

Oleksandr KORNIEVSKYY

National Institute for Strategic Studies, Kyiv  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1512-0326>

DOI : 10.14746/ps.2019.1.24

Olexii ROZUMNYI

Razumkov Centre, Kyiv  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1592-7960>

## **NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AS ACTORS OF UKRAINIAN POLITICS OF MEMORY**

The majority of publications on the politics of historical memory in Ukraine focus on the role of the state: the President, the Verkhovna Rada, the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance, the Ministry of Education with its textbook policy, etc. Based on the study of the activities of these institutions certain conclusions are drawn about the tendencies and peculiarities of Ukrainian politics of memory, which is involuntarily reduced to a single direction of the state policy.

While giving due regard to the important role of state institutions in shaping the historical memory of society, we would like to draw attention to the significance of other non-state actors active in the “struggle for historical memory.” According to studies by domestic and foreign authors, such actors include international organizations, political parties, non-governmental associations and movements, individual political leaders and public figures, historians, and media representatives (Mink, 2009: 74–75; Воляннюк, 2013: 101). Particularly interesting, numerous and diverse category among the listed entities is represented by non-governmental organizations.

This article analyzes the role of NGOs as subjects (actors) of Ukrainian politics of memory, as well as the mechanisms they utilize to influence the formation of the historical memory of Ukrainian society.

The activities of NGOs aimed at influencing the historical memory of Ukrainian society are briefly covered in many publications devoted to Ukrainian politics of memory, but this specific aspect of the issue becomes an independent research subject surprisingly rare.

Ukrainian researcher Y. Opalko was among the first to point out that non-governmental organizations are active subjects of the politics of memory along with state institutions; he concluded that, since the statutory goals and objectives of most of these NGOs coincide with the tasks of the state memory policy, therefore various directions and forms of activity of these organizations for the preservation and revival of historical consciousness and historical and cultural heritage objectively contribute to implementing the state memory policy (Опалько, 2009: 48).

L. Chupriy conducted substantive research on the participation of NGOs in the politics of memory. The researcher drew attention to the fact that there are many NGOs

in Ukraine, involved in shaping public perceptions of the country's historical past and proposed their classification by the direction of activity: 1) organizations conducting research activities and protecting memorials; 2) educational and enlightenment organizations; 3) Cossack-oriented organizations; 4) youth organizations of historical direction; 5) veteran organizations. L. Chupriy pointed to the necessity of interaction of the state with this segment of civil society and drew attention to a significant number of organizations promoting the Soviet-Russian historical narrative (Чупрій, 2009).

Based on the analysis of the register of civic organizations of the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine and the program documents of certain civic associations acting as subjects of the politics of memory, O. Volyanyuk developed the following classification: 1) civic organizations established by live witnesses, participants or victims of certain events in the past, or in memory of the victims of tragic historical realities; 2) civic organizations, the activities of which are aimed at protecting and recreating certain traditions preserved by public memory; 3) scientific and cultural-educational organizations with activities focused on studying and popularizing knowledge about the past, research and discovery of previously unknown pages of history. At the same time, O. Volyanyuk points out that the information indicated in the official register does not fully disclose the practical activities of these organizations, and most of the registered organizations are not active at all (Воляннюк, 2009).

V. Babka proposed the classification of NGOs according to the degree of priority of the politics of memory, along with other activities: 1) those specializing in this work (or if it is essential for them); 2) those engaged in the specified activity along with other projects; 3) those occasionally engaged in carrying out tasks of the politics of memory (Бабка, 2014).

L. Vengrynuk, based on a somewhat extended Volyanyuk's classification, analyzed the list of non-governmental organizations registered by regional departments of justice in Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk and Ternopil oblasts (Венгрінюк, 2013).

Overall, the activities of NGOs as actors of Ukrainian politics of memory are under-researched. Existing research is mostly based on the analysis of NGO registries, names and official programs of these organizations. At the same time, some authors consider it difficult to draw up a more or less comprehensive and adequate list of civic organizations that implement their own memory policies. In particular, according to Y. Opalko, this direction is not recorded as a separate activity in the statistical reporting, and most domestic NGOs, according to their own reports, are polyfunctional, which means they are active in various spheres of public life (Опалько, 2009: 46). O. Volyanyuk points to the fact that only 10–20% of NGOs registered by the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine are truly active, while the quality of civil society is determined not only by the number of associations but also by their effectiveness and the ability to influence the state's decision-making (Воляннюк, 2009).

These circumstances urged us to abandon quantitative research methods in favor of comparative qualitative analysis, namely the method of studying specific cases (case study). The expediency and necessity of applying qualitative comparative methods in political science along with quantitative (statistical) were proved by A. Lijphart. Case study is appropriate if quantitative methods do not allow obtaining relevant results. At the same time, given the small sample, this research strategy is more suitable

for developing hypotheses and their testing than for formulating general conclusions (Lijphart, 1971).

In general, case study is an in-depth study of a single situation (several situations) in order to understand a wider class (of similar) cases. The case study may include studying one, two or more cases. A single case is often used by scientists at the pilot stage of the study; it is primarily intended to generate hypotheses or to test the likelihood of a hypothesis. Also, the case study method is used in the form of dual comparison – the study of two cases (similar as much as possible, or vice versa – fundamentally different from each other). Another option is to analyze several situations. Four, five and even more cases may be chosen, but most often three cases become the objects of the study. Sometimes this research strategy is used for classification, where each case describes different variations and forms of a particular phenomenon (Арабаджиев, 2015). In our opinion, the latter option is the most preferred, since it combines the capabilities of the other two, and also allows researchers to apply the most comprehensive and varied array of information.

Based on common typologies of approaches to the use of the case study method in political sciences, we can place our study into the empirical-interpretative direction, which involves working with case-objects as empirical units, on the basis of which certain interpretive schemes are constructed (Ragin, Becker, 1992; Atteslander, 2008; Яковлев, 2011).

When applying the method of studying individual cases, a well-reasoned and careful selection of specific cases is crucial. Our criteria for selecting objects for analysis were as follows: 1) indisputable participation in the politics of memory – only those NGOs that openly declare their purpose to influence public perceptions of the past and implement their own memory policies actively and systematically were considered; 2) high influence – organizations have significant potential to influence drafting the state memory policy/significant resources to influence public opinion/powerful sponsors and patrons. At the same time, the authors of this article tried to select those organizations that take up very different positions on the battlefield for memory and identity.

Hence, the following NGOs were identified as objects of our research: the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement, which focuses on the history of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and is closely integrated with modern state memory policy in Ukraine; “Tkuma” Ukrainian Institute for Holocaust Studies founded by the Jewish community of the city of Dnipro, which includes mighty rich and influential people in Ukraine; the Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial Center, the key sponsors of which have close ties with Russia, and the project itself has repeatedly been accused of ignoring the Ukrainian memorial context and recreating the Soviet model of memory of the Second World War.

It should be noted that the link between the public image of the historical past and politics is tight and multifaceted: the historical memory of society sets the meaning and value frameworks for the political process, and its participants, in turn, not only adapt to these frameworks but also try to regulate them according to their own needs. In this article, we consider politics of memory as social practices and norms related to the regulation of the collective vision of the past (this definition of the politics of memory suggested by the Political Encyclopedia leaves aside another equally impor-

tant aspect – political instrumentalization of the past (*Політична енциклопедія*, 2012: 570–571). Therefore, we do not aim to analyze the purpose why some actor propagates a certain historical narrative, but merely acknowledge its activity in shaping the historical memory of society.

### CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT

The Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement is a non-governmental organization that explores various aspects of the Ukrainian liberation movement of the 20th century, processes of overcoming the consequences of the totalitarian past in the former USSR countries, countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The Center was founded in 2002 in Lviv. According to open source information, the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement is active in many directions simultaneously (*Енциклопедія історії України*, 2013: 455–456; *Центр досліджень визвольного руху*; *ЦДВР – Національний музей-меморіал жертв окупаційних режимів*):

- apart from research the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement analyzes national memory policy, develops curricula, provides institutions and stakeholders with consultations, expert assessments on the history of the liberation movement, repressive regimes of the 20th century;
- the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement held documentary exhibitions “The Ukrainian Insurgent Army: the Story of the Unbroken,” “The Willpower: Leaders of the Liberation Movement: E. Konovalts, S. Bandera, R. Shukhevych, V. Cook.” Also, the Center has published dozens of historical monographs and publishes the journal “Ukrainian Liberation Movement” annually;
- in 2009, the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement in cooperation with the Security Service of Ukraine became a co-founder of the Lonsky Prison Museum and Memorial to Victims of Occupation Regimes in Lviv in the former KGB and Gestapo prison;
- the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement has a specialized library and archive, assists citizens in finding archival information on the victims of repressions and supporters of the liberation movement;
- in cooperation with the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv and the Lonsky Prison Museum and Memorial to Victims of Occupation Regimes, the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement created the Electronic Archive of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement, which today contains over 26,000 documents (*Електронний архів українського визвольного руху*);
- the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement developed the program of access to the archives of the KGB of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (inherited by the Security Service of Ukraine), which was launched in 2008–2010 and further developed after 2014.

It should be noted that such extensive and multifaceted activities of this organization involve significant organizational and resource opportunities.

Quite detailed information on the activities of the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement can be found in the press release of this organization, published after

the report-election conference held on March 22, 2008. According to the report, when discussing the activities of the Center, the conference participants paid particular attention to cooperation with authorities, scientific institutions, NGOs and individuals.

In such a way, at that time, the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement provided information and consultation support for national events of the Lviv Regional State Administration on preserving national memory. At the request of the Standing Committee of the Lviv Regional State Administration on Culture, Spiritual Revival, Mass Media and Tourism, the Center, together with the Lviv office of the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance, had developed a five-year program (2008–2012) on preserving national memory. According to it, individual projects of the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement (including long-term ones) should have been financed. Together with the Lviv City Council, the Center and the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance carried out a project on creating the Lonsky memorial-research complex under the concept developed by the Center. Such cooperation also was established with the Secretariat of the President of Ukraine: the Center provided professional assistance during the organization of foreign visits of the Head of State that were thematically related to the Ukrainian liberation movement. The Center's management also planned a series of negotiations with state administrations of the western regions on implementing programs aimed at popularizing the history of the Ukrainian liberation movement and declared its intention to extend this practice to the east of the country in the future.

Moreover, the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement established close cooperation with the vast majority of local history museums in Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, academic institutions (I. Krypiakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Dnipropetrovsk National University, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukrainian Catholic University, National University of Ostroh Academy, etc.) in scientific activity, which included holding scientific conferences, roundtables and implementation of joint publishing projects.

Among the priorities of the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement was the development, lobbying and monitoring of the implementation of the regional "Program of Commemoration of National Memory" for 2008–2012 and the establishment of offices in the central and eastern Ukraine (which involved carrying out projects related to the activities of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists in this region by the Center's partners) (*Центр досліджень визвольного руху обрав нове керівництво...*, 2008).

One should also notice direct incorporation of representatives of the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement into line state structures (such as the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance), which ensured them significant influence on state memory policy in 2008–2010 and especially from 2014. The prime example here is the biography of V. Vyatrovych, who headed the Center in 2002–2008. In 2008, he started working at the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance and became a scientific consultant of the international project "Ukraine Remembers – the World Acknowledges" – an information campaign developed by this institution for the 85th anniversary of the Holodomor (which fell at the wake of President V. Yushchenko's memory policy). The same year V. Vyatrovych became the director of the Branch State Archives of the

Security Service of Ukraine and held this post until March 2010. After the Revolution of Dignity, in 2014, he was appointed director of the restructured Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance and became one of the key figures in shaping state memory policy in Ukraine (while remaining the head of the Academic Council of the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement and, undoubtedly, retaining great influence within this organization) (*Вятрович Владимир...*, 2017). It was during this period that a number of dekomunization laws were drafted and approved in Ukraine, and they fully meet the declared objectives of the Center's activities (in particular, the Laws "On the Legal Status and Remembrance of the Fighters for the Independence of Ukraine in the 20th Century," "On Access to the Archives of Repressive Bodies of Totalitarian Communist Regime of 1917–1991" and "On the Condemnation of the Communist and National Socialist (Nazi) Regimes, and Prohibition of Propaganda of Their Symbols").

Other representatives of the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement have a similar employment history (*Український інститут національної пам'яті, Центр досліджень визвольного руху обрав нове керівництво*, 2014). For example, A. Shpak, who served as a director of the Center after V. Vyatrovych's resignation, later became his deputy at the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance. I. Kulyk used to be an expert on access to archives at the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement; in 2014–2015, he was director of the Archives of the Security Service of Ukraine, and now he heads the Department for the Institutional Support of the National Memory Policy at the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance. A. Kohut, who for some time also served as a director of the Center and led the Electronic Archive of the Liberation Movement, in 2016, headed the Archives of the Security Service of Ukraine; he also serves as a manager of the "National Memory Policy" group of the "Reanimation Package of Reforms" and a member of the Public Committee for Commemorating the Victims of the Holodomor-Genocide of 1932–1933 in Ukraine (*Політика національної пам'яті; Архів СБУ очолив новий директор*, 2016).

### **"TKUMA" UKRAINIAN INSTITUTE FOR HOLOCAUST STUDIES**

The "Tkuma" Ukrainian Institute for Holocaust Studies was founded in 1999 by the Jewish community of Dnipro as a charitable organization (*"Ткума" – інститут вивчення Голокосту*, 2017). The initial task of the Institute was to establish the "Memory of the Jewish People and the Holocaust in Ukraine" Museum, which opened in 2012. This museum evinces the great resource capabilities of organizations and people who had contributed to the creation of "Tkuma." This is the third largest Holocaust memorial in the world. The total area of its exposition is about 3 thousand square meters. The museum comprises four main halls located on three floors of the "Menorah" cultural and business center owned by the Dnipro Jewish community. As stated on the "Menorah" website, it is the world's largest Jewish complex, the idea and "full implementation of the project was possible thanks to the President of Dnepropetrovsk Jewish community Gennady Bogolyubov and

the President of the United Jewish Community of Ukraine Ihor Kolomoyskyi”<sup>1</sup> (*Культурно-деловий центр “Менора”*).

As explained by “Tkuma” director I. Shchupak, the main direction of the Institute’s activities is scientific work, namely the study of the contemporary problems of the Holocaust history, intercultural and interethnic relations and specific issues related to the Holocaust (righteous among the nations, collaboration, peculiarities of Nazi propaganda etc.). A range of publications (monographs, collections of documents and articles) and conferences is the product of their scientific work. “Tkuma” cooperates with many scientific centers such as the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, I. F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, and universities.

However, the educational and promotional activities of the Institute are equally robust. “Tkuma” works in partnership with the Institute of National Remembrance, the Ukrainian Catholic University, regional institutes of postgraduate education. In particular, together with institutes of postgraduate education, the program “Study of the History of the Second World War and the Holocaust in the Context of the Modern War Against Ukraine” was developed. Cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine has been maintained for over 15 years, which includes joint seminars and programs (*“Ткума” – інститут вивчення Голокосту*, 2017). For instance, the plan of measures approved by the Ministry for the 75th anniversary of the Babyn Yar tragedy (order № 312 of March 23, 2016) provides for holding the following events in cooperation with “Tkuma” Ukrainian Institute for Holocaust Studies:

- a series of seminars for teachers of history of Ukrainian secondary schools – “Study of the History of the Second World War and the Holocaust in the Context of the Modern War Against Ukraine”;
- mobile educational and museum exhibitions of “Tkuma” Ukrainian Institute for Holocaust Studies and the “Memory of the Jewish People and the Holocaust in Ukraine” Museum;
- a youth project (student youth from Ukraine, the US, Canada, Israel, Europe), which includes roundtables, educational sessions, trainings and the International Competition for Youth Works “Lessons of War and Holocaust – Lessons of Tolerance.”

Also, “Tkuma” Institute features as a co-organizer of the international symposium devoted to the Babyn Yar tragedy and memory of it.

According to I. Shchupak, “Tkuma” implements its educational programs primarily through work with teachers. “Yes, there are programs of work with both students and pupils, but we believe that the most effective way is to work with teachers because they are ‘multipliers’” (*“Ткума” – інститут вивчення Голокосту*, 2017). I. Shchupak himself is the author of a number of school history textbooks, which are widely used in the general education system (“World History. 11th Grade,” “World History. 10th Grade,” “World History. 9th Grade,” “World History. 6th Grade”) (Пришко, Щупак, 2013).

<sup>1</sup> Gennady Bogolyubov and Ihor Kolomoyskyi are at the top list of the richest people in Ukraine. See at: *100 richest Ukrainians ranking sees 20 new millionaires*, <https://www.kyivpost.com/ukraine-politics/100-richest-ukrainians-ranking-sees-20-new-millionaires.html> (27.10.2019).

Despite the apparent emphasis on the ethnohistory of Jews and the Holocaust, “Tkuma’s” activities cover a much wider range of historical issues. This includes rethinking of the history of the Holocaust as part of Ukrainian national narrative, and coverage of the supranational context of historical events (“Ткума” – *інститут вивчення Голокосту*, 2017). For example, on November 15, 2018, the exhibition “For our Freedom and Yours 1968–2018” was opened in the Holocaust Museum, which was dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the dissidents’ protests in defense of the Prague Spring. Among its co-organizers are the Embassy of the Czech Republic in Ukraine, the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes (the Czech Republic), the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance, the State Archives of the Security Service of Ukraine. The available information leads to the conclusion that “Tkuma” Institute is quite closely integrated into state memory policy.

### BABYN YAR HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL CENTER

According to the Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial Center website (babynyar.org), it is a non-profit educational institution that documents and commemorates the Holocaust, in particular, the Babyn Yar mass shootings of September 1941.

The following tasks of the Memorial Center are declared to:

- perpetuate the memory of all victims of the tragedy by telling their story;
- explain the relationship between Jews with non-Jews in Kyiv and Ukraine;
- establish a research center specialized on the Holocaust and other crimes committed in the territories of Ukraine, Eastern Europe, and the former Soviet Union;
- develop an educational platform aimed at stimulating a comprehensive understanding of the Babyn Yar tragedy and providing the public with tools for dealing with the Holocaust topic;
- attract the attention of society to the threats of totalitarian, extremist, nationalist and racist ideologies, while supporting cultural, ethnic, religious and social differences;
- show the value of heritage and memory in building a democratic society and a peaceful future (*Меморіальний центр Голокосту “Бабин Яр”*).

However, such Memorial Center does not yet exist either factually or legally. Judging by the website, one may note that it is just about the project to be finalized by the physically established Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial in 2023. The construction of the building itself is planned for 2020–2022, and till that time design will be developed, the historical narrative of the Center permanent exhibition will be defined, and the necessary financial resources will be attracted. The charitable organization “The Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial Center” Charitable Fund” founded in September 2016 is virtually engaged in the project implementation and accumulates resources for establishing the Memorial Center itself.

The Fund’s supervisory board includes well-known and influential people, in particular, businessman and philanthropist V. Pinchuk, singer S. Vakarchuk, former world boxing champion V. Klitschko (younger). However, most members of the supervisory board are not citizens of Ukraine. Among them, the most noticeable is a group of



large Russian businessmen of Jewish origin (born in Ukraine), including M. Friedman, G. Khan, and P. Fuks. According to one critic of the Fund's activities, the co-president of the Association of Jewish Organizations and Communities (Vaad) of Ukraine J. Zisels, these three persons are real project organizers, while the rest of the members of the supervisory board are rather "figureheads" (Зісельс, 2018). According to P. Fuks himself, apart from M. Friedman and G. Khan, the project is funded by V. Pinchuk. In total, about \$50 million is expected to be spent on the Fund's activities, but over time this amount may double (*Дороже денег...*, 2016).

It should be noted that the Fund's proposed concept of the Memorial Center and the basic historical narrative (*Базовий історичний нарратив...*, 2018) caused criticism from many Ukrainian historians – the Holocaust researchers (*Музей "Бабин Яр". Відкритий лист-застереження...*, 2017) and well-known representatives of the Jewish community of Ukraine (See at: Зісельс, 2017, 2018). As stated in the open letter from 16 Ukrainian historians, they consider to be false an attempt to tie the Babyn Yar with the Holocaust only, ignoring other victims and other dramatic moments in its history. In their view, such an approach will only aggravate the war of memories that has been ongoing in the Babyn Yar for many years (*Музей "Бабин Яр". Відкритий лист-застереження...*, 2017). J. Zisels points out: "The very name "the Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial Center" has a hidden contradiction. The Babyn Yar was only partly the Holocaust; it was "wider" than the Holocaust in this place. The Holocaust is limited to dealing only with Jewish and Romanian murders at that time. The rest is not included" (Зісельс, 2018). Historians A. Podolsky and V. Nakhmanovych also criticize the project for recreating the mental framework of the Soviet Union and the (post) colonial approach to the history of Ukraine (*Анатолій Подольський...*, 2017; *Віталій Нахманович...*, 2017).

However, despite criticism, the organizers of the project of the Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial Center hold an active lobbying campaign at the highest Ukrainian and international level. In particular, on behalf of the Memorial Center, a thematic exhibition and conference in the European Parliament was held, as well as meetings with the Prime Minister of Ukraine, the President of Israel and the Minister under the Federal Chancellor of Germany were organized. Kyiv mayor V. Klitschko is an active supporter of the project (Кличко, 2018).

In March 2018, a memorandum of cooperation was signed between the Fund, the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine, the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, the Kyiv City State Administration and the National Historical and Memorial Reserve "Babyn Yar" in order to create the Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial Center in Kyiv. The text of the memorandum confirms the role of the Fund as the organizer of public deliberations on the purpose, the procedure of establishing and functioning of the Memorial Center, the organizer of thematic information, educational, scientific and cultural events, the organizer of the architectural contest for the project of the Memorial Center, the organizer of the development and approval of the project documentation, the construction contractor. The remaining signatories are identified as "contributing" or "participating" at different stages of the project implementation (*Меморандум про співпрацю...*, 2018).

In fact, the charitable organization acts as the organizer of establishing a memorial project of an exceptional, not only national, but also international significance, and

receives passive assistance from a number of state institutions. We suppose that the cooperation with the latter was greatly facilitated by the lack of need for financial investments from the state or city budgets since the above-mentioned Fund assumed all expenses related to establishing the Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial Center. To date, it has every chance to “outrank” and, in essence, to replace another state project that involves the creation of the Museum of the Babyn Yar victims. Despite the support of Vaad of Ukraine and a group of historians united around the Institute of History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 27 million hryvnias of budget funds allocated to this project in 2017 were never used due to organizational and bureaucratic difficulties (Зісельс, 2018).

\* \* \*

In Ukraine, a number of non-governmental organizations, aimed at influencing the formation of the historical memory of society, exist and actively function. While studying them, one should not dwell solely on the analysis of formally registered NGOs that declare their historical, educational, or memorial protection, etc., as operating organizations may have another status (for example, a charitable organization). These organizations should not be considered atomistically, but rather as a kind of nodes in the network of social and financial ties. Only taking into account these links can we assess the actual and potential influence of a particular organization.

The methods of the activities of NGOs – actors of the politics of memory can be divided into two types: 1) direct influence on the formation of historical memory of society through holding information campaigns, exhibitions, and other educational activities, as well as through establishing museums, archives, publishing activities; 2) interaction with state institutions responsible for implementing memory policy (establishing cooperation, providing state support to their own projects or incorporating their representatives into relevant state structures).

For this reason, it is expedient for researchers to view such organizations as “pressure groups,” which achieve their goals through public campaigns affecting public opinion and lobbying. Important factors that determine the potential of such “pressure groups” are the availability of sponsors with significant financial capabilities and/or lobbyists in government agencies and institutions that are part of the state memory policy infrastructure.

## REFERENCES

- Atteslander P. (2008), *Methodenderempirischen Sozialforschung*, Erich Schmidt Verlag, Berlin.
- Lijphart A. (1971) *Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method*, “American Political Science Review”, Vol. 65.
- Ragin C. (1992), *Introduction: Cases of “What is a Case?”*, in: *What is a Case?: Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*, (eds.) Ch. Ragin, H. Becker, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- 100 richest Ukrainians ranking sees 20 new millionaires, <https://www.kyivpost.com/ukraine-politics/100-richest-ukrainians-ranking-sees-20-new-millionaires.html> (27.10.2019).
- Анатолій Подольський: Ми маємо виховати в собі культуру відповідальності за пам'ять про наше минуле, "День", <https://day.kyiv.ua/uk/article/cuspilstvo/babyn-yar-ta-postkolonialnyu-pidhid> (15.08.2017).
- Арабаджиев Д. (2015), *Метод кейс-стаді в сучасній політичній науці*, "Освіта регіону", No. 2.
- Архів СБУ очолив новий директор, "Історична правда", <http://www.istpravda.com.ua/short/2016/01/5/148852/> (5.01.2016).
- Бабка В. (2014), *Політика пам'яті: спроба теоретичного синтезу, моделі впровадження та роль у перехідному суспільстві*, "Наукові записки Інституту політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАН України", No. 6 (74).
- Базовий історичний наратив Меморіального центру Голокосту "Бабин Яр", <http://api.babiyar.org/uploads/files/fund/258303195689d66c2dc47ce660dda0e5.pdf> (1.10.2018).
- Венгринюк Л. Я. (2013), *Громадські організації у сфері політики пам'яті: регіональний вимір (порівняльний аналіз Івано-Франківської, Львівської та Тернопільської областей)*, "Прикарпатський вісник НТШ", No. 3.
- Віталій Нахманович: Українська держава в особі Президента України має взяти на себе реальну відповідальність за комплексне розв'язання проблеми довкола Меморіалу Голокосту, "День", <https://day.kyiv.ua/uk/article/den-planety-svitovi-dyskusiyi/babyn-yar-yak-placdarm-dlya-russkogo-myra> (7.08.2017).
- Воляннюк О. (2009), *Громадські формування в галузі політики пам'яті сучасної України*, "Освіта регіону", No. 3.
- Воляннюк О. (2013), *Суспільна пам'ять і політика: Мистецтво можливого*, Київ.
- Вятрович Владимир. Председатель Украинского института национальной памяти, "Досьє", <https://file.liga.net/persons/vyatrovich-vladimir> (27.04.2017).
- Дорожеденег. *Каким будет мемориал Бабий Яр и почему он нужен не только Киеву*, "Фокус", <https://focus.ua/ukraine/358482/> (9.10.2016).
- Електронний архів українського визвольного руху, <http://avr.org.ua/> (27.10.2019).
- Енциклопедія історії України: У 10 томах (2013), (eds.) В. А. Смолій etc., Наукова Думка, Vol. 10, Київ.
- Зісельс Й. (2017), *Роль комунізму. Виступ на обговоренні наративу Меморіалу "Бабин Яр"*, "Історична правда", <http://www.istpravda.com.ua/columns/2017/12/4/151559/> (4.12.2017).
- Зісельс Й. (2018) *Що відбувається довкола Бабиного Яру сьогодні?*, "Історична правда", <http://www.istpravda.com.ua/columns/2018/09/3/152870/> (3.09.2018).
- Кличко В. (2018) *Чому я підтримую проект Меморіального центру Голокосту "Бабин Яр"?*, "Меморіальний центр Голокосту «Бабин Яр»", <http://babiyar.org/byhmc-news/posts/news/vitalij-klicko-comu-a-pidtrimuu-proekt-memorialnogo-centru-golokostu-babin-ar> (27.07.2018).
- Культурно-деловий центр "Менора", <http://menorah-center.com/about/> (27.10.2019).
- Меморандум про співпрацю з метою створення на території м. Київ Меморіального центру Голокосту "Бабин Яр", "Меморіальний центр Голокосту «Бабин Яр»", <http://api.babiyar.org/uploads/files/fund/f9219c68b071a4af72a72e8046aa3dea.pdf> (16.04.2018).
- Меморіальний центр Голокосту "Бабин Яр", <http://babiyar.org/byhmc/about> (27.10.2018).
- Мінк Ж. (2009), *Геополітика, примирення та ігри з минулим: на шляху до нової пояснювальної парадигми колективної пам'яті*, "Україна модерна (Пам'ять як поле змагань)", Vol. 15 (4).

- Музей “Бабин Яр”. Відкритий лист-застереження українських істориків, “Історична правда”, <http://www.istpravda.com.ua/articles/2017/03/28/149652/> (28.03.2017).
- Опалько Ю. В. (2009), *Взаємодія громадських організацій з органами влади у реалізації державної політики пам’яті*, “Стратегічні пріоритети”, No. 3.
- Політика національної пам’яті, <https://rpr.org.ua/groups-rpr/17polityka-natsionalnoji-pam-yati/> (27.10.2019).
- Політична енциклопедія (2012), (eds.) Ю. Левенець, Ю. Шаповал etc., Парламентське видавництво, Київ.
- Пришко О. В., Щупак І. Я. (2013), *Суспільні інститути як майданчик для освітньої та виховної діяльності*, [http://virtkafedra.ucoz.ua/el\\_gurnal/pages/vyp113/Prishko-Shupak.pdf](http://virtkafedra.ucoz.ua/el_gurnal/pages/vyp113/Prishko-Shupak.pdf) (27.10.2019).
- Український інститут національної пам’яті, <http://www.memory.gov.ua/> (27.10.2019).
- “Ткума” – інститут вивчення Голокосту, “Ukrainian Jewish Encounter”, <https://ukrainianjewishencounter.org/uk/ткума-інститут-вивчення-голокост/> (23.11.2017).
- ЦДВР, “Національний музей-меморіал жертв окупаційних режимів”, <http://www.lonckoho.lviv.ua/muzej/tsdvr> (27.10.2019).
- Центр досліджень визвольного руху обрав нове керівництво та визначив напрями подальшого розвитку, “Наукове життя”, <http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/bit-stream/handle/123456789/65384/13-Tsentr.pdf?sequence=1> (1.04.2008).
- Центр досліджень визвольного руху обрав нове керівництво, “Націоналістичний портал”, <http://ukrnationalism.com/news/nationalist-movement/226-tsentr-doslidzhen-vyzvolnohorukhu-obrav-nove-kerivnytstvo.html> (5.01.2014).
- Центр досліджень визвольного руху, <http://www.cdvr.org.ua/> (27.10.2019).
- Чупрій Л. (2009), *Роль громадських організацій у формуванні історичної пам’яті українського народу*, <http://old.niss.gov.ua/monitor/Jul2009/32.htm> (27.10.2019).
- Яковлев М. В. (2011), *Застосування кейс-стаді як методу політичних досліджень: спроба типологізації*, “Наукові записки НаУКМА”, Vol. 121.

## ABSTRACT

The article investigates the role of non-governmental organizations as subjects (actors) of Ukrainian politics of memory, as well as the mechanisms used by them to influence the formation of the historical memory of Ukrainian society. The authors resort to comparative qualitative research, using an empirical-interpretative version of the method of studying specific cases (case study). The objects of analysis are: the Center for the Study of the Liberation Movement, “Tkuma” Ukrainian Institute for Holocaust Studies, and the Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial Center. The results of the study indicate that NGOs are actively influencing the process of forming the historical memory of Ukrainian society. Methods of such influence can be both direct (through various educational activities) and indirect (through interaction with state institutions responsible for the implementation of national memory policy). The effectiveness of this influence is determined by such important factors as the availability of sponsors with significant financial means and/or lobbyists in government agencies and institutions that are part of the state memory policy infrastructure.

**Keywords:** non-governmental organizations, politics of memory, memory policy, Ukraine

**ORGANIZACJE POZARZĄDOWE JAKO AKTORZY  
UKRAIŃSKIEJ POLITYKI PAMIĘCI****STRESZCZENIE**

Artykuł bada rolę organizacji pozarządowych jako podmiotów (aktorów) ukraińskiej polityki pamięci, a także stosowane przez nich mechanizmy wpływające na kształtowanie pamięci historycznej społeczeństwa ukraińskiego. Autorzy stosują porównawcze badania jakościowe, wykorzystując empiryczno-interpretacyjną wersję metody badania konkretnych przypadków (studium przypadku). Przedmiotami analizy są: Centrum Badań Ruchu Wyzwolenia, Ukraiński Instytut Badań nad Holokaustem „Tkuma” oraz Centrum Pamięci o Holokauście Babyn Yar. Wyniki badań wskazują, że organizacje pozarządowe aktywnie wpływają na proces kształtowania pamięci historycznej społeczeństwa ukraińskiego. Wpływ ten może być wywierany zarówno metodami bezpośrednimi (poprzez różnorodne działania edukacyjne), jak i pośrednimi (poprzez interakcje z instytucjami państwowymi odpowiedzialnymi za wdrażanie krajowej polityki pamięci). Skuteczność tego wpływu zależy od tak ważnych czynników, jak dostępność sponsorów dysponujących znacznymi środkami finansowymi i/lub lobbystów w agencjach rządowych i instytucjach będących częścią infrastruktury polityki pamięci państwa.

**Słowa kluczowe:** organizacje pozarządowe, polityka pamięci, Ukraina

