

The Development of Integration Theories in Ukraine

Csilla FEDINEC

ABSTRACT

In the following, we cite the first lines of the preamble of the Constitution of Ukraine (1996): ‘The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, on behalf of the Ukrainian people—citizens of Ukraine of all nationalities, expressing the sovereign will of the people, based on the centuries-old history of Ukrainian state-building...’. The function of the preamble is to summarize the purpose of the legislator. These cited lines of the preamble of the Ukrainian constitution have not changed since it was adopted, placing the state idea first. It has public legal, historical, and symbolic meanings; at the same time, the Ukrainian territories for several decades formed peripheries of larger state units that could not be legally separated. The administrative boundaries of the country were accepted only in the 20th century, and the country became independent only in 1991. The periods of decisive significance concerning the Ukrainian national idea and the independent state were the following: the first East Slavic state, the Kyivan Rus; from Slavic vassals of the Golden Horde medieval regions of Galicia and Volhynia, the Cossack Age (Zaporizhian Host); the period of the Ukrainian national revival in the 19th century; the period of the Ukrainian People’s Republic following the First World War; the Soviet Ukraine, when the borders of the present state were established; and the establishment of the present independent Ukrainian state.

KEYWORDS

Ukraine, history, federalization, autonomy, national movement, independent statehood, integration development.

Introduction

The fact that Ukrainian territories did not form a unified state, moreover, that they were parts of different countries for a very long part of their history, was a decisive reason for their self-identification against neighboring countries, their quest for allies in neighboring countries, and their integration into one country.

Fedinec, Cs. (2022) ‘The Development of Integration Theories in Ukraine’, in Gedeon, M., Halász, I. (eds.) *The Development of European and Regional Integration Theories in Central European Countries*. Miskolc: Central European Academic Publishing. pp. 225–243. https://doi.org/10.54171/2022.mgih.doleritincec_11

The self-designation 'Ukrainian' originates from the 19th century. Up until then, they were identified by the ethnonyms 'Ruthenian'¹ and 'Rusyn',² while the Poles called them 'little Poles' and the Russians called them 'little Russians.' The name 'Ukraine' was first used in reference to a part of the territory of Kyivan Rus. Later, the term Ukraine was used for the Cossack Hetmanate lands on both sides of the Dnieper. The importance of the Cossack era is stressed in the present Ukrainian anthem: 'Soul and body, yea, our all, offer we at freedom's call / We, whose forebears, and ourselves, proud Cossacks are!' Ukraine is the official full name of the country, as stated in 1991.

1. Medieval and early modern period

The origin of the Slavic peoples is one of the controversial issues of modern history. There is no evidence to prove that they had been living on the Eurasian Steppe before the 6th century. The question of homeland region is also quite open: most contemporary historians think it was in the central and eastern part of the present Poland and the northwestern part of Ukraine. In conjunction with the movement of peoples, the great migration of the Slavs from the postulated homeland region, the basin between the Vistula and the Dnieper north of the Carpathian Mountains, started in the 6th–8th centuries. Under the rule of the Rurik dynasty that emerged from the Varangian ethnic group from the southern part of Sweden in the 9th century, East Slavic tribes founded and baptized the 'Kyivan Rus', which meant acceptance of Orthodox Christianity.³ Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia claim to be legal heirs of the Kyivan Rus, similar to Germany and France, who want to consider the Carolingian Empire⁴ their own state. The present Belarus and Russia belong to the same political and economic community, while Ukraine turned toward the West. In consequence, Russian politics questioned the existence of the independent Ukrainian people, which, beginning in 2014, has brought about severe territorial conflicts and Russia's aggression against Ukraine.

Kyivan Rus was finally destroyed by the Mongol occupation in the first part of the 13th century. The Mongol khanate, the Golden Horde (Ulug Ulus), considered the disintegrated Slav principalities as vassals up to the early 15th century. In these Slav principalities, the first distinguishing features were linguistic-cultural, which were followed by full linguistic separation. East Slavic groups could be definitively

1 Derived from the Latin 'Rutheni'. 'For centuries thereafter Rutheni was used in Latin as the designation of all East Slavs, particularly Ukrainians and Belarusians. In the 16th century, the word more clearly began to be associated with the Ukrainians and Belarusians of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as distinct from the Muscovites (later known as Russians)...'. Himka, 1996.

2 Slavic equivalent of 'Ruthenian.'

3 Екельчик, 2010, pp. 33–34.

4 Екельчик, 2010, p. 51.

distinguished: Ukrainian, Belarus, and Russian identities appeared.⁵ As for Ukraine, in the period of disunity, the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia (Kingdom of Rus) meant historic continuity.

The Cossacks appeared in the late 13th century and represented a disorganized military force on the territory bordered by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Russia, the Crimean Khanate, and the Ottoman Empire. The appearance of the Cossacks was a new social phenomenon. In the beginning, they represented a profession and did not form a separate social category. Military service was considered the goal of their lives, by which they tried to rise financially and socially.

Since the mid-16th century, a part of the Cossacks began to serve the Polish kings. These were the registered Cossacks, who acquired rights and privileges inside Polish society. Concerning their significance and financial situation, wealthy Cossacks could have belonged to the Polish nobility; however, they did not get the letter of privileges granting a noble title. This caused social tension, which in 1648 led to the uprising under the command of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky (also known as the ‘Ukrainian people’s war of liberation’); a part of the peasantry also joined the movement.⁶

As a result of their initial success, the Cossacks re-evaluated the movement’s goal. In Chyhyryn, at the Hetman residence—one of the traditional places for the appointment to the office of Hetman of Zaporizhian Host—ambassadors of several European states were present and acknowledged the sovereignty of Bohdan Khmelnytsky’s state. In 1649, the Treaty of Zboriv was concluded, and the Ukrainian Cossack state—the Cossack Hetmanate, including the territory of the Kyiv Voivodeship, Bratslav Voivodeship, and Chernihiv Voivodeshi—was declared autonomous. However, the Treaty of Bila Tserkva in 1651 reduced autonomy in the territory of the Kyiv Voivodeship. By 1654, the movement weakened, Khmelnytsky needed allies, and after a long diplomatic search, he agreed with the tsar in Moscow.

As for Ukraine, the 1654 Treaty of Pereyaslav (also known as the Pereyaslav Agreement) meant that the supremacy of the Poles was changed by that of the Russians. In exchange, Moscow promised to protect the Ukrainian territories against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and other enemies. The territory of the Cossack Hetmanate was divided along the river Dnieper—the regions of Right-bank Ukraine (present-day districts of Vinnytsia, Zhytomyr, Kirovohrad) and Left-bank Ukraine (Chernihiv, Poltava, Sumy, Kyiv, Cherkasy) were established. The hetman considered himself the vassal of the Russian tsar, but he could govern in a quite sovereign way. After Khmelnytsky’s death, the Cossack Hetmanate (Left-bank Ukraine) was gradually repressed until, in 1774, it was irreversibly destroyed and fully integrated into the Russian public administration.⁷

In the First Partition of Poland in 1772, former Galicia-Volhynia—the Habsburg Empire—took control of Galicia and the Russian Empire of Volhynia. Based on the

5 Ploky, 2006, pp. 10–15

6 For details, see Чухліб, 2003, pp. 50–65.

7 For details, see Morrison, 1993, pp. 677–703.

Treaty of Jassy in 1792, Russia definitely acquired the northern coastline of the Black Sea and the Crimean peninsula, where the New Russia Governorate (or Novorossiia Governorate) (present-day districts of Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhzhia, Mykolaiv, Kherson, Kirovohrad, Odesa, Donetsk, and the Crimean Peninsula) was established. Since then, Sevastopol has been the Black Sea headquarters of Russian naval forces. In 1793, Right-bank Ukraine was annexed by the Russian Empire in the Second Partition of Poland, becoming part of the Little Russia Governorate (or Malorossiia Governorate).⁸

2. Period of the Ukrainian national revival

By the end of the 18th century, Ukrainian territories were parts of the Habsburg and Russian Empires. Concerning the awakening national idea, Galician Ukrainians played the main role because of the Habsburg Empire's more tolerant toward nationalities and the increasing oppressive politics of the Russian Empire. By the beginning of the 19th century, language became probably the most important motivational power of the national awakening. '... in the nineteenth century, questions and propositions about the Ukrainian language never existed in isolation, as purely linguistic issues but were always connected with larger processes: the shaping of Ukraine as a legacy, polity...'.⁹

National language was one of the most important and most promising means of designating the Ukrainian identity and the separation from Russian and Polish identities.¹⁰ Both in Russia and Poland, influenced by western modernizing ideology, the intelligentsia who considered themselves Ukrainian and wanted to be protected against the effects of homogenization and assimilation made significant decisions concerning the Ukrainian literary language at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries. For the old Ukrainian elite, the Old Church Slavonic was considered the literary language, which the development of the Russian language was also based on. The new intelligentsia—Hryhorii Skovoroda, Ivan Kotliarevsky and others—who wanted to strengthen the distinction from the Russian language, were to renew the Ukrainian language based on the 'folk language' (*narechie*). Some Russian philosophers, like Alexander Herzen and Nikolay Chernyshevsky, opposed the violent Russian national ideology and russification and supported the principle of national self-determination.¹¹ The national revival, which was developing on a linguistic basis, was placed on a political basis by ideologists in the second half of the 19th century.¹²

Greek Catholic canon Jan Mohylnycki was the first to celebrate a mass in 'folk language,' whose literary version was sometimes mentioned as the Ukrainian language.

8 Subtelny, 1988, pp. 145–148.

9 Koznarsky, 2017, p. 8.

10 Шандра, 2013, pp. XV., XVIII.

11 Romsics, 1998, p. 221.

12 Грицак, 2019, p. 44.

In Buda, the University Press published a catechesis in 1815 and a Slav-Rusyn ABC book in 1816. Among others, the catechesis influenced the Slovak linguist and historian Jozef Šafarik, who corresponded on it.¹³

Big university towns—Lviv in Galicia, Kharkiv and Kyiv in Russia—were a decisive cross-border influence. A national idea was built on the support of the question of culture and language; political demands were claimed later at the end of the 19th century.

The establishment of the university in Kharkiv was, in the first place, due to Vasily Karazin. The goal of the landowner of Ukrainian origin was to ensure the new generation of educated tsarist clerks. The university was organized using a western pattern; in the first years, neither Ukrainian nor Russian was used; the languages of education were Latin, French, and German. Foreign experts were needed to bring along the ideas of modern Europe, such as romanticism and nationalism. Educators and students at the university in Kharkiv tried to interpret their own surroundings in the spirit of these ideas. Scientists like Izmail Sreznevsky of Russian origin, the Ukrainian Petro-Hulak Artemovsky, Hrihorii Kvitka-Osnovianenko, and Mykola Kostomarov, who had a double identity, became more and more interested in Ukrainian folk literature and folklore. It was particularly important that they began to consequently use the ethnonym ‘Ukrainian’ instead of ‘little Russian.’¹⁴

Emperor Nicholas I was primarily stimulated to establish Kyiv University by the unsuccessful November Uprising (1830–1831) of partitioned Poland against the Russian Empire. The university’s primary task was to strengthen Russian culture among the mainly Polish speaking nobles, but the establishment of the university and the research in progress also contributed to strengthening Ukrainian national ideas. The university granted scientific backgrounds for developing Ukrainian national ideas. However, the educators, students, and young activists surrounding them were not satisfied with scientific results; they came forth with social, economic, and political demands.¹⁵

Three outstanding personalities of Ukrainian national revival—Markiyan Shashkevych, a priest of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church; historian and ethnographer Ivan Vahylevych; and professor of Ukrainian language and literature, Yakiv Holovatsky—studied at Lviv University. They founded the influential Ukrainian literary group ‘Ruthenian Triad’ (*Ruska triitsia*), whose goal was to make ‘folk language’ a literary language without Old Church Slavonic and other foreign linguistic elements. As the local censorship in Lviv prevented publication of the work summarizing their ideas, in 1837, Sashkevych et al. published *The Mermaid of the Dniester* [*Rusalka Dnistrova*], the first literary collection in the vernacular Ukrainian language, in Buda. The authors stressed the idea of the national unity of ‘Ruthenian-Ukrainian’ people living in the territory of the Habsburg and Russian Empires. Unfortunately, most of the one

13 Білий, 2010. p. 17.

14 For details, see Салтовський, 2002.

15 Магочій, 2012, p. 347.; Грицак, 2019, p. 72.

thousand volumes they wanted to take home were confiscated by the authorities, so only a few of them could be sold or given away. However, the Ukrainian language made the first steps on the path of a slow but irreversible development, resulting in a language that literature and science can use.¹⁶

More and more young people took part in the active cultural life of the universities, which started to support the Ukrainian national revival. By the middle of the century—in addition to scientific interests—political issues concerning the separation of Ukrainians were appearing. The first group in the areas along the river Dnieper that had a concrete political program was the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood founded in 1845 by young Ukrainian intellectuals. The society's programs are formulated in the documents *Books of the Genesis of the Ukrainian People* [*Knyhy bytiia ukrains'koho narodu*] and *The Statute of the Slavic Society of SS Cyril and Methodius: Its Main Ideas* [*Ustav Slov'ians'koho tovarystva sv Kyryla i Metodiia. Holovni ideii*]. According to Ukrainian historian Yaroslav Hrytsak, the ideas of the group were based on the ideologies of three movements: Ukrainian autonomism, the Polish democratic movement, and the Russian Decembrist revolt. In addition to Christianity, protests against social injustice as well as a Ukrainian national revival were also present.¹⁷ Fierce debates accompanied the development of the group's programs. All three of the main ideologists of the secret society had different viewpoints. While Panteleimon Kulish considered national revival to be of primary importance, Mykola Kostomarov focused on general human and Christian values, and for Taras Shevchenko, social justice was the most essential.¹⁸

In May 1848, Greek Catholic priests and secular intellectuals founded the Supreme Ruthenian Council (Holovna Rus'ka Rada), Galicia's first legal Ukrainian political organization, which was led by Hryhoriy Yakhymovych, Metropolitan Archbishop of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. The manifest *Appeal to the Ruthenian People* in 1848 declared:

We Galician Ruthenians belong to the great Ruthenian nation that speaks one language and counts fifteen million people, two and half million of whom inhabit the Galician land. It had its own perfected language, its own laws, and princes, in a word, it was flourishing, prosperous, and powerful.¹⁹

This manifest can be considered the first official document declaring the idea of the unity of the Ukrainian people living in the territory of the Habsburg and Russian Empires.

The new generation of Ukrainian intelligentsia established the first organization whose members formulated concrete political goals. They were known as the

16 Subtelny, 1988, pp. 240–241.

17 Грицак, 2019, pp. 75–76.

18 Грицак, 2019, p. 77.

19 Просук, 2019, p. 185.

Brotherhood of Taras, after the poet and founder of the modern written Ukrainian language, Taras Shevchenko. In 1893, they published their program *Profession de foi of Young Ukrainians*, criticizing the apoliticity of the previous generation of the Ukrainian national revival and explaining their ideas concerning political autonomy for Ukraine and dominance of the Ukrainian language.²⁰

In his 1881 paper, *Historical Poland and Great Russian Democracy [Istoricheskaia Polsha i velikoruskaia demokratiia]*, scholar and civic leader Mykhailo Drahomanov stated the following: ‘The independence of a given country and nation can be achieved either by its secession into a separate state (separatism), or by the securing of its self-government, without such separation (federalism).’ Of these two alternatives, Drahomanov preferred the latter.²¹ Drahomanov argued that the psychology of national identification is itself multi-layered and merges with other forms of identification, and expressed in various languages and manners that ‘Ukrainians would, perhaps, always be left with two literatures [Ukrainian and Russian], not one.’²²

3. Historical development of territoriality

The revolutions of 1848 (the Springtime of Nations) made it possible for the participants in the Ukrainian national movement to continue their cultural fight on a political basis; this was the first time Rusyns in Hungary (mainly living on the territory of present-day Transcarpathia) could join. There was no counter-revolutionary organization present in the territory of the Greek Catholic Eparchy of Mukachevo, where most Rusyns of Hungary lived. At the same time, an adverse process was emerging in the territory of the much smaller Eparchy of Prešov. Adolf Dobriansky, leading the group of pro-Habsburg Rusyns, canon Alexander Dukhnovych, and Greek Catholic bishop of Prešov Yosyf Gaganets decided which of the Rusyn territories in Hungary should be annexed to Galicia. However, the Austrian government refused the demands of the Dobriansky-group, which had few supporters among Rusyns in Hungary; at the same time, no hostile actions were implemented against them.²³

In Galicia, the Austrophile orientation, whose followers believed that the only chance the uprising of Galician Ukrainians had was their unshakable loyalty toward the Habsburgs, played an important role in Galician political life up to the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Adolf Dobriansky made proposals suggesting federalizing Austria and Hungary, which at the same time aimed at also protecting the rights of the non-Hungarian nationalities living in Austria and Hungary. In his 1871 political program, he listed the areas where the representatives of Rusyns were living. The detailed list indicated ‘Rusyns living beyond the Carpathian Mountains, in the

20 Грицак, 2019, pp. 158–159.

21 Rudnytsky, 1987, p. 396.

22 Cited by Shkandrij, 2001, p. 189.

23 Molnár, 2018, p. 113.

Hungarian Kingdom' were also present.²⁴ Federalization attempts failed; as a result of the Austrian-Hungarian Compromise in 1867, the Monarchy was changed into a dual state. Contemporary Hungarian and Galician Polish media discussed the idea that to the right of the Hungarian crown, Galicia should join St. Stephen's State, similar to the sub-dualist autonomous status granted in the Croatian Compromise. This step closed the dualist transformation of the Monarchy. Gyula Andrásy, as Prime Minister of Hungary (1867–1871), did not take actual political steps, but as Foreign Minister of Austria-Hungary (1871–1879), he tried several times to support Galician autonomy.²⁵

The Polonophile orientation did not recognize the separate ethnicity of Rusyns, who were considered an ethnic group of the Poles. Therefore, it had very weak support, and by the beginning of the 20th century, it was overshadowed in Rusyn groups. The Russophile orientation became popular among those who believed that they were betrayed by the Habsburgs, who handed the province entirely to the Poles. The representatives were attracted by the authority of the Russian Empire and culture. The Russophile idea was a union under the Russian tsar's supremacy—assimilation with Russians 'living between the Carpathian and Ural Mountains.' However, they had no comprehensive political program, focusing almost solely on literary questions and did not endanger the territorial unit of the Habsburg Empire.²⁶

Ukrainian ideologists first reached the idea of Ukrainian statehood independently at the end of the 19th century. Yulian Bachynsky, who studied at Lviv University, was the first author in history to argue that Ukraine should be independent. In his book *Ukraina irredenta* (1895), he defined Ukraine as the contiguous territory from the Sian River in the Habsburg Monarchy to the Caucasus, including the nine Ukrainian-speaking tsarist provinces.²⁷ Mykola Mikhnovsky's work, *Independent Ukraine [Samoistiina Ukraina]*, which presented a program for 'a single, united, indivisible, free, and independent Ukraine from the Carpathian to the Caucasian mountains' was published in Lviv in 1900.²⁸

Prominent intellectual Mykhailo Hrushevsky, first President of the Ukrainian People's Republic, suggested a federative state in his works published before the First World War. He did not consider Ukrainian sovereignty important; he thought that a federative Russian state would be the solution. The disintegration of tsarist Russia made it possible to gain Ukrainian independence, and Ukrainian territories could be united in one state. According to Hrushevsky, in the Ukrainian state, each people was important. They wanted to use autonomy to exercise their own rights; at the same time, they wanted to make it possible for other people as well. The wholeness of national life they wanted to reach for Ukrainian people should not suppress other people; fulfilment of their cultural and national development should not be limited.²⁹

24 Dobriansky, 1871, pp. 4–6.

25 Ress, 2007, p. 535.

26 Топильский, 2017, p. 27.

27 Liber, 2016, pp. 32–33.

28 Liber, 2016, p. 33.

29 Грушевський, 1991, p. 103.

The First World War enlivened nationality movements in Russia, the already politicized Ukrainian movement included. In March 1917, the mostly social democratic Ukrainian activists founded the Central Council (also called Central Rada) in Kyiv, whose task was to give voice to Ukrainian claims during the empire's expected transformation process. Out of the Ukrainian political claims, the All-Ukrainian National Congress convened in April 1917 was especially important. In his article *On the All-Ukrainian Congress*, published in March 1917, Mykhailo Hrushevsky called on Ukrainians and non-Ukrainians 'of all regions, lands, nooks and crannies of our national territory standing on the Ukrainian political platform.'³⁰ On the Congress, the Ukrainian organizations representing different political orientations presented their visions concerning the future of Ukrainian territories, resulting in a consensus of the demand of Ukrainian autonomy inside Russia.

The Central Council initiated discussions with the Russian Provisional Government, established following the February Revolution and abdication of Emperor Nicholas II. As the discussion with the Russian Provisional Government ended in a complete failure, the Central Council issued the First Universal of June 23, 1917, which proclaimed Ukraine's autonomy stating that 'from this day on we alone will create our life.' The Second Universal of July 16, 1917, proclaimed that the Central Rada would be 'the single supreme body of revolutionary democracy in Ukraine.' After the 1917 October Revolution (Bolshevik Coup), the Central Council did not recognize the Bolshevik Power; at the same time, they declared that they were interested in the civil democratic transformation and federalization of Russia.³¹ The Third Universal of November 20, 1917, proclaimed the creation of the Ukrainian People's Republic within a federated Russia. At last—opposing the more and more significant Bolshevik breakthrough—the Fourth Universal of January 22, 1918, proclaimed that the Ukrainian People's Republic 'hereby becomes an independent, free, and sovereign state of the Ukrainian people, subject to no one.'³² These universals were more than actual political declarations; they held symbolic meaning. Issuance of universals was common in the period of the Zaporizhian Host.³³

On January 22, 1919, exactly a year after the issue of the Fourth Universal, the 'Act of Unification' of the Ukrainian People's Republic³⁴ and Western Ukrainian People's Republic³⁵ was officially announced on the St. Sophia Square in Kyiv. In Ukraine, the Day of Unification has been officially celebrated since 1999. A day before, the representatives of the Transcarpathian Ukranophile movement declared in Khust that they were willing to join 'Great Ukraine.'

30 Солдатенко, 1999, p. 145.

31 Kasianov, 2015, p. 86.

32 Ploky, 2015, p. 209.

33 Kasianov, 2015, p. 82.

34 Dnieper Ukraine ('over Dnieper land') or Great Ukraine.

35 Eastern Galicia and part of Bukovina. Proclaimed November 1, 1918 on the former Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The territorial and social basis of the Ukrainian People's Republic was decreasing; however, Ukrainian politicians managed to send a delegation to the peace negotiations in Brest-Litovsk, where the representatives of the Central Powers—Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire, and Bulgaria—signed the peace agreement with Ukraine within a short time, as they wanted to put pressure on the Soviet Union.³⁶ For Ukraine, recognition of the independent state was a satisfying success, the more so as the Central Powers promised to support them in the armed struggle against the Bolsheviks. When on March 3, 1918, Bolshevik Russia signed a separate peace treaty, the military troops of the Central Powers occupied Ukrainian territories.

Different German attitudes appeared concerning Ukrainian statehood. In the opinion of the German general Erich Ludendorff, the existence of Ukraine depended on the presence of the German army. General Wilhelm Groener's opinion was similar; he said that—supposing that the existence of a state depends on an efficient army and good finance—one could not speak about a Ukrainian state. The State Secretary of Foreign Office Paul von Hintze thought the occupation of Ukraine made it possible to approach Russia; he wanted to Ukrainianize Russia starting from Kyiv.³⁷

It was more obvious than before that the Ukrainian state initiative was actually unable to control the territories belonging to it. As for compliance with the peace terms, German and Austro-Hungarian military leadership found a simple solution: they dismissed the seemingly incompetent leaders of the Ukrainian People's Republic and appointed Pavlo Skoropadskyi, the greatest landowner of Ukrainian territories. Skoropadskyi was of Ukrainian origin and called himself the hetman of the Ukrainian State.³⁸ However, the agreement with the occupants limited Skoropadskyi's scope of activities. The existence and fall of the hetman system depended on the First World War position of the Central Powers. As soon as their defeat became obvious in the autumn of 1918 and the German and Austro-Hungarian military leadership withdrew their troops from Ukrainian territories, Skoropadskyi had to leave, too.

A new leadership tried to grant the existence of the Ukrainian state, but it failed. Following the end of the First World War, Western Ukraine became part of re-emerging Poland for nearly two decades. Contemporary and historical works in the first part of the 20th century stated that Andrey Sheptytsky, the Metropolitan Archbishop of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, strengthened the Ukrainian national movement.³⁹ The two most important Ukrainian political organizations were the National Democratic Alliance (Ukrainske Natsionalno-Demokratychnе Obiednannia – UNDO) and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Orhanizatsiia ukrainskykh natsionalistiv – OUN). The radical OUN did not hold back from terrorist offenses. Their ideology was based on the national perception of political journalist and theorist Dmytro Dontsov, the 'spiritual father' of the OUN, who condemned the liberal nationalism

36 Lieb and Dornik, 2015, pp. 53–55.

37 Lieb and Dornik, 2015, pp. 66–67.

38 Hagen, 2004, p. 115.

39 Плохій, 2019, p. 309.

of the Ukrainian revolution. They considered the nation an all-important objective and wanted to achieve independence at any cost.⁴⁰ They considered the declaration of the state's independence, which was called Carpatho-Ukraine (present-day Transcarpathia) and belonged to Czechoslovakia in mid-March 1939, as part of the Ukrainian Piemont,⁴¹ the Ukrainian state building effort.

In 1922, most parts of Ukraine were integrated into the Soviet Union as a constituent republic. Each of the three Soviet Constitutions (1924, 1936, 1977), as well as the Soviet Ukrainian constitutions, involved the principle of secession, but it was actually never realizable. There was no place for dissidents (persons opposing the current political structure and nationalists were then called 'ideological deviationists') in the Soviet state. The Ukrainian question again became the question of protecting the Ukrainian language and identity. Ukrainian social activist Ivan Dzyuba argued in his samizdat essay *Internationalism or Russification?* (1965) that Ukrainian culture should be allowed to develop into a full-fledged and modern national culture and should not be treated as an ethnographic, provincial version of a higher all-Russian culture. He stated that there was continuity between the tsarist and the Soviet treatment of Ukraine.⁴² It is of special interest that the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic were founding members of the United Nations (1945). Until 1958, the permanent mission of Ukraine was led by the Minister of Foreign Affairs rather than the permanent representative. Since Ukraine's independence, membership in the United Nations has been a priority of Ukraine's foreign policy.

The Soviet Union established a huge Ukrainian republic within its own borders. The borders of the Ukrainian constituent republic had been expanding since 1922. In 1939, following the Invasion of Poland, German and Soviet troops divided the territory of Poland, and Galicia became part of Ukraine. In 1940, the Soviets annexed Bessarabia and northern Bukovina, which became parts of Soviet Ukraine. In 1945, by Treaty between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, Trans-Carpathian Ukraine (present-day Transcarpathia) united 'with its immemorial motherland, the Ukraine.' These territorial gains were internationally recognized by the Paris peace treaties of 1947.

In 1954—on the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav—the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union issued a decree transferring the Crimean peninsula from the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic to Soviet Ukraine 'taking into account the integral character of the economy, the territorial proximity, and the close economic and cultural ties between the Crimea Province and the Ukrainian SSR.'⁴³

Within the given borders, independent Ukraine became the second biggest state in Europe (after Russia).⁴⁴ However, even the most resolute Ukrainian patriots could

40 For details, see Erlacher, 2021.

41 Magocsi, 2002, pp. 2–4.

42 Szporluk, 1989, p. 30.

43 Jones, 2014, p. 121.

44 Area total 603,628 km².

not expect in early 1991 that Soviet Ukraine had a real chance to become an independent state, preserving its territorial unity. For the time being, the maximal political objective of the People's Movement of Ukraine (popularly known as Rukh) led by Viacheslav Chornovil was a federal Ukrainian state integrated in the confederation of previous Soviet republics. The most popular political act of the Rukh was the Human Chain on January 21, 1990, which commemorated the act of unifying the Ukrainian lands in 1919.

4. Independent Ukraine

As in 1917/18, when the fourth Universal declared the state's independence, in 1990/91, Ukrainian independence was discussed in two documents. The phases were the same: first the re-thinking of the country's position within the existing state in power, then the entire independence of the state. The 'Declaration on the state sovereignty of Ukraine' adopted by the parliament of Ukraine (Verkhovna Rada) on July 16, 1990, wanted to break away from the Moscow-based control in several questions, but did not want to leave the Soviet state. For example:

- 'proclaims the state sovereignty of Ukraine as supremacy, independence, completeness and indivisibility of the authorities of the republic within its territory and independence and equality in external relations.'
- 'The Ukrainian SSR is independent in the solution of any questions of the state life.'
- 'The Ukrainian SSR performs supremacy in all the territory.'
- 'The Ukrainian SSR independently determines the economic status and enshrines it in the laws.'
- 'The Ukrainian SSR independently establishes procedure for the organization of conservation in the territory of the Republic and procedure for use of natural resources.'
- 'The Ukrainian SSR is independent in the solution of questions of science, education, cultural and spiritual development...'

The Declaration was a large legal document, whose several paragraphs have been included in the present Constitution adopted in 1996.

The 'Act of Declaration of Independence of Ukraine' was adopted by the Verkhovna Rada on August 24, 1991. The short document consisted of a few lines referring to 'the thousand-year tradition of state development in Ukraine,' 'realizing the Declaration on State Sovereignty of Ukraine,' '—solemnly declares the Independence of Ukraine and the creation of an independent Ukrainian state—UKRAINE. The territory of Ukraine is indivisible and inviolable.' The Act was affirmed through a national referendum on December 1, 1991. Since 1992, Ukraine's Independence Day has been celebrated on August 24th. The disintegration of the Soviet Union was declared after the Ukrainian referendum, followed by the founding of the Commonwealth of

Independent States (CIS), which was a way leading to civilized divorce rather than integration.

The location of Central Europe has always depended on the actual balance of political powers. In the 17th and 18th centuries, it coincided with the territory of the Roman-German Empire. Up to the establishment of Germany based on the German small unit, German centrality did not change much; however, the approaches differed. In 1867, when Austria-Hungary was established, this virtual Central European area was spreading onto the Hungarian Kingdom and the northwestern parts of the Balkan peninsula. During the First World War, the focus was placed on cultural arguments rather than economic-cultural ones. Central Europe covered the area between the North and Baltic Seas and the southern edge of the Adriatic and the Danube plain, allowing the connection of countries situated on the edge and on the Russian language boundary to the East, a significant part of the Ukrainian Plain included.

As a matter of fact, the eastern orientation of political Central Europe was due to the First World War. A regional consequence of the Treaty of Versailles—the primary treaty produced by the Paris Peace Conference at the end of First World War—was the term Intermediate Europe, which became part of Central European discourse and was to define the buffer zone in the small states' region between Russia willing to expand to the west and Germany willing to expand to the east. After the Second World War, the term Central Europe became meaningless; the iron curtain divided the region—Eastern Europe was to the east and Western Europe to the west. Since the 1970s, the term Central Europe has reappeared as a historical, cultural, geographical, and social-geographical unit, a 'symbolic reality,' that did not want to be identified with Eastern Europe.⁴⁵

According to Georgii Kasianov, countries established after the disintegration of the Soviet Union now form the post-soviet space, without the Baltic states, which—joining the European Union in 2004—'returned' to Europe. Based on political geography, the area can be divided into new units: new Eastern Europe, including the countries of the Eastern Partnership (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine), the Central Asian region (Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan), and Russia, which is traditionally situated between 'East and West' and is willing to play a special role in the region as well as in the whole world.⁴⁶

Since Samuel P. Huntington created the theory of 'torn countries,'⁴⁷ stating that in the case of Ukraine, there is a multiple faulting line. The 'Two Ukraines' discourse has made analysts eager to clarify if this dividedness can be determined and if so, in which contexts. This approach has historical socialization (regional) roots, remembering mainly the historical Right-bank and Left-bank Ukraine.

It was an unexpected event of the Orange Revolution (Pomarancheva revoliutsiia) in 2004 that, during the presidential election campaign, the competing political sides

45 Mezó, 2001, pp. 81–103.

46 Касьянов, 2018, pp. 80–101.

47 For details, see Huntington, 1996.

stressed regional differences instead of economic-social issues. This way, the Two Ukraines discourse left the world of science and, widely spread, actually dominated the public discourse on Ukraine.

The Western world did not apply the category of political opposition in the case of the deeply divided country. In their opinion, there was a ‘geopolitical war’ between ‘European-oriented’ Western Ukraine and ‘Russian-oriented’ Eastern Ukraine. Canadian politologist Denis Soltys thought that placing the border of civilization on the Dnieper-line Huntington recreated the interpretation of international relations based on the categories of ‘influx zones,’ and it was a mistake to state that the West could define the borders of its ‘own’ civilization at its own discretion. The contrary could be observed in Ukrainian commentaries, and the problem of regionalism was often completely ignored.

The myth of ‘Two Ukraines’ (i.e., the nationally conscious Ukraine and the ‘other’ one—the first being the right norm) especially appeared in the publications of publicist and political analyst Mykola Riabchuk. Politologist Volodymyr Kulyk called attention to the fact that this approach ignored the differences between the given groups and other fault lines present in Ukrainian society. Writer Tatiana Zhurzhenko also argued against this concept. She thought it was unacceptable to create an etic fault line based on ethno-linguistic criteria, which would result in the Ukrainian speaking world being characterized by civil society and democracy, while Russian speaking people were identified with corruption, a shadow economy, and bad music. Historian Yaroslav Hrytsak stressed that it was incorrect to draw conclusions concerning the deepness of fault lines solely based on the two extremes, that is, (Western Ukrainian) Lviv and (Eastern Ukrainian) Donetsk.⁴⁸

Russia has been Ukraine’s most important commercial partner since the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Ukraine has been exposed to Russian import, concerning energy carriers, mineral products, and nuclear fuel. Ukraine is traditionally a transit country, situated on the transportation route of energy carriers; therefore it has great geopolitical significance. Pipeline gas and oil from Russia to Europe is primarily transported across Ukraine.

Independent Ukraine renounced the atomic weapons situated in its territory. In exchange, the three atomic great powers—Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom—who signed the Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, and later China and France, who issued a supporting declaration, granted the territorial integrity of Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan.

In 1995, the two countries signed the Russian-Ukrainian Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Partnership, which declared the mutual respect of territorial integrity. However, the agreement concerning the division of the Black Sea Fleet was only concluded in 1997 and was ratified by the two parliaments in 1999. In addition, the Agreement between the Russian Federation and Ukraine on the Parameters of the Division of the Black Sea Fleet (1996) and the Agreement between Ukraine and Russia on the Black

48 For details, see Портнов, 2007, pp. 93–138.

Sea Fleet in Ukraine (or the ‘Kharkiv Pact’) (2010) declared that Sevastopol remained the basis of the Russian naval forces on the Crimean peninsula. Russia wanted to prevent termination of the latter agreement, which led to the annexation of the Crimea in 2014.

It is a myth to think that Ukraine was oriented once to the East and once to the West. The country built parallel connections. Ukraine was the first CIS-country to sign an agreement of cooperation with NATO, joined the Partnership for Peace (PfP) (1994), and signed the Charter of a distinctive partnership (1997), the basic foundation underpinning NATO-Ukraine relations. In 2020—after Australia, Jordan, Georgia, Sweden, and Finland—Ukraine was the sixth to join the NATO Enhanced Opportunities Partners program founded at the NATO summit in Wales in 2014.

Ukraine is a member state of the Council of Europe (1995) and the World Trade Organization (2009). At the end of 2013, Ukraine should have signed the Association Agreement with the EU and joined the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) representing an integral part of the Association Agreement. Contemporary Ukrainian political leadership backed off, which led to a deep crisis in domestic politics—the Euromaidan Revolution or Revolution of Dignity (Revoliutsiia hidnosti) in late 2013 and early 2014, followed by the conflict with Russia in 2014. According to Timothy Snyder,

[t]he Russian invasion and annexation of Crimea and then the support of armed separatism in Donets’k and Luhans’k oblast ended a long moment in European and Atlantic history in which a certain order was thought to be durable and sovereignty taken for granted. [...] The subject was no longer a revolution within one country but the nature of the international order.⁴⁹

After the political leadership opposing the approach toward the European Union was overthrown, the Ukraine Association Agreement entered into full force on September 1, 2017. Ukraine is a priority partner within the Eastern Partnership (EaP) and the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP).

The successor states of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (‘the Lublin Triangle’⁵⁰) are Ukraine’s key partners. Since the democratic change, the eastern politics of Poland have not changed: the sovereignty of the Baltic states, Belarus, and Ukraine, should be granted by all means as these countries create a buffer zone between Poland and Russia. Warsaw would do its best to strengthen them, take part in their nation building attempts needed in society, and support them in approaching the western world. In 2004, in the period of the Orange Revolution and in the winter of 2013/14, during the Euromaidan Revolution, Lithuania seemed like a mediator and a strong supporter of Ukrainian democratic processes and European integration. Ukraine is in close cooperation with Moldova and Georgia, forming a trilateral alliance called the Association Trio in 2021 to promote their common joining of the EU.

49 Snyder, 2015, p. 695.

50 Denomination based on Union of Lublin (1569), created the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

According to Richard Sakwa

there are two contrasting visions of statehood, and ultimately the Ukrainian crisis of 2013–14 is a battle between the two. The first is monist nationalism, driven by the idea that after several centuries of stunted statehood the Ukrainian nation has had to seize the opportunity to join the front ranks of nation states. ... The model of integrated nationalism shares some of the concerns of the classic ideas of integral nationalism – the latter denoting the creation ... a united people with a single language, culture, and mythology...Integrated nationalism is fundamentally oriented toward a civic model of state development and is tolerant of diversity and rights.⁵¹

It can be best reflected by the laws concerning settling the situation of Temporarily Occupied Territories of Ukraine (the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and certain areas in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions) and the Ukrainian language as a ‘key factor of the unity of the Ukrainian state,’ which should grant the ‘monolithicity of Ukrainian society,’⁵² that is, the Law of Ukraine ‘On Education’ no. 2145-VIII of September 5, 2017, and the Law ‘On Ensuring the Functioning of the Ukrainian Language as the State Language’ no. 2704-VIII of April 25, 2019. The state language became the main cohesive power of state sovereignty, while at the same time, the situation for national minorities—with the exception of ‘indigenous peoples’(Crimean Tatars, Karaites, and Krymchaks)⁵³got worse than before 2014.

The breakup with Russia, officially considered an aggressor by Ukraine, and the commitment to the West were incorporated into the constitution. The Law of Ukraine ‘On Amendments to the Constitution of Ukraine (Regarding the Strategic Course of the State for Acquiring Full-Fledged Membership of Ukraine in the European Union and in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization)’ no. 2680-VIII of February 7, 2019, added the following to the preamble of the Constitution of Ukraine (1996)⁵⁴:

51 Sakwa, 2015, pp. 14., 20.

52 ‘The legal status of the Ukrainian language as the state language, enshrined in the provisions of Articles 10.1 and 10.2 of the Constitution, is at the same time a fundamental constitutional value, a specific feature, and a key factor of unity of the Ukrainian state and an integral part of its constitutional identity. As an institute of Ukrainian statehood that combines legal and value components, the Ukrainian language is called on to perform an integrative (unification) function and to ensure the monolithicity of Ukrainian society at various levels. The Ukrainian language as the state language is an important tool for regulating the activities of all state power and local self-government authorities; it has a crucial role in ensuring the political unity of the state and social cohesion in accordance with one of the aspirations guided by the constitution drafter in adopting the Constitution on June 28, 1996.’ Summary to the Decision of the Grand Chamber of the Constitutional Court of Ukraine no. 1-r/2021 of July 14, 2021, in the case upon the constitutional petition of 51 People’s Deputies of Ukraine on the constitutionality of the Law ‘On Ensuring the Functioning of the Ukrainian Language as the State Language’ (available at: <https://ccu.gov.ua/en/docs/3434>).

53 See most recently Law of Ukraine ‘On the indigenous peoples of Ukraine’ no. 1616-IX of 1 July 2021.

54 Frosini and Lapa, 2020, pp. 79–85.

The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, on behalf of the Ukrainian people—citizens of Ukraine of all nationalities ... caring for the strengthening of civil harmony on Ukrainian soil, and confirming the European identity of the Ukrainian people and the irreversibility of the European and Euro-Atlantic course of Ukraine...⁵⁵

References

- Dobriansky, A. (1871) *Проектъ политической программы для Руси австрійской*. Lvov: Ставропигійській институт.
- Erlacher, T. (2021) *Ukrainian Nationalism in the Age of Extremes. An Intellectual Biography of Dmytro Dontsov*. Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
- Frosini, J.O., Lapa, V. (2020) ‘The Historical and Legal Significance of Constitutional Preambles: A Case Study on the Ukrainian Constitution of 1996’ in Biagi, F., Frosini, J.O., Mazzone, J. (eds.) *Comparative Constitutional History*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, pp. 60–88.
- Hagen, M. (2004) ‘“I Love Russia, and/but I Want Ukraine”, or How a Russian General Became Hetman of the Ukrainian State, 1917–1918’, *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 2, pp. 115–148.
- Himka, J.-P. (1996) ‘Ruthenians’ in *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, available at: <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CR%5CU%5CRuthenians.htm> (Accessed: 10 December 2021).
- Huntington, S.P. (1996) *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Jones, D.A. (2014) ‘Quid pro Quo: Dependent Relative Revocation and Quixotic Military Dis-encirclement’, *Studia Europejskie-Studies in European Affairs*, 72(4), pp. 99–120.
- Kasianov, G. (2015) ‘Ukraine between Revolution, Independence, and Foreign Dominance’ in *The Emergence of Ukraine. Self-Determination, Occupation, and War in Ukraine, 1917–1922*. Edmonton – Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, pp. 76–131., available at: https://doi.org/10.26530/oapen_588020 (Accessed: 10 December 2021).
- Koznarsky, T. (2017) ‘“Neither Dead nor Alive”: Ukrainian Language on the Brink of Romanticism’, *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 4(2), pp. 7–37.
- Liber G.O. (2016) *Total Wars and the Making of Modern Ukraine, 1914–1954*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

55 Constitution of Ukraine (1996), (in Ukrainian on the site of the Verkhovna Rada available at: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/254%D0%BA/96-%D0%B2%D1%80#Text>; in English (amended 2019): https://www.legislationline.org/download/id/8233/file/Ukraine_Constitution_am2019_EN.pdf).

- Lieb, P., Dornik, W. (2015) 'The Ukrainian Policy of the Central Powers during the First World War' in *The Emergence of Ukraine. Self-Determination, Occupation, and War in Ukraine, 1917–1922*. Edmonton, Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Magocsi, P. R. (2002) *The Roots of Ukrainian Nationalism: Galicia as Ukraine's Piedmont*. University of Toronto Press, available at: <https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442682252> (Accessed: 10 December 2021).
- Mező, F. (2001) 'Közép-Európa fogalmi változása térben és időben', *Tér és Társadalom*, 15(3–4), pp. 81–103.
- Molnár, F. (2018) *A Munkácsi Görögkatolikus Egyházmegye története 1848–1849-ben. PhD-értekezés*. Budapest: ELTE BTK.
- Morrison, J. (1993) 'Pereyaslav and After: The Russian-Ukrainian Relationship', *International Affairs*, 69 (4), pp. 677–703., Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2620592> (Accessed: 10 December 2021).
- Plokhly, S. (2006). *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Plokhly, S. (2015) *The Gates of Europe: A History of Ukraine*. New York: Basic Books.
- Plokhly, S. (2009–2010) 'Poltava: The Battle That Never Ends', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 31 (4), pp. xiii–xxv.
- Procyk, A. (2019) *Young Europe and the Birth of Modern Nationalism in the Slavic World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ress, I. (2007) 'Andrássy Gyula, a "birodalmi miniszterelnök"?'', *Történelmi Szemle*, 49(4), pp. 519–530.
- Romsics, I. (1998) *Nemzet, nemzetiség és állam Kelet-Közép- és Délkelet-Európában a 19. és 20. században*. Budapest: Napvilág Kiadó.
- Rudnytsky, I. (1987) *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
- Sakwa, R. (2015) *Frontline Ukraine: Crisis in the Borderlands*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Shkandrij, M. (2001) *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Snyder, T. (2015) 'Integration and Disintegration: Europe, Ukraine, and the World', *Slavic Review*, 74 (4), pp. 695–707.
- Subtelny, O. (1988) *Ukraine: A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Szporluk, R. (1989) 'Dilemmas of Russian Nationalism', *Problems of Communism*, 38(1–2), pp. 15–35.
- Білий, Б.М. (2010) 'Іван Могильницький' in *Енциклопедія історії України*. Т. 7. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Вовк, О. (2010) 'Конституція Пилипа Орлика: оригінал та його історія', *Архіви України*, 39(3–4), pp. 145–166.
- Грицак, Я. (2019) *Нарис історії України: формування модерної української нації XIX–XX ст.* Київ: Генеза.
- Грушевський, М. (1991) *Хто такі українці і чого вони хочуть*. Київ: Т-во Знання України.

- Екельчик, С. (2010) *История Украины. Становление современной нации*. Киев: Издательство К.І.С.
- Касьянов, Г. (2018) *Past Continuous: Історична політика 1980-х – 2000-х. Україна та сусіди*. Київ: Laurus.
- Магочій П.-Р. (2012) *Україна. Історія її земель та народів*. Ужгород: Вид. В. Падяка.
- Плохій, С. (2019) *Брама Європи. Історія України від скіфських воєн до незалежності*. Харків: Клуб Сімейного Дозвілля.
- Портнов, А. (2007) ‘Упражнения с историей по-украински (Заметки об общественных измерениях функционирования истории в постсоветской Украине)’, *Ab Imperio*, 3, pp. 93–138.
- Салтовський, О. (2002) *Концепції української державності в історії вітчизняної політичної думки (від витоків до початку ХХ століття)*. Київ: Вид. ПАРАПАН.
- Солдатенко В. (1999) *Українська революція. Історичний нарис*. Київ: Либідь.
- Топильський, А. (2017) *Формирование украинского национального самосознания на территории Галиции во второй половине XIX – начале XX в. Диссертация канд. ист. наук*. Тамбов: Тамбовский государственный университет имени Г.Р. Державина.
- Чухліб, Т. (2003) *Гетьмани і монархи. Українська держава в міжнародних відносинах 1648–1714 рр.* Київ: Інститут історії України НАНУ.
- Шандра, В. (2013) ‘Мова як засіб формування національної ідентичності’ in Боряк, Г. (ред.): *Українська ідентичність і мовне питання в Російській імперії: спроба державного регулювання (1847–1914)*. Київ: Інститут історії України НАН України, pp. VII–XXXVIII.