

Kyiv Philosophical School as a Partner of International Scientific Life during the Cold War: The Experience of Dialogue in Geopolitical Confrontation

Heorhii Vdovychenko

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Senior Researcher, Taras Shevchenko National University
of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: georgyvovychenko@knu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8532-7672>

Vdovychenko, Heorhii (2021) Kyiv Philosophical School as a Partner of International Scientific Life during the Cold War: The Experience of Dialogue in Geopolitical Confrontation. *Future Human Image*, Volume 15, 122-135. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/15/11>

The article deals with the formation of the image of the Kyiv philosophical school as a well-known partner of international scientific life of the second half of the twentieth century in the context of oral autobiographical reproductions and, in general, memoirs of its founders and leading figures. Kyiv philosophical school was one of the most famous innovative academic humanitarian projects in the Ukrainian SSR during the Khrushchev "thaw," which was started in the 1960s by the director of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR P. Kopnin (1962 — 1968). Continued by his successor V. Shynkaruk (1968 — 2001) in a difficult period from the neo-Stalinist "stagnation" to Gorbachev's "perestroika," the collapse of the USSR and Ukraine's independence era, this project became a prominent participant in the international scientific life of the Cold War era. A number of the final autobiographical reconstructions of the creators of this school, first of all, academicians S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi, were received in independent Ukraine in the context of the first domestic project on the oral history of philosophy of T. Chaika and the one of Student Society of Oral History of Philosophy of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. They allow us to reproduce many of the silenced pages of the role of the Kyiv philosophical school on the world arena of that time, in particular, the experience of initiated and gained by their authors direct and indirect scientific dialogues with scholars and scientific institutions of the Eastern and Western blocs as participants in the global geopolitical confrontation. Memories of both academicians and their colleagues (A. Horak, V. Tabachkovskyi, M. Honcharenko, V. Lisovyi and others) reveal the contribution of the philosophers of the sixties of the Ukrainian SSR to the comprehension and overcoming of the mentioned confrontation between the USSR and the USA during the transition from the period of "nuclear race" to the "policy of detente."

Keywords: Ukrainian philosophy, Kyiv philosophical school, Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, Oral History of Philosophy, T. Chaika, P. Kopnin, M. Honcharenko, S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, V. Lisovyi, Y. Stratii

Received: 10 January 2021 / Accepted: 20 February 2021 / Published: 25 April 2021

© Vdovychenko, Heorhii, 2021

Introduction

The Kyiv philosophical school is defined and researched in a number of our publications, first of all in two articles (Vdovychenko, 2020; Vdovychenko, 2020), as one of the first domestic academic micromodels-prototypes of an open society in the Ukrainian SSR during the post-Stalinist period. This school, in our opinion, played a leading role in the revival and fruitful continuation of interrupted by the Stalinist regime in the 1930s, the longest and most controversial among others Soviet stage of modern Ukrainian national philosophy institutionalization. The Kyiv philosophical school was founded by a generation of philosophers of the sixties of the Ukrainian SSR in the late 1950s and early 1960s as a leading academic and university center of Ukrainian philosophical life of the last century. As such, it took an active part in establishing a scientific dialogue with many prominent philosophical educational and research centers and institutions of the “socialist” and “capitalist” camps, which were then in world geopolitical confrontation. The scientific staff of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, which represents this school first and foremost, began to form after World War II under its directors M. Omelyanovskiy (1946 — 1952) and D. Ostryanin (1952 — 1962), between the final stages of the Stalinist regime and Khrushchev’s “thaw.” It became not only a witness but also a forced participant in the Cold War between the USSR and the USA and their satellite states. As contemporaries of the emergence of a bipolar world with its supranational systems of military and economic unions, whose rivalry ranged from political and ideological struggles to conventional and nuclear arms races, caused a number of international crises, such as the Cuban Missile Crisis, and led to the threat of extinction, they left little-known memories of their own participation in these events in their oral autobiographical reconstructions and memoirs. Thus, *the purpose* of our research is to determine the general specifics of the image of the Kyiv philosophical school as a partner of international scientific life of the Cold War era, namely the experience of its philosophical dialogue with scientific circles from both warring camps based on the final oral memoirs of the creators of this school and the memoirs of their colleagues-contemporaries.

Kyiv philosophical school and the philosophical process in the USSR and Eastern Bloc: the humanistic transformation of dogmatized Marxism

It is noteworthy that the name and definition of the Kyiv philosophical school are still the subjects of topical and sometimes inflammatory discussions, despite the mentioned, in particular in our articles (Vdovychenko, 2020; Vdovychenko, 2020), a considerable list of devoted to their elucidation scientific studies. It is this school turned out to be in independent Ukraine the object of perhaps the most significant for modern domestic philosophical thought self-reflection of its founders and leading figures in the context of the oral history of philosophy as an actual alternative historical and philosophical approach/source/genre. Its first remarkable, successful, and demonstrative attempts at testing were the project “The Philosopher’s Oral Histories” of a former employee of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR T. Chaika (Chaika, 2009), and the one of the Student Society of Oral History of Philosophy of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, which involved many famous young professionals, such as X. Zborovska, A. Khelufi and V. Khoma. These projects effectively contribute to the return to both the expert community and the public of an amazing

inflorescence of the original uncensored visions of the history of Kyiv philosophical school by a number of its prominent creators. Their consideration, as well as the analysis of projects on the oral history of philosophers of I. Golybovykh and a group of her colleagues from Ilya Mechnikov National University of Odesa, allowed us to distinguish three conditional regional-urban circles of spatial conditionality of all known to us oral memories of the Ukrainian SSR philosophers. They are those: 1. Central Ukrainian circle with the center in Kyiv; 2. Western Ukrainian circle with the center in Lviv; 3. South Ukrainian circle with the center in Odesa. In our spotlight are the first two of them, which are decisive for the formation of the Kyiv philosophical school during the tenures of the mentioned institute directors D. Ostryanin and, mainly, P. Kopnin. The first of these circles are represented by four interviews of T. Chaika, taken by her from S. Krymskyi (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012), V. Horskyi (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014), M. Popovych and P. Yolon, of which only the first two of them have been completely deciphered and published. This also includes two fully published interviews taken by the Student Society of Oral History of Philosophy of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv from Y. Golovakha (Golovakha, 2017) and S. Proleev. The second of these circles are represented by three fully published interviews, one of which was taken by this society from Y. Stratii (Stratii, 2018). Two others, in particular (Kashuba, 2017), were taken by its colleagues from Lviv universities from M. Kashuba.

Almost all representatives of the first of these circles or the “philosophical” one was students of Kyiv State University while representing the second of them, or the “philological and philosophical” one classical philologist M. Kashuba and Y. Stratii are graduates of Lviv State University. Both of these circles testify to the direct and indirect insertion of these scholars since childhood in the achievements of Ukrainian and, at the same time, the world, especially Western European, science, and culture. Partly from the families of the repressed and, as a rule, students of leading national universities under the conditions of Russification of education, science and socio-cultural life of the Ukrainian SSR with its extremely rigid administration and politicization, they, in the vast majority, witnessed Stalinist policy before, during and after World War II. At the same time, almost all of them entered adulthood with the short-lived opening of the Iron Curtain and the controversial “democratization” of the USSR during Khrushchev’s “thaw.” On a larger scale and, in fact, deeper than his colleagues at the Kyiv philosophical school, covering in his own oral memoirs the Soviet period of their common life path, one of its most famous figures, S. Krymskyi recognized his generation as a witness and participant in unprecedented “radical changes” in mankind’s history: “There are actions now that have a common historical significance. There are more revolutions now in the field of culture and technology than in the entire history of mankind. This is a revolution in nuclear energy. This is a nuclear revolution and the ones in space, computer, biotechnology, nanotechnology, materials science, astronomy. All this continues before our eyes. A few years ago, it was discovered that all we see is only 4 percent. The main matter is invisible. 96 percent of matter is invisible to us. Its name is dark matter. I am not talking about the social aspect. The formations are changing before our eyes, and the transition from ideas of communism and the socialist camp to some new phase of human development is taking place” (Krymskyi, 2010: 178-179). S. Krymskyi, in more detail than his colleagues, comprehended the preconditions and history of the Kyiv philosophical school in an autobiographical chronicle-confession developed in his ten-year interviews to *The Day* newspaper and, mainly, in the one to T. Chaika. It is significant that he covered in them, in addition to scientific, also socio-political, spiritual and, at the same time, international

aspects of the image of this school in its complex development from the Stalinist Ukrainian SSR to independent Ukraine.

An important place in the oral memoirs of S. Krymskyi and, in fact, all his interviewed colleagues, as leading witnesses and participants in the philosophical life of the Ukrainian SSR from Khrushchev's "thaw" to Gorbachev's "perestroika", was occupied by the coverage of two turning points in the social and political situation in the USSR. They are as follows: 1. the beginning and development of the first of these periods during their higher education and entry into scientific life, primarily in the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, under its directors D. Ostryanin and P. Kopnin; 2. the beginning and development of the second period during tenures of both P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk. S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi and their colleagues, in particular the authors of the first books of memoirs about the Kyiv philosophical school, such as (Tabachkovskyi, 2002; Horak, 2009), paid special attention to their own work in the most non-conformal departments of this institute, namely of the Logic and Methodology of Science and of the History of Philosophy in Ukraine, whose research projects have made this institution widely known in the USSR and far beyond its borders. They jointly noted the crucial role of P. Kopnin in gaining by their institute and this school as a whole of unconditional scientific recognition and reputation. It is noteworthy that we know versions of the origin of the name of the Kyiv philosophical school, that its existence as a scientific school was questioned and denied not only by modern domestic researchers, such as A. Yermolenko, but also its creators M. Popovych and V. Lisovyi (Lisovyi, 2014: 192), which indicate mainly its occurrence outside the Ukrainian SSR. According to (Hrabovskiy, 2014), this unofficial colloquial name of the school, which dates back to the 1970s and with the beginning of Ukraine's independence was legitimized at the level of monographs and dictionaries, appeared, according to many sources, in the philosophical centers of the USSR, especially in Moscow and, in particular, as P. Yolon wrote about this, thanks to P. Kopnin (Yolon, 2017). Noting both his role and the role of his Moscow colleagues, academicians B. Kedrov and I. Frolov, as a "strong trinity" that "skillfully bypassed the Soviet political and ideological myths of that time" and "for a long time ruled the fate of all Soviet philosophy" (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 135), S. Krymskyi, as well as his colleagues, recognized P. Kopnin as the initiator of creation in their institute, according to P. Kopnin himself, "group of scholars which will sound", and its introduction on both the Soviet and international scientific levels.

S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi, for the first time, acquainted the general reader with many details of this process, unknown even to the expert community, including the interesting but briefly covered in their memories (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 145; Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 80) Kopnin's scientific trip to the United States for reading, according to evidence of the first of them, several lectures on Marxist philosophy. They and other creators of the Kyiv philosophical school have repeatedly noted the clearly pro-European vector of organizational and scientific work of P. Kopnin. A. Horak, for example, recognized for the great historical mission of him, as her teacher, that he brilliantly mastered the skill of presenting to students the advanced philosophical ideas of the West in the wrapper of fidelity to Marxism-Leninism (Horak, 2009: 184). V. Tabachkovskyi, in his turn, noted that P. Kopnin was a fighter against the canonization of Marxist philosophy in order to make it the most active participant in world intellectual dialogue (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 47). S. Krymskyi pointed out, that P. Kopnin began to introduce the institute headed by him to the "big world", namely, organized various symposia: first attracted scholars from Kyiv, later from Moscow, and then from Europe (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 120). He considered in panoramic way occasionally mentioned

by his colleagues their joint participation in long-term, both formal and informal, scientific cooperation with the Soviet “brothers in mind” from the Institutes of Philosophy in Yerevan, Tbilisi and, mainly, in Moscow. Pages of his memoirs are devoted to the mention of “warm and lasting ties” between the founders of the Kyiv philosophical school and, mainly, Moscow’s “philosophical environment from ancient times” as “our closest.” It is presented in his interview to T. Chaika with such well-known surnames as follows: A. Zinoviev, E. Solovyov, V. Lectorsky, A. Huseynov, G. Batishchev, G. Shchedrovitsky, A. Esenin-Volpin and other graduates of Moscow State University, as well as a number of their Ukrainian contemporaries, including Y. Golovakha and O. Rogero and S. Sekundant, as two participants of the project on the oral history of philosophers of I. Golybovych. They are together, although from quite different ideological and socio-political positions, contributed to the democratization of Soviet philosophy not only in the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences and a number of other Moscow’s academic institutions, but also in the Soviet Union as a whole.

Not once dwelling in detail on the assessment of the personalities of a number of his close acquaintances from this list, such as two of the most famous Russian Soviet dissident philosophers A. Zinoviev and A. Esenin-Volpin, S. Krymskyi noted their significant contribution to the de-Stalinization of Marxism-Leninism and its critical rethinking. It is significant that S. Krymskyi was quite close and for many years acquainted with both of them, the first of who, together with his family, hid in Kyiv for some time in Krymskyi’s apartment and kept in touch with him after his forced departure from the USSR. A. Esenin-Volpin, who was a patient in a Soviet mental hospital and an exile during the Stalinist era, and who later became a political immigrant in the USA, also very often communicated with Krymskyi. No less attentively, S. Krymskyi covered the person of his strange “as if from another planet” and with rather “exotic views,” friend, an employee of the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences G. Batishchev (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 192-196). He was, according to his colleagues, such as G. Tulchinsky, one of the most profound Soviet philosophers, who came to God with a brilliant knowledge of the teachings of Karl Marx from the original sources and whose work “Contradiction as a Category of Dialectical Logic” (1963) was, according to Krymskyi, immediately translated in America as an indicator of mysticism in the USSR (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 192). It was G. Batishchev who became for S. Krymskyi and, in fact, for the Kyiv philosophical school as a whole an important scientific source of comprehending anthropological issues on a “serious philosophical basis.” S. Krymskyi also mentioned that since the 1960s, many famous philosophers of Moscow, whose relations were marked by rich scientific communication and a very high professional level set by them, became friends of him and his colleagues from the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. In view of this, he recalled the seminars of the All-Union movement “Logic and Methodology of Science,” in which he repeatedly took an active part. Its participants were “mostly Moscow intellectuals,” such as E. Ilyenkov, A. Uyomov, I. Frolov, O. Bovin, some of whom had “strong ties” in the apparatus of the Central Committee of the CPSU and, consequently, the opportunity to “influence on the state policy” at least in questions “of legalization of scientific directions and preservation of scientific personnel” (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 320). Krymskyi also noted his no less friendly relations with the current corresponding member of the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia L. Abrahamyan, director of the Institute of Philosophy of the Georgian SSR N. Chavchavadze and their prominent contemporary M. Mamardashvili. This fruitful experience of scientific communication of philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR spread far beyond the Soviet republics, and in their field

of view, although to a lesser extent, were, in addition to this Soviet inter-republican level of philosophical relations, two other international levels of contacts with many famous scientists and scientific institutions.

Here they are (1) the “socialist camp” or the Eastern bloc led by the USSR in Europe, Asia and Latin America; (2) the “capitalist camp” or the Western bloc led by the United States and the developed countries of North America and Western Europe. The most significant of the examples of their scientific contacts within the first of these two levels available in the memoirs of the Kyiv philosophical school figures is a long and fruitful Ukrainian-Bulgarian philosophical cooperation. V. Horskyi describes it in his interview with T. Chaika, in which he highlighted his friendship with the Scientific Secretary of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences M. Bachvarov from the years of their studies at Kyiv State University (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 73-74). Recalling the assistance of his Bulgarian colleague together with P. Kopnin in employing V. Horskyi to the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, he noted their with M. Bachvarov work “Ukrainian-Bulgarian philosophical ties (Second half of the 21st century)” (1966) as a model of their joint contribution to bringing the dialogue of philosophical Slavic studies of the Ukrainian SSR and Bulgaria beyond the regulated by the official Soviet science narrow boundaries. V. Horskyi revealed the details of this interaction also on the example of his long-term cooperation with the Center for Bulgarian Studies of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, such as repeated participation in international scientific congresses held in Bulgaria. A notable example of this was his report at such a conference organized by the Cyril and Methodius Research Center at the mentioned academy in honor of the 1100th anniversary of the death of the Slavic educator St. Methodius (Sofia, 1987). At the same time, V. Horskyi described the little-known details of the organization of these visits, which were concealed than in the USSR (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 106-109). Recognizing them as quite ordinary, but pointing out, that their prerequisite was the obligation of a seconded scientist to receive a recommendation from the district committee of the CPSU with his personal characteristics, he stressed that he received a foreign business trip to Bulgaria only in Moscow. V. Horskyi traveled abroad from Moscow, after mandatory visits to the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, where he was instructed, issued currency and a foreign passport in the Department of International Relations. In addition to these scientific missions, both personal and as part of official delegations, the founders of the Kyiv philosophical school formed their idea of the development of the philosophical process in countries of the Eastern bloc and while working in the archives of their scientific institutions. An interesting example of this is the painstaking research work of P. Kopnin and V. Nychyk project participants on studying the philosophical heritage of professors of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in the foreign archives, including the Polish cities of Warsaw, Krakow and Lodz.

The participant of this project Y. Stratii, who together with V. Horskyi took part in the international symposium in honour of the 1080th anniversary of the death of the great Bulgarian educator St. Naum of Ohrid in Bulgaria (Etropole, 1990), also left interesting memories. In her interview (Stratii, 2018) she recalled the negative experience of the official reaction to her private trip to SFR of Yugoslavia in 1972, when she was still working at the Institute of Social Sciences in Lviv. According to Y. Stratii, then Khrushchev’s “thaw” had almost disappeared, but she still had the opportunity to go there to relatives and observe the Yugoslav cultural and political situation different from the Soviet one. She recognized as “cultivated savagery” the violent reaction of the director of the mentioned institute — the former secretary on the ideology of the regional committee of the CPSU, to this visit as an example of xenophobia

and condemnation of officially uncontrolled communication of USSR citizens with foreigners (Stratii, 2018: 195). Y. Stratii pointed out that many SFRY students had visited and trained in capitalist countries, and had studied “Western philosophy” not in terms of its critique. Such a typical situation was hidden than at the high Soviet official level, such as during pompous celebrations of the 100th anniversary of the birth of V. Lenin (1970) and the 50th anniversary of the formation of the USSR (1971) at the state level in Moscow and all Soviet republics. However, the most significant event for Ukrainian philosophy of national and international significance at the end of the span between XX (1956) and XXIV (1971) Congresses of the CPSU, as a stage of transformation of the USSR from Stalinism to neo-Stalinism, was the official celebration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of G. Skovoroda (1972). Thus, the Secretary of the Commission of the Ukrainian SSR for UNESCO organized a number of events aimed to form a positive image of the Ukrainian philosophy on the world stage. This included the organization of two book exhibitions in honour of G. Skovoroda in Paris in 1972 and the publication of a number of information in UNESCO periodicals where G. Skovoroda was recognized as a “Ukrainian Rousseau.” It was in 1972, the year of the removal of P. Shelest from the post of First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPU and the provocation of the Dobosh case by the KGB of the Ukrainian SSR as an excuse for new covert repressions against the Ukrainian national-cultural and human rights movement, the authorities struck the blow (Sheremeta, 2013) at the Department of the History of Philosophy of Ukraine of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. This was one of a series of official measures against the transition of Ukrainian philosophical thought to the uncontrolled entry into the world scientific arena and the conduct of free international dialogue.

The origins of the scientific and political dialogue of the Kyiv philosophical school with the Western Bloc: the multidimensional experience of the “Philosophical Looking Glass”

Noting in an interview (Rogero, 2017) that in the 1970s, the world situation in the humanities was characterized by the dominance of structuralism and the dawn of post-structuralism, O. Rogero, in fact, summarized the views both of himself and his colleagues from the Kyiv philosophical school on the basic trend of their innovative scientific research at the time. He expressed this in the thesis that the generation of Soviet philosophers of the sixties believed that it would overcome the “tradition and dogma and inertia,” liberate from the vulgarization of the ideas of Karl Marx and carry out the “convergence” of the authentic Marxism with the problems of Western philosophical thought of the post-Marxist period (Rogero, 2017: 211). And the slow establishment in the 1960s of official international contacts between Soviet and foreign scientific and public institutions, not least the Western European and North American ones, was one of the rather encouraging preconditions for this, according to O. Rogero, attempt to radically reform Soviet society, or, in other words, to build “socialism with a human face.” Thus, P. Kopnin was elected in 1963 by the USSR as a member of the Executive Committee of the International Federation of Philosophical Societies and in the same year took part in the XIII World Congress of Philosophy in Mexico. He was soon invited to the United States, where, according to the memoirs of V. Horskyi (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014), toured a number of universities with lectures on philosophy. Focusing on the recollection of these international scientific contacts, he paid special attention to P. Kopnin’s participation in them: “Kopnin turned out to be practically the only philosopher from Ukraine in those

years, who was included in the Soviet scientific delegations abroad. There was a practice that all official international philosophical meetings were invited not by specific scholars, but by the Soviet Union, and a delegation was formed on this principle. It usually consisted of four Muscovites and one someone from some periphery there. This one was most often Kopnin. In addition, Kopnin was in his intellectual development a head higher than many Moscow officials, and therefore he was sent to such foreign congresses, which simply did not dare to go to these Mitins, Yudins, Yovchuks” (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 80). At the same time, V. Horskyi also stressed the exceptionally important role of P. Kopnin in popularizing the results of these first attempts of this international dialogue in the staff of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR.

He noticed that P. Kopnin repeatedly turned the Academic Council’s meetings into notable events because they, as a “certain intellectual center of communication,” gathered the whole institute’s staff and many visitors from outside it. Noting that all this was unusual and interesting, V. Horskyi recognized their main usualness P. Kopnin’s reports on his foreign philosophical business trips: “And so, on our Academic Councils Kopnin, as a rule, reported about such trips. Moreover, he did it with pleasure, in detail, for a long time and incredibly exciting. As a rule, he began with a rather clever exposition of the essence of the philosophical problems discussed at the symposia. Then there was a detailed account of his own report, and later, he told us about the details of everyday life and the impressions of his stay behind the Iron Curtain. For us, for whom this curtain was still tight at the time, it was extremely important and interesting, because, in fact, it was the only “window” to the modern Western world. In addition, there was not a single Moscow philosopher who, for one reason or another, found himself in Kyiv, who was not brought to our Council by Kopnin with a scientific report” (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014: 81). In his interview with T. Chaika (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012) Krymskyi paid no less attention to the analysis of Kopnin’s place and role in the formation of a “true philosophical environment” in the USSR, in particular, explained his strategy as director of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR and, consequently, spokesman for the official scientific position in the field of philosophy. Recalling that Kopnin was just then a “favorite” of the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPU P. Shelest, he illustrated with the example of P. Kopnin the essence of the real official position of the USSR on its international scientific dialogue: “He assessed himself quite soberly, as, by the way, he estimated the “wind of time,” he explained to us: “The ruling elite does not need a creative philosophy now, they do not need new ideas. They need new slang in philosophy to show that we are together with the West and at its level ... he spoke of the need for modern philosophical jargon. You see, he was, in essence, an orthodox Marxist in all respects. However, he taught all this in another language: the language of Russell, the language of logic, although logic had nothing to do with his Marxism. That is, it seemed to him that he was teaching old Marxism in new Western slang” (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 126).

S. Krymskyi and V. Horskyi jointly noted the important role of P. Kopnin in the transformation of the institute headed by him into the main hotbed and, in fact, the centre of not only all-Soviet but also international philosophical cooperation in the Ukrainian SSR. One of the manifestations of this, according to Krymskyi’s memoirs, was the holding of a number of international symposia on logic in its Department of Logic and Methodology of Science in the 1960s. He stressed that the significant scientific achievements of this department, the subject of which was then outside the controlled field of official Soviet ideology, contributed

to the emergence of its international prestige. Also pointing out that he and his colleagues from this department were the first philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR, who were known and noted by “Western logicians,” Krymskyi said that this was primarily due to their scientific papers and personal contacts then. He noted, that the iconic collective monograph “Logic of Scientific Research” (1965) of this department under the direction of P. Kopnin, of the same name, interestingly, with no less notable work of K. Popper, was perceived in the world as a new understanding of logic and logic form and quite unexpectedly for its authors, including Krymskyi himself, was immediately translated into Japanese and German, and a little later — into English (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 144). The works of the founders of the Kyiv philosophical school, such as I. Bychko’s resonant ones “Knowledge and Freedom” (in Czechoslovakia (1972), Uruguay (1973)) and “In the Labyrinths of Freedom” (in Mexico (1979)), were then republished many times abroad in translations in many foreign languages. At the same time, the expert community and the wide readership of the Ukrainian SSR for the first time after Stalin’s repressions era gained a single opportunity to comprehend in Ukrainian the current scientific experience of foreign colleagues, albeit in very biased censorship, thanks to the journal “Philosophical Thought.” It was the only professional academic domestic periodical in philosophy in Ukraine at that time, founded in 1969 on the initiative of V. Shynkaruk, in the two rubrics of which “Criticism and Bibliography” and “Philosophy and Sociology Abroad” were published numerous reviews and critical publications on world philosophy. It is noteworthy that, according to Krymskyi’s memoirs, in the 1970s, this journal was headed by a “former Smershivist and KGB officer” V. Kutsenko, while each issue of “Philosophical Thought” in Soviet times was “very carefully, literally line by line, censored” in the Central Committee of the CPU (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 288). But the bulk of information about the current world philosophical process came to Soviet Ukraine, usually in the Russian-language papers in professional Moscow periodicals, namely in the equally censored journals “Questions of Philosophy” (since 1947) and “Philosophical Sciences” (since 1958).

M. Popovych, as the head of the Department of Logic and Methodology of Science of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, and his colleague in this department Krymskyi, have been actively involved in the international scientific dialogue since the 1960s. M. Popovych, in particular, as a representative of this institute, was a member of the Soviet National Committee of Philosophical Societies and participated in the preparation and holding of the number of the World Congresses of Philosophy. We note their participation in these international congresses and conferences, such as M. Popovych’s reports at the XIV World Congress of Philosophy (Vienna, 1968) and the VII International Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science (Salzburg, 1983), as well as his friend S. Krymskyi’s speeches at the IV (Bucharest, 1971) and VIII (Moscow, 1987) appropriate congresses. At the same time, Shynkaruk’s reports at the International Hegel Congress (Paris, 1966) and the World Congress of Philosophy (Vienna, 1968) became equally notable events. It is interesting that in his interview (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012) S. Krymskyi, in comparison with his colleagues at the Kyiv philosophical school — authors of oral memoirs, most clearly raised the question of its emergence and international recognition in the context of consideration of the issue of scientific heredity between P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk as directors of the institute and, in fact, founders of their own philosophical schools. Linking the emergence of the said school and the formation of its international image with the activities of P. Kopnin and the mentioned department, he noted: “I would venture to say that in the 1960s

it was our department under the leadership of Pavlo Kopnin, which laid the foundations of what was later called the Kyiv philosophical school. I say this because the Kyiv School is traditionally associated with the name of Shynkaryk, but it seems that the school can only be called what is recognized by the international scientific community, and the Shynkaruk's direction did not have such recognition. For the first time, it was received yet by our logicians" (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 144). It is significant that in the same interview, he questioned the role of V. Shynkaruk in the creation of the Kyiv worldview school and stressed that its real creator was namely V. Ivanov, whom S. Krymskyi, like many of his colleagues, recognized as one of the greatest thinkers who ever worked in the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR.

Occasionally mentioned in these memoirs, informal scientific contacts were an important aspect of the international dialogue of philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR with the philosophical thought of the democratic world, hushed up because of its taboo and criminal liability. This was, in particular, a secret acquaintance, either in the form of microfilms and "samizdat" (Lisovyi, 2014), or illegally imported from abroad in books (Tabachkovskyi, 2002), of the philosophical legacy of "bourgeois," mainly Western European, science, including Ukrainian diaspora. An interesting example of this is the story of V. Tabachkovskyi about receiving as a gift from M. Popovych, then his lecturer in Kyiv State University, of J.-P. Sartre's "Nausea" from "Paris second-hand booksellers" (Tabachkovskyi, 2002: 162-163). An illustrative example of this is also Horskyi's recollection of hiding by him, at the request of the soon-to-be arrested Y. Pronyuk, a photocopy of the edition of D. Chyzhevskyi's "Essays on the History of Philosophy in Ukraine". Hidden then by V. Lisovyi a large volume of microfilm copies of books probably was the subject of witnessed by him his long communication, before his arrest in 1972, with M. Popovych, as two clearly committed to the movement of the sixties of the Ukrainian SSR very progressive employees of the two mentioned departments of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. There were copies of foreign and pre-revolutionary editions: from works on analytical philosophy both in German and English (G. Frege, R. Carnap, A. Ayer, G. Moore, G. Ryle, P. Strawson, W. Sellars, W. Quine and others) and "almost everything" by E. Husserl in German to "small things" by S. Freud in Russian translations, books in English and German on social philosophy, ethics and philosophy of culture (H. Marcuse, G. Le Bon, J. Dewey, J. Ortega y Gasset, T. Parsons and others) and also the works of N. Berdyaev, L. Shestov and V. Rozanov (Lisovyi, 2014: 243). At the same time, V. Lisovyi clearly stated the "delay of the time" with the "entry" of the philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR in the "Western space of intellectual communication" (Lisovyi, 2014: 245), in particular, complained about the inaccessibility of published in Germany in the 1960s "works on hermeneutics" (H.-G. Gadamer and J. Habermas). V. Lisovyi thesis about the "narrowing of intellectual contacts at that time with the West" of both him and his friends was repeatedly confirmed by V. Horskyi and S. Krymskyi, in particular in the paradoxical confession of the second of them that at that time, "we do not know the real Marx." The same Krymskyi stressed that before the XX Congress of the CPSU (1956) the only philosophical connection with the West was, perhaps, a periodical of the World Peace Council, namely the "thin magazine" "In Defense of Peace."

The personal relations both of the founders of the Kyiv philosophical school and their institute colleagues at that time with foreign scientists from "capitalist" countries, which are seldom mentioned in their memoirs studied here by us, deserve special attention. One of

the few but significant episodes of interpersonal contacts of philosophers of the USSR and the world was the legendary symbolic meeting in Kyiv of I. Bychko with J.-P. Sartre, who in 1964 visited Hill of Taras as a member of the official UNESCO delegation in honour of the 150th anniversary of the day of Kobzar's death. No less remarkable was the arrival of the founder of the Harvard School of Sociology T. Parsons, in Kyiv in 1963, in particular his visit to the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. In the same final years of Khryshchev's "thaw," the Ukrainian SSR authorities initiated a series of visits by Ukrainian philosophers to several leading "capitalist" countries, the mentioned visit of P. Kopnin to the USA. Unfortunately, the long and interesting visit of P. Kopnin's permanent deputy as a director of the said institute, corresponding member of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences M. Honcharenko to a number of Western European, North American, and Oceania States has been forgotten. He was repeatedly mentioned in T. Chaika's interviews with S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi and M. Popovych, in particular as "not particularly talented, but quite tolerant" and "not malicious" person, "connected with the activities of the party apparatus" and having piety to logic and intellectuals (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 148-149). It is interesting that M. Honcharenko himself, who later, in the 1970s — 1990s, was an employee of the Institute of Art History, Folklore, and Ethnography of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, painted his original face of scientist in two scientific and journalistic works (Honcharenko, 1967; Honcharenko, 1973). They are devoted to a detailed memoir-biographical, rather polemical-sharp and, at the same time, highly professional consideration of his travels around the world. A participant in a number of international scientific events, such as the V International Congress on Aesthetics (Amsterdam, 1964), M. Honcharenko, as a UNESCO Fellow from the Ukrainian SSR, received a unique, more than six months, opportunity to visit the mentioned continents in the 1960s. He visited and described both the most famous universities of the democratic world and many unknown to the vast majority of his readers foreign scientific, socio-political, and cultural-artistic institutions.

An observant traveler, he included in these two, notably, Ukrainian-language editions, a rather large-scale review of the socio-cultural existence of the "capitalist" world of the heyday period of the human rights and protest movements against the geopolitical background of the consequences of the Cuban Missile Crisis and the growing Vietnam War. Honcharenko described in the first of these books, "By the Roads of the Western World" (1967) his visits to Great Britain (London, Cambridge, Oxford, Stratford-upon-Avon, Canterbury), Canada (Ottawa, Montreal, Vancouver), the United States (New York, Cambridge, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Washington and Chester) in 1964 — 1965. He painted a wide panorama of impressions from the "Mother of Parliaments," Hyde Park, the British Museum, Royal Albert Hall, the National Gallery of Canada (Ottawa), a number of New York museums, such as the Solomon R. Guggenheim museum, etc., — as well as many events, for example, the V Annual Festival of the Contemporary Arts (Vancouver, 1965). In this book, he paid attention to the analysis of current topics in the history and theory of culture, ethics, sociology and philosophy, including the materials of the unpublished in the USSR work of H. Reed, A. Toffler, D. Bell, W. Welton, A. Hauser, P. A. Sorokin and other foreign scientists, as well as a wide range of foreign periodicals, from *The Times* to *Life*. At the same time, M. Honcharenko introduced his readers to the universities he visited: the University of London, the University of Cambridge, the University of Oxford, the New York University, Columbia, the Harvard University, the Northwestern University (Evanston), the University of California (Berkeley)), — and some universities in Canada. Highlighting the structure of higher education in these countries in

the context of describing his meetings with professors and students of these universities, he revealed the content of this communication, including some scientific discussions, with well-known “bourgeois” scholars: Al. P. Maslow (the University of British Columbia), J. Portnoy (the New York University), H. D. Aiken (the New York University), T. Parsons (the Harvard University), R. Browning (the Northwestern University (Evanston)), O. Ashenberg (the University of California (Berkeley)) and others. M. Honcharenko entered to a rather polemical and, as a rule, politicized, but certainly professional discussions both with them and in student audiences and various social circles of all these countries, about the development of world educational and scientific, cultural and socio-political processes. In these conversations, he testified to worldview and anthropological — human-dimensional and humanistic, comprehension of the destiny of mankind in the key of reasoned dialogue, which is clearly typical for the research of the Kyiv philosophical school.

Honcharenko’s narrative and communication are fundamentally different from the militarized style of official Soviet science of the Stalin era, with its rigid, dogmatic dependence only on the party-leader narrative, postulated as absolute truth. They are related to the sound of the voices of memories of S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, and many of their colleagues, marked by balanced and, at the same time, paradoxical judgments, ironic and, however, often self-critical colouring. In the literal sense of A. Gladylin’s expression, the Kyiv philosophical school founders were “children of the XX Congress of the CPSU,” who represented a wide and often publicly expressed range of their civic stands: from apolitical non-conformism to nationally oriented dissent. However, as a human type, they were, according to S. Krymskyi, “a product of the Soviet-era” and, as a rule, “lived a spiritually double life” (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 164), as V. Horskyi (Horskyi & Chaika, 2014) and Y. Golovakha (Golovakha, 2017) also repeatedly mentioned. A clear confirmation of this was the contradiction of their thoughts and actions, more than once depicted by them, especially by S. Krymskyi. A striking example of this was Kopnin’s indirect initiation of the removal of D. Ostryanin from the post of the institute’s director and the search for support in the Central Committee of the CPSU, and, at the same time, Kopnin’s transformation of this institute into “another world” (Tabachkovskiy, 2002: 12). However, it was P. Kopnin and, at the same time, D. Ostryanin, who laid the foundations of the Kyiv philosophical school’s entry into the Soviet and international scientific arenas and, in fact, determined the European vector of institutionalization by this school of the national philosophical tradition of Ukraine. Almost half a century away from us, these first creative attempts of self-reflection of anti-Stalinist philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR upon the modern-postmodern intersection of Ukrainian history jointly revealed the irreversibility of changing the style of their thoughts and words in the 1960s. The “ability to say everything on one’s own behalf” without any mention of K. Marx and F. Engels (Krymskyi & Chaika, 2012: 147), was awakened in them, as it had happened in M. Mamardashvili. The Kyiv philosophical school was lucky in those years to critically but thoroughly rethink the world, mostly “anti-Soviet,” but in fact — anti-totalitarian, scientific experience. This contributed to the gradual realization by the vast majority of the creators of this school of their own historical role as scientists called to restrain and overcome the global worldview-armed geopolitical confrontation in a peaceful and constructive international philosophical dialogue.

Conclusions

The results of our research are as follows.

1. Autobiographical reconstructions of the creators of the Kyiv philosophical school, namely: S. Krymskyi, M. Popovych, V. Horskyi, P. Yolon, M. Kashuba, Y. Stratii, and Y. Golovakha, — initiated in Ukraine in the projects on the oral history of philosophy both of T. Chaika and the Student Society of Oral History of Philosophy of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, became a new important array of sources for the alternative historical and philosophical study of the formation of the image of this school as a participant in the international scientific life of the second half of the twentieth century.
2. The memoirs of the philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR obtained in these and other projects on the oral history of philosophy are divided in this article into three conditional regional-urban circles of their spatial conditionality: 1. Central Ukrainian circle with the center in Kyiv; 2. Western Ukrainian circle with the center in Lviv; 3. South Ukrainian circle with the center in Odesa. They, and first of all the system-forming for the Kyiv philosophical school first two of them, together testified to a lot of new data already published in independent Ukraine about three levels of its philosophical connections: 1. inter-republican in the USSR; 2. Eastern bloc led by the USSR; 3. The western bloc led by the United States.
3. The memoirs of S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi, Y. Golovakha and a number of their colleagues are supplemented by the memoirs of well-known representatives of the Odessa philosophical school O. Rogero and S. Sekundant, as participants in the project on the oral history of philosophers of I. Golybovyh and her colleagues from Ilya Mechnikov National University of Odessa. Together they showed that the inter-republican level of scientific ties of philosophers of the Ukrainian SSR, in addition to scholars of the Armenian SSR and Georgian SSR, was represented mainly by prominent Russian thinkers of the sixties, who influenced the humanization and Europeanization of Soviet philosophy, including the Kyiv philosophical school.
4. Oral memoirs of V. Horskyi, P. Yolon, and Y. Stratii jointly revealed a number of notable, including censored and silenced in the USSR, autobiographical data about their and their colleagues' acquaintance and cooperation with the scientific circles of Bulgaria, Poland and Yugoslavia. They testify, in particular, to officially defined and non-publicly practiced in the USSR, in many respects restricting their rights and freedoms, circumstances and demands. In addition to the chauvinistic and xenophobic ones, these were repressive measures taken by the Soviet authorities against scientific and personal contacts of domestic philosophers with colleagues from the Eastern bloc during Khrushchev's "thaw" and neo-Stalinist "stagnation."
5. The exceptionally important role of the director of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR P. Kopnin in establishing the first connections of the Kyiv philosophical school with the philosophical thought of the Western bloc states was revealed in the said autobiographical reconstructions of S. Krymskyi, V. Horskyi and the memoirs of their colleagues. This circumstance, as well as their no less interesting evidence of other, indirect and, less often, direct contacts with it in those years, such as the books of memoirs of M. Honcharenko as P. Kopnin's deputy, testified to the internationally recognized European vector of

development of this school as a leading center of world philosophical dialogue in the Ukrainian SSR.

References

- Chaika, Tatiana (2009) The Touching. The Presentation of the Project “The Philosophers’ Oral Histories.” *Philosophical Thought*, No. 3.
- Golovakha, Yevhen (2017) Subjective view of Ukrainian philosophy (Conversation with Xenija Zborovska, Amina Khelufi and Vsevolod Khoma). *Sententiae*, 1 (XXXVI).
- Honcharenko, Mykola (1967) *By the Roads of the Western World*. Kyiv: Naykova dumka.
- Honcharenko, Mykola (1973) *On the Cultural Meridians of Australia and Oceania*. Kyiv: Naykova dumka.
- Horak, Anna (2009) *Forty forties*. Kyiv, Stylos.
- Horskyi, Vilen, and Tatiana Chaika (2014) *I Lived a Happy Life (T. A. Chayka Interview Cycle)*. Kyiv, Izdatelskiy dom D. Byrago.
- Hrabovskyi, Serhii (2014) Revival of Ukrainian Philosophy in the USSR (1960s — 1980s): notes of the “involved observer.” Kyiv, NaUKMA.
- Kashuba, Maria (2017) “Philosophy is a flower blooming against a background of an epoch” (Conversation with Pavlo Bartusiak, Volodymyr Olinkevych and Olesia Smolinska). *Sententiae*, 2 (XXXVI).
- Krymskyi, Serhii (2010) *About Sophia, Truth, Meanings of Human Existence: Collection of Scientific and Journalistic and Philosophical Articles*. Kyiv: H. S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy.
- Krymskyi, Serhii, and Tatiana Chaika (2012) *Our Life-Long Conversation (T. A. Chayka Interview Cycle)*. Kyiv, Izdatelskiy dom D. Byrago.
- Lisovyi, Vasyl (2014) *Memories. Poems*. Ed. by Natalia Velbovets, Vira Lisova, Larysa Turovets-Lisova. — Kyiv: Smoloskyp.
- Rogero, Alexei (2017) From the History of Soviet Philosophy of the 1960s — 1970s (Part 2). *Doxa*, No. 2 (28).
- Sheremeta, Oksana (2013) Soviet investigations of the philosophic thought of Ukraine: the ideological and administrative context of research strategies. *Philosophical Thought*, No. 1.
- Stratii, Yaroslava (2018) Ukrainian Philosophy on the Fracture of Epoch (Conversation with Xenija Zborovska, Gennady Zinchenko and Sophia Dmitrenko) *Sententiae*, 37(1).
- Tabachkovskyi, Vitalii (2002) *In Search of Non-Wasted Time. Essays on the Creative Heritage of the Ukrainian Philosophers of the Sixties*. Kyiv: PARAPAN.
- Vdovychenko, Heorhii (2020) Personal Dimensions of the Kyiv Philosophical School and its Images through the Voices of Memory. *Future Human Image*, Volume 14. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/14/11>
- Vdovychenko, Heorhii (2020) Socio-Political Image of the Kyiv Philosophical School: from Internal Resistance to Open Attitude. *Ukrainian Policymaker*, Volume 7. <https://doi.org/10.29202/up/7/10>
- Yolon, Petro (2017) Symbolic Role of Pavlo Kopnin in the Critical Period of Activities of the Institute of Philosophy (Article 2). *Philosophical Thought*, No. 1.