

<https://www.doi.org/10.26565/2220-7929-2025-68-08>
УДК 930.2:82-94:327(091)(477:470)''1991/2024''

Vlada Sabadash

PhD student

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
4 Svobody Sq., 61022, Kharkiv, Ukraine

Email: vlada.sabadash@karazin.ua

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3832-7254>

UKRAINIAN-RUSSIAN RELATIONS IN THE MEMORY SPACES OF UKRAINIAN CITIES (1991–2024)

The article explores the dynamics of Russo-Ukrainian relations through the lens of urban memory spaces in Ukraine from 1991 to 2024. It is stated that memorials, monuments, street names, and cultural heritage sites have become pivotal arenas for representing and transforming narratives on those relations. The aim is to study the process of instrumentalization of memory spaces in shaping of a collective identity, emphasizing both their role in reflecting events and wider changes of their social impact. The article comprises examples that show how images of Russo-Ukrainian relations have adapted to significant geopolitical events represented in the memory spaces of Ukrainian cities. Particular attention is paid to the periods of heightened tension (2014 annexation of Crimea and the subsequent war in Donbas, the full-scale Russian invasion in 2022). These events catalyzed widespread processes of decommunization and decolonization, leading to the removal / recontextualization of Soviet-era monuments and street names. The article

Як цитувати: Sabadash V. Ukrainian–Russian Relations in the Memory Spaces of Ukrainian Cities (1991–2024). *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія «Історія»*. 2025. Вип. 68. С. 126–141. <https://www.doi.org/10.26565/2220-7929-2025-68-08>

How to cite: Sabadash V. Ukrainian–Russian Relations in the Memory Spaces of Ukrainian Cities (1991–2024). *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series History*. 2025. No. 68. PP. 127–142. <https://www.doi.org/10.26565/2220-7929-2025-68-08>

© Sabadash V., 2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

examines the impact of these transformations on the memory politics, highlighting the promotion of local and national narratives over imperial or colonial ones. The author aims to investigate the images of Russo-Ukrainian relations that are concentrated around the metaphors for «friendship», «brotherhood», «unity», «neighborhood» and their opposites — «hostility», «enmity», «rivalry», etc. The shifts from one metaphor to another in urban spaces are addressed. The author underscores the fluid nature of urban memory defined by a convergence of state policies, local initiatives, and public sentiments. Looking into specific cases from Kyiv, Kharkiv, Pereyaslav, and other cities, the article shows how these spaces serve as mirrors of historical memory and as tools of shaping collective consciousness amid the revision of Russo-Ukrainian relations.

Keywords: Russo-Ukrainian War, Russia, Ukraine, memory studies, cultural heritage, history politics, public spaces, city, monuments, decommunization, memory spaces, decolonization.

With the proclamation of independence in 1991, Russo-Ukrainian relations, to a large extent, evolved into a complex interaction between the former constituent republics of the USSR. Over the course of three decades, these relations gradually shifted from pragmatic partnership to outright confrontation, particularly acute after the annexation of Crimea in 2014 and the outbreak of war in Eastern Ukraine. These events have significantly shaped the Ukrainian national identity and the reinterpretation of historical ties with the neighboring country.

In this context, memory places — memorials, street names, monuments, and other material objects — that embody historical narratives and influence collective consciousness, serve as important tools for constructing national memory. Not only are they symbols of the past, but also they become spaces for political struggles over the interpretation of history, contributing to formation of identities at both the local and the national levels and provoking memory wars over the cultural heritage.

The interdisciplinary research of an interrelationship of memory, culture, and politics increasingly gains relevance in contemporary academic discourse, especially considering the Ukrainian context. Studying memory places in Ukraine through the prism of memory studies and cultural heritage theories allows us to better understand how historical events and their symbolic incarnations shape perceptions of the past and influence contemporary social processes. Thus, the article aims to address the role of memory places

in reflecting images of Russo-Ukrainian relations in the context of Ukraine's changing memory politics after 1991.

The main objective is to analyze how memorials and public spaces in different Ukrainian cities reflect the evolution of those relations from 1991 to 2024. Furthermore, the research aims to localize the impact of the war's different stages on the transformation of memorial symbols and narratives in urban spaces.

The main thesis states that the memory spaces in Ukrainian cities serve as focal points for the representation and transformation of Russo-Ukrainian relations, particularly in response to geopolitical events, evolving from preservation of the Soviet «friendship» and «fraternity» narrative to the «hostility» and «rivalry» one, but mostly by adopting a total negativation of the image of Russia.

The subject is the implementation, transformation and consolidation of the images of Russo-Ukrainian relations in the memory spaces of Ukrainian cities, including memorials, monuments, street names, and cultural heritage sites.

The object is the memory spaces in Ukrainian cities, including particular memorials, monuments and street names illustrating the evolving narratives on Russo-Ukrainian relations from 1991 to 2024.

As to the historiography, the following remarks are to be made. Firstly, in order to see the subject through the prism of memory studies and cultural heritage, texts which consider memory narratives within political contexts were analyzed. For instance, as regards the memory spaces conception the author follows the view of P. Nora. The idea of symbolic places which contain and represent the collective memory has a large impact on the analysis of the image of Russo-Ukrainian relations in Ukrainian urban spaces. In the article, material (monuments), symbolic (flags) and functional (symbolic practices) memory spaces are addressed. The research of E. E. Azar on international relations and conflict analysis allows us to track the interaction between the war's stages and their representation in the public discourse.

Secondly, texts on Ukrainian national identity were drawn upon. Works by T. Kuzio, O. Subtelny and others treating nation building, nationalism and the new Russian imperialism help to understand the general geopolitical

situation in the region and particularly the cultural and political dynamics between Ukraine and Russia. Specifically, in the light of the ongoing memory war over Crimea, the book by T. Kuzio «Ukraine – Crimea – Russia: Triangle of Conflict» gives vital insights into the irredentism in the region, political ambitions of Russia and their symbolic side, etc. (Kuzio 2014).

Thirdly, the role of memory transformations is investigated. The author follows the ideas of A. Assmann and J. Assmann on cultural memory and post-conflict shifting of public perceptions, the A. Kyrydon's conception of memory masks and their role in the slow transformation of urban spaces as they represent Russo-Ukrainian relations (Kyrydon).

Finally, as the article focuses on the memory politics in Ukraine and its urban spaces, the following was taken into account. G. Kasianov, whose work is centered around the history politics of Ukraine since its independence, highlights the need to look deeper into the actors and agents of memory in the Ukrainian public space and analyze their stance towards Russia in the past three decades (Kasianov 2018). S. Plokyh and E. Finkel deal with the memory politics in connection with the Russo-Ukrainian war instead, searching for the roots of the rivalry (Plokyh 2023; Finkel 2024). In her turn, V. Ageyeva concentrates on symbolic memory spaces of Russo-Ukrainian relations by looking into their reflection in Ukrainian literature (Ageyeva 2021).

Overall, the historiography is abundant. However, there is still a lacuna concerning the research of the main mechanisms and images, or metaphors that reflect Russo-Ukrainian relations in urban spaces, which is the main goal of the article.

The methodology combines field research of memory spaces in the Ukrainian cities, discourse analysis of public discourse, urban spaces and the Russo-Ukrainian hybrid war, as well as the precepts of new cultural history by P. Burke. In addition, the author uses interviews — especially with city dwellers and with monument sculptors. It allows us to look deeper into the perceptions of Russo-Ukrainian relations embodied in memory spaces.

The declaration of independence of Ukraine in 1991 created the need for a historical policy which would facilitate a «nationalization of history». The Ukrainian elite had to create a single narrative for the history of Ukraine

and its relations with other countries, in particular — with Russia. Given the Soviet context, the question arose whether to continue the narrative of the Russo-Ukrainian «friendship» and «unity». Indeed, August 24, 1991 became a serious test for the concept, as there was a discrepancy between the dichotomy «friendship–unity» and the trichotomy «friendship–brotherhood–unity» (heavily employed in the Soviet narrative on Russo-Ukrainian relations). First of all, it cannot be said that legally this act contradicted the previous developments, in particular taking into account the Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine. However, the ideological inertia was more powerful, so the new course met with serious resistance both politically and identirarily.

The Soviet «affirmative action empire» did not equalize the Great Russian project with the Little Russian one. The tradition, constructed during several centuries, was integrated into the discourse and shaped it as one of its components. The new imperial reality of the USSR and the construction of the «Soviet people» identity as an imperial and great-power one, to a large extent, contributed to a partial integration of the earlier model. For supporters of the (post-)imperial model, Ukraine's independence was a shock, a failure of their own project, a loss of the unity of the empire.

The declaration of independence, its subsequent approval by the referendum of December 1, 1991, and its recognition by the Russian Federation on December 5 led to the need to rethink the model of «friendship, brotherhood and unity of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples». The concepts of «friendship» and «brotherhood» were perceived differently: for some they had to recede into the background, for others — to acquire a new meaning and withstand the test of a new reality. A collapse of the image of «Russo-Ukrainian unity» in the Ukrainian memory discourse was met enthusiastically by a part of Ukrainian society, looked upon with bewilderment by another part, and rejected by still another one. Thus, during the dissipation of the Soviet model of historical politics, the image of «Russo-Ukrainian friendship» was questioned in Ukraine not only by those who did not believe in «friendship», but also by those who preferred «unity».

Apparently, the need to distance Ukraine from the Soviet system as incompatible with the nation-building required some «dismantling».

However, it had to be cautious so as not to annoy adherents of the pro-Russian (and at that time — simply nostalgic, in fact) memory model. In particular, this was manifested in decommunization. According to O. Hajdaj, the removal of Soviet monuments in Ukraine was limited and primarily initiated by individual communities depending on their perception of the recent history. On the other hand, in large cities, many residents were nostalgic for the previous regime. So, for example, the Lenin monument in Vinnytsia was taken down only two years after the relevant resolution, in 1992, at night — in order to avoid uproar (Hajdaj 2014, 3).

At the same time, some of the Soviet monuments dedicated to «Russo-Ukrainian friendship» began to gain other meanings. For instance, the image of B. Khmelnytsky in Ukrainian memory politics was transformed from the initiator of the «reunification of two peoples» and a fighter against Polish rule to the image of a fighter for Ukrainian independence, as evidenced by a new wave of construction of monuments to the hetman in the 1990s. Significantly, the accompanying images were subject to change: for example, instead of the text of the Pereyaslav Agreement (a symbol of Ukrainian loyalty to Russia), the figure carries a sabre and a mace, symbols of the struggle for freedom and authority*. The revival of the hetman's image rose to a memorial boom of considerable proportions in view of the celebrations of the 400th anniversary of his birth in 1995**. There were even cases of ceremonial restoration and reinstallation of Soviet monuments to him, as in Zaporizhia, where the monument of 1965 was covered with metal

* Пам'ятний знак на честь першої перемоги Богдана Хмельницького над поляками. Координати: 47.86078137573145, 35.071551064106934. Запоріжжя, 1995. Пам'ятник Богдану Хмельницькому на території Міжрегіональної академії управління персоналом. Координати: 50.4095704867568, 30.511844445639287. Скульптори О. Сидорук, Б. Крилов. Київ, 2005.

** Пам'ятник Богдану Хмельницькому. Координати: 49.43721849536406, 32.07466934960864. Скульптори А. Шаталов, А. Фуженко, архітектори Т. Довженко, В. Дмитренко. Черкаси, 1995. Пам'ятник Богдану Хмельницькому. Координати: 50.06972979531214, 31.41733758115989. Архітектор О. Ніколенко, скульптор О. Ковальов. Переяслав, 1995. Пам'ятник Богдану Хмельницькому. Координати: 48.50823471778613, 32.26145587786166. Архітектор А. Губенко, скульптори А. Гончарук, О. Гончар, М. Вронський. Кропивницький, 1995.

and raised with some pomp on one of the city's boulevards*. Now the hetman was less often associated with the image of «Russo-Ukrainian friendship», being turned into a national hero.

It should be emphasized that some monuments have become «places of memory» and «places of memory conflicts» simultaneously. For instance, on June 21, 1992, on Pereyaslav Council Square in Pereyaslav, Ukrainian Cossacks led by V. Chornovol held a public procedure of renouncing the oath of allegiance to the Russian tsar. Quite soon and on the same square the opposite occurred: a nongovernmental organization «Ukrains'ke Reiestrovo Kozatstvo» («Ukrainian Registered Cossacks») again swore an oath to the tsar (Ivanenko, Kolybenko 2013). However, this was not the first catalyst for a conflict of memories around that place. V. Vinaykin, a sculptor, says that back in 1991 an attempt was made to remove the monument to the 300th anniversary of the «reunification of Ukraine with Russia», but it was protected by workers of a local factory.

In the 2000s, a cautious approach to the image of the Russo-Ukrainian relations as represented in urban spaces still prevailed. There was a desire to highlight the «friendship» and «neighborly attitude» of the two peoples. For example, in Kharkiv on July 21, 2003 the «Friendship» square was opened with a column showing Ukraine and Russia with their flags and emblems. Ironically, the two countries became embroiled in a dispute over the Tuzla Island just several months later. Furthermore, in 2011 the column was even reconstructed, which signaled the image preservation¹. Loyalty towards Russia was common among bearers of the Little Russian identity, which is proved by a meeting held in Kharkiv at the B. Khmelnytskyi bust in 2012 to celebrate the 358-th anniversary of Pereyaslav Council².

Overall, in 1991–2013 the Ukrainian memory agents and actors seemed to be trying to change the purport of the memory spaces meant for glorification

* Пам'ятник Богдану Хмельницькому. Координати: 47.860610845092374, 35.095502545001246. Скульптори М. Худас, Ф. Зайцев. Запоріжжя, 1995.

¹ Сквер Дружба. Foursquare *City Guide*. Харків. URL: <https://ru.foursquare.com/v/%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B2%D0%B5%D1%80-%D0%B4%D1%80%D1%83%D0%B6%D0%B1%D0%B0/53205a7e498e36f40ee8d57d> (дата звернення: 18.12.2024).

² Пам'ятник Б. Хмельницькому в г. Харькове. *Шукач*. 2012. URL: <https://www.shukach.com/uk/node/9384> (дата звернення: 27.12.2024).

of Ukrainian heroes like B. Khmelnytskyi, but they didn't seem to try and diminish the image of «friendship». The reasons were mostly practical, in view of the relations with the Russian Federation which Ukraine preferred to keep friendly, lack of funds and much more pressing problems in the country³. For instance, the Kharkiv metro founded in Soviet times includes a planned station under the name of «Peoples' Friendship», and even in 2006 this name raised no hackles of the authorities⁴. The same was with the Peoples' Friendship Street in Kharkiv renamed only in 2024⁵. It can be stated that such attitude towards the image of Russo-Ukrainian relations in urban spaces constituted a memory mask (according to the classification of A. Kyrydon), as there was a residue of Soviet narratives.

The Russian aggression in 2014 shifted the public discourse and caused a negativation of «Russianness» and a general turn of the history politics and the Ukrainian identity as a whole against Russia. It changed dramatically urban memory spaces, with streets and other public places renamed during the second wave of decommunization. New memorials were installed as well. For instance, in 2017 a monument to the Anti-terrorist Operation (ATO) soldiers was opened in Kyiv⁶. Different symbols are used there to portray Russo-Ukrainian relations: a Ukrainian sword thrust into a map of Russia, with a yellow-blue-winged angel below holding a shield with a trident. The monument unambiguously presented Russia as the enemy. The image

³ Угода між Україною і Російською Федерацією про подальший розвиток міждержавних відносин. Дагомис, 1992. URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/643_018#Text (дата звернення: 28.12.2024).

⁴ Постанова Кабінету Міністрів України від 7 березня 2006 р. № 257 «Про затвердження Державної програми будівництва та розвитку мережі метрополітенів на 2006–2010 роки». URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?nreg=257-2006-%EF#Text> (дата звернення: 19.12.2024).

⁵ Розпорядження Харківської обласної військової адміністрації від 26 липня 2024 року №513В «Про перейменування об'єктів топонімії міста Харкова». URL: https://kharkivoda.gov.ua/content/documents/1277/127652/files/513%20%D0%92_.pdf (дата звернення: 19.12.2024).

⁶ У Києві з'явився новий пам'ятник бійцям АТО: опубліковані фото і відео. Апостроф. 2017. URL: <https://apostrophe.ua/ua/news/society/culture/2017-08-15/v-kieve-poyavilsya-novuj-pamyatnik-bojcam-ato-opublikovany-foto-i-video/104268> (дата звернення: 31.12.2024).

of Russo-Ukrainian «enmity» was broadcasted and accepted by the public discourse.

The influence of the «Great, Little and White Russia» idea remained strong though, due to the popularity of Russian online propaganda. The strife around the image of Russo-Ukrainian relations often rose to a memory war. For example, in Pereyaslav-Khmelnytskyi (now Pereyaslav), earlier crammed with illustrations of the Soviet myth of «Russo-Ukrainian friendship», plenty of objects began to be disparaged⁷. There are at least three monuments dedicated to that image. As per O. Ihnatenko and M. Tovkajlo, all three (those of 1954, 1961, and 1982) should be regarded as a complex (Ihnatenko, Tovkajlo 2020). The M. T. Rylsky Institute of Art History, Folklore, and Ethnology and the Institute of History (both — of the National Academy of Sciences) gave identical verdicts on the monuments as carriers of the Soviet myth of «two fraternal peoples», which contradicts historical facts. However, despite demands to remove the monuments, they remained in place for a long time. During that period, the 1961 monument was several times wrapped in the Ukrainian flag, the sculptures were dressed in national costumes, the Russian woman was covered with cloth, and even adorned with a banner of the OUN-B.

The Peoples' Friendship Arch in Kyiv has been the subject of protracted controversy. In 2015 S. Tselovalnyk, the chief architect of the capital, advocated its demolition, and in May 2016 a decision was made to dismantle it, which was later reversed⁸. Hence a memory war: in November 2018, the «Friendship Crack» performance was held⁹ (the painted crack is still there). Before that, the inscription «To commemorate the reunification of Ukraine with Russia» was removed from the monument.

⁷ Відкритий лист міському голові мера Переяслава-Хмельницького П. Костіну Т. В. *Діловий Переяслав*. 2019. URL: <https://dilovyi.info/vidkrytyj-lyst-miskomu-golovi-mista-pereyaslava-hmelnytskogo-p-kostinu-t-v/> (Дата звернення: 09.12.2024).

⁸ Головний архітектор Києва запропонував знести Арку Дружби народів. *LB.ua*. 2015. URL: https://lb.ua/society/2015/09/08/315386_glavniy_arhitekt_kieva_predlozhit.html (дата звернення: 09.12.2024).

⁹ На арці Дружби народів з'явилась «тріщина» через справу Сенцова. *Радіо Свобода*. 2018. URL: <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/news-na-arci-druzhy-narodiv-trishchyna/29618809.html> (дата звернення: 09.12.2024).

Another example of a memory war took place in the village of Ruska Lozova, near Kharkiv, on March 24 and July 12, 2021. A memorial sign of friendship between the Ukrainian and Russian peoples was restored in honor of the Pereyaslav Council. On both occasions it was destroyed the same day¹⁰. Thus, a complete rejection of «Russo-Ukrainian friendship» and of resorting to this image in wartime prevailed over the urge to restore the Soviet myth about said «friendship».

On the contrary, in the occupied territories there were attempts to preserve that myth. For example, in Kerch in 2010 a monument was erected in the form of a nautical knot dedicated to Russo-Ukrainian amity. Moreover, there is a sign under it with the following inscription: «Strengthening of friendship between Ukraine and Russia is a legacy of our ancestors and our mandate to our descendants!» (trans. from Russian)*. The knot was painted in the colors of the flags of both countries. Of course, a memory war happened even there: Leonid Taz'ba, a Russian sculptor, insisted that the monument was not worthy of a hero city¹¹.

So, in the period of 2014–2022 memory wars resurged not only in the occupied territories, but also in other Ukrainian regions. During that time the image of Russo-Ukrainian relations was especially marked by a struggle «at the top» (at the level of history politics in Ukraine and in the Russian Federation) and «at grassroots» (among common people, who cherished or abhorred of the images of Russo-Ukrainian «friendship», «brotherhood» and «unity»), resentment against the Russian narrative on Ukraine, a general

¹⁰ Под Харьковом камень «дружбы россиян и украинцев» не продержался и дня. Comments.ua. 2021. URL: <https://kharkov.comments.ua/news/society/accidents/6341-pod-harkovom-kamen-druzhby-rossiyan-i-ukraincev-ne-proderzhalsya-i-dnya-foto.html> (дата звернення: 07.12.2024). Под Харьковом представители «ОПЗЖ» снова восстановили камень «дружбы» с Россией. Successful City. 2021. URL: <https://www.successful-city.com/pod-harkovom-predstaviteli-opzh-snova-vosstanovili-kamen-druzhby-s-rossiej/> (дата звернення: 07.12.2024).

* Here and thereafter, unless otherwise stated, all translations are by the author of the article.

¹¹ В Керчи намеркнули, что памятник дружбе Украины и России «недостойн города-героя». Крым.Реалии. 2015. URL: <https://ru.krymr.com/a/news/27086476.html> (дата звернення: 19.12.2024). Памятник в честь дружбы России и Украины остаётся стоять в Керчи. Sevas. URL: http://news.sevas.com/crimea/pamyatnik_druzhby_rossii_i_ukrainy_v_kerchi_iyun_2016 (дата звернення: 19.12.2024).

disappearance of the concept of «Russo-Ukrainian friendship» due to its inconsistency with either the Ukrainian or the Great Russian («imperial») projects, etc. Overall, appeal to the images of «friendship» and «unity» became an important front in Russia's hybrid war against Ukraine ongoing since 2014.

After the Russia's full-scale invasion the Ukrainian memory policy as to «places of memory» shifted in the following ways. Firstly, Soviet sculptures that embodied the image of «Russo-Ukrainian friendship» began to be «vilified» and «forgotten». For instance, the memory war around the Monument to the 300th Anniversary of the Reunification of Ukraine with Russia in Pereiaslav finally went off the fence: on July 7, 2022, it was taken down, which was widely publicized¹². Significantly, before its removal local residents wrote on the pedestal the names of the cities that had suffered the most: Mariupol, Bucha, Irpin, Kharkiv, etc. That reflects a societal attitude to imposed images of «Russo-Ukrainian friendship and unity». Furthermore, the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy prepared a draft of an order to exclude the monument from the relevant public register¹³.

The outcome of the controversy around the Peoples' Friendship Arch in Kyiv was quite spectacular. Earlier the memory war produced only the «crack of friendship», but in 2022 the arch was finally purged of its initial meaning. On April 26, 2022, the monument to a Ukrainian worker and a Russian one (a part of the ensemble of the arch) was pulled down¹⁴. Ironically, during the process, the Russian's head broke off. Soon, on May 14, 2022, the Kyiv City Council decided to «decommunize» the designation of the arch.

¹² У Переяславі демонтували пам'ятник «возз'єднання» України з РФ. Інтернет-видання «Хмарочос». 2022. URL: <https://hmarochos.kiev.ua/2022/07/12/u-pereyaslavi-demontuvaly-pamyatnyk-vozyednannya-ukrayiny-z-rf/> (дата звернення: 20.11.2022).

¹³ Рішення МКІП щодо переміщення чи зняття статусу пам'ятників в рамках декомунізації та дерусифікації станом на 18 липня 2022 року. Київ, 2022. URL: https://mkip.gov.ua/files/pdf/Pamiatniku_18.07.22.pdf (дата звернення: 28.12.2024).

¹⁴ Кличко В. Друзі! Не без зусиль, але радянську скульптуру двох робітників (символ возз'єднання України та росії) під вечір таки демонтували. 2022. URL: https://t.me/vitaliy_klitschko/1378 (дата звернення: 28.12.2024).

It was renamed the Arch of the Ukrainian People's Freedom¹⁵. Moreover, the monument to the Pereyaslav Council (another part of the ensemble) was also removed¹⁶. The transformation of the arch as a place of memory is quite symbolic as it contains the theme of an arch: a sculpture, conceived to glorify the image of Russo-Ukrainian «friendship» and «the reunification of Ukraine with Russia», became a subject of a memory war (manifested in the «Friendship Crack» especially) and, ultimately, changed its spiritual meaning. Now it proclaims not «friendship of peoples», but forgetting that «friendship».

Secondly, Ukrainian urban spaces started promoting the image of «victimization» of Ukraine, continued highlighting the struggle against Russia and strengthening images of «hostility», «enmity» and «rivalry». The exposition of the Virtual Museum of Russian Aggression serves as an example. The museum contributed to the exhibition «10 Years of Aggression — 10 Years of Resistance» (February 26, 2024)¹⁷. New memorials were raised as well, such as the Monument to Little Angels (children who died in the war; 2023) or the sculpture of O. Matsievskiyi, a Ukrainian soldier shot in captivity after saying «Glory to Ukraine!» (2023)¹⁸. Plenty of streets have been renamed, many memorial gatherings held, etc., which may be considered a reflection of the war trauma (Nikolaienko 2024).

Images of «friendship» and «brotherhood» clearly became irrelevant to the Russian memory politics due to an expectation for the «unity» image

¹⁵ Кличко В. Друзі! Сьогодні Київрада ухвалила рішення щодо декомунізації назви арки Дружби народів. 2022. URL: https://t.me/vitaliy_klitschko/1404 (дата звернення: 28.12.2024).

¹⁶ У Києві зносять композицію на честь Переяславської ради під колишньою Аркою Дружби народів. Суспільне. Київ. 2022. URL: <https://suspline.media/kyiv/735135-u-kiievi-trivae-znesenna-pamatnikiv-i-skulptur-pid-kolisnou-arkou-druzbi-narodiv/> (дата звернення: 20.12.2024).

¹⁷ Відкриття виставки «10 років агресії — 10 років спротиву». Український Інститут Національної Пам'яті. 2024. URL: <https://uinp.gov.ua/pres-centr/anonsy-podiy/vidkryttya-vystavky-10-rokiv-agresiyi-10-rokiv-sprotuvu> (Дата звернення: 20.12.2024).

¹⁸ У Харкові відкрили пам'ятник дітям, які загинули внаслідок агресії рф проти України. Харківська обласна військова адміністрація. 2023. URL: <https://kharkivoda.gov.ua/news/121266> (дата звернення: 20.12.2024). Гіперреалістичний пам'ятник Олександрю Мацієвському в Києві спровокував дискусію: чи доречно так вшановувати загиблих. New Voice. 2023. URL: <http://surl.li/texlos> (дата звернення: 20.12.2024).

victory. This expectation is conveyed not only by speeches of Russian top officials, but also by shifts in memory spaces. The aforementioned nautical knot in Kerch was repainted in 2023 so as to conceal the flags of Russia and Ukraine and not provoke anyone¹⁹. On the unoccupied territory memory wars continue as well. For instance, on January 16, 2025 a plaque on the monument to M. Pushkar in Poltava was removed. He was described there as the «glorious champion of the unbreakable friendship of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples» (trans. from Ukrainian)²⁰.

In conclusion, the following can be said. A study of Russo-Ukrainian relations reflected in Ukrainian urban memory spaces (1991–2024) allows us to reveal the evolution of images of those relations from «friendship», «brotherhood», and «unity» to «hostility», «enmity» and «rivalry». At the turn of the century, both Ukraine and Russia habitually used images of «friendship» and «brotherhood» to advance the bilateral ties, which found its expression in monuments, toponymy, symbolism and joint cultural events. However, 2014 became a turning point when memory wars erupted, in which the Ukrainian nationalist discourse collided with the Russian imperialist and/or Soviet nostalgic one. The full-scale Russian invasion in 2022 has drastically reshaped Ukrainian urban memory spaces. The pro-Ukrainian discourse, stressing independence, resistance, and heroism, has displaced the images of «friendship», «brotherhood», and «unity» incompatible with the realities of war. Instead, the image of «hostility» has prevailed, reflecting a radical shift in the perception of Russo-Ukrainian relations. The process of eradicating vestiges of Russianness in urban spaces continues. It expresses not only a desire for decolonization, but also a search for new meanings that will correspond to the newfound national values and the identity of the majority of Ukrainians. This transformation is an important step in the reimagining of the collective memory and the construction of a new cultural and political landscape of Ukraine.

¹⁹ В Керчи закрасили цвета флагов на памятнике дружбе Украины и России. 2023. URL: <https://ru.krymr.com/a/news-kerchi-zakrasili-tsveta-flagov-na-pamyatnike-druzhbe/32529877.html> (дата звернення: 18.12.2024).

²⁰ Рудь Є. У Полтаві біля пам'ятника демонтували табличку «про дружбу з Росією». Полтавська Думка. 2025. URL: <https://dumka.poltava.ua/u-poltavi-bilia-pam-iatnyka-demonтуvaly-tablychku-pro-druzhbu-z-rosiieiu/> (дата звернення: 17.01.2025).

Список літератури / References

- Ageyeva V. *Za lashtunkamy imperii. Esei pro ukrains'ko-rosijs'ki kul'turni vidnosyny*. Kyiv: Vikhola, 2021. 360 s. (In Ukrainian)
- Агеева В. *За лаштунками імперії. Есеї про українсько-російські культурні відносини*. Київ: Віхола, 2021. 360 с.
- Finkel E. *Intent to Destroy: Russia's Two-Hundred-Year Quest to Dominate Ukraine*. New York: Basic Books, 2024. 336 p.
- Hajdaj O. *Istorychna polityka schodo monumental'noi spadschyny radians'koi doby v Ukraini (na prykladi Vynnyts'koi oblasti)*. *Visnyk Kharkivs'koho natsional'noho universytetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Serii «Istoriia»* [The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series History]. 2014. № 1117. Вур. 48. S. 69–78. (In Ukrainian)
- Гайдай О. *Історична політика щодо монументальної спадщини радянської доби в Україні (на прикладі Вінницької області)*. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія «Історія»*. 2014. № 1117. Вип. 48. С. 69–78.
- Ihnatenko O., Tovkajlo M. *Het' vid Moskvy chy naviky razom? Scho robyty z pam'iatnykamy, iaki vykonuiut' rol' ideolohichnoi otruty*. Pereiaslav.City. Data onovlennia: 29.03.2020. URL: <https://pereiaslav.city/blogs/70141/get-vid-moskvi-chi-naviki-razom-scho-robiti-z-pamyatnikami-yaki-vikonuyut-rol-ideologichnoi-otruti> (data zvernennia: 17.12.2024). (In Ukrainian)
- Ігнатенко О., Товкайло М. *Геть від Москви чи навіки разом? Що робити з пам'ятниками, які виконують роль ідеологічної отрути*. Переяслав.City. Дата оновлення: 29.03.2020. URL: <https://pereiaslav.city/blogs/70141/get-vid-moskvi-chi-naviki-razom-scho-robiti-z-pamyatnikami-yaki-vikonuyut-rol-ideologichnoi-otruti> (дата звернення: 17.12.2024).
- Ivanenko A., Kolybenko O. *Mistsia pam'iaty Pereiaslavschyny v istorii ta s'ohodenni*. *Natsional'na ta istorychna pam'iat'* [National and Historical Memory]. 2013. №8. S. 208–215. (In Ukrainian)
- Іваненко А., Колибенко О. *Місця пам'яті Переяславщини в історії та сьогоденні*. *Національна та історична пам'ять*. 2013. №8. С. 208–215.
- Kasianov G. *Past Continuous: istorychna polityka 1980-kh – 2000-kh. Ukraina ta susidy*. Kyiv: Laurus, Antropos-Lohos-Fil'm, 2018. 420 s. (In Ukrainian)
- Касьянов Г. *Past Continuous: історична політика 1980-х – 2000-х. Україна та сусіди*. Київ: Laurus, Антропос-Логос-Фільм, 2018. 420 с.
- Kuzio T. *Ukraine – Crimea – Russia: Triangle of Conflict*. Stuttgart: Ibidem, 2014. 247 p.

Kurydon A. «Masky pam'iaty» v umovakh suspil'nykh zlamiv. Ukrains'kyj instytut natsional'noi pam'iaty. URL: <https://old.uinp.gov.ua/publication/maski-pam-yati-v-umovakh-suspilnikh-zlamiv> (data zvernennia: 22.12.2024). (In Ukrainian)

Киридон А. «Маски пам'яті» в умовах суспільних зламів. Український інститут національної пам'яті. URL: <https://old.uinp.gov.ua/publication/maski-pam-yati-v-umovakh-suspilnikh-zlamiv> (дата звернення: 22.12.2024).

Nikolaienko O. Memorializatsiia travmy v mis'komu prostori Kharkova. *Doslidzhennia z istorii i filosofii nauky i tekhniky* [Studies in History and Philosophy of Science and Technology]. 2024. Tom 33. No. 2. <https://doi.org/10.15421/272425>. (In Ukrainian)

Николаенко О. Меморіалізація травми в міському просторі Харкова. *Дослідження з історії і філософії науки і техніки*. 2024. Том 33. № 2. <https://doi.org/10.15421/272425>.

Ploky S. The Russo-Ukrainian War: The Return of History. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 2023. 376 p.

Влада Сабадаш

аспірантка

Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна

Майдан Свободи 4, 61022, Харків, Україна

Email: vlada.sabadash@karazin.ua

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3832-7254>

УКРАЇНСЬКО-РОСІЙСЬКІ ВІДНОСИНИ У ПРОСТОРАХ ПАМ'ЯТІ МІСТ УКРАЇНИ (1991–2024)

У статті досліджується динаміка українсько-російських відносин крізь призму міських просторів пам'яті в Україні з 1991 по 2024 роки. Зазначається, що меморіали, пам'ятники, назви вулиць і об'єкти культурної спадщини стали ключовими аренами для репрезентації та трансформації наративів про ці відносини. Дослідження зосереджено на вивченні процесу інструменталізації просторів пам'яті у колективній ідентичності, підкреслюючи їхню роль як для відображення подій, так і для ретрансляції ширших змін суспільного значення. У статті наведено конкретні приклади еволюції образів українсько-російських відносин у відповідь на значні геополітичні події, що репрезентовані у просторах пам'яті в українських містах, які демонструють еволюцію образів українсько-російських відносин. Особливу увагу приділено періодам загострення напруги (анексія Криму у 2014 році та подальша війна на Донбасі, повномасштабне вторгнення Росії у 2022 році). Ці події стали

каталізатором широкомасштабних процесів декомунізації та деколонізації, що призвело до видалення / реконтекстуалізації пам'яток радянської доби та назв вулиць. У статті розглядається вплив цих трансформацій на політику пам'яті, наголошуючи на повторному утвердженні локальних і національних наративів замість імперських чи колоніальних. У дослідженні пропонується встановити образи російсько-українських відносин, що концентруються навколо метафор «дружба», «братерство», «єдність», «сусідство» та їхні протилежності — «неприятель», «ворожнеча», «суперництво» тощо. висвітлено трансформацію між зазначеними метафорами у просторі міст. Дослідження підкреслює гнучку природу міських просторів пам'яті зі зміною державної політики, місцевих ініціатив і суспільних настроїв. Аналізуючи конкретні випадки на прикладі таких міст як Київ, Харків, Переяслав та інші, стаття демонструє, як ці простори служать дзеркалами історичної пам'яті та інструментами формування колективної свідомості в умовах переформатування українсько-російських відносин.

Ключові слова: **російсько-українська війна, Росія, Україна, студії пам'яті, культурна спадщина, історична політика, публічний простір, місто, монументи, декомунізація, місця пам'яті, деколонізація.**

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 21.09.2025.

Date of the article's initial submission to the Journal: 21.09.2025.

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 14.11.2025.

Date of acceptance of the article for publication after peer review: 14.11.2025.

Дата публікації: 30.12.2025.

Date of publication: 30.12.2025.