



UDC: 323.1

Ponomarenko Liudmyla Viktorivna,
Leading specialist of the International Relations Division, Communications Department, the National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, 04050, Kyiv, Str. Puhachova, 12/2, tel.: +38 (044) 481 21 76, e-mail: plv_maren@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9999-6335

Пономаренко Людмила Вікторівна,
провідний фахівець відділу забезпечення міжнародних зв'язків управління комунікативними зв'язками Національної академії державного управління при Президенті України, 04050, м. Київ, вул. Пуґачова, 12/2, тел.: +38 (044) 481 21 76, e-mail: plv_maren@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9999-6335

Пономаренко Людмила Вікторівна,
ведучий спеціаліст відділу забезпечення

міжнародних зв'язків управління комунікативними зв'язками Національної академії державного управління при Президенті України, 04050, г. Київ, ул. Пуґачова, 12/2, тел.: +38 (044) 481 21 76, e-mail: plv_maren@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-9999-6335

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31618/vadnd.v1i14.116>

MODERN TRENDS AND CONTRADICTIONS IN THE PROCESSES OF NATION-BUILDING IN UKRAINE AND THE EUROPEAN UNION IN THE MIRROR OF ARCHETYPES

Abstract. The article is an attempt to study the nation-building processes in Ukraine and in the countries of the European Union. The similarities and differences are accentuated for Ukraine, which was able to restore its independence after a long national liberation struggle, and the countries of the European Union, most of which can be called the states with sustainable democracy. In order to study the peculiarities of the nation-building processes, universal features common for any nation are investigated: history, territory, language, culture and national self-consciousness.

The peculiarities of the nation-building in the newly and post-imperialist states are determined, as well as the influence of history on the formation of the archetypes of the nations. The reasons for the activation of the nation-building processes and their interrelation with the strengthening of separatist sentiments

are investigated. The urgency of the separatism issue on the agenda of not only Ukraine but also of the countries of Europe is mentioned. The influence of nation-building processes on the interpretation of historical facts and events, attempts to “rewrite” historical facts or to silence them is considered. The role of the language issue in the nation-building and the duality of its interpretation are studied. Particular attention is drawn to the disagreements that have emerged in the nation-building process in Ukraine and the Member States of the European Union. The contradictions in the interpretation of various social, political and cultural phenomena in Ukraine and the countries of the European Union are considered. The historical lessons of the European Union, which are worth learning in Ukraine for the further painless nation-building, and valuable European experience, which should be studied or taken into account in practice, are analysed. The main challenges facing Ukraine and the European Union countries regarding the future of the nation-building, peaceful coexistence and productive cooperation are highlighted.

Keywords: nation-building, Ukraine, European Union, territory, separatism, language, history, self-consciousness.

СУЧАСНІ ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ ТА ПРОТИРІЧЧЯ ПРОЦЕСІВ НАЦІЄТВОРЕННЯ В УКРАЇНІ ТА ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОМУ СОЮЗІ У ДЗЕРКАЛІ АРХЕТИПКИ

Анотація. Досліджено процеси націєтворення в Україні та країнах Європейського Союзу. Акцентовано увагу на факторах, що і спільними та відмінними для України, яка змогла відновити свою незалежність після тривалих національно-визвольних змагань, та країн Європейського Союзу, більшість з яких можна назвати державами із сталою демократією. З метою вивчення особливостей процесів націєтворення розглянуто універсальні ознаки, характерні для будь-якої нації: історію, територію, мову, культуру та національну самосвідомість.

Окреслено особливості націєтворення в новостворених і постімперіалістичних державах, а також вплив історії на формування архетипів націй. Досліджено причини активізації процесів націєтворення та їх взаємозв'язок із посиленням сепаратистських настроїв. Зазначено актуальність питання сепаратизму в порядку денному не лише України, але й країн Європи. Розглянуто вплив процесів націєтворення на тлумачення історичних фактів та подій, на спроби “переписування” історичних фактів або їх замовчування. Вивчено роль мовного питання в націєтворенні та двоякість його тлумачення. Окрему увагу звернено на розбіжності, що склалися у процесі націєтворення в Україні та державах – членах Європейського Союзу. Розглянуто суперечності у тлумаченні різних суспільно-політичних і культурних явищ в Україні та країнах Європейського Союзу. Проаналізовано історичні уроки Європейського Союзу, які варто засвоїти Україні для подальшого безболісного творення нації, та цінний європейський досвід, який варто вивчати або враховувати на практиці. Висвітлено основні виклики, що стоять перед

Україною та країнами Європейського Союзу, щодо подальшого націєтворення, мирного співіснування та продуктивного співробітництва.

Ключові слова: націєтворення, Україна, Європейський Союз, територія, сепаратизм, мова, історія, самосвідомість.

СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ И ПРОТИВОРЕЧИЯ ПРОЦЕССОВ НАЦИЕОБРАЗОВАНИЯ В УКРАИНЕ И ЕВРОПЕЙСКОМ СОЮЗЕ В ЗЕРКАЛЕ АРХЕТИПИКИ

Аннотация. Предпринята попытка исследовать процессы нациеобразования в Украине и странах Европейского Союза. Акцентировано внимание на факторах, являющихся общими и отличительными для Украины, которая смогла восстановить свою независимость после длительной национально-освободительной борьбы, и стран Европейского Союза, большинство из которых можно назвать государствами с устоявшейся демократией. С целью изучения особенностей процессов нациеобразования рассмотрено универсальные признаки, характерные для любой нации: историю, территорию, язык, культуру и национальное самосознание.

Определены особенности нациеобразования в новосозданных и постимпериалистичних государствах, а также влияние истории на формирование архетипов наций. Исследованы причины активизации процессов нациеобразования и их взаимосвязь с усилением сепаратистских настроений. Указано актуальность вопроса сепаратизма в повестке дня не только Украины, но и стран Европы. Рассмотрено влияние процессов нациеобразования на толкование исторических фактов и событий, попытки “переписывания” исторических фактов или их замалчивание. Изучена роль языкового вопроса в нациеобразовании и двойственность его толкования. Отдельное внимание обращено на различия, которые сложились в процессе нациеобразования в Украине и государствах-членах Европейского Союза. Рассмотрены противоречия в толковании различных общественно-политических и культурных явлений в Украине и странах Европейского Союза. Проанализированы исторические уроки Европейского Союза, которые стоит усвоить Украине для дальнейшего безболезненного созидания нации, и ценный европейский опыт, который стоит изучать или учитывать на практике. Освещены основные вызовы, которые стоят перед Украиной и странами Европейского Союза относительно дальнейшего нациеобразования, мирного сосуществования и продуктивного сотрудничества.

Ключевые слова: нациеобразование, Украина, Европейский Союз, территория, сепаратизм, язык, история, самосознание.

Target setting. Development of Ukrainian statehood has never been a simple and unambiguous process. Ukrainians have come a long way from the disenfranchised population of the conquered lands to full-fledged masters

in their own state. At the same time, proclamation of the European integration course, strengthening of the nation-building processes, and the desire to resolve national and foreign policy issues independently have unexpectedly provoked resistance, both within the “fifth column” in Ukraine and in its separate neighbouring states. While the state is weak, politically, economically or militarily, it is not capable to protect itself or its citizens.

Strengthening of the nation-building processes in Ukraine is an evidence of renewal, rethinking of statehood, awareness of one’s own belonging to the Ukrainian nation and of one’s own unique identity. This process is quite natural and legitimate, and it is typical not only for Ukraine, but also for the countries of the European Union. The EU Member States have passed or are still going through the same stages of the nation-building as Ukraine, referring to the same national archetypes that create each individual nation. Realizing the similarity of the nation-building processes in Ukraine and the European Union, we can talk about the further development of joint ways for peaceful coexistence, fruitful cooperation and full mutual understanding, as among equitable states of the unified European family.

Analysis of basic research and publication. The issues of the nation, nationalism, national elites and national idea evoke the expected interest in modern Ukrainian society and have been widely reflected in the researches of national and foreign scholars. The issue of the nation-building is mainly considered in the context of the above-mentioned issues. Among the research-

ers who worked in this direction, we can mention B. Anderson, E. Weber, Ya. Dashkevych, K. Deutsch, E. Gellner, B. Kravchenko, V. Lypynskyi, I. Lytsiak-Rudnytskyi, E. Smith and others.

At the same time, the issue of the nation-building, the search for common elements in the nation-building processes in Ukraine and in the countries of the European Union, despite its relevance, remains relatively poorly studied.

The purpose of the article is to determine the characteristic features inherent in the processes of nation-building in Ukraine and the European Union in the mirror of archetypes.

The statement of basic materials. The modern world, like modern Europe in particular, is globalizing every year. Borders are opened, visa procedures are simplified or cancelled, migration is intensified, especially labour migration, which contribute to the erosion of the monolithic nature of nations and cultural values.

The creation of the European Union as supranational unity implies not only the integration of markets and the unification of the legislation norms of the Member States, but also the generalization of the daily life foundations of the average European.

At the same time, against the backdrop of the policy of integration, unification, standardization and multiculturalism, there are clearly traced trends towards upholding one’s own national identity. And in the old Europe, where the alignment of forces has been constant for many decades, nation-building processes are revitalized, the relevance of the own nation-building archetypes is growing.

The obvious thing is that the nation-building process is peculiar not only to newly founded states that recently declared or returned their independence, but also to states that have never lost it.

In many European countries there is an imperial past in their historical luggage, and in the foreign or national policies of such states one can observe the archetypes of behaviour common for the former British Empire, the French colonial empire, Austria-Hungary or the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Domination archetype, embedded in the subconsciousness, forces them to be *primus inter pares** and do not settle for less.

The European Union opens wide economic opportunities for the countries of Europe, however it limits their own self-identification and freedom of decision-making. Therefore, the revival of national movements, including separatist sentiments, the aggravation of nationalism in certain countries, becomes a kind of protest.

Strengthening of the nation-building processes can be caused by various reasons. For some countries, like for Great Britain, they can be economic, and for others, like Poland, ideological [1; 2]. The activation of the nation-building processes in Ukraine, which to a large extent have never stopped on Ukrainian lands, was detonated by the threat of losing independence, triggered by external military aggression. In response, Ukrainians turned to those sources, those archetypes on which the nation is created.

The issue of creation of any nation is very sensitive. It is significantly in-

fluenced by the historical peculiarities of the nation's development, the archetypes, which provided a basis for the nation at the dawn of its origin, and those external influences that affected the nation during its existence.

Therefore, in order to understand the modern nation-building processes in the European Union and in Ukraine, one should study the universal distinctive features common for each nation, namely: history, territory, inhabited by the nation, language, culture, national self-awareness [3]. These are the features appealed by those citizens during the revitalization of the nation-building processes in the state.

The history of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people was not simple and unambiguous. The loss of independence, fragmentation, division of Ukrainian lands between the western and eastern neighbours, centuries of occupation and enslavement could not but affected the nation-building processes in modern Ukraine. The proclamation of independence in 1991 triggered those processes of the nation-building, which during previous centuries were suppressed or which developed extremely slowly, compelled to overcome numerous obstacles.

Interest in its historical past, in the sources of the nation is natural. Numerous historical events were rethought, getting rid of ideological eclipsing and silencing. In a new way, we managed to look at the figures of many Ukrainians who were creating Ukrainian history. So, for example, you can now speak aloud about the genocide of the Ukrainians in 1932–33; on forced relocation to Siberia and inhuman conditions of detention for political prisoners in the

* First among equals (Lat.)

Soviet concentration camps; the names of the representatives of “Executed Renaissance” have returned from non-existence; Hetman Ivan Mazepa lost the epithet of “traitor”. The logical continuation of this process is in the publication of updated textbooks on history, researches and publications, as well as informing the general public about historical facts in a simple for understanding way, through the media or social networks.

Unfortunately, as a result of a deliberate distortion of historical facts, criminal silencing and frank rewriting of historical sources by Moscow occupiers of the Ukrainian lands, Ukrainians today do not fully know their own history, gleaning valuable information, in particular from the studies of European historians whose researches have not undergone anti-Ukrainian censorship and from the data from yet confidential archives.

At the same time, the studying of the own history has to do with the history of other states. And no matter how much the EU countries would like to say about the closure of historical accounts to each other, about their final “burial”, the practice shows the opposite. Therefore, the attempts of individual states to “rewrite” separate historical events, giving them a new interpretation or denying the very fact of their existence, seem logical. Historical falsifications, first emerged back in the days of Ancient Egypt, exist to this day. Even the “official” Bible was repeatedly rewritten and edited during numerous church councils. However, for modern Europe, the interpretation of the history of World War II and the post-war period seems more relevant. Some states

are trying to “bleach” their role in the past events, shifting their responsibility to other sides of the confrontation.

And the heroes of the national liberation war for one state may prove to be an enemy for another, as evidenced by, for example, the figure of the Latvian Herberts Cukurs, who is today called the national hero by ones, and a war criminal of the World War II by others [4].

The World War II left behind itself not only ambiguities in the interpretation of certain historical events and figures, but also in matters of post-war territorial division of Europe. After the World War II, world leaders tried to consolidate the borders of countries in the limits of that time, but in Europe, as in the whole world, the nation-building processes continue and, therefore, national confrontations and outbreaks of separatism arise.

For example, it is worth mentioning the rather acute situation in Spain with the Basque Country, as well as a similar situation with the Catalans and Galicians. In France, the issue of Corsica remains open as well as to a lesser extent, Brittany. In Belgium, tension remains between Walloons and Flemings. Great Britain experienced a difficult period of confrontation with separatist tendencies in Northern Ireland, and now has to resist the attempts of Scotland to withdraw from its composition.

Ukraine, unlike the above-mentioned examples, was able to regain its independence, breaking free from imperialist oppression. Unfortunately, it failed to avoid territorial claims. Relevant statements were made by Poland, Hungary and Romania. The economic and political weakness of Ukraine influ-

enced negatively over the attempts to assimilate disputed territories, which resulted in an outbreak of pro-Russian separatism in the most vulnerable regions of Ukraine – in the Crimea and Donbas, which resulted in armed annexation of the peninsula and military confrontation with the invaders and separatists in the Lugansk and Donetsk regions.

At the same time, while Europeans actively oppose separatist sentiments in their own states, the corresponding opposition from Ukraine causes condemnation and “concern” on the part of Europeans. However, as the Ukrainian experience of 2014 showed, indecision in opposing separatism is a threat to every citizen of Ukraine and can become fatal for the independence of the state as a whole. Therefore, the protection of the territorial integrity and defence of the state are the issues of national security and require decisive and thoughtful actions. And in this situation, both territorially interested states and “concerned” observers from the EU should remember the Sudetenland occupation in 1938 and the consequences it had for the whole of Europe.

Today, the European Union includes 28 Member States and officially speaks 24 languages. One can say a lot about the importance of English in international communication, but it should be noted that before speaking English, the Member States fully protected their right to their own language.

Particularly striking is the linguistic example of France. Despite its imperial past, it also faced the need to develop and protect the French language as a state language. More than one and a half centuries of struggle on the lan-

guage “front” have given the legislative consolidation of the status of the French language, in particular, in the fields of education, labour, trade and public services, language quotas on radio, the financial support provided by the legislation for promotion of language and penalties for violators of the corresponding language legislation, in particular the Toubon Law [5]. At the same time, not only certain public structures are standing guard for the state language, but also numerous language associations.

And only in the recent years the conservative in terms of language France has gone to the minimal, but still unheard of for it, concessions, an example of which is the introduction in the National School of Administration (ENA), which prepares the elite of the French public service, of the English-language courses for foreigners.

You can also give an example of Fennomania – the national liberation movement in Finland, the goal of which was to switch from Swedish into Finnish, as well as Finland’s independence [6]. Despite the current official Finnish bilingualism, one can confidently talk about the victory of not so “soft” Fennomania. The struggle for one’s own language ensured the growth of the level of national self-awareness of the Finns, sufficient for obtaining state independence and its further protection.

And among the most recent examples one should mention the situation in Estonia, where you can lose your job today for not knowing the state language [7]. The corresponding requirements for proficiency in the state language are also fixed at the legislative level.

The Ukrainian language, despite the lingvocide, which it had to endure during its existence, and dozens of prohibitions over the past 400 years, was, fortunately, not in such a difficult situation as, for example, Hebrew. At the same time, it is difficult to imagine some Legion of the Ukrainian language defenders, who would walk the streets of Ukrainian cities and scold passers-by, who speak Russian, with the words: “The Ukrainian, speak Ukrainian!”. But such a Legion existed in Israel and it was this kind of activity, among other things, that it was engaged in [8].

While such countries as France have made considerable efforts to develop and protect their state language, unexpected condemnation on the part of certain states is caused by modest attempts of Ukraine to protect the language of 42 million of its citizens, 77,8 % of which, according to the Population Census 2001, are ethnic Ukrainians, and the survey data by the Razumkov Centre in 2017 indicate that the overwhelming majority of Ukrainians – 92 % consider themselves to be ethnic Ukrainians [9, 10].

Therefore, the Ukrainization is quite natural in the monoethnic Ukrainian state, as a necessary measure of protection for ethnic Ukrainians from the attempts of the neighbouring states to “save” us from fictitious threats. Language is not just a means of communication, but one of the most powerful archetypes in the development of the state, the source that has fed the national liberation spirit of Ukrainians for centuries, and despite all the prohibitions continues to unite Ukrainians.

In the process of the nation-building, typical is the nation’s return to its own

sources, historical and cultural roots, in which the archetypes of the nation are encrypted, those features that distinguish it from other members of the European family.

Huge funds are invested both by the European Union in general, and by individual European countries in particular, into the development of their own culture and its popularization outside the EU. The Ukrainian people, for millennia of its existence, has an enormous historical heritage, but, unfortunately, it is not able to manage it properly yet. Some of the cultural artefacts were lost during the occupation by various states, when national treasures were exported to the museums of the occupying states, and some were lost due to a lack of own “managerial skills”. However, Ukrainian identity is not limited to material artefacts, which can be lost or destroyed. This is a huge layer of cultural and spiritual values, which includes folk art, arts and crafts, beliefs, traditions and customs but is not limited to them. All together they help Ukrainians to be Ukrainians.

The difficulties faced by Ukrainians in recent years have unexpectedly become an incentive lacked by many citizens of our state on their way to national self-awareness. The population of Ukraine, which for a long time hardly differed from the population of other countries of the former USSR, under the influence of powerful shocks, finally became aware of itself as citizens, and not just some citizens, but Ukrainians, an authentic and ancient nation which has a majestic and tragic history, not easy present day and future that needs to be build right now.

The total restoration of the national memory – this is how one can characterize the processes taking place in the Ukrainian society today. Similar processes took place in the countries that for a long time were deprived of their statehood, and natural national processes of which were suppressed. It is logical that the counteraction to such “amnesia” is accompanied by the aggravation of the long-standing interethnic conflicts and interstate conflicts. It is difficult even to name a European state that escaped conflicts with its neighbours. Practically each of them, on the slightest occasion, finds a number of historical claims, just waiting for an opportunity to remind of themselves.

The nation-building processes in Ukraine and in the countries of the European Union, the archetypes, which are referred to by all the nations without an exception, in general are very similar, as well as the difficulties that they have to overcome on their way. Tolerance and liberality must be the pillars of that nation-building.

Ukraine is often and undeservedly fault for the things, that among others, make us a nation. However, it is strange to reproach with the adoption of language laws at a time when the same laws exist in the countries of the European Union, including those already mentioned by France and Estonia. The torchlight procession on the streets of Ukrainian cities does not look so threatening if we recall the torchlight procession in Great Britain and Scotland, in Latvia or France [11].

Patriotism, political and civic activity in Ukraine are treated as radical nationalism, while at the same time nationalists are legitimately occupying

the places in the parliaments of France and Germany, and also actively express themselves in Austria and Poland. It is inappropriate to talk about territorial claims in the context of the signed Helsinki Accords and other treaties.

Conclusions. Archetypes, which are inherent in every nation, are transmitted from generation to generation. The Ukrainian lands will be so far as the people speak Ukrainian, respect Ukrainian culture, know the true Ukrainian history, aware themselves Ukrainian and bring up this awareness in their children and grandchildren. And an important task today is respect for each other, a balanced attitude to the national diversity in the countries of Europe, which include Ukraine as well, and awareness of our own national dignity.

Nation-building processes in Ukraine will continue, and taking into consideration numerous internal and external threats, they require special attention and support from the state. Success of reforms implementation, restoration of economic stability, national security depends namely upon the full awareness of the reasons and purpose of these processes, as well as from balanced state support. Further academic research should take place in this direction.

REFERENCES

1. *Forbes* (2016), “3 Reasons Brits Voted For Brexit”, available at: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnmauldin/2016/07/05/3-reasons-brits-voted-for-brexit/#3e684bde1f9d> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
2. *The Daily Star* (2018), “Memory laws and nationalist lies”, available at:

- <https://www.thedailystar.net/opinion/project-syndicate/memory-laws-and-nationalist-lies-1552414> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
3. *History of Ukraine* (2010), “Nation”, available at: <http://histua.com/slovník/n/naciya> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
 4. *Revisionism of the Holocaust* (2013), “Herberts Cukurs – myths or principles?”, available at: http://holocaustrevisionism.blogspot.com/2013/01/blog-post_25.html (Accessed 30 March 2018).
 5. *ZN.UA* (2011), “Language legislation and linguistic relations in France: a look through the centuries-2”, available at: https://dt.ua/POLITICS/movne_zakonodavstvo_i_movni_vidnosini_u_frantsiyi_poglyad_kriz_viki-2.html (Accessed 30 March 2018).
 6. *Texty.org.ua* (2009), “How Finns became Finns. Against Sweden – folklore, against Russia – terror”, available at: <http://texty.org.ua/pg/article/newsmaker/read/11032/> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
 7. *Yevropeiska pravda* (2018), “In Estonia, due to the lack of knowledge of the state language, a dozen rescuers were fired”, available at: <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/news/2018/03/29/7079660/> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
 8. *UA Modna* (2018), “Hebrew: resurrection from the dead (ending)”, available at: https://uamodna.com/articles/ivryt-voskresinnya-z-mertvyh-zakinchennya/?utm_source=daily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=20180321 (Accessed 30 March 2018).
 9. *State Statistics Committee of Ukraine* (2003), “On the number and composition of the population of Ukraine according to the results of the All-Ukrainian Population Census 2001”, available at: <http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/results/general/nationality/> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
 10. *Razumkov Centre* (2017), “Ukrainians from left to right”, available at: <http://razumkov.org.ua/statti-ta-interviu/ukraintsi-zliva-napravo> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
 11. *Vgolos* (2016), “Do not be afraid of torches”, available at: http://vgolos.com.ua/articles/ne_varto_boyatys_smoloskypiv_243639.html (Accessed 30 March 2018).

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Forbes* (2016), “3 Reasons Brits Voted For Brexit”, available at: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnmauldin/2016/07/05/3-reasons-brits-voted-for-brexite/#3e684bde1f9d> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
2. *The Daily Star* (2018), “Memory laws and nationalist lies”, available at: <https://www.thedailystar.net/opinion/project-syndicate/memory-laws-and-nationalist-lies-1552414> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
3. *Історія України* (2010), “Нація” [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://histua.com/slovník/n/naciya> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
4. *Ревизионизм Холокоста* (2013), “Херберт Цукурс – мифы или принципы?” [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://holocaustrevisionism.blogspot.com/2013/01/blog-post_25.html (Accessed 30 March 2018).
5. *ZN.UA* (2011), “Мовне законодавство і мовні відносини у Франції: погляд крізь віки-2” [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: https://dt.ua/POLITICS/movne_zakonodavstvo_i_movni_vidnosini_u_frantsiyi_poglyad_kriz_viki-2.html (Accessed 30 March 2018).

6. *Тексти.org.ua* (2009), “Як фіни ставали фінами. Проти Швеції – фольклор, проти Росії – терор” [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://texty.org.ua/pg/article/newsmaker/read/11032/> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
7. *Європейська правда* (2018), “В Естонії через незнання державної мови звільнили дюжину рятувальників” [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <https://www.euointegration.com.ua/news/2018/03/29/7079660/> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
8. *UA Modna* (2018), “Іврит: воскресіння з мертвих (закінчення)” [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: https://uamodna.com/articles/ivryt-voskresinnya-z-mertvyh-zakinchennya/?utm_source=daily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=20180321 (Accessed 30 March 2018).
9. *Державний комітет статистики України* (2003), Про кількість та склад населення України за підсумками Всеукраїнського перепису населення 2001 року [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/results/general/nationality/> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
10. *Центр Разумкова* (2017), “Українці зліва направо” [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: <http://razumkov.org.ua/statti-ta-interviu/ukraintsi-zliva-napravo> (Accessed 30 March 2018).
11. *Вголос* (2016), “Не варто боятись смолоскипів” [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://vgolos.com.ua/articles/ne_varto_boyatys_smoloskypiv_243639.html (Accessed 30 March 2018).