Making Ukrainians in the Library: Language, Libraries, and National Identity

Dr. Maria Haigh
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
School of Information Studies
3210 N. Maryland Ave
Bolton Hall, Rm. 568
Milwaukee, WI 53211
mhaigh@uwm.edu

This paper outlines and explores a new framework in which to consider the role of libraries in the development of national identity. Benedict Anderson’s highly influential work on the construction of nations as “imagined communities” (Anderson 2006) emphasizes the importance...
of national print languages as the foundation for the establishment of coherent national identities. This insight leads me to examine the role of libraries in establishing these national print languages and so in constructing national identities. After outlining this concept and reviewing the sparse literature on libraries and national identities (none of which deals with linguistic issues) I use the case of Ukraine, independent for less than twenty years, to explore the involvement of libraries and the professional communities around them in the establishment of a national print language. Ukrainian was marginalized in Soviet times but is now the only official national language. I propose three areas for investigation and sketch initial findings in each: the role of national and research libraries in establishing a print corpus in national languages, language choice for public library website provision, and language use in library and information science education and professional discourse.

Nations as “imagined communities” built around “print languages”

His 1983 book *Imagined Communities* established Benedict Anderson as the most broadly influential scholar of nationalism in recent decades, indeed as one of the most influential social theorists of his generation. Discussion of national identity and its formation has inevitably focused largely on historical examples. Anderson’s point of departure is his much quoted observation of an apparent paradox: “the objective modernity of nations to the historian’s eye vs. their subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists” (5). Today we expect the world to divide neatly into autonomous nation states with strong central governments and clear borders. We expect all people to belong to one or another of these nations.

The nation is, according to Anderson, an “imagined” community in a literal sense because of its size. Traditional communities, such as villages or tribes, were small enough for members to establish actual mutual bonds based on regular interaction. Nations create strong bonds of shared identity between much larger groups of people, most of whom can never know or even meet each other. But the term *imagined* also draws attention to the constant cultural work needed to construct and maintain this powerful sense of subjective identity among a national public of millions of diverse individuals.

Anderson treats the modern nation state essentially as a cluster of technological and political inventions (or, as he puts it, an “artifact”) that, once proven in a particular context, was transplanted across the world and
applied in many different circumstances (or, as he puts it, “became ‘modular,’ capable of being transplanted” [4]). He credits late-eighteenth-century developments in the Americas (among them the American Revolution) as the source of these innovations, but, like other scholars of nationalism, views nineteenth-century Europe as a crucial locus for their institutionalization. Prior to this era, Europe consisted instead of a collection of kingdoms, duchies, and principalities with significant autonomy for local rulers. Their inhabitants identified primarily with these local identities. Empires came and went and often allowed considerable latitude in customs, culture, ethnicity, and language. This was particularly true of the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires, major forces in Central, Southern, and Eastern Europe. By 1920 these empires had been swept away, replaced by a collection of new nations such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania.

What makes Anderson particularly relevant to a library and information science audience is his stress on early information technologies as the crucial medium through which these imaginary national communities were established. According to Anderson, the single most important factor in the invention of nationalism was the existence of entrepreneurial publishers issuing books and newspapers in local vernacular languages in search of a mass audience. Thanks to this “print-capitalism,” a handful of popular dialects emerged as favourites for the exchange of information and won the status of “national print-languages.” Acceptance of these dialects over a wide area established the cultural foundation for the emerging nation. The emergence of these national languages led to the displacement of local dialects and the replacement of Latin as the official state language. This has a lot in common with the idea of an “infosphere” (Toffler 1980), which has been discussed in recent years, though in the language of postmodern theory it could also be said that Anderson sees a nation first as a shared discourse.

Nation states were expected to have a single national language, a set of national traditions, beloved national poets and playwrights, artistic movements, cultural institutions, and the like. These did not flow automatically from the achievement of political independence or unification, which occurred most often as the result of a particular war having been won or lost. Scholars of nationalism often quote the words attributed to Massimo D’Azeglio, a leader of Piedmont, on the occasion of Italy’s unification: “We have made Italy. Now we have to make Italians” (Stewart-Steinberg 2008, 1). A bold statement of this thesis was made by Ernest
Gellner: “The cultural shreds and patches used by nationalism are often arbitrary historical inventions. Any old shred and patch would have served as well” (Smith 2001, 65). Anthony D. Smith, author of an excellent summary of the literature on nationalism (Smith 2001), endorses a different position, which he terms the “ethno-symbolic” approach. He sees the “the process of nation formation as not so much one of construction, let alone deliberate ‘invention,’ as of reinterpretation of pre-existing cultural motifs and of reconstruction of earlier ethnic ties and sentiments” (83).

For our current discussion, the point is that nationalism has been a major topic of study for historians and sociologists in recent decades and there is a consensus that nations are a relatively recent phenomenon (whether or not they reflect cultural continuities with earlier ethnic communities) whose invention is associated with the development of modern states, the industrial revolution, and the spread of literacy with the associated development of mass market books and newspapers published in national languages.

**Libraries, language, and national identity: The current literature**

As we have seen, Anderson saw the establishment of national print languages as the most important mechanism for the creation of modern nations. Yet strangely Anderson entirely neglected the importance of another key institution of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century: the public library. Libraries played an important role in disseminating printed materials to the masses, while their cataloguing and collection policies served to select and structure new national cannons. Surely national print languages became the foundation for popular nationalism only when the masses had easy access to a large national corpus of print. Public libraries served exactly the kind of newly literate mass population discussed by scholars of nationalism (Hammond 2002) and played an important part in the development of working-class culture (Pateman 2005). This same lacuna is apparent throughout the literature on national identity, despite significant work done within museum studies (Carbonell 2004) on museums as agents of nationalism and imperialism. Encyclopedias and dictionaries have likewise been analyzed as nation-building projects (Donato 1993).

But if scholars of nationalism have ignored the role of libraries, then library historians have likewise, and with very few exceptions ignored the challenges and questions posed by Anderson and other theorists of
nationalism. Library history is a well-developed field, with a long tradition of scholarship within the library and information science field. However, most work in this area has been within what historians of science (Cohen 1990) would categorize as an “internalist” vein. That is to say that it has been concerned with the internal institutional development of libraries, of ideas within librarianship, and of the library profession. Its audience and concerns have been drawn from within the library and information science community. While concerted attempts have been made to integrate library history into broader currents of social and cultural history (Black 1996), this has not so far led many scholars toward questions of national identity.

To date the most significant exception to this mutual disinterest is a provocative article by G.K. Peatling (2004) arguing that “library history should definitely be one of ‘the places’ where national identity is considered, interrogated, and defined” (35). He suggests a number of possible avenues for future research, including the “propagation of libraries by the state or local elites,” “censorship and stock control,” and “display and commemoration in libraries” (38). Even Peatling, however, does not include any language-related issues in his list of promising historical phenomena. This is perhaps because his object of study is the United Kingdom, which created its national identity over hundreds of years of independence and stable borders in a process quite unlike the experience of contemporary Eastern Europe. In this context, language emerges only as an issue on the fringes of the country. Scholars who have taken up Peatling’s challenge have likewise maintained a focus on the English-speaking world, investigating Australia (Tiffen 2007). Alex Byrne has explored libraries and national identity in the present day, with a particular focus on international development and newly created states (Byrne 2004).

The literature on libraries and national identity in Eastern Europe is still sparser and largely neglects linguistic issues. Pamela Richards (2001) explored the role of libraries in Cold War foreign policy, sketching uses made of libraries in the foreign policies of both the USA and USSR. Addressing national identity more explicitly, Mary Stuart (1995) has explored the contribution of the Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg to the establishment of national identity in the 1860s. She argues that the library’s collection of foreign-language writings about Russia played a significant part in shaping Russian notions of patriotism, cultural heritage, and national identity. Edward Kasinec (2001) has reflected on the influence Soviet-era cataloguing and censorship practices at Moscow’s Lenin Library had on work of Western scholars researching there.
Work on the political and nationalist dimensions of language choice is also sparse within the library literature. Most countries accommodate significant minority language populations. Several developed countries such as Canada, Belgium, and Switzerland have multiple official languages, generally with different languages used in different parts of the country and two or more required for official national documents. The challenges and opportunities this issue poses for library systems have received considerable discussion in the literature, but usually from the viewpoint of library practitioners and online system designers (Cenoz and Gorter 2006; Curry 2000; Dowding 1994; Nelson 1991). Thus the implications of library language provision for the shaping of national identity have gone unexamined.

**Language and national identity in Ukraine**

Ukraine, independent for less than two decades, is particularly interesting as a reminder that nation building is not an obscure phenomenon confined to a remote historical era. The linguistic dimensions of national identity creation play an important role in shaping library provision. Ukrainian is the only official language. However, most existing library materials are written in Russian and in most of the country library patrons are more comfortable in Russian than Ukrainian.

Ukraine declared independence in 1991. But the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic had already, in 1989, adopted a law making Ukrainian the only official state language. Ukrainian has gradually replaced Russian in official settings such as street signs, maps, school textbooks, and government forms. Western films are now dubbed into Ukrainian and subtitled in Russian (though films made in Russian are left untouched). This policy was controversial, and President Leonid Kuchma came to power in 1994 with a promise, never fulfilled, to restore the status of Russian as an official language. Most politicians and public administrators make at least some effort to speak Ukrainian, though for many the effort is visibly straining and even some supporters of nationalism lapse back into Russian after completing prepared remarks. Choice of language can itself be a political statement, dividing pro-Western politicians from their pro-Russian counterparts. In the endless and inconclusive debates that followed the Orange Revolution of 2004, politicians on opposing sides have literally been speaking different languages.
To observe modern Ukraine is to be continually made aware of the constructed and contested nature of national identity and its powerful relationship with linguistic politics. Most of present-day Ukraine fell under Tsarist rule in the eighteenth century and remained part of the Russian Empire and its successor, the Soviet Union, until 1991 (except for interludes during the civil war and Second World War). Ukrainian nationalists (Wilson 1997) have constructed a new history, in which the moral valance of many chapters of the story has been reversed from the version taught during Soviet days. Nationalists focus a great deal of attention on historical moments in which the region was politically independent of Russia, including the Ukrainian Cossack uprising of the seventeenth century and the Civil War era (1917–21). Ukrainian partisan groups active during the Second World War, depicted during Soviet times as terrorists working hand-in-hand with the Nazis, are now celebrated in much of the country as brave patriots. The process echoes many of the phenomena discussed in the historical and theoretical literature on nationalism.

Even the question of whether Ukrainian is a language or a mere dialect of Russian is politically charged. According to Laada Bilaniuk, author of a splendid anthropological study of language use in contemporary Ukraine (2005), “The degree of mutual intelligibility of the standard Ukrainian and Russian languages is very limited without some background knowledge owing to different phonological rules, some different grammatical structures, and a large portion of basic vocabulary without common roots” (3). Ordinary Ukrainians often switch back and forward between the languages, and many speak a mixture known as Surzhyk.

But regional patterns remain strong. In the west, Ukrainian is dominant and Russian marginalized. In the industrial heartland of the east, Russian prevails and Ukrainian is rare in domestic life. Kyiv is the nation’s capital and, unsurprisingly, a locus of national sentiment. Ukrainian is still a minority language on Kyiv streets (though it is heard more often than a decade ago), and in many social contexts to speak it marks one as a visitor from western Ukraine or member of the Ukrainian diaspora. So in many contexts Russian remains a higher status language.

Bilaniuk shows that the often confusing status of the Ukrainian language in modern Ukraine is a result of its complex history. Like other nationalist movements in Central and Eastern Europe, Ukrainian nationalism gained strength during the late nineteenth century. Under Russian
imperial rule the language was generally suppressed, including prohibitions on the printing of books and the destruction of key archives and libraries. Speaking or singing in Ukrainian was an act of rebellion. Ukrainian culture found freer expression among the western parts of Ukraine, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. There schools, newspapers, and books were established. Language and national sentiment were inseparable. The exiled poet Taras Shevchenko (1814–61) rose from humble origins as a serf to prove the literary potential of what had been seen as a vernacular language for the lower classes. Thanks to this linguistic accomplishment he is the dominant figure in the Ukrainian cultural pantheon.

The Soviet Union’s relationship to the Ukrainian language was more ambiguous than one might expect, as was its relationship to Ukrainian nationalism (Yekelchyk 2007). During the 1920s Ukrainian books, grammars, and dictionaries were produced, Ukrainian schools were founded, and efforts were made to adopt Ukrainian for official purposes. Lenin realized that supporting the use of local language and culture would undermine the threat posed by nationalist movements and help the USSR contrast its record favourably with that of the czarist authorities. The process was reversed in the 1930s, as policy shifted toward the imposition of Russian throughout the Soviet Union. This process involved not only discouraging the use of Ukrainian but also redefining the language itself (Bilaniuk 2005) to minimize its differences from Russian. Grammatical rules were changed, letters eliminated, and many words purged from dictionaries in favour of alternatives modelled on Russian vocabulary. This linguistic assault was accompanied with more physical measures—Stalin is widely believed to have deliberately triggered the starvation of millions of Ukrainians during the 1930s to crush nationalist sentiment and ensure the adoption of collective farming. Yet the USSR also carved a larger Ukrainian republic out of the pieces of several countries. After the Second World War the Ukrainian Socialist Republic grew to encompass ethnic Ukrainian communities in territory formerly part of Poland and Romania. Forced population exchanges across these borders destroyed the long-established pattern of mixed ethnic and linguistic communities in favour of more homogenous populations clumped together inside national boundaries (Brown 2004).

A policy of bilingualism, established in 1958, ostensibly allowed Soviet parents to choose between Russian or local languages for their children. But as Russian was seen as the language of science, professions, political
power, and high culture, this led to a rapid shift away from Ukrainian in schools (particularly in urban areas). This in turn cemented perceptions of Ukrainian as the language of villagers and peasants.

Initial findings: Research libraries in Ukraine

In this section I sketch the issues posed by language and national identity for two of Ukraine’s most important libraries: the Vernadsky National Library in Kyiv and Chernivtsi University Library in western Ukraine. National libraries, like national museums, have complex histories. The great metropolitan institutions of London and Paris have undergone their own shifts as imperial glory fades and national identity shifts in new directions. Ukraine, however, presents the interesting case of a nation whose national libraries have endured interludes of independence and as part of several different states. In this sense their role in shaping, rather than just reflecting, national identity has been made more explicit by Ukraine’s tangled trajectory.

Kyiv was the Soviet Union’s third-largest city and lay at the heart of a major complex of scientific and industrial activity. Its largest library, today the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, now boasts a collection of more than 15 million items. The library was established in 1918 during the Civil War as the national library for the new and short-lived Ukrainian state. Ukraine’s incorporation into the Soviet Union left it a national library without a nation, but it emerged as the main technical library for the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the official repository of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Soviet libraries created closed sections known as spetskhran to prevent access to ideologically undesirable material (Stelmakh 2001) and so large portions of the collection, including those dealing directly with Ukrainian nationalism, were unavailable to researchers during Soviet times (Wilson 1997). During the Soviet era, Russian was the language of science and government across the USSR, and the library’s holdings from this period reflect this fact. The Soviet cataloguing system (BBK) reflected a bias toward Russia in its organization of subject headings (Caidi 2004; Olson 2006).

Following the independence of Ukraine, its status as a national library was restored in 1996. I have written elsewhere (Haigh 2009) about the library and the extent to which Soviet-era practices continue to shape user experiences there. However, the issue of language and its relation-
ship to national identity provides an illuminating perspective. As a national institution, the library has been expected to switch to the only official national language. Whereas Ukrainian had not previously been seen as the language of science or high culture, the Vernadsky is now the centre of the development of Ukrainian as a print language (to use Anderson’s term) for modern Ukraine. As well as holding the country’s main technical and scientific collections, it is an archival centre for Ukrainian presidential records, rare Slavic documents, and the personal papers of eminent Ukrainians.

Today Ukrainian language is used exclusively on signs within the library and on the many forms researchers must have stamped to request books or move around the library from one room to another. The Soviet classification system has been retained, but keywords and subject headings have been translated into Ukrainian. Integration of the library into the international scientific community and the addition of online subscriptions to international journal packages means that more and more of the library’s holdings are in English. English-language materials are abstracted into Ukrainian. However, in an example of the unofficial taken-for-granted bilingualism that one encounters in many aspects of Ukrainian life, Russian abstracts are included without translation.

Challenging as the linguistic issues faced by the Vernadsky National Library are, they pale in comparison with those posed by the complex history of another of Ukraine’s most important libraries, the Chernivtsi University Library. Its story reflects the history of Ukraine as an area perpetually on the borderlands of one power or another but always seen as a part of the periphery rather than as a place in its own right (Brown 2004). During the late nineteenth century, Chernivtsi was the seat of the prosperous Hapsburg duchy of Bukovyna. The library was founded in 1852 as the first public library in Bukovyna. An experimental showcase for self-governance, Bukovyna became a key centre of the emergent Ukrainian nationalist movement. The library’s initial holdings reflected this balancing of imperial high culture and local pride. Initially developed from private collections of ancient Germanic manuscripts, the library also developed the leading collection of Ukrainian-language sources. In 1875 the whole library collection was transferred to the newly founded Chernivtsi University (Cheban 2003; Shylyuk 2005).

From 1919 to 1940 the city was part of the new nation of Romania, and the region’s demographics and language altered appreciably. Library and
university became agents of an aggressive Romanian cultural nationalism. Ukrainian professors were dismissed from the university and Ukrainian language instruction ended. The library developed significant Romanian language holdings (37% of the total).

Chernivtsi was seized by the Soviets in 1940 in accordance with the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. At this point the library claimed the Soviet Union’s third-largest collection after Lenin’s Library in Moscow and Saltykov-Schedryn Library in Leningrad (Shylyuk 2005). War soon intervened, and the city shifted several times between German/Romanian and Soviet control before settling down as part of the newly enlarged Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Between 1946 and 1951 its collections were purged of nationalist and ideologically unacceptable work (150,000 items were lost, representing almost a third of its total pre-war holdings, and 21,000 more shifted to special sections with restricted access). Many of its rarest holdings were transferred to the collection of the Lenin Library in Moscow. The Soviets were keen to integrate western Ukraine into their cultural sphere, and so the library was reborn with a new mission. Thousands of Soviet books were delivered, and a new cataloguing system imposed. From 1945 to 1952 the library received copies of all books published in the USSR. It grew rapidly with extensive Russian-language scientific holdings and books seized from private collections.

The dissolution of the USSR in 1991 left the library as the main library in Ukrainian-speaking western Ukraine. Charged with its fourth nation-building exercise in less than 150 years, the library has rapidly expanded its Ukrainian-language websites, joined an initiative to provide a Ukrainian-language portal to international scientific resources, and opened an information centre on the European Union (reflecting support in the region for Ukraine’s integration with European institutions).

**Initial finding: Language in Ukrainian websites**

Ukrainian-language politics also play out in the development of its public library system. Public libraries, like many aspects of Soviet life, had been controlled from the Ministry of Culture in Moscow. Many aspects of library design were standardized across the nation, from the cataloguing system to the provision of book series “scientifically compiled” to “guarantee the fulfillment of tasks of ideological, moral, and aesthetic education”
The collapse of the Soviet Union destroyed their whole way of doing business (Knutson 2007), forcing them to find new sponsors and build new kinds of relationship with their users.

Ukraine’s public libraries have embraced the Internet as an important means of communicating with patrons, publicizing their services, and providing online access to catalogues and other resources. However, they faced special challenges in doing so. Ukraine’s economy collapsed after independence, causing budget shortages in public institutions of all kinds and hindering the development of new communications infrastructures and the kind of middle-class population able to afford Internet access.

In 2007–8 Solovyanenko surveyed Ukrainian library websites. His findings suggest strong regional variations in website language provision in different regions of Ukraine (2007; 2008).

The pattern is clear. Public libraries in Crimea use Russian exclusively. In western Ukraine they use Ukrainian exclusively. The picture in the rest of the country is more mixed, with the Kyiv region split equally between Ukrainian and bilingual Russian/Ukrainian websites. Websites in central and northern Ukraine sometimes included a smattering of Russian, while those in the south were approximately evenly split.

Outside Crimea, library websites seem more skewed to Ukrainian than the populations they serve—western Ukraine with its Ukrainian-speaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Ukr. only</th>
<th>Rus. only</th>
<th>Rus. with some (&lt; 30%) also in Ukr.</th>
<th>Rus. with much (30–80%) also in Ukr.</th>
<th>Ukr. with some (&lt; 30%) material also in Rus.</th>
<th>Ukr. with much (30–80%) material also in Rus.</th>
<th>Fully bilingual (&gt; 80% in each language)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central/ North</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyiv area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kobzarenko 1979, 149). (V9 9/10/09 02:30) UTP (6"x9") AGaramond 1125 CJILS 33:3/4 pp. 141–158 1157 CJILS 33_3-4_02_Ch02 (p. 152)
population had no Russian-language content at all in the libraries surveyed, whereas in the Russian-speaking east more sites were Ukrainian only than Russian only and most were largely or fully bilingual. While further work is needed to explain this finding, it may reflect the state’s promotion of Ukrainian as its official language, the interests of funding agencies, or even nationalist sentiment of library staff who may not use Ukrainian as their first language.

The possible influence of funding agencies is a particularly interesting topic. One important source of funding during the dark days of the 1990s was the array of foreign governmental and non-governmental agencies funding library development programs in Ukraine. Many Ukrainian public libraries thus constructed their first websites as part of foreign-funded initiatives to connect them and their patrons to the Internet. For example, the Library Electronic Access Project administered through the Public Affairs Section of the US Embassy had funded the development of more than 100 Internet centres in public libraries by 2008 (United States 2008). But libraries faced the language question: Should websites be constructed in Ukrainian, Russian, or both? Ukrainian was the official language of the new state, but Russian was more widely used in most areas of the country. Funding sources provided their own rules and agendas. Since 1998 the International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX) has operated the Internet Access and Training Program (IATP) in Ukraine, funded by the United States Agency for International Development. IATP defines of its missions to promote Web content development in local languages. Such work continues today, with initiatives such as the Biliomist program funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and administered with the help of IREX.

**Initial findings: Language in LIS professional training and discourse**

Patterns of language use in LIS education and scholarly discourse seem to mirror that of Ukrainian higher education as a whole. But of course this will in turn influence the work and attitudes of future library professionals, and thus will influence the experiences of future generations of library users.

I have written elsewhere (Haigh 2007) about the Ukrainian system of education in library and information science and its transition from the
Soviet era. The Soviet library system was run centrally by the Ministry of Culture and was not ashamed of its mission to politically educate the population along Marxist lines. Librarians earned degrees within a dozen institutes of culture, alongside musicians, circus performers, and other members of the state’s army of cultural workers. However, it was more common to earn a vocational qualification in librarianship, which was offered within more than 100 colleges by the 1970s.

In Soviet Ukraine education was carried out primarily in Russian, reflecting its status as the language of science and politics. Examinations (often oral), syllabi, textbooks, and other materials were in Russian. However, some individual instructors chose to use Ukrainian within the classroom. This was accepted but uncommon in Kyiv and much more common in western Ukraine.

Today Ukrainian is the main language for syllabi, course catalogues, university Web pages, and similar official documents. However, some institutions provide translated versions of at least some of their Web pages in other languages, most commonly Russian and English. Further research is needed to see how languages are actually used inside the classroom and whether Russian-speaking students resent the official emphasis on Ukrainian. At the present time, bachelor’s degrees in library science are offered in four schools, serving different regions of the country. These are the Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts (central Ukraine), the Kharkiv State Academy of Culture (eastern Ukraine), the Rivne State University of Culture (western Ukraine), and the Mykolaiv branch of the Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts (southern Ukraine).

Initial indications are that language use in different regions continues to follow the pattern of the local population, although Ukrainian has more of a presence in the classroom in eastern Ukraine than it does on the street. Olga Sushenko, a professor at the University of Luhansk in eastern Ukraine, states that many professors offer students a choice of languages for class instruction. Even though Ukrainian is rarely spoken at home, students often pick it for lectures. “When language policies are implemented wisely and gradually, people accept the new language.”² Ukrainian is gradually gaining prominence as a language for professional and scholarly discourse in the field. The first Ukrainian-language dictionary of library and information science terms was published in 2004 (Strishepets 2004), standardizing Ukrainian vocabulary in the field and making translation of English-language materials much easier.
The well-known annual series of Crimea conferences in library and information science (known officially as the Crimea Libraries and Information Resources in the Modern World of Science, Culture, Education, and Business) provide another interesting window onto the political significance of language in modern librarianship in the former Soviet Union. Crimea is part of Ukraine, having been transferred from Russia to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in 1954 as an autonomous region. But most Crimeans are ethnically and linguistically Russian (in part because Stalin deported the region’s indigenous Tartars and several other minority populations). Local groups protest increased use of the Ukrainian language, which is almost unknown among Crimeans (Kucera 2009). Crimea’s resorts remain a popular tourist destination for Russians, and Russian military forces continue to control military facilities in the area. In recent years the area has seen significant political tensions, as reports of Russia issuing its own passports to tens of thousands of Crimeans gave rise to fears that military intervention might follow (as in Georgia) under the pretext of defending these Russian citizens (Blomfield 2008). Russian politicians (including the mayor of Moscow) have called for the annexation of Sevastopol by Russia.

The primary organizers of the Crimea LIS conferences are Russian (the primary organizer is the Russian National Public Library for Science and Technology, the Russian Ministry of Culture is listed second), as are the great majority of the attendees. Officially the conference has three languages: Russian, Ukrainian, and English. Abstracts can be submitted in any of these languages, and translation is performed competently into the others. However, at the conference itself the vast majority of papers are delivered in Russian. The Russian delegates showed little awareness of being in a foreign country. Sentimental Russian anthems were sung at the closing ceremony. At the 2007 conference Ukrainian was heard only at a special day-long session on Ukrainian libraries. But even here the few presenters who attempted to speak in Ukrainian were heckled with complaints that they were not intelligible. As a result they switched to Russian.

Conclusions

I have presented preliminary analysis here of the relationship of language and national identity in three key facets of Ukraine’s library practice: national libraries, library and information science education, and public...
library websites. Interpreting these findings within the framework of the social and linguistic construction of national identity helps us to understand the special challenges faced by Ukrainian LIS professionals. But it also points toward the relevance of a number of important questions so far neglected by scholars of nationalism and within the LIS literature. In modern Ukraine libraries are not merely reflecting broader shifts in language, politics, and political identity. They are also playing a part in the shaping the ever-changing currents of national identity that swirl through this young nation. Ukraine is a nation reading itself into existence.

Notes
1. The author thanks Dr. Solovyencko for providing his data from this survey tabulated in a way that made it possible to extract this information.
2. Personal communication.
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