

UDC 329.73

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2640.2020.145.10>Ye. Mykhalkovska, Master's Student
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

THE FORMATION OF NATIONAL IDENTITY THROUGH THE THEORETICAL APPROACHES OF LINGUISTIC AND LANGUAGE IDENTITY OF UKRAINIAN DISSIDENTS

In this article, the author analyzes the ideological struggle for the Ukrainian national identity happened in a meaningful time of Khrushchev Thaw when first dissidents appeared. Additionally, we have applied the theme of ideological propaganda and agitation considered through language approach to a larger scientific extent. First, we characterize separately the creating of an ethnic identity endorsed by the SRSR, and national identity of the URSR as an integral part of a specific social identity, linguistic identification with representatives of a certain nation, its culture and traditions, which include the entire complex of emotions caused by the sense of belonging. By involving the idea of identity as a relational, socio-cultural phenomenon, we considered the concept of Bucholt and Hall, J. Mead, K. Levy-Strauss. Next, we identify the works of Anthony Smith, Herbert Blumer, Ernest Gellner, Eric Gobsbaum. Trying to conduct the concept analysis of the formation of the Ukrainian national identity through the semantic and semiotic aspects of the language identity according to the Dissidents movement we used 3 key topic notions: – Identity as a relational, socio-cultural phenomenon; – Socio-historical contextualization of showing the national identity as an environmental product of the nation; – Ideology of the Standard Language. Finally, the author comes to an outcome that the Soviet ideology allowing the formation of the so-called ethnographic identity of Ukrainians, made considerable efforts to prevent the creation of a nationwide identity that Ukrainian Dissidents were fighting for, herewith, artificially imposing the idea of the disunity of Eastern and Western Ukraine.

Keywords: *identity, dissidents, Khrushchev Thaw, Ukraine, 1960's, 1980's, standard language, homo sovieticus, Ukrainian language.*

Problem statement. In the current Ukrainian realities, national identity is characterized by ambivalence, significant regional differences, manifested within the perception of certain historical events, figures, symbols, languages etc. Such contradictions were oftentimes used by various political forces of the post-Stalin era during 1960-1980's, and resulted in the appearance of some doubts in the society about the unity of the Ukrainian nation and the appropriateness of preserving the integrity of our state in the future. The above-mentioned timeframe focuses our attention on the extremely crucial period. When after a decade of the Soviet terror, in the total atmosphere of rigorous control and with all visible means available for ideological making, such astonishing challenge to the regime as the Sixties was born. A number of scholars consider the impact from the Soviet ideology as an art of human manipulation [16]. In this context, the Soviet power changed not only national ideals but also people's behavior.

According to the author, the phrase "social soviet engineering" is appropriate to characterize the use of manipulative strategy and the process of imperative (directing) influence exercised by the soviet leaders [16, p. 86]. Additionally, the theme of ideological propaganda and agitation considered through language approach has not been applied to a large extent by the Ukrainian scientists. But, the long-term effect of Soviet propaganda exists currently today keep going to complicate the formation of a political Ukrainian nation. As it is well known, in Soviet times, the problems of national identity in the social sciences were related to the accusations of bourgeois nationalism and were interpreted exclusively as "the inability of attempts of modern bourgeois philosophy to use the category... in the ideological struggle" [21, p. 172-174]. And anti-research approaches were combined with the complete separation from the achievements of Western historiography of these phenomena. So, there is an urgent need to review the ideological struggle for the Ukrainian national identity happened in a meaningful time of the Khrushchev Thaw when the first dissidents appeared.

Analysis of sources and literature. Within the theoretical framework of our research we tried to involve a large number of scientific studies from the West that are devoted to the problems of national identity. Significant contribution to the development of this problem was made by cultural anthropologists (J. Mead expressed the idea of the social nature of identity [20], K. Levy-Strauss developed the idea

about identity crisis [19]). Also, involving the idea of identity as a relational, socio-cultural phenomenon, we considered the concept of Bucholt and Hall [14]. The great accent was put on the classical works of Anthony Smith [22], Herbert Blumer [13], Ernest Gellner [15], Eric Gobsbaum [18]. These concepts shed the light on the identity as a changing structure that develops throughout the life of a person as an essential part of a nation. Even more, the authors proved the fact that the formation of an identity is possible only in a society. According to many foreign scientists mentioned above, the main role in the development of a national character or national identity belonged to a language and culture as to the prior identical fields in national building [18, p. 44]. But, it is important to consider separately the creating of an ethnic identity endorsed by the SRSR, and national identity of the URSR as an integral part of a specific social identity, linguistic identification with representatives of a certain nation, its culture and traditions, which include the entire complex of emotions caused by the sense of belonging. Among the Ukrainian scientists there are G. Kasyanov [8], V. Sereda [21, p. 160], Yu. Shelvelov [12] who made attempts to extrapolate the concepts of the named authors to the Ukrainian context. A major project through this perspective was related with the publication – "Ukraine Modern" (2007), devoted to the identities of the inhabitants of Lviv and Donetsk. On the whole, the question of national identity in Ukrainian historiography is considered mainly in sociological and political format.

Setting objectives. Within the framework of the presented concepts above, we plan to raise the question of the essence of the concepts of national identity and Soviet ideology, trying to outline the strokes of their interconnection with Dissidents movements in Ukraine. Trying to conduct the concept analysis of the formation of the Ukrainian national identity through the semantic and semiotic aspects of the language identity according to the Dissidents movement we used 3 key topic notions: – Identity as a relational, socio-cultural phenomenon (the concept by Bucholt and Hall);

- Socio-historical contextualization of showing the national identity as an environmental product of the nation;
- Ideology of the Standard Language (general mentally-provided complex of the standardization especially through the linguistic and language issue that Soviet Union tried to build up in the former USSR).

Presentation of the main research material. In a broad context, under the national identity, we define an individual and collective sense of belonging to a particular national community, identification with its symbols, values, culture, history, territory, state and legal institutions, political and economic interests. It is important to mention that the basis of any ideological constructions is often hidden from its carriers, and ideological ideas that express the private interest. This idea is formulated by N. Louman: "the support of any ideology," he writes, "consists primarily of the noncommunicativeness of the problem which ideology is associated with" [9, p. 199]. One of the issues is the ratio of national (national-civil) and state (political) identity. These phenomena are interdependent, but not identical.

Considering the notion of state identity, a group of sociologists led by L. Drobizheva emphasize: "the state identity is formed ... by the will of the leader, the political elite through the means of education, mass media, symbols that influence the public consciousness and are fixed in official documents" [3, p. 124]. In their interpretation, state identity involves loyalty and self-identification of the majority with a certain set of symbols corresponding to the general vector of state policy. In this regard, the influence of the state identity on everyday practice will only manifest itself in the most general form. The national identity is much more bigger in this sense because it includes "not only loyalty to the state, but also identification with the citizens of the country, the idea of community, solidarity, responsibility for the fate of the country" [4, p. 69].

With the advent of the Ukrainian political independence, eyewitnesses of the process of formation of national identity have become Dissidents – the opposition movement in SRSR during 1960-1980s, whose members advocated for the democratization of society, the observance of human rights and freedoms. In Ukraine, they stand for the free development of the Ukrainian language and culture, the implementation of the rights of the Ukrainian people to gain their own statehood. But the official collapse of the Soviet identity did not mean its actual overcoming, just as Ukrainian statehood did not mean the absence of internal Ukrainophobic forces or equally threatening inert, nationally indifferent masses.

Even now it could not be certain to neutralize the threat to the national identity of Ukrainians. Talking about the reasons that caused such kind of national-soviet identity, it is important to recall that "Soviet Identity" based on political and ideological identification, replaced the national identity of many of the citizens of the USSR. It mainly covered the "denationalized" population, which was torn away from its small homeland and from its cultural group, perceiving the political and ideological identity as the main one. And here we can define the typical features that are characteristic of "homo sovieticus" [5, p. 145]. Thus, political scientist V. Zemlyuk believes that the overwhelming majority of Ukrainians of the Soviet era in generalized form, albeit to varying degrees, had the following typical features: almost complete absence of self-awareness as a subject of history, political nihilism; inferiority; conformism; marginality; absenteeism (indifferent attitude to its socio-political rights); ambivalence (split personality, duality); impudent obedience to the authorities; life is based on the principles of "quieter you go – further you will"; paternalism; the low level of political culture, political limitation. A significant part of the population was characterized by social apathy, passivity, adaptability, attitude to political actions as formal rituals, legal nihilism [7, p.110]. Some paradoxical "homo sovieticus" Ukrainian scholar L. Nagorna considers that the term "Soviet human" was used to obtain all material goods from the state [10, p. 135]. Sociological data on a specific

empirical material shows that communist ("Soviet") identity has become a substitute for national identity in the regions where this identity has been lost. In addition, the following indicators towards this group of people who bear the Soviet identity are stable: Russian as a language of superior communication (72 %), a significant percentage of disagreeing with the statement about the positive significance of the collapse of the USSR for Ukraine (73 %) [10, p. 134].

The "plantation" of the Soviet ideology, like any other totalitarian ideology, was aimed at leveling out the critical thinking of citizens, but for the part of the population the effect turned out to be the opposite and embodied in the formation of counter-culture. This was evident at political jokes "from the kitchens" to the manifestations of active dissidents (rallies, demonstrations, the formation of public organizations). In this context, L. Nagorna's conclusion around the Ukrainian history of the Soviet period is methodologically significant in that way that the experience of Ukraine has shown that terror, deportations, concentration camps are powerless in the fight against the carriers of the national idea [10, p. 146]. Thus, despite the enormous efforts of the Soviet ideology, there was no complete displacement of the fundamental national values of Ukrainian people. And, to my mind, this proved to be the undisputed version of the ideological and linguistic victory of the dissidents. The spread of dissidents in the 1960s and 1980s (Figure 1), the spread of oppositional movements (Figure 2) became a peculiar reaction to the collapse of the process of de-Stalinization of Soviet society, non-state status of Ukraine, oppression of national cultural and spiritual life regarding Ukrainians. Regarding to the effectiveness of Soviet propaganda and agitation, this can be explained by Heidegger's existentialism of understanding the nature of membership and the principle of being together [17, p. 81].

The need to be together, the need to belong is determined by the concern of an individual experience. And the concern forms the basis of identity, prompting membership by itself but in the complex of the standardization especially through the language approach that Soviet Union tried to build up in the former USSR. And, this thesis approves that the language policies coming out of the former Soviet Union and of the Kremlin today is considered to be simply a continuation of the Soviet policy of using language as a mechanism to homogenize those countries which are near. Therefore, the concept of the Standard Language appears. This is precisely because language aspect was supposed to be more than just a tool for communication; it was a basic element of group identity, in our case Ukrainian.

Thus, even a superficial analysis of the history of Ukraine of the Soviet era testifies to the double identity of the formed society. It is possible to define two kinds: official (soviet, political) and national (ethnic). The American socioculturalists – Bucholtz and Hall identified the identity in both directions: as the product and as the source of linguistic and other semiotic practices. Therefore, the identity can be linguistically indexed through different labels, stances, styles, or in our case, through the linguistic approach used by the dissidents. And, as far as we know, they defined three types of constructing identities: – the legitimizing identities established by the dominant institutions to expand their domination; – identity of resistance, formed by actors who are in a compressed or stigmatized position, for struggle and survival; – design identities which are constructed for the design and modification of already existing identities. Accordingly, the identity becomes a project of better life, within the framework of new values that are declared [14, p. 472]. The implementation of this scheme demonstrates the belonging of the Soviet identity to the first type of this classification, at the same time, the second

type can be directly related to the appearance of dissident movement. Also, the "rebuilding processes" put forward the so-called "design identity" – the idea of the revival of the national, authentic identity, which has become a sign of democratic European values. Even more, these slogans occur most often in the programs and documents of informal dissidents' organizations of the late 80's of the 20th century.

Turning back to the 1917 where was a new language developed, the language of the Soviet officialism and in the future – Soviet propaganda. It is known that a new reality generates new words, and this process is natural when it occurs naturally. However, the Soviet authorities, with the help of the newcomers (in the form of the post-Khrushchev power structure), sought to introduce the mass consciousness of official ideology. Even more, the technological development of the information space associated with the proliferation of large volumes of nonobjective information creates a cultural chaos that erodes any national identity. As a result, information and propaganda technologies of consciousness management are improved, what allow to purposefully introduce the disorganizing myths into the social sphere [10, p. 382]. With such linguistic manipulations, the authorities tried to direct the masses in the right direction. As an evidence of the importance of the Soviet linguistic-ideological discourse we can mention the appearance in 2004 of a special explanatory dictionary of ideological and political terms of the Soviet period in Russia. The author and compiler of the dictionary M. Heveshi not only systematized political expressions, but also tried to show how ideologically the language of the Soviet "official-house" was interpreted [6, p. 151-152].

In different periods of Soviet history, different slogans served as a psychological factor in suggesting values that were produced by the authorities. Moreover, the illusion of the involvement of the ordinary people to great achievements was created and the demonstration of the party's concern about the people ("the people and the party are united", "the mind, honor and conscience of our era", "the party is our helmsman", "the eternally living teaching of Leninism", "Stalin is invincible", "Lenin is alive forever"). A large group of words and slogans of the Soviet lexicon consisted of expressions aimed at forming the image of the enemies among people, as external ("international imperialists", "revenchists", "external threat") and internal ("saboteurs", "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists", "non-formals"). In fact, we can talk about the interaction of both the political language and social reality. However, it is noteworthy that the process of the language formation developed in parallel – on the part of the authorities and among ordinary people.

According to Dissidents' rhetoric, in the Soviet period there was another language formed as a language of the opposition to officialism, as a way of confronting the communist party [7, p. 134]. And through this context, we can notice the linguistic affect from the dissidents' representatives. With a help of their samizdat-texts (illegal production and distribution of the literature banned in the USSR by censorship [2]), it is easily to trace the general evolution of the linguistic situation of Ukrainian society between its inclusion in the Soviet space and beyond the latter. The main thing is the range between two trends: the political attraction to monolingualism (namely, Russian-speaking) during the period of the multinational Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and bilingualism – in the conditions of separate national states. As a reaction to both, the dissidents saw a threat to the Ukrainian language. Therefore, in accordance with the change of the isolated tendencies, there was a noticeable shift from the largely declarative facts about the threatened position of the Ukrainian language in the 1960's to illegal samizdat and official publications (analytic work by

I. Dziuba "Internationalism or Russification?" with a separate "linguistic" paragraph) [2]. The first actual linguistic performances of the "Khrushchev's thaw", mostly, stated the linguistic Russification of Ukrainians.

Speaking on behalf of the mother tongue in the early 60's, the authors did not adopt far-sighted anti-Soviet aims. Therefore, their texts belong to the so-called pre-political stage of the journalism of the Sixties-Eighties and can be considered as the traditional ones for every Ukrainian national revival. In this context we are talking about Dissidents as "providers" for socio-historical contextualization of showing the national identity through the raising of the language issue (Figure 3). But at the same time, the various ways of discussing the linguistic problems by dissidents gave the authorities a real reason to perceive the language motives for persecution among modern Ukrainian generation and patriots. The conference, organized in February 1963 at the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR and which was attended by more than 800 people, eventually was turned into a public forum of protest against the persecution of Ukrainian language in the USSR [1, p. 167]. According to L. Alekseeva, this example regarded to be typical because, as a rule, soviet propaganda has strengthened the supranational Eastern Slavic identity particularly among the Ukrainians and Belarusians.

However, the American historian with Armenian origin, Ronald Sun, considering the problem of forming a national identity in the Soviet times, reaches the paradoxical conclusion that the USSR was an entity that contributed not so much to the destruction of nations as to their formation. According to R. Sun, "there is a lot of irony in Soviet history. Most clearly, it was manifested in the fact that a radical socialist elite, having adopted internationalist slogans calling for an end to bourgeois nationalism, eventually gave birth to the same nation within the political space, which itself managed" [11, p. 193]. Consequently, the causal link between national politics, ideology and propaganda, on the one hand, is the direct formation of national identity, on the other, is not direct. Measures used by Soviet regime and aimed at reducing the importance of national identity among representatives of ethnic minorities, including Ukrainians (Sixties, Dissidents), had a complex, multidimensional effect. But, unfortunately, although the state that created it ceased to exist, the Soviet identity imposed from above is still preserved.

Conclusions. To conclude, it is important to note that the Soviet ideology, allowing the formation of the so-called ethnographic identity of Ukrainians, made considerable efforts to prevent the creation of a nationwide identity that Ukrainian dissidents were fighting for. The issues raised in the research paper are just a dotted line of the whole spectrum of problems associated with the contradictions in the formation of Ukrainian national identity within the Soviet reality.

Important areas of perspective scientific research in this area are:

- the concrete historical filling of theoretical schemes with the facts of national history, in particular with regarding to language, history and culture;
- defining the structure for regional peculiarities of processes;
- the specifics of the so-called "cartridge-client" model of Russian-Ukrainian relations in ideological, linguistic and national terms;
- the emergence of counterculture and the opposition movement as a reaction to ideological challenges;
- transformation of the role of ideological structures of the party-state apparatus of the Ukrainian SSR and its experience in the interaction with an ideology and national identity.

List of used sources

1. Алексеева Л. История инакомыслия в СССР: новейший период / Л. Алексеева. – Вильнюс; Москва: Весть, 1992. – 348 с.
2. Дзюба І. Інтернаціоналізм чи русифікація? / І. Дзюба. – К.; KM-Academia, 1998. – 276 с.
3. Дробижєва Л. М. Государственная и этническая идентичность: выбор и подвижность / Л. М. Дробижєва // Гражданские, этнические и религиозные идентичности в современной России / отв. ред. В. С. Магун. – М.: Институт социологии Российской академии наук, 2006. – С. 10–29.
4. Дробижєва Л. М. Процессы гражданской интеграции в полиэтничном российском обществе / Л. М. Дробижєва // Общественные науки и современность. – 2008. – № 2. – С. 68–77.
5. Журженко Т. Ю. Мовна політика в сучасній Україні / Т. Ю. Журженко // Розвиток демократії в Україні: мат. міжнар. наук. конф., (Київ, 29 верес. – 1 жовт. 2000 р.): наук. зб. – К.: Центр освітніх ініціатив, 2001. – С. 39–50.
6. Захаров А. Рец. на кн.: Хевеши М. А. Толковый словарь идеологических и политических терминов советского периода. М.: Международные отношения, 2002. 160с. / А. Захаров // Социологические исследования. – 2003. – №10. – С. 151-152.
7. Землюк В. П. Політична ідентичність в Україні в період кризи "розвинутого соціалізму" і здобуття державної незалежності: дис. ... канд. політ. наук / В. П. Землюк; Інститут політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса. – К., 2007. – 178 с.
8. Касьянов, Г. Незгодні: українська інтелігенція в русі опору 1960–80-х рр. / Г. Касьянов. – К.: Либідь, 1995. – 224 с.
9. Луман Н. Тавтология и парадокс в самоописаниях современного общества / Н. Луман // Социологос. – 1991. – Вып. 1. – С. 194–216.
10. Нагорна Л. Регіональна ідентичність: український контекст / Л. Нагорна. – К.: Інститут політичних і етнонаціональних досліджень ім. І. Ф. Кураса, 2008. – 405 с.
11. Суни Р. Диалектика империи: Россия и Советский Союз / Р. Суни // Новая имперская история постсоветского пространства / ред. И. Герасимов и др. – Казань: Центр исследований национализма и империи, 2004. – С. 163–196.
12. Шевельов Ю. Українська мова в першій половині двадцятого століття (1900-1941). Стан і статус / Ю. Шевельов. – Х.: Сучасність, 1987. – 295 с.
13. Blumer, H. Society as Symbolic Interaction / H. Blumer // In Human Behavior and Social Processes / ed. by A. M. Rose. – Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962. – P. 179–192.
14. Bucholtz, M. Theorizing Identity in Language and Sexuality Research / M. Bucholtz, K. Hall // Language in Society. – 2004. – 33 (4). – P. 469–515.
15. Gellner, E. Nations and Nationalism / E. Gellner. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1983. – 150 p.
16. Hadnagy, C. Social Engineering. The Art of Human Hacking / C. Hadnagy. – Chichester: Wiley, 2010. – 408 p.
17. Heidegger M. Poetry, Language, Thought / M. Heidegger. – N. Y.: HarperCollins, 1971. – 256 p.
18. Hobsbawm E. Are All Tongues Equal? Language, Culture, and National Identity / E. Hobsbawm. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. – 98 c.
19. Levi-Strauss, C. The Scope of Anthropology / C. Levi-Strauss // Current Anthropology. – 1966. – 7(2). – P. 112–123.
20. Mead, G. H. Mind, Self, and Society / G. H. Mead. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934. – 400 p.
21. Sereda V. Regional Historical Identities and Memory / V. Sereda // Україна модерна. – Л.; Донецьк: соціальні ідентичності в сучасній Україні. Спец. вип. – 2007. – 12(2). – С. 160–209.

22. Smith, A. D. National Identity / A. D. Smith. – L.: Penguin. 1991. – 236 p.

References

1. Alekseeva, L. (1992). The History of Dissident Movement in USSR: Contemporary Period. Vilnius – Moscow: News. [In Russian].
2. Dziuba, I. (1998). Internationalism of Russification? Kyiv: KM-Academia. [In Ukrainian].
3. Drobizheva, L. (2006). State and Ethnical Identity: Choice and Mobility. In V. Magun (Ed.), *Civic, Ethnic and Religious Identities in Modern Russia*. Moscow: Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Pp. 10-29. [In Russian].
4. Drobizheva, L. (2008). Processes of Civic Integration in the Polyethnic Russian Society. *Social Sciences and Modernity*, 2, 68-77. [In Russian].
5. Zhurzenko, T. (2001). Language Politics in Modern Ukraine. In *Proceedings of International Scientific Conference "Development of Democracy in Ukraine"* (Kyiv, September 29 – October 1). Kyiv: Center for Educational Initiatives. Pp. 39-50. [In Ukrainian].
6. Zaxarov A. (2003). Xeveshi M. A. Dictionary of Ideological and Political Terms of the Soviet Period. Moscow: Foreign Affairs, 2002. 160 p. [Book Review]. *Sociological Researches*, 10, 151-152. [In Russian].
7. Zemliuk, V. (2007). *Political Identity in Ukraine during the Period of Developed Socialism and Acquisition of Independence*. Unpublished Thesis (PhD in Political Science). I. F. Kuras for Political, Ethnic and National Studies. [In Ukrainian].
8. Kasianov, H. (1995). *Dissenters: Ukrainian Intellectuals in the Resistant Movement, 1960's – 1980's*. Kyiv: Lybid. [In Ukrainian].
9. Luman, N. (1991). Tautology and the Paradox in the Self-descriptions of Modern Society. *Sociologos*, 1, 194-216. [In Ukrainian].
10. Nahorna, L. (2008). Regional Identity: Ukrainian Context. Kyiv: I. F. Kuras for Political, Ethnic and National Studies. [In Ukrainian].
11. Suni, R. (2004). Dialectics of Empire: Russia and the Soviet Union. In I. Gerasimov et al. (Eds.), *New Imperial History of Post-soviet Area*. Kazan: Center for Nationalism and Empire Studies. Pp. 163-196. [In Russian].
12. Sheveliov, Yu. (1987). *Ukrainian Language in the 1st Half of the 21st Century (1900-1941)*. Kharkiv: Modernity. [In Ukrainian].
13. Blumer, H. (1962). Society as Symbolic Interaction. In A. Rose (Ed.), *Human Behavior and Social Processes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Pp. 179-192.
14. Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2004). Theorizing Identity in Language and Sexuality Research. *Language in Society*, 33(4), 469-515.
15. Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
16. Hadnagy, C. (2010). *Social Engineering. The Art of Human Hacking*. Chichester: Wiley.
17. Heidegger, M. (1971). *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: HarperCollins.
18. Hobsbawm E. (1997). *Are All Tongues Equal? Language, Culture, and National Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
19. Levi-Strauss, C. (1966). The Scope of Anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, 7(2), 112-123.
20. Mead, G. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
21. Sereda, V. (2007). Regional Historical Identities and Memory. *Modern Ukraine. Lviv-Donetsk: Social Identities in the Modern Ukraine. Special Issue*, 12(2), 160-209.
22. Smith, A. (1991). *National Identity*. London: Penguin.

Надійшла до редколегії 17.03.20

FIGURES



Figure 1. Spread opposition in Ukraine in order to protect the rights and freedoms of Ukrainian political dissidents-prisoners as a reaction to the collapse of the process of de-Stalinization of Soviet society
 URL: <https://tsdazu.archives.gov.ua/archives/708>



Figure 2. The formation of dissidents' movement

URL: <https://tsn.ua/analitika/istoriya-z-grifom-sekretno-ostannya-chehistska-p-yatirichka-rik-1988.html>



Figure 3. Dissidents as "providers" for socio-historical contextualization of showing the national identity as an environmental product of the nation through the raising of the language issue

URL: <http://www.istpravda.com.ua/articles/2011/01/12/13866/>

Є. Михалковська, студ. магістратури
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

ФОРМУВАННЯ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ ІДЕНТИЧНОСТІ ЗА ДОПОМОГОЮ ТЕОРЕТИЧНИХ ПІДХОДІВ ДО МОВНОЇ ІДЕНТИФІКАЦІЇ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ДИСИДЕНТІВ

Проаналізовано ідеологічну боротьбу за українську національну ідентичність, що відбулася у час "відлиги", коли з'явилися перші дисиденти. Крім того, розглянуто тему ідеологічної пропаганди та агітації за допомогою мовного аспекту аналізу. По-перше, ми характеризуємо окремо створення етнічної ідентичності, схваленої СРСР, та національної ідентичності УРСР як невід'ємної частини специфічної соціальної ідентичності, мовної ідентифікації із представниками певної нації, її культури та традицій, які охоплюють цілий комплекс емоцій, викликаний почуттям приналежності. Залучаючи ідею ідентичності як реляційного, соціокультурного явища, ми розглянули концепцію Бухольта і Холла, Дж. Міда, К. Леві-Стросса. Проаналізовано також погляди Ентоні Сміта, Герберта Блюмера, Ернеста Гелнера, Еріка Гобсбаума. Намагаючись провести концептуальний аналіз формування української національної ідентичності через семантичний та семіотичний аспекти мовної ідентичності згідно з опозиційним дисидентським рухом, ми використали три ключові тематичні поняття: ідентичність як реляційне, соціокультурне явище; соціально-історична контекстуалізація показу національної ідентичності як екологічного продукту нації; ідеологія стандартної мови. Зроблено висновок, що радянська ідеологія, яка дозволяла сформувати так звану етнографічну ідентичність українців, доклала значних зусиль для запобігання створенню нашої загальнонаціональної ідентичності, за яку боролися українські дисиденти, при цьому штучно наві'язуючи ідею роз'єднаності Східної та Західної України.

Ключові слова: ідентичність, дисиденти, "відлига", Україна, 60-ті рр., 80-ті рр., стандартна мова, гомо советікус, українська мова.