

Alla Kyrydon, Serhiy Troyan

THE UKRAINIAN- POLISH BORDERLAND AS A HETEROGENEOUS SOCIODYNAMIC SPACE. THEORETICAL DISCOURSE

Abstract

The article explains the concept of the borderland, national and ethno-cultural identity, the 'Ours – The Stranger – The Other' relations in the context of the borderland, ethnic and sociodynamic situation in the Ukrainian part of the Ukrainian-Polish borderland (Kresy). The borderland is treated as an area near the border dividing certain spaces. In the conditions of the formation of the modern Ukrainian-Polish border, political, economic and sociodynamic factors, as also historical, cultural, ethnic, identity factors have a significant impact on the character of the borderland. The intersection, within one social space, of different social contexts, the transformation of the functional load of the concept of frontier necessitate the need to relate the analysis of the relevant phenomenon to the socio-cultural approach.

Keywords:

borderland, space, identity, ethnicity, culture, Ukraine, Poland.

Introduction

Territorial and political transformations in Europe in the late 1980s and early 1990s contributed to drastic spatial changes. They

caused fundamental changes in the geopolitical environment of Ukraine, which in turn led to the formation of a new border of the Ukrainian state. Ukraine's first-order neighbours are two groups of states – the first from the Euro Atlantic and European integration space (the Republic of Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Hungary), while the second is formed by the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (Belarus, Moldova, Russian Federation). Therefore, in the first case, between 1999 and 2007, a new border of Ukraine with the European Union (EU) member states of the Schengen area was created and is functioning today.

The border between Ukraine and the EU has some features of socio-cultural importance, which Pierre Bourdieu introduced into the properties of the structure of social space. First of all, it is about “feeling the border” as “feeling the situation”, “feeling the distance”, “feeling what can and cannot be allowed”.¹ They define both the essential side of the borderland and the specificity of its functioning, which was pointed out in their research by foreign and Ukrainian scientists.²

1. Бурдьє П. [Bourdieu P.], *Соціологія соціального пространства* [Sociology of social space], пер. с фр., общ. ред. Н.А. Шматко (СПб.–Москва: Ин-т експерим.соціології–Алетейя, 2005), 22.

2. Верменич Я. [Vermenych Y.], *Пограниччя як соціокультурний феномен: просторовий вимір* [Borders as a Sociocultural Phenomenon: Spatial Dimension], *Регіональна історія України*, Вип. 6, (2012): 67–90; *Форум «Поверх кордону»: концепція прикордоння як об'єкт дослідження* [Forum “Above the Border”: the Concept of Borderlands as an Object of Research], *Україна модерна, Пограниччя. Окраїни, Периферії*, no. 18 (2011): 47–77; Чорновол І. [Chornovol I.], *Компаративні фронтири: світовий і вітчизняний вимір* [Comparative Frontiers: World and Domestic Dimension] (Київ: Критика, 2015); Anderson M., *Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern World* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1996); Babiński G., *Pogranicze polsko-ukraińskie. Etniczność, różnicowanie religijne, tożsamość* [The Polish-Ukrainian Borderland. Ethnicity, religious diversity, identity] (Kraków: Nomos, 1997); Babiński G., *“Tożsamości na pograniczach”* [Identities in the borderlands], [in:] *Tożsamość bez granic. Współczesne wyzwania* [Identity without Borders. Contemporary Challenges], ed. E. Budakowska (Warszawa: WUW, 2005), 99–117; Granowetter M., “The Strength of Weak Ties”, *American Journal of Sociology*, no. 6, vol.

78 (1973): 1360–1380; Kurczewska J., “Granica niejedno ma imię. Trzy podejścia teoretyczne” [The Border has Many Names. Three Theoretical Approaches], [in:] *Granice na pograniczach* [Borders on the borderlands], ed. J. Kurczewska, H. Bojar (Warszawa: Wyd. IFiS PAN, 2005), 365–396; Kyrydon A., Troyan S., “Granice i pogranicza współczesnej Europy. Dynamiczne pole oddziaływania w wymiarze tożsamości i pamięci historycznej” [Borders and Borderlands of Contemporary Europe. Dynamic Field of Influence in the Dimension of Identity and Historical Memory], [in:] *Na Pograniczach. Pamięć – historia – kultura* [In Borderlands. Memory – history – culture], ed. A. Chudzik, D. Wojakowski (Sanok: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa im. Jana Grodka w Sanoku, 2014), 11–30; Kyrydon A., Troyan S. “*Swój–Inny–Obcy w kontekście dialogu kultur*” [“Ours–The Stranger–The Other” in the Context of the Dialogue of Cultures], [in:] *Na Pograniczach Kultur i Narodów* [On the Borderlands of Cultures and Nations], vol. VII, ed. P. Frączek, J. K. Karolczuk (Sanok: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa im. Jana Grodka w Sanoku, 2017), 13–28; Nechayeva-Yuriychuk N., “Problems of Cross-Border Cooperation Development along the EU External Borders”, *Eurotimes*, no. 27–28 (2019): 279–294; Sadowski A., “Pogranicze jako przedmiot badań socjologicznych w warunkach integracji europejskiej” [Borderland as a Subject of Sociological Research in the Conditions of European Integration], [in:] *Pogranicza i multikulturalizm w warunkach Unii Europejskiej* [Borderlands and Multiculturalism in the Conditions of the European Union], ed. K. Krzysztofek, A. Sadowski (Białystok: Wyd. UwB, 2004), 15–27; Sadowski A., “Pogranicze – pograniczność – tożsamość pograniczna” [Borderland – Bordering – Borderland Identity], [in:] *Pogranicze. Studia Społeczne. Tom XIV. Numer specjalny. Polskie granice i pogranicza: nowe problemy i interpretacje* [Borderland. Social Studies. Vol. XIV. Special Issue. Polish Borders and Borderlands: New Problems and Interpretations], ed. H. Bojar, D. Wojakowski, A. Sadowski (Białystok: UB, 2008), 17–31; T. M. Korczyński, ed., *Swój – Obcy – Wróg. Wędrowki w labiryntach kultur* [Ours – The Stranger – The Enemy. Wandering in the labyrinths of cultures] (Warszawa: WN Katedra, 2015); Troyan S., “Koncepcje teoretyczne pogranicza na Ukrainie” [Theoretical Concepts of the Borderland in Ukraine], [in:] *Pogranicze. Studia Społeczne. Tom XIV. Numer specjalny. Polskie granice i pogranicza: nowe problemy i interpretacje* [Borderlands. Social Studies. Volume XIV. Special Issue. Polish Borders and Borderlands: New Problems and Interpretations], ed. H. Bojar, D. Wojakowski, A. Sadowski (Białystok: UB, 2008), 50–57; Wojakowski D., “Kłopoty z pograniczem. Socjologia wobec tradycji i ponowoczesności” [The Trouble with Borderlands. Sociology Towards Tradition and Postmodernity], *Zeszyty naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria: Organizacja i zarządzanie* [Scientific Journals of the Silesian University of Technology. Series: Organization and Management], no. 65 (2013): 419–431.

The proposed article chooses to focus on the following essential questions:

- a) the concept of borderland;
- b) the concept of national and ethno-cultural identity;
- c) 'ours – the stranger – the other' relations in the context of borderland;
- d) theoretical borderland discourse: ethnic and sociodynamic situation.

The concept of borderland

Mankind is now faced with a paradox described by the German sociologist Ulrich Beck: "With the development of globalization, the importance of borders increases, and the control of borders also increases, although of course they no longer perform the same functions they once did. Today's borders are more like Swiss cheese: they have systemically inserted 'holes' in them in the form of various exceptions to the rules. Their purpose is to provide the movement of information, capital, people and services from one place to another with the click of a computer mouse"³ He continues, "in the 21st century, there is no longer a closed space that can be called the 'Christian West'. (...) Europe is an open network with moving borders, where everything that is outside already exists inside"⁴

The basic structural element of the border is a state of unstable equilibrium. Within the framework of border theory, a number of border issues are considered, also important and relevant to the Ukrainian-Polish border region. The Polish language dictionary defines a borderland as "an area near the border dividing certain spaces" or "a period, state, or area where two cultures, epochs, etc.

3. Бек У. [Beck U.], "Трансформация политики и государства в эпоху глобализации" [Transformation of politics and state in the era of globalization], *Свободная мысль*, XXI, no. 7 (2004): 3.

4. Бек У. [Beck U.], *Космополитическое мировоззрение* [Cosmopolitan Vision] (Москва: Центр исследований постиндустриального общества, 2008), 246.

border each other”⁵. In the conditions of formation, normalization and functioning of modern European borders, including the Ukrainian-Polish border, the character of the borderland is significantly influenced by political, economic and sociodynamic factors, but also by historical, cultural, ethnic, and identity factors. Polish sociologist Andrzej Sadowski describes the borderland as ‘the area, the social space and the political, economic, socio-cultural structures, intercultural contacts occurring there, together forming a laboratory for research, testing many fundamental questions in sociology, both of a general theoretical, scientific-research, and practical nature. They concern especially: nation and ethnic (cultural) groups, cultural contact, ethnic relations, intercultural relations, culturally diverse, pluralistic, multicultural society, and the influence of these variables on political, economic relations, and on the formation of identity structures of the inhabitants’⁶.

Grzegorz Babiński, another Polish sociologist, has a similar perspective, noting that the theoretical consensus around borderlands is quite traditional. This can be interpreted as a sign that the discipline has reached a certain theoretical stability, or as a tendency to theoretical closure.⁷

According to Andrzej Sadowski, “borderland refers to areas concentrated most often at the administrative-political borders or just within the borders of individual countries”. In turn, the social

5. Szymczak M., ed., *Słownik Języka Polskiego* [Polish Language Dictionary], vol. II (Warszawa: PWN, 1979), 1087.

6. Sadowski A., “Pogranicze – pograniczność – tożsamość pograniczna” [Borderland – bordering – borderland identity], [in:] *Pogranicze. Studia Społeczne. Tom XIV. Numer specjalny. Polskie granice i pogranicza: nowe problemy i interpretacje* [Borderlands. Social Studies. Volume XIV. Special issue. Polish Borders and Borderlands: New Problems and Interpretations], ed. H. Bojar, D. Wójcikowski, A. Sadowski (Białystok: UB, 2008), 28–29.

7. Babiński G., “Tożsamości na pograniczach” [Identities in the Borderlands], [in:] *Tożsamość bez granic. Współczesne wyzwania* [Identity without Borders. Contemporary Challenges], ed. E. Budakowska (Warszawa: WUW, 2005), 99–117.

(socio-cultural) borderland is “the totality of representatives of two or more ethnocultural communities remaining in permanent contact with each other, realized in the context of their special relationship with the territory (inhabited or imagined territory), whose actions aim at its maintenance (or appropriation), as well as the results of these actions”⁸

Although the formation of “Europe without borders”, as mentioned by Polish sociologist Dariusz Wojakowski,⁹ has significantly changed the perception of borders, they still function as factors marking both national borders and differences in mentality and national identities of the multiethnic European environment. In the context of the formation and functioning of contemporary European borders, there is the issue of identity, an individual and collective mental choice that is directly influenced by historical memory. Identity, according to German researcher Iver B. Neumann, “is a relationship that is constantly forming and changing within the limits of a particular discourse”¹⁰

The concept of national and ethno-cultural identity

National identity signifies identification of people with the corresponding national (ethnic) community, the realization of one’s own sense of belonging to a particular nationality and to a particular state. National identity means ethnic and civic-political identification. British sociologist and one of the founders of the study

8. Sadowski A., “Pogranicze – pograniczność – tożsamość pograniczna” [Borderland – Bordering – Borderland Identity], [in:] *Pogranicze. Studia Społeczne. Tom XIV. Numer specjalny. Polskie granice i pogranicza: nowe problemy i interpretacje* [Borderlands. Social Studies. Volume XIV. Special issue. Polish Borders and Borderlands: New Problems and Interpretations], ed. H. Bojar, D. Wojakowski, A. Sadowski (Białystok: UB, 2008), 24.

9. Вояковський Д. [Wojakowski D.], *Ментальні кордони в Європі без кордонів: монографія* [Mental boundaries in a Europe without borders: Monograph] (Київ: Ніка-Центр, 2015).

10. Neumann I., “Russia and Central Europe’s Constituting Other”, *East European Politics and Societies*, vol. 7, no. 2 (1993): 349.

of nationalism Anthony Smith distinguished five main elements of national identity: 1) historical territory; 2) common myths and shared memory; 3) common culture; 4) uniform rules and duties; 5) common economy.¹¹

According to the observations of Montserrat Guibernau, a political science professor at the University of London and a researcher at the Center for Global Surveillance, “national identity has acquired a new dimension, making it more open, able to attract foreign components without radically changing its core. In other words, national identity tolerates a higher level of hybridization and border blurriness than it used to”.¹² This trend is realized through the phenomenon of the elimination of borders between nation states, the increase in the level of mobility of people, and the increase in the number and importance of national minorities in various countries.

Ethnic identity refers to a certain group of people with certain social and cultural characteristics: common origin and history, living in a certain territory, having their own culture, tradition, language and religion. Ethnic groups also have their own name, which distinguishes them from wider communities, e.g. Basques as opposed to Spaniards or Silesians as opposed to Poles. Ethnic identity in such groups is usually very strong, its members not only want to maintain their traditions, but also want to be different from other communities – which is a very important feature of ethnic identity.

National identity may be something broader than ethnic identity – it implies a sense of belonging to a broad group of people, which may, after all, consist of many ethnic groups. Both national and ethnic identities are formed in contrast to other nations or ethnic groups. They highlight what is common, drawing attention especially to history, language, territory, etc.

11. Сміт Е. [Smith A.], *Національна ідентичність* [National identity] (Київ: Основи, 1994).

12. Гібернау М. [Guibernau M.], *Ідентичність націй* [The Identity of Nations] (Київ: Темпора, 2012), 247.

Andrzej Sadowski explains three types of collective identities: fundamentalist identities, borderland identities, and inter-border identities, adding that “the typical identity in borderlands is the borderland identity. Its characteristic feature is a sense of uprootedness, surrender, suspension between borderland groups and an outsider identity”.¹³ It is characterized by attitudes of escape from the problems of the borderland, often in the form of various forms of rationalization (escape into education, professional development). It is not a coincidence that borderlands are probably more often inhabited by individuals who are outstanding in some respect, but are lost in some other.

Ethnic identities in borderlands are characterized by: ethnic culture, the formation of their own cultural society and their way of social and cultural communication. This, however, provides for the actuality of dialogue between different cultures. Now researchers look at the borderland primarily as a zone of interaction between different cultures. According to Anna Kholodny, it is “a limited space of changing values within which different cultures first encounter ‘Otherness’ and try to adapt to it”.¹⁴ These categories come to the fore in analysing the often complex and controversial processes of cultural interaction, heredity, and cross cultural communication.

Ours–The Stranger–The Other in the context of borderlands

The cognitive element of identity is often defined by the binary logic of ‘us–them’ or in the triangle ‘ours – the other – the strang-

13. Sadowski A., “Pogranicze – pograniczność – tożsamość pograniczna” [Borderland – Bordering – Borderland Identity], [in:] *Pogranicze. Studia Społeczne. Tom XIV. Numer specjalny. Polskie granice i pogranicza: nowe problemy i interpretacje* [Borderlands. Social Studies. Volume XIV. Special Issue. Polish Borders and Borderlands: New Problems and Interpretations], ed. H. Bojar, D. Wójcikowski, A. Sadowski (Białystok: UB, 2008), 27.

14. Klein K. L., ed., *Frontiers of Historical Imagination. Narrating the European Conquest of Native America, 1890–1990* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press, 1997), 210.

er' and is based on the opposition of one's own community to the 'others'/'strangers', including cultural differences in the way certain historical events are recorded in the collective memory. Therefore, the issue of forming one's own positive identity should become a factor that helps to understand oneself and 'others', to build relationships on the level of 'ours – stranger', 'us – them', and to move away from the dangerous negative dichotomy existing at this level.

The process of cultural interaction makes it possible to clearly identify the factors affecting cultural diffusion. Therefore, it is the level of intensity of contact and are the conditions of contact. They can take place naturally, or coercively. The German philosopher Bernhard Wandelfels emphasizes that "if something is 'strange', it will always manifest itself in one way or another and provoke certain reactions".¹⁵ Thus, any forced imposition of culture inevitably results in the rejection and overemphasis of one's identity, historical memory, or language. Under such circumstances, ethnic culture has the capacity to respond to the discomfort caused by the emergence of new elements through internal transformation.

Ethnic culture, with the help of norms, values and ideals, shapes its cultural society, its way of social and cultural communication, and its moral and ethical principles of social life, including its own way of thinking, value system, based on the worldview characteristic of that nation. However, this does not mean that dialogue between different cultures is impossible, which, due to the processes of social acculturation occurring in it, promotes their development.

Dialogue (understood as cultural interaction) gradually shapes common basic values and in this respect has a multilevel human character. A dialogue of cultures based on tolerance and mutual understanding makes it possible to preserve the national characteristics of each culture.

15. Вальденфельс Б. [Waldenfels B.], *Топографія Чужого: студії до феноменології Чужого* [German: *Topographie des Fremden – Studien zur Phänomenologie des Fremden*] (Київ: ІІІС-2002, 2004), 6.

It seems interesting that the dialogue of cultures is based simultaneously on two imperatives: 'strange' and 'own'. The history of culture is a history of contacts, diffusion, mutual inspirations, thanks to which the conviction was built that we exist as 'we', never as a lonely island, but surrounded by others.¹⁶ Hence the tendency – equally individual and collective – to categorize these others and place them in a broad spectrum of variants: 'own' – 'friend' – 'enemy' – 'other' – 'monster', etc.

The world of the past is considered through the prism of an external system of norms and regularities which are an attempt to understand historical being, and which introduce the inner world of historical figures from specific epochs who become participants in a dialogue with modernity. G. Knabe emphasized that "the living nature of culture and social being are rather manifested in the unique interaction between 'personality' and 'individual', which corresponds to each specific historical and cultural situation".¹⁷ Generally speaking, experiencing the state of the 'Other' can cause someone to display ethical virtues such as compassion, empathy and mutual understanding.

The phenomena of 'Ours', 'The Stranger', 'The Other' – despite all their contradictions – are quite fluid and mobile in culture. They are capable of transformation, marking valuable meanings of the socio-cultural space. The 'Ours–Stranger' opposition is most clearly revealed in the cultural codes that regulate behavioral activity, shaping stereotypes of thinking. As Julia Kristeva points out, the understanding of the Self begins not with the awareness of the Self, but with the confrontation with the Stranger. To the question "Who

16. Korczyński T. M., ed., *Swój – Obcy – Wróg. Wędrowki w labiryntach kultur* [Ours – The Stranger – The Enemy. Wandering in the Labyrinths of Cultures] (Warszawa: WN Katedra, 2015), 342.

17. Кнабе Г. [Knabe H.], "Изменчивое соотношение двух постоянных характеристик человека" [The variable ratio of two constant human characteristics], [in:] *Одиссей. Человек в истории. Личность и общество*, ed. М. Гуревич (Москва: Наука, 1990), 11.

is the Stranger?”, J. Kristeva answers as follows: “One who is not part of the group, one who is not ‘it’, another. (...) The Stranger is mostly defined according to two legal regimes: *jus solis* and *jus sanguinis*, the *law of the land* and the *law of the blood*”¹⁸ – argues the author.

The differentiation ‘Ours–The Stranger–The Other’ is the characterization of oneself with the original forms of one’s own culture, which forms the basis for the self-identification of society, including in border areas.

Sociocultural discourse of the borderland: the situation of ethnic and social dynamic

The problem of studying the phenomenon of the frontier requires the study of the context of social space. This means that the study area is considered, firstly, as the border of cultures, ethnic groups, states, communities, traditions, norms and values, and secondly, as a field in which the superposition of social structures (spaces, dimensions) on the geographical (physical) space of society.

Thus, the border is a specific socio-cultural and ethno-social space on the border of cultures, ethnic groups, certain political entities.

By the degree of cultural distance between neighbouring socio-cultural communities, there are two types of borderlands: 1) cultural-variable, where close cultures coexist; 2) culturally opposed, where communities belonging to different civilizations border. According to the degree of dominance of one of the interacting cultures, the border can be divided into symmetrical-cultural and asymmetrical-cultural. In accordance with this division and on the basis of theoretical and applied analysis, the Ukrainian-Polish border belongs to the cultural variable and symmetrical-cultural vari-

18. Kyrydon A., Troyan S., “*Swój – Inny – Obcy w kontekście dialogu kultur*” [‘Ours – The Stranger – The Other’ in the Context of Cultural Dialogue], [in:] *Na Pograniczach Kultur i Narodów*, vol. VII, ed. P. Frączek, J. K. Karolczuk (Sanok: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa im. Jana Grodka w Sanoku, 2017), 19.

eties¹⁹ (clarification of this provision, study of its features on both sides of the border is possible and appropriate, based on sociological research).

Consideration of the border as a space of interaction of different cultures, histories, religions, etc. requires the study of society, which fills this space. Ethnonational culture is of great importance in the formation of cultural space in geographical coordinates. Space does not exist in itself, it is created by subjects who enter into certain relationships. Entering the social space means entering the sphere of one's own boundaries, as well as admitting oneself together with one's own existence and functioning of other subjects and institutions. This situation at the border indicates the normative bases of the ethnic and socio-dynamic nature of the border, which is directly related to its Ukrainian-Polish segment.

Thus the border as a socio-cultural phenomenon is based on the following features: 1) the border is territorially bound; 2) it acts as a specific region; 3) it has its own dynamics of development. These features allow us to consider the boundaries of the three approaches. The first is based on the socio-cultural dimension, where the border is a contact zone between two or more ethnocultural communities localized in space. The second is based on the spatial geographical dimension, which means by the border only the territory that is near the border and far from the center. The third is based on the personal and cultural dimension and focusing on the border as a place of formation of a certain type of person in a border society.

Based on the above, in a spatial sense, the Ukrainian-Polish borderland is a historically formed region located far from the

19. *Всеукраїнський перепис населення 2001* [All-Ukrainian population census 2001], accessed December 5, 2020, <http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/results/>; Мручковський П. [Mruchkowski P.], “Етнічна структура населення української частини українсько-польського прикордоння (територіальні відмінності)” [Ethnic structure of the population of the Ukrainian part of the Ukrainian-Polish border (territorial differences)], [in:] *Вісник ОНУ. Сер. Географічні та геологічні науки*, vol. 20, вип. 2 (2015): 109–120.

center near the state borders of Ukraine and Poland. In the socio-cultural context, this borderland is distinguished by socio-cultural contacts between representatives of ethnic groups living in this region.

An important feature of the population of border ethno-contact areas is its ethnic structure and the degree of ethnic differentiation. The ethnic structure of the population of Ukrainian border areas depends on the peculiarities of the state border, which does not always coincide with ethnic boundaries.

Another feature of the Ukrainian-Polish borderland is that the titular nations are linguistically and culturally close peoples, which affects the course of ethnic processes, the formation of borders, and the development of transitional sub-ethnic groups in the borderland.

The nature of the Ukrainian-Polish borderland, where we are dealing with a Ukrainian majority and dispersed ethnic communities, means that factors of locality and sociodynamics are of particular importance to the nature of ethnic relations. Also, the sociodynamic, socio economic, and state-political factors of the integration processes of Poland and Ukraine are, I think, important for the functioning of these communities, including the ethnic self identification of their members.

In terms of theoretical socio-cultural approach the Ukrainian-Polish borderland (on the Ukrainian side) as a territory of residence of various nations and national (ethnic) minorities, especially Ukrainian and Polish, is characterized by strongly expressed multiculturalism and a tendency toward identity diversity, and this requires great attention to take into account the interests of the Ukrainians and other national minorities in the borderland, especially Poles, in order to create favourable conditions for all of them to live and work, and to take into account their specific national, identity-ethnic and identity-cultural needs.

Summary

We conclude that in the situation of explaining the content of the borderland, including the contemporary Ukrainian-Polish borderland, we aim at combining the classical and postmodern approaches, which are treating the borderland from the perspective of consciousness, cultural imagination, and interaction. This methodological approach allows a comprehensive review and analysis of borders and cross-border interactions in modern conditions of increasing mobility of societies and their components. From this point of view, according to D. Wojakowski, reducing the borderland to a specific kind of experience (the incompatibility of cultural content) and to the awareness of such an experience allows for a multidimensional treatment of the concept. In the strongest version, borderland will be defined by the situation when individuals perceive the cultural ambiguity of 'our' territory, that is, they have borderland awareness. In another dimension, borderland will be any situation where individuals ascribe different cultural images to the same territory. This dimension brings the interpretation of borderland closer to postmodern ideas.²⁰

These features of the border play an important role in the interaction of states with the common border that is neighbours of the first order, which include Ukraine and the Republic of Poland. It should be noted that here the border is not only a factor of distance, but also a means of communication between these countries and peoples. Such a border is a specific socio-cultural and ethno-social space, located on the border of cultures, ethnic groups, political entities. This allows us to interpret it not only in territorial but also cultural, ethno national, socio-dynamic framework. The intersection within one social space of different social contexts, the trans-

20. Wojakowski D., "Kłopoty z pograniczem. Socjologia wobec tradycji i ponowoczesności" [The Trouble with Borderlands. Sociology Towards Tradition and Postmodernity], *Zeszyty naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria: Organizacja i zarządzanie*, vol. 65 (2013): 428.

formation of the functional load of the concept of frontier necessitate the need to turn in the analysis of the relevant phenomenon to the socio-cultural approach.

In the future, it is important to compare the sociodynamic ethno-national situation of the Ukrainian-Polish borderland with other parts of the Ukrainian border, as well as with the situation on the other (Polish) side of the Ukrainian-Polish border.

Translated by Michelle Atallah

Bibliography

1. Anderson, M. *Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern World*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1996.

2. Babiński, G. *Pogranicze polsko-ukraińskie. Etniczność, zróżnicowanie religijne, tożsamość* [The Polish-Ukrainian Borderland. Ethnicity, religious diversity, identity]. Kraków: Nomos, 1997.

3. Babiński, G. "Tożsamości na pograniczach" [Identities in the Borderlands]. [In:] *Tożsamość bez granic. Współczesne wyzwania* [Identity without Borders. Contemporary Challenges], edited by E. Budakowska, 99–117. Warszawa: WUW, 2005.

4. Klein, K. L., ed. *Frontiers of Historical Imagination. Narrating the European Conquest of Native America, 1890–1990*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London: University of California Press, 1997.

5. Granowetter, M. "The Strength of Weak Ties". *American Journal of Sociology*, no. 6, vol. 78 (1973): 1360–1380.

6. Kurczewska, J. "Granica niejedno ma imię. Trzy podejścia teoretyczne" [The Border has Many Names. Three Theoretical Approaches]. [In:] *Granice na pograniczach* [Borders on the Borderlands], edited by J. Kurczewska, H. Bojar, 365–396. Warszawa: IFiS PAN, 2005.

7. Kyrydon, A., Troyan, S. "Granice i pogranicza współczesnej Europy. Dynamiczne pole oddziaływania w wymiarze tożsamości

i pamięci historycznej” [Borders and the Borderlands of Contemporary Europe. Dynamic Field of Influence in the Dimension of Identity and Historical Memory]. [In:] *Na Pograniczach. Pamięć – historia – kultura* [In Borderlands. Memory – History – Culture], edited by A. Chudzik, D. Wojakowski, 11–30. Sanok: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa im. Jana Grodka w Sanoku, 2014.

8. Kyrydon, A., Troyan, S. “*Swój–Inny–Obcy w kontekście dialogu kultur*” [“Ours – The Stranger – The Other” in the Context of Cultural Dialogue]. [In:] *Na Pograniczach Kultur i Narodów*, vol. VII, edited by P. Frączek, J. K. Karolczuk, 13–28. Sanok: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa im. Jana Grodka w Sanoku, 2017.

9. Nechayeva-Yuriychuk, N. “Problems of Cross-Border Cooperation Development along the EU External Borders”. *Eurolimes*, no. 27–28 (2019): 279–294.

10. Neumann, I. “Russia and Central Europe’s Constituting Other”. *East European Politics and Societies*, vol. 7, no. 2 (1993): 349–369.

11. Sadowski, A. “Pogranicze jako przedmiot badań socjologicznych w warunkach integracji europejskiej” [Borderland as a Subject of Sociological Research in the Conditions of European Integration]. [In:] *Pogranicza i multikulturalizm w warunkach Unii Europejskiej* [Borderlands and Multiculturalism in the Conditions of the European Union], edited by K. Krzysztofek, A. Sadowski, 15–27. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2004.

12. Sadowski, A. “Pogranicze – pograniczność – tożsamość pograniczna” [Borderland – Bordering – Borderland Identity]. [In:] *Pogranicze. Studia Społeczne. Tom XIV. Numer specjalny. Polskie granice i pogranicza: nowe problemy i interpretacje* [Borderlands. Social Studies. Volume XIV. Special issue. Polish Borders and Borderlands: New Problems and Interpretations], edited by H. Bojar, D. Wojakowski, A. Sadowski, 17–31. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2008.

13. Szymczak, M., ed. *Słownik Języka Polskiego* [Polish Language Dictionary], vol. II. Warszawa: PWN, 1979.

14. Korczyński, T. M., ed. *Swój – Obcy – Wróg. Wędrowki w labiryntach kultur* [Ours – The Stranger – The Enemy. Wandering in the Labyrinths of Cultures]. Warszawa: WN Katedra, 2015.

15. Troyan, S. “Konceptcje teoretyczne pogranicza na Ukrainie” [Theoretical Concepts of Borderland in Ukraine]. [In:] *Pogranicze. Studia Społeczne. Tom XIV numer specjalny Polskie granice i pogranicza: nowe problemy i interpretacje* [Borderlands. Social Studies. Volume XIV. Special Issue Polish Borders and Borderlands: New Problems and Interpretations], edited by H. Bojar, D. Wojakowski, A. Sadowski, 50–57. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2008.

16. Wojakowski, D. “Kłopoty z pograniczem. Socjologia wobec tradycji i ponowoczesności” [The Trouble with Borderlands. Sociology Towards Tradition and Postmodernity]. *Zeszyty naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria: Organizacja i zarządzanie* [Scientific Journals of the Silesian University of Technology. Series: Organization and Management], no. 65 (2013): 419–431.

17. Бек, У. *Космополитическое мировоззрение* [Cosmopolitan Vision]. Москва: Центр исследований постиндустриального общества, 2008.

18. Бек, У. “Трансформация политики и государства в эпоху глобализации” [The Transformation of Politics and the State in the Era of Globalisation]. *Свободная мысль*, XXI, no. 7 (2004): 3–11.

19. Бурдые, П. *Социология социального пространства* [Sociology of social space]. Ред. Н. А. Шматко. СПб.–Москва: Ин-т эксперим.социологии–Алетейя, 2005.

20. Вальденфельс, Б. *Топографія Чужого: студії до феноменології Чужого* [A Topography of the Other. Studies for a Phenomenology of the Other]. Київ: ППС-2002, 2004.

21. Верменич, Я. “Пограниччя як соціокультурний феномен: просторовий вимір” [Borders as a Sociocultural Phenomenon: Spatial Dimension]

nomenon: Spatial Dimension]. [In:] *Регіональна історія України*, 67–90, Вип. 6, 2012.

22. Вояковський, Д. *Ментальні кордони в Європі без кордонів: монографія* [Mental Boundaries in Europe Without Borders: Monograph]. Київ: Ніка-Центр, 2015.

23. *Всеукраїнський перепис населення 2001* [All-Ukrainian population census 2001]. Accessed December 5, 2020. <http://2001.ukrcensus.gov.ua/results/>.

24. Гібернау, М. *Ідентичність націй* [Identity of Nations]. Київ: Темпора, 2012.

25. Кнабе, Г. “Изменчивое соотношение двух постоянных характеристик человека” [The variable ratio of two constant human characteristics]. [In:] *Одиссей. Человек в истории. Личность и общество*. М. Гуревич (ред.), 10–12. Москва: Наука, 1990.

26. Мручковський, П. “Етнічна структура населення української частини українсько-польського прикордоння (територіальні відмінності)” [Ethnic structure of the population of the Ukrainian part of the Ukrainian-Polish borderland (territorial differences)]. [In:] *Вісник ОНУ. Сер. Географічні та геологічні науки*, vol. 20, Вип. 2 (2015): 109–120.

27. Сміт, Е. *Національна ідентичність* [National Identity]. Київ: Основи, 1994.

28. “Форум «Поверх кордону»: концепція прикордоння як об’єкт дослідження” [Forum “Above the Border”: the Concept of Borderlands as an Object of Research]. *Україна модерна. Пограниччя. Окраїни. Периферії*, no. 18 (2011): 47–77.

29. Чорновол, І. *Компаративні фронтири: світовий і вітчизняний вимір* [Comparative Frontiers: World and Domestic Dimension]. Київ: Критика, 2015.

About the Authors

Alla Kyrydon (Prof., PhD), Director of the State Scientific Institution “Encyclopaedic Publishing House” in Kiev.

ORCID: 0000-0003-4375-5350

Serhiy Troyan (Prof., PhD), employed at the Institute of Sociology of the University of Rzeszow (Poland), and Professor at the Department of International Relations, Information and Regional Studies of the National Aviation University in Kiev (Ukraine).

ORCID: 0000-0002-3053-6530