
Abstract. The relevant observation in this research is a determination of the tendencies as well as social and cultural transformations in the Dnieper region within the 20th century. The development stages of one of the latest industrial complexes of Ukraine, namely the Dnieper region, were defined and analyzed. Dnieper region is also called Prydniprovia, it includes the Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhya regions. The industrialization of the Dnieper region was considered along with the political and cultural dynamics. The problematics of this research is comprised of certain results which are mainly focused on the analysis of the ethnical component and cultural politics and which in this research became the key factors in the life activity of two interdependent regions during the industrialization period. During the industrialization period of both regions, favorable conditions were created in the whole for functioning and their economical establishment in Ukraine. The role of the theatrical art in the Dnieper region deserves individual attention in the paper, as during the period of industrialization the theatrical art is one of the largest indicators of influence on the life of workers, country people, and Red Army men. Therefore, the paper makes an emphasis simultaneously on the topic of industrialization of the Dnieper region as well as on providing insight into the fundamental principles that were developed during the formation of the theatrical activity of the Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhya regions.
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The articulation of the problem. The author defined the existing principles of the economical functioning of the Dnieper region that as far as is known were implemented by the decisions of the Soviet government within this territory (present-day Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhia oblasts) to implement the set of measures after the revolutionary events and create the whole industrial complex with the coal and metallurgical base owing to the totally favorable location of natural resources of Dnipropetrovsk oblast, Zaporizhzhia oblast, and Donbas. However, as we understand, the population, mainly country people, had a very negative attitude to the focus and noticeable actions on the practical implementation of government measures. As the result, the direction of society development was changed by the ideological identification where the new moral values were created along with the introduction of a significant quantity of regulations and provisions to the education and culture sphere. It means that an economy-oriented approach contributed to implementing and creating a new legal self-regulating and simultaneously controlling system in all aspects of art, most significantly in theatrical art. The theatre groups that held views of the state ideology achieved state status and the best stage directors and actors joined them. According to the modern understanding the so-called effect of “propaganda” was widely spread and used, where theatrical art was applied by state opponents for the creation of ideological values, simultaneously a range of conceptual bases in self-identification of the population appeared through the interpretation of images in art. Actually, in the global sense, “industrialization” led to the practical implementation of an effectively working model in the culture, where first of all through the synthetic art of the theatre the changes of certain moral values of the society happened, and then certain stereotypes of the “socialistic person” were established. This became an unavoidable objective reality that was difficult to do anything about. The tandem of ideology and theatrical art shaped the “Soviet society” in the process of the closest interaction. Therefore, the proposed theme should be considered in a broader context that is the context of the transformation of the traditional Ukrainian society, the major part of which was comprised mainly of country people and later Soviet society. All this required long-term searches and comparison of found data in order to emphasize the result of the analysis, where, to some extent, the theatre became not only the center of cultural dynamics but also the life of people. In this regard, the theatre art becomes the main factor of significant changes in the life activities of the population and acquires specific changes, which coincide in time with modernization, the process of construction of the Dnieper Hydroelectric Station, which in a global sense was the beginning of the industrialization of the Dnieper region.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The Dnieper region was analyzed in the political as well as social and economic discourse in the research of O. Amosh [1; 2], V. Liashenko [12], R. Prokopenko, S. Ivanov, S. Dziuba, I. Semencha [14], Yu. Zaloznova, I. Pidorycheva, etc. Additionally, one of the most
global reforms periods in the theatre sphere of 1917-1920 was analyzed which during this period and at its subsequent development stages influenced theatre development. Thus, one of the most global reforms periods in the theatrical sphere was analyzed owing to the study of scientific works, monographs, papers, and publications of the leading art experts and theatre researchers such as I. Bezghin, O. Bezghin [3; 4], M. Zakharevych [7], N. Kornienko [10], A. Liahushchenko [11], Yu. Stanishevskyi [15; 16], and many other respected researchers.

The theme of the research is considered by the author in terms of a constant synthesis of political and cultural transformation in the Dnieper region in the first third of the 20th century.

The purpose of the paper is to give insight into the extralarge potential of theatrical art for the Soviet government during the global industrialization of the Dnieper region.

The scientific novelty of the paper consists in in-depth research and giving insight into artistic processes and sociocultural changes that took place in the Dnieper economic region in the first third of the 20th century. The researcher analyzed and defined the main factors of influence in sociocultural dynamics as well as cultural policy in the Dnieper region. In the research, the author introduced some of her own thoughts and comparisons from the point of view of comprehension and study of significant scientific works of leading Ukrainian researchers, economists, art experts, and theatre researchers. The proposed results of the research are introduced for scientific use by the author for the first time.

The body text of the paper. First of all, the Soviet government staked on the role of culture as much as possible, and in the first third of the 20th century it facilitated the development of theatres. Most of them became officially state-owned and introduced plays of well-known Soviet playwriters into the theatre repertoire according to the regulations of state policy. Certainly, as we know from monographs, papers and publications of theatre researchers and art experts, it is possible to speak about the power of the performance and its large patheticalness today as a legend, when the reactions of the spectators were overwhelming. The spectators joined the performance with admiration for its large patheticalness and with exclamations to establish justice. The spectators of the Red Army particularly imbued with the events of the Civil War were so captivated by represented events that they felt an impulse to get on stage to help to overcome the enemy, and there were often rallies in the theatre after the performance, after which the troops were immediately headed off to war.

The policy of the Ukrainian SSR encouraged theatres to create new value orientations for workers and country people by introducing a range of state stationary theatres for them. However, theatres have been misled, and many promises of the government that were implemented step-by-step did not receive a positive response from leading artists, Ukrainian stage directors, and actors. Thus, Ukrainian stationary theatres began working under the conditions of a totalitarian state, although during
that period there were attempts to implement positive and qualitative reforms on the financing of theatres, subsidies, taxation in the organization of the theatre activity but already beginning from the 1920s most of the reforms forced the theatre to be dependent on the government both economically and artistically. All the above had an impact on the industrialization expansion of the Dnieper region, and other demonstrations of cultural policy can be considered along with the accelerated modernization of Eastern Ukraine, which caused the transformation of an agrarian country into an industrial one and made its changes in the way of life.

As known, the constant political changes and social processes took place dynamically in all regions of our state. However, in the first third of the 20th century in the life of the Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhia regions, a special priority was given to the implementation of experiments by the Soviet government. One of the experiments involved the Dnieper Hydroelectric Station, which later took the place of one of the greatest factors of influence in the social and economic life of our state and Russia (in the 20-30s of the 20th century).

Due to the construction of the DniproHES and plants of the Dnieper industrial complex in the 1930s Zaporizhzhia expanded by several times. Volunteers from Zaporizhzhia were involved in the construction of the DniproHES and the industrial complex belonging to it, and many workers that arrived from Russia were provided to help them. The city population almost quadrupled. At that time in Zaporizhzhia the largest metallurgical enterprises not only of the UkrSSR but the whole Soviet Union were built. First of all, the consequences of the social and economic way of life influenced the changes in the life of the Ukrainian people in the South of Ukraine.

In order to support the processes of industrialization and the stable functioning of production, it became necessary to settle a large number of workers. The Ukrainian state institute of urban design (Dniprograd) developed a general plan of “Large Zaporizhzhia”. The approved project covered an area of 42674.8 ha, where 500 thousand new inhabitants (Zaporizhzhia Oblast, 2004). As of 22.06.1941, the population in Zaporizhzhia amounted to 350 thousand people (of which 35 thousand lived in the right-bank part of the city). Unfortunately, however, this global and rapid construction development was interrupted by the Second World War.

The large-scale construction of 'Large Zaporizhzhia' was one of the factors which, in its historical context, caused the introduction of the term the Dnieper region in the first third of the 20th century. Currently, according to the terminology in the publicly available free multilingual online encyclopedia Wikipedia, it is explained that the Dnieper economic region is an economic region of Ukraine, which includes Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhia oblasts, it is the second region after the Donetsk region by the volume of industrial production (both regions amount to 33% of industrial production of the state). The set of common characteristics of the Donetsk-Dnieper economic district is scientifically studied in the book (Nemets 2014, pp. 80-81), it is also noted here that in 1961 by order of the government, three economic
regions of the USSR were established in the territory of Ukraine. It was then that Donetsk economic region was merged with Dnieper economic district according to the administrative-territorial division. In this paper, the researcher proposes to consider only the Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhia regions.

During that period the following was observable: purpose uncertainty and reluctance of the Soviet government to publicly recognize the exceptional role of the South (Donetsk-Dnieper region) in the history of Ukraine in the first third of the 20th century, which was emphasized by M. Hrushevskyi. This can be explained by the fact that the political and ideological bias as well the measures of the Soviet government were focused on reducing the proportion of ethnic Ukrainians. It is strange, but the facts of the dominance of the Ukrainians in the South are also admitted by Russian historians, although their mission was focused on other issues, namely on giving insight into the so-called processes of interethnic integration and later on the natural cause of assimilation, to cover up the forced assimilation policy, i.e. the Russification policy of the state. So among few Russian historians V. Kabuzan represented the dominant tendency to show the processes in the South in the Russia-wide context and truthfully specified the fact of the dominance of the Ukrainians in his works.

Therefore, the ethnic identity and mentality of the majority of country people and workers in the first third of the 20th century in the South of Ukraine were formed in the course of spreading national and political ideas, objective processes, and as a result of the relationship of the Ukrainians with other communities (ethnic population).

The processes of organization of Ukrainian statehood and the formation of the Ukrainian national idea were preserved mainly in the village and among the Ukrainian nobility, represented by the prosperous class of Cossacks at that time. In some ways, the Cossack system reflected the freedom-loving spirit of the Zaporizhian Sich and gave Zaporizhzhia the status of the cradle of statehood in the struggle for Ukrainian freedom. Therefore, it is necessary to emphasize that each region in the state has its own history in the formation of an individual style in the national art, and this in a global sense becomes further an indicator of the mentality of the people, that forms based on circumstances, culture and political principles.

Along with the political ideology of the government the issue of the ethnonational composition is of interest in the research, where, as we understand, the bias of the population census was intent on reducing the share of the ethnic Ukrainians. At the same time, the Ukrainian language and culture were supplanted step by step by the Soviet regime, and after the reforms carried out in 1919-1920s in the sphere of education and theatre, the Soviet government gradually implemented the measures of the russification policy in the South of Ukraine.

In 1919 a certain system of theatre activity state control was established in Ukraine which underwent all future transformations and changes under ideological pressure of the system. The State theatre declared its right to receive financial support
from the national budget. However, as is known, the implementation of these declarations was guaranteed only under the conditions of executing a corresponding ideological order from the government, which in its turn had sufficient means of pressure on individuals and whole ensembles. (Tymoshenko 1994, p. 107). Oleh Olehovych also noted that this principle became one of the main directions of the Soviet theatrical policy for many years. As since the 15th of March 1919 after certain preparatory work the Chief Directorate of Arts and National Culture together with the Executive Committee of the Kyiv Council of Workers' Deputies and the Collegium of the Arts Subdepartment of the Kyiv Council issued an order about the nationalization of theatrical premises in Kyiv. «...» Accordingly, the State Drama Theatre was named the First Drama Theatre named after T.H. Shevchenko, Solovtsov Theatre was named the Second Drama Theatre named after V.I. Lenin, the city opera house was named the Opera House named after K. Libkneht (Tymoshenko 1994, p. 104). The First, Second theatres, and Opera House of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic were placed under control of the Office of State Theatres, the rest were placed under control of the Collegium of Arts of the Kyiv Education Department of the Kyiv Council of Workers' Deputies. (Shpakovska 2018, p. 11). During the Soviet period, Ukrainian culture did not have the opportunity to develop in a free, natural, independent way, but the Soviet regime, which was intended to “form a new socialistic person” and considered the so-called “cultural revolution” as one of its achievements, created a network of state cultural institutions and provided cheap access to a wide range of cultural services. «...»Thus, as of 1990, there were already 125 theatres and 25.1 thousand clubs and houses of culture functioning in Ukraine (Bezghin 2013, pp. 53-54) (italic in the author's edition - M. M.).

During the nationalization of theatres the Dnipropetrovsk National Academic Ukrainian Musical and Drama Theater named after T. H. Shevchenko took the lead. It began its important period in theatre history in Kyiv. The theatre was founded in 1918 as the first professional theatre in Ukraine, at that time it was named the State Drama Theatre of Ukraine.

In the book confined to the 100th anniversary of the Dnipropetrovsk National Academic Ukrainian Musical and Drama Theater named after T. H. Shevchenko (T. Shpakovska 2018. p. 10), the author narrates, «The biography of the Dnieper Ukrainian Music and Drama Theatre named after T. H. Shevchenko has many colorful bright pages. The date of theatre opening at different times, depending on many objective historical, political, and subjective factors was determined differently. Some sources state that the theatre was opened in 1918 (i.e. during the rule of Hetman P. Skoropadskyi), while other sources state that it was 1919 (according to the calendar of the Soviet government)».

Therefore, according to many theatre researchers, the theme is still relevant today, and it continues to fascinate and involve more and more researchers on this subject to make certain discoveries, find new milestones in history and finally enrich
history with the explanations of the organizational and artistic bases of the theatre for its work period of more than 100 years.

In this respect, it is necessary to remind that the first attempt to nationalize the theatres in Ukraine was made in Kharkiv. The premises of the famous “Missouri” theatre in Kharkiv were often used for various agitation and propaganda events by the new government. The management of the department of the People's Commissariat for Education (Narkomos) addressed the presidium of the Kharkiv provincial executive committee with a proposal to nationalize the theatre. The theatre premises were taken away and given for use to the theatre committee (since the 4th of February 1919). In this regard, O. Tymoshenko noted that the nationalization of Kharkiv theatres was only the beginning of the activity of the Narkomos (Tymoshenko 1994, pp. 103-104). When the Narkomos moved from Kharkiv to Kyiv in March 1919, the department was enriched by famous theatre workers. Famous theatre researchers such as O. Kysil, A. Deich, S. Mokulskyi, H. Kryzhitskyi and stage masters such as I. Mar’ianenko, K. Mardzhanishvili, P. Kovalenko, and many other personalities actively participated in the activity of this theatre. It is also necessary to remind that on the 26th of January 1919 the All-Ukrainian Theatrical Committee (VUTECOM) was founded under the Council of Arts of the Narkomos of UkrSR. Actually, this committee was in charge of the whole theatrical process. And at its request, in 1919 the State Drama Theatre named after T. Shevchenko was merged with the Young Theatre.

The formation of new management principles defined new principles for the structure and its organization, on the other hand along with the introduction of plan tasks for theatres the bases were created for state funding of theaters in the 20-30s of the 20th century.

Thus, in the 1920s, theaters had to provide 50% of the seats for workers and Red Army men, the other half was sold at the rates established by the authorized representatives of the troupe together with the relevant government authorities, so as to be able to pay for all the expenses for keeping the troupe, technical staff, and production of the play. The government could bear only a quarter of the total amount of expenses. As a result, taxes disappeared, instead, 50% of tickets were distributed for free, and at the same time, there was a strict regulation of both repertoire policy and the price per ticket as well as the number of performances (Zakharevych 2013, p. 91). State theatres became budgetary institutions and were fully dependent on the government in the regulation of their artistic policy.

In the paper by A. H. Liahushchenko «Spectator in the theater, Ukraine, the twenties» the author draws attention to the fact that after the nationalization theatres were still deprived of the possibility to work in a fixed location, and eventually without permanent location and promised conditions, theatre managers and authorized workers tried to make provision for strategies to attract spectators. Here is a quote, «Such famous theatrical groups as the First Theatre named after
T. Shevchenko and the Theatre named after M. Zankovetska worked in the first half of the 20s in the cities of Ukraine without help from the government, without own permanent premises. The descendants of the Young Theatre, namely the group of actors of Les Kurbas («Kydramte», studio theatre in Bila Tserkva) and the New Drama Theatre named after I. Franko under the direction of Hnat Yura, existed under the same conditions. And later, when in autumn 1923 the theatre group of the New Drama Theatre named after I. Franko was invited to the capital of the republic Kharkiv and became a state stationary theatre, they received most of their funds not from the People's Commissariat of Education, but from the community «Ukrrobselteatr» for several years» (Liahushchenko 1994, p. 108).

At that time all leading theatres of the state dreamed of overcoming financial difficulties. At the same time, many newly created theatres strived to represent their directorial interpretation and find stability during crisis periods, and therefore repertoire policy had to consider the interests of all possible spectators, mainly workers, country people, and military men.

Finally, touring skills also helped the theatre groups to achieve significant success and victories. Thus, Yu. Stanishevskyi recalled that Ukrainian theatre troupes were on tours constantly in many cities in Ukraine and Russia, the best of them performed with great success in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Warsaw, and even Paris. (Stanishevskyi 1980, p. 32) (italics in the author's edition - M. M.).

Certainly, theatres tried to remain independent of ideological pressure, but already in the early 1930s the main change in the organization of the theatre activity was the inclusion of plays of the leading Soviet playwriters, which was obligatory and regulated by Orders and Provisions about the inclusion of certain plays to theatre repertoire policy, in case of disobeying or refusal the stage directors and actors were punished for disobedience and for trying to go their own way.

Despite many troubles, there were happy and joyful moments in the life of each theatre group. For instance, the theater named after M. Zankovetska has its fixed location in Zaporizhzhia in 1931-1941, and later here the music and drama theater named after M. Shchors began its professional activity. Today this famous theatre is named after the legendary stage director and actor V. H. Mahar, who glorified Ukraine at the Decade of Ukrainian Literature and Art in Moscow (1960). Volodymyr Herasymovych became the producer of many stage performances. The Theatre named after M. Shchors cared by him was one of the founders of the professional Ukrainian theatre art. Theatre critics in Moscow wrote approving reviews about his work. Curiously enough, Vladimir Herasymovych Mahar himself insisted on performing only in Ukrainian during theatre tours. At that time, under the direction of V. H. Mahar, performances were in Ukrainian even in Russia. Although the majority of spectators didn’t know the Ukrainian language, they learned to understand it, as they were favorable to the performance, the actors, and the theatre itself, thus people learned to respect the whole Ukrainian nation, its language, traditions, ethnos and right to life.
Before that, in the Zaporizhzhia region the theatre named after M. Zankovetska helped to include Ukrainian classical heritage into the repertoire and became one of the first initiators of Ukrainian-language repertoire.

In the Zaporizhzhia region (it would be more correct to name it Zaporizhzhia province) from the 28th of April 1920 the Administrations of country houses in volosts and villages of the provinces began to appear. There were also administrations that took care of country houses and their task was considered to control and carry out the political and educational activity.

Other theatrical events and organization of performances in the Zaporizhzhia region (in the 20-30s) mainly took place in houses of culture, although the idea of organizing a professional travelling workers' and peasants' theatre appeared as early as the beginning of the construction of the Dnieper Hydroelectric Station, it was put into practice only in June 1927. At that time, the organization of the group was entrusted to V. Raievskyi, who had already had work experience in this sphere (he had worked at the Odessa Workers' and Peasants' Theatre).

In 1927 the Dnipropetrovsk region became the place of the permanent location of one of the most historically valuable centers of theatrical art, the first professional theatre in Ukraine bearing the honorary name today, that is the Dnipropetrovsk Academic Ukrainian Music and Drama Theatre named after Taras Shevchenko, which had been on tour in Dnipropetrovsk many times.

The play *An Optimistic Tragedy* by V. Vyshnevskyi was an extraordinary event in the artistic life of the Dnipropetrovsk theatre named after Shevchenko, as ist stage director L. Yuzhanskyi created a spectacular adaptation for the stage based on musical and dramatic traditions of Ukrainian theatre, as well as on the principles of socialist realism. The reviewers of the play wrote for a long time in the newspaper *Zoria* about the acting talents of A. Khoroshun, N. Dotsenko, and L. Zadniprovsksyi. The reviewers also noted the actors’ expressiveness and talent gifted by nature.

As is known, it was at the end of the 1930s that most of the performances were directed by Illia Kobrynskyi and Leonid Yuzhanskyi.

Also in 1927 one more of the oldest theatres in the Dnipropetrovsk region, namely Dnieper Academic Theatre of Drama and Comedy (Theatre of Russian Drama and Comedy named after M. Horkyi) began its artistic activity. The theatre started its functioning based on the decision of the executive committee to create Russian theatre in the city in 1927. At that time touring troupe of Moscow Maly theatre took an active part in creating a new theatre. The new theatre was headed by V. Yermolov-Borozdin.

V. Yermolov-Borozdin, as a stage director, introduced a special concept into the artistic activity of the theatre, namely to speak to the spectators only about present issues. This concept defined the following directions in the repertory policy of the theatre. Firstly, it specified the existing problems in the life of society. Secondly, it created the stage space in the actor's work on the role, where actors also had to define
what attitude people should have to the circumstances of life (the new Soviet society) in solving these issues. According to the stage director, this concept had to satisfy the artistic ambitions of the actors as well as the government.

Thus, some concepts of cultural policy implemented along with the nationalisation of theatres (1919) only conditionally made provision for the birth of the measures of their “nationalization” in theatre and culture, because as early as 1927 the places of the dominance of the Russians appeared on the historical Ukrainian territories. As researchers and historians report, by the end of 1927 it was clear that the “policy of korenization” (Ukrainization) came into contradiction with the centralizing and unifying policy of Moscow.

Summarizing the research, the author makes the conclusion that ethnic changes encouraged the Bolsheviks in their intentions to turn a highly developed Ukrainian nation into labour force. Thus, according to the Bolsheviks’ strategy, the structure of our country underwent a large number of changes in the administrative-territorial migration of the population and sociodemographic changes. Integration from the perspective of the revolutionary events of 1917, according to the available propaganda dogmas, began to influence the social factor of Ukrainian society and its all possible spheres of life. In particular, the orientation of national traditions and doctrines changed because the new propaganda ideas of socialist construction were against Ukrainian nationhood. However, we understand that in the ideological and theoretical aspect in newspaper publications since the first third of the 20th century there are too many articles and historical facts related to the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people for freedom, independence, and reunification with the fraternal Russian people. The ideological identification became objectively demonstrated in the process of differentiation of the population. A social and cultural character in the aspect of interethnic relations between the modern states of Ukraine and Russia existed owing to the psychological influence, as it was caused by economic, demographic, geographic, and social factors.

However, it is impossible to speak only of the unifying policy of Moscow and its famous stage directors and actors who worked in Ukraine, because there were infrequent misunderstandings between the actors of Russian and Ukrainian theatres, and even vice versa, there were cases when the history was enriched only due to great friendship and mercy. The Russian entrepreneur M. Solovtsov and the actors of his troupe had such a good attitude towards the Ukrainian theatre and Ukrainian actors.

Conclusion. In the paper, the author gives a global characteristic of political and cultural dogmas. The insight is given to the problem of this research in the analysis of the cultural policy of the Soviet government and its ethnic component. It was explored that the primary factors of influence on the life of the two interconnected regions were the Dnieper Hydroelectric Station and the industrial complex, which began the process of the industrialization of the Dnieper economic region (today historians and economists in publications and articles define it like a
region as well as a district). During the industrialization period amazing phenomena took place in the economic history of our state, and in this sense theatre also becomes both the political and cultural factor of influence on the society of the Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhya regions for many decades.
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