

Personal Dimensions of the Kyiv Philosophical School and its Images through the Voices of Memory

Heorhii Vdovychenko

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

Vdovychenko, Heorhii (2020) Personal Dimensions of the Kyiv Philosophical School and its Images through the Voices of Memory. *Future Human Image*, Volume 14, 90-101. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/14/11>

The article deals with the history of the Kyiv philosophical school of the second half of the twentieth century as one of the main and topical objects of the historical and philosophical study of the formation of a modern national Ukrainian philosophical tradition. An extensive and often controversial set of scientific and non-scientific definitions and characteristics suggests the need to study this phenomenon both as a scientific and socio-cultural one using little-studied primary sources. The initial generalizing examination of a significant part of the memoirs of the creators of mentioned school, mainly a series of autobiographical reconstructions of Academicians S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, M. Popovych, realized in T. Chaika's project "The Philosophers' Oral Histories" as the actual approach in the branch of history of the recent Ukrainian philosophy, allows admitting this school the main center of the revival of interrupted by the Stalinist repressions in the 1930s institutional philosophizing at the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. The studied inflorescence of their personal visions of the Kyiv philosophical school, like a number of original biographical reconstructions of some their colleagues, gives a foundation to estimate this school as an exceptional phenomenon in the history of domestic philosophy, namely the leading ideological and organizational academic-institute capital's center-school of institutionalization of the Ukrainian philosophic tradition as a national one in Ukraine in the second half of the twentieth — the first decades of this century.

Keywords: Ukrainian philosophy, Kyiv philosophical school, Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, Kyiv State University, "The Philosophers' Oral Histories," P. Kopnin, M. Popovych, S. Krymskyi, V. Lisovy, V. Horskyi

Received: 29 August 2020 / Accepted: 1 October 2020 / Published: 3 November 2020

Introduction

The topical task of studying the history of philosophical education, science and culture in Ukraine is the study and reconstruction of a very complicated and tragic formation of the national philosophic tradition of the twentieth century. Now special attention of Ukrainian and foreign researchers of the history of Ukrainian philosophy is directed to the interrupted by the Stalinist repressions process of institutionalization of this tradition in the 1920s — early 1930s in the institutions of the “philosophical front” of the Ukrainian SSR and in the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences by scientists of the European level — academicians S. Semkovskiy, V. Yurinet, P. Demchuk and a galaxy of their also repressed colleagues and students. The study and introduction into scientific circulation, in particular by the author of this article (Vdovychenko, 2015), of their names and their creative heritage, were started in the mid-1950s — after the death of J. Stalin, by researchers at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR and Kyiv State University. This became vivid evidence of the revival of the institutionalization of domestic philosophy in the Ukrainian SSR in the 1950s — 1980s, from the Khrushchev thaw to Gorbachev’s perestroika, mainly in the form of the phenomenon of the Kyiv philosophical school, which appeared in these two leading institutions of Ukrainian philosophical education, science and culture under the direction of academicians P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk. This unique phenomenon that has been repeatedly discussed and debated with the active participation of their well-known colleagues and their students, for example, Academicians of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine M. Popovych and S. Krymskiy, and researched by the creators of this school and their successors from the mentioned institute and higher educational institutions of Ukraine, first of all, in a series of scientific and educational publications of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, basically (Konverskiy, 2005; Gyberskiy, 2010), it became the subject of very controversial interpretations in independent Ukraine, mainly after the Orange Revolution and the Revolution of Dignity. An important authentic source of their revaluation is a valuable, both well-known and little-studied, an array of philosophical memoirs: from scientific and biographical essays (Tabachkovskiy, 2002; Horak, 2009) by famous scientists — contemporaries and figures of the Kyiv philosophical school, to a series of implemented in hours of interviews oral autobiographical reconstructions of creators of this school, basically (Krymskiy, 2012; Horskiy, 2014), realized in T. Chaika’s project “The Philosophers’ Oral Histories” as the actual approach in the branch of history of the recent Ukrainian philosophy (Chaika, 2009).

Thus, *the purpose* of our research is to determine the general specificity of the image of the Kyiv philosophical school by its creators M. Popovych, S. Krymskiy, V. Horskiy, V. Lisoviy, and a group of their colleagues in the context of studying their final autobiographical research as unique samples of intersubjective analysis.

Kyiv philosophical school as an object of research: a controversial set of modernized images of the past

The geopolitical changes at the end of the twentieth century, primarily the collapse of the USSR, led to the still ongoing difficult process of the entry of its former republics, including Ukraine, into the post-Soviet multicultural-globalized world. The cardinal change in the images of the past and the future observed now in Ukrainian humanities as a result of its

transformation from a totalitarian to a post-totalitarian image of the world, to a large extent in the diverse sphere of Ukrainian philosophical education, science and culture determine an unprecedented inflorescence of models of their development. At the same time, this process is accompanied by a very tangible loss of objective perception and understanding of the tragic social and personal experience of generations of Ukrainian thinkers as an almost entirely repressed “philosophical front” of the Ukrainian SSR of the 1920s -1930s, or the epoch of The Shot or Red Renaissance, and several generations of their successors. According to most of the known to us researchers of the history of philosophical thought in Ukraine, particular attention among the latter deserved the founders of the Kyiv philosophical school of the second half of the twentieth century. These are the ideological heirs of repressed by Stalinism creators of the Kharkiv and Kyiv philosophical schools from the Ukrainian Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the philosophical institutions of the All-Ukrainian Association of Marxist-Leninist Research Institutions, and, at the same time, the founders of a qualitatively new period in Ukrainian academic philosophy of the postmodern era. Their undoubtedly exceptionally bright figures, like the ones of directors of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk, of their students and colleagues, for example, M. Popovych, S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, and others, according to the recollections of their many contemporaries, became during the era of Khrushchev thaw and neo-Stalinist stagnation a significant unofficial embodiment of the collective image of the Ukrainian philosopher of the future, that is, of the present. Indeed, as confirmed by the scientific and other publications mentioned in this article, in particular our study, devoted also to the contribution of several generations of leaders of the Kyiv philosophical school to the study of topical issues of the crisis and the future of culture (Vdovychenko, 2013: 852-862), they largely initiated a dialogue of the censored Soviet humanities of the Ukrainian SSR with European and, in fact, world culture and contributed to its democratization and transformation into the socio-communicative space of civil society in independent Ukraine.

The study of this exceptional phenomenon in the history of domestic philosophy as the leading ideological and organizational academic-institute capital's center-school of institutionalization of the Ukrainian philosophic tradition as a national one in Ukraine in the second half of the twentieth — the first decades of this century, testifies to both significant achievements in its professional study in the expert environment, and about the annoying shortcomings in relaying the experience of the Kyiv philosophical school in the student and wide public space. Although global network interactivity has become a sign of the post-Soviet scientific discourse, the results of a questionnaire survey of masters of philosophy from some leading Kyiv universities (Intellectual Memory Test, 2015) testified to a very general superficiality of their ideas about the Kyiv philosophical school and its founders, the most recognizable of which for them were images of V. Shynkaruk and P. Kopnin, and, to a lesser extent, V. Tabachkovskyi, S. Krymskyi and M. Popovych. It is significant that a number of modern Ukrainian philosophers, researchers of the history of this school, have repeatedly noted its unconditional complexity not only as a scientific but also as a socio-cultural phenomenon, and recognized that it still remains a phenomenon not clear enough not only in the eyes of an outside observer but also in the vision of the very philosophical community of Ukraine (Boichenko, 2015: 47). An important contribution to changing this situation was the publication in independent Ukraine of the first collected works of the creators of the mentioned school, namely, selected works in three volumes by V. Shynkaruk, one-volume books by V. Bosenko and M. Zlotina, reprints of publications of different years and new works by M. Popovych, S. Krymskyi, I. Bychko, V.

Horskyi and V. Lisovyi. A representative list of written, by them and with their participation textbooks, for example (Bychko, 1994; Horskyi, 1997; Lisovyi, 2008), and solid scientific works, in particular of their students and ideological heirs (Konverskyi, 2005; Gyberskyi, 2010), as well as articles in specialized periodicals, primarily in the journal “Philosophical Thought” and in “Philosophical and Anthropological Readings,” is devoted to the professional examination of their views and teachings.

However, wider attention was deserved by the first — very resonant and debatable, books of memoirs about the Kyiv philosophical school as a scientific and, no less important, socio-cultural phenomenon (Tabachkovskyi, 2002; Horak, 2009). It was these two first holistic attempts of scientific-memoir and, what is extremely important, uncensored professional and, at the same time, autobiographical reconstruction of the declared in them the phenomenon of the Kyiv philosophical school as the leading center of the “philosophers of the sixties” of the Ukrainian SSR, and laid the foundation for the coverage of its image in the form of systematic final autobiographical assessments as samples of so unique for the domestic philosophical tradition intersubjective analysis. A. Horak, as an active participant in the life of the University’s Faculty of Philosophy from Stalinism to independent Ukraine, gave in forty “opuses” of her work a comprehensive review of the scientific and civil evolution of its graduates of the first half of the 1950s M. Popovych, S. Krymskyi, I. Bychko, V. Ivanov and other future luminaries of Ukrainian philosophy as a “backbone of the sixties” in the philosophical thought of the Ukrainian SSR, who, under the leadership of P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk, not only changed the image of institute, but turned into a real science center and actively contributed to the preservation of our philosophical culture, the culture of the nation being revived today (Horak, 2009; 270). V. Tabachkovskyi, as an active participant in the history of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR of the second half of the twentieth — early twenty first centuries, for the first time widely disclosed in the light of the historical and philosophical, biographical analysis of the creative path of P. Kopnin, V. Shynkaruk and their colleagues and students, as having outgrown their time and in tune with the spiritual needs of modernity the most famous in Ukraine and abroad domestic “philosophers of the sixties,” created by them at this institute “the meditative environment” or “a lacuna of free-thinking” as the second in the twentieth century, but not shot, philosophical revival in Ukraine (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 12). Both authors, widely analyzing the experience of not only the official, but also the unofficial work of their own and their colleagues in the light of revealing the existential experience of the official and unofficial atmosphere of the scientific and social life of that time in the Ukrainian SSR and in the world, confirmed the Europeanization of Ukrainian philosophical thought under P. Kopnin and his young employees, their entry into the scientific arena (Horak, 2009: 270) and a breakthrough in Europe (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 47).

It was in independent Ukraine, in addition to these two works, that the first separate memories of the history of this school were published by its creators themselves and their contemporaries-colleagues, in particular essays (Shynkaruk, 1998; Horskyi 1998; Krymskyi, 1998; Hrabovskyi, 2009) and the first — a magazine version of the book of memoirs by V. Lisovyi (Lisovyi, 2014). At the same time, a contemporary and colleague of these authors, graduate of the Faculty of Philosophy of the Kyiv State University (now the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv) Tetyana Chaika began to systematically develop these attempts at a qualitatively new level and started an extraordinary pilot project “The Philosophers’ Oral Histories.” Within its limits, she took a series of interviews with V. Horskyi, P. Yolon, S. Krymskyi, M. Popovych, partially published in “Philosophical Thought” in 2011 — 2019,

as well as in separate editions (Krymskyi, 2012; Horskyi, 2014). These four scientists from P. Kopnin's inner circle at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR in the 1960s, as well as their mentioned colleagues, also graduates of Kyiv State University, A. Horak, V. Lisovyi and V. Tabachkovskyi, made a tangible contribution to the analysis of the Kyiv philosophical school phenomenon in TV and radio programs, interviews with specialized and other media, scientific reports and publications. Closely related to them are the bibliography of P. Kopnin and a group of biobibliographies of his students and colleagues (Horskyi, 2000; Popovych, 2010; Krymskyi, 2010; Lisovyi, 2015) with a series of prefaces-memoirs by P. Yolon and M. Tkachuk, as well as several collections of memoirs about these scientists, for example (*Vilen Horskyi: Touches, Meanings, Contemplations: Collection of Scientific Papers*, 2011; Krymskyi, 2012), and materials of dedicated to the readings and conferences. At the same time, including the sharply discussed rethinking of this historical and philosophical experience, especially after the Revolution of Dignity, contributed to the actualization of the issue of the role of the Kyiv philosophical school in scientific and social changes in Ukraine in the second half of the twentieth — early twenty first centuries, and, what is indicative, about its status as a school and the problematic nature of the fact of its existence as a whole.

The existing set of definitions of this school: from denying it in general and as a scientific school in particular to justifying its existence as the Kyiv worldview-anthropological or worldview-epistemological direction and, in fact, the school of philosophy amazes with the inconsistency of the options for its vision. Suppose some researchers limit themselves only to its conditionally geographical localization as a circle or some kind of Kyiv philosophical environment and, in fact, a kind of community of philosophers in Kyiv of the Ukrainian SSR era. In that case, others offer its politicized definition as a cohort of Ukrainian philosophers of the sixties and, in general, Ukrainian neo-Marxist current — Ukrainian neo-Marxism of the 1960s — 1980s, represented by the “red positivism” and “red existentialism” and even post-Marxism. Significantly, many researchers, in particular (Tabachkovskyi, 2002; Horak, 2009; Hrabovskyi, 2009), have used these names in parallel more than once. Separate attention should be paid to the varying degrees of caution with which the leaders of this school themselves related to such a definition. For example, they recognized, as M. Popovych and a number of his colleagues (Popovych, 2015; Yermolenko, 2015), or, like V. Lisovyi, sharply refuted its opposition to the official doctrine of the USSR, but at the same time, all together cast doubt on its existence as a school because, in their opinion, the absence of a common for it: thesaurus (Popovych, 2015: 7), paradigm (Yermolenko, 2015: 63), methodology and problems (Lisovyi, 2014: 192). This, like the discussion of the phenomenon of the school of philosophy, in particular the Kyiv philosophical school, in several series of articles by scientists from the H. S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy and universities of Ukraine, like Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, in the first place (Hrabovskyi, 2009; Minakov, 2009; Yermolenko, 2015; Liakh, 2015; Yolon, 2015; Yosypenko, 2015; Boichenko, 2015), as well as their objective attempt to present the author's biographical and scientific portraits of nine leading figures of the Kyiv philosophical school in the dedicated to the sixtieth anniversary of the founding of this institute the sixth-anniversary issue of “Philosophical Thought” for 2016, became an occasion for us to comprehend the mystery of the emergence of this school in the light of new methods of understanding the personal dimensions of its creators-microcosms.

Philosophical memoirs and “oral history”: an inflorescence of personal visions of the Kyiv philosophical school

Pursuing the idea of supplementing traditional historical sources with the achievements of “oral history” — a story that tells about itself, a deep connection of the Past and Future in a single temporal link (Chaika, 2009: 140), T. Chaika, as well as, at the same time, M. Boichenko, K. Sigov and a number of other scientists, contributes to the expansion of the perception of the phenomenon of the Kyiv philosophical school beyond the boundaries of a scientifically formalized analysis of its history, which began in the 1990s with the memoir sketches of V. Shynkaruk, V. Horskyi, V. Malakhov and, mainly, the mentioned works of V. Tabachkovskyi and A. Horak. The introduction by these authors into the field of the modern philosophical discourse of their visions of the experience of unofficial scientific and extra-scientific communication of the creators of the Kyiv philosophical school as an existential experience of personal “human time” (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 7) is the subject of ever-greater scientific and, broader, public attention. The manifestation of this experience in a censored in the USSR, and in uncensored in Ukraine, form in the context of a wide range of studies that do not require unnecessary mention because of their fame, studies of representatives of this school, mainly M. Popovych and S. Krymskyi, as well as, to a somewhat lesser extent, V. Horskyi and V. Lisovyi, received in an interview with the first three of them to T. Chaika, as in the memoirs of the last of them, the informal status of the leading topic of their final philosophical reflections. Our preliminary assessment of these sources — both interviews (Krymskyi, 2012; Horskyi, 2014; Lisovyi, 2014; Popovych, 2015) and the memoirs preceding them (Tabachkovskyi, 2002; Horak, 2009), testifies to Russian-Ukrainian bilingualism as a consequence of the formation of their authors in the Russian-speaking educational and scientific environment of the Ukrainian SSR in the late 1940s — early 1950s. It was precisely the period of the transition from Stalinism to the Khrushchev thaw: the warm 1960s (Horskyi, 2014: 89), a certain beginning of something new after 1956 (Popovych, 2015: 8), initiated by the Khrushchev’s report at the XX Congress of the CPSU social and political changes (Lisovyi, 2014: 117), the outbreak of Ukrainism under Shelest (Krymskyi, 2012: 154), — and the resulting Ukrainian-language scientific projects and official events, first of all, the celebration in 1972 of the 250th anniversary of the birth of H. Skovoroda.

All these sources, with the exception of the two informational insufficient interviews of M. Popovych, jointly revealed the conduct of biographical narratives in three basic conditional plans: 1. self-analysis of personality formation from childhood to adulthood in the circle of family and friends; 2. detailed consideration of the educational process and scientific life of the Ukrainian SSR and the place of themselves and their colleagues in them; 3. assessment of the influence of socio-cultural contexts, in particular the socio-political situation in the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, and then in Ukraine and the world, in the middle of the 20th — beginning of the 21st centuries. In the center of attention of S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, M. Popovych, and V. Tabachkovskyi are the second plan with the main attention to the activities of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, which they, like other memoirists, actualized to a large extent in conjunction with the third plan. Thus, they began to reconstruct their Kyiv philosophical school images as a socio-cultural phenomenon, associated mainly with this institution. Comprehended by us in the light of a significant array of published information, their experience of reconstructing their personal “image of a philosopher” differs and is especially noteworthy for the common involvement

of their individual voices of memory to store in them, according to M. Popovych, “another world” as an invented and, however, so real Kyiv mental habitat (Tabachkovskiy, 2002: 12). Indicative signs of its general constitution, common to the memoirs of the creators of the Kyiv philosophical school and their colleagues, were the opposition to the official existence of the times of totalitarianism in a particularly suffocating atmosphere of the Ukrainian environment with its depersonalization, dullness, and hopelessness (Horak, 2009: 269), with its philosophical education as hell and horror (Krymskiy, 2012: 62) and forced thought as a whole (Lisovyi, 2014: 190), of a real philosophical environment (Krymskiy, 2012: 126), with a free, creative and cheerful atmosphere of a very friendly family (Horskiy, 2014: 78), a blinking light that shone in the darkest periods of obscurantism (Horak, 2009: 273).

A diverse range of assessments of the motives for choosing one’s specialty: from recognizing that it was accidental (Horak, 2009: 5; Horskiy, 2014: 34) to a more confident (Lisovyi, 2014: 114) and conscious decision in cases of M. Popovych and S. Krymskiy (Krymskiy, 2012: 49), turns into a solitary recognition of an unsatisfactory level of teaching from a restrained recognition of only the philosophical alphabet in the audience (Horskiy, 2014: 55) to a very emotional denial of the then level of teaching as almost entirely ignored and absurd (Krymskiy, 2012: 47). By giving detailed distinctions and descriptions of the official atmosphere and structure in the Ukrainian SSR, in particular in educational and scientific institutions, and an atmosphere that cannot be structured (Tabachkovskiy, 2002: 10), an informal structure (Horak, 2009: 272), subculture as a form of protection (Krymskiy, 2012: 49), the authors of these memoirs revealed the multifaceted specifics of significant institutional changes in the Ukrainian scientific and educational process during the Khrushchev Thaw. Comprehending this short stage between the end of the Stalinist dictatorship and the beginning of the era of neo-Stalinism or stagnation as a period of an outburst of neo-anticolonial movements, in particular, the Ukrainian human rights movement and, in general, the phenomenon of the sixties as certain democratization of social relations, they paid special attention to a gradual change in the image and ideal of a person in their socio-communicative environment of that time. Instead of residual principle in the selection of mostly professionally unfit students for obtaining a philosophical education in conditions of strict administration of their public and personal life in order to form impersonal unified propagandist of the official doctrine in conditions of alcoholism, ignorance, conformism, careerism, and xenophobia, the type of student and scientist of a new kind comes. A striking example of this is the numerous references by the authors of these memoirs about the formation of the first composition of the Kyiv philosophical school, in particular its leader V. Shynkaruk, precisely at the Faculty of Philosophy of Kyiv State University at the end of the era of Stalinism as a clearly non-conforming environment of thinkers who have outgrown their time and are in tune with the spiritual needs of our time (Tabachkovskiy, 2002: 13). It was the student graduations of this faculty in 1953 — 1955, of which the most notable figures of M. Popovych, S. Krymskiy, O. Yatsenko, I. Bychko and V. Ivanov, gave rise to the formation of a qualitatively new — human-dimensional, the image of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR under the leadership of P. Kopnin, and after V. Shynkaruk.

The main achievement of the development of this institute as, according to T. Chaika, a living organism that cannot exist outside the context of the intellectual and cultural environment surrounding it (Krymskiy, 2012: 190), in our opinion, were the pupils of the Kopnin school, such as M. Popovych, S. Krymskiy, V. Horskiy and, in particular, their colleague V. Lisovyi. To a large extent, the successors of his work through various tactics and strategies — from open dissidence to internal ideological resistance, both in the scientific and educational processes,

and, to a large extent, in the social and political life of Ukrainian SSR and independent Ukraine, they embodied in them the attitudes of their images of Kyiv philosophical school. Analyzing his image of this school in an interview with T. Chaika on the birthday of their friend S. Krymskyi in the light of the assessment of the perplexed psychological and ideological climate at the mentioned institute after the XX Congress of the CPSU — at the beginning of the Khrushchev thaw and later, M. Popovych defined this school as the intellectual environment or a greenhouse of reason, created by P. Kopnin in a tolerant democratic atmosphere as a counterweight to the Stalinists. Seeing even in their common student years the beginning of a rather successful, albeit the openly opportunistic, group of researchers (Krymskyi, 2012: 388), created in this school with the participation of himself and of S. Krymskyi, he characterized both this group and his friend as a democratic and humanist (Krymskyi, 2012: 394). In an interview with M. Boichenko, he acknowledged for a possible assessment of the Ukrainian philosophical environment and the Kyiv philosophical school in the sense that there are certain features that distinguish Kyiv philosophers and, in broad terms, the Ukrainian ones, who were people of different nature, but from the different positions were spinning in one tangle of problems, starting in 1956 as the start of something new, significant for all of them (Popovych, 2015: 8). Pointing out that it is impossible to combine P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk into one narrow school, he defined it as a philosophical movement, which was called in different ways, in particular a school, and added that this can only be said with certain warnings, bearing in mind, that this is a strong metaphor (Popovych, 2015: 8).

V. Lisovyi, whom his colleague S. Hrabovskyi recognized as one of the very few Ukrainian post-Marxists in the Ukrainian SSR, who grew up in those years from the logical-epistemological and metascientific research begun by P. Kopnin (Lisovyi, 2014: 10), and, at the same time, one of the most moral participants in the Resistance Movement of the 1960s — 1980s (Lisovyi, 2014: 9), sharpened explanation by M. Popovych of the Kyiv philosophical school. Indicatively putting the point of his memoirs with the same name under a question mark, he stressed that there is no reason to use the term school in its academic meaning in this case, because there was no group of people united by a common approach (methodology) or problematic, or a special revisionist trend or school, except for the inputting of elements of creative philosophical thinking in line with official Marxism-Leninism (Lisovyi, 2014: 192).

At the same time, he allowed the use of the word school to refer to the Faculty of Philosophy of Kyiv State University and the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR of those years as centers of philosophical education and certain centers of communication (Lisovyi, 2014: 193). Interestingly, friends and colleagues of these two scientists, namely S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi, gave in their own memoirs somewhat different, more institutional, definitions of this school as socio-cultural, but also a scientific phenomenon. While admitting in an interview to T. Chaika, as well as his colleagues, that it was precisely P. Kopnin that they owe the formation of a real philosophical environment in the said institute, as well as in Ukraine as a whole (Krymskyi, 2012: 126), S. Krymskyi, however, as he said, risked admitting that it was his department of logic under the leadership of P. Kopnin laid the foundations of what was then called the Kyiv philosophical school (Krymskyi, 2012: 144). At the same time, he rejected the traditional attribution of this school to V. Shynkaruk, taking into account the fact that only that which received the recognition of the international scientific community, as the mentioned department of logic, can be called a school. In contrast, V. Shynkaruk's domestic philosophy direction did not receive such recognition (Krymskyi, 2012: 144).

Significantly, it was S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi who, back in the 1990s, gave in their articles (Krymskyi, 1998; Horskyi, 1998) a scientific and memoir review of the work of their departments in the mentioned institute — logic and history of philosophy in Ukraine, and noted the great contribution of each of them to the achievements of Ukrainian philosophical thought in the second half of the twentieth century. Detailing this analysis in his interview with T. Chaika in the context of revaluation the innovations introduced by P. Kopnin at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, V. Horskyi recognized his team as a community built on the principle of the family (Horskyi, 2014: 152), which has always been in close contact with his alma mater, the Faculty of Philosophy of the Kyiv State University. It is noteworthy that V. Horskyi devoted special attention to studying the phenomenon of the school of philosophy, and some of his colleagues directly testified that his description of it depicts the scientific community that this institute became during P. Kopnin's time (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 10). It is also significant that both V. Horskyi and S. Krymskyi, as before, both V. Tabachkovskyi and A. Horak, noted the important role in the scientific life of this institute not only of its directors P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk, as well as their predecessor in this position D. Ostryanin and the circle of his supporters, who more than once received in these memoirs very critical, but thoughtful and well-grounded assessments of their scientific and personal qualities, but also many other colleagues, as integral elements of their images of the Kyiv philosophical school. Their half-forgotten galaxy encompasses several generations of scientists: from the repressed participant in the “philosophical front” of the Ukrainian SSR of the epoch of The Shot or Red Renaissance and its historian, the very remarkable personality (Horskyi, 2014: 82) of M. Yushmanov; clever, front-line soldier, war hero (Krymskyi, 2012:58), philosopher-peripatetic from God (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 85) M. Zlotina and P. Kopnin's deputy on his position at the mentioned institute, quite tolerant (Krymskyi, 2012: 148-149) M. Goncharenko to their student friends. Among them are V. Bosenko, M. Tarasenko, V. Mazepa, M. Bulatov, V. Chernovolenko and, especially, V. Ivanov, who entered a very noticeable plan of the scientific life of the institute (Horskyi, 2014: 125) and was one of the greatest thinkers who ever worked at the institute and a real creator of the Kyiv worldview school (Krymskyi, 2012: 170).

An indicative feature of the illuminated images of the Kyiv philosophical school is the reproduction of the academic and scientific aspect of its activities in a cross-cutting examination of the socio-cultural and, to a large extent, the socio-political life of the Ukrainian SSR, as well as the USSR and the world on the second half of the twentieth century. Consideration by memoirists of the stage of transition from the Khrushchev thaw to stagnation-neo-Stalinism in the history of this school, marked in 1972 by the arrests of V. Lisovyi and Y. Pronuk and the dismissal of colleagues who sympathize with them, outlined the democratic foundations of the civic position of its creators in all variety of their assessments and self-assessments: a general democratic orientation and dissident moods of M. Popovych (Lisovyi, 2014: 194-195), it's hard to make a dissident hero out of me (Horskyi, 2014: 103), I did not become a dissident (Krymskyi, 2012: 50), — summarized in one of the anonymous denunciations of the creators of the Kyiv philosophical school for their nationalism and revisionism (Shynkaruk, 1998: 21). Their actions were very indicative of this position: from P. Kopnin's care on the preservation of this school before his recall to Moscow (Krymskyi, 2012: 129) and his help, as well as the attempts of V. Nichik and V. Horskyi to intercede for V. Lisovyi and Y. Pronyuk (Horskyi, 2014: 100) to V. Shynkaruk's personal role in the fact that the institute was not disbanded in the 1970s (Krymskyi, 2012: 153). This body of evidence, in our opinion, outlines the image

of the Kyiv philosophical school as one of the first micromodels-prototypes of modern civil society, active participation in the formation of which also in independent Ukraine, took many of its creators, like M. Popovych and V. Lisovyi. The initial generalizing examination of a significant part of the memoirs of the creators of the Kyiv philosophical school of the second half of the twentieth century, in particular, the comprehending of their personal biographical images of this school, as well as the place of themselves and their colleagues in it, gives us grounds to assert, that the experience of “oral history” should to become a qualitatively new — highly informative and problem relevant component of both professional study and public awareness of the phenomenon of the Kyiv philosophical habitat or environment that goes beyond the boundaries of only a scientific phenomenon. The range of his images in the memoirs of the creators we have mentioned testifies, in our opinion, to the correctness of each of them in defining this phenomenon in its formation — its cumulative effect of evolving from the ideological community of like-minded people to the known for its achievements both in the Soviet and international scientific arena, center of the revival of interrupted by the Stalinist repressions in the 1930s institutional philosophizing at the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR (Horskyi, 1998: 27).

Conclusions

The results of our research are as follows.

1. Memoirs of the creators of Kyiv philosophical school S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, M. Popovych, realized in the project “The Philosophers’ Oral Histories” of T. Chaika, is a highly informative component of both professional studying and public awareness of this exceptional phenomenon in the history of the Ukrainian philosophic tradition.
2. Reconstructed inflorescence of personal visions of the Kyiv philosophical school of its creators established that it was the main center of the revival of interrupted by the Stalinist repressions Ukrainian academician philosophy of The Shot Renaissance era.
3. Analysis of all those biographical narratives in three basic conditional plans, from self-analysis of personality formation to assessment of the influence of socio-cultural context, outlines the image of the Kyiv philosophical school as one of the first micromodels-prototypes of modern civil society.

The Kyiv philosophical school was the leading ideological and organizational academic-institute capital’s center-school of institutionalization of the Ukrainian philosophic tradition in the second half of the twentieth century.

References

- Boichenko, Mykhailo (2015) Fate of scientific schools in modern Ukrainian philosophy in the light of change of philosophic generations *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
- Bychko, Ihor, Mykola Tarasenko, and Vitalii Tabachkovskiy (1994) *Worldview and Philosophical Situation in Ukraine: Through the Ruin to Self-Regeneration*. In *History of Philosophy of Ukraine: Textbook*. Kyiv, Lybid. (in Ukrainian).
- Chaika, Tetiana (2009) The Touching. The Presentation of the Project “The Philosophers’ Oral Histories.” *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).

- Gyberskyi, Leonid, Anatolii Konverskyi, and others (2010) *The Genesis of Philosophical Research at Kyiv University*. Kyiv, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. (in Ukrainian and Russian).
- Horak, Anna (2009) *Forty forties*. Kyiv, Stylos. (in Russian and Ukrainian).
- Horskyi, Vilen, and Tatiana Chaika (2014) *I Lived a Happy Life (T. A. Chayka Interview Cycle)*. Kyiv, Izdatelskiy dom D. Byrago. (in Russian).
- Horskyi, Vilen (1997) *History of Ukrainian Philosophy. Lecture Course*. Kyiv: Naykova dymka. (in Ukrainian).
- Horskyi, Vilen Serhiyovych. *Biobibliographic Index* (2000) Compiled by T. Patrusheva; Introd. by M. Tkachuk. Kyiv, Vydavnychi Dim "KM Academia." (in Ukrainian).
- Horskyi, Vilen (1998) Something About History With the History of Philosophy (Subjective Reasoning About the Anniversary). *Philosophical Thought*, No. 4-6. (in Ukrainian).
- Hrabovskyi, Serhii (2009) In Search of Truthes: Ukrainian Neo-Marxism of 1960-1980th. *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
- Hrabovskyi, Serhii (2014) *The Revival of Ukrainian Philosophy in the Ukrainian SSR (1960th-1980th)*. Kyiv, NaUKMA. (in Ukrainian).
- Intellectual Memory Test: Students' Thoughts on the "Kyiv Philosophical School" 1960-1980s (2015). *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
- Konverskyi, Anatolii, Ihor Bychko, and Ivan Ohorodnyk (2005) *Philosophical Thought at Kyiv University: History and Modernity*. Under the general ed. of Prof. A. Konverskyi. Kyiv, Tsentri Navchyalnoyi Literary. (in Ukrainian).
- Kozlovskyi, Viktor (2015) "Kyiv School" Recoded Soviet Dogmatic Marxism-Leninism." *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
- Krymskyi, Serhii, and Tatiana Chaika (2012) *Our Life-Long Conversation (T. A. Chayka Interview Cycle)*. Kyiv, Izdatelskiy dom D. Byrago. (in Russian).
- Krymskyi, Serhii Borysovych. *Biobibliografic Index* (2010) compiled by O. Lukashyk, L. Melishkevych. Introd. By P. Yolon. Kyiv, H.S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy. (in Ukrainian).
- Krymskyi, Serhii (1998) Formation of Ideas of the Logic of Scientific Research in Ukraine (60-80s) *Philosophical Thought*, No. 4-6. (in Ukrainian).
- Liakh, Vitalii (2015) The Criterion for the Achievements of Predecessors is the Ability of Ukrainian Philosophy to Adapt to New Realities. *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
- Lisovyi, Vasyl (2014) *Memories. Poems*. Ed. by Natalia Velbovets, Vira Lisova, Larysa Turovets-Lisova. Kyiv: Smoloskyp. (in Ukrainian).
- Lisovyi, Vasyl Semenovich. *Bibliografic Index* (2015) compiled by S. Kudra. Kyiv, H.S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy. (in Ukrainian).
- Lisovyi, Vasyl (2008) Ukrainian Philosophical Thought in the 60s-80-s of the XX Century. In *History of Ukrainian Philosophy: Textbook*. Kyiv, Kyivskyi universytet.
- Minakov, Mykhailo (2009) Tenebrae seu lux ex oriente? Re-Evaluation of the Soviet Philosophy in Contemporary Anglo-American Historiography *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
- Ohorodnyk, Ivan, and Myroslav Rysun (1997) *Ukrainian Philosophy in Names: Textbook*. Kyiv, Lybid. (in Ukrainian).
- Ohorodnyk, Ivan (2015) Glorious Kyiv School. *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
- Popovych, Myroslav Volodymyrovych. *Biobibliografic Index* (2010). compiled by O.

- Lukashyk. Introd. By P. Yolon. Kyiv, H.S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy. (in Ukrainian).
- Popovych, Myroslav (2015) "Kyiv Philosophical School" as a Subject of Discussion. Interview by Myroslav Popovych. *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
- Shynkaruk, Volodymyr (1998) "Khrushchev Thaw" and New Trends in Research of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in the 1960s. *Philosophical Thought*, No. 4-6. (in Ukrainian).
- Tabachkovskyi, Vitalii (2002) *In Search of Non-Wasted Time. Essays on the Creative Heritage of the Ukrainian Philosophers of the Sixties*. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo PARAPAN. (in Ukrainian).
- Vdovychenko, Heorhii (2015) *Cultural-Philosophical Heritage of the Philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR of the Era of The Shooted Renaissance*. Kyiv, Kyivsky universytet. (in Ukrainian).
- Vdovychenko, Heorhii (2013) Contemporary Cultural Studies Before the Challenge of Global Problems. In *Culturology: A Textbook For Students of Higher Educational Institutions*. Ed. by A. Konverskyi. Kharkiv, Folio. (in Ukrainian).
- Vilen Horskyi: *Touches, Meanings, Contemplations: Collection of Scientific Papers* (2011) Ed. by Maryna Tkachuk. Kyiv, Agrar Media Group. (in Ukrainian).
- Yermolenko, Anatolii (2015) World-view Approach in the System of Paradigm Coordinates. *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
- Yolon, Petro (2015) "Kyiv Philosophical School" as a Phenomenon. *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).
- Yosypenko, Serhii (2015) "The School" as an Object of Reflection in the Field of History of Philosophy. *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3. (in Ukrainian).