СОЦІАЛНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ

IMAGE OF THE "ENEMY" AS A FACTOR OF CONSTRUCTING THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY

Nataliia Kryvda,

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of the Department of Ukrainian Philosophy and
Culture of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
n.kryvda@britishmba.in.ua
ORCID 0000-0001-7429-7693

Sviytlana Storozhuk,

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of the Department of Philosophy of the
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
sveta0101@ukr.net
ORCID 0000-0002-7947-6268
DOI: [https://doi.org/10.34017/1313-9703-2020-1\(15\)-2\(16\)-57-66](https://doi.org/10.34017/1313-9703-2020-1(15)-2(16)-57-66)

Анотация

Наталія Кривда, Светлана Сторожук. Образът на “врага” като фактор за формирането на украинската национална идентичност. Статията показва, че изграждането на образа на “врага” дълго време остава неразделен елемент от стратегията за формирането на националната идентичност, обаче препоръчително е тази практика да се разглежда като един от остатъците на националната политика на модерното време, тъй като тогава хомогенната национална идентичност беше единственият начин да се получи политическа независимост за определена културна общност.

За разлика от това, формирането на хомогенна национална идентичност в съвременните условия е конфликтна стратегия, която може да доведе до социално разделение и фрагментация на държавните граници. Имайки предвид това, изглеждат по-ползотворни стратегиите, които са насочени към осигуряване на високо ниво на гражданската лоялност към политическите институции на държавата въз основа на “конституционен”, “териториален”, “регионален” и други патриотизъм.

В контекста на прилагането на такава стратегия и рационална културна политика, насочена към разработване на система от ценности, която е близка и разбираема за по-голямата част от населението на държавата, е възможно да се преодолее мирогледното разделение и да се запази националната идентичност.

Ключови думи: национална идентичност, национална стратегия, образ на “враг”, “Ние” / “Други” / “Те”, конфликт

Анотація

Наталія Кривда, Світлана Сторожук. Образ “ворога” як чинник формування української національної ідентичності. В статті показано, що конструювання образу “Ворога” тривалий час залишається невіддільним елементом стратегії формування національної ідентичності, проте цю практику доцільно розглядати як рудимент національної політики модерного періоду, оскільки тоді гомогенна національна ідентичність була єдиним способом здобуття політичної незалежності свідомої власної культурної відрубності спільноти. Натомість в сучасних умовах – формування гомогенної національної ідентичності є конфліктною стратегією, котра може зумовлювати суспільний розкол та фрагментацію державних кордонів. З огляду на це, більш плідними видаються стратегії, котрі спрямовані забезпечити високий рівень лояльності громадян до політичних інститутів держави на основі “конституційного”,

“територіального”, “крайового” тощо патріотизму. За умов впровадження такої стратегії та раціональної культурної політики спрямованої на розробку системи цінностей, котру поділятиме більшість населення певної держави, можливе подолання світоглядного розколу та збереження її національної ідентичності.

Ключові слова: національна ідентичність, національна стратегія, образ “ворога”, “Ми” / “Інші” / “Вони”, конфлікт

Abstract

Nataliia Kryvda & Svitlana Storozhuk. Image of an “Enemy” as a Factor of Constructing the Ukrainian National Identity. The article shows that contrary to the fact that constructing the image of an “Enemy” for a long time has been remaining an inseparable element of the strategy of forming a national identity, yet it should be regarded as a rudiment of the national policy of the modern period, since then homogeneous national identity was the only way to gain political independence of a conscious proper cultural cutoff of the community. Meanwhile, in today’s conditions, the formation of a homogeneous national identity is a conflict strategy that can lead to a social split and fragmentation of the state borders. Given this, strategies that are aimed at ensuring a high level of citizens’ loyalty to the political state institutions on the basis of “constitutional”, “territorial”, “regional” and other patriotism seem more fruitful. Under conditions of implementing such a strategy and rational cultural policy aimed at developing a system of super-ethnic values that will be shared by the majority of the population of a certain state, it is possible to overcome the world-view split and save the national identity.

Key words: national identity, national strategy, image of an “enemy”, “We” / “Others” / “They”, conflict

Formulation of the problem. Despite the fact that the problem of constructing the Ukrainian national identity is an integral part of Ukrainian studies and socio-humanities, there is currently no reason to speak of a conceptual approach that can be part of a national strategy and lay the foundation for consolidating the Ukrainian society. On the contrary, in recent times the polarization of thoughts and approaches to solving this issue has been increasingly observed in Ukrainian socio-political thought. Thus, as a result of the long military conflict in the East of Ukraine, in which an information confrontation has become its fueling force, the cultural policy of Ukraine has become clearer, which, to a large extent, has manifested in the intention to form a nationwide communicative space. At the same time, this strategy has led to internal resistance among the part of Ukrainians, for whom the Russian language was native and pacifically combined with Ukrainian identity as a result of historical circumstances. Such a position is more often encountered among the educated urban population, which professes cosmopolitan liberal values – for them, the rights and freedoms of every person are the basis of their value system; instead, the national policy oriented to the development of the values of the titular ethnic group is considered as a repressive one. As a result, not only on the outside, but in the internal space of Ukrainian society, the image of “Other” (“Enemy”) is about to be distinguished.

Without going into detail and being distanced from the value judgments about the above-mentioned polar positions, it is worth noting that such an internal confrontation, as the American scientist J. Haidt proves, is world-wide. In particular, the researcher in a number of his works argues that after the end of the Cold War, public attention in the Euro-Atlantic world was concentrated on the domestic, particularly civil and cultural spheres, because, despite the hope and high living standards of society, the intentions of the ideological fragmentation and ideological confrontation amidst the society have been clearly manifested here (Haidt, 2015). This situation, according to the American researcher, has become a logical consequence of the permanent destruction of group values as a result of the high level of migration and multiculturalism, whose ideals have jeopardized the values that have long been the basis of group identity.

Concerns about the possibility of destroying the basis of national identity is expressed by B. Yack, who, considering the process of forming a national identity through the prism of social friendship, focuses

attention on the consistent patterns of creating the image of the "Other", while investigating the conditions for its transformation into the image of the "Enemy" (Yack, 2017, p. 291). Instead, O. Hrytsay and M. Nikolko, tracing the significance of the "Other" image in the process of forming a national identity, focus their attention not only on the theoretical aspects of its existence, but also on the specifics of its consolidating potential in the process of developing the Ukrainian national identity (Gritsay & Nikolko, 2009). A similar approach is also found in the Polish scholar O. Hnatyuk, who, while considering strategies for the development of Ukrainian identity, does not overlook the problem of "Other", expanding it in diachronic terms (Hnatyuk, 2005).

In general, the image of "Enemy" or "Other" is directly or indirectly found in practically all researchers who studied the problem of forming the Ukrainian identity. In this context one can recall the works of M. Stepyko (Stepyko, 2017), Y. Hrytsak (Hrytsak, 2011), H. Kasyanov (Kasyanov, 2007), B. Kravchenko (Kravchenko, 2011), S. Storozhuk (Storozhuk, 2016), N. Kryvda (Kryvda, 2017) and many other Ukrainian researchers who have offered fruitful exploration of some aspects of the problem of constructing the image of "Other" ("Enemy") and its significance in the process of community consolidation. Nevertheless, in today's Ukraine-study discourse, there is currently no conceptual approach to solving this issue, which greatly complicates the clarification of the perspectives of the consolidation of the "Other" and especially the "Enemy" in the modern socio-cultural conditions of the Ukrainian society. In view of this, the **purpose** of our work is to highlight the image of the "Enemy" in the process of forming a national identity and identifying the heuristic potential of this concept in the process of formation of Ukrainian national identity.

The main content. Spite of the fact that the problem of forming the national identity has repeatedly become the subject of scientific research, there is no reason to speak about the development of such a conceptual approach, which, at least in the most general terms, could correspond to the urgent demands of society. This situation is quite logical, since, as P. Berger and T. Luckmann noticed in their time, the actualization of this topic takes place whenever identity becomes a problem caused by changes in psychic reality under the influence of social transformations. In such cases, a number of new psychological theories usually appear, and competing with the current ones, seek to explain the changes that have taken place in the world. In other words, according to P. Berger and T. Luckmann, theorizing on identity, aimed at explaining the changes that took place in the structure of identity itself, are changed themselves in this process. That is, identity can become a problem at the level of the theory itself or in the course of internal theoretical development (P. Berger & T. Luckmann, 1995, p. 119).

The apparent simplicity of the above-mentioned conclusions of authoritative scholars is combined not only with an extremely high heuristic potential, but also an opportunity to understand the reasons for the return of nation-building issues to the world and Ukrainian intellectual discourse in the form of a problem of identity. The fundamental changes taking place around the world under the influence of globalization have led to the erosion of state borders and the destruction of those, as a rule, objective factors that for a long time have been providing a group identity. Of course, a high level of generalization of the above-mentioned causes may raise doubts, and with it the discussion, with the disorientation of people in the process of forming a national identity, clearly expressed today, remaining their only undoubted moment. This is not surprising, because, as E. Gellner showed perfectly, the formation of national communities, which began in the modern era, was under the influence of radical social transformations due to the transition from agrarian to industrial production. At that time, as the researcher quite rightly observes, the stable and isolated "Babylonian system" of agrarian communities (separated socially, culturally and geographically) is replaced by "a new type of Babylon" (E. Gellner) – new, and what is important, unstable cultural boundaries are formed, the existence being provided by a standardized education system aimed at homogenizing the society (Gellner, 2003).

In general, sharing E. Gellner's view of the modern character of nations of the national states, we would like to draw attention to the observations of J. Armstrong, the American researcher of the nation-building processes. He believes that the nation and national unity are a modern equivalent of the pre-modern ethnic identity that had been existing throughout the written history, since the differences between the members of the ethnic community and foreigners are the basis of the stability of the group's ethnic borders and was therefore

present in all languages (Smith, 2004, p. 306-307). In other words, the American scientist argues that, despite the modern nature of national unity, it appears in some space of freedom, defined by the objective factors, and is determined by ethnic boundaries. At the same time J. Armstrong argues that ethnic and national interactions are determined not by some kind of cultural "essence", but rather by how it is perceived as a common one.

In view of the comments made, we consider it appropriate to agree on the definition of the national identity proposed by M. Gibernau. In particular, the researcher believes that national identity is "a collective feeling that is grounded in belief in belonging to one nation and in the commonality of most attributes that make it different from other nations," while at the same time emphasizing the dynamism and fluidity of its character (Gibernau, 2012, p. 20). The specified clarification, in our opinion, is extremely important, since it gives an opportunity to understand the fluidity and variability of those attributes (language, territory, culture, etc.) that provide "a sense of collective unity", thereby actualizing the need for state (political) provision of national identity. In a particularly acute way these problems are manifested in the context of globalization, which blurs the cultural homogeneity of the population within the state, thereby destroying the foundations of individual and collective identity. This process is substantially complicated by the emergence of a new type of "Babylon" (multilingualism), which undermines modern strategies for the formation of national identity, thereby actualizing the need for strategies that, in the new economic and socio-cultural conditions, will be able to consolidate the society.

Of course, the permanent changes taking place all over the world do not allow forming a general strategy for constructing a national identity, its development depending largely on both the international and internal political conditions, and on the peculiarities and conflicts of the historical development of the community, as well as on many other factors. In spite of this, it is possible to analyze the strategies that most countries resort to in their efforts to maintain a unified national identity. Among the latter, according to M. Gibernau, particular attention is drawn to: 1) the purposeful formation of a unified image of a nation, which is built on the cultural background of the dominant ethnic group in the state, which has a common history, culture, territory, etc.; 2) introduction of a number of symbols and rituals aimed at forming a sense of collective unity; 3) civic politics, which defines a set of legal, political and socio-economic rights and responsibilities, which ultimately promotes a sense of loyalty to the state and its political institutions. On the same basis, the state is authorized to conduct a demarcation line between those belonging to the community of citizens and those who are not included in it; 4) the establishment of common enemies, according to M. Gibernau, has repeatedly proved its effectiveness in the process of forming and (or) strengthening the sense of collective unity; 5) the progressive development of the national education system, which remains one of the most effective tools for implementing the above-mentioned values, and thus is extremely important in the process of forming and strengthening the national identity (Gibernau, 2012, p. 38-39).

Given the recently-popularized policy of multiculturalism in the Euro-Atlantic area, some of M. Gibernau's outlined strategies for the formation of national identity can predetermine disagreement and discussion, taking into account the orientation of national and civil policy, characteristic of a number of leading European states, on "constitutional patriotism" (Habermas, 2002, p. 373). Meanwhile, these conclusions will be somewhat premature and in extremely unilateral way will outline the peculiarities of the formation of national identity. In particular, speaking of the strategies of national identification, M. Gibernau quite rightly paid attention to the consolidating role of the "common enemy" image, which is an important factor in forming a sense of solidarity among the members of a particular community, even though there is a significant hyperbolization of this strategy. In our view, at the contemporary level of civilizational development, considering the problem of forming a national identity, one should emphasize the "Other", which, unlike the pre-modern culture, is not always associated with the "Enemy", but, as B. Yack rightly points out, represents some intermediate zone between "We" and the hostile "Others". In fact, the scholar continues to believe that there are a number of people: acquaintances, strangers, neutral, occasional, etc. – to which "We" may not be particularly loyal and patronizing, at the same time without showing any hostility (Yack, 2017, p. 291). It is significant that this intermediate link "Other", creating a contradiction between loyalty and intercession with the members of the group and the sense of justice, makes social friendship and international cooperation possible (Yack, 2017, p. 302-305).

The above remark is quite rational, especially when it comes to Ukrainian socio-cultural realities of the XIX century, that is, the time when the Ukrainian identity began to emerge. In this context, attention is drawn to H. Hrabovych's remark that the thematization of the Ukrainian cultural space took place in parallel with the formation of the Ukrainian literary language, which "not only separates the Ukrainian element (ethnos, folk culture, its spirituality and creativity) from Russian, and not only denies the possibility of a common canon, but also develops a new identity" (Hrabovych, 1997). Meanwhile, according to the Ukrainian research of that period, the indicated separation took place not so much by contrasting the Russian and Polish culture, that is, the establishment of the image of the "Enemy", but by constructing the image of the "Other", which, as G. Hegel rightly noted, opens up the possibility for "I" (as well as for "We") to represent oneself and to be recognized as "I" (or "We") (Hegel, 2000, p. 99). The stated intention was clearly manifested in the work of M. Kostomarov, who in his "Two Russian nationalities" (Kostomarov, 1861) reveals the historical causes of the radical difference between the "South-Russian" and "Great Russian" peoples, highlights their mental characteristics, while not opposing the two peoples. In this work Great Russians (velykorosy) come out as "Others", with us being thematized and represented as "We" through their prism.

Certainly, it can be assumed that the isolating "We" among the "Others" carries in itself the idea of hostility and opposition, however, as the "Books of the Being of the Ukrainian People" testify (Kostomarov, 1847), that time Ukrainian contemporaries consider themselves part of a broad Slavic world. Ukraine, M. Kostomarov remarks, "liked both the Poles and the Muscovites as their brothers and did not want to cease to live as friends with them, it wanted all to live together, united as one Slavic nation with another Slavic nation, and those two – with the third, and there would be three Commonwealth (Rzecz Pospolita) in one unity, indivisible and unmixed in the image of the Trinity of God inseparable and immiscible, as once all Slavic peoples would be united among themselves" (Kostomarov, 1847). Instead, the peoples of the Western European world look the "Enemies" at that time: the Germans, the French, who, through the development of philosophy, "devised a new god for themselves", whose name is "selfishness or interest" (Kostomarov, 1847).

Without going into a thorough analysis of all the contemporary scientific and literary works, we would like to draw attention to the work of T. Shevchenko, who made one of the first attempts to represent Ukrainian identity through opposition to those communities that among his contemporaries were considered "Others" and about which, speaking B. Yack's words, could have a sense of loyalty and intercession. In this context, it is appropriate to mention not only the "Behest" of the Great Kobzar, where he calls to spout the freedom with "the enemy's evil blood", but also "Dream", where the image of the Muscovite, just as everything from Moscow is represented as hostile and destructive:

*"It's hard to me
To sneak above the Neva.
Ukraine is distant,
Maybe it is gone.
I wish I could fly and have a look,
But God does not let me.
Maybe Moscow burned it out
And Dnipro descended
In the blue sea, excavated and destroyed
High Graves – Our glory.
Dear God, have mercy
And pity, dear God".*

The works of T. Shevchenko mentioned by us and many other works have prophesied and made an extraordinary influence on the formation of the Ukrainian identity, which since then has been represented not only by the combination of ethno-cultural characteristics, but also by the opposition to the hostile "Other". The indicated tendency, as E. Durkheim argued in his time, is quite logical, since the creation of internal borders, especially in conditions of organic solidarity, leads to the definition of "external boundaries", which are an integral

part of the integration process (Durkheim, 1990, pp. 142-146). A similar opinion was also expressed by F. Barth, who emphasized the dominant role of ethnic boundaries in the process of formation, or, to be absolutely precise, constructive, collective identity. In particular, the Norwegian scientist is convinced that the ascending point of the formation of collective identity is the ethnic boundaries, which serve as unique markers for distinguishing "We" from "Others", and at the same time constructing the collective identity (Barth, 2006, p. 17). The mental characteristics, features of ritual and customary practices, religiosity, etc., which have become a permanent marker of ethnic boundaries could be this cultural marker, especially in cases of high similarity of cultures.

The rationality of F. Barth's theoretical and methodological remarks about the important role of ethnic boundaries in the process of forming a national identity is clearly demonstrated by the Ukrainian realities of the XIX century, and, first of all, T. Shevchenko's construction of the image of the "Enemy", with whom the political boundaries unite, but the ethnic boundaries separate. In fact, the work of T. Shevchenko for the first time marked the beginning of the conflict, which, taking into account the theoretical and methodological foundations of L. Koser, can be considered a logical result of the emergence of a clear demarcation boundary between "us" and "them". It should be noted that simultaneously with the transformation of "Others" into the "Enemies" the development of strategies aimed at preserving social friendship and loyalty amidst "We" was taking place. In this context, the work of M. Hrushevskiy "Who are Ukrainians and what they want," where, in attempt to avoid a separating strip, he writes, "... a sense of national, territorial solidarity, protection of the interests of the laboring people of the whole of Ukraine must be developed, – and the elements of chauvinism and non-tolerance to a laborer, race or language must be excluded" (Hrushevskiy, 1991, p. 21), and later adds, "... Ukraine, is not only for Ukrainians, but for everybody who lives in Ukraine, while living, loves it, but loving, wants to work for the good of the country and its people, serve it ..." (Hrushevskiy, 1991, p. 106).

Despite the fact that in contemporary intellectual thought there are very controversial assessments of the role of the Soviet regime in the process of formation of Ukrainian identity, in our opinion, one should not forget that the formation of the USSR was based on an ethnic principle, which became not only a guarantee of the establishment of the political borders of Ukraine (Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, 1994, p. 458), but also played an extraordinary role in the process of forming the Ukrainian identity. So, for example, the American scientist R. Brubaker emphasizes that "the Soviet regime, albeit anti-nationalist, and, of course, brutally repressive in all possible relations, was not at all antinational. Far from ruthless suppression of nationality, the regime has taken unprecedented, serious steps towards its institutionalization and codification. It smashed the Soviet territory into more than fifty supposedly autonomous national "homelands", each of them "belonging" to a particular ethnonational group; and it gave each citizen the ethnic "nationality" attributed to him/her at birth on the basis of his/her origin, was registered in personal identification documents" (Brubaker, 2012, p. 109). In general, agreeing with the conclusions of R. Brubaker, we would like to emphasize that the institutionalization of ethnic identity in the USSR was carried out thanks to the thematization of "We" in the general space of "Others", but not hostile. "Others", not "We," but due to the formal preservation of the ethnic principle, they were not seen as a threat to the existence of "We".

Of course, such an assumption is too courageous, and in some cases may even seem premature given that Ukrainian Soviet history was marked by a large number of protests against a totalitarian system that repeatedly neglected the right of Ukrainians to develop their own nationality and culture. Despite this fact, the movement was represented only by the most conscious part of Ukrainian society, which, sharing in general the basic principles of communist ideology, sought their practical implementation. In this context, the work of I. Dziuba "Internationalism or Russification" is indicative (Dziuba, 1998), where a well-known Ukrainian public figure raises the question of the need to change the cultural, educational and labor policy of the Soviet power in order to ensure its effective functioning against the background of the ethnic principle. Probably, the "cold war" provided an essential role in maintaining loyalty to the totalitarian regime. Thanks to it, the Soviet society, as a poly-ethnic integrity, as well as the European society, received a common enemy, the threat of which, as the American scientist J. Haidt rightly observed, contributed to the reorientation of attention from internal problems to external ones (Storozhuk, 2016). Certainly, this situation contributed to the transfer of the line of social split from

ethnic boundaries to political ones; as a result internal ethno-cultural problems were regarded as secondary and insignificant.

The collapse of the USSR and the formation of a number of sovereign states on its background turned the problem of forming the national identity into the sphere of public attention, its formation every time actualizing the image of the "Other" and the image of the "Enemy". In other words, the formation of the national identity among the peoples of the former communist camp was a challenge that had not only internal, but also international resonance. Demarcation between friends and enemies, partners and competitors became a challenge to the whole democratic world. For Ukraine, this situation was greatly exacerbated by the fact that it inherited not only a clearly defined ethnic area, but also a multi-ethnic society and, what is especially important, the Soviet strategies for the formation of collective identity. In this context, in our opinion, the extremely indicative are the remarks by B. Kravchenko that "no radical break with the Soviet past in Ukraine has taken place – on the contrary, we have the very continuity, the lack of which in the national history the Ukrainian intellectuals always complain about ..." (Kravchenko, 2011, p. 455). This, in its turn, meant preserving the ethnic principle, which, under the new political conditions, became the basis for the production of a civil conflict.

Our arguments are totally consonant with O. Hnatyuk's conclusions, who reasonably proves that in the majority of post-communist countries (with the exception of Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary, where the total totalitarianization of social life did not take place), in spite of the present transformations, models of homogeneous identity predominate: a society or state (often a "party of power") exerts pressure towards unanimity ("patriotic considerations", "state interests", "fight against terrorism", "struggle against proselytism"). As a result, individual identity becomes marginalized, giving way to the collective identity. Such a change should be perceived as an alarm signal" (Hnatyuk, 2005, p. 62). In full agreement with the outlined assessment, given that it has already fully revealed its consequences in Ukraine, where political and cultural elites picking up and continuing the strategies for the development of homogeneous identity, inherent in the XIX-XX centuries, contributed to the formation of the image of the enemy "Other" in the Ukrainian society. The formation of the line of split of homogeneous ethnic identity was facilitated by the cultural interaction in the border territories, which is able to erode ethno-cultural borders while simultaneously leveling the cultural differences and identity, and was thoroughly covered by F. Barth (Barth, 2006, p. 18). Particularly problematic is the situation when the society perceives power as something alien, political and cultural elites throw on some of the community their own image of the community and the models of communication with other communities and cultures, which, as O. Hnatyuk rightly observes, may lead to auto-correction of the collective identity, beyond it the desire for sovereignty and dominance gradually appearing (Hnatyuk, 2005, p. 60).

Obviously, all the outlined socio-cultural tendencies are fully manifested in contemporary Ukrainian society, which, as a result, develops a strategy of homogeneous identity, is becoming more and more entrenched in different distinct strips. According to the Polish researcher E. Novitska, this phenomenon is quite logical, since the "times of sudden social transformations and social instability", which in our opinion are an inalienable attribute of Ukrainian reality throughout the period of independence, lead to increased ethnocentrism. Meanwhile, the researcher continues her opinion, it is due to the long "frustration and deceived hopes", "the futility of the aspirations and ambitions of the group", which in unity give rise to "the appearance of magical and superstitious thinking, the search for the gooseberry goats, who very often strangers turn into" (Nowicka, 1990, p. 45).

In conditions of prolonged frustration, as O. Hnatyuk rightly observes, usually not external, but internal enemies become strangers, hostile "Others" – they make it possible to shift responsibility for the current state of affairs from themselves on others. This strategy is particularly effective in cases where the "Others" at least partially censure those values that provide group identity within the national community. At the same time, the researcher continues her thought, the discourse, "focusing on "Others", "Othering", with its inherent rhetoric of seizure or withdrawal, although it has outside supposedly positive effects – contributes to the internal consolidation of the community – yet diverges attention from important internal problems: social, economic, cultural. Therefore, despite the seemingly temporary benefit, such a discourse has a negative effect: it creates the appearance of treatment, and the disease in the meantime develops unhindered" (Hnatyuk, 2005, p. 64).

The rationality of the conclusions drawn is also fully confirmed by L. Koser's conflict theory, who emphasizes the fact that the emergence of a clear separation line in the society will necessitate a conflict. Instead, in the presence of a developed civil society that ensures the segmentation of identity by membership in a multitude of associations and groups: religious, ethical, professional, status, and others – it becomes impossible to single out one main group line of social rupture, and thus to produce a conflict (Koser, 2000, p. 102).

Given the above and subject to the ambiguous Soviet heritage, especially in the language issue, of forming a homogeneous, built on the background of one, even the title ethnic group, identity appears a conflict strategy, with its negative results being manifested both on the internal and on the external level. On the other hand, open societies are not inclined to identify the "Others" with the hostiles, due to the fact that they easily enter into communication and cultural interaction, which promotes the constant formation of meanings and values that, despite the dynamic nature of the national identity, ensure its temporal unity.

Conclusions. Despite the fact that the creation of joint enemies has been remaining for a long time an inseparable element of the strategy for the formation of national identity, it should be regarded as a rudiment of national policy of the modern period, since then homogeneous national identity was the only way to gain political independence of the conscious self-cultural separation of the community. Meanwhile, in today's conditions, the formation of a homogeneous national identity is a conflict strategy that can lead to a social split and fragmentation of state borders, the contemporary socio-political and cultural realities of Ukraine having become their example. In view of this, strategies that are aimed at ensuring a high level of citizens' loyalty to political institutions of the state on the basis of "constitutional", "territorial", "regional" and other patriotism seem more fruitful. Under conditions of implementation of such a strategy and rational cultural policy aimed at developing a system of super-ethnic values that will be shared by the majority of the population of a certain state, it is possible to overcome the world-view split and form the newest Ukrainian national identity.

Література та посилання

- Бергер, П., Лукман, Т. (1995), *Социальное конструирование реальности. Трактат по социологии знания*, Медиум, Москва, 323 с.
- Брубейкер, Р. (2012), *Этничность без групп*. Высшая школа экономики, Москва, 408 с.
- Гегель, Г. В. Ф. (2000), *Феноменология духа*, Наука, Москва, 495 с.
- Гібернау, М. (2012), *Ідентичність націй*, Темпора, Київ, 303 с.
- Гнатюк, О. (2005), *Прощання з імперією: Українські дискусії про ідентичність*, Критика, Київ, 528 с.
- Гравович, Г. (1997), "До історії української літератури. Дослідження, есе, полеміка", *Основи*, Київ, 604 с., Електронний ресурс. Режим доступу (23.01.2020): <http://litopys.org.ua/hrabo/hr06.htm>
- Грицай, Е., Николко, М. (2009), *Украина: национальная идентичность в зеркале Другого*. Европейский гуманитарный университет, Вильнюс, 220 с.
- Грицак, Я. (2011), *Страсті за націоналізмом. Стара історія на новий лад*, Критика, Київ, 176 с.
- Грушевський, М. (1991), *Хто такі українці і чого вони хочуть*, Знання, Київ, 240 с.
- Гелнер, Е. (2003), "Нації та націоналізм; Націоналізм", *Таксон*, Київ, 300 с., Електронний ресурс. Режим доступу (23.01.2020): <http://litopys.org.ua/gellner/gel04.htm>
- Дзюба, І. М. (1998), "Інтернаціоналізм чи русифікація?", *Видавничий дім "KM Academia"*, Київ, 276 с., Електронний ресурс. Режим доступу (23.01.2020): <http://litopys.org.ua/idzuba/dz.htm>
- Дюркгейм, Э. (1990), *О разделении общественного труда. Метод социологии*, Наука, Москва, 575 с.
- Касьянов, Г. (2007), "Украина-1990: "бои за историю"", Електронний ресурс. Режим доступу (23.01.2020): <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2007/83/ka8.html>
- Козер, Л. (2000), *Функции социального конфликта*, Идея-Пресс, Москва, 208 с.
- Костомаров, М. (1847), "Список "Книги буття українського народу", що був вилучений у м. І. Гулака під час обшуку 2 квітня 1847 р.", Електронний ресурс. Режим доступу (23.01.2020): <http://litopys.org.ua/rizne/kmt02.htm>

- Костомаров, Н. (1861), "Две русские народности", *Основа*. СПб., №3, с. 33-80.
- Кравченко, В. (2011), "Поневолення історією: радянська Україна в сучасній історіографії", *Україна, Імперія, Росія. Вибрані статті з модерної історії та історіографії*, Критика, Київ, с. 455-528.
- Кривда, Н. (2017), "Українська ідентичність як світоглядний конструкт", *Науковий вісник НУБіП України. Серія: Гуманітарні студії*, Вип. 274, с. 109-124.
- Лисяк-Рудницький, І. (1994), "Радянська Україна з історичної перспективи", Лисяк-Рудницький І. *Історичні есе: в 2 т. Т. 2*, Основи, Київ, с. 457-469.
- Смит, Э. (2004), *Национализм и модернизм: Критический обзор теорий современных наций и национализма*, Практис, Москва, 464 с.
- Степико, М. (2017), "Сучасне русинство: етнополітичний проект чи криза української національної ідентичності", *Стратегічні пріоритети. Серія: Політика*, № 1, с. 39-46.
- Хабермас, Ю. (2002), "Европейское национальное государство: его достижения и пределы. О прошлом и будущем суверенитета и гражданства", *Нации и национализм*, Практис, Москва, с. 364-380.
- Этнические группы и социальные границы. Социальная организация культурных различий Сборник статей*, под ред. Ф. Барта (2006). Новое издательство, Москва, 200 с.
- Як, Б. (2017), *Национализм и моральная психология сообщества*, Изд-во Института Гайдара, Москва, 520 с.
- Haidt, J. (2015), "The top 10 reasons American politics are so broken", viewed 21 January 2020, available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/01/07/the-top-10-reasons-american-politics-are-worse-than-ever/?utm_term=.1726c3c50170
- Nowicka, E. (1990), "Swojskość i obcość jako kategorie socjologicznej analizy", *Sxvoi i obcy*, E. Nowicka (red.). Instytut Socjologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa, s. 5-53.
- Storozhuk, S. & Goian, I. (2016), "The ethnic hinciple as the basis of civil politics", *Cherkasy University Bulletin: Philosophy*, No.11/13, pp. 31-36.

References

- Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1995), "The Social Construction of Reality. A treatise on the sociology of knowledge" ["Sotsialnoe konstruirovaniye realnosti. Traktat po sotsiologii znaniya"], *Medium*, Moscow, 323 pp. [in Russian]
- Brubaker, R. (2012), *Ethnicity without groups [Etnichnost bez grupp]*, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, 408 p. [in Russian]
- Durkheim, E. (1990), *On the division of social labor. The method of sociology [O razdelenii obschestvennogo truda. Metod sotsiologii]*, Science, Moscow, 575 p. [in Russian]
- Dzyuba, I. M (1998), "Internationalism or Russification?" ["Internatsionalizm chy rusyfikatsiia?"], KM Academia Publishing House, Kyiv, 276 p., viewed 21 January 2020, available at: <http://litopys.org.ua/idzuba/dz.htm> [in Ukrainian]
- Ethnic groups and social boundaries. Social Organization of Cultural Differences Collection of articles [Etnicheskie gruppy i sotsialnyie granitsyi. Sotsialnaya organizatsiya kulturnyih razlichiy Sbornik statey]*, (2006) / Ed. F. Bart, New Publishing House, Moscow, 200 p. [in Russian]
- Gellner, E. (2003), "Nations and Nationalism; Nationalism" ["Natsii ta natsionalizm; Natsionalizm"], Taxon, Kiev, 300 pp., viewed 21 January 2020, available at: <http://litopys.org.ua/gellner/gel04.htm> [in Ukrainian]
- Gibernau, M. (2012), *The Identity of Nations [Identychnist natsij]*, Tempora, Kyiv, 303 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Gritsay, E. & Nikolko, M. (2009), *Ukraine: national identity in the mirror of the Other [Ukraina : natsionalnaya identichnost v zerkale Drugogo]*, European Humanities University, Vilnius, 220 p. [in Russian]
- Habermas, J. (2002), "European National State: its achievements and limits. About the past and future of sovereignty and citizenship" ["Evropeyskoe natsionalnoe gosudarstvo: ego dostizheniya i predelyi. O proshlom i buduschem suvereniteta i grazhdanstva"], *Nations and nationalism*, Praxis, Moscow, pp.

364-380. [in Russian]

- Haidt, J. (2015), "The top 10 reasons American politics are so broken", viewed 21 January 2020, available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/01/07/the-top-10-reasons-american-politics-are-worse-than-ever/?utm_term=.1726c3c50170
- Hegel, G. V. F. (2000), *Phenomenology of the Spirit [Fenomenologiya duha]*, Science, Moscow, 495 p. [in Russian]
- Hnatyuk, O. (2005), *Farewell to Empire: Ukrainian Discussions on Identity [Proshchannia z imperiei: Ukrainski dyskusii pro identychnist]*, Criticism, Kiev, 528 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Hrabovych, G. (1997), "Towards a History of Ukrainian Literature. Research, essay, controversy" ["Do istorii ukrainskoi literatury. Doslidzhennia, ese, polemika"], Fundamentals, Kiev, 604 s., viewed 21 January 2020, available at: <http://litopys.org.ua/hrabo/hr06.htm> [in Ukrainian]
- Hrushevsky, M. (1991), *Who are Ukrainians and what they want [Khto taki ukraintsi i choho vony khochu]*, Knowledge, Kyiv, 240 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Hrytsak, Y. (2011), *Passions for nationalism. An old story in a new way [Strasti za natsionalizmom. Stara istoriia na novyi lad]*, Criticism, Kyiv, 176 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Kasyanov, G. (2007), "Ukraine-1990: "battles for history" ["Ukraina-1990: "boi za istoriyu"]", viewed 21 January 2020, available at: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2007/83/ka8.html> [in Russian]
- Koser, L. (2000), *The functions of social conflict [Funktsii sotsialnogo konflikta]*, Idea Press, Moscow, 208 p. [in Russian]
- Kostomarov, M. (1847), "Books of being of the Ukrainian people" ["Knyhy buttia ukrainskoho narodu"], viewed 21 January 2020, available at: <http://litopys.org.ua/rizne/kmt02.htm> [in Ukrainian]
- Kostomarov, N. (1861), "Two Russian nationalities" ["Dve russkie narodnosti"], *Osnova*, SPb., No. 3, pp. 33-80. [in Russian]
- Kravchenko, V. (2011), "The enslavement of history: Soviet Ukraine in contemporary historiography" ["Ponevolennia istoriei: radianska Ukraina v suchasni istoriografii"], *Ukraine, the Empire, Russia. Selected articles on modern history and historiography*, Criticism, Kiev, pp. 455-528. [in Ukrainian]
- Kryvda, N. (2017), "Ukrainian identity as a worldview construct" ["Ukrainska identychnist yak svitohliadnyi konstrukt"], *Scientific Journal of NULES of Ukraine. Series: Liberal Arts*, Iss. 274, pp. 109-124 [in Ukrainian]
- Lysyak-Rudnitsky, I. (1994), "Soviet Ukraine from a Historical Perspective" ["Radianska Ukraina z istorychnoi perspektyvy"], Lysyak-Rudnitsky I. *Historical Essays: in 2 vols: vol. 2, Osnovy*, Kiev, No. 2, pp. 457-469 [in Ukrainian]
- Nowicka, E. (1990), "Swojskość i obcość jako kategorie socjologicznej analizy", *Sxvoi i obcy*, E. Nowicka (red.). Instytut Socjologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa, s. 5-53.
- Smith, A. (2004), *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Review of the Theories of Modern Nations and Nationalism [Natsionalizm i modernizm: Kriticheskiy obzor teorii sovremennykh natsiy i natsionalizma]*, Praxis, Moscow, 464 p. [in Russian]
- Stepyko, M. (2017), "Contemporary Ruthenia: An Ethnopolitical Project or the Crisis of Ukrainian National Identity" ["Suchasne rusynstvo: etnopolitychnyi proekt chy kryza ukrainskoi natsionalnoi identychnosti"], *Strategic priorities. Series: Politics*, No. 1, pp. 39-46. [in Ukrainian]
- Storozhuk, S. & Goian, I. (2016), "The ethnic principle as the basis of civil politics", *Cherkasy University Bulletin: Philosophy*, No. 11/13, pp. 31-36.
- Yack, B. (2017), *Nationalism and the moral psychology of the community [Natsionalizm i moralnaya psihologiya soobschestvay]*, Publishing House of the Gaidar Institute, Moscow, 520 p.

© **Nataliia Yurevna Kryvda, Sviytlana Volodymyrivna Storozhuk**