

## HISTORICAL TRADITIONS AND PRESENT NATIONAL STATE FORMATION IN UKRAINE ACCORDING TO FOREIGN HISTORIOGRAPHY

At the present stage in Ukraine, a complicated process of forming basic foundations for the independent state, seeking for the most rational and proper forms of uniting national historical traditions with world experience of state creation is developing, considering the impact of globalization on further development of states and nations.

At the intersection of the millennium, the Ukrainian people gained a unique chance to create their own independent state, while by the 1980s among world existing 8 thousand language groups, only 200 constituted themselves as nations with the own states and about 600 were seeking for autonomy<sup>1</sup>. So today it is especially important to aspire more research on this complex problem, and provide nation-state formation in Ukraine with grounded theoretical basis, using the best ideas of Western scientific political thought.

One of the main problems being worked out for a long period of time in Western historical and political science is particulars and regularities of national state creation. The well-known scholars in this field appear M.E.Brown, W.Connor, A.Hastings, D.Horowitz and others<sup>2</sup>. They have the priority in working out the concepts of formation and development of nations, dynamics of national-liberation movements during 19<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, giving appropriate definitions, determining general aspects of nation-forming processes, solving problems of turning ethnic groups into nations. In these papers the analysis of historical results of nation-forming processes in main European states and the particulars of above-mentioned processes regarding dependent and stateless peoples, is of great interest for present Ukraine.

Within this context, the primary attention is paid to research the interconnection of the processes of nation-forming and state creation. The historical development having been experienced by those peoples who have created their independent states consisted of the following components: ethnic rebirth (the stage of self-cognition and gaining self-consciousness); politization of ethnicity (struggle for political power for the ethnic group); gaining political power and creation the system of control over the introduction of national interests through state structures<sup>3</sup>. As a result, the newly formed state performs important functions concerning further development of the nation and safeguarding its interests in political, economic, legal and other spheres.

The example of simultaneous emergence of nation and state can be given by the West European experience. In Europe, as R.Pipes considers, even during the Middle Ages, the territorial principle suppressed the ethnic one. England, for example, is a sample of the territorial national state, which was formed in 1600<sup>4</sup>. After the French revolution, according to M.Hechter, national states became the dominating political organization and the carrier of collective ethnicity on the European continent<sup>5</sup>. The difference of historical traditions of the European states from those of the post-soviet region, as T.Spybey considers, is that they were developing as the conglomeration of independent national states within the European civilization, and not as the single imperial hierarchy<sup>6</sup>.

The well-known opinion in the political thought is that till the 19<sup>th</sup> century “ethnographic ideas were not of special significance”, that national component as an important part of socio-political life emerged during the period of bourgeois-democratic revolutions<sup>7</sup>. But the historical development of many states, as for instance, Ireland, is the bright example of the English failure to suppress Irish separatism, though discriminating methods and physical destruction of the people were going on since the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century<sup>8</sup>.

Much importance for this topic is presented by the research of O.Pritsak, where the writer analyses the significance of the church for the formation of the civil society, rights and freedoms of its members<sup>9</sup>. He stresses that the concept of nation and national rebirth is the typical product of Western civilization and was absolutely strange for the orthodox vision till the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The struggle between the church and the state in the West favoured the development of the intellectual sphere and the emergence of Humanism, Italian Renaissance, Reformation, Scientific Revolution, French and English Renaissance. As a result, the refined culture was formed and based on folk elements. O.Pritsak considers it to be significant that in the 11<sup>th</sup> century, the political institutions of Western Europe gave up the concept of universalism (one emperor for the whole Christian

world); in the Feudal society, the system of contract relations between the seignior and his vassal existed, which later turned the principle of the individual freedom into the main one in the system of European democracy.

Ukraine's position on the border of Catholic and Orthodox worlds, the common boundary with Catholic states (from 1000 with Hungarian Kingdom, from 1320 with Polish Kingdom) resulted in the active participation of Kyiv Princes in the European policy; in Rus' the own mother country was created; and attempts to form a union with Rome are known from 1245.

But the Orthodox Church in Ukraine never gave up the concept of universalism; but even during the period of the activities of Ostroh and Kyiv Mohyla Academies, Ukraine mainly absorbed the antihuman spirit of Jesuit counterreformation and not the ideas of Western Renaissance and Enlightenment<sup>10</sup>.

The Cossack-Hetman state of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi possessed specific features of state-forming in Ukraine considering the problem of formation of leading and politically conscious layers as the basis for nation-forming. Certain imitation of particulars of Polish statehood resulted in petty bourgeois' failure to form a separate layer. Moreover, according to T.Zarycky, "the Ukrainian shlyakhta (gentry) became the basis for modern Polish intelligentsia"<sup>11</sup>. After 1649, representatives of church were not given the proper position in the state, which caused their tending to Moscow protectorate. In contrast to Europe, lack of development of bourgeois elements within the society was of negative impact on the future of Ukraine, as it was in the 19<sup>th</sup> century when bourgeoisie presented the basis for a new state ideal.

The particular feature of the situation in Ukraine is that for a long period of time our people were politically dependent and stateless, so with gaining independence the two simultaneous processes of nation-forming and state-building take place, the coincidence of them in time makes results slow and more difficult to reach.

To apprehend particulars of national state formation in Ukraine, it is important to consider that, as O.Pritsak and J.Reshetar stress, Ukrainians were dwelling not only within the borders of the two Empires – Russia and Austro-Hungary, but also in six cultural zones: Slobids'ka Ukraine with the Cossack order, but this territory was under Moscow Tsar from the very beginning; Left-Bank Ukraine with stable and strong Cossack traditions; Novorossia (former lands of Zaporizka Sich and Crimean Khanat) with the centre in Odessa; Right-Bank Ukraine and Volyn' where Polish culture was dominating; Galychyna and Bukovyna as a part of Austria from 1772 – 1774 with the center in Lviv; Transcarpathia which for a long time was a part of Hungarian Kingship. There was no direct connection between the two centers of Ukrainian rebirth in the 19<sup>th</sup> century – Slobids'ka Ukraine and Galychyna, they were separated by the sphere of Polish influence and by the areas of Jewish settlements<sup>12</sup>.

If after the Austro-Hungary's disintegration, the states started to create democratic regimes, then in fact the USSR was a new Empire which inherited Russian tradition. According to A.J.Motyl, Moscow and St. Petersburg represented political, economic and cultural metropolis with different levels of imperial control over its regions: this control was much stronger in Poland, Byelorussia, Ukraine and in the Caucasus, and weaker in Finland, the Baltic region and the Middle Asia. Traditionally strong was the control of the center over Ukraine during the Soviet period as well<sup>13</sup>.

R.Pipes, while studying the problem of evolution of Russian national identity, stressed that it was bad for Ukrainian development that in Russia no loyalty to independent institutions and human rights protection was formed due to a number of historical reasons. Before 1861, serfs were not only representatives of ethnic minorities, but a large part of Russians, and the possible bourgeois-democratic revolution did not take place in Russia<sup>14</sup>. Under these circumstances, Ukrainians together with Russians were more and more lagging behind the main European trends of national and state development. The result of such situation, and of the differential approach to national policy in different regions, was substantial differences in the tempo and levels of national development of peoples and ethnic groups in the Russian Empire. Moreover, in Western historiography it is fixed that Baltic peoples, for example, while developing their national identity in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, followed the German model of national development, which was supported by the elements of British and American models after the First and Second World Wars. In national and state formation it was the orientation toward the highest world cultural and economic standards. And, as a result, in 1920 – 1930 Estonia and Latvia belonged to the states of the highest grade of literacy in the world<sup>15</sup>.

The particular feature of nation-forming and state creation within the borders of Austria-Hungary, Russian and the Ottoman Empires in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> – the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, was mentioned by the American scholar A.D.Smith. He stressed that in contrast to West European traditions, nations in those states were created not on the basis of state apparatus and not within the existing borders, but on the basis of ethnic, linguistic and religious heritage<sup>16</sup>. Even the USSR was built on the principle of federation of Soviet national states, and this was, according to R.Suni, the experiment on creation of "the only state in the world, built according to the ethnic principle"<sup>17</sup>.

After the USSR disintegration, Ukraine inherited the boundaries which were formed under the Soviet period, moreover, administrative apparatus was not principally changed, as there was no change of the ruling elite in the

state. This gives certain grounds to speak of the identity of state formation of Ukraine with that in post-colonial states of Africa, Asia and Latin America, which, according to A.Giddens, are trying to become nations basing on territories inherited from the colonial past, and the own administrative apparatus<sup>18</sup>.

The dominating influence of historical traditions, dependence between the main religion and the modern process of formation of political systems in post-communist states, were shown by the well-known scholar H.Kitschelt. He introduced a very interesting classification of three types of political systems in these states. The first type includes patrimonial communist states where one of the fractions of former communists came to power having no strong opposition of anticommunist forces. They are Russia, Ukraine and Byelorussia with the dominating influence of Orthodox tradition. (Though some researchers stress that “Ukraine is far from being a typical Orthodox state, with the same role of the Orthodox religion as in Russia”<sup>19</sup>). The second type contains bureaucratically-authoritarian communist systems where the former communist elite lost its identity as in the Czech Republic, former GDR, Latvia and Estonia. In religious aspect, Protestantism is dominating here. National-communist states – Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Litva, belong to the third type. In these countries opposition and former communists could co-ordinate their positions, and Catholic Church was of much importance here<sup>20</sup>.

It goes without saying that during the Soviet period, most of national contradictions in Ukraine were settled by force, even by means of war, though in 1970 – 80s certain conservation of these problems took place. Even under these circumstances at the beginning of 1970s, T.Rakovska-Harmstone mentioned the paradox nature of results of the USSR national policy: it was formed the new type of nationalism of soviet national elite which agreed with the principles of existing political system, but gave up Russian leadership. In this respect, the rehabilitation of deported peoples and representatives of the USSR political authorities of 1930s, the attempt to reestimate historiography of national movements in the republics, demands to rehabilitate the “borot’bysts”, academic discussions on the essence of soviet federalism in the middle of 1960s and others, were of great importance. Moreover, T.Rakovska-Harmstone came to the conclusion that “in fact, voice in Ukraine was risen for separatism, with the demand if independence, following the example of East European states”<sup>21</sup>. Having given the correct assessment to the USSR national problem, some western analysts emphasize that without the soviet factor Ukraine would never have had present borders from Uzhhorod to Donetsk and the Crimea<sup>22</sup>. As to ethnic homogenization in the state, the Soviet Union never supported this process.

Stateless status of Ukrainian people caused forming certain particulars of Ukrainians which exert their influence upon the development of modern state-creation. Their characteristic feature is lack of superpower ambitions, they are not orientated toward suppression of other peoples, they mainly demonstrate tolerance to national minorities. But this factor hinder the process of political and national emancipation, the essence of which, as stated by Polish researcher I.Kurchevska, is the enrichment of state ideology with national arguments; creation of institutions for protection of national heritage and culture; giving legal rights to national minorities; returning of national traditions in public discourse; reforming of the system of education and others<sup>23</sup>. These measures are especially important considering conditions of weak national identity of Ukrainians, evidence of ethnic cultural groups with hybrid consciousness. During 1990s for most Ukrainians, in contrast to Baltic peoples, it was not acceptable to determine their national identity by means of direct opposition and hostility toward Russians. According to sociological research held in Ukraine during 1990s, there is certain difference in national self-identification of the people due to historical and geographical factor. From western to eastern regions the part of original and self-identified Ukrainians is changing from 87,3 % of respondents in the western areas to 25,4 % in the eastern ones. Dual Ukrainian-Russian self-identification (both Ukrainian and Russian at the same time) is rather widely spread in Donetsk (54,6 %), Lugansk (48,9 %), Odessa (41,1 %), Kharkiv (46,7 %) regions. This research has also proved that level of support of the idea of national independence is different: among respondents 70,1% of Ukrainians, 48,6% of “Ukrainians-Russians”, 36,8% of Russians stood for its strengthening, In the west of Ukraine, twice more respondents supported the idea of strengthening independence, than in the east<sup>24</sup>.

In this connection, the western scholars have certain grounds to determine new post-soviet states including Ukraine as “the regimes being nationalized”<sup>25</sup>. Despite possible consequences of this process the Russian factor will always be one of the main aspects of political life of Ukraine. About 11 million Russians dwelling here, which equals the numerical quantity of some average European state, are called not simply a national minority, but a superminority by some scholars. The important point is that about 6,5 million of them (about 56,7%) were born in Ukraine and Ukrainian cultural and social spheres are not alien to them.

Very interesting historiographical research by V.Petrovskiy<sup>26</sup> deals with present Russian-Ukrainian relations in their western interpretation. The fact that for the latest ten years this topic was partially or fully studied in 300 monographs and 1500 articles and reviews of the English language historiography, proves not only the rising interest to this topic, but also understanding of the long-term significance of the Russian factor and Russia’s general influence on the modern socio-political life in Ukraine. In this sense, politologists’ forecasts look especially convincing. As the Ukrainian scholar Y.Zherebetskyi mentioned, due to an expected important change in geopolitical

situation in the near future, the loss of Siberia and the Far East, “Moscow would try to compensate it with its geopolitical success in the West, trying to join Ukraine and Bilorus”<sup>27</sup>.

As far as Ukraine concerns, the analysts are expecting further development of wide discussion on the role of historical and cultural traditions in the process of state formation, and the using of national factor in the political struggle. Under these circumstances, the important point for scholars of social sciences is to realize that “cultural factor possesses the highest degree of correlation with political processes”<sup>28</sup>. Grounded scientific knowledge of the problems and state of Ukrainians and other peoples living on Ukrainian territory, is the important instrument in preventing complications of inter-ethnic relations. Even today it is clear that not only problems of our historical past, but also current steps in nation- and state formation may produce some false situation, inadequate to historical reality. For example, the leaders of the Jewish community in Ukraine do not agree with the results of the 2001 census of population, according to which the numerical quantity of the Jewish people makes up 103.591 and insist on the fact that it is from 300 to 500 thousand people. To their mind, about 200 thousand Ukrainian citizens at the least, were afraid to inform their nationality because of deeply historically rooted fear<sup>29</sup>.

Painful historical facts, complicated socio-political reality for Ukrainian people to prove their independence, make historical research even more significant, cause wide discussion and scientific debates, co-ordination of efforts of native and foreign scholars. The problem of particular historical influence on the modern process of state formation in Ukraine is multi-sided and needs not only concentration of efforts of many experts but also considering thorough research done by western scholars with their rich experience of studying state formation problems. It is especially important under present conditions when due to the deep socio-political alterations at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, on the whole post-soviet area the methodological principles and many historical theories having been considered the most stable, are changed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Gellner E. Nations and nationalism. – Oxford, 1983. – P. 231.

<sup>2</sup> Brown M.E. Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict. – London, 1997; Connor W. Ethnonationalism. The Quest for Understanding. – Princeton, 1994; Hastings A. The construction of Nationhood. – Cambridge, 1997; Horowitz D.L. Ethnic Groups in Conflict. – London, 1985; Hutchinson J., Smith A. Nationalism. – Oxford, 1994.

<sup>3</sup> Osnovy etnoderzhavoznavstva. Pidruchnyk. – Kyiv, 1997. – P. 277, 278.

<sup>4</sup> The Future of Nation State: Essays on cultural Pluralism and Political Integration / Ed. by Gustavson S., Lewi L. – London, N.Y., 1996. – P. 44.

<sup>5</sup> Hechter M. Internal colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British national development, 1536 – 1966. – London, 1975. – P. 124.

<sup>6</sup> Spaibi T. Evropejs’ki natsional’ni derzhavy i globalizatsiya // Globalizatsiya. Regionalizatsiya. Regional’na polityka. Khrestomatiya z suchasnoi sotsiologii regioniv / Ukl. Kononov I.F., Borodachiv V.P., Topol’skov D.M. – Lugans’k , 2002. – P. 67.

<sup>7</sup> Giddens A. Contemporary critique of historical materialism. Vol. 2. The Nation-state and violence. – Cambridge, 1985. – P. 71.

<sup>8</sup> Dragomanov M. Vybrane. – Kyiv, 1991. – P. 520.

<sup>9</sup> Pritsak O. Prolegomena to the National Awakening of the Ukrainians during the nineteenth century / Culture and Nationalism in Nineteenth Century East Europe. – Columbus, 1985. – P. 97.

<sup>10</sup> Pritsak O. Op. cit. – Pp. 97 – 98.

<sup>11</sup> Zaryts’kyi T. Mozaika Tsentral’noi Evropy: Porivnyal’nyj analiz pol’s’kogo ta ukrains’kogo prostoriv // Globalizatsiya. Regionalizatsiya. Regional’na polityka. Khrestomatiya z suchasnoi sotsiologii regioniv... – P. 520.

<sup>12</sup> Pritsak O., Reshetar J.S. The Ukraine and the dialectics of nation-building // Slavic Review. Vol. XXII, № 2, 1963. – Pp. 224 – 225.

<sup>13</sup> Motyl A.J. From Imperial Decay to Imperial Collapse : The Fall of the Soviet Empire in Comparative Perspective. In: Nationalism and Empire. The Habsburg Empire and the Soviet Union. – Ed. by R.L.Rudolf and D.F Good. – Minnesota, 1992. – P. 20.

<sup>14</sup> The Future of the Nation State... – P. 147.

<sup>15</sup> Kurth J. The Baltics: Between Russia and the West // Current History. – 1999. – Vol. 98. – №. 630. – P. 336.

<sup>16</sup> Smith A.D. Nationalism and modernism: A critical survey of recent theories of nations and nationalism. – London, N.Y., 1998. – P. 75.

<sup>17</sup> Etnichnost’ i vlast’ v polietnicheskikh gosudarstvakh. – Moscow, 1994. – P. 14.

<sup>18</sup> Giddens A. Contemporary critique of historical materialism ... – P. 83.

<sup>19</sup> Kitschelt H. Formation of party cleavages in post-communist democracies: theoretical propositions // Party Politics. – 1995. – № 1 (4). – P. 59.

<sup>20</sup> Kitschelt H. Formation of party... – P. 61.

<sup>21</sup> Rakovska-Harmstone T. The dilemma of Nationalism in the Soviet Union // The Soviet Union under the Brezhnev and Kosygin./ Ed. By John W.Strong. – Cincinnati; Toronto, London, Melbourne, 1971. – P. 116.

<sup>22</sup> Rowley, David G. Imperial versus national discourse: the case of Russia // Nations and Nationalism . – 2000. – № 6. – P. 43.

- <sup>23</sup> Kurchevs'ka I. Rozpad pislyakomunistychnoi Evropy – novi i stari susidstva natsional'nyh kul'tur // Politychna dumka. – 2002. – № 1. – P. 73.
- <sup>24</sup> Politicheskie nastroeniya nakanune vyborov. Ukraina. Dekabr' 1997. – Kiev, 1998. – P. 18, 21.
- <sup>25</sup> Wolchuk K. History, Europe and the “National Idea”: the “Official” Narrative of National Identity in Ukraine // Nationalities Papers. – 2000. – Vol. 28, № 4. – Pp. 675 – 676.
- <sup>26</sup> Petrovskyi V. Sovremennye ukrainsko-rossijskie otnosheniya v zapadnoj interpretatsii. – Har'kov, 2002.
- <sup>27</sup> Zherebets'kyi Y. Kinets' imperii? // Dzerkalo tyzhnya. – 2003. – 11. 01. – P. 3
- <sup>28</sup> Chernysh N. Politychni transformatsii v Ukraini u 90-h rokakh // Polska – Niemcy – Ukraina w Europie. Doswiadszenia z transformacji i wspolpracy. – Rzeszow, 1998. – P. 53.
- <sup>29</sup> Macisaac D. Jews underrepresented in census, leaders claim // Kyiv Post. – 2003. – Feb. 6<sup>th</sup>.

**Наталія ТЕРЕС**  
**Київ**

## **ІСТОРИЧНІ ТРАДИЦІЇ ТА СУЧАСНЕ НАЦІОНАЛЬНО-ДЕРЖАВНЕ БУДІВНИЦТВО В УКРАЇНІ В ОЦІНЦІ ЗАРУБІЖНОЇ ІСТОРИОГРАФІЇ**

*Стаття присвячена вивченню в англomовній зарубіжній історіографії окремих аспектів впливу історичних та історико-культурних традицій на процес державотворення в сучасній Україні. Звертається увага на здобутки зарубіжних дослідників у вивченні зв'язку між формуванням нації та утворенням держави, оцінкою значення та впливу Російської, Австро-Угорської імперій та СРСР на процес формування головних державотворчих засад сучасної України.*