THE ROLE OF HOLODOMOR IN THE POLITICS

OF NATION BUILDING IN UKRAINE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

DEVRAN DÖNMEZ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER SCIENCE
IN
EURASIAN STUDIES

DECEMBER 2015

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof.Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master Sciences.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Akçalı
Head of the Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master Sciences.

_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Işık (Kuşcu) Bonnenfant
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Tuba Ünlü Bilgiç	(METU, IR)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Işık (Kuşçu) Bonnenfant	(METU, IR)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Yuliya Biletska	(Karabük Uni., IR)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Devran DÖNMEZ

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF HOLODOMOR IN THE POLITICS
OF NATION BUILDING IN UKRAINE

Dönmez, Devran
M.A., Department of Eurasian Studies
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Işık (Kuşçu) Bonnenfant

December 2015, 82 pages

The aim of this thesis is to define the role of Holodomor, the Ukrainian famine of 1932-1933, in the politics of nation building in Ukraine. With this goal in mind I aim to examine the impact of Holodomor in (re)creating the national consciousness, identity and memory in the post-Soviet period. In order to better analyze why Holodomor became one of the central pillars of Ukrainian national identity, I will discuss the history of famine years. I also provide a brief history of Ukraine in order to highlight the relationship between the national identity formation and periods of independence in history. Since policy makers play a significant role in nation building projects, I analyze the attitude of Ukrainian presidents towards Holodomor. The ethno-symbolist approach is used in the analysis of the study in the thesis.

Keywords: Holodomor, nation building, Ukrainian identity, ethno-symbolism, collective memory.

ÖZ

UKRAYNA'DAKİ ULUS İNŞASI SİYASETİNDE HOLODOMOR'UN YERİ

Dönmez, Devran
Yüksek Lisans., Avrasya Çalışmaları
Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr.Işık (Kuşçu) Bonnenfant

Aralık 2015, 82 sayfa

Bu tezin amacı Holodomor'un (1932-1933 yıllarında meydana gelen Ukrayna kıtlığı) ulusal bilinç, ulusal kimlik ve ulusal hafızanın yeniden yaratılmasında etkilerinin incelenerek bu olayın Ukrayna'daki ulus inşası politikasındaki rolünü belirlemektir. Bu tezde Holodomor'un Ukrayna milli kimliğinin merkez ayaklarından biri haline gelmesinin anlaşılabilmesi için kıtlık yıllarının tarihi ortaya konulmuştur. Ayrıca ulusal kimliğin oluşumu ile geçmiş bağımsızlık deneyimi arasındaki ilişkiyi aydınlatmak için Ukrayna'nın tarihini de kısaca gözden geçirilmiştir. Son olarak politika yapıcılarının ulus inşası projelerindeki belirleyici rollerinden dolayı, Ukrayna devlet başkanlarının Holodomor yaklaşımları da bu tez içinde analiz edilmiştir. Bu çalışmada milliyetçilik teorilerinden etno-sembolist yaklaşımdan faydalanılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Holodomor, ulus inşası, Ukrayna kimliği, etno-sembolizm, toplumsal hafıza.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introducing the Study

Ukraine is a country in Eastern Europe, bordered clockwise by Russia to the east and northeast, the Black Sea and Sea of Azov to the south and southeast, Moldova, Romania, and Hungary to the southwest, Poland and Slovakia to the west and Belarus to the northwest. It has an area of approximately 577.500 km^2 (without Crimea). According to the 2001 census, the population is 48.923.200 (State Statistic Service of Ukraine), making Ukraine the most populous country after Russia among the post-Soviet states. Kiev is the capital and the most populated city.

By late 1991, with the end of the Soviet Union, fifteen independent republics emerged. Like others, Ukraine also had to build own independent state along with dealing with nation building problems. Since independence, Ukraine has been struggling to build a nation and to create a common national identity. In order to do this, political and cultural elite use different tools. One of them is the Holodomor, referring to the famine in 1932-1933, which acquired great importance with the independence of Ukraine as one of the historical narratives. In fact, the famine affected several regions of the Soviet Union but the term Holodomor refers only the Ukrainian famine in 1932-1933. Holodomor as a historical catastrophic event has controversial points such as the number of victims, genocide allegation, and reasons of the famine. The first studies on the famine were produced, relatively late, in 1980s, in the ideological context of the Cold War with the help of Ukrainian Diaspora.

Holodomor, as a victimization narrative, defines Ukrainian people as the victim while determining the "other" as the perpetrator in a hostile mood. However such a narrative for nation building purposes might be risky in divided states such as

Ukraine. West/east schism in Ukraine is one of the obstacles in uniting the nation under one identity. Also this schism is used by politicians for the sake of their political interest. For politicians, politicizing history and referring to national traumas generally serves to reach their political aims promptly and mobilize the population in the short term, on the contrary the nation building process requires long term. Ukraine is not an exception in the context of the Holodomor. The Holodomor is used not only for domestic policy but also in foreign policy especially in relations with Russia.

In the light of these, in this thesis, I aim to analyze the place of Holodomor in politics of nation building in Ukraine. I will examine the role of Holodomor in creating/strengthening the national consciousness and identity. Since it is the political entrepreneurs who play a greater role in nation-building projects, I will examine the issue under different presidents of Ukraine since independence. I will give particular attention to the attitudes of policy makers in the context of Holodomor which are sometimes forced by political goals or sometimes restrained by foreign relations or popular desires. The discourse of Holodomor does not only affect domestic nation-building but also affects the Ukrainian foreign policy especially in defining relations with Russia. Therefore I will also examine the foreign policy orientation under different presidents. In doing all these, I will use an ethno-symbolist perspective.

1.2. Methodology

In this thesis documentary research method is used. Documentary research includes the use of books, articles in scientific periodicals, official documents as well as legal documents, newspapers, reports, researches, materials of media and monographs. The sources in English, Russian and Turkish will be used.

The weakness of the research is the problems associated with documentary research model: accuracy and reliability of materials are problematic because some materials may have been produced for influencing the perception of people for the furthering political goals. However, a critical evaluation of documents can ensure for minimizing this weakness.

1.3. Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is composed of six chapters. The first chapter introduces the study, explains the methodology and the organization of the thesis. The second chapter is about the theoretical framework including various approaches to nationalism. In this part I will discuss particularly the modernist and ethno-symbolist approaches to nationalism. In the third chapter, Holodomor, with a focus on the dominant debates over the phenomenon are presented. In the fourth chapter, I will discuss the history of Ukrainians till post-Soviet and its effect on national identity formation. In the fifth chapter, I will analyze the use of Holodomor in political discourse from an ethno-symbolist perspective under different leaders. Finally in the sixth chapter I will examine the outcomes of Holodomor policy in domestic and foreign policy spheres. The sixth chapter will be the concluding part of the thesis.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To be able to better understand the nation-building process in Ukraine in terms of Holodomor, it is essential to be familiar with theories of nationalism. Understanding nationalism requires an understanding of related concepts, such as ethnicity, nation, national identity and nation-building. Since nationalism and national identity are the essential components of the nation-building process, in this chapter, I will present the main approaches to national identity and nationalism.

2.1 National Identity

In order to be understood the term of 'national identity', the term of 'identity' has to be understood firstly. Richard Jenkins, a prominent scholar in identity issues, argues in his book that questions such as "who I am" or "who we are" requires the "other" as the opposite. Jenkins (1996) stresses that "human social life is unimaginable without some means of knowing who others are and some sense of who we are". He (1996) also asserts that "Identity cannot be explain as a datum that simply 'is', It can only be understood as process, as 'being' or 'becoming'".

Jenkins' two fundamental elements "others" and "becoming" are similar to the national identity approach of Montserrat Guibernau. Guibernau (2007) defines two fundamental elements of national identity: continuity over time and differentiation from others. He (2007) defines national identity as a "collective sentiment based upon the belief of belonging to the same nation and sharing most of the attributes that make it distinct from other nations." To understand the concept of 'nation' in the definition, the definition of Walker Connor is useful. Connor (1994) defines nation as "a group of people who believe they are ancestrally related, and it is the largest grouping that shares such a belief". "The nation is based on felt kinship ties that its basis is the psychological ties that joins people and differentiates them

from everyone else, in the sub-conscious conviction of its members" (Connor, 1994). According to these definitions of national identity and nation, one of the crucial points is the "belief of the members". Since it depends on belief, some theorists assert that the concept of nationality can be created by manipulating the historical events and constructing imagined blood ties, whilst some theorists asserts that the nationality is initial. The former, recognized by modernist approach, asserts that there is no need for connecting ethnicity and nation since nation is a product of modernity, not history. According to the modernist approach, it is nationalism that creates nations. As Hobsbawm (1990) argues, nations are invented traditions which are socially engineered similar to Anderson's (2006) assertion that the nation is imagined.

The latter asserts the continuity between ethnicity and nation also considers the nation as a continuation of the culture of ethnicity. Anthony D. Smith (2000) defines the nation as "a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myth and historical memories, a mass public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members". As seen from the definition, the territory in which memories and events of the past took place is the basic element of nation. Smith (1994) also emphasizes the importance of common myths and historical memory which consolidate the idea of historical territory. Moreover, Calhoun (1993) emphasizes the importance of history in building a national identity, since it is shaped to create a national history for the aim of giving students and readers a sense of collective national identity. From the other point of view, Eric Hobsbawm (1990) argues that language is a tool of communication between members of society while it makes one group different from another. Language is an important component of nationalism, because; firstly, it is a key tool for claiming that nationhood is rooted in ethnicity; secondly, the shared language is a condition to claim a national community; thirdly, it is a tool for nation builders to match the state and the nation (Calhoun, 1993). This perspective better explains attempts to increase the use of Ukrainian language and revival of Holodomor in the post-Soviet Ukraine.

5

2.2 Nationalism

In social sciences, nationalism is a contested concept and has different meanings for different theorists of nationalism. I will use Anthony Smith's definition of nationalism throughout this thesis as it is most capable of explaining the phenomenon in hand. According to Smith (2001), "nationalism is an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity on behalf of a population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential nation". After giving this definition, he (2001) adds that, this definition presupposes a 'nation' concept but it does not suggest that nations exist before nationalism. The words 'or potential nation' recognize many situations like nations without nationalism, which are not limited to generally political goals. They cover cultural and social areas and ideal of national identity whilst every type of nationalism pursues the goal of national identity in varying degrees for different cases (Smith, 2001). In this section, I will present the main approaches to the concept of nationalism for subsequent interpretations of the nation-building process in post-Soviet Ukraine.

2.2.1 Ethnic Nationalism and Civic Nationalism

In social sciences the issue of nationalism as a collective belief or political ideology has many different classifications. One of the most widely used classification is the ethnic and civic (political) nationalism which created by Hans Kohn (1944).

From an ethnic perspective, members of the nation share a common heritage, language, religion, traditions, history, blood relationship based on common origin, the emotional attachment to the land, so that they together form a single nation or super-family, kinship community (Smith,1998). Ethnic nationalism asserts that nations are based on the common origin, whether real or perceived. Traditions and history are also necessary for territorial and political claims. As Calhoun (1993) asserts, for cultural traditions and ethnicity as the fundamentals of nationalism, they must contain the generally accepted ideas (historical memory), which can stand as a reference point for the society. Because of that the oral tradition and transfer of

6

personal experience are often insufficient for that, the communication sources (language, print, media, etc.) play a decisive role.

Civic nationalism on the other hand, is based on citizenship and it is a territorial conception that belongs to nation. As Smith put it, first element in civic nationalism is a demarcated territory, which is an acknowledged legal unit proved by history. To create a loyalty, it must be made 'historic' land "where terrain and people exerted mutual and beneficial influence over generations" (Smith, 1991). The second element is the regulators with the will of nation. These regulations are especially laws and institutions in order to pose common political purposes to citizens. The third element is citizenship, which means legal equality in terms of rights and duties. Particularly, in civic nationalism, nations must have common culture as nations viewed as cultural communities, with a civic, inclusive ideology, common understanding and aspiratory sentiments and ideas that bind the population together in their homeland/territory (Smith, 1991). In a true civic nationalism, diversity is praised and it includes different cultures within national symbols of the state and its political institutions (Smith, 2001). In civic nationalism, political legitimacy of state comes from the active participation of citizens in political decision-making.

In the case of Ukraine, it is difficult to argue about the dominance of one kind of nationalism. Another perspective on the type of nationalism argues that every type of nationalism has both civic and ethnic components in varying degrees and in different forms (Smith, 1991). In line with Smith, Ronald G. Suny argues that "the nation is more often both civic and ethnic than either one exclusively" (2006). Also Kohn (2005) asserts that "in any mature nation it is possible to notice the elements of ethnic as well as the elements of civic nationalism." As explained above, the perspective which asserts that every type of nationalism has both civic and ethnic nationalism. Because of that the Ukrainian nation-building process in terms of specific case of Holodomor cannot be analyzed only one perspective of civic or ethnic nationalism.

2.2.2 Modernity and Nationalism

Another controversial subject about nationalism is whether it is created or preexisted. Modernist approach argues that nationalism is a modern phenomenon as a result of industrialization. Proponents of modernist paradigm consider that industry with its contributions has helped the development of nationalism. Contribution of industry is the main reason of the creation of nationalism via the standardization of education, literacy, media, political and economic centralization. According to modernist scholars, nationalism is a construct of modernity but it is not preexisting. For the modernists this constructed phenomenon is created by elites. As Gellner (1964) pointed it out "nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness; it invents nations where they do not exist…".

Benedict Anderson (2006), a prominent scholar of modernism, defines the nation as an "imagined political community and it is imagined as something necessarily limited, but at the same time it is sovereign." Anderson (2006) asserts that the nation is imagined, "because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellows meet with them or even hear about them, while in the mind of each lives the image of what they have in common". So he (1983) explains the tool of this imagination such as, nation is a "half conscious, but explosive interaction between a production system and productive relations (capitalism), communications technologies and type of fatality of human linguistic diversity". Anderson (1994), as well as Gellner, asserts that along with the fact that the nation has no real historical roots, it is a product of industrial society, in particular printing press and the capitalist system, "as the printing press made it possible to produce the same text for a largely coherent readership in a limited number of close-to-vernacular languages and thereby standardizing the spoken languages to these languages, while capitalism in its constant search for unsaturated markets which made the print industry turn form Latin to these languages". Calhoun (1993) notes that "this is true not just of the contents of tradition, as folklore gives way simultaneously to scientific history and national myth, but of the very medium. Not only literacy but space-transcending communications technologies from print through broadcast can play a crucial role both in linking dispersed populations and in

creating the possibility for producing a popular memory beyond the scope of immediate personal experience and oral traditions". So, in Anderson's opinion, imagining of the nation entails imagining of national history and national myth.

Eric Hobsbawm (1992), another important scholar of modernism, asserts that "every sufficiently large human community whose members see themselves as a "nation" may be regarded as a nation". He also believes that nationalism is a political program and a recent concept development. Hobsbawm, as Gellner, believes that the nation is a product of the industrial revolution and nations are artificial constructs or invention in order to serve the elites' interest by channeling the potential of the nation because of the inventions are the results of social engineering. He emphasizes that nations appeared after the French Revolution.

While the scholars discussed above contributed greatly to the literature on, nationalism, in the next part I will focus on the ethno-symbolist approach as this approach is more appropriate in order to respond the research question of this thesis. Anthony Smith, as the most important representative of this tradition and his ideas will be discussed in order to analyze the issue in hand.

2.2.3. Ethno-symbolist Theory of Nationalism

Ethno-symbolism is an approach to nationalism, which stresses the role of myths, symbols, traditions, values and memories in the formation of nationalism and also in its continuity. In line with Anthony Smith, John Armstrong (1982) argues that the boundary which is protected by cultural symbols (language, dress, law religion etc.) is very important for maintaining ethnic communities which are equal to pre-modern nations. Also Smith (2001) emphasizes the "limits of the strategies of elites" in order to show that nationalism cannot be created purely with elite action as the masses have their own culture, tradition and memory to build on. In fact Smith acknowledges that nations are not primordial but claims that nations are rooted in premodern history, as ethnic consciousness was persistent at all times. He asserts that ethnic origins of nations are older than nationalism, while accepting that nationalism is a modern phenomenon. He (1986) stresses the importance of ethnic communities and their myths, common ancestry, symbols, memories and indicates that these exist

in both modern and pre-modern times, with continuity in history. As Smith (1986) put it, this is because: "Myths, symbols, memories and values are carried in and by forms and genres of artifacts and activities which change only very slowly, so ethnie[*] once formed, tend to be exceptionally durable under normal vicissitudes and to persist over many generations, even centuries, forming moulds with which all kinds of social and cultural processes can unfold and upon which all kinds of circumstances and pressures can exert an impact".

Hence Smith prefers to say reconstruction instead of construction, reinterpretation but interpretation. Nations are long-term processes, reenacted and reconstructed constantly; so that, they require ethnic cores, heroes, homelands and golden ages if they will survive (Smith, 1986). Smith (1986) also states that "modern nations and nationalism have only extended and deepened the meanings and scope of older concepts and structures. Nationalism has certainly universalized these structures and ideals, but modern civic nations have not in practice really transcended ethnicity or ethnic sentiments". Shortly, whilst some scholars see nation-building and nationalism as modern phenomena, Anthony Smith sees them as a continuity of ethnicity and pre-modern features (Smith, 1991). Smith argues that nationalism uses the pre-existing history of the population in order to form this history into a sense of shared history. In other words, past events, generally, reinterpreted defectively for the purpose of creating a collective memory. Because ruling elites provoke and mobilize the population through a project which should has resonance in the collective memory of population. While Smith`s perspective has limitations too, it is the most suitable approach for the Holodomor case which is constructed and adopted by the elite and masses as a collective memory by post-Soviet Ukrainian politics.

---

[*] An ethnie, in Anthony Smith's definition, is a looser cultural unit than nation. It shares common ancestry, myths and historical memories, has elements of shared culture, and some link with the historic territory and some measure of solidarity, at least among its elites (Smith, 1995)

CHAPTER III

HISTORY of HOLODOMOR: CONTROVERSIAL DISCOURSES

3.1. The Etymologic Roots of the Term: Holodomor

The term of Holodomor is a hybrid word, which is consisted of holod and mor. Holod (in Ukrainian) means hunger, starvation. Mor (comes from *moryty*) means death, extermination and plague. The literally translation "hunger death" is not fitting thoroughly. "Killing by hunger" or "plague of hunger" is more appropriate for Holodomor, which refers to the Ukrainian famine in 1932-33.

The origins of the term are not clear. General acknowledgement is that the term "Holodomor" was invented in the diaspora in 1970s and the diaspora used it firstly. Prominent scholars such as Hryshko and Kasianov agree to this. But Himka (2013) claims that the term "Holodomor" was used in mid 1960s in a dictionary and in 1944 as *nom de guerre*.

Despite the fact that the term Holodomor literally does not contain any meaning close to genocide, the term implicitly suggests that there was genocide. Throughout this thesis I will use the term only to refer the famine of 1932-1933 in Ukraine without the implicit baggage that the term carries. .

3.2. History of the Famine Years

The legitimization of the Soviet rule was derived from the Communist ideology, which has been formulated by Karl Marx in the nineteenth century. The Soviet ideologists desired to form a classless and equalitarian Communist society, through economic transformation. In this society the working proletariat would have the means of production. In order to provide the requirements of all workers, the newly established workers' state would construct a rational centrally controlled economy. By the second half of 1918, wherever the Bolsheviks come to power, they tried to create a classless communist state promptly. The Bolshevik led government

11

nationalized all industries (even the small-scale) including transportation, communication and power facilities and also rural areas. The use of money was prohibited and barter relations were introduced among industries and agricultural sectors. This new approach to the economy was named as "war communism".

Russia's already wounded economy under the circumstances of World War I and Russian Civil War was affected by the results of the war communism negatively. Thus Lenin, in March 1921, had to decide to implement what he called 'strategic retreat'. This strategic retreat was not resignation of bringing the industry and land under the state control, but that that was only a putting off the Lenin's ultimate goal till the conditions were convenient. As Lenin's famous dictum, "One Step Backward to Make Two Steps Forward". This symbolic retreat was the partly return to a market economy which is named as the New Economic Policy (NEP) with the goal to restore economic productivity. According to Mace (2013), Lenin takes this backward step, proclaiming the NEP, "in order to overcome rural resistance to the Soviet order". So NEP "ended forced procurements and allowed a private market in which agricultural producers could sell what they had produced" (Mace, 2013). The implementation of NEP gave rise soon to a flourishing local agricultural market economy and trade (Magocsi, 2007) and the economy had reached its levels of the Russian Empire on the eve of World War I (Magocsi, 2010).

Although NEP encouraged the local markets and put an end to requisitioning, the policy did not firstly create the expected positive results in the Ukrainian SSR. The main cause of this condition was the replacement of requisitioning with a system called tax in kind (prodnalog), by which farmers had to make payment of duty in foods that often made half their crop (Magocsi, 2010). The policy on the land question before the NEP, which has the "principle that all land should belong to those who work it" (Magocsi, 2010), paved the way to peasant war between poor peasants and prosperous peasants. This peasant war, tax burden and the armed uprising were combined with a severe draught in 1921 and destroyed the harvest in Ukraine. According to Magocsi (2010) the famine of 1921, lasted nearly two years, had casualties estimated 1.5 to 2 million lives with reference to official reports.

In 1928 Stalin introduced the command economy which replaced the NEP. According to command economy, the entire Soviet Union was to be treated as a single economic unit. All decisions about this unit were to be taken at the center in Moscow under the direction of the State Planning Commission (Gosplan)[*].

Hereafter, Soviet rulers started to manage economy according to the Five-Year Plan by means of its goals and schedules for every sector. The First Five Year Plan (1928-1932) had the goal of rapid industrialization which required equipment produced abroad. As an agrarian society, Soviet Union's grain had to be produced and sold in order to finance industrialization. Stalin's solution in order to increase the grain production was total collectivization. According to Wanner (1998) the implementation of the plan entailed the forcing peasants to leave their own private farms and work on recently collectivized farms managed by state, and give to the state their harvest.

Ukrainian SSR, especially lower Dnieper region and Donbas-Donetsk Basin, was singled out as a primary area for industrialization by Soviet rulers and obtained extensive state investment (Magocsi, 2007). Stalin stated that 20 percent of the investment should go to Ukraine and as a result of this policy many substantial industrial developments have been initiated such as the steel plant in Zaporizhia, Azov and the hydroelectric power station on Dnieper River (Cheng, Y., 2012). The main goal of Moscow for implementing such policy was to convert the Ukrainian SSR to an industrial base for metallurgy and coal extraction along with its major source of sugar and grain into the Soviet Union (Magocsi, 2010).

A number of power stations were constructed in the southern and eastern parts of Ukrainian SSR especially in Zaporizhia, Donbas-Donetsk Basin, Kiev, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Kryvyi Rih, Mariupol and Odesa and through these electric power plants production of electric power in Ukrainian SSR raised nearly tenfold between 1928 and 1940 (Magocsi, 2010). Another sphere of investment was

---

[*] The State Planning Commission (Gosplan) was established in 1927 in order to oversee and to plan the economy.

transportation system during the interwar period in Ukrainian SSR. According to Magocsi (2010) under the influence of massive investments on transportation system, 4000 km railroad track and 13700km paved highway constructed, the number of motor vehicles was affected by these developments and increased intensely from 11,400 in 1932 to 84,300 in 1937. As a result of the implementation of first two five-year plans the industrial production of Ukrainian SSR increased 3-5 times between 1928 and 1937.

After the First Five-Year Plan interested in heavy industry in Ukraine, the Second Five-Year Plan (1933-1937), and the Third Five-Year Plan (1938-1941) paid importance on the technological infrastructure of industry, chemical industry, transportation, and agriculture via collective farms and centralized control over industry in addition to heavy industry, but the Third Five-Year Plan was left unfinished by Soviet rulers because of the destructive nature of the World War II (Magocsi, 2010).

Nationalizing production tools including workers and establishing command economy was not challenging as much as the reorganizing the agricultural sector for Stalin. Soviet rulers aimed to establish a system in the agricultural sector based on the low cost food production which had to compensate the expenses of rapid industrialization and to provide the needs of rapidly growing working class. So they saw the collectivization of the land as the only solution in order to supply the food to the growing industrializing Soviet cities.

The process of collectivization which was postponed by Lenin's NEP put into practice once again but in a different way since voluntary collectivization policy did not turn out as expected by Soviet rulers. Thus in 1929 Soviet rulers initiated a forced collectivization policy. As a result of this policy 70 percent of the Ukrainian SSR's arable land had been collectivized by the central authorities by the end of 1932 and the percentage reached 91 percent by 1935 (Magocsi, 2007).

In order to achieve the forced collectivization, "in January 1930 the All-Union Communist party ordered the liquidation of the kulaks[*] as a class" (Magocsi, 2007) and within two months, Kulaks with their families were deported from the Soviet Ukraine to Central Asia, Siberia and the Soviet Far East. Because of the conditions during the exile many of thousands died. The process of deportation of kulaks, known as dekulakization ended up elimination of estimated quarter million people (Magocsi, 2010). After the implementation of dekulakization the central government achieved to convert lands to collective farms but faced the opposition of peasants and local rulers since the plan commanded harsh increasing quotas.

The Soviet authorities estimated that production would rise in the wake of agricultural collectivization, but as just the opposite of their expectations, the famine broke out in some parts of Ukrainian SSR in 1932 and the devastating effects of the famine increased dramatically by the beginning of 1933.

Historians claim as the reasons of famine generally: Dekulakization, class war, vigilant collection of grain to finance industrialization and as a result of these sharp decreases on harvest.

An American scholar, Tauger (2001), claims that low harvest due to natural disasters together with augmented demand for food as a result of the rapid industrialization, urbanization and collectivization was the main reason of the famine. In addition to that during 1932-33 under severe conditions of famine, the Soviet Union exported 1.7 million tons of grain (Wanner, 1998), but that amount did not able to change the situation significantly taking into consideration of grain production data in that years. In 1930, 1931 and 1932 the production of grain decreased from 23.1 to 18.3, and to 14.6 million tons respectively: in 1933 production increased significantly to 22.3 million tons but interestingly when the

---

[*] "A decree in May 1929 defined a kulak as someone who had a minimum income of 300 rubles (or 1500 rubles per household) and who used hired laborers and owned any kind of motorized farm machinery." (Magocsi, Paul R., 2010). "By 1929, 71, 500 households in Ukraine had been classified as kulak (Krawchenko 1985:122)" (Wanner, Catherine, 1998).

famine was over in 1934 production had fallen to 12.3 million tons which was lower than the amount of 1932 (Krawchenko, 1985).

According to Cheng (2012), the main cause of the famine was ineffective collectivization policy since the collective farms was provided insufficient farming equipment, livestock and unproductive management by people lacking of knowledge in agriculture. He (2012) also emphasized that organization of process of the grain procurement got out of control thus nothing left to peasants to feed.

3.3. The Debate over Holodomor

So far, I gave the mostly accepted part of the history of Holodomor. But there is a fiery debate over Holodomor in terms of the number of casualties caused by Holodomor and whether it was genocide or not.

3.3.1. Numbers of Deaths

The exact number of people who died in the famine and after the famine due to its consequences remains the subject of intense debate not only among historians but also politicians.

The British historian Robert Conquest, perhaps the earliest and most famous of leading historians of the Holodomor, estimates in the book "Harvest of Sorrow (1986)" that the death toll was at around fourteen million and as many as five million in Ukraine alone.

Contemporary historians question the accuracy of Conquest's method and demographical data of Ukrainian SSR. Also some historians criticize him using personal accounts and interviews to write about heroes and anti-heroes. Some historians condemn him using stories such as documents. As Penner (1998) argues "Villagers' belief that the famine was deliberately organized, of course, proves nothing".

Historian Sergei Maksudov's (2007) estimate is between four and four and half million people and prominent Ukrainian historian Stanislav Kulchytsky estimates between three and three and half million.

The Commission on the Ukraine Famine (1988) of the United States Congress in their report determined eight million people died. The Ukrainica Institute, Canadian-Ukrainian organization in Canada, has put the number at ten million. The administration of Yushchenko also used seven to ten million as the number of victims of Holodomor.

3.3.2. Genocide Argument

The other controversial subject on famine is whether it was genocide. This is not only a debate only among historians even among the Ukrainian politicians. But I will analyze the use of this traumatic event with political concerns in the subsequent section.

Robert Conquest and James E. Mace's book "The harvest of Sorrows", published in 1986 was the first significant scholarly work to consider the Holodomor as genocide against the Ukrainians. In his book, Conquest asserts that the famine was man-made which was planned by Soviet authorities and suggest that it was genocide against Ukrainians.

In addition to Conquest and Mace, the genocide thesis has been accepted by most Ukrainian historians, by most of the Diaspora, and by a minority of Western historians.

The genocide thesis advocate Stanislav Kulchytsky (2005), Ukrainian Historian, says that most historians remained unpersuaded by Ukrainians attempts to differentiate the Holodomor from the wider USSR grain procurement-induced famine in 1931-1932 famine that occurred in various other Soviet Republics.

Also Yuri Shapoval and Volodymyr Hryshko as Kulchytsky, outspokenly claim that the famine had been designed intentionally and constituted genocide of the Ukrainian nation.

An Italian scholar Andrea Graziosi is also an advocate of the Genocide thesis. But according to him, Stalin did not plan the Famine, but once the famine was there, he used it to teach a lesson by crashing the population of those regions where the

conflict with peasantry had become particularly acute, and aggravated by political, national or religious opposition.

"Many scholars like Fischer, Bilinsky and Hosking argue that the famine that proceeded was some form of punishment for the Ukrainian peasants' fight against collectivization" (Sawicky, 2013).

The non-genocidal perspective is based on the following arguments: the famine hit many areas, not only Ukraine and also Northern Volga, Kuban, Kazak and Kırgız Regions, Smolensk and Oral regions and also it was not directed at Ukrainians as an ethnic group, because when the famine hit Ukraine it affected others such as Russians, Germans, Mennonites, Greek, Poles, Bulgarians, Tatars, Moldavians and Jews.

According to Danies and Wheatcroft (2004), the famine was neither desired, nor expected by the authorities, but the result of the rapid industrialization plans for which Soviet authorities had to take the rural area under control through collectivization and dekulakization. They (2004) argue that the main causes of the deterioration of grain production were the disorder in administration, in agriculture and the discouragement of peasants. Also they (2006) claim "moreover, in their most secret letters and telegrams to Stalin, his closest associates Molotov and Kaganovich treat hunger and death from famine as an evil for which the kulaks or wider sections of the peasants, and inefficient local organization, are largely responsible, but which must be mitigated as far as possible by local and central measures". They (2004) conclude different from Robert Conquest, the famine was resulted partly by their unwise policies, but was unexpected and unwanted.

Mark Tauger (2001) interprets the famine as the result of a natural disaster. He does not deny the food exports during the crisis, rapid industrialization, collectivization and dekulakization but he focuses particularly on the environmental factors "such as drought, poor weather conditions and the over-exhaustion of soil".

Interpretations of the famine can be classified under four groups. Some scholars indicate Stalin as the organizer of the famine, because of his hatred of

Ukrainian nation (Hosking, 1987). Others assert that the famine was not engineered, but Stalin had knowledge about it and ignored not doing anything (Moore, 2012). Still other scholars claim that the famine was just a result of the Soviet Union's push for rapid industrialization and that caused the destruction of the peasant lifestyle (Fischer, 1935). The final group of thought argues that the famine was the result of factors beyond the control of the Union although Stalin took measures to decrease the effects of the famine on the people (Davies and Wheatcroft, 2006).

It is beyond the scope of this work to evaluate whether the famine was genocide. I only presented various categories of interpretations and underlined the ongoing debate which can't be concluded. In the next chapter I will discuss in detail the politicization of Holodomor after the independence of Ukraine in the nation building process and in addition to these I will show its examples of usefulness for the politicians for the short term political goals since it was preferable for them to rewrite history which is not known concretely.

3.4. Ukrainian Diaspora and Holodomor
Satzewich (2002) in his book "The Ukrainian Diaspora" claims that Ukrainian immigration to North America (Canada and US) occurred in three waves. According to him (2002) the first wave émigrés which was consisted of laborers and farmers began to immigrate roughly in 1880s and the authorities settled these émigrés generally in arable lands to set up small farms, or oriented them to work in heavy industries. While the second wave has occurred during 1920s and 1930s which were the years of the World War I, the Ukrainian War of Independence and integration of Ukraine into the Soviet Union, the third wave started in 1940 and continued to 1950s which were also the years of the World War II and the Cold War (Satzewich, 2002). Unlike the first wave émigrés, the second and third wave émigrés did not consist of only laborers and farmers but also intellectual refugees who were fleeing from Soviet regime due to political issues and looking for economic opportunity.

With the attempts of these intellectuals despite their infighting -based upon religion (Ukrainian Catholicity, Ukrainian Orthodoxy and Russian Orthodoxy), political affiliation etc.- a Ukrainian identity was formed in the United States and Canada based upon their language and culture as well as the collective memory, which is fed by suffering narratives. This victimization narrative is a significant tool of Diaspora even after the independence.

The influential activities of Ukrainian diaspora begins with late 1970s and 1980s which is coincided with a renewed flow of hostility towards Moscow in the United States in the ideological context of the Cold War. Perhaps, activating Ukrainian nationalist forces against the Soviet Union was one of the anti-Soviet projects of the Reagan Administration. Ukrainian history and culture institutes and centers were established in 1970 at prestigious universities such as Harvard and Saint Andrews. The term Holodomor was coined in the 1970s and used for the Ukrainian famine. In 1989, Ukrainian diaspora organized the 50th anniversary of the tragedy in the United States. North American Ukrainian Diaspora introduced and sponsored four projects in order to create awareness of the Famine: a) production of the film 'Harvest of Despair' in 1984; b) publishing of Robert Conquest's book 'Harvest of Sorrow' in 1986 and the organization of scholarly symposiums and publications; c) the establishment of a US Congressional Commission on the Ukrainian Famine in 1985; and d) the assembling of an international commission of inquiry into the Famine in 1988 (Sysyn, 1999).

The film "Harvest of Despair" was dismissed before long on the grounds that it is biased politically and doubtful scientific accuracy. Robert Conquest's study "Harvest of Sorrow" was criticized and attacked due to its ideological bias, accuracy and interpretation of data and his reliance on victims' accounts. In 1988, the US Commission headed by James Mace, which based its conclusions on testimonies of around 200 witnesses, reached the conclusion that the Famine constituted genocide against the Ukrainian people. However, Mace (2009) himself admitted that the application of the UN Convention was problematic in this case, because he claimed that the focus of the Famine was not a selected ethnicity such as Ukrainians but

geographic. Significantly, the International Commission of Inquiry into the Famine failed to give a common answer to whether the Famine was planned and whether it constituted genocide.

After the independence in 1991, the diaspora's aim, independence of Ukraine, was replaced with raising awareness about Holodomor and pushing for recognition of the Holodomor as genocide in the international arena.

CHAPTER IV

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY FORMATION from a HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

In the process of nation building, creation of a national identity and collective memory by political action are essential. Both of them are derived from history in line with the interest of policy. As Weaver (1993) specifies, "national identity as a discursive construction needs to draw on a reservoir of myths, stories and historic representations".

The notion of nationality as in many parts of Eastern Europe emerged by the 1850s. At the time, ethnic Ukrainian territories were shared by two empires. The western part consisting of Galicia (the city of Lviv in this region), Volhynia (consisted of Lutsk, Rivne), Bukovyna (Chernivtsi in the region) and Transcarpathia (Uzhhorod in the region) was under the Habsburg rule and the rest of contemporary Ukraine was under the rule of the Russian Empire. According to Wilson (1997), western part of Ukraine enjoyed the suitable conditions provided by the liberal Habsburg ethnicity policy, as a result of this the national consciousness and culture flourished whereas the Ukrainians living in the regions under the Russian control suffered from oppressive policies of Russian rule in terms of language, culture etc.

The consequences of the World War I along with the collapse of both empires paved the way for ethnic Ukrainians to independence and Ukrainian People's/National Republic (Ukrainian acronym UNR) was declared in Kiev in November 1917, in the wake of the October 1917 revolution in Russia (Wilson, 1997). In a short time, in December 1917, the Bolsheviks declared the Soviet Ukrainian state in the eastern city of Kharkiv. As the Habsburg Empire collapsed, the Western Ukrainian People's Republic (Ukrainian acronym ZUNR) emerged in Lviv in November 1918.

In a short time, in July 1919, the Polish army annexed the Western Ukrainian People's Republic which remained a part of the interwar Polish state until 1939. In 1920, Bolsheviks captured Kiev and in 1922 Ukrainian People's Republic formally joined the Soviet Union under the name Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. In November 1918 the Romanian troops beat Ukrainian government in Bukovyna and shortly after, in April 1919, the Czechoslovakian army took over Transcarpathia (Wilson, 1997).

During the interwar period the Ukrainian SSR had a degree of cultural and political autonomy thanks to Lenin's policy of *korenizatsiia*[*]. At that time, in the Ukrainian SSR, Ukrainianization had been launched in many spheres such as education, culture, language, media and even religion. Wilson (1997) underlines that the right-wing Polish government's breaking its word and introducing oppressive cultural policies in Galicia caused radicalization of Ukrainian nationalism and emerging of terrorist movement against Polish nationality policies.

Under Stalin, the policy of *korenizatsiia* was shifted inversely in Soviet Ukraine. Russification, Stalinist purges and Great Famine of 1932-33 caused a decrease in population and changes in the social structure. Wanner (1998) emphasizes that many Ukrainian-speaking peasants as the time went by assimilated to the Russian language or to *surzhyk*[**] as a result of Stalinist oppressive policies derived from aggressive Soviet ideology. In 1939, Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union signed a non-aggression pact known as Molotov-Ribbentrop pact named after the foreign ministers of signatory countries. Besides securing the non-aggressive attitudes between these countries, the pact also contained articles regarding allocation of some parts of Eastern Europe. In consequence of the pact Galicia, Volhynia, northern Bukovyna and southern Bessarabia were occupied by the Soviet Union from 1939 to 1940. Transcarpathia's incorporation into the Soviet Ukraine followed that in

---

[*] Korenizatsia (Russian) means indigenization which is Lenin's policy, instituted in 1921, allowed greater cultural autonomy to titular nations and minorities in USSR.

[**] Surzhyk is a dialectic mixture of Russian and Ukrainian languages.

1945. In 1954 Khrushchev transferred ethnically predominantly Russian Crimea to the Ukrainian SSR and Crimea became a part of Ukraine till Russia annexed in 2014.

By the mid-1950s Soviet army annihilated the anti-Soviet military uprising thus the Ukrainian national movement transformed to civic and cultural nature which paved the way the national democratic movement Rukh (Wilson, 1997).

Ukrainian nation-building efforts could not be completed due to a variety of factors. As Weber (1978) claims, group identity is formed by political act. So national identity, is often, shaped by state. The consciousness of national identity is an essential factor in the nation-building process for states. But as mentioned above, under the oppressive nationality policies implemented by sovereign countries to Ukrainians, and since they neither had *longue duree* independence on its territory until 1991 nor had a nation building process experience through its history, they were deprived of constant political act which was necessary forming the national identity. Lack of wholly acknowledged heroic events special to only Ukrainians, also assimilation of culture and language were other obstructions on the creation of national consciousness. In addition to these, Victory of World War II as a powerful identity marker bonding Ukrainians and Russians strengthened the supra-identity of Soviet. The demographic structure of Ukraine did not facilitate the creation of a national identity on a purely ethnic base. Besides the existence of largest minority – Russians- Russophone Ukrainians, mixed-marriages, and regional identity divisions made it very difficult to construct a common national identity. According to Wilson (1997) Ukrainian speaking Ukrainians of western Ukraine persisted to assume Russia as the fundamental threat to the existence of the Ukrainian nation and identity thinking that Russia has maintained chauvinistic habits of Russian imperialism or the Soviet totalitarianism. Unlike the Ukrainophone Ukrainians, the Russian speaking Ukrainians saw Russia as a kindred country also they identified themselves through the Soviet Union (Riabchuk, 2002). According to a survey conducted in 1995, 30% of the residents of the eastern city of Donetsk identified themselves with Ukraine; furthermore 33% of who ascribed themselves with the Soviet Union, however in Lviv 75% of the inhabitants identified themselves with Ukraine (Abdelal, 2001).

24

For such multi-ethnic state, the national identity has to be founded on a "civic" rather than an "ethnic" basis in order to unite and build a nation. Graham Smith (1998) identifies three tendencies that nation-builders usually display in the process of establishing boundaries between the national group and the 'others': the tendency to essentialize the groups; the propensity to historicize, refer to a 'Golden Age'; and the tendency to totalize. But lacking of any 'Golden Age'[*] belonging to only Ukrainians or of any wholly acknowledged heroic event suitable for the historical narratives, Ukraine opted for victimization narratives developed by the Diaspora initially. Holodomor as a victimization narrative partially fits Graham Smiths' (1998) categories, it is not from the 'Golden Age' but from past and creates two opposed distinct groups: the Ukrainian people which is described in positive terms (such as liberal, independent, innocent, peaceful), while the Russians is ascribed with the negative terms (aggressive, perpetrators). But this creation of "others" with the hostility to Russians pave the way for construction an identity on an ethnic base, far from to uniting an already divided nation. According to Smith (1998) victimization narratives must be simple in order to be concurrent for most of citizens. But victimization narratives are often complex and controversial and also difficult to accept by citizens, as Holodomor narrative is not an exception.

It is worth noting that in the context of "Holodomor" the political act was required in creating national identity as Weber (1978) claimed that political act is necessary in the formation of group identity. As Kasianov (2008) emphasizes that in the USSR there was no the subject of Holodomor among the intellectual sphere, although witnesses of the famine were enough to for that to record at least to preserve the collective memory. The fact that the first discourses about Holodomor was developed by the Ukrainian diaspora and advocators of Holodomor are mostly from the western part of Ukraine who did not directly suffered from the famine as part of Poland. That testifies to the fact that political act has crucial role in using the tools by which national identity is formed.

---

[*] The period of a fully independent state when the state has stability, prosperity, harmony, peace and power.

As a historical narrative and collective memory, Holodomor has been made one of the central pillars of Ukrainian national identity and used as a political tool after the independence of Ukraine in 1991. In the following chapter I will analyze the use of Holodomor discourse by the political elite, mainly the presidents, in Ukraine.

However, it is worth to note that, Holodomor is not the only one historical narrative in Ukrainian ideological policy in the nation building process. Besides Holodomor, there are either heroic and victimization narratives or symbols derived these narratives at the ideological sphere. Some of the prominent ones of these narratives are such.

Medieval Kievan Rus' state is one of the historical narratives of Ukraine which has the symbols derived from that ancient state such as symbol of trident (*tryzub*) and the currency of *hryvnia*. But this narrative is problematic for distinguishing national identity since the Belarussians, Ukrainians, and Russians all claim Kievan Rus' as their cultural ancestors and their own history.

Another narrative is the Cossack Hetmanate centered on the Dnieper River in 17th century. The culture of Cossacks, particularly way of life and clothes, has been cherished in contemporary Ukraine.

The World War II also another heroic narrative despite that while the Ukrainians fought under the Soviet identity with other Soviet nations against Germany some of Ukrainians fought on the German side against Soviets.

Besides Holodomor there were other famines as victimization narratives but another victimization narrative is the Chornobyl nuclear accident which is shared by Ukraine and Belarus.

CHAPTER V

HOLODOMOR ISSUE in INDEPENDENT UKRAINE from an ETHNO-SYMBOLIST PERSPECTIVE: DOMESTIC POLITICS and FOREIGN POLICY

With the disintegration of the USSR all new post-Soviet states embarked a process of national building. Their endeavor in building the nation challenged with various obstacles. In order to build a new nation, all of them strived to create new national consciousness and national self-confidence with a unique self-identity different from the Soviet and Russian identity. For the creation of these two notions political elite in the former republics has been using history, collective memory, culture and language. Most of them rewrote their national history and tried to indoctrinate the public through education, media, commemorations, ceremonies on the new national discourses. They tried to preserve their culture and clean it from the Soviet and Russian elements. In order to construct their own national culture they tried to make their national language prominent and marginalize Russian language. Some of them change the alphabet to make a quicker transition. Cultural transition projects were not limited only to language. Also they changed the names of the streets, museums, operas and even cities with their own- or allegedly own-figures in history. Monuments dedicated to a tragic or heroic event were constructed and replaced with the Soviet era ones (such as the statue of Lenin or Stalin) in early post-Soviet states. While the economic dependency mostly remained they changed ruble to their own currency. But this also has significance because they mostly used, on their money the figures through old/heroic history, which, as a proof of identical success, is a tool of helping to form a national identity.

Similar projects of national-building were also implemented in Ukraine too. But Ukraine is one of these states with some sui generis features. Ukraine was and is still the most populous state after Russia.

According to the 2001 census Ukrainian population is 48.923.200 (State Statistic Service of Ukraine). Its ethnical distribution is that 37.541.693 people are Ukrainian and 8.334.141 are Russian (State Statistic Service of Ukraine). But for the nation-building endeavors of the state, it is more important than its ethnical distribution is the linguistic division in Ukraine. According to the 2001 census 32.577.468 people are Ukrainophone and 14.273.670 (%29) people are Russophone (State Statistic Service of Ukraine). That means ethnically the nearly 77% of population is Ukrainian while %17 is Russian. According to the use of language, approximately %67 of the population is Ukrainophone when roughly %29 is Russophone.

The distribution in identity and language is divided along regional lines. The eastern and southern part of Ukraine is more Russophone when the center and the western part of Ukraine is Ukrainophone. This regional schism also reflects the political tendency of Ukraine. Since history as a convenient and efficient tool can be used as creating a common identity beyond the linguistic and regional divisions, Ukraine utilized history to overcome the division problem. So Holodomor has been selected by policy makers of Ukraine as one of the fundamental symbols of national historical myth aiming to construct a common national identity of independent Ukraine.

In the next part, I will analyze the use of Holodomor as a nation building tool under five presidents: that of Leonid Kravchuk (1991-1994), Leonid Kuchma (1994-2004), Viktor Yushchenko (2004-2010), Victor Yanukovych (2010-2014) and Petro Poroshenko (2014-…).

5.1. Leonid Kravchuk (1991-1994)

In 1991 Ukraine had its independence with referendum, when 90% of the population voted for independence. Predicting the change, the former communist nomenklatura[*] adapted itself to nationalist programs with the aim of building of new Ukrainian state and to sustain its power. A good striking example of the newly "nationalized" communist was the first Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk who adopted the program of the Rukh Party. While he had been sitting in the post of the Department of Agitation and Propaganda of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CC CPU) between 1980 and 1988, he took part in counter-propaganda of the 50th anniversary of Holodomor and he kept on his stance as the head of the Department of Ideology of CC CPU from 1989 to 1990 by being a fiery opponent of the national democrats (Kasianov, 2008). And in 1990 he became the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine (9th chairman of the Verkhovna Rada).

5.1.1. Nation Building in the Context of Holodomor under Kravchuk

In 1992, via Vitold Fokin, the then prime minister constructed the Bell of Peace commemorative complex-consisted of a burial mound and a huge bell with a cross- in the city of Lubny in Poltova oblast. As a first instance of ethnic symbolism led by state, it did not create a major impact in public.

President of Ukraine, Kravchuk, complained in an official ceremony in 1993 that "the Ukrainians do not have their own history". Afterwards National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine immediately published the catalogue of a fifteen-volume history of the Ukrainian people that Rem Symonenko, a staff member of the Institute of Ukrainian History at the Academy, summed up its spirit as: "the restoration of national history per se to its rightful place; its restoration as the past of the Ukrainian ethnos on its own autochthonous territory. The subject here is Ukrainian history as a

---

[*] The nomenklatura were a category of people within the Soviet Union and other Eastern Bloc countries who held various key administrative positions in all spheres of those countries' activity: government, industry, agriculture, education, etc., whose positions were granted only with approval by the communist party of each country or region (Wikipedia).

unique, uninterrupted process whose principal object is the Ukrainian people from its primal origins to its present-day sovereign statehood" (Kasianov, 2012).

From a modernist approach, as Anderson and Gellner emphasize nations have no real historical roots, it is a product of industrial society. Since nationalism is product of modernity, history is constructed in a way to help with creating this identity. In this context Kravchuk's policy of reconstructing history of the Ukrainian people is in line with the modernist approach. Moreover, Ethno-symbolist approach, which is criticized by modernism, is more appropriate for this context. Rem Symonenko emphasized the "restoration of national history", similarly to Smith's assertion of history, which is the reinterpretation of past events for the purpose of creating a collective memory.

In 1993, during the commemorations for the sixtieth anniversary of Holodomor a major historical debate among politicians emerged in terms of the commemorative measures to choose. In this debate Kravchuk took part in the position of the supporter of commemorative programs at the state level. As Kasianov (2010) argues Kravchuk supported the programs in order to show his loyalty to the national democrats regarding nation-building process, and also he had to refrain from radical actions to avoid conflict with the powerful left-wing lobby in parliament.

19 February 1993 was a turning point for memory politics of Ukraine as Kravchuk issued a decree titled 'on measures in connection with the sixtieth anniversary of the Holodomor in Ukraine' (O meropriiatiiakh v sviazi s 60-letiem golodomora v Ukraine) presenting ideologically highlighted term Holodomor soon to become widespread in the spheres of scholar, politics, and even legislation furthermore it was legalized also in the common sense and interpretation of the famine (Kasianov, 2010). The appearance of the term "Holodomor" in official decrees is, perhaps, the most important contribution of Kravchuk as a political action in the nation-building process.

In 1993, Kravchuk denied any support to extreme projects of nationalists such as the proposal to organize a "Popular Tribunal" to judge symbolically the perpetrators of the famine or the construction of a parliamentary commission to

instruct an enquiry into the Holodomor (Kasianov, 2010). Kasianov (2010) asserts that Kravchuk's policy in terms of Holodomor was an act of "dodge the rain". According to Kasianov, Kravchuk was implementing a balance policy between national-democrats and powerful left wing in parliament in domestic policy.

Historical debates in politics or in in historians, commemorations and decrees about Holodomor in the period of Kravchuk had no great public resonance. According to Kasianov the reason was "lack of any systematic historical policy." Kasianov argues that Kravchuk`s policies regarding Holodomor increased in the eve of election 1994 mostly in order to collect the nationalists' votes. Other than that there were more urgent problems of the newly independent country such as the economic crises of the period, struggle for transition to market economy, transition to democracy and mass poverty.

5.1.2. Creation of Enemy Image and Foreign Policy
After the independence of Ukraine, national values and Ukrainian independence became significant not only in domestic but also in foreign policy. Recognition of the Ukrainian territorial integrity and independence by Russia was a very delicate issue for Ukraine in the early years of its independency. Russia though was not very willing to develop equal relations with Ukraine in order to sustain its influence. After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, Russia was reluctant to acknowledge the new borders of Ukraine as international borders. Russia's tendency was in direction towards ideas of "East Slavic Unity".

Russian stance together with Ukraine`s anti-Russian stance and its desire to integrate with the west were the main controversial issues along with other problems such as the Russian fleet in Crimea, statuses of Crimea and Sevastopol, Ukraine's nuclear status and the redistribution of Soviet property.

The perception of Russian threat in Ukraine could have facilitated the process of nation building in the new independent Ukraine. In applying nation-building process in order to consolidate national identity, one has to condemn an enemy in historical narrative. In 1992, Kravchuk indicated this enemy as the Stalinist regime. "Kravchuk declared in 1992 that the Ukrainians had suffered more than anybody else

under the Stalinist machine. Against the backdrop of the genocide thesis, Ukrainians could be established as first-class victims of Stalinism." (Wemheuer, 2009). He also emphasized "the victims of Stalinism" in his discourse in line with Holodomor victimization narrative.

In September 1993, President Kravchuk said 'I wholly agree that this was planned genocide against our own people. But I would not stop here. Yes, against our own people, but in accordance with directives from another center' referring to the Holodomor in an international conference titled 'Holodomor in Ukraine, 1932-33: Causes and Consequences,' in Kiev (Kasianov, 2010).

The fluctuation of the target in discourses of Kravchuk from the enemy in the past to the current concrete enemy shows us his political maneuvers in the issue. The allusive accusation towards the "another center" was clearly directed at Moscow that is present unlike the Stalinist regime which Kravchuk condemned before. And the introduction sentence "But I wouldn't stop here" displays that the following sentence will be too daring for the time. It is worth to note that this statement was given in the pre-election year. That may be an example of the exploitation of Holodomor in domestic politics.

It was again during Kravchuk`s presidency, the first attempt of internationalization of Holodomor occurred in 1993. "The ministry of Foreign Affairs received a directive to submit a proposal to UNESCO requesting that the UNESCO calendar mention the tragedy" (Kasianov, 2010). But these efforts remained unsuccessful possibly due to lack of supports from US because of the nuclear arsenal of Ukraine had controversial status at the time.

5.2. Leonid Kuchma (1994-2004)

Kravchuk`s nation building policies were resisted against especially in the east and south of the country. Coupled with the economic crisis in his period Kravchuk was not able to be re-elected. In the 1994 presidential elections it was Kuchma who defeated Kravchuk and became a president.

Kuchma, from the eastern part of Ukraine was supported mainly by the Russophone population of Ukraine. While the support for Kuchma was into single digits in Galicia, he got 90% of the votes of the Russian population in Ukraine. His campaign rhetoric affected these results. During his campaign for elections, he promised stabilizing the economy, introducing Russian as a second state language and forging a strategic partnership with Russia.

5.2.1. Ideological Policy under Kuchma

It is generally considered that with Kuchma's accession to power he placed much less emphasis on ideological sphere than Kravchuk so that some scholars define the Kuchma's policy towards historical issues as "a project of amnesia" (Kasianov, 2010). However he used the historical past for his political goals. One may also be argue that the period was not an ideological but a pragmatic one based on the delicate balancing principle.

Indeed the 1994 presidential election demonstrated how polarized Ukraine was. That division of Ukraine along ethnic and regional lines limited Kuchma on using controversial issues in order not to deepen the East/West divide in the country. This also forced him to pursue a balance policy.

Nevertheless, Kuchma did not completely abandon the policy of national democrats, even at a time when pro-presidential parties were dominant in the Parliament. He reneged on his promise which was given in the presidential election campaign in introducing Russian as a second state language. In the meantime he learned Ukrainian language and strived to speak Ukrainian in official speeches. Also he stated that "we made Ukraine, now we need to make Ukrainians". His words emphasize the need for common national identity, which must be constructed with the help of pre-existing history. As it is Smith asserts that histories are the basic elements of nation.

A decree was issued in October 1998 determining the order of commemorative events which had already been unofficially in force (Kasianov, 2010). In a separate decree, Kuchma signed in November, he established the 'Day of

Remembrance of Victims of the Famine' to be celebrated every last Saturday of November as an official commemorative date. Later, Kuchma renamed this commemorative date as 'Day of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holodomor and of Political Repressions'.

Kuchma`s commemorative decree, "On Measures Related to the 70th Anniversary of the Holodomor in Ukraine", was signed in February 2002. According to Kasianov (2010), one purpose of the decree was to seize the initiative from the emerging parliamentary opposition. He also stresses the time of decree which coincided with the March 2002 Parliamentary elections as a test of strength before the presidential elections of 2004. A directive introduced establishing Memorial to the Victims of Famine and Political Repression which was not implemented due to bureaucratic interception and reluctance of local administrators on the historical politics (Kasianov, 2008).

In line with his pragmatic policy, Kuchma exploited the ideological potential of Holodomor especially after 2000, when he began to lose his popularity sharply. This decline was due to growing authoritarianism and pressure on media, most notably the "Tapegate"[*] scandal. While this loss of popularity in domestic policy pushed him to use Holodomor to regain political weight, but on the other hand anxiety of possible tension on Russian-Ukrainian relations due to Holodomor restrained him.

5.2.2. Foreign Policy in the Context of Holodomor

In foreign policy, especially in affairs with Russia during Kuchma's presidency a balancing policy was pursued, as it was the case in domestic policy. At the beginning of his presidency, he looked like he had tendency to follow the Russian direction. But his pragmatism dictated something else; Ukrainian dependence on the west and on Russia led him to pursue a dual policy orientation. For example, despite the fact that Kuchma advocated a strategic reorientation towards Moscow, he

---

[*] In November 2000, the opposition journalist Georgiy Gongadze was found beheaded outside of Kiev. "Melnychenko tapes", secretly recorded by the President's former bodyguard, revealed Kuchma's personal involvement in the abduction and murder of Gongadze.

emphasized that "integration to European structure: direction of our foreign policy" (1999, İzvestiya). However right after in his speech Kuchma pointed out that "Past experience and today's reality don't allow to turn back on our neighbors, before all on Russia and on members of CIS" (1999, İzvestiya).

As a result of parliamentary hearings on the Holodomor, which began in February 2003, a special session was held in the Verkhovna Rada, Ukrainian Parliament, in 14 May 2003. The parliament approved the resolution qualifying the Holodomor as a deliberate act of genocide against the Ukrainian people. In one part of the resolution, Holodomor was described as "we consider that in an independent Ukraine the state must proclaim the terrible truth about those years, because the Stalin regime deliberately organized the Holodomor of 1932-33, and Ukrainian society and the international community must publicly condemn that event as one of the largest acts of genocide in world history in terms of the number of victims." (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine). While this declaration was referring to the Holodomor as genocide it also indicated the perpetrator of genocide as the Stalinist regime. By pointing the responsible for genocide as the Stalinist regime, they isolated the Soviet rule and its successor Russia. As Jenkins and Guibernau emphasized that national identity formation requires "others". In line with the theory of construction of Ukrainian identity, the 'Russian other' is a fundamental element. The other significant consequence of the resolution was the establishing of the word "genocide", indicating Holodomor at the state level.

In 2003, the same year of the resolution on Holodomor, the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry, under President Kuchma launched an offensive campaign on the international stage for the recognition of the Holodomor as genocide. "Twenty six states belonging to the UN, including Russia, passed a declaration of defining the famine as a national tragedy that caused 7 to 10 million deaths in the Soviet Union" (Wemheuer, 2009), but ceased to define the famine as genocide. It looks like that the policy was more of a failure than achievement for the Ukrainian part, nevertheless for the first time, the term "Holodomor" was used on an international stage.

Through this international campaign, Kuchma probably hoped to raise his popularity in domestic policy on the eve of the presidential elections of 2004. However he did not abandon entirely his cautious moves with the fear that the relations between Ukraine and Russia might be deteriorated. So, probably due to that, he declared the year of 2003 as the year of Russia in Ukraine.

5.3. Victor Yushchenko (2004-2010)

In 2004, the presidential election was held in Ukraine between Yushchenko and Yanukovych. Yushchenko obtained 39.9 percent of the votes while Yanukovych 39.3 percent in the first round of elections (Tudoroiu, 2007). However, in the second round of the presidential election resulted with the victory of Yanukovych which entailed the assertion of fraud in elections. The discontent of election results among politicians, population, international organizations gave rise to Orange Revolution in Ukraine, which was the first mass protest since independence, especially in "Maidan". Supporters of Yushchenko took the Kiev streets to protest the results of the election, blockaded administrative buildings in the capital. These mass protests in Kiev spread out to other cities of Ukraine. The core component of the protests was the Ukrainian youth. The protests gained more supporters especially from government officials in Kiev, Ternopil, Vinnytsia and Ivano-Frankivsk and the councils of these cities did not recognize the results of the second round of the elections (Hesli, 2006). In addition to these, international support through non-governmental organizations played an important role in the success of the Orange Revolution.

This chaos was resulted in the Ukrainian Supreme Court declaring the election to be invalid and calling for a new election. Despite the Kremlin's overt support for Yanukovych and Yanukovych's campaign "Ukraine-Russia: Stronger together", Yushchenko won the second runoff election with the slogan "Away from Moscow" (Wilson, 2005).

Yushchenko, as a native of eastern Ukraine, asserted that his student years in the western city of Ternopil made him "more Ukrainian" (Wilson, 2005). The underlying fact in his mentality is that when the central-western part of Ukraine is

real Ukrainian, the Southeastern part of Ukraine is the region, which lost its own identity and was Russified. The threat of losing identity in his view causes the securitization problem of Ukrainian identity. This mentality of Yushchenko is reflected in his actions during his period of his presidency. Even before his presidency, when he formed his bloc he named it as "our Ukraine" which may be interpreted in opposition to "their Ukraine" which doesn't have real essence of being Ukrainian. Yushchenko constructed his bloc while opposing the Kuchma regime. While Yushchenko was once the prime minister of Kuchma, with the members who were more dynamic and younger, relative to other party members.

5.3.1. Holodomor under Yushchenko

In 2005 after the re-run of the rigged elections, in which Yushchenko enjoyed the overwhelming support of the western and central Ukraine he claimed that his priority was to unite the country, to overcome regional divisions that almost tore the country apart (Wilson, 2005). In order to manage that, he conducted an unprecedented ideological and political campaign as making the Holodomor the central pillar of the national identity-building project. He dedicated himself to create a collective memory of Holodomor and to replace it as the central mobilizing symbol of Ukrainian history in order to overcome the Ukrainian identity problem.

In the commemoration of Holodomor of 2005, Yushchenko, in his National Radio Address, said:

> (Holodomor) was a real war against the nation. (…) The Soviet regime knew that this was the only way to wipe out the national memory. (…) What kind of a people can live without the memory? It is a tumbling weed without roots. No family, no tribe. No past and no future. It is the kind of people that can be easily manipulated, easily enslaved.
>
> Even today our society reaps the bitter fruit of the loss of memory. Nonsense, but the execution of millions of people is still a matter of discussion: was it a famine or was it a poor harvest? Was it a crime or was it negligence? (Yushchenko, 2005).

In this speech he stressed the importance of memory for the free future as a nation and the necessity of putting the loss of memory in place.

In 2005, Yushchenko issued several commemorative decrees as such: in July 2005 "on Additional Measures to Immortalize the Memory of the Victims of Political Repression and Holodomors in Ukraine" (Decree, 2005), on 4 November 2005 "on Honoring Victims and Causalities of Holodomor in Ukraine (Decree, 2005), on 22 November 2005 "on the Observance of a Day of memory Victims of Holodomor and Political Repression" (Decree, 2005). With these decrees he foreboded a bill to give a "political and legal assessment of Holodomors in the history of Ukraine" (Kasianov, 2010). Also through these decrees, he strove to make commemorations more activated, remarkable and persistent in the memory, thus he struggled for the resurgence of collective memory of Holodomor.

On 2 November 2006, Yushchenko submitted the bill "on the Holodomor of 1932-1933 years in Ukraine." According to Kasianov (2010), this draft was a "gambit" to instigate the opposition to object the decree, that aiming to use this response to discredit the opposition, while the opposition had majority in the Verkhovna Rada and thus Yanukovych government was on duty. As was to be expected, very fiery debates were held in Verkhovna Rada, but finally a compromise

was reached. In the first Article, the statement of "Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine is the genocide of Ukrainian nation (natsia)" was replaced with "Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine is the genocide of Ukrainian people (narod)" (Law, 2006). The term "people" versus to nation is an inclusive term which is not keeping out other nations of Soviet Union such as ethnic Russians which were the victims of the Holodomor in Ukraine. Another debated issue in Article 1 was the term "genocide". Yanukovych's party (the Party of Regions) which has the majority in Verkhovna Rada initially wanted to exclude the term Genocide but later accepted under the condition of defining genocide as: "criminal actions of the repressive totalitarian Stalin regime directed toward the mass destruction of part of the Ukrainian people and other peoples of the USSR as a result of the man-mad Holodomor of 1932-1933" unlike the definition of The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (CPPCG) (Kasianov, 2010). Article 2 mentioned that "public denial of the Holodomor of 1932-33 is regarded as an insult to the memory of the

38

millions of victims of the Holodomor and to the dignity of the Ukrainian people and is unlawful" (Law, 2006). This article, despite its inclusion of no criminal responsibility, was criticized for its ambiguous format in that whether it condemns the denial of the fact of Holodomor or of Holodomor as genocide.

Adoption of the law did not put an end to the struggle. On 28 March 2007, Yushchenko submitted a bill establishing criminal liability for "denial of the Holodomor of 1932-33 as genocide of the Ukrainian people and of the Holocaust as genocide of the Jewish people" (Kasianov, 2010). The bill stated that:

> The public denial of the Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine as a genocide against the Ukrainian People and the Holocaust as a genocide against the Jewish people would impose a penalty of 100 to 300 time the untaxed minimum income level, or a custodial sentence for up to two years, for the public denial of the fact of the Holodomor in Ukraine as genocide against the Ukrainian people and the Holocaust as genocide against the Jewish people, and for preparing and dissemination of materials containing such denial (Den, 2007).

This bill had three additional dimensions to the law on Holodomor denial. The first dimension was the criminal liability of denial which was criticized on the ground that, restriction of the freedom of speech are permitted by Constitution only in specified situations such as national security. In this case Yushchenko, might be, considered such denial of Holodomor as a threat to national security since he assumed it as a threat to Ukrainian national identity. The second dimension of the bill was the reference to Holocaust and parallel laws in European countries which aimed to make bill more convincing and to legitimize the bill. The third dimension of the bill was the penalty for state employees in the case of violating prohibition. That was clearly intended for the local authorities of southern and eastern regions in order to force them to fulfill the president's instructions on commemorations of Holodomor. This bill was postponed due to the dissolution of Verkhovna Rada in 2007. Despite the Yushchenko's several attempts, this bill was never adopted because of the political crises. With the law banning denial of Holodomor, cleavages within political camps and regional lines in Ukraine were deepened. Yushchenko claimed that he intended to create a united identity. Despite his denial of any dividing intent,

his acts and rhetoric adopted an "us versus them" version. Also he damaged the process of transition to the democratic state with the repression by law.

In 2006, the "Institute of National Remembrance" was established by Yushchenko's decree on 31 May 2006. The institute was established as modeling the Polish Institute of National Remembrance. However, when an independent president headed the Institute of National Remembrance in Poland, unlike that the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance was headed by one of Yushchenko's allies. Although its function was confirmed by decree in 2008 as integrating the initiatives of institutions, researchers and NGOs on politics of memory, it couldn't function properly according to Kasianov (2012). He (2012) asserts that it couldn't compete with the existing research institutions due to lack of strategy and organizational weakness.

In 2007, the creation of a national Book of Remembrance, which was the one of the main aspects of Yushchenko's campaign, was initiated under the coordination of the Institute of National Remembrance. The local groups consisted of teachers, students, librarians; museum staffs, local historians were formed under local state administrations in order to collect information about the victims of Holodomor. This project was criticized by scholars for putting pressure on the local administrations and thus being turned into "chasing after numbers in order to fill quotas" (Kasianov, 2012). The counterattack came from Russian media to the data in 2009. The assertion was that the local authorities of Sumy Region (Yushchenko's homeland) had used the list of village's current voters as a list of Holodomor victims (İzvestia, 2009). Another assertion by Vladimir Kornilov, representative of the institute of CIS countries in Kiev, emphasized that Holodomor victims kept growing due to the pressure on the local authorities. They have been using the victims of alcohol, accidents, drunken fights, and also of people fallen under horses (İzvestia, 2011).

In May 2007, Yushchenko amended Kuchma's decree separating the "Day of Remembrance of the Victims of Holodomor", which was remained as the last Saturday of November, from the "Day of Remembrance of the Victims of Political Repression", which was designed as the third Sunday of May (Decree, 2007). This

amendment was done in order to avoid commemorating the victims at the same time with executioners, some of which were victims of political repression (Kasianov, 2010).

Another project of Yushchenko was the Holodomor Memorial Complex. On 22 November 2008, on the 75th anniversary of Holodomor, the "Inextinguishable Candle" was erected, as part of a memorial complex. Under the monument of the Candle of memory, beneath the surface, the Holodomor Museum located. In this museum, a "Black List" and a "Book of Remembrance" is located. The design of the museum reflects a commemorative rather than an informative one. On the day of 22 November 2008, the date of inauguration of the Holodomor Memorial, Yushchenko stated that:

> It will be a resurrection of our memory, purification from lies and filth. It is to be pure and honest work-only such work can help bring a just national order and decent living condition in Ukraine. We must dress Ukraine in a neat shirt and remove the symbols of totalitarianism from her body (Yushchenko, 2008).

In his speech, Yushchenko said that the only way of resurrection of memory as the disposal of the Soviet symbols defining them as filth.

The mass commemorative practices reached to unprecedented levels in 2008 due to the 75th anniversary of the Holodomor. These practices included organizations of gatherings, exhibitions, contests and concerts to grieve the victims alongside the laying of wreaths, sheaves and ears of rye or wheat and construction of spaces of memory such as the foundation of memorial complexes, museum and school exhibits and even lessons in schools in remembrance of Holodomor (Kasianov, 2012). The scale of commemorations was still great in 2009, which was the pre-election year. That year also testified the participation of Yushchenko to these commemorations. As Kasianov (2012) emphasized that although such commemorative practices had occurred previously, it was Yushchenko transformed these commemorations into nationwide nature through the full support and involvement of official administrations led by the president himself.

In May 2009, the Security Service of Ukraine (SBU) undertook a criminal investigation against the perpetrators of Holodomor via opening its archives, conducting investigations in the field and demanding information from other countries. When the SBU compiled enough proofs to criminate the case, they submitted it to Kiev Appeals Court in January 2010. The court decided the case as genocide and identified the following perpetrators as guilty: Stalin, Molotov, Kaganovich, Postyshev, Kosior, Chubar and Khataevich. However it had to dismiss the case, since according to the Ukrainian code, deceased people cannot be sentenced. It is worth noting that the court noted that this decision was strictly legal and did not have a political dimension (Muzichenko, 2010). Yushchenko stated that the court decision "restores the historical truth and gives a chance to build Ukraine on fair and democratic principles" (Muzichenko, 2010). Yushchenko allegedly put pressure both on the SBU and the court in his last days of presidency with the intent of conveying the Holodomor on legal arena beside the political one to gain the votes back on the presidential election.

According to a survey conducted in 2013, 20,7% and 24,7% respondents, respectively, fully agreed and partially agreed to the claim that Holodomor was targeted elimination of the Ukrainian nation (The Ukrainian Week, 2013). This survey even as an insignificant research represents that Yushchenko's campaign could not achieve uniting Ukraine through establishing Holodomor as a national mobilizing symbol in the collective memory. On the contrary the acts of Yushchenko caused more divisions in the country. The acts of Yushchenko's were based on his way of thinking. According to him, the eastern part of Ukraine was the victim of Holodomor in every sphere such as culture. Thus this part of Ukraine was easily Sovietized and Russified and so lost their original identity. Also he thought that the "genuine" Ukrainian identity is dominant in the western part of Ukraine. He argued that the eastern part is devoid of collective memory describing the people of region as victims. With this way of thinking he tried to create a common identity by imposing the identity dominant in the west of Ukraine to the eastern/southern Ukraine rather than uniting these identities. He also materialized his ideas with acts such as decrees and law on Holodomor denial. This went further, when the law on

Holodomor was boycotted by the representatives of the southern/eastern regions, with the response of Igor Yukhnovsky, an ally of Yushchenko. Yukhnovsky claimed that the Holodomor affected people of southern and eastern regions of Ukraine the most, who died out. Afterwards, this vacant region was resettled with Russian people. Thus, today their descendants, having the same soul, will not recognize the Holodomor as genocide (Knyajitskaya, 2010). According to Yushchenko, denying the Holodomor was a threat for 'genuine' Ukrainian identity and the threat was directed from the east. Thus Yushchenko caused to deepen the schisms in the already divided country and so he could not get any support from "excluded" "other" east part of country.

Yushchenko's exaggeration on the numbers of victims as 7 to 10 million or falsifications on information during his campaign are not of significance according to both modernist and ethno-symbolist approach. The important thing is that the perception of people towards the historiography and their beliefs on the narrative. Yushchenko's imposing attitude had resulted with an adverse reaction on the Russophone part of Ukraine despite his use of all kind of materials of ethno-symbolism. However his exclusive and imposing attitude created more polarized structure both in nation and politics. Another reason for this adverse reaction was his policies aiming for a rapid change of identity. According to ethno-symbolism identities change over time yet this change occurs slowly.

Yushchenko opted using "resurgence" of collective memory instead of creation of it, which was in line with the ethno-symbolist approach unlike the modernist. This choice of wording shows us that Yushchenko believed collective memory of Holodomor had always existed among Ukrainians, but it had to be resurged by political act. In the context of Holodomor, the commemorative practices were ramped in Yushchenko's period and new traditions dedicated to the famine were introduced to national sphere as a uniting symbol.

5.3.2. Foreign Policy of Yushchenko in the Context of Holodomor: Creating the Enemy Image and Internationalization of Holodomor

In addition to the domestic politics, in Yushchenko's period, the issue of Holodomor had been politicized in the international sphere. The acknowledgment of Holodomor as genocide in international level was a tool for Yushchenko in order to convince people and to point out the enemy which is the threat to Ukrainian national identity. Also this type of acknowledgment was deemed by Yushchenko as a precaution lest Russia attempts for incidents such as Holodomor again as well as to prevent potential interventions of Russia. When Yushchenko administration struggled to launch this campaign in international organizations and individual states, it avoided to exacerbate relations with Russia which were already tense since Orange Revolution.

5.3.2.1. Relations with Russia

Yushchenko' efforts and campaign on acknowledgment of Holodomor provoked counter attack from Russia. Despite Yushchenko's refusal on holding any country responsible for Holodomor, his campaign was widely perceived as an attack to Moscow. Also compensation of moral and material responsibility was demanded by Kendzor, a supporter of Yushchenko, from Russia as the legal successor of Soviets (Kasianov, 2010). But the Russian view of Holodomor was that the famine of 1932-33 was a tragedy of all Union scale due to crop failure of 1932.

After indirect demand of apology and compensation, Russian State Duma adopted a resolution in 2008.

> Seeking to solve at any price the questions of provisioning of industrial centers in full growth, the leadership of the USSR and Soviet republics applied the repressive measures to ensure the grain procurements, which significantly aggravated the serious consequences of the crop failure of 1932. However, there are no historical proofs that the famine was organized by ethnic criteria. Its victims were millions of citizens of the USSR, members of various nations and nationalities living largely in agricultural areas of the country. This tragedy does not and cannot answer the internationally defined criteria of genocide and must not be the object of contemporary political speculations (Statement, 2008).

In line with Russia's stance, resolution denies the genocide assertion of Holodomor and defines this assertion as contemporary political speculation.

Shortly after, President Medvedev of Russia responded the claims through a letter to President Yushchenko. He harshly criticized Yushchenko's attempts to criminalize Holodomor with a clear language. He started his first sentence with "the so called Holodomor" implying that he did not agree on this term. He condemns Yushchenko for exploiting Holodomor for short-term political goals and disuniting nations, which had links. He also challenges Yushchenko by suggesting "a study to form a common approach to these events" by inviting experts from also Kazakhstan, Belarus and other former Soviet republics. He concludes his letter with this sentence: "At the moment, in view above, I do not consider my participation in commemoration events in Ukraine of 75th anniversary of Holodomor is possible" (Medvedev, 2008).

The counterattack by Russia was not only via such statements. Russia claimed that she revealed falsifications of Ukraine on the subject such as names in the Books of Memory who did not affected by Holodomor or the pictures used for Holodomor in fact which had been taken in Volga region in 1921 and other places (İzvestia, 2011). Russia even used the historians to testify on favor of Russian approach to Holodomor. In this counter attack the media was very useful tool.

However, Russia's efforts was not restricted only in the frame of state to state level but, also at the international organizations level Russia took measures to turn it in favor of herself. In the following section, when Yushchenko's efforts on the international sphere will be analyzed, the Russia's measure against the Ukraine's efforts will be mentioned.

5.3.2.2. Yushchenko's Efforts on the International Sphere

In 2007, Yushchenko launched a campaign for the recognition of Holodomor as genocide at international level under the slogan "Ukraine remembers, the World acknowledges". As an invitation to issue he published a brochure on the official website of the President of Ukraine which was named "Holodomor: Ukrainian Genocide in the early 1930s". At the beginning of this, Yushchenko called the world

"I address you on behalf of a nation that lost about ten million people as a result of the Holodomor genocide… we insist that the world learn the truth about all crimes against humanity. This is the only way we can ensure that criminals will no longer be emboldened by indifference." This calling had the intent of creating a worldwide awareness of Holodomor and defining as a crime while it uncovers the criminal. Also it is stated "the goal of bringing the Holodomor to international attention is to pay tribute to the millions of innocent victims, to condemn the crimes of the Soviet Communist regime, to restore historical justice and obtain international recognition of the Ukrainian genocide" (Brochure, 2011).

In this statement, despite the designation of Soviet Communist regime as responsible for Holodomor, the restoration of historical justice was demanded. The responsibility of that restoring duty, predictably, loaded to Russia in the hidden meaning of the statement. That statement was followed by that "by making the case of the Holodomor as genocide, Ukraine seeks to increase the international community's awareness of the fact that engineered famines are still being used as a weapon, and through this awareness to help prevent such deplorable acts elsewhere in the world" (Brochure, 2011). This latter statement stressed the prevention of such acts elsewhere but intended the prevention of repetition of events in Ukraine and imposing the threat of Russia for Ukraine.

Ukraine`s first attempt for the recognition of Holodomor as genocide in international organizations was in 2006, during the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of CIS countries. Lavrov, the then foreign minister of Russia, eliminated Ukraine's attack against Russia such: "It was our misfortune. Russia shares the pain of Ukrainians and Kazakhs. They share the pain of Russia for the lives of those who at the time were lost. But how we need to move forward and solve the concrete tasks facing our countries" (Utro.ru, 2006).

In November 2007 was an active month for the adoptions of resolutions on Holodomor by international organizations. In UNESCO on 1st November 2007, a resolution with the item entitled "Remembrance of Victims of the Great Famine (Holodomor) in Ukraine" was adopted (Records of the General Conference of UN,

2007). The words of "artificially created famine" were omitted, and the following sentence was added: "Equally commemorating the memory of millions of Russians, Kazakhs and representatives of other nationalities who died of starvation in 1932-1933 in the Volga River region, North Caucasus, Kazakhstan and in other parts of the former Soviet Union" in draft resolution by the result of Russia's efforts (Records of the General Conference of UN, 2007). Russia refused to support the final version of resolution. Also in the OSCE, Ukraine's efforts aimed the recognition of Holodomor as genocide was blocked by Russia. The final document, adopted by the OSCE in November 2007 defined the famine as a "tragedy took innocent lives of millions Ukrainians as a result of the mass starvation brought about by the cruel actions and policies of the totalitarian Stalinist regime" (Statement of the OSCE, 2007).

Unlike the UNESCO and the OSCE, the Baltic Assembly adopted a statement in November 2007 mentioned that "the Baltic Assembly (…), condemning the genocide and political repression committed in 1932 and 1933 as a result of which the Ukrainian people experienced mental and physical sufferings; (…) (Statement of the Baltic Assembly, 2007).

In 2007 and 2008, Ukraine attempted to have the UN adopt resolutions defining Holodomor as genocide. Both attempts were opposed by Russia thus the issue was kept away from the UN agenda.

Efforts of Ukraine to get the Organization for Democracy and Economic Development GUAM (Georgia, Ukraine, Armenia, Moldova) to recognize the Holodomor as genocide resulted in the following statement of the organization "Holodomor as a crime against humanity" excluding the term 'genocide' in 2008, predictably, due to the dependence of the organization members to Russia (GUAM Summit, 2008).

In 2008, shortly after the GUAM's expression, the European Parliament recognized the Holodomor with the same expression as a "crime against humanity"

but the document of European Parliament did not contain the word 'genocide' (European Parliament, 2008).

While Yushchenko's efforts to obtain recognition for Holodomor in international sphere were not very successful, more awareness of the Holodomor was raised in the eyes of international community.

Besides attempts on the international organizations, Kiev attempted on parliaments acknowledgement of Holodomor as genocide. Before the period of Yushchenko, Estonia (1993), Australia (1993), Canada (2003) and the United States (2003) had recognized the Holodomor as genocide. As of 2005, with the efforts of Ukrainian diplomacy under Yushchenko, Lithuania (2005), Georgia (2005), Paraguay, Peru, Brazil, Ecuador, Colombia (2007), Poland, Mexico and Latvia (2008) also recognized the Holodomor as genocide (Embassy of Ukraine in Canada, 2012). However, Slovakia, Spain, Czech Republic, Chili and Argentina opted to commemorate the victims of Holodomor but avoided calling it as genocide (Kasianov, 2010).

It is also worth to note that Israel was disturbed about the situation because of the Yushchenko's determination of Holodomor which threatened the Holocaust`s unique status by demanding to share same status for Holodomor.

Yushchenko was successful in recognition of Holodomor as genocide in a very restricted geography; nevertheless he raised the awareness of Holodomor in international sphere successfully.

5.4. Victor Yanukovych (2010-2014)

In 2009, Yanukovych declared that he would be a candidate for the approaching presidential election. Yanukovych candidacy was initially endorsed by The Party of Regions followed by the Youth Party of Ukraine at the end of 2009 (Ukraine Country Study Guide, 2013).

The first round of the election on 17 January 2010 was not concluded because no candidate was able to exceed 50% of votes. Thus Yanukovych with the 35,8% of the vote and Timoshenko with the 24,7% of the vote faced each other in the second

round of election that took place on 7 February 2010 (Ukraine Country Study Guide, 2013). Exit Polls indicated that Yanukovych won the election with 48,95% of the vote compared with 45,47% for Timoshenko (Ukraine Country Study Guide, 2013).

Soon after, Yanukovych called on Timoshenko to resign as Prime Minister (BBC News, 2010). As a result of resistance by Timoshenko, on 3 March 2010, the Ukrainian Parliament passed a vote of no confidence in the Government so the cabinet was dismissed (KyivPost, 2010). As a result, Timoshenko had to resign from the Prime Minister post on 4 March 2010 (KyivPost, 2010). Yanukovych also formed a parliamentary majority soon after his presidential victory. In addition to that, contrary to the Yushchenko's "generational shift" that moved Ukraine's ruling elites to the middle generation, "Yanukovych era has taken Ukraine again to the Kuchma era when it was ruled by the older generations" (Kuzio, 2010). According to Kasianov (2012) "The Party of Region itself never had a clear ideological platform, being a conglomerate of representatives of big businesses and associated bureaucratic elements, as well as local political elites". He (2012) asserts that "The basic elements of post-emergent ideological platform were the status of the Russian language in Ukraine and, accordingly, the defense of the rights of the "Russian-speaking population", as well as a "struggle against nationalism," above all in the sphere of historical policy". These elements were in line with Yanukovych's way of thinking, thus he successfully exploited these elements in politics.

Yanukovych had the Eurasianist view unlike his predecessors. Because of that he had a pro-Russian ideology and the relations with Russia were not deteriorated. Due to that, in the context of Holodomor, Yanukovych was in line with Russia, international and domestic politics in the period of Yanukovych will be presented under one title.

5.4.1. Holodomor under Yanukovych
The first thing Yanukovych did after his inauguration on 28 February 2010 was to remove the Holodomor section from the president's official internet site. Kuzio (2015) in his book "Ukraine: Democratization, Corruption, and the New

Russian Imperialism" interpreted Yanukovych's first act as a signal of the impending counterrevolution.

On 27 April 2010, Yanukovych's statement on the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) in Strasbourg was the complete opposite to the policy of his predecessor. He asserted that "declaring the Holodomor an act of genocide against one nation or another would be incorrect and unjust" (Unian, 2010). Due to his statement, some of the Ukrainian participants' efforts to preserve the use of term 'genocide' has failed. It is worth noting that on the same day of Yanukovych's denial, the agreement on the Black Sea Fleet was ratified by the Ukrainian and Russian parliaments (Law, 2010). After the Yanukovych's denial of Holodomor as genocide during PACE speech, his political opponents tried to take Yanukovych to court on the strength of "Law on the Holodomor of 1932-33" (Ukrainskaya Pravda, 2010).

In 2010, the Soviet archives about the Holodomor were closed, which were released to the public domain by the SBU under Presidents Kuchma and Yushchenko, furthermore historians who had used the archives came under SBU scrutiny (Kuzio, 2015).

The most significant change under Yanukovych was the change of status of the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory. The decree of Yanukovych dated 9 December 2010 has set up the Institute as a scholarly research institution managed and funded by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (Ukraine Government Portal, 2011).

In 2010 also there was the preparation of a project of a joint Ukrainian-Russian textbook for teachers of history. This project caused very fierce criticism, and has never been undertaken.

Yanukovych, in the period of his presidency, has never identified the Holodomor as genocide, he opted to describe the Holodomor with terms such as; tragedy, Armageddon and crime. However, he participated to all anniversary commemorations of Holodomor. His rhetoric was changed in time to a more open

Holodomor rhetoric. On 23 November 2013, during the commemoration on National Museum of Remembrance, Yanukovych said that:

> Our goal is to preserve memory of everything happened at our land-heroic and tragic. Common memory and history must unite us and make us stronger. It is the foundation of our future, (…) Today; we must put away all political discussions and be united. We are all united with a memory of the deceased compatriots. This day is beyond politics, (…) We have saved ourselves as a people, retained our identity and gained state independence, (…) That is why current generation must take into account the difficult lessons of the past and work over the development of modern Ukraine, (…) Safety, freedom and welfare of a person must always be in the center of state policy. Humanism, as a feature of healthy and mature society, must become a basis of our country. I am confident that we will never let such tragedies happen in Ukraine again (Ukraine Party of Regions, 2013).

Some authors interpreted the change of Yanukovych's rhetoric due to the efforts to take him to court for denying Holodomor as genocide in 2010, but this alone can`t be sufficient to explain his motives. Some asserted that the upcoming trade agreement with the EU force him to adopt a more pre-western rhetoric. This theory may seem more reasonable but Yanukovych rejected the Association Agreement with the EU in November 2013. Perhaps it is a combination of several reasons. A major reason can be cited as his anxiety about the votes in western Ukraine. 2013 was the pre-election year for the next president of Ukraine and he might be wanted to look more pro Ukrainian nationalistic. But he was not able to attend the elections because of that he ousted and had to flee from his country due to the mass protest after the rejection of Association Agreement with EU.

Despite the unwillingness of Yanukovych regarding Holodomor genocide, and the Yanukovych's downplaying of Holodomor issue, the ideological practices of Holodomor remained untouched. Anniversary Commemorations of Holodomor became rituals. In this regard, Kasianov (2012) emphasized "It may be said that Yanukovych has personally made a de facto return to the 'ambivalent' historical policy practiced in Kuchma's time. That policy combines ethno-symbolism (to the extend required for the authorities' national legitimation) with elements of Soviet

nostalgia (as a necessary gesture to that part of the citizenry attached to the corresponding collective experience)".

5.4.2. Yanukovych's Exile and Provisional Government of Ukraine

President Viktor Yanukovych's decision not to sign the political association and free trade agreement with the European Union at the summit of the Eastern Partnership at Vilnius on 21 November 2013 led to massive public protests in the subsequent days. Yanukovych instead chose to strengthen economic ties with Russia which all led to gathering of thousands at Maidan, a square in the center of Kiev (Forsthuber, 2013). The protests, which started in November 2013 and lasted till last days of February 2014, testified violent conflicts between protestors and police. Protests were not only limited to the capital Kiev, the protestors occupied state administration buildings all around the country. As tensions rose, Yanukovych first fled to Kharkiv on 21 February 2014 where he gave his last public statement and moved to Russia on the 22nd (Higgins and Kramer, 2015).

Parliament voted on 22 February to remove Viktor Yanukovych from his post on the grounds that he was unable to fulfill his duties, and exercised its constitutional powers to set an election for May 25 to select his replacement (Higgins and Kramer, 2014).

After the ousting of Viktor Yanukovych, a new provisional government formed immediately. But, Russia refused to recognize the new interim government, calling the revolution a *'coup d'état'* (the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2014).

Russian response did not end here. On February the 22nd, Russian President Vladimir Putin got together an all-night meeting with security services chiefs to discuss the extrication of deposed President, Viktor Yanukovych, and at the end of that meeting Putin had said that "we must start working on returning Crimea to Russia" (Yahoo News, 2015). In a few weeks, strategic sites across Crimea were taken over by armed gunmen (Reuters, 2014). On 16 March, the referendum, which was held in Crimea, resulted in favor of annexation with Russia (Reuters, 2014).On 18 March 2014; The Treaty on the Accession of the Republic of Crimea to Russia

was signed between the representatives of the Republic of Crimea and the Russian Federation (RT, 2014). The treaty was ratified by the Federal Assembly of Russia on the 21st of March (official website of president of Russia, 2014).

In the same month (March 2014), the ongoing conflicts had started between so-called pro-Russian separatists and Ukrainian law enforcement in the Donbas region of Ukraine.

5.5. Petro Poroshenko (2014-......)

With Yanukovych's removal from the office of President of Ukraine, Ukraine entered into a chaotic period in the country. To overcome this period and start normalizing political and social life in Ukraine, Poroshenko volunteered to run in presidential elections which were scheduled to take place on 25 May 2014. Poroshenko's popularity was escalated since he supported protest actively even financially (Olszański and Miazga, 2014). Although he did not join any party during the protests, he had won the presidential elections with the 54.7 percent of the votes (Interfax-Ukraine, 2014) with the slogan: "Live in a new way -- Poroshenko!" (Spiegel Online, 2014).

On 25 May 2014, after his presidency was confirmed, he announced that his first presidential trip would be to Donbas (CCTV, 2014), where armed pro-Russian separatists in Donetsk and Luhansk declared independence after an unrecognized referendum on 11 May 2014 (BBC News, 2014). The new president also promised to return Crimea to Ukraine (the Guardian, 2014). The Verkhovna Rada assigned Poroshenko as the new president of Ukraine on 7 June 2014 (Alpert, 2014).

5.5.1. Holodomor under Poroshenko

Poroshenko inherited from his predecessor a country in chaos. Probably because of the chaotic period, he was not able to pay attention to "the Holodomor" issue in the first months of his presidency. However later his approach towards the issue revealed as it was directly opposite of that of his predecessor Yanukovych. Furthermore Poroshenko was able to convert the chaotic situation into an advantage and has used a sharp and fearless rhetoric on Holodomor issue against Russia. His rhetoric on the Holodomor Remembrance Day, on November 22nd, 2014,

demonstrated not only his way of thinking on the issue but also his persistence on the issue. His statement was informative on historical issues besides being provocative and emotional. But the most significant theme in his speech was the analogy between Holodomor and conflicts in the eastern Ukraine.

On 22 November 2014, as Poroshenko laid a wreath during the ceremony at the Holodomor memorial, he started his speech by commemorating the victims of Holodomor: children, mothers, elderly people, grain growers, Ukrainian artists, writers, poets, scientists, and then everyone. After The President counted 'everyone' as victim he explained its reason such: "because Ukraine has almost no family that was not affected by the famine".

When he advocated the genocide thesis, he stated that:

Polish expert on criminal law Raphael Lemkin has been the first to formulate and substantiate the term "genocide" - four years earlier than the United Nations. Back in 1953 he showed that Holodomor in Ukraine was a classic example of genocide.(...)
But most importantly, Holodomor has finally imprinted in our historical memory as genocide. According to the latest sociological research, three-quarters of Ukrainians firmly believe that Holodomor was genocide against the Ukrainian people. And the number of those who do not recognize the genocide rapidly decreases. For the facts are stubborn things.

Poroshenko chose Lemkin's definition of genocide probably since the UN's genocide definition, which was prepared for Holocaust, is not a proper fit for Holodomor. The other point here is the research, which Poroshenko emphasized in his speech. The accuracy of this research is questionable but it is worthy of analysis for other reasons. In the case of that the result of research was accurate, that proves the power of political act on recreating a collective memory by referencing the historical events. However, in the case of that the result of research was inaccurate, that shows that Poroshenko was implementing an ethno-symbolist policy anyway, since ethno-symbolism ignores the relevance of accuracy of the historical event.

Poroshenko drew a parallel between Holodomor and so-called Donbas war saying that "Today, already having the experience of the Patriotic War of 2014 with

the enemy who invaded our land, we have another point of view at the events of 32-33 years. It was also real and an undeclared war against Ukraine". Then he went further, probably alluding Putin and stated: "It looks like the spiritual descendants of Stalin, Kaganovich and Postyshev didn't dissolve in the darkness of history". So he indicated the enemy very clearly by blurring the history. Then he highlighted the analogies:

> They repeat the criminal experiment of Holodomor era depriving civilians of food. Other terrible analogies appear. Leaders of the Soviet Union rejected any help for the starving people in Ukraine. When Galicians sent rafts with food on Zbruch and Bug to their starving brothers, Soviet border guards shot people who tried to get that life-saving food. Today, when food riots have started in the occupied territories of the Donbas, gunmen are shooting the vehicles with the Ukrainian humanitarian aid.

Poroshenko asserted that within the two years after the Bolshevik revolution, the genocide in Ukraine led to the murder of 4 to 10 million innocent citizens. The amount of casualties asserted by Poroshenko was in a wider range with 4 to 10 million than Yushchenko's assertion which was 7 to 10 million.

He also quoted from James Mace and Robert Conquest in his speech praising Conquest's book "The Harvest of Sorrow".

In his speech Poroshenko pointed out the main cause of Holodomor as dictatorship and totalitarianism and he ensured that catastrophe such Holodomor would not happen again in Ukraine as being a democratic state in the European path.

> Holodomor tragedy would have never happened in Ukraine if it had been an independent and democratic state. Such disasters like genocide are a feature of dictatorship and totalitarianism. It will never happen again in Ukraine, which has chosen the European path.

When he concludes his speech he mentioned again the conflicts and called the Ukrainians to be united against enemy:

> Today, the enemy again tries to divide us, make us quarrel, spread discord and hatred among us. Today, we need unity more than ever. I believe that we can learn the lessons of the past. They shouldn't hope to conquer Ukraine again – we've become strong, wise and we will fight back. We will never give up! We will never finish struggling! Glory to Ukraine!

These last words of his speech were very similar to provocative propaganda of war times with its clear definition of the enemy, the goals of enemy, enemy actions from the past and other slogans (Official website of President of Ukraine, 2014).

On 07 November 2015, The Memorial to Victims of Holodomor of 1932-1933 in Ukraine was opened in Washington D.C. Poroshenko did not participate in the ceremony but his wife took part in the opening of the memorial and he participated with a speech via video in the ceremony. His speech was completely parallel with his previous speech on the Remembrance Day (Official website of President of Ukraine, 2015).

> The Memorial in Washington is being opened when Ukraine is defending its independence, overcoming obstacles and rebuffing the aggression of Russia. Again, as in times of Holodomor, Kremlin is trying to wipe Ukraine off the map. Death is coming from the East once again.

Poroshenko emphasized the analogy between the so-called "Donbass war" and Holodomor describing the perpetrator again as Kremlin/Moscow outspokenly. He had used the Holodomor as a historical event for uniting against an ongoing event. He described Holodomor as an attempt to destroy Ukrainian national identity he has been trying to embed into public memory a threat perception from east.

> In this way, the empire tried to ruin the very foundations of a freedom-loving nation, undermine our spiritual culture and ethnic identity. But I am deeply convinced that just as 80 years ago, any Moscow's power is unable to put Ukrainians down on their knees and force them abandon the idea of Freedom, Independence, Dignity and Unity.

He said that "They tried to wipe out even the smallest parts of memory of it". So by alluding Holodomor in 'us versus them' rhetoric, he sent a message to secure the memory of Holodomor collectively.

He particularly recalled James Mace and Robert Conquest. This was probably a message to the Diaspora, which would be able to take an opportunity to work with the Ukrainian administration in the nation building process.

On 28 November 2015, the Holodomor Remembrance Day, Poroshenko participated with his wife to ceremony in National Museum "Memorial to Holodomor Victims in Ukraine". His speech was similar to his previous speeches. He mentioned that the creation of modern Ukraine is impossible without fair and careful approach to history. He again drew analogy between hybrid war of Russia against Ukraine and artificial famine of Stalin's regime. Then he pointed the aim of these out as elimination of Ukrainians which is the image of threat. He stated that "Restoration of Ukraine has already begun. It is an irresistible process of purification of our lives, formation of renewed state, emergence of new people - patriots of Ukraine, heroes who stopped the attack of Empire with their feats". The emphasis on 'Restoration of Ukraine' and 'formation of renewed state' shows a practice of using ethno-symbolist theory (Official website of President of Ukraine, 2015).

It is worth to note that, the president's wife Maryna Poroshenko has been actively taking part in organizations dedicating to Holodomor. She has participated every official Holodomor commemorations with presidents, besides that she has been participating to organizations dedicating to Holodomor such as the opening of memorial in Washington on 07 November 2015 and the opening of conference "Heritage of Holodomor in Ukraine: From Post-Genocide to Civil Society" in Netherlands with the title of "first lady" (Official website of President of Ukraine, 2015). Her special interest on Holodomor issue has more sincere effect on the people of Ukraine since she has no official status. However, her acts cannot be evaluated as irrelevant, since they have the value of political action.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, like all other post-Soviet republics, Ukraine had also launched its own nation-building process. The nation building process depends on previous consciousness of national identity and political acts of ruling elite. Ukraine did not have the chance to build its own nation independently until the disintegration of Soviet Union as I already discussed in Chapter IV. The lack of an independent state until 1991 deprived the Ukrainian ruling elites of constructing a common national identity. After 1991 Ukraine caught a historical opportunity to construct its national identity. As Calhoun and Smith argue a preexisting history in creating its national identity is crucial for nation building. Ukraine picked the event of Holodomor as a central pillar in its nation-building process. In this thesis, in Chapter V, I have analyzed the place of Holodomor in the politics of nation-building in Ukraine. Besides I have also examined the role of Holodomor in recreating/strengthening the national consciousness and national identity. Since the ruling elite have a significant role in the nation building process, I have examined the issue chronologically under the rule of various presidents of Ukraine in the independence period.

I have followed an ethno-symbolist approach which is presented in Chapter II, as Ukraine's path in nation-building process in the context of Holodomor can most appropriately be understood within such a theoretical framework. Since 1991, Ukraine has been struggling with the reconstruction of the historiography and the reinterpretation of Holodomor. In line with Anthony Smith's assertion that national elites use the ethnic material in their nation building process (yet this is restricted because it is the reconstruction of history, not the 'inventing' of the whole (Smith, 1998)), Ukrainian political elite utilized Holodomor as such. Also in accordance with Smith`s argument that reinterpreting history was for the purpose of creating a

collective memory, the political elite gradually used the Ukrainian Holodomor case in constructing a collective memory since independence. The Ukrainians' perception on Holodomor was changed by political acts. So, Holodomor in the collective memory of Ukrainians evolved from the Kravchuk period to Poroshenko's which the commemorations testify that year by year.

In Chapter III, I have presented the history of Holodomor years and its controversial issues aiming to make an accurate analyze since it is impossible to achieve fair judgment without these knowledge. These controversial issues have been used in the process of nation building in the contemporary Ukraine. In this chapter Ukrainian Diaspora, its history, goals and contributions have been presented.

Anthony Smith (2001) emphasizes the "limits of the strategies of elites" in order to show that nationalism cannot be created purely through elite action as the masses have their own culture, tradition and memory to build on. In Ukrainian case, the memory to build on is Holodomor, which is part of the preexisting history and not invented just reinterpreted. The limits are not restricted with the historical base for politicians. In the context of Holodomor, policy makers of Ukraine sometimes restrained foreign relations particularly due to Russia's attitude to issue. The East West regional divisions in Ukraine also limited the politicians sometimes, as they fear for losing the eastern votes.

Ethno-symbolist approach has limitations for the Ukrainian Holodomor case due to Ukrainian regional divisions and the uniqueness of the Holodomor. The gradually increasing tones of the rhetoric 'us versus them', which is used to strengthen national identity, causes to deepen the east-west schism.

As ethno-symbolist approach confirms that ruling elites provoke the population referring to an event which should has resonance in the collective memory, politicians politicize history and refer to national traumas to reach their political interest promptly. In Ukraine, the ruling politicians for the sake of their short term interests benefitted from Holodomor especially during the pre-election years. Although the nation building process requires long term, these political acts

for the short term interests had consequences in the nation-building process such as the recreation of collective memory of Holodomor.

Another issue analyzed in this thesis is the endeavors of the enemy creation/indication of presidents in the context of Holodomor discourse. The aim of this policy was to resurgent/strengthen the Ukrainian identity through creating a threat perception against the Ukrainian identity. Such attitude of presidents has gradually increased with the exception of Yanukovych. The attitudes of first two presidents were very balanced with the allusions of condemning the totalitarian Soviet regime. The indirect condemnation of Ukraine directed to Russia ramped with the Yushchenko's period. But anyway it was not very clear due to his blurred history discourse. At the time of Poroshenko, the condemnation was very clear and directly to contemporary Russia due to the annexation of Crimea and ongoing Donbas war.

In conclusion, as this study demonstrated, when analyzed the progress of effect of Holodomor on the collective memory and thus its indirect effect on national identity from the independence to today, it can be qualified as a remarkable progress although it is partly in terms of geography.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Printed Sources

Abdelal,Rawi, *National Purposes in the World Economy: Post Soviet States in Comparative Perspective* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001)

Anderson, B., *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (1st edn, London, Verso, 1983(revised edn, London, New York, Verso, 2006))

Armstrong, J., *Nations before Nationalism* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1982)

Calhoun, C., 'Nationalism and Ethncity*, Annual Review Sociology*, (19:211-39. 1993)

Cheng, Yiwei, "An Analysis of the Main Causes of the Holodomor", History & Classics Undergraduate Student Journal, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Winter, 2012), pp. 207-214

Connor, W., *Ethno-Nationalism: The Quest for Understanding,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994)

Conquest, Robert, *The harvest of sorrow: Soviet collectivization and the terror-famine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986)

Davies, R.W. and Stephen G. Wheatcroft, *The Years of Hunger: Soviet Agriculture, 1931-33* (London: Palgrave, 2004)

Davies, R.W. and Stephen G. Wheatcroft, "Stalin and the Soviet Famine of 1932-33: A Reply to Ellman" (Europe-Asia Studies, Vol.58, No.4, Jun., 2006)

Fischer, L., *Soviet journey* (H. Smith and R. Haas, 1935)

Gellner, E. (ed), *Thought and Change* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964)

Guibernau, M. 2007. *The Identity of Nations*. Polity Press

Hesli, V.L., 2006, "The Orange revolution: 2004 presidential elections(s) in Ukraine", (Electoral Studies 25 (1)), pp. 168-177.

Himka, John-Paul, "Encumbered Memory: The Ukrainian Famine of 1932-33", Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, Volume 14, Number 2, (Spring 2013), pp. 411-436

Hobsbawm E., *Nations and nationalism after 1780: program, myth, reality* (Cambridge University Press, 1992)

Hosking, G.A. "Arranging a Catastrophe" (Times Literary Supplement, Feb., 1987)

Jenkins, R., *Social Identity* (London: Routledge1996)

Kasianov, Georgiy "Revisiting the Great Famine of 1932–1933, Politics of Memory and Public Consciousness (Ukraine after 1991)" in Michal Kopecek (ed), Past in the Making : Historical revisionism in Central Europe after 1989 (Central European University Press, 2008)

Kasianov, Georgiy "The Holodomor and the Building of a Nation" (Russian Politics and Law, vol. 48, no. 5, September-October 2010, pp. 25-47, 2010)

Kasianov, Georgiy, "The Great Famine of 1932–1933 (Holodomor) and the Politics of History in Contemporary Ukraine", In: Troebst, Stefan (Hg.): Postdiktatorische Geschichtskulturen im Süden und Osten Europas. Bestandsaufnahmen und Forschungsperspektiven. Diktaturen und ihre Überwindung im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert 5 (Göttingen, 2010, pp. 619–641)

Kasianov, Georgiy , *Danse macabre, Голод 1932-1933 років,у політиці, масовій свідомості та історіографії (1980-мі – початок 2000-х)*, Київ, Наш Час, 2010.

Kasianov, Georgiy "The "Nationalization" of History in Ukraine" (The Convolutions of Historical Politics, CEU Press, 2012, pp. 141-174)

Kohn H., *The idea of nationalism: a study in its origins and background*, (New Brunswick, N.J. : Transaction Publishers, 2005, Originally published: New York : Macmillan, 1944.)

Krawchenko, Bohdan, *Social Change and Consciousness in Twentieth-Century Ukraine* (London: Macmillan Press, 1985)

Kuzio, Taras, "Yanukovych's first hundred days, Back to the Past, but what's the rush?" (Demokratizatsiya: The Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization. - Vol. 17. - No. 3 (Summer 2010). - PP. 208-218.)

Kuzio, Taras, *Ukraine: Democratization, Corruption, and the New Russian Imperialism* (California: Praeger, 2015)

Mace, James E, "Soviet Man-made Famine in Ukraine" in Samuel Totten, William S. Parsons(eds), *Centuries of genocide : essays and eyewitness accounts* (New York : Routledge, 2013)

Mace, James E, "Ukrainian Genocide" in Encyclopedia of Genocide, Vol. 2 p. 565, quoted in Wemheuer,Felix, "Regime Changes of Memory, Creating the Official History of the Ukrainian and Chinese Famines under State Socialism and after the Cold War", Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, Volume 10, Number 1, (Winter 2009), p. 46

Magocsi, Paul Robert, *A history of Ukraine: the land and its peoples* (Toronto ; Buffalo : University of Toronto Press, June 2010)

Magocsi, Paul Robert, *Ukraine: an illustrated history* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007)

Moore, R. "A Crime Against Humanity Arguably Without Parallel in European History: Genocide and the 'Politics' of Victimhood in Western Narratives of the Ukrainian Holodomor" (Australian Journal of Politics & History, 58(3), 2012).

Penner, D'Ann, "The Agrarian "Strike" of 1932-33", (Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 1998)

President of Ukraine, Viktor Yushchenko. National Radio Address. 26 November 2005, (quoted from: Budjeryn, Mariana, The Role of Context in Securitization Theory: Holodomor Discourse and Societal Security in Ukraine, Hungary, 2010)

Riabchuk, Mykola, "Culture and cultural politics in Ukraine: A postcolonial perspective" in Taras Kuzio and Paul D'Anieri (eds), *Dilemmas of State-Led Nation Building in Ukraine* (Westport CT: Praeger Publishers, 2002)

Satzewich, Vic, The Ukrainian Diaspora (London: Routledge, 2002)

Sawicky, Nicolas D., "The Holodomor: Genocide and National Identity" (State University of NewYork: Education and Human Development Master's Theses, 2013)

Smith, Anthony D., *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Historical Society of Israel, Brandeis University Press, University Press of New England, 2000)

Smith, Anthony D., *National Identity* (London:Penguin Books, 1991)

Smith, Anthony D., *Milli Kimlik* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları 1994 [1991])

Smith, Anthony D., *Nations and nationalism in a global era* (Great Britain: Polity Press, 1995)

Smith, Anthony D., *Nationalism and modernism: a critical survey of recent theories of nations and nationalism* (London ; New York : Routledge, 1998)

Smith, Anthony D., *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*, (Polity Pres, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2001)

Smith, Graham (et al.), *Nation Building in the Post-Soviet Borderlands, The Politics of National Identities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Suny, R.,G., "Nationalism and Nation Making and Post-Colonial States of Asia, Africa and Eurasia," in Lowell W. Barrington, *After Idependence: Making and Protecting the Nation in Post-Colonial and Post-Communist States* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Ch.11, pp. 279-295, 2006)

Sysyn, Frank, "The Ukrainian Famine of 1932-3: the Role of the Ukrainian Diaspora in research and Public Discussion" in Levon Chorbajian and George Shirinian (eds), *Studies in comparative genocide* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), pp.182-215

Tauger, Mark B., "Natural Disaster and Human Actions in the Soviet Famine of 1931-33" (The Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies, 2001)

Tudoroiu, Theodor, "Rose, Orange, and Tulip: The failed post-Soviet revolutions", (Communist and Post-Communist Studies 40, 2007), pp. 315-342

Wæver, Ole; Buzan, Barry; Kelstrup, Morten and Lemaitre, Pierre, *Identity, migration and the new security agenda in Europe* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993)

Wanner, Catherine. *Burden of dreams: history and identity in post-Soviet Ukraine* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998)

Weber, Max, *Economy and Society* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1978), Chapter 5 (Ethnic Groups: pp.385-398)

Wemheuer, Felix, "Regime Changes of Memory: Creating the Official History of the Ukrainian and Chinese Famines under State Socialism and after the Cold War" (Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, Volume 10, Number 1, Winter 2009, pp. 31-59)

Wilson, Andrew, *Ukrainian Nationalism in the 1990s: A Minority Faith* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

Wilson, Andrew, *Ukraine's Orange Revolution* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 2005)

………………….."Holodomor and Holocaust Denial to be Criminal Offense", Den, 03 April 2007, (quoted from: Boryk, Jennifer. 2011, Memory Politics: The Use of Holodomor as a Political and Nationalistic Tool in Ukraine)

………………. "Ukraine Country Study Guide, Volume 1, Strategic Information and Developments, International Business Publications", (USA Washington DC, USA, 2013)

Online Sources

Alpert, Lukas, "Petro Poroshenko to Be Inaugurated as Ukraine President June 7", The Wall Street Journal, 29/05/2014 (Online: https://web.archive.org/web/20140529234158/http:/online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20140529-707812.html) Accessed on 18.11.2015.

BBC News, "Ukraine election: Yanukovych urges Tymoshenko to quit", 10/02/2010 (Online: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/8508276.stm) Accessed on 18.11.2015.

BBC News, "Ukraine crisis: Timeline", 13/11/2014 (Online: http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-26248275) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

CCTV, "Poroshenko: First visit as president is to go to Donbass", 26/05/2014 (Online: http://english.cntv.cn/2014/05/26/VIDE1401071047789539.shtml) Accessed on 02.12.2015.

"Communiqué of Batumi GUAM Summit", *GUAM Organization Website,* (Online: http://guam-organization.org/en/node/380) Accessed on 16.11.2015.

Decree of the President of Ukraine "Про додаткові заходи щодо увічнення пам'яті жертв політичних репресій та голодоморів в Україні", 2005 (Online: http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1087/2005) Accessed on 13.11.2015.

Decree of the President of Ukraine "Про вшанування жертв та постраждалих від голодоморів в Україні", 2005 (Online: http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1644/2005) Accessed on 13.11.2015.

Decree of the President of Ukraine "Про відзначення Дня пам'яті жертв голодоморів та політичних репресій", 2005 (Online: http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1544/2005) Accessed on 13.11.2015.

Decree of the President of Ukraine "Про заходи у зв'язку з 70-ми роковинами Великого терору - масових політичних репресій 1937-1938 років", 2007 (Online: http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/431/2007) Accessed on 13.11.2015.

Embassy of Ukraine in Canada, "International recognition of Holodomor", 2012 (Online: http://canada.mfa.gov.ua/en/ukraine-%D1%81%D0%B0/holodomor-remembrance/holodomor-international-recognition) Accessed on 17.11.2015.

European Parliament, "Parliament recognises Ukrainian famine of 1930s as crime against humanity", 23-10-2008 (Online: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?language=EN&type=IM-PRESS&reference=20081022IPR40408) Accessed on 16.11.2015.

Forsthuber, Denise, "From Russia Without Love", USNews, 27/11/2013, (Online: http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/11/27/ukraines-surprising-rejection-of-the-european-union-reflects-russias-power) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

"Голодомор на Украине: геноцид или фальсификация", *Utro.ru*, 21/04/2006, (Online: http://www.utro.ru/articles/2006/04/21/542561.shtml) Accessed on 16.11.2015.

Higgins Andrew and Kramer Andrew E., "Ukraine leader was defeated even before he was ousted", The New York Times, 03/01/2015, (Online: http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/04/world/europe/ukraine-leader-was-defeated-even-before-he-was-ousted.html?referrer&_r=5) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

Higgins Andrew and Kramer Andrew E., "Archival is freed as Ukraine leader flees", The New York Times, 22/02/2014, (Online: http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/23/world/europe/ukraine.html?_r=0) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

Holodomor, Ukrainian Genocide in the early 1930s (Digital Brochure), Official Website of the United Nations (Online: http://un.mfa.gov.ua/mediafiles/files/holodomor-booklet.pdf) Accessed on 16.11.2015.

Interfax-Ukraine, "Poroshenko wins presidential election with 54.7% of vote", 29/05/2014 (Online: http://en.interfax.com.ua/news/general/207146.html) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

"Item 14.3: Remembrance of victims of the Great Famine (*Holodomor*) in Ukraine", *Records of the General Conference, 34th session, Paris 16th October – 2nd November 2007. Volume 1: Resolutions, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*, p 62. (Online: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001560/156046e.pdf) Accessed on 16.11.2015.

"Item 14.3 of the Provisional Agenda, Remembrance of Victims of the Great Famine (Holodomor) in Ukraine (Explanatory Note and Draft Resolution)", General Conference of UNESCO, 34th session, Paris, 8/10/2007, (Online: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001538/153838e.pdf) Accessed on 16.11.2015.

"Joint Statement of the OSCE participating States […] on the 75th anniversary of the Holodomor of 1932 and 1933 in Ukraine", OSCE, Madrid, 30/11/2007, (Online: http://www.osce.org/mc/33180?download=true) Accessed on 16.11.2015.

KyivPost, "Ukraine parliament votes out Tymoshenko's government", 03/03/2010 (Online:http://web.archive.org/web/20100311220422/http://www.kyivpost.com/news/nation/detail/60896/) Accessed on 16.11.2015.

Knyajitskaya, Elena, "Переселение россиян в Украину стало следствием Голодомора 1933 года", Unian, 17.08.2010 (Online: http://www.unian.net/common/391314-pereselenie-rossiyan-v-ukrainu-stalo-sledstviem-golodomora-1933-goda.html) Accessed on 13.11.2015.

Kulchytsky, Stanislav, "Why did Stalin exterminate the Ukrainians?" (2005) (Online: http://www.faminegenocide.com/resources/kulchytsky/kulchynsky1.htm   ) Accessed on 14.07.2015.

Kuchma, Leonid, "Ukraina ne otvorachivaetsia ot Rossii", İzvestiya, 10.11.1999 (Online: http://www.ualberta.ca/~khineiko/Izvestia_2003/1127936.htm) Accessed on 15.10.2015.

Law of Ukraine "Про Голодомор 1932-1933 років в Україні", 2006 (Online: http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/376-16) Accessed on 13.11.2015.

Law of Ukraine "Про ратифікацію Угоди між Україною та Російською Федерацією з питань перебування Чорноморського флоту Російської Федерації на території України", 2010 (Online: http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2153-vi) Accessed on 18.11.2015.

Maksudov, Sergey, "Genocide Remembered", The Moscow News Weekly (2007) (Online: http://www.paulbogdanor.com/left/soviet/famine/maksudov.html) Accessed on 14.07.2015.

Medvedev, Dimitriy, "Дмитрий Медведев направил послание Президенту Украины Виктору Ющенко, посвящённое проблематике так называемого «голодомора»", 14.11.2008, Official website of the President of Russia (Online: http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/2081) Accessed on 16.11.2015.

Muzichenko, Yaroslav, "The Kiev Court of Appeals Named the Organizers of Holodomor" Ukraina Moloda (2010) (Online: http://umoloda.kiev.ua/number/1574/222/55413/) Accessed on 13.11.2015.

Official website of president of Russia, "Подписаны законы о принятии Крыма и Севастополя в состав России", 21/03/2014 (Online: http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/20625) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

Official website of President of Ukraine, "President's word on the occasion of Holodomor Remembrance Day", 22/11/2014 (Online: http://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/slovo-prezidenta-u-den-vshanuvannya-pamyati-zhertv-golodomor-34103) Accessed on 02.12.2015.

Official website of President of Ukraine, "President about the opening of the Memorial to Victims of Holodomor in Ukraine in 1932-1933 in Washington: Not a single problem can defeat our people", 07/11/2015 (Online: http://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/zhodnim-liholittyam-ne-zdolati-nash-narod-prezident-pro-vidk-36266) Accessed on 02.12.2015.

Official website of President of Ukraine, "Petro Poroshenko: We will not forget crimes of Holodomor-genocide and perpetrators of those crimes", 28/11/2015 (Online: http://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/ne-zabudemo-zlochiniv-golodomorugenocidu-ta-jogo-vinuvatciv-36379) Accessed on 02.12.2015.

Official website of President of Ukraine, "Maryna Poroshenko: Holodomor is a national wound", 27/11/2015 (Online: http://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/marina-poroshenko-golodomor-ce-nasha-nacionalna-rana-36375) Accessed on 02.12.2015.

Olszański Tadeusz A. and Miazga Agata Wierzbowska, "Poroshenko, President of Ukraine", 28/05/2014 (Online: http://www.osw.waw.pl/en/publikacje/analyses/2014-05-28/poroshenko-president-ukraine) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

Reuters, "How the separatists delivered Crimea to Moscow", 13/03/2014 (Online: http://in.reuters.com/article/2014/03/13/ukraine-crisis-russia-aksyonov-idINL6N0M93AH20140313) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

RT, "Crimea, Sevastopol officially join Russia as Putin signs final decree", 21/03/2014 (Online: https://www.rt.com/news/russia-parliament-crimea-ratification-293/) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

Spiegel Online, "Ukraine Election: The Chocolate King Rises", 22/05/2014 (Online: http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/profile-of-petro-poroshenko-in-the-run-up-to-the-ukraine-elections-a-970325.html) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

State Duma, "постановление гд фс рф от 02.04.2008 n 262-5 гд "о заявлении государственной думы федерального собрания российской федерации "памяти жертв голода 30-х годов на территории СССР"", 02.04.2008 (Online: http://duma.consultant.ru/documents/955838?items=1&page=4   )Accessed on 16.11.2015.

State Statistic Service of Ukraine (державна служба статистики україни) (Online: http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/operativ/operativ2007/ds/nas_rik/nas_r/nas_rik_r.html   ) Accessed on 08/09/2015.

State Statistic Service of Ukraine (державна служба статистики україни) (Online: http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/rus/results/nationality_population/graphic) Accessed on 08/09/2015.

"Statement On Commemorating the Victims of Genocide and Political Repressions Committed in Ukraine in 1932 and 1933", 26th Session of the Baltic Assembly, 13th Baltic Council, from 22 to 24 November 2007, Riga (Online: http://baltasam.org/images/front/_pdf/Doc_8_ENG.pdf) Accessed on 16/11/2015.

The Guardian, "Poroshenko promises calm 'in hours' amid battle to control Donetsk airport", 26/05/2014, (Online: https://web.archive.org/web/20140529072943/http:/www.theguardian.com/world/2014/may/26/poroshenko-peace-donetsk-airport-air-strike-separatists) Accessed on 01/12/2015.

The Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Comment by the Information and Press Department of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding the situation in Ukraine", 07/03/2014 (Online: http://archive.mid.ru/bdomp/brp_4.nsf/e78a48070f128a7b43256999005bcbb3/370a01fb82d770ea44257c9900613cd6!OpenDocument) Accessed on 01/12/2015.

Ukraine Government Portal, "Government has set up the Ukrainian Institute of National Memory", 12/01/2011 (Online: http://www.kmu.gov.ua/control/publish/article?art_id=243978009) Accessed on 18/11/2015.

Ukraine Party of Regions, "President honors memory of victims of Holodomor 1932-1933", 23/11/2013 (Online: http://partyofregions.ua/en/news/blog/52907421c4ca42c47a00003d?print=1) Accessed on 18/11/2015.

Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine "Про Звернення до Українського народу учасників спеціального засідання Верховної Ради України 14 травня 2003 року щодо вшанування пам'яті жертв голодомору 1932-1933 років" (Online: http://zakon0.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/789-15?test=4/UMfPEGznhhIqa.ZiwvoPQYHI4FUs80msh8Ie6) Accessed on 14/10/2015.

Yahoo News, "Putin describes secret operation to seize Crimea", 08/03/2015 (Online: http://news.yahoo.com/putin-describes-secret-operation-seize-crimea-212858356.html) Accessed on 01.12.2015.

Yushchenko, Viktor, "President Yushchenko's speech dedicated to Holodomor", 2008 (Online: http://www.wumag.kiev.ua/index2.php?param=pgs20074/14) Accessed on 13/11/2015.

……………………"Who is to Blame" (The Ukrainian Week, No:22 , December 2013, pp.21)   (Online: http://i.tyzhden.ua/content/photoalbum/2013/december/03/book%2022_2013.pdf) Accessed on 13.11.2015.

…………………..Wikipedia (Online: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nomenklatura) Accessed on 14/10/2015.

…………………. "Янукович сказав депутатам ПАРЄ, що Голодомор - не геноцид", УНІАН(Unian), 27/04/2010 (Online: http://eunews.unian.ua/352130-yanukovich-skazav-deputatam-pare-scho-golodomor-ne-genotsid.html) Accessed on 18.11.2015.

………………….. "Януковича будут судить за отрицание Голодомора?" (Yanukovych will be judged on the denial of the Holodomor), Ukrainskaya Pravda, June 14, 2010   (Online: http://www.pravda.com.ua/rus/news/2010/06/14/5137127/) Accessed on 18.11.2015.

…………………..."Ющенко заморил всех", İzvestia, 21.09.2011 (Online: http://izvestia.ru/news/353240) Accessed on 13.11.2015.

……………….."Библиотекарь вернула к жизни жертв голодомора", İzvestia, 27.08.2009 (Online: http://izvestia.ru/news/352368) Accessed on 13.11.2015.

APPENDICES

A. TURKISH SUMMARY

UKRAYNA'DAKİ ULUS İNŞASI SİYASETİNDE
HOLODOMOR'UN YERİ

Bu tezin amacı Holodomor'un (1932-1933 yıllarında Ukrayna'nın büyük bir bölümünde meydana gelen kıtlık) ulusal bilinç, ulusal kimlik ve ulusal kolektif hafızanın yeniden yaratılmasındaki etkilerini incelemek ve bu olayın Ukrayna'daki ulus inşası politikasındaki rolünü belirlemektir.

Ulus inşası sürecinde politika yapıcılar tarafından uygulanması gereken temel unsurlarından biri ulusal kimliğin yerleştirilmesidir. Bu amaçla kimlik, ulusal kimlik, milliyetçilik kavramları teorik çerçeve başlığı altında incelenmiştir. Kimlik oluşumunun ve kimlik tanımının olmazsa olmazı olan "biz-onlar" karşılaştırması bu bölümde anlatılarak Ukrayna milli kimliğinin yaratılmasında düşman imajının yaratılmasının önemine vurgu yapılmıştır. Holodomorun Ukrayna milli kimliğinin yerleştirilmesinde merkez ayaklardan biri haline gelmesi ve ulus inşasında ideolojik politikanın yapı taşlarından biri olması nedeniyle teoride etnik veya sivik milliyetçilik teorilerinden herhangi birine uymadığı değerlendirilerek etno-sembolist teoriye göre değerlendirilmesi uygun görülmüştür. Bu amaçla etno-sembolizm ve teorinin öncüleri arasında sayılan Anthony Smith'in görüşleri bu çalışmanın teori kısmında sunulmuştur. Etno-sembolizm milliyetçiliğin oluşumunda ve sürdürülebilirliğinde mit, sembol, gelenek, değer ve anıların rolünü vurgulayan bir teoridir. Smith, modern teorinin aksine milliyetçiliğin sadece politik hareketle yaratılamayacağını toplumun kendi kültür, gelenek ve anılarının üzerine kurulabileceğini yani geçmişten beslenmesi gerektiğini iddia eder.

Bu tezde yapılan analizin daha iyi anlaşılabilmesini amacıyla Holodomor ile ilgili bilinmesi gereken bilgiler detaylı olarak 3'üncü bölümde verilmiştir. Bu bölüm Holodomor kelimesinin anlamı olan açlık ölümü karşılığının açıklanması, kelimenin kökleri ve ilk ortaya çıkışı hakkında bilgiler ile başlar. Daha sonra bu bölümde Holodomorun gerçekleştiği yılların öncesinden başlanarak kapsamlı bir tarih bilgisi verilmiştir. Bu tarih kısmı Bolşevik devrimiyle başlar ve bu bölümde Lenin döneminde komünist ideolojinin yerleştirilme çabaları ve karşılaştığı güçlükler anlatılır. Bu ideolojinin savunduğu ekonomik modelin gerektirdiği devletleştirme politikaları ile büyük endüstrilerden küçük işletmelere tüm endüstri alanları, ulaşım, haberleşme ve kırsal alanlar devletleştirilmeye başlanır. Endüstri ve tarım sektöründe para transferi yasaklanıp takas usulüne geçilir. Ancak bu uygulamalardan kötü etkilenen ekonomiden dolayı Lenin'in stratejik geri adım olarak adlandırdığı Yeni Ekonomik Plan devreye sokulur. Ancak bu plan 1928 yılında Stalin'in merkezi planlı ekonomiyi devreye sokmasıyla sona erer. Merkezi planlı ekonomi politikası ile hızlı bir endüstrileşme dönemi başlar. Bu endüstrileşme atılımını beslemek için tarımsal ürünlerin arttırılması ve ihracatı gerekmektedir. Daha verimli bir tarım üretimi için Stalin tarım alanlarının da devletleştirilmesi gerektiğini düşünerek kuvvet kullanılarak kolektif çiftlikler oluşturulur. Bu süreçte zengin toprak sahipleri sürgüne gönderilir veya idam edilir. Kolektif çiftlikler yeni kurumsal organlarla yönetilmeye başlanır ve çiftliklerden beklenen üretim kotaları her yıl için artarak belirlenir. Bu sistemin içinde 1932 yılında Ukrayna'nın büyük bir bölümünü etkileyen kıtlık meydana gelir. Kıtlığın sebebi olarak bazı yazarlar tarafından sadece Stalin'in zulmü gösterilirken bazı yazarlar ise kuraklık, bilinçsiz kişilerce yönetim, tarım aletlerinin yetersizliği, yönetim zafiyeti, yanlış bilgilendirme gibi birçok unsurun bir arada meydana gelmesini göstermektedir. Tarih kısmı Holodomor konusundaki tartışmalı konular dışarıda bırakılarak verilmiştir. Tartışmalı konular olan Holodomor sebebiyle meydana gelen kayıpların sayısı ve Holodomorun soykırım olup olmadığı iddiaları ayrı başlıklar altında verilmiştir. Zaten Holodomorun politikleştirilmesi bu iki tartışmalı konu üzerinden yapılmaktadır. Batı yanlısı ve Batılı yazarların büyük çoğunluğu Holodomorun soykırım olduğunu iddia ederken ve kayıp sayılarını yüksek verirken, Rus yanlısı ve Rus yazarların büyük bölümü Holodomorun bir doğa

olayı olduğunu veya dönemin yanlış politikalarından kaynaklandığını ancak soykırım olmadığını iddia etmektedir ve kayıp sayılarını daha düşük vermektedir. Aynı durum politikacılar ve politik tutumlarına göre ülkeler için de geçerlidir. Ayrıca Ukrayna Diasporası tarihi, oluşumu ve girişimleri bu bölüm içinde verilmiştir. Ukrayna Diasporası Amerika'nın kuzeyi ve Kanada'da yerleşmiş ve örgütlenmiştir. 1880'li yıllarda ilk dalga göç olmuş bu dalganın üyeleri daha çok maden işçisi ve çiftçiler olmuştur. İkinci dalga 1920 ve 1930'lu yıllarda üçüncü dalga ise 1940 ve 1950'li yıllarda gerçekleşmiştir. İkinci dalga ve üçüncü dalga göç üyeleri arasında işçi ve çiftçilere ek olarak entelektüeller de yer almıştır. Diasporanın örgütlenmesinde ve kurulmasında bu entelektüellerin etkisi vardır. Ukrayna Diasporasının etkinliklerinin başlangıcı soğuk savaş döneminin sıcaklığının en yüksek olduğu yıllar olan 1970 ve 1980'lerde başlar. Holodomor kelimesi Diaspora tarafından 1970'li yıllarda icat edilir ve kullanılmaya başlanır. 1989 yılında Diaspora Amerika'da Holodomorun 50. yıl anma törenlerini gerçekleştirir. 1980'li yıllarda Diasporanın yardımlarıyla Holodomor ile ilgili olarak kitap basımı, film çekimi, Birleşik Devletler kongresinde komisyon kurulması ve uluslararası sorgu komisyonu oturumu gerçekleşmiştir. 1991 yılına kadar Ukrayna'nın bağımsızlığını kazanması için faaliyetlerde bulunan Diaspora 1991 yılında Ukrayna'nın bağımsızlığını kazanmasının ardından faaliyetlerini değiştirerek Holodomorun farkındalığını arttırmak ve soykırım olarak tanınmasını sağlamak için faaliyetlerde bulunmaya başlamıştır.

Dördüncü bölümde, ulusal kimliğin oluşumu ile geçmiş bağımsızlık deneyimi arasındaki ilişkiyi aydınlatmak için Ukrayna'nın tarihi de kısaca gözden geçirilmiş ve bunun analizi yapılmıştır. Ukrayna'nın bu kuşbakışı tarihine 1850 yıllarından başlanmış ve hangi devletlerin egemenliği altında olduğu ve bu dönemlerde kültürünü yaşatma konusunda ne kadar bağımsız oldukları anlatılmıştır. Ukrayna'nın 1991 yılına kadar uzun dönemli bir bağımsızlığının bulunmamasından dolayı ulus inşası sürecini tecrübe edememiş olmasının ulusal kimliğin oluşmasında olumsuz etkileri olduğu değerlendirilmiştir. Bu bölümde Holodomorun ulus inşası sürecinde Ukrayna ideoloji politikasının yapıtaşlarından birisinin olmasının sebebi de tarihsel sürece bağlı olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Ayrıca Ukrayna milli kimliğinin yaratılması

sürecinde kullanılan Holodomor dışındaki Kiev Rusyası, Kozak Hanlığı, İkinci Dünya Savaşı, Çernobil nükleer patlaması gibi tarihi olay anlatımları da verilmiştir.

Bölüm 5'te politika yapıcılarının ulus inşası projelerindeki belirleyici rollerinden dolayı, Ukrayna devlet başkanlarının Holodomor yaklaşımları analiz edilmiştir. Başkanlar itibarıyla dönemsel politikalar incelenmeye başlanmadan önce kısa bir giriş ile 1991 yılında Sovyetler Birliğinin dağılması sonrasında meydana çıkan bağımsız devletlerin ulus inşasında uyguladıkları politikalar belirtilmiş daha sonra Ukrayna özelinde ülkenin yapısı ve Doğu-Batı bölünmüşlüğü vurgulanmıştır.

Ukrayna'nın ilk devlet Başkanı olan Kravchuk'un 1991 yılı öncesinde Holodomor konusuna bakışı milli demokratların aksine Rusya'nın bakışı ile paralel idi. Ancak başkanlığı ile birlikte Holodomoru Ukrayna halkına karşı planlı ve bilinçli olarak yapılmış yapay bir kıtlık olarak ifade etti. Bu planlanmış kıtlığın sorumlusu olarak Stalin rejimini işaret etmiş olsa da başka bir merkezden alınan emirle olduğunu söyleyerek Moskova'yı ima ederek düşman imajı oluşturma çabasında bulunmuştur. Başkanlığı döneminde iç politikada ideolojik politikaya önem vermiş Ukrayna'nın kendine ait bir tarihi olmadığını ifade ederek Ukrayna Milli Bilimler Akademisini Ukrayna'nın kendi tarihini yazması konusunda harekete geçirmiştir. Bunun yanında Holodomorun 60'ıncı yılı olan 1993 yılında Holodomor anma törenlerine ilişkin bir yönetmelik yayınlamıştır. Kravchuk'un belki de Holodomorun politikleştirilmesindeki en büyük katkısı bu yönetmelikte Holodomor kelimesinin yer almasıydı. Kelimenin resmi dokümanda görünmesinden sonra akademik ve politik çevrelerde kullanımı hızla yaygınlaşmıştır. 1993 yılının başkanlık seçimlerinin öncesi olması Kravchuk'un ulusal demokratların ve ülkenin batı kesiminin oylarını toplamak istemesinden kaynaklandığı düşünülmektedir. Ayrıca 1993 yılında Kravchuk, Dışişleri Bakanlığı aracılığı ile Holodomor konusunun Birleşmiş Milletler Eğitim, Bilim ve Kültür Örgütü (UNESCO) gündemine alınması için girişimde bulunmuş ancak tahmin edileceği üzere Rusya engellemeleri nedeniyle başarılı olamamıştır.

1994 yılında yapılan Başkanlık seçimleri ile Kuchma Başkanlık seçimlerini kazanmış ve Başkanlık görevini iki dönem boyunca sürdürmüştür. Başkanlık

seçimlerinden önce yürüttüğü seçim kampanyasında ekonomik istikrarın, Rusçanın ikinci resmi dil olacağının ve Rusya'yla stratejik ortaklık kurulacağının vaatlerini vererek ülkesinin doğu kesiminin oylarının çok büyük bir bölümünü elde etmiştir. Bazı yazarlar Kuchma dönemini unutkanlık projesi diye adlandırsalar da Kuchma ideolojik politikayı tamamen yok saymamış menfaat sağlanacağı takdirde bu politik manevraları kullanmıştır. Bu durumda Kuchma döneminin pragmatik bir denge politikası dönemi olarak adlandırılması daha doğru görünmektedir. Kuchma Doğu-Batı ayrımını derinleştirmemek için ideolojik politikaya temkinli yaklaşsa da tamamen terk etmemiştir. Rusçayı ikinci resmi dil yapma sözünden dönmüş hatta Ukraynaca öğrenip resmi açıklamalarını Ukraynaca dilinde yapmıştır. Ayrıca Holodomor anma gününü belirleyerek anma törenlerinin tarihini Kasımın son cumartesi günü olarak resmileştirmiştir. 2002'de Holodomorun yetmişinci yıldönümü anma törenleri için de yönetmelik çıkararak anma törenlerinin kapsamını belirtmiştir. 2002 parlamento seçimlerinin yapılacağı yıl olmasının Kuchma'nın Holodomora vurgu yapmasında önemli rol oynadığı iddia edilmektedir. Ayrıca 2002 yılı parlamento seçimlerinin 2004 yılı başkanlık seçimleri için bir prova niteliği taşıdığı değerlendirilmektedir. Başkanlığının ilk yıllarında Kuchma her ne kadar Rusya ile aynı çizgide görünse de sonraları Rusya'nın tepkisini almadan Batı ile yakınlaşma yoluna girmeye çalışmıştır. Bu bağlamda Holodomor politikasından da faydalanmıştır. 2003 yılında Ukrayna Parlamentosundan çıkan karar ile Holodomor soykırım olarak nitelendirilmiş ve aynı karar ile diğer ülkeler tarafından da tanınarak kınanması gerektiği belirtilmiştir. 2004 seçimlerinden hemen önce gerçekleşen bu çabalarla alınan bu parlamento kararı 26 ülke tarafından bir trajedi olarak nitelendirilmiş ancak soykırım kelimesi sarf edilmemiştir.

2004 yılı başkanlık seçimleri Ukrayna'da turuncu devrim olarak adlandırılan ülke geneline yayılan toplumsal protestolara sebep olmuştur. Yanukoviç ile Yuşçenko arasında geçen başkanlık seçimleri yarışı Yanukoviç lehine sonuçlanınca seçimlerde hile olduğu iddiası ile halkın gösterdiği tepki kısa zamanda ülke geneline yayılarak büyüdü. Protestolar özellikle Ukrayna'nın batı ve orta kesimlerinde gerçekleşti. Protestocular devlet binalarını işgal ettiler. Ukrayna yüksek mahkemesi seçimlerin geçersiz olduğunu yeniden tekrarlanacağını bildirmek zorunda kaldı. Yeni

seçimlerin sonucu Yuşçenko'nun zaferi ile sonuçlandı. Yuşçenko'nun gelişi ile ulus inşası sürecinde daha önce eşi görülmemiş çabalar sarf edildi. Yuşçenko Holodomor ile ilgili iki adet yönetmeliği 2005 yılında çıkardı. 2006 yılında ise Holodomor hakkında Kanun yürürlüğe girdi. Kanuna göre Holodomor Ukrayna halkına karşı yapılan bir soykırımdı ve bunun umumi inkârı yasaktı. Ancak bu Kanunun herhangi bir cezai yaptırımı bulunmuyordu. Hemen ardından Yuşçenko bu Kanunu değiştirmeye yönelik bir tasarı teklifinde bulunda. Yeni tasarıda cezai yaptırım, Yahudi soykırımı ve devlet memurlarına ayrı cezai yaptırımlar bulunmaktaydı. Ukrayna Anayasasının ifade özgürlüğüne ters düştüğü gerekçesiyle tasarı kanunlaşmadı. 2006 yılında Ulus inşası için tarih alanında çalışmalarda bulunmak amacıyla Polonya'daki örneği model alınarak Ulusal Anma Enstitüsü kuruldu. 2007'de Holodomor sonucunda yaşamlarını kaybedenlerin isimlerinin bulunacağı Ulusal Anı Kitabı oluşturma çalışmalarına başlandı. Bu çalışmalar tüm ülke genelinde çalışma grupları oluşturularak gerçekleşti. Bazı akademisyenler tarafından bu çalışmalar istenilen sayıya ulaşmak için isim bulma çabası olduğu iddiası ile eleştirildi. Rusya'dan da kitapta yer alan isimlerin Holodomor kurbanları olmadığı yönünde iddialar ile karşı ataklar oldu. 2008 yılında içinde müze ve anıtlar barındıran Holodomora adanmış Holodomor Abide kompleksi açılışı Yuşçenko tarafından gerçekleşti. Açılışta konuşma yapan Yuşçenko Ukrayna hafızasının bu kompleks ile yeniden dirileceğini dile getirdi. Holodomorun 75'inci yıldönümü olan 2008 yılında Holodomor anma törenleri eşi görülmemiş bir düzeye ulaştı. Devlet eliyle birçok alanda Holodomor adına çeşitli faaliyetlerde bulunuldu. 2009 yılında Ukrayna Güvenlik Servisi Holodomor sorumlularına yönelik yürütülen soruşturma için arşivlerini açtı. Ukrayna Güvenlik Servisinin (SBU) sağladığı verilerle Kiev Temyiz Mahkemesi Holodomor sorumluları olarak Stalin, Molotov, Kaganovich, Postyshev, Kosior, Chubar ve Khataevich'i suçlu buldu. Ancak Ukrayna yasalarına göre ölü insanlar hakkında hüküm verilemeyeceğinden dava düşmek zorunda kaldı. Ayrıca mahkeme, kararının tamamen yasal olduğunu ve hiçbir politik boyutunun olmadığını belirtti. Yuşçenko bu kararı tarihi gerçeğin restorasyonu olarak yorumladı. Yuşçenko'nun Holodomora bakışı ve Ukrayna kimliği algısı başkanlığı dönemindeki uygulamalarına da yansımıştır. Yuşçenko Ukrayna'nın doğu kesimini gerçek

kimliğini yitirmiş ve Ruslaşmış olarak görmekte ve bunu gidermenin yolunun Ukrayna'nın gerçek kimliği olan Batıda yaşayanların kimliğinin doğu bölgelerine empoze edilmesi gerektiğinden geçtiğini düşünmektedir. Yuşçenko her ne kadar etno-sembolist teorinin genel çerçevesi dahilinde hareket etmiş olsa da onun tek ve genel bir kimlik yaratmak yerine baskı ile kimlik empoze etme çabası doğu-batı ayrıklığı olan ülkede bu ayrımın derinleşmesine sebep olmuştur. Yuşçenko'nun Holodomor tutumu iç politika da olduğu gibi dış politikada da aktif şekilde kendini göstermiştir. Ancak Ukrayna'nın Rusya ile ilişkileri ciddi anlamda gerilmiştir. Dünyanın Holodomor'u soykırım olarak tanıması için girişilen çabalar Rusya tarafından tepki ile karşılandı. Ukrayna içinde Rusya'nın Holodomordan sorumlu tutulması ve karşılığında gayri resmi de olsa özür ve telafi talep edilmesi gerektiği iddiası Rusya'nın parlamentosundan Holodomorun bir trajedi olduğu ve planlı olmadığı yönünde bir karar çıkarmasına sebep oldu. Ayrıca dönemin Rusya devlet başkanı Medvedev tarafından Yuşçenko'ya ağır eleştiriler içeren bir mektup gönderildi. Yuşçenko 2007 yılında başlattığı kampanya ile Dünya çapında Holodomorun soykırım olarak kabul edilmesi davetinde bulundu. Yuşçenko yayınladığı bir broşürde bunun amacının milyonlarca masum insanın hakkının sunulması, Sovyet komünist rejim suçlarının kınanması, tarihi adaletin hak ettiği yeri bulması ve Ukrayna soykırımının uluslararası düzeyde tanınırlık kazanması olduğunu belirtti. "Ukrayna hatırlar, dünya tanır" sloganıyla başlayan kampanya çerçevesinde Holodomorun soykırım olarak tanınması amacıyla 2006 yılında Bağımsız Devletler Topluluğuna (CIS), 2007 yılında Birleşmiş Milletler Eğitim, Bilim ve Kültür Örgütüne (UNESCO), Avrupa Güvenlik ve İşbirliği Teşkilatına (OSCE), ve Birleşmiş Milletlere (UN), 2008 yılında ikinci kez Birleşmiş Milletlere (UN), Demokrasi ve Ekonomik Kalkınma Örgütüne (GUAM) ve Avrupa Parlamentosuna başvurularda bulunuldu. Başvurular sonucunda Rusya'nın müdahaleleri sonucunda Ukrayna istediği sonucu elde edemese de Holodomor konusunda farkındalık yaratmayı başardı. Ayrıca ülke parlamentoları bazında da girişimlerde bulunarak bazı ülkelerde istediği desteği buldu. Yuşçenko'nun uluslararası düzeyde Holodomoru soykırım olarak tanıtmaya çalışmasındaki öne çıkan amaçları, iç politikada halkın Holodomoru soykırım olarak kabul etmesinde

ikna gücü sağlaması, Ukrayna milli kimliğine tehdit oluşturan bir düşman algısı yaratması ve Holodomor benzeri bir olayın veya Rusya'nın Ukrayna'ya müdahalelerinin gerçekleşmemesi olarak sayılabilir.

2010 yılında yapılan seçimler sonucunda Yanukoviç başkan oldu. Kısa bir süre sonra da kendi hükümetini kurmayı başardı. Yanukoviç diğer başkanların Avrupacı tutumunun aksine Avrasyacı tutumu benimsemekteydi ve Rusya ile aynı çizgide hareket etmeye özen gösterdi. Yanukoviç'in Holodomor ile ilgili yaptığı ilk iş Holodomor başlığını başkanlık resmi sitesinden kaldırtması oldu. Yanukoviç 2010 yılında Avrupa Konseyi Parlamenterler Meclisinde (PACE) yaptığı konuşmasında Holodomorun bir millete karşı yapılan bir soykırım olarak ifade edilmesinin haksız olduğunu ifade etmiştir. Bu hareketiyle mecliste alınacak kararda soykırım ifadesinin bulunmasını arzulayan bazı Ukrayna tarafından katılan katılımcıların çabalarının önünü kesmiş oldu. Yanukoviç'in bu açıklamasından sonra Yanukoviç muhaliflerinden bir kaçı Yanukoviç hakkında Holodomor hakkındaki Kanuna dayanarak dava açtı. Yine aynı yıl içinde Yanukoviç Ukrayna Güvenlik Servisinin (SBU) Holodomor hakkındaki Sovyet arşivlerinin kapatılmasını sağladı. 2010 yılında yayımladığı bir yönetmelik ile Ukrayna Ulusal Anma Enstitüsünün statüsü değiştirilerek etkisizleştirildi. Yanukoviç başkanlığı boyunca Holodomoru tanımlarken hiçbir zaman soykırım ifadesini kullanmadı. Holodomoru trajedi, suç, felaket gibi kelimelerle ifade etti. Buna rağmen Yanukoviç'in başkanlık dönemi incelendiğinde Yanukoviç'in söylemlerinin giderek değiştiği bir miktar daha Holodomora ılımlı hale geldiği fark edilmektedir. Bazı yazarlar bu söylem değişimini yaklaşan Avrupa Birliği Ticaret Antlaşması sebebiyle Avrupa'ya yakınlaşma çabalarına bağlarken bazı yazarlar hakkında açılan davanın etkisine bağlamışlardır. Ancak yine de bu değişimin sebebi olarak en büyük etkinin yaklaşan başkalık seçimleri nedeniyle milliyetçi oyların kaygısı görüşü daha kabul edilebilir görünmektedir. Yanukoviç'in Başkanlık süreci bir bütün olarak ele alındığında Holodomor konusunda isteksiz tutumuna rağmen Holodomor anma törenleri ve pratikleri aynen devam etmiştir. Yanukoviç'in Avrupa Birliği Ticaret Antlaşmasını imzalamaması ağırlıklı olarak Kiev'de olmasına rağmen ülke genelinde özellikle orta ve batı Ukrayna'da büyük çaplı protestoların olmasına yol açmış ve Yanukoviç

ülkeyi terk etmek zorunda kalmıştır. Ukrayna Parlamentosu Yanukoviç'in başkanlık görevinin kaldırılmasını ilan ettikten sonra geçici hükümeti ve yeni başkanlık seçimleri tarihini ilan etmiştir. Bu olayların akabinde Rusya Kırım'ı ilhak etmiş ve Ukrayna'nın doğu kesiminde Rus ayrılıkçıları ayaklanmıştır. Doğu bölgesinde Donbas savaşı olarak adlandırılan çatışmalar halen devam etmektedir.

2014 yılında bu kargaşa halindeki ülkenin yeni başkanı Yanukoviç'e karşı olan protestolarda aktif rol alan Poroşenko olmuştur. Ülkedeki kargaşa sebebiyle Holodomor konusuna çok fazla ilgi gösteremese de Holodomor anma törenleri esnasında yaptığı konuşmalarında çok sert ve açık bir üslup ile Rusya'yı suçlamıştır. Poroşenko, Donbas savaşı ile Holodomor arasında analoji kurarak düşman olarak Rusya'yı en net şekilde işaret eden ilk başkan olmuştur. Konuşmalarında hafıza ve tarihin önemini belirterek yeniden canlandırmanın önemine vurgu yapmıştır. Söylevlerindeki yapı etno-sembolist yaklaşımla uyum içinde olmuştur. Ayrıca Ukrayna Diasporasının çalışmalarını takdir ederek katkılarına yeşil ışık yakmıştır. Özellikle söylevlerinde Diasporanın önde gelen isimleri olan Robert Conquest ve James Mace'den övgüyle bahsetmiştir. Bunun yanında Poroşenko'nun eşi "first lady" sıfatıyla Holodomor ile ilgili organizasyonlarda yarı resmi bir algı ile aktif rol almaktadır.

Sonuç olarak, Sovyetler Birliğinin dağılmasından sonra ortaya çıkan tüm devletlerdeki gibi Ukrayna da kendi ulus inşası sürecine başlamıştır. Ulus inşası süreci yönetici elitin politik girişimlerine ve geçmiş milli kimlik bilincine bağlıdır. Bu bağlamda Ukrayna Sovyetler Birliğinin dağılmasına kadar kendi ulusunu bağımsızca inşa edecek bir şans yakalayamamıştı. 1991 yılına kadar uzun süreli bir bağımsızlık dönemi olmayan Ukrayna bu sebeple ortak bir milli kimlik oluşturacak bağımsız yönetici elitler yetiştiremedi. Ancak 1991 yılında bağımsızlığını kazanması ile birlikte ulus kimliğini yaratacak tarihi fırsatı yakalamış oldu. Calhoun ve Smith'in iddia ettiği gibi ulus inşası için milli kimliğin yaratılmasında önceden var olan bir tarihin kritik önemi vardır. Ukrayna kendi ulus inşasında bir yapı taşı olarak bu tarihi olayı Holodomor olarak seçmiştir. Bu tezde de Holodomorun Ukrayna'daki ulus inşası politikasındaki yeri analiz edilmiştir. Bunun yanında bu çalışmada milli bilinç ve milli kimliğin yeniden yaratılması ve / veya güçlendirilmesinde Holodomorun

rolü incelenmiştir. Ukrayna'da politikayı belirleyen gücün Başkanların kendisi olduğundan ve politika yapıcıların ulus inşası sürecinde etkin rol oynamalarından dolayı Holodomorun ulus inşası sürecindeki etkisi Başkanlar dönemleri itibarıyla incelenmiştir. Bu inceleme yapılırken Holodomor bağlamında en uygun yaklaşımın etno-sembolist teori olduğu düşünülerek politika belirleyicilerin konu hakkındaki politik hareketleri etno-sembolist çerçeveden değerlendirilmiştir. Ukrayna 1991 yılında bağımsızlığını elde ettiğinden beri tarih yazıcılığını yeniden inşa edip Holodomoru yeniden yorumlama konusunda gayret sarf etmektedir. Anthony Smith'in politika yapıcıların ulus inşası sürecinde etnik malzemeyi kullanmaları iddiasına uygun olarak Ukrayna politika yapıcıları Holodomoru bu süreçte kullanmışlardır. Ayrıca, Smith tarihin yeniden yorumlanmasını toplumsal hafızayı yaratmanın amacı olarak öne sürmektedir. Bu bağlamda, Ukrayna politika yapıcıları toplumsal hafızayı yaratmak için Holodomor fenomenini aşamalı olarak kullanmışlardır. Böylece Ukraynalıların Holodomor algısı değişikliğe uğramıştır. Kravçuk döneminden Poroşenko dönemine kadar Ukraynalıları toplumsal hafızasındaki Holodomor gelişmiştir ve bunun en büyük göstergesi her yıl önemini artıran Holodomor anma törenleridir. Bununla birlikte Smith politika yapıcılarının kısıtlarının olduğundan bahsetmektedir. Ona göre milliyetçilik salt politika belirleyicilerinin uygulamaları ile yaratılamaz çünkü topluluğun kendine ait bir kültürü, geleneği ve hafızası vardır ki milliyetçilik bunlar üstüne kurulacaktır. Ukrayna özelinde üstüne kurulan anı Holodomordur ve teoride olduğu gibi geçmişte yaşanmıştır yoktan icat edilmemiştir sadece yeniden yorumlanmaktadır. Ancak politika belirleyicilerinin kısıtları teoridekiyle sınırlı kalmamaktadır. Holodomor bağlamında, Ukrayna politika yapıcılarını kısıtlayan bir diğer konu ise Rusya'nın Holodomor konusundaki tutumudur. Bir diğer unsursa Ukrayna'daki doğu-batı bölünmüşlüğünün politik eğilimlere etkisidir. Bu etki politika belirleyicilerinin ellerindeki gücü muhafaza edebilmek ve bölgesel oy kayıplarını engellemek kaygısıyla zaman zaman Holodomor konusuna çok net değinememelerine zaman zaman da Holodomora ağırlık vermelerine sbep olmuş kısacası daha pragmatik davranışlara sahne olmuştur. Ancak etno-sembolist yaklaşımın dahi Ukrayna'nın ve Holodomorun kendine özgü durumlarından dolayı bir takım yetersizlikleri

mevcuttur. Ulusal kimliği güçlendiren "biz-onlar" söylemi, Ukrayna'da ortak bir kimlik yaratmanın tersine doğu-batı ayrımını derinleştirmiştir. Etno-sembolist yaklaşıma göre politika yapıcılar halkı harekete geçirirken toplumsal hafızada karşılığı olan bir olaya atıfta bulunurlar. Ukrayna özelinde politikacılar politik çıkarlarına kısa vadede ulaşmak amacıyla Holodomordan faydalanmışlardır. Ulus inşası süreci uzun soluklu bir süreç olmasına rağmen, politika yapıcıların kısa vadeli çıkarlarına hizmet eden hareketleri Holodomora ait toplumsal hafızanın yeniden yaratılmasına etki etmiştir. Bu tezde analizi yapılan bir diğer konu da Ukrayna Başkanlarının Holodomor konusu bağlamında düşman algısı oluşturma çabalarıdır. Bu çabanın başlıca amacı Ukrayna kimliğine karşı tehdit algısı oluşturarak Ukrayna kimliğinin yeniden dirilmesinin/güçlenmesinin teminidir. Yanukoviç haricindeki Ukrayna Başkanlarının bu çabası zamanla daha açık bir şekilde görülebilmektedir. İlk iki Ukrayna Başkanının tavırları denge politikası gütmekle birlikte Sovyet totaliter rejimini suçlayan imalarla doludur. Rusya'ya yönelik direk suçlamalar ise Yuşçenko dönemi ile başlamaktadır. Fakat yine de Yuşçenko'nun tarihi bulandıran tarzı nedeniyle suçlama adresi çok net değildir. Poroşenko zamanında ise, Kırım'ın ilhakı ve sürmekte olan Donbas savaşı sebebiyle Holodomor suçlamaları net ve dolaysız bir şekilde Rusya'yı hedef almıştır. Sonuç olarak bu çalışma Holodomorun toplumsal hafıza ve dolaylı olarak da milli kimlik üzerindeki etkisinin gelişiminin coğrafi olarak kısmi de olsa kayda değer bir öneme sahip olduğunu göstermektedir.

B. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☐

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı :
Adı :
Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☐   Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐

3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: