

**References**

1. Aharkova, V. V. (2016). Modern Library: Strategic Directions and Professional Development Guidelines: zb. mat-liv VII Lviv. mizhnarod. bibl. forumu «Moderna bibliotek@ v minlyvomu sviti. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
2. Amelchenko, Yu. (2015). Odessa Public Libraries: Implementing Social Policy. Retrieved from : metodistodessa.blogspot.com/. [in Ukrainian].
3. Bohza, N. F. (2011). Public libraries of the region: results of advocacy and partnership activities, analysis of performance indicators. *Bibliotekna praktyka: riznomastist i diievist*, 16, 3-12. Mykolaiv [in Ukrainian].
4. Voskoboinikova-Huzieva, O. (2016). Socio-communication activity of libraries of Ukraine in the latest conditions. *Biblioteknyi visnyk*, 1, 12-17 [in Ukrainian].
5. Vylehzhana, T. (2007). The place of the public library in the socio-cultural space of the region. *Bibliotekna planeta*, 2, 4-6 [in Ukrainian].
6. Denysiuk, Zh. Z. (2018). Influence of information and communication environment on the axiosphere of society. *Visnyk NAKKiM*, 4, 127-131 [in Ukrainian].
7. Korotun, N. I. (2016). Open library: new projects and programs for development of socio-cultural environment: zb. mat-liv VII Lviv. mizhnarod. bibl. forumu «Moderna bibliotek@ v minlyvomu sviti. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
8. Kokhanova, I. (2010). The library as a means of continuity of cultural heritage. *Visnik Knizhkovoyi palati*, 4, 127-131 [in Ukrainian].
9. Miednikova, H. S. (2017). The concept of "cultural practices" and its role in the transformation of modern culture : naukovyi chasopys Natsion. pedahohichnoho universytetu im. M. P. Drahomanova. Seriya 7 : Relihiieznavstvo. Kulturolohiia. Filosofii, 37(50),30-39 [in Ukrainian].
10. The Mykolaiv regional library for youth. Retrieved from <http://unbib.mk.ua/>. [in Ukrainian].
11. Mykolaiv Oblast Universal Scientific Library. Retrieved from <http://www.reglibrary.mk.ua/>. [in Ukrainian].
12. Odessa National Scientific Library. M. Gorky. Retrieved from <http://odnb.odessa.ua/>. [in Ukrainian].
13. Odessa Regional Universal Scientific Library. M. Hrushevsky. Retrieved from <http://biblioteka.od.ua/>. [in Ukrainian].
14. Prystai, H. I. (2016). The library as a component of the cultural and artistic environment of the region. Candidate's thesis. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
15. Sydorenko, T. V. (2017). Cultural and educational activities of public libraries in the South of Ukraine in the context of social changes. Candidate's thesis. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
16. Solonska, N. H. (2012). Model of the concept of activity of cultural and educational centers of libraries: a new approach: *Biblioteka u sotsiokulturnomu prostori: innovatsiini proekty : materialy Vseukr. nauk.-prakt. konf. Odesa* [in Ukrainian].
17. Library Development Strategy for 2025 «Qualitative Changes to Libraries to Ensure Sustainable Development of Ukraine». (2016). Retrieved from <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/219-2016-%D1%80>. [in Ukrainian].
18. Strunhar, V. (2017). Introducing the library in an interactive media environment: a content analysis, 46, 329-344.
19. Kherson Regional Library for Children. Of the Dnieper Seagull. Retrieved from <http://www.library.kherson.ua/lw/>. [in Ukrainian].
20. Kherson Regional Universal Scientific Library. O. Honchar. Retrieved from <http://lib.kherson.ua/>. [in Ukrainian].
21. Central Library. ML Kropyvnytskyi Central Library for adults of Mykolaiv. Retrieved from <http://www.niklib.com/home.ua/>. [in Ukrainian].

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 28.07.2019 р.*

UDC 021.8:351.751.5(477) "193"  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.3.2019.191785>

**Karakoz Olena**  
Ph.D. in Historical Sciences,  
Associate Professor,  
Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts,  
ORCID 0000-0002-7772-1530  
[karakoc@ukr.net](mailto:karakoc@ukr.net)

## **THE GENESIS OF LIBRARY CENSORSHIP IN THE THIRTIES OF THE XX CENTURY WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF UKRAINIAN CULTURAL HERITAGE FORMATION**

**The purpose of the article** is to study the main methods of introducing Soviet-era censorship policy in the libraries of Ukraine in the 1930s, to review the specifics and procedures of control by the state authorities over library collections. **Methodology** of the research is based on the use of scientific methods, first of all, analysis, synthesis, statistical, as well as special historical approaches, in particular: problem-chronological, historical-comparative and historical-genetic, which made it possible to explore the totalitarian regime's methods of controlling of dissenting view through the implementation of total censorship, mechanisms of the public's mind manipulation and a new Soviet mindset formation. **The scientific novelty** of the research lies in the analysis based on the recent evidence of the implementation methods of putting censorship into librarianship by the Soviet authorities. **Conclusions.** The work principles of the Soviet censorship institutions, which limited the libraries' activity focus, turning them into institutions of political propaganda, were clarified. Library censorship is shown as a social phenomenon; its importance is analyzed for access limitation to information and the printer's ink. It has been proved that the mass "purging" of library collections, the creation of slush funds and restricted-access collections have brought the destruction to a large number of books and the general cultural stagnation. The formation of an information vacuum through providing users with ideologically oriented publications testified to mental violence, deformation of the public's mind and blocked the development of both national and world culture.

**Key words:** "purging" of library collections, totalitarianism era, library censorship, repression, repressed writers, Ukrainian intellectual class.

*Каракоз Олена Олександрівна, кандидат історичних наук, доцент, Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв*

**Гене́за бібліотечної цензури 30-х рр. XX століття у контексті становлення українського культурного надбання**

**Метою статті** є дослідження основних методів запровадження радянської цензурної політики в бібліотеках України у 30-ті роки ХХ століття, розгляд специфіки та процедури контролю з боку органів державної влади над бібліотечними фондами. **Методологія** дослідження базується на використанні загальнонаукових методів, передусім, аналізу, синтезу, статистичного, а також спеціальних історичних підходів, зокрема: проблемно-хронологічного, історико-порівняльного та історико-генетичного, які дали можливість дослідити методи боротьби тоталітарного режиму з інакомисленням через впровадження тотальної цензури, механізми маніпуляції свідомістю населення та формування нового радянського світогляду. **Наукова новизна** дослідження полягає в аналізі на основі новітніх даних методів впровадження органами радянської влади цензури у бібліотечній справі. **Висновки.** З'ясовано принципи роботи радянських цензурних інституцій, які регламентували напрями діяльності бібліотек, перетворюючи їх на заклади політосвіти. Показано бібліотечну цензуру як соціальне явище, проаналізовано її значення щодо обмеження доступу до інформації та друкованого слова. Доведено, що масові «чистки» бібліотечних фондів, створення «спецфондів» та спецхранів призвели до знищення значної кількості книг та загального культурного занепаду. Утворення інформаційного вакууму через забезпечення користувачів ідеологічно спрямованими виданнями свідчило про психологічне насилля, деформацію суспільної свідомості та перешкоджало розвитку як вітчизняної, так і світової культури.

**Ключові слова:** «чистка» фонду, доба тоталітаризму, бібліотечна цензура, репресії, репресовані автори, українська інтелігенція.

*Каракоз Елена Александровна, кандидат исторических наук, доцент, Киевский национальный университет культуры и искусств*

#### **Генезис библиотечной цензуры 30-х гг. XX века в контексте становления украинского культурного наследия**

**Целью статьи** является исследование основных методов введения советской цензурной политики в библиотеки Украины в 30-е годы XX века, рассмотрение специфики и процедуры контроля со стороны органов государственной власти над библиотечными фондами. **Методология** исследования базируется на использовании общенаучных методов, прежде всего, анализа, синтеза, статистического, а также специальных исторических подходов, в частности: проблемно-хронологического, историко-сравнительного и историко-генетического, которые позволили исследовать методы борьбы тоталитарного режима с инакомыслием путем внедрения тотальной цензуры, механизмы манипуляции сознанием населения и формирования нового советского мировоззрения. **Научная новизна** исследования заключается в анализе на основе новейших данных методов внедрения органами советской власти цензуры в библиотечном деле. **Выводы.** Выяснено принципы работы советских цензурных учреждений, которые регламентировали направления деятельности библиотек, превращая их в учреждения политпросвещения. Показано библиотечную цензуру как социальное явление, проанализировано её значение для ограничения доступа к информации и печатного слова. Доказано, что массовые «чистки» библиотечных фондов, создание «спецфондов» и спецхранов привели к уничтожению большого количества книг и общего культурного упадка. Образование информационного вакуума путем обеспечения пользователей идеологически направленными изданиями свидетельствовало о психологическом насилии, деформации общественного сознания и препятствовало развитию как отечественной, так и мировой культуры.

**Ключевые слова:** «чистка» фонда, эпоха тоталитаризма, библиотечная цензура, репрессии, репрессированные авторы, украинская интеллигенция.

*The relevance of the research topic.* In the midst of nation`s collective memory retrospective, a key priority is to develop fundamentally new conceptual approaches to receive adequate attention to the intellectual history of Ukraine, especially those of its chapters, which have been over silenced for a long time, have been bent as dictated by a set ideology. Therefore, there is a need for a systematic study of the mechanisms of the public`s mind manipulation under the totalitarian regime and formation through the printed products of the Soviet man`s worldview. Strongarm methods of such influence were part of an overall policy aimed at both the physical destruction of dissentients and indirectly through the mentoring and education, deprivation of national memory and the “Soviet idols” employment. The introduction of library censorship by the Soviet rulers as one of the measures of such a policy makes it possible to understand the logic and motivation of the party leadership.

*Research and publications analysis.* In Soviet historiography, issues of Bolshevik censorship have not been comprehensively studied in the light of ideological prohibitions. With the declaration of state independence of Ukraine, it became necessary to white light national history, abetted by the end of the ideology of historical science.

Ukrainian historians, on a new source base from recently classified slush funds of libraries and archives, have been working toward white lighting the mass state terror that has lasted in Ukraine for more than a decade. This is discussed in the research of I. Bilas [1], H. Yefimenko [6], H. Kasianov [8], S. Kulchyt-skiy [9], Yu. Shapoval [13–14].

Some studies on the implementation of Soviet censorship in all spheres of life of Ukrainian society in the era of totalitarianism can be found in the works of such scientists as: S. Bilokin (“On the shelves of slush funds in different years”, 1990; “Mass terror as a means of public control in the USSR (1914-1945)”, 1999), V. Ocheretyanko (“Hardened books. Party-state supervision over the publication, distribution and use of literature in Ukraine in the 20s - 30s”, 1999), O. Fedotova (“Political censorship in the Ukrainian SSR: the press products` restrictive practice”, 2012).

Thus, in his scientific works, Bilokin has analyzed the essence, main forms of nature and directions of Bolshevik terror revealed the methods used in the political and ideological control over the activity of bookstores and libraries of various types. There was the destruction of “ideological dubious” literature that was included into “Consolidated Lists of Books to be Seized from Sales, Libraries and Educational Institutions” by the newly created Glavlit (abbreviated from General Directorate for the Protection of State Secrets in the Press under the Council of Ministers of the USSR), which included works of writers repressed by the Soviet authorities [2-4].

V. Ocheretyanko revealed the basic historical backgrounds for Soviet political censorship, under the control of which all USSR information institutions were, including libraries; defined the stages of formation and reorganization of party bodies that implemented political censorship in all spheres of socio-cultural life

[10]. O. Fedotova's work covers the activity of state and public institutions aimed at introducing censorship in the work of libraries and publishing houses of Ukraine, analyses the USSR and Ukrainian SSR Glavlit's guidance, lists, and materials. In particular, the researcher uses the term "bibliocide" to emphasize that such Soviet policy had led to the devastation of book stocks and, as a consequence, "the mass extermination of books is still noticeable ... and may have consequences for a long time" [12, 3].

However, in the light of the declassification of new source files, regulatory documents, non-fiction materials, released issues and the rise of new information, there is a need for a more detailed study of library censorship in the 30s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Ukraine.

*The purpose of the research* is to analyze the place, role, and activity of state censorship bodies in the librarianship sector. There is to highlight the methods of implementation of Soviet censorship policy in libraries of Ukraine in the 1930s, specifics, and procedures of control of library funds by the state authorities (a "purging" campaign making through library funds off the so-called "ideologically ruinous", and "nationalist" literature).

*Presentation of the main material of the research.* Censorship in the librarianship sector had occurred as far back as the Library of Alexandria. It appeared and existed as a powerful tool to impact readers' mind on the one hand, and as a means of restricting access to "dangerous" literature on the other. The main means of censorship were: the publication of guidance notes, the development of special orders and regulations that determined the main areas of library activity, the mass "purging" of library books, and the formation of "restricted-access collections", arson, and others. [11].

In Ukraine, censorship was introduced by the Soviet authorities in the 1930s with unprecedented intensity and cruelty to all spheres of the socio-political and cultural life of the population. Communist ideology has been actively implanted in various forms using an increasing number of repressive methods. Although Soviet censorship policy had much in common with the censorship policy of imperial rule, there were also fundamental differences: first, Soviet censorship served not so much the needs of the state as the needs of the ruling party, and secondly, its mere existence opposed the fundamental law of the country (the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR of 1929 and 1937). Printed matter censorship policy was guided by a single principle: the leadership of the country knows what it is necessary for its citizens, preventing society from seeing a real picture of the political, economic and social situation in the country.

In the late 1920s, a branched network of government agencies was formed to systematically oversight and control all types of printed matter, which had been under active study to follow the ideological policies. Thus, the authorities tried to manipulate public opinion, to keep the people within the "limits".

The main components of this system were the departments of the People's Commissariat (People's Commissariat of Education) of the Ukrainian SSR, first of all, Glavlit (the Main Department for Literature and Publishing) and Main Political and Educational Committee of the Republic. Ideological and cultural monopoly demanded a complete restructuring of library activity in the early 1930s, which was facilitated by the Resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of the Bolsheviks "On the Improvement of Library Work" (1929), which referred to the need during 1929 and 1930 to "purge ideological libraries off the literature that is harmful, outdated and does not correspond to the type of library" [7, 85]. The "ideologically harmful" literature included the works of former leaders of the October Coup, who were turned into the "enemies of the people". Frightened by numerous guidance notes and orders, librarians, using "self-censorship", removed the works of current leaders either. There were J. Stalin, L. Kahanovych, V. Molotov, V. Lunacharskyi's works [18, 77].

According to figures provided by archives, in Dnepropetrovsk, most of the 65,000 books that were stored in the library were considered ideologically "improper". 80% of the literature stored in the rural libraries of the Kyiv region had happened to be the same. According to the results of the inspections, "harmful" books were stored in the libraries of Kyiv, Kharkiv, Chernihiv, Melitopol, Odesa, Izium, and subsequently its presence was found throughout the republic [15, 10]. The destruction of literature led to a decrease in the number of libraries. Thus, from 1930 to 1932 the library collections in the republic decreased by 10% [16, 25].

The Soviet government and Golovlit both imposed censorship, which played a crucial role, as Golovlit maintained control over intellectual activity both in Russia and in Ukraine. The Soviet system of total supervision of all printed matter could not function effectively without Golovlit, as the main state-administrative institute. After all, it was ordered to destroy everything that contradicted the ideological principles of the Soviet governing elite, including literature, the content of which contradicted the conceptual issues of communist ideology [7, 87]. Golovlit's censorship in librarianship was carried out in a systematic and systematic manner, leaving far behind the "handicraft" methods of Main Political and Educational Committee of the Republic and the People's Commissariat [7, 96].

In 1930, the reorganization of the Republican Golovlit's departments took place. The Decree of the Central Executive Committee and Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR "On Approval of the Establishment of the Main Agencies for Literature and Publishing and its Local Authorities" as of 1931 stated that the duties of the Glavlit include "the exercise of all kinds of political, ideological, military and economic control over advertisement or distribution of prints, manuscripts, books, posters, paintings, etc." [17, 45]. Feature of censorship in Ukraine was that the printed book had been under the double pressure of censorship by Glavlit of the Soviet Union and the Ukrainian Glavlit of the Ukrainian SSR, which controlled librar-

ies of the country, issued secret orders and guidance notes about the destruction of the literature of repressed writers. The Soviet's Glavlit destroyed books that were published in Russian and the Ukrainian Glavlit, which was subordinated to the Soviet's one must destroy the Ukrainian books by the hands of Ukrainians [7, 91].

During the 1930s, the purging of library collections of the "ideologically improper literature" was in progress. In the 1920s, the "purging" of the collections was due to the task of ideological struggle, in the 1930s the works of repressed writers were seized mainly. Indeed, the activities of art and educational unions, as a rule, conflicted with the regime policies, and the new government, in turn, began to establish a system of strict political and ideological control.

The Bolsheviks had to create their own model of belief system, which would be manifested in a new form of human relations, philosophy, culture and, in particular, in the literature, initiating prohibition of free creative process through various censorship filters and creating their own literature, which was used for the further subjugation of mass consciousness of the population in a single dogma. It was at this time that the party leadership took a course on industrialization, and at the same time starting the process of unification of the spiritual life [7, 96]. However, Glavlit had applied a policy of censorship and various taboos against the Ukrainian intellectual class, which did not understand the violent and demagogic forms of influence on the social mind and argued against the subordination of the literary creativity task for the organization of the Soviet society [7, 97]. Along with banned books, the outstanding artists in words had gone down a hole [5].

During the period of 1934-1936, Glavlit of the Ukrainian SSR made lists of literature that were withdrawn from library collections, in particular, certain "Lists" had 4 numbers, which formed the "Consolidated Lists of Books to be Removed from Sales, Libraries and Scholastic Institutions", which included information about the author, title, publishing house, year of publication, and language. According to the "List No.1", the works of the following writers were included in the special funds: V. Derdukivskiy, S. Efremov, J. Hermaize, O. Vyshnia, O. Dosvitnyi, D. Zahul, M. Irchan, S. Pylypenko, M. Skrypnyk, A. Shamray, M. Yavorivskiy, M. Drahomanov, and M. Maksimovich. It was willful destruction of the Ukrainian culture, using the most savage methods of reprisal against the persons and the results of their literary activities.

"List No.2" was expanded with pieces of writing by H. Holoskevych, K. Panchenko-Chalenko, H. Kholodnyi, Les Kurbas, O. Komyshan, P. Khristyuk, H. Chuprynka, O. Shumskiy, H. Ivannyts, V. Podhayevskiy, H. Kholodnyi, M. Chekhovska, V. Shepotyev, and others. Much of the banned publications belonged to scientists and writers who went through the trial of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine in 1930 (the showcase was fabricated against the fictitious anti-Soviet Union of Liberation of Ukraine, with the aim of discrediting leading figures of Ukrainian culture and public life - *author*): J. Hermaize, V. Durdukivskiy, M. Ivanchenkov, A. Nikovskiy, L. Staritskiy-Chernyakhivskiy [7, 99].

On July 13, 1935 Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine made a decision to republish the 1935-1936 works of P. Tychyna, I. Mykytenko, P. Panch, O. Korniyuchuk, I. Kyrylenko, A. Holovko, L. Pervomaiskiy, O. Kopylenko, M. Hrushevsky, L. Yurkevych, D. Yavornytskiy, D. Dontsov, M. Mohylyanskiy, O. Shulgyn, V. Plekhanov, and others. At the same time (July 19, 1935) Golovlit prepared the largest list of works by Ukrainian writers – the "List No. 3", which were subject to unconditional removal from the library collections. And in the amendment to the secret Decree of the Central Committee of the of the Communist Party of Ukraine, the following writers were mentioned: B. Antonenko-Davydovych, V. Vrazhlyvyi, O. Vlyzko, H. Epik, K. Kotko, H. Kosynka, P. Kozlanyuk, I. Lakyza, V. Mysyk, O. Oles, M. Oliynyk, V. Pidmohlynyi, H. Shkurupiy, M. Voroniy, P. Kapelhorodsky, M. Kulish, V. Atamanyuk, V. Bobynskiy, O. Vyshnia, O. Dosvitnyi, M. Skrypnyk, L. Chernov, L. Starytska-Chernyakhivska, A. Rychyitskiy M. Yavorskiy, M. Yalovyi, M. Volobuyev, D. Zahul, M. Irchan, S. Pylypenko, A. Shamray, V. Yurynets, P. Vanchenko, P. Lisovyi, V. Myshkis, V. Masyk, H. Maytset, B. Navrotskyi, A. Paniv, V. Polishchuk, D. Falkowskyi, V. Stange, and many others. "List No.4" included books by M. Voroniy and Les Kurbas [7, 102].

These lists are evidence of changes that have taken place in Ukraine's political, national, cultural and spiritual life. They removed the most valuable literary achievements of Ukrainians and, to a certain extent, showing the timing of their arrests. Across the country, as of 1938, 1,606 authors were subject to repression and 4,966 works were removed (10,375,706 copies) [7,104].

The Stalinist regime's fierce struggle against the so-called "enemies of the people", which in Ukraine was held under the slogan of the struggle against "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism", led to the destruction of library collections, where Golovlit took active participation.

Censorship has also been extended to librarianship's literature. In 1935, the order of the Head of the Department of the Library People's Commissariat of the Ukrainian SSR A. Koblenz was issued on the examination of professional knowledge and retraining of librarians in order to obtain one of six ranks. Thus, a list of the literature recommended for certification was published, which suggested critical criticism of individual works, including "Guidance to Small and Medium Libraries" by L. Khavkina (Moscow, 1930); "Cataloguing" by M. Shamurin (Moscow, 1934); "Classification" by M. Shamurin (Moscow, 1934). Although the scientific work of L. Khavkina was republished 5 times. In it, the author analyzed the experience of foreign libraries, especially the USA's. The librarian adhered to democratic positions and opposed the introduction of the principle of partisanship in the selection of literature for library holdings, the recommendations of books to readers' class [7, 109].

The 1930s formed in the minds of people a new Soviet reality that was detached from reality. From the point of view of the modern user of the library, the above-mentioned actions of the authorities are inadmissible. In 2017 the Presidium approved the Recommendations of the Ukrainian Library Association "On How Libraries Can Resist Censorship". The document emphasizes that the library should provide free access to legal information resources, including Internet resources, to form up-to-date collections of documents on different media with their presentation in the most accessible form for reading [19].

*Conclusions.* Library censorship issues of free access to information and intellectual freedom remain relevant to the global community. The current situation gives the opportunity to consider censorship not only as one of the methods of political repression but also as an important part of public life and socio-cultural phenomenon.

Consequently, throughout the 1930s, the party and state leadership of the country had taken strict control over the publication and preservation of books, trade, and bookcrossing, the whole book control system in society in order to strengthen the position of Stalinism.

With the strengthening of the totalitarian regime more stern guidance notes were adopted. In the 1920s the literature, the content of which does not coincide with the ideology of the ruling Communist Party was seized, and in the 1930s not only the "ideologically improper works" were exterminated, but repressions were applied to their authors.

During the mass "purging" of library collections, the original part of Ukrainian art and scientific literature, reference publications, published during the period of national state formation and of Ukrainization have been removed. The destruction of almost half of the fund primarily religious and Ukrainian books led to cultural decline.

Purging of library collections, the formation of a "special funds", restricted-access collection and rough destruction of literature had a negative impact on reading activity since the literature in the funds could not meet the needs of users. Formation of information vacuum by providing users exclusively ideologically publications testified to the ideological and psychological abuse, the deformation of social mind and prevented the development of both Ukrainian and world culture.

#### *Література*

1. Білас І. Репресивно-каральна система в Україні (1917–1953): суспільно-політичний та історико-правовий аналіз. Т. 1. Київ : Либідь : Війська України, 1994. 428 с.
2. Білокін С. Масовий терор, як засіб державного управління в СРСР (1914–1945 р.р.) : джерелознавче дослідження. Київ, 1999. Т. 1. 448 с.
3. Білокін С. На полицях спецфондів у різні роки. Слово і час. 1990. № 1. С. 69–76.
4. Білокін С. І. Управління державним терором. Політичний терор і тероризм в Україні ХІХ–ХХ ст. : іст. нариси. Київ, 2002. С. 496–532.
5. Доляр Л. Практика заборони книжок в УСРР (1919–1937 рр.): історіографічний аспект. Вісник Книжкової палати, 2018. № 1. С. 49–52.
6. Єфіменко Г. Г. Національно-культурна політика ВКП(б) щодо радянської України (1932–1938) / Ін-т історії України. Київ, 2001. 540 с.
7. Каракоз О. Цензура в публічних бібліотеках України 1917–1939 р.р. : монографія. Київ : Видавництво Ліра-К, 2015. 180 с.
8. Касьянов Г. В., Даниленко В. М. Сталінізм на Україні: 20–30-ті роки. Київ : Либідь, 1991. 342 с.
9. Кульчицький В. С. Масовий терор як метод експропріації селян-власників. Політичний терор і тероризм в Україні ХІХ–ХХ ст. : іст. нариси. Київ, 2002. С. 340–345.
10. Очеретянко В. І. Загартовані книги. Встановлення партійно-державного контролю над виданням, розповсюдженням та використанням літератури в Україні у 20–30-ті роки. З архівів ВУЧК, ГПУ, НКВД, КДБ : наук. публіцист. журн. 1999. № 1/2. С. 129–141.
11. Пічугіна Ю. О. Сучасна цензура як метод впливу на вибір користувачів бібліотек. Вісник наукової бібліотеки / Харків. нац. техн. ун-т сіл. господарства ім. Петра Василенка. Харків, 2012. Вип. 2 : Бібліотека і освіта: користувачі, ресурси, послуги. С. 133–137.
12. Федотова О. О. Політична цензура друкованих видань в УСРР–УРСР (1917–1990 рр.) : монографія. Київ : Парламентське видавництво, 2009. 352 с.
13. Шаповал Ю. І. Україна 20-50-х років: сторінки ненаписаної історії. Київ : Наук. думка, 1993. 200 с.
14. Шаповал Ю. І. У трагічні роки: сталінізм на Україні. Київ : Політвидав України, 1990. 340 с.
15. Центральний державний архів вищих органів влади та управління України (ЦДАВО України), ф. 166, оп. 4, спр. 967, арк. 14.
16. ЦДАВО України, спр. 972, арк. 35.
17. Там само, ф. 177, оп. 1, спр. 103, арк. 72.
18. Центральний державний архів громадських об'єднань України (ЦДАГО України), ф. 1, оп. 20, спр. 2702, арк. 117.
19. Як бібліотеки можуть протистояти цензурі : рек. Укр. бібл. асоц. URL: [https://ula.org.ua/images/documents/3751/ULA\\_Statement\\_2017.pdf](https://ula.org.ua/images/documents/3751/ULA_Statement_2017.pdf) (дата звернення: 16.08.2019).

#### *References*

1. Bilas, I. (1994). Repressive and punitive system in Ukraine (1917–1953): socio-political and historical-legal analysis. (Vol. 2). Kyiv: Lybid; Troops of Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
2. Bilokin, S. (1999). Mass terror as a means of public control in the USSR (1914–1945 years): source study. (Vol. 1). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
3. Bilokin, S. (1990). On the shelves of the slush funds in different years. Slovo i chas, 1, 69-76 [in Ukrainian].
4. Bilokin, S. (2002). Management of state terror. Political Terror and Terrorism in Ukraine XIX-XX centuries (pp.496-532). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
5. Doiar, L. (2018). The practice of banning books in the USSR (1919–1937): the historiographical aspect. Visnyk knyzhkovoi palaty, 1, 49-52 [in Ukrainian].

6. Yefimenko, H.H. (2001). A national-cultural policy of the CPSU (b) concerning Soviet Ukraine (1932–1938). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
7. Karakoz, O. (2015). Censorship in the Public Libraries of Ukraine, 1917–1939. [Monograph]. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Lira-K [in Ukrainian].
8. Kasianov, H.V., & Danylenko, V.M. (1991). Stalinism in Ukraine: 20-30 years. Kyiv: Lybid [in Ukrainian].
9. Kulchytskyi, V.S. (2002). Mass terror as a method of expropriation of farmers-owners. Political Terror and Terrorism in Ukraine in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (pp. 340-345). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
10. Ocheretianko, V.I. (1999). Hardened book Hardened books. Party-state supervision over the publication, distribution and use of literature in Ukraine in the 20s-30s. From the archive VUChK, HPU, NKVD, KDB, 1-2, 129-141 [in Ukrainian].
11. Pichughina, Yu.O. (2012). Modern censorship as a method of influencing the choice of library users. Visnyk naukovoi biblioteki, Vol. 2: Biblioteka i osvita: korystuvachi, resursy, poslughy, 133-137. Kharkiv: Kharkivskiy natsionalnyi tekhnichnyi universytet silskoho hospodarstva imeny Petra Vasylenka [in Ukrainian].
12. Fedotova, O. (2009). Political censorship of publications in the Ukrainian SSR (1917–1990). [Monograph]. Kyiv: Parlamentske vydavnytstvo [in Ukrainian].
13. Shapoval, Yu.I. (1993). Ukraine 20-50-ies: unwritten page of history. Kyiv: Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].
14. Shapoval, Yu.I. (1990). In the tragic years: Stalinism in Ukraine. Kyiv, Ukraine Polityvdav [in Ukrainian].
15. Central State Archives of higher authorities and management of Ukraine (Ukraine TSDAVO), f. 166, op. 4, spr. 967, arc. 14 [in Ukrainian].
16. Central State Archives of higher authorities and management of Ukraine, spr. 972, arc. 35 [in Ukrainian].
17. Central State Archives of higher authorities and management of Ukraine, f. 177, op. 1, spr. 103, arc. 72 [in Ukrainian].
18. Central State Archive of Public Organizations of Ukraine (Ukraine TsDAHO), f. 1, op. 20, spr. 2702, arc. 117 [in Ukrainian].
19. How libraries can counter censorship: recommendations from the Ukrainian Library Association. Retrieved from [https://ula.org.ua/images/documents/3751/ULA\\_Statement\\_2017.pdf](https://ula.org.ua/images/documents/3751/ULA_Statement_2017.pdf) [in Ukrainian].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 15.05.2019 р.

УДК 658.290:005  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.3.2019.191788>

**Коваленко Єлена Ярославівна**  
кандидат економічних наук, доцент,  
доцент кафедри арт-менеджменту  
та івент-технологій  
Національної академії керівних кадрів  
культури і мистецтв  
ORCID 0000-0003-2253-5762  
[elena.kovalenko.ya@gmail.com](mailto:elena.kovalenko.ya@gmail.com)

## МІЖКУЛЬТУРНІ МЕНЕДЖМЕНТ-КОМУНІКАЦІЇ: МОДЕЛЮВАННЯ ТА КУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЧНИЙ ПРОГНОЗ

**Мета роботи** – моделювання і прогнозування міжкультурних менеджмент-комунікацій та пошук шляхів підвищення їх ефективності з позицій українського менеджменту. **Методологічною** основою дослідження є діалектичний принцип пізнання, системний і культурологічний підходи, статистичні методи опитування, експертного оцінювання, аналітичного групування, математичного моделювання, аналізу та прогнозування міжкультурних менеджмент-комунікацій, а також фундаментальні положення теорії управління в міжкультурному середовищі. **Наукова новизна** одержаних результатів полягає у визначенні кількісних співвідношень і закономірностей різноманітних типів міжкультурної менеджмент-комунікації, що дозволяє здійснювати культурологічні прогнози імовірної поведінки українських менеджерів у менеджмент-культурах різних країн світу, а також обґрунтовано розробляти відповідні стратегії поведінки в цих країнах і за рахунок цього підвищувати ефективність менеджмент-комунікацій. **Висновки.** Менеджмент-комунікації – явище полікультурне. Тому здійснюючи міжнародне ділове спілкування менеджери не можуть дозволити собі керуватися поглядом на світ винятково крізь призму власних цінностей. Встановлено, що правильним у веденні міжнародних ділових відносин і здійсненні міжкультурних менеджмент-комунікацій є підхід, який ґрунтується на рівній цінності різних культур і визнанні культурних розбіжностей як певного блага, що забезпечує гармонійність існування людства. Однак ці розбіжності приносять розчарування, через труднощі їхнього сприйняття, заплутаність й непередбачуваність. Запропоновані у статті розробки, математичного моделювання, аналізу і прогнозування міжкультурних менеджмент-комунікацій, зводять до мінімуму заплутаність і створюють можливості кількісного відчуття міжкультурних розбіжностей та передбачуваності комунікаційних реакцій з позицій культури українського менеджменту.

**Ключові слова:** міжкультурна менеджмент-комунікація, тип комунікаційної менеджмент-культури, профіль міжкультурної менеджмент-комунікації, комунікаційна культурна розбіжність, комунікаційна реакція, модель менеджмент-комунікації, культурологічний прогноз.

*Коваленко Єлена Ярославівна, кандидат економічних наук, доцент кафедри арт-менеджменту та івент-технологій Національної академії керівних кадрів культури та мистецтв*

**Межкультурные менеджмент-коммуникации: моделирование и культурологический прогноз**

**Цель работы** – моделирование и прогнозирование межкультурных менеджмент-коммуникаций и поиск путей повышения их эффективности с позиций украинского менеджмента. **Методологической** основой исследования является диалектический принцип познания, системный и культурологический подходы, статистические методы опроса, экспертной оценки, аналитической группировки, математического моделирования, анализа и прогнозирования межкультурных менеджмент-коммуникаций, а также фундаментальные положения теории управления в межкультурной среде. **Научная новизна** полученных результатов заключается в определении количественных соотношений и закономерностей различных типов межкультурной менеджмент-коммуникации, что позволяет осуществлять культурологические прогнозы вероятного поведения украинских менеджеров в менеджмент-культурах разных стран мира, а также обоснованно разрабатывать соответствующие стратегии поведения в этих странах и за счет этого повышать эффективность менеджмент-коммуникаций. **Выводы.** Менеджмент-