

UDC 930.1:94(477.83/.86) “1914–1919”
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.17.218203

Oleksandr REIENT

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Corresponding Member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Deputy Director of the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 4 Mykhailo Hrushevskiy Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01001 (Reent.O.P@nas.gov.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0001-5141-7445

Volodymyr VELYKOCHYI

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Professor of the Department of Historiography and Source Studies, Dean of the Faculty of Tourism of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57 T. Shevchenko Street, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine, postal code 76000 (volodymyr.velykochyу@pnu.edu.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0002-6926-1474

Олександр РЕЄНТ

доктор історичних наук, професор, член-кореспондент НАН України, заступник директора Інституту історії України НАН України, вул. Михайла Грушевського, 4, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 01001 (Reent.O.P@nas.gov.ua)

Володимир ВЕЛИКОЧИЙ

доктор історичних наук, професор, професор кафедри історіографії і джерелознавства, декан факультету туризму Прикарпатського національного університету імені Василя Стефаника, вул. Т. Шевченка, 57, м. Івано-Франківськ, Україна, індекс 76000 (volodymyr.velykochyу@pnu.edu.ua)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Reient, O. & Velykochyi, V. (2020). Consolidation of the nation during the Ukrainian revolution of 1914 – 1923: main directions of historiographical discourse. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 17, 237–250. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.17.218203

**CONSOLIDATION OF THE NATION DURING THE UKRAINIAN
REVOLUTION OF 1914 – 1923: MAIN DIRECTIONS
OF HISTORIOGRAPHICAL DISCOURSE**

Abstract. *The purpose of the study is to analyze the place and role of the national unification movement during the Ukrainian revolution of 1914 – 1923, to elucidate the origins of this process and the influence of party-political, the state-building factors on it. The methodology of the research is based on the objective critical analysis of the historiographical complex, the elucidation of factors influencing the vision formation of the studied historical processes, a comparative historical identification of ideological differences assessments, typology of different blocks of scientific works according to logical characteristics. The Scientific novelty of the research consists in proving in modern state historiography the dominance of the state paradigm in the unification processes coverage, which was created by direct participants of the events, highlighting the key trends in the approaches of the authors of the so-called “Pro-*

UNR” and “Pro-ZUNR” currents to understanding the origins, goals and role of the Dnieper Ukraine and Western Ukrainian political and state elites, respectively, in the national consolidation process. **The Conclusions.** The analysis of the Ukrainian historiography has shown that most authors, describing the problem of conciliarity/ unification during the first stage of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1914 – 1923, usually focus on the cultural and educational processes of a national nature combined with support for the first military national formation – the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen. It has been proved that the conciliar and consolidation-state processes of the period March of 1917 – April of 1918 were covered in the form of gaining a territorial unity and initiating a national-state dialogue with Western Ukraine. At the same time, we believe that the conciliar processes during the period of the Hetmanate have not yet become the subject of special studies in the national historiography. What concerns the very year of 1918, the central place is occupied by the relations between the Directory of the Ukrainian People’s Republic (UNR) and the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic (ZUNR), and the core problem remains the Act of Unification. The national historiography identifies as one of the main obstacles to the state consolidation, the conciliar processes different in content vectors of the state-building in the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic (ZUNR) and the Ukrainian People’s Republic (UNR). It has been stated that the national historiography, although rather slow, still overcomes another research stereotype about a separate international policy of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic (ZUNR) or the Ukrainian People’s Republic (UNR).

Key words: national unification process, conciliarity/unification, military revolutionary era, Ukrainian revolution, consolidation of the nation, statehood, republic.

КОНСОЛІДАЦІЯ НАЦІЇ В УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ РЕВОЛЮЦІЇ 1914 – 1923 рр.: ОСНОВНІ НАПРЯМИ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ

Анотація. *Мета дослідження* полягає в аналізі місця і ролі національного об’єднавчого руху в Українській революції 1914 – 1923 рр., з’ясуванні витоків цього процесу та впливу на нього партійно-політичних, державотвірних чинників. **Методологія** ґрунтується на об’єктивно-критичному аналізі історіографічного комплексу, з’ясуванні чинників впливу на формування бачення досліджуваних історичних процесів, порівняльно-історичному виявленні ідеологічних розбіжностей оцінок, типологізації різних блоків наукових праць за логічними ознаками. **Наукова новизна** визначається доведенням домінування у сучасній національній історіографії державницької парадигми у висвітленні об’єднавчих процесів, яка була створена ще безпосередніми учасниками подій, виокремленні ключових тенденцій підходів авторів так званих “проунрівської” і “прозунрівської” течій до розуміння витоків, цілей, і ролі відповідно наддніпрянської та західноукраїнської політичних і державницьких еліт у процесі національної консолідації. **Висновки.** Аналіз української історіографії засвідчив, що більшість авторів, описуючи проблему соборництва впродовж першого етапу Української революції 1914 – 1923 рр. зосереджуються, як правило, на культурно-освітніх процесах загальнонаціонального характеру у поєднанні з підтримкою першої військової національної формації – Українських січових стрільців. Доведено, що соборницькі й консолідаційно-державницькі процеси періоду березня 1917 – квітня 1918 рр. знайшли висвітлення у формі здобуття територіальної єдності та започаткування національно-державницького діалогу із західноукраїнськими теренами. При цьому соборницькі процеси в добу Гетьманату, вважасмо, ще не стали предметом спеціальних досліджень національної історіографії. Стосовно 1918 р. центральне місце займають взаємини між Директорією УНР та ЗУНР, а стрижневою проблемою залишається сам Акт Злуки. Національна історіографія виокремлює як одну з головних перешкод на шляху консолідаційно-державницьких, соборницьких процесів різні за змістом вектори становлення державного будівництва в ЗУНР та УНР. Констатовано, що національна історіографія хоч і досить повільно, та все ж долає ще один дослідницький стереотип щодо окремишньої міжнародної політики ЗУНР чи УНР.

Ключові слова: національно-об’єднавчий процес, соборність, воєнно-революційна доба, Українська революція, консолідація нації, державність, республіка.

The Problem Statement. During the period of the centenary of the Ukrainian Revolution at the beginning of the XXth century, one of the most significant and important topics is

the problem of the consolidation of the nation. In the Ukrainian historiography, there is a tradition to understand this process under the term “conciliarism”¹.

The conciliar idea of the period of the Ukrainian Revolution is quite naturally and justifiably found in the national historiographical field. At the same time, the most distinctive, specific feature of the historiographical analysis of the conciliar movement during the Ukrainian Revolution is the need to study the process of its practical implementation, the first attempts of which took place at that time. **The purpose** of this article is to clarify the development of the national historiography concerning the directions and vectors assessment of the practical implementation of the Ukrainian lands unification and the national state formations during the Revolution of 1914 – 1923.

The Statement of the Basic Material. The problem of the national consolidation during World War I and at the beginning of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1914 – 1923 became the subject of consideration already during the events by its direct participants. Thus, the head and one of the founders of the Chief Ukrainian Council (CUC), and later – the General Ukrainian Council (GUC), Kost Levytsky emphasized that the unification of the Ukrainians was the problem, which should have been resolved during the Great War. Therefore, taking the side of the countries of the Triple Alliance, the Galician Ukrainians “formulated ... the main claim: the liberation of great (the Dnieper) Ukraine from the Russian (tsarist) yoke, and they reasoned that when Great Ukraine became an independent state, the Galician land would soon join it” (Levytskyi, 1928, pp. 10–11). In his famous work, the author emphasized that it was with the aim of gaining a single independent state and the question was raised about the creation of the

¹ Currently, there is a rather paradoxical situation when the term *unity* (Ukrainian: *sobornist*) is used by scientists, public, political, statesmen; its established and generally accepted interpretation has not been introduced in scientific circles. In particular, *Dictionary of the Ukrainian language in 11 volumes* (edited by I. Bilodid, vol. 9, p. 433) explains unity, referring to the meaning of *united*: “UNITY, *fem., obs.* is a property with the meaning **united** 3”. **The third property of the term *united* means “joined”, “indivisible”.** The most modern *Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine* does not explain this term either in the 9th or in the 3rd volume, where there should probably be an interpretation of such a phenomenon as a *Union (Zluka)*. We do not find an explanation of the term *unity* both in the 8th volume of the *Encyclopedia of Ukrainian Studies* (dictionary part) and in its general part. In the latter, however, there are considerations about the path chosen by the authorities to implement unity during the Ukrainian revolution of 1914 – 1923 (p. 531). There is an explanation of the term *unity* in the *Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary*, but in the understanding of Orthodox Christian unity and the way of mental existence, worldview (p. 591). Without claiming the final filling of a clearly obsolete gap, we consider it possible to offer our own vision. The concept of *unity* is borrowed from religious vocabulary, and it was first used in a purely political sense. The initial stage of the idea genesis of unity is associated with feudal fragmentation, foreign domination, lack of religious unity. It appeared in various interpretations during the Ukrainian national liberation revolution of 1648 – 1654, the liquidation of the Hetmanate, and in the conceptions of the figures of the Russian Trinity and the Cyril and Methodius Society. *The Statute of the Slavic Society of St. Cyril and Methodius* and also *The Book of the Existence of the Ukrainian people are the program documents of the latter organization which are permeated with the ideas of “tribal and religious unity”, Ukrainian messianism. The statelessness of the 19th century contributed to the revival in socio-political thought of the idea of unity, calls for the struggle for the unity of ethnic Ukrainian lands, and the culture of their people and church. This period is marked by fundamental changes in ethno-political processes. The formation and consolidation of the Ukrainian nation (as the highest form of ethnic development) took place. A necessary condition for this process is believed to be a commonality of the territory, language, economy, culture, and national consciousness. It was the first component that was absent due to the fact that the border along the Zbruch River divided the Ukrainian community into two parts with all the consequences. Socio-political and ethno-social processes of the 19th century gradually prepared the ground for the perception of the “Ukrainian idea” by an increasing part of the population of Ukrainian lands divided by borders; they convinced people of the need to fight together for their social, national and political rights. The growth of economic contradictions and social tensions in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, mass demonstrations by peasants and workers, and the opposition movement of intellectuals accelerated the formation of national political parties and organizations. Their program provisions (albeit to varying degrees) reflected the desire of Ukrainians to live in a single national sovereign state. The apogee of attempts to realize this goal in practice was the Ukrainian revolution of 1914 – 1923 (for more information, see: Reient O.P. *Ukraina soborna* [Unity of Ukraine: Scientific Research and Reviews] (to the 15th anniversary of Ukraine’s independence). K., 2006. 155 p.; Reient O.P., Lysenko O.Ye. *Ukrainska natsionalna ideia i khrystyanstvo* [Ukrainian National idea and Christianity]. K., 1997. 128 p.). Therefore, we declare the understanding of the term *unity* as a phenomenon of consolidation of national state, territorial, political, social, cultural, artistic life in order to unite disparate people within a single ethno-national space, to develop a single paradigm of existence and development.*

first national military formation in the Austro-Hungarian Army – the Legion of the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen. K. Levytsky points at the cooperation of the the Chief Ukrainian Council, and later the the General Ukrainian Council with the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine to organize and propagate, primarily, the Ukrainian ideas among the Russian army prisoners of war of the Ukrainian origin in the Austro-Hungarian imperial camps.

Thus, it is cultural, educational and political activities in combination with the support of the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen as a national military formation became the main directions of the consolidation, a conciliar movement at the first stage: during 1914 – 1917. This refrain can be found in the vast majority of works by the Ukrainian historians about this stage, among which we single out the works of O. Reient (Reient, 2006, pp. 7–24), I. Pater (Pater, 2000), S. Adamovych (Adamovych, 2005) and the others. At the same time, Galicia was the promoter of these processes, it largely determined the vectors and dynamics.

The issue of the Ukrainian conciliarity during the period of the Central Rada, beginning with M. Hrushevsky and ending with a representative group of modern researchers (Bevz, 1994, pp. 57–62; Verstiuk, 1995, pp. 66–78, Horban, 1999, pp. 29–37; Hrushevskiy, 1992, pp. 138–140), is considered in two main areas: 1) achieving a territorial unity within the Dnieper Ukraine; 2) its relations with the Ukrainians, who lived in enclave groups in different parts of Russia. The related processes and phenomena are represented as the stage of uniting of the Ukrainian ethnic territories and the precondition for the transition to the all-Ukrainian national-state consolidation. Its relations with the Western Ukrainian branch of the national organism became an integral part.

A number of I. Hoshuliak's publications on the Central Rada's relations with various Ukrainian ethnic areas are thorough in terms of facts. Considerable attention is paid to the relations with Eastern Galicia. In a chronological order, there is reproduced the growth of centripetal tendencies, which were the main content of the all-Ukrainian national consolidation process from March of 1917 till November of 1918. The main analysis of the events was connected with the negotiation process in Brest, but the direct contacts between the two political leaders were clarified superficially (Hoshuliak, 1994, pp. 42–51; Hutsal, 2005, pp. 267–273).

In the works of the “Pro-UNR” orientation it was always asserted that the “revolutionary Dnieper region” was ahead of the conciliar movement, leading “conservative” Galicia. Substantiating this position, modern researchers make interesting, but sometimes controversial statements. Thus, V. Yaremchuk claims that Galician Ukrainians only under the influence of the universals of the Central Rada embarked on the path of conciliarity and at the same time distanced themselves from Vienna (Yaremchuk, 2003, pp. 38–45). However, we believe that the radicalization and transition of the Ukrainian national movement in Galicia to the position of independence and conciliarity/unification until November 1918 were stimulated, primarily, by the internal processes. In the coverage of the events, the researchers of the “Pro-Zunr” orientation dwell on first relations with the Poles and Vienna not accidentally, and only then on the influence of the Central Rada.

The problem of the Ukrainian conciliarism during the period of Hetman P. Skoropadsky looks even more complicated. Despite a number of scientific works on the history of this state formation stage, we believe that it has not yet become the subject of a special research. Its coverage is marked by a considerable controversy. In its turn, this leads to the polarity of assessments of the Hetman's regime. Against this background, a number of important issues for the state-parliamentary process are raised, concerning the sending of Kyiv Ye. Konovalts

Sich Riflemen to Galicia, the relations with the western Ukrainian region of P. Skoropadsky government and the others. Among them, a special place is occupied by the plans to introduce in Ukraine a monarchical form of government in the form of the Hetmanate (Snyder, 2011).

Modern researchers of the Hetmanate: Yu. Pavlenko, Yu. Hramova, R. Pyrih, F. Prodaniuk, O. Reient prove that this political regime was the “central moment”, the “apogee” of the state-building process of Ukraine in 1917 – 1920. The above-mentioned authors positively, although from different angles, evaluate the national unification aspirations of its leader. The historians argue that the idea of conciliarity/unification was one of the main policies of P. Skoropadsky. After all, he proclaimed himself “Hetman of All Ukraine” and with this step proved his desire to unite all Ukrainian ethnographic territories. They prove his commitment to the idea of unification with Eastern Galicia, but the practical rapprochement seems to be hampered by the political leadership. The latter feared the prospect of becoming the part of the “united Russia² and at the same time hoped that the Ukrainians of the region themselves would be able to realize the right of the peoples of Austria-Hungary to self-determination.

The memoirists, and with them researchers of the “Pro-Zunr stream” (H. Mykytei, O. Nazaruk, L. Tsehelsky, S. Yaroslavyn, M. Lytvyn, O. Pavliuk, O. Pavlyshyn, etc.), despite numerous nuances, generally adhere to this opinion that already during the Hetmanate official relations between the Ukrainian political leaders of the Dnieper region (Naddnyprianshchyna) and Galicia began. At the same time, in their view, it was the latter, who initiated and took concrete steps to get closer to Kyiv. Without denying contacts with the political forces opposed to P. Skoropadsky, the historians argue that the Galicians sought to “reconcile” both sides, so they not only “did not support” the anti-Hetman uprising, but also opposed it.

Thus, despite the different views on certain aspects of the relations between the Hetmanate and the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic, in a domestic historiography the idea that these contacts became the first “stage” was established, even the “precondition” for further national consolidation steps, which were soon crowned by the Act of Unification.

The relations between the Directory of the Ukrainian People’s Republic and the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic occupy a central place in the historiography of Ukrainian Unification during the military revolutionary era. It is in the very context that a wide range of issues concerning the conclusion of the Act of Unification on January 22, 1919 and its consequences are considered. In clarifying the consequences, we observe the situation, in which a variety of research topics is imposed on numerous ideological and theoretical methodological approaches. The works of political scientists, lawyers and representatives of other social sciences add their expressive colors and less noticeable details to it. In this article we mention at least the latest works of I. Monolatii, a famous Ivano-Frankivsk scientist (Monolatii, 2020). This, of course, affects the content characteristics of the historical works and at the same time complicates significantly the development of a “historiographical image” of this issue. The prevailing tendency consists in the following item: in the works on the history of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic the problem of conciliarity and consolidation of the nation occupies more space than in the publications devoted to the Directory of the Ukrainian People’s Republic. This is evidenced by the works of modern researchers of Western Ukrainian statehood in 1918 – 1919 – I. Vasiuta, O. Vivcharenko and V. Tyshchuk, M. Lytvyn, K. Naumenko, S. Makarchuk, O. Krasivsky, V. Kondratiuk, V. Rehulsky, M. Senkiv, O. Pavliuk, O. Pavlyshyn, a collective monograph edited by O. Karpenko and the others. They provide a detailed documentary reconstruction of the national consolidation process. Its significance is assessed in a more attractive light than in the

works on the history of the Ukrainian People's Republic. The main paradigm of the conciliar movement is presented as a bilateral counter-process, which reflected the legitimate desire to unite the two Ukrainian states and political formations. Numerous objective and subjective factors hindered the conciliar process. Such an "integral" of the consolidation process elucidation is accompanied by numerous controversial approaches and interpretations.

In the works devoted to the Directory, as well as in generalizing works on the history of the Ukrainian Revolution, the issue of the unification of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR) and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR) is often covered, let's say, "occasionally" or as a "component" of other "central" socio-political events, including the Labour Congress, etc. This phenomenon more or less clearly follows from the works of B. Andrusyshyn, V. Verstiuk, M. Lytvyn, O. Kopylenko, M. Kopylenko, O. Reient, O. Rubliov, V. Semenenko, V. Soldatenko, M. Yatsiuk and the others. At the same time, the study of the history of the Ukrainian People's Republic or the Western Ukrainian People's Republic has one indicative feature: the state-building processes in both Ukrainian republics are considered almost completely separated from each other. This phenomenon, to some extent, reflects the real state of affairs, significantly grounding, levelling numerous arguments, which were used to prove the "natural" character of the national consolidation process.

The issue of uniting the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic also occupies a prominent place in special monographic studies on the history of the Ukrainian conciliarity, which became a new phenomenon in the Ukrainian historiography. The closest to the monographic studies in thematic terms is the book by M. Senkiv. The author summarized the results of published works, supplemented with memoirs and source materials, recreated in detail the development of the state-parliamentary process in the western Ukrainian lands in 1918 – 1919 (Senkiv, 1999). The project, unique in domestic science, was implemented by the author's team of the Institute of Political and Ethno-National Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (I. Hoshuliak, V. Kryvosheya, V. Soldatenko, V. Yaremchuk) in the form of a two-volume popular science publication. It traces the origins and stages of the conciliar idea formation (Hoshuliak, Drobot, Kryvosheya, Kucher, Obushnyi, 2000). The controversial historiosophical understanding of the conciliar idea formation is contained in the monograph of I. Kuras and V. Soldatenko (Kuras & Soldatenko, 1999, p. 4–21). A collection of documents on the history of the Ukrainian conciliarity, published by V. Serhiichuk, gained recognition. The author's comments in it reflect important aspects of its implementation during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917 – 1920 (Serhiichuk, 1999).

The solemn proclamation of the Act of Unification on January 22, 1919 is invariably presented in a public opinion and historiography as the "apotheosis of the Ukrainian conciliarity". The course of this event is restored on the basis of a rather limited range of sources, including the memories of the very participants (Bachynskyi, 1927, p. 2), written on the "hot tracks" of reviews of famous figures (Yefremov, 1919) and the others. Here we see an unexpected "rethinking" of the very atmosphere of this event. The participants talked about conciliarity without obvious admiration, even in frankly gray, indistinct colors, inspired by reflections on the difficult situation and prospects of the struggle. However, in modern historical literature, especially during the first half of the 90-ies, under the influence of the national patriotic feelings, the minor tone changed into a major one. Thus, the gathering on Sofia Square began to be considered as a solemn, elevated national manifestation.

In modern national historiography and public consciousness the Act of Unification became a symbolic embodiment of the Ukrainian conciliarity of the Revolution of 1914 – 1923

(and to a large extent of the entire recent history of Ukraine). It is associated with the main achievements, drawbacks and unjustified expectations of the national unification process of that period. In this regard, in modern historiography there have been outlined a number of debatable issues that reflect both the individual content characteristics and the general historical significance and consequences of this event.

We state that in the national historiography there has been established a rather interesting algorithm of development of the state-consolidation and conciliar processes. In particular, the events, which took place “before” the Act of Unification on January 22, 1919 are presented in the context of the growth of centripetal forces, and those events, which took place “after” it – as centrifugal processes. Accordingly, the accents in the reproduction of the dynamics of the national unification movement change: from showing the growth of “conciliar aspirations” and “counter-steps” – to emphasizing the differences, contradictions, the “objective factors”, which led to its defeat during the first decades of the XXth century. Under this paradigm, under the conditions of interpretation of these processes from the “Pro-UNR” or “Pro-ZUNR” positions, we observe numerous controversial views, polar assessments and characteristics.

Therefore, the researchers, especially the “Pro-ZUNR”, are forced to “reconcile” constantly the historical realities, declared aspirations, the actual steps of the leaders of the UNR and the ZUNR, and, finally, their own conciliar beliefs. This is manifested, for instance, in the statements that the government of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic never recognized the power of the Directory as the supreme power in the territory of Eastern Galicia, although, it never abandoned the search of the ways and forms of creating a nationwide body (Pavlyshyn, 2002, pp. 327–349). The same assertion that the government of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic took a “completely independent position” concerning the Directory, and the assertion that the government of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic was “forced to coordinate” with the Directory the most responsible state steps (in the relations with Soviet Russia, etc.) (Makarchuk, 1997) do not contradict the formal scientific logic. The assertions reflect rather the complexity and contradictions of the domestic and international situation of both republics.

Finding out the reasons for the split of the unification front is one of the most favourite topics in the historiography of the Ukrainian Revolution. Despite the distinct “national sounding”, there is a tendency to cover it from “Pro-UNR” or “Pro-ZUNR” positions and views. This approach implies an axiological variety of the events. Here is a collision peculiar to the assessment of this event. If domestic historians made significant progress in accumulating the factual material for the reconstruction of the conciliar process, however, in clarifying the reasons for its failures and consequences, the interpretations of the first chroniclers of the Ukrainian Revolution continue to be used. The interpretations cover all aspects of relations – from the socio-economic and international to the party-political and interpersonal.

From the “submission” of the leaders of the Ukrainian People’s Republic V. Vynnychenko and M. Shapoval, an almost axiomatic view was established that in Eastern Ukraine the basis of the state-building processes was the “social” factor – a social revolution, and in Western Ukraine – the “national” factor – a national revolution. Hence, the revolutionary processes in both parts of the country had different ideals during the Revolution of 1914 – 1923. That is why, this “Ukrainian dilemma” actually foretold the failure of all aspirations and steps towards consolidation. This aspect, in fact, cannot be denied. However, we believe that it should not be absolutized. Moreover, all the differences are often reduced to different principles of an agrarian transformation: the Directory advocated the socialization of the land, while in Galicia it was even forbidden to campaign for the socialization of the land

under threat of imprisonment. When clarifying this phenomenon, the historians sometimes “arbitrarily” interpret the nature of the liberation struggle and the national relations in Eastern Galicia. In particular, V. Tkachenko came to the following conclusion: since the land in Eastern Galicia belonged to the Poles, the Galician army fought bravely against the Polish army, defending the right of the Polish landowners to own land. The ban on socialization of land by the Ukrainian People’s Council, according to the author, was due to fears that it would not liked by the Entente (Tkachenko, 1994, pp. 90–98).

In fact, the “national” and “social” postulates were present in the programmes and practical actions of the political leadership in both the Dnieper region (Naddnyprianshchyna) and Eastern Galicia, that is why, to assert the superiority of one of the postulates in the state-building processes of one or another side can only be conditional. During the Revolution, their absorption had a party-ideological basis, but in our opinion, a modern historiography should abandon it, because such approach simplifies, stereotypes the complex multifaceted events and phenomena of the conciliar-unification movement.

The institutional aspect of the consolidation-conciliar process is developed in the context of historical, political science and sociological researches. The first historians-memoirists of the Ukrainian Revolution and authors of the Ukrainian diaspora determined the main forces, primarily, governmental state factors. The party-political structures were assigned a “secondary”, mostly “destructive” role. It came to the point that the socialists from Naddnyprianshchyna and the Galician national democrats were located on the opposite sides of the barricades. Each side was exhibited in such colours that any compromise between them seemed to be a hopeless affair.

Such stereotypes are difficult to overcome by a domestic historiography, although, the political parties are already considered as independent factors that influenced significantly, and sometimes played a decisive role in the national consolidation movement. These issues are studied in the context of the formation of the Ukrainian party-political system, in particular, in Eastern Galicia (O. Zhernokliev, M. Kuhutiak, T. Panfilova, V. Rasevych, etc.) or as one of the development directions of ideology and practical activity of the political parties (T. Bezv, I. Drobot, O. Liubovets, O. Pavlyshyn, etc.). The approaches to a comprehensive study of the problem are intensified.

At the same time, historians cannot get rid of one collision. On the one hand, the differences between the dominant party-political influences in Galicia-ZUNR (the national Democrats, less radicals) and Naddnyprianshchyna-UNR (the socialists) are presented as one of the main obstacles and reasons that led to the collapse of the Ukrainian national unification front. On the other hand, when it comes to the role of the parties in the struggle for the Ukrainian statehood, it is organically embedded in the conciliar channel. This is clearly manifested in the works of M. Kuhutiak, T. Panfilova, V. Rasevych on the history of the Ukrainian national democracy (Kuhutiak, 2000, pp. 163–170; Panfilova, 2004; Rasevych, 1999, pp. 270–278). This situation is explained not only by the stereotype of “the primacy of party-political interests over the national ones”, but also by the principled defense of the ideological foundations, which, however, also declared devotion to the idea of conciliarism.

A number of original, though sometimes debatable scientific and theoretical generalizations on this issue were proposed by O. Liubovets (Liubovets, 2000). The researcher elucidated the issue that during the pre-revolutionary times the idea of conciliarity did not dominate in the parties programmes, but during the process of building the state and political formations, the idea of conciliarity acquired the status of the official doctrine. The conclusions made by O. Liubovets also look interesting: a) in 1917 – 1919 the principle of conciliarity became the

only universal basis of the programmes of all political parties; b) the proclamation of the Act of Unification marked the programmes implementation in practice. This means that the political parties, which did not share the idea of the internal civic conciliarity are also responsible for the inability to achieve a territorial unity (it was undoubtedly to become the main unifying factor in the society). However, here we see another extreme: the absolutization of the role of parties in the national consolidation process does not take into account other equally important factors (military, political, international, etc.), which also influenced the nature and consequences of the consolidation process. In general, this formulation of the question makes sense and encourages clarification of the role and importance of the political parties in the implementation of the idea of conciliarity, and not as destructive, but creative factors.

The study of the Ukrainian conciliarity in the context of international relations has a long historiographical tradition, markedly enriched by the works, in which its individual aspects were interpreted in the context of such a popular topic among domestic historians, as “The Ukrainian Issue in International Politics” during the military revolutionary era. During the last decade, its development was significantly intensified in the context of various foreign policy vectors.

The approach is alarming, according to which the Ukrainian national unification process is considered in the context (as a component) of a foreign policy of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic or the Ukrainian People’s Republic. This approach is gradually established in modern historiography, a typical, expressive example of which is given in the monograph “Western Ukrainian People’s Republic. 1918 – 1923: History”. The issue of the Ukrainian conciliarity, in particular, the Act of Unification of January 22, 1919, is clarified in the context of a foreign diplomatic activity of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic (Karpenko, 2001). We believe that “inter-Ukrainian” relations, in particular, between the two national state formations – the ZUNR and the UPR, on the one hand, and the interstate relations of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic with foreign states, on the other hand, have a qualitatively different – both formal and legal, national political nature. Therefore, it is difficult to consider expedient and justified their study in the same scientific and social planes.

It seems productive to study the Ukrainian consolidation processes in the context of international relations. We note the increased attention of the historians: V. Verstiuk, O. Kopylenko, R. Symonenko, V. Soldatenko, P. Prytuliak and the others (Prokhoda, 1968/69, pp. 260–270) to the Brest Treaty, concluded on February 9, 1918 between the UNR and the states of the Quaternary Union. Along with its traditional interpretation as the first international legal act to grant Ukraine the formal status of an independent neutral state, the researchers consider it from the point of the national unification processes. The reason for this is the secret appendix, according to which Galicia and Bukovyna were to gain autonomy within Austria-Hungary. Thus, in historiography there begins to be established the view of the Brest Treaty as a real manifestation of the conciliar aspirations of the Ukrainians. Although, the agreements of that period remained unfulfilled, they began to be associated with the beginning of the defense of all-Ukrainian conciliar interests in the international arena.

If the “pro-German vector” of relations is mostly shown as the manifestation of a “real” policy in resolving the “Ukrainian issue”, the orientation to the Entente is often interpreted as the illusory hopes of the Ukrainian leaders, which only intensified the internal strife, prevented the search of an acceptable platform for the internal unity. This tendency can be traced in the works by the historians of the Ukrainian diaspora and modern scientists: M. Stakhiv, V. Fedorovych, L. Vasylykivsky I. Zavada, I. Hoshuliak, O. Pavliuk, T. Halytska-Didukh

and the others (Vasylykivskiy, 1970, pp. 109–123; Halytska-Didukh, 2005, pp. 202–217; Hoshuliak, 1997, pp. 26–41; Pavliuk, 1996; Stakhiw, 1964; Fedorovych, 1990, pp. 12–18). Despite various nuances in the interpretation of certain aspects of the issue in historiography, the following key provisions are asserted: relying on the help of the Entente did not live up to expectations, as the restoration of united Ukraine did not meet the interests of Britain, France and the United States. The latter sought to achieve a political balance in Europe through the restoration of united and indivisible Russia. The Entente policy intensified the division and tension in the relations between the UPR and ZUNR; The Act of Unification created a formal basis for defending the interests of an independent conciliar Ukrainian state in the international arena, but internal contradictions hindered joint foreign policy activities. Thus, the postulate was established: different foreign policy orientations became one of the main obstacles to the Ukrainian conciliarity.

The authors, who specialize in the study of the history of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic or the Ukrainian People's Republic, based on the key positions of their research, shed different light on the influences of certain foreign policy factors on the Ukrainian consolidation processes. This is most evident in determination of the role and place of the "Polish factor". The researchers of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic believe that the Polish-Ukrainian war in Western Ukraine became a powerful catalyst for the unification processes. However, the authors of the works on the Directory are almost unanimous in the idea that it was the prospect of getting another enemy in the face of Poland that raised concerns among the leaders about unification with Eastern Galicia. As a result, their enthusiasm vanished, it was replaced by skepticism. At the same time, the representatives of the first and second groups of scholars agree that the leaders of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic and the Ukrainian People's Republic mutually relied on the military and political support from each other to solve their own problems of the state building.

In modern historiography, the Ukrainian conciliarity begins to be considered as a significant factor influencing the international activities of the UNR and ZUNR. This approach is clearly presented in the works of O. Pavliuk, in which the national unification process is once again considered as a component of the foreign policy of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic from November 1918 till March 1923. The author traced its transformation consistently from the focus on the unification with Greater Ukraine to the plans for the federation with Czechoslovakia, non-Bolshevik Russia, and, finally, the defense of the independence of the Galician state. Explaining this inconsistency in the complex military political and international situation, O. Pavliuk proves, and that the unification with the UNR corresponded to the aspirations of the Galician Ukrainians, and that other orientations were conditioned by a forced reaction to the international situation and the policies of the neighbouring states. We should pay attention to the evolution of the views of the scientist: his first works are characterized by critical and sarcastic expressions such as "unprincipled", "conjunctural" policy of the "top" of the ZUNR, etc., gradually changed into restrained balanced interpretations (Pavliuk, 1994, pp. 7–8; Pavliuk, 1992, pp. 176–178.).

The Conclusions. Summarizing the achievements of the Ukrainian historiography in covering the process of the nation consolidation during the Revolution of 1914 – 1923, we single out the directions of the study and state the following. Firstly, the Ukrainian historiography, describing the issue of conciliarism during the first stage of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1914 – 1923, focuses, as a rule, on the cultural and educational processes of a national nature in combination with support of the first military national formation –

the Ukrainian Sich Riflemen. With the proclamation of the national statehood in 1917, the content of these processes naturally takes on other forms and manifestations. Secondly. The conciliar and consolidation-state processes of the period from March of 1917 till April of 1918 (the era of the Ukrainian Central Rada) are covered in the national historiography in two directions: 1) obtaining a territorial unity within the Ukrainian lands, which were the part of the Romanov Empire during the Great War of 1914 – 1923; 2) strengthening relations with the Ukrainians living in the enclave within the Russian Empire; 3) initiating a national state dialogue with Western Ukraine. Thirdly. We believe that the conciliar processes during the period of the Hetmanate have not yet become the subject of special studies of the national historiography. The conciliar processes fragmentary coverage in monographic works, articles or researches is marked by controversial views and approaches. At the same time, the researchers of this stage of the formation of the national statehood during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1914 – 1923 assert the idea of initiating the state-consolidation processes between the Hetmanate and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic, which later led to the Act of Unification. Fourthly. In the historiography of the Ukrainian conciliarity of this historical chronotope, the central place is occupied by the relations between the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic. The core problem remains the Act of Unification, the events that preceded and followed it. It is noteworthy that in the course of elucidating these processes there is a somewhat paradoxical dichotomy: the centripetal tendencies of consolidation processes between the ZUNR and UPR before the Act of Unification and the centrifugal tendencies after the Act of Unification. The problem of the split of the front since the last third of 1919 deserves a special attention. In this case there is the problem of updating the assessments of this process by a modern national historiography, which so far uses, as a rule, the approaches and conclusions of the chroniclers of the Revolution. Fifthly. National historiography singles out as one of the main obstacles to the consolidation state, conciliar processes different in content the vectors of the state-building in the Western Ukrainian Republic and the Ukrainian People's Republic. In the first one, the most urgent was the solution of problems of a national-state character, in the second one – a social character. This stereotyped approach has dominated since the first works of the direct participants and witnesses of the events. But the available documentary and historiographical base allows us to state with a full responsibility the need to rethink this stereotyped approach. Sixthly. National historiography, although rather slow, nevertheless overcomes another research stereotype about the place and role of conciliar efforts during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1914 – 1923. We mean the fact that the national consolidation processes are less and less considered in the context of a separate international policy of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic or the Ukrainian People's Republic, but as an important factor in joint activities of this nature.

Thus, the problem of consolidation of the nation during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1914 – 1923 is one of the prevailing and most covered in the national historiography. The modern historiographical base, created by researchers during almost three decades of Ukraine's independence, gives grounds to assert serious reasons for expanding and deepening the study of these processes, the development of updated constructs and paradigms of the conciliar process, built not only on the methodology and principles of positivism and the state school.

Acknowledgments. We express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing.

Funding. The authors received no financial support for the research and publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamovych, S.** (2005). *Problema sobornosti u suspilno-politychnomu zhytti Halychyny (1991 – 2004 rr.)* [The Problem of Conciliarity in the Socio-Political Life of Galicia (1991 – 2004)]. Ivano-Frankivsk, 52 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Bachynskiy, L.** (1927). Obiednannia Ukrainy. 3./I. – 22./I.1919. [Unification of Ukraine. 3./I. – 22./I.1919]. *Hromadskiy holos, 1–2, 2.* [in Ukrainian]
- Bevz, T. A.** (1994). Do pytannia sobornosti ukrainskykh zemel v dobu Tsentralnoi Rady [On the Issue of Conciliarity of the Ukrainian Lands during the Period of the Central Rada]. In I. F. Kuras (Ed.), *Problemy sobornosti Ukrainy v XX stolitti* (pp. 57–62). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]
- Fedorovych, V.** (1990). Yak Antanta “pomahala” Ukraini, 1919 – 1920 rr. [How the Entente “Helped” Ukraine, 1919 – 1920]. *Visti kombatanta, 3, 12–18.* [in Ukrainian]
- Halytska-Didukh, T.** (2005). Zovnishnopolitychna diialnist uriadiv UNR i ZUNR u konteksti derzhavno-sobornytskoi idei (1919 – 1920 rr.) [Foreign Policy of the Governments of the Ukrainian People’s Republic (UNR) and the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic (ZUNR) in the Context of the State-Parliament Idea (1919 – 1920)]. *Ukraina soborna: zb. nauk. statei, 2 (1), 202–217.* [in Ukrainian]
- Horban, T.** (1999). Etnopolityka Ukrainy Tsentralnoi Rady [Ethnopolitics of the Ukrainian Central Rada]. *Naukovi zapiski Institutu politychnykh i etnonacionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy, (8), 29–37.* [in Ukrainian]
- Hoshuliak, I., Drobot, I., Kryvosheia, V., Kucher, V. & Obushnyi, M.** (2000). *Sobornist Ukrainy* [The Conciliarity of Ukraine] (2 vols.). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]
- Hoshuliak, I.** (1994). Deiaki aspekty problemy sobornosti ukrainskykh zemel v 1917 – 1920 rr. [Some Aspects of the Conciliarity Issue of the Ukrainian Lands in 1917 – 1920]. In I. F. Kuras (Ed.), *Problemy sobornosti Ukrainy v XX stolitti* (pp. 42–51). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]
- Hoshuliak, I. L.** (1997). Problema sobornosti ukrainskykh zemel u dobu Tsentralnoi Rady [The Conciliarity Issue of the Ukrainian Lands during the Period of the Central Rada]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal, 3, 26–41.* [in Ukrainian]
- Hrushevskiy, M.** (1992). Chy Ukraina tilky dlia ukrainsiv? [Is Ukraine only for the Ukrainians?]. In *Na porozhi novoi Ukrainy: statyi i dzherelni materialy* (pp. 138–140). New York, Lviv, Kyiv, Toronto, Munich. [in Ukrainian]
- Hutsal, P.** (2005). Moralno-politychna i dyplomatychna pidtrymka ukrainsiv SShA i Kanady Zakhidnoukrainskoi Narodnoi Respubliki (1918 – 1919 rr.) [A Moral, Political and Diplomatic Support of the Western Ukrainian People’s Republic (1918 – 1919) by the Ukrainians in the United States and Canada]. *Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho nacionalnoho pedahohichnoho univesytetu im. Volodymyra Hnatiyky – Scientific Issues Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, History, (1), 267–273.* [in Ukrainian]
- Karpenko, O.** (Ed.). (2001). *Zakhidno-Ukrainska Narodna Respublika. 1918 – 1923: istoriia* [The Western Ukrainian People’s Republic. 1918 – 1923: History]. Ivano-Frankivsk, 628 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Kuhutiak, M.** (2000). Ukrainski politychni partii i ZUNR [The Ukrainian Political Parties and Western Ukraine]. *Ukraina. Kulturna spadshchyna, nacionalna svidomist, derzavnist – Ukraine: Cultural Heritage, National Identity, Statehood, (6), 163–170.* [in Ukrainian]
- Kuras, I. & Soldatenko, V.** (1999). Ukrainska revoliutsiia: novitnii stan istoriohrafii problemy ta aktualni zavdannia doslidzhennia [The Ukrainian Revolution: the Latest State of Historiography Issue and Current Research Objectives]. *Naukovi zapysky Institutu politychnykh i etnonacionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy, (7), 4–21.* [in Ukrainian]
- Levytskyi, K.** (1928). *Istoriia vyzvolnykh zman halytskykh ukrainsiv z chasu svitovoi viiny 1914 – 1918 rr.* [History of the Liberation Struggle of the Galician Ukrainians since the World War of 1914 – 1918]. Lviv, 500 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Liubovets, O. M.** (2000). *Ideino-politychni protsesy v ukrainskykh partiakh u konteksti alternatyv revoliutsiinoi doby (1917 – 1920 rr.)* [Ideological and Political Processes of Ukrainian

Parties in the Context of the Alternatives of the Revolutionary Era (1917 – 1920)] (*Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis*). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]

Makarchuk, S. (1997). *Ukrainska respublika halychan: narysy pro ZUNR [The Ukrainian Republic of the Galicians: Essays on the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR)]*. Lviv, 192 p. [in Ukrainian]

Monolatii, I. (2020). *Syla ZUNR: vybrani pytannia potentsialu, bezpeky i dyplomatii derzhav [The Power of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR): Selected Issues of Potential, Security and Diplomacy of the States]*. Ivano-Frankivsk, 88 p. [in Ukrainian]

Panfilova, T. O. (2004). *Ukrainska narodno-trudova partiia: borotba za derzhavnu nezalezhnist i sobornist Ukrainy (1919 – 1924 roky) [Ukrainian National Labour Party: Struggle for State Independence and Unity Ukraine during 1919 – 1924] (Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis)*. Lviv. [in Ukrainian]

Pater, I. (2000). *Soiuz vyzvolennia Ukrainy: problemy derzhavnosti i sobornosti [The Union of Liberation of Ukraine: Problems of Statehood and Conciliarity]*. Lviv, 346 p. [in Ukrainian]

Pavliuk, O. (1992). *Dyplomatiia Zluky UNR i ZUNR [Diplomacy of the Unification of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR) and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR)]*. *Vsesvit*, 1–2, 176–178. [in Ukrainian]

Pavliuk, O. (1994). *Vid zluky do rozryvu. Vzaiemny uradiiv UNR i ZUNR u 1919 rotsi [From Unification to Split. Relations between the Governments of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR) and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR) in 1919]*. *Nauka i suspilstvo*, 4–6, 7–8. [in Ukrainian]

Pavliuk, O. (1996). *Borotba Ukrainy za nezalezhnist i polityka SSHA (1917 – 1923) [The Struggle of Ukraine for Independence and the USA Policy (1917 – 1923)]*. Kyiv, 188 p. [in Ukrainian]

Pavlyshyn, O. (2002). *Obiednannia UNR i ZUNR: polityko-pravovyi aspekt (kinets 1918 r. – persha polovyna 1919 r.) [Unification of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR) and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR): a Political and Legal Aspect (the end of 1918 – the first half of 1919)]*. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seria istorychna*, 37 (1), 327–349. [in Ukrainian]

Prokhoda, V. (1968/69). *Natsionalno-kulturna revoliutsiia u viisku [National, Cultural Revolution in the Army]*. *Naukovi zapysky. Ukrainskyi Tekhnichno-Hospodarskyi Instytut*, (18), 260–270. [in Ukrainian]

Rasevych, V. (1999). *Rol ukrainskoi natsionalno-demokratychnoi partii v orhanizatsii ukrainskoho derzhavnogo zhyttia [The Role of the Ukrainian National Democratic Party in the Organization of the Ukrainian State Life]*. In Ya. Hrytsak, Ya. Dashkevych, O. Kupchynskyi, & I. Skochylas (Eds.), *Materialy zasidan Istorychnoi ta Arkheohrafichnoi komisii NTSh v Ukraini*, (Vol. 2, pp. 270–278). Lviv. [in Ukrainian]

Reient, O. P. & Lysenko, O. Ye. (1997). *Ukrainska natsionalna ideia i khrystianstvo [Ukrainian National Idea and Christianity]*. Kyiv, 128 p. [in Ukrainian]

Reient, O. P. (2006). *Ukraina soborna: Naukovi rozvidky i retsenzii (do 15-richchia nezalezhnosti Ukrainy [Ukraine Conciliar: Scientific Researches and Reviews (Dedicated to the 15th Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence)]*. Kyiv, 155 p. [in Ukrainian]

Senkiv, M. (1999). *Z istorii sobornosti ukrainskykh zemel 1917 – 1945 rr. [From the History of Conciliarity of the Ukrainian Lands in 1917 – 1945]*. Drohobych, 163 p. [in Ukrainian]

Serhiichuk, V. (1999). *Ukrainska sobornist. Vidrozhennia ukrainstva v 1917 – 1920 rokakh [Ukrainian Conciliarity. Revival of the Ukrainians in 1917 – 1920]*. Kyiv, 413 p. [in Ukrainian]

Snyder, T. (2011). *Chervonyi Kniaz [The Red Prince]*. Kyiv, 296 p. [in Ukrainian]

Stakhiw, M. (1964). *Ukraina v dobi Dyrektorii UNR [Ukraine during the Directorate of the Ukrainian National Republic] (Vol. 4: Dyrektorii i Antanta)*. Scranton, 352 p. [in Ukrainian]

Tkachenko, V. M. (1994). *Akt Zluky: uroky istorii [The Act of Unification: Lessons of History]*. In I. F. Kuras (Ed.), *Problemy sobornosti Ukrainy v XX stolitti* (pp. 90–98). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]

Vasylkivskiy, L. (1970). Prychynky do istorii dyplomatii v 1917 – 1921 rokakh [Reasons for the History of Diplomacy in 1917 – 1921]. *Suchasnist – Suuasnist*, 6 (114), 109–123. [in Ukrainian]

Verstiuk, V. (1995). Ukrainska revoliutsiia: doba Tsentralnoi Rady [The Ukrainian Revolution: the Period of the Central Rada]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 6, 66–78. [in Ukrainian]

Yaremchuk, V. D. (2003). Vplyv derzhavotvorennia v Naddnyprianskii Ukraini na rozvytok natsionalno-vyzvolnoho rukhu u zakhidnoukrainskykh zemliakh [The Influence of the State Formation in Naddnyprianska Ukraine on the National Liberation Movement Development in the Western Ukrainian Lands]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 4, 38–45. [in Ukrainian]

Yefremov, S. (1919). Dukh vikiv [Spirit of the Ages]. *Ukraina*, January 29. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received on April 16, 2020.
Article recommended for publishing 26/11/2020.*