

УДК 165.745

*I. A. Yanushevich**candidate of philosophical sciences, associate professor
Odessa national polytechnic university***PROBLEMS OF THE CREATION OF NATIONAL STATEHOOD
AND FORMATION OF DEMOCRATIC UKRAINIAN SOCIETY**

The achievement of status of the sovereign Ukrainian state is closely connected with aspiration of Ukraine to become the civilized state and to create democratic society. The national states for today remain the most important element of the international system. However, it should be noted that some attempts of transferring of the European model of the national statehood on the new state formations have often led to unsatisfactory results. The national project, which is offered the Ukrainian society was not rejected, but isn't accepted. The Ukraine has still failed to acquire the distinct features of a civilized country. A deep crisis gripping all spheres of life might well be regarded as the singular specificity of its current national development. This crisis originates in the lack of state strategy, conceptual helplessness, and ill-defined tactics of nation-building.

Unfortunately, the authors of available publications on problems of Ukrainian state-building, which have appeared in the past several years, are primarily concerned with trying to prove to the world community and Ukrainian society the historical inevitability and significance of the very fact of independent Ukraine's emergence on the world political map. In particular, the model of the civil statehood, where the problem of the nations doesn't necessary exist in general because the nations and ethnoses have never been the subjects of its formation, are widely discussed in these articles [1]. All citizens are a part of such state on equal terms, irrespective of a national identity. It is considered modern type of the European statehood which arose in the twentieth century. Unfortunately, such type has badly got accustomed in multinational societies, such as Ukraine. This type of statehood is more suitable for ethnically uniform societies, as the Czech Republic or Slovakia. However, most of these publications testify that for the time being of Ukrainian independence our country exists without any coherent political philosophy adequate to current realities. The authors of these publications avoided to discuss the problem that the construction of the Ukrainian state takes place by secret, private means closed to the public and far from society as a whole. In doing so, the top leadership relies primarily on its own former narrow group activities devoid of any state-building experience and marked by a corporative understanding of the national interests. But it is not

really possible to «build» a state only on the basis of abstractly grounded patriotic feelings. It is not enough reasonable to be satisfied with publicizing one's patriotism at home while suffering fiascoes in solving burning domestic problems and defending its national interests on the international arena.

In this regard we try to make a methodological analysis of the political strategy of the creation of national statehood and formation of democratic Ukrainian society that can be identified depending on specific type of cognitive strategies, and that would be free from propagandist pathos and excessive descriptive detail. We would like to examine both the specifics of formation of the nation in the Ukraine and the possibilities of Ukrainian national state-building and the special features of the Ukrainian struggle for independence as well as the weight and role of its inner and external factors. Our major aim is to contribute to the forming of a truly democratic Ukrainian society and to stimulate its will to building its own future full-fledged nation. There can be no doubt that the cause of nation-building cannot be farmed out to those who wield power and chimeras of an "objective course of history".

Nation-building is constructing or structuring a national identity using the power of the state. It is thus narrower than one used to call "nation formation", the broad process through which nations come into being. Nation-building aims at the unification of the people within the state so that it remains politically stable and viable in the long run. Nation builders are those members of a state who take the initiative to develop the national community through government programs, including military conscription and national content mass schooling. Nation-building can involve the use of propaganda or major infrastructure development to foster social harmony and economic growth.

Nation-building includes the creation of national paraphernalia such as flags, anthems, national days, national stadiums, national airlines, national languages, and national myths. At a deeper level, national identity needed to be deliberately constructed by molding different ethnic groups into a nation, especially since in many newly established states colonial practices of divide and rule had resulted in ethnically heterogeneous populations.

In the modern era nation-building referred to the efforts of newly independent nations, notably

the nations of Africa but also in the Balkans, to reshape territories that had been carved out by colonial powers or empires without regard to ethnic, religious, or other boundaries. These reformed states would then become viable and coherent national entities.

However, many new states were plagued by tribalism; that is, rivalry between ethnic groups within the nation. This sometimes resulted in their near-disintegration, such as the attempt by Biafra to secede from Nigeria in 1970, or the continuing demand of the Somali people in the Ogaden region of Ethiopia for complete independence. In Asia, the disintegration of India into Pakistan and Bangladesh is another example where ethnic differences, aided by geographic distance, tore apart a post-colonial state. The Rwandan genocide as well as the recurrent problems experienced by the Sudan can also be related to a lack of ethnic, religious, or racial cohesion within the nation. It has often proved difficult to unite states with similar ethnic but different colonial backgrounds. Whereas successful examples like Cameroon do exist, failures like Senegambia Confederation demonstrate the problems of uniting Francophone and Anglophone territories.

Traditionally, there has been some confusion between the use of the term nation-building and that of state-building (the terms are sometimes used interchangeably in North America). Both have fairly narrow and different definitions in political science, the former referring to national identity, the latter to infrastructure and the institutions of the state. The debate has been clouded further by the existence of two very different schools of thought on state-building. The first (prevalent in the media) portrays state-building as an interventionist action by foreign countries. The second (more academic in origin and increasingly accepted by international institutions) sees state-building as an indigenous process.

With the development of capitalist relations, economic and cultural links strengthened, the national market emerged, economic fragmentation of nationalities was eliminated, and their different parts were consolidated in single national whole. The nationalities developed into nations. Thus, a nation as a community of people arises at the time of appearance of capitalism on the bases of community of economic life, territory, language, certain features of psychology, traditions of everyday life and culture. A nation is the most stable community of people and its stability is ensured first of all by profound economic factors.

Nations emerged both out of related tribes and nationalities and out of groups of unrelated tribes, races and nationalities. The specific features of historical development, of economic structure, culture, geographic and historical environment,

everyday life, and traditions impose an imprint on the nation's spiritual image, shaping the national character and national self-consciousness.

Every historically formed nation rises to the realization by its most advanced representatives of its common national interests, culture, traditions and prospects of development. It possesses a particular way of thinking and form of expressing the emotions; it has its national dignity. All this makes a nation a unique historical structure. However nations have not only distinctive feature, but common ones as well, uniting rather than differentiating them: some nations speak the same language, some live on the same territory, others have a great deal in common in their history, culture, everyday life and psychology. The diversity of national features constitutes mankind's wealth, its treasury of values. Wellbeing of the nation in many respects depends on the pursued state policy. The sphere of politics has a relative independence. Since politics is the art of government, it must be an art in the highest sense of the term: first, it must rely on the achievements of science, and second, it must correspond to the highest criteria of morality, for it is precisely political activity that is the most responsible of all the types of social activity [2, p.168–179].

In the most general form political activity includes three basic elements. First, the ability to set the proximate or tactical and the more distant or strategic real goals, and to solve these tasks by properly handling the relations between the social forces and taking account of all of the society's possibilities at a concrete stage. Second, the working out of effective methods, ways and forms of organization of the social forces for the achievement of these goals. And finally, third, selection and placement of personnel capable of solving the tasks facing them.

Politics as "the art of running a state" is a special kind of activity which also regulates the relations between large social groups, states and nations in particular. Such is the definition of the forms, tasks and content of the existence of the nation. The goal of politics is always the preservation or creation of the most advantageous conditions of the realization of power. Therefore one of the principal goals of politics is the organization of state power: in particular politics of the national state system implies defence of sovereignty of nation or another ethnos in one or another form. The policy has impact on formation of the state system, in particular national statehood.

On the whole the concept "national statehood" has more broader sense, than the concept "national state". For example, autonomous areas and regions are not the states, but usually are examined as original kinds, forms of the national statehood, because they express sovereignty of corresponding

ethnos and under certain circumstances can be transformed into the national state. The creation of the national statehood is directed on satisfaction of the natural necessity of ethnos in using the political power and her facilities for the consolidation, defence and development of the language and cultural originality, interests and values. Formation of the national statehood is not casual; it was and today to a certain extent remains the general tendency of national and national-liberation movement.

The political value of the «national statehood» to an even greater degree depends upon the sense that is put in this concept. In hands of antidemocratic, chauvinistic forces it can serve as the means of suppression of democracy, violation of human rights, spreading of separatism, disconnection and opposition of nations. In the hands of democratic forces the national statehood grows into the important factor of strengthening of democracy, observance of human rights, people and national minorities, solidarity of ethnos and maintenance, strengthening of unity and integrity of the state rights. In a really democratic country the national statehood is called to express and protect interests of representatives not only by a “title nation” but also residents of all other nationalities on her territory.

One of the classical models of formation of the national statehood in Europe of the period of developed and late feudalism is the history of the state formation of France. France existed as this model till the XIX century when the French classical state system was destroyed by Great French revolution of 1789. In the period of developed and late feudalism France played almost exclusive, priority role in all areas of the European life – economic, political and cultural.

The empire of Carolingians, which was created by Charles the Great in the IX century, was disintegrated. Then the period of feudal dissociation came. By XI century all internal political and external economic pre-conditions, as well as foreign-policy pre-conditions for a way out of the feudal dissociation (growth of the cities, trade, craft, changing of character of the royalty in France) were created. This state started playing a noticeable role in geopolitical structure of Europe in XI century.

After the period of feudal dissociation the consolidation of the French state was started from the North. Exactly royal power came forward as a consolidating power in this process. The French king’s policy, which set the purpose of creation of the unity of national states, was supported by the cities that gave to the French king financial and military support. The king was helped by his vassals and knights of other areas, which directly weren’t belonging to him. He was also supported by clergy, which gave to the royalty aura of sanctity and in such way strengthened authority of the monarch.

The great number of the states that included different nations, as well as the states, which included only part of nation, and also the states that were divided into two parts (such as Korea, Germany) arose at the end of the twentieth century.

The result of such variant of national device were the national conflicts. National conflicts began to arise between the national states or inside the national states either. In case some people proceed from the idea that every nation has a right on a separation and creation of the national state, without taking into account any criteria of national belonging, the violence becomes an important and even decisive argument. So it happened with Scotland and Wales in Great Britain, Brittany in France, a country of basques in Spain, flemings and walloons in Belgium. The USSR and Yugoslavia were disintegrated on the separate states with a mass of unsolved national conflicts. National conflicts stormily arise in and between the African states. The Ukraine didn’t avoid this fate as well.

The globalization which is followed by a mass national migration strengthened national friction. The growing gap between so-called countries of North and South, or more precisely between the group of economically developed countries and a great number of developing countries, aggravated all national conflicts and in a great deal was determined by it. In the conditions of nuclear weapon as well as economic and ecological problems, the national conflicts assume especially dangerous character. The national conflicts became a nutrient medium for modern terrorism. These conflicts are also the reason for emergence of very aggressive trends in religions. Nowadays it became obvious for everyone that we need some fundamentally new approach to the problems of nation and to the problems of the national states.

The most important problem and extremely difficult task for today’s Ukraine is the preservation of territorial integrity and in this regard the development of political national strategy. In the new geopolitical conditions, which are characterized as real processes of changing of the world order, it is especially important for the modern state constructions to solve the problems of national and regional security. And now this is the main problem in the political strategy of the Ukrainian society.

In the conditions of new calls – external and internal threats for political stability of the Ukrainian society – it is necessary to study the political interactions of various actors of political process who differently regards threats to security and mechanisms of its decision. This activity is realized at a choice of national strategy of Ukraine in the conditions of the transformed social space.

Political national strategy can be identified

depending on specific type of cognitive strategies, or in other words, depending on certain methodological orientations. The problem is that the corresponding political technology has to be conformed with the accepted methodology, and it is in itself serious difficulty. As soon as we start discussing a methodological problem, we come across the wider philosophical questions.

Which explanation of the political phenomena can be admitted as an adequate and on what basis? Can the absence in concrete science (for instance, in political science) of its own specific method be regarded as admission of its scientific groundlessness? Is it really important where the method was adopted from? The most important requirement to the political method is his effectiveness in giving the results. Especially if to accept the principle of «methodological individualism» as for political sciences, the requirement of existence of any own specific method loses sense in general.

Taking this thought into account, it is possible in general to distinguish three scientific ways of formation of the political national strategy: inductive, hypothetical-deductive and synthetic.

An inductive method, that is spontaneously-traditional method, assumes stage-by-stage accumulation of empiric materials, further generalization of data, the development of specific methods of research, establishment of laws or regularities on the investigated object, verification and falsification of judgments. Almost all sciences (natural, humanitarian and social disciplines, including political science) followed mainly this way of development [3, p. 177–178].

But if natural sciences on this way achieved considerable success, the induction used in quality of the political strategy didn't yield essential results. Political sciences which practically don't use an experimental method, as well as the other quantitative ways of confirmation and refutation of its concepts, didn't give yet some theoretical knowledge which would answer all necessary signs of any standard scientific theory. Perhaps, such knowledge can appear as a result of development of the inductive direction when history many times will check in practice different political forms and institutes. However such prospects aren't absolutely clear, while a requirement in political strategy has already aroused now. As an empirical material of political sciences has tendency to quickly broadening, it should be in anyway theoretically organized and interpreted. Until such work isn't made, the political science as a strict science won't exist.

One more possible way – hypothetical-deductive – implies advancement of a hypotheses which with a high probability explains a certain

circle of the phenomena, with further empirical verification of consequences from the accepted hypotheses. This way of a reasoning and action, apparently, takes place in political science. Only one Marxist hypothesis of reorganization of public life on the theoretical beginnings cost people the great many human lives! No one theory is worth these victims. Unfortunately, the mankind paid too high price for similar historical experiments.

The third way is a “synthetic” way, which is used in more developed (in the empirical relation) fields of knowledge, and also for those subject fields of knowledge where the need in the scientific theory that solves at least some of their problems is extremely sharp. Then it would be possible “to shorten the way”, to refuse the long and labor-intensive process of gradual accumulation and generalization of knowledge, and thus to use such steady national strategy which was well developed and approved. This method of formation of the theories found his application in gnoseology and gave considerable results in this field of knowledge [4].

For example, the Ukraine could use the model of creation of the national state which is successfully used in Israel. This state was created as a symbol of revival and reunion of Jewish nation. The bases of state ideology of Israel are principles of national revival and development of society. The “title nation”, which makes a basis of the state, controls all spheres of social and political life of the country – the government, banks and finances, the big and medium business, Mass-media etc.

The similar picture can be observed in the majority of other countries of the world that were built by the principle of the national state. As an obvious example, except Israel, it is possible to give an example of China and Iran. These states also follow the way of purely national cultural and historical development. Some former republics of the Soviet Union – for example, Belarus, Kazakhstan or Turkmenistan – with a confidence could be regarded as the national states. In all these states the national values and interests stand on the first place, and only then – all the other values, for example, liberal and democratic values, communistic interests or any others.

It should be noted that in general the national states are characterized by quite low crime rate and violence in society in comparison with the states where the liberal ideology dominates. The national state allows the “title ethnos” to live in the traditional cultural environment and to keep identity (in contrast, for instance, to the liberal state, which in the liberal promotion pursues purposeful policy of destruction of national values and religious foundations of society). Therefore it is worth reflecting why many states preferred a way

of creation of the national state, having refused a way of construction of the classical liberal state as modern France or England.

The methodological analysis of the concepts of organization of Ukrainian society and state showed that the political science possesses primary signs of classical science: it is the science not in strict, but in a broad sense of the word.

On the other hand, the analysis of methodology of political science showed that the methods which are used in modern political science don't allow recognizing as possible the full theorization of political science. At creation of theoretical political science it is necessary to define the most optimum way of creation of the political theory.

There are three ways of creation of the scientific theory: the inductive, deductive and synthetic (hybridization). It seems to us that the most perspective is the third way, which realization in relation to political science would mean «inoculation» on her ideas of the adequate scientific theory.

Literature

1. Рудич Ф.М. Громадянська суспільство в Україні: проблеми становлення / Ф.М. Рудич. – К. : Наукова думка. – 2003. – 104 с.; Колодій А.Ф. На шляху до громадянського суспільства: теоретичні засади й соціокультурні передумови демократичної трансформації в Україні : [монографія] / А.Ф. Колодій. – Львів : Червона Калина, 2002 – 267 с.; Кириченко С.О. Шляхи формування громадянського суспільства і правової державі / С.О. Кириченко. – К. : Логос, 1999. – 85 с.
2. Гаджиев К.С. Введение в политическую науку : [учебник для высших учебных заведений] / К.С. Гаджиев. – М. : Логос, 1999. – 544 с.
3. Никитина А.Г. О том, «как возможна» наука политология: становление и основные методологические проблемы / А.Г. Никитина // Полис. – 1998. – № 3. – С. 147–156.
4. Цофнас А.Ю. Теория систем и теория познания / А.Ю. Цофнас. – О. : АстроПринт, 1999. – 308 с.

Summary

Yanushevich I. A. Problems of creation of national statehood and formation of democratic Ukrainian society. – Article.

The state policy fills with the semantic content the concepts of a “nation” and a “national statehood”. The strategy of formation of a national statehood demands theoretical substantiation. This article deals with the influence of public policy on a choice of a way of creation of national statehood and formation of democratic Ukrainian society.

Key words: national statehood, national state, inductive cognitive strategy, hypothetical-deductive cognitive strategy, synthetic cognitive strategy.

Анотація

Янушевич І. А. Проблеми побудови національної державності та формування демократичного українського суспільства. – Стаття.

Державна політика наповнює смисловим змістом поняття «нація» і «національна державність». Стратегія побудови національної державності вимагає теоретичного обґрунтування. У статті розглядається питання впливу державної політики на вибір шляху побудови національної державності та формування демократичного українського суспільства.

Ключові слова: державність національна, національна держава; індуктивна пізнавальна стратегія, гіпотетико-дедуктивна пізнавальна стратегія, синтетична пізнавальна стратегія.

Аннотация

Янушевич И. А. Проблемы построения национальной государственности и формирования демократического украинского общества. – Статья.

Государственная политика наполняет смысловым содержанием понятия «нация» и «национальная государственность». Стратегия построения национальной государственности требует теоретического обоснования. В статье рассматривается вопрос влияния государственной политики на выбор пути построения национальной государственности и формирование демократического украинского общества.

Ключевые слова: государственность национальная, национальное государство, индуктивная познавательная стратегия, гипотетико-дедуктивная познавательная стратегия, синтетическая познавательная стратегия.