



*Darina Grigorova,
Assoc. Prof. Dr. in Russian History
Faculty of History,
Sofia University,
Head of Eurasia center VIA EVRASIA*

**UKRAINIAN JANUS BETWEEN GALICIA AND MALORUSSIA:
FORMATION OF NATIONAL IMAGE AGAINST THE BACKDROP OF
THE GEOPOLITICAL TECHTONICS (19TH-21ST CENTURY)**

Why Ukrainian Janus?

Why Ukrainian Janus? Already since the 19th century, the Ukrainian dualism has been an object to self-reflection on the part of the Ukrainians and “external” studies in terms of the different historical narrative, in accordance with the own national structure and geopolitical identification – whether Russian, Polish, German or Austrian.

The national self-awareness is something fragile and more susceptible to irrational uniting factors, which resist the mass political invasion and, vice versa,

react to nano impulses, such as a single sentence of Paissii of Childenar: “Oh, you insensible and stupid people, why are you afraid to call yourself Bulgarians!”, the spells of a poet, like Hristo Botev (unpopular for his time, unlike the short-lived poetical talent of Stefan Stambolov but having decoded the Bulgarian National Revival spirit forever) or a sacred figure, such as Vassil Levski, having followed irrational behaviour¹ in order to trigger alone the fight for Bulgaria’s liberation, while most Bulgarians were far away from being revolutionary minded. In his book “Records of Bulgarian Uprisings”, Zahari Stoyanov outlines best the broad attitudes among the Bulgarians, while Benkovski urged the citizens of Panagyurishte to join the April Uprising: windows would open, then close and that was all². However, it was Benkovski’s hoarse voice and not the philistine, complacent passivity that became a part of the national identity.

Luckily, our historical destiny has spared us the painful dual consciousness, which is rather typical for the modern Macedonians (while not being verbalized, the Bulgarian roots cannot be forgotten, even when artifacts of the medieval Bulgarian state in today’s Macedonian territory are being destroyed) and for the Ukrainians’ national self-awareness already at the beginning of their National Revival in the 19th century.

1 *“...Panayot Hitov withdrew in Bulgaria under the highest mercy of the Government, the head of the Flying Detachment, Totyu, became a tavern-keeper in Odessa, Zhelyu became a tile-maker in Braila, fabulous Dishliya was appointed as controller of the quality of the wine, offered in the taverns, Rakovski had been buried for a long time, Kassabov published official information that his name was not Kassabov but Kassabiano, i.e. they were all disappointed. Everyone sought not to fight Turkey but his own existence... ..Apathy reigned everywhere, a fear before the Turkish greatness and self-confession that the Bulgarians should get redemption with patience and supplications to the Bosphorus Giant.*

Only Levski did not wish to make a compromise with the spirit of the epoch...”:

3. Стоянов. Васил Левски (Дяконът). Черти из живота му. http://www.promacedonia.org/zs/zs_9.htm

2 *“The doors and windows were shut noisily, as if the whole marketplace was full of blacksmiths and the street in front of us became deserted in two or three minutes [...] “Riot, riot! Get out! The citizens of Koprivshitsa have been fighting for five hours now,” we cried. We split in pairs, Benkovski and Volov, from the one side, and Ikonomov and me, from the other, and entered the neighbourhood, along the Pazardjik road. In vain did we cry “Riot!” and “Take your arms!” There was not a single man in the streets but only curious women and children stood at the walls and stared at us with great attention. Everyone has managed to go home, running away from our voices, as if we were evil spirits.”* Захари Стоянов, Записки по българските въстания. <http://www.slovo.bg/showwork.php3?AuID=149&WorkID=5774&Level=3>

The Ukrainian dualism is, of the one part, Ukrainian-Russian and, of the other – Galician-Malorussian. The family of Russian philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev sets the best example of the Russian-Ukrainian dualism: two brothers by birth, representing two nations – the Russian and the Ukrainian. Sergei Berdyaev chose to be Ukrainian, while Nikolai Berdyaev had Russian self-awareness³. This was not narrowly specific for the end of the 19th century and the non-Soviet emigrant 20th century, when George Vernadsky, a Russian history lecturer at the Yale University, who introduced the Eurasian periodization, considered himself “simultaneously as Ukrainian and Russian”⁴. The same phenomenon is typical of modern Russia as well: radio journalist Anastasia Onoshko has Russian identity, while her sister – Ukrainian one and this does not cause any controversies or inferiority complexes. It is a matter of choice and self-perception. On the literary plane, the Russian-Ukrainian dualism is manifested as “Russian-Ukrainian intertextuality”⁵, using both languages and preserving the dual identity.

*Ukrainian Janus is not as Russian-Ukrainian,
as it is Galician-Malorussian*

The Ukrainian identity, based on the model of Galicia (the western Ukrainian land, over which Russia lost control in the middle of the 14th century until the beginning of WW II (1939), is ethno-centric, focused on Russophobia, anti-Semitism and anti-polonism, united by 1991. Today, it is a part of Eastern

3 Vadim Skuratovskij. Pour une typologie des relations culturelles russo-ukrainiennes. *Cahiers du Monde russe*, Vol. 36, No. 4, L'ukraine ancienne et nouvelle, Réflexions sur le passé culturel et le présent politique de l'Ukraine (Oct.–Dec., 1995), p. 409.

4 Георгий Вернадский: “считаю себя украинцем и русским одновременно”. – *Ab Imperio*, 2006, 4, 347–369.

5 Shakandrij M. *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times* (McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001), 269.

Orthodox Ukraine (Ukrainian Orthodox Church – Kiev Patriarchy). In the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, their language was full of Polish and German words as a result of the Austrian policy.

During WWI Russophilic-minded Galicians, Ruthenians, who called themselves Moscowphiles in the 19th century, died in Austrian concentration camps in Terezin and Talerhof. Today, part of their successors is a minority in Western Ukraine keeping a low profile. The Ruthenians in the region beyond the Carpathians, remained protected from the mountain and, as uninteresting Ukrainian periphery, preserved their nationality. In the 19th century their ethnic identity, was transformed into a national – Ruthenian – one in the 20th century, being ethno-dualistic (accepting kinship with the Russian culture as the closest but also feeling emancipated from it).

The anthisemithism of the Ukrainian ethno-centric model was first revealed in the outrages against the Jews during the Civil War in the 20th century, when the troops of Ukrainian socialist and nationalistic Symon Petliura cruelly killed the Jewish population in Ukraine. Petliura died in Paris (1926) from the hand of a Jew as a revenge for the massacres and the French court acquitted the assassin.

Petliura himself denied involvement in the antisemitic outrages in Ukraine and accused the Bolsheviks⁶ about them. Even today, Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko does not confess the involvement of the Kiev Army and the National Guard in the murders of civilians in Donbas although the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) found mass graves at places of deployment of the national battalions with corpses of tortured women, old people, without their

⁶ “Палачи наши большевки повсюду распускают слухи, будто бы украинские повстанцы уничтожают еврейское население. А, Главный Атаман Украинского Войска, не верю этому, не верю, ибо знаю, народ украинский, который, притесняемый грабителями-завоевателями, сам не может притеснять другой народ [...] еврейское население... уничтожают его сами большевики” Обращение С. Петлюры к населению Украины относительно недопущения еврейских погромов. – В: Симон Петлюра. Главный атаман в плену несбыточных надежд. М.–Спб., 2008, 314–315.

internal organs, sold on the black market, resembling the crimes performed by the Kosovo mafia during the war with Milosevic.

The Ukrainian identity, based on the model of Malorussia (Kiev and Eastern Ukraine) was a part of the Russian empire and, in the 19th century, it was revived on the grounds of the rediscovery of the Ukrainian culture, being related to the Russian one; Eastern Orthodox (largely belonging to Ukrainian Orthodox Church – Kiev Patriarchy). Its language was the melodious Ukrainian, the model was ethno-dualistic – they felt Russians and Ukrainians at the same time until the flagrant administrative interference of the imperial authorities under Alexander II after the Polish Uprising (1863), when the Ukrainophiles were treated as Polish agents and any activities of Ukrainian cultural life were prohibited (Ems Decree, 1876). Apart from distancing them from the Russian roots, this pushed them from Kiev to Lvov (Galicia), where the foundation of the Galician-styled modern Ukrainian nation were laid.

After the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian and the Russian empires after WWI, Western Ukraine became a Polish outskirt again, while the eastern territories, together with Novorossia became a Soviet project with the blessing of Lenin, a conscious champion of Ukrainization due to his pathological hatred towards everything Russian. During WWII (1939), the project was extended to cover Galicia.

The attitude towards the war – WWII for the Galician model and Great Patriotic for the Malorussian one - is the main dividing line between the two Ukrainian nations: the Galician (Western) one that sees collaborationists Stepan Bandera and Roman Shukhevych as its heroes and idolizes them, while not concealing its liking of Nazism, and the Eastern Ukrainians, six million of whom fought within the Soviet Army up to Berlin, observe 9 May as a sacred holiday and have preserved the dualistic Malorussian-styled Ukrainian-Russian model.

The Galician-styled ethno-centric model was reproduced during WWII not just as collaborationsim with Nazi Germany but also in the form of ethnic purges against Poles and Jews in Galicia, carried out by the Ukrainian nationalists of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) (already in the end of the 1930s the German intelligence, Abwehr, cooperated with OUN). It is not a mere chance that the outrages against Jews in Kiev and Lvov, the cruel ostentatious killing of the Polish citizens of Volyn (Volyn massacre, 1943) are compared to the Holocaust policy and are recognized as genocycle (in April 1943, 30-year old Mikola Lebed from OUN-Bandera suggested “to clean the whole revolutionary territory from the Polish population”). The Ukrainians, who volunteered in the Galician Waffeb SS Divison numbered 80,000⁷.

The Galician-styled nation-centric model was imposed on modern Ukraine after the disintegration of the USSR and began re-formatting the historical memory with fixation on the image of the enemy – Russia. This specific policy is determined precisely by Georgiy Kasianov, who introduced the term “nationalization of history”. Kasianov proposes two periods of “nationalization” of the Ukrainian history (the first is from the middle of the 19th century, has been completed by Mykhailo Hrushevsky lasting by the end of WWII; the second begins from the end of the 1980s and continues until present; historical cannon is established in both cases)⁸.

7 “Ukrainian partisans who mass-murdered Poles in 1943 followed the tactics they learned as collaborators in the Holocaust in 1942: detailed advance planning and site selection] persuasive assurances to local populations prior to actions] sudden encirclements of settlements] and then physical elimination of human beings. Ukrainians learned the techniques of mass murder from Germans. This is why UPA ethnic cleansing was striking in its efficiency”: Timothy Snyder. *Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999*. Yale University Press, 2003, p. 144, 160, 162, 165.

8 Georgiy Kasianov. “Nationalized” History: Past Continuous, Present Perfect, Future... *Laboratory of Transnational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography*. Edited by Kasianov, Georgiy, Ther, Philipp. (Central European University Press, Budapest-New York, 2009), 7, 15.

Another interesting term, proposed by Kasianov for the modern Ukrainian historical writings, is “normative historiography”, which is not influenced by the “field of force” of the “official historiography”, following the political status quo of the “patriotic extasy”⁹.

The specific dimension of the “nationalization” of Ukraine’s history after 1991 and, particularly, after the establishment of a Polish-styled Institute of National Memory (2006) are: the glorification of UPA and OUN (in 2008, Stepan Bandera was declared a national hero by President Viktor Yushenko, later cancelled under President Viktor Yanukovich); the interpretation of the “Holodomor” [hunger extermination] as a genocide against the Ukrainian nation¹⁰.

The policy of the Soviet authorities during collectivization (1932–1933) having resulted in the mass hunger in Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Caucasus and the Volga Valley can be defined as genocide but on social rather than national basis. It is directed against the Soviet village and the victims represent different nationalities only because they inhabit the rich grain areas of the USSR.

For 23 years of independence, the Ukrainian nation, acting in Galician style, failed to bend the Eastern Ukrainians but has influenced a large part of the young generation, which smilingly makes Molotov cocktails and - without any remorse – sets their fellow citizens on fire only because of the Georgian ribbon as witnessed in Odessa (2 May 2014 – the Odessa Hatin). The attempt to impose the Galician-styled ethno-centric model has resulted in the partial and undeclared civil war in Donbas in 2014.

Andreas Kappeler notes the mistake of the Ukrainian authorities after 1991 and, particularly, after the Orange Revolution (2004) to idealize Stepan Bandera

9 Георгий Касьянов. Современное состояние украинской историографии: методологические и институциональные аспекты. *Ab Imperio: Теория и история национальностей и национализма в постсоветском пространстве*. № 2, 2003, 493–494.

10 Georgiy Kasianov. *The “Nationalization” of History in Ukraine*. – *The Convolution of Historical Politics*. Edited by Alexei Liller and Maria Lipman. (Central European University Press. Budapest–New York, 2012), p. 150, 153, 156, 159.

and persons, such as Petliura or Mazepa. They cannot be uniting for the whole Ukraine, which is multi-ethnic. According to Kappeler, the most appropriate Ukrainian historical hero would be Bogdan Khmelnytsky because this will extend “the narrow mono-ethno-national approach” to the multiethnic Ukrainian history¹¹.

Another approach to the Ukrainian history and identity is the one of the “transnational history”, which is trying to avoid the “national frameworks of historiography” and has been rather fashionable for some time now – as part of the re-formatting of the historical science in accordance with the criteria of globalization. The definition of Philipp Ther of “transnational history” is most of all a study of the trans-cultural relations rather than diplomacy or internationalism¹². This is a specific continuation of the approach of “crossed culture” or “crossed history”, introduced in France in the 1980s¹³.

Such theoretical structures are interesting, particularly, in comparative history but in case of a painful dualism in the national identity with historical burdens (a legacy of two empires – the Hapsburg and the Russian ones), such as the one witnessed in Ukraine, these structures could hardly outline the panacea for reconciliation and the building of a common identity or at least one, which is not burdened with self-destructive anomosity.

“Central European” – “Eastern European” – “Post-Soviet” Ukrainian Identity

The Canadian historian of Ukrainian origin, John-Paul Himka identifies two modern Ukrainian identities: “Central European” and “post-Soviet”, differentiated

11 Andreas Kappeler. *From an Ethnonational to a Multiethnic to a Transnational Ukrainian History*. Laboratory of Transnational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography. Edited by Kasianov, Georgiy, Ther, Philipp. (Central European University Press, Budapest-New York, 2009), 61, 72.

12 Philipp Ther. *The Transnational Paradigm of Historiography and Its Potential for Ukrainian History*. Laboratory of Transnational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography. Edited by Kasianov, Georgiy, Ther, Philipp. (Central European University Press, Budapest-New York, 2009), 82, 84, 86.

13 “histoire croisee” (“crossed history”)

on geographical and linguistic principle. “People with Central European identity speak Ukrainian and it dominates in the west, while people with post-Soviet identity speak Russian and it is spread almost everywhere in Ukraine”; Galicia is the heart of the “Central European” Ukrainian identity, while the “post-Soviet” Ukrainian identity is spread in Soviet Ukraine within its borders by 1939 (the annexation of Galicia by Stalin). Particularly in regards to Kiev, Himka establishes the emergence of a “Euro-Ukrainian” identity, which is represented by the elite and has the characteristics of an “all-Ukrainian” identity, which has yet not been completed¹⁴.

However, the language in post-Soviet Ukraine is not such nation-forming factor. It rather plays a political role and is used by the different regional forces for electoral victory. The second Majdan showed the existence of citizens speaking Russian without the specific hollow “h”. However, these people have Ukrainian ethno-centric self-awareness of citizens of the South East, which is a result of the policy of “nationalization of history”, enforced after the Orange Revolution but having begun already in the first years of independence of Ukraine. At the same time, there are Ukrainian-speaking citizens having preserved the ethno-dualistic model of Malorussia but speaking Russian with an accent.

Himka gives examples for the restructuring of the “Central European” Ukrainian identity after 1991 through the Ukrainian Diaspora in Canada and USA, representing mostly the western regions and heirs of collaborationists from UPA and OUN. Himka also underscores the specific role of the Greek Catholic Church in Ukraine, which was revived in 1989 and whose Mitropolitan in Lvov is of American origin. The rectors of the Lvov Theological Academy (the future Ukrainian Catholic University) are also immigrants. The same applies to the people

14 “*Central European Identity*”, “*post-Soviet Identity*”, “*Euro-ukrainian Identity the most all-Ukrainian Identity in Ukraine*”: John-Paul Himka. *The Basic Historical Identity Formations in Ukraine: A Typology. Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1/4, RUS' WRIT LARGE: LANGUAGES, HISTORIES, CULTURES: Essays Presented in Honor of Michael S. Flier on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday (2006), pp. 483–484, 495.

from the circle of the Orange authorities, such as the justice minister, who was an American of Ukrainian origin. Many non-governmental organizations, representing the Ukrainian Diaspora in Canada, also held key positions after 2004¹⁵.

Himka objects to the glorification of UPA and OUN after 1991 and the canonization of the role of Hitler's collaborationists during WWII as "key for the Ukrainian identity", whereby he has drawn the anger of the modern Ukrainian nationalists, who accused them of treachery. Himka identifies himself as Ukrainian, speaks Ukrainian within his family and upbrings his children in Canada in the same spirit. The fact that Himka is not Greek Catholic but Eastern Orthodox Ukrainian has probably also contributed to his neo-nationalist views, far away from the ethno-centrism of the followers of UPA. In 2010, he wrote to a friend that he has lost the fight and that "to be Ukrainian today means to accept their [UPA's] legacy"¹⁶.

Not only John-Paul Himka is an object to aggressive criticism due to his alternative thinking. Far more moderate historians and even ones, approving of the Galician model, as Mark von Hagen suffer from attacks from the Ukrainian censorship, which stifles any, even slightly deviating, interpretation of the Ukrainian identity. Von Hagen says that he has been compared with a "Russian imperial wolf"¹⁷.

15 John-Paul Himka. The Basic Historical Identity Formations in Ukraine: A Typology. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1/4, RUS' WRIT LARGE: LANGUAGES, HISTORIES, CULTURES: Essays Presented in Honor of Michael S. Flier on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday (2006), p. 493–494.

16 "I think I may be done crusading. But my crusade was not anti-OUN-UPA as such, it was a crusade to keep OUN-UPA from becoming a central point of Ukrainian identity. I think I lost that battle. To be 'Ukrainian' today means to embrace their heritage". John-Paul Himka to Alan Rutkowski, April 29, 2010. John-Paul Himka. *Challenging the Myths of Twentieth-Century Ukrainian History. – The Convolution of Historical Politics*. Edited by Alexei Liller and Maria Lipman. (Central European University Press. Budapest–New York, 2012), 226.

17 Marc von Hagen. *Revisiting the Histories of Ukraine*. Laboratory of Transnational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography. Edited by Kasianov, Georgiy, Ther, Philipp. (Central European University Press, Budapest-New York, 2009), 27.

The term “galicianization” has been expressly introduced for the forced Galician-styled ukrainization of Southeastern Ukraine and expressly for Donbas¹⁸. The “Galician import” finds an expression even in the symbols of independent Ukraine, which has accepted the colours and the coat-of-arms of the Ukrainian People’s Republic at the time of the disintegration of the Roman Empire (1917). The Ukrainian nationalistic narrative presents the yellow-and-blue flag as continuity from Kievan Rus and the Zaporozhye Cossacks, which is a part of the national mythology, developed by the Polish chroniclers and their successor – Mykhailo Hrushevsky – and presenting the Kievan Rus as Ukrainian and Russia – as Tatar state. This flag appeared for the first time in Lvov (1848), which was within Austria at that time, while in Donbas it was enforced for a brief period of time by the Ukrainian nationalists (1918), allies of Germany during WWI, when they destroyed the Donetsk Republic¹⁹.

Serhii Plokhy outlines two “Eastern European identities” – “Ukraine” and “Malorussia”, and uses the term “Cossack nation”²⁰. Regarding the post-Soviet period of Ukraine, he also observed a tendency of “orientation of the national culture to the West and underscoring the differences with the Russian culture and tradition”. Plokhy, however, presented the modern Russian national idea in a simplified manner as having “purely anti-Western orientation” and manifestation of “pan-Russism”²¹.

18 “Galicianization” (*Galitsyzatsiia*): Andrew Wilson. The Donbas between Ukraine and Russia: The Use of History in Political Disputes. *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Apr., 1995), 281.

19 Andrew Wilson. The Donbas between Ukraine and Russia: The Use of History in Political Disputes. *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Apr., 1995), p. 282.

20 “Today, it is clear that the terms “Ukraine” and “Little Russia” represent very different East Slavic identities. But is there *good reason to believe that they also denoted different national identities in early modern times?*”: Serhii Plokhy. *The Origins of the Slavic Nations. Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus*. (Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 302, 339.

21 Serhii Plokhy. The Ghosts of Pereyaslav: Russo-Ukrainian Historical Debates in the Post-Soviet Era. *Europe-Asia Studies*, Vol. 53, No. 3 (May, 2001), p. 502.

In an article with a challenging title “Does Ukraine Have a History?”, Marc von Hagen does not talk only about “Central European” or “Eastern European” identity about Ukraine but develops the idea that the Ukrainians are “a part of the big dilemma between Eastern and Central Europe”. It is yet another issue that Von Hagen develops the idea that Ukraine will have a history, only if it secedes from Russia through a denial of its post-Soviet past, allowing also the possibility for imposing the “dogma of integral nationalism” as a “triumph of the Ukrainian nation”²². Marc von Hagen admits the existence of a dilemma and dualism of the Ukrainian identity only for the past but it applies to the present as well.

Andreas Kappeler also prefers the concept of “Eastern Slav identity”, which is in the process of formation based on different scenarios”²³ in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Other terms, showing the dualism of the Ukrainian identity, are the division into “communists” and “nationalists” (to a certain extent, this coincides with the typology of John-Paul Himka). The Ukrainian communists are presented as part of the “artificial Soviet culture”, while the “strategic partnership” between Ukraine and USA is determined as having primary importance for the national structuring. They would quote Zbigniew Brzezinski (1996) as saying that USA is a guarantor that Ukraine “will not be re-integrated into the Russian empire”²⁴. Brzezinski assigns Ukraine the role of a barrier to Russian influence and a guarantor for the

22 Mark von Hagen. Does Ukraine Have a History? *Slavic Review*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Autumn, 1995), p. 659, 664–665.

23 Alexei Miller. *Ukrainian Question: Russian Nationalism in the 19th Century*. (CEU Press, 2003), 37.

24 “Ukrainians have been fearful that an American-Russian accommodation might leave their country vulnerable to reintegration within the Russian empire”: Zbigniew Brzezinski. *Ukraine: the search for a national identity*. Edited by Sharon L. Wolchik and Volodymyr Zviglyanich, (Rowman&Littlefield publishers, Ins. 2000), p. xi, xiv.

security of Poland, Romania and even Turkey²⁵. Due to its enormous territory, according to European standards, Ukraine is used as a key unit in the Eastern Partnership Project, aimed at the building of a sanitary cordon of former Soviet republics between the Russian Federation and the European Union.

Brzezinski, who does not conceal the priority strategic interests of USA in Ukraine, defines Ukraine's geopolitical identity as single and "Central European".

Ukraine's role as anti-Russian geopolitical barrier between Europe and Russia is an old view, shared by the Ukrainian nationalists already in the beginning of the 20th century. Simon Petliura promoted the idea about the Russian threat for Europe and, thence, the mission of the Ukrainian state in the "final and irreversible division" of Russia²⁶. Petliura set an ultimate goal for the exiled Ukrainian immigrants: destruction of Russia. Regarding Poland, he was adamant: "The Poles are weak as colonizers". In the spring of 1920, he was inclined to cooperate with them against the "historical and eternal enemy": "the Moscovism with its sick culture with big contrasts"²⁷.

Poland is not less interested in similar cooperation and, after 1991, it has strengthened its contacts with independent Ukraine as a specific mediator in its relations with EU and NATO. According to Marc von Hagen, former Polish presidents Lech Walesa and Aleksander Kwasniewski "rushed to be advocates of

25 "First of all, Ukraine's existence enhances the security of Poland by reducing a traditional dilemma that Poland had always faced, namely that of threatening powers existing simultaneously on its western and eastern frontiers. Ukraine's existence also enhances the security of Romania, which is far more safe today than when it bordered on the Soviet Union or on the Russian Empire. It enhances the security of Turkey and it makes Turkey much more confident in its dealings with its neighbors, and it even shuts off, in effect, a geopolitically significant access by Russia to the Mediterranean region": Zbigniew Brzezinski. *Ukraine's Critical Role in the Post-Soviet. Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 20, UKRAINE IN THE WORLD: Studies in the International Relations and Security Structure of a Newly Independent State (1996), p. 4, 7.

26 "...мы должны скопрометировать идею реставрации великой России как идею нереальную, искусственную и невыгодную для Европы, представляя вместо ее план ее раздела в качестве наиболее целесообразного решения надоевшего, беспокойного вопроса, который всегда таил в себе, да и теперь таит в себе угрозу и опасность для Европы". Симон Петлюра. *Борьба против "Великой и единой России"*. – В: Симон Петлюра. *Главный атаман в плену несбыточных надежд*. М. – Спб., 2008, с. 409, 411.

27 Письмо С. Петлюры Военному Министру УНР об отношениях с поляками. 30 декабря 1921 года. – Симон Петлюра. *Главный атаман в плену несбыточных надежд*. М. – Спб., 2008, с. 321, 323.

Ukraine for its accession to EU and NATO”. The Polish universities actively develop Ukrainian studies and translate Ukrainian authors on a larger scale, while the latter’s opinions on the national questions are an object to public discussions²⁸. This has been a permanent and consistent political line already since 1991, unlike Russia, which neglects its participation in the Ukrainian cultural area and, even less, popularizes it on its own terrain.

The most frequent explanation of the Ukrainian dualism is the referral to the historical narrative of the Ukrainian nationalists of the 19th century that the “Ukrainian dichotomic character” is a result of the “clash of nation and empire”. The followers of this version consider the Ukrainians as a single nation, which wrongly has had “regional Malorussian identity”, combined with the “imperial Ruthenian identity”, while Russia has nothing to do with Rus, Kiev and, therefore, with the Ukrainians²⁹ (which is a repetition of the Polish historiographic theory from the 16th century until present).

The researchers, who accept the relation between Kievan Rus and Russia as conditional and, mostly, as part of the Russian historical writings, call the medieval Russian state “a medieval East Slavic state” and describe the ethnic identity, Rus, as “non-identifiable”³⁰.

Two empires – Two Ukrainian Nations (19th century)

28 Marc von Hagen. *Revisiting the Histories of Ukraine*. Laboratory of Transnational History: Ukraine and Recent Ukrainian Historiography. Edited by Kasianov, Georgiy, Ther, Philipp. (Central European University Press, Budapest-New York, 2009) 29.

29The Ambiguities of National Identity: The Case of Ukraine Orest Subtelny. *Ukraine: the search for a national identity*. Edited by Sharon L. Wolchik and Volodymyr Zvygnyanich. (Rowman&Littlefield publishers, Ins. 2000), p. 1, 3.

30“Kievan Rus, the medieval East Slavic state”, “the elusive nation”: Serhii Plokhyy. *The Origins of the Slavic Nations. Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus*. Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 1–2. “The ancient Eastern Slavic state of Kyivan (Kievan) Rus”: Mikhail A. Molchanov. *Borders of Identity: Ukraine's Political and Cultural Significance for Russia*. *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*, Vol. 38, No. 1/2 (MARCH–JUNE 1996), p. 182.

It is not a mere chance that the 19th century, influenced by the European Romanticism, became an incubator of nationalism. The Russian national idea emerged after the Patriotic War (1812), when all layers of the society took part in the defence and, then, into the victorious campaign. After 1812, the state began a consistent policy of creation of a national community preserving the imperial principle (Eastern Orthodox = Russian, irrespective of the ethnic roots), but also adding (Russian = European, as affiliation to the Russian culture and language, created by Pushkin). The aristocracy began writing in Russian, parallel to the French (the Russian was introduced at the latest in the documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs under Alexander III. By that time, the French was the leading language).

Under Nikolay I, not only the whole history of the Russian statehood of Nikolay Karamzin was published but also monumental sculpture and paintings dedicated to Russian history was also encouraged and financed. Of course, purely administrative extreme manifestations of bureaucratic patriotism, based on Uvarov's "Triad", also followed (Eastern Orthodox religion–autocracy–nationality), which is inevitable for an imperial structure, such as the Russian one, but the general tendency of patronage of the study and the discussion of the Russian history and culture creates the lasting background of the European cultural identity of the Russian nation.

The Patriotic War of 1812, after its glorification by Mikhail Lermontov ("Borodino"), Lev Tolstoy ("War and Peace") and Pytor Tchaikovsky ("Overture 1812"), became a part of the nation's soul for all times³¹.

31 It is not a mere chance that the Bolsheviks, following the initially international (actually, globalist) project of Lenin, who tried to destroy everything Russian and replace it with inter-proletarian. In the 1920s, under the direction of historian Mikhail Pokrovsky, the study of Russian history, the terms "Russia", "patriotic", "patriotism" were prohibited; monuments of arts, such as the Christ Saviour Church (because this church was built in honour of 1812) were blasted, national Russian heroes, such as Alexander Nevsky, Minin and Pozharsky, etc. were banned. A commission in charge of Latinizing the Cyrillic alphabet was set up and the replacement of Russian with Esperanto – planned. That anti-Russian policy lasted for a decade after the end of the Civil War. It was changed by Stalin as of the middle of the 1930s, when the effect of the pendulum reversed the direction and, by WWII and already during the war, the Russian symbols were restored as an uniting factor for the Soviet nation.

The 19th century also shaped the Ukrainian nation with two faces of Janus – Malorussian (ethno-dualistic within the Russian Empire) and Galician (ethno-centric within the Hapsburg Empire). Two empires – two Ukrainian nations, whose cultural dualism and incompatibility is a fact even today.

*Romantic Ukrainophilia in Russia:
“Ukrainians”, “Malorussians” or “South Russians”*

The first half of the 19th century is accepted as the romantic period of formation of the Ukrainian nation within the Russian Empire. The interest in the Ukrainian language and culture begins from the Slav circles and, initially, it did not have a political but a purely academic nature. Usually, the gradual revival and, then, the political evolvement of the people into a nation are explained with the research in the area of ethnography and folklore having rediscovered the Ukrainians in the Russian Empire.

Undoubtedly, all published collections of songs and proverbs and, then, the searching for specific historical interpretations of the past, independent from the Russian historical writings, is an important incentive for the national educational process with the Ukrainians.

However, the Russian and the Polish revolutionary movements have exerted not smaller but equal and, maybe, even stronger influence on the future Ukrainians. Without the Russian democrats and socialists, or “narodnitsi” [nationalists], as they called themselves, the Ukrainian nation would not have revived with such strength in the 19th century, to be completed by the rooting policy of the Bolsheviks in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in the 1920s.

It is true that democrat Vissarion Belinsky (similarly to Pushkin during the Polish Uprising in 1831) assumed a state and imperial position, not tolerating any ideas of separatism, while Aleksandr Herzen (liberal Westerner and founder of the Russian Socialism), as well as Mikhail Bakunin (the eternal practitioner-revolutionary and anarchist by soul and biography) and their followers among the Russian democratic intellectuals stand closely behind the aspiration for cultural and political autonomy both of the Poles and of the Ukrainians within the Slav Federation.

The two ideologists of the Ukrainophilia, Mikhail Dragomanov and Mykhailo Hrushevsky, developed the two opposite viewpoints for the Ukrainian nation in the 19th century. They were democrats and socialists receiving the support of the Russian democratic and socialist community and Hrushevsky – even of the Bolshevik and the Soviet ones. The reason for that is the common enemy – the autocracy and the faith in the world revolution of the socialists, as well as the democrats’ idealism for the building of a world without national, religious, social and any other animosities. While Mikhail Dragomanov remained a democrat and, thence, a cosmopolitan rather than patriot, Mykhailo Hrushevsky evolved from a socialist into a Ukrainian nationalist.

“Malorussia” vs “Ukraine”:

Struggle for Ukrainian National Concepts

The political design of the Ukrainian nation and the fight for the terms for defining it emerged for the first time within the educational Cyril and Methodius Society (brotherhood), 1847³² The Statute of the Society is strongly influenced by

32 There is also another chronological starting date for this struggle – the 1860s – and the two periods of “romanticization” of the concepts “Malorussian” and its “nationalization” (1859). See, the detailed analysis of the evolution of the terms “Malorussian” and “Ukrainian”: *Котенко, А.Л., Мартынюк, О.В., Миллер, А.И.* Малоросс. – Понятия о России. М., 2012, 392–443.

the liberal-democratic ideals for a Slav Federation of the Russian intellectuals, having exerted considerable impact on the Ukraianophiles as well (Nikolay Kostomarov, Pantaleon Kulish, Taras Shevchenko, etc.), and by the Polish revolutionary ideas and language.

The Society's political objective is "spiritual and political union of the Slavs into a Christian Federation", as each Slav people will have "its Rzeczpospolita" (republic) with cultural and social autonomy. The preference of a "Christian" to "Eastern Orthodox" federation is conscious and is due to the confessional differences (not so much due to the ones between Poles and Russians but because of the division between the Eastern Orthodox Malorussians in Russia and the Uniat Ruthenians in Galicia (within Austria as of the end of the 18th century after the division of Poland under Catherine II).

The democratic element in the Statute envisaging "overall equality and freedom and no social differences" echoed the Spring of Nations in Europe (1848). In this context, the Russian Ukrainophiles were not isolated. On the contrary, they were a part of the all-European tendency of the 19th century.

Russian emigrant and historian N. I. Ulyanov proposes the version of masonian continuity of the political ideas of the Federation of the Cyril and Methodius Society, having inherited the programme of the Decabrist masons of the Kiev Lodge of 1818, called United Slavs and set up with a strong Polish influence. Decabrist Kondraty Ryleev wrote poems idolizing the Cossacks and sets the beginning of their mythologization³³.

The most curious thing in the text of the Statute is the beginning of the fight of the terms describing the Ukrainian nation that has persisted up to the present day. The Cyril and Methodius Society began the policy of depersonalization of the concepts "Malorussian" and "Malorussia" and their replacement with the term

33 Ульянов, Н.И. Происхождения украинского сепаратизма. М., 2007, с. 163, 158–161.

“Ukrainian”, which was not popular by the end of the 19th century neither in Russia, nor even in Galicia, where the Slav population called themselves “Ruthenians”, while part of the intellectuals, polonized due to the century-long cohabitation and obedience to the Polish gentry gradually re-discovered themselves as “Ukrainians”. Another part of the Ruthenian intellectuals identified themselves with “Rus” and “Russia”. While in Russia the fight for a national concept was between “Malorussian” and “Ukrainian”, in Galicia (Austria), it was between “Ruthenian” and “Ukrainian”. The Ukrainian nationalists prevailed ultimately during WWI because they were supported by the Austrian and German authorities.

The set of concepts in the Ukrainian history proved basic for the structuring of national consciousness because, while no one denies the existence of a Ruthenian people in Galicia and of Malorussian in Russia, the structuring of a nation depends on the education, the writing, the language, and the name. This technology was known to the Ukrainophiles and through the 19th century they regularly re-formatted the meaning of the concept “Ukraine”, which changed from “pokrainina” [outskirts] (Russian, Polish or Austrian) to acquire the connotation of “national” (the national consciousness is irrational and works with symbols (images) rather than with rational definitions).

The Statute of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood consciously does not mention the term “Malorussia” or “Malorussionas” (because of Russia), or “Ruthenians” (because of Galicia and the memory of the Principality of Galicia having seceded from Kievan Rus after the Tatar-Mongol invasion and having survived for a century and a half after it until it was subdued by Poland and its population, converted from the Eastern Orthodox to the Greek Catholic religion). Instead, the Statute mentions “Ukrainians” or “Sothern Ruthenians”.

Alexei Miller’s understanding that the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood set the beginning of the “cultural transformation of the Ukrainophilia into a nationalist

ideology”³⁴ is partially categorical and could be true, if all texts of the brotherhood had followed the Statute. N. I. Kostomarov and P.A. Kulish rather present the Ukrainophilic and not the nationalistic point of view. Outside the Statute, in their personal correspondence or publications, the members of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood use the term “Malorussia” because by the end of the 19th century “Ukraine” was a literary concept with limited influence.

During his interrogation by the Russian authorities about the involvement in the brotherhood, Taras Shevchenko (the Ukrainian Pushkin – more as a national relic than as poetical talent) used the term “Malorussians” for the audience for his poems, while he did not use “Ukrainians” even on a single occasion³⁵.

Pantaleon Kulish did not neglect the term “Malorussia” like the Ukrainian nationalists but used it actively as a collective image of the “Malorussian” consciousness (as a synonym of the “Ukrainian” trying to outgrow the “Great Russian” one). He, himself, however, recognized the lack of popularity of the Ukarinophilia in Malorussia and placed his hopes on the young generation, fascinated by the democratic ideas³⁶. When mentioning Galicia, P. A. Kulish called it “Galician Rus” and not “Galician Ukraine”³⁷. He identified himself as “Malorussian”, which was for him a synonym of “Ukrainian”, while he did not spoke well of the Galicians: “although a Galician, he was an honest man, which is a rarity among Galicians”³⁸.

34 Alexei Miller. *Ukrainian Question: Russian Nationalism in the 19th Century*. CEU Press, 2003, p. 52.

35 Допрос Т.Г. Шевченка в 1847 г. (Из рукописных заметок Н.А. Ригельмана). – *Киевская старина*, 1902, № 2, с. 185.

36 “Я с глубокою горестью и презрением смотрю на современное малороссийское общество и успокаиваюсь душою только в будущих поколениях, которые призваны к самосознанию”. Письмо П.А. Кулиша к Г.П. Галагану. – *Киевская старина*, 1902, № 1, с. 6.

37 Письма П.А. Кулиша с А.Ф. Кистяковскому. – *Киевская старина*, 1902, № 2, с. 303, 312.

38 Письма П.А. Кулиша с А.Ф. Кистяковскому. – *Киевская старина*, № 3, с. 520, 522.

Part of the national emancipation of the Ukrainophiles through the fight of terms involves depersonalization of the “Russians” (national identity of the time of the empire: the term may be either “Rossiyanin”, introduced by Teofan Prokopovich under Peter I or “Russian subject”, popular in the 19th century but having in mind the Eastern Orthodox subject irrespective of the ethnic origin to “Great Russians” (popular characteristics not national) or “Moskals”³⁹.

Another specific detail of the future Ukrainophilic political theory, set in the Statute of the Cyril and Methodius Society, is the complex of the scapegoat, combined with a messianic feeling⁴⁰. Ukraine is presented as crucified and tormented by Poland and Russia. In the 20th century, the image of the victim is preserved but it is already of Germany and USSR, while after 1991 and, particularly, after the second Majdan (2013) – of USA and the Russian Federation.

In Mykhailo Hrushevsky’s writings, the complex of the victim goes as far as accusing the Poles of the outrages against the Jews ruling out any Ukrainian involvement in them⁴¹. The logic is that, if something bad has happened, it is Poland, Russia or Germany to be blamed.

The messianic feeling for the Ukrainians as carriers of freedom to the peoples of the Russian empire and saviours of the autocratic evil is traced in the Ukrainian writings of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Mykhailo Hrushevsky is convinced that the “advanced Ukrainian intellectuals” will liberate Russia from the “bureaucratic absolutism and centralism”⁴².

39 *Из истории "Общества св. Кирилла и Мефодия". Устав и правила. Прокламации. – Былое, 1906, 2, с. 67, 68.*

40 “Братья великороссияне и поляки!

Сие глаголет к вам Украина, нищая сестра ваша, которую вы распяли и растерзали, и которая не помнит зла и соболезнует о ваших бедствиях, и готова проливать кровь детей своих за вашу свободу”. *Из истории "Общества св. Кирилла и Мефодия". Устав и правила. Прокламации. – Былое, 1906, 2, с. 68.*

41 *Грушевский, М. Конец гетто. – В: Освобождение России и Украинский вопрос. Статьи и заметки. Спб., 1907, 146–148.*

42 *Грушевский, М. Освобождение России и Украинский вопрос. Статьи и заметки. Спб., 1907, с. 7.*

In December 1991, after USSR was denounced at the Bialowieza Forest by Boris Yeltsin, Leonid Kravchuk and Stanislav Shushkevich, the idea of the key role of the Ukrainian President in the liberation of the Soviet peoples of USSR is being imposed. After the two majdans – not so explicitly after the Orange one (2004) but more categorically after the second one (2013–2014), the version that Ukraine is a “liberator” of the Russian people from the “putinization” has been circulated.

When Mikhail Khodorkovsky visited the Majdan after the ousting of Viktor Yanukovich, it was not a mere chance that the crowd welcomed him with shouts “Stand up, Russia!” One of the most frequently seen posters in the peaceful stage of the Majdan was: “We Love the Russians but We Do Not Love Putin”, as in the 19th century, they would say “We love the Great Russians but not Autocracy”.

This “liberator” role, as part of the Ukrainian national mythology, was developed already in the 19th century by opposing the free Cossack spirit to the serf mentality of the Russian.

Of course, the existence of Russian Cossacks, such as the Don ones, having nothing to do with the Zaporozhye Cossacks, is a detail, which is not commented by the Ukrainian ideologists because what matters in this case is not the historical fact but the Cossack myth, as one of the pillars of the emancipated Ukrainian history. It is not being noticed that there have never been Cossacks in Galicia either. However, this is not an obstacle for the national Ukrainian mythology, namely, because the nation lives in a mythological and not in real time. Therefore, opposing the national myth to the rational arguments is a waste of time and effort. A myth can be refuted only by another myth.

For this reason, during the Majdan, the Russian media actively revived the image of the fascist, who is unconditionally present among the neo-Nazi followers of most of the Ukrainian nationalist groupings. Unfortunately, from armed defendants of the Majdan, they turned into a National Guard and part of the

security forces in Kiev. However, the phenomenon of the Ukrainian Majdan cannot be described only with the neo-Nazism or only with the technology of the coup d'état based on a recipe of the colour revolutions. Here, the logic is redundant. It is the symbol that matters. For the Russian, unlike the common European, who is not used to sacrifice himself for anything and has a more pragmatic and realistic approach to life, fascism is an absolute evil, which he defeated on 9 May 1945. He would always mobilize for a new fight because the messianic feeling is a part of the Russian national idea and conduct.

“South Russian” vs “North Russian” identity

The Ukrainophile, Nikolay Kostomarov, proposes to build the Ukrainian national identification on the dualism, “south” vs “north” Russian people, as, in his opinion, the Ukrainian people represent the “South Russian” identity. Kostomarov does not avoid the term “Malorussian” but identifies it with the “South Russian” one, as well as the “Great Russian” with the “North Russian” one. The South Russian beginning is the federative, while the North Russian – the autocratic⁴³. Kostomarov accepts the concepts “Ukraine”, “Malorussia” and “Getmanshtina” as archaisms of the 17th century, while the “South Russians” is perceived as a modern literary term of the 19th century⁴⁴.

43 Nikolay Kostomarov outlines six Russian nationalities: South Russian, Northern, Great Russian, Balrusian, Polish and Novgorod as all six are referred to as “Russian land”, fighting with the two beginnings – federative and autocratic, as the former is characteristic of South Rus and Novgorod: *“Русь стремилась к федерации.. Вся история Руси... есть постепенное развитие федеративного начала, но вместе с тем и борьбы его с началом единодержавия”*. Костомаров, Н. Мысли о федеративном начале в древней Руси. – *Основа*, 1861, 1, 135–136, 158.

44 *“В 17 веке являлись названия: Украина, Малороссия, Гетманщина, названия эти невольно сделались теперь архаизмами, ибо ни то, ни другое, ни третье е обнимало сферы всего народа, а означало только местные и временные явления его истории. Выдуманное в последнее время название Южноруссов остается пока книжным”*. Костомаров, Н.И. Две русские народности. – В: Исторические монографии и исследования. Кн. 1, Спб., 1913, с. 38.

The individualism and the personal freedom of the South Russians vs the collectivism and the community of the North Russians. The federative and democratic merits of the South Russians – the South Russian “community” is opposed to the North Russian “world” (commune)⁴⁵.

Russian liberal and writer in “Vestnik Evropy” Alexandr Pipin shared Kostomarov’s view and believed that there was compatibility between “South Russian” and “Southwest Russian”. He shaped his views under the influence of the Cossacks, in a “patriarchal-democratic spirit”. As Slavist, he discovered the “Slav revival” in the period of formation of the “South Russian awareness”⁴⁶.

It is not a mere chance that the liberal circle of “Vestnik Evropy” supported Ukrainophilia and promoted the rediscovery of the Ukrainian-Malorussian culture. Mikhail Dragomanov, who used to criticize everyone, spoke positively about “Vestnik Evropy” although from the point of view of the “Malorussian” patriotism. The idealization of the “Malorussians” (“idealism and tenacity”) vs the “Great Russians” (“utilitarianism and slackness”) was also joined by Ivan Turgenev, highly respected by the Ukrainophiles for his praise for the Ukrainian literature and people. At his funeral, Mikhail Dragomanov laid a wreath bearing the inscription “From the Ukrainian press”⁴⁷.

45 *“Москва, поработавшая и подчиняя других, тем самым возрождала идею общего отечества, только уже в другой форме, не в прежней федеративной, а единодержавной. Так становилась монархия Московская; так из нее образовались государственное русское тело. Ее гражданственная стихия есть общность, поглощение личности, так как в южнорусском элементе... так и в Новгороде, принцип личности постоянно показывал свою живучесть”*. Костомаров, Н.И. Две русские народности. – В: Исторические монографии и исследования. Кн. 1, Спб., 1913, с. 50, 55, 61.

46 Пытин, А.Н., Спасович, В.Д. История славянских литератур. Т. 1, Спб., 1879, с. 305, 315, 349, 377, 372.

47 *“Я вот из журналов наших потому люблю больше всех “Вестник Европы”, что в редакции его мало великороссов, и в нем наименее нашей великороссийской распущенности”*. – Цит по: Отношения Тургенева к украинской литературе. – Киевская старина, 1902, № 4, с. 22.

Nikolay Kostomarov also introduced the theory of the South Russian Eastern Orthodox denomination as “much more spiritual, vital and internally strong”⁴⁸ compared to the North Russian one, confined to ceremonies.

The quest for “true” followers of the Eastern Orthodox religion is due to their identity in many respects with Russians and Ukrainians. However, a new nation is to be formed, while the religion is common. So, the division will be into “true” believers, the South Russians, vs the Great Russian formalists. This “truthfulness” of the Ukrainian Eastern Orthodox religion, compared to the Russian, is repeated after Kostomarov by the Ukrainophiles and – in a more extreme form – by the Ukrainian nationalists. After 1990, the question is resolved with the split between Ukrainian Eastern Orthodox Church (Kiev Patriarchy) and Ukrainian Eastern Orthodox Church (Moscow Patriarchy)⁴⁹, which is a continuation of the political independence but at the moment creates serious problems in the Ukrainian congregation and is far from reconciling the two Ukrainian nations.

Nikolay Kostomarov does not imagine the Malorussians (South Russians) and the Great Russians (North Russians) in separate countries in spite of the differences between them and does not deny their common spirituality⁵⁰, like the Ukrainian nationalists after Mykhailo Hrushevsky.

48 *Костомаров, Н.* Мысли Южнорусса. О преподавании на южнорусском языке. – *Основа*, 1862, 5, с. 3.

49 In 1990 the Ukrainian Exarchy was granted administrative independence and renamed to Ukrainian Eastern Orthodox Church, headed by Kiev Metropolitan Filaret, who later proclaimed himself as Patriarch of the Church. From the perspective of the Moscow Patriarchy, Ukraine is a part of his canonic territory. Вж. *Кирилл Фролов.* Украина: выбор веры, выбор судьбы. Двадцать лет независимости Украины, двадцать лет борьбы за единство Русской Церкви. Спб., 2011.

50 “...расторжения никак нельзя ожидать между южнорусской и великорусской народностями, потому что они соединены не только по принципу государственной необходимости, но связаны и духовным родством веры и происхождения [...] уже в поздние времена влияние европейских идей – сочетание государственного единства с единством народности, зародило и у нас несправедливую мысль, что поддержка южнорусской народности и развитие южнорусского языка могут быть вредны для государственной целостности”. *Костомаров, Н.* Мысли Южнорусса. О преподавании на южнорусском языке. – *Основа*, 1862, 5, 4–5.

Kostomarov's position was similar to the one of the Ukraionophilic academic circle of public figures of the “Kievskaya Starina” magazine (1882—1906), who use “Malorussia” and “South Russia” synonymously and treat equally “Malorussian” and “Ukrainian” people.

The official Russian academic position, expressed in the encyclopedia of Brokgaуз and Efron, also defines the South Russians (or Malorussians) as a separate nationality but also as part of the three Russian nationalities (along with the Belarusians and Great Russians). Galicia-Volin also falls within “Malaya Rus”⁵¹.

Yuriy Venelin, who is Ruthenian with Malorussian identity also accepts the division into “South Russian” and “North Russian” nationalities. He considers the terms “Ruthenian”, “Russak”, “Russian” and “Rossiyanin” as synonymous. He pays special attention to the disputes between “Southerners” and “Northerners” for their “Ruthenian” affiliation (Rossism) among the common people divided into “mustached”/“усачи” and “bald-headed” (Southerners) and into “bearded”/“бородачи” (Northerners)⁵².

Yuriy Venelin mentions, however, a “third Russian tribe, Eastern or Volgan”, which he identifies with the Bulgarians due to the “language version used by the whole Russia for prayer”⁵³.

Actually, Yuriy Venelin’s interest towards Bulgarians is not purely Slavic or academic but has been prompted by his own research of the Russian roots outside Russia (he defines the historian’s work as studying the “historical skeleton” – in this case of the ancient Rus), due to his Russian origin. Venelin was searching for

51 Энциклопедический словарь Брокгауза и Ефрона, т. XIII. – В: <http://bibliotekar.ru/bem/96.htm>

52 “...ты скажешь, что ты Мало-Росс; все равно, все ты не Русский; и будет ли этот Росс велик или мал, для него все равно, только он убежден, что он не Русский, а Поляк, или Хохол, или Литва, или Козак, или Украинец, или что-либо похуже; словом, что он не свой. И в самом деле, можно ли человека почесть своим, который не носит красной или цветной рубашки, называет ци борцом, и не гаварит харашио, а добре!!”. Д. Ч. Юрий Венелин. О споре между южанами и северянами на счет их россизма. – В: Чтения в императорском обществе истории и древностей Российской при Московском университете. Заседание 29-го ноября, 1847 года. Год третий. № 4. М., 1847, с. 4.

53 Д. Ч. Юрий Венелин. О споре между южанами и северянами на счет их россизма..., с. 3.

Russians but discovered Bulgarians. Curiously, his observation identifying the Bulgarians with the “third Russian tribe” emerged in a review, published in 1847, only 17 years after the publication of “For Contemporary and Modern Bulgarians” (1829), where the Bulgarians are simply described as Slavs⁵⁴.

*“Cosmopolitanism” and “Europeanism” vs “Nationalism”:
Ukraionophilia of
Mikhail Dragomanov*

Mikhail Dragomanov develops the views of Nikolay Kostomarov and, like him, belongs to the Romantic Ukrainophilia. A democrat by spirit, Dragomanov categorically differentiates himself from the Ukrainian nationalists due to their aggressive rhetoric towards Russians and Poles. This Ukrainian enlightener focuses mostly on the study and promotion of the Ukrainian language and folklore: “the political history of the Ukrainian people as told by himself”⁵⁵.

Dragomanov’s idea about the Ukrainian national consciousness is dualistic (Ukrainian-Russian) and democratic. He is convinced that only the democratic ideas of the Russian literature are able to create Ukrainian national consciousness in Galicia⁵⁶.

54 “Болгары племя Славянское”. Венелин, Ю.И. Древние и нынешние болгаре в политическом, народописном, историческом и религиозном их отношении к россиянам. Т. 1, М., 1829, с. 1.

55 “Сам украинец родом... я во многом разделял стремления и идеи украинских националистов, но во многом они мне казались реакционными: я не мог разделять пренебрежения их к русской литературе, которую считал более развитую теперь, чем украинской; не нравилась мне и резкость в отношении украинцев к полякам, а мысль о каком бы то ни было союзе с царским правительством против поляков казалась мне возмутительную и ошибочную. Меня и некоторых других, так думающих, украинцы бранили космополитами, которое мы принимали за похвалу”. Драгоманов, М. П. Автобиография. – Былое, 1906, 6, с. 187, 191.

56 “...распространить в Галиции украинское направление посредством новой русской (великорусской) литературы, которая своим светским и демократическим характером подорвет в Галиции клерикализм и бюрократизм и обратит молодежь к демосу, а так как демос там украинский, то украинское национальное самосознание получится там само собою”. Драгоманов, М. П. Автобиография. – Былое, 1906, 6, с. 195.

Like Kostomarov before him, Dragomanov rejects the national state for the sake of “Europeanism” and “cosmopolitanism”, of the “all-human beginning in culture” and the “social” to “superfluous nationalism”⁵⁷. Dragomanov criticizes the Ukrainophiles calling them “culturalists”, isolating themselves from the “new European culture” and seeking the support of the church (clericalism), while he was an atheist.

The cosmopolitan democraticism of Dragomanov was not convenient either to the Russian authorities, which accused him of separatism (they alleged that he wanted to annex Malorussia to Poland) and forced him leave Russia, or for the nationalists and the radicals. While the Russian conservatives called him “separatist”, the Ukrainian nationalists considered him as “Russificateur” and “agent of the Russian government abroad”.

Mikhail Dragomanov describes his work as “literary/political” and himself – as “socialist by ideals” and federalist. Interestingly enough, he deliberately writes about the Socialist ideas in Ukrainian, and in Russian - about the liberal ones and about federalism, depending on the audience.

Dragomanov admires Aleksandr Herzen’s political thinking in terms of its democraticism but not regarding the Ukrainian issue, which draws his criticism: “Moscow Slavophil” or “Great Russophile”. However, they share an ideal: “social-democratic federal pan-Slavism”⁵⁸. Dragomanov accuses the Russian socialists of “Jacobinian centralism”⁵⁹, when they are against the Ukrainian nation. As

57 *“Пребывание в Западной Европе окончательно убедило меня, что именно европеизм, или космополитизм, который не отрицает частных национальных вариаций общих идей и форм, и есть лучшая основа для украинских автономных стремлений, и что теперь всякая научная как и политическая деятельность, должна быть основана на интернациональном фундаменте”*. Драгоманов, М. П. Автобиография. – *Былое*, 1906, 6, с. 197, 200.

58 А.И. Герцен и его отношение к польско-украинскому вопросу. – *Киевская старина*, 1906, № 1, с. 3, 10, 21.

59 М. Бакунин и русские прогрессисты 60-х гг в вопросе о польско-украинских отношениях. – *Киевская старина*, 1906, № 4, с. 331.

Dragomanov himself says, of the Russian liberal camp, Alexandr Pipin was closest to him in terms of views on the Ukrainian issue.

Ukrainian nationalism:

Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Ivan Lissac-Rudnitsky

Mykhailo Hrushevsky was the ideologist of the Ukrainian nationalism and main opponent of Mikhail Dragomanov, whom he defines as “culturalist”. Hrushevsky extends the federalism of the Ukraionophiles with “national-territorial autonomy”⁶⁰.

The Polish version of the stolen ethnonym, which is popular even today (Russians (Moscovites) having stolen the concept of “Rus” from its due successors, the Ukrainians (genuine Rus), has been developed in detail by Mykhailo Hrushevsky⁶¹. He adheres to the line of belittling the concept of “Malorussia” and its replacement with “Ukraine”⁶². According to Mykhailo Hrushevsky, the borders of the Ukrainian territory run from the Carpathians to the Caucasus⁶³ and, he locates the national-territorial autonomy within this framework,

60 Грушевский, М. Украинство в России, его запросы и нужды. Спб., 1906, с. 45, 47.

61 “...исконное историческое имя этой народности Русь, Русин усвоено было великорусской народностью и московским государством, в эпоху политического упадка украинских земель смотревшим на себя, как на единственного наследника старого киевского Русского государства, созданного украинскими племенами”. Грушевский, М. Украинский вопрос. – В: Освобождение России и Украинский вопрос. Статьи и заметки. Спб., 1907, с. 12.

62 “Будучи официального, книжного происхождения, имя это: Малороссы, Малороссия не было прозято народом, и теперь во все более широкое употребление входит имя Украина, Украинцы, начавшее приобретать характер национального имени уже с 17 в.”. Грушевский, М. Украинский вопрос..., пак там.

63 “Австрия – восточная Галиция, северная Буковина; Венгрия – северо-восточные комитаты; Россия – губернии: Киевская, Подольская, Волинская, Херсонская, Екатеринославская, значительная часть Люблинская, Седлецкая, Гродненская, Минская, Бессарабская и Таврическая, за Днепром губернии Полтавская, Харьковская, почти всю Черниговскую, части Курской, Воронежской, области Донской и Кубанской, губерний Черноморской и Ставропольской”. Грушевский, М. Украинский вопрос. – В: Освобождение России и Украинский вопрос. Статьи и заметки. Спб., 1907, 13–14.

denying the multinational presence at these geographical latitudes but marking them as ethnic Ukrainian⁶⁴ – ethnocentric approach.

Ukrainian emigrant historian Ivan Lissiac-Rudnitsky completes the structure of the Ukrainian nationalists M. Hrushevsky and not only denies the term “Malorussia” but also perceives it as “Russification” (“Malorussinization”) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic – as “neo-Malorussia”⁶⁵.

Russia and Ukraine are incompatible: the first is “Eurasian” (a successor of the “world of the Eurasian nomads”) and the second is “European” (successor of the “Byzantine cultural tradition”). Lissiac-Rudnitsky uses the term “proto-Ukrainians” to signify them as autochthonic population, while the Russians have come from the nomadic steps. He repeats the theory of the stolen ethnonym, not at such elementary level as M. Hrushevsky but defining Kievan Rus as “Eastern European” rather than as “Russian” state, which is accepted by the modern non-Russian historiography for Ukraine. In order to avoid the term “Rus”, he calls Kievan Rus “Kievan Federation” or “united Kievan Principality” and, what is more, he uses the concept “Rus-Ukraine”, because he believes that it is normal “to apply the modern national concept “Ukraine” in regards to previous epochs... when the term was non-existent”⁶⁶.

Ivan Lissiac-Rudnitsky does not differentiate between the two Ukrainian nations. In his opinion, there is no dualism and, on the contrary, the Galician nation has defeated the Malorussian one in his concept. In his vocabulary the Ruthenians

64 *Грушевский, М.* Наши требования. – В: Освобождение России и Украинский вопрос. Статьи и заметки. Спб., 1907, с. 89.

65 “Я считаю, что украинские эмигрантские исследователи и публицисты, которые занимаются советской проблематикой, часто совершают концептуальную ошибку. Они переоценивают опасность руссификации в смысле исчезновения украинского народа как этноса и недооценивают опасность “малороссиизации” в смысле ассимиляции украинцев к всероссийской советской имперской системе”. *Лысяк-Рудницкий, И.П.* Русификация или малороссиизация. – В: Между историей и политикой: (сборник статей). М., 2007, с. 599.

66 “...было бы более правильно сказать так: государство Владимира и Ярослава не было ни “украинским”, ни “русским” (московским) в современном понимании; это было единое восточноевропейское государство периода патримониальной монархии”. *Лысяк-Рудницкий, И.П.* Между историей и политикой: (сборник статей). М., 2007, с. 52, 70–71.

are “Galician Ukrainians”, while their Moscowphilia is explained with the Russian “charm” and “shining”⁶⁷.

The emancipation of the Ukrainian nation cannot do without the Ukrainian per iodization of history, proposed by the Ukrainian narodniks in the 19th century: principality, Lithuanian-Polish and Cossack periods and national revival. Ivan Lissiac-Rudnitsky does not conceal its vulnerability due to the Cossacks, typical both of Russia and of Poland and also due to the “principality period”. In order to visualize the European affiliation of Ukraine, he would prefer the division into: Antiquity, Middle Age and Modern Time. However, this does not eliminate the need of internal per iodization, such as the one each European state has. Therefore, Ivan Lissiac-Rudnitsky suggests the following for the 19th century: Narodnichestvo (1840–1880) and Modernism (1880–1914), which in its essence complies with the Russian historical writings.

Fadey Rilsky:

Transformation of Conscience from Polish Szlachta into Ukrainian Narodnik

Against the backdrop of the structuring of a negative identity by the Ukrainian nationalists (with the invariable image of the enemy – Russia and the remaining, depending on the situation – Poland or Germany), Fadey Rilsky sets a remarkable example of the building up of a *positive Ukrainian identity* on the right bank of Dnieper River (not only theoretically and visually, revealed at an interesting discourse over a cup of tea but as lifestyle with all ensuing risks).

The transformation from a Polish szlachta into a Ukrainian narodnik was not a rare phenomenon in the 1860s, when the revolutionary ideals of the Russian and

⁶⁷ “...очарование Россией действовало даже на тех украинцев, которые жили за пределами империи”. Лысяк-Рудницкий, И.П. Между историей и политикой: (сборник статей). М., 2007, с. 117.

Polish narodniks also spread to the young intellectuals on the right bank of Dnieper (obtaining an alloy of democratic ideas and a romantic aspiration for national revival). The narodnichestvo (an ideological movement of socialists and democrats without discrimination as to national identity and religious denomination) was perceived by many of his contemporaries as “liberating epoch” (liberation from autocracy, on the one hand, and from the imperial national framework, whether Russian or Polish). The narodniks of the 1860s were a part of the Ukrainophilic circles, which recognized them as “deeply sincere and ideologically fair”⁶⁸.

Fadey Rilsky, like many of his fellow students from the Faculty of History and Philology with the Kiev University, although being from a family of a Polish szlachta established close relations with his Maloruissian collages and joined the Ukrainian community, which caused his “spiritual rebirth” from a Pole into a Ukrainian narodnik. His father was shocked by the news (“for the Ukrainian ideas and feelings of the son”) and hoped that this would go as a serial rebellion of the young against the old. He even decided to send him from Kiev to the St. Petersburg University but quickly abandoned the idea because at that time, from the 1860s to the end of the century, the university circles in the capital had a positive attitude towards the Ukrainian revival. In the 1860s, in St. Petersburg, the Ukrainophiles set up their own publication, the “Osнова” [Foundation] magazine, which included publications of Fadey Rilsky⁶⁹. After the Polish Uprising (1863) Fadey Rilsky was supposed to be displaced in Kazan but, finally, this was cancelled. He did not give up his mission of returning to the national roots of the Ukrainians (in his view, the Polish nobility on the right bank of Dnieper is nothing but polonized Ukrainians”⁷⁰).

68 О.Л. Фадей Розеславович Рыльский. Некролог. – *Киевская старина*, 1902, № 11, с. 335.

69 О.Л. Фадей Розеславович Рыльский. Некролог. – *Киевская старина*, 1902, № 11, с. 342.

70 “Несколько слов о дворянах правого берега Днепра”. – Цит. по: О.Л. Фадей Розеславович Рыльский. Некролог. – *Киевская старина*, 1902, № 11, с. 339.

Fadey Rilsky lived like real narodnik: he remained a Catholic but was a trustee of an Eastern Orthodox Village school, where he was teaching along with the clergyman. The local representatives of the Polish szlachta wrote denunciations against him as one of the accusations against him was that he had married a peasant woman and “co-habitated too well with the peasants” also supporting them in their claims to the szlachta. The conduct of Fadey Rilsky as narodnik, which proved in practice that representatives of the Catholicism and of the Eastern Orthodox religion of one nation can live together in peace and love, established in practice the model of the *positive national identity* (seeking mobilization not by pointing at the enemy but accepting the differences as something existing by default which is positive for the development). The unique fate of Fadey Rilsky’s great grandfather, Romuald, was in the basis of this enlightening aspiration for national revival of his.

The family history of the “Koliivshchina” (the “Massacre” of the Polish population on the right bank of Dnieper by the Gaydamaci Cossacks in 1768) turned out to be in the roots of Fadey Rilsky’s personality in the 19th century. Fadey Rilsky’s great grandfather, Romuald, was a student in the Uman high school, when the town was attacked by Cossack hordes. Prior to killing the Polish-Jewish population in the town, the Cossacks fastened the 14-year old Romuald to the pillar and he started singing the Malorussian popular psalm “Пречистая Диво, Маты руського краю” [“Virgin Mary, Mother of the Russian Land”]. His voice was trained while chanting in the uniat church in Uman. The ataman was moved and ordered nobody to be killed. The suppression of the Gaydamaci Cossacks by the Russian troops was followed by long adventures (describing the everyday cruelties between Poles and Cossacks, the religious intolerance, from which he was saved

due to the fact that he knew equally well Russian and Polish) until Romuald's happy reunion with his family.⁷¹

The story of Fadey Rilsky is one of the examples dethroning the Cossack myth in the Ukrainian national idea, which has been poeticized by Kondraty Rileyev and Taras Shevchenko, sacralized in the picturesque prose of Nikolay Gogol and, finally, in the historical writings of Mikhailo Hrushevsky. Pantaleon Kulish, an associate (but not always follower) of Nikolay Kostomarov in the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood, was one of the few Ukrainophiles, who would depict adequately (not idealistically) the Cossacks based on historical documents. Kulish differentiates between “Great Russian” and “Malorussian” Cossacks but generalizes both types as “Ukrainian pirates”, demonstrating their affiliation to the Christian religion through a conduct of “dark paganism due to which he calls them “religiants”⁷². Kulish even describes the Cossacks as “basibozuk”⁷³. The “Koliivshchina” (The Massacre, 1768) was but one confirmation of the unequivocal Cossack habits, which, however, has not prevented the Cossack myth from living up to the present day.

Third face of Ukrainian Janus: Ruthenians

While the 19th century gave birth to the two Ukrainian nations (Malorussian, based on the dualistic model of Dragomanov and Galician – based on the ethnocentric model of M. Hrushevsky), which were doomed to encounter in a single state in the 20th century (1939) and co-habitate as a single political nation (1991 until the second Majdan, 2013), while the 20th century gave birth to the third

71 *Рыльский, Ф.Р.* Рассказ современника о приключениях с ним во время “Коліївщини”. – *Киевская старина*, 1887, № 1, 51–64.

72 *П. Кулиш.* Козаки по отношению к государству и обществу. – *Русский архив*, 1877, № 6, 120–122.

73 Письма П.А. Кулиша с А.Ф. Кистяковскому. – *Киевская старина*, № 4, с. 6.

Ukrainian nation – the Ruthenian – not a regional but as national identity. This process continues up to the present day and, within this context, the beautiful name, given to it by one of its contemporary researchers, Kiril Shevchenko - “Slav Atlantida”⁷⁴ – is not correct. This new nation is rather a “Slav Aurora” because it emerged officially on 7 March 2007 at the Carpathian Regional Rada, where the “Ruthenian” nationality was legitimized”⁷⁵.

The Ukrainian historian from Canada, John-Paul Himka, recognizes the existence of a “local Ruthenian identity”⁷⁶ in the Carpathians. Yet, it can be defined as local only for the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. The Ruthenians had their own Diaspora (separate from the Ukrainian one) in Canada and USA, plus the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary. In the late 20th century⁷⁷ they withstood the concept “Ruthenian” as national and not as ethnic identity. At present, it is centred in the Carpathians but, actually, the Ruthenian nation is a successor of the Ruthenians in Galicia of the 19th century and, in particular, of the part of them, perceiving themselves as “Moscowphiles” and being culturally oriented towards Russia. The Galicians do not call themselves Ukrainians but Ruthenians and even Ukrainophile Pantaleon Kulish, when talking about Galicia, uses the term “Galician Rus” and not “Galician Ukraine”⁷⁸. P. Kulish does not speak well of the Galicians: “although a Galician, he was an honest man, which is a rarity among Galicians”.

74 *Шевченко, К. В.* Славянская Атлантида: Карпатская Русь и русины в XIX - первой половине XX вв. М., 2011.

75 *Шевченко, К. В.* Славянская Атлантида..., с. 17.

76 “*Local Rusyn Identity*”. John-Paul Himka. The Basic Historical Identity Formations in Ukraine: A Typology. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1/4, *RUS' WRIT LARGE: LANGUAGES, HISTORIES, CULTURES: Essays Presented in Honor of Michael S. Flier on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (2006), p. 495.

77 Numerical strength of Ruthenians: 740,000 in Ukraine; 130,000 in Slovakia; 60,000 in Poland; 25,000 in Serbia; a total of 640,000 in USA and Canada. *Шевченко, К. В.* Славянская Атлантида..., с. 14.

78 Письма П.А. Кулиша с А.Ф. Кистяковскому. – *Киевская старина*, 1902, № 2, с. 303, 312.

The Ruthenian nation was a natural reaction to the Galician-styled policy of Ukrainization of the ethnocentric Ukrainian nationalists of the second half of the 19th century until the end of WWI. The Galician-styled model was developed in the 19th century based on Russophobic, anti-Polish and anti-Semite principles. After the ethnic purges against the Polish and Jewish population in Galicia (1941–1943), the Russophobia has remained dominating, while the image of Russia is presented as top enemy. The Ruthenians, as successors of the Principality of Galicia–Volhynia, having survived a century and a half after the Tatar invasion of ancient Rus, but subdued to Poland and forced to adopt partially the Greek Catholic religion, identify themselves as nationality, different but similar to the Russian one, in the 19th century. This nationality had a deep Russophilic feeling towards the “historical fatherland” through the 20th century.⁷⁹

The Ruthenian nation is also a reaction to the polonization of the educational policy in Galicia of Austria and, then of Austria-Hungary. After the Polish Uprising (1863) many Polish revolutionaries escaped from Russia into Galicia and began work mostly as teachers. One of them, Paulin Stachurski-Swencicki urged for “Cossack and republican Ukraine” and introduced the term “Ukrainian” as replacement of “Malorussian” or “Ruthenian” – the serial stage in the fight for national concepts⁸⁰.

79 Из письмо профессора филологии ужгородской гимназии П.И. Яновича журналу Словенин от 6 июня 1864 г.: *“Я... теперь занимаюсь составлением русской грамматики, но на великорусском; на нашей Угорской Руси большая часть ученых хочет принять эту писменность... В том деле украинском писал я господину редактору Дедицкому, чтоб они не кокетировали с Украиною.. чтоб не позволяли раскол делать... Это упрямство против России и языка Русского, инспирированное поляками или фанатичными униатами...”*.

Из меморандума депутации крестьянского сословия Подкарпатской Руси, преподнесенного президенту Т.Г. Масарику 10 февраля 1920 г.:

“Наш русский народ, окруженный чужими, большей частью враждебно относящимся к нему народами, жил у подножия Карпат, в продолжение веков... русской культурной и христианской верой, поддерживаемой непоколебимой верой в лучшее будущее, ожидаемое им с Востока, от его брата, Русского великана... Наш народ не переставал надеяться, что рано или поздно он непременно должен слиться хотя бы только культурно со своим могучим братом, родным ему по языку и вере. Это чистосердечная мысль культурного единства с великим русским народом спасла нас до начала всемирной войны от полного народного ослабления...” – Цит. по: Шевченко, К. В. Славянская Атлантида..., с. 63.

80 Марков, Д. А. Русская и украинская идея в Австрии. – В: “Украинская” болезнь русской нации. М., 2004, с. 197.

Swencicki has been appointed by the Galician authorities as teacher in Malorussian in the Lvov High School⁸¹. Galicia adopted the concepts “Ukrainian-Russian” (to be distinguished from “Russian” – like today’s Macedonians, who in all possible ways avoid to write “Ъ” but cannot skip it while speaking. However, this technology of structuring a difference is old and inefficient - due to the irrational moment again – a symbol (image) has more strength than tones of academic literature).

The Polish university lecturers in Lvov encouraged the Ukrainian national version of separation from the Russian cultural spectrum and by all means hindered the Ruthenians’ attempts to develop their own grammar, close to the of Russian (Great Russian) language, of the one part, and, of the other, they rarely allowed a Malorussian within their circles and this political line would persist throughout the 19th century.

The Russian policy among the Ruthenians was contrary to the Polish one: partial support, which, however, had no effect due to its inconsistency. Under Alexander II (1876) Russia financed the Rusophilic publication of the Ruthenians in Galicia - “Slovo” [Speech], but this lasted only until September 1880, when Interior Minister M. Loris-Melikov stopped the subsidies⁸².

In 1901, the Taras Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lvov filed a petition to the Austrian authorities for the establishment of a “Malorussian university”⁸³. The lecturers identified themselves as “representatives of the Malorussian science” and complaint of the “Polish print” on the Lvov University and rare admission of

81 Мончаловский, О. А. О названиях "Украина", "украинский". – В: "Украинская" болезнь русской нации. М., 2004, 187–188.

82 Alexei Miller. *Ukrainian Question: Russian Nationalism in the 19th Century*. (CEU Press, 2003), 213–214.

83 In 1805, the Lvov University was closed, part of the departments were transferred to the Krakow University. Only the Lycee was left, where teaching in Latin prevailed in order to prevent classes in Ruthenian and because it was close to the Greek Catholics and not to the Eastern Orthodox Ruthenians. In 1818, the Lvov University was reinstated but it was under strong German-Latin influence. As of 1871, the Lvov University was no longer German. It was allowed to teach in one of the local languages there – Polish or Ruthenian but the latter was fully neglected.

lectures in Malorussian⁸⁴. The Ruthenians would be appointed to the university only if they were “gente Ruthenus, natione Polonus”. If they had to choose between a Pole and a Ruthenian, the application of the former would be approved irrespective of their academic assets. The problem with the language was serious: the Dean would deprive Prof. Mikhailo Hrushevsky of the right to take the floor at the Academic Meeting as he spoke Ukrainian and not Polish⁸⁵.

In the beginning of the 20th century, the terms “Malorussians”, “Ukrainians” and “Ruthenians” were already approved synonyms in Galicia. In other texts, in connection with the enlightenment struggle in Lvov, Ukrainian nationalists would also use the concept “Ruthenian-Ukrainian University” along with “Malorussian”.

The polonized Ruthenians are called “hard-core Ruthenians”, equivalent to national traitors “who have obediently denounced their Ukrainian rights”. The Ukrainian nationalists in Galicia, however, do not recognize the Ruthenian identity and reiterate with contempt the Polish theory: “yesterday’s Pole – today’s Ruthenian”⁸⁶. Just for the sake of comparison, in Slovakia, they say: “It is not a shame but an honour to be a Ruthenian!” (2009). During the population census (2001), they quoted 19th-century Ruthenian enlightener, A. Duhnovich. Modern Ukrainians painfully perceive the revival of the Ruthenian nation and, with no less haughtiness than the Poles, they repeat the theory: “the Carpathian Ruthenian is not a nationality, not a national minority, even not an ethnic group, but a profession”, backed by “Kremlin’s fifth column”⁸⁷.

Obviously, US Senator McCain should be added to the fifth column, since the Ruthenian Diaspora in USA convinced him in 2007 that President V.

84 Петиция Львовского ученого общества имени Шевченка австрийскому рейтсрату об учреждении самостоятельного малорусского университета в Львове. 21 ноября (4 декабря) 1901 г. – *Киевская старина*, 1902, № 1, 1–4.

85 С. Ефремов. В борьбе за просвящение. – *Киевская старина*, 1902, № 2, 313–346.

86 Из Львовского университета. – *Киевская старина*, 1902, № 5, 111–115.

87 “Я русин был, есмь и буду, а при списованию людей у маю 2001 на то не забуду!”. – с. 7, 15.

Yushchenko should not create hindrances to the proclamation of the Ruthenian nation in the Carpathian region. John McCain was not just a herald. The US interest in that young nation is not occasional: the question is whether it would keep the dualistic model, involving the recognized historical relation with Russia and a Rusophilic position, combined with own Ruthenian identification or, on the contrary, in case of carelessness of the Russian authorities, would develop as the consecutive Eastern Orthodox Russophobic nation.

The revival of the Ruthenians is irrational and styled after the mythological existence of the national consciousness. The fight with the national concepts has a variable outcome and there is not an eternal winner in it. The same applies to the attempt to replace “Malorussian” with “Ukrainian” or delete “Ruthenian” because the political means have a short-lived effect in terms of historical eternity, while the cultural germs of the national archetypes can be revived into a single image, word or song and then the community awakens.

Conclusion:

Many-sided Ukrainian Janus

The rational factors for the establishment of the two Ukrainian nations in the two empires (Austria-Hungary and Russia) in the 19th century are the following:

– democratic radicalism of the Polish, Russian and Ukrainian intellectuals – I place it first because, in the 19th century, without the support of the Polish and most of the Russian democrats and socialists, up to the Bolsheviks, the Ukrainophiles of both movements (the ethno-dualistic model of Mikhail Dragomanov and the ethno-

centric one of Mikhailo Hrushevsky) would have not developed and would have remained existing only in theory.

- the shortsighted policy of the Russian authorities after the Polish Uprising (1863), which suppressed any cultural activities of the Ukrainian nation thus pushing it towards Galicia, which, on its part, due to the liberal political life in Austria, turned into a laboratory of the Ukrainian Galician-styled nationalism;
- the Slavic interest in folklore of the Slav nationalities in the three empires (Russian, Habsburg and Ottoman);
- the geopolitical tectonics during WWI having catalyzed the Ukrainian national educational process from an enlightenment project with a federative autonomy into a political project for national sovereignty.

Irrational factors for the formation of the Ukrainian dualism are within the realm of the national mythology:

- the Cossack myth, monopolizing the Cossack identity (obliviating the existence of such both in Poland and Russia) and idealizing the ataman's aspiration to freedom (ignoring their bandit/robbery practices);
- the myth about the “genuine” successor of ancient Rus (under the ethno-centric Galician identity, the Ukrainians are the “true” Rus people, while the Russians/Ruthenians or Moscovites are Tatars, Finns and a little bit of Slavs but not Rus people, while the ethno-dualistic Malorussian model recognizes the “Rus” as the common history of the three independent nations: Russian, Malorussian and

Belarusian, which have a common kinship, while retaining their specific features, accumulated in the course of their independent existence in different state and political formations; the same viewpoint is adopted by the Ruthenians (the third and youngest Ukrainian nation), while, by 1917, the Russians adhered to the imperial narrative: Kievan Rus – Moscow – Saint Petersburg, three peoples (Malorussian /Little Russian/, Great Russian, Belarusian) – one nation (all-Russian, Russian, Ruthenian). In modern Russia, this imperial view is accepted only from the extreme conservatives and part of the nationalists;

– the first red line was formed after WWII/the Great Patriotic War with the emergence of new mythological layers deepening the cultural incompatibility between the Galician and the Malorussian models; it covers all aspects of the “nationalization” of history after 1991 and, particularly, of the Orange Revolution (2004).

– the second red line was formed after the conditional end of the Cold War (1991), during the second Majdan (2013–2014), which gave birth to new heroes and anti-heroes (the so-called “Nebesna Sotnya” of the defence of the Majdan, liquidated by the snipers without due investigation but canonized by Kiev, of the one part and, of the other, the “Berkut” (the special unit, guarding the statehood, in the face of Yanukovich, part of whom have fallen victims to Molotov cocktails) and Odessa (2 May 2014 – Odessa Hatin), the burnt-alive, after torture, Odessa citizens holding anti-Majdan position and the Georgian ribbon, as a symbol, different from the trident, the execution-style murder of whom reminded of Nazi burning of Odessa citizens (Jews, communists or simply people, opposing the regime during the occupation of German and Romanian troops (1941–1944). All this divided the two Ukrainian nations by bloodshed.

The perfect version of a *positive national identity* (co-existence of the two Ukrainian nations plus the Ruthenian one) finds an expression in the rational example with the life of Fadey Rilsky on the right bank of Dnieper: a Catholic and a nobleman (*szlachta*) with narodnik ideology, who was a trustee and a teacher in an Eastern Orthodox school and was married to a peasant woman. In his environment, there was equality and respect irrespective of the religious or other affiliation.

However, there was an irrational fateful development behind this example dating back to the dark times of the Koliivshchina (the Massacre, 1768), when the Catholic boy of the Polish family Romuald (Faradey's grandfather), tied up to the pillar to be shot out by the Eastern Orthodox Gaydamaci Cossacks (haidouks by conduct), began singing in Malorussian "Пречистая Диво, Маты руського краю" and the life of all non-Cossacks (Poles and Jews) was saved.

I reminded this story again because the life of people and of nations is actually a sequence of such irrational moments (if they are around 30, this is already half a minute of eternity). But this is lyrics and history allows it only as an exception and not as a mass process.

It is difficult to say, however, what the alchemical balance between the rational and irrational factors for the Ukrainian dualistic identity is. It reminds of a computer, which changes its IP address upon every connection to the network and leaves different virtual traces. Besides, it can surprise you by a shortcut. The Ukrainian case visualized the infantilism of the question: "How can this happen in the 21st century?" The year and the century will be different, according to the Mayan calendar or the Jewish one. Human development is illusionary, to a certain extent.

As the brilliant maxim of Leonid Radzihovsky says: “the ancient Greeks did not know that they were ancient”. The same applies to nations and mythological thinking, combined with the high-tech technologies, which can produce as a result an enthusiastic urka with an i-phone or a renaissance population, not protected from the primitive lifestyle. Both are a repetition of the “myth of the eternal recurrence” (of Mircea Eliade), because human life is of a limited time-span and there is no guarantee that the gathered experience, knowledge and internal development will be passed onwards. In this context, every new generation is ready for its mythology, whether national or other (with changing community forms) and every nation (Mikhail Bulgakov paraphrased) is mortal but this is a semi-trouble, it becomes suddenly mortal... but it may as well suddenly wake up.

ALMANACH VIA EVRASIA, 2014, 3



***THE EURASIAN GEOPOLITICAL VECTOR
IN THE POST-COLD WAR GLOBALIZATION***

www.viaevrasia.com

ISSN (online) 1314-6645