

## CHAPTER «HISTORICAL SCIENCES»

### NATIONAL MINORITIES OF UKRAINE IN THE SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE OF UKRAINIAN AND FOREIGN RESEARCHERS OF 1990'S OF 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY – BEGINNING OF 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

Vitalii Kotsur<sup>1</sup>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-588-15-0-97>

**Abstract.** In the proposed historiographical survey, the problems of national minorities of Ukrainian researchers of the 1990s 20 century – beginning of the 21 century are considered through a series of problematic and meaningful blocks, which determined the priorities of research practices at one or another stage of Ukrainian state formation under the influence of internal and external factors. The study revealed that in the existing Ukrainian and foreign scientific discourse, national minorities were thoroughly and multifacetedly revealed as a subject of Ukrainian state formation in the conditions of socio-political transformations, political instability and foreign policy challenges of the 1990s 20<sup>th</sup> century – beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. At the same time, however, the large range of views, opinions, and assessments belonging to representatives of national minorities and ethnic groups is not adequately represented, which actualizes further research practices in the new historical realities. At the present stage of development of Ukraine formed a modern galaxy of scientists with new scientific thinking in the field of study of ethno-national issues, seeking not only to objectively interpret it, but also to resist destructive forces, expansion of ideology of the “Russian world”, responsibly predict the future and practice. It is in the focus on practical results that the possible plane of productive interaction between the historian and the authorities

---

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D. in Political Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Senior Research Scientist of the Department of National Minorities of I.F. Kuras,  
Institute of Political and Ethno-National Research of the  
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine

in the field of ethno-national issues is seen in the context of international, socio-economic and political challenges for Ukraine in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### 1. Introduction

Ukraine is a multi-ethnic state at the intersection of civilizational influences, a clash of political, economic, socio-cultural interests of the democratic and totalitarian states of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Russian aggression against Ukraine has prompted historians to significantly rethink Ukrainian-Russian, first of all, inter-ethnic relations in the territory of our Motherland from the perspective of our own national interests. Domestic, foreign historians have noticed a clear trace of Russian petrodollars and in the European civilization space, namely: Russia's interference in electoral processes abroad, the creation of an anti-Ukrainian “fifth column” there. The bribery and blackmail of Western politicians are one of the instruments of influence on national minorities of Transcarpathia, Southern Ukraine. The Hybrid War has become an integral part of Russian foreign policy, particularly in the area of Ukrainian international relations. National minorities play an important role in the history of independent Ukraine. Ethno-national diversity in Ukraine has to some extent influenced the socio-political, cultural, economic, denominational or ideological processes within the country. Understanding the role of national minorities in all spheres of public and political life of Ukraine, both nationally and regionally, is not only scientifically-cognitive but also safe for a country that defends European values in military confrontation with the Russian Federation, of the civilized world.

**The object of the study** is national minorities as a subject of Ukrainian state-building, a determining factor of socio-cultural progress, socio-political transformations and, at the same time, political instability in the context of the foreign policy challenges of the 1990s 20<sup>th</sup> century – beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**The subject of the study** is the discourse of Ukrainian and foreign scholars on the role of national minorities of Ukraine in the state-making processes of the 1990s 20<sup>th</sup> century – beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**The purpose of the study** is to analyze the scientific discourse on the place and role of national minorities of Ukraine in the socio-political of the 1990s 20<sup>th</sup> century – beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**Achieving this goal** involves solving the following research problems: firstly, to outline the current problems of contemporary domestic and foreign studies in the field of national minorities of the 1990s 20<sup>th</sup> century – beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century; second, to identify the relationship between socio-political-transformations at the turn of the century and the socio-cultural, information and communication state of historical science; third, to analyze the change in the thinking style of scientists and their influence on the development of the historiographic process, the emergence of new scientific institutes, areas of research in the field of international relations.

**A peculiarity of the methodological base** is the combination of general scientific, interdisciplinary, political science, empirical, source and archival methods of scientific search. The study is based on the principles of historicism, authenticity, objectivity, axiology, systematicity, continuity and synergy. The scale and nature in the scientific discourse on the issues of national minorities of Ukraine of the 1990s 20<sup>th</sup> century – beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century were determined using the bibliographic method. This method was useful not only for the compilation of the bibliographic characteristics of scientific works and documents, but also for the structuring, clarification of completeness, controversy of the available scientific knowledge on the outlined problems.

## **2. Features of periodization of scientific discourse**

The whole historiographic array of the problems can be divided into two periods: 1991-2013, when scientists were looking for scientifically sound solutions to the problems in the field of national relations after the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the national factor was used by politicians, as in internal electoral, electoral struggle. as well as for external interference in Ukrainian affairs through the establishment of pro-Kremlin governments, the “cultivation” of pro-Russian regional leaders, parliamentarians, the creation of pro-Russian policies these parties – the “fifth column” of, internal areas of social and political instability. In the context of a multifaceted foreign policy, and later an openly pro-Moscow orientation, crisis phenomena in the field of national relations were resolved by the price of “concessions” and “compromises”, sacrificing national interests step by step, despite the strategic reservations of Ukrainian reserchers, led Ukrainians in the 21<sup>st</sup> century to the civilization choice in revolutionary way.

According to O. Rafalskyi, only during the period 1990-2000, more than two thousand books, brochures, articles were published in Ukraine, and dozens of doctoral and PhD theses were published on the general problems of the theory and practice of ethno-national relations, their legal support, and the lives of individual major ethnic groups (Russians, Poles, Jews, Germans, Greeks, Bulgarians, etc.) [62, p. 356]. During 2000 – 2012, more than 10 monographs and hundreds of articles on topical issues of national minorities of Ukraine and their socio-economic, political, cultural, legal support were published [18]. They, together with other published books, brochures, articles, give a real increase in knowledge of the ethnic history of Ukraine, specific national groups, enrich the historical and ethnological science and at the same time approve new names of scientists who lay the foundation of current historical research, form the historians of history cells throughout Ukraine [62, p. 37].

At the same time, in the context of the globalist challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the Russo-Ukrainian war, in which the aggressor uses a national factor to justify the aggression plans, a broad historical discourse on the identified issues was actualized, which included rethinking key issues of ethno-national and ethnic critique of Ukraine by pro-Russian separatist forces in Crimea and southeastern Ukraine during the period under study, political conjuncture in the ethno-political mosaic of Transcarpathia, tactical and strategic miscalculations in the attitude of the state bodies of Ukraine for decades before the resolution of cultural and territorial problems of the native Crimean-Tatar people.

The second historiographical period started in 2014 and continues in the conditions of the Ukrainian people's war for independence. In Ukrainian historiography there is an intensive process of rethinking the problems of national minorities, overcoming the stereotypes of previous decades, described by Russian propagandists and historians as “common past”, “close intertwining of historical destinies”, from which there is a direct denial of self-identity of the “Russian world”.

In the second historiographical period, the problems of inter-ethnic relations gained new dimensions from the perspective of defending Ukrainian state interests in the conditions of the “hybrid war”. Russian aggression against Ukraine has removed the taboo from exploring a number of issues of international relations that have been deliberately concealed by politicians, avoiding aggravation of relations with Moscow or the European Union.

### **3. National minorities of Ukraine in the discourse of domestic scientists**

For a long time, Ukrainian scholars have been studying the socio-political, legal, socio-cultural components of national minorities, both as a whole and in individual communities. The works of well-known Ukrainian researchers, such as I. Kuras, M. Panchuk, O. Mayborody [45], O. Rafalskyi, Y. Kalakura, V. Kotygorenko, S. Makarchyk, O. Antonyuk, V. Brittan, O. Vysotsky, K. Kolesnikov, G. Lutsyshyn, V. Zagorska-Antoniuk, V. Naulko, R. Korshuk [27], G. Lozko and others are significant achievements in the field of ethno-national relations.

Monograph by I.F. Kuras “Ethno-Politics: History and Modernity. Articles, Speeches, Interviews of the 90s” synthesizes articles, reports and speeches from 1991 on topical issues of ethno-political development and the humanitarian sphere of Ukraine as a whole [36], namely: since the beginning of Ukrainian ethno-politics, its regulatory framework, laid the foundations of a new historiographical generation in the field of ethnopolitics, which today defines the strategies of Ukrainian historical science.

The fundamental research, which is still of considerable historiographic interest, is the monograph “National Minorities of Ukraine in the Twentieth Century: the Political and Legal Aspect” (M. Panchuk, V. Voynalovych, M. Genik, O. Kalakura, V. Kotygorenko, etc.), in 6 chapters, which discuss the issues of national minorities of the independent Ukrainian state, in particular, the formation of the legal status of ethnic minorities, their cultural and social and religious activities, international recognition and ethno-political challenges of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea [52, p. 356]. The monograph “National Minorities of Ukraine in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century: A Historiographical Sketch” by O. Rafalskyi explores the leading tendencies of accumulation of knowledge on the problems of national minorities of Ukraine in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Prominent place in the monograph is the historiographical analysis of the works published after the proclamation of Ukraine's sovereignty and state independence, and the aspects of ethnic relations and legal protection of ethnic groups were highlighted, which were fragmented in the historical and ethnological literature at that time [62, p. 46-47].

Regional peculiarities of ethnopolitical processes in Ukraine are investigated in the book by I.T. Zvarych “Ethnography in Ukraine:

Regional Context”. In particular, the author summarizes the experience of the state ethno-national policy of the modern Ukrainian state in its complex interrelation with regional peculiarities. The author’s vision of the contemporary concept of regionalism, its role and place in the study of interethnic relations is revealed. The researcher focused on the phenomenon of “new regionalism”, which in the conditions of Ukraine is a state with excessive politicization of regional factors, that carried real threats and challenges to its national security [97]. In the collective monograph “Ethnopolitical Processes in Ukraine: Regional Features” by M. Panchuk, V. Yevtukh, V. Voynalovych, V. Kotygorenko, O. Kalakura, N. Kochan, N. Makarenko, T. Gorban, O. Liashenko and L. Kovach, the range of scientific problems regarding ethnopolitical processes in Ukraine and their regional specificity is expanding. In particular, the authors analyze the results of studies of historical conditions, political, economic, social, demographic, cultural, denominational and other aspects of the ethnopolitical regionalization of Ukraine’s public space [13].

In research practices, scientists use modern concepts to define the terms “Ukrainian ethnopolitics”, “inter-civilizational relations”, “ethnopolitical regionalization”, etc., which testified the transition of historians and political scientists to a new model of science and strategy of relations between scientists and authorities.

In a collective study of the staff of the I.F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, edited by Yu.A. Levenets, V.A. Voynalovych, O.P. Dergacheva, G.I. Zelenko, V.O. Kotygorenko, O.M. Mayboroda, M.I. Mykhalchenko, Yu.I. Shapoval and V.O. Perevezii, the influence of Russian and European civilization factors on the ethno-political development of Ukraine in the conditions of globalization is revealed [9].

The publications of domestic scientists on the broad aspect of organizational foundations of ethno-political management in Ukraine are drawn to the attention of all representatives of poly-ethnic Ukrainian society. Within this topic, the functioning of the institutions of ethno-political management in Ukraine [17] and its influence on the political activity of national-cultural societies are considered [5, p. 56-82]. Among a number of works, we highlight V. Kotygorenko’s research “Formation of State Ethnopolitical Management in Ukraine”, where the author points out the need for active involvement of

national minorities in political decision-making, in their own interests [35]. G. Lutsyshyn is of the same opinion in his surveys [43]. In the research of V. Kolisnyk “The correlation of politics and law in the process of formation of modern state ethnopolitics of Ukraine” indicates inconsistency in the implementation of state ethno-national policy and its structural application during the election campaigns in Ukraine [96].

Features of ethno-cultural diversity of modern Ukraine are considered in the article by O. Grytsenko “Imagining the Community: Perspectives on Ukraine’s Ethno-cultural Diversity”, 2008 [54].

An ethno-national component of identity politics is revealed in a monographic study by L. P. Sermon on “Sociocultural Identity: The Traps of Value Distinction”, which explores the place and role of sociocultural identities (ethnic, territorial, professional, gender, religious, etc.), taking into account the dominant values and behavioral stereotypes [50].

V.O. Kotygorenko, V.A. Voynalovych, O.Ya. Kalakura, L.L. Kovach, V.V. Kotzur, N.I. Kochan, O.O. Liashenko, N.Yu. Makarenko, Yu.O. Nikolayets, M.I. Panchuk, O.V. Pozniak, O.O. Rafalskyi and M.Yu. Riabchuk in the monograph “Halychyna in the Ethnopolitical Dimension” in a wide historical range reveal the connection of the political and ethnic in the dynamics of the composition of the population of Ivano-Frankivsk, Lviv and Ternopil regions of sovereign Ukraine, highlight the features of its socio-professional stratification, linguistic, cultural and preferences characteristic features of regional identity, electoral and other social behavior [16].

In the monograph by V.A. Voynalovych, N.I. Kochan “The Religious Factor of Ethnopolitical Processes in Galicia: The Postwar Soviet Age and Modernity.” Are revealed the peculiarities of the interaction of ethno-national, ethno-national and religious factors of politics in Galicia from the Soviet period to the present. The authors note that this period is marked by a wide range of interaction between religion and politics, religious and ethnic [88].

A large group of scientific studies determines the “perspective view” of the peculiarities of the identity of particular ethnic communities. First of all, the works by I.F. Kuras, Ya.O. Kalakur, O.I. Kotliar, V.A. Vasylov, N.P. Shypka [70], V.M. Vasylichuk [84], V.P. Shvarets, O.M. Ivanova, A.V. Skliar, V. O. Kotygorenko, L. L. Kovacs and other researchers.

The subject of analysis of domestic researchers became the international documents in the field of regulation of the rights of national minorities of Ukraine. Thus, V. Borodinov in the article “International experience in protecting the rights of national minorities” emphasized that the Hague and Oslo recommendations of 1996 and 1998 set out the content of the rights of national minorities to education and language, and the accompanying explanatory notes to the recommendations refer to the relevant international norms [6]. At its 95<sup>th</sup> session of the Council of Europe, on 10 November 1994, the Committee of Ministers adopted the Framework Convention, the main purpose of which is to effectively protect the rights of national minorities and the freedoms of persons belonging to minorities. In a historical context, the Framework Convention became the first legally binding multilateral international instrument for the protection of national minorities in all spheres of public life. The source of the convention was the Vienna Declaration of the Heads of State and Government of the member states of the Council of Europe, the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the UN and OSCE documents obliging to protect national minorities [6].

In the national historiography a large array of works is devoted to the analysis of state legislation on the protection of the rights of national minorities [6; 61, p. 67; 62, p. 327-328].

The researchers came to the opinion that providing national and cultural revival of the Ukrainian people, their traditions, national and ethnographic features, functioning of the Ukrainian language as a state language in all spheres of public life and taking care of meeting the national, cultural, spiritual and linguistic needs of Ukrainians living outside the country, the mentioned legal acts of the state guaranteed to all peoples, national groups, citizens living on its territory equal political, economic, social and cultural rights [6, p. 326].

A noticeable historiographic stratum in contemporary sociohumanities is the works devoted to the peculiarities of contractual relations between Ukraine and other states in the protection of the rights of national minorities [6, p. 338].

In his article “Constructing Common Sense: Language and Ethnicity in the Ukrainian Public Discourse”, V. Kulyk analyzed influential presentations of language and ethnicity in Ukrainian political and media discourse.



Exploring the ambiguous legacy left by Soviet discourse and practice, the author showed how the project of a “centrist” post-Soviet regime for the sake of social stability outweighs the “national-democratic” discourse that seeks to radically transform the common sense of Ukrainians in accordance with the norms of the nation-state [86]. V. Kulyk also raises a language problem in the article “Language Policy in the Ukrainian Media: Power, Manufacturers and Consumers” [87].

In the multifaceted historiographic array of works on national relations in Ukraine during the Independence Day, a number of works were devoted to individual national minorities living in the Ukrainian territory. These scientific works reveal the place and role of Poles, Germans, Bulgarians, Jews, Greeks and other national minorities during the formation of the Ukrainian state [62, p. 299]. O.Kalakura, V. Todorov [79, p. 20], A. Vasylova [85, p. 157–162], O. Kotliar [28, p. 29–33], E. Tadeev and A. Buzarov [76], V. Lukash [42, p. 8], V. Shkvarets [69], O. Ivanova [21, p. 301–305], L. Khamula [25, p. 618–622], O. Shcherba [67, p. 138–143], L. Strilchuk [75, p. 96–102], A. Skliar [71, p. 214–220]. In particular, O.Ya. Kalakura [23, p. 508], N.O. Zinevych [95, p. 18], V.O. Kotygorenko [33, p. 222] investigate respectively national minorities of Poles, Gypsy ethnic groups and Crimean Tatar repatriates.

A prominent place in contemporary historiographical discourse is the “Rusyn question”. In “Conclusions of the I.F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Curator on the “Rusyn Question” was expressed the opinion about the uniqueness of the Ruthenian ethnic group, which is actively developing in the process of prolonged national formation. According to the All-Ukrainian Population Census, the number of persons who identified themselves as “Ruthenians” was 32.4 thousand (the results of the survey indicate: – “Who do you consider yourself to be?” (a). Ukrainian, b). Ukrainian-Rusyn, c). Rusyn). These statistics are confirmed by the Transcarpathian authorities [55, p. 134-135]. In particular, they indicate that there were more than 20 public organizations operating in the regions of the Transcarpathian region (the Seymus of the Subcarpathian Rusyns, the People's Council of Rusyns, the Regional Society of the Subcarpathian Rusyns, the Rusyn Scientific and Educational Society, etc.); 27 Sunday Schools where Rusyn language, literature and culture were studied; the Rusyn language was

published in the newspapers “Podkarpatskaia Rus”, “Pidkarpatskyi Rusyn” and the collections “Rusnatskyi Svit”; developed creativity of Ruthenian writers, artists, artists, held exhibitions, scientific and practical round tables, conferences. According to the printed editions in the Rusyn language, Ukraine took the second place in Europe after Slovakia [55, p. 135].

Scientists have come to the opinion that the state should promote the development of the Ruthenian cultural and educational movement, but not turn it into a movement for the preservation of sub-ethnicity, artificial creation of a separate nationality, to which some activists of the so-called “Rusinophilism” sought, which served as the cause of the fervor of separatism [55, p. 136].

Issues of research on the ethnic minority of Roma were updated. According to the researchers, both the “majority” relations with the Roma and the main problems facing this nation in Ukraine need public attention. In 2001, the Roma community numbered about 47,600 people, of whom nearly 14,000 lived in Transcarpathia and 4,000 in Donetsk, Dnipropetrovsk and Odesa regions. However, some scholars, representatives of the Roma community and some officials, believe that in fact Roma are much larger in Ukraine. Thus, according to the calculations of the Institute of Art Studies, Folklore and Ethnology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, the number of Roma ethnic groups in Ukraine reaches about 200,000 people, but Roma often hide their ethnicity [1].

The position of the German national minority is revealed in the scientific intelligence of L.M. Kotsur, which discusses the peculiarities of compact living of the German national minority in Ukraine, its participation in the social and political life of the country of the 1990s, in particular, the presidential and parliamentary elections, in the work of local self-government bodies [32]. And in the article of the researcher “Politicization of the German National Minority of Ukraine in the Conditions of Security Challenges in 1990” the reasons of politicization of the German National Minority in Ukraine are revealed, the specific relationship between representatives of the German National Minority and the higher authorities of Ukraine at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century are revealed [30].

The Russian National Minority is devoted to the publication of I. Stebelskyi, “Ethnic Self-Identification in Ukraine, 1989-2001: Why More Ukrainians and Less Russians?”, where the author emphasizes that

the most ready to move from Russian to Ukrainian identity are members of Russian-Ukrainian families [19]. L.M. Kotsur in the articles “Tactics of strengthening Russian influence on the ethno-national sphere of Ukraine in the second half of 1990s” [31] and “Ethno-political specifics of the Russian Federation on the territory of Ukraine in the 1990s” [29, p. 132-139] proves that at the end of the 21<sup>st</sup> century the Russian national minority of Ukraine was used by the Russian state to put pressure on the adoption of important internal political decisions by the highest authorities of Ukraine. Ethnic Russians, in particular, have been actively used by the Russian Federation during the artificial injection of hysteria around “forced Ukrainization” and crises in the Crimea and the Donbass. And many people’s deputies, Russians by nationality, lobbied the language issue in parliament in order to give the Russian language the status of a second state language.

However, according to Finnish journalist Anna-Lena Lauren, “with their invasion of Ukraine in 2014, Russia achieved the opposite effect, convincing at least Ukrainians that they did not need the “Russian world” [39, p. 118-119].

The Russian-Ukrainian war has drawn a bloody border between the two peoples, has proved that Russia is waging an ethnic war on extermination against Ukraine, organizing on the lands of Ukraine, according to Yu. Shcherbak, clashes of the dictatorial East civilizations with the democratic West, destroying the foundations of the Ukrainian national identity language, culture, historical memory) [66. p. 211].

According to Ye. Marchuk, Russia has long been preparing a political, military, information operation against Ukraine. To this should be added the certification of the population of Crimea, organized by Russia, which is not made impromptu [47, p. 349]. At the same time, Russian annexation of the Crimea drew the attention of world players, who realized that it was a problem not only for Ukraine but for the whole world, because Russia had actually terminated the Budapest Memorandum and put a cross on the problem of nuclear security in the world [47, p. 354].

In an interview, A. Mayboroda reveals the specifics of the situation of the Russian national minority in Ukraine, indicating that these issues remain the least explored [49].

As we can see, the multidimensional study of the Russian national minority in Ukraine in time, taking into account the new challenges of

the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the course of the Russian-Ukrainian war and the Russian Federation's attempts, with the help of Kremlin-funded politicians and public organizations, to destabilize the political situation in our country.

Russian constant interference in Ukrainian internal affairs, the changing socio-political situation in our country, it is necessary to systematically and thoroughly monitor the mood of the Russian community in Ukraine, in particular, with regard to the issue of the war in eastern Ukraine, annexation of Crimea, and European integration. The pro-Ukrainian part of the Russian national minority defends in the war in the east the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Ukrainian state, at the same time there are also elements that support the ideas of the "Russian world" and anti-Ukrainian actions of the eastern neighbor.

Back in 2010, long before the Russian aggression against Ukraine began, Filaret, the Patriarch of Rus-Ukraine, noted that the imperial idea of depriving Ukraine of its statehood and independence was hidden under the auspicious sign of the "Russian world" [66, p. 163].

According to Yu. Shcherbak, the "Russian measure" is based on the missionary ideology of Russian exclusivity ("the great Russian civilization", according to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation Lavrov), aggressive plans for "protection of compatriots" regardless of whether they need and ask. defense – the presence of large reserves of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of "Russian measure" gave birth to an ugly geopolitical chimera – the so-called Novorossiiia [66, p. 164].

Sociological surveys and historical research practices should address these and other questions, predicting likely scenarios for new political and international challenges for Ukraine in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

A separate historiographic group brings together works that reveal the place and role, the ripe problems of the Crimean Tatar society. A number of works – "Problems of integration of Crimean repatriates into Ukrainian society" [58, p. 88], "Ukraine is multiethnic" [81, p. 156], "Elections of 2002 in the context of inter-ethnic relations" [8, p. 54], "Problems of integration of Crimean repatriates in Ukrainian society" [59, p. 530], "Social adaptation of Crimean Tatar repatriates: the context of political relations", "Crimean Tatar repatriates: the problem of social adaptation" by V. Kotygorenko [33], "The problem of integration of the Crimean Tatar people into Ukrainian society" by M. Panchuk, [64, p. 391], became an

important step in scientific understanding of the problems of indigenous people return home in conditions of globalization, strengthening imperial encroachments on Russia's sovereignty, territorial integrity of Ukraine.

Many studies by Ukrainian scholars have indicated external factors, in particular, the influence of the Russian Federation on the politicization of national minorities in Ukraine. Already at the beginning of the new millennium, the separatist nature of autonomous tendencies in the activities of part of national minority organizations actively supported by the Russian side was traced [56, p. 130-138; 53, p. 253-265; 52, p. 284-300], as well as the use of the language issue to destabilize the situation in Ukraine in combination with the requirement to recognize Russians on the same footing as a state-forming, nation-building nation to preserve the common information space of the Russian Federation and Ukraine, Russian education and expand support for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church the church of MP [51, p. 166-174; 7, p. 132-143]. In particular, V. Nagirnyi in the article "Politicization of Russian Ethnicity in Ukraine: An Attempt to Organize" stated that the very proclamation of Russian nationality by the national minority, after the collapse of the USSR, became the objective reason for their politicization, which had a chain reaction to influence on other group minorities (*p. 166*). According to the researcher, significant Russification of both the Ukrainian population and some other groups of national minorities and a purposeful foreign policy of the Russian Federation played an important role in this sense, which provided for the possibility of exploiting the "Russian card" in the political life of Ukraine, in particular, in election campaigns where raised the issue of expanding cooperation with the Russian Federation and changing the status of the Russian language in Ukraine, etc. [51, p. 167].

In this context, the monograph of the collective of the I.F. Kuras IPaENS of NAS of Ukraine – "Transcarpathia in the Ethnopolitical Dimension" (2008). is important. It reveals the content, nature and implications of government policy across different entities regarding the ethnic sphere of the Transcarpathian region. Particular attention is paid to the nature and course of ethnopolitical processes in Transcarpathia in the context of general social changes during the Soviet regime and under conditions of independent Ukraine [80].

Enhances understanding of the regional ethno-national specificity of the monograph "Donbass in Ethnopolitical Dimension", which summarizes

the results of a comprehensive study of the history and modern dynamics of ethnopolitical processes in the territory of the Ukrainian Donbass. The authors revealed the relationship of ethnic and political in the formation of composition, employment and socio-professional stratification, linguistic, cultural and religious orientations, regional identity and features of social behavior of the population of Donbass region of Ukraine, as well as substantiated a set of proposals on the conditions and ways of reintegration population in the public space of Ukraine [11].

In contemporary research practices, the issues of political and legal status of ethnic minorities, their self-governing activity, return of deported Crimean Tatars and other peoples to ethnic territories, inter-ethnic and inter-ethnic relations in the sphere of culture, religion, language, historical heritage, etc. are actively considered [4, p. 1].

The formation and functioning of national-cultural associations of Ukraine was also one of the leading topics of modern scientific discourse, during which new methodological approaches to generalization and systematization of various forms of public activity of ethnic groups and their place in the institutional structure of civil society were proposed [40, p. 51-60].

Contemporary Ukrainian historiography and the problems of ethnic contradictions and conflicts in the country have not passed. Fundamental in this sense is the work of V.O. Kotygorenko “Ethnic Contradictions and Conflicts in Modern Ukraine: A Political Science Concept”. The monograph reveals the nature, content and dynamics of ethno-political conflicts caused by the legacy of the communist system, the specifics of the development of the ethno-demographic and ethno-social structure of Ukrainian society, features of the national economy and politics, culture and social consciousness and psychology, geopolitical and civilizational activism their interests in the process and after Ukraine gained independence [34].

#### **4. Problems of national minorities of Ukraine in the views of foreign scientists**

National minorities of Ukraine during the period under study became the subject of attention, primarily Russian and English historiography.

Thus, a comparative analysis of the parliamentary processes in Ukraine and the Russian Federation with the emphasis on the role of citizens in forming support for leading political parties has taken place in

V. Kuvaldin's study [37, p. 134-138], which pointed to the different features of pathogenesis due to the difference in the geopolitical position of Russia and Ukraine. The paper reveals the position of Russians in Ukraine and their representation in parliament, as well as presents separate assessments of the prospects of creating ethnic parties in Ukraine or those that would support the foreign policy of the Russian Federation. T. Huzenkova's work [15] presents the author's determination of the effectiveness of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine's work in the field of consolidation of the multi-ethnic Ukrainian society, in particular, by means of "shadow" and public policy with coverage of the participation of ethnic groups of certain regions of Ukraine in political activity. M. Sedin's dissertation [65] contains an analysis of the influence of sociocultural environment and ethnicity of Ukrainian citizens on their inclusion in the political process. O. Amiantov carried out a comparative analysis of the legislation of Ukraine and the Russian Federation from the point of view of finding out how the parties that won the parliamentary elections implemented their election programs and whether they succeeded in fulfilling their promises and how it affected electoral preferences [3, p. 15].

Actually, the process of politicization of ethnicity in Ukraine was considered by many Russian researchers as a natural result in a multi-ethnic state with weak central power. However, some researchers have emphasized that the process of forming the territory of Ukraine was accompanied by a "forcible" inclusion of non-Ukrainian population (primarily Russian), who did not consider Ukraine as their Motherland. At the same time, the analysis of the process of politicization of ethnicity was accompanied by the coverage of various points related to the confrontation between the Ukrainian and Russian population, or the emphasis on differences in the worldview, professional and socio-cultural activity of Ukrainians and Russians [72; 68]. Russian scientists have expressed doubts about the preservation of the unification of Ukrainian lands in the conditions of the spread of regionalism and increasing the politicization of ethnicity with "significant differences" in assessing the prospects of foreign policy orientation by representatives of different ethnic groups in Ukraine [78]. On the other hand, researchers from the Moscow State Institute of International Relations back in 2009, based on sociological polls, noted that the experience of the "Orange Revolution" points to the strengths of Ukrainian political identity, which eliminates the real risks of the country's split [63, p. 761].

However, since the second half of the 1990s in Russian historiography the idea that the statehood of Ukraine is a “temporary misunderstanding”, “an inattentive step of such a province of Russia”, characterized by a certain peculiarity of thoughts and views, but always in the line of all-Russian interests despite the rash “manifestations of local nationalism”. The “artificiality of Ukrainian statehood” tried to prove on the facts of politicization of ethnicity in Ukraine, the formation of patterns of political behavior of the Russian, Russian-speaking population, the historical conditionality of political Rusynism, centrifugal processes in Crimea. At the same time, attempts to resolve “contradictory points” between representatives of different ethnic groups in Ukraine are often presented as “forced Ukrainianization” and in some cases as “Russophobia” which “engulfed” Ukraine. And differences in the estimates of the population of different regions of individual historical events and prospects of European integration were highlighted as a “civilizational split” of Ukraine. All this was used as an excuse for ideological campaigns to “protect” the rights of Russians, who seemed unable to fully pursue their linguistic and cultural aspirations outside the Russian Federation, which “justified” the imperial, expansionist ambitions of the top Russian leadership, especially after Putin came to power.

V.G. Alekseev in the article “Ukraine: the battle in the field of education (On the implementation of constitutional guarantees in the field of language).”, analyzing from the standpoint of Russian interests the national policy of Ukraine, notes that the basis of the policy of forming a “new” person in Ukraine with the support of the West there is an eradication of Russian identity and a hostility between the two states, especially among young people, through the education system. He is convinced that “myths instead of history, the transformation of black into white and vice versa, have become characteristic features of the social sciences. “According to the author, a special role in the process of creating a new citizen of Ukraine was given to language policy.” The elimination of Russian-language education has been elevated to virtually the rank of state policy, and this policy is pursued by the executive authorities with gross violations of existing provisions of the Constitution, which guarantee at least some rights in Russian [2].

Russian authors from the department of world political processes and the department of applied analysis of international processes of the



Moscow State Institute of International Relations I.D. Loshkarev and A.O. Sugentsov's article "Radicalization of Russians in Ukraine: From" Casual "Diaspora to Insurgent Movement" justifies the radicalization of the national Russian minority in Ukraine after the Revolution of Dignity 2013-2014. They note that "after the Euromaidan, political institutional design was unfavorable for the Russian diaspora in the East. and southern regions. This prevented the stable development of post-Soviet identity of Russians in the country. But during the Euromaidan protests, the Russians responded to the unpleasant political situation by examining who they were and what social and political goals they had... The violent actions of the newly-formed authorities in Kyiv, according to the authors of the late Putinism era, radicalized the Russian diaspora. Diasporas began to create alternative authorities in regions where the government had no monopoly on the use of force. The involvement of Russia and international volunteers complicates the situation in the Donbas and the process of political formation of unrecognized republics, also known as the DPR and LNR" [20]. At the same time, the authors deliberately omit the real role of the Russian Federation in fomenting separatism in eastern Ukraine, spreading the ideas of the "Russian world", seizing the territory of a neighboring state in violation of the fundamental principles of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum

The study of the participation of representatives of national minorities of Ukraine in ethno-political processes by European and American researchers was carried out not only in the context of evaluations of the process of democratization in Ukraine, but also in view of the realities of geopolitics, based on the need to determine the prospects of primarily Russian influence in the Ukrainian territories, and to preserve the integrity of the Ukrainian economy in the world market.

Yes, the contemporary relations between the peoples of Ukraine have been explored by Valentin Sazhin [83], and Tamara J. Rossler from the University of Wyoming examines the problem of the dilemma of democratization and protection of minorities in Russia, Ukraine and Lithuania [77].

At the same time, the peculiarities of conducting election campaigns in Ukraine under the conditions of increasing politicization of ethnicity and influence of this factor on the prospects of preserving the territorial integrity of Ukraine were studied. In the field of view, the ability of the Ukrainian politicum, taking into account the interests of different parts of

the multi-ethnic society, to avoid interethnic conflicts on the territory of the state was in the view of the researchers. In the same context, the issue of “civilizational split” in the territory of Ukraine was discussed, but it was completely detached from the Ukrainian realities.

The research of V. Reisinger, A. Miller, V. Lesley and K. Hill reflects the peculiarities of the parliamentary elections in Ukraine as a whole and the electorate of different regions, in particular, analyzes the political activity of representatives of national minorities in political races [89]. The influence of the politicization of ethnicity on the course of democratization of Ukrainian society and the manifestation of authoritarian tendencies were investigated by a team of scientists involved in the work by Cambridge University [10]. In this context, foreign researchers have paid attention to the process of interaction or lack of political decision-making between civil society organizations, in particular, national minorities and state structures [57; 94; 92]. Researchers have followed the tendency of gradual integration of the Ukrainian society into the pan-European political and cultural space [93, p. 284]. Prominent in the writings of foreign researchers is the problem of participation of representatives of national minorities in the movement for the restoration of the Ukrainian state and the role of the population of different regions in this process [24; 38; 60; 48; 82; 44].

In the context of the characteristics of ethno-political processes and their impact on the restoration of the Ukrainian state, we distinguish the study of the British scientist E. Wilson [90; 91]. At one time, critical of the work of this author, "Ukrainian nationalism in the 1990s: A minority faith" wrote M. Ryabchuk: “Deconstructing nationalist myths, Andrew Wilson seamlessly creates myths new, professionally wrapped in liberal phraseology and respectful academic objectivity. Some of the observations and conclusions of the English scientist are already very similar to the narrow-party, tendency-propaganda concepts of a certain environment of Russian-speaking conservatives in Ukraine, who rather call themselves “liberals” because of misunderstanding than objective nature. While building his content, E. Wilson often focuses exclusively on the Russian-Ukrainian confrontation and, accordingly, reducing to it the problem of Russification of the East Ukrainian population, avoiding conversations about the socio-political activity of representatives of numerous ethnic groups in the territory, thereby automatically delimiting their borders.

Russian-Ukrainian confrontation. At the same time, according to modern Ukrainian researchers, the economic levers of influence over much of the eastern Ukrainian territories were in the hands of Tatars, Jews, and Greeks during the 1990s” [11, p. 221-260]. Therefore, it can be argued that the problems of nationalism, which are addressed by E. Wilson and the main factors affecting the collective orientations of societies of the post-colonial space, which are territorially located not only on the state border, but also on the geopolitical, are much more complex and contradictory.

Some aspects of Russian resistance to linguistic Ukrainianization in Central and Eastern Ukraine were explored by Anna Fournier [14]. For his part, Lowell Barrington in his article “Russian-Speakers in Ukraine and Kazakhstan: Nationality,” “Population,” or Neither?” Emphasizes that the status of “Russian-speaking” in Ukraine is a more important pro-Russian identifier than nationality or actually of this ethnic group [41]. At the same time, Stephen Seigel from the Department of History at Northern Colorado University analyzed the impact of geographical location, identity and citizenship on the mentality of the conflicting Russian-Ukrainian border territories [74]. Eliza Giuliano from the Harriman Institute at Columbia University (New York, USA). In the article “Who Supported Separatism in the Donbass? Ethnicity and Popular Opinion at the Beginning of the Ukrainian Crisis” “emphasizes that their working group monitored public opinion in Donbass before the armed conflict began to determine whether a high concentration of ethnic Russians focused on separatism was maintained. A sociological survey showed that ethnic Russian respondents supported separatist sentiment more than ethnic Ukrainians and hybrid identities. At the same time, an analysis of the original database of the statements of the residents of Donbass indicates that they were motivated to support separatism by local interests, contrary to Kyiv, rather than Russian or pro-Russian foreign policy issues [12].

The article “Ethnic Conflict and Conflict Resolution in Ukraine” by Hans van Zon, 2001). states that the history of independent Ukraine is characterized by relative peace in ethnic terms, although about one quarter of the population is ethnic minorities and less than half have a state language as their first language.

The contours of civic and ethnic national identification in Ukraine are reflected in the exploration by Southern Illinois University researcher

Stephen Shulman [73]. He substantiated competing identities and loyalty to Russians in Ukraine.

Problems of international legal protection of national minorities were traced by Western European scholars: G. Alfredsson, A. Balogh, B. Vukas, G. Gilbert, E.-I. Daes, V. Van Dyke, A. Eide, F. Ermakora, F. Capotorti, V. Kimlicka, G. Lauterpacht, N. Lerner, K. Mintti, T. Musgrave, M. Novak, J. Packer, G. Pentassulla, A. Ross, A. Spilopulu-Ackmark, K. Tomushat, P. Thornberpy, D. Turk, R. Hoffmann [28, p. 29-33]. M. Steven (Ethnicity, Nationalism and Minority Rights), A. Spielopoule (Ensuring the Rights of National Minorities in International Law), M. Rien (Impact of the Mechanisms for Ensuring the Rights of National Minorities). A. Tarr, R. Williams, J. Mark (Federalism, sub-national constitutions and rights of national minorities). and other foreign researchers. At the same time, it seems that the aforementioned studies mostly concerned the issues of theoretical and methodological approach and international legal principles for the protection of the rights of national minorities [46, p. 383].

The programs of cooperation of ethno-historians of Ukraine with their counterparts from Greece, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Israel have intensified [62, p. 37].

### 5. Conclusions

Thus, research practices are carried out mainly in the spiritual and intellectual content of the new era, which changed the thinking style of scientists, methodological guidelines and concepts of modern history of Ukraine. The beginning of rethinking and exploring the outlined scientific issues coincides with the transformation of the Ukrainian historiographical discourse from a secondary marginal structure of the Soviet era into a national historical science with its institutions, personnel, influences of European socio-humanitarian studies.

In the scientific works of M. Panchuk, V. Kategorynka, O. Mayboroda, O. Kalakura, M. Karmazina, T. Bevz and others, not only the cognitive and practical orientation is traced, but also the expert evaluation aimed at solving the socio-political and socio-cultural problems of the 21<sup>st</sup> century in the sphere of inter-ethnic relations that have matured in the Ukrainian society.

At the present stage of scientific research on the issues of national minorities in Ukraine, especially in the conditions of aggression of the

Russian Federation, hybrid war, historical science is finally getting rid of rosentrichesky prejudices, distorted historical facts, hyperbolized pro-Russian chauvinistic versions of the past and present Ukrainian.

“At the same time, the position of the majority of Russian historians, who undertook to justify the annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea with historical facts and supported the Kremlin separatist-terrorist forces in the Donbass, adds to the relevance of the problem [22, p. 57].

In the current historical realities of the new stage of the struggle for the establishment of the Ukrainian state, a new “historiographic generation” with its own “ideological-value and socio-genetic dimensions” [26, p. 33] is formed, and at the same time a characteristic feature of the modern model of relations between “historians and authorities in Ukraine” is the direct participation of scientists in Ukraine. national identity through historiographic modules of national history [26, p. 53].

In today’s context, when the Ukrainian elite is “interested in creating a respectable national narrative” [26, p. 53], the problem of ethnopolitical processes in Ukraine of the 1990s – 2000s remains relevant and far from being exhausted in terms of the new influences of the globalized world, the “hybrid war”, so and the continued replacement of the “Party culture” (by I. Kolesnyk). with a new culture of thinking.

Topical issues of current research practices in the field of national relations include the “historical burden” of the unresolved issues of the Crimean Tatar people and the occupation of Russia by the peninsula; the Russian national minority in Ukraine in the context of the “hybrid war”, the seizure of Crimea and parts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions; the Russian trace in the “Hungarian question” in Transcarpathia in the conditions of electoral and financial and energy dependencies of the ruling elites of Hungary from Russia; national minorities and subversive activities of Russian special services in the south of Ukraine; state language issues, educational reform and implementation of social, political and socio-cultural needs of national minorities; Involvement of national minorities in active state-making on the basis of European values of democracy, the rule of law.

### References:

1. «Forum natsiy». Navishcho «byty» etnichnu kartu? Poky kandydaty v prezydenty ne bachat' problem u mizhnatsional'niy sferi, pryvody dlya shtuchnykh spekulyatsiy znakhodyat' polittekhnolohy (2004). [“Forum of Nations”. Why “beating”

an ethnic card? Until presidential candidates see problems in the international sphere, political technocrats find the cause for artificial speculation]. Zhovten' [October]. № 10(29). Retrieved from: <http://www.forumn.kiev.ua/Forum34.htm>

2. Alekseev V. (2000). Ukraine: The Battle in the Field of Education (On the Realization of Constitutional Guarantees in the Sphere of Language). *Journal Russian Education & Society*, Volume 42. Issue 10. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.2753/RES1060-9393421069> (accessed 23.07.2018).

3. Amiantov A. (2008). Aktual'nye problemy stanovleniya i razvitiya parlamentarizma v SNG: sravnitel'nyy analiz na primere Rossii i Ukrainy: diss. kand. polit. Nauk. [Actual problems of the formation and development of parliamentarism in the CIS: a comparative analysis on the example of Russia and Ukraine]. (PhD Thesis) watered Sciences. M., p. 15.

4. Arsenian M. (2011). Virmenska spadshchyna Kili [The Armenian Heritage of Kyilia]. *Virmenskyi visnyk*. [Armenian Bulletin]. Informatsionno-analiticheskoe izdanie obshchestvennoy organizatsii «Soyuz Arman Ukrainy» [Information and analytical publication of the public organization “Union of Armenians of Ukraine”]. Sichen'. Berezen' [January. March]. № 1-3(51). 32 p.

5. Baranovska N.V. (2012). Natsionalno-kulturni tovarystva u zhyttievomu prostori derzhavy. [National-cultural societies in the living space of the state]. *Zhyttievyi prostir Ukrainy: politychnyi ta humanitarnyi vymiry (1991-2010 rr.): zbirnyk naukovykh statei* [Living space of Ukraine: political and humanitarian dimensions (1991-2010): collection of scientific articles]. Kyiv, 260 p.

6. Borodinov V. Mizhnarodnyi dosvid zakhystu prav natsionalnykh menshyn. [International experience in protecting the rights of national minorities]. Retrieved from: [www.viche.info/journal/2705/](http://www.viche.info/journal/2705/)

7. Burdiak V. (2008). Rozvytok derzhavnoi etnonatsionalnoi polityky v suchasni Ukraini [Development of state ethno-national policy in modern Ukraine]. *Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy* [Scientific Notes by I.F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethno-National Studies, NAS of Ukraine]. Kyiv. No. 40. 392 p.

8. Konhres natsionalnykh hromad Ukrainy. Vybory 2002 u konteksti mizhnatsionalnykh vidnosyn (2002). [Congress of National Communities of Ukraine. Election 2002 in the context of international relations]. *Materialy monitorynhu* [Monitoring materials]. Kyiv. No.1. 54 p.

9. Suchasna ukrainska polityka (2009). [Contemporary Ukrainian politics]. *Analitychni dopovidi Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy* [Analytical Reports of the F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethno-National Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. Kyiv: IPIEND im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy [I.F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethno-National Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. 448 p.

10. Eds. K. Dawisha, B. Parrott (1997). *Democratic changes and authoritarian reactions in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova Cambridge*: UP. XVIII. 386 p.

11. Donbas v etnopolitychnomu vymiri. (2014). *Donbas in the Ethnopolitical Dimension*. Kyiv: IPIEND imeni I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy [I.F. Kuras IPAENS, NAS of Ukraine]. 584 p.

12. Elise Giuliano (2018). Who supported separatism in Donbas? Ethnicity and popular opinion at the start of the Ukraine crisis. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, Volume 34. Issue 2-3. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1060586X.2018.1447769> (accessed 20.07.2018).

13. Etnopolitychni protsesy v Ukraini: rehionalni osoblyvosti (2011). [Ethnopolitical Processes in Ukraine: Regional Features]. [Monograph]. Kyiv: Instytut politychnykh ta etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy [I.F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethno-National Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. 396 p.

14. Fournier A. (2002). Mapping Identities: Russian Resistance to Linguistic Ukrainisation in Central and Eastern Ukraine. *Europe-Asia Studies*, Volume 54. Issue 3. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09668130220129542?src=recsys> (accessed 17.07.2018).

15. Guzenkova T. (2002). Verkhovna Rada in 1991–2001 (The historical formation of the newest Ukrainian parliamentarism). (PhD Thesis) East. Sciences. M., 409 p.

16. Halychyna v etnopolitychnomu vymiri (2017). [Halychyna in ethnopolitical dimension], ed. CL: V. Kotygorenko (Head), V. Voynalovych, O. Kalakura, L. Kovach, V. Kotsur, N. Kochan, O. Liashenko, N. Makarenko, Yu. Nikolayets, M. Panchuk, O. Pozniak, O. Rafalskyi, M. Riabchuk. Kyiv: IPaENS, 840 p.

17. Havrada N. Instytutsiina skladova realizatsii derzhavnoi etnopolityky: tsentralnyi ta rehionalnyi vymiry. [Institutional component of state ethnopolitics realization: central and regional dimensions]. Retrieved from: <http://buktolerance.com.ua/?p=2187> (accessed 11.11.2014).

18. Instytut politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy [I.F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. Biblioteka [Library]. Retrieved from: [www.IPaENS.gov.ua/?mid=30](http://www.IPaENS.gov.ua/?mid=30) (accessed 17.07.2018).

19. Ihor Stebelsky (2009). Ethnic Self-Identification in Ukraine, 1989–2001: Why More Ukrainians and Fewer Russians?. *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, Volume 51. Issue 1. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00085006.2009.11092603> (accessed 17.07.2018).

20. Ivan D. Loshkariov, Andrey A. Sushentsov (2016). Radicalization of Russians in Ukraine: from ‘accidental’ diaspora to rebel movement. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*. Volume 16. Issue 1. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14683857.2016.1149349> (accessed 20.07.2018).

21. Ivanova O. (2010). Movno-osvitni problemy rosiiskoi menshyny v Ukraini ta ukrainskoi menshyny v Rosiiskii Federatsii (90-ti roky XX stolittia). [Language and educational problems of the Russian minority in Ukraine and the Ukrainian minority in the Russian Federation (90-ies of the XX century)]. *Nauk. pratsi ist. f-tu Zaporizkoho natsionalnoho universytetu [Science works of the historical faculty of Zaporizhia National University]*. No. XXVIII. P. 301–305.

22. Kalakura O. (2016). «Syndrom komunikatsii» istorykiv i yoho zhyvuchist u postradianskii ukrainskii istoriohrafii [“Syndrome of communication” of historians

and its survivability in post-Soviet Ukrainian historiography]. *Istoryk i vlada. Kolektyvna monohrafiia. Vidpovid. Red. V. Smolii, tvorchyi kerivnyk proektu I. Kolesnyk* [Historian and authorities. Collective monograph. Edited by V. Smolii, creative director of the project I. Kolesnyk]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii NAN Ukrainy [Institute of History of NAS of Ukraine]. P. 57.

23. Kalakura O. (2007). *Poliaky v etnopolitychnykh protsesakh na zemliakh Ukrainy u XX stolitti* [Poles in Ethnopolitical Processes on the Lands of Ukraine in the 20th Century]. Kyiv: Znannia Ukrainy, 508 p.

24. Kamynskyi A. (1990). Na perekhidnomu etapi. «Hlasnist», «perebudova» i «demokratyzatsiia» na Ukraini [At a transitional stage. “Glasnist”, “perestroika” and “democratization” in Ukraine]. *Miunkhen* [Munich]. 623 p.

25. Khamula L. (2008). *Khamula L. Stereotypy polsko-ukrainskykh vidnosyn u polskii presi 90-kh rr. XX st. – pochatku XXI st.* [Stereotypes of Polish-Ukrainian relations in the Polish press of the 1990s – beginning of the 21st century]. *Ukraina kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist.* [Ukraine cultural heritage, national consciousness, statehood]. No. 17. Pp. 618-622.

26. Kolesnyk I. *Ukrainskyi istoryk ta Vlada: tochka nepovernennia.* [Ukrainian historian and Power: point of no return]. *Istoryk i vlada* [Historian and authorities]. P. 33.

27. Korshuk R. *Modeli etnopolityky.* [Models of Ethnopolitics]. Retrieved from: [http://archive.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc\\_Gum/Gileya/2010\\_40/Gileya40/P12\\_doc.pdf](http://archive.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/Gileya/2010_40/Gileya40/P12_doc.pdf)

28. Kotliar O. (2012). *Pravove vrehuliuvannia zakhystu prav natsionalnykh menshyn Nimechchyny* [Legal regulation of the protection of the rights of national minorities in Germany]. *Zhurn. Nauka i praktyka* [Journal. Science and practice]. No. 2(37). P. 29–33.

29. Kotsur L. (2015). *Etnopolitychna spetsyfika diialnosti Rosiiskoi Federatsii na terenakh Ukrainy u 1990-kh rr.* [Ethnopolitical specifics of the Russian Federation on the territory of Ukraine in the 1990s.]. *Naukovi zapysky z ukrainiskoi istorii : zb. naukovykh statei* [Scientific notes on Ukrainian history: collection. scientific articles]. № 36. *Pereiaslav-Khmelnyskyi: Lukashevych O.M.* [Pereiaslav-Khmelnyskyi: Lukashevych O.M.]. P. 132–139. Retrieved from: [https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?user=XzTrv0YAAAAJ&hl=ru#d=gs\\_md\\_cita-d&p=&u=%2F citations%3Fview\\_op%3Dview\\_citation%26hl%3Dru%26user%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%26citation\\_for\\_view%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%3AW7OEmFMy1HYC%26tzom%3D-180](https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?user=XzTrv0YAAAAJ&hl=ru#d=gs_md_cita-d&p=&u=%2F citations%3Fview_op%3Dview_citation%26hl%3Dru%26user%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%26citation_for_view%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%3AW7OEmFMy1HYC%26tzom%3D-180) (accessed 26.07.2018).

30. Kotsur L. (2017). *Polityzatsiia nimetskoj natsionalnoi menshyny Ukrainy v umovakh bezpekovykh vyklykiv u 1990 rokakh.* [Politicization of the German National Minority of Ukraine in the Conditions of Security Challenges in 1990]. *Naukovi zhurnal «Molodyi vchenyi»* [Molodyi Vchenyi]. No. 9(49.1). Kherson. P. 87–92. Retrieved from: [https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?user=XzTrv0YAAAAJ&hl=ru#d=gs\\_md\\_cita-d&p=&u=%2F citations%3Fview\\_op%3Dview\\_citation%26hl%3Dru%26user%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%26citation\\_for\\_view%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%3A9ZIFYXVOiuMC%26tzom%3D-180](https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?user=XzTrv0YAAAAJ&hl=ru#d=gs_md_cita-d&p=&u=%2F citations%3Fview_op%3Dview_citation%26hl%3Dru%26user%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%26citation_for_view%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%3A9ZIFYXVOiuMC%26tzom%3D-180) (accessed 26.07.2018).

31. Kotsur L. (2017). *Taktyka posylennia rosiiskoho vplyvu na etnonatsionalnu sferu Ukrainy u druhii pol. 1990-kh rr.* [Tactics of strengthening Russian influence



on the ethno-national sphere of Ukraine in the second gender. 1990s.]. *Naukovi zapysky z ukrainskoi istorii: zb. nauk. statei* [Scientific Notes on Ukrainian History: Coll. of science articles]. № 42. Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskyi (Kyiv. obl.) : Dombrovska Ya.M. [Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskyi (Kyiv region): Dombrovska Ya.M.]. P. 144. Retrieved from: [https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?user=XzTrv0YAAA&hl=ru#d=gs\\_md\\_cita-d&p=&u=%2Fcitations%3Fview\\_op%3Dview\\_citation%26hl%3Dru%26user%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%26citation\\_for\\_view%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%3AmVmsd5A6BfQC%26tzm%3D-180](https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?user=XzTrv0YAAA&hl=ru#d=gs_md_cita-d&p=&u=%2Fcitations%3Fview_op%3Dview_citation%26hl%3Dru%26user%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%26citation_for_view%3DXzTrv0YAAAAJ%3AmVmsd5A6BfQC%26tzm%3D-180) (accessed 26.07.2018).

32. Kotsur L. (2015). Natsionalni menshyny Ukrainy v etnopolitychnykh protsesakh naprykintsi 1980-kh – u 1990-kh rr. [National minorities of Ukraine in ethnopolitical processes in the late 1980s – in the 1990s.]. *Avtoreferat ... istorichnykh nauk* [dissertation author's ... historical sciences degree]. Ministerstvo osvity i nauky Ukrainy [Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine]. Derzhavnyi vyshchyi navchalnyi zaklad "Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskyi derzhavnyi pedahohichnyi universytet imeni H. Skovorody [State Higher Educational Institution "Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskyi State Pedagogical University named after H. Skovoroda"]. P. 26 Retrieved from: [http://176.105.99.186:8081/xmlui/bitstream/handle/8989898989/1336/%D0%9A%D0%BE%D1%86%D1%83%D1%80%20%D0%9B.%20%D0%9C.\(211%D0%94%D0%B8%D1%81\).pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](http://176.105.99.186:8081/xmlui/bitstream/handle/8989898989/1336/%D0%9A%D0%BE%D1%86%D1%83%D1%80%20%D0%9B.%20%D0%9C.(211%D0%94%D0%B8%D1%81).pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) (accessed 26.07.2018).

33. Kotygorenko V. (2005). Krymskotatarski repatrianty: problema sotsialnoi adaptatsii [Crimean Tatar repatriates: the problem of social adaptation]. Kyiv: Svitohliad, 222 p.

34. Kotygorenko V. (2004). Etnichni protyrichchia i konflikty v suchasni Ukraini: politolohichniy kontsept [Ethnic Contradictions and Conflicts in Modern Ukraine: A Political Science Concept]. Kyiv: Svitohliad, 722 p.

35. Kotygorenko V. Stanovlennia derzhavnoho etnopolitychnoho menedzhmentu v Ukraini. [Formation of State Ethnopolitical Management in Ukraine]. Retrieved from: <http://www.politik.org.ua/vid/magcontent.php3?m=1&n=34&c=600> (accessed 11.11.2014).

36. Kuras I.F. (1999). Etnopolityka: Istoriia ta suchasnist. Statti, vystupy, intervju 90-kh rokiv [Ethnopolitics: History and Modernity. 90s articles, speeches, interviews]. Kyiv: IPiEND [IPAENS], 656 p.

37. Kuvaldin V. (1998). Prezidentskaya i parlamentskaya respublika kak forma demokraticeskogo tranzita (rossiyskiy i ukrainskiy opyt v mirovom kontekste). [Presidential and parliamentary republic as a form of democratic transit (Russian and Ukrainian experience in a global context)]. *Polis [Policy]*. No. 5. P. 134–138.

38. Kvitkovsky D. (1993). Borotba za ukrainsku ideiu : zb. publitsyst. Tvoriv. [The struggle for the Ukrainian idea: coll. publicist. Works]. Uporiad. i red. V. Veryha [Order. and ed. B. Chain]. Detroit – New York – Toronto. 604 p.

39. Lauren Anna-Lena, Ludenius Peter (2016). Ukraina na mezhi [Ukraine on the border]. Lviv: LA «Piramida» [LA "Pyramid"]. P. 118–119.

40. Loiko L. (2005). Typolohichne pozytsiuvannia natsionalnykh orhanizatsii v instytsionalnii strukturi hromadianskoho suspilstva [Typological Positioning of National Organizations in the Institutional Structure of Civil Society]. *Politychnyi menedzhment [Political Management]*. № 5. P. 51–60.

41. Lowell Barrington (2001). Russian-Speakers in Ukraine and Kazakhstan: «Nationality», «Population» or Neither? Post-Soviet Affairs. Volume 17. Issue 2. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1060586X.2001.10641498> (accessed 19.07.2018).
42. Lukash V. Realii ta perspektyvy politychnoi ta ekonomichnoi stabilizatsii v Krymu [Realities and prospects of political and economic stabilization in Crimea]. Retrieved from: [http://archive.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc\\_Gum/Gileya/2012\\_63/Gileya63/P22\\_doc.pdf](http://archive.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/Gileya/2012_63/Gileya63/P22_doc.pdf) – 8 c. (accessed 19.07.2018).
43. Lutsyshyn H. Natsionalni menshyny ta politychnyi protses v Ukraini. [National minorities and the political process in Ukraine]. Retrieved from: <http://www.westukr.itgo.com/Lucyshyn.html> (accessed 31.05.2014).
44. Magocsi P. (1996). History of Ukraine. – Seattle: University of Washington Press. 784 p.
45. Maiboroda O. (2006). Khoch i pro holovne, ale pisnia stara [Although the main thing is, but the song is old]. Konhres natsionalnykh hromad Ukrainy [Congress of National Communities of Ukraine]. Forum natsii [Forum of Nations]. Retrieved from: <http://www.forumn.kiev.ua/Forum34.htm> (accessed 19.07.2018).
46. Maliuska A. Vplyv natsionalnykh menshyn pokhodzhenniam z prykordonykh z Ukrainoiu derzhav na formuvannia vnutrishnoi i zovnishnoi polityky Ukrainy [The Influence of National Minorities Originating from the Borders with Ukraine on the Formation of the Internal and Foreign Policy of Ukraine]. Naukovi Zapysky IPiEND im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy [Scientific Notes by IPAENS IF Kurasa, NAS of Ukraine]. Issue 49. P. 380–396.
47. Marchuk Ye. (2016). Na shliakhu do NATO [On the way to NATO]. Kyiv – Paris – Dakar. P. 354.
48. Motyl A. (1990). Sovietology, rationality, nationality: coming to grips with nationalism in the USSA. New-York. 343 p.
49. Zahadky ukrainskykh rosiian: naibilsha natsionalna menshyna naimenshe doslidzhena [Mysteries of Ukrainian Russians: the largest national minority least explored]. Hromadske radio, 05.11.2014 [Public radio, 11/05/2014]. Retrieved from: <https://hromadskeradio.org/ru/programs/hromadyany-ukrayiny/zagadky-ukrayinskyh-rosiyan-naybilsha-nacionalna-menshyna-naymenshe-doslidzhena> (accessed 26.07.2018).
50. Nagorna L. (2011). Sotsiokulturna identychnist: pastky tsinnisnykh rozmezhuvan [Sociocultural identity: traps of value distinction]. Kyiv: IPiEND im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy [I.F. Kurasa IPaENS of the NAS of Ukraine]. 272 p.
51. Nahirnyi V. (2000). Polityzatsiia rosiiskoi etnichnosti v Ukraini: sprobha orhanizatsiinoho oformlennia [Politicization of Russian Ethnicity in Ukraine: An Attempt at Organizational Design]. Naukovi zapysky. Zbirnyk, seriia «Politolohiia i etnolohiia» [Scientific Notes. Collection, series “Political Science and Ethnology”]. No. 14. Kyiv: IPAENS, 246 p.
52. Panchuk M., Voynalovych V., Genyk M., Kalakura O., Kotygorenko V. (2000). Natsionalni menshyny Ukrainy u XX stolitti: polityko-pravovyi aspekt. [National minorities of Ukraine in the twentieth century: the political and legal aspect]. Kyiv: IPEIND [IPAENS], 356 c.

53. O. Liashenko. Do pytannia pro perspektyvy administratyvno-terytorialnoi reformy v Ukraini: dosvid avtonomizatsii Krymu ta Zakarpattia [On the prospect of administrative-territorial reform in Ukraine: experience of autonomy of Crimea and Transcarpathia (2006). Scientific notes. Collection]. Kyiv: Naukovi zapysky. Zbirnyk Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy [I.F. Kuras Institute of Political and Ethno-National Studies, NAS of Ukraine]. Seria «Politolohiia i etnologiiia» [Political Science and Ethnology Series]. No. 29. 409 p.

54. Oleksandr Hrytsenko (2008). Imagining the Community: Perspectives on Ukraine's Ethnocultural Diversity. Nationalities Papers. Volume 36. Issue 2. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00905990801934280> (accessed 19.07.2018).

55. Vysnovok Instytutu politychnykh i etnontsionalnykh doslidzhenim. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy shchodo «Rusynskoho pytannia» (2008). [Opinion of the I.F. Kuras Institute for Political and Ethnic Studies of the NAS of Ukraine on the Rusyn Question]. Visnyk derzhkomnatsrelii Ukrainy [Bulletin of the State Committee on Religions of Ukraine]. Kyiv. No 1. P. 134–136 p.

56. Panchuk M., Rafalskyi O. (2001). Etnopolityka Ukrainy: dosvid desiatylittia [Ethnopolitics of Ukraine: the experience of the decade]. Ukrainske derzhavotvorennia: uroky, problemy, perspektyvy [Ukrainian state formation: lessons, problems, perspectives]. Materialy naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii [Materials of a scientific-practical conference]. Lviv: LFUUU, part 2, 268 p.

57. Potekhin O. (1996). Ukraine at the cross – roads. Stockholm: Olof Palme Intern. Center, 54 p.

58. Problemy intehratsii krymskykh repatriantiv v ukrainske suspilstvo (2004). [Problems of integration of Crimean returnees into Ukrainian society. Zbirnyk materialiv seminaru Kyivskoho proektu instytutu Kennana ta Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen NAN Ukrainy, 13-14 travnia 2004 r. [Proceedings of the Seminar of the Kyiv Project of the Kennan Institute and the Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the NAS of Ukraine. May 13-14]. Kyiv: Stylos, 2004. 88 p.

59. Problemy intehratsii krymskykh repatriantiv v ukrainske suspilstvo (2004). [Problems of integration of Crimean returnees into Ukrainian society]. Materialy Vseukrainskoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii [Proceedings of the All-Ukrainian Scientific and Practical Conference]. Kyiv, 13-14 travnia 2004 r. [May 13-14, 2004]. Kyiv : Svitohliad, 530 p.

60. Prokop M. (1993). Naperedodni nezalezhnoi Ukrainy [On the eve of independent Ukraine]. New York – Lviv: NTSh, 502 p.

61. Pylypenko T. (2008). Stan implementatsii polozhen Ramkovoii Konventsii Rady Yevropy pro zakhyst prav natsionalnykh menshyn v Ukraini [State of implementation of the provisions of the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of the Rights of National Minorities in Ukraine]. Visnyk derzhkomnatsrelii Ukrainy [Bulletin of the State Committee for National Religions of Ukraine]. Kyiv. № 1. P. 65–105.

62. Rafalskyi O. (2000). Natsionalni menshyny Ukrainy u XX stolitti: Istoriohrafichnyi narys. [National Minorities of Ukraine in the 20th Century: A Historiographical Sketch]. Kyiv: Polus. 447 p.

63. Istoriya Rossii: XX vek. (2009). [Russian history: 20th century]. In 2 v. V. 2: 1939-2007. M.: Astrel: ACT, 829 p.

64. Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen NAN Ukrainy (2005). [Scientific notes of the Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies of the NAS of Ukraine]. Kyiv: Kurasivski chytannia-2005. IPIEND. Ser. «Politolohiia i etnolohiia» [Kurasiv readings. IPAENS, Political Science and Ethnology]. No. 30. Vol. 1. 2006. 391 p.

65. Sedin N. (2002). Osobennosti stanovleniya i razvitiya parlamentarizma v Rossii i Ukraine [Features of the formation and development of parliamentarism in Russia and Ukraine]. Diss. kand. polit. nauk [Diss. Cand. watered Sciences]. M., 196 p.

66. Shcharbak Yu. (2017). Ukraina v epitsentri svitovoho shtormu: otsinky, prohnozy, komentari [Ukraine at the Epicenter of the World Storm: Ratings, Forecasts, Comments]. Kyiv: Yaroslav Val, p. 163–211.

67. Shcherba O. (2012). Krymskotatarska spilnota yak subiekt polityky: teoretychnyi aspekt [The Crimean Tatar community as a subject of politics: a theoretical aspect]. Ukrainska natsionalna ideia: realii ta perspektyvy rozvytku. [The Ukrainian National Idea: Realities and Prospects for Development]. Iss. 24. 138–143 p.

68. Shirokorad A. (2008). Rossiya i Ukraina. Kogda zagovoryat pushki... [Russia and Ukraine. When the guns speak]. M.: AST: AST MOSCOW, 429 p.

69. Shkvarets V. Nimtsi pivdennoho rehionu suchasnoi ukrainskoï derzhavy [Germans of the southern region of the modern Ukrainian state]. Retrieved from: [www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc\\_Gum/Nvmdulst...3...shkvarets.pdf](http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/Nvmdulst...3...shkvarets.pdf)

70. Shypka N. Uhorska natsionalna menshyna u vyborchykh protsesakh nezaleznoi Ukrainy. Hungaria national minority in the electoral processes of an independent Ukraine. Retrieved from: [http://archive.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc\\_Gum/Npchdu/Politology/2008\\_66/66-22.pdf](http://archive.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/Npchdu/Politology/2008_66/66-22.pdf)

71. Skliar A. (2009). Pytannia zabezpechennia prav natsionalnykh menshyn yak pryklad asymetrychnosti vzaiemyn u dvostoronnnykh vidnosynakh mizh Ukrainoiu ta Rumuniieiu [The issue of securing the rights of national minorities as an example of asymmetric relations in bilateral relations between Ukraine and Romania]. Nauk. Visn. Dyplomatychnoi akademii Ukrainy [Diplomatic Academy of Ukraine Science Jour]. No. 15. P. 214–220.

72. Smirnov A. (2008). Istoriya Yuzhnoy Rusi. [History of Southern Russia]. M.: ALGORITHM, 352 p.

73. Stephen Shulman (2004). The contours of civic and ethnic national identification in Ukraine. Europe-Asia Studies. Volume 56. Issue 1. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0966813032000161437?src=recsys> (accessed 17.07.2018).

74. Steven Seegel (2016). Geography, identity, nationality: mental maps of contested Russian–Ukrainian borderlands. Nationalities Papers. Volume 44. Issue 3. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00905992.2015.1130029> (accessed 20.07.2018).

75. Strilchuk L. (2009). Pytannia etnichnykh menshyn u vidnosynakh mizh Ukrainoiu ta Polshcheiu [Ethnic minority issues in relations between Ukraine and

Poland]. *Istorychni studii. Volynskyyi nats. Univer-t im. L. Ukrainky* [Historical studios in L. Ukrainka Volyn Nat. Univ]. P. 96–102.

76. Tadeev E., Buzarov A. *Osetyny yak natsionalna menshyna Ukrainy* [Ossetians as a national minority of Ukraine]. Retrieved from: <http://www.viche.info/journal/3015/>

77. Tamara J. Resler (1997). Dilemmas of democratisation: Safeguarding minorities in Russia, Ukraine and Lithuania. *Europe-Asia Studies*. Volume 49. Issue 1. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09668139708412428> (accessed 19.07.2018).

78. Tishkov V. *Etnicheskiy konflikt v kontekste obshchestvovedcheskikh teoryi*. [Ethnic conflict in the context of social science theories]. Retrieved from: [www.impulse.kz/mif/Obch/teor.html](http://www.impulse.kz/mif/Obch/teor.html)

79. Todorov V. (2009). *Bolhary ukraïnskoho Prydunavia: etnografichna kharakterystyka* [The Bulgarians of the Ukrainian Danube region: an ethnographic characteristic]. *Avtoref* [Author's abstract]. 20 p.

80. *Zakarpattia v etnopolitychnomu vymiri* (2008). [Transcarpathia in the Ethnopolitical Dimension]. Kyiv: IPIEND imeni I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy. [I.F. Kuras IPAENS, NAS of Ukraine]. 682 p.

81. Ed. by Sagon O., Pylypenko T. (2008). *Ukraina bahatoetnichna* [Ukraine is multiethnic]. *Derzh. kom. Ukrainy u spravakh natsionalnosti ta relihii* [State com. of Ukraine in matters of nationalities and religions]. Kyiv: *Svit znan* [The World of Knowledge]. 156 p.

82. Ed. By R. Solchanyk. *Ukraine: From Chernobyl to Sovereignty* (1991). – London, 284 p.

83. Valentin Sazhin. *Contemporary relations among nationalities in Ukraine* (1993). *Nationalities Papers*. Volume 21. Issue 2. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00905999308408286> (accessed 19.07.208).

84. Vasylychuk V. *Hromadske i dukhovne zhyttia nimetskoï spilnoty v Ukraini* [Public and spiritual life of the German community in Ukraine]. Retrieved from: [http://archive.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc\\_gum/Npifznu/2006\\_20/20/vasylychuk.pdf](http://archive.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/Npifznu/2006_20/20/vasylychuk.pdf)

85. Vasylova V. (2010). *Stanovyshe natsionalnykh menshyn ta etnopolitychny aspekt ukraïnsko-rumunskykh vidnosyn u 90-kh rr. XX st.* [The situation of national minorities and the ethno-political aspect of Ukrainian-Romanian relations in the 1990s.]. *Nauk. visnyk Volynskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni L. Ukrainky* [Sciences. Bulletin of the Volyn National University named after L. Ukrainka]. P. 157–162

86. Volodymyr Kulyk (2006). *Constructing common sense: Language and ethnicity in Ukrainian public discourse*. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. Volume 29. Issue 2. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01419870500465512> (accessed 20.07.2018).

87. Volodymyr Kulyk (2013). *Language Policy in the Ukrainian Media: Authorities, Producers and Consumers*. *Europe-Asia Studies*. Volume 65. Issue 7. Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09668136.2013.824138> (accessed 23.07.2018).

88. Voynalovych V., Kochan N. (2018). *Relihiinyi chynnyk etnopolitychnykh protsesiv u Halychyni: povoienna radianska doba i suchasnist* [The religious factor

## Chapter «Historical sciences»

---

of ethno-political processes in Halychyna: the post-war Soviet era and modernity]. Kyiv: IPiEND im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy [Kyiv: I.F. Kurasa IPaENS of the NAS of Ukraine], 408 p.

89. William M. (1994). Reisinger. Political Values in Russia, Ukraine and Lithuania: Sources and Implications for Democracy/ William M. Reisinger, Arthur H. Miller, Vicki L. Hesli and Kristen Hill // *British Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 24. No. 2. P. 183–223.

90. Wilson A. (2000). *The Ukrainians: Unexpected nation*. New Haven; London: Yale UP. XVIII. 366 p.

91. Wilson A. (1997). *Ukrainian nationalism in the 1990s: A minority faith*. New York: Cambridge UP. 300 p.

92. Wolczuk K. (2001). *The moulding of Ukraine: The constitutional politics of state formation*. Budapest: Central European University. XXI. 315 p.; Nahaylo B. *The Ukrainian resurgence (1999.)*. London: Hurst. XIX. 608 p.

93. Wolczuk K. (2001). *The moulding of Ukraine: The constitutional politics of state formation*. Budapest: Central European University. XXI. P. 284.

94. Zhukova T. (1996). *Ukraina i omvandling: Folkomflyttningar och etniska relationer*. Stockholm: CEIFO, 92 p.

95. Zinevych N. (2005). *Tsyhanskyi etnos v Ukraini (istoriohrafia ta dzherela. [Gypsy Ethnicity in Ukraine (historiography and sources). Avtoref. dys. kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.06; NAN Ukrainy [Author's abstract. diss. Cand. ist. Sciences: 07.00.06; NAS of Ukraine]. In-t ukr. arkhеоhrafii ta dzhereloznavstva im. M.S. Hrushevskoho. [M.S. Hrushevskyi Inst. archeography and source studies]. Kyiv, 18 p.*

96. Zynych V. (2006). *Rozseleennia y oblashtuvannia deportovanykh natsionalnykh menshyn – vazhlyva skladova etnonatsionalnoi polityky derzhavy. [Resettlement and Arrangement of Deported National Minorities – An Important Component of Ethno-National Policy of the State. Scientific Notes]. Naukovi zapysky. Kurasivski chytannia-2005. Seria «Politolohiia i etnologhiia» [Kurasiv Readings. Political Science and Ethnology Series. Kyiv: IPiEND [IPAENS]. No f. 30, Vol. 1. 2005. 391 p.*

97. Zvarych I. (2009). «Etnopolityka v Ukraini: rehionalnyi kontekst» [“Ethnopolitics in Ukraine: Regional Context”]. Kyiv: Delta, 320 p.