

Johannes REMY
Helsinki

THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF FINNS AND UKRAINIANS UNDER RUSSIAN EMPIRE

SOME COMPARATIVE ASPECTS

1. *The conditions for the emergence of national movement*

The idea that the territory ruled by a government must be congruent with the territory inhabited by a nation is relatively new one. It became politically important in the course of the French revolution and Napoleonic wars, but received general acceptance much later. This was so because nationalism needs in order to gain support rather many conditions, which actually belong to modern industrial society. There must be a sufficient spread of literacy. An illiterate person may be attached to his or her immediate homeland, but he or she is rather often unaware of a greater bond between all countrymen. The spread of elementary education is all the more essential for the emergence of nationalism, since it is a precondition for the existence of a standardised literary language. If there is no unified literary language, it is often difficult to define the area where a language is spoken. There may well exist dialects, of which it is disputed to which language they belong. A sufficient circulation of mass media is necessary to create a sense of unity between inhabitants of various regions. The development of communications between various localities is necessary for a creation of a single national culture.

In a traditional, agricultural society the higher strata of society are as a rule not interested in supporting national bond between themselves and the peasants. On the contrary, rather often they emphasise their ancestry different from the peasants and speak another language. Hence the frame of identification is more often by social class than by nationality. That is why the politically active part of population does not attempt to create national statehood, but is more often satisfied with a multinational empire. In this kind of society, their birth background dictates the social status and character of work of the overwhelming majority of population. The education of literate specialists takes quite a lot of time, and they are not considered people, whom it is easy to replace. Because of insufficient communication, the peasants do not form a single national, but rather a rich variety of regional cultures¹.

This situation is reversed when the old agricultural society is being transformed into a new industrial one. Because of the rapid change, both the geographical and social mobility must be promoted. In order for an industrial society to survive, the majority of its population must be literate and have elementary education. A peasant's son no more automatically becomes a peasant. Now the question of official language and education becomes an important issue. Such nationalities, which previously lacked their own upper class and high literary culture, now present cultural and political demands. People begin to identify more with their nations, though identification with social classes does not completely lose its importance. Ultimately the process leads to the breakdown of great empires and the establishment of national states.

Naturally, the scheme is not always so simple as presented above. The local peasant communities do communicate with each other. The literate and illiterate classes do interact and influence each other, for instance, through the activities of clergy among peasants. Religious and linguistic bonds and differences do exist already before the emergence of nationalism and create a sense of pre-national ethnic identity². Nevertheless, the theories that connect nationalism with modernisation are useful in that they correctly describe the idea of nationality as one emerging, developing and changing in the process of modernisation. It is not anything set once and for all.

Apart from modernisation, there are many other conditions for the emergence of a nationalism of any one ethnic group. The culture of the group must be different enough from the cultures of neighbouring ethnic groups. The difference in language and/or religion between neighbours promotes the formation of national identity and national movement. The history of a group must offer building blocks for construction of national interpretation and mythology. By historical mythology is meant here some aspect of a nation's past, which is assumed to unite all its members and to express the nation at its best. The government borders and administrative units in pre-nationalist era are also important. An administrative area is often understood as the area of a certain nationality even when it in fact contains regions where some other ethnic group forms the majority. Moreover, an ethnic group must have an intellectual elite in order to develop nationalism. Although there may be a great interest in peasant culture, it is at first not the peasants themselves who write about it, but the elite. The national consciousness and ideology then spread from the elite to all social classes of the society. Thus such ethnic groups which do have their own nobility and which are in dominant position in a state have better opportunities to develop their own national identity than have the other ethnic groups, which lack pre-modern elite. The Czech scholar Miroslav Hroch gives the term "oppressed nations" for these nations lacking their own state and upper class. For Hroch, this is a technical term, which must not be understood as containing the moral evaluation of the policies of the dominant nations. The development of national consciousness and national movement among these oppressed nations was different from dominant nations. For the members of the oppressed

nations, the very choice of national identity was often rather complicated, since they were exposed to two nationalisms, that of the dominant nation as well as that of the oppressed nation³.

2. *Similarities and differences of the conditions for the emergence of nationalism between Finland and Ukraine*

Finland and Ukraine both experienced the industrial upsurge in the second half of the 19th century, while the majority of the population in both countries continued to work in agriculture. Finns and Ukrainians are oppressed nations in Hroch's sense. In the beginning of 19th century Finns lacked their own nobility, since practically all nobles were Swedish-speaking and considered themselves Swedes. This did not completely preclude Finnish non-ethnic local patriotism. Also the bourgeoisie in towns was mostly Swedish speaking. However, the lack of these social classes within Finnish ethnic group was to some extent compensated by the fact that the local clergy often was bilingual in both Finnish and Swedish. It was also important that the status of at least the upper stratum of Finnish peasants was relatively good. All the peasants were personally free, and rather many of them had a legal ownership of the land they cultivated. The existence of intelligentsia was guaranteed by the Abo Academy founded in 1640. In the beginning of 19th century it functioned with Swedish and Latin as the languages of instruction. After the Russian conquest the Academy was renamed the Imperial Alexander University and in 1828 transferred to Helsingfors (Helsinki).

In Ukraine, Great Russian and Polish languages and cultures played a role somewhat similar to that of the Swedish culture in Finland. However, on the left bank of Dnieper there indeed were noblemen with Ukrainian identity. This did not often hinder them to consider themselves also as Russians, since the Ukrainian and Russian national identities were not as yet clearly demarcated from each other⁴. In the beginning of the 19th century the only university in Ukraine existed in Lviv (Lemberg) in Austrian Galicia, but the establishment of the universities of Kharkov (Harkiv, 1805) and Kiev (1834) facilitated the existence of secular intelligentsia in the Dnieper Ukraine under the Russian Empire.

As regards to history, Ukrainians were in a better nation-building position than Finns. In the great Cossack wars of the 17th century, one part of the land had formed an independent political force. A Ukrainian state, the Hetmanate, had existed since the middle of 17th century until 1780s, although for most of the period only as an autonomous region under Russian supremacy. In folk tales and songs there was plenty of material depicting those times of independent or semi-independent existence. It was relatively easy for nationally minded poets and historians to elevate the Cossack period as the Golden Age of the nation. However, in order for this to happen, the historical memory had to be selective. Only on the left bank of Dnieper was there a clear continuity from Cossack times to the first half of 19th century. Although the autonomy had been abolished, the local nobility acknowledged the Cossack *starshchyna* elite as their direct ancestors. On the contrary, it was hard to find arguments, why the people in Austrian Galicia should have recognised the Cossack tradition as theirs⁵. In 17th century, the Cossack movement had touched the Lviv region rather briefly in a form of invasion from Dnieper region. The Cossacks struggled against Roman Catholicism and Uniatism (Greek-Catholicism), whereas the overwhelming majority of the would-be Ukrainians in Galicia belonged to Uniat confession. That the Galicians finally identified themselves as Ukrainians belonging to the same nation with the population of the Dnieper Ukraine shows that certainly it was neither history nor religion which marked the dividing line between nations in this region.

Finland historically lacks its own pre-modern statehood. In the end of 16th century, the country had been given the name "Grand Duchy of Finland", but in the 18th century this name had little significance. That is why the Russian annexation of Finland from Sweden in 1808 – 1809 was a rather important event. It created a situation, in which the political ties to the old dominant nation had to be severed, while the Russians were so different by their language, religion and historical tradition that the assimilation into them was not a relevant option. The interest in Finnish language appeared in the decades that followed the annexation. The promotion of Finnish language was facilitated by the fact that it was literary since 16th century. The Lutheran Church considered it desirable that everyone should be able to read the Holy Scripture in his or her own language, and hence many peasants were taught rudimentary literacy in Finnish. There was a well-established tradition of book printing in Finnish, although all the publications were very basic religious books or practical didactic ones.

In Ukraine the imperial Russian rule hindered the development of Ukrainian national consciousness. There is no doubt that the Ukrainian language and unique historical experience form a sufficient ground for the existence of the Ukrainian nation. However, it is also true that the cultural and linguistic distance between Ukrainians and Great Russians is not very long. For the majority of population, there is not any religious difference between the two nations. As one of the dominant nation, Russian national identity instead of the Ukrainian was a serious option to many inhabitants of Dnieper Ukraine. At least well into 19th century, it was possible to combine Ukrainian and Russian identities and consider Ukrainian distinct traits just a variant of a common all-Russian nationality.⁶ In the beginning of 19th century it was Russian (or less often Polish), which was the language of administration and high culture, whereas the modern literature in Ukrainian vernacular was only emerging. To be sure, the Ukrainian language had previously been one of high culture together with Old Slavonic, but this tradition had been interrupted. Hence the first generations of Ukrainophile intelligentsia of Dnieper region were bound to be bilingual in Ukrainian and Russian. Of the two traditionally dominant nations in Ukraine, only Poles were in a state of political weakness similar or, after 1831, worse than that of Swedes in Finland. The imperial government had no reason to support the Swedish language in Finland, but it chose to support the Russian language in Ukraine.

3. *The development of national movement in Finland*

The prehistory of Finnish nationalism began in the end of 18th century. A few nobles thought that sooner or later Russia would take Finland from Sweden. These events could be anticipated so that the Finnish nobility would itself try to separate the country from Sweden. This would facilitate a benevolent Russian imperial policy in relation to Finland. The country should be established either as a completely independent state or as a Russian protectorate with a large autonomy. These early Finnish separatists had some influence over situation during the Swedish-Russian war 1788 – 1790, when a group of officers stationed in Finland went on strike and refused to obey king's orders. However, soon the King Gustaw III regained full control of his army. The separatists were not nationalists in the sense that they were not at all interested in Finnish language and ethnic Finns.

The annexation of Finland by Russia in 1808 – 1809 forced the reluctant majority of the nobility to accept the separation from Sweden. After the occupation of southern Finland, the annexation proceeded in four steps: at first Alexander I proclaimed Finland his domain. The oath of allegiance was received from the population. Then the representatives of the four estates (nobility, clergy, bourgeoisie, peasantry) of the Grand Duchy of Finland were summoned to a meeting in Borgå (Porvoo), where the Emperor promised to maintain the privileges and constitutions of Swedish times. The promise was made in somewhat vague terms. Finally, Sweden recognised its loss of Finland in the peace treaty of Fredrikshamn. Finland emerged now as a separate administrative entity of Russian Empire under its own laws and Swedish as the administrative language. The country began to resemble a state in that those central institutions, which had been lacking in the Swedish time, were created.

The exact limits of Finnish autonomy were left indefinite. It was not stated which were the constitutions confirmed by Alexander I. In the following decades, Finns developed their own theories of the status of the country. According to it, the imperial act of 1809 was bilateral agreement binding both sides. This idea hardly reflected the historical reality, for Finland had been officially annexed into Russian Empire already before the Borgå meeting. Further, it was thought that the imperial promise should mean the Swedish constitutions of 1772 and 1789. According to these charters, king had wide powers, but he was not an autocrat. He could summon or not summon the representatives of estates as it him pleased. The estates had no right to propose new laws, and the executive power was not responsible to them. However, the king could not decree new laws without the estates' approval. The estates could reject law proposals made by the king. On the basis of this limitation of monarchic power, it is not surprising that Alexander I did not specifically mention the Swedish charters. Moreover, the imperial promise concerned only the inner administration of the country. The relation between all-Russian and Finnish laws was not clearly defined. It was evident that at least some all-Russian laws were in force also in Finland. For instance, the Emperor nominated as his representative in Finland a Governor-General. This office belonged to the Russian administrative system. Finns knew that in practice it was impossible that their estates would prevent the execution of imperial will. When Finns occasionally were dissatisfied with imperial policies, they preferred to try to influence the Emperor rather than to try to overrule the imperial will by the decision of estates. That is why before 1890s there never was an open conflict between the emperors and Finnish political bodies.⁷

After 1809, Alexander I no more summoned the estates. Neither did Nicholas I, although he officially confirmed the imperial promise of 1809 about maintaining the constitutions of Finland. However, under Alexander II a political change took place. As part of the general liberalisation policy and as a response to situation in Poland, the Emperor summoned the estates in Helsinki in 1863. In his speech to the deputies, he stated explicitly that the Swedish charters of 1772 and 1789 were in force. This was a great victory to Finnish politicians, but the exact relation between Finnish and all-Russian laws was again left indefinite. In the 1860s and 1870s, progressive reforms were introduced, which strengthened Finland's position as a state. The estates were granted the right to make law proposals and they began to meet regularly every five years. Finnish mark was introduced as currency and separate national army units were created. The network of elementary schools with Finnish and Swedish as the languages of instruction was established. In summer of 1863, the Emperor decreed that Finnish was to become the official language of the country together with Swedish after the transition period of twenty years.

It was the emergence of the Fennomans movement what made the language reform possible. The first signs of enthusiasm for Finnish language appeared in Academy circles in 1810s. The Society of Finnish Literature was founded in 1831. Being themselves mainly intellectuals of Swedish-language background, the Fennomans emphasised the importance of Finnish language and national culture. They wanted to spread enlightenment in Finnish among the common people and they demanded that the nobility and intelligentsia should switch from Swedish to Finnish. They raised their arguments especially against Swedes, not the imperial rule. As a result of their efforts, Finnish indeed soon emerged as a language of high culture. Especially important in this process was the national epos Kalevala (1835 and 1849) collected, compiled and partly written by Elias Lönnrot. Johan Ludvig Runeberg wrote in Swedish "Ensign Stool's Tales", a poem about the events in Finnish War 1808 – 1809. Zacharias Topelius created a national mythological view of Finnish past in his "Assistant Doctor's Tales", emphasising especially the role of Finns in Swedish conquests in 17th century. Aleksis Kivi's "Seven Brothers" depicting the peasant life was the first novel written in Finnish and of high literary standard. The first long-lasting Finnish regular newspaper, Suometar, began to appear in 1847. The first doctoral thesis in Finnish was approved at the university in 1858. By the end of 19th century, there existed rather well

developed Finnish press. Both artistic and scholarly works were published in the previous “peasant language”.

The industrial upsurge in Finland began in earnest in 1860s, just by the time the Finnish autonomy had received the imperial confirmation. The autonomous status of Finland affected industrialization so that it strengthened the Finnish language and Finnish national identity. People were not allowed to move freely from the Empire to Finland, so the Finnish peasants provided the working force for the new factories. There were indeed plenty of landless agricultural workers who moved to towns and made the population in them more Finnish-speaking than previously. Finnish ceased to be the language of only peasant and priest and became one of worker and entrepreneur as well. This facilitated the smooth transfer of information from towns to countryside. Especially the paper industry affected the countryside, because the industrial enterprises bought their raw material from landowning peasants. In this way the countryside was connected to money economy and domestic and international markets.

The achievements of the Finnish national movement were possible because they coincided with the short-term views of the imperial government. The latter took into account two considerations when defining its language policy in Finland: 1. The general conservative order of the society should not be threatened; 2. The country should be alienated from former Swedish motherland. In the end of the reign of Nicholas I, the government paid more attention to the first consideration. That is why an imperial decree of 1850 banned all publications in Finnish except religious and practical guidebooks. The decree was explicitly motivated by the fact that persons literate only in Finnish belonged to lower social classes and hence should not be allowed to read anything except the most necessary things. However, as the country in general and especially the Fennomans showed their loyalty during the Crimean War, this policy was reversed, and the emphasis shifted to the second consideration. The language decree passed into oblivion and was finally abolished in 1860. From the abolition of restrictions on Finnish language only three years passed before the imperial decree made it the second official language. The Swedish opposition to Finnish movement was not militant, since it would have meant siding with a weak neighbouring state against both the imperial policies and the Finnish national movement. Indeed, towards the end of the century many Swedes developed a Swedish-Finnish identity, considering themselves different from Swedes in Sweden.

The alliance of the imperial government and the Fennomans was temporary. The co-operation was possible between the multinational empire and Finnish national movement. It became gradually impossible towards the end of 19th century, as the imperial government took steps to make the Empire more nationally Russian. In part, the Russification policy was a response to national movements on the borderlands of the Empire; in part it resulted from the modernisation process of Russia itself. With industrialisation, the language of the masses began to matter.

Finland was the last of the borderlands affected by the Russification policy, which began in February 1899. Nicholas II and his aides used the loophole in the undefined relation between all-Russian and Finnish legislation. The Emperor decreed in a manifesto that the laws relevant for all the Empire should be prepared and promulgated through all-Russian administrative bodies. The Emperor himself had the right to decide which laws had such a relevance. Finnish government and citizens protested eagerly, claiming that the imperial manifesto was unconstitutional. Indeed, from purely legal point of view they were wrong. There never had been any legislative act, which would have granted to Finnish estates the right to decide about the relation between Finnish and all-Russian laws. Rather important legislative acts, like the language decree of 1863 had been introduced by imperial decree without consulting the estates. Another thing was that behind the imperial manifesto there was a consistent aim to abolish most of the Finnish autonomy. Imperial decrees followed which abolished Finnish army units, granted to the citizens of Russia equal rights with Finnish citizens and introduced Russian language into administration. This policy was indeed a unilateral repeal of the tacit mutual agreement established in 1860s between Finland and imperial Russia. It was unacceptable to most Finns of all political persuasions. Nevertheless, there were no attempts to suppress non-governmental Finnish-language cultural activities, and Finnish and Swedish remained the languages of instruction⁸.

In the turn of the century, Finnish national movement had gained considerable influence, but it had not yet mobilized the masses. This mobilisation proceeded in the first decade of the 20th century partly under the banner of opposition against Russification, partly under that of socialism. These two movements overlapped each other. Apart of the nationalists, also the Finnish Social Democratic Party opposed Russification. The Swedish Party was especially staunch in its opposition against imperial policy, while the moderate wing of Fennomans unsuccessfully tried to reach a compromise with the imperial government. In the context of revolution of 1905, the Social Democrats and Finnish-language political parties forced through a general strike Nicholas II to repeal the February manifesto and to decree the establishment of a parliament elected on the basis of universal and equal male and female suffrage. Although the Russification policy was reintroduced after few years, the imperial government never reached its goal of abolition of the Finnish autonomy. Although the top executive offices were manned with Russians, they had to rely on Finnish bureaucracy hostile to their main aims. It was too late for the imperial government to suppress the Finnish national movement, which had had the opportunity to spread national consciousness under four decades of undisturbed autonomous rule. To be sure, the Finns had grave antagonisms between themselves and the primacy of the national in relation to social question was not unanimously recognised.

Despite the lack of Finnish-speaking nobility and historical tradition of statehood prior to 19th century, Finland was able to reach independence, when the Russian Empire collapsed in 1917 – 1918. We must conclude that the

autonomous governmental status of Finland was of crucial importance for its national development. Certainly industrialisation and modernisation of the society would in any case have facilitated the emergence of national movement, as they did in Baltic countries. Nevertheless, the autonomy promoted and hastened this development especially by facilitating the growth of Finnish-language popular education and press. By accepting the Finnish-language culture as equal with Swedish-language culture, the imperial government made the option of Swedish national identity less relevant and less attractive. When the government finally attempted Russification, it was too late.

4. *The development of national movement in Ukraine*

In Ukraine, the struggle of the previous Cossack upper stratum for the imperial recognition of its nobility rights in the end of 18th century gave the first impulse to the interest in national history. Some works about Ukraine's own distinct past were published or circulated in manuscript form. Granting some of the Cossack elite the rights of hereditary noblemen solved the dispute. In the beginning of 19th century, most of the nobility were fully satisfied with their status and did not try to restore autonomy. The country did not receive any special status before the revolution. On the contrary, remnants of its previous autonomy, the Kiev city administration according to Magdeburg rights and the functioning of local, Lithuanian Law Code, were abolished in 1830s and 1840s.

The Ukrainian national cultural movement began in the very end of 18th century. Although part of Ivan Kotljarevskij's "Enejida", a travesty of Vergilius, was first published without the author's permission in 1798, it did not remain an isolated incident. Ukrainian literature was further developed in Harkiv romantics from 1810s to 1830s. The publication of Taras Shevchenko's "Kobzar" (Minstrel) in 1840 was an important landmark in the development of Ukrainian literature, for it showed that it was possible to create literary works of high quality and serious contents in Ukrainian. In many ways, the Ukrainian national movement proceeded in its initial stage more rapidly than its Finnish counterpart. For instance, the first Ukrainian-language plays were staged in 1819, about 50 years before Finnish ones.

The political implications of Ukrainian national awakening became evident in 1847, when the Society of St. Cyril and St. Methodius was denounced to imperial authorities. The society was inspired by Christianity interpreted in egalitarian and republican manner. It aimed at the establishment of a republican Pan-Slav federation, in which the Ukraine would be a state among equals and the capital of which was to be Kiev. In the Ukrainian state, the official language was to be Ukrainian. Although the activities of the society lasted only for about one year, they marked a great achievement of the Ukrainian national movement. Here the Ukrainian identity was unequivocally seen as exclusive one, which it was not possible to combine with Russian or any other national identity. The Ukrainian cause was seen as revolutionary one opposed to the interests of Russian Empire. Finns did not form this kind of subversive national societies before the beginning of 20th century. However, the society showed also how problematic for the Ukrainian nationalists was their relation to both great neighbours, Russia and Poland. Their main ideological document "Zakon Bozhija" (God's Law) was written under strong influence of Adam Mickiewicz's "Books of the Polish Nation and Polish Pilgrimage". The society did not propose complete independence. Indeed, the Ukrainian conspirators showed their affiliation with Great Russian high culture by proposing that Russian would become the language of Slavonic federation. This is not surprising, for the scope of literature in Ukrainian was as yet rather narrow. All Ukrainian writers in the Russian Empire at this time, even Shevchenko, wrote also in Russian. Federal proposals circulated among Ukrainian nationally active intellectuals also in 1860s and 1880s⁹.

If the close historical and linguistic ties to Russia had some effect on Ukrainian national activists, all the more they influenced the government policy and those educated people not affiliated with the national cause. In the beginning, the government actually supported Ukrainian cultural activities.¹⁰ They were deemed harmless or even beneficial for the government interests, since they provided arguments against Polish claims for the restoration of independence within pre-partition borders of 1771. However, this benevolent government attitude to Ukrainian activities was only possible so long as the relation between Russian and Ukrainian identities was seen as inclusive, with Ukrainians forming just one variant of Russian nation. As soon as it turned out that the Ukrainian movement could turn to exclusive identity, the government adopted negative attitude to it. Since 1847 except for brief interim periods the government policy towards Ukrainophiles was hostile. At the same time as Finns and Baltic Germans were treated with tolerance, there were severe repressions against Ukrainian activities. There were various reasons for this peculiar treatment of the Ukrainians:

1. The recognition of Ukrainians as a separate nationality would have endangered the claim of the Empire to be the sole inheritor of the tradition of Kievan Rus and affected the situation in Poland. Catherine II had grounded the partitions of Poland on national arguments, claiming that they restored the unity of Russian nation.¹¹ Later under Nicholas I Nikolaj Ustrjalov from the University of St. Petersburg further developed the same line of thought.¹² If there was no national unity between Ukraine and Russia, this argument against Poland was invalid. Occasionally in Russian conservative nationalist circles the idea was expressed that the Ukrainian movement was a Polish trick. I do not think that government officials very often sincerely believed it. The Ukrainophiles criticised Poles so often and so heavily that to any unprejudiced observer it was clear that they formed their own separate group with aims distinct from Polish ones.¹³ Rather the government circles were aware of the Ukrainian question being connected with the Polish question in a more general sense.

2. The relation between Ukrainian and Russian nations was indeed far from clear. Many educated inhabitants born

in Ukraine did not support the national movement even in cultural and linguistic sense, but rather identified themselves as Russians. Some of the most ardent enemies of Ukrainophile movement were natives of Ukraine. Since many would-be Ukrainians themselves denied the existence of the Ukrainian nationality, it was not surprising that the government did the same. Unlike in Finland, the political status of the country promoted identification with the traditional dominant nation, which controlled a mighty empire.

3. The Ukrainians formed a much greater share of the population of the Empire than did the Finns. Hence their special potential status would have affected the unity of the Russian Empire much more than Finnish autonomy did. In 1876 Alexander II wrote that the might of Russia was in its unity. That is why it was not possible to tolerate anything what might weaken this unity¹⁴. There were 22 millions of Ukrainians in 1897, and most of them had not yet exactly defined their nationality. They formed 17,8% of all the population of the Empire. If all these people would have been given elementary instruction in Ukrainian, the loss for the Russian nation would have been formidable¹⁵.

4. The government was aware of the revolutionary potential of Ukrainian national movement. Although the Ukrainophiles after 1840s publicly tried to emphasise that they abstained from political activism, they nevertheless considered the Cossack freedom and egalitarian social order the clearest expression of national character. These ideas were most rather evident in Shevchenko's poetry and historical and polemical writings of Mykola Kostomarov.¹⁶ In the beginning of 1860s, Kievan Ukrainophiles lead by Volodymyr Antonovych rather strongly attacked the Polish claims to Ukraine right of Dnieper and thus effectively sided with the Russian government. This policy was somewhat analogous with anti-Swedish actions of Fennomans, especially because Antonovych himself was of Polish background. However, the argument against Poles was as much social as it was national. Antonovych and his colleagues criticised Polish nobility for its oppression of peasants. These arguments could as well be used against Russian and Ukrainian nobility on the left bank of Dnieper. This was certainly understood by many readers, including government officials. Moreover, both the separation of Ukraine from Russia and the establishment of Pan-Slav republican federation were discussed in the Ukrainophile semi-clandestine "Hromada" groups in 1860s, and the government received evidence of these discussions¹⁷. A few individuals combined Ukrainian national and revolutionary activities¹⁸. Although they were not in the mainstream of the Ukrainian movement, they did not add to trust towards Ukrainophiles in government circles.

The brief periods of government tolerance were rather important for the Ukrainian movement. In late 1850s and early 1860s there were many publications in Ukrainian, including the bilingual journal "Osнова" (Foundation) in 1861–1862. The language was used in popular education based on voluntary teachers, and there were attempts to spread the use of Ukrainian even to government's elementary schools. The Ukrainian national intelligentsia was for the first time really trying to gain influence over the peasants. The government put an end to these tendencies in July 1863. The Minister of the Interior, Petr Valuev, sent a circular banning all publications in Ukrainian except pure literature. Valuev mentioned literature directed to common people as especially dangerous. It is remarkable that his circular was the exact opposite of ban on Finnish publications in 1850. Whereas in Finland only religious and simple educational literature had been allowed, in Ukraine it was most eagerly banned. On the contrary, Valuev's circular allowed Ukrainian artistic literature directed to intelligentsia, which in Finnish case had been forbidden. This discrepancy most likely followed from the fact that in Finland rather many peasants could read only Finnish. This could be accepted, because it was the traditional state of things. However, in the Ukraine there were as yet not many peasants who had been taught literacy in Ukrainian. That is why the government wanted to prevent the formation of such a category of peasants in the very beginning. It was most concerned to block all the influence of national intelligentsia over the peasants¹⁹.

In the first half of 1870s Ukrainian cultural work, though not educational activities, was again tolerated. This period ended in the most draconic anti-Ukrainian government measure, the imperial Ems decree of 1876. Now publications in Ukrainian were banned altogether. Allegations of separatist tendencies motivated Alexander II. Although the measure did not completely finish Ukrainophile attempts to express their loyalty towards the Empire, practically the loyalist option ceased to be viable. The censorship rules forced the Ukrainians of the Russian Empire to close co-operation with the Ukrainians of Austrian Galicia, where there were more freedom of expression. Although the Ukrainophiles in Russia had always considered Ukrainians in Austria their compatriots, the same was not necessarily case the other way round. Galician Uniat population was divided between three national options. There were adherents of all-Russian identity, a separate Galician one and the all-Ukrainian identity combining Ukrainians of the Russian and Austrian Empires into one nation. Some Ukrainians from Russia, most notably Mihaylo Drahomanov, did their best to promote the all-Ukrainian national identity. Publishing in Austria offered an outlet to expression of opinions completely outside the control of Russian government.

The industrial revolution in Ukraine took place from 1870s to 1890s at the time when Ukrainian activities were forbidden. The process had in Ukraine opposite effect from that in Finland, for it weakened the position of Ukrainian language and culture. Mainly the immigrants from Russia proper provided the working force in mines and factories. The movement from agricultural work in Ukrainian countryside to industrial work in cities remained relatively weak. This was hardly surprising, since the Ukrainian peasants traditionally most often paid their land rent in work obligations, whereas in Russia payment in cash or kind was more widespread. That is why Russian peasants could more easily move even after the abolition of serfdom. The majority of those Ukrainians who moved to cities rather soon assimilated

into Russians. After all, assimilation into Russian-language culture provided better opportunities both in government bureaucracy and in private sector of the economy. This was the opposite of the situation in Finland, where educated Finnish-speakers were valued especially at the time when they were not yet very numerous. In Ukraine, the similarity of the two languages made the switch to Russian relatively easy. The Ukrainian national identity came to be connected with countryside and somewhat old-fashioned peasant life. The towns and industrial enterprises were dominated by Russians, many of who were natives of Ukraine.²⁰ This was mainly, but not exclusively due to government repressions against Ukrainian national movement and other reasons mentioned above. An additional cause for that the Ukrainian movement did not reach to cities and all classes of society was that the emphasis on peasant culture was rather widespread among Ukrainophile intelligentsia.

The implementation of Ems decree was ceased after the revolution of 1905. After that the Ukrainian movement progressed rather quickly, despite that the government soon tried to return to previous repressive policies. In the revolutionary process 1917 – 1921, the Ukrainian nationalists proved that they were able to mobilize masses for their cause. Nevertheless, the Ukrainian cause failed not only because its formidable red and white enemies. The Ukrainians lost also because the national development remained incomplete. Many people from various social classes: noblemen, entrepreneurs, workers and intelligentsia opted for Russian identity even during the revolution.

5. Conclusions

Although many analogies of the national development under Russian Empire can be found between Finns and Ukrainians, there are also great differences. The national movement began in both countries as a result of deterioration of the traditional agricultural society, in which a person's place was based on his or her birth background. Both Finnish and Ukrainian movements were part of the general trend of the non-dominant nations of the Eastern Europe to assert themselves. Considering the social structure and historical tradition, the Ukrainians were in the beginning of 19th century in somewhat better position to develop national consciousness and national movement. Comparing to Ukrainians, the assets of Finns in this field were the existence of literary language, relatively widespread literacy and long cultural and linguistic distance from the ruling nation of the Empire. Swedes in Finland and Poles in Ukraine were in a somewhat similar situation as traditional ruling nations, which had lost their political power. Finns could choose Swedes as their main enemies and receive some support from the imperial government, since Finnish common people lived under Russian upper class only in rather few places. Some Ukrainophiles attempted the same kind of policy in relation to Poles on the Right Bank Ukraine, but without success, since their movement could as well be directed against Russian rule and conservative social order on the left bank of Dnieper. The problem was that what the Swedes were in Finland, both the Russians and Poles were in Ukraine. The national development began in both countries at about the same time and proceeded at first roughly on equal speed. However, the Finns managed to complete their national development in the first decades of 20th century, whereas Ukrainians faced the collapse of the Russian Empire in the situation of incomplete national mobilization. The main reason for this difference was that Finns managed to exploit state power for promotion of their culture, whereas Ukrainians faced repressions even against their language as such. However, the Russian imperial policy was not the only cause of the discrepancy between the two nations. Other reasons were lesser spread of literacy in Ukraine, cultural and linguistic proximity between Ukrainians and Russians and the differences in how the industrialisation affected Finns and Ukrainians.

¹In my description of transition from traditional to modern society, I follow Gellner Ernest: *Nations and Nationalism*. London 1983.

²One of the formidable critics of Gellner's and modernisation theories of nationalism is Anthony D. Smith in his *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford 1987. Whereas Gellner sees the dividing lines between modern nationalities as something rather accidental, Smith points out that the modern nationalities often have long historical roots.

³Hroch Miroslav: *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe. A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*. Cambridge 1985. P. 25 – 28.

⁴Magocsi Paul Robert: *A History of Ukraine*. Seattle 1996. P. 354 – 355, 360 – 363.

⁵For this idea I am indebted to Roman Szporluk.

⁶Some Ukrainophiles themselves either sincerely or insincerely expressed this idea. See, for instance, Savchenko Fedir: *Zaborona ukrajinstva 1876r. Do istoriji hromads'kyh ruhiv na Ukrajinu 1860 – 1870-h r.r.* Harkiv – Kyiv 1930. P. 25 – 35 concerning Pavlo Chubyns'kyj.

⁷I follow Osmo Jussila's interpretation of Finland's governmental status. See his *Maakunnasta valtioksi. Suomen valtion synty*. Porvoo 1987.

⁸Polvinen Tuomo: *Imperial Borderland. Bobrikov and the Attempted Russification of Finland, 1898 – 1904*. London 1995.

⁹Kirilo-Mefodijivs'ke tovaristvo. 1 – 3. Kyjiv 1990. Part 1: 150 – 169, 250 – 258 contain the society's charter and God's Law, the title of which could be translated also as "Catechism". For federal proposals, see Fedchenko P. M.: *Myhajlo Drahomanov*. Kyiv 1992. P. 50 – 51, 56, 73, 122–123. Kostomarov Nikolaj: *Ukrajna. Kolokol No 61, 15th January 1860*. P. 502–503.

¹⁰Magocsi 1996: 358 – 360.

¹¹Shil'der N. K.: *Imperator Nikolaj I i Pol'sa v 1825 – 1831*. *Russkaja Starina* 2/1900, p. 291 – 292.

¹²Ustrjalov: *Izsledovanie voprosa, kakoe mesto v russkoj istorii dolzhno zanimat' Velikoe Knjazhestvo Litovskoe?* S.Peterburg 1839.

¹³The most famous of these early Ukrainian anti-Polish texts is, of course, Antonovich Vladimir: *Moja ispoved'*. *Osnova* 1/1862.

¹⁴Savchenko 1930:113.

¹⁵Saunders David: *Russia's Ukrainian Policy (1847–1905): A Demographic Approach*. *European History Quarterly*, vol. 25 (1995), p. 188–189.

¹⁶Kostomarov 1860: 499–504. Kostomarov: *Dve russkie narodnosti*. *Osnova* 3/1861.

¹⁷Gnip Myhajlo: *Hromads'kyj ruh 1860 r.r. na Ukrajinі. Poltavs'ka hromada*. Kyiv 1930. P. 36–37. Gnip: *Do istoriji hromads'koho ruhu 1860rr. (Zapiska A. A. Shimanova)*. *Za sto lit No 5*, 1930. For "Hromada" groups in general, see Katrenko A. M: *Ukrajins'kyj natsional'nyj ruh XIX st. Chastina II. 60 – 90-ti roki XIX st.* Kyiv 1999.

¹⁸Notably Stepan Nos and Andrij Krasovskij. See *Materialy dlja istorii revoljutsionnago dvizhenija v Rossii v 60-h gg. Vtoroe prilozhenie k sbornikam "Gosudarstvennye prestuplenija v Rossii"*. Paris 1905. P. 117–120, 166–172. *Obschestvenno-politicheskoe dvizhenie na Ukraine v 1856 – 1862 gg.* Kyiv 1963. P. 259, 265–271, 277–284.

¹⁹Saunders David: *Russia and Ukraine under Alexander II: The Valuev Edict of 1863*. *The International History Review*, XVII, 1, February 1995. P. 27–50. Savchenko 1930: 191–204. Savchenko emphasises the fear of authorities that the Ukrainophiles would not remain within limits of cultural work.

²⁰Kappeler Andreas: *The Ukrainians of the Russian Empire, 1860 – 1914*. In: *the Formation of National Elites. Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic groups in Europe, 1850 – 1940*. Vol. VI. Dartmouth 1992. P. 105 – 122.