

УДК 930.2+17

SOURCE STUDY OF THE CRIMEAN CONFERENCE 1945: SCIENTIFIC ETHICS ISSUE

Oleg Shevchenko

*Crimean University for the Humanities (Yalta),
2, Sevastopolskaya Str., Yalta, the Crimea, Ukraine, 98635, tel: +30677037675,
e-mail: Yalta-1945@yandex.com*

The options of historical source crisis in the works devoted to the Crimean conference, 1945 are determined. The objective reason of insufficient source treatment is the tradition to consider the Crimean conference globally in one publication is found. Wherein, starting from 1945 the historical texts about Yalta are being created not just using simple analysis of facts, but bright combination of the micro historical mode of life with macro history of the event. Evidently, in connection with impossibility to grasp the immensity, historians started to ignore firm rules when working with historical sources in favor of emotional coloring the text and wide analysis of the associates' strategies geopolitics.

Key words: Yalta–45, historiography of Yalta conference, source studies, historical epistemology.

Topicality: the Crimean conference (1945) left a deep trace in conscious minds of the Europeans and Asians as a historical event. It fixed the genesis of the New World, the emergence of the new configuration of the borders between European and Asian countries. It was quite natural for the event with such considerable resonance to attract dozens if not hundreds opinions of the scientists from the USSR, the USA, Great Britain, France, Japan, etc... Later on, the scientists from Russia, Ukraine and Belorussia paid much of their attention to the event. However, behind those hundreds of articles and dozens of monographs the essential unit of historical study seemed to melt in the texts and thoughts of the historians. The thing is Chronology.

Object: chronology of the Crimean conference.

Subject: «Historical source» as a phenomenon of «Yalta meetings» historiography.

Objective: determination crisis parameters of the historical source in Crimean conference scientific works.

Tasks: to make outline of historiographical basic steps of the Crimean conference; identify the range of the sources concerning «Yalta meetings»; to denote methodological principles of historiographic works and the sources concerning «Yalta»; to fix aberrations in «scientific ethics» reality and designate its grounds; to suggest resolution options for particular crisis context.

Main results of scientific research: Both in Russian Federation, partly in Ukraine the efforts of historians are based on soviet studs: archival publications, theoretical developments, methodological clichés. The claim is rather bold as for the beginning of the article but I beg to take it as a theoretical bill that would be explained below. At present stage the claimed thesis presupposes denoting the stages of the soviet

consideration of the Conference 1945 as a historical event. The longest journey of the crisis situation began with the first step. It had of course its latent period, maturation and development. Its roots should have been found in the soviet scientific school.

Perhaps the first soviet work devoted to the Crimean conference became A. S. Yerusalimsky's public report and its reprint [2]. In this booklet we may find fundamental elements of all further study of soviet historiography. Let us group the elements in several points.

Firstly, the booklet captures total information about the Crimean conference, starting from arguments about where the conference should be held and ending by geopolitical analysis of all the solutions.

Secondly, before starting analyzing the problem the reader is forewarned about the most typical features of the west historiography in the shape of telegraph sketches or publicistic passages.

Thirdly, precise dissection of the Crimean conference to several topical units: «Poland point», «Yugoslavia point», etc.

Another valuable book in soviet tradition is, of course, S.B. Sosinsky's monograph [12]. Sergey Bronislavovich brings new ideas and techniques in soviet historiography concerning «Yalta». Primarily, it's an effort to orient the enormous amount of the material to figure out the U.S. position in 1945 and in the midst of Cold War. It's rather political science than historical task. Although it was being settled by historians. S.B. Sosinsky, for example, brings in the tradition of Yalta' comprehension lyrical notes of micro history. It concerns the description of Anglo-American delegation loading on the aircraft on Malta [12, p.50]. When describing almost dramatized Stalin emergence in conference hall much attention is paid to delegation movements, single items of landscape and service. Eventually, the book makes an impression of some mixture of ethnography with geopolitics; verbal «tightrope-walking» of associates is brightly expressed.

The collection of V.Y. Sipoles works presents another direction of soviet historiographical school [8; 9]. Thus, apologists' essays following the tradition are much more restrained, they contain more facts and analytic reviews. However, they don't omit local history description passages that help to produce total impression of the conference as the global world event (more detailed description in the articles [14; 15]).

After the USSR collapse the subjects of the Crimean conference no longer present any interest for historical community. Thus in Russia only several books presenting «Yalta» are published, among them we should pick out B.N. Slavinskiy monography [10]. By the fact, the book remains apart and doesn't have any followers.

Since 1992 no dissertation was defended on the stated subjects in Russia. Articles and sections of monographs concerning Yalta strictly followed soviet traditions sometimes even considerably yielding to them. Thus, when soviet authors filled their works with massive quotes from English sources, which aim was not just cross recheck of material, but they were rich in mentioning historical facts. Vice versa modern publications are as a rule entirely oriented on Russian texts and strictly follow published there verbatim reports.

In Ukrainian historiographic tradition Yalta agreements do only exist in the context of the history of Ukraine, they are of its interest and serve for clarifying key parameters of the Ukrainian history of mid- XX century. All other variety of meanings although is consumed but doesn't undergo historical discussion. This fact neglects soviet traditions, but not in methodological context (here they stick to parameters), but when dealing with ideological restrictions and connotations [1, p. 40–41].

Since 1995 it becomes possible to talk about the Crimean direction if not the Crimean school. Unlike Russian and Ukrainian colleagues, the Crimean historiographers demonstrated extreme research activity. Books containing new archival and memorandum documents [4; 17; 18], complex monographs [19] are published. Scientific references opening new aspects of the problem are produced [16]. The Crimeans start organizing thematic conferences [3; 13; 20; 22].

At present judging by the amount of publications issued and conducted scientific arrangements the Crimean historiographic unit «Yalta» is actually concerned as the engine of the matter. Neither Russian, nor Ukrainian tradition can be equal to it. But the Crimean direction entirely apprehended the majority of the soviet investigatory methodologies and their features. Moreover the Crimean researches have perfected them logically therefore the situation reached its dead end. This is a peculiarity of any research tradition on its highest point and thereby unable to transforming or self-reflection. At this stage it becomes possible to denote structural drawbacks of the system. The drawbacks offset in the moment of development and almost unseen in faint efforts of Yalta' colleagues from Russia and Ukraine, but visible enough in the Crimean research works.

The main structural or if you wish to call it systemic problem of the Crimeans is the problem concerning ethics and source study. Let's try to find out what the Crimean conference of 1945 means for soviet (therefore the Crimean) historians. The analysis of scientific works leads to discouraging conclusion. The unified reality as it seems at first glance falls apart into single locuses and units when reading thoughtfully and analyzing details. Thus, examining links and commentaries we ascertain in coexisting of another political, military, medical, psychological reality... Each source is not a brick in fundamental monograph (article), but a separate «brush» growing by itself beside a well or a porch. This is a piece of a landscape, but not constructive element of a building.

The sources are introduced almost without any attribution as undoubted facts than don't need any verification. The question about its reliability doesn't come up. Sometimes several pages of the text contain Bacchanalia of source study: historical military facts confirmed with encyclopedia links, political history is grounded at ease by memorandum of the politicians, private correspondence and references to conventional (that doesn't mean reliable) collections of documents.

Cross analysis of the sources as it should be doesn't exist at all the same applies to systematic work and representativeness. New data input occurs as simple as reference to classic monograph and these two methodologically different processes are almost impossible to distinguish in the text. In fine these are the most typical features of a modern history [10]. The absence of documental editions (fully devoted to publishing

new documents, their analysis, attribution, etc.) is the main proof of the above statement. The only exception may be considered the only one publication although having significant reservations.

The objective reason for such frivolous treatment of procedural manipulations of scientific moral was the ambition to immediately and completely enlighten the Crimean conference: starting with Orange tree questions in Vorontsov Palace entry and ending with philosophical and economic problems concerning reparations with Germany. This ineradicable eagerness to generalize occurs in many of «Yalta» scientific works, the «romantic» feature that makes scientists feel as if they had been an object of mockeries, when filling their texts with absolutely different types of sources (on micro and macro levels).

What was the reason of such eagerness to mix facts and events from different parts of the historical event? Why the tendency became determinative? There should exist distinct and clear facts which made the tendency iron rule.

The answer is in the concept «historical source» itself.

Historical canvas is lively displayed in memorandums and letters. A historian like no one else can describe finishing facilities problems or emotional characteristics of the Americans as they are from the point of view of a soviet NKVD co-worker. In this unit we can feel time pulse, fluttering of the historical epoch and wobbling of the reality veil. But when passing from theory discussion to the decisions made on the Conference or the progress of negotiations a historian confuses and hesitates. He suddenly starts to stick to published verbatim reports, obeying the facts stated there. «Yalta» historian follows it matching real events with the document. This effect produced by such matching was distinctively described by Y.A. Svyatets [7, p. 44–47]. His conclusions beautifully explain the aberration established when referring to the verbatim reports of the Conference. When developing the question, we should mention that there is no reality behind the words «Verbatim report of the Crimean conference». Thus, in fact at the Crimean conference meetings no verbatim reports were made at all. The interpreters were making personal, operative notes about the negotiations progress. Afterwards the notes were summarized to a single relatively sequential unit and reprinted. We have no information about any corrections made or cupping the document at this stage. The emended text was target for private archive of I.V. Stalin and for administrative use. It didn't aim to fully, comprehensively enlighten the event. The material became the basis for soviet publications which were completely expressed in classical compilation [11]. The edition was doctored and original documents unavailable. In fact, a researcher had no documents of full value (the American compilation also had similar drawbacks and both publications still had no cross-check till now (!)).

Thereby, either microfacts or the so-called «sources of specific origin» (letters, diaries, memorandums...) remained the only historical sources [5, 6]. For a historian, a verbatim report was just a scheme, the only one and ... inevitable. It excluded any interpretation or comprehension. Creation liberty could only manifest itself in microhistory and ethnography.

N. A. Narochnitskaya's efforts [21] in solving the dilemma and providing the researchers with worthy materials from Stalin's folder enjoyed partial success. The materials appeared to be far from perfection. And they were not even published in full. Neither were brought into circulation private official remarks on the documents, although made by I.V. Stalin's distinct handwriting. The original documents remain closed up to the present. Therefore, the experts have no clear direct sources till now just indirect and sometimes doubtful ones.

Conclusion. The historiography of Yalta conference exuberates with theses, articles, monographs published in Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian languages since 1945, despite the source study basis being rather narrow. Schematic, docked and some few chaotic set of verbatim reports about the conference on one hand and a lively canvas of verbal history on the other. A historian was forced to neglect all sorts of scientific etiquette rules in order to make full review on the conference process. An unlucky star of the historiography related to Yalta – 45 demanded not simple analysis of the facts, but bright combination the micro and macro history of the event, not omitting global vision of Yalta role in the postwar political game. Evidently, because of the impossibility of comprehending the immensity and being only oriented at the first soviet scientific works, the scientists started to neglect the immutable rules of historical source processing. Unfortunately Ukrainian and Russian scientists «inherited» this inaccurate aberration. Moreover, neglecting scientific ethics occurs among most of historians (active publishers) who have to apply the sources of different origin and classes in their scientific works. The blow that stroke scientific etiquette

Weak source study basis and boundless geopolitical task that stroke scientific etiquette like a blow can just be retorted by the strictness of thought and dry facts, as a consequence of scrupulous work on original texts related to Yalta – 45 (verbatim reports, official notes, record books, etc.)

REFERENCES

1. *Shevchenko O. K.* Yalta-45: Ukrainian science historiographic realia in globalization and universalism era // *Science and Education a New Dimension. Humanities and Social Science.* – 2013. – Issue: 12. – Vol. I. – № 2. – P. 39–42.
2. *Ерусалимский А. С.* Крымская конференция: Стенограмма публичной лекции / Ерусалимский А. С. – М. : Правда, 1945. – 26 с.
3. Крымская (Ялтинская) конференция 1945 года: уроки и перспективы : материалы Междунар. науч. симпозиума. – Симферополь : Крымский архив, 1996.
4. Крымская конференция в воспоминаниях и документах / сост.: Е. Н. Дорошенко, О. А. Шамрин; под ред. С. В. Юрченко. – Симферополь : Крым; Таврия, 2006. – 208 с.
5. *Острянюк А.* Джерела особового походження : семантика поняття / Острянюк А. // *Сйдос.* – 2010/2011. – Вип. 5. – С. 230–242.
6. *Папакін Г. В.* Використання історичних джерел в археографічних публікаціях: суспільні виклики та наукові проблеми (роздуми архівознавця) / Папакін Г. В. // *Український історичний журнал.* – 2009. – № 6. – С. 135–146.
7. *Святец Ю. А.* Исторический источник: современная научная категория или архаизм / Святец Ю. А. // *Крыніцазнаўства і спецыяльныя гістарычныя дысцыпліны : навук. зб.* – Вип. 6. – Мінськ : БДУ, 2011. – С. 41–55.

8. Сиполс В. Я. На пути к великой Победе : Советская дипломатия в 1941–1945 гг. / Сиполс В. Я. – М. : Политиздат, 1985. – 495 с.
9. Сиполс В. Я. Крымская конференция. 1945 год / Сиполс В. Я., Чельшев И. А. – М. : Междунар. отношения, 1984. – 96 с.
10. Славинский Б. Н. Ялтинская конференция и проблема «северных территорий» / Славинский Б. Н. – М. : Новина, 1996. – 221 с.
11. Советский Союз на международных конференциях периода Великой Отечественной войны 1941–1945 гг. – Т. 4. – М. : Политиздат, 1979.
12. Сосинский С. Б. Операция «Аргонавт» (Крымская конференция и ее оценка в США) / Сосинский С. Б. – М. : Международные отношения, 1969. – 127 с.
13. Три подхода к войне и миру: Сталин, Рузвельт, Черчилль на Крымской (Ялтинской) конференции 1945 г. и уроки для формирования новой системы международной безопасности : мат-лы науч. конф. (5–7 февраля 2004 г.); под ред. С. В. Юрченко. – Симферополь : Магистр, 2004.
14. Шевченко О. К. 1945–1974 гг. как период формирования советской историографии Ялтинской конференции / О. К. Шевченко // Культура народов Причерноморья. – 2013. – № 254. – С. 174–177.
15. Шевченко О. К. Расцвет советской историографии Ялтинской конференции в 1975–1987 гг. / О. К. Шевченко // Культура народов Причерноморья. – 2013. – № 257. – С. 115–120.
16. Шевченко О. К. Ресурси наукового архіву Лівадійського палацу-музею і Кримська конференція 1945 р. : історіографічна розвідка // Вісник Львівського університету. – 2013. – С. 47–54. – (Серія міжнародні відносини; вип. 33).
17. Юдина Л. Д. Саки – «ворота» Крымской конференции. 1945 год / Юдина Л. Д. – Симферополь : Магистр, 2005. – 48 с.
18. Юрченко С. В. Гриф секретности снят: охрана Ялтинской конференции 1945 года / С. В. Юрченко. – Севастополь : Мир, 2003. – 178 с.
19. Юрченко С. В. Ялтинская конференция 1945 года: хроника создания нового мира / С. В. Юрченко. – Симферополь : Крым, 2005. – 340 с.
20. Ялта 1945–2000: проблемы международной безопасности на пороге нового столетия : материалы междунар. науч. симпозиум (4–7 февраля 2000 г., Ялта); под ред. В. П. Казарина. – Симферополь : Крымский архив, 2001.
21. Ялта-45. Начертания нового мира / отв. ред. Н. А. Нарочницкая. – М. : Вече, 2010. – 288 с.
22. Ялтинская система и современный мировой порядок: проблемы глобальной и региональной безопасности : мат-лы науч. конф. (Ялта. 17–21 февраля 2010 г.); под ред. С. В. Юрченко. – Симферополь : Антиква, 2010.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 01.12.2013

Прийнята до друку 20.12.2013

ДЖЕРЕЛОЗНАВСТВО КРИМСЬКОЇ КОНФЕРЕНЦІЯ 1945 р.: ЩОДО ПИТАННЯ ПРО НАУКОВУ ЕТИКУ

Олег Шевченко

*Кримський гуманітарний університет (м. Ялта),
вул. Севастопольська, 2, м. Ялта, АР Крим, Україна, 98635, тел.: +30677037675,
e-mail: Yalta-1945@yandex.com*

Визначено параметри кризи історичного джерела в роботах про Кримської конференції 1945 р. Окреслено базові етапи історіографії Кримської конференції; виявлено коло джерел з «Ялтинських зустрічей»; визначено методологічні принципи роботи істориків з джерелами стосовно «Ялти»; зафіксовано аберації в реальності «наукова етика» та розкрито їхні причини; запропоновано варіант вирішення певної кризової ситуації.

Об'єктивною причиною незадовільного поводження з джерелами стосовно «Ялта–45» є традиція глобального охоплення Кримської конференції в одній публікації. При цьому, починаючи з 1945 року, історичні тексти про Ялту створюють не у форматі сухого аналізу фактів, а барвистого суміщення мікроісторії побуту та макроісторії події. Вочевидь, не можна досягнути неосяжне, і орієнтуючись на традицію перших радянських праць, вчені-історики стали ігнорувати непорушні правила обробки історичного джерела на догоду барвистості тексту та широкого аналізу стратегієм геополітики союзників.

Ключові слова: Ялта–45, історіографія Ялтинської конференції, джерелознавство, історична епістемологія.

ИСТОЧНИКОВЕДЕНИЕ КРЫМСКОЙ КОНФЕРЕНЦИИ 1945 г.: К ВОПРОСУ О НАУЧНОЙ ЭТИКЕ

Олег Шевченко

*Крымский гуманитарный университет (г. Ялта),
ул. Севастопольская 2, г. Ялта, АР Крым, Украина, 98635, тел. +380677037675,
e-mail: Yalta-1945@yandex.com*

Определены параметры кризиса исторического источника в работах о Крымской конференции 1945 г. Объективной причиной неудовлетворительного обращения с источниками является традиция глобального охвата Крымской конференции в одной публикации. При этом, начиная с 1945 года исторические тексты о Ялте создаются не в формате сухого анализа фактов, а красочного совмещения микроистории быта и макроистории события. Очевидно, что нельзя объять необъятное, и ориентируясь на традицию первых советских работ, ученые-историки стали игнорировать незыблемые правила обработки исторического источника в угоду красочности текста и широкого анализа стратегієм геополітики союзників.

Ключевые слова: Ялта–45, историография Ялтинской конференции, источниковедение, историческая эпистемология.