

## REFERENCES

1. *Annenkov, I. O.* (2010). Sil's'kogospodars'ke mashy'nobuduvannya Ukrayins'koyi RSR v umovax narostannya kry'zovy'x yavy'shh (1980-ti roky') [Silskogospodarske machine-building of the Ukrainian PCR in the minds of the growth of crises (1980s)]. *Candidate's thesis*, Xarkiv (in Ukrainian).
2. Bolshaya sovetskaya jenciklopediya v 30-ti tomah [Great Soviet Encyclopedia in 30 volumes] (1975). (Vols. 21) A.M. Prohorov (Ed.). Moscow: Sovetskaya jenciklopediya, 608 p. (in Russian).
3. Central State Archive of Public Association of Ukraine. Rep. 1. Inv. 32. Rec. 818 (in Ukrainian).
4. Ekonomichna ency'klopediya. U 3-x tomah [Economic encyclopedia. In 3 volumes] (2000). (Vols. 1) S.V. Mocherny'j (Ed.). Ky'yiv: Vy'davny'chy'j centr «Akademiya», 864 p. (in Ukrainian).
5. *Kry'vokon', O. G., Bibly'k, V. V., Abdula, S. L.* (2006). Evolyuciya rozvy'tku produkciyi VAT «XTZ» [Evolution of product development of JSC «HTZ»] *Visti Akademiyi Inzhenerny'x nauk Ukrayiny'*, 1, pp. 18–21.
6. Lozovskomu kuznechno-mahanicheskomu zavodu – 50 let. Pishem istoriyu zavoda I goroda vmeste [Lozovsky forging and mechanical plant – 50 years. We write the history of the plant and the city together] (2016). V.I. Chernomaz, A.V. Babenko, A.O. Karpov et al. (Ed.). Kharkiv: Golden Pages, 139 p. (in Russian).
7. *Petrov, G. D.* (2003). Stranici istorii selhozmashinostroenija [Pages of the history of agricultural engineering]. *Traktori I selskohozajstvennie mashini*, 5, pp. 45–47 (in Ukrainian).
8. State Archive of Kharkiv region. Rep. P-5652. Inv. 6. Rec. 1260 (in Ukrainian).
9. State Archive of Kharkiv region. Rep. 2. Inv. 163. Rec. 1. (in Ukrainian).
10. State Archive of Kharkiv region. Rep. P-5652. Inv. 6. Rec. 1224 (in Ukrainian).
11. State Archive of Kharkiv region. Rep. P-5652. Inv. 6. Rec. 1265 (in Ukrainian).
12. State Archive of Kharkiv region. Rep. P-5652. Inv. 6. Rec. 2133 (in Ukrainian).
13. State Archive of Kharkiv region. Rep. 2. Inv. 183. Rec. 127 (in Ukrainian).
14. State Archive of Kharkiv region. Rep. 2. Inv. 201. Rec. 63 (in Ukrainian).

*Received 23.01.2022*

*Received in revised form 17.02.2022*

*Accepted 25.02.2022*

DOI: 10.15421/272211

UDC 069.8: 719 «001.51»

**D.P. Hrytsiuk**

*Administration of the historical and cultural reserve in Lutsk, Lutsk, Ukraine*

## **PROBLEMAL ASPECTS OF CLASSIFICATION OF HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL RESERVES ON THE EXAMPLE OF INSTITUTIONS OF THE WESTERN REGIONS OF UKRAINE**

**E-mail:** gricukdenis666@gmail.com

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4110-5162>

**Abstract.** The publication considers topical issues of classification of historical and cultural reserves. The study of species diversity and the specification of historical reserves remains one of the most complex and understudied topics. The delimitation of reserves in accordance with the peculiarities of the organization of work to ensure the proper state of preservation and promotion of certain types of monuments is an important aspect in the study of historical and cultural reserves. The study provides a description of the state (hierarchical) classification of historical and cultural

reserves. It was found that this classification is based on the principle of significance for the state of cultural heritage sites that form the basis of individual reserves. Legislative acts are analyzed and the shortcomings admitted in the theory of classification and their consequences in practical implementation are established, on the example of historical and cultural reserves in the western regions of Ukraine. Based on the ratio of theoretical approaches and their practical expression, the inconsistency of the classification with reality was established. Recommendations necessary to ensure the practical expression of this classification in the work of state bodies and historical and cultural reserves were offered. The study considers the classification of historical and cultural reserves formed by the typological affiliation of monuments. It was found that the above classification is based on the species diversity of cultural heritage sites. On the basis of a comparative analysis of the classification of types of reserves and cultural heritage sites, discrepancies in the classification systems were identified. In particular, discrepancies between species classifications of monuments and reserves in the norms of the Law of Ukraine «On Protection of Cultural Heritage» were established. Recommendations for systematization of nature reserves by types of monuments are given. A mechanism for determining the species of historical and cultural reserves was also developed. The article proposes a new approach to determining the type of reserves based on the percentage of ensembles of cultural and historical heritage, which form the basis of historical and cultural reserves.

**Keywords:** object of cultural heritage, type of reserve, level of subordination, legislation, monument protection work, practical reflection, quantitative indicator, historical value, ensemble of monuments.

Д.П. Грицюк

*Державний історико-культурний заповідник у м. Луцьку, Луцьк, Україна*

## ПРОБЛЕМНІ АСПЕКТИ КЛАСИФІКАЦІЇ ІСТОРИКО-КУЛЬТУРНИХ ЗАПОВІДНИКІВ НА ПРИКЛАДІ УСТАНОВ ЗАХІДНИХ ОБЛАСТЕЙ УКРАЇНИ

**Анотація.** У публікації розглядаються актуальні питання класифікації історико-культурних заповідників. Розмежування заповідників відповідно до особливостей організації роботи для забезпечення належного стану збереження та популяризації окремих видів пам'яток є важливим аспектом у процесі дослідження історико-культурних заповідників. У дослідженні надається характеристика державної (ієрархічної) класифікації історико-культурних заповідників. Проаналізовано законодавчі акти та встановлено недоліки, допущені в теорії класифікації та їх наслідки в практичній реалізації, на прикладі історико-культурних заповідників у західних областях України. На основі співвідношення теоретичних підходів та їх практичного вираження було встановлено невідповідність класифікації до реальності. Були запропоновані рекомендації, необхідні для забезпечення практичного вираження цієї класифікації в роботі державних органів та історико-культурних заповідників. У дослідженні розглянута класифікація історико-культурних заповідників, сформована за типологічною приналежністю пам'яток. Зокрема, встановлено розбіжності видових класифікацій пам'яток та заповідників у нормах Закону України «Про охорону культурної спадщини». Подані рекомендації щодо систематизації видів заповідників за типами пам'яток. У статті запропоновано новий підхід до визначення виду заповідників на основі відсоткового співвідношення ансамблів пам'яток культурної та історичної спадщини, які становлять базу історико-культурних заповідників.

**Ключові слова:** об'єкт культурної спадщини, вид заповідника, рівень підпорядкування, законодавство, пам'яткоохоронна робота, практичне відображення, кількісний показник, історична цінність, ансамбль пам'яток.

**Problem statement.** Classification of historical reserves is one of the most complex and insufficiently studied topics at the present stage of study of monument protection institutions of Ukraine. An important aspect in the process of studying the types of reserves is the ratio of legal and scientific terminology on the essence of the concept of historical and cultural reserves. [32]. Therefore, it is necessary to characterize the state (hierarchical) classification of historical and cultural reserves formed on the basis of the level of significance of cultural

heritage sites for the state. Provide recommendations on the practical expression of this classification in the work of government agencies and reserves. Consider the classification of historical and cultural reserves formed by the typological affiliation of monuments. Based on the comparative analysis of the classification of reserves and cultural heritage sites, identify inconsistencies in the classification systems and provide recommendations for the systematization of nature reserves by types of monuments. Consider the mechanism for determining the species of historical and cultural reserves and provide recommendations for improving the classification of these institutions.

**Topicality.** Research in the field of conservation of historical and cultural reserves requires a detailed study of many aspects of these institutions. The legal classification of the latter is important in the process of studying historical and cultural reserves. Legislative and scientific approaches to the classification of reserves need to be substantiated and the advantages and disadvantages of modern species diversity need to be identified.

The urgency of the study is due to the lack of a sound position in Ukrainian legislation on the types of reserves. There is also a need to unify approaches to the classification of reserves and cultural heritage sites in the scientific literature and legislation. The study of classification approaches plays a significant role in the process of basic and applied research related to the activities of historical and cultural reserves.

**Analysis of research and publications.** The topic of organization of monument protection work in Ukraine is a very popular area of research among domestic researchers. Scholars pay considerable attention to the study of many areas in the field of cultural heritage protection. In particular, a lot of research is devoted to the formation and analysis of the legal system of protection of historical heritage. Thus, theoretical issues of legal protection of cultural heritage sites were considered in the works of V. Akulenko [1], PM Rabinovych [14], TV Kurilo [11], OV Usenko [15] and others. Problems of the relationship between Ukrainian legislation and the international legal system of cultural heritage protection are presented in the studies of G. Andres [2] and O. Melnychuk [12]. In the process of researching historical and cultural reserves, the work of S. Kot deserves special attention, who formulated the scientific concept of «reserves» and paid special attention to the legal status of the latter [9]. The activities of monument protection institutions and their place in the state system of cultural heritage protection are also presented in the works of V. Antoshkina [3] O. Epifanov [5] and others. V. Kholodok investigates the issues of state management of cultural heritage protection [16]. V. Vechersky made a significant scientific contribution to the topic of methods of protection and preservation of urban complexes and methodological principles of protection and restoration of monuments [4 p. 276–333]. Some aspects of the implementation of monument protection measures on the basis of historical and cultural reserves are considered by O. Zlyvkova [8]. Linyova, LV Pribega and others. The above researchers also pay attention to the organization of historical and cultural reserves. However, the issue of classification and delimitation of historical and cultural reserves in the scientific literature is not given due attention.

**Purpose and objectives.** The aim of the study was to study the approaches to the classification of reserves. Carrying out a comparative analysis of state classifications proposed for reserves and cultural heritage sites, in order to identify classification shortcomings in the legislation. Providing recommendations for improving the classification of reserves.

**Presentation of the main material.** Prerequisite for the study of certain types of reserves is a comparative description of the concept of historical and cultural reserve and the specification laid down in the terminology, depending on the activities of these institutions. In scientific circles, the term introduced by S. Kot is mainly used., with. 21]. According to this concept, historical and cultural reserves act as a certain area of the historical environment (territory). Thus, the defining feature of the reserve, from the point of view of the scientist, is the presence of a separate territory on which the cultural heritage objects are concentrated, which together form the basis of the reserve. However, it does not correspond to legal terminology, because Art. 33 of the Law of Ukraine «On Protection of Cultural Heritage» provides for the establishment of reserves on the basis of a complex

(ensembles) of monuments. Thus, the legislator proposes to consider historical and cultural reserves as a set of material objects that have historical or cultural significance and can clearly represent historical events and processes. Legislative interpretation in the presented sense is significantly narrowed, but based on the content of Art. 33 in general, the formation of reserves can take place both on the basis of a separate complex and in the territory where cultural heritage sites are located [6, p. 33]. At the same time, the legislator has significantly expanded the concept of a reserve, because in the sense of the Law, a reserve is not only a collection of monuments or a certain territory, but also a legal entity. Historical and cultural reserves are research and monument protection institutions. The state also assigns a number of monument protection and cultural-educational tasks to the reserves. The main function of the institution is to study, protect, preserve and promote cultural and historical heritage. Based on the relationship between legal and scientific concepts, historical and cultural reserves can be considered as territories, ensembles of monuments and research institutions at the same time.

Regarding the classification of historical and cultural reserves in the Law of Ukraine «On Protection of Cultural Heritage» we meet several approaches. Depending on the significance for the state of cultural heritage sites, on the basis of which a reserve is formed. There are historical and cultural reserves of state and local importance [6, Art. 32]. The Law also provides a description of the classification of the reserve by importance for the state. In particular, the basis for determining the reserve of national importance is the availability and provision of state protection (thus can be counted only objects that are on the state register and have the status of monuments) complexes or ensembles of monuments «having special cultural, historical and scientific value, had a significant impact on the development of culture, architecture, urban planning and are directly related to outstanding historical events» [6, Art. 33]. Reserves of local significance include: «complexes (ensembles) of monuments that reflect the characteristics of history, culture, architecture or urban planning of a particular region or locality» [6, Art. 33]. Also in the legislation we find the terms «national reserve» and «republican reserve», but such wording is only the status of the institution and does not apply to the types of reserves. Accordingly, when determining the classification, we do not take them into account. However, the practical purpose of such a division remains unclear. It can be assumed that the division should provide for the appropriate level of subordination of historical and cultural reserves. In this case, reserves of national importance must be subordinated to the highest executive bodies, whose powers include the protection of cultural heritage. In Ukraine, such a body is the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy. Whereas local reserves should be subordinated to local cultural heritage protection bodies, in particular to the relevant Departments of oblast or city councils. In practice, the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine has only twenty-three institutions out of sixty state historical and cultural reserves [6, Art. 33]. The reserves subordinated to the highest executive body of the state in the western regions of Ukraine include:

1. National Reserve «Ancient Halych»;
2. Kremenets-Pochaiv State Historical and Architectural Reserve;
3. State Historical and Architectural Reserve in Berezhany;
4. Khotyn Fortress State Historical and Architectural Reserve;
5. Kamyanets National Historical and Architectural Reserve;
6. State Historical and Memorial Reserve «Field of the Battle of Brest»;
7. State Historical and Cultural Reserve in Belz;
8. Ternopil Castles National Reserve [8, p. 59 61].

Outside the office of the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy and in the relevant subordination of local authorities, among the historical and cultural reserves of national importance remained:

1. State Historical and Cultural Reserve in the city of Lutsk;
2. State Historical and Cultural Reserve «Ancient Vladimir»;
3. Tustan State Historical and Cultural Reserve;

4. State Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve «Lychakiv Cemetery»;
5. Zhovkva State Historical and Architectural Reserve;
6. Nahujevychi State Historical and Cultural Reserve;
7. State Historical and Cultural Reserve in Dubno;
8. State Historical and Cultural Reserve in Ostroh;
9. Samchyky State Historical and Cultural Reserve;
10. Medzhibizh State Historical and Cultural Reserve;
11. Zolochiv Castle Museum-Reserve;
12. State Museum-Reserve «Olesky Castle» [8, p. 62 63].

Thus, on the example of historical and cultural reserves in the western regions of Ukraine we trace the inconsistency of the practical implementation of the legislation. It is expedient to subordinate all historical and cultural reserves of state importance to the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine, and to reserve reserves of local significance in the department of local state authorities. This approach will speed up the search for and protection of cultural heritage sites on the ground by organizing new reserves of local importance.

The legislation also provides for the types of historical and cultural reserves according to the types of monuments on the basis of which they are formed. There are historical-architectural, architectural-historical, historical-memorial, historical-archaeological and historical-ethnographic reserves [6, p. 33]. All these species are considered by the legislator to be historical and cultural reserves. However, the normative opinion on the listed classification groups remains unclear. In particular, there are no explanations about the features on the basis of which the historical-architectural and architectural-historical reserves are distinguished. In the outlined question, we can trace the elements of the classification built on the principle of the percentage of components of the reserve. However, this approach has not been properly developed in legal norms. The legislator also singled out museums-reserves. However, in the scientific literature there is no distinction between historical and cultural reserves of all kinds and museums-reserves. Researchers consider museum-reserves as a kind of historical and cultural reserves. According to scientists, the peculiarity of museums-reserves is the mode of keeping monuments and their historical territories. It is proposed to consider museums-reserves only those institutions for which the prohibition of production activities and agricultural land use in the territory where such institutions are located [4, p. 67]. This conclusion is also suggested by the legislator, as both types of reserves are regulated by the same legislation and are subject to state protection on general legal grounds. The law does not differentiate between concepts and does not clarify the grounds for granting certain groups of monuments the status of a historical and cultural reserve or museum-reserve. As the regulations do not provide any justification for distinguishing these concepts, researchers do not consider historical and cultural reserves and museum reserves as two different types of institutions. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider museums-reserves as a kind of historical and cultural reserves. In this way, historical and cultural reserves can be divided into six groups, which are divided according to the typical features of cultural heritage sites.

The Ukrainian legislation provides a separate classification of cultural heritage sites, which is based on the species by type of monument. Thus, it is possible to trace the interdependence of classification systems of reserves and monuments built on the principle of typological affiliation of cultural heritage sites. According to paragraph 2 of Art. 2 of the Law of Ukraine «On Protection of Cultural Heritage», cultural heritage objects are divided into: archaeological, historical, monumental art objects, architectural objects, urban planning objects, objects of garden and park art, landscape and objects of science and technology [6, Art. 32]. Given this approach, we find inconsistencies in the distribution of historical and cultural reserves by type of monument, provided by the official classification. The proposed classification systems do not partially correspond to each other, despite their official definition in the legislation. The only thing that is understandable is the allocation of historical and archeological reserves to a separate

group, as this group corresponds to a separate type of monuments. Thus, it can be stated that historical and architectural reserves are declared and specialized on the basis of archaeological complexes such as: their remains or ruins, megaliths, caves, rock paintings, areas of historical cultural layer, fields of ancient battles. Regarding the latter group, we note that its enrollment is related to the definition of the Law which states that this group of monuments includes «buildings, structures, their complexes (ensembles)» [6, Art. 33]. It can be assumed that a group of architectural reserves is created and operates on the basis of historically formed complexes to which the legislator includes: «centers of settlements, streets, neighborhoods, squares, with preserved planning and spatial structure and historic buildings, and individual buildings partially preserved in authentic condition» [6, Art. 33]. There is also a partial correspondence between the group of historical and memorial reserves and historical cultural heritage sites. In fact, the legislation included in the group of historical monuments: «landmarks associated with important historical events, with the lives and activities of famous people» [6, p. 33]. However, the volume of the range of monuments included in the historical group remains unclear, which allows to include several types of historical and cultural reserves in one group of monuments. A further comparison of the classifications shows a complete discrepancy between the groups of monuments and reserves, both in terms of species and quantity. After all, there are eight types of monuments and only six types of historical reserves. The classification of historical and cultural reserves remains a problematic issue at present. It is advisable to develop a new classification of reserves taking into account the existing methodological, methodological and practical achievements of foreign and domestic scientists in the field of classification of cultural heritage sites [3, p. 117]. This will make it possible to more thoroughly assess the specifics of the work of historical and cultural reserves in relation to certain groups of monuments and to better organize the protection of monuments.

The mechanism of determining the species affiliation of historical and cultural reserves has not been studied. Monument ensembles often consist of different types, as the feature of immovable historical monuments is an extremely wide range of content embodied in them. Cultural heritage sites can be linked to different historical events, personalities, architectural value and archaeological heritage sites at the same time.

A percentage approach should be used to objectively assess the specialization of reserves. It is necessary to calculate the quantitative and qualitative composition of cultural heritage sites and determine the type of reserve according to the dominant composition of monuments. To ensure the quality of the calculation procedure and determine the type of reserves, the whole process must be legally approved.

An important aspect is the expression of the specialization of historical and cultural reserves. It is difficult to provide an objective assessment of the quality of conservation measures carried out by reserve administrations. Therefore, it is impossible to determine the features of certain types of reserves in accordance with their specialization. At the state level, Regulations «on the administration of the state historical and cultural reserve». This document is adopted and approved for each institution separately, and is the main document that organizes the activities of reserves [13]. However, such provisions are typical for all types of reserves and do not have any differences in their content depending on the specifics of the institutions. In the process of approving the administrations of historical and cultural reserves, it is necessary to provide for the availability of appropriate specialists in relation to the quantitative indicators of cultural heritage sites. This approach will optimize and improve the work of institutions. The outlined issue needs to be finalized at the national level, and should correspond to the classification of reserves.

**Conclusions.** In summary, we can say that there are gaps in Ukrainian legislation in the field of organization of historical and cultural reserves. The term historical and cultural reserve can be interpreted in three definitions, as an institution, territory and complex of monuments. However, officially these concepts are not represented by a separate legal act, which leads to problems of interpretation of the concept of historical and cultural reserve. Two classifications are used for historical reserves. The essence of the first is to allocate

reserves by level of subordination. In practice, this classification is distorted and does not reflect the legislative idea. Another classification is based on the species diversity of cultural heritage sites. However, the content of such a distinction does not comply with the law. Species classification is not properly reflected in the regulations designed to regulate the activities of historical and cultural reserves.

#### REFERENCES

1. *Akulenko, V. I.* (1991). *Okhorona pamiatok kultury v Ukraini (1917–1990)*. [Protection of cultural monuments in Ukraine (1917–1990)]. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola, 274 p. (in Ukrainian).
2. *Andres, H. O.* (2009). *Okhorona kulturnoi spadshchyny Ukrainy v konteksti svitovykh intehratsiinykh protsesiv (druga polovyna XX – pochatok XXI stolittia)* [Protection of Ukraine's cultural heritage in the context of global integration processes (second half of the XX – beginning of the XXI century)]. *Ukrainske tovarystvo okhorony pamiatok istorii ta kultury*. Kyiv: Tsentri pamiatkoznavstva, P. 152–157 (in Ukrainian).
3. *Antoshkina, V. K., Murzin, V. Y., Taran, V. O.* (2011). *Okhorona kulturno-istorychnoi spadshchyny u svitli suchasnoho zakonodavstva Ukrainy* [Protection of cultural heritage of Ukraine in the context of world integration processes (second half of the XX – beginning of the XXI century) Protection of cultural and historical heritage in the light of modern legislation of Ukraine]. Donetsk: Yuho-Vostok, 140 p. (in Ukrainian).
4. *Vecherskyi, V. V.* (2001). *Okhorona i restavratsiia arkhitekturnoi ta mistobudivnoi spadshchyny* [Protection and restoration of architectural and urban heritage]. *Arkhitekturna y mistobudivna spadshchyna doby Hetmanshchyny*. Kyiv: NDITIAM, p. 276–333 (in Ukrainian).
5. *Iepifanov, O.* (2018). *Konstytutsiino-pravovi zasady okhorony kulturnoi spadshchyny: problemy teorii ta praktyky* [Constitutional and legal principles of cultural heritage protection: problems of theory and practice]. *Instytut zakonodavstva Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy*. Kharkiv. 193 p. (in Ukrainian).
6. *Zakon Ukrainy «Pro okhoronu kulturnoi spadshchyny»* [Law of Ukraine “On Protection of Cultural Heritage”]. (2000) *Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy (VVR)*, № 39, p. 333. URL: <http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1805–14> (in Ukrainian).
7. *Zaremba, S. Z.* (1995). *Ukrainske pamiatkoznavstvo: istoriia, teoriia, suchasnist* [Ukrainian monument studies: history, theory, modernity]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 289 p. (in Ukrainian).
8. *Zlyvkova, O., Hradun, E., Zvirniak, A., Yerazina, I.* (2007). *Istoryko kulturni zapovidnyky Ukrainy* [Historical and cultural reserves of Ukraine]. Kyiv: Feniks, 176 p. (in Ukrainian).
9. *Kot, S. I.* (2006). *Istoryko-kulturni zapovidnyky* [Historical and cultural reserves]. *Entsyklopediia Suchasnoi Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, NTSh*. Kyiv. URL: [https://esu.com.ua/search\\_articles.php?id=12771](https://esu.com.ua/search_articles.php?id=12771) (in Ukrainian).
10. *Kulturna spadshchyna v konteksti «Zvodu pamiatok istorii ta kultury Ukrainy»* [Cultural heritage in the context of the «Collection of monuments of history and culture of Ukraine»]. (2015). *Kot, S.I. Ukrainske tovarystvo okhorony pamiatok istorii ta kultury*. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy, 2015. 486 p. (in Ukrainian).
11. *Kurylo, T. V.* (2006). *Pravova okhorona kulturnoi spadshchyny Ukrainy* [Legal protection of cultural heritage of Ukraine]. Lviv: «Novyi Svit- 2000», 152 p. (in Ukrainian).
12. *Melnychuk, O.* (2008). *Mizhnarodno-pravovyi status vsesvitnoi kulturnoi i pryrodnoi spadshchyny* [International legal status of world cultural and natural heritage]. Kyiv: «Naukova dumka», 287 p. (in Ukrainian).
13. *Pro zatverdzhennia Typovoho polozhennia pro administratsiiu istoryko-kulturnoho zapovidnyka* [On approval of the Standard Regulations on the administration of the historical and cultural reserve]. *Postanova vid 26 chervnia 2013 r. № 452*. URL: <http://zakon.rada.gov.ua>. (in Ukrainian).
14. *Rabinovych, P.* (2001). *Metodolohiia yurydychnoi nauky* [Methodology of legal science]. *Yurydychna entsyklopediia*. S. Shemshuchenko ed (vols 1–6). Kyiv: «Ukrainska Entsyklopediia», 792 p. (in Ukrainian).
15. *Usenko, O.* *Derzhavno-pravove rehuliuвання vidnosyn u sferi okhorony kulturnoi spadshchyny* [State and legal regulation of relations in the field of cultural heritage protection]. URL: [http://www.irbisnbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis\\_nbuv/cgiirbis\\_64.exe](http://www.irbisnbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe) (in Ukrainian).

16. *Kholodok, V.* (2011). Derzhavne upravlinnia okhoroноiu kulturnoi spadshchyny v Ukraini: stan i perspektyvy rozvytku [State management of cultural heritage protection in Ukraine: state and prospects of development]. *Derzhavne budivnytstvo*. (№ 1). URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/DeBu\\_2011\\_1\\_49](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/DeBu_2011_1_49) (in Ukrainian).

*Received 16.01.2022*

*Received in revised form 25.02.2022*

*Accepted 25.03.2022*

DOI: 10.15421/272212

UDC 9(477.54)

**В. Попович**

*Харківський національний педагогічний університет імені Г.С. Сковороди*

## **ВИХОВАННЯ РАДЯНСЬКИХ ЦІННОСТЕЙ У СТУДЕНТІВ В УМОВАХ АКАДЕМІЧНОГО ПОВСЯКДЕННЯ У 60–80 РР. XX СТ. (ЗА МАТЕРІАЛАМИ ПЕРІОДИЧНИХ ВИДАНЬ ХАРКІВСЬКИХ ВНЗ)**

**E-mail:** [vadympopovych@ukr.net](mailto:vadympopovych@ukr.net)

**ORCID:** 0000–0002–0720–6541

**Анотація.** У статті крізь призму періодичного друку розглядається академічне повсякдення студентів ВНЗ Харкова як середовище формування радянських цінностей. У вітчизняній історичній науці питання конструювання «радянської людини» є досить актуальним. Його у своїх дослідженнях торкалася ціла низка вітчизняних та закордонних науковців. Особливий інтерес, з огляду на своє значення в радянському суспільстві, становить дослідження студентської молоді в контексті виховання радянських цінностей. Джерельну базу дослідження становлять газети вищих навчальних закладів Харкова (Харківського державного університету, Харківського політехнічного інституту, Харківського авіаційного інституту, Харківського автомобільно-дорожного інституту, Харківського медичного інституту), архівні матеріали Державного архіву Харківської області та Центрального державного архіву вищих органів влади та управління України. Дослідження виконане з використанням спеціально-історичних та загальнонаукових методів із залученням теоретичних напрацювань історичної імагології та історії повсякденного життя. У процесі дослідження було встановлено, що більшість матеріалів, газетних статей, які відображають академічне повсякдення, були присвячені складанню студентами іспитів. Для таких публікацій характерна типова структура, яка включала в себе похвалу найбільш успішних студентів та критику на адресу тих, хто отримував незадовільні оцінки. Критиці піддавали також тих студентів, які демонстрували посередню успішність у навчанні. Їх звинувачували в байдужості до освітнього процесу. Подібна практика публічної похвали та публічного засудження мала виховувати в студентській молоді почуття колективізму та спільної відповідальності за результати навчальної діяльності. До того ж на важливій ролі колективу в освітньому процесі постійно робиться наголос у відповідних публікаціях. Навчальний процес був досить заідеологізований – він перебував під пильною увагою партійних та комсомольських комітетів навчального закладу. Ще однією поширеною формою відображення в пресі академічного життя були карикатури, гуморески та фейлетони. Загалом же вища освіта на сторінках періодичних видань ВНЗ міста сприймалася як інструмент підготовки інтелектуальної еліти радянського суспільства, а інтелектуальна праця легітимізувалася через долучення студентів до трудових практик, поширених у радянському суспільстві, та опанування молоддю основ марксистсько-ленінського вчення.

**Ключові слова:** студенти, освіта, радянські цінності, періодика, Харків.