*, Derjavne Vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1924, Harkiv.

<sup>17</sup>Tyutyunnyk, p. 4-5.

<sup>18</sup>Tyutyunnyk, p. 5.

that the main traitors are German, French and Polish. He mentioned that the UNR administration was oppressing the peasants and workers. He explained in detail that Petliura and his men were operating in Tarnov, Poland, after the Riga agreement signed between the Soviets and Poland, and explained their plans for Ukraine<sup>19</sup>.

He says that the nationalists in Galicia chose to fight with Denikin against the Soviets rather than join the Polish imperialists. Saying that establishing an army was not Petliura's success, Tyutyunnyk emphasizes that even Pilsudski preferred to reach an agreement with Makhno before him. He says that Petliura offered Galicia, Holmschina and Volhynya to Poland. Tyutyunnyk, who says that the Poles closed Ukrainian schools in these regions and tortured the peasants and workers, writes that Petliura knowingly watched this from Warsaw, where he escaped silently<sup>20</sup>. He also did not forget to mention pogroms. He wrote about Petliura's that "a characteristic feature of Petliura is his reluctance to take responsibility for decisions, and all the time he is on his own and not his territory, he consults, although neither meeting obliges him to anything. These meetings are convened by Petliura solely for the purpose, in case of failure, of assigning responsibility to all free or non-free advisers. It's not for nothing that a whole series of anecdotes about Petliura's "environment" have been compiled"<sup>21</sup>. Showing Petliura as a coward who avoids responsibility is not only in this work, we will see these in later films as well.

The entire book is full of such statements and says that the people in Ukraine did not support Petliura at all and that he was deceiving the people by falsely claiming that the people in Ukraine were

---

<sup>19</sup>Tyutyunnyk, p.6.

<sup>20</sup>Tyutyunnyk, p.14.

<sup>21</sup>Tyutyunnyk,p.26.

rebellious for independence. In fact, he repeatedly emphasized that the peasants and workers had now established an order and wanted to survive, and that they did not support Petliura and his men.

On February 12, 1929, Yuri Tyutyunnyk was arrested for the second time, accused of “propaganda of Ukrainian fascism and concealment of a counter-revolutionary element”. On October 20, 1930, he was shot in Moscow. On November 28, 1997, Tyutyunnyk was rehabilitated by the decision of the General Prosecutor's Office of Ukraine.

Yet the strongest role in the dissemination of negative portrayal of Petliura was played by the history films produced through the 1920s and 1930s, especially by the 1939 film *Shchors* directed by Oleksandr Dovzhenko<sup>22</sup>. The film was commissioned by Joseph Stalin. It is a biography of the partisan leader and Ukrainian Bolshevik Nikolai Shchors. In 1918-1919 he fought against Ukrainian People's Republic<sup>23</sup>. Shchors was a hero that the Soviets tried to create in Ukraine in contrast to Petliura. There was even a statue of Shchors on a horse in Kyiv, Ukraine, until last month. The statue, which was attacked several times, was finally removed<sup>24</sup>.

The film begins with the battle of the Ukrainians with the German army in the sunflower field representing Ukraine, and the Ukrainians saying “The Germans are coming, the landlords are with them”. A few young Ukrainians go to Shchors to deliver news and get help. The response given by the Ukrainians who came to Shchors here

---

<sup>22</sup><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NZy5bqBlhxI&t=12s> (10.10.2023).

<sup>23</sup>George E. Liber, Dovzhenko, “Stalin and the (Re)creation of Shchors”, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol.21, No 3/4, 1997, pp. 271-286.

<sup>24</sup><https://suspilne.media/culture/635412-pamatnik-sorsu-v-kievi-vid-stvorennia-do-demontazu-u-foto/> (27.01.2024)

when soldier asked for documents is interesting: “We have a few documents, Petliura's, Hetman's”, says one, while the other says, “I also have some documents that the Germans gave” and shows the whip marks on his back. Shchors is invited to save the Ukrainians oppressed by the Gaydamaks or the Germans, he is the only hope. In the text written by Shchors, those who join the army swear to “To fight against Petliura, Hetman and the tyranny of capitalism”. Having won the victory in Chernihiv, Shchors' army attends a wedding, and those at the celebration use such an expression: “The end of Petliura has come”. When the people at the celebration are asked whose side they are on, they answer, “We are neutral. We support whoever wins”, but at the end of the event, the bride leaves the groom and chooses Shchors' “fearless soldier”. And Shchors makes a speech: “We will defeat Petliura and the landowners. We will take the land from them and distribute it to the peasants”.

After this scene, Petliura is seen in the 48th minute. While Petliura does not shy away from emphasizing his own status in his speech, he says that the workers are about to tear them apart, the Jews remain silent, and no one is happy about the declaration of UPR. Those around him voice different opinions: “America needs to recognize us, we need to give two million from the safe to the two Americans who come”. It is an important detail to state that there is money in the state. Petliura, on the other hand, is someone who is helpless. He is not “daredevil” like Shchor. Petliura is shown as the one who supports factory owners, landlords and rich peasants. Later in the scene, Petliura jumps in fear when he hears that Shchors is heading towards Kyiv. In general, Petliura is a coward and a rash person. Later in the movie, his soldiers begin to join Shchors' army. The people are afraid of Petliura.

Shchors is the people, Petliura is the bourgeois. The people, who are afraid of Petliura, trust and love Shchors.

One of the striking scenes is the people giving *horilka* to Shchors. Shchors says here, “I don't drink horilka, and I don't let my soldiers drink it either”. In return, the mujik replies: “The Petliura's men drank it like fish”. It is once again emphasized that Petliura and his men cannot fight without drinking and that they are cowards. In another scene, an old man says that he wants to fight against Petliura, even the children express that they want to join the war, and Shchors says “Are you going to fight against Petliura?” He says “Yes” with enthusiasm. In the film, the importance of Ukraine for the revolution is shown and it is emphasized that the people are on the side of the Bolsheviks, and they are the only ones on the side of the peasants and workers. The people chose Shchors and rejected Petliura or all other powers.

The film ends with Shchors' victory and Bozhenko's<sup>25</sup> death. The film is very important in terms of showing the extent of propaganda against Petliura. When we look at the years when the film was published and prepared, it allows to think that Petliura was still seen as a threat in the Soviets, even though 13 years had passed since his death.

#### *Pilsudski Kupil Petliuru (P.K.P.)*

*Pilsudski Kupil Petliuru (P.K.P.)*<sup>26</sup> Soviet silent feature film, was filmed at the All-Ukrainian Photo and Film (VUFKU) Administration studio in 1926. Known for the participation of Yuri

---

<sup>25</sup>Bozhenko Vasily Nazarovich is a Russian revolutionary, a participant in the Civil War of 1918-1922, one of the organizers of the Red Guard and partisan detachments in Ukraine.

<sup>26</sup><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nfCz8woy1iI> (14.11.2023)

Tyutyunnyk in it, who played himself in the film. The film premiered on September 28, 1926 (Kyiv), June 8, 1928 (Moscow).

The film begins with a scene where a Ukrainian peasant decipheres in his own way the abbreviation of the state railway “Polska Kolej Paristwowa” - P.K.P., as “Pilsudski bought Petliura”. Hotel “Bristol”. Petliura and Pilsudski meet, Petliura, who at first opposes Pilsudski's offer, accepts the offer when Pilsudski offers a million marks and divides Ukraine into two on the map (giving the western part to Pilsudski). Poles start looting in Ukraine and in the movie Poles are seen taking away sacks of sugar, bread, etc. Kotovsky's cavalry opposes the Poles. The Poles are defeated, Petliura flees to Poland. The film shows Petliura and the Direktoriya's escape to Poland for several minutes.

Petliura appoints Tyutyunnyk to lead the rebellion in Ukraine. Meanwhile, Soviet Ukraine is recovering with its workers and peasants. The text appears on the screen: “The chauvinist intelligentsia is waiting for the UPR yellow and blue flag”. The oppression inflicted on the villagers by the expositura while preparing for the rebellion is shown. While they live well, they beat the villagers. At the same time, Petliura, who lives in Poland, is shown to be in a good mood, participating in entertainment and drinking and having fun with his wife. Head of the Ukrainian Underground Dnistro deceives everyone by saying that he works and collects the money. He is shown drinking at a party and becoming completely drunk. In one scene, a woman prepared by the Poles comes to Petliura and says, “Petliura batushka, come to Ukraine, what are you doing here? Save us. Ukrainian Napoleon”. Petliura is flattered and they raise their glasses to him, while the Poles laugh sheepishly on the sidelines. Tyutyunnyk is at the head of the rebellion,



they are preparing for the rebellion, but the Bolsheviks learn about this and attack.

This one-hour short silent film tried to show “the incompetence, salesmanship and indifference” of Petliura and the UPR management. The most important scene is the division of Ukraine into two by Petliura on the map in the most striking way. Considering the period in which it was released, it can be said that the film was effective.

## **II. Representation of Symon Petliura in the Ukrainian historiography after the World War II**

### **2.1 Diaspora/Emigre books**

After the Second World War, a number of Ukrainians chose to settle in other countries, were forced to do so, or chose not to return from where they had been taken as laborers during the war. A wave of emigration to the United States and Canada had already occurred. It is estimated that 15000 Ukrainians settled in the USA and 70000 in Canada after the Second World War. The new immigrants were mostly Galician and did not get along well with the settled Ukrainians who were there before them, mostly farmers in Canada and industrial workers in the US. This new wave of immigrants was mostly educated and nationalistic. While the children of the older generation assimilated into North American culture, the newcomers strongly rejected it. John Paul Himka mentions that by the 1960s this second wave of migrants and their children had become leaders in Ukrainian society there. For the newcomers, the war was not over, it was still going on because the Soviets had won. Of course, some of them collaborated with Nazi Germany, but they saw themselves as independence fighters, fighting both Germany and the Soviets. They did not mention their collaboration

with Nazi Germany in killing Jews, nor their crimes against the Polish people. This is how the diaspora explained itself, Himka says in his article: “They explained that Ukrainians joined the Waffen-SS division because Germany was clearly losing the war at the time of its formation in the spring of 1943, and Ukrainians wanted to use the division to form the basis of an independent Ukrainian army that would defend the land against Soviet invaders. The division had insisted that it could only be used on the Eastern front. Far from being pro-German, the members of the division were merely using the Germans in order to establish an independent Ukrainian state. These were patriots and could not be called collaborators”<sup>27</sup>. This defense continued until the Soviet and Polish archives were opened in the 1980s. Over time, as films and documents emerged, the Diaspora turned to victimization to defend itself and anti-Semitism was reawakened. In his article, Himka also shares the names of people and websites in North America who still write and post anti-Semitic articles. Himka points out that victimization and anti-Jewish narratives became rallying points for Ukrainians, especially victimization has turned out to be the behavioral pattern, and the nursing of injuries to a cultural reflex.

In addition to Canada and the USA, a large number of Ukrainians were in Germany at the end of the Second World War. These people, most of whom were forced laborers, did not want to return to the Soviet Union after the end of the war. In West Germany there were about a hundred Displaced Persons' Camps for Ukrainians, where they tried to assert their identity. According to the data, 30 to 40 percent of

---

<sup>27</sup>John Paul Himka, A Central European Diaspora under the Shadow of World War II: The Galician Ukrainians in North America, *Austrian History Yearbook*, Volume 37, 2006, pp. 17 – 31.

the 200,000 Ukrainian DPs who remained in the western regions of Germany after 1945 were refugees who actively left their homeland for fear of Soviet rule; the rest were former slave laborers imported by the Germans<sup>28</sup>. Some of these people were people involved in the OUN-b organization and their goal was to gain recognition as a national group from the Western Allies and thus prevent forced repatriation and, in the long run, to free Ukraine from both Soviet and Russian rule. Of course, these people were also fighting against Poland. These people, who were mostly in managerial positions in the camps, followed a very nationalist path. For example, all languages except Ukrainian were forbidden to be used in the camps. The same pressure was applied on religion. For nationalization the people in the camps education was used as one of the main tools. As Jan Hinnerk Antons points out “Education became especially important for conveying national traditions, values, and attributes to the next generation and preserving them for a future independent state”<sup>29</sup>. One of the tools of nationalization was historical narrative. For this purpose some commemorative days and national holidays were commemorated and celebrated. It is interesting that they commemorated Petliura despite his close relationship with Poland. Hrushevsky was not important to them because he had returned to Ukraine in agreement with the Soviets. But Petliura, who was considered a traitor because he had broken unity with his agreement with Poland, suddenly became an important figure. On the twentieth anniversary of his death, a monument to Petliura was erected in

---

<sup>28</sup>Jan Hinnerk Antons, The Nation in a Nutshell? Ukrainian Displaced Persons Camps in Postwar Germany, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 2020, Vol. 37, No: 1/2 (2020), pp. 177-212

<sup>29</sup>Jan Hinnerk Antons, The Nation in a Nutshell? Ukrainian Displaced Persons Camps in Postwar Germany, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 2020, Vol. 37, No: 1/2 (2020), pp. 177-212

Heidenau, which today can be found in the Ukrainian section of the local cemetery. In any case, when choosing the heroes to be commemorated, it was important that they had fought against the main enemy, Russia and later Poland. Here also we can see, presenting Ukraine as a victim of neighboring powers. Of course, the issue of collaboration with the Nazis against the Jews was completely rejected, even Panas Fedenko, who was one of the first to raise this issue, had to leave the meeting because his life was in danger.

The main aim of these people who united here was to create a Ukrainian nation separate from the Russians and Poles and to stand against the Soviet system. Some of these people were anti-Soviet and some were Nazi collaborators. What united these people was their extreme nationalist feelings and ideas.

For this reason, it is difficult to see an objective point of view in the books written by the Ukrainian diaspora after the Second World War. Both their extreme nationalism, their efforts to overcome negative propaganda in the fight against the Soviets, and their anti-Jewish attitudes exclude their works from objective evaluation.

To review the books we will start from *Symon Petliura Iak Polityk i Derzhavny Muzh*<sup>30</sup>, written by Oleksandr Lototsky, provides a thorough analysis of Petliura's life and political career, portraying him as a national symbol of Ukraine's struggle for independence from both the Soviet Union and the Russian Empire. The author, Oleksandr Lototsky (1870-1939), was an Ukrainian public and political figure, writer, publicist and scientist who served in imperial administration in

---

<sup>30</sup>Oleksandr Lototsky, *Symon Petliura Iak Polityk i Derzhavny Muzh*, Paris, London: Soborna Ukraina, 1951.

Kyiv and St. Petersburg and later became one of the organizers of the Ukrainian National Rada in Petrograd. The book, which was published for the 25th anniversary of Petliura's death, set the canonical standard of his representation in the Ukrainian emigre historiography. In the opening pages of the book, Lototsky acknowledges Petliura's place in Ukrainian history as a revered figure, citing the yearly celebrations held in his honor as proof of his lasting influence. From an early age, he emphasizes Petliura's patriotism, stressing his work as a journalist and his attempts to Ukrainianize the army. Terms like "Petlurowschina", which are meant to undermine Ukraine's rightful struggle for independence from Russian imperialism, are refuted by Lototsky. The author emphasizes the importance of Petliura's fight for independence and his fortitude in the face of outside pressure by drawing comparisons between him and historical characters like Cossack Hetman Ivan Mazepa, who was traditionally perceived as a symbol of the Ukrainian Cossack anti-Russian autonomism. He draws attention to Petliura's steadfast support for Ukrainian independence and his initiatives to bring together the working class, peasants, and intelligentsia. He also explores Petliura's foreign policy endeavors, highlighting his attempts to build relationships with nations such as Georgia and England and to secure backing from European states. According to the author, Petliura was a strategic thinker who recognized the value of foreign alliances in Ukraine's struggle for independence.

The book's examination of Petliura's position on the church issue is one of its standout features. Lototsky highlights Petliura's wish for political autonomy from the patriarch of Moscow and his idea of an autocephalous Ukrainian church governed by the Kyiv Metropolitan. The author's goal in writing Petliura's biography is to present him as a

statesman and patriot, elevating him to the status of a national hero and highlighting his continuing importance in Ukrainian history. Lototsky ends the book with a tribute to Petliura's eternal memory and glory in an attempt to immortalize his memory and legacy by portraying Petliura as a mythic figure. In conclusion, his writing honors Symon Petliura by showing him as a key player in the Ukrainian independence movement and emphasizing his lasting reputation as a national hero.

In the same year, 1951, Symon Petliura was depicted in Petro Sahajdacznyj's (it was, obviously, a pen name, taken from a famous Cossack leader of the early seventeenth century) book named *V Yoho Tini*<sup>31</sup> as both the embodiment and symbol of Ukrainian independence in addition to being a military leader. Similarly to Lototsky, by drawing comparisons between Petliura and Ivan Mazepa, Sahajdacznyj presents Petliura as a supporter of Mazepa's beliefs and goals for Ukrainian sovereignty. The way the author portrays Petliura's early life emphasizes his awareness of the suffering of his people and his desire to become independent and build an army in Ukraine. Petliura was instrumental in uniting the army and steering it toward victory in the independence war. The narrative presents Petliura and the Ukrainian war of independence as being closely related. Sahajdacznyj speculates that Petliura was well-liked and regarded as a representation of the country's liberation struggle. In light of the geopolitical circumstances of the day, the author defends Petliura's decisions, including the Warsaw Agreement, as practical ones made with Ukraine's best interests in mind.

---

<sup>31</sup>Petro Sahajdacznyj, *V Yoho Tini, Symon Petliura v Istorii Ukrainskogo Narodu*, Ukrainske Vydavnytsvo, New-York, 1951.

Sahajdacznyj depicts Petliura as a unifying figure who transcends partisan politics and represents the aspirations of the entire Ukrainian people, despite subsequent defeats and the start of the emigration period. Petliura's involvement in pogroms and other criticisms are downplayed or ignored by the author, who instead emphasizes Petliura's inclusive rhetoric about the Ukrainian People's Republic being a republic for all peoples and minorities. In response to Petliura's accusation of dishonor arising from agreements with Poland, Sahajdacznyj argues that such agreements were typical of Ukrainian history and frequently required for survival. The author highlights Petliura's lasting legacy, implying that his principles and demeanor inspire the Ukrainian people even after his passing.

In the last chapters, Sahajdacznyj compares Petliura to Mazepa once more, showing Petliura as a hero whose enemies despise him, just like Mazepa did before him. In an attempt to revise and reinterpret the negative stereotype of Petliura, the author portrays the followers of Petliura as quintessential Ukrainian patriots representing all classes of society: "Petliura also followed Mazepa's footsteps. Petliura has a shadow on everything Ukrainian. The enemies hated Petliura just as they hated Mazepa. Until Petliura there was Mazepa, Mazepinstvo, now there is Petlurovshina, Petlurovtsy. Who is Ukrainian for the enemy: Petlurovets. Worker, peasant or clergyman, it doesn't matter, they are all Petlurovets for the enemy"<sup>32</sup>. The book ends with a poem that honors Petliura's legacy and imagines future generations following in his footsteps. It implies that Petliura has evolved into a new Ukrainian hero whose influence will endure beyond time. All things considered, "V

---

<sup>32</sup>Sahajdacznyj. p.55-58.

Yoho Tini” offers an extremely reverent and idealized portrait of Symon Petliura, praising him as a hero and supporter of Ukrainian independence. The book pays homage to Petliura's lasting influence on Ukrainian history and identity as well as his lasting legacy.

Nine chapters in Vasyl Ivanys's book *Symon Petliura-Prezydent Ukrainy*,<sup>33</sup> that was published immediately afterwards, in 1952, provide a detailed account of Petliura's life and accomplishments. The author, Vasyl Ivanys (1888-1974), an emigre politician and public figure, engineer, economist and historian, explores a number of facets of Petliura's life, including his early years and schooling as well as his leadership during the turbulent time of Ukrainian independence. Ivanys compares Petliura to the legendary Cossack hetman Bogdan Khmelnytsky, who led Ukraine to freedom in the 17th century, which is one noteworthy aspect of the book. Ivanys portrays Petliura as a hero destined to liberate Ukraine from oppression by drawing comparisons between Petliura's voyage to the Kuban and Khmelnytsky's momentous departure from the Zaporizhian Sich. Ivanys delves into Petliura's early nationalist beliefs and his changing political beliefs throughout the story, highlighting the influence of Ukrainian intellectuals such as Ivan Franko. The author emphasizes Petliura's nationalist viewpoint, which developed while he was in Moscow and worked with Russian scholars who were in favor of Ukrainian independence.

Ivanys also looks at Petliura's attempts to make Ukraine a political nation, including his proclamation during World War I to win support for the Ukrainian cause abroad. Notwithstanding his aspirations,

---

<sup>33</sup>Vasyl Ivanys, *Symon Petliura, Prezydent Ukrainy 1879-1926*, Trident Press, Toronto-Kanada, 1952.



Petliura encountered difficulties in becoming well-known among the Ukrainian people, being eclipsed by more well-known individuals such as Volodymyr Vynnychenko and Mykhailo Hrushevsky. Petliura's contribution to the formation of the Ukrainian army and the encouragement of Ukrainianization among soldiers is covered in great detail throughout the book. Ivanys presents Petliura as a forward-thinking commander dedicated to creating a potent military force that embodies Ukrainian identity.

Ivanys' book was also an attempt to deny Petliura's responsibility for anti-Jewish pogroms and, in general, to acquit the Ukrainian national movement of anti-Semitism. Ivanys clears Petliura of any direct responsibility by attributing the violence to Russian troops and monarchists who were against Ukrainian nationalism. The author highlights Petliura's opposition to pogroms and his attempts to keep the army disciplined.

Ivanys closely examines Petliura's diplomatic efforts to win support for Ukraine as his political career develops overseas, paying particular attention to his outreach to France and the Anglo-Saxon world. Petliura's decisions have been criticized, but Ivanys defends them and presents Petliura as a patriot committed to the liberation and unification of Ukraine. Overall, Petliura is portrayed in "Symon Petliura-Prezydent Ukrainy" as a nationalist hero whose contributions to Ukrainian independence are deserving of acknowledgement and are shown with sympathy. Ivanys eventually defends Petliura's contribution to forming Ukrainian history and identity, even though he acknowledges the debates and criticisms surrounding his legacy.

Such representation of Petliura was slightly modified in the Ukrainina emigre publications of the next decades, for example in Panas Fedenko's book *Holovny Otaman*<sup>34</sup> that was written to honour the 50th year of death of Symon Petliura. The author, Panas Fedenko (1893-1981), a socialist leader, historian, writer and publicist, paid special attention to his leadership role in the fight for Ukrainian independence. Fedenko's research sheds light on Petliura's contributions to Ukrainian socialism and his attempts to negotiate difficult political terrain by highlighting his early activism and ideological development. The first section of the book looks at Petliura's early years, highlighting his involvement in organizing and journalism during 1905's revolutionary period. Fedenko presents Petliura as a major player in the leftist Ukrainina parties, RUP and USDRP, and an advocate of a particular Ukrainian socialist ideology, highlighting his dedication to Ukrainian cultural and linguistic rights within the framework of larger socialist movements. Fedenko also explores Petliura's views on the Russian Revolution and his hesitancy to support different political groups. He delves into Petliura's doubts about joining the *Soyuz Vyzvolenna Ukrainy* and his critiques of Russian Socialist Democrats who were against Ukrainian sovereignty.

Fedenko's analysis includes an important analysis of Petliura's attempts to form a Ukrainian army and the difficulties he encountered in garnering support. Fedenko talks about the challenges of Ukrainianizing the armed forces and the ensuing disenchantment of Ukrainian soldiers, especially as Bolshevik propaganda became more popular. The book delves deeper into Petliura's leadership during the

---

<sup>34</sup>Panas Fedenko, *Holovny Otaman, Iz Kulturnoi ta Politycnoi Dialnosti Symona Petlury*, Nashe Slovo, München-London, 1976.

turbulent 1918 period, covering the talks with Poland as well as the larger geopolitical background of Ukraine's independence movement. Fedenko sheds light on Petliura's thought process and recognizes the intricacies at play, such as competing interests and internal conflicts within Ukrainian society. Petliura is portrayed by Fedenko as a strong and devoted leader who is committed to the cause of Ukrainian independence, even in the face of eventual defeat and his exile in France. He draws attention to Petliura's ongoing activism while living abroad and his initiatives to win over other countries to Ukraine's cause. Fedenko emphasizes Petliura's enduring legacy as a champion of national sovereignty throughout the book, portraying him as a hero and a symbol of Ukrainian resistance. Fedenko eventually honors Petliura's contributions and presents him as an iconic figure in Ukrainian history, even as he acknowledges his flaws and the difficulties he faced.

If an Ukrainian emigre socialist activist Fedenko emphasized the interconnectedness of national and social emancipation in Petliura's program, the right-wing nationalist emigre author Volodymyr Kosyk (1924-2017) emphasized Symon Petliura's role in the formation of the Ukrainian army. This work was originally written and published in French under the pseudonym Borys Martchenko in 1976, and 25 years later republished in Ukraine in Ukrainian <sup>35</sup>. Kosik starts off by praising Petliura's initiative in pushing for the Ukrainization of military forces operating under the Russian Empire in order to establish a Ukrainian army. He highlights Petliura's attempts to secure backing for this cause, including financial support from France. While presenting contrasting interpretations of Petliura's decision to emigrate to Poland

---

<sup>35</sup>Volodymyr Kosik, *Symon Petlura* (translated by Yarema Kravets), NTS, Lviv, 2000.

as either a courageous act in pursuit of Ukraine's interests or a betrayal, Kosik acknowledges the controversial nature of this decision. Petliura's visits to soldiers on the front lines are seen as acts of bravery and inspiration, despite criticism.

The author explores the nuances of the deal Petliura signed with Poland, talking about the reasons behind Poland's lack of support, such as Poland's worries about the power of the Ukrainian army and the Ukrainian people's view of Poland as a conqueror. To demonstrate his dedication to the fight for Ukrainian rights, freedom, and state independence, Kosik uses quotes from Petliura. He discusses how Soviet propaganda demonized Petliura and his adherents and draws attention to the wider ramifications of calling dissidents "Petlurists".

Kosik's analysis includes a noteworthy section on Petliura's anti-pogrom efforts. Similarly to other emigre authors, he argues against blaming Petliura and other Ukrainians in particular for these atrocities, pointing out the larger context of violence in areas ruled by different armies. Petliura is portrayed by Kosik as a committed leader in the struggle for Ukrainian independence and a pro-European politician overall. He highlights Petliura's significance as a representation of the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people and stresses the significance of putting an end to national oppression through just and holy means.

One thorough reference on the literature on Symon Petliura is *Symon Petliura, A Bibliography*<sup>36</sup> which was put together in 1977 by Oleh S. Pidhainy and Olexandra I. Pidhainy on behalf of the Symon Petliura Institute in Philadelphia. It is emphasized as the first attempt to

---

<sup>36</sup>*Symon Petliura, A Bibliography*, ed. By Oleh. S. Pidhainy, Olexandra I. Pidhainy  
New Review Books, New York, Toronto. 1977.

compile a bibliography devoted exclusively to Petliura, with the goal of assisting future studies on his life and historical contributions to Ukraine. The book is divided into several chapters, each of which focuses on a distinct facet of Petliura's life and contributions. After a brief biography, it covers books, articles, and memoirs about Petliura's early years, his participation in the Ukrainian Revolution, and his roles as a soldier and statesman. Notably, the bibliography tackles the controversial subject of Jewish pogroms during Petliura's leadership and offers extensive coverage of his influence on Jewish cultural life.

Petliura's personal order as Commander in Chief against pogroms is one notable inclusion that highlights his efforts to address and combat violence against Jewish communities. The bibliography also includes literary depictions of Petliura, illustrating the ways in which different writers have revered, lamented, and mythologized him. All things considered, the bibliography's depth makes it an invaluable tool for academics and researchers who want to learn more about Petliura's life and contributions. It provides a clear and thorough picture of Petliura's personality and accomplishments, portraying him as a hero, a capable statesman, and a capable military commander.

With the growth of Ukrainian academic studies in the North America in the 1970s and 80s, there was also an attempt to promote more positive revised representation of Petliura in the English-language historiography. In 1985, *Symon Petliura and the Jews: A Reappraisal*<sup>37</sup>, written by Taras Hunczak (b.1932), a professor of history at Rutgers University in Newark, New Jersey, provides a detailed analysis of the relationship between Symon Petliura and the

---

<sup>37</sup>Taras Hunczak, *Symon Petliura and The Jews, A Reappraisal*, Rutgers University, Toronto, Munich, 1985.

Jewish community during the turbulent years of the Ukrainian National Republic (UNR), which lasted from 1917 to 1921. Hunczak wants to refute the widely held belief that the Ukrainian government is anti-Semitic and reevaluate Petliura's contribution to the pogroms that took place at this period. The first section of the book focuses on the distinct historical background of the political environment in Ukraine, especially the enactment of laws granting Jewish autonomy within the Ukrainian National Republic. Hunczak then explores the nuances surrounding claims that Petliura was responsible for the pogroms, especially in light of Sholem Schwarzbard's trial.

Hunczak methodically investigates a number of variables, such as political differences and outside influences, that are causing tensions between Jews and Ukrainians to rise. Citing incidents in which Petliura stood up for Jewish rights and shielded Jews from harm, he highlights Petliura's attempts to stop pogroms and defend Jewish communities. Hunczak also clarifies more general topics like Judeophobia and the background of anti-Semitism in Ukraine, including how Nicholas II's government encouraged anti-Jewish sentiments. He emphasizes how the Directory works to protect Jewish citizens' rights and safety by enacting laws and other agreements that counteract anti-Semitism.

Hunczak makes the case that it would be unfair and incorrect to hold Petliura responsible for the tragedies that befell Ukrainian Jewry through painstaking examination of old records and eyewitness accounts. He ends by defending Petliura's innocence and arguing for a more complex interpretation of the relations between Ukrainians and Jews during this turbulent time. To sum up, *Symon Petliura and The Jews: A Reappraisal* attempted to challenge the prevailing negative or shady representation of Petliura in the English-language academic

historiography, and shed light on the complexities of interethnic dynamics in early 20th-century Ukraine.

The rehabilitation and glorification of Petliura became one of key issues in the Ukrainian emigre historiography immediately after the World War II. Through the positive representation of Petliura Ukrainian emigre authors from both the left and the right tried to reconceptualize Ukrainian nationalism as democratic, emancipatory and inclusive social movement. Yet, the most contested issue, that is of Petliura's responsibility for anti-Jewish violence, was addressed from the consolidated nationalist perspective and did not develop into the topic of internal discussion in the Ukrainian emigre community.

## **2.2 Historiographic Representation of Petliura in Contemporary Ukraine (after 1991)**

Scholarly publications on Petliura that appeared after 1991 in post-Soviet Ukraine continued the main argumentation of the works that were previously published in diaspora. *Symon Petliura ta Yoho Rodyna*<sup>38</sup>, written by Dmytro Vlasovych Stepovyk (b.1938), a well-known Ukrainian historian and art critic, delves into the political and personal life of Symon Petliura, with a special emphasis on his family and the period of his emigration. Published to mark the 70th anniversary of Petliura's passing, the work seeks to offer glorified image of Petliura as a family man and as a national leader. Stepovyk introduces Petliura's political acumen in the first chapter, "Symon Petliura, Osobystist, polityk, strateg" ("Symon Petliura, Personality, Politician, Strategist"), using a selection of Petliura's writings from 1919 to 1922. These letters, written to ministers and diplomats, demonstrate Petliura's ability to think strategically and his steadfast support for the Ukrainian cause.

---

<sup>38</sup>Dmytro Vlasovych Stepovyk, *Symon Petliura ta Yoho Rodyna*, Rada, Kyiv. 1996.

Any country would have been proud to have such a resolute and capable leader, according to Stepovyk, who contends that Petliura's political genius was underestimated in his day.

The second chapter turns to Petliura's responsibilities as a husband and father, showcasing him as a perceptive and compassionate person via his interactions with his daughter Lesya Petliura and wife Olga. Stepovyk's portrayal of Petliura's private life, which was mainly kept secret during the communist regime, is based on archival documents from France and Prague. Stepovyk highlights that the Ukrainian people, who viewed Petliura as a symbol of resistance against communist rule, gave him a great deal of support. The public's declarations of allegiance and willingness to fight under Petliura's leadership are cited by the author: "We are waiting for your action, your word, your leadership, your help, Commander in Chief. Extend your hand, give us your voice, we swear that we will all unite and go to war with the enemy. Either we will get what we want, or we will not be back!". These statements highlight the admiration that Petliura's fellow countrymen had for him as a great leader, diplomat, and patriot.

To sum up, Stepovyk's *Symon Petlura ta Yogo Rodyna* presents a close-knit and comprehensive portrait of Symon Petliura, fusing political analysis with firsthand accounts to present a complete picture of his life and contributions. Stepovyk hopes to emphasize Petliura's lasting significance in Ukrainian history as well as his major contributions to the country's independence movement through this work.

More thorough academic attempt to address contested Petliura's legacy was represented by the monograph *Sud Istorii: Symon Petlura i*



*Petluriana*<sup>39</sup> by Sergiy Lytvyn (b.1950), a Ukrainian military historian and archivist. It is a comprehensive and important work that explores the life, activities, and legacy of Symon Petliura in great detail in eleven chapters.

In the first chapter of the book, “The State of Scientific Development of Petliuriana,” Lytvyn assesses the academic literature on Petliura, pointing out the mistakes and distortions that were common in Soviet publications. According to Lytvyn, Soviet attempts to discredit leaders like Petliura and paint the Ukrainian revolution in a negative light in order to discourage aspirations for statehood were intended to stifle national consciousness. He points out that Petliura was one of the most maligned leaders of the Ukrainian revolution, and that the Soviet regime continuously avoided providing unbiased evaluations of them. Lytvyn talks about how Ukrainian historiography has recently undergone a paradigm change, redefining heroes and traitors, nationalists and patriots, from a class-based to a national-based approach. He highlights the importance of critically analyzing memoirs, particularly those written under duress like Yu. Tyutyunnyk's post-arrest accounts, which were influenced by Soviet authorities, and cites V. Kotsur's observations on this shift.

Examining the pogroms and the charges of anti-Semitism against Petliura, Lytvyn tackles one of the most contentious facets of Petliura's legacy. He cites the writings of T. Hunchak, V. Mikhalchuk, and V. Sergiychuk, which identify the real pogrom perpetrators and clear Petliura of these accusations. Lytvyn highlights that these studies offer vital evidence that disproves Petliura's charges of anti-Semitism. Lytvyn describes Simon Petliura's efforts to create a Ukrainian military

---

<sup>39</sup>Sergiy Lytvyn, *Sud Istorii: Symon Petlura i Petluriana*.

force in the chapter “Symon Petliura and the Ukrainization of the Army,” emphasizing his methodical and practical approach. Lytvyn portrays Petliura as a steady and visionary leader who recognized the need for a potent military to preserve Ukraine's independence, in contrast to the unfavorable descriptions of Petliura by contemporaries such as V. Vynnychenko. He emphasizes Petliura's vision in seeing the Bolsheviks as a serious threat and his unwavering resistance to them starting in 1917.

A whole chapter of Lytvyn's book is devoted to Petliura's foreign policy, specifically to his Warsaw Pact strategic alliance with Poland. He details the terrible conditions that Ukraine was forced to endure, such as isolation and an Entente blockade, which made it necessary to find allies in order to carry on the country's independence movement. Despite being contentious, Lytvyn contends that the Warsaw Pact was an essential step in thwarting Bolshevik aggression and upholding Ukrainian statehood. He claims that both countries' alliance with Poland was crucial and had a big impact on the stability of the area. In his final remarks, Lytvyn affirms Petliura's lasting significance as a representation of Ukrainian independence and statehood. According to him, Petliura has been the most steadfast supporter of Ukraine's European orientation—a position that is still popular in the country today. In order to honor Petliura for his contributions to the national liberation movement and state-building endeavors, Lytvyn advocates for his memory to be honored through monuments, museums, and named streets. In conclusion, Sergiy Lytvyn's *Sud Istorii: Symon Petlura i Petluriana* set a new academic standard for the works that attempted to restore Petliura's reputation by showcasing his astute

strategic thinking, commitment to Ukrainian independence, and nuanced legacy in both domestic and international contexts.

The thorough and in-depth biography *Simon Petlura*<sup>40</sup> by Viktor Savchenko (b.1961), a Ukrainian writer, publicist, teacher and local historian, aims to present an impartial portrait of Symon Petliura, standing in stark contrast to the frequently negative portrayal of the man in Soviet historiography. Savchenko carefully studies Petliura's life, setting him in the larger framework of Ukrainian history and the turbulent events of his era.

Savchenko emphasizes in the book's introduction the necessity of reevaluating Petliura's legacy in light of the facts. He points out that, especially in Soviet narratives intended to demonize him, Petliura has frequently been compared to other controversial figures like Makhno or Denikin. Nonetheless, Petliura continues to represent nationalism and the fight for independence for a large number of Ukrainians. The importance of legends in shaping national identity is emphasized by Savchenko, who also contends that Petliura represents the “Ukrainian idea” and the “romantic Cossack” vision of a free Ukraine. Savchenko critiques Petliura's idealized portrayal of Ukraine, pointing out that he ignored the social and economic problems facing the nation. According to him, Petliura was an idealist who wanted to see the Cossack past return, but the population's varied economic and social backgrounds did not generally share his nationalist views. Savchenko recognizes Petliura's contribution to the “Ukrainian phenomenon” and the development of a national identity among those who had previously identified as “Rusyn” or “Little Russian”, despite these flaws.

---

<sup>40</sup>Viktor Savchenko, *Simon Petlura*, Kharkiv, Folio, 2004.

The book spends a good deal of time discussing the Jewish pogroms during the Civil War, particularly in the chapter “Executors and Victims”. Savchenko acknowledges the complexity and larger background of the civil war while attempting to offer an unbiased analysis of these tragic events. He points out that the pogroms started even before the Ukrainian People's Republic was proclaimed and got worse when Petliura was imprisoned during the Hetmanate era. Savchenko emphasizes how Petliura and Vynnychenko, his political allies, were against the pogroms and wanted to punish those who were behind them. Nonetheless, many Ukrainian army soldiers either acted independently or joined other factions due to the chaotic circumstances. According to data presented by Savchenko, there were 226 pogroms committed by the White Army, 29 by the Polish army, 834 by independent groups, and 139 by Petliura's forces. He makes the case that Petliura should not be held solely responsible for these atrocities, citing his attempts to stop them and drawing comparisons with other leaders who faced comparable charges, such as Denikin, Pilsudski, and Skoropadski.

Savchenko offers a critical assessment of Petliura's political legacy, acknowledging that he was raised in socialist traditions and that, in his ideal Ukraine, he was unable to accommodate big capital or the urban proletariat. He criticizes Petliura for his revolutionary romanticism, selfishness, tactical inconsistencies, and patriarchal viewpoint. Savchenko contends against mythologizing Petliura and supports an impartial assessment of his significance and contributions to Ukrainian history in spite of these objections.

In conclusion, *Simon Petlura* by Viktor Savchenko attempts to situate Symon Petliura in his proper context within Ukrainian history

by providing a thorough and fair portrayal of the man. The book clarifies Petliura's beliefs, his contribution to the development of Ukrainian nationalism, his contentious participation in the civil war and pogroms, and his lasting, if nuanced, legacy.

The book *Vynnychenko i Petlura. Politychni Portrety Revolutsiynoy Doby*<sup>41</sup> was written by a renowned Ukrainian historian Valeri Fedorovych Soldatenko (b.1946), a corresponding member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. One may argue that it represents the mainstream in the recent Ukrainian historiography. It offers a comparison analysis of Volodymyr Vynnychenko and Symon Petliura, two well-known political figures in Ukraine.

In the beginning of the book, Soldatenko discusses how Soviet historiography tried to standardize Vynnychenko and Petliura by designating them as counter-revolutionaries who were bourgeois-nationalist. The author points out that despite these attempts, there were still a lot of disagreements and conflicts between the two leaders that were never entirely resolved. Because he was perceived as a Bolshevik supporter overseas, Vynnychenko was shunned by the anti-Soviet emigrant community. Petliura, on the other hand, had a mixed reputation among émigrés; while some saw him as a national hero, others saw him as a weak politician who was a liability to the Ukrainian cause. Soldatenko criticizes the mythologizing of Petliura in Ukraine that began after 1991. He observes that reprints of diaspora publications and numerous public events have elevated Petliura's status, sometimes disproportionately. Soldatenko criticizes writers such as O. Klimchuk and I. Sribnyak for their exaggerated depictions of Petliura and offers

---

<sup>41</sup>Valeri Fedorovych Soldatenko, *Vynnychenko i Petlura. Politychni Portrety Revolutsiynoy Doby*, Natsionalna Akademiya Nauk Ukrainy, Institut Politychnyh i Etnonatsionalnyh Doslidjen im. I.F.Kurasa, Kyiv, 2007.

examples of such claims. He contends that Vynnychenko's important leadership roles and contributions during the revolutionary era are frequently overlooked by this mythologization.

Although he recognizes the value of unbiased research, Soldatenko criticizes other works for their prejudices. He commends Serhy Yekelchuk's work on Jewish pogroms and Petliura for its careful investigation and well-rounded conclusions. He does, however, believe that "Simon Petliura" by V.A.Savchenko favors Petliura excessively at the expense of Vynnychenko. By stressing Vynnychenko's positions in the Central Rada and as the head of the Directory, Soldatenko persistently presents Vynnychenko as the more important and capable leader, criticizing Petliura for what is seen as his lack of consistency and noteworthy accomplishments.

In closing, Soldatenko emphasizes how Petliura and Vynnychenko have received different levels of recognition, pointing out that while Ukrainian dignitaries have paid respects at Petliura's tomb, Vynnychenko has not received the same recognition. He wonders why, in spite of Vynnychenko's greater contributions to Ukrainian statehood and independence, Petliura is remembered more widely. Soldatenko's appreciation of Vynnychenko and his disapproval of Petliura's legacy raise concerns about the objectivity of his research because they seem biased. Even though Soldatenko's work supports objectivity, it seems to support his own viewpoint on the relative importance of the two figures. *Vynnychenko i Petlura* by Soldatenko is a thorough comparative analysis that asks the reader to reevaluate the historical accounts of these two Ukrainian leaders. Although the book provides insightful analysis and criticisms of Petliura's mythologization, it is also evident that Soldatenko's personal prejudices shaped his portrayal of

Vynnychenko as the more capable leader. This emphasizes how difficult it is to be truly objective in historical research, particularly when discussing controversial characters like Petliura and Vynnychenko.

Another critical viewpoint on Symon Petliura's place in Ukrainian history is provided by Danylo Yanevsky's *Proekt "Ukraina"*<sup>42</sup>, particularly in relation to the Directorate and the Ukrainian People's Republic. Yanevsky contends in the third chapter, "Proekt Ukraina abo Krakh Symona Petlury" (Project "Ukraine" or the Collapse of Symon Petliura), that the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Directorate were destined to fail because they were not supported by the domestic or international community.

Yanevsky challenges Petliura's sincerity and efficacy as a leader in the opening of his analysis with the thought-provoking section "Attention: Fake". He also criticizes the Ukrainian Social Democratic Labor Party, claiming that leaders such as Lenin did not take it seriously and that it never operated as a legitimate political party. This viewpoint supports Yanevsky's theory that internal flaws and poor leadership contributed to the Ukrainian revolution's failures in addition to outside influences.

Yanevsky uses Mykyta Shapoval, who portrayed Petliura as an outsider with dubious intentions, to bolster his criticism. Shapoval's contempt for Petliura's strategies and viewpoints exposes the differences amongst Ukrainian officials. He calls Petliura's military actions deceitful and asserts that opportunism rather than true leadership played a larger role in Petliura's ascent to power. Shapoval asserts that Petliura was more focused on his status than the cause of

---

<sup>42</sup>Danylo Yanevsky, *Proekt "Ukraina"*, Grushevsky, Skoropadsky, Petliura, Folio, Harkiv, 2011.

the country, and that he did not contribute significantly to the first independence uprising. Yanevsky uses Hans Kohn's nationalism framework, making a distinction between “people's” or ethnic nationalism and state or civil nationalism. He contends that rather than emerging from the bottom up, Petliura's nationalism was of the state kind, started by the political elite. This theoretical approach validates Yanevsky's claim that Petliura's ideas were not well received by the Ukrainian peasantry as a whole, which limited his influence and base of support.

In addition, Yanevsky quotes Vynnychenko's memories, which confirm Shapoval's mistrust of Petliura. Even among social democrats, Vynnychenko saw Petliura as self-serving and lacking in real support. This portrayal supports the theory that Petliura was a divisive and ultimately ineffectual leader rather than the heroic figure that is sometimes made out to be. Yanevsky comes to the conclusion that Petliura's uprising against Hetman Skoropadsky sparked a civil war in Ukraine, which aided in the Bolshevik advance. He rejects the idea that Petliura was a national hero, contending that true popular support and effective leadership were absent from the actual independence movement. Yanevsky believed that internal strife and the shortcomings of the Ukrainian leaders, especially Petliura, were what ultimately brought about the collapse of the revolution. Yanevsky's work, taken as a whole, offers a critical reevaluation of Petliura's legacy by undermining the exalted narratives and highlighting the difficulties and shortcomings of the Ukrainian independence movement during this turbulent time.

Discussion around the controversial role of Symon Petliura during the revolutionary period continues also in the international



academia. The book edited by David Engel, *The Assassination of Symon Petliura and the Trial of Sholem Schwarzbard 1926-1927: A Selection of Documents*<sup>43</sup>, offers a thorough examination of the assassination of Symon Petliura and the trial that followed, presenting different points of view on the incidents.

Engel describes how the trial was significantly influenced by the French legal system, which was founded on the revolutionary heritage of human rights. The author highlights the trial's intricacies and shows how, in the face of international pressure, it was seen as a test of France's capacity to administer justice. He points out that even though there was insufficient proof to connect Schwarzbard to Soviet spies, the trial nevertheless sparked important discussions in politics and society. The book also explores the various interpretations of Petliura's assassination throughout Europe. Petliura was considered a nationalist icon in Romania and his assassination was perceived as a premeditated attempt to crush Ukrainian dreams. Similar worries about Moscow's involvement were voiced in Czechoslovakia. These differing reactions are a reflection of the concerns about Soviet influence throughout Europe as well as the larger geopolitical ramifications of Petliura's passing. Engel draws attention to the divisive responses within Ukraine. While some praised Petliura as a national hero and martyr, others condemned his political choices, especially his alliance with Poland and rejection of socialism. Petliura's death served as a catalyst for the growth of the Ukrainian nationalist movement, which portrayed him as a martyr for the cause of Ukrainian independence. Schwarzbard's

---

<sup>43</sup> *The Assassination of Symon Petliura and the Trial of Sholem Schwarzbard 1926-1927, A selection of Documents*, Edited by David Engel, The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, 2016.

defense presented Petliura as a Jewish persecutor, which changed the focus of the story from victimization to culpability.

Schwarzbard's defense, which attempted to link Petliura to the Jewish pogroms during the Ukrainian Civil War, was a crucial component of the trial. Documents from Schwarzbard's defense committee's attempt to link Petliura to the atrocities and use that evidence to support the assassination as a form of retaliatory justice are included in the book. This part of the trial impacted public opinion and historical narratives by bringing to light the horrors of the pogroms and the long-standing ethnic tensions.

Engel's work presents the various perspectives and documentary evidence surrounding Petliura's assassination and Schwarzbard's trial in a balanced manner, leaving it up to the reader to interpret these events. The book emphasizes how Petliura's assassination turned him into a symbol and changed the conversation about Ukrainian politics and the leaders' legacies. Engel highlights the relationship between national identity, historical memory, and justice while ensuring a nuanced understanding of this complex historical episode through the inclusion of diverse perspectives. To sum up, *The Assassination of Symon Petliura and the Trial of Sholem Schwarzbard 1926-1927* is an essential tool for comprehending the complexities of Petliura's murder, the ramifications of the trial, and the long-lasting influence on Ukrainian historiography and national identity.

In the recent year the personality and legacy of Petliura was intensively discussed in Ukraine on both national and regional level. A compilation of academic papers and publications given at the Ninth Petliura Readings, a conference held in Poltava to mark the 140th anniversary of Symon Petliura's birth, is titled *Poltavska Petluriana:*

*Dev'ati Petlurivski Chitannya*.<sup>44</sup> In addition to being a month of national pride and grief, May is significant historically for Ukrainians as it commemorates the birth of national heroes like Petliura, the moving of Taras Shevchenko's tomb to Ukraine, and the assassination of Petliura by Communist regime operatives.

The book compares and contrasts Petliura's approach to Russia with that of contemporary Ukrainian leaders, including President Petro Poroshenko. Poroshenko's opposition to allying with Russia is consistent with Petliura's past stance. The quote from Poroshenko that is highlighted in the book emphasizes the idea that Ukraine's independence and statehood are threatened by relations with Russia. Petliura's policies are framed as forerunners of modern Ukrainian national strategies through this comparison. The book devotes a large amount of its content to addressing and refuting the accusations and slander that have damaged Petliura's reputation, especially those that have been spread by Russia. The collection claims that these defamations have been a part of a larger campaign to discredit modern leaders like Viktor Yushchenko and Petro Poroshenko, as well as important figures in Ukrainian nationalism like Yevhen Konovalets, Stepan Bandera, and Roman Shukhevych.

A noteworthy piece by Leonid Kushnir, “The Image of Symon Petliura through the Prism of Correspondence with Mykola Shumytsky (1921–1924),” provides a thorough examination of the correspondence Petliura exchanged with Shumytsky while he was living in exile. These letters shed light on Petliura's thoughts and actions while he was traveling, outlining his organizational difficulties, diplomatic efforts,

---

<sup>44</sup>*Poltavska Petluriana* 8, ed. By Babenko L.L., Moklyak V.O., Suprunenko O.B. Dvovosvit, Poltava, 2019.

and strategic goals for Ukraine. Kushnir's analysis of this correspondence demonstrates Petliura's commitment to Ukrainian independence and his attempts to win over other countries. Petliura collaborated closely with Mykola Shumytskyi, a significant political figure and diplomat, in a variety of roles. The letters covered in this article address a variety of subjects, such as the setup of consular services, initiatives to support Jewish emigration under the UNR flag, and pursuits of financial support for Ukraine. They also discuss Petliura's opinions on foreign policy, particularly his desire to form alliances with nations like Italy, Turkey, and England. Several additional articles that delve deeper into Petliura's life and significance are included in the collection:

“Symon Petliura's Unprinted Letter from the Lukyaniv Prison”

“Fedir Petliura (1876–1907): The Brother of the Chief Ataman of the UNR” and “The Attitude of Ukrainian Radical Democrats to the Chairman of the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic Symon Petliura in Exile”

All of these efforts work together to give Petliura a more complex and favorable image, dispelling unfavorable myths and emphasizing his contributions to the national struggle of Ukraine. Reflections on the ongoing difficulties in changing the public's perception of Petliura are included in the book's conclusion. Even with the advancements brought about by scholarly and cultural endeavors, efforts to repair his reputation must go on. The project is a continuation of a tradition that was started in 2017 in response to the centennial celebrations of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, with the goal of honoring and faithfully portraying significant figures in Ukrainian history. In conclusion, this book is a valuable academic tool for learning

about the political tactics used by Symon Petliura, his significance in Ukrainian history, and his attempts to rebuild his reputation in the face of ongoing defamation.

*Kulturna Dyplomatiija Symona Petlury: "Shedryk" proty "Russkogo Myra"*<sup>45</sup>, Misija Kapely Oleksandra Koshytsa, by Tina Peresunko, was published in 2019 and explores Symon Petliura's cultural diplomacy initiatives, especially the international tours of the Ukrainian Republic Capella led by Oleksandr Koshyts. The book highlights the importance of these cultural missions by examining how the Capella was received in the Ukrainian People's Republic, Europe, and America. It is divided into three main sections.

Peresunko highlights Petliura's calculated application of cultural diplomacy as a weapon to thwart Russian disinformation and advance Ukrainian independence and culture abroad. The Capella's tours were the country of Ukraine's first modern cultural diplomacy initiative, supported by the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Education, and the Arts of the Ukrainian People's Republic. Mykola Leontovych's "Shchedryk", which became a symbol of Ukrainian cultural identity and was well-received in 17 countries, was one of the important pieces performed during these tours. By highlighting Ukraine's distinctive cultural legacy, Petliura's cultural strategy sought to refute the narratives of the Bolshevik and tsarist periods. His creative use of music to bring the Ukrainian issue global exposure revealed a deep comprehension of soft power. Petliura aimed to win over Western Europeans to Ukraine's independence by showcasing Ukrainian culture.

#### Important Elements Emphasized by Peresunko

---

<sup>45</sup>Tina Peresunko, *Kulturna Dyplomatiija Symona Petlury: "Shedryk" proty "Russkogo Myra"*, Misija Kapely Oleksandra Koshytsa, Kyiv, ArtEk, 2019.

1. Encouraging the Ukrainian Identity: Petliura worked hard to set Ukrainian culture apart from Russian culture. Petliura instructed Koshyts to highlight the distinctive qualities of Ukrainian songs as part of an independent Ukraine, demonstrating the tours' goal of showcasing the originality and independence of Ukrainian music. 2. Impact of “Shchedryk”: The Capella's triumph and the promotion of a favorable perception of Ukrainian culture around the world were greatly aided by the performance of “Shchedryk”. The international recognition of Ukraine as a state was bolstered by this cultural interaction. 3. Correspondence and Ideological Environments: Petliura's letters to Koshyts are excerpted in Peresunko, demonstrating Petliura's insight into the historical significance of the choir's mission. He gave the Capella instructions to use their music to quietly promote Ukrainian independence. The fact that Koshyts referred to Petliura as the nation's chief in his responses further demonstrates his regard and admiration for the man.

According to Peresunko, a key element of Petliura's larger plan for Ukrainian independence was his use of cultural diplomacy. In an era where military might proved insufficient to achieve triumph, Petliura took advantage of cultural endeavors to foster global solidarity and support for Ukraine. This strategy highlights Petliura's role as a nationalist and historical figure dedicated to the cause of Ukrainian independence through a variety of channels, including cultural engagement in addition to armed conflict. *Kulturna Dyplomatiya Symona Petlury* by Tina Peresunko is a significant academic work that illuminates a sometimes-overlooked facet of Symon Petliura's campaigns for Ukrainian independence. Petliura was able to bring Ukrainian culture to a worldwide audience through the use of cultural

diplomacy, which helped her win acceptance and support for Ukraine's sovereignty from other countries. The book emphasizes Petliura's multifaceted strategy for nation-building as well as the long-term effects of his cultural projects.

Scholarly and semi-scholarly publications on Petliura that appeared after 1991 provide a thorough portrait of Symon Petliura as a sophisticated and multidimensional leader. His legacy is comprised of both noteworthy controversy and noteworthy accomplishments. Petliura faced many obstacles in his quest to create an independent Ukrainian state, including threats from the outside and internal discontent. His cultural diplomacy demonstrated his creative approach to nation-building that goes beyond simple military and political tactics, especially through the promotion of Ukrainian music. The authors' diverse viewpoints enhance our comprehension of Petliura's lasting influence on Ukrainian nationalism and identity. Petliura continues to be a crucial figure in Ukrainian history, representing the ongoing fight for independence and self-determination, in spite of the criticisms and disputes. His life and work, which capture the enduring complexity of Ukraine's national narrative, continue to inspire and spark discussion.

### **III. The Contested Place of Symon Petliura in the Collective Memory in Independent Ukraine**

As Anna Wylegala mentions in her article, in every cultural and national context, a difficult past means something different. Usually, it is associated with certain events which refuse to simply become a part of history and instead trouble contemporaries, demanding attention and

provoking strong emotions. Central and Eastern European societies have to deal with a difficult past stemming from experiences of totalitarianism, war, and occupation (often two or even three occupations) as well as the brutal establishment of a new postwar order accompanied by repressions, forced resettlement, ethnic purges, and genocide. Fifty years of Communist rule have either deprived the region's inhabitants of the opportunity to reflect upon and critically analyze these experiences or severely limited their freedom to do so<sup>46</sup>. Ukraine is not an exception. The first half of the 20th century was quite difficult for Ukraine. And the events that took place could never be openly discussed or analyzed in the Soviet regime. Banned names and events remained covered up until independent Ukraine.

Anna Wylegala divides these events of the past into two categories: First, they should include elements of Ukrainian history that are evaluated in fundamentally different ways by broad segments of society. Such events are naturally present in the history of any nation or society, but in the case of Ukrainians they are crucial for defining national identity and one's place in the wider historical process. Thus, these elements define national survival, distinguish traitors from heroes, and include or exclude individuals from an imagined national community. The second type, the problematic event, consists of uncomfortable issues that jeopardize the positive image of the entire national community, which most Ukrainians either prefer to forget or have already forgotten<sup>47</sup>.

---

<sup>46</sup> Anna Wylegala, Managing the difficult past: Ukrainian collective memory and public debates on history, *Nationalities Papers*, 2017 Vol. 45, No:5, pp. 780-797, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2016.1273338>

<sup>47</sup> Anna Wylegala, pp.780-797.



The various regions of Ukraine, ruled by different states, not only absorbed the different political and cultural traditions of the states they ruled, but also their experiences and assessments of important historical events, national heroes and villains, us and the other. This has profoundly influenced Ukrainian historiography, historical and collective memory. Yaroslav Hrytsak divided historical memory into “Soviet” and “Ukrainian”. And in this historical or collective memory, Symon Petliura, the subject of the thesis, was not always viewed favorably, even with hostility.

Of course, it would not be correct to divide Ukraine in two, as Mykola Ryabchuk<sup>48</sup> does, but it is not inappropriate to say that Symon Petliura was perceived differently in different parts of Ukraine. Yaroslav Hrytsak's phrase "22 Ukraine, not 2" fits this issue perfectly.<sup>49</sup> Evaluation of Symon Petliura differently is related to the controversy of values. In this sense, the perception of Petliura varies depending on many factors, as ethnicity of people, living in the city, moreover the way they define themselves (nationalists, pro-Russian etc), education, gender, age. In their study Burns and Gimpel find significant relationship between education level and negative stereotyping tendencies. While women are traditionally thought of as more tolerant than men, studies in various settings have shown that women tend to be more conservative and supportive of “traditional values”<sup>50</sup>. The way

---

<sup>48</sup>A western Ukraine with pure Ukrainian identity and “creolized” Russian Ukrainian identity in the east. *Regionalism Without Regions*, Ed. Ulrich Schmid, Oksana Myshlovska, CEU Press, Budapest-New York, 2019. p.10

<sup>49</sup>Oleksandr Hrytsenko, *Pamyat Mistseвого Vyrobnystva*, Kyiv, “KIC”, 2014, pp.5-6.

<sup>50</sup>Peter Burns, James G. Gimpel, “Economic Insecurity, Prejudicial Stereotypes, and Public Opinion on Immigration Policy”, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol 115, No:2, 2000, pp.201-225. Lowell W. Barrington, Erik S. Herron, “One Ukraine or Many? Regionalism in Ukraine and Its Political Consequences”, *Nationalities Papers*, Vol 32, No:1, March 2004, pp. 53-86.

Petliura is perceived does not fit into any scheme applied for regionalism. We cannot say that Petliura was a traitor in the east and a hero in the west.

One of the biggest problems in Ukraine, especially in the construction of historical and collective memory, is that memory changes with the change of the rule. As Hrytsenko points out in his book, when you reduce collective memory, it is actually a tool under the control of the state, used to idealize the past. We can say this especially for the Soviet period, history was manipulated<sup>51</sup>. For example, Petliura was vilified at the time and placed in the collective memory as a negative person. In Ukraine, it was a case of leaning towards a “soviet” path and then, with a change of leadership, changing the path back to what we call “nationalist” or “Ukrainian”, and people who were in the collective memory were included or excluded accordingly. Since the late 1980s, mainly through the efforts of scientists and social activists, the memory of the events and figures of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921 has been updated and Soviet falsifications of the history of that time have been dismantled. That process of “rehabilitation” did not cover all the figures of the Ukrainian revolution, but some of the projects started under L. Kuchma, for example, the creation of the M. Hrushevsky Museum in Kyiv, the publication of a collection of his works, the construction of monuments to Sobornost, public rethinking of the meaning of such figures as S. Petliura were not completed<sup>52</sup>. Work on conceptualizing, modeling, schematizing the historical memory of modern Ukrainian society began after 2004.

---

<sup>51</sup>Oleksandr Hrytsenko, *Prezidenti i Pamyat*, p. 16

<sup>52</sup>Hrytsenko, p. 696.

The first important work on Petliura was done during the time of Viktor Yushchenko. On May 16, 2005, V. Yushchenko issued decree N9 793 "On perpetuating the memory of outstanding figures of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic", the declared purpose of which was "to perpetuate the memory of outstanding figures of the UPR and WUNR, establishing in the public consciousness an objective assessment of their role in history, ensuring the consolidation of the Ukrainian nation." Also, "execution in 2005-2009 of the anniversary of the birth of outstanding figures of the UPR and WUNR". For example, the 140th anniversary of M. Hrushevsky (September 2006), the 80th anniversary of the death of S. Petliura (May 2006) and the 130th anniversary of his birth (May 2009). For their anniversaries, it was proposed to "hold celebrations, thematic scientific conferences, round tables, scientific readings, publish scientific works, collections of documents and materials dedicated to the history of the national liberation struggle of the early twentieth century in Ukraine, the life and work of outstanding figures of the UPR and WUNR, the publication of their works; organization of permanent exhibitions, exhibitions of documents and photographic materials." He also formulated decree N9793 of the tasks for the construction of monuments, the naming of streets and educational institutions: "... to consider the issue of assigning individual educational institutions, institutions, military units the names of outstanding figures of the UPR and WUNR, naming or renaming in the prescribed manner streets, squares, parks , to resolve in the prescribed manner the issue of constructing monuments to V. Vynnychenko, S. Petliura, and other

outstanding figures of the UPR and WUNR in Kyiv and other populated areas.”<sup>53</sup>.

Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in July 2005 made a survey where The struggle for independence in 1917-1920 in the list of “The most significant achievements of the Ukrainian people, which can be a source of national pride” got 12th place<sup>54</sup>. During Yushchenko’s time was due to 16 decrees about National liberation movement and national statehood of 1917-1921. Among the political figures mentioned in V. Yushchenko's decrees, those who in Soviet times did not have a chance to be mentioned positively in historical paratives dominate (from I. Vygovsky and I. Mazepa to V. Chernovol and P. Grigorenko)<sup>55</sup>.

The ideological framework underpinning Yushchenko's policy signifies a substantial departure from the ideological underpinnings of L. Kuchma's memory policy, leaning towards a pronounced reinforcement of endorsement for the national paradigm of Ukrainian history, while refraining from a wholesale repudiation of the Soviet legacy.

The other decrees about 1917-1921 were: N9 879/2006, 946/2009, Ukrainian liberation movement of the twentieth century. The activities of the Ukrainian liberation movement still require “comprehensive study and objective coverage,” which will contribute to the “process of national reconciliation” “recognizing the role and significance of the Ukrainian liberation movement of the twentieth century in Ukraine gaining independence”. N9 297/2007, Ukrainian National revolution of

---

<sup>53</sup>Hrytsenko, p. 697.

<sup>54</sup>Hrytsenko, p.20-21

<sup>55</sup>Hrytsenko, pp. 284, 289.

1917-1921, which was expressed in the founding and activities of the Ukrainian People's Republic and Western Ukrainian People's Republic. N9 1132/2006, 1219/2007, 1158/2008, AKT of the reunification of the UPR and WUNR (Conciliarity Day) The need for “proper celebration of the Conciliarity Day” at the state level according to the appropriate procedure<sup>56</sup>.

In general, V. Yushchenko's decrees provided for the construction or at least “studying the issue of construction” of more than thirty monuments and memorials. In 2001 in Rivne was opened a bust to S.Petliura. The memorial sign to Petliura in Poltava was installed in May 2007 and dismantled in October. Presidential Decree N9 1333/2005 issued an order dated December 24, 2005 N9 564-p, which approved the Action Plan for the creation of the memorial historical and architectural complex "Alley of Outstanding Figures of Ukraine". The actual process of implementing this plan immediately began to deviate from the decree. In particular, “public participation in the formation of the list of outstanding figures of Ukrainian history” was not noticed. According to information received at the end of 2008 from employees of the Ministry of Culture, the mentioned list entitled “List of names to perpetuate their memory in the “Alley of Outstanding Figures of Ukraine” according to a certain chronology of the eras of Ukrainian statehood” was prepared by the Academy of Sciences and sent to the ICT in 2007. The list of names has 127 positions. It includes: 17 sovereign and political figures where one of them was Symon Petliura<sup>57</sup>.

Museum of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921 (Museum of the UNR) in pursuance of Presidential Decree N9 793/2005 "On

---

<sup>56</sup>Hrytsenko, p. 380.

<sup>57</sup>Hrytsenko, pp. 390, 392, 406.

perpetuating the memory of outstanding figures of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic" and Decree N9 297/2007 "On events to celebrate the 90th anniversary of the events of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921 and honoring the memory of its participants" UINP created a permanent exhibition "Museum of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917-1921". The grand opening of the exhibition took place as part of the celebration of the 90th anniversary of the Zluka Act on January 22, 2009. However, the museum did not have time to legally establish the museum as a separate institution of the UINP, therefore, during the presidency of V. Yanukovich, there were attempts to destroy the museum, but due to public protests and opposition to the then head of the UINP V. Soldatenko was not allowed to do this<sup>58</sup>.

Minister of Culture and Tourism Igor Likhovoy and his deputy O. Bench at a press conference on May 16, 2006 stated: "In order to perpetuate the memory of outstanding figures of the UPR and WUNR, an organizing committee was created, the chairman of which was the Minister of Culture and Tourism. In pursuance of the Presidential decree, together with The Academy of Sciences has developed an action plan. "Minister I. Likhovy added that the first of the large-scale events will be the celebration of the 80th anniversary of the death of the Ukrainian statesman and political figure Symon Petliura, and explained: "Petliura's personality in Ukraine has not yet found, unfortunately, a corresponding contribution to the construction of the Ukrainian nation, the Ukrainian state of the place, and therefore a political decision was made at the highest level to do everything to ensure that children in Ukraine are no longer frightened by Symon Petliura, as was the case for

---

<sup>58</sup>Hrytsenko, p. 460.

a long time. We must break this stereotype”. Leaders of the Ministry of Culture said that the anniversary events should include an artistic event at the National Opera of Ukraine with the participation of the president, a screening of a film about S. Petliura, as well as an exhibition of photographic documents. On the day of S. Petliura’s death, May 25, the exhibition “Knight of the Ukrainian Revolution” opened at the National Museum of the History of Ukraine; On the same day, a funeral service was held in the Vladimir Cathedral with the participation of the head of the UOC-KP, Patriarch Filaret. The Institute of History of Ukraine hosted a round table “Symon Petliura - a public, political and military figure of Ukraine”<sup>59</sup>.

On May 27, 2009, in pursuance of the order of the Cabinet of Ministers N9 20397/1/1/09, the Ministry of Culture organized a “cultural and artistic event” in Kyiv in honor of the 130th anniversary of the birth of S. Petliura. The celebration of the 130th anniversary of S. Petliura was not limited to the event with the participation of the president - anniversary events were held in several cities: “On May 13, an evening of memory “Petliura’s figure against the background of the era” was held at the Ternopil Regional State Administration. On May 20, the Chernigov Regional State Administration organized a thematic literary evening dedicated to the 130th anniversary of the birth of S. Petliura. On May 20-22, a number of events were held by the Poltava Regional State Administration (laying flowers and a solemn meeting, presentations of books, films and exhibitions, a scientific conference). On May 23, flowers were laid at memorial plaques in the cities of Polonnoye and Kamenets-Podolsky, Khmelnytsky region, organized by local governments and the public. On May 31, the event “Petliura Days

---

<sup>59</sup>Hrytsenko, pp.698-699.

in Lviv” took place in Lviv (laying flowers and placing information materials on the houses where S. Petliura was)”<sup>60</sup>.

And the report of the Poltava Regional Department of Culture for 2009 reported: “The Poltava region celebrated the 130th anniversary of the birth of the Chairman of the UPR Directory, Chief Ataman of the UPR troops S. Petliura. A solemn meeting was held and flowers were laid at the memorial plaque; scientific and practical conference; presentation of the book "Poltavskaya Petliuriana"; an exhibition of archival and photographic materials dedicated to the UPR took place”. The statement that on S. Petliura’s birthday, May 23, a memorial stone will be erected in Poltava on the site of the future monument to the Chairman of the Directorate of the UPR, caused a mixed reaction in the regional center. The persistent initiative of the Poltava governor V. Asadchev to immortalize Symon Petliura in the city where he was born did not please all Poltava residents. In a news release from the city TV channel “Gorod”, the secretary of the Poltava City Council A. Kozub stated that the installation of a memorial stone on the site of the future monument is possible only after the city council makes a decision to allocate a plot of land and provide all the necessary documentation to the mayor’s office. Unfortunately, O. Kozub stated, the initiators of the opening of the memorial stone have not yet done this, and the city council has not made a decision on allocating land for the monument. In Poltava they predict that the opening of a memorial stone in honor of a controversial figure in Ukrainian history will cause a negative reaction from some citizens and political forces, primarily communists.”The main opposition came not from the communists, but from the Poltava City Hall, which decided to dismantle the memorial stone, which was

---

<sup>60</sup>Hrytsenko, p.702.



installed improperly. That's why Petliura was honored by his fellow countrymen under the memorial plaque. The public atmosphere and the discourse in memory of Petliura and other outstanding fighters for the independence of Ukraine in Ivano-Frankivsk were different. Local authorities proclaimed May 24 as Heroes' Day in memory of those figures of the liberation movement who died in May (S. Petliura, E. Konovalts, M. Mikhnovsky). On this day: "Delegations of UPA veterans from all regions of the Carpathian region made a solemn march to the Vecheva Square of Ivano-Frankivsk, where a meeting was held on the occasion of Heroes Day."<sup>61</sup>.

In the field of scientific research of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution, the most notable achievement was the holding of conferences and readings: Scientific readings dedicated to the 130th anniversary of S. Petliura (UINP, NAS of Ukraine, Fastiv Local History Museum, 04/28/2009); Scientific conference "The figure of S. Petliura in history and national memory" (UINP, Poltava Regional State Administration, Poltava Pedagogical University named after V. Korolenko, 05/20-22/2009), A. Kucheruk "Kyiv 1917-1919. Addresses. Events. People", his illustrated booklet "Symon Petliura", published by the UINP for the opening of the UPR Museum". The decision of the Kyiv City Council, adopted in June 2009, to rename Comintern Street to Symon Petliura had considerable publicity<sup>62</sup>.

Yushchenko was the first president of Ukraine who attached importance on historical memory. It is also important to note that after a short period in the late 1980s and early 1990s, there were no consistent and systematic attempts to reckon with the Soviet past in Ukraine at the

---

<sup>61</sup>Hrytsenko, p.703-705.

<sup>62</sup>Hrytsenko, p. 708-710.

national level until the start of the “decommunization” campaign of 2015–2017. Yushchenko was the first president to make an attempt at a systemic level to begin the “decommunization” of symbolic space; at least two of his decrees contain direct statements of the need to dismantle monuments and eliminate toponymy associated with the “communist totalitarian regime”<sup>63</sup>.

If to look at Viktor Yanukovich, who took office after Yushchenko, he worked on this area completely differently. During the time of V. Yanukovich, the “hetman period” and the Ukrainian liberation movement of the twentieth century, which were priorities for V. Yushchenko and L. Kuchma, the authorities not only forgot, but it became the function of the Verkhovna Rada to sanction their state celebration.

Petro Poroshenko's term, who took office after the eventful end of Yanukovich's term, is very important. Poroshenko's ascension to power amid the transformative events of November 2013 to February 2014, commonly referred to as the "Revolution of Dignity," appears to align with a historical politicking paradigm reminiscent of the era of Viktor Yushchenko. The prevailing political landscape, marked by Russia's annexation of Crimea, conflict in eastern Ukraine, and persistent threats to national integrity and sovereignty, drives Poroshenko towards a historical narrative with substantial political mobilization potential. This predisposition positions Poroshenko as a successor to the "Yushchenko legacy." Despite encountering significant criticism, including from within his own political circles, Poroshenko swiftly endorsed all "memorial" legislation. Notably, one such law,

---

<sup>63</sup>Georgy Kasianov, *Ukraina i Sosedi, Istoricheskaya Politika, 1987-2018*, Moskva, NLO, 2019, pp.67, 75.

pertaining to the legal status of participants in Ukraine's 20th-century struggle for independence, reflects a program initially conceived under Yushchenko's decree and developed in collaboration with the nationalist party All-Ukrainian Association "Svoboda." Poroshenko staunchly advocated for "decommunization," actively participating in its implementation by decreeing the removal of all Soviet attributes from Ukrainian military unit names, particularly those referencing orders bestowed during the Soviet era. Under his stewardship, the expansion of nationalist memory narratives from Western Ukraine to Central Ukraine intensified, elevating key figures of the nationalist memory pantheon to the forefront of national historical policy<sup>64</sup>.

Poroshenko started decommunization campaign with the program introduced by the four Memory Laws ratified in May 2015. On April 9, 2015, the Ukrainian parliament by a comfortable majority adopted the four decommunization laws, which had been prepared under the auspices of the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory, a government body originally created by Yushchenko to support research and forge a policy. They include Law No. 2558, "On the condemnation of the communist and national socialist (Nazi) regimes, and prohibition of propaganda of their symbols"; Law No. 2538-1, "On the legal status and honoring of fighters for Ukraine's independence in the twentieth century"; Law No. 2539, "On remembering the victory over Nazism in the Second World War"; and Law No. 2540, "On access to the archives of repressive bodies of the communist totalitarian regime from 1917–1991".<sup>65</sup> While Poroshenko did not specifically enact laws related to

---

<sup>64</sup>Kasianov, *Ukraina i Sosedi*, p. 78.

<sup>65</sup>David Marples, *Decommunization, Memory Laws, and "Builders of Ukraine in the 20th Century"*, *Acta Slavica Iaponica*, Tomus 39, pp. 1–22; Oxana Shevel,

Petliura during his presidency, his administration was focused on promoting Ukrainian national identity and independence, which would naturally involve commemorating figures such as Petliura who played significant roles in Ukraine's history. Poroshenko was mentioning Petliura during his speeches, there were attempts to erect statue to Petliura and also was made film “Tayemnyj Shodennyk Symona Petliury”.

After Poroshenko took office, what Poroshenko said about Petliura was included in the Russian media. For example: “Petro Poroshenko advised the citizens of the country to study history and read several books, including a brochure by Symon Petliura entitled “Moskovskaya Vosh””<sup>66</sup>, “Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko, while on an official visit to Israel, put on a kippah and prayed at the Western Wall, the main shrine of the Jews. And at this time, on January 21, 2019, a bas-relief was solemnly unveiled in Kyiv in honor of a man whom many historians consider guilty of the so-called small Holocaust and whose guilt in the deaths of tens of thousands of Jews, albeit indirectly, was recognized by a French court back in 1927 year”<sup>67</sup> etc.

At the same time, the president of the period also mentioned Petliura on his Twitter page. He said: “Centuries ago, during the Ukrainian national liberation revolution, both Hetman Pavlo Skoropadsky and Symon Petliura began Ukraine’s path to the

---

The Battle for Historical Memory in Postrevolutionary Ukraine, *Current History*, Vol. 115, No:783, Russia and Eurasia (October 2016), pp. 258-263

<sup>66</sup><https://ria.ru/20180122/1513080665.html> (18.03.2024)

<sup>67</sup><https://eadaaily.com/ru/news/2019/01/22/poroshenko-petlyura-izrail-i-politicheskie-metamorfozy> (18.03.2024).

autocephalous Orthodox Church. Ukraine bows to its great ancestors and remembers their testament. Today everything is ready to fulfill it”<sup>68</sup>.

During Poroshenko's time, the issue of erecting a statue for Petliura was brought up again and was implemented in several places. The Vinnytsa monument was erected on October 14, 2017. Its prototype was the famous photograph of Symon Petliura on a bench near the Directory building in Kamenets-Podolsky. The monument in Vinnytsa was installed in the historical district of Jerusalem and that caused a very critical response on the international level. From the name of the area it is clear that the area was inhabited mainly by Jews. The opening of the monument was condemned by the World Jewish Congress. The monument was opened also in Ternopil on August 24, 2018. Chronologically, the first was the Rivne monument. It was opened on October 14, 2001<sup>69</sup>. The idea of placing a statue of Petlura was put forward in Kyiv, Poltava and Kamenets-Podolsky, but no result was reached. Discussions about such monuments have been going on for decades. In Kamenets-Podolsky on July 2, 2004, at the height of the presidential election campaign, the head of the city organization of the Union of Architects, Vasily Ad, in the local newspaper "Kamenets-Podolsky Vestnik" expressed the idea of installing monuments to Symon Petliura and Ivan Ogienko in the city. The architect was

---

<sup>68</sup><https://www.dsnews.ua/politics/poroshenko-na-obeditelnom-sobore-vspomnil-o-petlyure-15122018155900> (18.03.2024).

<sup>69</sup>That time unofficial Day of the defender and defenders of Ukraine. After gaining independence, the defenders of the Motherland were honored on February 23, according to Soviet custom. Defenders Day in Ukraine began to be celebrated for the first time in 2014 by decree of President Petro Poroshenko. The holiday was tied to the Christian celebration of the Intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary - October 14. The Zaporozhye Cossacks greatly revered the Intercession. In 2023, Defender of Ukraine Day was moved to October 1 by decree of President Vladimir Zelensky. The holiday changed its date due to the reform of the church calendar.

supported by a number of city political organizations. The issue was brought to a session of the city council. The deputies refused. In 2009, the local branch of the right-wing radical party Svoboda made the same proposal. The toponymic commission supported the idea. However, further bureaucracy made it impossible for the monument to Symon Petliura to appear in Kamenets-Podolsky. On October 14, 1919, in Kamenets-Podolsky, a solemn oath of allegiance to the UPR was taken by the Directory, officials and troops. Of course, Symon Petliura was also present there. Accordingly, the idea arose to build a monument in honor of this event. In 2017, local Enlightenment launched “the Oath of 1919” project. The project received the support of the mayor, a design competition was soon announced, a site for construction was determined, and fundraising began. In April 2019, the first stone of the Oath of Allegiance to Ukraine Memorial was laid. However, the memorial itself was never built. Symon Petliura has the status of an Honorary Citizen of the city and a street in his honor.

The first attempts to honor Petliura in Poltava began in the late 1980s. However, they were local and, of course, could not yet set the goal of erecting a monument. In the 1990s. The series of publications "Poltavska Petliuriana" began. In 2005, President Viktor Yushchenko issued a decree “On perpetuating the memory of outstanding figures of the UPR and WUNR,” which provided for the construction of monuments in Kyiv and other settlements. Two years later, the Poltava Regional State Administration was able to install a stone on the site of the future monument. However, this caused fierce resistance from local leftist and pro-Russian organizations. They even created the Anti-Petliura Committee. The stone was finally removed by city utilities. In 2006, a memorial plaque was installed on the building of the former

theological seminary where Petliura studied. In April 2017, it was destroyed by vandals. In the summer of 2020, the construction of the monument finally moved forward. The city council allocated a plot of land. The Poltava Regional State Administration announced an All-Ukrainian open architectural competition for the construction of a monument to Symon Petliura in Poltava."<sup>70</sup>

In Kyiv Petliura is marked with a street (since 2009) and an annotation board (since 2019). The board was opened at the height of the presidential election campaign and, therefore, the celebration was of a politicized nature, which had the veiled purpose of supporting one of the presidential candidates. There has been talk about the Petliura monument in Kyiv for several decades. The construction of the monument was mentioned twice in the decrees of Presidents Yushchenko (2006) and Poroshenko (2017). Top officials spoke about support for construction - Deputy Prime Minister Pavel Rozenko, heads of the UINP (Ukrainian Institute of National Memory) Volodymyr Vyatrovych and Anton Drobovych. A place was determined - the left of the building of the Ukrainian Central Council (Modern Kyiv City Teacher's House). There was even a memorial plaque erected about this. However, formally, due to the unresolved land issue, the monument was never erected. In addition to the above memorial and information boards, there are boards in Zdolbunov, Vinnytsa (at the railway station in honor of the meeting of Symon Petliura and Jozef Pilsudski in 1920),

---

<sup>70</sup>[https://rus.lb.ua/news/2021/01/20/475657\\_poltave\\_ustanovyat\\_pamyatnik\\_Symon\\_u.html](https://rus.lb.ua/news/2021/01/20/475657_poltave_ustanovyat_pamyatnik_Symon_u.html) , also about the monuments  
<https://www.historians.in.ua/index.php/en/istoriya-i-pamyat-vazhki-pitannya/472-sergii-shebelist-memory-and-memorials-poltava-without-mazepa-and-petliura> (18.03.2023)

Shepetivka (at the railway station and memory of April 20, 1919), Novograd-Volynsky.

Murals have become popular recently. In Ukraine, there are two known murals depicting Symon Petliura. The first one is in Kyiv on Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya Street. The Kyiv mural was opened on May 22, 2019, on the 140th anniversary of Symon Petliura. In the same year, a mural dedicated to Symon Petliura was created in Kamenets-Podolsky. The opening took place on August 24 on the facade of the house on the street. The author of the mural is the artist Taras Dovgalyuk. For the image, was used a popular photograph of Symon Petliura on a bench in the garden of the building where the Directorate of the UPR was located in Kamianets-Podolsky<sup>71</sup>.

Apart from the studies carried out to break the negative perception of Petliura, another important issue is how effective these studies are and how the public sees and evaluates Petliura. The best place to see these over time is the various sociological surveys conducted. We can see from some surveys whether the efforts to rehabilitate Petliura in Ukraine and bring him back to history as a positive character were successful or not. From these surveys, we can compare how much Petliura's popularity has increased or decreased each year. For example, historian Yaroslav Hrytsak mentions a survey conducted in 2002 in his book *Strasti za Natsionalizmom*. Here the main heroes and anti-heroes of Ukrainian historical consciousness alternate in exactly this order: Khmelnytsky and Peter I, Brezhnev and Hrushevsky, Chornovil and Khrushchev, in the first case heroes, and Gorbachev and Stalin, Bandera and Kravchuk, Lenin and Petliura - in

---

<sup>71</sup> <https://www.istpravda.com.ua/articles/2021/05/21/159546/> (18.03.2023)



the second antihero<sup>72</sup>. Although Hrytsak argues that this survey should not be evaluated regionally, the surveys he included later show that Petliura has a more positive image in the West and a more negative image in the east and south. For example, to the question “What achievements of the Ukrainian people, in your opinion, most deserve to be the subject of national pride today? (V %)” The answer “Activities of outstanding leaders of the Ukrainian national liberation movement (M. Hrushevsky, V. Vynnychenko, S. Petliura and others)” were chosen in July 2005 by 12.9%; in August 2006 by 10.2%. Regionally (at the time of the last survey): the activities of outstanding leaders of the Ukrainian national liberation movement (M. Hrushevsky, V. Vynnychenko, S. Petliura and others) was chosen by western 27.6%; Central 9.6%; Eastern 2.9%; South 5.0%<sup>73</sup>.

Also on September 9-15, 2010, the "Ukrainian Democratic Circle" commissioned the Institute of Politics to conduct an all-Ukrainian survey within the framework of the "Ukraine Needs Heroes" project. The sample population represented the adult population of Ukraine and covered all regions of the country. 1,200 respondents aged 18 and older were interviewed by place of residence. The respondents were asked to rate their attitude towards 20 cultural figures, as well as historical and political figures. Only in relation to three historical figures, the negative attitude of Ukrainians outweighs the positive: Joseph Stalin (64% have a negative attitude, and 28% have a positive attitude), Stepan Bandera (51% against 28%), Simon Petliura (48% against 29%). On the other hand, in the Western region, 56% have a positive attitude towards Stepan Bandera and 50% towards Simon

---

<sup>72</sup>Hrytsak, *Strasti za Natsionalizmom*, p.269.

<sup>73</sup>Hrytsak, pp.191-193.

Petliura, while in the Eastern region, 9% and 11% respectively. Regarding Stepan Bandera and Symon Petliura, residents of rural areas are more positive than urban residents, young people under 30 think the same way, unlike other age groups, as well as men compared to women. The same research was conducted in 2002 and 2006 and the data showed that positive attitudes towards Symon Petliura increased from 21% to 28%<sup>74</sup>.

Year	Positive	Hard to answer	Negative	I do not know the person
------	----------	----------------	----------	--------------------------

Symon Petliura	2002	21	29	40	10
	2006	21	27	42	10
	2010	28	16	48	8

There was another survey "Region, Nation and Beyond. An Interdisciplinary and Transcultural Reconceptualization of Ukraine" (University of St.Gallen) co-organized by Viktoria Sereda. The result of the survey which was made on March of 2013 was: open questions about 3 positive historical figures, 3 negative, and monuments that must be erected or demolished. Never mentioned: Cherkasy, Zhytomyr, Kyiv oblast, Kirovohrad, Volyn, Zaporizhzhia. Negative figure (1 or maximum 2 persons mentioned Petliura): Crimea, Dnipro, Chernihiv, Donetsk, Kherson, Khmelnytsky, Kyiv city, Odesa, Poltava, Sumy, Vinnytsia, Zakarpattia. Positive figure (every time 1 or

<sup>74</sup><https://polityka.in.ua/info/456.htm> (14.02.2024)

maximum 2 persons mention): Chernivtsi, Ivano-Frankivsk, Kharkiv, Luhansk, Lviv, Mykolaiv, Rivne. To erect a monument: Ternopil (1 person)<sup>75</sup>.

The result of the survey which was made on March 2015 was: Never mentioned: Cherkasy, Chernihiv, Chernivtsi, Donetsk, Kherson, Kirovograd, Luhansk, Mykolaiv, Odesa, Sumy, Zakarpattia, Zaporizhzhia. Negative figure (1 or maximum 2 persons mention): Volyn, Dnipro, Zhytomyr, Kyiv, Kharkiv. Positive figure (1 or maximum 2 persons mention): Vinnytsia, Ivano-Frankivsk, Kyiv oblast, Lviv, Poltava, Rivne, Ternopil, Khmelnytsky, Kyiv City. To erect a monument: Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Kharkiv, Kyiv city<sup>76</sup>.

The last survey was done by Kyiv International Institute of Sociology in January 2023, “Istorychna Pam’yat” (results of a sociological survey of adult residents of Ukraine). This is the results of a survey of Ukrainian residents conducted by the Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (KIIS) commissioned by the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine. The study examined the opinions and views of Ukrainian residents on various issues related to the perception of history and ideas about historical figures and events. The survey was conducted January 19-27, 2023 using a telephone interview. Adult residents of Ukraine were surveyed (2004). A random selection of mobile phone numbers generated randomly (random digit dialing) was used. At the data processing stage, the results obtained were weighted taking into account the age and sex structure of the permanent population of Ukraine in accordance with the data of the State Statistics

---

<sup>75</sup> <https://www.uaregio.org/en/surveys/methodology/> (14.02.2024)

<sup>76</sup> <https://www.uaregio.org/en/surveys/methodology/> (15.02.2024)

Service as of January 1, 2022 (information as of February 24, 2022 was taken for the respondent's place of residence). The survey included attitudes towards individual historical figures and events. Regarding the majority of historical figures included in the surveys, there is a consensus among Ukrainian residents: the majority of Ukrainian residents in all socio-demographic categories and in all regions of Ukraine (with minor differences) have a positive attitude towards the survey of Ukrainian historical figures who played a role in the formation of the Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian state, and who have a sharply negative perception of Russian/Soviet political leaders and figures. In order to understand how residents of the country perceive the past of their own people, respondents were asked to answer what their attitude was towards individual historical figures or events that played one role or another in the history of Ukraine. Regarding Symon Petliura and Nestor Makhno, the assessments are less clear, although the percentage of those who have a positive attitude towards them significantly exceeds those who have a negative attitude. In particular, according to the survey, 64% have a positive attitude towards Symon Petliura, 18% have a negative attitude, 11% are undecided and 7% do not know him<sup>77</sup>.

In particular, younger people (18-29 years old) have a slightly more positive view of Symon Petliura than older people: among people aged 18 to 29 years old 84% (or 90%) have a positive view of Symon Petliura, (who knows such a person), among those over 30 years of age 60% (or 65% of those who know such a person) have a positive attitude towards Symon Petliura<sup>78</sup>.

---

<sup>77</sup>Kyiv International Institute of Sociology, *Istorychna Pam'at*, 2023, pp. 5, 13.

<sup>78</sup>pp. 15.



Among those who know

Positive	74	64	90	74	59	65	58	64	63	64	74	59	71
Negative	16	22	6	14	23	24	27	22	22	21	17	24	17
Hard to say	10	14	5	12	18	10	16	13	15	15	9	17	11
Balance of positive/negative attitude	58	43	84	61	36	41	31	42	41	44	56	35	54

Knowledge and attitude to individual historical figures, by place of residence (until February 24, 2022) and migration status (%)<sup>80</sup>:

Type of settlement (till February 24)	macro-regions (until February 24)				Movement in the situation of war between Russia and Ukraine			
Urban	Rural	West	Center	South	East	Did not move	Moved	Moved, but

<sup>80</sup>p.62.

	94	92	93	94	94	89	92	94	9
Know	94	92	93	94	94	89	92	94	9
									6
Among those who know									
Positive	65	76	76	73	61	55	69	66	7
									0
Negative	22	14	15	16	24	27	20	17	1
									8
Hard to say	13	10	9	11	15	18	12	17	1
									2
Balance of positive/negative attitude	43	62	62	57	36	28	49	50	5
									2

Knowledge of and attitude towards individual historical figures, according to the level of interest in the history of Ukraine (%)<sup>81</sup>:

The level of interest in the history of Ukraine

<sup>81</sup>Kyiv International Institute of Sociology, *Istorychna Pam'at*, 2023, p.65.

	Low or no interest (1-5 points)	Moderate points)	(6-8 High (9-10 points)
Symon Petliura			
Know	91	94	94
Among those who know such a historical person			
Positive	55	73	71
Negative	31	16	17
Hard to say	14	11	12
Balance of	24	57	54
positive/negative attitude			

Furthermore, there was done a pilot-survey among the Ukrainian students of humanities and social sciences conducted by me. The survey started on 01.09.2023 and was finished on 30.09.2023. This survey was conducted among experts, studying in humanities. The lower age limit was 18, and the upper age limit had not been determined. The purpose of the survey was to find answers to the following questions: 1.Has society's perception of S. Petliura changed over the years of Independence, has it been possible to overcome stereotypes (Soviet, Russian)? 2.What caused this change (e.g. Revolution of Dignity, war)? 3. The image of Petliura is not only in the historical narrative, but also in the public consciousness. How much has it changed since the restoration of Ukraine's independence? 4. How was the reaction to the idea of installing a statue of Petliura in Kyiv?



The following questions were asked: 1. Do you know about Symon Petliura 2. Did you learn about him in history classes at school or university? 3. Who do you think Symon Petliura is? 4. Has your perspective changed over the years? 5. Did the current war or Revolution of Dignity change your point of view? 6. Should there be a monument to Petliura in Kyiv?

A total of 18 people took part in the specified survey. 4 people are 20-25 years old, 8 people are 25-30, 5 people are 30-40, 1 person is 46 years old, and 1 person is 18 years old. 6 people are from Kyiv, 4 people from Dnipro, 1 from Lutsk, 1 Chernihiv, 1 Lugansk, 1 Rivne, 1 Vasylkiv, 1 Ternopol, 1 Kharkiv and 1 from Kramatorsk. 17 people stated that they knew Petliura and only 1 person stated that he had very little information about him. Only two people did not remember whether they had studied Petliura at school or university, while 16 people stated that they learned about Petliura in "Ukrainian History" courses at school and university.

The answers to the question "Who do you think Petliura was?" are quite interesting. O.Y., who thinks he is a hero by emphasizing his controversial personality is 22 years old. He said: *One of the most influential figures of his time. A person who fought for Ukraine. Although the Soviet authorities tried to spoil his reputation and rewrite history, I consider him more of a hero than a traitor.* In total, four people stated that he was a hero fighting for Ukrainian independence. 9 people answered that he was an important politician, nationalist, patriot and military commander who played a key role in the revolutionary period. One person answered that he was the one who founded the Ukrainian army, and 2 people did not have information about his political activities. The answer of a participant who is a researcher and studies

Jewish history is quite interesting: *He was the Supreme Commander of the Ukrainian People's Army. He is controversial person. On the one hand, he is perceived as a national hero as a fighter for Ukrainian freedom, but at the same times his troops are responsible for massive Jewish pogroms.* The answer of 1 person is ambiguous.

10 people said that their perspective have not changed over the years. 7 people said that their persperctive on Petliura changed over the years to the positive side and only one person T.S. said it changed to the negative side because she started learning Jewish history. 8 people's point of view was not affected by war or Maidan (Only T.S.'s answer has a negative meaning). 4 people said that the war affected their point of view. For example one the answers was: *Thus, after the start of the war, Vynnychenko's pacifist position became unclear and a better understanding of Petliura's actions came.* 5 people answered that the Revolution of Dignity and Maidan affected their point of view, where Maidan made it more patriotic.

10 people think that there has to be Petliura's monument in Kyiv. M.S. answer was: *It seems that he made a great contribution to the development of Ukrainian statehood. His monument could replace the monument to Shchors<sup>82</sup>, which Klitschko did not demolish during the 9 years of war.* The other interesting answer was the answer of T.Z: *We should respect all of our historical figures, so if he has a monument, then should Soviet Marshals, such as Marshal Rybalko and others, since we should not forget any of our famous and influential people, and not cow down before nationalist tendencies.* One of the participants

---

<sup>82</sup>Monument to the red commander, division commander of the Civil War of 1917-1922. Nikolay Shors The monument was opened on April 30, 1954 - the opening was timed to coincide with the 300th anniversary of the reunification of Russia and Ukraine.

said it would be better if in Kyiv they have monument of Pavlo Skoropadsky or Bolbochan. The other participant thinks there has to be monument for all participants of Ukrainian Revolution who were fighting for Ukrainian independence. One answer was negative. And last two participants think that a memorial plaque that they have now is enough. T.S. also added: *There was a big scandal among Jewish community when the monument was established in Vinnytsia.*

The following conclusions can be drawn from this pilot-survey. The majority of participants (17 out of 18) are knowledgeable about Symon Petliura, with most having learned about him through Ukrainian history courses in school or university. This indicates a significant level of awareness and educational exposure to Petliura among individuals in the humanities field. Participants' perceptions of Petliura vary, reflecting his complex and controversial legacy. While some view him as a hero fighting for Ukrainian independence, others acknowledge his role as a politician, nationalist, and military commander, but also recognize his involvement in controversial actions such as pogroms against Jewish communities. The survey suggests that historical events such as the ongoing war and the Revolution of Dignity have influenced participants' perspectives on Petliura. Some individuals' viewpoints have become more positive, viewing Petliura's actions in a new light amidst contemporary circumstances, while others, particularly those delving into Jewish history, have developed more critical perspectives. There is a diversity of opinions regarding the installation of a monument to Petliura in Kyiv. While many participants support the idea, citing Petliura's contributions to Ukrainian statehood, others express reservations or suggest alternative commemorative approaches, highlighting the complexities and sensitivities surrounding historical

memory and public commemoration. Participants' responses reflect broader socio-political dynamics, including debates over historical figures, nationalist sentiments, and considerations of inclusivity and sensitivity towards minority communities, particularly regarding contentious figures like Petliura.

As all these surveys show perception of Petliura has been changing during the years. It is clear that Petliura, who was seen by the majority as a negative personality in the early 2000s, is seen more as a positive personality in Ukrainian history in the early 2020s.

Another source we need to look at to see how Petliura is perceived in today's Ukraine is historical textbooks. Historical textbooks play a pivotal role in shaping collective memory by serving as primary conduits for disseminating and perpetuating historical narratives within societies. These textbooks serve as foundational resources through which individuals, particularly students, engage with and internalize historical events, figures, and interpretations. Historical textbooks often reflect the dominant narratives and interpretations endorsed by educational authorities or governing bodies. By standardizing historical accounts, these textbooks contribute to the establishment of a shared understanding of the past among citizens. By highlighting exemplary behavior or valorizing certain historical figures, textbooks implicitly endorse specific values and norms deemed desirable for society. Certain topics may be marginalized or altogether omitted to align with prevailing ideological perspectives. In general, historical textbooks wield considerable influence in shaping collective memory by framing historical narratives, constructing national identities, and transmitting societal values and ideals. It is important to remember that these books are a reflection of the state's policy. In this

respect, it is necessary to examine the treatment of Petliura in school textbooks.

In Ukrainian schools, history lessons start in 5th grade and the history of the 20th century is covered in grades 9 and 10. 10th grade history books cover period from World War I to World War II. In this section, we will examine how Symon Petliura is covered in 7 different history books. The book, *Istoriya Ukrainy*, by V.S.Vlasov, S.V. Kulchytsky<sup>83</sup>, in the chapter "Deployment of liberation struggles", covers Petliura under the title "Portrait of Symon Petliura against the background of the period" on pages 140-144 in subsection 33.34. While the entire process of UNR is covered in detail, Petliura and the duties he undertakes and was elected for are also included here. Subsequently, Osyp Nazaruk, Sergiy Yefremov and Isaak Mazepa's comments about Petliura, emphasizing his success in building an army, his honesty and determination added in the chapter. At the same time, the agreement with Poland in 1920, Petliura's opinions on the agreement are included. The most striking feature is having a short section on Petliura. One of the interesting points is that there is information that Petliura was killed by a Bolshevik agent, and moreover, the pogroms are never mentioned. On the book, *Istoriya Ukrainy* by I.O. Burneyko, G.M.Hlibovska, M.E. Kryjanovska, O.V.Naumchuk<sup>84</sup>, Petliura's name is seen for the first time in an article he wrote in the journal "Ukrainskaya Jizn". This is followed by an excerpt from this article. Then, Ukrainian independence and the Haydamatskyi Kish Slobidskoi Ukrainy, of which Petliura was the commander, are mentioned. In the section on UNR foreign policy, it is written that he was the head of the Direktoriya and underneath,

---

<sup>83</sup> V.S.Vlasov, S.V. Kulchytsky, *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Kyiv, Litera, 2018.

<sup>84</sup> I.O. Burneyko, G.M.Hlibovska, M.E. Kryjanovska, O.V.Naumchuk, *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Ternopol, Aston, 2018.

additional information about his life is briefly given and a link to the movie is added. The Warsaw Treaty is also covered and the events and terms of the treaty are mentioned chronologically. Although these two books provide detailed information about Petliura's life, they never touch on controversial issues. While the pogroms were ignored, the Warsaw agreement was included only as a historical event, and the two main events for which Petliura was accused were ignored without any positive or negative comment.

On the other book, *Istoriya Ukrainy* by O.V.Gisem, O.O. Martinyuk<sup>85</sup>, Symon Petliura's name is also mentioned quite often. The book points out the large number of people Symon Petliura knew as otamans and the chaos they created. It is also the first time that information about the pogroms is given and that not only Ukrainians but also the Red Army were involved. It was emphasized that the Direktoriya and Petliura were against the pogroms<sup>86</sup>. Volodymyr Oskilko's opposition to Petliura's strengthening, his declaration of himself as the commander-in-chief of the UNR army, and the conflict between Petliura and P. Bolobochan are detailed for the first time in this book. The condemnation of the Warsaw agreement by Hrushevsky and Vynnychenko and the criticism of the Galychyna people for Petliura's signing of this agreement are mentioned. There is also information that the Polish army carried out pogroms against the Jewish and Ukrainian population. The years 1918-1921 are described in great detail in this book. However, in general, there is no information about his life and death, and the period of emigration is not discussed. The book *Istoriya Ukrainy* by N.M. Sorochynska, O.O. Gisem is identical to this book,

---

<sup>85</sup> O.V.Gisem, O.O. Martinyuk, *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Harkiv, Ranok, 2018.

<sup>86</sup> O.V.Gisem, O.O. Martinyuk, p.67.

with the only difference being the photographs<sup>87</sup>. The next book is *Istoriya Ukrainy* by O.K. Strukevych<sup>88</sup>. Petliura's position in the General Secretariat is mentioned and then a very brief account of his life is given. The rebellion against the hetman and his arrest are also pointed out. His trip to Warsaw and his agreement with Pilsudski are given, as well as the Warsaw Treaty and the fact that Ukraine had no other choice at that time. Petliura's struggle for independence is covered in great detail. These three books included the Warsaw agreement, mentioned Pilsudski, and underlined Petliura's forced choice. The struggles for power and the damaged image of Petliura as a result of the Warsaw agreement are discussed.

The next book is *Istoriya Ukrainy* by O.I. Pometun, N.M. Gupan<sup>89</sup>. Symon Petliura is mentioned only 4 times in this book. The first is the *Ukrainskaya Jizn* magazine and his article published there. The first *Universal* published later, on June 28, 1917, provides information about Petliura's mission. Petliura is seen in the photograph of the announcement of the Third *Universal*, where also Mykhaylo Hrushevsky and Volodymyr Vynnychenko can be seen<sup>90</sup>. Then, in the section where his name is mentioned, information about his life and activity is given briefly. There is very limited information about Petliura in the book.

In general all books (except the last one) discuss Symon Petliura to varying degrees, highlighting his role in Ukrainian history and his significance in the context of the Ukrainian People's Republic

---

<sup>87</sup> N.M. Sorochynska, O.O. Gisem, *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Ternopol, Navchalna Knyga-Bogdan, 2018.

<sup>88</sup> O.K. Strukevych, *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Kyiv, Gramota, 2018.

<sup>89</sup> O.I. Pometun, N.M. Gupan *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Kyiv, Orion, 2018.

<sup>90</sup> O.I. Pometun, N.M. Gupan, p.52

(UNR), touching upon his involvement in the UNR and leadership role in the Direktoriya. Also Warsaw Treaty's implications for Ukraine, acknowledging Petliura's role in negotiating it are mentioned. Each book delves into Petliura's efforts and struggles for Ukrainian independence during the chaotic period following World War I. Moreover, while not consistently mentioned in all books, some acknowledge the issue of pogroms and Petliura's stance against them. If to look at contraversies, the portrayal of Petliura differs across the books. While some present him in a predominantly positive light, emphasizing his role as a freedom fighter and leader, others provide a more critical view, discussing controversies surrounding his leadership and actions. Some explicitly address this dark aspect of history as pogroms, while others either omit it or provide limited coverage. Furthermore, additional information about Petliura's interactions with other historical figures like Volodymyr Oskilko and P. Bolobochan, enriches the understanding of his role and challenges during that period. In the textbooks, Petliura is discussed as an important part of the UNR and does not create a negative impression.

One of the most important tools for creating collective memory is movies. It has the enormous scope of keeping memory alive, but also of institutionalizing it to avoid events to be forgotten or to be understood in a different way from the official interpretation. Movies can be a good tool, especially to bring someone who has been vilified in a certain period of history back into history as a hero or to change the attitude to the positive about him/her, to show the reality about the person. Promoting Petliura and creating a positive perception about him can be more impressive and reach a wider audience with short videos made in the cinema or on the internet. There are many short or long videos about



this on social media. However, only films that are works of major projects will be examined here. One of the such films, *Taemmitsy Velykyh Ukraintsev* is a very striking documentary. In English “Secrets of Great Ukrainians”<sup>91</sup> is a Ukrainian historical series of documentaries by Akim Galimov. Akim Galimov is one of the most prominent popularizers of history on Ukrainian Youtube. Galimov works as a producer at 1+1 media, where he creates documentaries for the TV channels of this media group<sup>92</sup>.

The film was first shown on the TV channel "1+1" on February 7, 2021. The cycle consists of 8 episodes, which tell about the lives of eight important historical figures in the history of Ukraine. The series was produced by "1+1 Production" with the support of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine. The series tells about the lives of eight historical figures: Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Anna Kyivska, Ivan Mazepa, Simon Petliura, King Danylo, Roksolana, Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Andrey Sheptytsky.

The film begins with the murder of Petliura in Paris. Petliura is said to be the one cursed by the Jews after they mentioned that he was trying to free Ukraine from the clutches of Russia. It is mentioned that his murderer is glorified and even has several streets named after him in Israel. It is said that documents found in French archives call into question Petliura's role in the pogroms. “Who was Petliura bloody otaman or person purposefully defamed for 100 years in the eyes of millions people?” asks the film. Stephane Dunikowski a French attorney of Ukrainian background was trying to solve the Petliura murder case. The film continues with the research and explanations of

---

<sup>91</sup><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=INT8RiYV12o> (20. 03.2024)

<sup>92</sup><https://abn.org.ua/ru/istoriya/akim-galimov-iskonno-russkaya-zemlya-eto-tam-gde-rossiyane-vse-unichtozhili-i-sterli-istoriyu/> (06.05.2024).

attorney Dunikowski and Akim Galimov. Attorney Dunikowski shows the time on the letter that Schwarzbard sent to his wife on the day Petliura was killed, the time was automatically added to the letter by the post, it is 14:35. But what is interesting is that at this hour, Petliura had been dead for 20 minutes and Schwarzbard had been arrested by the police. This raises the suspicion that Schwarzbard was not alone and that this was a pre-arranged assassination. Schwarzbard said that 15 of his relatives died in the pogrom carried out by Petliura's army in Balta, Odessa. To investigate this, Akim Galimov goes to a synagogue which has archive, in Odessa where there is information about Jews. He is helped there by Ukraine's well-known historian Viktor Savchenko. Savchenko shows a document stating that Shmuel (Samuel) Schwarzbard was born in Odessa in 1888. Schwarzbard told the court that his family was killed in Balta during the pogroms in May 1919. When checked with documents, it was seen that Petliura and his army were not in Balta at that time. Savchenko shows a book written by Antonov Ovsienko who was a commander of Red Army in Ukraine, where he wrote that on 6th April 1919 Red Army is in Balta. They pushed Petliura's forces to the west. So Savchenko says that pogroms might be done by anyone except Petliura's forces. Later, information about Schwarzbard's past is given. Later, Galimov goes to Kamyanets-Podolsk and investigates Petliura during the later periods of UNR. Here it is mentioned that Petliura created first Ukrainian choir, a Ukrainian chapel and sent it on a tour across the world. The relationship between Petliura and the Jews is mentioned here. Here Petliura met with the Jewish delegation which was headed by rabbi Gudman. At this meeting, promises were made that the UNR and the Jews would live in respect

and love. It is mentioned that Petliura wanted to ally with the Jews against the Russians. Archive documents regarding this are shown.

It is mentioned how Henry Torres, Schwarzbard's lawyer, was a good actor and he was manipulating. He had arranged interviews with famous people as Maxim Gorki, Albert Einstein, Romain Rolland who were defending Schwarzbard. Later in the movie, it is mentioned that Schwarzbard's lawyer brought a nurse from the Proskuriv (Khmelnysky) district to the court as a pogrom witness. Galimov goes to Khmelnytsky to investigate this incident and there he meets with the representative of the Jewish Community Semen Milman. One of the most terrible pogroms of the period took place in Proskuriv. Milman shows documents containing information about the injured and dead. During this period, the city was in the hands of the UNR army and the nurse who appeared in court told the truth. This pogrom, in which 2000 people were killed, was carried out by 23-year-old commander Semesenko.

During the course of the court, documents were collected by Petliura's wife, Olha, to show that Petliura was innocent, and the lawyer Dunikowski, who conducted the investigation, accesses these documents. However, the documents reach the lawyer at the last minute when the court date takes place, but they never appear or even disappear. In the film, it is stated that Petliura accepts Jews as citizens of the UNR with equal rights, and the UNR constitution is shown.

Andriy Rukkas is a historian who was doing investigation on Petliura's case. He shows the document about setting up a commission to investigate pogroms. Here they also mention that Semesenko was arrested and executed in 1920, what means he acted in Proskuriv without Petliura's order, which was supported by UNR Army officer

Colonel Dotsenko's testimony. Also in the film the documents where Petliura supported victims of pogroms (11,460.000 hryvnas) are shown. In the movie, it is stated that with these documents, Petliura could be acquitted in court in time.

It is stated that the Soviets delivered documents about the pogroms to Lawyer Torres. Viktor Savchenko mentions that there was agent in Odessa in 1920, who took part in the organization of the Cheka there called Zakordot, and that the organization sent him to Western Europe. His name was Mykhail Volodin. It is stated that this agent persuaded Schwarzbard to kill Petliura. Galimov shows the documents held by the foreign intelligence service. Here it can be seen that the Soviets were constantly following Petliura. In one of the documents, it was mentioned that Petliura's influence was quite high in Ukraine even in 1925, and that the peasants considered him their own father. Information about all of Petliura's meetings abroad was also included in these documents. So due to the film this is how and why the agent went to France and convinced Schwarzbard to kill Petliura, Also Soviet regime launched a massive disinformation campaign about the antisemitic views of UNR government. Towards the end of the film, Serhii Lytvyn, who has worked on Petliura, joins the film. He mentions Petliura and the Promethean movement. He even states that these action plans were the reason why he was killed.

The inclusion of important historians and scientists, explaining and interpreting events with historical documents in the film is very interesting. The film illuminates the most controversial event about Petliura. It reveals the work that Petliura, who was accused of Jewish pogroms, actually did to prevent the pogroms. The work is quite impressive in terms of Petliura's acquittal and his place as a hero in

Ukrainian history. The film also mentions and draws attention to the Soviets' creation of a monster, a traitor, out of Petliura, and the efforts they made to achieve this. The fact that historians describe the events and that the research is carried out in different cities and countries further increases the realism of the film.

The next film is “Symon Petliura”<sup>93</sup> from *Hra Doli* which was made in 2021. *Hra doli* is a project that emerged after the Orange Revolution in 2005. The creators of the project say the following about *Hra Doli*: “This was the authors’ emotional response to Ukraine’s expectation of renewal, to the desire to know more positive things about itself and its history. The opportunity to tell the audience in an accessible, interesting way in Ukrainian about our own heroes, not imposed from a neighboring country, seemed very important to us”<sup>94</sup>. *Hra Doli* is supported by the Ukrainian Cultural Foundation. One of the films they made is about Petliura. Petliura's life is described in detail in the film. When talking about their political activities, the conflict between Petliura and Vynnychenko is mentioned. It is said that Petliura admired Vynnychenko's works but when he tried to communicate with him, Petliura only saw arrogance, egoism and Bohemian habits. It is mentioned that Vynnychenko tried not to notice Petliura and called him "little journalist". It is mentioned that he personally gave permission for the formation of Jewish combat squads in Ukraine to protect Jewish people from pogroms. The revolution and Skoropadsky's administration are discussed in detail and Petliura's activities for this period are described. In the film, it is said that the pogrom that took place in Proskuriv was that the Bolsheviks revolted the Jews against the

---

<sup>93</sup><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R5lz3R6tQzM&t=1s> (08.04.2024)

<sup>94</sup><https://hradoli.com/about/> (08.04.2024)

Directorate, that they took over the mail and telegraph, and that commander Semenenko ordered his soldiers to kill the Jews as instigators of the Bolshevik revolt. Then it is said that Petliura took aside his troop and Semesenko was executed by shooting. Also the orders to stop pogroms in 1919 and 32million hryvna allocated for aid to victims of pogroms by Petliura are shown. And it is emphasized that the Bolsheviks and other enemies used the events of this period to denigrate Petliura.

The film is quite remarkable in terms of the photographs, video recordings and archive documents it uses. The entire historical process is explained in great detail. However, the objectivity of the film is questionable and it gives off the feeling of nationalist propaganda. In particular, Petliura's allocation of 32 million hryvna as aid is not credible. Considering the conditions of the period and the situation of the directorate, it is out of the question to allocate such an amount. Despite of such facts, the film is quite impressive to introduce Petliura and place it in people's memory as a positive figure.

It seems that both films mentioned were made with the support of the Ministry of Culture and the Ukrainian Cultural Fund after Volodymyr Zelensky took office. It is indisputable that they were made within the framework of state policy. Akim Galimov's series also deals with topics such as "The origin of the idea of Russian-Ukrainian brotherhood", the Crimean Khanate, and the establishment of Kharkiv. Both projects aim to counter Russian propaganda and debunk myths. In fact, after the start of the war, Akim Galimov created the YouTube channel "Real Story" together with the editor-in-chief of the project, Hanna Yurlovska, and continues to make important posts from there. These people are waging a state-sponsored war against Russian

propaganda through the media. The UNR independence struggle comes to the fore in this sense. And here the importance of Petliura, who fought against Russia to the end and is said to have been killed by the Soviets, also increases. The aim is not to completely exonerate Petliura, but to highlight his war of independence against Russia.

*Tajemnyj Shodennyk Symona Petliury*<sup>95</sup> (The Secret Diary of Simon Petliura) is a 2018 Ukrainian historical-biographical film directed by Oles Yanchuk and written by Mykhailo Shayevych. The film begins with Schwarzbard's court scene. Later, in 1930, Petliura's daughter Lesya is shown in a treatment center. A stranger gives Lesya, Petliura's diary. In the following scene, Petliura begins to write his diary and the process of Ukraine's struggle for independence starts. Volodymyr Vynnychenko criticizes the proclamation of the Ukrainian People's Republic, noting that declaring a free state does not mean protecting it from invaders. Petliura reports on the deployment of Bolshevik units in Kyiv and calls to attack them. However, Vynnychenko offers to make peace with them in order to lure some of them to the side of the Ukrainian People's Republic. Mykhailo Hrushevsky discusses them: Vynnychenko sets out to achieve his goal by diplomacy, and Petliura by force.

There is a lack of shells in the battle with the Bolsheviks, but the infantry attack under Petliura's command succeeds. He orders to throw captured Bolsheviks into prison despite the possibility of execution. Petliura's wife, Olga, warns him that he has many enemies, but he ignores it. He commands the defense against the cavalry, but the troops do not have medicine, they do not have enough fighters. Petliura meets with General Antin Kravs to organize a defense that strengthens his

---

<sup>95</sup><https://kinogo.biz/50957-tajnyj-dnevnik-simona-petljury.html> (09.04.2024)

position. One of the striking scenes is when French journalist Jan Pelisye on the battlefield says to Petliura, who saw the doctor who could not do anything to the wounded soldier without medicine, "I understand you, but Europe does not care about you and your Ukraine." Petliura says, "Then there is no other choice, we will fight until the end." It is shown that even in 1926, Petliura held talks in France for Ukraine and did not receive support.

The year 1919 comes, Vynnychenko plans to arrest the overly ambitious and unstable Pyotr Bolbachan, whose actions threaten the integrity of the UNR. Petliura warns him that this will only lead to a mutiny among the army. Instead, he sends Bolbachan to Italy on a diplomatic mission. Bolbachan refuses to go, then he is accused of attempted coup and executed. Soldiers begin to doubt their leaders. Petliura's meeting with Pilsudski is shown, and on Pilsudski's request for Ukrainian lands, Petliura says that people will not understand him. It is shown that the public ostracizes him for allying with Poland.

In 1926, Symon Petliura had been in exile in Paris for two years. He reflects on the reproaches directed at him for taking the place of a leader he was unworthy of. Petliura concludes that the lack of unity among Ukrainians was the reason for the defeat. He is trying to find support among French high-ranking officials who would recognize Ukraine as independent. When this fails, Petliura sets himself the goal of uniting Ukrainians abroad. Consul General of the USSR Otto Aussem, in order to prevent this, plans to find assassins in France who will eliminate Petliura. Agent Mikhail Volodin offers to find a Jew who will kill Petliura supposedly for pogroms of Jews in the Ukrainian People's Republic, committed by Petliura's general Semesenko. Michael seeks out Samuel for murder and promises that he will be



acquitted, but instead he gains fame as an avenger. Here, the following dialogue is included in the conversation between them: “No one believes that Petliura carried out the pogroms, even a Jewish minister was working with him”. Volodin answers: “We will say that the pogrom was Petliura's work anyway. We will spread that this is the ideology of the nationalist spirit of Ukraine”. Samuel gets the call, goes in for the kill and shoots Petliura several times in the street. Petliura later dies in the hospital. Lawyer Torres intimidates Samuel through the jailer so that he says only what is necessary for an acquittal. At the court, he tells that he has been planning revenge for a long time and pretends to be crazy. False witnesses say that Petliura himself took part in pogroms. Real witnesses intercede, reporting that Petliura was personally an opponent of the pogroms. Rabbi Gutman convinces the Parisian Jews that Petliura has been lied to, but they are ignored. The jury decides that the killer was justified. The court agrees with them and acquits Schwarzbard, and also awards a symbolic fine for washing the sidewalk from the blood of the murdered man. After the trial, Gutman warns Samuel that the punishment for the deception will one day catch up with him when the truth is revealed. Blackbeard flees from possible revenge to South Africa, but his conscience torments him, Samuel dreams of Petliura and eventually he dies of a heart attack.

It is difficult to classify this film purely in the genre of fiction or documentary. The events were not conveyed truthfully and were slightly distorted. For example, his conversation with Pilsudski. Important details about the pogroms are omitted. However, it is still the only film made to promote Petliura. From this perspective, the film is important.

## **Conclusion**

Nation-building is based on the assumption that the collective unit recognized as a nation has a common past. At this point, what is “imagined” with the nation is also a past. Each of the people who make up a nation must be convinced that they have a common past and the experiences gained from this past, which we can call memory construction. Memory construction is the most important foundation of nation-building because there cannot be a nation without a common perception of the past. Memory construction, in this respect, is to convince people who have nothing or very little in common, who do not know each other at all, who are not aware of each other at all, that they have a common life.

Memory construction is roughly realized through media, propaganda, literature, cinema, cultural activities and education. In this sense, those who hold power, politicians, intellectuals, artists, educators and writers contribute to the construction of memory. As Ernest Renan said, the first condition for becoming a nation is to forget. Only after forgetting can the nation be built by planting a new culture in the minds of the collective unity. On the other hand, imagining the nation and memory construction is not a one-sided, top-down process; it is dialectical.

In the process of memory construction, the public contextually embraces some things and rejects others. Over time, the view of some of the events may change. Things that used to be considered negative may become positive, and people who were hated may become loved. History does not end where it happened. History is always on the move in the minds of societies and is variable. The connection to the past is

always under the influence of politics, culture, wars, economic activity or problems. Differences between generations, the position of societies in the era they live in, changes in the understanding of history, cultural policies of governments and political administrations, revisions and reforms always change the relationship with the past.

In addition, shocking events, crises, wars, natural disasters, revolts can radically change the view of the past. As the relationship with the past is transformed, the epistemological basis on which the nation imagines itself is shaken and changed. Identity constructs itself with a difference. This difference cannot exist without an other. The self is constructed with the other. In other words, the collective self as a national identity becomes meaningful when it exists with an other. In this context, traumatic situations play a leading role in changing both the way the past is understood and the way the current nation is understood.

As for the purpose of this study, the reason for studying Symon Petliura is that Petliura and his supporters, who were the “other” during the Soviet era, are being revisited in the Diaspora and contemporary Ukraine and are actually being rehabilitated, if not whitewashed.

After the fall of the Soviet Union, a state that began writing its own history needed a single, unquestionable historical account that all of its people could agree upon. However, as was typical in other post-Soviet regions, emphasis was placed on building the new national identity around heroic myths, historical continuity symbols, and tales of suffering. Ukraine was rewriting its history. In Ukraine, as Tatiana Zhurzhenko points out “in the context of Ukraine’s competitive politics, the legislation of historical memory has been an instrument used to gain electoral support, to create political alliances and to denounce

opponents”. Due to Ukraine's relative political pluralism in the early 1990s, history was able to enter the public sphere and become subject to political manipulation and instrumentalization. The Ukrainian parliament has been the scene of contentious discussions regarding Ukraine's past since the early 1990s. Since the mid-2000s, in particular, presidents, political parties, and deputies have been prolific in crafting memory laws<sup>96</sup>.

However, Ukrainian history moved in a nationalist direction in the 2000s. The nationalist memory narrative, as Kasianov emphasizes, was a regional phenomenon in the 1990s. It was incorporated into the national memory landscape in the 2000s. Following 2014, the nationalist interpretation of history became an essential component of the national heroic narrative meant to inspire mobilization against Russian aggression.<sup>97</sup>The nationalist memory narrative was personally endorsed by two Ukrainian presidents, Victor Yushchenko (2005–2010) and Petro Poroshenko (2014–2019), albeit for different reasons. Yushchenko thought it would aid him in furthering the project of national identity. Poroshenko exploited it to win over the far-right to his cause of opposing Russian aggression. Both gained the allegiance of far-right and nationalist factions while losing the support of the general public. New legends and heroes were needed for this new agenda. And in this context, Petliura once again attracted attention, though not as popular as Bandera. Today, Tina Peresunko's work on Symon Petliura is precisely about creating this new heroic image.

---

<sup>96</sup>*Memory Laws and Historical Justice: The Politics of Criminalizing the Past*, ed by Elazar Balkan, Ariella Lang, Palgrave Macmillan, p. 102.

<sup>97</sup>Georgiy Kasianov, Nationalist Memory Narratives and the Politics of History in Ukraine since the 1990s, *Nationalities Papers* (2023), pp. 1–20

Especially after Maidan, nationalists were appointed to various high positions. In this context, the support *Hra Doli* received from the Ukrainian Cultural foundation for her film *Petliura* is noteworthy. Although *Petliura* is not completely whitewashed in these works made with the support of the nationalist community, it is still not treated very objectively. The films included in this study have been chosen specifically for this reason.

The school textbooks studied were published in 2018 and were written after the decomunization laws. Therefore, *Petliura* is given a special place in them and efforts are being made to bring him back into Ukrainian history. Surveys conducted in recent years also show that *Petliura*'s popularity and positive image is growing, especially among the younger generation, although not to a great extent.

Of course, the situation is slightly different in terms of published academic studies. *Petliura* is praised and included in the list of heroes, as well as critical writings and objective perspectives. In this context, Diaspora studies cannot be expected to offer an objective perspective. Considering the conditions of the period, these studies were a struggle against *Petliura*'s being “otherized” by the Soviets and being declared an enemy or traitor by propaganda.

One of the controversial issues today is whether the statue of Symon *Petliura* should be placed in Kyiv or in other cities. Interestingly, the removal of some statues under the decomunization laws caused controversy and one of them was the statue of Mykola Schors in Kyiv. Schors' statue was only removed almost two years after the war started. Schors was a hero created by the Soviets to replace *Petliura* (a review of the movie is very important in this context. This comparison and the attempt to create a new hero is strikingly evident in the movie). There

is no doubt that Petliura's statue will be there when a national pantheon alley is established, but his statue as a great hero, as a martyr, is unlikely to be seen in Kyiv.

Petliura's legacy inside Ukraine is still debated. In fact, Petliura is not a figure that either the political right or the political left sees as their hero. A socialist democrat, Petliura left the left while fighting for Ukrainian independence, but he did not become a right-winger because of his socialist ideas. But the unifying point today is that he fought against the “common enemy” - Russia. There have been various debates about Petliura within Ukraine between pro-Soviet and nationalists. Nationalists consider it important that he fought for Ukrainian independence and commemorate his struggle. For the pro-Soviet side, Petliura caused chaos at the time, did not understand the peasants and defended bourgeois nationalism. At the same time, nationalists do not hold Petliura responsible for the Jewish pogroms. For them, Petliura tried to take measures to prevent the pogroms and punished the perpetrators of the pogroms. Although the participation of Petliura's army in the pogroms is known, they argue that Petliura should be held individually responsible. Soviet supporters, on the contrary, raise this issue and blame Petliura. For Soviet supporters, Petliura represents a problematic and controversial figure who is seen as exclusionary and divisive to the nationalist agenda. They argue that glorifying Petliura misses the complexity of his legacy, including his alleged role in fueling ethnic tensions.

If we evaluate Petliura today, Petliura participated in a very important period in Ukrainian history and fought for Ukrainian independence. However, it is out of the question to mythologize Petliura as the hero of that period. Those roles have already been distributed and

Mykhailo Hrushevsky has been named the most important politician of that period, the founder of Ukrainian history. What can be done for Petliura today is to rehabilitate him, to include him in the list of important people who fought for Ukraine. Until now, creating a common history in a culturally diverse country with distinct regional identities and collective memories did not seem possible. Especially considering the Crimea and Donbass regions. But as Kasianov mentions in his article, the war is changing this situation. People will cling more to their roots, their sense of ethnic identity will be strengthened and everyone who has fought and is fighting against Russia, which is now an “other”, an enemy, will become a hero. Petliura will take his place in Ukrainian history for his struggle.

## **Bibliography**

### **1. Primary Sources**

BABENKO L.L., MOKLJAK V.O., SUPRUNENKO O.B. (Ed),

*Poltavska Petluriana* 8, Dyvosvit, Poltava, 2019

BURNEYKO I.O., HLIBOVSKA G.M., KRYJANOVSKA

M.E., NAUMCHUK O.V., *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Ternopol, Aston, 2018

ENGEL David (ed), *The Assassination of Symon Petliura and the Trial*

*of Sholem Schwarzbard 1926-1927, A selection of Documents*, The

Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, 2016

FEDENKO Panas, *Holovny Otaman, Iz Kulturnoi ta Politycnoi*

*Dialnosti Symona Petlury*, Nashe Slovo, München-London, 1976

GISEM O.V., MARTINYUK O.O., *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Harkiv, Ranok,

2018

HUNCZAK Taras, *Symon Petliura and The Jews, A Reappraisal*,

Rutgers University, Toronto, Munich, 1985

IVANYS Vasyl, *Symon Petliura, Prezydent Ukrainy 1879-1926*,

Trident Press, Toronto-Kanada, 1952

KOSIK Volodymyr, *Symon Petlura* (translated by Yarema Kravets),

NTS, Lviv, 2000

LOTOTSKY Oleksandr, *Symon Petliura Jak Polityk i Derjavny Muzh*,

Paris, London: Soborna Ukraina, 1951

LYTVYN Sergiy, *Sud Istorii: Symon Petlura i Petluriana*, Kyiv,

Vydavnytstvo Imeni Oleny Telegi, 2001



- PERESUNKO Tina, *Kulturna Dyplomacija Symona Petlury: "Shedryk" proty "Russkogo Myra", Misija Kapely Oleksandra Koshytsa*, Kyiv, ArtEk, 2019
- PIDHAINY Oleh, PIDHAINY Olexandra I., *Symon Petliura, A Bibliography*, New Review Books, New York, Toronto. 1977
- POMETUN O.I., GUPAN N.M., *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Kyiv, Orion, 2018
- SAHAJDACZNYJ Petro, *V Yoho Tini, Symon Petliura v Istorii Ukrainського Narodu*, Ukrainske Vydavnytsvo, New-York, 1951
- SAVCHENKO Viktor, *Simon Petlura*, Kharkiv, Folio, 2004
- SOLDATENKO Valeri Fedororovich, *Vynnychenko i Petlura. Politychni Portrety Revolutsiynoy Doby*, Natsionalna Akademiya Nauk Ukrainy, Institut Politychnyh i Etnonatsionalnyh Doslidjen im. I.F.Kurasa, Kyiv, 2007
- SOROCHYNSKA N.M., GISEM O.O., *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Ternopyl, Navchalna Knyga-Bogdan, 2018
- STEPOVYK Dmytro Vlasovych, *Symon Petliura ta Yogo Rodyna*, Rada, Kyiv. 1996
- STRUKEVYCH O.K., *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Kyiv, Gramota, 2018
- TYUTYUNNIK Yuri, *Z Poljakamy Protly Vkrainy*, Derjavne Vydavnytstvo Ukrajiny, Harkiv, 1924
- VLASOV V.S., KULCHYTSKY S.V., *Istoriya Ukrainy*, Kyiv, Litera, 2018
- YANEVSKY Danylo, *Proekt "Ukraina", Grushevsky, Skoropadsky, Petliura*, Folio, Harkiv, 2011

## **2. SECONDARY SOURCES**

### **a. BOOKS**

- BALKAN Elazar, LANG Ariella (ed), *Memory Laws and Historical Justice: The Politics of Criminalizing the Past*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2022
- BALYUKA Valentyna, MAKAR Yuriya, DOROSHKHA Mykola (Ed.), *Spadshina Pilsudskogo ta Petlury*, Kyiv, UMKS, 2021
- HRYTSENKO Oleksandr, *Pamyat Mistsevogo Vyrobnystva*, Kyiv, “KIC”, 2014
- KASIANOV Georgiy, *Laboratory of Transnational history, Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography*, Budapest, CEU Press, 2009
- KASIANOV Georgiy, *Memory Clash, The Politics of History in and around Ukraine 1980s-2010s*, Budapest, CEU Press, 2022
- KASIANOV Georgiy, *Ukraina i Sosedni, Istoricheskaya Politika, 1987-2018*, Moskva, NLO, 2019
- MARPLES David R, *Heroes and Villains, Creating National History in Contemporary Ukraine*, Budapest, CEU Press, 2007
- SCHMID Ulrich, MYSHLOVSKA Oksana (ed), *Regionalism Without Regions*, CEU Press, Budapest-New York, 2019
- WYLEGALA Anna, GLOWACKA GRAJPER Malgorzata (Ed), *The Burden of the Past. History, memory and Identity in Contemporary Ukraine*, Indiana University Press, 2020
- YEKELCHYK Serhy, *Writing the Nation, The Ukrainian Historical Profession in Independent Ukraine and the Diaspora*, ibidem-Verlag, Stuttgart, 2023

## **b. Articles**

- Antons Jan Hinnerk, *The Nation in a Nutshell? Ukrainian Displaced Persons Camps in Postwar Germany*, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 2020, Vol. 37, No: 1/2 (2020), pp. 177-212

- BARRINGTON Lowell W., HERRON Erik S., “One Ukraine or Many? Regionalism in Ukraine and Its Political Consequences”, *Nationalities Papers*, Vol 32, No:1, March 2004, pp. 53-86
- BURNS Peter, GIMPEL James G., “Economic Insecurity, Prejudicial Stereotypes, and Public Opinion on Immigration Policy”, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol 115, No:2, 2000, pp.201-225
- HIMKA John Paul, A Central European Diaspora under the Shadow of World War II: The Galician Ukrainians in North America, *Austrian History Yearbook*, Volume 37 , 2006 , pp. 17 – 31
- KASIANOV Georgiy, Nationalist Memory Narratives and the Politics of History in Ukraine since the 1990s, *Nationalities Papers* (2023), pp. 1–20
- LIBER George E., Dovzhenko, “Stalin and and the (Re)creation of Shchors”, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol.21, No ¾, 1997, pp. 271-286
- MARPHLES David, Decommunization, Memory Laws, and “Builders of Ukraine in the 20th Century”, *Acta Slavica Iaponica*, Tomus 39, pp. 1–22
- SHEVEL Oxana, The Battle for Historical Memory in Postrevolutionary Ukraine, *Current History*, Vol.115, No:783, Russia and Eurasia (October 2016), pp. 258-263
- WYLEGALA Anna, Managing the difficult past: Ukrainian collective memory and public debates on history, *Nationalities Papers*, 2017 Vol. 45, No:5, pp. 780-797
- YEKELCHYK Serhy, “Good Ukrainians vs Petliurites: The Ukrainian Revolution as a Soviet, Young-Adult Tale”, *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, Volume III, No:1, 2016, 111-136

YEKELCHYK Serhy, National Heroes for a New Ukraine: Merging the Vocabularies of the Diaspora, Revolution, and Mass Culture, *Ab Imperio*, N:3, 2015,97-123

**c. Survey**

Kyiv International Institute of Sociology, *Istorychna Pam'at*, 2023

**d. Internet Sources**

<https://www.uaregio.org/en/surveys/methodology/>

<https://abn.org.ua/ru/istoriya/akim-galimov-iskonno-russkaya-zemlya-eto-tam-gde-rossiyane-vse-unichtozhili-i-sterli-istoriyu/>

<https://eadaily.com/ru/news/2019/01/22/poroshenko-petlyura-izrail-i-politicheskie-metamorfozy>

<https://hradoli.com/about/>

<https://kinogo.biz/50957-tajnyj-dnevnik-simona-petljury.html>

<https://polityka.in.ua/info/456.htm>

<https://ria.ru/20180122/1513080665.html>

[https://rus.lb.ua/news/2021/01/20/475657\\_poltave\\_ustanovyat\\_pamyatnik\\_Symonu.html](https://rus.lb.ua/news/2021/01/20/475657_poltave_ustanovyat_pamyatnik_Symonu.html)

<https://suspilne.media/culture/635412-pamatnik-sorsu-v-kievi-vidstvorenna-do-demontazu-u-foto/>

<https://uinp.gov.ua/istorychnyy-kalendar/kviten/20/1891-narodyvsya-yuriy-tyutyunnyk-general-horunzhyy-armiyi-unr>

<https://www.dsnews.ua/politics/poroshenko-na-obedinitelnom-sobore-vspomnil-o-petlyure-15122018155900>

<https://www.historians.in.ua/index.php/en/istoriya-i-pamyat-vazhki-pitannya/472-sergii-shebelist-memory-and-memorials-poltava-without-mazepa-and-petliura>

<https://www.istpravda.com.ua/articles/2021/05/21/159546/>

<https://www.istpravda.com.ua/articles/2021/05/21/159546/>

<https://www.uaregio.org/en/surveys/methodology/>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=INT8RiYV12o>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nfCz8woy1il>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NZy5bqBIhxI&t=12s>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R5lz3R6tQzM&t=1s>