



Rivar

REVISTA IBEROAMERICANA DE
VITICULTURA, AGROINDUSTRIA
Y RURALIDAD

Editada por el Instituto
de Estudios Avanzados de la
Universidad de Santiago de Chile

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE HOLODOMOR ON MODERN UKRAINIAN AGRICULTURAL POLICIES



Consecuencias económicas del Holodomor en las políticas agrícolas ucranianas modernas

Consequências econômicas do Holodomor nas políticas agrícolas ucranianas modernas

Vol. 11, N° 33, 146-161, septiembre 2024

ISSN 0719-4994

Artículo de investigación

<https://doi.org/10.35588/rivar.v11i33.6366>

Svitlana Vlasenko

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
and Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
Kyiv, Ukraine

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1073-9680>
svvlasenko11@ukr.net

Recibido

11 de noviembre de 2023

Aceptado

22 de diciembre de 2023

Publicado

Septiembre de 2024

Cómo citar

Vlasenko, S. (2024). Economic Consequences of the Holodomor on Modern Ukrainian Agricultural Policies. *RIVAR*, 11(33), 146-161, <https://doi.org/10.35588/rivar.v11i33.6366>

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the work is to analyse the public policy of national memory in Ukraine regarding the commemoration of the victims of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 and its recognition as a genocide of the Ukrainian people. A number of methods were used, among which it is worth highlighting the method of logical analysis, legal hermeneutics, deduction, induction, and synthesis. In the course of the research, the concept of "genocide" was defined, and its characteristic features were given in accordance with international law. An analysis of the legal and regulatory framework of Ukraine was carried out in relation to the implementation of the public policy of national memory in honouring the victims of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 and its recognition as a genocide of the Ukrainian people. The results of this study can become a component in the formation of national memory, national identity and national consciousness, especially in the conditions of a full-scale war of the Russia against Ukraine.

KEYWORDS

Genocide, Holodomor, civil society, public policy, Russian aggression.

RESUMEN

Analizamos la política pública de memoria nacional en Ucrania en relación con la conmemoración de las víctimas del Holodomor de 1932-1933 y su reconocimiento como genocidio del pueblo ucraniano. Se utilizaron varios métodos, entre los que cabe destacar el método de análisis lógico, la hermenéutica jurídica, la deducción, la inducción y la síntesis. En el curso de la investigación se definió el concepto de "genocidio" y se expusieron sus rasgos característicos de acuerdo con el derecho internacional. Se llevó a cabo un análisis del marco jurídico y normativo de Ucrania en relación a la aplicación políticas públicas de memoria nacional en homenaje a las víctimas del Holodomor de 1932-1933 y su reconocimiento como genocidio del pueblo ucraniano. Los resultados de este estudio pueden convertirse en un componente en la formación de la memoria nacional, la identidad nacional y la conciencia nacional, especialmente en las condiciones de una guerra a gran escala de la Federación Rusa contra Ucrania.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Genocidio, Holodomor, sociedad civil, política pública, agresión rusa.

RESUMO

Analizamos a política pública de memória nacional em Ucrânia em relação com a comemoração das vítimas do Holodomor de 1932-1933 e seu reconhecimento como genocídio do povo ucraniano. Utilizaram-se vários métodos, entre os que cabe destacar o método de análise lógico, a hermenêutica jurídica, a dedução, a indução e a síntese. No curso da investigação definiu-se o conceito de "genocídio" e expuseram-se seus rasgos característicos de acordo com o direito internacional. Realizou-se um análise do marco jurídico e normativo de Ucrânia em relação com a aplicação de políticas públicas de memória nacional em homenagem às vítimas do Holodomor de 1932-1933 e seu reconhecimento como genocídio do povo ucraniano. Os resultados deste estudo podem se converter num componente na formação da memória nacional, a identidade nacional e a consciência nacional, especialmente nas condições de uma guerra a grande escala da Federação Russa contra Ucrânia.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Genocídio, Holodomor, sociedade civil, política pública, agressão russa.

Introduction

The Holodomor-genocide of 1932-1933, committed in Ukraine by the criminal policy of the communist totalitarian regime, is a national tragedy of the Ukrainian people. Honouring the victims of this tragedy occupies an important place in the public policy of national memory of Ukraine. Today, the memory of the genocide is one of the significant consolidating factors in Ukrainian society. Along with this, the international recognition of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as a genocide of the Ukrainian people gives grounds to talk about the world's support for Ukraine in its desire to restore historical justice.

Genocide is, by its very nature, an internationally recognized crime where acts are committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. It can be (Yerkin et al., 2018):

1. Killing off group members.
2. Causing members of the group to suffer severe physical or psychological harm.
3. Purposefully causing the collective conditions of life to be such that it is physically destroyed in whole or in part.
4. Enforcing policies meant to stop births within the group.
5. Forcing the group's children to be transferred to another group.

The Ukrainian people, respecting the memory of millions of compatriots, seeks to achieve from the international community a fair legal identification of the greatest national tragedy in its history. These processes gained special importance in the conditions of the full-scale war of the Russia against Ukraine, which intensified the issue of the genocide of the Ukrainian people, carried out by the communist authorities in the 20th century, and the genocide of the Ukrainian people, carried out by the Russian authorities in the 21st century. Ukraine calls on the world to prevent a new genocide, which is being committed today by the Russian aggressor on the territory of Ukraine (Voyvoda, 2022). In particular, in March 2022, the International Court of Justice of the United Nations in The Hague considered Ukraine's claim against the Russia regarding the interpretation, application, and implementation of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. In it, Ukraine, as a plaintiff, stated that Russia distorts the concept of "genocide" to justify its aggression and claimed that it is planning acts of genocide in Ukraine and intentionally kills representatives of Ukrainian nationality and inflicts serious damage on them. Today, on the territory of Ukraine, Russian troops are committing crimes against Ukrainians, defined by article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948) as genocide: murder, infliction of serious bodily and psychological injuries, forcible removal of children outside of Ukraine, deliberate creation of living conditions designed for complete or partial physical destruction.

Millions of Ukrainians died during the Holodomor, also referred to as the Great Ukrainian Famine, a man-made famine that struck Ukraine in 1932 and 1933. In independent Ukraine, some researchers began analysing the number of losses caused by the Holodomor in the 1990s, but an official estimate was made only in 2009 at the initiative of then-President Viktor Yushchenko. At the request of the Security Service of Ukraine, which was investigating the case of genocide in Ukraine in 1932-1933, researchers from the Ptoukha Institute for

Demography and Social Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine conducted an examination. They found that 3.941 million Ukrainians of all ages died as a result of the famine in the 1930s, and 1.1 million were lost to the unborn. After more detailed calculations in 2015, the scientists concluded that the unborn losses amounted to 600,000 people. It was the estimate of 3.9 million that was used by the Kyiv Court of Appeal, which in 2010 recognised the Holodomor as genocide and named the perpetrators of this crime.

However, in October 2019, the Holodomor Museum initiated a new investigation into the genocide of Ukrainians in 1932-1933. The SSU appointed a new examination, which determined that 10.5 million Ukrainians were victims of the Holodomor. Of these, 9.1 million were killed in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and 1.4 million in places where Ukrainians lived compactly within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Holodomor Museum presented this data on 7 September 2021 at the International Forum *Mass Man-Made Famines: Remembering and Commemorating* and in the book *The Genocide of Ukrainians in 1932-1933 Based on the Materials of Pre-trial Investigations* (Vasylenko, 2013).

The reason for this terrible tragedy lay primarily in national factors. Some researchers indicate that the purpose of the genocide of the Ukrainian people was the destruction of the Ukrainian nation as a political factor and social organism (Shahini et al., 2023). They believe that the separation of ethnic categories from socio-political ones is important in the study of the Holodomor. The first priority in the study of crimes against Ukrainians in the 20th century is the issue of legal qualification and political and legal assessment of the Holodomor of 1932-1933. One of the strong evidences of these crimes the desire of the Soviet authorities to hide the fact of artificial famine in Ukraine, the consequences of which were the deaths of millions of Ukrainians. Delineating the concepts of official and personal memory, it is worth emphasizing the importance of oral historical sources in the study of the crimes of the totalitarian regime, including the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine. Boyd-Barrett (2023) calls the Holodomor of 1932-1933 a collective, historical and individual trauma and a serious interdisciplinary problem, particularly in history, psychology, linguistics, social and political sciences. It is appropriate to study these problems in the field of public administration, because the memory of the Holodomor-genocide of the Ukrainian people is a component of the policy of national memory.

The Holodomor of 1932-1933 stands distinctively as an act of genocide against the Ukrainian people, deserving international recognition on several grounds. Unlike the famines that occurred in other periods, the Holodomor was marked by a deliberate, politically motivated campaign by the Soviet regime under Stalin to suppress and control the Ukrainian population, who were seen as a threat to centralized Soviet power due to their growing national consciousness. The policies implemented, such as the seizure of grain and other foodstuffs, the blockade of food aid, and the restriction of population movement, were targeted actions to create and exacerbate the famine conditions. The catastrophic scale of death and suffering, estimated to be in the millions, alongside the specific intent to target a national group, aligns with the United Nations' definition of genocide. This targeted, systematic approach to subdue a national identity through starvation clearly distinguishes the Holodomor from other famines experienced in the Ukrainian SSR, underscoring its characterization as a genocide.

Based on the above, the purpose of the research is to analyse the public policy of Ukraine

regarding the commemoration of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 and its recognition as a genocide of the Ukrainian people.

Materials and methods

This study was carried out using various types of analysis methods. The method of functional analysis made it possible to define the concept of "genocide" in accordance with established international provisions, to distinguish its characteristic features and elements. The method of logical analysis was used to provide a description of the stages of public policy to commemorate the memory of the national tragedy. Equally important was the application of this method in determining the policy of the international community regarding the recognition of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as genocide of the Ukrainian people.

The formal-legal method allowed an analysis of normative legal acts relating to the public policy of national remembrance regarding the commemoration of the victims of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 and the recognition of it as genocide of the Ukrainian people. Also, with the help of this method, compliance with the implementation of measures to commemorate the current regulatory and legal requirements is analysed. And the method of legal hermeneutics provided an opportunity to highlight the measures that were implemented in connection with the adoption of appropriate regulatory decisions. Among such normative legal acts, it is worth noting the acts of the state authorities of Ukraine: Law of Ukraine "On the Condemnation of the Communist and National Socialist (Nazi) Totalitarian Regimes in Ukraine and the Prohibition of Propaganda of their Symbols" (Parliament of Ukraine, 2015), Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine "On the 70th Anniversary of the Holodomor in Ukraine" (Parliament of Ukraine, 2002a), Decree of the President of Ukraine "On the Announcement in Ukraine of 2008 as the Year of Remembrance of the Holodomor Victims" (Parliament of Ukraine, 2007), Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine "On the Address of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to the Partner States of Ukraine Regarding the Recognition of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine as a Crime of Genocide of the Ukrainian People" (Parliament of Ukraine, 2016). International legal acts were also taken into account: Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948).

The dogmatic method allowed to analyse the features of the general nature of the activities of institutions whose functions are regulated by current legislation. The use of the statistical method made it possible to track quantitative indicators that reflect the state and dynamics of the processes of recognition of the Holodomor-genocide. The application of the dialectical approach contributed to the determination of essential features of the formation of values of public administration in the sphere of implementation of the policy of national memory. A sociological method made it possible to analyse the processes of formation and mutual influence of systems of social and managerial values. The method of deduction was used to characterize the Holodomor-genocide of 1932-1933 based on its features, existing elements and methods of implementation. In turn, the induction method provided an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the public policy of national memory in honouring the victims of the tragedy and recognizing it as genocide based on the adopted legislative norms, implemented measures and the position of the world community. The synthesis method made it possible to combine all the constituent elements of public policy into a single whole to provide its characteristics.

Thus, the methods of functional and logical analysis, as well as deduction and induction, provided an opportunity to investigate political measures in Ukraine to commemorate the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as a national tragedy and recognize it as a genocide of the Ukrainian people. The formal-legal, dogmatic and method of legal hermeneutics allowed to analyse the norms enshrined in national and international normative legal acts, as well as the activities of authorities, institutions and organizations whose powers are regulated by relevant normative documents and related to the implementation of the public policy of national memory. In turn, the methods of deduction, induction, and synthesis provided an opportunity to focus on certain components of this policy, in particular, regarding commemoration and recognition of the Holodomor-genocide of the Ukrainian people in 1932-1933.

Results

The path of Ukrainians to restore memory, awareness of the scale and consequences of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine was quite long. This process began in the late 1980s. And the society played a special role in it, which gave impetus to the decision-making by the authorities to restore the memory of the national tragedy of the Ukrainian people. In particular, the importance of this issue for Ukrainian society is evidenced by the statements of one of the most influential public organizations in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the People's Movement of Ukraine. They talked about the artificial nature of the Holodomor.

With the restoration of Ukraine's independence in 1991, the issue of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 became a component of the public policy of national memory and gradually gained greater public importance. Bodies of state power and local self-government, research, museum, archival and other institutions, as well as public organizations and individual scientists, carried out a great deal of work, the result of which were thousands of studies dedicated to the events of 1932-1933. Along with the study of the history of the Holodomor, the activity of perpetuating the memory of the victims, compiling the martyrology of the victims, collecting memories and testimonies of eyewitnesses was launched. The result of such purposeful painstaking work was the identification of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as an act of genocide of the Ukrainian people, and it also contributed to its recognition by a number of foreign countries and international organizations. For the first time at the state level, the anniversary of the Holodomor was celebrated in 1993—sixty years after the tragedy (Parliament of Ukraine, 1993).

During the following years, the strengthening of the policy of national memory regarding the Holodomor of 1932-1933 became noticeable. In particular, in the course of preparation for the 70th anniversary of the tragedy in 2002, a number of normative legal acts were adopted, which provided for the implementation of a complex of various measures in Ukraine: the installation of monuments, monuments and commemorative signs; conducting morning rallies and other commemorative events; coverage of tragic events in media; conducting scientific conferences and educational events. It was also determined the need to carry out appropriate international activities aimed at recognizing the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as a genocide of the Ukrainian people by the world community (Parliament of Ukraine, 2002a). During the preparations for the 70th anniversary, the President of Ukraine Leonid Kuchma issued an order to build a memorial to the victims of the famine and political repressions in Kyiv (Parliament of Ukraine, 2002b). However, it was not possible to implement it, and only in the second half of the 2000s was the construction of the first phase of the memorial complex

completed, and at the end of the 2010s, the construction of the second phase was built.

However, of course, a huge step in the policy of national memory regarding the Holodomor of 1932-1933 was the resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, adopted in November 2002 (Parliament of Ukraine, 2002a). For the first time, the term “genocide” was used for the tragic events of 1932-1933 and condemned the policy of the totalitarian regime against the Ukrainian people. In addition, this resolution accelerated the process of recognition by the international community of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine as an “act of genocide against the Ukrainian people.” One of the important measures for the further implementation of this resolution was the appeal of the participants of the special session of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to the Ukrainian people on May 14, 2003. In it, the Holodomor was defined as a “Ukrainian national catastrophe”, “inhumane methods of liquidation of millions of Ukrainians”, “a targeted terrorist action of the political system of Stalinism”. It was also emphasized the need for public condemnation of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as one of the largest acts of genocide in terms of the number of victims in world history, which should become an important element of restoring historical justice (Parliament of Ukraine, 2002a).

The subsequent policy of national memory regarding the Holodomor of 1932-1933 was affected by the effectiveness of state authorities and local self-government bodies, as well as by the activation of the entire Ukrainian society. This is primarily due to the state position of the President of Ukraine in 2005-2010, V. Yushchenko. The adoption of the Law by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine had enormous social and political significance during this period of Ukraine “On the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine” (Parliament of Ukraine, 2006), which became the final act of recognizing the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as genocide of the Ukrainian people.

At the same time, for the implementation of the state policy of national memory, on May 31, 2006, a central body of executive power with a special status was created, the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory. Important changes also took place in the composition of the Organizing Committee for the preparation and holding of events for the 70th anniversary of the tragedy, headed by the Prime Minister of Ukraine Anatoliy Kinakh. It included not only representatives of central executive bodies, but also heads of regional state administrations and representatives of state scientific institutions. Public institutions were also widely represented: All-Ukrainian Society “Memorial” named after V. Stus, All-Ukrainian Society “Prosvita” named after T. Shevchenko, All-Ukrainian Society of Political Prisoners and Repressed, Ukrainian Society for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments, All-Ukrainian Union of Local Historians, National Union of Artists and National Union of Writers.


Large-scale nationwide events dedicated to the 75th anniversary of the tragedy testify to the intensification of the public policy of national memory. In particular, the President of Ukraine declared 2008 the Year of Remembrance of the Holodomor Victims (Parliament of Ukraine, 2007). Also, at the same time, considerable attention was paid to diplomatic work abroad and to intensifying cooperation with the UN to recognize the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as a genocide of the Ukrainian people by the international community.

Much attention was paid to the declassification of Holodomor-era documents, the search for new documented facts, scientific research, publicizing the truth about the crime of the Soviet government that led to the tragedy of the Ukrainian people. In particular, according

to the data of the State Archives Committee of Ukraine, 221,137 archival documents about the events of 1932-1933 were taken into special records. It was the documents and other evidence that became the basis for the recognition in 2010 by the Court of Appeal of the city of Kyiv of the guilt of the Soviet leadership at various levels in the deliberate creation of living conditions designed for the physical extermination of Ukrainians, which is “intentionally organized genocide” (Court of Appeal of the City of Kyiv, 2010). The evidence base of the criminal activity of the communist totalitarian regime, as well as the mechanisms and methods of committing the Holodomor-genocide by the communist totalitarian regime, are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2.


Figure 1. The evidence base of the criminal activity of the communist totalitarian regime, which caused the Holodomor-genocide of the Ukrainian people in 1932-1933

Figura 1. La base de pruebas de la actividad criminal del régimen totalitario comunista, que causó el Holodomor-genocidio del pueblo ucraniano en 1932-1933



Source/fuente: Court of Appeal of the City of Kyiv (2010).

Figure 2. Mechanisms and methods of committing the Holodomor-genocide of the Ukrainian people in 1932-1933 by the communist totalitarian regime
Figura 2. Mecanismos y métodos para cometer el Holodomor-genocidio del pueblo ucraniano en 1932-1933 por el régimen totalitario comunista



Source/fuente: Court of Appeal of the City of Kyiv (2010).

During the presidency of Víktor Yushchenko, there was also an increase in recognition of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 by the world community. Table 1 shows that in the period from 2005-2008, 9 more states recognized the Holodomor as genocide of the Ukrainian people. And on October 23, 2008, the European Parliament adopted the corresponding resolution, in which it recognized the Holodomor as an "artificial famine in Ukraine" and "a terrible crime against the people of Ukraine and all humanity".

Table 1. Countries that have recognised the Holodomor in Ukraine as genocide
Tabla 1. Países que reconocieron el Holodomor en Ucrania como genocidio

Country	Date
Lithuania	November 24, 2005
Georgia	December 20, 2005
Poland	December 4, 2006
Peru	June 19, 2007
Paraguay	October 25, 2007
Ecuador	October 30, 2007
Colombia	December 21, 2007
Mexico	February 19, 2008
Latvia	March 13, 2008

Source: own elaboration. Fuente: elaboración propia.

The 80th anniversary of the Holodomor-genocide took place in conditions of radical changes in Ukrainian society. The Revolution of Dignity, the “hybrid war” of Russia against Ukraine in 2014-2022 and the full-scale war of the Russia against Ukraine, which began on February 24, 2022, confirmed the readiness of Ukrainians to fight for democratic rights and freedoms, for their European choice. And this significantly influenced the public policy of national memory in Ukraine. In particular, in 2015, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, responding to society’s requests, adopted a number of important laws in the field of national memory, including the Law of Ukraine “On the Condemnation of the Communist and National Socialist (Nazi) Totalitarian Regimes in Ukraine and the Prohibition of Propaganda of their Symbols” (Parliament of Ukraine, 2015).

In 2023, the policy on the Holodomor genocide, acknowledging its recognition as a genocide by at least 27 countries, including the significant endorsement by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe on October 12, 2023, will focus on expanding global awareness and fostering historical accountability. This policy will aim to institutionalize the memory of the Holodomor in international discourse through educational initiatives, diplomatic engagement, and cultural programs. The policy aims to contribute to a broader understanding of the Holodomor, reinforcing the global commitment to human rights and the prevention of such atrocities in the future (Boyd-Barrett, 2023).

In the international activity of Ukraine, the policy of national memory is also extremely important. On December 7, 2016, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine appealed to Ukraine’s partner countries to recognize the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as a crime of genocide against the Ukrainian people (Parliament of Ukraine, 2016). And the world supported the Ukrainians: on March 3, 2017, the Holodomor genocide was recognized by Portugal, and on October 4, 2018, by the United States of America. And after the start of Russia’s full-scale war against Ukraine, Holodomor-genocide was recognized: in 2022 the Czech Republic (April 6), Brazil (April 26), Ireland, Moldova, and Romania (November 24), Germany (November 30), and in 2023 – Bulgaria (February 1), Belgium (March 10), Iceland (March 23), France (March 28), Slovenia (May 23), Great Britain (May 25), Luxembourg (June 13), Slovakia (June 20), Croatia (June 28) and Netherlands (July 7).

In general, as of July 2023, the Holodomor-genocide was recognized by 33 foreign countries and Ukraine, as well as a significant number of regional and municipal authorities of a number of countries around the world. The resolution adopted by the European Parliament on December 15, 2022, in which the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine was recognized as genocide of the Ukrainian people, was of great importance. It condemned the Soviet totalitarian regime, whose deliberate policy led to the deaths of millions of Ukrainians and caused significant damage to the foundations of Ukrainian society (Voyvoda, 2022).

The preservation and transmission of the memory of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 across generations, despite the long period of silence and suppression, is a testament to the resilience of Ukrainian cultural and familial traditions. During the decades of Soviet rule, when open discussion of the Holodomor was prohibited, the memory of this tragedy was kept alive through private family narratives, discreet community gatherings, and the oral transmission of survivor accounts. These personal and communal recollections served as vital conduits for the intergenerational transfer of this history, ensuring that the reality of the Holodomor was not forgotten even in the face of official denial and censorship. In the late

1980s, as political reforms like Glasnost and Perestroika opened space for freer expression, these long-preserved private memories emerged into public discourse, enabling a broader societal acknowledgment and commemoration of the Holodomor. This transition from private memory to public remembrance was pivotal in reinstating the Holodomor into the national consciousness of Ukraine and in framing it as a foundational event in the country's history.

It is also worth adding that the Ukrainian diaspora was also the reason for recognising the Holodomor as genocide. Comprising individuals and communities who were either direct survivors or descendants of those affected by the Holodomor, the diaspora has played a crucial role in keeping the memory of this tragedy alive beyond Ukrainian borders. Through persistent and coordinated efforts, including academic research, cultural and educational programs, lobbying activities, and the establishment of memorials and museums, they have successfully brought the reality of the Holodomor to international attention. On September 11, 1933, a memorial service took place in Berlin for the victims of the Holodomor, a man-made famine in Soviet Ukraine from 1932 to 1933. The service was held at the Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church. The memorial service was organized by Ukrainians in exile and was attended by a large number of people, including prominent figures such as Mayor Vincent Impelliteri and Professor Raphael Lemkin, who called the Soviet Union's actions against Ukrainians "a classic example of genocide" (Coulson, 2021). On October 29, 1933, a liturgy for the millions of Ukrainians killed during the Holodomor was held at St. George's Cathedral in Lviv. The service was attended by representatives of the Public Committee for the Salvation of Ukraine, which was created by Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskii (Coulson, 2021). This event aimed to commemorate the victims of the Holodomor and draw attention to the tragic impact of the man-made famine on the Ukrainian people.

The contribution of public organizations in shaping the policy of national memory regarding the Holodomor has been substantial and multifaceted. They have collected a wealth of testimonies, photographs, and artifacts that provide tangible evidence of the Holodomor. This archival work has been critical in countering denial and misinformation about the Holodomor. Public organizations have actively engaged in educational initiatives. They have developed educational programs, exhibitions, and publications that delve into the causes, events, and consequences of the Holodomor. By integrating Holodomor studies into educational curriculums and organizing public lectures and seminars, these organizations have fostered a deeper understanding of this historical tragedy. Public organizations have organized memorial services, erected monuments, and instituted annual days of remembrance to honor the victims of the Holodomor. These acts of commemoration play a vital role in keeping the memory of the Holodomor alive, serving as a reminder of the past atrocities and a solemn vow to prevent such tragedies in the future. Moreover, these organizations have also been influential in advocating for political recognition of the Holodomor. Through lobbying and public campaigns, they have pushed for governments worldwide to acknowledge the Holodomor as a genocide.

Discussion

In international law, genocide is defined as one of the worst and most shameful crimes against humanity committed with the intent to destroy a national, ethnic, racial or religious group. The concept of "genocide" in the international legal field is used in connection with

the adoption by the UN General Assembly of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), which defines it as a crime condemned by the civilized world, and the perpetrators must bear the appropriate punishment. Defining the Holodomor as genocide became a cornerstone of Ukrainian national consciousness. It is important not only to condemn the crimes of the communist totalitarian regime, but also to overcome their consequences through the development and implementation of comprehensive measures necessary for the restoration of historical memory, the spiritual healing of society, national consolidation, democratic development and the construction of a successful state (Cherniavskyi et al., 2019).

It is absolutely important to talk about the first steps of commemorating the victims of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine and the formation of public policy in this area. In particular, Lagodiienko et al. (2022) wrote that at the end of the 1980s, for the first time, scientists had the opportunity to work and put into circulation previously hidden archival documents about the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine, which gave an impetus to a deep and comprehensive study and understanding of the national tragedy. The result of this was the preparation of a collection of documents unique at that time (Yerkin et al., 2018). It is worth agreeing with the author that the appearance of this publication was of great scientific importance, since it was the first time in the Soviet Union that a complex of previously secret documents was made public. At the same time, the collection had a huge social and political significance, because its appearance demonstrated a powerful pressure on the Communist Party nomenclature of Ukrainian society, which demanded the implementation of the principles of democracy and the revival of the national memory of the Ukrainian people (Chochia et al., 2018).

With the restoration of Ukraine's independence in 1991, the issue of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 became one of the important components of the public policy of national memory. For example, Blikhar *et al.* (2022) note that since Ukraine gained independence, narratives about the Holodomor have changed from memories to a statutory history of Ukrainian national identity. The formation and implementation of the public policy of national memory regarding the Holodomor of 1932-1933 included the introduction of democratic principles in the state in the first years of independence, the declassification, and publication of archival documents of the Soviet era, the fruitful work of scientists studying the causes, events, and consequences of the tragedy, as well as the active activity of the public regarding the actualization in Ukraine and throughout the world of the issues of the genocide of the Ukrainian people in 1932-1933. However, Revak and Kondro (2020) consider the government's activity in this direction in the first ten years of independence somewhat passive and calls the 60th and 65th anniversaries of the tragedy demonstrative ignoring.

In subsequent years, the intensification of the public policy of national memory regarding the Holodomor of 1932-1933 became noticeable. Along with the adoption of a number of normative legal acts regulating the actions of state authorities and local self-government in Ukraine, as well as state diplomatic services abroad, public participation in these processes increased. Vasylenko (2013) considers the adoption of the Law as the first serious step in recognizing the Holodomor as genocide of Ukraine "On the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine" (Parliament of Ukraine, 2006), the investigation by the Security Service of Ukraine of a criminal case on the fact of committing genocide and the decision of the Court of Appeal of Kyiv in this case. The same opinion is held by Coulson (2021), who defines the Holodomor as

an act of genocide of the Ukrainian people and qualifies the Law of Ukraine “On the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine” (2006) as a powerful tool for the formation of collective national memory. It is worth agreeing with the above opinions that this legislative act became an important stage in the implementation of the public policy of national memory regarding the recognition of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as genocide of the Ukrainian people.

Based on the above, there are significant objective and subjective reasons to hope that against the background of the bloody crimes against humanity committed by the Russian authorities on the territory of Ukraine, the process of international recognition of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 as a genocide of the Ukrainian people will be fair and successfully completed, and the genocide of the Russia, which is being carried out today on the territory of Ukraine, will receive international condemnation and the inevitable punishment of the guilty. The prospects for further improving the national memory policy regarding the Holodomor genocide of 1932-1933 are related to the need for greater global recognition and education about the Holodomor, integrating its history into international educational curriculums and diplomatic dialogues. Also, enhancing the digital and archival infrastructure to preserve and disseminate historical documents and testimonies about the Holodomor can make the information more accessible worldwide. Fostering cultural and academic exchanges, including exhibitions, conferences, and research projects, could deepen the understanding of the Holodomor’s impact and legacy. Supporting initiatives that commemorate the victims and educate about the genocidal policies can ensure that the memory of the Holodomor remains a vital part of national and global consciousness, contributing to the prevention of similar tragedies in the future.

Conclusions

The research was carried out with the aim of analysing the public policy of national memory in Ukraine regarding the Holodomor-genocide of the Ukrainian people in 1932-1933. Firstly, the concept of “genocide” was defined in accordance with the norms of international law and its characteristic features were identified. The main attention is paid to the study of the progressive course of this policy, starting from the first public initiatives at the end of the 1980s and the first state measures that fell on the 60th anniversary of the Holodomor in 1993. It was established that at the legislative level in Ukraine, the definition of the tragedy of the genocide of the Ukrainian people was established in 2006 in the Law of Ukraine “On the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine”. At the same time, it was established that for the first time in legal acts the term “genocide” in relation to the Holodomor of 1932-1933 was used back in 2002 in a Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine “On the 70th anniversary of the Holodomor in Ukraine”. The adoption of these documents laid the foundation of the legal framework and became an important factor in the formation and implementation of the public policy of national memory in Ukraine regarding the Holodomor-genocide of the Ukrainian people in 1932-1933. The subjects of this policy in Ukraine are state authorities, local self-government bodies, and institutions of civil society.

Since the mid-2000s, the policy of national memory regarding the Holodomor of 1932-1933 has been characterized by purposeful measures to honour the victims of the tragedy and recognize it as genocide of the Ukrainian people. The periods of 2006-2009 and after 2014 were the most effective. An important decision at this time was the creation of the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance and the National Museum of the Holodomor-genocide,

which ensure the implementation of the state's policy of perpetuating the memory of the victims of the Holodomor-genocide. Considerable attention was paid to the analysis of the components of the public policy of national memory, which include: the presence of an appropriate regulatory and legal framework; creation of a network of state and public institutions for the implementation of this policy; implementation of measures to declassify documents of the Soviet period stored in state archival institutions of Ukraine; collection and formation of testimonies of witnesses and victims of criminal acts of the totalitarian regime; ensuring thorough scientific research; conducting educational work, educational events and actions commemorating the victims of the national tragedy. Also, an important component of this policy is the activity of Ukrainian diplomatic services around the world, including with the involvement of representatives of the Ukrainian diaspora, to inform the international community about the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine with the aim of recognizing it as a genocide of the Ukrainian people.

It was determined that despite certain problems in the implementation of the public policy of national memory regarding the Holodomor-genocide of 1932-1933 throughout the entire period of Ukraine's independence, in general it can be characterized as quite effective. The result of this policy was national and international recognition of the Holodomor as a genocide of the Ukrainian people: in Ukraine—93% of citizens, and in the world—27 states and many regional and municipal authorities. Today, the memory of the Holodomor-genocide of 1932-1933 in Ukraine is a powerful unifying factor for the Ukrainian nation all over the world. Further research will be aimed at conducting an analysis of state policy regarding the commemoration of those who died as a result of the full-scale invasion of the Russian army on the territory of Ukraine and the Russian genocide of the Ukrainian people.

References

- Blikhar, V.S., Vinichuk, M.V., and Ryzhkova, A.A. (2022). Institutional Foundations of De-shadowing the Economy of Ukraine in the National Financial Security System. *Social and Legal Studies*, 5(2), 68-76. <https://doi.org/10.32518/2617-4162-2022-5-2-68-76>
- Boyd-Barrett, O. (2023). Media and Cultural Agenda in the EU Countries Against the Background of Russian Military Aggression in Ukraine (Sociological and Contextual Research). *European Chronicle*, 8(1), 37-45.
- Cherniavskiy, S.S., Holovkin, B.M., Chornous, Y.M., Bodnar, V.Y., and Zhuk, I.V. (2019). International Cooperation in the Field of Fighting Crime: Directions, Levels and Forms of Realization. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 22(3).
- Chochia, A., Troitiño, D.R., Kerikmäe, T., and Shumilo, O. (2018). Enlargement to the UK, the Referendum of 1975 and Position of Margaret Thatcher. In D.R. Troitiño, T. Kerikmäe and A. Chochia (Eds.), *Brexit: History, Reasoning and Perspectives* (pp. 115-139). Springer.
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948). *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*. https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/documents/atrocities-crimes/Doc.1_Convention%20on%20the%20Prevention%20and%20Punishment%20of%20the%20Crime%20of%20Genocide.pdf

- Coulson, J. (2021). The Holodomor in Collective Memory: Constructing Ukraine as a Post-genocide Nation. *The General Assembly*, 2(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.5206/tgar.v2i1.10421>
- Court of Appeal of the City of Kyiv (2010). *Resolution of the Court of Appeal of the City of Kyiv on the Preliminary Consideration of a Criminal Case*. Court of Appeal of the City of Kyiv. <https://reyestr.court.gov.ua/Review/9470003#>
- Lagodiienko, V., Franchuk, V., Yurii, D., Melnyk, S., Shuprudko, N., and Hobela, V. (2022). Food Security of Ukraine: Estimation of Factors' Impact, Postwar Trends and Ways to Supply. *Financial and Credit Activity: Problems of Theory and Practice*, 5(46), 427-437. <https://doi.org/10.55643/fcaptop.5.46.2022.3891>
- Parliament of Ukraine (1993). *Decree of the President of Ukraine On Measures in Connection with the 60th Anniversary of the Holodomor in Ukraine*. Parliament of Ukraine. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/38/93#Text>
- _____. (2002a). *Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine On the 70th Anniversary of the Holodomor in Ukraine*. Parliament of Ukraine. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/258-15#Text>
- _____. (2002b). *Decree of the President of Ukraine On Additional Measures in Connection with the 70th Anniversary of the Holodomor in Ukraine*. Parliament of Ukraine. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/393/2002-%D1%80%D0%BF#Text>
- _____. (2007). *Decree of the President of Ukraine On the Announcement in Ukraine of 2008 as the Year of Remembrance of the Holodomor Victims*. Parliament of Ukraine. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1144/2007#Text>
- _____. (2006). *Law of Ukraine On the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine*. Parliament of Ukraine. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/376-16#Text>
- _____. (2015). *Law of Ukraine On the Condemnation of the Communist and National Socialist (Nazi) Totalitarian Regimes in Ukraine and the Prohibition of Propaganda of their Symbols*. Parliament of Ukraine. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/317-19#Text>
- _____. (2016). *Resolution of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine "On the Address of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to the Partner States of Ukraine Regarding the Recognition of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine as a Crime of Genocide of the Ukrainian People*. Parliament of Ukraine. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1777-19#n9>
- Revak, I. and Kondro, I.V. (2020). Sectoral Analysis of Import Dependence of Ukraine's Economy. *Social and Legal Studies*, 3(3), 145-153. <https://doi.org/10.32518/2617-4162-2020-3-145-153>
- Shahini, E., Misiuk, M., Zakhodym, M., Borkovska, V., and Koval, N. (2023). Analysis of the Economic Efficiency of Growing Pigs for Meat and its Improvement. *Scientific Horizons*, 26(6), 110-120. <https://doi.org/10.48077/scihor6.2023.110>

- Vasylenko, V. (2013). Methodology of the Legal Assessment of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine as a Crime of Genocide. In V. Vlasylenko and Antonovych, M. (Eds.), *The Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine as a Crime of Genocide under International Law* (pp. 13-73). Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.
- Voyvoda, E. (2022). Contextual Analysis of European Integration Sentiments in Post-communist Countries: Trends, Changing Rhetoric, and Sequence of Practical Steps (1991-2021). *European Chronicle*, 7(1), 22-29.
- Yerkin, A., Zhekiyeva, B., Kurimbayev, S., Myrzabayev, A., and Utebayev, I. (2018). The Teaching Policy of Imperial Russia Directed to Foreign People Including the Kazakh. *Astra Salvensis*, 6(1), 55-73.