

A fractured identity, a fractured democracy: the national facet of Ukraine's transition

Amy Lewis

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
in political studies

December 19 2013

Word Count: 35,556

Abstract

After the dissolution of the USSR in 1991, Ukraine became an independent state. Despite an initial period of optimism regarding the future of the state, after twenty-two years, Ukraine has continued to remain politically unstable. This has culminated in periods of civil unrest with the Orange revolution in 2004 and the 'EuroMaidan' protests of 2013. In 1991, political scholars anticipated that the former Soviet republics would embark on a transition towards democracy. However, traditional theoretical frameworks have been proven to be ineffective for analysing the current political and social situation in Ukraine. Drawing on Taras Kuzio's 'quadruple transition' framework, this thesis contents that it is the nation element of transition that prevents the consolidation of democracy in Ukraine. This thesis argues that the current citizens of Ukraine are divided into two political cultures, with distinct perspectives of the *raison d'être* and the national identity of the Ukrainian state. A historical analysis of the history of Ukraine illustrates that this divide has been entrenched by the various imperial rulers of ethnic Ukrainians. This divide in political culture is then applied as a paradigm in order to understand the discourse of Ukrainian politics since independence. As democratic political systems depend upon their citizens for political legitimacy, the identity of the nation and citizenship laws are vital for creating a united *demos*. This research illustrates how Ukraine's legislation regarding the identity of the state did not provide a clear definition of the Ukrainian *demos*. Ultimately, my research concludes that Ukraine will continue to evade the consolidation of its democracy until it can establish a consensus on the Ukrainian *demos*.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I want to express my gratitude to my supervisor, James Headley. Your patience, perseverance and his insightful opinions have guided this research. Your continued support over the years has been remarkable and I have been honoured to work with you.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to the European Union Centres Network for their support. My affiliation with them has been extremely rewarding. They have provided me with support in so many ways: a scholarship for this research, academic support, conference experience where I have meet amazing like-minded people and an exceptional internship opportunity.

Needless to say, I owe many friends and family a debt of gratitude for their emotional and academic support through this journey. A special thank you for those who have proofread and provided their thoughts on this work: Jill Lewis, Melanie Lewis, Olive Tabor and Hannah Morgan. Thank you all for your time and efforts.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vi
List of Maps	vii
List of Abbreviations	viii
Note on transliteration	ix
Map of Ukraine's borders and <i>oblasti</i> (regions)	x
Introduction	1
1 - Nation and State Building - Theoretical framework.....	12
1.1 Terminology and definitions.....	13
1.2 Democratisation theory.....	16
1.3 National identity and democracy	21
1.4 Citizenship, the nation and nationalism.....	23
1.5 Political culture.....	29
Conclusion	31
2 - The Development of Two Political Cultures in Ukraine.....	32
2.1 Historical overview	36
2.2 Political culture of west Ukraine	46
2.3 East Ukraine.....	53
2.4 How did the USSR affect Ukraine's political cultures?.....	57
Conclusion	64
3 - The national identity of the independent state	65
3.1 - The demographics of the independent Ukrainian state.....	68
3.2 - Ukraine's political cultures and independence.....	69
3.3 - Political cultures and nation building.....	72
3.4 - The identity of independent Ukraine	80
Conclusion	90
4 - How has the political culture divide prevented democracy?	93
4.1 Kravchuk's presidency.....	94
4.2 Kuchma's presidency	95
4.3 The Orange Revolution.....	100

4.4 Yushchenko's presidency	103
4.5 The 2010 presidential elections.....	110
4.6 Yanukovich's presidency	111
4.7 Retaliation of west Ukraine?.....	117
Conclusion	119
Conclusion	121
Bibliography	129

List of Tables

Table 1 - Results from round two of 1991 Presidential election	30
Table 2 - Results from round two of 1994 Presidential election	30
Table 3 - Results from round two of 1999 Presidential election	30
Table 4 - Results from round two of Voting (December re-election) in 2004 Presidential election.....	31
Table 5 - Results of round two 2010 Presidential election.....	31
Table 6 - Ukraine Corruption Perceptions Ranking Index	98
Table 7 – <i>Svoboda</i> results in west Ukraine from 2010 parliamentary election	107

List of Maps

Map 1 - Voting in the 2004 presidential election	29
Map 2 - Map of Kievan Rus in the 11th century.....	33
Map 3 - Map of the three partitions of Poland	38
Map 4 - Results from Ukraine's independence referendum	74

List of Abbreviations

CA - Competitive Authoritarian

CPSU - Communist Party of the Soviet Union

CPU - Communist Party of Ukraine

EU - European Union

NATO - North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

OECD - Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

OR - Orange Revolution

OSCE – Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe

OUN - Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists

PLC – Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth

RUKH – Peoples Movement of Ukraine

SBU - Security Service of Ukraine

UAOC – Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church

UDAR – Ukrainian Democratic Alliance for Reform

Ukrainian SSR – Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

USSR – Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Note on transliteration

This thesis has used the Library of Congress transliteration from Russian and Ukrainian to the Latin alphabet.

Map of Ukraine's borders and *oblasti* (regions)



Introduction

To look at Ukraine on a map, one is struck by its geopolitical significance. To the west, Ukraine's borders meet with Poland and Romania, the edge of the European Union (EU); while along its eastern boundary, the Russian Federation is its sole neighbour. As a result of its geopolitical location, every stage of Ukraine's existence has been influenced by the actions of its neighbours. Even the name Ukraine, which translates to 'borderland,' reflects its geographical and cultural character. This borderland mentality defines the identity of the present citizens of Ukraine.

This 'borderland' position has often made Ukraine vulnerable to invasion and imperial domination. Consequently, the modern-day territory of Ukraine was divided between multiple imperial powers. Since the ancient Slavic empire of Kievan Rus in the 9th century, the modern borders of Ukraine have come under the imperial power of the Mongolians, Lithuania, Poland, Austria, Hungary and Russia. However, a distinct and conscious Ukrainian identity prevails despite its convoluted cultural history. In the preface of his seminal work, *Ukraine: A History*, Orest Subtelny stresses that an overarching theme of Ukraine's history is statelessness.¹ Noting that this theme has defined Ukraine and has been a cause of great frustration for the Ukrainian people. The history of Ukraine, consequently, is "the history of a nation that has had to survive and evolve without the framework of a full-fledged national state."²

Ukraine only became an independent state in 1991, following the dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). This was the first sovereign and unified Ukrainian state to come into existence. Ukraine faced a challenging situation as the fraternal relationship between Ukraine and Russia required redefinition, in terms of how Ukrainians identified and defined themselves. However, the relationship

¹ Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), xiii.

² Ibid.

between Ukraine and its neighbours, including its former imperial power, also needed to be redefined. Academics and politicians alike raised grave concerns regarding the likelihood of inter-ethnic conflict in Ukraine. It was perceived as high-risk for conflict due to its large ethnic diversity and, in particular, its large Russian minority.³ Fears were raised that its minorities would be persecuted in the process of developing the Ukrainian state. After twenty-two years of independence, Ukraine has avoided violent ethnic conflict, although, ethnic tensions continue to contribute to dysfunction of the state.

At the time of writing this thesis, hundreds and thousands of Ukrainians are demonstrating in Maidan Square in Kiev. These protests were caused by the decision of Ukraine's President, Viktor Yanukovich, to decline signing an Association Agreement and Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with the European Union (EU) at the Vilnius Summit. Yanukovich explained his decision, based upon the fact that the European deal would not compensate for a forecasted loss in trade with Russia. However, it seems that Russia did everything within its power to prevent Ukraine from signing the agreement. Promising several billion Euros in subsidies and written off debt, while the EU could only offer loans worth 610 million Euro.⁴ Ukraine's economy remains contracted with a Gross Domestic Product growth rate of 0.3% for 2013,⁵ its foreign reserves are shrinking and it is facing tough trade restrictions and increasing oil and gas prices from Russia, its largest trading partner.⁶ The 'EuroMaidan' political crisis is not limited to purely economic concerns; it also represents the future of Ukraine, and whether it would prosper with further integration to Europe or Russia.

³ Robert Burns, "CIA says Economic Woes, Ethnic Tensions could split Ukraine," *Associated Press*, January 26 1994, <http://www.apnewsarchive.com/1994/CIA-Says-Economic-Woes-Ethnic-Tensions-Could-Split-Ukraine/id-f65d8a332b317e60933f06ce144d4bc8>, (accessed 19 March 2013).

⁴ Spiegel Online International, "Putin's Gambit: how the EU lost Ukraine," November 25 2013, <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/how-the-eu-lost-to-russia-in-negotiations-over-ukraine-trade-deal-a-935476.html>, (accessed 12 December 2013).

⁵ Olga Pogarska and Edilberto L. Segura, "Ukraine Economic Situation Report," *SigmaBleyzer*, October 2013, [http://www.usubc.org/site/files/UKR-MonthlyEcReport\(October_2013\).pdf](http://www.usubc.org/site/files/UKR-MonthlyEcReport(October_2013).pdf), (accessed 14 November 2013).

⁶ Ibid.

The current protests can draw parallels to the protests of the 2004 Orange Revolution (OR), and reflect the continued volatility of Ukraine's political environment. Many scholars would agree that the OR was the watershed of Ukraine's political transition. Electoral fraud in the second round of voting in Ukraine's 2004 presidential election brought hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians into Maidan Square in Kiev. Presidential candidate Viktor Yanukovich was declared the initial winner, amidst allegation of electoral fraud by the opposition and international and domestic election observers. Yanukovich was the candidate supported by the incumbent president, Leonid Kuchma, who was widely unpopular at the end of his two electoral terms. Viktor Yushchenko, the other presidential candidate, laid a complaint with the Central Electoral Commission, while protesters blocked off presidential buildings. Yanukovich refused to acknowledge the allegations of fraud, while civil unrest continued. Political negotiations between the presidential candidates, President Kuchma and international mediators were held in order to negotiate a solution. Eventually, a compromise was reached introducing constitutional amendments, weakening the power of the presidency, in return for a re-run of the second round of voting. The second round of voting was held and declared free and fair, and Yushchenko was elected president.

The OR protests represented the defeat of a corrupt administration through the mobilisation of mass public dissidence. However, the promises of the Orange Government were never fulfilled. Yushchenko has promised to fight corruption and improve standards of living. In addition to this, he also committed himself to the reinvigoration of Ukrainian nationalism and consequently, removing Russian interference from Ukrainian affairs. The media portrayed Yushchenko as a candidate who would steer Ukraine towards European integration and affirm ties with the West; thus predicting a new era of Ukrainian politics. However, Yushchenko's tenure did not bring about the changes promised during the OR, and after a single term the public voted out Yushchenko in favour of Yanukovich.

Dysfunction sums up the current situation of the Ukrainian politics. Ukraine remains stagnant in its political, economic and social reform, and its current administration is becoming ever increasingly authoritarian in its nature. The former leader of the opposition, Yulia Tymoshenko, is serving a seven-year prison sentence for abuse of office, a trial that the EU has criticised for its politically motivated selective justice.⁷ There is no shortage of reports on the authoritarian nature of President Viktor Yanukovich's regime. *Freedom House*, a United States based democratic watchdog, downgraded Ukraine from 'free' to 'party free' in 2011 in its annual global ratings.⁸ This reflected the limitation of civil liberties and increase of presidential power at the expense of democratic development. It also released a report warning of the degradation of Ukraine's democratic progress, with areas of concern in: the consolidation of power in the executive branch at the expense of democratic development, tighter measures against the media, and freedom of speech, selective rule of law and prosecution against members of the opposition and increasing illegal use of the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU).⁹ The report warned that "if left unchecked, the trends set by Ukraine's current leadership will move the country toward greater centralisation and consolidation of power—that is, toward authoritarianism."¹⁰

Statement of the problem

Ukraine can be considered democratic in some procedural respects. It has democratic institutions, a parliament and it conducts regular elections. However, for the above-mentioned concerns it cannot be considered as a democratic regime. Consequently, the question that drives this research is simply: why is Ukraine not democratic? This thesis argues that Ukraine cannot be considered democratic because there is a

⁷ European Commission, "ENP Package, Country Progress Report Ukraine," MEMO/12/344, May 15 2012), <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/344&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>, (accessed 12 August 2012).

⁸ David J. Kramer, Robert Nurick, Damon Wilson and Evan Alterman, "Sounding the Alarm: Protecting Democracy in Ukraine," *Freedom House*, Washington D.C., 2011, <http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/special-reports/sounding-alarm-protecting-democracy-ukraine>, (accessed 8 August 2012).

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Kramer, Nurick, Wilson and Alterman, "Sounding the Alarm," ii.

fundamental divide within its population regarding Ukraine's national identity, which consequently, prevents democratic state building. This thesis argues that Ukraine's population is divided into two political cultures, engendered by Ukraine's imperial history. The divide amongst Ukraine's citizens prevents democracy in two ways: first, the lack of consensus on the definition of Ukraine's national identity prevents the creation of a united political community, a necessity for a democracy. Second, the antagonism between the political cultures for control of the state has become more important to the political elite than democratic reform, as they focus on repressing their rival.

This thesis highlights the concept of national identity and nation building as the most important element of the transition from the USSR, because democracy relies on the support of the political community it represents. If there is no consensus on who, or what, defines this political community, then there can be no commitment to reform, let alone to democracy. Ukraine did not inherit a uniform level of national consciousness throughout its territory; the Tsarist and Soviet Empires repeatedly repressed Ukrainian nationalism. Because both Central European and Russian Empires have ruled Ukraine, my research argues that there is a distinction in the sense of identity, level of national consciousness and acceptable political behaviour caused by the social environments of each empire. The political culture divide will be utilised as a paradigm for understanding political discourse in Ukraine since independence. Therefore, this thesis examines Ukraine's colonial history in order to trace the development of identity and political culture in independent Ukraine to the current political situation.

Theoretical background

Theorists have engaged in vigorous debate to explain, categorise and predict the trajectory of states transforming from totalitarian rule. This branch of political theory is known as democratisation theory. This theory evolved during the latter half of the twentieth century, when decolonisation and transitions to democracy were numerous. This literature has reached wide acclaim through research by Francis

Fukuyama and Samuel Huntington, with their respective works *The End of History* and *Third Wave of Democratisation*.¹¹ These theorists asserted that states in transition were on a trajectory towards democracy and a market economy, which reflected the political situation in the 1970s and 1980s in Latin America, Africa and South-East Asia. While the theory may have had more success in other parts of the world, in Eastern Europe, it has had limited success. Focusing on democracy as the 'goal' of transition produced a weak conceptual basis for analysis of transitioning states. Only states that achieve consolidated democratic status were perceived as successful; the theory was unable to make sense of the situation in non-democratic states. Thomas Carothers famously coined the term 'grey zone' to describe countries that exist somewhere between the spectrum of authoritarianism and democracy.¹² However, as the twentieth century began to close, many of the post-Soviet states were stagnant in their transition from Soviet republics, casting doubt that they were continuing reform towards democracy. Scholars soon realised that these 'grey zone' states were not in transition, but were in a state of suspension, somewhere between democracy and authoritarianism.

Scholars have interpreted Ukraine's political cultural divide in many ways. Canadian expert on authoritarian regimes, Lucan Way, argues that Ukraine has developed "pluralism by default" because divisions over national identity have made it possible for the opposition to use national identity as a tool to mobilise the population to protest against an incumbent.¹³ He argues that the division over national identity in Ukraine has engendered political competition and consequently, promoted democratic consolidation.¹⁴ While this contains an element of truth, in that Ukraine

¹¹ See: Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History?" *National Interest* 16 (1989): 3-18; Samuel Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratisation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991), 1.

¹² Thomas Carothers, "The End of the Transition Paradigm," *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 1 (2002): 5-21.

¹³ Lucan Way, "Identity And Autocracy: Belarus And Ukraine Compared," (paper presented at Second Annual Danyliw Research Seminar in Contemporary Ukrainian Studies, University of Ottawa, Canada, 12-14 October 2006, www.ukrainianstudies.uottawa.ca/pdf/P_Way_Danyliw06.pdf, (accessed 28 October 2013).

¹⁴ Lucan Way, "Identity And Autocracy: Belarus And Ukraine Compared," (paper presented at Second Annual Danyliw Research Seminar

has not consolidated an autocratic or authoritarian regime, the division of identity has resulted in a discourse where the competition for control of the state undermines any democratic progress. Electoral fraud is utilised in order to retain power; the opposition is discredited or forcibly removed in order to prove the dominance of the incumbent and freedom of expression is confined to within parameters determined by the state. Way and Steven Levitsky posit that strong linkages with Western institutions can explain why the former Soviet Baltic states have joined the EU, but states such as Ukraine have not.¹⁵ Linkages include cultural and media influences, political networks and pressure. The greater the linkages, the riskier it becomes to continue authoritarian practices and, as such, democratisation becomes more likely. In a similar line of thought, Kataryna Wolczuk, a British scholar on east European politics, has purported that democratic reform is stagnant because there is no external motive for Ukraine to democratise, such as the incentive of EU membership.¹⁶

Other scholars argue that former Soviet republics have weak civil society structure due to a lack of experience with democracy and a 'Soviet hangover.' They argue that the "civic skills" needed to support a democratic system are not mature enough in these states.¹⁷ D'Anieri, Taras Kuzio and Paul Kubicek all support the 'Soviet Hangover' hypothesis.¹⁸ D'Anieri explains this phenomenon as the "political and institutional legacy of the Soviet Union."¹⁹ The legacy includes the monopolisation of power in the CPSU and its lack of division of power within the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. Secondly, the state controlled almost all of the economy.

in Contemporary Ukrainian Studies, Chair of Ukrainian Studies, University of Ottawa, October 2006). www.ukrainianstudies.uottawa.ca/pdf/P_Way_Danyliw06.pdf, (accessed 12 October 2012).

¹⁵ Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way, "The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism," *Journal of Democracy* 13, no 2 (2002): 51-65.

¹⁶ Kataryna Wolczuk, "Integration without Europeanisation: Ukraine and its Policy towards the European Union," European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, 15 October 2004, http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/WP-Texts/04_15.pdf, (accessed 21 March 2013).

¹⁷ Marc Morjé Howard, "The Weakness of Postcommunist Civil Society," *Journal of Democracy* 13, no.1 (2002): 157-169.

¹⁸ See: Paul D'Anieri, *Understanding Ukrainian Politics: Power, Politics and Institutional Design* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe Inc, 2006); Paul Kubicek, "Problems of Post Postcommunism: Ukraine after the Orange Revolution," *Democratization* 16, no. 2 (2009). And Taras Kuzio, "Political Culture and Democracy: Ukraine as an Immobile State," *East European Politics and Societies* 25, no.1 (2011): 88-113.

¹⁹ D'Anieri, *Understanding Ukrainian Politics*, 13.

This induced political corruption and the harmonisation of economic and political power. These scholars argue that the Soviet legacy was continued in independent Ukraine, as there was no revolution or break with the Soviet political system. This thesis agrees with this argument, however, it seeks to link Ukraine's current political situation to all historic imperial rule over Ukraine.

Theoretical categorisation of Ukraine

Much debate surrounds the classification of Ukraine's political system.²⁰ I will argue that Ukraine is best categorised as a Competitive Authoritarian (CA) state, whereby the state is best understood as an authoritarian regime with regular, but flawed, elections. A CA regime is not unique to Ukraine; other CA regimes include Russia under Vladimir Putin, Serbia under Slobodan Milošević and Croatia under Franjo Tudjman. Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way regard competitive authoritarian regimes as:

Civilian regimes in which formal democratic institutions are widely viewed as the primary means of gaining power, but in which fraud, civil liberties violations, and abuse of state and media resources so skew the playing field that the regime cannot be labeled democratic.²¹

Ukraine conducts elections that are not just a façade; indeed opposition parties participate in elections to contest for power. However, the electoral environment is biased towards the incumbent in such a manner, that the ability of opposition forces to participate is handicapped. CA regimes are conceptually closer to democracy in their institutional structure, but closer to authoritarianism in their political conduct. The façade of democracy is democratic enough to attract the EU, without disengaging from Russia.

This framework acknowledges both the democratic and authoritarian nature of Ukraine's political system. The incumbent's inability to gain support from the entire

²⁰ See Matthijs Bogaards, "How to Classify Hybrid Regimes? Defective Democracy and Electoral Authoritarianism," *Democratisation* 16, no 2 (2009): 399-423.

²¹ Steven Levitsky and Lucan A. Way, "Competitive Authoritarianism: The Origins and Dynamics of Hybrid Regimes in the Post-Cold War Era," www.iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/4396/Levitsky-Way-Stanford.pdf, (accessed 12 July 2001).

nation maintains the competition in Ukraine's political elections. Way asserts that an authoritarian regime is defined by the integration of the state and the regime.²² The state, he determines, is understood as the "apparatus used for the exercise of public power,"²³ while the regime refers to "the procedures that regulate access to state power."²⁴ Under authoritarian rule the actions of state actors - bureaucratic employees, tax authorities, the judiciary, the military and the police - are used less to serve citizens and more to preserve and protect the incumbent's power. Under full authoritarian regimes, not only are the state and the regime intertwined, but also state and society. The representation of various political preferences within society is not a constraint on political power, nor is it a source of legitimate power. There is limited political pluralism in authoritarian regimes and therefore limited political mobilisation.

Methodology

Research methods are "the procedures and activities for selecting, collecting, organising and analysing data."²⁵ I consider the research as a longitudinal study of Ukrainian nation and state building. The focus is on the processes of nation and state building as intertwining elements, rather than the outcome of the CA regime. This research engages with both theoretical and empirical sources. Democratisation and identity theories are utilised in order to provide the foundation of knowledge in the area of study. The theoretical literature is used to provide a universal foundation and to place Ukraine's experience into a global perspective. My evidence for the CA behaviour in Ukraine is qualitative empirical data sourced from both primary and secondary resources. These empirical sources are combined with the theory in order to explain the development of CA in Ukraine. Primary sources include documents such as archival government documents and presidential speeches, news reports and public surveys. Secondary resources, such as journal articles, International

²² Lucan Way, "Authoritarian Failure: How does State Weakness Strengthen Electoral Competition," in *Electoral Authoritarianism: The Dynamics of Unfree Competition*, ed. Andres Schedler (London: Rienner Publishers, 2006), 169.

²³ Way, "Authoritarian Failure," 169.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Norman Blaikie, *Designing Social Research: the Logic of Anticipation* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010), 8.

Governmental Organisation and Non-Governmental Organisation reports will make up most of the literature for this research.

Limitations of the research

A limitation of this research is language, in that I do not speak or understand Ukrainian or Russian. This has limited the access to, and understanding of, the full range of original Ukrainian documents. However, this has not been of great detriment to this study as there are a wide variety of English-language resources available. Another limitation is the lack of field research conducted in Ukraine. While this has limited the data available, it has not weakened this research, as much of this thesis deals with Ukrainian history and the re-conceptualisation of theory.

This research focuses on the political ideology and behaviour of the president as obstacles to democracy. Consequently, the political actions of civil society are outside of the scope of this research. The reason for this is to focus the research on the political contestation for control of the state. This follows the constructivist logic that concludes that identity is a social construction manipulated by the state. Also, this research is designed to describe and explain how the antagonism between these two political cultures has resulted in a CA regime, but it does not form an opinion on to which of the two is more appropriate or successful for Ukraine. Neither does it focus upon how to resolve the antagonism between the political cultures or on how to reconcile Ukraine's national identity.

This research seeks to make both substantive and theoretical contributions to the study of Ukrainian politics. It will build upon the studies on Stephen Shulman, whose studies on the nature of civic and ethnic identification in Ukraine has provided a foundation for this research.²⁶ This thesis asserts that Ukraine's socially constructed, imperial history defines its current political situation. It also endeavours to contribute to the theoretical understanding of democratisation in the post-Soviet

²⁶ Stephen Shulman, "The Contours of Civic and Ethnic National Identification in Ukraine," *Europe-Asia Studies* 56, no.1 (2004): 35-56.

states, by asserting that the element of nation has been neglected in the transition literature.

Structure

This thesis is structured into four chapters and a conclusion. Chapter one presents an overview of democratisation theory and nationalism and introduces the concepts of nation and state building. Chapter two presents a history of Ukraine and an explanation of the creation of Ukraine's political culture divide. Chapter three analyses how identity has been institutionalised within the independent state, and what elements of identity prevent the development of a national consensus on the identity of the independent state and a Ukrainian *demos*. It highlights the contentious issues relating to a heterogeneous population, language law, minority rights and citizenship legislation. Chapter four then addresses how the antagonistic relationship between the cultures has contributed to the CA nature of Ukraine's politics. It purports that the definitive characteristic of Ukraine's political discourse is the oscillation of political power between the political elite of west and east Ukraine. The conclusion will include the final remarks of this research in direct reference to the central research question. It will also address the implications for the theoretical literature and ramifications for Ukraine's political future.

Chapter One

Nation and State Building - Theoretical framework

Ukrainians, as an ethnic group, existed long before the contemporary state of Ukraine was created. The term 'Ukrainian' was first documented in the twelfth century, yet the independent state of Ukraine only came into existence twenty-two years ago.²⁷ An immediate concern is the temporal disparity between the creation of the Ukrainian people and the state, and the relationship between the two entities. Ukraine's 1990 'Declaration of State Sovereignty' announced the state's intention to "express the will of the people" and to strive to "create a democratic society."²⁸ This declaration denied the legitimacy of state power coming from a single person or political party, renouncing the rule of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). Instead, "the people of Ukraine are the sole source of state authority in the republic."²⁹ Therefore, Ukraine based its new state upon democratic ideals, asserting that the relationship between Ukrainians and the new independent state would dictate the standard of its democracy.

Following independence, the international community was optimistic about Ukraine's political future. It was predicted that Ukraine would become a successful liberal democratic and wealthy state. It was the second largest territory in Europe after Russia, with the fifth largest population in Europe and a significant amount of natural resources.³⁰ Ukraine's commitment to democratic reform was considered the most genuine in the post-Soviet region, following the peaceful transfer of power in the 1994 presidential elections from President Kravchuk to Kuchma. However, over twenty years later, these predictions have not come to fruition.

²⁷ Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 25.

²⁸ "Declaration of State Sovereignty," Ukrainian Verkhovna Rada, http://static.rada.gov.ua/site/postanova_eng/Declaration_of_State_Sovereignty_of_Ukraine_rev1.htm, (accessed 14 May 2013).

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ "Ukraine Country Profile," *BBC News International*, last updated April 26 2012, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/country_profiles/1102303.stm (accessed 25 May 2013).

This chapter provides a theoretical framework that will provide a foundation for the subsequent chapters. Due to the relative youth of Ukraine as an independent state, theory on democratic transition is useful in order to explain and predict the trajectory of Ukraine's state development. It also provides a conceptual anchor; allowing a comparison of the situation in Ukraine to other experiences and the universal literature.

This chapter is founded upon an argument of Taras Kuzio, a prominent Canadian scholar on Ukrainian and post-Soviet politics and nationalism. In order to better understand Ukraine's transformation from a Soviet republic, this chapter will expand on what Kuzio terms a "quadruple transition."³¹ This chapter introduces the 'national' element of Ukraine's transition from the USSR and will demonstrate why understanding this specific element of transition is crucial to understanding Ukraine's democratic transition as a whole. This chapter will explore the theoretical relationship between nation and state building and democracy. It begins by providing definitions for the key terms of nation building and state building. Then democratisation theory is presented, in order to understand the dearth in the literature of the national element of transition. It then explores Kuzio's quadruple transition in greater detail. It examines why democracy needs a defined nation and explains how this nation is understood using the theory of political culture.

1.1 Terminology and definitions

This thesis asserts that a conceptual separation of nation and state building is necessary for democratisation theory. This separation is crucial to understanding Ukraine's transition from the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) to an independent state. Before this research can proceed, definitions are required for the terms 'nation' and 'state' and subsequently, the processes of nation and state building. Often, there is ambiguity when using these terms, as they have been used

³¹ Ibid., 146.

interchangeably in the political vernacular. Some institutions, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) have conceptually separated the processes of nation and state building. However, many institutions, particularly United States, have merged the two terms into state building. The OECD has explicitly stated that “state building is not nation building,” and refers to nation building as the strategies used by politicians to generate a common sense of national identity; this cohesion is subsequently used to support the state-building project.³² Yet, when the United States government discusses its nation building efforts in post-conflict situations, often it is discussing building the institutions of democratic governance, democratic state institutions.³³ Definitions of the terms for this thesis will now be provided, because they are important terms in the theoretical study of democracy. They will also provide the conceptual building blocks for analysing Ukraine’s current political situation. The following section will analyse the inherent relationship between the nation, the state and democracy.

State and state building

Max Weber’s interpretation of the state has become the classical definition. Essentially, the state is the administrative and legal order of a defined territory.³⁴ This institution claims binding authority over all members of the administration and citizens and controls all actions within its jurisdiction by the monopoly over the legitimate use of force.³⁵ The Montevideo Convention of 1933 provides a succinct and practical definition of a state for international law, in which it was stated that a state should meet four criteria: a permanent population, a defined territory, a governing body and the capacity to enter into relations with other states. In addition to this, the

³² Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, “Concepts and Dilemmas of State Building in Fragile Situations: From Fragility to Resilience,”

Journal on Development, 2008, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/fragilestates> (accessed 8 April 2013)

³³ James Dobbins, “Nation-building: UN Surpasses U.S. on Learning Curve,” Rand Corporation, Spring 2005, <http://www.rand.org/pubs/periodicals/randreview/issues/spring2005/nation.html> (accessed 25 November 2013).

³⁴ Max Weber, “The Fundamental Concepts of Sociology,” in *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, ed. Talcott Parsons, ed. (New York: Free Press, 1964), 156

³⁵ Ibid.

political existence of a state is granted by recognition by other states.³⁶ The ability of the state to function is dependent upon its institutions, legislation and state officials. Therefore, in order to maintain a monopoly of force within its territory, a state needs an organisational capacity, a decision-making capacity, an enforcement capacity and resources to fund these activities. These state capacities are made up of institutions such as an executive, a legislature, bureaucracy, police, military, judicial system and a means to extract economic resources, such as collecting taxes.³⁷ A framework of order binds these institutions as defined by constitutions, traditions, customs and laws.

State building can be understood, once the term 'state' has been defined. Margaret Canovan asserts that the aim of state building is to create a monopoly of legitimate force, not of physical force but the "concentration and expression of collective power without the need to exercise coercion."³⁸ Therefore, state building refers to the "process of increasing the state's capacity to perform the basic functions of governance."³⁹ State building can refer to establishing these state institutions or the process of enhancing their capacity.

Nation and nation building

As Walker Connor observed, "defining and conceptualising the nation is much more difficult because the essence of a nation is intangible."⁴⁰ Anthony Smith's definition of a "nation" will be adopted for this thesis: it is "a named community possessing an historic territory, shared myths and memories, a common public culture and

³⁶ Council on Foreign Relations, "Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States," 2012, <http://www.cfr.org/sovereignty/montevideo-convention-rights-duties-states/p15897> (accessed 27 March 2013).

³⁷ Juan J. Linz, "State building and Nation Building," *European Review* 1, no. 4 (1993): 355-369.

³⁸ Margaret Canovan, "Sleeping Dogs, Prowling Cats, and Soaring Doves: Three Paradoxes of Nationhood," in *The Fate of the Nation-State*, ed. M. Seymour, (Portland: McGill-Queens University Press, 2004), 22.

³⁹ Sarah Whitmore, "State and Institution Building under Kuchma," *Problems of Post-Communism* 52, no. 5 (2005): 4.

⁴⁰ Walker Connor, "A Nation is a Nation, is a State, is an Ethnic Group, is a..." in *Nationalism*, eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 36.

common laws and customs.”⁴¹ Smith’s approach will be re-introduced into this thesis later in the chapter.

Nation building refers to the endogenous process of how the state administration constructs a collective identity within its territory. This is done in order to legitimise public power within the state and inculcate a sense of belonging amongst the citizens. It draws on “existing traditions, institutions, and customs, redefining them as national characteristics in order to support the nation’s claim to sovereignty.”⁴² It can involve citizenship laws, education programs and language laws.

Demos and political community

The words *demos* and political community will be used interchangeably throughout this thesis. *Demos* is an ancient Greek word referring to the political unit of a democracy. Matthias Kaelberer provides further definition of *demos* as: “a political community whose members share a commitment to each other and exercise self-governance.”⁴³ Inherent amongst the group is the innate feeling of solidarity in order to allow the community to make sacrifices for each other. In a democracy, the *demos* is both the group of which power is exercised over and the group that provides the source of legitimate political power.

1.2 Democratisation theory

Democratisation theory is utilised in this thesis in order to provide the conceptual understanding of the process of transition. The literature on transition developed as a branch of democratisation literature, as democracy was once considered the

⁴¹ Anthony D. Smith, “Gastronomy or Geology? The Role of Nationalism in the Reconstruction of Nations,” *Nations and Nationalism* 1, no.1 (1995): 13.

⁴² Armin von Bogdandy, Stefan Häußler, Felix Hanschmann, Raphael Utz, “State-Building, Nation-Building, and Constitutional Politics in Post-Conflict Situations: Conceptual Clarifications and an Appraisal of Different Approaches,” *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law* 9 (2005), http://www.mpil.de/shared/data/pdf/pdfmpuny/bogdandyua_9_579_613.pdf (accessed 28 March 2013).

⁴³ Matthias Kaelberer, “The Euro and the European Demos: Money and Community beyond the Nation-state,” *Global Society* 24, no.4 (2010): 488.

normative outcome of transition. Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe Schmitter defined democratisation theory as a "transition from certain authoritarian regimes toward an uncertain 'something else.'"⁴⁴ The uncertain 'something else' could be democracy or the restoration of some authoritarian regime. The literature was concerned with the necessary conditions required for transition to occur; what drove the process of transition; how the transition process unfolded and the final outcome. Throughout the twentieth century, the study of transitions became increasingly pertinent. The aftermath of war and the dissolution of empires opened up this field, which concerns itself with the theory of political, economic and social transition after periods of authoritarian rule. Transitions were found all over the globe; however, the literature was formulated with the experiences of Southern Europe (Portugal, Greece and Spain) and Latin America (Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Brazil and Uruguay) following the decay of dictatorships.

The development of democratisation literature reflected the contemporary global situation. Therefore, when the theory was developing, the states it was analysing were actually re-democratising and not establishing democratic regimes for the first time. These states had clearly defined nations within defined territories and no question as to their national identity. Consequently, the focus of democratisation theory was centred on aspects of political and economic transition. However, the issue of the nation in these democracies was not pursued. In 1970, Dankwart Rustow published his seminal piece on democratisation.⁴⁵ While the body of his work focuses on what conditions allow democracy to emerge, he adds an important structural precondition. He warns that a necessary precondition for democratic transition is that the "vast majority of citizens in a democracy-to-be must have no doubt...as to which political community they belong to."⁴⁶ He posits that democracy is a system of

⁴⁴ Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe Schmitter, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies* (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1986), 3.

⁴⁵ Dankwart Rustow, "Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model," *Comparative Politics* 2, no. 3 (1970): 350.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

political contestation and “temporary majorities;”⁴⁷ therefore, the national identity of the state and its citizens must be resolved in order for the political elite to safely alternate. However, issues of national integration were not of great concern at the time, as the period of authoritarian rule in these regions had not changed the form of the state or the nation. The populations were generally homogeneous, the borders were defined, the state apparatus had continued to exist and the political community that the state represented had not been altered.

The transitions of the newly independent Soviet republics following the collapse of the United Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) presented formidable challenges to the traditional literature. Michael McFaul recognised these distinct transitions by referring to them as the “fourth wave” of democratic transition.⁴⁸ He argued that these states represent a different kind of transition where de-communisation has resulted in both democracy and dictatorship.⁴⁹ Transition from the USSR differed from the previous transitions for many reasons: the length of time under authoritarian rule was longer than any previous experience, many of the newly independent states had always been under some form of Russian influence and some republics had never been states before. Unlike previous transitioning states, these new post-Soviet states often lacked a strong sense of national identity, distinguishing them from the central European post-communist states, which will be discussed below. Identity issues were a major source of potential conflict following the dissolution of the Soviet Empire. Many of these states had heterogeneous populations that had been united by a totalitarian, oppressive regime. This was combined with strong nationalist movements within the republics that had successfully agitated for independence. These movements had popular support, yet they were unprepared for the challenge of government.

Democratisation literature of the 1990s

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Michael McFaul, “The Fourth Wave of Democracy and Dictatorship: Noncooperative Transitions in the Postcommunist World,” *World Politics* 54, no. 2 (2002).

⁴⁹ Ibid., 65.

The literature of the 1990s reflected the peculiarities of these new transitions. Issues of statehood were worked into democratisation literature, resulting in three elements of transition research: political, economic and state. Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan argued that “stateness” complexities were the most significant challenges for the emergence of democracy in the former Soviet Union.⁵⁰ They identify “stateness” as the “complex relationship between state, nation(s) and democratisation.”⁵¹ According to this, they define a “stateness problem” as when there are “profound differences about the territorial boundaries of the political community’s state and profound differences regarding who has the right of citizenship in that state.”⁵²

While issues of nation and state were interrelated, Kuzio argued that addressing these concepts as one issue had served the central and eastern European nation-states, but not the former Soviet republics.⁵³ The ‘quadruple transition’ incorporates four key elements of transition that are simultaneously transforming in the post-Soviet states. They face a political transition from a communist to a democratic state; an economic transition from a command economy to a free market; a state transition from a Soviet republic to an independent state; and a national transition from a Soviet citizen to a Ukrainian citizen. A quadruple transition occurs because the elements of state and national transition are treated as distinct phenomena. How Ukraine adopted its state apparatus and territorial borders differed greatly from how the Ukrainian nation was created, therefore, they should be researched as distinct entities. To make Ukraine’s situation even more complex, Ukrainians were only one part of the population; there was also a large Russian minority and a variety of smaller groups. What this thesis asserts, in line with the logic of Kuzio, is that the national element of transition should be the central focus of research in relation to democratic transition. While there are conflicting ideas of who constitutes the

⁵⁰ Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-communist Europe* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996), 356.

⁵¹ Linz and Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*, xiv.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 16.

⁵³ Taras Kuzio, “The National Factor in Ukraine’s Quadruple Transition,” *Contemporary Politics* 6, no.2 (2000): 143-164.

political community and what constitutes the national identity, then democracy will remain elusive.

The central and eastern European populations were more ethnically homogeneous than the former Soviet republics; therefore, national integration posed less challenges. Canovan highlighted the conceptual need for democratic literature to pay greater attention to the establishment of 'the people' or the *demos*. She highlighted that contemporary discussions of democratic theory assumed "that existing state boundaries can be taken as given"⁵⁴ and are not called into question by the implementation of democracy. In addition to this, it is taken for granted that each of these states contained 'a people,' in the democratic sense of the word.⁵⁵ Canovan's concerns highlighted genuine problems for the suitability of democratic theory for the situation following the collapse of the Soviet Union, as the newly independent Soviet republics adopted state boundaries that had been established by the Soviet Union.

Kuzio adapted Canovan's argument specifically for Ukraine and other former Soviet republics. He argued that the Southern European and Latin American transitions had taken place in states with long established borders and homogeneous populations, while this was not the case in the former Soviet republics. In these republics there was a greater degree of cultural, linguistic and religious pluralism. Kuzio's central argument is that, the greater the degree of cultural, linguistic and religious pluralism in an immature state, the more complex the democratic transition.⁵⁶ This results in citizens identifying with a mixture of identities, which compete for allegiance, to the detriment of the new nation-state.⁵⁷ He argues that democratisation literature was

⁵⁴ Margaret Canovan, *Nationhood and Political Theory*, (Edward Elgar Publishing Limited: Cheltenham, 1996), 18.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Taras Kuzio, "Transition in Post-Communist States: Triple or Quadruple?," *Politics* 21, no.3 (2001): 169.

not comprehensive enough for the challenges of the former Soviet republics while it subsumed issues of state and nation into one research area.⁵⁸

1.3 National identity and democracy

This section explains why a consensus on national identity is a necessary precondition for a successful democratic transition. This will be answered by addressing the relationship between nation, state and democracy. Demonstrating how the resolution of the identity of the *demos* is a requirement for a functional democracy.

What is democracy?

Democracy is the dominant model of political governance in the 21st century. It is championed by the United Nations as a core value and the ideal form of governance that allows the “protection and effective realisation of human rights.”⁵⁹ Democracy is another opaque term in need of further clarification and it can be understood in a procedural or an idealistic manner. David Held provides a basic definition of democracy as a political community in which there is some form of political equality among the people.⁶⁰ Roland Pennock provides a procedural definition as:

[R]ule by the people where ‘the people’ includes all adult citizens ... “Rule” means that public policies are determined either directly by vote of the electorate or indirectly by officials freely elected at reasonably frequent intervals and by a process in which each voter who chooses to vote counts equally.⁶¹

Robert Dahl also highlights seven minimum requirements for a democracy: 1) elected officials control government decision-making, 2) these officials are elected in regular, free and fair elections, 3) practically all adults have the right to vote, 4) practically all adults have the right to run for office, 5) citizens have freedom of speech, 6) citizens

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ United Nations Website, “Global Issues: Democracy,”

<http://www.un.org/en/globalissues/democracy/> (accessed 25 May 2013).

⁶⁰ David Held, *Models of Democracy* (Cambridge: Standord University Press, 2006), 1.

⁶¹ Roland J. Pennock, *Democratic Political Theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979).

have a right to seek out information freely and 7) citizens have the freedom of association.⁶² These procedural definitions are considered as minimal definitions, as they outline the basic requirements of democracy. Pennock also provides an apt description of the ideal and maximum definition of democracy:

Government by the people, where liberty, equality and fraternity are secured to the greatest possible degree and in which human capacities are developed to the utmost, by means including free and full discussion of common problems and interests.⁶³

In a fully functional democracy not only do all people, or the *demos*, participate in political governance, but they also have equal opportunities to participate and ensure a collective common good. Not only do the people receive the benefits of collective governance, but also they are accountable for the standard of governance.

In a democracy, political legitimacy and accountability reside within a bounded, united and equal political community. Elections are held in order to elect members of the community to a state government. Political legitimacy is achieved by winning the majority of the vote in free and frequent elections. The government works on behalf of the state as an organisation that exercises central control over the *demos* in order to form collective decisions on behalf of the people. Therefore, officials are voted into government with the support of the largest proportion of the people, giving them the authority to make decisions on behalf of society. This support is known as political authority, and the legitimacy of this authority comes from the support of the majority of the people.

Membership in the political community is referred to as citizenship, and is offered to those who fit the legal criteria as defined by the state. Membership in a political community grants an individual certain rights, but also subjects them to societal obligations and duties. Citizenship works as an exchange of “political allegiance, for the right to certain privileges and protections.”⁶⁴ Because there are obligations of

⁶² Robert Dahl, *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy: Autonomy vs. Control* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982), 11.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁶⁴ George Kelly, “Who Needs a Theory of Citizenship?,” *Daedalus* 108, no. 4 (1979): 23.

membership, such as taxes or military service, citizens expect that the resources they contribute to will benefit themselves and other citizens. This requires a linkage between the citizens that transcends political association, a certain innate loyalty to the community, based on the belief that the citizens of a nation share a common past and are working together for a better, collective future. If citizens are sacrificing something for the benefit of society, they expect that it will also benefit them in the long term.

A central concern of democracy is the clarification of what defines the membership of the *demos*? What is the glue that voluntarily binds these people into a collective political community? Democracy scholar, Frederick Whelen postulates: "boundary-drawing and the determination of political membership are perhaps the most fundamental political decisions."⁶⁵ However, it is also one of the most complex issues in regards to democracy. Canovan raises four pertinent points in regards to defining 'the people:' what are the limits of this collective? What makes an individual within those boundaries part of the people? What are the qualifications for citizenship? What makes those specified a collective 'people' able to take decisions and undertake long-term commitments?⁶⁶ Essentially, what defines the collective identity and the essence of the nation? These questions are resolved through the definition of a state's citizenship laws.

1.4 Citizenship, the nation and nationalism

There are three areas of concern that structure debates of citizenship and national identity. First, there is the issue of how to define the nation and nationalism. The point of contention amongst scholars is defining what creates the sentiments of unity amongst individuals. Second, debates arise over when nations first appeared: some argue that they are primordial or have existed since the beginning of mankind; others suggest they are perennial; while others consider them as a modern

⁶⁵ F.G. Whelan, "Democratic Theory and the Boundary Problem," *Liberal Democracy*, eds. J.R. Pennock and J.W. Chapman (New York, New York University Press, 1983), 13.

⁶⁶ Canovan, *Nationhood and Political Theory*, 18.

phenomenon arising from industrialisation. The third issue is how nations have developed: whether they are a natural reflection of society or, alternatively, are a result of political craftsmanship.

There are two main approaches that seek to explain how national identity is formed: essentialism (primordialism) and constructivism. Essentialists argue that national identity is based upon a primordial ethnic core and that nations are the natural assertion of this ethnic identity.⁶⁷ The nation is the intrinsic assertion of a political community based on shared ethnic attributes such as blood-ties, language, religion, culture and myths. Consequently, the role of the political elite is to articulate this ethnic identity. Alternatively, constructivists argue that the political elite is responsible for forming and mobilising national identity.⁶⁸ Constructivists focus on the invented characteristics or symbols of the group and argue that they are selected, manipulated or selectively forgotten by the political elite.⁶⁹ The role of political and cultural elite severs the intrinsic link between ethnicity and the nation as asserted by essentialists. The historical experiences and the collective memory of the *demos* can be reinvented, accentuated or repressed by politicians in order to mobilise the population.

Many scholars have argued that a heterogeneous population is not conducive to democracy. Arend Lijphart argued: "deep ethnic and other societal divisions pose a grave problem for democracy and that, *ceteris paribus*, it is more difficult to establish and maintain democracy in divided than homogenous societies."⁷⁰ The diversity of different ethnic, cultural, linguistic and values groups is not congruent with the logic of democracy. This is because democracy operates by representing the political preferences of the majority. Therefore, sheer numbers determine political outcomes, which is not always truly beneficial for the entire population. This is particularly

⁶⁷ Anthony D. Smith, *Nations and Nationalism in the Global Era*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), 45.

⁶⁸ Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1983), 89.

⁶⁹ Lars-Erik Cederman, "Nationalism and Bounded Integration: What it would take to Construct a European Demos," European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, San Domenico, RSC No. 2000/34, 2000. 6.

⁷⁰ Lijphart, Arend, "The Wave of Power-Sharing Democracy" in Andrew Reynolds, ed., *The Architecture of Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 37.

pertinent during the initial phases of democratic transition, when the “rules of the game” are being established. Walker Connor has criticised this concept of nation building in multinational states, arguing that history has shown that nation building should be perceived as “nation destroying”, as most states simply force assimilation to the larger cultural or ethnic group.⁷¹

Multinational states in transition face two nation-building alternatives: to build the independent state on an ethnic-based identity or to attribute a civic-based identity to the state. However, scholars have questioned the dichotomy of this decision in recent years, arguing that there are analytic ambiguities and a lack of consensus regarding the definition and distinction of the terms ‘ethnic’ and ‘civic.’⁷² However, their ideal types are still useful for understanding the purpose of a new state. This is a pertinent decision that will lay the foundations for the political make-up of the new state and determines the relationship of the people to the state. However, the decision is made complex following the dissolution of the USSR, as the Soviet Republics had highly heterogeneous populations and a loose sense of national identity. As a land-based empire, the USSR encouraged the internal migration of its citizens throughout the Soviet republics. Inter-ethnic marriage was also common, complicating and diluting ethnic identification in the next generation. Cultural traditions were also subdued under the USSR, as a Soviet identity was purported by the state and religion traditions were forbidden. Therefore, the decision of the nature of citizenship laws and nation building direction would be one of the most important decisions for the new state.

Inherently, if the citizenship legislation within a state were based on an ethnic core, then the purpose of the state would be to represent and protect the political interests of the titular ethnic group. This is because an ethnic interpretation accepts an essentialist understanding of a nation, and that a state is an assertion of this ethnic nation. However, if a civic identity was purported, it is able to unite individuals

⁷¹ Walker Connor, “Nation-building or Nation-destroying?,” *World Politics* 24, no.3 (1972), 234.

⁷² Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity Without Groups*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004).

under shared values and beliefs, rather than an ethnic identification. A civic approach accepts a constructivist approach to identity that allows the political elite to construct a national identity of the state. Many scholars have asserted that the most successful way to implement democracy in a multinational situation is to institutionalise a civic identity. Linz and Stepan hypothesised that the chances of consolidating democracy in a multi-national setting are increased by government policies that grant “inclusive and equal citizenship” and grant equal individual rights to all citizens.⁷³ Anthony Smith explains that in a civic model, “unity arises from a historic territory, laws and institutions, the legal-political equality of members that expresses itself in a set of rights and duties, and a common civic culture and ideology.”⁷⁴ Also supporting this concept, Michael Ignatieff characterises the civic model as a “community of equal, rights-bearing citizens, united in patriotic attachment to a shared set of political practices and values.”⁷⁵ Therefore, unity is established by creating a sense of equality through the development of a civil society, which is safeguarded by legislation and institutions.

The Ukrainian context presented a plethora of complications for the nation building process. These include: the psychological transition of Ukrainians from a minority to a majority and the change of Russians from the dominant group to a minority; the large number of minorities within the Ukrainian population and the ambiguous identity of some of its citizens. With its ethnically heterogeneous population, defining the state in ethnic terms would lead to political instability. Yet, ethnic Ukrainians demanded that an independent state was required in order to protect and represent ethnic Ukrainians who had never achieved statehood. However, the decision of how to define the Ukrainian political community was to become a politicised battle between the traditional political forces of Ukraine, rather than a roundtable discussion as occurred in many other former communist states.

⁷³ Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, “Toward Consolidated Democracies,” *Journal of Democracy* 7, no.2 (1996), 21.

⁷⁴ Anthony Smith, *National Identity*, (London: Penguin, 1996), 12.

⁷⁵ Michael Ignatieff, *Blood and belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism*, (New York: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1993), 6-7.

An alternative approach?

Regardless of theoretical considerations, it cannot be denied that ethnicity is still a strong force in global politics. It is ubiquitous and has caused much bloodshed in recent decades. One only needs to think of the breakup of Yugoslavia or the genocide in Rwanda to recognise this. However, the role of political actors was also demonstrated throughout the twentieth century. They can serve either as an ethnically divisive leader such as Idi Amin and Slobodan Milošević, or as a uniting force such as Marshall Tito. Therefore, a political theory is needed that conflates both the sentimental power of ethnicity, and the power of politicians to mobilise populations. Smith suggests a new theoretical approach that focuses on “understand[ing] the relationship between modern nations and pre-modern culture.”⁷⁶ He argues that states cannot be repeatedly reinvented on a whim of the political elite without a constant cultural thread defining the nature of state building.⁷⁷

Anthony Smith and Miroslav Hroch offer frameworks that combine elements of each approach in order to better understand national identity.⁷⁸ They agree that nations are modern and that the political and cultural elite can construct identity. However, they acknowledge the influence of culture and ethnicity in constructing this identity. Smith argues that we should

Trace them [nations and nationalism] back to their underlying ethnic and territorial contexts; we must set them in wider historical intersection between cultural ties and political communities, as these were influenced by, and influenced, the processes of administrative centralisation, economic transformations, mass communications and the disintegration of traditions which we associate with modernity.⁷⁹

His approach is referred to as “ethno-symbolism,” which emphasises the role of ethnicity in nationalism, while still adhering to the modernist paradigm. He defines

⁷⁶ Anthony D. Smith, “Gastronomy or Geology? The Role of Nationalism in the Reconstruction of Nations,” *Nations and Nationalism* 1, no.1 (1995), 13.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Miroslav Hroch, “Real and Constructed: The Nature of the Nation,” in *Comparative Studies in Modern European History: Nation, Nationalism, Social Change*, eds. Miroslav Hroch (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007), 95.

⁷⁹ Anthony D. Smith, “When is a Nation?” *Geopolitics* 7, no. 2 (2002), 14.

ethnicity as a “named community of shared origin myths, memories and one or more elements of common culture, including an association with a specific territory.”⁸⁰ He stresses the role of socio-cultural symbols, myths, memories, and traditions in creating collective cultural identities, which constitutes an ethnic grouping. In other words, Smith argues that while these ethnic myths and traditions are created or rather manipulated for modern purposes, they are still substantive and still deserve attention from scholars.

However, Smith also argues for an element of constructivism in his theory, which he refers to as “political archeology.”⁸¹ Continuing this logic, he refers to nationalist intellectuals and politicians as “political archeologists.”⁸² Their role is to “rediscover, reinterpret and regenerate”⁸³ the indigenous ethnic past in order to explain and locate the present community in history. Rediscovery refers to the search for materials and resources to contribute to the ethno-history of the culture. Political “archeologists” must also interpret this history and choose their particular understanding of history (and occasionally the present) in order to frame the nation as legitimate and authentic. Finally, regeneration uses this selection of the past as a political tool to activate the community. This action unifies the knowledge gained from the previous actions of discovering and interpreting the cultural past in order to achieve political goals. Therefore, Smith’s approach determines that nation is based upon the titular ethnic group, however the political elite must assist the nation to fully develop its national identity.

Hroch has a similar alternative approach that merges the theories of essentialism and constructivism. Hroch takes the element of a substantive ethnic group forming the basis of a nation and explains how a “national movement” (Hroch’s preferred term over nationalism) is created.⁸⁴ Hroch defines the demands of a national movement as pushing for 1) cultural and linguistic demands – local language used in literature,

⁸⁰ Smith, “When is a Nation,” 15.

⁸¹ Smith, 15.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid., 16.

⁸⁴ Hroch, “Real and Constructed,” 95.

education, and political administration; 2) political demands – political self-determination and 3) social demands, which depend upon the current social and economic situation, but generally call for the ethnic group to break out from the cultural hegemony of the dominant ethnic group, usually within an empire. His national movement has three phases, whereby the nation precipitates the state. First, there is a rise in self-reflected scholarly works by intellectuals of the linguistic, cultural, social, economic and historical attributes of the non-dominant ethnic group. Second, there is a flow on effect and a range of activists emerging that are ready for patriotic agitation in order to establish a state. The final phase is achieved once this nationalist fervour has spread to the mass populace.

Both of these approaches connect the current political environment to historical and cultural conditions, whilst acknowledging the influential role politicians play in using this information to mobilise the population to meet their demands. This is a useful tool for analysis for Ukraine as its political discourse is dominated by issues that relate to ethnic identification, such as the status of the Russian language and the *Holodomor* famine. These issues have become such hot battlegrounds because politicians have connected these issues to the survival of their culture.

1.5 Political culture

Why are these alternative approaches useful for the Ukrainian democratic transition? Ukrainian politics has been dominated by the discourse of two distinct ‘political cultures’ whose competition for political power has stymied democratic development. This thesis will use Smith’s ethno-symbolism as a conceptual basis for ‘political culture,’ whereby ethnic markers are the foundation for the group, but they are profoundly influenced and manipulated by the attitudes and practices of the political elite.

The term ‘political culture’ is used to refer to the ethos or the characteristic attitudes and behaviour of the political elite that have developed under different social environments caused by imperial legacies. Gabriel Almond asserts that ‘political

culture' theory recognises that the relationship between political structure and culture is interactive. He argues that "one cannot explain cultural propensities without reference to historical experience and contemporary structural constraints and opportunities."⁸⁵ He adds that attitudes and beliefs can be used to explain political and structural phenomena such as national cohesion, patterns of political cleavage, modes of dealing with political conflict and respect for authority.⁸⁶ As Lucian Pye explains, political culture is the "sum of traditions of a society, the spirit of public institutions, enthusiasm, collective memory and the reasoning of its citizenry, the style and operating codes of its leaders that are meaningfully codified in historical experience and relationships."⁸⁷

Political culture is pertinent for this research because it explains how the social environment has entrenched political and cultural divisions that continue to stymie political reform. The political culture divide provides a paradigm for understanding Ukraine's current political discourse. Within Ukraine there are two deep-seeded political cultures that have developed out of different social environments, specifically different imperial legacies. These cultures have developed independent of each other for centuries and have entrenched certain attitudes, practices and beliefs into the society and government. While Ukraine inherited its state apparatus and structure, its population also inherited its political attitudes. The western political culture perceives Ukraine as a European country, having developed under the rule of Central European empires. It asserts Ukraine's independent ethnic identity and the need for a state based upon self-determination against the continued imperialist tendencies of Russia. The eastern political culture has developed under the sphere of Russian imperial influence. It accepts a multi-faceted identity with Ukrainian identity alongside a collective eastern Slavic identity with Russia and Belarus.

⁸⁵ Gabriel Almond, "Communism and Political Culture Theory," *Comparative Politics* 15, no. 2 (1983): 127.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Lucian W. Pye, "Introduction: Political Culture and Development," in *Political Culture and Development*, eds. Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965), 7.

Conclusion

This chapter has analysed the literature of democratic transition theory in order to illustrate why Ukraine should be understood as a quadruple transition. It has argued that the national element of transition is the foundation for a successful democratic transition. It has analysed the complex relationship between the state, the nation and democracy. This analysis has demonstrated how a bounded national community is the source of legitimate power and authority in a democratic society and that without a *demos*, there can be no democracy. Due to the heterogeneous populations of the republics that emerged from the Soviet Union, our conceptual understanding of the nation must incorporate elements of ethnic identity and the socially constructed influence of politicians in their abilities to mobilise the population. The following chapter will address the content of Ukrainian national identity and the creation of two distinct political cultures on Ukrainian territory.

Chapter Two

The Development of Two Political Cultures in Ukraine

Throughout my research for this thesis, a trend became apparent in the voting behaviour in Ukraine. Further research illustrated that this divide not only represented political preferences, but also fundamental social and cultural differences. The motivation behind this research was the need to explain this divide in Ukraine's voting and political behaviour. Map 1 below shows this divide in the notorious 2004 presidential elections, where voters in the east overwhelmingly voted for Yanukovych and voters in the west voted for Yushchenko. The divide between the presidential candidates took the same shape in almost every election, with the east voting one way, and the west voting the other. Tables 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 illustrate the large cleavage in regional support for each presidential candidate in the second round of voting. This divide essentially splits Ukraine into two groups, what I refer to as west and east Ukrainians. This chapter will demonstrate that this division is explained by historical cultural legacies cause by imperial divisions.

Map 1 - Voting in the 2004 presidential election



Source - <http://itre.cis.upenn.edu/~myl/language/log/archives/001675.html>

Table 1 - Results from round two of 1991 Presidential election

Oblast (Province)	Chornovil	Kravchuk
Lviv (West)	75.86%	11.50%
Ivano-Frankivsk (West)	67.10%	13.70%
Ternopil (West)	57.45%	16.79%
Chernivtsi (West)	42.67%	43.56%
Zakarpattya (West)	27.58%	58.03%
Luhansk (East)	9.94%	76.23%
Donetsk (East)	9.59%	71.47%
Kharkiv (East)	19.66%	60.85%
Dnipropetrovsk (East)	18.15%	69.74%
Ukrainian total	23.27%	61.59%

Source - www.electoralgeography.com

Table 2 - Results from round two of 1994 Presidential election

Oblast (Province)	Kravchuk	Kuchma
Lviv	93.77%	3.90%
Ivano-Frankivsk	94.46%	3.86%
Ternopil	94.80%	3.75%
Chernivtsi	61.84%	35.27%
Zakarpattya	70.52%	25.51%
Luhansk	10.11%	88.0%
Donetsk	18.49%	79.0%
Kharkiv	25.95%	71.01%
Dnipropetrovsk	29.72%	67.81%
Ukrainian total	45.06%	52.15%

Source - www.electoralgeography.com

Table 3 - Results from round two of 1999 Presidential election

Oblast (Province)	Kuchma	Symonenko
Lviv	91.59%	5.15%
Ivano-Frankivsk	92.30%	4.48%
Ternopil	92.17%	4.84%
Chernivtsi	73.21%	21.43%
Zakarpattya	84.63%	9.66%
Luhansk	40.74%	53.87
Donetsk	52.98%	41.23%
Kharkiv	46.64%	46.46%
Dnipropetrovsk	56.35%	38.08%
Ukrainian total	56.25%	37.80%

Source - www.electoralgeography.com

Table 4 - Results from round two of Voting (December re-election) in 2004 Presidential election

Oblast (Province)	Yushchenko	Yanukovich
Lviv	93.74%	4.72%
Ivano-Frankivsk	95.72%	2.86%
Ternopil	96.03%	2.70%
Chernivtsi	79.75%	17.37%
Zakarpattya	67.25%	27.58%
Luhansk	6.21%	91.24%
Donetsk	4.21%	93.54%
Kharkiv	26.37%	68.12%
Dnipropetrovsk	32.01%	61.13%
Ukrainian total	52.0%	44.20%

Source - www.electoralgeography.com

Table 5 - Results of round two 2010 Presidential election

Oblast (Province)	Tymoshenko	Yanukovich
Lviv	86.20%	8.6%
Ivano-Frankivsk	88.89%	7.0%
Ternopil	88.39%	7.90%
Chernivtsi	66.50%	27.60%
Zakarpattya	51.70%	41.60%
Luhansk	7.70%	88.96%
Donetsk	6.50%	90.44%
Kharkiv	22.4%	71.35%
Dnipropetrovsk	29.10%	62.70%
Ukrainian total	45.50%	49.0%

Source - www.electionresources.sorg.ua/president

It is clear from the results of the five past presidential elections that Ukrainian voter behaviour is extremely polarised. Candidates generally win clear majorities in either east or west Ukraine. The voting system in Ukraine exacerbates this divide, as a majority (50% or higher) of the vote is required for a candidate to win. This results in two rounds of voting, where the two candidates with the highest number of votes enter a second round of voting. In elections where there the second round candidates have come from opposing political cultures (1994, 2004, 2010), the election campaign

has focused upon issues of Ukraine's national identity. However, when the candidates originated from the same political culture (1991, 1999), then matters of economy, governance acumen and political ideology took precedence.

This chapter will demonstrate how two political cultures exist in the present day territory of Ukraine. Citizens of Ukraine are currently made up of ethnic Ukrainians with two levels of national consciousness and other minority groups who were within Ukraine's borders at the time of independence. I refer to these as west and east Ukraine; west Ukraine asserts an ethnic Ukrainian national identity, while east Ukraine represents a more civic interpretation of Ukraine's national identity. The influence of historical imperial rule has established two distinct communities of Ukrainian citizens, what this thesis refers to as political cultures. These political cultures were formed in contrasting social environments established by the imperial forces of Central European and Russian powers. These different political cultures have influenced the conception of national identity and political preferences of Ukrainian citizens, consequently fragmenting Ukraine's political community.

The previous chapter illustrated how the national element of Ukraine's quadruple transition is the most important concern in regards to democratisation theory. Without a functioning *demos* or political community, the prospect of a successful democratic transition seems bleak. A complex situation arises, as each political culture has a different concept of what constitutes Ukrainian identity and how Ukraine should continue its nation building process. This chapter will connect the history of the Ukrainian territory to the current political environment in Ukraine. The chapter will be broken down into four sections. The analysis will begin by providing a brief historical outline of the modern-day territory of Ukraine from Kievan Rus up until independence in 1991. The second section will introduce the political culture of west Ukraine, and the third section will introduce the political culture of east Ukraine. Finally, the fourth section will evaluate the impact of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) on the cultures.

2.1 Historical overview

In order to understand the nuances of Ukraine's east and west political cultures, a brief historical narrative is necessary. This section draws on the history of the territory of present day Ukraine as described by Canadian scholars, Orest Subtelny and Paul Robert Magosci, whose works were the first Ukrainian historiographies following independence in 1991.⁸⁸ Up until independence, the history of the territory of Ukraine had been written as part of Russian historiography. However, following independence, a key priority of scholars was to assert a Ukrainian historiography.

Subtelny describes ethnic Ukrainians as part of a Slavic group of agrarian peoples who originally settled around the northern slopes of the Carpathian Mountains, the Vistula valley and the Prypiat marshlands.⁸⁹ Linguistic analysis has shown that by the sixth century, the Slavs had evolved into three linguistic subgroups: West Slavic (Polish and Czech), South Slavic (Bulgarian, Macedonian and Serbo-Croatian) and East Slavic (Ukrainian, Belorussian and Russian).⁹⁰ By the 10th Century, the eastern Slavs were under the control of Kievan Rus, and it is here that the dialectics of Ukrainian nation building began.

⁸⁸ Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988) and Paul Robert Magosci, *A History of Ukraine*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996).

⁸⁹ Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 19.

⁹⁰ Anna Siewierska and Ludmila Uhlirová, "An Overview of Word Order in Slavic Languages," in *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe*, ed. Anna Siewierska. (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998), 105.

Map 2 - Map of Kievan Rus in the 11th century.



Source - <http://peter.mackenzie.org/history/hist33143.htm>

Kievan Rus is a unique historical entity; it was not cohesive enough to warrant the title of 'empire,' yet it constituted a political entity robust enough to be considered the historical homeland of the Eastern Slavs. Essentially, it was a federation of principalities, united by strong leaders since Prince Oleg in 880 AD. It grew in strength by exploiting its geographical position and controlling important trade routes from the Black Sea to the Orient. The most influential legacy of Kievan Rus is that of Christianity, as its leader, Volodymyr the Great, converted to Byzantine Christianity from Paganism, making it the official religion of his realm in the late 980s. Kievan Rus disintegrated into successor principalities in 1240, following the invasion of the Mongolians.

Kievan Rus is relevant to this thesis because it is the alleged historical and cultural predecessor of both Ukraine and Russia. This establishes an initial cultural conflict between the two present-day states. Jaroslaw Pelenski argues that the struggle over the legacy of Kievan Rus has an extensive impact on all aspects of the "cultural perception," "historical awareness," and the "modern national consciousness of

Ukraine and Russia.”⁹¹ The official Ukrainian state interpretation of history recognises Kievan Rus as the ancestor of the independent state of Ukraine. In its declaration of independence it refers to a “thousand-year tradition of state development in Ukraine.”⁹² However, Russia interprets Kievan Rus in a different manner, as Russian historian Boris Rybakov asserts: “Kievan Rus was the original name of what eventually came to be known as Russia.”⁹³ This historical dispute is indicative of the cultural tension between Ukraine and Russia.

Collapse of Kievan Rus, 1240-1450

Ethnic Ukrainians were united under the control of Kievan Rus. They lived under a single government, as one of many ethnic groups within Kievan Rus. Ethnic Ukrainians became divided in the aftermath of the disintegration of Kievan Rus, as the territory of modern day Ukraine was dominated by the imperial powers of Russia, Poland, Lithuania, and the Mongolian Golden Horde. The centralised leadership of Kievan Rus entered a period of political decline; conversely as its neighbours were gaining strength. Realising the potential political instability that faced them, the princes of Kievan Rus came to an agreement to mutually recognise the existing assignment of land to the present rulers and their ancestors.⁹⁴ This was known as the Conference of Liubech, signed in 1097, and it had a lasting effect on the governance of Kievan Rus, moving power away from the centre to regional princes. This resulted in the dominance of three regional centres following the Mongolian invasion: Galicia and Volhynia (which united in 1199) in the southwest, and Vladimir-Suzdal’ in the northeast and Novgorod in the far north.

From the 13th century onwards, ethnic Ukrainians were divided under the governance of various imperial powers. They were absorbed into the principalities of

⁹¹ Jaroslaw Pelenski, *The Contest for the Legacy of Kievan Rus* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1998), 1.

⁹² Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine Official Web Portal, “Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine Resolution: On Declaration of Independence of Ukraine,” http://static.rada.gov.ua/site/postanova_eng/Rres_Declaration_Independence_rev12.htm, (accessed 9 September 2012).

⁹³ Boris Rybakov, *Kievan Rus* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1984), 5.

⁹⁴ Magosci, *A History of Ukraine*, 79.

Galicia-Volhynia and Vladimir-Suzdal'. Prominent Ukrainian historian, Stepan Tomashivsky, argues that Galicia-Volhynia should be considered as the first Ukrainian state, because at the height of its power (in the 13th century), it contained about 90% of the population living in the modern-day borders of Ukraine.⁹⁵ The remainder of ethnic Ukrainians were absorbed into Vladimir-Suzdal', the strongest of all the northern Rus principalities. During the 14th century, Galicia-Volhynia was absorbed into Polish Crown, and eventually the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (PLC) and Vladimir-Suzdal' evolved into the Tsardom of Russia. It is from this time that the powers of central and Eastern Europe and Muscovy became locked in a battle for territory, while ethnic Ukrainians struggled to retain their cultural and political autonomy. The ongoing battles over the present-day Ukrainian territory would define the Ukrainian nation as the social environments created by these foreign powers forced the Ukrainians to either assimilate or rebel.

The period of 1450 - 1686

The PLC and the Tsardom of Russia owe much of their contrasting social environments to religious differences. A religious distinction between the two political cultures was established by the defeat of Constantinople and the Byzantine Empire by the Ottomans in 1453. Without a spiritual home for Orthodoxy, Moscow considered itself the new centre of Orthodox Christianity. In 1595, Orthodox Bishops within the PLC decided (under duress from the PLC authorities) to devote their church to the Pope of Rome rather than the newly established Patriarch of Moscow, thus creating the Uniate (Greek Catholic) Church. This decision was known as the Union of Brest, which established a Roman Catholic faith in Eastern Europe. Ethnic Ukrainians under the PLC were forced to accept the Treaty of Brest and its religious consequences, distinguishing them from ethnic Ukrainians under the Tsardom of Russia.

⁹⁵ Stepan Tomashivsky, quoted in John-Paul Himka, *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century* (London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1988).

Throughout this time period, ethnic Ukrainians had brief interludes of self-determination. During the 17th century, a Ukrainian nomadic tribe occupying the Steppe region, known as the Cossacks, established an autonomous Ukrainian state. Known as fierce warriors, they were often employed by leaders of both the PLC and Russian Tsars to defend their imperial borders. Traditionally, the *Zaporozhian* Cossacks (a sub-tribe of the Cossacks) had been faithful to the PLC authorities, protecting the frontier from raids by the Crimean Tartars. However, after the Union of Brest, the Cossacks felt the need to assert their autonomy against the encroachment of the PLC authorities, in order to protect the rights of Ukrainians. This rebellion is known as the Khmelnytsky Uprising of 1648 -1657. Cossack leader, Bohdan Khmelnytsky, led the *Zaporozhians* (with the help of the Crimean Tartars and Ukrainian peasants) into battle against the Polish domination of the Ukrainians. During the uprising Khmelnytsky created an autonomous Ukrainian state known as the Cossack Hetmanate. This state was based in the central region of modern day Ukraine, hugging the left and right banks of the Dnieper. This has become a definitive moment of Ukrainian state building and is revered by present day ethnic Ukrainians as a moment where Ukrainians established a state to protect their culture against foreign oppression.⁹⁶ It is also in the historic memory of ethnic Ukrainians as because the *Zaporozhian* Cossacks wrote a constitution in 1710, what they consider as the first constitution of the Ukrainian state and evidence of ethnic Ukrainians' democratic traditions.⁹⁷

The end of the Hetmanate also became a historical moment in the collective memory of ethnic Ukrainians. The state Hetmanate was short-lived, as it was soon signed to the protection of the Russian Tsar. After years of war, Khmelnytsky recognised that an external protectorate was required, in order to maintain victory over the Poles and to provide the Cossack state with legitimacy. Khmelnytsky's decision would lead to another historic moment in Ukrainian history, the Treaty of Pereiaslav. This was an

⁹⁶ "Yushchenko Prepares for Inauguration," *Kiev Post*, January 22 2005, <http://www.kyivpost.com/content/business/yushchenko-prepares-for-inauguration.html?flavour=mobile>, (accessed 18 November 2013).

⁹⁷ Omeljan Pritsak, "The First Constitution of Ukraine (5 April 1710)," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 22 (1998): 473.

agreement signed in 1654, whereby Khmelnytsky swore allegiance to the Muscovy Tsar and agreed to the imperial rule of Muscovy over his state. This moment is perceived by present day ethnic Ukrainians in west Ukraine as a travesty, whereby Ukrainian autonomy and territory were willingly signed over to Muscovy. However, in Russia today, the Treaty is viewed as a natural union whereby Russia offered protection for its Slavic brother.⁹⁸ But this was not the final transfer of Ukrainian territory to Moscow. After thirty years of war from 1657 between Muscovy, Poland, the Ottomans and Cossacks, a treaty known as “the Eternal Peace” was signed. Poland and Muscovy agreed that Muscovy would receive Kiev and Cossack lands (Sloboda, Zaporozhia, and the Hetmanate) and land east of the Dnieper River, while Poland would take lands west of the Dnieper. This is the line that divided imperial influence over Ukrainians and this is the line that present-day voting in Ukraine follows.

The period of 1687 – 1917

This era is characterised by a shift in imperial powers of Europe. This shift would see more ethnic Ukrainians absorbed into the Russian Empire and the dissolution of the PLC, to be replaced with the Habsburg Empire. The removal of Polish power would place Poles and Ukrainians in competition against each another for statehood following World War I. Emboldened by his territorial gains, Peter I adopted the title of Emperor and changed the name of the Tsardom of Muscovy to the Russian Empire in 1721. In contrast, by the 18th century, the PLC was in political decline, maintaining its system of decentralised control under a weak king. In order to restore the balance of power in Europe (and to appease an expansionist Russia), the leaders of the Habsburg, Prussian and Russian Empires proposed to share parts of the PLC amongst themselves. This was the beginning of three partitions of Poland in 1772, 1793 and 1795. In the first partition, the Habsburg Empire received the regions of Galicia, Belz, Bukovina and Transcarpathia (modern day *oblasti* of west Ukraine:

⁹⁸ Roman Woronowycz, “Putin visits Kyiv to Conclude “Year of Russia in Ukraine,” *Ukrainian Weekly*, January 23 2004, <http://www.ukrweekly.com/old/archive/2004/050401.shtml> (accessed 18 November 2013).

Ternopil, Ivano-Frankivsk, Lviv, Chernivtsi and Zakarpattia). In the second partition, the Russia Empire received the remaining territory of Ukraine: the right bank of the Dnieper River (modern day *oblasti* of Volyn, Rivne, Vinnytsia, Zhytomyr, Kirvohrad and Kiev). In the third partition, both the Habsburg and Russian Empires claimed further territory that wiped Poland off the map (see map 3 below).

Map 3 - Map of the three partitions of Poland



Source - <http://www.yorku.ca/lockshin/courses/huma2850/lectures/lecture18.html>

From the late 18th to early 20th centuries, the territory of present day Ukraine was divided amongst the Habsburg and Russian Empires, which continued to cultivate distinct Ukrainian political cultures. This was particularly so for ethnic Ukrainians living under Habsburg rule, as nationalist movements were starting to challenge the imperial order of Europe in the 19th century. This culminated in the 'Spring of Nations,' a series of nationalist revolutions that took place in Europe in 1848. Revolutions occurred all throughout Europe with people demanding changes in a

variety of issues, including the improvement of political representation, better working conditions and national self-determination. The 'Spring of Nations' would result in the battle for self-determination in Europe, and World War I. The social environment created by the Habsburgs would expose ethnic Ukrainians under their rule to extreme nationalist fervour, which would consequently influence them to push for greater self-governance within the Empire. This exposure would help to construct the identity of west Ukrainian political culture.

The political landscape of central and Eastern Europe was altered greatly by World War I, which would have a profound impact on ethnic Ukrainians. Both the Habsburg and Russian Empires ceased to exist after the war, exposing an opportunity for the ethnic Ukrainians to establish their own state. During the war, Ukrainians were compelled to protect their existence, whilst also fighting for both sides. The Habsburgs were part of the Central Powers alongside Germany and Italy, which had been defeated by the Allied Forces. The Russian Empire withdrew from World War I in 1917, because of the Russian Revolution, which had erupted into a civil war between the White Russians and the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks gained victory, killed the royal family and re-established Russia according to Marxist ideology as the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic. This later became the USSR as the Bolsheviks expanded their power over parts of the Russian Empire in 1922.

The period of 1917 - 1991

The period following World War I held great potential for the formation of a Ukrainian state. From 1917 to 1923, ethnic Ukrainians under both imperial powers fought in order to establish a Ukrainian state. This occurred alongside a power struggle between the Poles and the Russians for the present-day lands of west Ukraine. Both the west and east Ukrainians were able to establish autonomous Ukrainian states. The Ukrainian People's Republic was established in Kiev in 1917 within the Russian Republic, shortly replaced with the Ukrainian National Republic. Habsburg Ukrainians also established the West Ukrainian People's Republic in the dying days of the Habsburg Empire in November 1918. The two Ukrainian republics

united in January 1919, creating a somewhat superficial union. There were no collective government structures and both states were fighting different enemies. This demonstrates the weakness and vulnerability of the Ukrainians, and highlights the problem of considering them as a united political community. The National Republic was absorbed into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) following the Treaty of Riga between the USSR and Poland. The West Ukrainian People's Republic was absorbed into the Polish state as ordained by articles from the Paris Peace Conference and the Treaty of Riga; however, some Ukrainians were also absorbed into Romania and Czechoslovakia. All the momentum for Ukrainian self-determination, which had been high in the lead up to World War I, was defeated.

World War II provided another opportunity for Ukrainian statehood and nationalist sentiment increased in west Ukraine. Poland was attacked by both Germany and the USSR. Ethnic Ukrainians in west Ukraine were attacked on all fronts; they fought the Nazis and the Soviets, as well as fighting their ethnic kin under Soviet rule. Ethnic Ukrainians in west Ukraine were concerned with the lack of political representation and regard for Ukrainians during the war, resulting in the creation of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN). The OUN was a political organisation established to protect (occasionally using violence) ethnic Ukrainian interests against the Polish and Soviet authorities, although its principal goal was the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state.⁹⁹ Due to an ideological rift in the leadership, the OUN split into two factions and Stepan Bandera led a new revolutionary faction. The OUN left a solid impression on the historical memory of ethnic Ukrainians and remains a contentious topic within identity politics of present day Ukraine.

World War II ultimately united ethnic Ukrainians within one state, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR). The USSR conquered most of the western Ukrainian territories during World War II, and the remainder they gained from the Yalta Conference in 1945. However, despite the establishment of this unified state, Ukrainians remained under imperial rule and were unable to determine their own

⁹⁹ Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 441.

political fate or begin the process of nation building. Indeed, the USSR would be the most totalitarian imperial force to govern the Ukrainians, repressing Ukrainian culture. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) was attempting to create a new social order and consequently, established a totalitarian state that controlled all aspects of government, the economy, and daily life. The policies of cultural oppression became brutal under the reign of Josef Stalin, enforcing strict compliance to the state.

Even after the death of Stalin in 1953 and the 'destalinisation' that was to follow, nationalist movements were carefully managed within the USSR. Throughout this period, Subtelny notes that the USSR was transformed from a society marked by totalitarianism and fear to a more rational and manageable Soviet system.¹⁰⁰ However, many aspects of life established under Stalin remained unchanged and nationalist movements were managed by the powerful presence of secret police. In 1954, Crimea was gifted to the Ukrainian SSR in order to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereiaslav. This was to remind Ukrainians of the political control Russia retained over their lives, as well as to deeper intertwine the relationship between the Russian and Ukrainian Republics. The leadership of the CPSU was rejuvenated under a more liberal socialist ideology under Mikhail Gorbachev. His policies of *Glasnost* (openness) and *Perestroika* (restructuring) paved the way to the end of the USSR in 1991. The dissolution of the USSR would allow the former Soviet republics to declare their independence, which will be explored in the following chapter.

This section has provided a brief overview of the history of the Ukrainian people. What is evident from this narrative, are the limited opportunities that ethnic Ukrainians have had for self-governance. It has also illustrated that the formation of their identity has been created in response to imperial governance. Imperial legacies have pervaded the social, cultural, political and economic conditions of Ukrainian

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 509

consciousness. This next section will elaborate these historical events in order to distinguish and define the two political cultures of Ukraine.

2.2 Political culture of west Ukraine

This thesis utilises the terms west and east Ukraine to describe the political cultures. West Ukraine refers to the territory that was part of the central European empires, and east Ukraine refers to the territory under Russian empires. There has been much debate regarding the number of regional divides that exist in Ukraine,¹⁰¹ however, this thesis argues that in terms of political culture, two regions exist. However, the regions between east and west Ukraine, the central regions around the Dnieper River, are not so starkly divided because they have historically been under the influence of both empires. Therefore, their political culture affiliations are not concrete and can vary.

The social environment of west Ukraine has been shaped by its connection to the central European powers of the PLC and the Habsburg Empire. It was also the last part of modern Ukraine to become part of the USSR between 1939 and 1945, meaning that the Soviet influence was not as entrenched.¹⁰² For this thesis, west Ukraine represents the modern day *oblasti* (regions) of Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ternopil, Chernivtsi and Zakarpattya. Zakarpattya does not entirely represent the political culture, like the other *oblasti*, because it is home to many ethnic Ukrainians, it is also home to a large number of minority groups that speak their eponymous language.¹⁰³ There is also contention between two major ethnic groups, the Ukrainians and the Rusyns, an ethnic sub-group of Ukrainians. Consequently, the levels of ethnic Ukrainian consciousness are diminished. West Ukrainian sentiment is the strongest

¹⁰¹ See Paul Kubicek "Regional Polarisation in Ukraine: Public Opinion, Voting and Legislative Behaviour," *Europe-Asia Studies* 52, no.2 (2000): 273-294 and L.W Barrington and Erik S. Herron, "One Ukraine or Many? Regionalism in Ukraine and its Political Consequences," *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity* 32, no. 1 (2004): 53-86.

¹⁰² Roman Szporluk, "West Ukraine and West Belorussia: Historical Tradition, Social Communication and Linguistic Assimilation," *Soviet Studies* 31, no.1 (1979): 78.

¹⁰³ Jennifer Dickinson, "Languages for the Market, the Nation, or the Margins: Overlapping ideologies of Language and Identity in Zakarpattya," *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 201 (2010): 54.

in the region of Galicia: Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk and Ternopil. While *oblasti* on the right-bank of the Dnieper River were under Russian rule for a longer period of time, they were under the PLC until 1793. Therefore, many in these *oblasti* support the sentiments of west Ukraine as a representation of the Cossack spirit, such as Volyn, Rivne and Vinnytsia.

Identity and culture

The empires that ruled over present-day Ukraine were multi-ethnic societies; however, it was only in west Ukraine that ethnic Ukrainian culture and identity was encouraged to develop. Under both the PLC and the Habsburg Empires, ethnic Ukrainians were recognised as a distinct ethnic group. Although Ukrainians were subject to ethnic persecution under the PLC, there was no doubt as to the existence or distinction of their ethnicity. Due to the limited number of ethnic Russians living in west Ukraine, there was little Russian influence on the identity of these Ukrainians.¹⁰⁴ Under the rule of the Habsburgs, Ukrainians were recognised as a very distinct ethnic group because they were recognised as Eastern Slavic and followers of the Orthodox Church. There was no state doctrine that attempted to assimilate the various ethnic groups of the Habsburg Empire.¹⁰⁵ Ukrainians were allowed to speak their own language and were even granted the right to establish Ukrainian-speaking schools and tertiary institutions during the educational reforms of Joseph II.¹⁰⁶ This is markedly different from the east Ukrainian experience, where Russian rulers perceived Ukrainians as part of a Russian identity, stemming from the Russian-led Eastern Slavic group.

¹⁰⁴ For example in the oblast of Zakarpattya, only 2.5% of the population identified themselves as ethnic Russian. While in Luhansk 39% identified themselves as ethnic Russian. State Statistics Committee of Ukraine, "All-Ukrainian 2001 Population Census," <http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/eng> (accessed 27 June 2013).

¹⁰⁵ Orest Subtelny, "The Habsburg and Russian Empires: Some Comparisons and Contrasts," <http://src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/sympo/94summer/chapter4.pdf>, (accessed 27 June 2012), 90.

¹⁰⁶ Paul Robert Magocsi, "A Subordinate or Submerged People: The Ukrainians of Galicia under Habsburg and Soviet Rule," in *Nationalism and Empire: The Habsburg Monarchy and the Soviet Union*, eds. Richard L. Rudolph and David F. Good, (New York: St Martin's Press, 1992), 98.

The history of ethnic Ukrainians in west Ukraine has been dictated by their agricultural existence. This has played a major role in defining the political culture of west Ukraine. Throughout the reign of the PLC, Roman Catholicism and the Poles retained a privileged position with the state. Many Ukrainian noble families converted to Catholicism and adapted to Polish language and culture in order to retain their social rank. Effectively, this was the “polanisation” of Ukrainian political and religious nobility in order to retain their current social status.¹⁰⁷ Consequently, Ukrainians lost their political and cultural leadership. However, Ukrainian culture was kept alive through the traditional folklore of the peasants. Ukrainians in west Ukraine remained agricultural peasants, as the focus of urban development and industrialisation were in the western parts of the empire. But the large number of Ukrainian peasants allowed the region to retain its cultural folklore as the peasants continued to use the Ukrainian language and embrace a traditional culture of myths, legends, songs and music.¹⁰⁸ This peasant culture was utilised following the national awakening of 1848 and provided the foundation for traditional Ukrainian culture.

The proximity to Western Europe and the influences of the 1848 European revolutions engendered a political space within the Habsburg Empire that permitted these Ukrainians to develop an ethnic-based cultural consciousness. The 19th century brought rapid changes to the structure of society and industry in Europe. The industrial revolution and the ‘Spring of Nations’ in 1848 shaped political, socio-economic, and cultural forces in all parts of the continent. The ‘Spring of Nations’ involved mass protests, demanding more democratic governance, higher levels of representation, better working standards; and some even pushed for national self-determination. This threatened the unity of the Habsburg Empire, as ethnic minorities began to demand self-determination. This inspired ethnic Ukrainians to establish the first Ukrainian political organisation (the Supreme Ruthenian Council), the first cultural organisation (the Congress of Ruthenian Scholars), the first

¹⁰⁷ Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 94.

¹⁰⁸ I.L. Rudnytsky, “The Ukrainians in Galicia under Austrian Rule,” *Austrian History Yearbook* 3, no. 2 (1967): 394-429.

Ukrainian military unit and finally, the first Ukrainian newspaper.¹⁰⁹ While these organisations were not long lasting, they were effective enough to break down the political lethargy and launch Galicia as the “bastion of Ukrainianism.”¹¹⁰

This awakening of national consciousness supports the alternative approach to nation building as argued by Miroslav Hroch and Anthony Smith in chapter one. These Ukrainian nationalist organisations were formed by the political elite, but were founded upon socio-cultural symbols and ethnic collective identity. Consequently, these organisations generated a widespread interest in the cultural history of ethnic Ukrainians. As Hroch identified, they established a national movement that by increasing scholarly interest in ethnic culture, which would engender nationalist fervour. Many Ukrainian intellectuals from the east Ukraine were drawn to Galicia in order to study at its institutions and to publish scholarly works in Ukrainian. The most notable appointment was the invitation of scholar Mykhailo Hrushevsky (arguably the father of Ukrainian historiography), to come from Kiev to become the first professor of Ukrainian history at the University of Lviv.¹¹¹ This interest in history overflowed into a general awakening of national activism, intensified by the sense of competition for autonomy between the two stateless ethnic groups in Habsburg Galicia, the Poles and the Ukrainians.

The twentieth century and two World Wars provided some opportunities to establish a Ukrainian state, but international forces intervened. However, this was still a formative period in the development of a west Ukrainian nationalist identity. The political elite of west Ukraine was determined to create a nation-state in order to provide political representation for ethnic Ukrainians. Woodrow Wilson’s ideology of self-determination guided the post-war treaty settlements, and while the Poles were granted a state, the seven million former Habsburg Ukrainians were not.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ Magosci, *A History of Ukraine*, 406.

¹¹⁰ Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 251.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 326

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 425.

This heightened the sense of injustice for Ukrainians and vindicated their need for a Ukrainian state.

Religion

Religion is also a distinguishing cultural feature of Habsburg Ukrainians. It is an area where the imperial divide is evident and is another indication of the influence of political elite in shaping national identity. As previously mentioned the Union of Brest rescinded the Orthodox Church, a bastion of Slavic identity. The Greek Catholic Church was established by the previously mentioned Union of Brest, a Treaty that reflects the influence of the Roman Catholic Polish authorities. However, it also reflected the wishes of the west Ukrainian clergy to remain distinct from the Russian Orthodox Church. Under pressure from the PLC authorities, the Orthodox Bishops agreed to devote themselves to the Roman Catholic Church rather than the Moscow Patriarch, aligning themselves closer to their European counterparts. This created a geographic divide from Ukrainians under the Muscovite Tsar, where the Orthodox Church was an important feature of Muscovite life. The UAOC was originally established in 1919 as part of the Ukrainian People's Republic in order to establish a Ukrainian Orthodox Church to contend with the Moscow Patriarch. It was popular with the people for its modernised and democratic approach to religion but it was officially banned during the Soviet era.¹¹³ The existence of both churches reflects the distinct political and social history of west Ukraine and its proximity to Europe. The religious landscape in present-day Ukraine is defined by this history. While believers of the Greek Catholic Church only made up 7.6% of the total Ukrainian population in 2010, in west Ukraine they made up 37.2% of the population.¹¹⁴

Politics

¹¹³ The UAOC used Ukrainian language instead of Church Slavonic in its services, modernised the appearance of its Clergy by banning robes, long hair and breads, allowed its bishops to marry and elected its council of bishops.

¹¹⁴ Razumkov Centre, "Faith and Religion in Ukraine: Public Opinion," *National Security and Defence*, no.1-2 (2011): 15-33. http://www.razumkov.org.ua/eng/files/category_journal/NSD119_eng_2.pdf (accessed 11 June 2013).

The structures and institutions of central Europe shaped the parameters of acceptable political discourse for ethnic Ukrainians west Ukraine. While political power was seen as resting absolutely within the Tsar in the Russian Empire, political power was more decentralised in west Ukraine and ethnic Ukrainians living under the PLC were not habituated to autocratic power. Electoral representation was a feature of European political systems; in contrast, it was not introduced in Russia until the 20th century. When the PLC was formed it was agreed that there would be an elected monarch and a common assembly. During the 15th century, the nobility controlled the seats of parliament and their local estates. Satoshi Koyama argues that the PLC became a federation of local administrations run by the local nobility.¹¹⁵ Consequently, the King lost control to the periphery and his bureaucracy relied on the nobility to govern. This contributed to the decline of the commonwealth and its eventual disintegration, but consequentially, the population remained unreceptive to highly centralised rule.

This traditional electoral representation was continued under the Habsburgs. The Habsburg Empire was characterised by its “enlightened absolutism and the progressive policies of its Monarchs.”¹¹⁶ A progressive feature of the Habsburg Empire was its elected representative institutions such as the Reichsrat in Vienna, local diets (parliamentary assemblies), and communal councils.¹¹⁷ From 1873, Ukrainians in the regions of Galicia, Bukovyna (Chernivtsi) and Transcarpathia (Zakarpattia) were able to elect representatives to the provincial diets and the Austrian and Hungarian parliaments.¹¹⁸ In contrast, ethnic Ukrainians under Tsarist rule only had access to voting in *Duma* elections briefly from 1906 to 1917.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ Satoshi Koyama, “The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as a Political Space: Its Unity and Complexity,” in *Regions in Central and Eastern Europe: Past and Present*, ed. Tadayuki Hayashi and Fukuda Hiroshi (Sapporo: Slavic Research Centre, 2007).

www.src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/coe21/publish/no15_ses/08_koyama.pdf, (accessed 4 May 2013).

¹¹⁶ Franz A. Szabo, *Kaunitz and Enlightened Absolutism 1753-1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 2.

¹¹⁷ Sarah Birch, “Interpreting the Regional Effect in Ukrainian Politics,” *Europe-Asia Studies* 52, no.6 (2000): 1021.

¹¹⁸ Sarah Birch, “Electoral Behaviour in Western Ukraine in National Elections and Referendums, 1989-91,” *Europe-Asia Studies* 47, no. 7 (1995), 1146.

¹¹⁹ Birch, “Electoral Behaviour in Western Ukraine,” 1147.

Habsburg elections continued up until the conquest of the region by the Soviet forces, although during the inter-war period these elections were marred with violence and electoral fraud. This is reflected in the region in present day Ukraine, as these regions have the highest levels of political mobilisation and voter participation.¹²⁰ This democratic tradition improved the rights of Ukrainians and engendered a political voice that was not available until much later in east Ukraine. Therefore, Ukrainians under the Habsburgs were accustomed to electoral representation, unlike the ethnic Ukrainians under Tsarist rule.

In terms of self-identification and regional identity, ethnic Ukrainians in west Ukraine consider themselves a part of Europe. They were governed by Central European empires, surrounded by European nationals and they were affected by European affairs. This exposure to European institutions and norms has affected the contemporary foreign policy direction of ethnic Ukrainians, who seek closer Ukrainian integrate with the European Union (EU). These Ukrainians share the political culture of Europe because that was the social environment that surrounded them, in their living standards, legal systems and political institutions. The strength of these legacies is evident in the disparate support for integration with the EU within Ukraine. Support for integration with the EU remains high in west ukraine at 74.2%, whereas in east Ukraine, support drops to 26.4%.¹²¹

The history and consequently, political culture of ethnic Ukrainians has been moulded by Central European empires. The imperial legacy heightened the sense of an ethnic Ukrainian identity and historical circumstances engendered the nationalist movement. They have a strong belief in Ukrainian self-determinism and a sense of nationalism that asserted the need for a Ukrainian state. As a result of their strong ethnic Ukrainian consciousness, they believe that the national identity of a Ukrainian state should be founded upon an ethnic nation. These Ukrainians are also

¹²⁰ D'Anieri, *Understanding Ukrainian Politics*, 120.

¹²¹ Democratic Initiatives Foundation, "Ukrainians opt for EU membership, in particular the youth," December 2011, <http://dif.org.ua/en/publications/press-relizy/dfefwgr.htm>, (accessed 11 June 2013).

distinguished by their religious beliefs, which were shaped by the Polish political elite, but also defined by their defiance against the Russian Orthodox Church. While, ethnic Ukrainians in west share the historical legacies of absolute imperial rule with ethnic Ukrainians in east Ukraine, power was not vested in a single figure. These characteristics and trends are the result of centuries of rule under the influence of Central European rulers. This sense of ethnic Ukrainian identity is not equalled by ethnic Ukrainians under Russian rule.

2.3 East Ukraine

For this research, east Ukraine refers to the area of present-day Ukraine that is east of the Dnieper River. However, east Ukrainian political culture is most intense in the modern day *oblasti* of Luhansk, Donetsk, Kharkiv and Dnipropetrovsk, which have been under control of Russian rulers since the 17th century. However, it is seen to a lesser extent in the *oblasti* of Poltava, Kherson and Zaporizhia. East Ukraine is home to a large ethnic Russian minority and Russian is widely spoken throughout the region.¹²² Its proximity to Russia and the length of time under Russian control has seen it adopt elements of Russian identity and culture. The identity of ethnic Ukrainians in east Ukraine has been influenced by the forces of imperial Russia. This has had a huge impact on the level of ethnic identification of these ethnic Ukrainians, which has become evident after the creation of the independent Ukrainian state. Centuries of Russian rule have resulted in a blurring of the ethnic and linguistic demarcation between Russians and Ukrainians. As a result, the political culture of east Ukraine reflects a more civic based national identity for independent Ukraine. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Moscow Patriarchate) continues to be one of the most popular churches in Ukraine, solidifying the cultural connections between Russia and Ukrainians in east Ukraine.¹²³ However, another religious trait caused by

¹²² Stephen Shulman, "The cultural foundations of Ukrainian National Identity," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22, no. 6 (1999): 1018.

¹²³ Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, "Ukraine: Information on the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate, including structure and hierarchy; information on the dispute between the Kyiv and Moscow Patriarchates (2012-April 2013)," 9 May 2013, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/5214a44f4.html> (accessed 18 November 2013).

the history of imperial legacies is the prominence of atheism, a hangover from the Socialist beliefs of the USSR.

Identity and culture

Throughout history, rulers of Russian Empires have sought to restore Russia to its previous imperial glory. The Tsars sought to reinstate the imperial legacies of the past under the patronage of the Russian Empire. Ivan IV was guided in his foreign and domestic policy to claim Moscow as the 'Third Rome' and the rightful protectorate of the Orthodox Church.¹²⁴ Ivan IV was convinced of this because Ivan III had married the niece of the last Byzantine Emperor, making Russia the rightful successor to the Byzantine Orthodox Empire.¹²⁵ Following the fall of Rome and Constantinople, Moscow asserted its sole claim as the home of Orthodoxy. From the 16th century onwards, Tsars sought to reclaim and protect Orthodox believers. For Russian rulers, this legitimised Russia's claim to govern the Ukrainians. The most popular religion in present day Ukraine is Russian Orthodox, known as the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Moscow Patriarchate).¹²⁶ This is concentrated in the east of Ukraine.

Ethnic Ukrainians living under the Russian Empire adopted multiple identities. Resulting in a weakened ethnic Ukrainian consciousness amongst this group. The Russian state granted ethnic Ukrainians two identities: an imperial one and a regional one. The imperial title was *Rossiiskij*, which it used for all citizens of the Russian state. The regional title was *malorusski*¹²⁷ or "Little Russian" – used by Russians to describe ethnic Ukrainians. Consequentially, a Ukrainian consciousness

¹²⁴ Alar Laats, "The Concept of the Third Rome and its Political Implications," 2011, www.ksk.edu.ee/wp-content/.../03/KVUOA_Toimetised_12-Laats.pdf (accessed 18 June 2013): 104.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Razumkov Centre, "The Church and Religious Situation in Ukraine: Present State and Trends," *Journal of National Security and Defence* http://www.razumkov.org.ua/additional/analytical_report_NSD10_eng.pdf, (accessed 13 June 2013).

¹²⁷ Igor Torbakov, "Ukraine: Vagaries of the Post-Soviet Transition," *Demokratizatsiya* 8, no.4 (2001): 463.

did not develop as Ukrainian culture was not considered as distinct, but a part of Russian identity.

'Little Russian' came into the common vernacular during the 18th century, following the Treaty of Pereiaslav. The Treaty referred to the Tsar as the 'Tsar of Great and Little Russia,' reflecting the common usage of the term. Little Russian identity lost its distinction from the Great Russian (Russians) particularly after the abolition of the Hetmanate in 1775. In contrast to the ethnic Ukrainians in west Ukraine (whose identity was a source of competition with the Poles for the creation of a homeland), 'Little Russians' were absorbed into the Russian identity because they were considered similar in identity. 'Little Russian' gentry were suspicious of accepting Ukrainian culture because it was considered the culture of their serfs.¹²⁸ The existence of alternatives (such as pan-Slavic or Russian) allowed the Ukrainian gentry to choose a different identity.

Economically, east Ukraine differed greatly from west Ukraine as it experienced rapid industrialisation and urbanisation under the USSR. The Donbas region of east Ukraine, parts of Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk and Luhansk, has large natural coal deposits. During Stalin's industrialisation during the 1920s, many coal mines and factories were developed in this area. Consequently, the area became heavily urbanised, as many, particularly Russian, workers moved to the region to work in the mines and factories. This also had a great impact on the demographics of east Ukraine; it increased the number of workers and reduced the number of farmers.¹²⁹ It also brought many ethnic Russians to work in the region, with ethnic Russians making up 53.5% of the population in Donetsk in the 1989 Soviet census. In addition to this, Russian-speakers made up 80.5% of the Donetsk population.¹³⁰ This shift in demographics during the Stalinist era has altered the economic, linguistic and ethnic characteristics of the region, polarising them from west Ukraine.

¹²⁸ Zenon E. Kohut, "The Development of a Little Russian Identity and Ukrainian Nationbuilding," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10, no. 3 (1986): 576.

¹²⁹ Birch, "Interpreting the Regional Effect," 1026.

¹³⁰ Yaroslav Hrytsak, "National Identities in Post-Soviet Ukraine: The Case of Lviv and Donetsk," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 22 (1998): 265.

Politics

Zbigniew Brzezinski asserts the highly autocratic nature of Russian politics, singling it out as the central characteristic of Russian politics throughout history.¹³¹ White supports this assertion, arguing that there is a “distinct Russian social structure” that sustains a traditional Russian political culture based on centuries of absolutism.¹³² White suggests that the reasons behind this trait of Russian culture are due to Russia’s unique geography.¹³³ It’s lack of natural geographic borders, left it vulnerable to military conquests and demanded a centralised political unit to combat this. Russia was also isolated from major trading routes, which prevented the development of oligarchs, who could provide competition for political power. The Russian political system lacked a genuine institution that checked the power of the Tsar. While the *Duma* was officially recognised as a legislative body within the Russian state during the early 20th century, the Tsar was able to use his position to override its authority or control its membership because it had no constitutional powers.¹³⁴

After coming to power in the 1917 revolution, Lenin lamented the state of the political structures and institutions that he had inherited. A central concern was the “threat of bureaucratisation, alienation from the people and the lack of checks and balances”.¹³⁵ Russia’s bureaucracy has expanded rapidly under Peter the Great (1682–1725). Over twenty years of war with Sweden had left the Russian Empire in a dire financial situation. In response to this, Peter introduced widespread financial and administrative reforms, unifying Russian territory under eight administrative regions.¹³⁶ The Tsar nominated each region a governor who was to have sizeable

¹³¹ Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Ideology and Power in Soviet Politics* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962), 74.

¹³² Stephen White, “The Imprint of Autocracy,” in *Developments in Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics*, eds. Stephen White, Alex Pravda and Zvi Gitelman (Hampshire, The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1990), 22.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Alana V. Ledeneva, *Can Russia Modernise?: Sistema, Power Networks and Informal Governance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 32.

¹³⁶ Natalia Victorovna Platonova, “Peter the Great’s Government Reforms and Accounting Practice in Russia,” *Accounting History* 14, no. 4 (2009): 445.

powers. Hierarchical power structures characterised this bureaucracy: all decisions were ultimately decided by the Tsar and were not horizontally shared. This developed a tradition of vertical and non-transparent decision-making. The bureaucracy became highly centralised and nepotistic, with the higher escalons of power coming from hereditary lines of succession.¹³⁷ This characteristic can be recognised as east Ukraine controls power in Ukraine today. There is a strong political core and strong regional networks of political patronage and clans within the political structure.

The scope of political control of the Russian state was unusually large in comparison to European counterparts. Almost all aspects of daily life and identity were regulated by the state. The identity of Ukrainians was dominated, not by a sense of sentiment to a collective identity of their ethnic kin, but by a sense of allegiance to the state. White argues that this was caused by a lack of autonomous sub-state activity. Mobilisation of workers was limited as trade unions were forbidden until 1905, and when they were allowed, they were highly restricted in their actions. Religious affairs were also subordinate to the state, through the creation of the Holy Synod under Peter the Great in 1721. The Holy Synod replaced the Patriarchate of Moscow, becoming the state governing body of the church. The state gained control of the church's land, power and resources. Under the reign of Tsar Nicholas I (1825-1855), the official ideology of the Russian Empire became "*samoderzhavie, pravoslavie, narodnost*" (orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality). The Russian Minister for Education in the 1830s highlighted these attributes as distinguishing features of Russian society. He advised Tsar Nicholas I that these principles should form the foundation for Russian education, protecting it from the influence of Europe. These principles embodied the fundamental elements of Russian politics and society, and were imposed upon the Ukrainians incorporated into the Russian Empire.

2.4 How did the USSR affect Ukraine's political cultures?

¹³⁷ Edward L. Keenan, "Muscovite Political Folkways," *Russian Review* 45, no. 2 (1986): 175.

This chapter now addresses the impact of the USSR on Ukraine's political cultures. While the USSR represented many of the characteristics of Russian political culture, it also differed in some crucial respects. In terms of political style, the Soviet political system was a centralised, hierarchical system with a large system of bureaucracy, crafted from a party membership of the CPSU reminiscent of the Tsarist system. The USSR also provided ethnic Ukrainians with a new national identity, Soviet citizenship. A new social order was designed to realign the allegiance of its citizens to the CPSU and the new Soviet order. This section will discuss the effect of the USSR on the population within present day Ukraine's borders. It argues that while the USSR actually established the first united Ukrainian state, it also crystallised the differences between the two political cultures. Simultaneously, the Soviet regime reinforced the traditional political culture of east Ukraine, while for those in west Ukraine; it reiterated the need for a Ukrainian state.

Nationalities policy

While the USSR never intended to establish a Soviet nation, a Soviet identity was created. Consequently, this prevented the development of a Ukrainian national identity in the newly unified Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR). This Soviet identity was the first united, state-wide identity that east and west Ukrainians had ever shared. With the creation of the USSR, and its new social order, there was also a creation of a new "supranational historical community."¹³⁸ Yet, nationality still existed, however there was a disjunction between citizenship and nationality. In order to create the social homogeneity needed to establish a political community, a new supranational identity (not based upon national identity) was created. Throughout the 1960s, the ideological concept of a 'Soviet people' was established, based upon a "new historical form of social and international unity of people of different nations."¹³⁹ The content of Soviet identity was based upon the notion of

¹³⁸ Quote from Leonid Brezhnev's Speech at 24th Congress of the CPSU, 1971, in "Brezhnev and the Communist Party," ed. Darrell P. Hammer, *The Soviet and Post-Soviet Review* 2, no. 1 (1975): 13.

¹³⁹ Zvi Y. Gitelman, "Nations, Republics and Commonwealth," in *Developments in Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics*, ed. Stephen White, Alex Pravda and Zvi Y. Gitelman (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1992), 135.

reaching the next stage of society where class (and consequentially, nations) were abolished, replaced with socialism.

Vladimir Lenin was concerned that Russian chauvinism would destabilise the USSR, therefore he introduced a policy of *korenizatsiia*, or indigenisation. This policy encouraged the culture of national minorities to participate Soviet institutions, ensuring a smooth transition to the Soviet identity. In contrast, Joseph Stalin argued that it was the national minorities who posed the greatest threat to the Union. Therefore, Stalin established a policy that would acculturate all of the Union's national minorities with Russian. Stalin's nationalities policy presupposed that national sentiment was a product of capitalism and, therefore, perpetuated it.¹⁴⁰ In 1933 the policy of *korenizatsiia* was discontinued and the supremacy of Moscow and the standardisation of Soviet life were introduced. The nationalities policy was changed so that the *Sliianie* (merger) of Soviet citizens would be facilitated through Russian culture to ensure a rapid transition to socialism.¹⁴¹ This resulted in the 'Russification' of Soviet society, particularly the eastern Slavic nationalities that were already conceived as culturally similar to the Russians. Historiography was rewritten under the Soviet period to accept that the past achievements of Ukrainians were due to their close relationship with Russia.¹⁴²

From the Stalinist era onwards, the USSR nationalities policy focused upon the creation of a communist society through the medium of Russian language and culture. The Soviet authorities repressed Ukrainian culture, as it was perceived to be a threat to the unity of the Union. The Russian language was perceived as the language of modernisation and Sovietisation and became the *lingua franca* of the USSR. In 1951, 80% of Ukrainian elementary children were enrolled in Ukrainian speaking schools. By 1989 this number was down to 47.5%.¹⁴³ All tertiary education

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 134.

¹⁴¹ Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 423.

¹⁴² Magosci, *A History of Ukraine*, 647.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 669.

courses were taught in Russian and all professional jobs required Russian.¹⁴⁴ This was combined with a mobilisation of Soviet ideology in the study of history. Historians were forced to interpret events through Soviet ideology, which asserted the superior status of Russian culture amongst the Eastern Slavs and the historical unity of the Russian and Ukrainian people and their desire for reunification.¹⁴⁵

Effects on political culture

The greatest legacy of the USSR for Ukrainians was the creation of the first unified Ukrainian state. Up until this moment, ethnic Ukrainians on both sides of the Dnieper had only united briefly under the political union of the West Ukrainian People's Republic and the Ukrainian National Republic in 1919. In 1990, the Ukrainian SSR and the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic signed a bilateral treaty recognising the territorial integrity of each republic, based on the Soviet borders.¹⁴⁶ When considering the original formation of the USSR, Bolshevik leaders recognised that socio-cultural change and the "internationalisation" of nationalities within the Union would require meticulous engineering, rousing debate as to how the new socialist state should be structured.¹⁴⁷ Lenin insisted that Stalin construct a Marxist policy regarding the "national question" within the Union.¹⁴⁸ Stalin determined that the nation was a "historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up, manifested in a common culture."¹⁴⁹ The Union Treaty of 1922 determined that the larger non-Russian nationality groupings would be given republic status within a Soviet federation. This would honour their right to succession and grant these nation groups relative cultural autonomy; in return these

¹⁴⁴ Michael Kirkwood, "Glasnost" "the National question" and Soviet language policy," *Soviet Studies* 43, no.1 (1991): 65.

¹⁴⁵ Magosci, *A History of Ukraine*, 647.

¹⁴⁶ Roman Solchanyk, "Ukraine, Russia, and the CIS," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 20 (1996): 23.

¹⁴⁷ Gail Warshofsky Lapidus, "Ethnonationalism and Political Stability: The Soviet Case," *World Politics* 36, no. 4 (1984): 556.

¹⁴⁸ Graham Smith, "Nationalities Policy from Lenin to Gorbachev," in *The Nationalities Question in the Soviet Union*, ed. Graham Smith (London; New York: Longman Publishers, 1990).

¹⁴⁹ J. Stalin, "Marxism and the National Question" in *Collected Works* vol. 2, ed. J. Stalin (Moscow, 1952), 307.

states would rescind state sovereignty and join the Union.¹⁵⁰ The Soviet authorities decided that the criteria for establishing the borders of the USSR should be defined by national, economic and administrative considerations.¹⁵¹ Borders of the republics of the USSR were drawn up to reflect the spoken language of its citizens, a functional and economic network of infrastructure, and to protect the administrative integrity of the Union.¹⁵² Unification of the ethnic Ukrainians was a result of the decision of Soviet authorities and not from an indigenous movement of Ukrainian self-determination. However, following 1991, there was a general consensus between Ukraine's political cultures to accept the established borders.

Before the creation of the USSR, nationality held no genuine meaning for Ukrainians. Only until the borders had been drawn up were ethnic Ukrainians able to attach themselves to a national identity. This is yet another example of how Ukraine's national identity was constructed by members of the political elite. Political institutions such as the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) and the use of nationality as an identity marker on the Soviet passport cultivated a sense of allegiance to the Ukrainian SSR. However, this could not be considered as a political community, as citizenship was not attached to this Ukrainian national identity. Citizenship within the USSR was organised on a Soviet and state-wide level.

However, while the USSR managed to give meaning to a Ukrainian national identity, it also reinforced the division between Ukraine's two political cultures. The totalitarian and oppressive nature of the Soviet regime solidified the distinction of ethnic Ukrainians in west Ukraine, by reiterating the need for an independent Ukrainian state to represent their political needs. Ethnic Ukrainian identity was suppressed under the USSR, particularly under the rule of Stalin. Stalin policies of cultural assimilation within the Soviet Republics had disastrous effects on Ukrainians. However, for Ukrainians in east Ukraine, it was yet another form of

¹⁵⁰ Smith, "Nationalities Policy," 6.

¹⁵¹ Francine Hirsch, "Toward an Empire of Nations: Border-Making and the Formation of Soviet National Identities," *The Russian Review* 59, no.2 (2000): 211.

¹⁵² Ibid.

imperial Russian governance and it introduced a large number of ethnic Russians to the Ukrainian SSR. A survey of Ukraine's national identities asserted that Donetsk oblast had the highest levels of Soviet sentiment, 37.1% identifying their "cultural traditions" as Soviet, with 25.8% Ukrainian and 22.5% Russian.¹⁵³ Contrarily, the levels of allegiance to Soviet cultural traditions in Western Ukraine are very low, with 15.7% in Volyn and 0.3–1.5% in Galicia.¹⁵⁴

The movement for Ukrainian independence was strongest in west Ukraine. Its allegiance to pre-Soviet cultural and political institutions was strong enough to persist, albeit in a clandestine manner, for forty-five years of Soviet rule. During the final years of the USSR, the revival of these pre-Soviet institutions was a strong force in pushing for independence.¹⁵⁵ There was a strong relationship between its religion and nationalism, with the Greek Catholic Church representing the unique history of the region and a bastion of the Ukrainian language.¹⁵⁶ Under the liberalised environment under Gorbachev, the Greek Catholic clergy were inspired to come from the underground and canvass authorities to reinstate their church, which had been banned in 1946.¹⁵⁷ The independence movement mobilised following the weakening of its autocratic control under Mikhail Gorbachev. Public protests calling for the end of the USSR were strongest in Lviv and Kiev, with over 200,000 protesters in one rally in Lviv in 1988.¹⁵⁸ The strongest democratic nationalist political party in Ukraine was the People's Movement for Restructuring (RUKH), which found most of its support in west Ukraine.¹⁵⁹ In 1990, RUKH sponsored a human chain reaching from Lviv to Kiev in order to commemorate the union of the Ukrainian National Republic and the West Ukrainian People's Republic in 1919. West Ukraine was able

¹⁵³ Taras Kuzio, "Soviet Conspiracy Theories and Political Culture in Ukraine: Understanding Viktor Yanukovich and the Party of Regions," *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 44, (2011): 223.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Martin Åberg, "Putnam's Social Capital Theory goes East: A Case Study of Western Ukraine and L'viv," *Europe-Asia Studies* 52, no. 2 (2000): 298.

¹⁵⁶ Gretchen Gee, "Geography, Nationality, and Religion in Ukraine: A Research Note," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 34, no.3 (1995): 389.

¹⁵⁷ Bohdan Nahaylo, *The Ukrainian Resurgence* (London: Hurst & Company, 1999), 87.

¹⁵⁸ Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 503.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

to invoke its pre-Soviet nationalist movements in order to support the late 1980s independence movement.¹⁶⁰

Both the population in west and east Ukraine supported Ukraine's independence in the referendum. While the independence movement existed in east Ukraine, the sentiment for Ukrainian self-determination was not at the same level as in the west. Support for Ukrainian independence was over 95% in all of the western *oblasti*, in the east it was around 80%.¹⁶¹ While this is high, it does not match the levels of support in west Ukraine. The east was home to a large Russian minority, which called for the continuation of the status quo within the USSR. However, Ukrainians in east Ukraine were economically dependent on the USSR, as it relied on state subsidies for the survival of its heavy industry economy.¹⁶² Therefore, many Ukrainians in east Ukraine were unsure about the economic viability of an independent Ukraine state and did not see it as a political necessity.

The mentality of the USSR, in regards to identity, conformed to the traditional Russian political culture. It committed itself to creating a Soviet identity; which continued to privilege an eastern Slavic and Russian identity. The continuation of this identity policy left little space for a Ukrainian consciousness to develop and stymied the development of a Ukrainian civil society. While the USSR adopted traditional Russian culture, it took it to an extreme level, enforcing allegiance to the state through an environment of fear, coercion and surveillance.¹⁶³ Ultimately, the USSR can be understood as another imperial force imposing itself on Ukrainians and, therefore, it perpetuated the positions of Ukraine's west and east political cultures.

¹⁶⁰ Birch, "Electoral Behaviour in Western Ukraine," 5.

¹⁶¹ Kubicek, "Regional Polarisation in Ukraine," 283.

¹⁶² Ibid., 275.

¹⁶³ Mark R. Beissinger, "Beyond the Nationalities Question?," *Problems of Post-Communism* 58, no. 4-5 (2011): 39.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided the historical context of the creation of two political cultures in Ukraine. It has demonstrated how the different social and political environments of imperial forces have engendered distinct political cultures within the Ukrainian population. Ethnic Ukrainians in west Ukraine have a developed sense of a Ukrainian ethnic identity, political community and the consequent need for a Ukrainian state. This heightened sense of Ukrainian self-consciousness results from the manner in which the PLC and the Habsburgs recognised Ukrainians as a distinct ethnic identity. The need for Ukrainian self-determination was exacerbated by the competition for the creation of a state with the Poles following World War I. Ethnic Ukrainians in east Ukraine do not share this Ukrainian sentiment, due to the forced acculturation with Russia for centuries. The 'Little Russian' mentality encouraged Ukrainians to see themselves as a part of a larger Russian identity, with their political allegiance to the Russian state, not the Ukrainian people. The monolithic and oppressive Soviet state exacerbated the pre-Soviet concepts of Ukrainian identity, while establishing the first Ukrainian state. The following chapter will analyse the manner in which identity has been institutionalised within the independent Ukrainian state and how these political cultures have prevented the creation of a Ukrainian *demos*.

The political culture divide becomes obvious after independence, as these political cultures debate the fundamental identity of the new state. The political elite of each culture supports conflicting political preferences: cleavages in the perception of the Ukrainian nation and *demos*, and division over the need for the Ukrainian state. West Ukraine has a highly developed sense of ethnic Ukrainian consciousness, which they want to use to define the independent state, while those in east Ukraine do not. West Ukrainians assert that a Ukrainian state is a homeland for the ethnic Ukrainian nation. However, in east Ukraine, this sense of ethnic identity does not exist.

Chapter Three

The national identity of the independent state

As discussed in chapter one, a united political community, or *demos*, is essential to the functioning of a democratic political system. The participation and support of the *demos* provides a democratic government with the legitimacy to govern on behalf of the majority of the population. A sense of unity and collective national identity within the population is required to generate commitment to a democratic political community. However, divided imperial governance has engendered a divergence in acceptable political attitudes and identity within the Ukrainian population. This thesis argues that the political culture divide prevents the consolidation of democracy in two ways. This chapter will focus on the first obstacle: how the lack of consensus regarding the Ukrainian nation and its state identity prevents a unified *demos*.

A central concern of this thesis is how scholars have neglected the national element of transition. This has resulted in a misunderstanding of Ukraine's transition and why it has been so protracted and complex. Due to the sudden nature of the dissolution of the USSR, resolution on issues of the nation were foregone for the pressing concern of building the state apparatus. This prevented the development of a Ukrainian *demos* because "defining the national 'self' not only accomplishes a symbolic break with the previous political community, but also sets out the parameters of statehood with regard to language and minority rights."¹⁶⁴ Consideration was not given to the parameters of the relationship between the nation and state. There was no decision on how to, in the words of Gail Lapidus, "privilege the cultural and political leadership of the titular group without alienating key minorities or jeopardising the stability and integrity of [the] new state?"¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁴ Kataryna Wolczuk, "History, Europe and the "National Idea": The "Official" Narrative of National Identity in Ukraine," *Nationalities Papers* 28, no. 4 (2000): 671.

¹⁶⁵ Gail W. Lapidus, "Ethnicity and State-building: Accommodating Ethnic Differences in Post-Soviet Eurasia," in *Beyond State Crisis? Post-Colonial Africa and Post-Soviet Eurasia in Comparative Perspective*,

Decisions defining the nation and its identity should have been the most important decisions of the independent Ukrainian state. However, Ukrainians were forced to privilege matters of statehood over nation building. Conflict over the definition of the Ukrainian nation reflects more than just different political preferences; it represents an inherent divide over who is included in the Ukrainian political community. Therefore, the interface between the Ukrainian state and the Ukrainian nation at the time of independence needs to be explored. Due to the multinational make up of the population within Ukraine's boundaries at independence, citizenship laws and the *raison d'être* of the state would need definition.

Complexities developed while drafting legislation on these matters, as the political cultures had contrasting opinions on the nation building legislation. This legislation refers to laws on citizenship, national minorities, state language, education and cultural policies. This division turned the nation and state building process into a highly politicised affair. However, as this chapter will demonstrate, the decisions on aspects of state identity were vague and contradictory, serving immediate political needs rather than long-term conciliation between the divided population. The political elite of east Ukraine controlled Ukraine's political environment immediately following independence. But, in order to acquiesce the vocal politicians and civil society of west Ukraine, the independent state adopted many ethnic Ukrainian cultural symbols. Contrarily, the most crucial element of nation building for a democracy, citizenship laws, was civic rather than ethnic based. This rejected the *raison d'être* of the new state as a state to protect and represent the interests of ethnic Ukrainians. This blend of ethnic symbols and civic citizenship would increase the levels of antagonism between the political cultures.

This chapter addresses the national element of transition in Ukraine by addressing two core questions. First, how was identity institutionalised within the state during

eds. Mark R. Beissinger and Crawford Young (Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Centre Press, 2004), 331.

the initial phase of independence? The initial stage of independence refers to the timeframe of 1989 until 1996, when the constitution was drafted. The second question is how did the institutionalisation of this identity prevent a Ukrainian *demos*? This chapter is broken into four sections. The first section introduces the demographics of independent Ukraine, the second looks at the political cultures at the time of statehood; the third section examines the debates over nation building by the two political cultures; and the final section analyses the national identity that was decided for Ukraine and how this prevented a united political community.

Chapter one outlined the importance of decisions regarding the identity in multinational states. Scholars have generally considered a constructed, civic-based citizenship laws as the best option for multinational states. However, the ability of states to be entirely civic has also been called into question.¹⁶⁶ Despite this criticism, the ideal forms of essentialism and constructivism can still assist in understanding the nation building process. The challenge for the Ukrainian political elite was to create a national identity that was narrow enough to support the legitimacy of the state, yet broad enough to incorporate the multinational population that resided within Ukraine.

Political transitions in multinational states can be an uncertain time, when the traditional order of society and the political interests of the state are reshuffled. The disruption and instability can result in the population strengthening ties with their ethnic kin, or in politicians winning populist support by appealing to their respective ethnic group.¹⁶⁷ If a single ethnic group has dominated the authoritarian society, then a transition can threaten the privileged status of this group. Russians were the privileged group in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), while in Yugoslavia it was the Serbs. In the Ukrainian context, the collapse of the USSR converted the Russians from a privileged group to an ethnic minority. This change to the political environment was a key factor contributing to Ukraine's political

¹⁶⁶ Tim Reesens and Marc Hooghe, "Beyond the civic-ethnic Dichotomy: Investigating the structure of Citizenship concepts across thirty-three Countries," *Nations and Nationalism* 16, no.4 (2010): 579-597.

¹⁶⁷ Jack Snyder, *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2000), 54.

instability and prevented the development of democracy.

3.1 - The demographics of the independent Ukrainian state

A demographic breakdown of Ukraine's multinational state is necessary to understand challenge facing the independent state in 1991. The 1989 Soviet census provides the demographics of the early independent Ukrainian state. While the numbers are likely to favour Russians, it still provides a snapshot of the population within Ukraine's borders. The population of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) was 51,452,000, with 72.7% of the population identifying as ethnic Ukrainian.¹⁶⁸ Russians made up the largest ethnic minority in the Ukrainian state, constituting 22% of the total population.¹⁶⁹ In terms of native language, 87.7% of ethnic Ukrainians spoke Ukrainian as their main language, while 12.3% spoke Russian.¹⁷⁰ Amongst the ethnic Russians, 98.4% spoke Russian as their first language.¹⁷¹ In independent Ukraine there were three main ethno-linguistic groups: Ukrainian-speaking Ukrainians (44%), Russian-speaking Ukrainians (30%) and Russians (22%).¹⁷² There is a concentration of Russian speakers in east Ukraine. The remaining 5.2% of the Ukrainian population was made up of 108 ethnic minorities including Jews, Poles, Belarusians, Hungarians and Moldovans.¹⁷³ This indicated that the language spoken did not necessarily match with ethnic identification, making the nation building process more complex.

In the 2001 Ukrainian census, the demographic data reflected the circumstances of ten years of independence. Those who identified themselves as Ukrainian had risen to 77.8% of the population, while those who declared themselves as Russian had decreased to 17.3%. In terms of spoken language, 65% of Ukraine's population used

¹⁶⁸ Janusz Bugajski, "Ethnic Relations and Regional Problems in Independent Ukraine," in *Ukraine: The Search for a National Identity*, eds. Sharon L. Wolchik and Volodymyr Zviglyanich (Boston: Roman & Littlefield Publishers Inc, 2000), 165.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Dominique Arel and Valerii Khmelko, "The Russian Factor and the Territorial Polarisation in Ukraine," *Harriman Review* 9 (1996): 83.

¹⁷³ Ibid.

Ukrainian and 33% spoke Russian.¹⁷⁴ The number of ethnic Ukrainians may have increased due to the Ukrainisation of the new state; however, this may have simply been a more accurate reflection of the Ukrainian population, with people pressured to identify as Russian in the USSR census. Another important change reflected in the 2001 census was the influx of approximately 200,000 Crimean Tatars, who returned to their Crimean homeland, after they were persecuted in the USSR. There has not been a census held since 2001, indicating how contentious the issue of the Ukrainian nation is.

Although minorities constituted less than a quarter of the population, they still posed a potential threat to Ukrainian nation unity. Their distribution and consequent concentration threatened the central political authority of Ukraine, as these minority enclaves proclaimed their right to self-determination. Ethnic Russians have mostly settled in the south and east of Ukraine, remaining in areas where the Russian Empires have dominated. In Donetsk, Russians make up 38.2% of the regional population; however, ethnic Russians make up 58.3% of the population in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea. There are also enclaves of Moldavians, Hungarians and Romanians near the borders of their respective states. In Chernivtsi, Romanians make up 12.5% of the population, while Moldavians make up 7.3%.¹⁷⁵ Finally, in Zakarpattia, Hungarians represent 12.1% of the population.¹⁷⁶ Therefore, regional separatism was also of grave concern for the independent state. Therefore, the role of the political elite in constructing an identity for the new state was of crucial importance.

3.2 – Ukraine’s political cultures and independence

The following section will address the transition of the Ukrainian political cultures from dissident movements under the Ukrainian SSR to the independent state. It will

¹⁷⁴ State Statistics Committee of Ukraine, "All-Ukrainian Population Census 2001," www.2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/eng (accessed 25 August 2013).

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

explore how the political cultures morphed into political parties and how these parties politicised the nation building process. It is important to emphasise that despite the existence of two political cultures, with their own respective historical experiences and social environments, there was still a desire to create a single Ukrainian nation within the new Ukrainian state. Because the two cultures had different perspectives on the role of the independent Ukrainian state, this makes the political cultures different political communities, not just groups with different political preferences.

The dissolution of the USSR initiated the quadruple transition in Ukraine. The removal of foreign control over Ukraine created a political vacuum, which politicised the two political cultures as they fought for control of the state. Independence forced these cultures to morph into political parties, which could contest for control of the state and represent their political interests. The two political cultures were not represented by two political parties: a variety of parties emerged after independence, but the crucial ideological diversity amongst the parties centred upon the *raison d'être* of the Ukrainian state and whether the state should be democratic or communist in nature.¹⁷⁷ Disagreement over the *raison d'être* of the state is the key issue that prevents the creation of a bounded political community, able to withstand the requirements of democracy.

On one side of the spectrum were parties asserting that the purpose of a Ukrainian state should be to protect the ethnic Ukrainian people, embodying the collective values of west Ukraine. The most widespread of these 'national democratic' parties was the People's Movement of Ukraine (RUKH). RUKH stood for the revival of the ethnic Ukrainian nation and the implementation of a liberal democratic society.¹⁷⁸ It was founded in Galicia, with a mandate to establish an independent Ukrainian state

¹⁷⁷ Razumkov Center, "Ukraine's Party System: Specifics of Establishment, Problems of Function, Trends of Evolution,"

http://www.razumkov.org.ua/eng/files/category_journal/NSD116_eng_1.pdf (accessed 20 August 2013), 4.

¹⁷⁸ Vladimir Paniotto, "The Ukrainian Movement for Perestroika — 'Rukh': a Sociological Survey," *Soviet Studies* 43, no.1 (1991): 174.

to protect ethnic Ukrainians. At the first RUKH congress, delegates of the party were 90% Ukrainian and over 50% of delegates came from west Ukraine.¹⁷⁹

The popularity of RUKH and the national democratic parties in west Ukraine was made evident during the first 'free' elections for the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Council in March 1990. While the elections were not genuinely free in conduct, they were multi-candidate, following the decision of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) to allow non-CPSU candidates to run for Council seats. These elections represented a symbolic victory for the western political elite, as they moved from a dissident opposition to a legitimate opposition within the Supreme Council. These elections also demonstrated the commitment of west Ukrainian voters to nationalist and democratic ideals, through the concentration of their electoral support. A variety of organisations supporting independence (RUKH, the Ukrainian Language Society, Green World Association and the Ukrainian Helsinki Union and worker's unions) established a coalition called the 'Democratic Bloc' to run for the election. The 'Democratic Bloc's' manifesto was essentially an adaptation of RUKH's programme.¹⁸⁰ Despite electoral manipulation, the 'Democratic Bloc' received approximately 28% of the vote, dominating the local councils in the *oblasti* of Lviv, Ternopil and Ivano-Frankivsk.¹⁸¹ The DB won eighteen of the twenty-two seats in Kiev. The party leader of RUKH, Vyacheslav Chornovil was elected as the chair of the Lviv *oblast*, declaring it as an "island of freedom"¹⁸² within Ukraine.

On the other side of the spectrum, are parties that supported the continuation of the pre-independence, communist status quo; reflecting the broad interests of east Ukraine. These political elite asserted a more Slavic interpretation of the independent state's national identity, supporting either a Soviet or Russian foundation for

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 177.

¹⁸⁰ Bohdan Nahaylo, *The Ukrainian Resurgence* (London: Hurst & Company), 244.

¹⁸¹ Dominique Arel, "Voting behaviour in the Ukrainian Parliament," in *Parliaments in Transition: The New Legislative Politics in the Former USSR and Eastern Europe*, ed. Thomas F. Remington (Chicago: Westview Press, 1994), 130.

¹⁸² Taras Kuzio and Andrew Wilson, *Ukraine: Perestroika to Independence* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1994), 127.

national identity. The Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) was banned in 1991 (only to reform in 1993) however; it was replaced by the Socialist Party of Ukraine and was supported by the Agrarian Party of Ukraine. These parties were characterised as wanting the continuance of communism over democracy, acknowledging the rights of the large ethnic Russian minority and retaining close relations with Russia.

However, parties also emerged that lacked a clear political ideology. The most influential of these groups were the 'national communists,' led by the former head of ideology for the CPU, Leonid Kravchuk. This group was made up of the oligarchic elite who had prospered under the CPSU. Taras Kuzio characterised them by their "economic and political conservatism, a penchant for authoritarianism and command-administrative methods, and clan connections."¹⁸³ National communists are commonly viewed as the group that ushered in Ukraine's independent government. They defected from the CPSU as soon as it lost power and established an uneasy alliance with the national democrats, united by their common goal of Ukrainian independence. These national communists did not create a formal political party, but continued to stand as independent candidates in independent Ukraine; by doing so, they retained their political power in their local constituencies. They lacked a distinct political ideology, but evolved around populist principles in order to maintain control of political power. The identity of the independent state was not a central concern of the national communists and this is why the matter was not resolved during the early days of independence.

3.3 – Political cultures and nation building

Chapter one highlighted the importance of the conceptual separation of nation and state building. In his argument, Kuzio added a parenthesis, asserting that the nation-building process, following independence from a landlocked empire (without nature borders), will essentially force political elites to define the identity and *raison d'être* of the independent state in order to distinguish who is included and who is an

¹⁸³ Taras Kuzio, *Ukraine: State and Nation Building* (London: Routledge, 1998), 31.

outsider.¹⁸⁴ This was a complex task for Ukraine, as it shares a special historic relationship with Russia, although the whole population did not share this sentiment. Independence forced the political cultures to crystallise into political parties, vying for government, and competing for the power to control the future of the Ukrainian state. This complex situation combined with the general apathy towards identity politics by the national communists, ensured that the initial phase of nation building would be a protracted process that would delay progress on matters of state building.

There were four areas of nation building that would cause contention between the national-democrats and the leftist parties. The first is the definition of the intrinsic *raison d'être* of the Ukrainian state and the interpretation of the nation. The second issue focused on structure of the new state, whether it was unitary or federal. The third issue relates to the type of governance, state institutions and the division of powers. The final issue was the unique challenge of Crimea. A major challenge relating to the first two areas was what Kataryna Wolczuk refers to as the 'Russian question.'¹⁸⁵ She deconstructs the Russian question into three areas, the legality of the Russian minority, the status of the Russian language and Ukraine's foreign policy towards Russia.¹⁸⁶ She argues that the high profile of the Russian question around Ukraine's elections indicates that, "the very notion of political community, national identity and geopolitical orientation was open to contestation."¹⁸⁷ The political elite was forced to redefine the relationship former imperial ethnic majority and its colonial minority.

Raison d'être of Ukrainian state and the interpretation of the nation

The fundamental difference between the two political cultures was that independence represented different realities to the different political cultures. Support for the CPSU has been strongest in east Ukraine and following

¹⁸⁴ Taras Kuzio, "Identity and Nation-building in Ukraine," *Ethnicities* 1, no.3 (2001): 361.

¹⁸⁵ Kataryna Wolczuk, *The Moulding of Ukraine: The Constitutional Politics of State Formation*, <http://books.openedition.org/ceup/1742#bodyftn15> (accessed 20 August 2013).

¹⁸⁶ Wolczuk, *The Moulding of Ukraine*, 136.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

independence, its politicians could either attempt to fight the dissolution or they could adapt and control the transition. While the dissolution of the USSR posed a threat to their existence, it also posed an opportunity to extend their political power by controlling the political situation in independent Ukraine. This was in stark contrast to the west, which viewed independence as a victory in the long Ukrainian struggle for statehood. It presented the opportunity for democratic reform and finally a state to represent the Ukrainian people.

Another area of contention was the definition of the identity of the state, in terms of its nation and citizens. While west Ukrainian politicians asserted an ethnic Ukrainian definition of the nation, the political elite of the east demanded a more civic interpretation of the nation, which aligned with its Slavic identity. The pivotal goal of the national democrats was the assertion of the state for the titular majority, asserting that: "Ukrainian ethnicity served as the 'foundation' around which a political community was to be built."¹⁸⁸ This was reflected in their use of the Ukrainian word "*natsiia*," or the Ukrainian ethnic nation.¹⁸⁹ Therefore, the original Ukrainian nation should be defined by ethnic elements of Ukrainian identity such as Ukrainian ancestry and language. This was expressed in RUKH's 1991 national programme:

The national question in Ukraine is about the development of the Ukrainian nation, ethnic groups and national minorities, their integration into a common social fabric (socium) of the republic, the core of which are the people that gave the name to their nation-state.¹⁹⁰

However, this decision would run the risk of ostracising the minority groups within Ukraine's borders, effectively denying these minority groups as a part of the nation.

The political elite of east Ukraine disagreed with the national democratic interpretation of the nation and its limited *raison d'être*. They claimed that the ethnic definition of the 'Ukrainian people' only reflected the interests of ethnic Ukrainians.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 228.

¹⁹⁰ Oxana Shevel, "Citizenship and Nation-building in Ukraine," (paper presented at the Workshop: Understanding the Transformation of Ukraine: Assessing What Has Been Learned, Devising a Research Agenda, 15-16 October 2004, University of Ottawa)
www.ukrainianstudies.uottawa.ca/pdf/P_Shevel.pdf (accessed 18 November 2013).

In order to represent the interests of its Russian-minded constituents, these parties asserted that it was wrong to define the Ukrainian nation in such strict, ethnic terms, isolating the remaining population as a minority.¹⁹¹ The east “defined the political community of Ukraine as the territorial, supra-ethnic community ‘the people of Ukraine’ (*narod Ukrainy*).”¹⁹² They argued it was only appropriate to define the Ukrainian population *tabula rasa* from independence, because of Ukraine’s complex and fractious history.

Consequently, the two political cultures also had differing views on citizenship laws, specifically the criteria for citizenship and the concept of dual citizenship. As mentioned in chapter one, citizenship laws are key for creating the boundaries of the political community. This ensures that the citizens exchange their political allegiance for the privileges and protection of the state. The national democrats of west Ukraine asserted that ethnic Ukrainians represented the core of the Ukrainian nation, and argued that citizenship laws should reflect this. West Ukraine’s political elite asserted that Ukraine’s citizenship should be based upon ethnic identifiers, such as language and Ukrainian ancestry.¹⁹³ They were also against dual citizenship, believing that it would undermine the unity of independent Ukraine. Contrarily, the eastern political culture pushed for a dual citizenship policy, in order to maintain a link with Russia. Because much of the population in east Ukraine still identified themselves as Soviet and Slavic and felt apathetic towards Ukrainian national identity.¹⁹⁴

The ‘Russian question’ also arose in regards to language law. The political cultures had differing perspectives on this area; west Ukraine asserted that the role of the state was to protect and develop the Ukrainian language, by endorsing it as the sole

¹⁹¹ Wolczuk, *The Moulding of Ukraine*, 189.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 193.

¹⁹³ Chrystyna Lapychak, “Parliament Votes to Boycott Union Structures: Passes law on Ukrainian Citizenship,” *The Ukrainian Weekly*, October 13 1991, http://ukrweekly.com/archive/pdf3/1991/The_Ukrainian_Weekly_1991-41.pdf, (accessed 11 October 2013).

¹⁹⁴ 45% of surveyed Donetsk residents felt that the ‘Soviet’ category, which did not appear as a choice in the old passports, best described them. See George O. Liber, “Imagining Ukraine: Regional Differences and the Emergence of an Integrated State Identity, 1926-1994,” *Nations and Nationalism* 4, no. 2 (1998): 198.

state language. However, east Ukraine felt that this law would disadvantage the majority of Ukrainians that spoke Russian, and advocated for Russian to become a second state language. However, this is a complicated issue, surveys have shown a disjuncture between ethnic identification, spoken language and native language. The Soviet census of 1989 determined that among those who identified as ethnic Ukrainian, 84.3% considered Ukrainian as their native language, while approximately 62% could speak Russian fluently.¹⁹⁵ However, according to a 1992 survey, 29% of Ukrainian citizens spoke Russian at home, 36.8% spoke Ukrainian and 32% spoke both.¹⁹⁶ The debate regarding language in Ukraine is centred upon how language should be protected and endorsed by the state. West Ukraine's position was articulated through the RUKH party programme: "a national language is the foundation and the primary source of a culture, the basis of the national existence of a people, and a universal human value."¹⁹⁷

Finally, religion provided another area in regards to nation building. This disagreement related to the adoption of the official state religion. As mentioned in chapter two, Ukraine's political cultures have distinct religious beliefs established by historical circumstances; the east embraced the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Moscow Patriarchate), while the west accepted the Greek Catholic, the Autocephalous Orthodox Church, as well as the newly established Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Kiev Patriarchate). Following independence, President Kravchuk attempted to create a united national church under the newly established Kiev Patriarchate. However, this was abandoned under President Kuchma, who regarded it as a breach of religious freedom.¹⁹⁸

Unitary or federal Ukrainian state

¹⁹⁵ Tadeusz A. Olszański, "The Language Issue in Ukraine: An Attempt at a new Perspective," *OWS Studies* 40, Centre for Eastern Studies, Warsaw, May 2012, 16.

¹⁹⁶ Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, "Ukrainian Society: 20 years of Independence," Sociological Monitoring Survey, 2013. <http://www.issp.org/page.php?pageId=4>, (accessed 2 December 2013).

¹⁹⁷ Wolczuk, *The Moulding of Ukraine*, 145.

¹⁹⁸ Bohdan Harasym, *Post-Communist Ukraine* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2002), 227.

The historical divide between the political cultures also defined arguments over the shape of the new state. Independence created a power vacuum, which caused the political cultures to compete for the right to decide the political architecture of the new state. West Ukraine's political elite supported a unified state with centralised political control in Kiev, as they were concerned that granting too much political power to the regions would threaten the integrity of the vulnerable Ukrainian state.¹⁹⁹ They believed that the new state was already weak and that power should remain centralised to expedite the transition process. In addition to this, they also argued that the east had been so "Russified" that the west should commit to a process of Ukrainisation, in order to establish a sense of Ukrainian ethos in the east.²⁰⁰ Contrarily, many in the east were committed to a federal structure, which would allow gradual state integration through political decentralisation, particularly in the economic realm.²⁰¹ Many in the east felt ostracised by Kiev, which had hastily adopted the ethnic sentiments of west Ukraine. With politicians in Kiev lacking experience, the eastern political culture argued that autonomous regions would provide strong governance, which would also reflect the demographic realities and political beliefs of all people of Ukraine.

Type of government and state institutions

The institutional structure of the independent state was another area of contention between the political cultures. Political elite of the west wanted a parliamentary system with a president, while the east wanted the retention of the Soviet system of Soviet councils. West Ukrainian politicians argued that a head of state was necessary to represent and protect the nascent state in the international community. The 1992 RUKH party programme highlighted this position:

The form of government that in terms of [Ukraine's] historical traditions, theoretical thoughts on statehood at the beginning of the twentieth

¹⁹⁹ Stephen K. Batalden, *The Newly Independent States of Eurasia: Handbook of Former Soviet Republics* (Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx, 1997), 80.

²⁰⁰ Victor Basiuk, "Ukraine: Toward a Viable National Ethos," in *Ukraine: The Search for a National Identity*, ed. Sharon L. Wolchik and Volodymyr Zviglyanich (Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Ltd, 2000), 33.

²⁰¹ Bugajski, "Ethnic Relations and Regional Problems," 168.

century, and the psychological traits of the Ukrainian nation is most appropriate is that of a parliamentary-presidential republic with the head of state, who is not the chief executive. Historically, this is confirmed by the forms of governments utilised in the Cossack Republic and the Ukrainian People's Republic.²⁰²

The left demanded the retention of collective power within the Soviet model of people's Soviets (*rada*). The local *rada* would work as a local government, with the Supreme Council at the centre of the institutional framework.²⁰³ The Chairman of the Supreme Council would act as the head of state, replacing a President. The *nomenklatura* of the national communists also supported a strong presidency for self-interested reasons. Because the Chairman of the *Verkhovna Rada* at the time of independence (and first president of Ukraine), Leonid Kravchuk, wanted to be the first head of state of independent Ukraine.

Crimea

The history of Crimea and its consequent demographics posed a unique problem for Ukraine's nation building. The threat of separatism has always been the highest in Crimea, due to its multinational demographics. Crimea was made part of the Ukrainian SSR in 1954, as a gift from Russia to mark the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereiaslav. The Crimean Peninsula is home to multiple ethnic groups, yet its ethnic majority are ethnic Russians, which make up 58.5% of the population. Indeed, it is the only *oblast* in Ukraine where Russians are the majority. The Russian majority abhors the official status of Ukrainian over Russian and places pressure on the state to grant Russian equal status.²⁰⁴ Ethnic Ukrainians make up only 24.4% of the population, while Crimean Tatars constitute 12.1%, as well as groups of Jews, Belarussians and Hungarians.²⁰⁵ Crimean Tatars are indigenous to this area; however, Stalin deported them during World War II for allegedly collaborating with the Nazis. Following the dissolution of the USSR, the Tatars

²⁰² Wolczuk, *The Moulding of Ukraine*, 144.

²⁰³ Ibid.

²⁰⁴ Hans van Zon, "Ethnic conflict and Conflict Resolution in Ukraine," *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 2, no.2 (2001): 226.

²⁰⁵ State Statistics Committee of Ukraine, "All-Ukrainian Population Census: Crimea," 2001. <http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/eng/results/general/nationality/Crimea>, (accessed 18 November 2013).

returned to their homeland in Crimea. Tension between the Russian majority and the Crimean Tatars is high, because both the Tartars and the Russians see themselves as indigenous to the area. The political culture divide is still applicable in Crimea as the Russian majority supports the politicians of east Ukraine, while the Crimean Tatars support west Ukraine's politicians.

Crimea had the lowest levels of support for independence in 1991 at 54%.²⁰⁶ This was concerning for the Ukrainian authorities as separatism was a potential threat for the new state in 1991, with the Donbas region (Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk and Luhansk), Zakarpattia and Crimea all calling for individual political autonomy. Crimea posed the greatest regional challenge to Ukraine's national unity. Following independence, concerns of the validity of the 1954 Soviet transfer of Crimea to Ukraine were voiced, with secession seen as a solution. Crimean secession was not permissible under Kravchuk and he warned that negotiations over Ukraine's territory were inconceivable.²⁰⁷ Crimea declared self-governance and passed its own constitution in its parliament on May 6 1992. Kiev eventually forced Crimea to annul its declaration of self-governance, in return for greater autonomy within the Ukrainian state. In October 1993, Crimea established the position of president, which the Ukrainian *Verkhovnaa Rada* again abolished when it implemented the 1996 Ukrainian constitution. The Ukrainian constitution renamed the region the 'Autonomous Republic of Crimea,' whilst granting it some autonomy, it insisted that Crimea was an "inseparable constituent part of Ukraine."²⁰⁸ Yet tensions still develop, dependent on the party in control of the local administration.

Another issue for Ukraine in regards to Crimea is the Black Sea Fleet. The Black Sea is a large unit of the Russian (former Soviet) navy, based in the capital of Crimea, Sevastopol. The fleet is a source of major contention between Ukraine and Russia, as nationalists in Ukraine insist that the Fleet represents the continuance of Russian

²⁰⁶ Roman Solchanyk, "The Politics of State Building: Centre-Periphery Relations in Post-Soviet Ukraine," *Europe-Asia Studies* 46, no. 1 (1994): 48.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 55.

²⁰⁸ Viktor Yanukovych, President of Ukraine, "Constitution of Ukraine," <http://www.president.gov.ua/en/content/constitution.html>, (accessed 10 November 2012).

domination over Ukraine and violates the constitution. The Fleet has been based in Sevastopol since 1784 under Catherine the Great and maintains special status under Ukraine's constitution. Following the dissolution of the USSR, Moscow and Kiev agreed upon Russia maintaining its fleet in Ukraine until 2017. If the Fleet remains on Ukrainian territory, it prevents Ukraine from joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, thus preventing closer links with Europe and the United States. Therefore, the Black Sea Fleet reflects motivations on foreign policy orientation and the decision to align with European or Russian military institutions. It also represents a problem for state building, as the presence of the Fleet is in breach of Ukraine's constitution, as a foreign military presence threatens its state sovereignty. Therefore, politicians from east Ukraine have allowed the Fleet to remain, while west Ukraine's politicians have attempted to remove the Fleet.

3.4 – The identity of independent Ukraine

The first indications of the identity of the Ukrainian state were written into state policy, even before independence. Policies of language and the declaration of sovereignty demonstrated that the new state would be founded upon ethnic Ukrainian identity. However, this section will demonstrate that the identity and purpose of the Ukrainian state was not resolved to a degree that, as Dankwart Rustow argued, the majority of citizens knew which political community they belonged to.²⁰⁹ The legislation for language was established in 1989, which was common amongst the many of the Soviet republics. 'On Languages in Ukrainian SSR' prescribed Ukrainian as the official state language, but guaranteed "Ukrainian citizens the right to use their national language."²¹⁰ However, it is pertinent to note that the Soviet constitution remained in force, which determined Russian as the official language of the USSR. Theoretically, the Ukrainian language was the official language of the state, but in practice, this legislation was vague, as it did not define

²⁰⁹ Dankwart Rustow, "Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model" *Comparative Politics* 2, no. 3 (1970): 339.

²¹⁰ Verkhovna Rada Website, "On Languages in Ukrainian SSR," January 1 1991, <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/not/en/8312-11>, (accessed 25 July 2013).

how the Ukrainian language was to be distinguished from the official Soviet language and other minority languages. For this reason, language law would remain an unresolved issue, which would continue to be electoral fodder in later elections, particularly for the political elite of east Ukraine.

The first indication of the *raison d'être* of independent Ukraine was laid out in the 'declaration of sovereignty' in July 1990. This document indicates the antagonism between providing a state to represent ethnic Ukrainians and remaining a homeland for the minorities who lived within its boundaries. Ultimately, the declaration struck a balance between the two, committing itself as a state for Ukrainians while not persecuting minorities on its territory. The declaration proclaims that the sovereign Ukrainian SSR "protects and defends the national statehood of the Ukrainian people,"²¹¹ asserting an ethnic interpretation of identity. However, the declaration also articulates Ukraine's commitment to civic-based citizenship: "citizens of the Republic of all nationalities comprise the people of Ukraine"²¹² and that the state "guarantees all nationalities living on the territory of the Republic the right to free national and cultural development."²¹³ It announced that a "new time has come for the development of interethnic relations."²¹⁴ Yet, this document would be futile without a policy on citizenship or minority legislation to support it.

Another document establishing Ukraine's state identity was the 'Declaration of Independence.' The 'Declaration of Independence' Act was passed in parliament on the 24 August 1991; however, the Act would not be ratified until it passed a citizens' referendum in December that year. The declaration was announced as a response to the perceived danger to Ukraine following the August 1991 coup d'état in Moscow

²¹¹ *Verkhovna Rada* Website, "Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine" July 16 1990, http://static.rada.gov.ua/site/postanova_eng/Declaration_of_State_Sovereignty_of_Ukraine_rev1.htm, (accessed 25 July 2013).

²¹² *Ibid.*

²¹³ *Ibid.*

²¹⁴ *Verkhovna Rada* Website, " On Address of the Presidium of the *Verkhovna Rada* of Ukraine to Citizens of Ukraine of All Nationalities," August 26 1991, http://static.rada.gov.ua/site/postanova_eng/Res_All_Nat_Address_rev11.htm, (accessed 25 July 2013).

and the potential dissolution of the USSR. Ukrainian independence occurred quickly because both east and west Ukraine felt it was beneficial to their political interests. Those in the east supported independence as it allowed them to maintain political control, while those in west Ukraine also supported independence, as a means to achieve their goal of Ukrainian self-determination.

Voting behaviour for the referendum on independence is divided on the same political cultural divide. The August 'Declaration of Independence' was approved in December after 90.32% of Ukrainians supported independence in a referendum.²¹⁵ Support for independence was universally high in all *oblasti*, except Crimea, as shown on the map below. The higher levels of support in the west demonstrate the concentration of nationalist sentiment in this region. This is in contrast to the east, where levels of support are relatively lower. This is due to the east Ukrainian mentality that relies on close relations with Russia, as well as the high percentage of Russians and Russian-speaking Ukrainians living in east Ukraine. Many voters were unsure of removing Ukraine from the Soviet Union.

²¹⁵ Chrystyna Lapychak, "Independence: Over 90% vote yes in Referendum; Kravchuk elected President of Ukraine," *The Ukrainian Weekly*, December 8 1991, http://www.ukrweekly.com/archive/pdf3/1991/The_Ukrainian_Weekly_1991-49.pdf, (accessed December 5 2013).

Map 4 - Results from Ukraine's 1991 independence referendum



Source - http://www.ukrweekly.com/archive/pdf3/1991/The_Ukrainian_Weekly_1991-49.pdf

Citizenship and minority laws

Determining Ukraine's citizenship laws was significant, as it clarified the official identity of the Ukrainian *demos*. Ukraine adopted its legislation on citizenship in November 1991, a month before independence was ratified by public referendum. Citizenship was granted to:

[A]ll citizens of the former USSR, who at the moment of declaration of Ukraine's independence [August 24, 1991], resided permanently in the territory of Ukraine, who were not citizens of other states and who did not object to becoming citizens of Ukraine.²¹⁶

In addition to this, those outside the territory could claim citizenship if they had at least one Ukrainian parent or grandparent.²¹⁷ A condition was added to this law: citizens must have "knowledge of the Ukrainian language to the extent sufficient for

²¹⁶ Shevel, "Citizenship and Nation-building," 3.

²¹⁷ Ibid.

social interaction.”²¹⁸ This condition was included to appease the west Ukraine elite, ensuring that the Ukrainian language was safeguarded within its borders, however it was never enforced. Many scholars consider this citizenship legislation to be highly inclusive, particularly in contrast to Estonia or Latvia, which used ethnicity and ancestry to define their citizens.²¹⁹ Ukraine’s citizenship laws were considered as the most liberal of the former Soviet republics. They benefitted the minorities within Ukraine, who were granted Ukrainian citizenship, regardless of ethnic or nationality group. In terms of dual citizenship, a political compromise was struck that determined that “in Ukraine there is single citizenship. Dual citizenship is allowed on the basis of bilateral agreements.”²²⁰ To date, there has been no such agreement made.

Chapter one introduced Margaret Canovan and her key points that needed to be addressed when defining the nation and its citizens. These were: what are the boundaries of this collective; what makes an individual within those boundaries part of the people; what are the qualifications for citizenship; and what makes the collective able to undertake commitments to the state?²²¹ Ukrainian citizenship was granted to anyone that held Soviet citizenship that was on Ukrainian SSR territory. The boundaries of the Ukrainian nation were based upon a territorial definition, a civic definition of citizenship. However, for those who were not in the Ukrainian SSR at the time of independence, an ethnic notion of ancestry applied. To the question of what made an individual part of the people, the answer is very little. The only prerequisite for Ukrainian citizenship, for those on Ukrainian territory, was Soviet citizenship. However, the political elite neglected to create a sense of collective identity, something that would establish a sense of unity amongst the citizens. This would ultimately prevent the creation of a Ukrainian *demos*.

²¹⁸ Lapychak, “Parliament Votes to Boycott Union Structures.”

²¹⁹ Alfred C. Stepan, Juan J. Linz, and Yogendra Yadav, “Ukraine: State nation Policies in a Unitary state,” in *Crafting State-Nations: India and Other Multinational Democracies*, ed. Alfred C. Stepan, Juan J. Linz and Yogendra Yadav (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011).

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, 4.

²²¹ Margaret Canovan, *Nationhood and Political Theory* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 1996), 18.

The 1992 law on national minorities expresses Ukraine's commitment to creating an independent, inclusive and democratic state. The state guarantees all national minorities the right to cultural autonomy and extends state protection to ensure the development, self-awareness and self-expression of minority culture.²²² However, these minorities were to remain loyal to the Ukrainian constitution and were not to disrupt state sovereignty or territorial integrity.²²³ Minority groups were entitled to use their native language in "working places of state bodies" as long as the majority of the population in that place spoke that language.²²⁴ This final article does not stipulate how to determine if the minority is the majority, or how the change of language is to be institutionalised and exactly where it is to be used. As a result of this ambiguity, language is a constant source of contention in Ukrainian politics. This point will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Constitution

The most fundamental document to resolve questions of identity is a constitution. Ukraine's constitution was not completed until 1996, reflecting the difficulties of negotiating an agreement on fundamental principles of Ukrainian society. The constitution combined elements of Ukrainian ethnic identity, while also acknowledging Ukraine's inclusive civic citizenship. The preamble of the constitution acknowledges the "Ukrainian people – Ukrainian citizens of all nationalities," indicating the compromise made by the political cultures.²²⁵ It also refers to the "centuries old history of Ukrainian state building" and the "right to self-determination realised by the Ukrainian nation."²²⁶ However, this raises the question, what constitutes the Ukrainian nation? Is it ethnic Ukrainians or those who found themselves on Ukrainian territory at independence? This is never clearly defined. As well as reiterating the ethnic core of the Ukrainian nation-state through

²²² Boriss Cilevics, "Law on National Minorities," June 25 1992, http://www.cilevics.eu/minelres/NationalLegislation/Ukraine/Ukraine_Minorities_English.htm, (accessed 8 November 2013).

²²³ Ibid.

²²⁴ Ibid.

²²⁵ Viktor Yanukovich, President of Ukraine, "Constitution of Ukraine," <http://www.president.gov.ua/en/content/constitution.html>, (accessed 2 November 2012).

²²⁶ Ibid.

single citizenship, the constitution also recapitulated its role in regards to language policy. This was to “ensure the comprehensive development and functioning of the Ukrainian language in all spheres of social life.”²²⁷ Ukrainian was declared the official language; in addition to this, the constitution also stipulated that the president must have a command of the Ukrainian language. Russian was categorized as a minority language, but it also guaranteed the “free development, use and protection of Russian, and other languages of national minorities of Ukraine.”²²⁸

Cultural policies

The newly independent Ukrainian state pursued cultural policies that constructed a Ukrainian national identity by connecting it to the past. The political elite adopted ethno-symbolic nation building policies that embraced and privileged ethnic Ukrainian culture. John Breuilly argues that cultural symbolism is an important process of nation building. He posits that symbols such as flags, anthems and photos of the leaders are used to imbue a sense of cohesion within the population.²²⁹ The political elite of Ukraine constructed a sense of Ukrainian identity that had existed for centuries by engraining ethnic Ukrainian cultural symbols within the independent Ukrainian state. In February 1992, Ukraine’s national flag and official symbol, the trident, were declared. The colours of yellow and blue were traditionally attached to Kievan Rus, and had also been part of Cossack military uniform. The trident of the princedom of Volodymyr the Great in Kievan Rus was used as the official state emblem. It was adopted as the state symbol of the Ukrainian People’s Republic in 1917 and was used again as a symbol of the nationalist movement under the USSR. The trident represented the history of Ukrainian statehood and emblematically linked Kievan Rus to the new state. The national anthem “*Shche ne vmerla Ukraina*” (Ukraine has not yet perished) was adopted in 1992. The lyrics were adapted from a poem written by an ethnic Ukrainian ethnographer, Pavlo

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ Ibid

²²⁹ John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 277.

Chubynsky in 1862.²³⁰ The lyrics embrace west Ukrainian historiography: “we, brothers, are of the Cossack nation.” The lyrics are very patriotic, telling the struggle of ethnic Ukrainians for a homeland, positing that: “we will not allow others to rule in our motherland.”²³¹ All of this seeks to ground the new state and its nation with a sense of history.

Ethnic Ukrainian culture was used in its education policy, to explain the history of Ukraine. Education is a vital tool in the construction and development of national identity, as it teaches “the way of the state to the people and the duties of the people to the state.”²³² Independent Ukraine continued the Soviet system of highly centralised education, preventing local authorities, ethnic minorities or family from distorting the official cultural and historical narratives.²³³ This ensured that the state’s official interpretation of national culture, historical narrative, language, literature, law and customs would become standardised throughout Ukraine. The strategic direction for education was formalised in report entitled *Education: Ukraine of the twentieth first century* in 1993. This report explained that education in Ukraine was to:

[E]spouse a national orientation which proceeds from the integrity of education based on national foundations, the organic unity with national history and ethnic traditions, and the preservation and enrichment of the culture of the Ukrainian people.”²³⁴

History lessons during independence portrayed Russia as an oppressor, vindicating the need for a Ukrainian state. Children were taught that Ukraine is reclaiming its culture and history after its repression during the USSR. Kuzio highlights key areas of education that engender a Ukrainian national identity: First, Kievan Rus is

²³⁰ Internet Encyclopaedia of Ukraine, “Pavlo Chubynsky,” <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CC%5CH%5CChubynskyPavlo.htm>, (accessed 11 December 2013).

²³¹ Nationalanthems.info, “Ukraine,” <http://www.nationalanthems.info/ua.htm> (accessed 11 December 2013).

²³² Jan Germen Janmaat, “Nation-Building, Democratization and Globalization as Competing Priorities in Ukraine’s Education System,” 2008, <http://eprints.ioe.ac.uk/5190/1/Janmaat2008Nation1.pdf> (accessed 20 November 2012), 3.

²³³ Ibid.

²³⁴ Karina Korostelina, “Shaping unpredictable past: National Identity and History Education in Ukraine,” *National Identities* 13, no.1 (2011): 3.

depicted as a proto-Ukrainian state. Second, the 1654 Treaty of Periaslav is interpreted as a military alliance between two equals, the Cossacks and Muscovite Tsar Alexey I (in Soviet historiography this Treaty had been portrayed as a reunion of Ukraine with Russia). In terms of foreign rule, Tsarist Russia is portrayed as detrimental to state building, while Hapsburg rule is purported as engendering Ukrainian nationalism. Fourth, the Ukrainian People's Republic, the Directory and the Hetmanate are all depicted as attempts of Ukrainian state building. Fifth, Stalin's reign of the USSR is portrayed as a direct attack upon Ukrainian culture and the famine of 1932-1933 is viewed as ethnocide. Finally, battles of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army of during World War II were fought against both the Soviets and the Nazis.²³⁵ These elements of history are contentious between the political cultures, as they portray Russia as a negative force interfering in Ukrainian affairs.

While this history was adopted to create a sense of enduring identity for the newly established state, it favoured the history of west Ukrainian history. A key problem with teaching this version of history is that it privileges one political culture over the other, creating tension. The version of history taught in schools privileges ethnic Ukrainians and the role of west Ukraine in the history of the independent state. This is a backlash against the decades of Soviet history, in which the history of ethnic Ukrainians was assimilated with Russian and Soviet history. However, it creates antagonism between the political cultures, denying the history of ethnic Ukrainians living in east Ukraine. The fact that those living under west and east Ukraine have different interpretations of their own history prevents the concept of a united Ukrainian political community. This in turn, damages the sense of equality amongst the nationalities of Ukraine and consequently, prevents a united Ukrainian *demos*.

Foreign policy

Foreign policy also plays an important role in institutionalising identity as it cements the process of defining 'us' from the conceptual 'other' in the international context. It

²³⁵ Taras Kuzio, "History, Memory and Nation Building in the Post-Soviet Colonial Space," *Nationalities Papers* 30, no. 2 (2002): 253.

also assists in prioritising the interests of the state on a global level. The decision to enter into bilateral and multi-lateral agreements is guided by cooperating with those states that are allies of the nation. This is seen in the foreign policy direction of former Soviet republics that geopolitically straddle the international organisations of the EU and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Membership in these organisations is dependent on whether the state perceives its values, customs and strategic future as more aligned with Europe or Russia.

Following independence, Ukraine appeared to focus its foreign policy aspirations on simply introducing itself as a new state in the international community. Immediately after independence, Ukraine sought to assert its position in central Europe, focusing on establishing good relations with its neighbours. The earliest official visits of President Kravchuk were to Washington, Paris, Bonn, Brussels and Helsinki, indicating a clear western focus in diplomatic relations.²³⁶ The 'Declaration on the Foundations and Fundamental Directions in the Development of Polish-Ukrainian Relations' was indicative of this position. Signed in October 1990, it asserted the kinship between Ukrainian and Polish people. In focusing on central Europe, Ukraine wished to establish Russia as the political and cultural 'other.' Relations with Russia were limited to economic and nuclear disarmament cooperation. Kravchuk also commenced negotiations for membership into European institutions and multi-lateral organisations. Ukraine applied for membership in the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Central European Initiative and the Visegrad Agreement. The OSCE is the world's largest regional security organisation that provides a platform for political negotiation in conflict and crisis management issues. The Central European Initiative was a regional organisation based in central, eastern and southern Europe with the aim of reducing political and economic division amongst the region following the end of the Cold War. The Visegrad Agreement was the alliance of the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia for the purposes of furthering European integration. Commencing official relations with these European organisations all signaled Ukraine's desire to integrate into

²³⁶ Nahaylo, *The Ukrainian Resurgence*, 446.

European political spheres and to assert its autonomy from Russia. This foreign policy position indicates another way in which the political values of west Ukraine were embraced following independence.

However, Kuchma adopted a pragmatic approach to his foreign policy, asserting that Ukraine should not ignore its economic partnership with Russia. In Kuchma's inaugural speech in 1994, he criticised Ukraine for having been a passive and lethargic member of the Eurasian economic and cultural space.²³⁷ Kuchma argued for the need to "normalise" relations with Russia as an unabated strategic partner, but he did not want this to impede genuine cooperation with Europe.²³⁸ This culminated with the conclusion of the "Treaty of friendship, cooperation and partnership between the Russian Federation and Ukraine" in 1997. This document acknowledged the close relations between the two states and the need to strengthen these relations for the benefit of their people.²³⁹ In contrast to Kravchuk, Kuchma did not believe that economic relations with Russia would shadow its sovereignty, but was a necessity resulting from the economic interdependence during the USSR. The oscillation between Europe and Russia indicates that Ukraine's political elite was unable to come to a consensus on the ideological 'other' of the independent state. This reflects the inability of a domestic consensus of the independent state's allies.

Conclusion

This chapter has argued that division between the political cultures has driven the nation building and consequently, the state building process in Ukraine. Independence transformed the political cultures into political parties, which competed for political influence of the state. The eastern political culture was dominant in the newly independent state, as the national communists retained political power through the transition. However, the east Ukrainian political elite

²³⁷ Marta Kolomayets, "Leonid Kuchma Sworn in as President of Ukraine," *Ukrainian Weekly*, July 24 1994, <http://ukrweekly.com/calendar/TOC/94/30.htm> (accessed 28 November 2013).

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Taras Kuzio, "Neither east no west: Ukraine's Security policy under Kuchma," *Problems of Post-Communism* 52, no.5 (2005): 63.

utilised elements of ethnic Ukrainian identity, to appease the political elite of the west and to establish a sense of the longevity to the Ukrainian state. However, The cultures had differing perspectives regarding the *raison d'être* of the new state, whether it should be a unitary or federal state, its citizenship and language laws and the format of its state institutions. In order to move through the political impasse and to expedite the nation and state building process, legislation relating to identity was vague and contradictory. Consensus on these fundamental issues of national identity was not achieved.

Ukraine introduced a liberal and civic definition of citizenship, as a trade-off creating stability for the new state. Permanent residents, who were citizens of the USSR, at the time of independence, were granted instant Ukrainian citizenship. Concessions were made to some west Ukrainian demands: ethnic ancestry was required for those who were outside of Ukraine's borders at the time of independence, no dual citizenship and a knowledge of Ukrainian was requested, but not enforced. In terms of Ukraine's minorities, the Ukrainian state would protect their right to their culture, so long as they did not disrupt the sovereignty of the state. Essentially, there was nothing within these citizenship laws that integrated the Ukrainian population enough for them to feel responsible to the Ukrainian state. However, this did impinge on Ukraine's ability to define its 'people' in a manner that would ensure that they were prepared to commit to Ukraine's quadruple transition. This raises the questions posed by Margaret Canovan in chapter one: what are the limits of this collective, what makes an individual within those boundaries part of the people and what makes those specified a collective 'people' able to take decisions and under-take long-term commitments?²⁴⁰ In applying these questions to Ukraine's citizenship laws, the answer would appear to be very little. For Ukrainians, particularly east Ukrainians, that already had a weak sense of identity, these citizenship laws did not engender the bonds required for a democratic political community.

Therefore, Ukraine did not establish a unified, equal political community. While

²⁴⁰ Canovan, *Nationhood and Political Theory*, 18.

Ukraine's legislation on identity issues should have resolved issues, it has left some of the Ukrainian population feeling as second-class citizens, or apathetic towards the political process. As chapter one demonstrated, democracy relies on the equal opportunity and participation of all citizens. The manner in which citizenship was institutionalised left Ukraine with a weak political community, unable to meet democratic requirements of a strong civil society. Ukraine institutionalised elements of ethnic Ukrainian identity, whilst trying to not ostracise its minority groups. The contradiction in the fundamental identity of the state was a result of a compromise, a need to resolve a political impasse and to progress with state building. Ultimately, divisions over the fundamental identity of the Ukrainian nation, and consequently the state, have prevented progress on democratic state building. This will be discussed in further detail in the following chapter.

Chapter four

How has the political culture divide prevented democracy?

This thesis has demonstrated how Ukrainians have been divided into two political cultures through their pre-Soviet experiences under different imperial rule. The division between the political cultures has prevented democracy in two ways. First, it has prevented the creation of a united Ukrainian community, as analysed in chapter three. Secondly, the antagonism between the political cultures had resulted in the political elite focusing on subverting its opponent, rather than focusing on democratic reform. This second issue is the focus of this chapter.

This chapter illustrates that the competition between the politicians of the two political cultures has established a situation that can be best understood as a Competitive Authoritarian (CA) regime. In this chapter I will use the political culture divide as a paradigm to understand Ukraine's contemporary political discourse. It will illustrate how Ukraine's four presidents have represented the interests of each political culture. Ukraine's political discourse can be understood as oscillating between the political cultures. When in power, the presidents assert a national identity that advances their political culture agenda. Consequently, there is protest from the opposing culture, which manifests in public protests or protests within the *Verkhovna Rada*. In order to repress the opposition, the state becomes more authoritarian, particularly under the political elite of east Ukraine, who has a historical proclivity towards autocratic rule.

It is pertinent to note that this thesis does not assert that one political culture is more democratic than the other. The political elite from both political cultures has prevented the consolidation of Ukraine's transition. It argues that both of the political cultures are undemocratic, but in different respects. The political elite of west Ukraine is undemocratic because they assert an exclusive ethnic Ukrainian identity

as Ukraine's national identity. Alternatively, the political elite of east Ukraine engages in authoritarian political behaviour.

This chapter will put Ukraine's political discourse between its presidents into the political cultural divide context. The actions of the president will be analysed, because the president is the most influential player in Ukraine's political environment and, according to Kuzio, they play "the key role in the construction of national identity."²⁴¹ It will examine Ukraine's political discourse chronologically, focusing upon instances of conflict between the political elite that has subverted democracy in Ukraine. It will begin with President Kravchuk from 1991-1994, President Kuchma from 1994-2004, President Yushchenko from 2004-2010 and President Yanukovych from 2010 to the present.

4.1 Kravchuk's presidency

Leonid Kravchuk's presidency reflected the muddled identity of Ukraine at the time of independence. Kravchuk was a national communist, previously working as the Chief of Ideology for the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU). However, as he was born in the *oblast* of Rivne, he also represented some of the political interests of west Ukraine. This balance is demonstrated in his nation building policies, which privileged the ethnic Ukrainian nation to an extent, but not enough to aggravate his east Ukrainian national communists. Kravchuk established Ukraine's "ethno-symbolic" national identity. He emphasised the need to build the independent state upon ethnic Ukrainian tradition, adopting its symbols, heroes and folklore.²⁴² Yet, simultaneously, he referred to the multinational nature of Ukraine and how the state would national minorities as equal Ukrainian citizens, with the freedom to develop their culture.²⁴³

²⁴¹ Taras Kuzio, "Identity and Nation Building in Ukraine: Defining the Other," *Ethnicities* 1, no.3 (2001): 344.

²⁴² The Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, "Golden Line in the History of our State - President Leonid Kravchuk," <http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/fpu/1992/gu19920826.htm> (accessed 15 September 2013).

²⁴³ Ibid.

Kravchuk was a tactical politician in regards to language policy. He advocated for the state to play a role in protecting the Ukrainian language, whilst not demoting the use of Russian. In 1992, Kravchuk implementing policies of 'Ukrainisation.' This affected the language of state administration and official documents, the language of instruction in schools (the percentage of Ukrainian-instructed students was to be aligned with the number of ethnic Ukrainians in the population) and the language of state-owned television.²⁴⁴ Nevertheless, he refrained from making Ukrainian the exclusive language of the state, satisfying his Russophone supporters.

Kravchuk's presidency should be conceived as a balance between Ukraine's political cultures. He attempted to privilege ethnic Ukrainians, whilst acknowledging the multinational demographics of the independent state. However, Kravchuk's presidency was also unique in that it was the first peaceful transfer of power amongst the former Soviet republics. Ukraine's democratic credentials were strong at the outset of Kuchma's presidency.

4.2 Kuchma's presidency

Kuchma's identity and cultural policies appealed less to the ethnic Ukrainian identity than his successor. In his inauguration speech he revealed: "the political romanticism and euphoria associated with a new state need to be replaced with realism, concrete action and pragmatism."²⁴⁵ He continued to appeal to both political cultures, whilst incrementally reducing the ethnic Ukrainian identity of the state. According to Wolczuk, Kuchma believed that the 'national idea' needed to be modernised.²⁴⁶ Kuchma asserted that "we have to understand that Ukraine is a multinational state. Any attempt to ignore this fact threatens to profoundly split society and to ruin the

²⁴⁴ Dominique Arel, "Language Politics in Independent Ukraine: Towards one or two State Languages?" *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity* 23, no.3 (1995): 613.

²⁴⁵ Nahaylo, *The Ukrainian Resurgence*, 473.

²⁴⁶ Kataryna Wolczuk, "History, Europe and the "National Idea": The "Official" Narrative of National Identity in Ukraine," *Nationalities Papers* 28, no. 4 (2000): 688.

idea of Ukrainian statehood.”²⁴⁷ Kuchma opined that the previous government had prioritised the consolidation of national and ethnic identity, which had exacerbated political divisions and tensions between Ukraine’s regions and resulted in Ukraine’s economic hardship.²⁴⁸ Kuchma argued that strengthening the economy and introducing market and democratic reforms would unite the multinational Ukrainian people.²⁴⁹ Removing ethnic Ukrainian identity from the state identity, conformed to the mentality of east Ukraine, and revoked the cultural policies of his nationalist-minded predecessor.

Kuchma’s language policy was tactical, as he strategically balanced the interests of his political culture with the interests of west Ukrainian politicians. Kuchma wanted to preserve the Ukrainian language without alienating Russian speakers. During his campaign for the presidency in 1994, he promised to grant Russian official language status, while preserving the state status for Ukrainian.²⁵⁰ However, this promise was not kept and Russian was not recognised as an official language under the 1996 constitution. The constitution declared Ukrainian as the only state language, but it rather ambiguously guaranteed the “free development, use and protection of Russian.”²⁵¹ He also retained the ‘Ukrainisation’ policies of this predecessor by increasing Ukrainian as the language of instruction in schools. However, under Kuchma, there was an increase in the use of Russian in the media, popular culture and business.²⁵²

²⁴⁷ Dominique Arel, “Ukraine: The temptation of the Nationalising State,” in *Political Culture and Civil Society in Russian and the new States of Eurasia*, ed. Vladimir Tismaneanu (Armonk New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1995), 168.

²⁴⁸ Holos Ukrainy, “Address of the President of Ukraine at the Celebratory meeting dedicated to Independence Day of Ukraine,” August 28 1995, <http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/fpu/1995/gu19950828.htm>, (accessed 31 January 2013).

²⁴⁹ Ibid.

²⁵⁰ Marta Kolomayets, “Leonid Kuchma Sworn in as President of Ukraine,” *The Ukrainian Weekly*, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/16268798/The-Ukrainian-Weekly-199430>, (accessed 20 December 2012).

²⁵¹ Viktor Yanukovych, President of Ukraine, “Constitution of Ukraine,” <http://www.president.gov.ua/en/content/constitution.html>, (accessed 8 January 2013).

²⁵² Volodymyr Kulyk, “Constructing Common sense: Language and Ethnicity in Ukrainian public Discourse,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29, no. 2 (2006), 307.

Kuchma's foreign policy objective was to establish a multi-vector policy that would improve Ukraine's economy. In accordance with the beliefs of east Ukraine, Kuchma believed that the solution to Ukraine's flailing economy was improved relations with Russia. In his inaugural speech in 1994, he criticised Ukraine for having been a passive and lethargic member of the Eurasian economic and cultural space.²⁵³ Kuchma argued for the need to "normalise" relations with Russia as an unabated strategic partner, but did not want this to impede genuine cooperation with the European Union.²⁵⁴ In contrast to Kravchuk, Kuchma did not believe that economic relations with Russia would shadow its sovereignty, but regarded them as a necessity resulting from its economic interdependence under the USSR. In addition he proposed full membership in the CIS in order for Ukraine to take an active role in its economic affairs. However, in order to reform the economy he knew that he would need to continue good relations with western financial and technical institutions. Ukraine became the first former Soviet state to sign a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with the EU in May 1994. It also became a member of the Council of Europe in November 1995. While Ukraine signed multiple agreements and paid lip service to western institutions; the reforms that were required to bring Ukraine into Europe were never introduced.

Kuchma's second term

In 1999, Kuchma won his second term as president. His second term was characterised by Kuchma's continued attempts to maximise his presidential power, with a disregard for democratic reform. The political culture generated by Kuchma's presidency was reminiscent of that found during the Soviet era.²⁵⁵ Neo-patrimonial networks, where state resources were used in order to buy political loyalty, and nepotism characterised political allegiances between the executive and the *Verkhovna*

²⁵³ Kolomayets, "Leonid Kuchma Sworn in as President of Ukraine."

²⁵⁴ Ibid.

²⁵⁵ Oleh Protsyk, "Constitutional Politics and Presidential Power in Kuchma's Ukraine," *Problems of Post-Communism* 52, no. 5 (2005): 25. (23-31).

Rada. Kuchma surrounded himself with political allies and rewarded loyalty with political and economic privilege in order to protect his own political power.²⁵⁶

The lead up to the 1999 election illustrated the lengths that Kuchma would go to maintain his political power. The 1999 elections were between two candidates of east Ukraine, however a candidate from west Ukraine who had been expected to fare well in the upcoming elections was removed from the candidacy. Vyacheslav Chornovil had been a dissident Ukrainian leader under the USSR and was the leader of RUKH. Six months before the elections, he was killed in a mysterious car accident, as his car crashed into an unlit truck making a U-turn on the Boryspil Highway. Suspicion was raised after the Interior Minister, Yury Kravchenko, quickly announced that the crash was an accident and ruled out the possibility of a murder investigation. Leader of the Christian Democratic Party, Vitalii Zhuravskyi stated: "I do not believe the death of Vyacheslav Chornovil was an accident. It was a fair warning to those who have not made their choice on the eve of the election season."²⁵⁷

Kuchma attempted to amend the constitution in order to increase his presidential power. In January 2000, he signed a decree to conduct an all-Ukraine referendum that would increase the powers of the president, at the expense of the *Verkhovna Rada*. Articles 155 and 156 of the 1996 Constitution state that constitutional amendments are not allowed by referenda,²⁵⁸ however this did not deter Kuchma. While the four referendum questions on weakening the powers of the *Verkhovna Rada* were approved by the public, they never approved by a two-thirds parliamentary majority. However, the discovery of a nefarious scandal forced Kuchma to abandon his ambitions to increase his power.

²⁵⁶ Kuzio, "Ukrainian Politics, Energy."

²⁵⁷ Roman Woronowycz, "Rumors of Conspiracy inflamed by lack of Criminal Investigation into fatal Collision," *The Ukrainian Weekly*, April 4 1999, www.ukrweekly.com/Archive/1999/149908.html, (accessed 1 November 2013).

²⁵⁸ Viktor Yanukovich, President of Ukraine, "Constitution of Ukraine," <http://www.president.gov.ua/en/content/constitution.html>, (accessed 10 November 2012).

Throughout Kuchma's tenure, there were nefarious attacks against anyone who challenged his authority. Politicians were not the only targets, anyone who spoke out against the regime were also violently oppressed. The most notorious incident was the murder of Heorhiy Gongadze, a Ukrainian freelance journalist. Gongadze wrote openly of the coercion and corruption of Kuchma's presidency on his website *Ukrayinska Pravda* (Ukrainian Truth), which he established to evade the government's influence over traditional media. In September 2000, he was kidnapped and two months later, Gongadze's mutilated body was found in a forest. Later that week, Socialist Party leader, Oleksandr Moroz, was presented with tapes, made by a former presidential guard Mykola Melnychenko. These tapes contained voice recordings of discussions within the presidential office between 1998 and 2000. The interlocutors were Kuchma and his colleagues, discussing the need to do away with Gongadze.²⁵⁹ A criminal case was opened against Kuchma on March 21, 2011 in which he was charged with exceeding his authority and official powers, resulting in Gongadze's murder. On December 13, 2011, the Pechersky District Court in Kyiv ruled that the criminal case against Kuchma was opened illegally, as the court did not accept the voice recordings as substantial evidence.

Kuchma continued to use his political power in many ways that, as Danish political scientist Oleh Protsyk describes, "raised many questions about his commitment to the principles of democratic governance and rule of law."²⁶⁰ However, it was this behaviour that transformed Tymoshenko into an opposition politician, representing west Ukrainian beliefs. In response to the growing concerns of his unchecked political power, the "Kuchmagate" protests were initiated under the 'Ukraine without Kuchma' movement. Just prior to these protests, Tymoshenko, who had served as Kuchma's Deputy Prime Minister for Fuel and Energy, was criminally charged for embezzlement and tax evasion and fired from her government

²⁵⁹ *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, "Transcript: What Do Melnychenko's Tapes Say About Gongadze Case?," March 3 2005, <http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1057789.html>, (accessed 4 November 2013).

²⁶⁰ Oleh Protsyk, "Constitutional Politics and Presidential Power," 30.

position.²⁶¹ Weeks later the charges were dropped and Tymoshenko was released from prison. It is reported that Tymoshenko was fired because she had started shutting down dubious energy operations, upsetting many of Kuchma's allies.²⁶² However, it is evident that Kuchma was focused on removing Tymoshenko, rather than addressing the demands of protesters. It was at this point that Tymoshenko became a member of the west Ukraine political elite, establishing the 'National Salvation Front.' The Front was an alliance of fifteen political parties united by the goal to remove Kuchma's regime.²⁶³ A few months later, the Front became part of the Yulia Tymoshenko bloc.

4.3 The Orange Revolution

The OR is an important event in the political discourse of Ukraine. While it is considered as the pinnacle of Ukraine's democratic transition, it represented the success and failure to both of the politicians from the political cultures. These elections were crucial for the safety of Kuchma's oligarchic establishment. He had fulfilled his two terms, so unwilling to run for office, Kuchma appointed a successor that would continue his style of leadership and offer him political protection from prosecution for his years of political transgressions. Kuchma and his oligarchic clans supported Prime Minister Yanukovich, backing a candidate that would protect their business interests and continue their symbiotic relationship.

The election campaign was intense, with the mainstream media providing limited coverage of Yushchenko's campaign. Yushchenko's electoral campaign focused on many issues that were pertinent for citizens in west Ukraine. It was based upon establishing Ukraine as a European nation, capable of meeting the EU's democratic

²⁶¹ Irena Chalupa, "Ukraine's Gold-Plaited Comeback Kid," *Kiev Post*, September 23 2008, http://www.rferl.org/content/Tymoshenko_Profile/1291005.html, (accessed 3 December 2013).

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ Tammy Lynch, "Orange Revolution: The Prehistory," *Perspective* 15 no. 2, (2005) <http://www.bu.edu/iscip/vol15/lynch.html>, (accessed 3 December 2013).

²⁶³ Ibid.

demands.²⁶⁴ Yushchenko campaigned against Russian interference in Ukrainian affairs, the reassertion of the independent Ukrainian nation and a renewed commitment to EU membership. He also pursued a populist program to remove the corruption of the previous regime, including improved social welfare for pensioners and children, less bureaucratic regulation and better management of the economy.²⁶⁵ In terms of his identity politics, he spoke Ukrainian and promised to protect it as Ukraine's sole state language.²⁶⁶ The religious divide between the two political cultures was also involved in the OR, with the Russian Orthodox Church of Moscow Patriarchate supporting Yanukovych and the Kyiv Patriarchate and the Uniate Church supported Yushchenko.²⁶⁷ The campaign turned malicious when Yushchenko was taken to hospital for alleged dioxin poisoning in early September.²⁶⁸ While it remains unclear of who poisoned Yushchenko, and whether it was supposed to kill him, the event polarised the situation further.

Viktor Yanukovych's presidential campaign was designed to appeal to the voters of the eastern Ukraine political culture. He promised to introduce Russian as an official language, to introduce dual Russian-Ukrainian citizenship and to retract Ukraine's commitment to join the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO).²⁶⁹ In terms of foreign policy, Yanukovych promised to involve Ukraine in regional structures, acknowledging euro-integration whilst cooperating with Russia.

After the second round of voting in November, international and domestic election observers raised allegations of electoral fraud at Yanukovych's victory. Yushchenko laid a complaint of electoral fraud with the Electoral Commission, calling for re-

²⁶⁴ Bohdan Harasymiw, "Elections in Post-Communist Ukraine, 1994-2004: An Overview," *Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 47, no. 3 (2005): 207.

²⁶⁵ Taras Kuzio, "With or Without Baloha, Yushchenko's Unelectable," *Kiev Post*, May 28 2009, <http://www.kyivpost.com/opinion/op-ed/with-or-without-baloha-yushchenkos-unelectable-42373.html?flavour=mobile>, (accessed 5 November 2013).

²⁶⁶ *BBC News International*, "Ukraine Divided over Language row," April 22 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4472069.stm>, (accessed 25 October 2013).

²⁶⁷ Brian Whitmore, "Analysis: 'Orange Revolution' Highlights Ukraine's Religious Divide," *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, December 21 2004, <http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1056528.html> (accessed 4 November 2013).

²⁶⁸ Paul D'Anieri, *Understanding Ukrainian Politics*, 96.

²⁶⁹ Harasymiw, "Elections in Post-Communist Ukraine," 207.

elections, as Yanukovych refused to stand down as president. Roundtable negotiations took place between Kuchma, *Verkhovna Rada* Chairman Volodymyr Lytvyn, Yushchenko and Yanukovych, with European and Russian mediators. Yushchenko argued that electoral laws needed to be amended in order to prevent future electoral fraud.²⁷⁰ He called for the composition of the Central Electoral Commission to be changed and for Yanukovych to be dismissed as prime minister before the re-run of the second round of voting occurred. Kuchma would only support these demands if Yushchenko and the *Verkhovna Rada* accepted constitutional amendments that would reduce the powers of the president. Yushchenko accepted this deal in order to get Kuchma and Yanukovych to support a re-run of the second round of voting. As one of his final acts as president, Kuchma signed constitutional amendments that allowed parliament to: approve and dismiss all cabinet ministers except the ministers of defense, foreign affairs, the heads of the security service, the national security and defense council, the national bank and the procurator general.²⁷¹ The *Verkhovna Rada* was also to approve the president's nomination for prime minister and in essence, controls cabinet. Finally, the term of office for cabinet was changed to coincide with parliamentary elections, which strengthened the influence of parliament over the cabinet.²⁷² On December 3 2004, the Supreme Court annulled the result of the second round and called for a re-election. In this round of voting Yushchenko was the victor.

The constitutional amendments were the key consequence of the OR. Ostensibly, the OR represented a failure for Kuchma and Yanukovych, losing an election even after they conducted electoral fraud. However, Kuchma had controlled the situation, ensuring that his successor would be weakened and that he would avoid political prosecution for his actions. Contrarily, Yushchneko's victory was actually his subversion to the political dominance of east Ukraine's political elite, as the constitutional amendments prevented him from implementing his democratic agenda. These constitutional amendments were motivated by political expediency,

²⁷⁰ Protsyk, "Constitutional Politics and Presidential Power," 23.

²⁷¹ Ibid., 26.

²⁷² Ibid.

demonstrating how the competition between the political cultures superseded genuine democratic reform. Ultimately, these amendments were illegal, as the Constitutional Court had not been involved in the process. This is why the amendments were subsequently annulled in 2010. The amendments also demonstrated Kuchma's motivation to retain his political power, as throughout his term he had attempted to increase his power. Yet, when it became obvious that he was going to lose the election, he amended the constitution to weaken the presidency.

However, the OR also cemented Yushchenko and Tymoshenko's anti-establishment position and defined the narrative of the OR government. Up until this point, Yushchenko has been hesitant about vocalising his opposition to Kuchma. However, after the protests and electoral victory, Yushchenko and Tymoshenko became heroes of the people. Yushchenko remodeled himself as a political candidate, representing anti-establishment interests, gaining massive support from voters in west Ukraine.²⁷³ The pro-Orange forces of Tymoshenko and Yushchenko made strange bedfellows and unlikely nationalist heroes. Both hailed from east Ukraine and had previously served under Kuchma's establishment. However, the actions of President Kuchma forced both Yushchenko and Tymoshenko to revise their political positions as leaders of a mobilised nationalist movement.

4.4 Yushchenko's presidency

Following his electoral victory, Yushchenko announced, "this is a victory of freedom over tyranny, law over lawlessness and the future over the past."²⁷⁴ He intended to bring a nationalist and democratic agenda to his administration, in order to redress Kuchma's authoritarianism. Yushchenko referred to the OR as a choice of genuine

²⁷³ Stephen Mulvey, "Ukraine's Heroes Turn into Foes," *BBC News International*, November 1 2005, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4393178.stm>, (accessed 5 December 2013).

²⁷⁴ Ukraine Government Portal, "Inaugural Address of the President of Ukraine, Viktor Yushchenko to the Ukrainian People on Independence Square," http://www.kmu.gov.ua/control/en/publish/article?art_id=11100895&cat_id=244315174, (accessed 21 February 2013).

Ukrainian independence, he announced in his inauguration speech that: “we have chosen justice, since lawlessness must not become a norm in the state where [a] thousand years ago the “*Ruska Pravda*” (Russian truth) law book was introduced.”²⁷⁵ By this, Yushchenko referred to Kuchma as perpetuated the status quo of Russian influence in Ukrainian politics. In doing this, Yushchenko distinguished himself as a nationalist politician, bringing the political agenda of west Ukraine to the state administration.

Yushchenko’s focus on national identity was one of the most distinct characteristics of his presidency. This was in stark contrast to his predecessor, who removed identity politics from the state narrative. Yushchenko posited that the most important attribute of a nation was its memory, and he constantly referred to the ethnic Ukrainian past in his presidential speeches.²⁷⁶ As part of this historical identity, Yushchenko also asserted Ukraine’s place as a European nation, and declared that he would direct Ukraine on a course to return to its “European home” in his 2008 independence anniversary speech.²⁷⁷ Reminiscent of Kravchuk, he refers to Ukraine’s history as ascending from Kievan Rus: “we are the heirs of Kievan Rus. We are the builders of the Galicia-Volhynia state. We are the people, who established the Cossack state.”²⁷⁸

In terms of foreign policy, Yushchenko was determined to continue with European integration. Ukraine’s foreign policy priorities were focused on improving relations with European nations and political institutions. However, much like his predecessors, Yushchenko realised the symbiotic nature of Ukraine and Russia’s economies. Yet, Yushchenko was determined to engage with “its strategic partner,” Russia, on equal terms and to prevent Russia from interfering in Ukrainian affairs.²⁷⁹

²⁷⁵ Ibid.

²⁷⁶ President of Ukraine Official website, “President Victor Yushchenko’s Address on the occasion of the Independence Day of Ukraine,” August 24 2013, <http://www.president.gov.ua/news/7263.html> (accessed 21 January 2013).

²⁷⁷ Ibid.

²⁷⁸ Ibid.

²⁷⁹ Zenon Zawada, “Foreign policy is top Priority of Yushchenko's first 100 days,” *The Ukrainian Weekly*, <http://www.ukrweekly.com/old/archive/2005/200503.shtml>, (accessed 21 January 2013).

Yushchenko rebuked Russia's engagement with Georgia in the 2008 South Ossetia war. He also refused to renew the Black Sea Fleet agreement with Russia, meaning that Russia would have needed to withdraw its Fleet in 2017.

Throughout his presidency, Yushchenko associated the protection of the Ukrainian language to the protection of Ukrainian culture and consequently, its freedom and independence. "If a nation loses its language, it loses its memory, its history, and its identity."²⁸⁰ He argued that there was "no alternative to the Ukrainian language as the language of government and official language of communication. It is the language of our freedom."²⁸¹ He actively pursued a language policy that protected the privileged status of the Ukrainian language. Indeed, in one of his final acts as president he issued a decree stating that all citizens of Ukraine must know the state language. However, while he upheld the privileged status of Ukrainian and would not consider granting Russian official status, he assured that all citizens would be able to speak their native language on Ukrainian soil.²⁸²

Another issue of national identity distinguishing Yushchenko's presidency from other Ukrainian presidents was his determination to acknowledge the *Holodomor* as Ukrainian genocide. The *Holodomor* was an artificial famine that killed millions of Ukrainians, caused by the agricultural collectivisation policies of Stalin in the early 1930s. The Soviet and now Russian authorities have denied that this famine was an act of genocide, designed to subvert ethnic Ukrainians within the USSR. Therefore, the matter is a contentious issue between Russia and Ukraine. Yushchenko passed legislation in 2006 that formally acknowledged the *Holodomor* as genocide of the Ukrainian people; it declared public denial of this genocide an affront against the Ukrainian nation and endorsed state and local authorities to promote awareness and

²⁸⁰ *Spiegel Online International*, "Interview with Ukrainian President Viktor Yushchenko: 'The Problems Began After the Orange Revolution,'" <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/interview-with-ukrainian-president-viktor-yushchenko-the-problems-began-after-the-orange-revolution-a-647401.html>, (accessed 22 January 2013).

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*

²⁸² President of Ukraine Official website, "President Victor Yushchenko's Address."

memorials in memory of the event.²⁸³ Yushchenko pushed to criminalise denial of the *Holodomor*, but this was never passed in the *Verkhovna Rada*. Yushchenko also managed to have the perpetrators of the famine face trial in the Kiev Court of Appeal. However, this was a symbolic victory only, as the defendants were all deceased.

Antagonism between the political cultures

The antagonism between the political cultures increased under Yushchenko's tenure when Yanukovych's Party of Regions won a parliamentary majority in the 2006 *Verkhovna Rada* elections. The parliamentary majority had increased powers as the 2004 constitutional amendments came into force at the beginning of 2006. In the 2006 elections, the Party of Regions won 186 seats of the 450 seats, or 32.1% of the vote.²⁸⁴ The Yulia Tymoshenko Bloc won 22.3% or 129 seats, and Yushchenko's Our Ukraine Party won 13.9% or 81 seats.²⁸⁵ Finally, the Socialist Party won 5.7% or 33 seats and the Communist Party of Ukraine won 3.7% and 21 seats.²⁸⁶ No party won enough seats to form a coalition alone. Under pressure to form a government, initially an 'Orange Revolution' coalition was formed with the Yulia Tymoshenko Bloc, Our Ukraine and the Socialist Party. However, this was a fragile alliance and negotiations over the appointment of prime minister and speaker of the house disbanded the coalition. Socialist leader Moroz demanded to be speaker of the house; however, Tymoshenko wanted Petro Poroshenko in this position. The Party of Regions, the Socialist Party and the Communist Party concluded an agreement, establishing a new parliamentary majority coalition. The Party of Regions and the Communist Party would support Moroz for parliamentary speaker, in exchange for the Socialist Party supporting the Party of Region's candidate for prime minister, Yanukovych.

The conflict between Yushchenko's government and the Party of Regions parliamentary majority created a protracted political stalemate. Yushchenko signed

²⁸³ Alliance Maidan Ukraine, "Verkhovna Rada passes Law declaring Holodomor Genocide," 2011, <http://eng.maidanua.org/node/648>, (accessed 8 January 2013).

²⁸⁴ Vicki L. Hesli, "The 2006 Parliamentary Election in Ukraine," *Electoral Studies* 26 (2007): 510.

²⁸⁵ Ibid.

²⁸⁶ Ibid.

two agreements with his rival Yanukovych in order to progress from the political impasse; both of these agreements would compromise Yushchenko's presidential power. The first occasion followed the dismissal of Tymoshenko in September 2005, and Yushchenko needed the *Verkhovna Rada* to approve his replacement, Yuriy Yekhanurov. Yushchenko signed an agreement with Yanukovych, gaining votes from his Party of Regions in order to approve of Yekhanurov as prime minister. The agreement included two pertinent issues. First, Yushchenko was unable to initiate "political repressions against the opposition" and secondly, Yushchenko was obliged to grant political amnesty for those guilty of electoral fraud in 2004.²⁸⁷ Essentially, Yushchenko agreed to something beyond his prerogative and reneged on his OR promises. He agreed not to open a criminal case on the extralegal activities of electoral fraud in 2004 for his own political benefit. This demonstrates how political expediency took prevalence over the ideals of democracy.

The second agreement followed the 2006 parliamentary elections, when there was no parliamentary majority. Negotiations to form a parliamentary majority lasted four months and in the interim, the Socialist Party (who were part of the Orange coalition) signed into a coalition with the Party of Regions-led opposition. Yushchenko had two options: either to dissolve the *Verkhovna Rada* and call new elections or to agree to form a government with Yanukovych. Yushchenko agreed to nominate Yanukovych as prime minister, yet Yushchenko forced Yanukovych to sign a "Declaration of National Unity," which compelled Yanukovych to support the administration's position on European integration.²⁸⁸ Yushchenko argued that this agreement was the only way to forego the political deadlock and create national unity: "I call on the nation to understand that today we have a unique chance to

²⁸⁷ Jan Maksymiuk, "Ukraine: Has Yushchenko Betrayed the Orange Revolution," *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, September 30 2005, <http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1061785.html>, (accessed 25 February 2013).

²⁸⁸ Quoted in Steven Lee Myers, "Ukraine Leader forms Alliance with Rivals," *The New York Times*, August 4 2006, <http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F5091EFC3A5B0C778CDDA10894DE404482>, (accessed 9 December 2013).

bring together both banks of the Dnieper River.”²⁸⁹ Tymoshenko refused to sign the agreement, objecting to a coalition with Yanukovych, consequently moving into political opposition, as Yanukovych became prime minister on August 4 2006. Many people lost faith in the Orange government and its ability to enact the ideals of west Ukraine following Yushchenko’s decision to unite with Yanukovych. This is another example of how the political culture divide dictated Ukrainian political discourse.

The uneasy coalition between Yushchenko and Yanukovych would continue to create political instability and distract politicians from Ukraine’s political transition. As Prime Minister, Yanukovych worked on increasing his parliamentary majority, bribing parliamentary deputies to join the Party of Regions-led coalition.²⁹⁰ If Yanukovych could achieve a two-thirds majority in the *Verkhovna Rada*, he would be able to enact constitutional amendments and override the presidential veto. This resulted in Yushchenko dissolving the *Verkhovna Rada* and calling for new elections in April 2007. He accused Yanukovych of illegally increasing his coalition by targeting individuals, when the law stipulates that only factions can join a coalition. This caused a political crisis lasting for two months, as Yanukovych and his majority voted that the decree was unconstitutional and refused to agree to the funding of new elections. The legality of the decree was debated in the Constitutional Court, which resulted in Yushchenko firing three Constitutional Court judges and the Prosecutor General. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe condemned Yushchenko’s intervention in the Constitutional Court as undemocratic.²⁹¹ The crisis was resolved two months later, as Moroz, Yushchenko and Yanukovych agreed to hold elections in September 2007. This behaviour demonstrated that both Yushchenko and Yanukovych were more concerned with

²⁸⁹ *Spiegel Online*, “Pragmatism after the Revolution: Yushchenko Reaches Agreement on New Ukraine Government,” August 3 2006, <http://www.spiegel.de/international/pragmatism-after-the-revolution-yushchenko-reaches-agreement-on-new-ukraine-government-a-429997.html>, (accessed 4 March 2013).

²⁹⁰ Andrew E. Kramer, “Ukrainian Leader Disbands Parliament,” *The New York Times*, April 3 2007, <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/03/world/europe/03ukraine.html>, (accessed 9 December 2013).

²⁹¹ Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, “Functioning of Democratic Institutions in Ukraine,” Council of Europe, April 19 2007, <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=17533&lang=en> (accessed 9 December 2013).

attacking their opponent than with democratic ideals. This was evident in levels of public support for the Orange Government. In February 2005, Yushchenko's public approval was at 48.3% and by April 2009 his approval rating was at 2.4%.²⁹² For the same dates, Tymoshenko had 41.5% and 12%.²⁹³

Overall, Ukraine made gradual progress towards democracy under Yushchenko. During the years of his presidency, *Freedom House* reports upgraded Ukraine's status from 'partly free' to 'free,' indicating a growth in democratic political rights, civil liberties and freedom of the press.²⁹⁴ The Orange Government abstained from political interference in the media, while journalists did not face government intimidation.²⁹⁵ The institution of the judiciary was more respected under Yushchenko's administration and the Court was "an important arbiter in the political battles between the president and the prime minister."²⁹⁶ However, corruption continued under Yushchenko's administration as *Transparency International's* Corruption Perception Index indicates in table 6.²⁹⁷ Yushchenko's final year of presidency ranked at 146, more corrupt than Kuchma's final year, scoring 122. There was a notable decline in corruption from 2005-2006, which can be attributed to targeted policies against corruption in the gas industry by Tymoshenko. However, Yushchenko dismissed Tymoshenko after seven months, arguing that she had created conflict within his government. This came after multiple top-level resignations and allegations of corruption within his Cabinet.²⁹⁸ Yushchenko lacked

²⁹² Razumkov Centre, Sociological Poll "Do you Support the Activity of Victor Yushchenko?" http://www.razumkov.org.ua/eng/poll.php?poll_id=89, (accessed 7 November 2013).

²⁹³ Ibid.

²⁹⁴ *Freedom House*, "Freedom in the World," 2013, <http://www.freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world>, (accessed 22 September 2013).

²⁹⁵ *Freedom House*, "Freedom in the World Report: Ukraine," 2011

<http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2011/Ukraine>, (accessed 9 December 2013).

²⁹⁶ Ibid.

²⁹⁷ The Index works on a scale of 0 (highly corrupt) to 10 (very clean) out of 183 countries.

The index draws on assessments and opinion surveys carried out by independent and reputable institutions. These surveys and assessments include questions related to the bribery of public officials, kickbacks in public procurement, embezzlement of public funds, and the effectiveness of public sector anti-corruption efforts.

²⁹⁸ Valentinas Mite, "Ukraine: President Yushchenko Sacks Government in Growing Crisis," *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, September 8 2005, <http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1061247.html>, (accessed 3 March 2013).

leadership acumen; this weakness ensured that he was unable to combat corruption and manage interpersonal conflict within his government. Although Kuchma's Government had been removed, the state apparatus remained the same, and continued to rely upon corruption in order to function.²⁹⁹

Table 6 – Ukraine's Corruption Perceptions Ranking Index

Year	Rank
2004	122
2005	107
2006	99
2007	118
2008	134
2009	146
2010	134
2011	152
2012	144
2013	144

Source - http://www.transparency.org/research/cpi/cpi_2004

4.5 The 2010 presidential elections

Following the clash of the political cultures throughout Yushchenko's tenure, the 2010 elections would determine the public's preference for east or west politicians. This election would demonstrate what the public preferred, a failed OR politician or a return to Kuchma-era politics typical of east Ukrainian rule. As the vote was already determined for Ukraine's west and east voters, voters in central Ukraine held the swing vote. The second round candidates of Yulia Tymoshenko and Viktor Yanukovych had similar political programmes based on highly populist promises of improving the economy and improving standards of living. Both candidates were from east Ukraine and sought to normalise relations with Russia after a tense relationship developed under Yushchenko. Both of the candidates also rejected the accession of Ukraine into NATO. The focus of this election was the declining

²⁹⁹ Paul Kubicek. "Problems of Post Postcommunism: Ukraine after the Orange Revolution." *Democratization* 16, no. 2 (2009): 332.

economy and the measures that each candidate would take to improving living standards.³⁰⁰

Both of the candidates represented the east Ukrainian political culture. However, the majority of voters in west Ukraine perceived Tymoshenko as the best candidate to represent their interests because of her OR credentials. Tymoshenko had the support of west Ukraine's most ardent nationalists. The leader of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), Mykhailo Zelenchuk, urged his "Ukrainian patriots" to vote for Tymoshenko to "defeat the pro-Moscow Yanukovych."³⁰¹ Tymoshenko did not support ethnic Ukrainian interests; however, she did support Ukraine's European identity.³⁰² However, she was a former gas-trading oligarch with business connections in East Ukraine, and for this reason she was reasonably popular in east Ukraine, gaining 29.10% of the vote in Dnipropetrovsk.³⁰³ The final result was 45.47% for Tymoshenko and 48.95% for Yanukovych,³⁰⁴ the closest result in the history of Ukraine's presidential elections. Yet again, Ukraine voted in the political elite of east Ukraine.

4.6 Yanukovych's presidency

Yanukovych's government quickly institutionalised its political power, and implemented its narrative of Ukraine's state identity. Yanukovych quickly reversed many of Yushchenko's cultural policies. He rescinded Yushchenko's 'Hero of Ukraine' award to Stepan Bandera, reversed Ukraine's *Holodomor* policy, introduced a Soviet-minded education minister, aligned with the Moscow Patriarchate of the

³⁰⁰ Marko Bojczun, "The International Economic Crisis and the 2010 Presidential Elections in Ukraine," *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 27, no. 3 (2011): 505.

³⁰¹ *RiaNovosti*, "Ukrainian Nationalist leader urges support for Tymoshenko," February 5 2013, <http://en.ria.ru/exsoviet/20100205/157780784.html>, (accessed 9 December 2013).

³⁰² Yulia Tymoshenko, "Ukrainians can save Democratic Orange Revolution on Feb 7," *Kiev Post*, January 28 2010, <https://www.kyivpost.com/opinion/op-ed/ukrainians-can-save-democratic-orange-revolution-o-58215.html>, (accessed December 9 2013).

³⁰³ Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, "Ukraine Presidential Election 17 January and 7 February 2010," OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report, <http://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/ukraine/67844>, (accessed 7 November 2013).

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

Orthodox Church and extended the lease of the Black Sea Fleet. A month after his election, the *Verkhovna Rada* dismissed the Tymoshenko Government as a result of a vote of no-confidence. This maximised Yanukovych's political power, as he controlled the presidency and the parliamentary majority. A new government coalition was quickly established between the Party of Regions, the Communist Party of Ukraine and the Lytvyn bloc, allowing Yanukovych to install a prime minister and consolidate his power. Due to his parliamentary majority with the Party of Regions, Yanukovych was able to appoint his electoral campaign strategist, Mykola Azarov (an ethnic Russian) as his Prime Minister, Tymoshenko became the leader of the opposition.

This thesis has demonstrated how the conflict between Ukraine's political cultures has driven Ukraine's political discourse. The political culture narrative provides a paradigm to understand the antagonism between politicians that represent the interests of west and east Ukraine. Chapter two demonstrated that the politicians of east Ukraine have a historical propensity to operate in an autocratic manner. In independent Ukraine, President Kuchma engaged in this political behaviour, subverting his opponents through extralegal behaviour. Under Yushchenko, while Ukraine remained corrupt, some democratic indicators improved, such as transparent elections, increased freedom of the press and retribution for past injustices.³⁰⁵ However, Yanukovych has followed the course of Kuchma; repudiation of the Orange Government and west Ukraine political ideals motivate his political behaviour. This has resulted in the extralegal use of secret service, persecution of the political opposition, human rights abuse, limited freedom of the press and cronyism.

Under Yanukovych, the Ukrainian government has become increasingly nepotistic. Yanukovych has offered positions of power to those who have been faithful to him from his home city of Donetsk, in east Ukraine, similar to Kuchma in respect to Dnipropetrovsk. Donetsk is an economic and industrial hub with its many coal and

³⁰⁵ Zenon Zawada, "Yushchenko Administration's first 100 days Incorporate Promises made on Maidan," *The Ukrainian Weekly*, May 8 2005, <http://www.ukrweekly.com/old/archive/2005/190503.shtm,l> (accessed 10 December 2013).

steel industries; it is also the base of the Party of Regions. The Donetsk Clan have taken over Ukraine's government under Yanukovich and are protecting the intertwined political and economic interests of the Party of Regions oligarch. The Donetsk clan is referred to as "the Family" by the media and is comprised of Yanukovich, his two sons and financial backer of the Party of Regions, Rinat Akhmetov.³⁰⁶ Important cabinet positions are now filled by Yanukovich's associated from Donetsk, such as the current Prosecutor General of Ukraine, Viktor Pshonka. Ukraine's First Vice-Premier, Serhiy Arbuzov, was Ukraine's youngest Governor of the National Bank of Ukraine; prior to this, he was also a manager at Yanukovich's son's (Oleksandr Yanukovich) bank.³⁰⁷ Another minister who began in Yanukovich's bank is Minister of Revenue and Duties, Oleksandr Klymenko. The current Governor of the National Bank of Ukraine is also a member of the Donetsk clan. The new Donetsk clan has grown visibly stronger in Ukrainian government.

Ukraine's media environment has drastically changed since Yanukovich and the Party of Regions came to power. According to *Freedom House* reports, Ukraine's media is becoming monopolised by those who support the government. Yanukovich's administration has utilised many state powers to restrict the freedom of the media. In July 2012, tax inspectors raided the offices and froze the bank accounts of TVi, a national television station that was critical of the Yanukovich administration.³⁰⁸ In another attack against journalists under Yanukovich, the *Verkhovna Rada* attempted to pass legislation that would criminalise defamation. However, the bill was eventually dropped following international and domestic protests. Reportedly, an opposition broadcaster that protested the defamation legislation was subjected to a tax investigation and had its bank accounts frozen,

³⁰⁶ Oleksandr Kramar, "The Azarov/Arbuzov Government," *The Ukrainian Week*, January 22 2013, <http://ukrainianweek.com/Politics/70375>, (accessed 14 November 2013).

³⁰⁷ Sergil Leshchenko, "Ukraine: Yanukovich's Family Spreads its Tentacles," January 29 2013, <http://www.opendemocracy.net/od-russia/sergii-leshchenko/ukraine-yanukovichs-family-spreads-its-tentacles>, (accessed 14 November 2013).

³⁰⁸ Freedom House, "Freedom of the Press 2013," 2013, <http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2013/Ukraine>, (accessed 9 December 2013).

although it eventually had the charges dropped.³⁰⁹ In the lead up to the 2012 Parliamentary elections, 60 cases of attacks against journalists were reported in one month.³¹⁰

Repression against former Orange Government

A key motive beneath the authoritarian behaviour of Yanukovych is the repudiation of the Orange government and the persecution of its politicians. One of Yanukovych's first actions as president was the annulment of the 2004 constitutional amendments, returning to the 1996 constitution. Yushchenko had long pushed for constitutional reform; however, Yanukovych and his Party of Regions majority were not prepared to allow constitutional reform until Yanukovych held the presidency. Yanukovych refused to work under the constitutional constraints that Yushchenko had been compelled to work under. Yanukovych attempts to introduce legislation that would allow a referendum to decide upon the annulment of 2004 amendments. The *Verkhovna Rada* blocked this legislation, compelling Yanukovych to use the Constitutional Court to annul the 2004 amendments. Yanukovych and the Party of Regions majority sent an application to the Constitutional Court to review the 2004 amendments. During this review, four new judges (mostly from east Ukrainian *oblasti*) were appointed to the Constitutional Court. The Constitutional Court ruled on September 30 2010, that the 2004 amendments were unconstitutional and on October 1 2010, they were annulled. However, this was illegal as constitutional amendments are the passed by a two-thirds majority in the *Verkhovna Rada*.³¹¹ This annulment was indicative of Yanukovych's desperation to have the amendments annulled at any cost. He wanted to return Ukraine to a presidential system in order to maximise his political power.

Shortly after coming to power, Yanukovych initiated a campaign of selective justice

³⁰⁹ Committee to Protect Journalists, "Attacks on the Press: Journalism on the Front Lines in 2012," <http://cpj.org/2013/02/attacks-on-the-press-in-2012-ukraine.php> (accessed November 13th 2013).

³¹⁰ Freedom House, "Freedom of the Press 2013," <http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2013/Ukraine> (accessed November 13th 2013).

³¹¹ Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty, "Ukraine Court Bolsters Presidential Powers," October 10 2010, http://www.rferl.org/content/Ukraine_Rules_In_Favor_Of_Stronger_Presidential_Rule/2173534.html, (accessed 14 November 2013).

against the former Orange government. The motive behind this was to remove his political opponents in order to safeguard his political power. Yanukovych has targeted former Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko, former Interior Minister Yuriy Lutsenko, former Defence Minister Valery Ivashchenko, former Deputy Justice Minister Yevhen Korniychuk, former Economic Minister Bohdan Danylyshyn and Environmental Protection Minister Heorhiy Filipchuk. All of these arrests have come under Article 365 in the Ukrainian Criminal Code, abuse of power by exceeding political authority.

Tymoshenko has been the central target of repression by Yanukovych's forces because she is the strongest opposition candidate of west Ukraine politicians. In October 2010 she was arrested for the alleged misuse of state funds.³¹² Another "abuse of office" charge was laid months later in regards to a gas deal she had signed with Russia in 2009. In 2009, Ukraine was in the midst of dispute with Russia over the price it paid for gas, with Moscow threatening to cut off gas supplies to Europe, which is transported by Ukrainian pipelines. In December 2008, Russia had offered to sell its gas for USD\$250 per 1000 cubic metres, which Ukraine refused to accept. Tymoshenko met with Russian President Vladimir Putin in January 2009 in order to resolve the gas-price dispute. Tymoshenko and Putin had agreed to a price, leaving the Ukrainian state gas company Naftogaz to draw up the documents with Russian gas company Gazprom. This agreement locked Ukraine into paying USD\$450 per 1000 cubic metres for gas, much higher than the December offer.³¹³ The prosecutors found Tymoshenko guilty of abuse of office by ordering Naftogaz to sign the contract, forcing Ukraine to pay significantly higher prices for Russian gas. She is currently serving a seven-year jail term for this charge, preventing her from running in the 2015 presidential elections. The EU condemned the trial, stating that it "confirms that justice is being applied selectively in politically motivated

³¹² *The Telegraph*, "Yulia Tymoshenko Charged with Abuse of Power," December 20 2010, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/ukraine/8214916/Yulia-Tymoshenko-charged-with-abuse-of-power.html>, (accessed 10 November 2013).

³¹³ Olzhas Auyezov, "Ukraine-Russia Gas Deal: Tymoshenko's Biggest Bet," *Reuters*, October 11 2011, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/10/11/us-ukraine-tymoshenko-gas-idUSTRE79A4AV20111011>, (accessed 10 December 2013).

prosecutions of the leaders of the opposition.”³¹⁴ Further charges have been laid against Tymoshenko, in order to damage her future political credibility. Prosecutors brought charges against her for embezzlement and tax evasion from when she headed the gas company in the 1990s in October 2011.³¹⁵ Finally, charges had been laid against Tymoshenko for ordering the murder of Yevhen Scherban, however, this case was dropped in July for a lack of evidence.³¹⁶

Another supporter of the OR, Lutsenko, was the Interior Minister under President Yushchenko. Following the OR, he initiated various criminal cases of corruption against those who were responsible for causing the OR, mostly members of the Party of Regions.³¹⁷ His arrest under Yanukovych appears to be politically motivated, in retaliation for the investigations he initiated. Lutsenko was found guilty for abuse of office for organising a pension for his driver and for organising unlawful surveillance in February 2012, which the EU condemned as an unfair trial and an example of selective justice³¹⁸ In April 2013, Lutsenko was one of six prisoners officially pardoned by Yanukovych in response to appeals from EU officials. The media has speculated that his release would benefit Ukraine’s democratic credentials in the lead up to the EU Association Agreement.³¹⁹

Yanukovych has asserted the political dominance of east Ukraine by repressing the

³¹⁴ Europa Press Release, “Declaration by the High Representative Catherine Ashton on behalf of the European Union on the Verdict in the Case of Ms Yulia Tymoshenko,” *Europa*, October 11 2011, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/125033.pdf, (accessed 10 December 2010).

³¹⁵ *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, “Ukraine Opens New Case against Tymoshenko,” October 10 2011, http://www.rferl.org/content/ukraine_security_service_targets_tymoshenko_fresh_criminal_charges/24358654.html, (accessed 10 November 2013).

³¹⁶ *Kiev Post*, “Vlasenko: Prosecution General stops Investigation into Scherban Murder case,” May 13 2013, <https://www.kyivpost.com/content/politics/vlasenko-prosecution-stops-investigation-into-scherban-murder-case-324251.html>, (accessed 13 November 2013).

³¹⁷ Andrii Lavryk and Bohdan Butkevych, “Rough Landing for Ex-Minister Lutsenko,” *The Ukrainian Week*, December 30 2010, <http://ukrainianweek.com/Politics/17595>, (accessed 10 November 2013).

³¹⁸ Europa Press Release, “Statement by High Representative Catherine Ashton and Commissioner Stefan Füle on the verdict of Yuriy Lutsenko in Ukraine,” *Europa*, February 27 2012, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-140_en.htm?locale=en, (accessed 11 November 2013).

³¹⁹ Jakub Parusinski, “Lutsenko Pardon is no Signal for Change,” *New Eastern Europe*, April 9 2013, <http://www.neweasterneurope.eu/node/747>, (accessed 10 December 2013).

political figures and nationalist policies of west Ukraine. He has subverted his political opponents, removing them from the political arena and placing them in prison. Yanukovych has introduced many cultural and social policies that revoked legislation introduced by Yushchenko. He has upgraded the use of Russian by allowing it to be introduced as a regional language under new language legislation. His reforms to education policy have removed the ethnic Ukrainian historical narrative, replacing it with Soviet or Russian narratives. He has rescinded Ukraine's position on the *Holodomor*, purporting the Russian interpretation of events that denies it as a Ukrainian genocide. His foreign policy has also embraced Russia, with the extension of the Black Sea Fleet lease and the rejection of the Association Agreement with the EU in order to pursue economic integration with Russia.

4.7 Retaliation of west Ukraine?

Yankovych's administration has polarised the domestic political environment and transformed Ukraine's foreign policy into a zero-sum game between the EU and Russia. His adherence to the east Ukrainian ideals and his repression of ethnic Ukrainian political values has created civil unrest. Parallels can be drawn between the situation preceding the OR and the situation preceding the 'EuroMaidan' protests. Yanukovych's incarceration of Tymoshenko elevated levels of tension between ethnic Ukrainians in west Ukraine and the state authorities. The decision to renege on the EU Association Agreement triggered hundreds of thousands of protesters onto the streets. In 2000, tensions between the political cultures rose following the implication of Kuchma in the Gongadze murder; however, it was the 2004 presidential election fraud that initiated the OR protests.

Ukraine's 2012 parliamentary elections revitalised Ukraine's political opposition and renewed the nationalists of west Ukraine. The Party of Regions won 185 seats, Tymoshenko's *Batkivshchyna* (Fatherland) Party won 101 seats, Vitali Klitschko's UDAR won 40 seats, the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) won 32 seats and

Svoboda won 37 seats.³²⁰ The Party of Regions, the CPU and some independent deputies formed a parliamentary majority. *Batkivshchyna*, UDAR and *Svoboda* formed an opposition alliance. However, these parties have diverging party platforms. *Batkivshchyna* is a national democratic, pro-European party. It asserts that Ukraine is a “European nation, founded upon a civic unity.”³²¹ It asserts a vague notion of the Ukrainian nation, acknowledging that citizens of all ethnicities are Ukrainian citizens, whilst supporting Ukrainian as the sole official language of Ukraine and interprets the *Holodomor* as genocide.³²² UDAR has a pro-European and anti-corruption party programme. The party programme stipulates that the party wants to unite all Ukrainian citizens, regardless of ethnicity or language, within a civic interpretation of the Ukrainian nation.³²³ Finally, *Svoboda* is an extreme nationalist party, purporting Ukraine as a state for ethnic Ukrainians.

The rise of *Svoboda* is a response to the disregard of Yanukovych and the Party of Regions towards the political culture of ethnic Ukrainians. This neglect has led to the rise in support for *Svoboda* in west Ukraine (see Figure 2). Nationalist extremism has emerged in Ukraine’s political landscape as a response to Yanukovych’s adherence to Russia and his removal of ethnic identity from Ukraine’s national identity. A radical nationalist party has filled the political vacuum left after the disintegration of the Orange forces. *Svoboda*’s party programme asserts that Ukrainian citizenship should be determined by Ukrainian ancestry and the criminalisation of any act of “Ukrainophobia.”³²⁴ Oleh Tyahnybok, leader of *Svoboda*, has attributed the success of *Svoboda* as:

[A] response to the failures of the country’s traditional national democrats

³²⁰ Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, “Ukraine Parliamentary Elections 28 October 2012,” OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report, <http://www.osce.org/odihr/98578>, (accessed 10 December 2013).

³²¹ Yulia Tymoshenko Official Website, “Yulia Tymoshenko offers Ideological Manifesto for Batkivshchyna Party,” June 15 2013, http://www.tymoshenko.ua/en/article/yulia_tymoshenko_15_06_2013_03, (accessed 10 December 2013).

³²² Ibid.

³²³ UDAR Official Party Website, “Preamble Party Program,” <http://klichko.org/en/about/programma/preambula>, (accessed 10 December 2013).

³²⁴ *Svoboda* Party Website, “About Party,” <http://en.svoboda.org.ua/about/>, (accessed 10 December 2013).

and morally bankrupt parliament but also a sign of opposition to the anti-Ukrainian policies of a regime which is, in essence, a Kremlin colonial administration.

Table 7 – *Svoboda* results in west Ukraine from 2010 parliamentary election

Oblast	Svoboda
Lviv (West)	38.01%
Ivano-Frankivsk (West)	33.79%
Ternopil (West)	31.22%
Chernivtsi (West)	8.71%
Zakarpattia (West)	8.35%
Volyn	17.98%
Rivne	16.63%
Ukrainian Total	10.44%

Source www.electoralgeography.com

While, there is an argument that *Svoboda* is radicalising politics and dividing the population, extreme nationalist parties are on the increase elsewhere in Europe. This is seen as a response to financial and political hardship. Both Ukraine and Europe have faced economic and consequently, political crisis recently, which can cause populations to fragment into regional or ethnic groups, as national government appears to fail them. Responding to the financial and consequent political crisis exacerbates the tension between Ukraine's political cultures. As the resolution of these problems involves the future of Ukraine, there is much debate as to what political course will resolve Ukraine's ailments. Ukraine's political cultures have distinct opinions on the best political direction for Ukraine, based upon their historical experiences. The 'EuroMaidan' protests illustrate this situation, where west Ukraine political elite and citizens see the decision to rescind the EU Association Agreement as a bad decision for Ukraine's future.

Conclusion

Historically, neither of Ukraine's political cultures has been able to consolidate their

power over the entire nation. Both Kuchma and Yushchenko were highly unpopular at the end of their political terms, which resulted in their electoral defeat, as central Ukraine swung the vote in favour of the political challenger. In the case of the 2004 election, Kuchma's defeat was the defeat of his appointed successor Yanukovych. While in 2010, Yushchenko was voted out due to the failure to meet the promises of the OR. Consequently, Ukraine's government has alternated between the political elite of east and west Ukraine.

President Kuchma established a political environment where authoritarian behaviour was accepted within the state. This is typical of east Ukrainian politicians, who emulate the autocratic nature of Russian politicians. The rise of Yushchenko represents the political pendulum of power swinging back to west Ukraine. However, the constitutional amendments of 2004, which were considered the greatest move towards democracy, were only made during OR negotiations to restrain the political abilities of Yushchenko. This was a clear demonstration that democracy is not the motive for reform, but political power. In order to prevent west Ukraine regaining power in the 2015 presidential election, Yanukovych has used his formal and informal powers to persecute his most likely political challenger, Tymoshenko. This subjugation of west Ukraine political elite and their values has resulted in the rise of radical nationalist parties.

This chapter has demonstrated the second way that the Ukraine's political culture divide prevents the consolidation of democracy. Voters in east and west Ukraine support the political candidate that reflects their political attitudes and level of national consciousness. Therefore, the oscillation between the political elite of east and west Ukraine actually demonstrates the inability to define Ukraine's national identity and the Ukrainian *demos*.

Conclusion

At the beginning of this thesis, I referred to Orest Subtelny's claim that the theme of statelessness dominated Ukraine's history. Ethnic Ukrainians have been subject to imperial domination by both central European and Russian Empires. The history of ethnic Ukrainians has been pockmarked with periods of independence, but statehood was only achieved following the dissolution of the USSR.

Political scholars predicted that the former Soviet Republics would transform into democratic political systems following the dissolution of the USSR. This was founded upon transition theory, a framework developed for states transitioning from authoritarian rule during the 1970s and 1980s. These states were very different from the former Soviet Republics: they had existed as states before authoritarian rule and had no issues in identifying their national population. Yet, in 1991, scholars failed to acknowledge the unusual situation facing the former Soviet Republics, particularly the unusual situation facing Ukraine. Ukraine faced a quadruple transition: a political transition from a communist to a democratic state; an economic transition from a command economy to a free market; a state transition from a Soviet republic to an independent state; and most importantly for a democratic political system, a national transition from Soviet citizenship to Ukrainian citizenship.

The national transformation is the most important aspect of transition for Ukraine. The Ukrainian SSR was made up of ethnic Ukrainians and various nationalities that resided within Ukraine's borders. The independent state established in 1991 was the first Ukrainian state; therefore, the Ukrainian nation needed definition. Creating a bounded Ukrainian political community would be the first challenge for the new state, a challenge that has never been completely resolved. Ukraine inherited its borders, constructed by the USSR in the 1920s. Within these borders was an ethnically heterogeneous population, with a large Russian minority that would need

to psychologically transform from a privileged majority ethnic group to a minority. Another challenge was that the ethnic Ukrainians had varying levels of national consciousness, dependent on their historical experience under differing imperial rule.

Ukraine's demographics ensured that establishing a functioning democratic system would be complex. Functioning democracies depend upon bounded and unified political communities, where all participants are able to participate equally. Consequently, this *demos* is the legitimate source of authority and political power and without it, there can be no democracy. This thesis has argued that the creation of a unified *demos* in Ukraine has been prevented by the existence of two political cultures. This political culture divide is the result of historical circumstances that have constructed contrasting political and cultural attitudes amongst Ukrainian citizens.

The transition literature has generally neglected the national element of transition. For the former Soviet Republics this has been particularly detrimental, as this has been a key factor preventing the consolidation of its democratic transition. A key element of this research was the relationship between identity, *demos* and democracy in the Ukrainian context. In this thesis, I have argued that both essentialist and constructivist approaches explain the creation of national identity. It purports the ethno-symbolic theory of Anthony Smith, asserting that the political elite must construct a national identity from elements of ethnic identity and culture. The definition of citizenship is the most pertinent facet of identity construction for democracies, as it creates the boundaries of the nation and consequently, the *demos*. However, this thesis demonstrates that Ukraine's political elite never completely resolved issues relating to the national identity of the state.

The legislation relating to national identity, citizenship, language, minority and education and cultural policies, was too vague to create a bounded political community. Consequently, the *raison d'être* of the Ukrainian state was never

defined. The political elite privileged ethnic Ukrainian cultural symbols at the time of independence: Ukrainian was institutionalised as the sole official language, ethnic Ukrainian symbols became state symbols, such as the trident and the yellow and blue flag and the national anthem had been the anthem for the Ukrainian People's Republic in 1917. Education policy embraced Ukrainian historiography and taught lessons in Ukrainian. However, this essentialist approach was not applied to the definition of Ukraine's citizenship laws. A civic approach to citizenship was adopted to incorporate the overarching Slavic identity of those in east Ukraine. Citizenship laws defined Ukrainian citizens as any Soviet citizen within the Ukrainian SSR borders at the time of independence. There was no ethnic qualification for citizenship, unless you were not present within the borders in December 1991. This civic, multinational national identity was continued in Ukraine's founding documents. The constitution defined Ukrainian citizens as "Ukrainian people – Ukrainian citizens of all nationalities." The state guaranteed to protect the rights of minorities to continue their cultural traditions and speak their native language. The discord between privileging ethnic Ukrainians and a civic definition of citizenship resulted in a lack of clarification of the Ukrainian political community.

There is also an important relationship between Ukraine's political cultures, the economy and its foreign affairs. The Ukrainian economy is in financial crisis, as its foreign-currency reserves are less than USD\$20 billion and its total debt repayments total more than USD\$60 billion.³²⁵ There are two ways for Ukraine to avoid financial crisis, a situation which has also been framed by the media as a geopolitical choice for Ukraine. Ukraine can either appeal to Europe and the International Monetary Fund for loans, which will be supplied on the condition that Ukraine implements fiscal, energy and financial reforms. Or, Ukraine can seek economic integration with Russia, working to reduce the cost of its energy supplies and work to developing a

³²⁵ Daryna Krasnolutska, Krystof Chamonikolas and Ye Xie, "Ukraine Currency forwards signal Weakening as 2014 Yields Climb," *Bloomberg News*, December 11 2013, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-12-09/ukraine-default-swaps-jump-to-four-year-high-as-russia-backs-off.html>, (accessed 11 December 2013).

customs union with Russia. However, as my research has demonstrated, this decision is likely to divide Ukraine's political cultures even further.

This thesis has argued that Ukraine's political discourse is best understood through the narrative of a political culture divide. This divide has stymied the consolidation of democracy in Ukraine in two ways: it has prevented the creation of a united *demos*; and it has engendered an antagonistic relationship amongst the political elite, who have become more interested in subverting their rival than implementing democratic reform. Ukraine's political discourse can be understood as a power struggle between the political elite of east and west Ukraine. This struggle has culminated in two periods of mass civil unrest, the Orange Revolution and more recently, the 'EuroMaidan' protests.

According to my analysis, there are five potential outcomes for Ukraine. The first is that the Ukrainian *demos* will never form and that state power will continue to alternate between the political cultures, and Ukraine remains undemocratic. The second option is that Ukraine develops an inclusive national identity. The reconciliation of the national culture divide would, consequently, lead to close economic and social relations to both the EU and Russia. The third option is that Ukraine will adopt an ethnic Ukrainian interpretation of the Ukrainian people. Ethnic Ukrainians perceive themselves as a European nation, so potentially Ukraine would attempt to integrate with Europe, and potentially seek membership with the European Union (EU). A fourth option is that the *demos* will be defined in accordance to the political culture of east Ukraine. This would de-ethnicise the Ukrainian *demos* to bring it in line with a greater Slavic identity. In this option, Ukraine would be comparable to Belarus, with greater assimilation to Russian culture and dictatorial leadership, similar to Alexander Lukashenko. The final option is that tension between the political cultures culminates in a civil war. This could be a result of the radicalisation of the political cultures, using violence to control the state or one political culture attempting to secede.

Option five is unlikely, as I have demonstrated that the contingency of the independent state has generated a sense of loyalty to the unitary nature of Ukraine. However, this possibility is a disturbing option, as it would likely turn into a geopolitical war with its neighbours. The 2008 South Ossetia War illustrates this, as Russia supported the South Ossetia and Abkhazian separatist groups within Georgia, in order to demonstrate its political dominance over the region. As Ukraine has linkages with the Europe, the EU would be involved, triggering greater conflict between the EU and Russia. However, secession has been threatened multiple times in the past, but has never come to fruition. I have also illustrated that neither of the political cultures has been able to generate support from the entire nation, support remains regional due to the strength of the imperial legacies. Therefore, I do not believe that options three or four are likely. The second option could happen, but not in this generation, as the political culture cleavage is so deeply entrenched, that it will take some time for the antecedents to diminish. My analysis of Ukraine's political situation anticipates that Ukraine will continue to oscillate between meeting the domestic demands of ethnic Ukrainians and the citizens of Ukraine and the geopolitical demands of the European Union and Russia. Ukraine continues to avoid confronting the resolution of its national identity because it is such a contentious issue. This is illustrated by the physical violence and protests involved in debating any matter of identity in the *Verkhovna Rada*, and supported by the fact that Ukraine has not conducted a national census since 2001. Therefore, for as long as Ukraine avoids reconciling its national identity, it will avoid democracy.

The political culture divide will continue to dictate Ukraine's political discourse. It will continue to dominate the political environment until the *raison d'être* and the national identity of the state can be reconciled with the interests of both of the political cultures. This means that Ukraine is most likely to continue oscillating between the interests of west and east Ukraine in domestic policy, language law, education and cultural policies, but also in terms of foreign policy. It is likely that Ukraine will maintain its ambiguous course between the EU and Russia, as a zero-sum commitment to either would threaten the stability and unity of the Ukrainian

state. As Yanukovych increases his political powers, he will become more authoritarian in order to prevent another Orange Revolution. This in turn, will impel the nationalist forces of ethnic Ukrainians to become more radical in their behaviour. The rise of radical nationalist party *Svoboda*, is indicative of this political trend. As this thesis is being written the 'EuroMaidan' protests continue in Kiev. These protests validate the thesis argument and are indicative of the tension between the nationalist interests of west Ukraine and the Slavic affiliations of east Ukraine.

Despite the antagonism between the two political cultures, I have explained that there is a definite desire for the continuation of a unified Ukrainian state. Although regions within both west and east Ukraine have threatened to secede at times, the history of statelessness seems to compel citizens of both political cultures to respect the unity of the independent state. The contingency of the state also seems to motivate both political cultures to remain united. However, further research into what holds the Ukrainian state together is required and could be built upon this research.

My research has shown that the formation of national identity in Ukraine should combine elements of essentialism and constructivism. It has illustrated that Anthony Smith's 'ethno-symbolism' approach is useful in understanding Ukraine's nation building processes. Therefore, while civic and ethnic approaches are useful as analytical tools in the nation building process, there should not be a dichotomy between the two. Due to Ukraine's homogeneous population and divided ethnic Ukrainian consciousness, nation building policies must reconcile the history of both west and east Ukraine in order to create a bounded political community. With a bounded *demos*, Ukraine is in a better position to resolve its economic and foreign policy challenges. This will connect the current political environment to Ukraine's unique historical and cultural conditions. Ukraine can only become a democracy once this has been done, and a *demos* has been formed.

I acknowledge certain limitations that impact the validity of this research. This thesis has focused solely on Ukraine when applying democratisation theory to the former-Soviet republics. However, in doing so, it demonstrates the unusual situation that Ukraine presents. Ukraine is one of a limited number of states that has been historically divided by two different empires. This divided history is useful in understanding how national identity is formulated. This political culture divide could be used as a paradigm for future research into other post-colonial states.

A further limitation is that the political culture divide has focused upon the behaviour of the political elite and the president in particular. This research would have benefited from further investigation of the role of political parties within the political culture narrative. It could also have applied this narrative to civil society; however given the constraints of time and scope of a Masters thesis, these aspects were omitted. However, as the president is the most influential player in Ukrainian politics, it is a logical place to begin this research.

For the foreseeable future, Ukraine will continue to evade a consolidated democratic transition. Ukraine's political culture divide has driven the political development of the state since 1991. Ukraine will continue on its trend of authoritarianism in order to redress the political instability caused by the conflict between the two political cultures. Therefore, until the citizens of Ukraine have "no doubt or mental reservation as to which political community they belong to,"³²⁶ Ukraine will continue to avoid the consolidation of democracy.

³²⁶ Dankwart Rustow, "Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model," *Comparative Politics* 2, no. 3 (1970): 350.

Bibliography

- Åberg, Martin. "Putnam's Social Capital Theory goes East: A Case Study of Western Ukraine and L'viv." *Europe-Asia Studies* 52, no. 2 (2000): 295-317.
- Alliance Maidan Ukraine. "Verkhovna Rada passes Law declaring Holodomor Genocide." 2011. <http://eng.maidanua.org/node/648>. Accessed January 8 2013.
- Almond, Gabriel. "Communism and Political Culture Theory." *Comparative Politics* 15, no. 2 (1983): 127-138.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006.
- Antonovych, Myroslava. "Legal Accountability for the Crime of 1932-1933: Great Famine (the Holodomor) in Ukraine." Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Danyliw Research Seminar in Contemporary Ukrainian Studies, Chair of Ukrainian Studies, University of Ottawa, October 2008. http://www.ukrainianstudies.uottawa.ca/pdf/P_Danyliw08_Antonovych.pdf. Accessed November 14 2013.
- Arel, Dominique. "Language Politics in Independent Ukraine: Towards one or two State Languages?" *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity* 23, no.3 (1995): 597-622.
- — —. "Ukraine: The temptation of the Nationalising State." In *Political Culture and Civil Society in Russian and the new States of Eurasia*, edited by Vladimir Tismaneanu, 159-188. Armonk New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1995.

— — —. "Voting behaviour in the Ukrainian Parliament." In *Parliaments in Transition: The New Legislative Politics in the Former USSR and Eastern Europe*, edited by Thomas F. Remington, 122-158. Chicago: Westview Press, 1994.

Arel, Dominique and Khmelko, Valerii. "The Russian Factor and the Territorial Polarisation in Ukraine." *Harriman Review* 9, (1996): 81-91.

Ash, Timothy Garton and Synder Timothy. "The Orange Revolution." April 28 2005. <http://timothysnyder.org/articles-and-reviews/new-york-review-of-books/the-orange-revolution/>. Accessed December 4 2013.

Åslund, Anders. "Outdated Educational System translates into Lagging Economy." *Kyiv Post*, October 4 2012. <http://www.kyivpost.com/opinion/op-ed/why-ukraine-keeps-falling-behind-educationally-economically-313833.html>. Accessed November 14 2013

— — —. "The Ancien Régime: Kuchma and the Oligarchs" In *Revolution in Orange: The Origins of Ukraine's Democratic Breakthrough*, edited by Anders Åslund and Michael McFaul, 9-28. Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2006.

Auyezov, Olzhas. "Ukraine-Russia Gas Deal: Tymoshenko's Biggest Bet." *Reuters*, October 11 2011. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/10/11/us-ukraine-tymoshenko-gas-idUSTRE79A4AV20111011>. Accessed December 10 2013.

Barrington, L.W and Herron, Erik S. "One Ukraine or Many? Regionalism in Ukraine and its Political Consequences," *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity* 32, no. 1 (2004): 53-86.

- Basiuk, Victor. "Ukraine: Toward a Viable National Ethos." In *Ukraine: The Search for a National Identity*, edited by Sharon L. Wolchik and Volodymyr Zviglyanich, 31-48. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Ltd, 2000.
- Batalden, Stephen K. *The Newly Independent States of Eurasia: Handbook of Former Soviet Republics*. Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx, 1997.
- BBC News International. "Ukraine Country Profile." Last updated April 26 2012.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/country_profiles/1102303.stm.
 Accessed May 25 2013.
- — —. "Ukraine Divided over Language row." April 22 2005.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4472069.stm>. Accessed October 25 2013.
- — —. "Ukraine leader Cautious on Russian Customs Union Plans." January 4 2013, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-2090904>. Accessed January 24 2013.
- Beissinger, Mark R. "Beyond the Nationalities Question?" *Problems of Post-Communism* 58, no. 4-5 (2011): 33-45.
- Birch, Sarah. "Electoral Behaviour in Western Ukraine in National Elections and Referendums, 1989-91." *Europe-Asia Studies* 47, no. 7 (1995): 1145-1176.
- — —. "Interpreting the Regional Effect in Ukrainian Politics." *Europe-Asia Studies* 52, no.6 (2000): 1017-1041.
- Blaikie, Norman. *Designing Social Research: the Logic of Anticipation*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2010.

Bogaards, Matthijs. "How to Classify Hybrid Regimes? Defective Democracy and Electoral Authoritarianism." *Democratisation* 16, no 2 (2009): 399-423.

Bojcun, Marko. "The International Economic Crisis and the 2010 Presidential Elections in Ukraine." *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 27, no. 3 (2011): 496-515.

Boriss Cilevics, "Law on National Minorities," June 25 1992.

http://www.cilevics.eu/minelres/NationalLegislation/Ukraine/Ukraine_Minorities_English.htm. Accessed November 8 2013.

Bowring, B. "Law in a Linguistic Battlefield: The Language of the New State Versus the 'Language of the Oppressors' in Ukraine." *Language & Law* 1, (2012).
<http://www.languageandlaw.de/volume-1/3343>. Accessed January 25 2013.

Breuilly, John. *Nationalism and the State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Ethnicity Without Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew. *Ideology and Power in Soviet Politics*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962.

— — —. "Soviet Politics: From the Future to the Past?" In *The Dynamics of Soviet Politics*, edited by Paul M. Cocks, Robert Vincent Daniels, Nancy Whittier Heer, 337-352. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Bugajski, Janusz. "Ethnic Relations and Regional Problems in Independent Ukraine." In *Ukraine: The Search for a National Identity*, edited by Sharon L. Wolchik and Volodymyr Zviglyanich, 165-182. Boston: Roman & Littlefield Publishers Inc, 2000.

Burns, Robert. "CIA says Economic Woes, Ethnic Tensions could split Ukraine," *Associated Press*, January 24 1994.

<http://www.apnewsarchive.com/1994/CIA-Says-Economic-Woes-Ethnic-Tensions-Could-Split-Ukraine/id-f65d8a332b317e60933f06ce144d4bc8>.
Accessed March 19 2013.

Canovan, Margaret. *Nationhood and Political Theory*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 1996.

— — —. "Sleeping Dogs, Prowling Cats, and Soaring Doves: Three Paradoxes of Nationhood." in *The Fate of the Nation-State*, edited by M. Seymour, 104-132. Portland: McGill-Queens University Press, 2004.

Cederman, Lars-Erik. "Nationalism and Bounded Integration: What it would take to Construct a European Demos." European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, San Domenico, RSC No. 2000/34, 2000.

Chalupa, Irena. "Ukraine's Gold-Plaited Comeback Kid." *Kyiv Post*, September 23 2008. http://www.rferl.org/content/Tymoshenko_Profile/1291005.html.
Accessed December 3 2013.

Connor, Walker. "A Nation is a Nation, is a State, is an ethnic group, is a..." In *Nationalism*, edited by John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, 88-103. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Council on Foreign Relations. "Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States." 2012. <http://www.cfr.org/sovereignty/montevideo-convention-rights-duties-states/p15897>. Accessed March 27 2013.

Dahl, Robert. *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy: Autonomy vs. Control*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1982.

Dobbins, James. "Nation-building: UN Surpasses U.S. on Learning Curve." Rand Corporation, Spring 2005.
<http://www.rand.org/pubs/periodicals/randreview/issues/spring2005/nation.html>. Accessed November 25 2013.

D'Anieri, Paul. *Understanding Ukrainian Politics: Power, Politics and Institutional Design*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe Inc, 2006.

— — —. "Democracy Unfulfilled: The Establishment of Electoral Authoritarianism in Ukraine." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 26, no. 1 (2001): 13-35.

— — —. "Leonid Kuchma and the Personalization of the Ukrainian Presidency." *Problems of Post-Communism* 50, no.6 (2003): 58-65.

Europa Press Release. "Declaration by the High Representative Catherine Ashton on behalf of the European Union on the Verdict in the Case of Ms Yulia Tymoshenko." October 11 2011.
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/125033.pdf. Accessed December 10 2010.

— — —. "Statement by High Representative Catherine Ashton and Commissioner Stefan Füle on the verdict of Yuriy Lutsenko in Ukraine." February 27 2012.
http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-140_en.htm?locale=en. Accessed November 11 2013.

European Commission. "ENP Package, Country Progress Report Ukraine." MEMO/12/344, May 15 2012.
<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/344&>

format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en. Accessed August 12 2012.

Feifer, Gregory. "Experts say Yanukovych Instituting 'Neo-Soviet' Rule in Ukraine." *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, February 25 2012.
http://www.rferl.org/content/neo_soviet_rule/2320846.html. Accessed May 25 2013.

Fomichev, Mikhail. "Yanukovych praises Russian 'Political Stability.'" *RiaNovosti*, March 5 2010. <http://en.rian.ru/exsoviet/20100305/158107108.html>. Accessed March 9 2013.

Freedom House. "Freedom in the World." 2013.
<http://www.freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-world>. Accessed September 22 2013.

— — —. "Freedom in the World Report: Ukraine." 2011.
<http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2011/Ukraine>. Accessed December 9 2013.

— — —. "Freedom of the Press 2013." 2013.
<http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2013/Ukraine>. Accessed December 9 2013.

Fukuyama, Francis. "Nation-Building 101." *The Atlantic*, April 2009.
<http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200401/fukuyama>. Accessed April 8 2013.

— — —. "The End of History?" *National Interest* 16 (1989): 3-18.

Gee, Gretchen. "Geography, Nationality, and Religion in Ukraine: A Research Note." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 34, no.3 (1995): 383-390.

- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Gitelman, Zvi Y. "Nations, Republics and Commonwealth." In *Developments in Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics*, edited by Stephen White, Alex Pravda and Zvi Y. Gitelman 75-92. Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1992.
- Hammer, Darrell P. "Brezhnev and the Communist Party." *The Soviet and Post-Soviet Review* 2, no. 1 (1975): 1-21.
- Harasymiw, Bohdan. "Elections in Post-Communist Ukraine, 1994-2004: An Overview." *Canadian Slavonic Papers/Revue Canadienne des Slavistes* 47, no. 3 (2005): 202-224.
- — —. *Post-Communist Ukraine*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2002.
- Harding, Luke. "Viktor Yanukovich promises Ukraine will Embrace Russia." *The Guardian*, March 5 2010.
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/mar/05/ukraine-russia-relations-viktor-yanukovich>. Accessed March 4 2013.
- Held, David. *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Herszenhorn, David M. "Ukraine Government Plans to Charge Ex-Premier With Murder," *New York Times*, January 18 2013.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/19/world/europe/ukraine-government-to-charge-ex-premier-with-murder.html?ref=viktorfyanyukovich&r=0>.
 Accessed May 25 2013.
- Hesli, Vicki L. "The 2006 Parliamentary Election in Ukraine." *Electoral Studies* 26 (2007): 507-533.

Himka, John-Paul. *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1988.

Hirsch, Francine. "Toward an Empire of Nations: Border-Making and the Formation of Soviet National Identities." *The Russian Review* 59, no.2 (2000): 201-226.

Holos Ukrainy. "Address of the President of Ukraine at the Celebratory meeting dedicated to Independence Day of Ukraine." August 28 1995, <http://www.nbu.gov.ua/fpu/1995/gu19950828.htm>. Accessed January 31 2013.

Howard, Marc Morjé. "The Weakness of Postcommunist Civil Society." *Journal of Democracy* 13, no.1 (2002): 157-169.

Hroch, Miroslav. "Real and Constructed: The Nature of the Nation." In *Comparative Studies in Modern European History: Nation, Nationalism, Social Change*, edited by Miroslav Hroch, 91-106. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007.

Hrytsak, Yaroslav. "National Identities in Post-Soviet Ukraine: The Case of Lviv and Donetsk." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 22 (1998): 263-275.

Huntington, Samuel. *The Third Wave: Democratisation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991.

Ilko Kucheriv Democratic Initiatives Foundation. "Ukrainians Opt for EU Membership, in Particular the Youth." December 2011. <http://dif.org.ua/en/publications/press-relizy/dfefwgr.htm>. Accessed June 11 2013.

Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada. "Ukraine: Information on the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate, including structure and hierarchy; information on the dispute between the Kyiv and Moscow Patriarchates (2012-April 2013)." May 9 2013. <http://www.refworld.org/docid/5214a44f4.html>. Accessed November 18 2013.

Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. "Ukrainian Society: 20 years of Independence." Sociological Monitoring Survey. 2013. <http://www.issp.org/page.php?pageId=4>. Accessed December 2 2013.

Interfax: Russia & CIS Presidential Bulletin. "Ukraine will not have second state language – Yanukovych." March 9 2010, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/444070366?accountid=14700>. Accessed January 25 2013.

Interfax: Ukraine General Newswire. "Herman: Yanukovych Not Abandoning His Promise to Protect Russian Language in Ukraine." March 9 2010. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/444021686?accountid=14700>. Accessed January 24 2013.

Internet Encyclopaedia of Ukraine. "Pavlo Chubynsky." <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5C%5CH%5CChubynskyPavlo.htm>. Accessed December 11 2013.

Janmaat, Jan Germen. "Nation-Building, Democratization and Globalization as Competing Priorities in Ukraine's Education System," 2008. <http://eprints.ioe.ac.uk/5190/1/Janmaat2008Nation1.pdf>. Accessed November 20 2012.

- Jennifer Dickinson. 'Languages for the Market, the Nation, or the Margins: Overlapping ideologies of Language and Identity in Zakarpattia.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 201 (2010): 53-78.
- Kaelberer, Matthias. "The Euro and the European Demos: Money and Community beyond the Nation-state." *Global Society* 24, no.4, (2010): 487-505.
- Karatnycky, Adrian. "The Fall and Rise of Ukraine's Political Opposition: From Kuchmagate to the Orange Revolution." In *Revolution in Orange: The Origins of Ukraine's Democratic Breakthrough*, edited by Anders Åslund and Michael McFaul, 29-44. Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2006.
- Keenan, Edward L. "Muscovite Political Folkways." *Russian Review* 45, no. 2 (1986): 199- 209.
- Kelly, George. "Who Needs a Theory of Citizenship?" *Daedalus* 108, no. 4 (1979): 21-36.
- Kirkwood, Michael. "Glasnost' 'the national question' and Soviet language policy." *Soviet Studies* 43, no. 1 (1991): 61-81.
- Kohut, Zenon E. "The Development of a Little Russian Identity and Ukrainian Nationbuilding." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10, no. 3 (1986): 559-576.
- Kolomayets, Marta. "Leonid Kuchma Sworn in as President of Ukraine." *The Ukrainian Weekly*, July 24 1994.
<http://ukrweekly.com/calendar/TOC/94/30.htm>. Accessed November 28 2013.

Korostelina, Karina. "Shaping unpredictable past: National Identity and History Education in Ukraine." *National Identities* 13, no.1 (2011): 1-16.

Koyama, Satoshi. "The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as a Political Space: Its Unity and Complexity." In *Regions in Central and Eastern Europe: Past and Present*, edited by Tadayuki Hayashi and Fukuda Hiroshi, 64-91. Sapporo: Slavic Research Centre, 2007.

www.srch.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/coe21/publish/no15_ses/08_koyama.pdf.

Accessed May 4 2013.

Kramar, Oleksandr. "The Azarov/Arbuzov Government." *The Ukrainian Week*, January 22 2013. <http://ukrainianweek.com/Politics/70375>. Accessed November 14 2013.

Kramer, Andrew E. "Ukrainian Leader Disbands Parliament." *The New York Times*, April 3 2007.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/03/world/europe/03ukraine.html>.

Accessed December 9 2013.

Kramer, David J., Nurick, Robert, Wilson, Damon and Alterman, Evan. "Sounding the Alarm: Protecting Democracy in Ukraine," Freedom House, Washington D.C., 2011. <http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/special-reports/sounding-alarm-protecting-democracy-ukraine>. Accessed August 8 2012.

Krasnolutska, Daryna, Chamonikolas Krystof and Xie, Ye. "Ukraine Currency forwards signal Weakening as 2014 Yields Climb." *Bloomberg News*, December 11 2013. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-12-09/ukraine-default-swaps-jump-to-four-year-high-as-russia-backs-off.html>. Accessed December 11 2013.

- Kubicek, Paul. "Problems of Post Postcommunism: Ukraine after the Orange Revolution." *Democratization* 16, no. 2 (2009): 323-343.
- — —. "Regional Polarisation in Ukraine: Public Opinion, Voting and Legislative Behaviour." *Europe-Asia Studies* 52, no.2 (2000): 273-294.
- Kulyk, Volodymyr. "Constructing Common sense: Language and Ethnicity in Ukrainian public Discourse." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29, no. 2 (2006): 281-314.
- Kuzio, Taras. "European, Eastern Slavic, and Eurasian: National Identity, Transformation, and Ukrainian Foreign Policy." In *Ukrainian Foreign and Security Policy: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives*, edited by Jennifer D. P. Moroney, Taras Kuzio, Mikhail A. Molchanov, 197-226. Westport: Praeger, 2002.
- — —. "History, Memory and Nation Building in the Post-Soviet Colonial Space," *Nationalities Papers* 30, no. 2 (2002): 241-264.
- — —. "Identity and Nation-building in Ukraine." *Ethnicities* 1, no.3 (2001): 343-365.
- — —. "Political Culture and Democracy: Ukraine as an Immobile State." *East European Politics and Societies* 25, no.1 (2011): 88-113.
- — —. "Soviet Conspiracy Theories and Political Culture in Ukraine: Understanding Viktor Yanukovych and the Party of Regions." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 44 (2011): 221-232.
- — —. "The National Factor in Ukraine's Quadruple Transition." *Contemporary Politics* 6, no.2 (2000): 143-164.

— — — . “Transition in Post-Communist States: Triple or Quadruple?” *Politics* 21, no. 3 (2001): 101-110.

— — — . “Ukrainian Politics, Energy and Corruption under Kuchma and Yushchenko.” Paper presented at ‘How the Gas Issue Plays in Ukrainian Politics and How Ukrainian Politicians Play the Gas Issue,’ Harvard University, 7 March 2008.
http://www.taraskuzio.net/conferences2_files/Ukrainian_Politics_Energy.pdf. Accessed December 3 2013.

— — — . *Ukraine: State and Nation Building*. London: Routledge, 1998.

— — — . *Ukraine under Kuchma: Political reform, Economic transformation and Security policy in independent Ukraine*. New York: St Martin’s Press, 1997.

— — — . “With or Without Baloha, Yushchenko’s Unelectable.” *Kyiv Post*, May 28 2009. <http://www.kyivpost.com/opinion/op-ed/with-or-without-baloha-yushchenkos-unelectable-42373.html?flavour=mobile>. Accessed November 5 2013.

Kuzio, Taras and Wilson, Andrew. *Ukraine: Perestroika to Independence*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1994.

Kyiv Post. “Language Bill signed, Passed to President for Signature.”
<http://www.kyivpost.com/content/ukraine/language-bill-signed-passed-to-president-for-signature-310791.html>. Accessed January 25 2013.

- — — . "Ukraine Law comes into Force in Ukraine." August 10 2012.
<http://www.kyivpost.com/content/ukraine/language-law-comes-into-force-in-ukraine-311340.html>. Accessed December 10 2013.
- — — . "Vlasenko: Prosecution General stops Investigation into Scherban Murder case." May 13 2013. <https://www.kyivpost.com/content/politics/vlasenko-prosecution-stops-investigation-into-scherban-murder-case-324251.html>. Accessed November 13 2013.
- — — . "Yushchenko Prepares for Inauguration." January 22 2005.
<http://www.kyivpost.com/content/business/yushchenko-prepares-for-inauguration.html?flavour=mobile>. Accessed November 18 2013.
- Laats, Alar. "The Concept of the Third Rome and its Political Implications." 2011.
www.ksk.edu.ee/wp-content/.../03/KVUOA_Toimetised_12-Laats.pdf.
 Accessed June 18 2013.
- Lapidus, Gail W. "Ethnicity and State-building: Accommodating Ethnic Differences in Post-Soviet Eurasia." In *Beyond State Crisis? Post-Colonial Africa and Post-Soviet Eurasia in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Mark R. Beissinger and Crawford Young, 323-358. Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Centre Press, 2004.
- — — . "Ethnonationalism and Political Stability: The Soviet Case." *World Politics* 36, no. 4 (1984): 555-580.
- Lapuchak, Chrystyna. "Independence: Over 90% vote yes in Referendum; Kravchuk elected President of Ukraine." *The Ukrainian Weekly*, 8 December 1991,
http://www.ukrweekly.com/archive/pdf3/1991/The_Ukrainian_Weekly_1991-49.pdf. Accessed December 5 2013.

— — — . "Parliament Votes to Boycott Union Structures: Passes law on Ukrainian Citizenship." *The Ukrainian Weekly*, October 13 1991.

http://ukrweekly.com/archive/pdf3/1991/The_Ukrainian_Weekly_1991-41.pdf. Accessed October 11 2013.

Lavryk Andrii and Butkevych Bohdan. "Rough Landing for Ex-Minister Lutsenko." *The Ukrainian Week*, December 30 2010.

<http://ukrainianweek.com/Politics/17595>. Accessed November 10 2013.

Ledeneva, Alana V. *Can Russia Modernise?: Sistema, Power Networks and Informal Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Leshchenko, Sergil. "Ukraine: Yanukovych's Family Spreads its Tentacles." *Open Democracy*, January 29 2013. <http://www.opendemocracy.net/od-russia/sergii-leshchenko/ukraine-yanukovychs-family-spreads-its-tentacles>. Accessed November 14 2013.

Levitsky, Steven and Way, Lucan. "The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism." *Journal of Democracy* 13, no 2 (2002): 51-65.

— — — . "Competitive Authoritarianism: The Origins and Dynamics of Hybrid Regimes in the Post-Cold War Era." www.iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/4396/Levitsky-Way-Stanford.pdf. Accessed September 21 2013.

Levy, Clifford J. "'Hero of Ukraine' Prize to Wartime Partisan Leader is Revoked," *The New York Times*, January 12 2011. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/13/world/europe/13ukraine.html?_r=0. Accessed November 13 2013.

- Levytsky, Marco. "Yanukovych reveals himself as Moscow's Stooge." *Kyiv Post*, May 17 2010. <http://www.kyivpost.com/opinion/op-ed/yanukovych-reveals-himself-as-moscows-stooge-305288.html>. Accessed December 3 2013.
- Liber, George O. "Imagining Ukraine: Regional Differences and the Emergence of an Integrated State Identity, 1926-1994." *Nations and Nationalism* 4, no. 2 (1998): 187-206.
- Linz, Juan. "State building and Nation Building." *European Review* 1, no. 4 (1993): 355-369.
- Linz, Juan and Stepan, Alfred. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-communist Europe*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Lozowy, Ivan. "The 'Ukrainophobe' in Charge of Educating His Country's Youth." *Transitions Online*, October 7 2011. <http://www.tol.org/client/article/22761-university-education-policy-students.html>. Accessed November 14 2013.
- Lynch, Tammy. "Orange Revolution: The Prehistory." *Perspective* 15 no. 2, (2005). <http://www.bu.edu/iscip/vol15/lynch.html>. Accessed December 3 2013.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert. "A Subordinate or Submerged People: The Ukrainians of Galicia under Habsburg and Soviet Rule." In *Nationalism and Empire: The Habsburg Monarchy and the Soviet Union*, edited by Richard L. Rudolph and David F. Good, 109-134. New York: St Martin's Press, 1992.
- Magosci, Paul Robert. *A History of Ukraine*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Maksymiuk, Jan. "Ukraine: Has Yushchenko Betrayed the Orange Revolution." *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, September 30 2005.

<http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1061785.html>. Accessed February 25 2013.

McFaul, Michael. "The Fourth Wave of Democracy and Dictatorship: Non-cooperative Transitions in the Post-communist World." *World Politics* 54, no. 2 (2002): 212-244.

Mite, Valentinas. "Ukraine: President Yushchenko Sacks Government in Growing Crisis." *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, September 8 2005.

<http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1061247.html>. Accessed March 3 2013.

Mulvey, Stephen. "Ukraine's Heroes Turn into Foes." *BBC News International*,

November 1 2005. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4393178.stm>.

Accessed December 5 2013.

Myers, Steven Lee. "Ukraine Leader forms Alliance with Rivals." *The New York Times*, August 4 2006.

<http://select.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F5091EFC3A5B0C778CDDA10894DE404482>. Accessed December 9 2013.

Nahaylo, Bohdan. *The Ukrainian Resurgence*. London: Hurst & Company, 1999.

Nationalanthems.info. "Ukraine." <http://www.nationalanthems.info/ua.htm>.

Accessed December 11 2013.

Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. "Ukraine Parliamentary

Elections 28 October 2012." OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report. <http://www.osce.org/odihr/98578>. Accessed December 10 2013.

- — — . “Ukraine Presidential Election 17 January and 7 February 2010.”
OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report.
<http://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/ukraine/67844>. Accessed November 7
2013.
- Official Website of President of Ukraine. “President’s Address on Day of Holodomor
Victims.” March 19 2007.
<http://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/26134.html>. Accessed January 25
2013.
- Olszański, Tadeusz A. “The Language Issue in Ukraine: An Attempt at a new
Perspective.” *OWS Studies* 40, Centre for Eastern Studies, Warsaw, May 2012.
http://www.osw.waw.pl/sites/default/files/prace_40_en.pdf. Accessed
November 28 2013.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. “Concepts and
Dilemmas of State Building in Fragile Situations: From Fragility to Resilience.”
Journal on Development, 2008. <http://www.oecd.org/dac/fragilestates>.
Accessed April 8 2013.
- O’Donnell, Guillermo and Schmitter, Philippe. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule:
Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore and London: The
John Hopkins University Press, 1986.
- Paniotto, Vladimir. “The Ukrainian Movement for Perestroika — ‘Rukh’: a
Sociological Survey,” *Soviet Studies* 43, no.1 (1991): 177-181.
- Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. “Functioning of Democratic
Institutions in Ukraine.” Council of Europe. April 19 2007.
[http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-](http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=17533&lang=en)
[en.asp?fileid=17533&lang=en](http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=17533&lang=en). Accessed December 9 2013.

Parusinski, Jakub. "Lutsenko Pardon is no Signal for Change. *New Eastern Europe*, April 9 2013. <http://www.neweasterneurope.eu/node/747>. Accessed December 10 2013.

Pelenski, Jaroslaw. *The Contest for the Legacy of Kyivan Rus*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1998.

Pennock, Roland J. *Democratic Political Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Platonova, Natalia Victorovna. "Peter the Great's Government Reforms and Accounting Practice in Russia." *Accounting History* 14, no. 4 (2009): 437-464.

Pogarska, Olga and Segura, Edilberto L.. "Ukraine Economic Situation Report," *SigmaBleyzer*, October 2013. [http://www.usubc.org/site/files/UKR-MonthlyEcReport\(October_2013\).pdf](http://www.usubc.org/site/files/UKR-MonthlyEcReport(October_2013).pdf). Accessed November 14 2013.

President of Ukraine Official Website. "President Victor Yushchenko's Address on the occasion of the Independence Day of Ukraine." August 24 2013. <http://www.president.gov.ua/news/7263.html>. Accessed January 21 2013.

— — — . "President's speech in Palace Ukraine on 21st Anniversary of Independence." <http://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/25110.html>. Accessed January 21 2013.

Pritsak, Omeljan. "The First Constitution of Ukraine (5 April 1710)." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 22 (1998): 471-496.

Protsyk, Oleh. "Constitutional Politics and Presidential Power in Kuchma's Ukraine," *Problems of Post-Communism* 52, no. 5 (2005): 23-31.

Pye, Lucian W. "Introduction: Political Culture and Development." In *Political Culture and Development*, edited by Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba 89-102. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty. "Transcript: What Do Melnychenko's Tapes Say About Gongadze Case?" March 3 2005.
<http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1057789.html>. Accessed November 4 2013.

— — — . "Ukraine Court Bolsters Presidential Powers." October 10 2010.
[Http://www.rferl.org/content/Ukraine_Rules_In_Favor_Of_Stronger_Presidential_Rule/2173534.html](http://www.rferl.org/content/Ukraine_Rules_In_Favor_Of_Stronger_Presidential_Rule/2173534.html). Accessed November 14 2013.

— — — . "Ukraine Opens New Case against Tymoshenko." October 10 2011.
http://www.rferl.org/content/ukraine_security_service_targets_tymoshenko_fresh_criminal_charges/24358654.html. Accessed November 10 2013.

Razumkov Center. 'Ukraine's Party System: Specifics of Establishment, Problems of Function, Trends of Evolution." *Journal of National Security and Defence*.
http://www.razumkov.org.ua/eng/files/category_journal/NSD116_eng_1.pdf. Accessed August 20 2013.

— — — . "Faith and Religion in Ukraine: Public Opinion." *National Security and Defence*.
http://www.razumkov.org.ua/eng/files/category_journal/NSD119_eng_2.pdf. Accessed June 11 2013.

— — — . "The Church and Religious Situation in Ukraine: Present State and Trends." *Journal of National Security and Defence*.

http://www.razumkov.org.ua/additional/analytical_report_NSD10_eng.pdf
. Accessed June 13 2013.

Reeskens, Tim and Hooghe Marc. "Beyond the civic-ethnic Dichotomy: Investigating the structure of Citizenship concepts across thirty-three Countries." *Nations and Nationalism* 16, no.4 (2010): 579-597.

RiaNovosti. "Kyiv Church opposes Russian Patriarch's Inauguration Prayer in Ukraine." February 22 2010.
<http://en.ria.ru/world/20100222/157972553.htm>. Accessed November 15 2013.

— — —. "Ukrainian Nationalist leader urges support for Tymoshenko." February 5 2013. <http://en.ria.ru/exsoviet/20100205/157780784.html>. Accessed 9 December 2013.

— — —. "Yanukovych reverses Ukraine's position on Holodomor famine." April 27 2010. <http://en.rian.ru/exsoviet/20100427/158772431.html>. Accessed January 25 2013.

Rudnytsky, I.L. "The Ukrainians in Galicia under Austrian Rule." *Austrian History Yearbook* 3, no. 2 (1967): 394-429.

Rustow, Dankwart. "Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model." *Comparative Politics* 2, no. 3 (1970): 337-363.

Rybakov, Boris. *Kyivan Rus*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1984.

Shevel, Oxana. "Country Report: Ukraine." EUDO Citizenship Observatory. European University Institute. Robert Shuman Centre for Advanced Studies, Florence, 2010. <http://eudo->

citizenship.eu/docs/CountryReports/Ukraine.pdf. Accessed December 3 2013.

— — — . "Citizenship and nation-building in Ukraine." Paper presented at the Workshop: Understanding the Transformation of Ukraine: Assessing What Has Been Learned, Devising a Research Agenda, 15-16 October 2004, University of Ottawa. www.ukrainianstudies.uottawa.ca/pdf/P_Shevel.pdf.

Shulman, Stephen. "The Contours of Civic and Ethnic National Identification in Ukraine." *Europe-Asia Studies* 56, no.1 (2004): 35-56.

— — — . "The cultural foundations of Ukrainian National Identity." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22, no. 6 (1999): 1011-1036.

Siewierska, Anna and Uhlirová, Ludmila. "An Overview of Word Order in Slavic Languages," in *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe*, edited by Anna Siewierska, 44-68. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998.

Smith, Anthony D. *National Identity*. London: Penguin, 1996.

— — — . *Nations and Nationalism in the Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.

— — — . "Gastronomy or Geology? The role of nationalism in the reconstruction of nations." *Nations and Nationalism* 1, no.1 (1995): 3-23.

— — — . "When is a Nation?" *Geopolitics* 7, no. 2 (2002): 5-32.

Smith, Graham. "Nationalities Policy from Lenin to Gorbachev." In *The Nationalities Question in the Soviet Union*, edited by Graham Smith, 1-20. London; New York: Longman Publishers, 1990.

Solchanyk, Roman. "The Politics of State Building: Centre-Periphery Relations in Post-Soviet Ukraine." *Europe-Asia Studies*, 46, no. 1 (1994): 47-68.

— — —. "Ukraine, Russia, and the CIS." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 20 (1996): 19-43.

Spiegel Online International. "Interview with Ukrainian President Viktor Yushchenko:

"The Problems Began After the Orange Revolution."

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/interview-with-ukrainian-president-viktor-yushchenko-the-problems-began-after-the-orange-revolution-a-647401.html>. Accessed January 22 2013.

— — —. "Pragmatism after the Revolution: Yushchenko Reaches Agreement on New Ukraine Government." August 3 2006.

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/pragmatism-after-the-revolution-yushchenko-reaches-agreement-on-new-ukraine-government-a-429997.html>. Accessed March 4 2013.

— — —. "Putin's Gambit: how the EU lost Ukraine." November 25 2013.

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/how-the-eu-lost-to-russia-in-negotiations-over-ukraine-trade-deal-a-935476.html>. Accessed December 12 2013.

Stalin, J. Marxism and the National Question. In *Collected Works* vol. 2, edited by J. Stalin, 304-320. Moscow, 1952.

State Statistics Committee of Ukraine. "All-Ukrainian Population Census 2001." 2001. <http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/eng>. Accessed June 27 2013.

Stepan, Alfred C., Linz, Juan J. and Yadav Yogendra. "Ukraine: State nation Policies in a Unitary State." In *Crafting State-Nations: India and Other Multinational*

Democracies, edited by Alfred Stepan, Juan J. Linz and Yogendra Yadav, 173-200. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

Subtelny, Orest. *Ukraine: A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

— — —. "The Habsburg and Russian Empires: Some Comparisons and Contrasts." <http://src-h.slav.hokudai.ac.jp/sympo/94summer/chapter4.pdf>. Accessed June 27 2012.

Svoboda Party Website. "About Party." <http://en.svoboda.org.ua/about/>. Accessed December 10 2013.

Snyder, Jack. *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2000.

Szabo, Franz A.. *Kaunitz and Enlightened Absolutism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Szporluk, Roman. "Reflections on Ukraine After 1991: The Dilemmas of Nationhood." *The Harriman Review* 7, no. 7 (1994): 1-10.

— — —. "West Ukraine and West Belorussia: Historical Tradition, Social Communication and Linguistic Assimilation." *Soviet Studies* 31, no.1 (1979): 76-98.

The Telegraph. "Yulia Tymoshenko Charged with Abuse of Power." December 20 2010. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/ukraine/8214916/Yulia-Tymoshenko-charged-with-abuse-of-power.html>. Accessed November 10 2013.

The Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine. "Golden Line in the History of our State - President Leonid Kravchuk."

<http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/fpu/1992/gu19920826.htm>. Accessed September 15 2013.

Torbakov, Igor. "Ukraine: Vagaries of the Post-Soviet Transition." *Demokratizatsiya* 8, no.4 (2001): 461-470.

Transparency International. "Corruption by Country/Territory," 2012.

<http://www.transparency.org/country#UKR>. Accessed November 11 2013.

Tymoshenko, Yulia. "Ukrainians can save Democratic Orange Revolution on Feb 7."

Kyiv Post, January 28 2010. <https://www.kyivpost.com/opinion/oped/ukrainians-can-save-democratic-orange-revolution-o-58215.html>. Accessed December 9 2013.

UDAR Official Party Website. "Preamble Party Program."

<http://klichko.org/en/about/programma/preambula>. Accessed December 10 2013.

Ukraine Government Portal. "Inaugural Address of the President of Ukraine, Viktor Yushchenko to the Ukrainian People on Independence Square."

http://www.kmu.gov.ua/control/en/publish/article?art_id=11100895&cat_id=244315174. Accessed February 21 2013.

United Nations. "Global Issues: Democracy."

<http://www.un.org/en/globalissues/democracy/>. Accessed May 25 2013.

Vasilenko, Grigory. "Ukraine's Foreign Minister names Areas of Cooperation with Russia," *RiaNovosti*, March 28 2010.

<http://en.ria.ru/exsoviet/20100328/158336230.html>. Accessed November 15 2013.

Verkhovna Rada Website. "Declaration of State Sovereignty."

http://static.rada.gov.ua/site/postanova_eng/Declaration_of_State_Sovereignty_of_Ukraine_rev1.htm. Accessed May 14 2013.

— — — . "On Address of the Presidium of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to Citizens of Ukraine of All Nationalities." August 26 1991.

http://static.rada.gov.ua/site/postanova_eng/Res_All_Nat_Address_rev11.htm. Accessed July 25 2013.

— — — . "On Declaration of Independence of Ukraine."

http://static.rada.gov.ua/site/postanova_eng/Rres_Declaration_Independence_rev12.htm. Accessed September 9 2012.

— — — . "On Languages in Ukrainian SSR." January 1 1991.

<http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/not/en/8312-11>. Accessed July 25 2013.

Viktor Yanukovich, President of Ukraine. "Constitution of Ukraine."

<http://www.president.gov.ua/en/content/constitution.html>. Accessed November 10 2012.

Von Bogdandy, Armin, Häußler, Stefan, Hanschmann, Felix and Utz, Raphael.

"State-Building, Nation-Building, and Constitutional Politics in Post-Conflict Situations: Conceptual Clarifications and an Appraisal of Different Approaches." *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law* 9, (2005).

http://www.mpil.de/files/pdf2/mpunyby_bogdandyua_9_579_613.pdf. Accessed March 28 2013.

- Van Zon, Hans. "Ethnic conflict and Conflict Resolution in Ukraine." *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 2, no.2 (2001): 221-240.
- Way, Lucan. "Authoritarian Failure: How does State Weakness Strengthen Electoral Competition." In *Electoral Authoritarianism: The Dynamics of Unfree Competition*, edited by Andres Schedler, 38-52. London: Rienner Publishers, 2006.
- — —. "Identity And Autocracy: Belarus And Ukraine Compared. Paper presented at Second Annual Danyliw Research Seminar in Contemporary Ukrainian Studies, University of Ottawa, Canada. October 12-14, 2006.
www.ukrainianstudies.uottawa.ca/pdf/P_Way_Danyliw06.pdf
- Weber, Max. "The Fundamental Concepts of Sociology." In *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, edited by Talcott Parsons, 105-124. New York: Free Press, 1964.
- Whelan, F.G. "Democratic Theory and the Boundary Problem," *Liberal Democracy*, edited by J.R.Pennock and J.W. Chapman, 57-73. New York, New York University Press, 1983.
- White, Stephen. "The Imprint of Autocracy." In *Developments in Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics*, edited by Stephen White, Alex Pravda and Zvi Gitelman, 104-135. Hampshire, The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1990.
- Whitmore, Brian. "Analysis: 'Orange Revolution' Highlights Ukraine's Religious Divide." *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, December 21 2004.
<http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1056528.html>. Accessed November 4 2013.
- Whitmore, Sarah. "State and Institution Building under Kuchma." *Problems of Post-Communism* 52, no. 5 (2005): 3-11.

Wolczuk, Kataryna. *The Moulding of Ukraine: The Constitutional Politics of State*

Formation. <http://books.openedition.org/ceup/1742#bodyftn15> (accessed 20 August 2013).

— — —. "History, Europe and the "National Idea": The "Official" Narrative of National Identity in Ukraine." *Nationalities Papers* 28, no. 4 (2000): 671-694.

— — —. "Integration without Europeanisation: Ukraine and its Policy towards the European Union." Working paper for European University Institute: Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies. No. 2004/15. October 2004.
http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/WP-Texts/04_15.pdf.

Woronowycz, Roman. "Putin visits Kyiv to Conclude 'Year of Russia in Ukraine,'" *The Ukrainian Weekly*, January 23 2004.

<http://www.ukrweekly.com/old/archive/2004/050401.shtml>. Accessed November 18 2013.

— — —. "Rumors of Conspiracy inflamed by lack of Criminal Investigation into fatal Collision." *The Ukrainian Weekly*, April 4 1999.
www.ukrweekly.com/Archive/1999/149908.html. Accessed November 1 2013).

Yulia Tymoshenko Official Website. "Yulia Tymoshenko offers Ideological Manifesto for Batkivshchyna Party." June 15 2013.

http://www.tymoshenko.ua/en/article/yulia_tymoshenko_15_06_2013_03. Accessed December 10 2013.

Yushchenko, Viktor. "Why does Ukraine need Constitutional Reform?" *Brama*, September 25 2009.

http://www.brama.com/news/press/2009/09/090925yushchenko_constitution-e.html. Accessed December 9 2013.

Zawada, Zenon. "Foreign policy is top Priority of Yushchenko's first 100 days." *The Ukrainian Weekly*,
<http://www.ukrweekly.com/old/archive/2005/200503.shtml>. Accessed January 21 2013.

———. "Yushchenko Administration's first 100 days Incorporate Promises made on Maidan." *The Ukrainian Weekly*, May 8 2005.
<http://www.ukrweekly.com/old/archive/2005/190503.shtml>. Accessed December 10 2013.