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Abstract:
Major Russian media outlets produce narratives which are subordinated to concepts and ideologemes defined by their systemic nature and strong structure. These ideologemes are the binding glue of the seemingly chaotic narratives of the current ideological war. The chief among these concepts is Russianness ("russkost"), in turn connected with others such as the Russian civilization, Russians, the Western civilization, the Western man, Ukrainians and others, which together along with their correlates produce the insidiously enforced worldview. The content of these ideologemes, gleaned from publications of leading Russian media ideologists, diverges widely from the expected, carries a high evaluative load, is suggestive and strongly polarized.
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Introduction

Worldview wars are waged when two contrary ideological matrices collide. Each of the matrices, or worldview systems, defines topics, discussion objects and narratives composed into discourses, as well as a selection of value-laden verbal and non-verbal expressions which are best able to deliver the speaker’s intention. “The ideological matrix is a weapon of mass destruction for
a worldview”\(^2\) – writes Yevgenii Chernyshev, a prominent author in the Russian media. Making sense of the Russian media discourse via central ideologemes is a cornerstone to understanding which content modern Russian media impose onto generic language forms. It also helps in building up informational defences on behalf of the Ukrainian as well as the European society. The current paper is a continuation of the author’s publication in “Ante Portas – Security Studies” concerning the phenomenon of Russian information aggression\(^3\).

The ideological matrix of modern Russian media demonstrates a high repetitiveness and rigid internal organization of concepts and ideologemes which are represented by apex nomens (words, phrases or idioms) – compacted names for extensive situations which are, in the follow-up discourse, unravelled with key statements. It is these mechanisms that steer the seemingly chaotic narratives of the current consciental war. As material for our research we have chosen Ukraine-focused texts in the analytics and news Internet portal “Military review” (“Voennoe obozrenie”) published over the past 18 months. The overall number of analytical publications dedicated to Ukraine in said portal exceeds 550 (against approximately 70 for Belarus); over 80 new items were published while this research was being conducted.

**Central ideologemes of the Russian media**

The Russian media narratives which focus on Ukraine present themselves as numerous, thematically varied, having versatile objects, length, scope and intention; they also vary in degree of potential influence and aggression contained in the verbal and non-verbal markers of the attitude towards Ukraine, degree of simulacra prevalence. As a collection of texts, they do not form a system. The only way a system is revealed is when the overall discourse is analyzed by key ideologemes, which are strongly hierarchic in the way they organize the narratives within the discourse.

“The mycelium of narratives” the Russian media create can be traced to a single root concept from which all the narratives radiate, infected with that single system-forming idea. That root concept is the radically stated tenet of “Russianness” (“russkost’”) at the top of a triad: the opposition of “the Russian supernation/Russian civilization”, “Russian people” versus “the West/Western civilization”, “Western man” and “Ukraine/Ukrainian”, which stand in the


middle. Occasionally, “Ukraine” is the second member of the opposition, making the triad a diad. The central selection of ideologemes connected with Ukraine numbers as many as 20; apart from the above mentioned it includes “Russia”, “the Russian state”, “Russian-speaking”, “ancestral Russian lands”, “Russian mentality”, “the Russian issue”, “the Russian way”, “the Ukrainian language”, “Ukrainization”, “the Ancient Russian state”, “USSR”, “USSR-2”.

Below we analyze the content of the ideologemes as they appear in the “Voyennoe obozrenie” portal. The views expressed there are representative of the ideologists of Russian media. Thus, it is possible to provide definitive proof of the meanings that Russian media vest onto everyday contexts and language.

“Russianness” (“russkost’”) is presented as “the Russian code” which is incomprehensible to the West. It includes conscientiousness, a sense for fairness and proximity to a type of divine knowledge. The “russkost’” is the survival ethics of “the Russian civilization” – a key to maintaining and increasing population as well as preserving territory, language and history. “Russkost’” can be grafted onto someone else: “Russians… have made people of different tribes and cultures also Russian, equal to themselves, inoculating them with their higher-order spiritual and material culture. Foreigners and infidels were not exterminated but offered to become part of a great civilization. The new lands were not plundered but developed, elevated to be on par with the originally Russian regions”4. Concept: carriers of “russkost’” traits are morally superior to others and must stay together.

While the substantive “russkost’” is rarely directly defined, it is crucially included into the triad “Russian civilization” (where Russia is the centre) – “the West” – “Ukraine” (as the middle land). Russia is positioned as the homeland of the highly moral “Russian supernation/world/civilization”; “Ukraine” is broken, decaying and fooled by “the West” but still historically and nowadays a part of “the Russian world” and “true Russian orthodoxy”. There is a stark opposition between “the Russian civilization” and “the Western world”, which is nothing short of infernal.

The “russkost’” ideologeme is the intrinsic characteristic of “Russian people” who compose “the Russian supernation”; the lands settled by “Russian people” are “Great Russia/Rus-Russia”; “the Russian people” of “Rus-Russia” create “the Russian civilization/Russian world”; they profess “Russian orthodoxy” and live by “the Russian mentality”. They go through life via “the Russian way” and gather as one “the ancestral Russian lands”, the new wave of “russkost’” resurgence being “the Russian spring” of 2014 (fixedly described with the idiom “to rise from the knees”). It opens the possibility of “USSR-2”,

---

“the Russian union”. What is currently “the Russian state/Russia” is a federative structure in every way smaller than “the Russian civilization”.

The content of the triad of ideologemes “the Russian supernation/Russian civilization (Russian people)” versus “the West/Western civilization (the Western man)” and “Ukraine (Ukrainians)” as the mediator is closely connected to the central ideologeme of “russkost’”.

“The Russian civilization” (realized in the text through “Русь”, “русский суперэтнос”, “великое государство”, “русский мир”, “империя, какою она была во времена Российской империи и Советского Союза”, “русская цивилизационная идентичность”, “Русское “Царство Правды”, “Град Китеж”, “Царство Божье на Земле”) is the age-old antagonist and counterweight to “the Western civilization”. The foundation of “the Russian civilization” are Orthodoxy and collectivism, the communal way of life, the rule of “honor” and social fairness, the cult of sufficiency as opposed to the cult of affluence. In a nutshell, the moral and cultural value is higher by a margin than that of “the Western civilization”. The same “russkost’” applies to most of the Ukrainian population, which is mentally close to Russia. Residing predominantly in the industrial South and East, it is juxtaposed to “the Western (Catholic) civilization” which Galicia (Western Ukraine) favors. If Ukraine was to return to “the fold”, its statehood would need a complete rethinking on the foundation of “russkost’”. “The Russian supernation” is superior spiritually as well as intellectually and socially to the nations of Western Europe. It is a direct descendant of “the Hyperborea civilization”, “the Aryan civilization” and “Great Scythia”. The cumulative potential of “the Russian civilization” has been dealt a blow by the collapse of the USSR. Its survival could be enabled by maintaining and growing the population carrying the “russkost’” traits; preserving the territory, culture, language and history. A state’s external policy must be based on a reunification of the “Russian land” and the whole of “the Russian civilization”: “Velikaya”, “Malaya” and “Belaya” Russia as well as restoring influence across the whole of the Russian Empire and USSR. Intent: the interest of “the Russian civilization” lies in preserving and defending its civilizational space, resurrecting “the Russian civilization”, constructing a new “Velikorossiya” specifically. We find support of this in the paper of Marina Yangliaeva, who refers to text analyses done by experts from the NATO to state that “ideas of the Russian civilization (the Russian-speaking

---

Orthodox civilization) as different from the Western are the penultimate focus of Russian propaganda”.

“The Russian people” (as in “русские люди (русы)”, “русский народ”, “русские”, “русь”, “системообразующее ядро объединения народов российской державы”, “наши”, “жители Руси/Русской земли, в том числе жители Киевской Руси”, “постом Малороссии и Украинской ССР, также Беларуси”, “жители, которые этнически, исторически, религиозно, ментально связаны с Россией, составляют один народ”; “наиболее разделенный народ – носитель “русскости”) are a social group or stratum which is viewed as complementary to the “ruskkost’” trait due to one of the following: language, mentality or behavioral stereotypes, anthropological characteristics, religion, culture or territory of settlement. Alternatively, they are simply viewed as such by ideology masterminds. Writers of the said Internet portal claim that “the Russian people” are strong due to their acceptance of anyone willing to join their ranks. “Russian” is an adjective rather than a noun, a “which?” rather than a “who?” Being “Russian” means being vested with “the mysterious Russian soul” in polar opposition to the “gray race”, “the man of the world”, a sort of ideal slave. For centuries, “Russians” have resisted assaults from the West, have steadfastly carried forth the ethnic and genetic program of a supernation, propelling the civilizational and genetic evolution of mankind. It was Russians, according to the source, who first produced a future’s society – socialism, “the soviet civilization”. Spiritually, civilizationaly, genetically and culturally Russians are portrayed as superior to Westerners. Despite the recent decline, “the Russian people” are still capable of a spiritual rebirth, of recreating a Golden Age where the ethics of conscience would dominate. Millions of “Russian people” are in danger of Ukraine forcing them into a Polish-Romanian-Hungarian serfdom. Genetically disjointed by the Tartar-Mongol invasion of the 13th century, “the Russian people” found themselves scattered across three states: the Vladimir-Suzdal principality, later to become Muscovy, the Great Principality of Lithuania and Poland. It was only Muscovy that managed to preserve statehood and restore “the Russian civilization”. The two other “Russian” populations have lost their statehood. The Ukrainians, “malorosy”, are also carriers of “ruskkost’” trait. For four centuries the Polish kings attempted to assimilate “the Russian people” of Ukraine, to force-convert them to a Polish identity and Catholicism. Elsewhere apart from Galicia “the Russian people” prevailed and kept “the Russian identity” and Orthodox faith. Under the Polish influence a special “Ukrainian branch of the Russian people” was formed. In the later 20th-21st centuries the people of Galicia became part of “the Western civilization”.

The people of Eastern Ukraine – “Novorossiya” – are “Russians” in spirit and in essence. They are forced to take up arms to prove their place in the “Russian civilization”. “Novorossiya”, the name used for the territory of Eastern Ukraine, is intrinsically “a Russian land”. The population of Kharkiv and Odesa is, without a doubt, “Russian”. Belarusians are, simply put, “Russian” (as in “русские – белорусы”). People living in Transcarpathia (“Carpathian Rus’”) are “a Russian population”7. Message: “the Russian people” who carry the “russkost’” trait must be united within “the Russian civilization” whose interests lie in maintaining its civilizational space. Russia is tasked with resurrecting “the Russian civilization”, building “a new Greater Russia”, “returning into the fold all the southwestern lands today called Ukraine”.

“The West” (as in “Запад”, “англо-романо-германский мир”, “европейская цивилизация”, “Западная Европа”, “примкнувшие позже и взявшие на себя роль лидера и “командного пункта” западного мира – США, папский престол – Рим”) is the geopolitical enemy of “the Russian civilization” and “supernation”, an adversary to Russia; a global mafia hellbent on “solving the Russian issue”, a predatory and parasitic world of consumption and self-destruction; a civilizational, cultural and spiritual threat to mankind; a modern and materialistic world which occasions the human involution, simplification and degradation of the physical, intellectual, spiritual and moral kind; causes the extinction of “the white race”. The Western framework is, in its nature, one of slave ownership and social parasitism. It survives by subduing the folk masses, connivingly concealing knowledge, employing toxic information technology. It festers with its mass culture, a herd ideology, a worship of the golden calf, materialism, hedonism, racism, a Satanic concept of self-destruction. It is a cesspit, a predatory and cannibalistic society where parasites thrive, a vampire world subsisting on other cultures, nations and civilizations. The Western way of life is founded on Catholicism and individualism; a cult of wealth; a social segregation into the chosen and slaves or servants; it is plainly infernal and governed by rejoicing Satanists, dark forces, misanthropy and mysticism where everything of the Christian and Biblical has been replaced by post-Christi

habits, socioeconomic and cultural genocide (collapse of birth rate, propaganda of perversions and licentiousness; destruction of the nuclear family). It attempts to destroy Russia and “Russians”, who represent a higher spiritual and cultural breed of the human species. As an age-old enemy of “the Russian civilization” the West has captured Ukraine, crossed the red line. Americans are planning to conduct a genetic cleansing of Russia using the material they collected on the Russian genotype. Message: there is a need to resist the West as a civilizational influence. Georgii Pocheptsov aptly remarks that the Russian propaganda “undermines the legitimacy of the West as a normative force on a global scale”.

“The Western man” (as in “западный человек”, “население Запада”) lacks spirituality, is materialistic and predatory, possessed by an animalistic egotism. “Westerners” have built a society of bestial consumption, self-destruction and endless hedonism. They have always plundered and oppressed other nations, scavenged the planet’s resources into their lairs. The “Western population” worships the materialistic; it is zombified, has fallen victim to toxic virtual reality, is destroying the planet and humankind, precipitating a crisis of the biosphere and mankind; a crisis of “the white race”, of capitalism and the Western world.

“Ukraine” (as in “Украина-Малороссия”, “Малороссия-Украина”, “Малая Россия (Украина)”, “Мала Россия”, “Малая Русь”, “Западная Русь”, “Западная Русь – Россия”, “западная часть русского суперэтноса”, “одна из трех частей “русской цивилизации”, наряду с Российской Федерацией и Белой Русью”, “часть общерусского культурного дерева”, “анти-Россия”, “проект “Анти-Россия”) is a “limitrophic” (marginal, contingent) state lying on the fission crack between the two civilizations (“the Catholic Western” and “the Orthodox Russian”); a russophobic state; a polyethnic artificially created entity without a united nation and especially without a Ukrainian nation; civilizationally disrupted (most of the population were historically a part of “the Russian civilization”). Today’s Ukraine is “a Nazi colonial place”; the industrial cities of the East and South are mentally on Russia’s side, while Galicia has joined with the West. Ukraine is a part of “the Russian civilization” that is going extinct; “a holy land for Russians”; “consanguineous Russian
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land”; “the Western anti-Russia project”; an attempt to build a sociobiological rather than political nation (with Galician roots) founded on violence, terror, an assimilation of others and animosity towards Russia. Ukraine’s history is primarily mythical; its governance is done by elitist and nationalistic oligarchs, steeped in Nazism and incapable of building a true statehood. Following the collapse of the USSR Ukraine has spread deceitful ideologies based on an imaginary oppression from the side of Russia. It is a Western satellite market and pressure point on Russia; the battlefield in the global standoff between Russia and the USA. Doomed to deindustrialization and degradation, Ukraine is nothing else but a tool in the hands of the West, employed to stir up crises on its borders and excuses for sanctions. Verbal definitions of Ukraine include “таран Запада”, “марIONетка Запада”, “агрессивный монстр”, “больная страна”, “страна безумия”, “цирк”, “зоопарк”, “несуразное образование”, “цэевропа”, “минимирок”, “страна “404”, “несостоявшее государство”, “страна умащленных”, “палата № 6”, “психушка на 40 млн. человек”, “государственное злокаучественное образование”11. The temporarily Russia-occupied territories of Ukraine (the Crimea and parts of the Donetsk and Luhansk regions) are developing well because they carry “the Russian civilizational identity”; are prepared to maintain “the Russian civilizational choice” together with Russia; these regions are “Russian in spirit”12. Message: a view of Ukraine as a divided state, with the Southern and Eastern parts belonging with “the Russian supernation” through maintaining the matrix of “the Russian civilization”; in Galicia this matrix has collapsed. The leading discourse paints Ukraine, historically and nowadays, as a domain of “the Russian world and true Russian Orthodoxy”; today it is “a puppet of the West”. G. Pocheptsov expresses a similar thought: “Ukraine is evil because the West is an actor within it”13.

“Украинцы” (as in “украины”), “малороссы-украины”, “русские-малороссы”, “укры”, “этническая химера”, “придуманы в Польше, Ватикане, в Австрии и Германии, а затем в Англии и США (на Западе), чтобы расчленить единую русскую цивилизацию (Русь) и русский суперэтнос”) are “Russians” who have been brainwashed and zombified with the Ukrainian idea, a Southwestern branch of “the Russian supernation”, a people with “Russian roots”, “the Western Russian people” who managed to preserve their

“russkost’” and the Orthodox faith as well as language, traditions and memory; one of the two parts of one nation alongside Russians. According to the statement “the history of Ukraine is fiction”, Ukrainians are neither true Slavs nor descendants of Ancient Rus. Ukraine’s titular nation are portrayed as hard-headed nationalists with a hillbilly preference for all things Ukrainian and a rabid intolerance for other cultures and traditions. Some ways to express this thought are “небратья”, “укропейцы”, “сумасшедшие”, “больные”, “смешные”, “неполноценные”, “психически больные”, “физическими больные”, “глупые”, “идиоты”, “малоумные”, “неуважаемые”, “с подкастрюльным мышлением”, “кастрюлоголовые”, “галлюцинирующие”, “деградировавшие”, “деклассированные”, “игроки”. Galicians are described as having a deep-seated hillbilly mentality. Message: there is a need to denazify Ukraine and return it to the “russkost’” way of thinking, “the common Russian faith”, culture, history and language.14 Here statements made by the President of Russia chime in: “[Ukrainians and Russians] are part of the same nation, or two brethren-nations”.15

Narratives around “the Russian civilization” are complemented by others, such as Great Romania, which embodies the Panromanian idea by way of annexing Ukrainian lands; there are a few others16. During the past two centuries, active word-building using the prefix pan- has been used to create names of ethnic groups units: Panslavic, Pangermanic, Panmongolian, Panamerican, Panafrican, Panarabic, Panfarsi, PanEuropean, Panceltic and others. Thus, “the Russian world” is promoted as a dominant concept in a worlding context, which can be defined as a civilizational tendency. However, the means employed by Russian media to promote this are very specific: the language is categorical, confrontational and widely negative. The titles of articles themselves contain extremely negative emotional triggers (“предала, умирает, вымирает, жесткие реальности, боятся, ненавидят, сценарии уничтожения, объявлена война, выживание, глобальная смута, огненный пояс, жаром полыхнет”), are manipulative and harshly polarized, which is something Russian media authors are willing to admit: “Russia is a northern land. Half of their lives most Russians see two colours in the street: black trees

and white snow. One gets used to the fact that Russia is black and white. But what is strange is that lately it has been the same for Russian thinking. Some of our countrymen will stubbornly ignore the colors of the world. It is black, or white, and no half-shades in between”.

The system of active ideologemes of the Russian media

Apart from the three concepts represented by seven major ideologemes, there are other, contingent ones, in Russian media texts.

1. “Russia” (as in “Россия”, “Русь-Россия”) is portrayed as a country whose might lies in the unification of the splintered “Russian nation”\(^1\). It is interpreted as the mythical image of the Heartland – the axis, the innermost of the world; the word itself was introduced in the geopolitical concept writings of H. J. Mackinder. Russia is conceptualized as possessing the matrix for a Golden Age and mankind’s salvation. The message is that Russia is the center of “the Russian civilization”, the matrix country. The compound “Rus-Rossiya” calls for special attention as a template copy of the title of the book of first President of independent Ukraine Mykhailo Hrushevskii, The History of Ukraine-Rus.

2. “Ancestral Russian lands” are defined as in Russian emperor Nicholas I: “Where once the Russian flag was raised, it should never again be lowered”. This ancestral status is given to all lands once belonging to the ancient state of Rus. This creates the perspective that no “Polish” or Russian-speaking areas exist in Ukraine; all of it is “ancestral Russian land” liberated many times by the Russian army; it is “holy for Russians”; even Galicia, “the Red Rus”, was severed from the rest by the Tartar Mongol invasion but retains traces of “the Russian conscious”. The republics of the former USSR are national reservations, pieces carved from Russian territory, which led to the loss of “ancestral Russian lands” of “the Small (Malaya) and White (Belaya) Rus’”. Lviv is “an ancient Rus’” town and, thus, also “Russian”, Kyiv is “a Russian city”, “the ancient Russian capital”, “the mother of Russian cities”. This is where the Kyiv Rus’ originated, where Prince Vladimir baptized “the Russian people”, one of the centres of “the Russian civilization”\(^2\).


Message: the “Russian civilization’s” territory is where “Russians” reside (see definition above).

3. “Ukrainization” is a form of ethnic genocide: the more Ukrainians, the fewer “Russians”\(^{20}\).

4. “The Ukrainian language” is “a marginal variation of Russian”, “the Southern Russian dialect” purposely corrupted by Polonisms and new borrowings; “a novoyaz”\(^{21}\).

5. “The Soviet Union” (as in “Великая Россия”, “большая Россия”, “Россия”, “Советская Россия”) is defined directly with references to Vladimir Putin’s statements: “Russia, which in Soviet times was called the Soviet Union – abroad it was called precisely this, Soviet Russia”; references to Zbigniew Brzezinski “It was Russia, referred to as the Soviet Union”\(^{22}\). Message: the USSR and Russia are the same. Thus, the borders of “the Russian civilization” extend over all of the former USSR, which was successful in its antagonism with the West. This drives the USSR nostalgia. G. Pocheptsov rightly suggested as definitions of the USSR “the land of dreams” and “the land of illusions”\(^{23}\).

6. “The USSR-2” (as in “Русский союз”, “новый Союз”, “СССР-2”) is a future result of unifying “Russian lands” in a single “Russian state” as the new Soyuz is restored with full-scale animosity with “the West”, “the Eastern threat” (China and Japan) and “the global issues in the south”\(^{24}\).

7. “The Russian state” is a unity of nations where “the Russian people” have always been the core; it is held together by a single culture and civilization founded on the Russian language and culture, the unified heritage of all the peoples of Russia\(^{25}\).

8. “The Russian language” is native for Ukrainians, among others\(^{26}\).


9. “The Russian-speaking ballast of Ukraine” is a phrase used to denote “the Russian population” of towns in Ukraine’s south and east; doomed to extinction due to loss of industry and Ukraine reverting to an agricultural state27.

10. “The Russian mentality” is based on socialist values and aspirations with Orthodoxy at its core28.

11. “The Russian way” is a just and equal life system where consumption and destruction are not employed; a war must be waged to unify all “Russian lands” in a single state which is a restored Soyuz (“СССР-2”, “Русский союз”)29.

12. “Resolving the Russian issue” is the penultimate goal of “the Western project”; a total destruction of “the Russian civilization, Russian nation and the Russian language”30.

13. The Kyiv Rus’ – “an ancient Russian state”, the first stage of “Russian statehood”.

The structure of ideologemes in the Russian media

A number of ideologemes end up being unexpectedly asymmetrical; the ideologeme “Russia” (low activity) is much less frequently employed than “Ukraine” (extremely high activity); “Ukrainization” is an extremely negative process while “Russification” is extremely positive. Instead of the Russian Federation “the Russian state” is used to shift focus to the single civilizational code offered by “the Russian language and culture”. Many ideologemes are strongly value-laden; a few have zero reference (such as “the USSR-2”). A large number of ideologemes refer to very vague objects (“Киевская Русь”, “Русская держава”, the previously unmentioned “глубинное государство”).

What is significantly important is not only the content but the correlation of ideologemes which construct the discourse megaframe where “russkost’” is the apex nomen. The main confrontation unfolds along the line “the Russian civilization” (“the Russian man”) versus “the Western civilization” (“the Western man”) also on the mythological plane (the divine, Godly, blessed, spiritual nature of “russkost’” is contrasted with the dark, satanic, infernal nature of “the Western
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way”). Ukraine is seen as the middle land where the brunt of the assault on “the Russian civilization” takes place.

Most ideologemes contain the root morpheme rus-/ros- or its derivatives. The expansion of the morpheme’s meaning in the words built from it is not justified by any known versions of the origin of rus-/ros-: the southern (Boris Rybakov), the Norman (Herard Friedrich Muller), the Iranian (Vasilii Abaiev), the Celtic-Slavic (Vitalii Skliarenko), yet it has already made its way into Russian dictionaries. We note wide discrepancies between the ethnic name “Russians” in the 1960s and at the beginning of the 20th century. Compare “Russians are an eastern European people comprising the majority of the RSFSR and residing in significant numbers in other Soviet Republics; representatives of this people”31; a correlating definition without reference to the other Republics is found in Dmitry Ushakov’s dictionary32; is provided by Anastasiia Yevgenieva33. The definitions in the dictionaries of Sergey Ozhegov and Nataliia Shvedova are very different: “1. See Russian (above “The people constituting the majority of the original population of Russia”); 2. Referring to the Russian people, its language, national character, way of life and culture, as well as to Russia, its territory, internal organization and people; like what is done by Russians or in Russia”34. The latter definition makes it possible to define a broad circle of people from a random country as “Russians”.

The range of ideologemes deployed in the Russian media is wider than the list above; yet even the twenty we have gleaned from the Internet portal should suffice for an understanding of the basic message.

The main intended use of the media’s conceptual apparatus is to affect the recipients’ worldview. This has been stated clearly since the beginning of Russian hostilities in Ukraine: “The one adopting the enemy’s discourse will inevitably be the loser. The discourse contains a worldview. You accept the hostiles’ discourse – you will also have their worldview forced on you… Our aim is simple: to resurrect Holy Rus, which means to unify the Russian Civilization35. The author proceeds to outline the key principles of talking about Ukraine: saying in (в) Ukraine is not permissible because it is not a separate state; instead of “Kyiv Rus” we must say “Old Rus”; there is no Ukrainian language but the southern Russian dialect; instead of brethren peoples we should refer to the unity of three Russian nations; all things Ukrainian

(ukrainskost’) are, in essence, a part of the common Russian heritage. The Russian world is a valid civilizational entity; one must not say “Holodomor” (famine) but only “Holod” (hunger); instead of Russian speakers we have a part of the Russian civilization etc.  

The ideological framework of Russian media is not a creation of recent years; the civilizational conflict between “the Russian civilization” and “the Western civilization” had articles dedicated to it long before 2014. One author, Aleksandr Samsonov, has a range of eloquent articles including On the roots of Western russophobia (2011), The death of the Western civilization and Russia (2011), The military threat to Russia in the first half of the 21st century (2011) and others. After 2014 he went on to publish Why the West wants to destroy the Russian civilization (2016), The ideal of the Western world: a global serfdom (2017) etc. The new tendency since 2014 has been the positioning of Ukraine between “the Russian civilization” and “the Western civilization” and the strengthening of the evaluative component of ideologemes, leading to narrative transportation recently referred to by G. Pocheptsov, with references.

Conclusions

Awareness of the content of Russian media’s key ideologemes is an urgent task Ukrainian and Western societies face. This becomes clear from the stated purpose of the information aggression: “To achieve a closure of the nationalistic and russophobic project Ukraine, targeted activities of the Ukrainian counter-elite or active elite need to be supported from outside. For the elites accepting these new rules a system must be created in the post-Ukrainian space to make it into one whole with the country and advocating for common economical and political interests… It is in the interest of the Russian state to take steps to return the seized territory and people into the Russian civilizational space”. To maintain the sovereignty of Ukraine both Ukrainians and Europeans need to have a wide-angle awareness of the ideologeme system of Russian media and have its tenets comprehensively and professionally commented on. Similar things have been undertaken regarding the Ukrainian historic and linguistic phenomena in publications of academician Hrihorii

36 Ibidem.
Last but not least, we must elaborate on our own system of worldview-level concepts.
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