

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT MEANINGS
OF CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

ЯВНЫЕ И СКРЫТЫЕ СМЫСЛЫ
КУЛЬТУРНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ



**EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT MEANINGS
OF CULTURAL COMMUNICATION**

**ЯВНЫЕ И СКРЫТЫЕ СМЫСЛЫ
КУЛЬТУРНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ**

INSTITUTE OF EUROPEAN CULTURE
ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY IN POZNAN

ACTA HUMANISTICA GNESNENSIA
VOL. II

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT MEANINGS OF CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

The monograph represents the outcome of studies carried out by researchers from Poland, Russia and Ukraine.

The notion of culture became the core concept which drew contribution from representatives of various fields and disciplines of humanities such as cultural studies, linguistics, sociolinguistics, psychology, literature studies, theory and history of culture or political studies. We have chosen to construe that notion as a system of symbols and meanings: explicit, or palpable ones, which assume the concrete shape of the products of human labour and thought, as well as hidden, or intangible, less perceptible aspects of human behaviour. Such a methodological framework enabled us to approach the issues of cultural communication in an innovative, versatile and interdisciplinary fashion. As a result, we offer the Reader this very monograph, which demonstrates its interdisciplinary nature as well as the possibility of harmonious fusion of knowledge yielded by the investigations in social and philological sciences.

The monograph addresses a range of issues relating to cultural communication, which encompasses human behaviours, products and outcomes of the latter, methods of symbolic exchanges, patterns of response and interpretation, systems of norms and prohibitions which induce particular actions. Hence cultural communication subsumes processes in which social groups communicate with one another through everyday exchange and artistic output.

INSTITUTE OF EUROPEAN CULTURE
ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY IN POZNAN
ИНСТИТУТ ЕВРОПЕЙСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ
УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМ. АДАМА МИЦКЕВИЧА В ПОЗНАНИ

ACTA HUMANISTICA GNESNENSIA
Vol. II

**EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT MEANINGS
OF CULTURAL COMMUNICATION**

**ЯВНЫЕ И СКРЫТЫЕ СМЫСЛЫ
КУЛЬТУРНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ**

**JAWNE I UKRYTE SENSY
KOMUNIKACJI KULTUROWEJ**

Editor of volume / Редактор тома
Katarzyna Jędraszczyk

Series editor / Редактор серии
Leszek Mrozewicz



INSTYTUT
KULTURY EUROPEJSKIEJ
GNIEZNO

Gniezno 2015

INSTITUTE OF EUROPEAN CULTURE
ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY IN POZNAN

ИНСТИТУТ ЕВРОПЕЙСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ
УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМ. АДАМА МИЦКЕВИЧА В ПОЗНАНИ

INSTYTUT KULTURY EUROPEJSKIEJ
UNIwersytetu IM. ADAMA MICKIEWICZA W POZNANIU

Acta Humanistica Gnesnensia / Gnieźnieńskie Prace Humanistyczne

vol. II / tom II

Series editor / Редактор серии

Leszek Mrozewicz

Reviewers / Рецензенты

Ewa Pajewska, Roman Sapeńko

Language editor / Языковая редакция

Magdalena Górna

Translators / Переводы

Janina Chodera, Szymon Nowak, Katarzyna Jędraszczyk

Book cover design / Проект обложки

Julia Oreshkina, Władysław Kondej

Copyright © by IKE, Gniezno 2015

ISBN 978-83-60251-92-8

Editorial office / Адрес редакции

ul. Kostrzewskiego 5-7, 62-200 Gniezno, Polska / Польша

tel. / тел. +48 61 423 70 00, faks / факс +48 61 423 00 02

Typeset, printed and bound by / верстка, печать, переплет

Wydawnictwo Naukowe CONTACT / ABC

ul. Marcelińska 18, 60-801 Poznań

Katarzyna Jędraszczyk
(Gniezno)

Explicit and implicit meanings in the historical policies of Ukrainian presidents in 1991-2010

The reluctance of historians to the catchword “historical policy” stems from its negative connotations with the historical propaganda of the People’s Republic of Poland. The very combination seems an oxymoron to many historians. It is a historian’s ambition to attain the “truth” while the word “policy” in Polish, and even more clearly in Ukrainian contexts signifies manipulation, with seeking to serve current interests of certain groups, accomplishing specific goals (usually oriented towards political success of party or faction). It is therefore implicitly assumed that manipulation is an immanent feature of politics, while in historical policy, historical facts are manipulated. However, it should be noted that although the catchword is widely used with pejorative overtones, some experts in the field (especially in Germany but also in Poland) emphasize clearly that historical policy may, or even should be seen as a positive phenomenon, especially in the context of phenomena which promote identity-building and development of in-depth historical research. Historical policy also comprises institutional undertakings, which are aimed at propagating specific attitudes towards history.

As Bartosz Korzeniewski observes, most of the suggested definitions of historical policy contain the ideological elements, while proposals which are neutral in terms of evaluation are relatively few¹. Still, it seems that historical policy may be “good” and “bad”, i.e. strategies and institutional actions associated with that aspect of state functioning may be evaluated and assessed, as the issue lies in what Kazimierz Wóycicki calls not only overcoming the past but a political choice of “one and not another interpretation”². Such a notion of historical policy expresses the postulate of respecting and promoting a conviction about the importance of historical references in shaping the sphere of the symbolic in a given society and building collective identity, which is tantamount to avoiding instrumentalisation of those references³.

¹ B. Korzeniewski, *Polityka historyczna – propozycje definicji i spory wokół jej zakresu w polskim i niemieckim dyskursie naukowym*, [in:] B. Korzeniewski (ed.), *Narodowe i europejskie aspekty polityki historycznej*, Poznań 2008, p. 11.

² K. Wóycicki, *Rola polityki pamięci historycznej we współczesnych stosunkach polsko-niemieckich*, *Problemy międzynarodowe* 1, Summer 1998, p. 6.

³ After: B. Korzeniewski, *Polityka historyczna*, p. 13.

As the examples of Poland, Germany and Ukraine show, the style of pursuing historical policy is influenced primarily by the advancement of political culture the degree to which civil society has developed and the stage of the nation-building process, particularly in the case of Ukraine. In the latter instance, we are dealing with a vision of nation-building process which heads toward titular or civil nation.

The policy of memory is situated between historical consciousness (subjective factor of the historical process) and the culture of memory (the possibility of shaping historical consciousness, the related social, political and cultural conditions as well as practice). At this point, it would be worthwhile to consider the postulate advanced by Anna Wolff-Powęska, who claims that actions with respect to the past should be formulated jointly by the political class and the elites, institutions, association and scientific circles, so that propositions in the domain of historical policy become a subject of broad discussion⁴.

Andrzej Mencwel devised an interesting and exhaustive definition of historical policy, indicating its three scopes. "Firsly, it is a policy of narrow scope, in which usually one finds the authority, administration and journalism. It promotes certain events and persons on a provisional basis, granting awards, decorations, privileges and titles. Meanwhile, other events and persons are vetted – in the new senses of the old word. Such policy is pursued by every government and every administration, mass media cannot do without it either, but the policy itself does not need to have any profound justification; it is often obscured and subservient, verging on manipulation. As such it does not arouse any deeper collective feeling and seldom generates genuine public interest – even when it is whetted by overt promotion (...) there is palpable indifference towards it: "THEY do themselves well again". It is fairly commonly believed that each successive group of people in power has their own club of nominees and their own "honours list"”. The intermediate scope "means something more than promotions and demotions, as we enter into a realm of values and symbols, of structuring memory and choosing tradition, of creating or recreating collective identity, national identity included. This kind of thoughts and actions penetrates with greater intensity into public life and collective consciousness, as its domain encompasses that which is widely seen and felt – the naming of streets and squares, schools and universities, solemn celebrations and state rituals, erecting monuments and building museums (...). If those are not merely routine changes, which to a degree represent a historical revenge, they have to be a coherent composition which will enact a major structure of memory and a new choice of tradition. If, in turn, the composition will not go beyond opposition's references to the political adversaries of the past period, the structure will be a fragile one and the choice average. (...) If the narrow scope is a domain of administration and connections, the second appertains to power and opinion, the third

⁴ A. Wolff-Powęska, *Polskie spory o historię i pamięć. Polityka historyczna, Przegląd Zachodni* 1, 2007, pp. 3-44.

belongs to everyone, with special emphasis on those who conceive the historical vision which Jerzy Giedroyc called political vision. Creators of such vision inspire politicians, stimulate journalists, educate teachers, and through their combined agency shape collective consciousness”⁵.

Stefan Troebst classified the states in Central-Eastern Europe into four groups: 1) states and societies where the Communist regime was treated as alien and imposed also in the ethnic sense (Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia); 2) societies where there is no consensus as to the assessment of the communist past with evident disputes in the public discourse (Poland, Ukraine, Hungary); 3) countries where assessments are markedly polarised – on the one hand the communist period was a time when the country was modernised (positive evaluation) while on the other it was a system imposed from outside (Bulgaria, Romania, the Balkan states); 4) countries where the new elites emerged from the Communist elite and maintain the relation, perpetuating the authoritarian nature of structures with simultaneous approval of the society (Russia, Moldova, Belarus and other countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States)⁶. As regards Ukraine, Troebst sees it as a country where the culture of memory became a field of conflict between two large political factions.

The greatest dilemma of Ukraine’s historical policy lies in the marked influence of the split to which ethnic Ukrainian territory was subjected, i.e. the division between tsarist Russia and the Habsburg Empire. This is reflected in the sense of identity and the nature of national transformation. The Dnepr river marks the symbolic dividing line. Different superior authority and political culture, a different “Other”, varied arguments of the leaders and divergent goal caused two Ukrainian national movements to develop side by side. The situation seems to have continued until the present day. The complex past resulted in two historical frameworks and two types of historical narration. Yuri Shapoval defines one as nativist and the other as alternative. Each type offers a singular catalogue of events. The first narration includes Kiev Ruthenia, Principality of Galicia-Volhynia, the noblemen and the Cossacks of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the period under the rule of Russian and Austrian-Hungarian empires, the year 1917, the West Ukrainian People’s Republic, Ukrainian People’s Republic, liberation struggle, the Famine of 1932-33, Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists – Ukrainian Insurgent Army, dissidents and independence. Different elements appear in the alternative narration: the joint nation of old Ruthenia, Lithuanian-Polish colonisation, the Council of Pereyaslav, social and political movements of the 19th century, October Revolution, the people’s war, Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic, the Great Homeland War, fighting against the German invaders, Ukraine a member of the UN, downfall of

⁵ A. Mancwel, *Tradycja do remontu*, Rzeczpospolita, 16.09.2006.

⁶ S. Troebst, “What Sort of a Carpet?” *The Culture of Memory in Post-Communist Societies of Eastern Europe. An Attempt at General Description and Categorization*, after: M. Riabczuk, *Polityka pamiajti a kultura zabwjenija*, *Otieczestwiennyje zapiski* 1 (37), 2007.

the USSR as a tragic moment in history. Yaroslav Hrycak calls one vision of history a “Ukrainian, traditional” and the other a “Soviet” one. Both have their pantheons of heroes and, due to linear nature, both are simplifications in view of their linearity⁷. From the beginnings of Ukrainian independence, there have existed two “projects”, or rather visions of Ukrainian past and the country’s future as well. One may be termed “Ukrainian” and the other “post-Soviet”⁸. In the first, the narration recounts the history of oppression from Russia (as well as Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) with its tales of heroism, sacrifice and nationalist sentiments. In the latter, the narrative tells the story of friendship with the Russian nation, their kin in language religion and culture, a friendly nation since times immemorial.

Ukrainians themselves are in discord as to the interpretation of the Soviet period and its role in the process of national integration – on the one hand, in the “national/nationalist” discourse the regime and the dictatorship of the proletariat is seen as one which oppressed and stamped down on anything Ukrainian, making the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic a colonial country, while today the post-colonial legacy of the past hampers fast modernisation of the country. And yet, on the other hand, the period when Ukraine functioned as a Soviet republic gave Ukraine their first ever semblance of statehood with attributes which integrated the society (flag, UN membership, specifically construed local interest). The fusion of both centres of the Ukrainian national movement was a top-down process consisting in a merger of the territories of the so-called Eastern Borderlands of the 2nd Republic of Poland with what the Russians called Little Russia prior to the 1917 revolution. In 1939, Stalin established the “Great Ukraine”⁹. Adherents of the interpretation claim it provides grounds to highlight the role of Soviet identity as one which fostered the emergence of national distinctiveness, which then became major foundation for the development of national identity after gaining independence¹⁰.

According to Yaroslav Hrycak, the state of historical memory on the day USSR fell apart may be termed as “national amnesia”. Admittedly, to a degree the policies of memory in many countries are characterised by collective amnesia, i.e. forgetting about “inconvenient history”, but the specificity of the Soviet state consisted in forgetting everything that was not Soviet, both in the temporal aspect as well as in its nature (was against ideology). As Hrycak argues, in the case of Ukraine the phenomenon was very vivid and pertained particularly to figures and biographies. Some personages who rendered great services to history and culture of Ukraine were not to be mentioned at all, even in negative light (this applied e.g. to

⁷ Jakim maie buty suchasnyj pidruchnik z istorii [online]. LB [access: 2015-01-10]. Available at: <http://society.lb.ua/education/2010/05/26/46211_yakim_maie_buti_suchasnyy_pidruchni.html>.

⁸ Mykola Ryabchuk, who clearly sympathizes with the “Ukrainian” project, also uses other denominations: liberal-democratic and little-Russian/internationalist/imperialist-chauvinist.

⁹ More broadly in: R. Szporluk, *Imperium, komunizm i narody: Wybór esejów*, A Nowak (ed.), Kraków 2003, p. 210.

¹⁰ For more see: M. Studenna, *Między postulowaną inwersją a pożądaną rewizją. Wokół postkolonialnych akcentów w wybranych pracach Mykoły Riabczuka*, *Nowa Krytyka* 26/27, 2011.

Mykhailo Khrushchevski after 1934)¹¹. This was not a policy of Russification but rather Sovietization. Lenin's monuments were a striking symbol of that policy, with 5015 monuments found in Ukraine in 1990, which meant that they existed in every city, town and municipality¹².

Historical policy has also much in common with persuasion-oriented communication. The authority is the communicating entity, and in Ukraine, given his powerful constitutional status, it is the president. Meanwhile, Ukrainian public are the recipients. An analysis of historical policy in Ukraine enables one to attempt certain generalisations, or even periodisation related to successive presidential terms in office. The turn of the 1990s is associated with the need to effect the so-called sovereignisation of history. This happens largely due to Rukh, or People's Movement of Ukraine for reform (perestroyka). The organisation stressed the necessity to revise the official historiography. However, their slogans were not radical as Rukh wanted to unite rather than divide the Ukrainian society. A spectacular communication of such sentiments was the human chain of supporter of political reforms and the organisation which, in a symbolic gesture, connected Lviv and Kyiv on January 21st, 1990, on the 71st anniversary of unification of West Ukrainian People's Republic and the Ukrainian People's Republic. According to the data of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Ukrainian SSR, the chain consisted of 450,000 people. Activists of Rukh claim that approximately 5,000,000 people took part.

In the initial years of independence, Ukrainian authority strove to legitimise and consolidate its position, often patently demonstrating their respect for history. The leaders of independent Ukraine, who originated from the former communist elites, adopted the "national project" (national-democratic), which helped them justify the existence of a new political entity and distinguished the "new Ukraine" from its predecessor. As regards symbols and discourse, the ideological void of the early 1990s was filled with rhetoric which since then would be employed by pro-nation and pro-reform groups, gathered around Rukh. The organisation as well as the parties which emerged from it did not have sufficient political power at the time to implement their programme. Leonid Kravchuk would stress that the new state is a continuation of the pre-Soviet period of Ukrainian statehood, i.e. Ukrainian People's Republic, by symbolic assumption of the regalia of the state's head in emigration, Mykola Plavyuk. At the time, energetic work was in progress developing new curricula, course in the history of the USSR was renamed to history of Ukraine, archives were opened, many rehabilitation proceedings took place. New scientific works were published, discussing hitherto "forbidden" issues, e.g. the Ukrainian Famine of 1932-1933; contacts with foreign

¹¹ J. Hrycak, *Istoria w osobach: do formuwanija historycznoji pam'jati w Ukrajini, 1991-2011*, [in:] *Kultura historyczniji pam'jati: jewropejskij ta ukrajinskij doswid*, Kyjiw 2013, pp. 233-234.

¹² A. Iwczenko, *Mista Ukrajiny*. Dowidnyk, Kyjiw 1999, A. Iwczenko, *Misteczka Ukrajiny*. Dowidnyk, Kyjiw 2000, after: J. Hrycak, *Istoria w osobach*, pp. 233-234.

centres for Ukrainian studies intensified. There were spectacular changes in commemorations – the statues of leaders of the totalitarian system were demolished, while many new monuments, clearly referring to history, were erected, e.g. the monuments to the victims of Famine in Kyiv's Mikhailovskii Square (1993), the bust of Ivan Mazepa in the village of Mazepinci (1994). A number of streets were renamed while crosses and shrines went up by the roadsides. The process was much more dynamic in Western Ukraine and still continues, although many claim it is too slow and inconsistent, which causes a singular split among the observers, especially the younger generation. The first years of independence were also a time when a pantheon of heroes was developed. Given the complex past of the post-Soviet region, the task was not an easy one. The least controversial figure was Mykhailo Khrushchov, as the first Ukrainian president, outstanding historian, creator of a historical narrative which met the needs of the new state. Ivan Mazepa was a different case. Admittedly, he did appear on Ukrainian banknotes already in 1992, but president Kuchma himself was afraid that it may polarise the society¹³.

Ukraine still does not have a uniform inventory of national holidays. The only document which indirectly lists those as public holidays is the Labour Code, originating from the times of Ukrainian Soviet Republic, naturally with some adjustments which include the New Year, Christmas, the International Women's Day, the International Day of Solidarity of Workers, the Victory Day, the Constitution Day and the Independence Day. The catalogue also comprises a number of days off associated with religious holidays, e.g. Easter, Christmas or Feast of the Holy Trinity. Already in 1990 the Supreme Council of the Ukrainian SSR decided to include religious holidays in the Code, but the Day of the Great October Revolution remained as long as 2000.

The period under Leonid Kravchuk was characterised by seeking compromise and avoiding radical score-settling with the past, as he subordinated historical policy to an overriding goal – the building of a cohesive and lasting organism and preservation of state integrity. Mykola Ryabchuk calls that process a compromise between ideological adversaries, i.e. between national-democrats and sovereign-communists (communists who supporter sovereignty)¹⁴. Historical narration was based on the historiographic model conceived by Khrushchov. The elements omitted in the history written by that author proved a major interpretational challenge – the history of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, the experiences of the 1930s, especially the matter of the so-called Famine of 1932-1933. At the same time, there were controversial instances of removing certain names of streets and monuments of former "heroes" from the crucial locations in cities and villages of central, eastern and southern Ukraine. As a result, a singular pragmatic eclecticism remained,

¹³ A. Jaszczenko, Wasyl Łopata nie lisze maluje hrywni a i pisze pro nih, Informacyjne Agentstwo [online]. YHIAH [Access: 2015-01-10]. Available at: <<http://www.unian.ua/society/67542-vasil-lopata-ne-lishe-malyue-grivni-a-y-pishe-pro-nih.html>>.

¹⁴ M. Riabczuk, Kultura pamjati i polityka zabwienia, Otcieczstwiennyje zapysky 1, 2007, p. 44.

which at the time seemed less dangerous and promoted consolidation to a greater degree than planned and consistent eradication of memorials from the Soviet period. The authority initiated commemorations of figures, events and anniversaries from both discursive projects. As examples, one may quote the jubilee of the poet Vasyl Stus, and the anniversary of Shcherbytski, a secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine, with whose knowledge Stus was sent to a camp. People would commemorate the anniversary of the Famine in 1993 and celebrate the 80th anniversary of the Leninist Communist Youth Union.

The problem of historical policy in Ukraine may be encompassed in the answer to the question whether the decades of the Ukrainian SSR were a part of Ukraine's history, from which the country cannot dissociate itself, or whether they were a period of colonial-totalitarian and genocidal oppression which requires moral and legal evaluation.

The subsequent stage, i.e. from 1994 to 2004, is associated with the two terms of president Leonid Kuchma and largely involves rehabilitation of the Soviet legacy in Ukraine. This period saw monuments to the victims of the Chernobyl disaster unveiled, heroes of the Afghan war were commemorated in Kyiv in 1994, further memorials to the victims of the Famine were made.

In 1995, the 300th anniversary of birth of hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky became an official affair. The Cossack theme returned with the presidential decree concerning the celebrations of the 350th anniversary of the Pereyaslav Treaty. It would seem that the subject of Cossacks would not arouse controversy among Ukrainians. However, the act of the Pereyaslav Treaty is interpreted in extremely divergent terms by the historiography associated with the tradition of eastern and western Ukraine¹⁵. The decision – in the form of presidential decree – about celebrating the 350th anniversary of the Cossack Pereyaslav Council¹⁶ on March 13th, 2002, proved ill-advised. The period of “Cossack glory” was probably perceived by the president as the element of heritage which may offer a shared symbol. However, the communication was interpreted in western Ukraine as an exclusion from historical narration pertaining to a considerable part of the society, the descendants of those who did not take part in the Pereyaslav treaty. An element which was a hindrance to including the event in the general state narrative was the fact the Cossacks were rather anti-Uniate, while Greek Catholics remain a significant group in the religious structure of Galicia. The decree was in line with the beliefs of that part of the Ukrainian populace who were unhappy with the establishment of inde-

¹⁵ See: A. Gil, Dekret prezydenta Leonida Kuczmy o obchodach 350. rocznicy Kozackiej Rady Perejasławskiej w 1654 r. i jego znaczenie dla wewnętrznej i zewnętrznej sytuacji Ukrainy, Analizy Instytutu Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, Lublin 2003.

¹⁶ The outcome of the council was the Pereyaslav Treaty, or agreement concluded on January 18th, 1654 in Pereyaslav (Pereyaslav-Khmelnytsky) between the Cossack Council with Bohdan Khmelnytsky and a plenipotentiary of Russian tsar, Alexis I. By virtue of the instrument Ukraine was subjected to Russian jurisdiction and domination of Moscow. In the centre of Kyiv one finds a monument called Arka, which commemorates the 325th anniversary of the agreement.

pendent Ukraine, and who also often subscribed to the vision of history propagated in 1954 on the 300th anniversary of the Council¹⁷. The provisions of the decree stipulating that school children should be exposed to affirmation of the “pro-Russian model”, which stressed shared origins, common history and cultivated the superiority of the Russian nation met with backlash, especially in western Ukraine¹⁸.

In 1998, on the 65th anniversary of the Ukrainian Famine, Leonid Kuchma signed a decree which established a memorial day to the victims of famine and political repressions. In 1997, the president appointed a special committee for the assessment of historical role of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists – Ukrainian Insurgent Army. There also ensued an all-national debate on the difficult Polish-Ukrainian relationships (Volhynia, the Cemetery of the Defenders of Lvov).

During his presidential campaign in 1999, Leonid Kuchma exploited symbols associated with Ukrainian folk culture, but also used references to historical figures. One of the materials advertising his candidacy was a calendar entitled “Know our people!”, in which Kuchma appears in the company of Taras Shevchenko, the poet and writer, and Andriy Shevchenko, the footballer. Subsequent images feature Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Ivan Franko, Lesya Ukrainka – figures present both in national as well as Soviet narration; personages conspicuously rooted in the Soviet period – marshal Rybalko, Ivan Kozhedub; figures which would not be given a place in Soviet canon of heroes – Ivan Mazepa, Mykhailo Khrushchevsky; symbols of new Ukraine – president Kravchuk and the boxer Vitali Klitschko. There were no figures there which would antagonize the society, e.g. Khrushchev, Lenin, Shcherbytsky, or personages of the opposite extreme – Bandera or Petlura. Hrycak claims that it was a signal that Kuchma pursues a poly-ethnic concept of nation-building in Ukraine¹⁹. People seemed to give in to that historical narrative, as such a variant represented a compromise and caused little difficulty in interpretation.

Under Kuchma, the Battle of Kruty was included in the catalogue of important historical events which the state wished to celebrate. By virtue of another presidential decree from 2003, the heroic combat of defenders of railway station near Kruty, which took place on January 29th, 1918, would be commemorated each year. No more than 300 volunteers, chiefly students of the Kyiv University of St. Volodymyr and the Ukrainian Popular University, as well as older pupils of the Secondary School of St. Cyril and Methodius’ Brotherhood of the City of Kyiv stood defending the People’s Republic of Ukraine against approximately 4,000 Bolsheviks. All defenders died, becoming a symbol of struggle for independent Ukraine.

¹⁷ At the time Crimea was handed over to the Ukrainian SSR.

¹⁸ A. Gil, Dekret prezydenta Leonida Kuczmy, pp. 47-51.

¹⁹ J. Hrycak, *Istoria w osobach*, pp. 238-239.

Kuchma ascended to power as a representative of the historical awareness of eastern and southern Ukraine, but with time his policies became characterised by ambivalent yet fairly balanced attitude to the past. This was manifested for instance by the usage of neutral formulations (in contrast to president Yushchenko). Instead of using such terms as “celebration”, “paying homage” or “commemorating” in the titles of documents relating to anniversaries or jubilees, Kuchma would opt for the simple “on the anniversary”.

Viktor Yushchenko underwent a similar evolution, although in the opposite direction. The third stage, i.e. Yushchenko’s presidency (2005-2010), featured several dozen decrees and other documents concerning historical policy. During the electoral campaign, despite the attempts at confining him in the national or even nationalist narration, he appeared to be an advocate of consensus. With time, he began to subscribe to the slogan “one church, one language, one history”; his historical policy became more distinctive, surprising even his own supporters. This happened for instance when Roman Shukhvych and Stepan Bandera were announced Heroes of Ukraine, respectively in 2007 and 2010. His actions fuelled the latent discord concerning historical policy. He addressed the most controversial issue which the people of Ukraine are not yet ready to evaluate, namely the role of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army in the history of Ukraine. Undoubtedly, president Yushchenko should be credited with “activation” of the national memory of the 1932-1933 Famine. In 2006, acting on the initiative of president, the Supreme Council of Ukraine pronounced it to be a crime of genocide. Fairly soon, even in those parts of the country where the subject did not exist in public discourse or was interpreted in a different fashion, the knowledge of the event as a genocide spread quite quickly (significant increase from 39% to 63%)²⁰. Nonetheless, it should be emphasized that state documents concerning commemoration of the Famine victims are not Yushchenko’s exclusive merit, as they had been issued since 1993. As Svitlana Nabok observes, until 2003, “famine” had always been written with small caps, while after 2003 the term was mostly written with a capital letter²¹.

It should also be stressed that despite relevant decrees from the times of Kravchuk and Yushchenko on the removal of monuments associated with the Communist regime, in 2010 2692 statues of Lenin were still standing, most of which were found in Kyiv, Dnepropetrovsk and Donetsk oblasts²².

Viktor Yushchenko’s presidency (2005-2010) is also associated with the establishment of the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance in 2006, an institution which was to create and study issues of the nation’s history. However, the first opportunity to demonstrate the new vision of historical policy was the

²⁰ Survey from 2007 [online]. KiiS [access: 2015-01-10]. Available at: <old.kiis.com.ua/txt/doc/20112007/201107.doc>.

²¹ S. Nabok, *Derżawa i polityka pam’jati: doswid czotyr’och Prezydentiw Ukrainy w: Kultura istoryczyniji pam’jati: jewropejskyj ta ukrajinskyj doswid*, Kyjiw 2013, p. 269.

²² Data after: J. Hrycak, *Istoria w osobach*, p. 249.

anniversary of the end of World War II in 2005. Authorities of the Russian Federation organised grandiose celebration of the Victory Day in Moscow, but president Yushchenko decided that he would not participate in the undertaking. The idea of great celebrations in Kyiv was also abandoned. During the anniversary speech, the president called upon the veterans of the Great Homeland War and combatants of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army for reconciliation and forgiveness. Opponents of such attitude argue that the gesture confirmed that Yushchenko would be a continuator of Kravchuk's and Kuchma's policies and that he would not have sufficient determination to effect UIA's political rehabilitation. The attitude to UIA and the Red Army is not the only problem pertaining to the assessment of World War II. For instance, the denomination Great Homeland War, which in national or nationalist narration was a war of two totalitarian systems, by no means a „homeland” war, is nevertheless in constant use. The most neutral term, i.e. second world war is the most adequate for the national narration, given the fact that the territories of Carpathian and Western Ukraine experienced war before June 1941. Svitlana Nabok conducted qualitative and quantitative research on the usage of individual words associated with historical policy in Ukrainian documents after 1991. It turns out that the term Great Homeland War appears most frequently – over 200 times, Holodomor (Famine as genocide) comes second, used five times more seldom. As she observes, in the former context there is always a formulation concerning celebration of “victory” as opposed to “end” of World War II²³.

In 2005, president Yushchenko made November 22nd the Freedom Holiday. The holiday was established to commemorate the Maidan of Independence, barely a year after the event. The holiday was then abolished by president Yanukovych in 2011, who officially combined two events, the Day of Freedom on November 22nd and the Day of Unity on January 22nd, to create one holiday – the Day of Freedom and Unity. The opposition, with Yulia Tymoshenko at the forefront, criticised the gesture as a manifestation of fight against political adversaries. The event is a significant one, as it demonstrates instrumentalisation of historical policy by Yushchenko and Yanukovych. In view of the critical evaluations of Yushchenko's presidency and the doubtful achievements of the so-called Orange Revolution, there arises the question concerning temporal perspective in commemorating events and persons.

Another debatable issue is when to celebrate the Day of the Defender of Homeland. There are two available alternatives: on Pokrova Day on October 14th, the traditional holiday celebrating Ukrainian armed forces since the Cossack times to the era of People's Republic of Ukraine, and the day when UIA was officially established. Or, as it has been celebrated hitherto, on February 23rd, the day of the Red Army.

In 2007, president Yushchenko issued a decree entitled “Pro vyznachennya 65-iy rochnicy stvoryennya Ukrainskoy povstanskoy armiy”. Despite the fact that

²³ More broadly in: S. Nabok, *Derzawa i polityka pamjati*, pp. 255-257.

reluctance towards UIA among Ukrainians is on the decrease, the celebrations had no influence on the further steps taken by president Yushchenko. It was believed that he would decide to grant former UIA soldier the status of veterans. However, the matter remains regulated by a 1995 bill enacted under Leonid Kuchma, whereby UIA soldiers are considered equal to Red Army veterans only in special cases, i.e. when the UIA combatant took part in fighting against the Nazi invaders on the territory of occupied Ukraine in 1941-1944, without committing crimes against peace and humanity or was rehabilitated in accordance with relevant laws.

Yushchenko's rule was received in Poland with substantial optimism and trust in the new power. Several months after his assumption of authority, the Cemetery of the Eaglets was eventually opened in Lviv, an event long-awaited by Poland and previously postponed on several occasions²⁴. Subsequently, Polish authorities were surprised by a 2007 decree in which president Yushchenko ordered preparations for the 60th anniversary of the Operation "Vistula". In 2007 the status of the Hero of Ukraine was granted to Roman Shukhevych and finally in 2010 to Stepan Bandera, which was widely commented in Poland and Ukraine.

The flaw of Ukrainian historical policy lies in its not being pursued by appropriate institutions (with the exception of the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance) or collective organisation, but through presidential decrees. This results in a chaos, while since the times of Viktor Yushchenko many have had the impression that historical policy became an instrument of political manipulation. What is more, decrees do not offer the possibility of verifying whether the guidelines are practically implemented.

As a young state, Ukraine needs good historical policy and prudent support of the state in the process of studying and shaping of the image of its past. The lack of crystallised concept of policy of memory and its changeability are an acutely felt issue. There is no fixed calendar of national holidays and anniversaries which would be important for the Ukrainian citizen, a singular "charter" of memory. However, this is by no means a surprise as each citizen was brought up in a specific historiographic tradition, which still exerts an influence on the historical perception, interpretation and narratives. Unfortunately, history is fairly often a topic exploited for political purposes and a source of social rifts, which the political circles deliberately nurture and fuel. Consequently, it often happens that policy of memory breeds a conflict of memory.

²⁴ More broadly in: K. Jędraszczyk, *Cmentarz czy panteon? Konflikt wokół Cmentarza Orłąt Lwowskich*, Poznań 2004; K. Jędraszczyk, *Strategiczne partnerstwo ukraińsko-polskie. Polska w polityce niepodległej Ukrainy*, Poznań 2010, pp. 220-248.

Катажина Ендращик
(Гнезно)

Явные и скрытые смыслы исторической политики президентов Украины в 1991-2010 годах

Неприязнь историков к лозунгу „историческая политика” возникает в связи с отрицательными коннотациями лозунга с исторической пропагандой коммунистического периода. Само сопоставление представляется многим историкам как оксюморон. Заметим, однако, что некоторые из экспертов в этой области (особенно немецкие и польские), подчеркивают, что историческая политика может и должна рассматриваться как позитивное развитие, особенно в контексте явлений, благоприятствующих конструированию идентичности и развитию фундаментальных исторических исследований. Историческая политика также включает в себя институциональные меры, направленные на поддержку определенного отношения к истории. На стиль управления исторической политикой, прежде всего, имеет влияние этап в развитии политической культуры и уровень развития гражданского общества и (особенно в случае с Украиной) этап процесса национального строительства. В последнем случае мы имеем дело с видением развития процесса национального строительства в направлении титулярной или гражданской нации. Историческая политика имеет много общего с убедительным сообщением. В роли собеседника выступает правительство, а в случае с Украиной, из-за сильной конституционной позиции, это в основном президент; адресат – украинское общество.

Наибольшей дилеммой исторической политики Украины является ее все еще сильное влияние разделения украинских этнических земель между царской Россией и Империей Габсбургов. Это находит свое отражение в ощущении идентичности и характере народнических изменений. Символической разделительной линией является Днепр.

Результатом сложного прошлого является функционирование двух исторических схем и двух типов исторических повествований. Юрий Шаповал описывает их как нативистические и альтернативные. Каждый из них имеет уникальный каталог событий. В первом рассказе: Киевская Русь, Княжество Галицко-Волынское, дворянство и казачество в республике, период под властью России и Австро-Венгерской империи, 1917 года, Западно-Украинская Народная Республика, Украинская Народная Республика, освободительная борьба, голод, ОУН-УПА, диссиденты, независимость. В альтернативном повествовании выступают другие элементы: простые люди древней Руси, польско-литовская колонизация, Переяславская Рада, общественно-политические движения девятнадцатого века, Октябрьская революция, народная война, Украинская Советская Социалистическая Республика, Великая Отечественная война, борьба против немецких оккупантов, Украина-член Организации Объединенных Наций, распад СССР как трагический момент в истории. Ярослав Грицак два видения истории называет: „Украинское традиционное” и „Советское”. Оба видения имеют свой пантеон героев, и оба упрощены в силу линейности.

В Украине с момента обретения независимости работают параллельно два видения украинского прошлого. Мы называем их „украинский” и „постсоветский”. В первом видении мы имеем дело с повествованием, касающимся угнетения со стороны России (а также Польши), с историей, написанной героизмом, самоотверженностью и национализмом. Во втором – история дружбы с родственным с точки зрения языка, религии и культуры народом России, с которым Украину объединяет извечная дружба.

В первые годы независимости, украинское правительство стремилось узаконить и укрепить свои позиции, часто наглядно демонстрируя уважение к истории. Походящие из бывших коммунистических элит, лидеры независимой Украины приняли де-факто „национальный проект” (национально-демократический), что облегчало обоснование функционирования новой политической организации и отличало „новую Украину” от ее предшественницы. На уровне символов и дискурса, идеологический вакуум в начале 90-х годов заполнила риторика,

которой к этому времени пользовалось окружение, ориентированное на народ и реформы, сосредоточенное вокруг „Рука”.

Следующий этап, 1994–2004, связан с периодом двух сроков правления президента Леонида Кучмы и в значительной степени реабилитацией советского наследия Украины. Кучма пришел к власти в качестве представителя исторического сознания востока и юга Украины, со временем его политика приобрела черты амбивалентного и, одновременно, вполне сбалансированного отношения к прошлому.

Эволюцию, но в другом направлении, прошел президент Виктор Ющенко. В избирательной кампании, кроме попыток приготовления его к народному повествованию, и даже националистическому, появился в качестве представителя консенсуса. Со временем он стал поборником лозунга „одна церковь, один язык, одна история”. Своими действиями раздул скрытые споры в вопросах исторической политики. Он коснулся, пожалуй, самого спорного вопроса, к оценке которого общество еще не готово – роль Украинской Повстанческой Армии в истории Украины. Несомненной заслугой президента Ющенко была „активация” национальной памяти о голоде 1932–1933, создание Украинского института национальной памяти (2006).

Украина, как молодое государство, нуждается в доброй исторической политике и мудрой поддержке государства в процессе исследования и формирования образа своего прошлого. Поразительным фактом является отсутствие четкой концепции политики памяти и ее изменчивость. Отсутствие постоянного перечня важных для граждан национальных праздников и юбилеев, своего рода „каталога памяти”, не должно удивлять потому, что каждый гражданин вырос в определенной историографической традиции, которая все еще влияет на восприятие, интерпретацию и историческое повествование. К сожалению, история часто используется политикой и является источником общественных разделений, который иногда сознательно культивируется и подпитывается политическими кругами. Это приводит к тому, что довольно часто из политики памяти рождается конфликт памяти.

Katarzyna Jędraszczyk
(Gniezno)

Jawne i ukryte sensy polityki historycznej ukraińskich prezydentów w latach 1991–2010

Niechęć polskich historyków do hasła „polityka historyczna” wynika z negatywnych skojarzeń z propagandą historyczną z okresu PRL. Samo zestawienie wydaje się wielu historykom oksymoronem. Należy jednak zwrócić uwagę, że część specjalistów w tej dziedzinie (zwłaszcza na gruncie niemieckim, ale i polskim), podkreśla, że polityka historyczna może, a nawet powinna być postrzegana jako zjawisko pozytywne, zwłaszcza w kontekście sprzyjania konstruowaniu tożsamości i rozwojowi gruntownych badań historycznych. Polityka historyczna obejmuje także działania instytucjonalne, zmierzające do promocji określonych postaw wobec historii. Na styl uprawiania polityki historycznej wpływ ma przede wszystkim etap rozwoju kultury politycznej i poziom rozwoju społeczeństwa obywatelskiego oraz (zwłaszcza w przypadku Ukrainy) etap procesu narodotwórczego. W ostatnim przypadku mamy do czynienia z wizją rozwoju procesu narodotwórczego w kierunku narodu tytularnego lub obywatelskiego. Polityka historyczna ma wiele wspólnego z komunikatem perswazyjnym. Komunikującym jest władza, a w wypadku Ukrainy, w związku z silną pozycją konstytucyjną, jest to głównie prezydent; adresatem – społeczeństwo ukraińskie.

Największy dylemat polityki historycznej Ukrainy stanowi wciąż silny wpływ podziału ukraińskich ziem etnicznych pomiędzy carską Rosją a Imperium Habsburgów. Znajduje to odzwierciedlenie w poczuciu tożsamości i charakterze przemian narodowościowych. Symboliczną linię podziału stanowi Dniepr.

Efektom skomplikowanej przeszłości jest funkcjonowanie dwóch schematów historycznych i dwóch typów narracji historycznej. Jurij Szapował określa je jako natywistyczny i alternatywny. Każdy z nich ma swoisty katalog historycznych bytów i wydarzeń. W pierwszej narracji są to: Ruś Kijowska, Księstwo Halicko-Wołyńskie, szlachta i kozactwo w Rzeczypospolitej, okres pod władzą imperium rosyjskiego i austro-węgierskiego, 1917 rok, Zachodnioukraińska Republika Ludowa, Ukraińska Republika Ludowa, zmagania wyzwolenicze, Głód, OUN-UPA, dysydenci, niepodległość. W alternatywnej narracji mamy inne elementy: wspólny naród dawnej Rusi, litewsko-polska kolonizacja, Rada Perejaśwska, ruchy społeczno-polityczne XIX wieku, rewolucja październikowa, wojna ludowa, Ukraińska Socjalistyczna Republika Radziecka, Wielka Wojna Ojczyźniana, walka przeciw okupantowi niemieckiemu, Ukraina-członek ONZ, rozpad ZSRR jako tragiczny moment w historii. Jarosław Hrycak dwie wizje historii nazywa: „ukraińską tradycyjną” i „sowiecką”. Obie wizje mają swój panteon bohaterów i obie są uproszczeniem ze względu na linearność.

Na Ukrainie od początku jej niepodległości dwie wizje ukraińskiej przeszłości funkcjonują równolegle. Możemy je nazwać „ukraińską” i „postsowiecką”. W pierwszej wizji mamy do czynienia z narracją dotyczącą opresji ze strony Rosji (ale i Rzeczypospolitej), z historią pisaną heroizmem, poświęceniem i nacjonalizmem; w drugiej – historię przyjaźni z pokrewnym pod względem języka, religii i kultury narodem rosyjskim, z którym Ukrainę łączy odwieczna przyjaźń.

W pierwszych latach niepodległości władza ukraińska dążyła do legitymizacji i utrwalenia swojej pozycji, często wyraźnie demonstrując szacunek do historii. Wywodzący się z dawnych elit komunistycznych przywódcy niepodległej Ukrainy przejęli *de facto* „projekt narodowy” (narodowo-demokratyczny), co ułatwiało uzasadnienie funkcjonowania nowego podmiotu politycznego i odróżniało „nową Ukrainę” od poprzedniczki. Na poziomie symboli i dyskursu, ideologiczna próżnia na początku lat 90. wypełniona została retoryką, którą do tego czasu posługiwały się środowiska zorientowane pronarodowo i reformatorsko, skupione wokół „Ruchu”.

Kolejny etap, lata 1994-2004, wiąże się z okresem dwóch kadencji prezydenta Leonida Kuczmy i w dużej mierze rehabilitacją radzieckiej spuścizny Ukrainy. Kuczma dochodził do władzy jako reprezentant świadomości historycznej wschodu i południa Ukrainy, z czasem jego polityka nabrała cech ambiwalentnego, ale też dość wyważonego stosunku do przeszłości.

Ewolucję, ale w innym kierunku, przeszedł prezydent Juszczenko. W kampanii wyborczej, pomimo prób przyporządkowania go do narracji narodowej, a nawet nacjonalistycznej, jawił się jako rzecznik konsensusu. Z czasem stał się rzecznikiem hasła „jedna cerkiew, jeden język, jedna historia”. Swoimi działaniami rozdmuchał utajone spory w kwestii polityki historycznej. Dotknął bodaj najbardziej kontrowersyjnej kwestii, na ocenę której społeczeństwo nie jest jeszcze gotowe – roli Ukraińskiej Powstańczej Armii w historii Ukrainy. Niewątpliwą zasługą prezydenta Juszczenki była „aktywizacja” narodowej pamięci dotyczącej głodu 1932-1933, utworzenie Ukraińskiego Instytutu Pamięci Narodowej (2006 r).

Ukraina jako młode państwo potrzebuje dobrej polityki historycznej i mądrego wsparcia państwa w procesie badania i kształtowania obrazu swojej przeszłości. Jaskrawym zjawiskiem jest brak wykrystalizowanej koncepcji polityki pamięci i jej zmienność. Brak stałego katalogu ważnych dla obywatela świąt i rocznic narodowych, swoistej „karty pamięci”, nie powinien jednak dziwić, bo faktem jest, że każdy z obywateli wyrósł w określonej tradycji historiograficznej, która wciąż wpływa na postrzeganie, interpretowanie i narrację historyczną. Niestety historia jest niejednokrotnie tematem wykorzystywanym politycznie oraz źródłem podziałów społecznych, czasem celowo pielęgnowanych i podsycanych przez kręgi polityczne. Sprawia to, że wcale nierzadko z polityki pamięci rodzi się konflikt pamięci.

